

## Chapter 2

# Critiquing Anthropocentrism

### Implications for Rights and Responsibility for Others

#### 2.1 Introduction: Recognition of Shared Vulnerability

The chapter is focused on exploring the following:

- How can policymakers develop agreement on (a) what constitutes and (b) supports wellbeing of the planet, rather than the gross domestic product of a nation state (Stiglitz, Sen and Fitoussi 2010)?
- It discusses thinking and practice to test out ‘technologies of humility’ (Jasanoff, S. 2003). It suggests the potential for a hybrid bricolage of laws and praxis to enable the transformation of our *designs for living to support biospheres*. Biospheres need to be understood as oceans, rivers, the air we breathe, the earth that supports the food chain and the universe of which we are a part. In other words, this reframed definition extends beyond the original definitions of that which was outside the boundaries of a nation state. Instead, it locates nation states within the regional biosphere which sustains them. Caretaking needs to be rooted in many kinds of knowledge, in order to:
  - *Decentre* anthropocentrism and
  - *Address* the convergent social, cultural and economic crisis.
- The challenge is to *promote* an *ever-extending* or *widening circle of solidarity in order to care for* the next generation of life. It also requires the creation of new global narratives arising out of a cross-pollination of spiritual ideas from a range of religious and spiritual practices. This appreciation of narratives could inform discursive engagement to help establish ethical processes to support wellbeing (Braun et al. 2010) at a post-national level. This requires discursive engagement as well as participatory governance to enable accountability and whistleblowing on the misuse of power or resources.

Expanding pragmatism (McIntyre-Mills 2009a, b) is based on considering the consequences for the environment—on which we depend—could make it possible to scale up universal concerns. One of the reasons we remain within the *lobster pot of contained thinking* is through *being trapped by narrow pragmatism*, based on thinking about the consequences only for our own group at the expense of others through

colonialism, imperialism or economic globalisation. The way out of the lobster pot is through expanded pragmatism that considers the benefits of balancing individual and collective interests through socio-cultural solidarity and collective action for this generation of life and the next.<sup>1</sup>

But that draws the line at extremist forms of diversity, rooted in, for example, economic or religious fundamentalism.<sup>2</sup>

## 2.2 Non-anthropocentric Sense of Time, Space, Solidarity and Identity

The time for change—perhaps the great transformation—predicted by many—but ignored by most nation states and their citizens—has arrived. Change requires necessity, desire and will (see Bogue 1989 on Deleuze and Guattari). The problem is that a global covenant (Held 2004) needs to create an architecture for stewardship. There is nothing more powerful than idea whose time has come—anthropocentric approaches to consuming the planet are no longer sustainable (Elkington 1994, 1997; Mathews 1991; Goodall 2011).<sup>3</sup>

### 2.2.1 *Expanding Our Sense of Identity and Solidarity with Others*

Ethics, democracy governance and law rest on ensuring that freedom and diversity are supported to the extent that freedom and diversity are not undermined. Different forms of interaction need to be combined within a cycle from policy deliberation to direct voting on policy issues to representative votes for candidates who stand on the basis of political platforms that emerge from regional dialogues. Once elected and in federal parliament, candidates need to remain accountable agents. They could be held to account by means of ongoing flows of information from the local governments in the regions they represent.

The nation state cannot secure either wellbeing or resilience without a wide internationalist perspective and ‘global covenant’ (Held 2004). By according respect to others and the environment, we will ensure the essential requirements for

<sup>1</sup> The chapter extends a paper entitled: A way out of the lobster pot (McIntyre-Mills 2012).

<sup>2</sup> On April 5, 2011, the sound of the radio alarm. In half sleep, I heard the newsreader say that Obama had been overruled and that the trial for one accused of the September 11 attacks will be held at Guantanamo Bay and not in a civilian court. In the next breath, the newsreader spoke of the burning of the Koran and how this led to deaths in Afghanistan. With whom and what do we identify as human beings? We are co-determined by one another and the land and we live with creatures and design ways of life for which we are inherently responsible.

<sup>3</sup> [http://www.voiceless.org.au/About\\_Us/Media\\_Releases/jane\\_goodall\\_and\\_michael\\_kirby\\_join\\_animal\\_think\\_tank\\_voiceless\\_as\\_patrons.html](http://www.voiceless.org.au/About_Us/Media_Releases/jane_goodall_and_michael_kirby_join_animal_think_tank_voiceless_as_patrons.html); accessed 21/11/2011.

a life worth living. If we accept human rights, then we need to accept regionalist approaches that ensure a decent quality of life, including decent standards of living and decent work standards with which the public, private and non-government organisations will be required to comply within regionalist post-national federations. Nevertheless, as Leonard (2011) stresses, the system of governance must never be so large that it cannot be held to account. If several federalist courts were established in overlapping regions, then systems of governance—guided by the global axioms that decisions cannot be taken that undermine the rights of others or future generations—could develop many forms of cross-cutting representation and accountability. The notion of human agency through bottom-up whistle-blowing<sup>4</sup> (McIntyre-Mills 2011b, c) to achieve ‘multilevel and multimodal regulation through governance’ was discussed at the International Sociological Association Conference: ‘Democratic Participation in Employment and Societal Regulation’ at the École Normale Supérieure in Paris (27–30 June) hosted by the International Sociological Association. The focus was on the social, economic and environment crisis. It was held in the Marie Curie theatre in 36° heat wave. As a result of compartmentalization and disciplinarity, little attention has been paid to climate change by sociologists, with the exception of those such as Lever-Tracey (2008, 2010). It reminded me of the heat wave in Europe in 2003 and South Australia in 2008 when people—particularly the elderly—died. On a flight from Paris to Indonesia (via Heathrow and the public sector strikes), I reminded myself that by travelling I contributed to the carbon footprint and was thus part of the problem, even if ironically the conferences were framed as part of the dialogue for change! Academic conferences need to be conducted in local spaces with digital linkages that are well supported by the socially, environmentally and technically literate. It is a problem that face-to-face conferences are not as yet carbon neutral. Instead, the events as they are currently designed are part of the problem, rather than part of the solution.

Urban life in Europe is becoming more like Asia and Africa. In Paris, the street sellers of tourist trinkets reminded me of the hawkers in Jakarta, Manila and Johannesburg. But unlike the bricolage of found materials used in Africa or the natural resources in Jakarta—woven baskets, wooden artifacts or a bricolage of wire and recycled tin, the icons of the Eiffel tower sold on the streets of Paris are manufactured in factories and sold to the street hawkers—many of whom are from French colonial Africa. The technocratic turn has already been taken in Europe—where democratic

<sup>4</sup> The pea and the thimble trick was played at country fairs at the turn of the century and continues to be played out on a much wider scale today. The idea is to guess which thimble the pea is under. Let us consider the pea and thimble trick as a metaphor for understanding (a) the movement of information, (b) the export and import of resources (including energy or capital) or (c) the allocation of carbon credits. If you add more thimbles (nation states, public, private and volunteer sectors) and enable peas (commodities) to move rapidly from thimble to thimble, it becomes increasingly difficult to manage the size of the carbon footprint (McIntyre-Mills 2010). The ‘zero sum’ approach has been reflected in the legal and governance system. Law can be characterized as monist, dualist or based on harmonization as detailed in Identity, Democracy and Sustainability (McIntyre-Mills and De Vries 2011). The ability of corporations to cover their tracks and to accumulate wealth through moving assets to tax havens is another way in which the social contract is eroded. This was described as ‘the pea and thimble trick’ in which assets are moved rapidly across national boundaries (McIntyre-Mills and De Vries 2011).

election was replaced by merely appointing leaders, for example, Greece, in order to ensure that austerity measures were applied.

Europe and Africa are *more than* borderlands (Balibar 2006), just as Australia and Asia are regional neighbours. Reciprocal rights form the basis for the social contract which protects citizens, but not those who are voiceless.<sup>5</sup> The economy has focused on economic productivity, instead of social, economic and environmental wellbeing (Stiglitz 2010) and resilience. The EU for all its failings provides some lessons for enhancing solidarity. It remains a work in progress. It is corporatist and participation remains limited. The challenge is to ensure that regionalist, federalist constitutions do not erode welfare and that the economy supports democratic participation in communities and companies (Szell 2010; Garibaldi and Telljohann 2004) that protect the environment on which we depend.

Governments cannot simply 'plan from above,' using master narratives. Global citizens need to share narratives to include those who are to be affected by decisions. The basic biological needs of food, energy and water are primary to everyone. Human survival requires livable cities supported by regional biospheres. Human culture shapes the environment (Hulme 2009, 2011).

The cosmopolitan argument is supported by second-order cybernetics. Von Foerster (1995) argues that 'A is better off when B is better off.' The caveat needs to be added—'provided B does not wish to eliminate A or the conditions of life to support A!' This axiom sums up the argument for democracy and governance based on caretaking that is developed in the paper. Thus, for science and democracy, we need a structure, or constitution-spanning nation states (Habermas 2001), to buttress the conditions that will foster a willingness to be open, to consider the possibility of 'contingency and irony' (Rorty 1989)—and to see the humanity of others with all our own failings—as a precursor to solidarity with others—including sentient beings.<sup>6</sup> The revised Lisbon Treaty supports constitutional rights and responsibilities

<sup>5</sup> The past president Sarkozy described asylum seekers escaping the food crisis in Africa as a 'tsunami of refugees.' According to the debate at that time in the European parliament, the introduction of immigration checks to control the asylum seekers fleeing the drought in Tunisia was potentially threatening the union. The Alliance of Liberals and Democrats said that they would fight the re-introduction of checks. If nation states retreat within nationalist agendas, they will still have to address the human rights concerns of refugees crossing borders to which all the EU states subscribe. It is debatable to what extent a socialist prime minister of France will succeed in addressing social and environmental justice. What are the implications of so-called technocrats introducing austerity measures to conserve a currency? The safety net of social security for the very poor has been removed—driving people to protest the consumption by global elites. What are the implications of jeopardizing democracy through top-down forms of governance that override participatory democracy and the xenophobic responses to asylum seekers?

<sup>6</sup> If we accept human rights, then we need to accept regionalist approaches that ensure a decent quality of life, including decent standards of living and decent work standards with which the public, private and non-government organisations will be required to comply. If we accept that as human animals our survival is linked with the survival of many other forms of life, then we will re-think our role as caretakers living within nation states that are located within overlapping regions for which we are all responsible. Choices need to be made in ways that respect local identities which encompass 'religion, morality, politics and aesthetics' (West Churchman 1979, 1982). These human values (called the 'enemies within' by West Churchman 1979) filter the way in which we

spanning the nation states of the EU. But the problem is that the balance between individual and collective concerns needs to be redressed, if the potential for protecting the environment and social justice is not be lost in the wake of the global financial crisis. The social contract is anthropocentric—giving rights to those who meet limited criteria set by the state. The risks of limiting public policy to protect only those within the mantle of the state will risk the very fabric of life and the wellbeing of all.

The imposition of values and a lack of acceptance of debate is the first step in the direction of totalitarianism. The conundrum is this—all dialectics move through a cycle of thesis, antithesis and then synthesis, but synthesis is problematic—who decides what constitutes an adequate synthesis? The tension of the dialectic needs to be ongoing—a moving dialogue that is always in the process of ‘unfolding’ (West Churchman 1982) as an open, critical system that enables freedom and diversity to the extent that diversity for some does not undermine the very fabric of the system. This is where the line needs to be drawn in law to protect the global commons (framed as sacred biosphere for the collective good). The core ethical axiom ought to be that we can be free and diverse to the extent that we do not undermine the right to freedom and diversity. Arguably, the consumption that has prevailed is unacceptable in many modern democracies. It is arguably appropriate to reign in consumption if stewardship and a non-anthropocentric approach to ecological governance are to be achieved (Mathews 1991; Rose 1996, 2004). How to reduce consumption in a socially and sustainable and just manner is the subject of current research on ways to implement social, economic and environmental changes outlined in ‘Identity, Democracy and Sustainability’ and ‘Transformation from Wall Street to Wellbeing’.

The EU needs to live up to the promise of the principle of subsidiarity and further develop the potential of the Aarhus Convention (1998) to enable poorer citizens who have borne the brunt of austerity measures to participate and to access information freely (McIntyre-Mills 2011b).

Democracy is coming to mean much more than periodic elections—though nothing less. It means the permanent public scrutiny and restraint of power, wherever it is exercised in the domestic and cross border fields of government and civil society. (Keane, 2009a, p. 6)<sup>7</sup>

The Aarhus Convention provides a means to enable the Lisbon Treaty (2009)<sup>8</sup> to address the concerns of local residents who wish to have access to information and

---

see the world. Critical thinking that draws on many kinds of knowing can help to enhance our praxis (McIntyre-Mills 2006a, b, c). A Chinese engineering student at Adelaide University stressed that he feeds stray cats ‘just to keep her alive ... she is very afraid, but now she comes to me when I call.... I also have a poodle dog ... they are also my friends. I will live here in Adelaide. But my other home is still China’.

<sup>7</sup> Keane, J. 2009a. Democracy failure: The root of the global economic crisis is political. [http://scholar.google.com.au/scholar?cites=16220241904322824583&as\\_sdt=2005&sciodt=0,5&hl=en](http://scholar.google.com.au/scholar?cites=16220241904322824583&as_sdt=2005&sciodt=0,5&hl=en); accessed March 31, 2011.

<sup>8</sup> [http://europa.eu/lisbon\\_treaty/index\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu/lisbon_treaty/index_en.htm) ‘The Treaty of Lisbon entered into force on 1 December 2009. It provides the EU with modern institutions and optimised working methods to tackle both efficiently and effectively today’s challenges in today’s world. In a rapidly changing world, Europeans look to the EU to address issues such as globalisation, climatic and demographic changes, security and energy’; accessed 5/06/2012.

the right to be heard about their local concerns for the environment. Currently, only environmental issues are covered by the convention. Florini (2003)<sup>9</sup> mentioned the liberative potential for this convention. McIntyre-Mills and De Vries (2011) have suggested ways that this environmental convention, together with the United Nation Local Agenda 21 (1992), could support triple bottom line accounting and also the local representation of residents. Thus by combining already existing laws, conventions, treaties and agendas, social movements from below could pressure governments that tend to represent narrow party interests—could be persuaded to apply a new fabric of law to protect social and environmental justice. This could enable broad-based post-national regional participation to ensure that social, economic and environmental considerations underpin the governance of biospheres. Several responses to climate change are needed, including:

- Narratives to decentre anthropocentric ideas and expand a sense of space and time beyond national identity to consider future generations of life on the planet. By creating shared narratives, we could help to create socio-cultural webs of meaning that support quality of life (McIntyre-Mills 2000, 2010; Szell 2004, 2010).<sup>10</sup>

Moral progress is a matter of wider and wider sympathy. It is not a matter of rising above the sentimental to the rational. Nor is it a matter of appealing from lower, possibly corrupt, local courts to a higher court which administers and a historical, incorruptible, transcultural moral law. (Rorty 2000, pp. 82–83; cited by Precht 2007)

For Rorty (2000), the conundrum is that if social truth is not merely found—it is co-created through engagement with others and creating greater understanding of one another. But even from this perspective, it is only possible within the framework of a system that upholds justice. The principle of subsidiarity within the EU needs to be more than rhetoric *and applied* if the Treaty of Lisbon is to succeed in giving local people a say in governance rather than lapsing into a technocracy (O'Neill 2011).

<sup>9</sup> The potential of the Aarhus Convention (1998) is raised by Florini (2003) and provides an example of a cultural shift and indicates that we do have the capability to act as stewards. This convention provides a starting point, albeit a work in progress example of how to scale up social and environmental justice. According to Crossen and Niessen: '[It] ... does not create a substantive right to a healthy environment. Rather the Convention creates procedural rights to assert the 'right to live' in and environment adequate to his or her health and wellbeing (they cite the preamble Para 7). To have meaning ... a substantive right must be accompanied by the ability to seek enforcement of that right'. It provides the right to citizens of the EU to have a say irrespective of where they are working. This could and should be scaled up regionally in federalist structures supported by the legal system.

<sup>10</sup> 'The Lisbon agenda speaks of a knowledge-based society. The biggest economic sectors in the world today are agriculture, IT, health/care, entertainment, tourism which are at the same time the weakest in regard to unionization. Performance is certainly the issue of today, but also quality. And quality of life and working life are actually the most important targets of the Rio and Lisbon agendas... we need a kind of socio-cultural revolution...' (Zell 2010, p. 706).

- International governance that ensures sustainable approaches need to be applied across nations, regions and post-national regions. Federalist responses need to ensure regional areas co-operate and do not compete for resources, such as water. The River Murray in Australia was under threat during the drought in 2010 as upstream states considered the rights of their voters at the expense of downstream states. This is a challenge that the states within the Federation of Australia need to manage more effectively. It is also a challenge that will be faced at a post-national level.
- Direct action by individuals, households and communities that could be supported through invoking the Aarhus Convention.
- Subsidies to foster research and new Green responses to aid.
- Market responses that taxes carbon in ways that send a strong message to polluters.

## 2.3 Co-creating Shared Priorities Through Narratives and Laws to Protect the Biosphere

How do we move from ‘us them’ approaches based on competition? How far can solidarity be extended? Intelligent, sentient animal life requires protection, and we need to lower our carbon footprint and we need to avoid destroying biodiversity. This has wide-ranging implications for reframing anthropocentric culture through re-considering what constitutes sustainable living, through applying the human sustainability index on being, doing, having and interacting (Max-Neef 1991). Indicators that will help to test social, economic and environmental decisions need to be co-created on the basis of narratives, in order to establish whether they support a sustainable future for the planet. Several responses to climate change are needed. Engagement of the public through narratives and conversation in the spirit of ‘truth and reconciliation’ (based on amnesty towards greed) could be a first step to new post-national constellations, which need to be buttressed in law to protect biospheres.

Some lessons can be garnered from truth and reconciliation processes, a way to move forward (Abegunrin 2002, p. 32; Olayiwola 2002).<sup>11</sup> As a first step, truth and

---

<sup>11</sup> Relationships between male and female and between human beings of the same gender are still issues that are fraught in many parts of the world. In Africa, homophobia can be used as an excuse for violence. A bill to outlaw same-sex relationships has been drafted in.... In Australia, a bill for same-sex marriage has not been passed. Relationships between human beings and animals: implications for humanism and cultural identity. Zuma has declared that it is a Western trait to walk dogs and to take them to the vet. He asks, how can we treat animals better than humans? Humanist exhortations to achieve human rights at the international level have not achieved a narrowing the gap between haves and have-nots. The Millennium Goals remain a dream. Thus, the question of how scarce resources ought to be spent is important, as is the issue of corruption and misappropriation of funds on a grand scale. In Australia, livestock can be transported. The so-called live meat trade has outraged those who support animal rights. But in New Zealand, it is banned.



reconciliation processes need to be held spanning nation states, in order to discuss ways to achieve social and environmental justice.

An elaborate set of indicators could help to measure the implications of governance decisions not only within the boundaries of a nation state, but at a post-national level. Rising sea levels may have greater immediate impact on Tuvalu than on Australia, but the long-term implications of carbon emissions will impact the global commons and affect the wellbeing of everyone as we consume resources to fuel an unsustainable lifestyle (Odum 1996).

Amnesty is vital as a precursor for conversations dedicated to human survival that precede the institution of monitory democracy. Diverse democratic governance strategies for working at this level need to be explored, ranging from:

- Narrative to explore complexity (Atkinson 2002; Hulme 2010, 2011; Wadsworth 2010; McIntyre-Mills 2003, 2008a, b, c; Ng 2011), which are a precursor to populate open access software that maps the perceptions (as it is used by local residents).
- More structured approaches to dialogue (Beer 1994; Christakis and Bausch 2006).
- Approaches that (a) measure the implications of policy design choices (Murray et al. 2007) and (b) straddle all these aspects at different stages of a cyclic process.

### ***2.3.1 Recognizing the Implications for Our Individual and Collective Rights and Responsibilities***

New forms of monitory democracy and governance—that could enable creative, responsive transformation and the emergence of new relationships—are central for transformation from Wall Street to wellbeing. Respecting biodiversity requires re-thinking discourses on democracy and governance (Kivisto and Faist 2007, p. 18). Policies need to support the United Nations Convention on Corruption and the European ‘Whistle Blowing legislation’ (see also Brown 2008) through Held’s (2004) ‘Global Covenant’ spanning, post-national federations serve regions (drawing on the potential and pitfalls of the Lisbon Treaty) and mindful of the implications for the UN Millennium Goals and the Paris Convention on International Aid.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>12</sup> The Paris Declaration and Accra Agenda for Action ‘are founded on five core principles, born out of decades of experience of what works for development, and what doesn’t. These principles have gained support across the development community, changing aid practice for the better: It is now the norm for aid recipients to forge their own national development strategies with their parliaments and electorates (ownership); for donors to support these strategies (alignment) and work to streamline their efforts in-country (harmonisation); for development policies to be directed to achieving clear goals and for progress towards these goals to be monitored (results); and for donors and recipients alike to be jointly responsible for achieving these goals (mutual accountability)’. [http://www.oecd.org/document/18/3343,en\\_2649\\_3236398\\_35401554\\_1\\_1\\_1\\_00.html#Pars](http://www.oecd.org/document/18/3343,en_2649_3236398_35401554_1_1_1_00.html#Pars); accessed on July 2011.



Reframing the nature of representation, and accountability, is vital for a culture of post national resilience. Central to cultural transformation is our ability to identify with others and to develop a sense of solidarity and compassion for sentient beings. The culture of identifying the worth of human–animal relationships (Sharpe 2005) and animal rights cannot be dismissed as a hysterical privileged viewpoint—after all, we are human animals. If the rights of sentient beings are acknowledged (Kirby 2011; Nussbaum 2006; White 2002), it could lead to a complete re-design of ethics, democracy and governance buttressed through international law and post-national legislation.

Living sustainably in large cities requires food, energy and water. How can burgeoning cities within nation states in a region continue to maintain unsustainable living as the farming land shrinks? According to Adib Muhammed Abdushomad, ‘everyone in Jakarta is in search of a village.



View of a city neighbourhood within Jakarta

They want to hear the sound of animals and to breathe fresh air'. This observation was made as we moved slowly through the traffic en route to the village where we were guests of the University of Indonesia. As the cars, bikes and four-wheel drives approached a village, they snaked off the highway. At the point of exit from the main road, we paid a toll, we passed the many little houses in which we saw people sitting on chairs eating a meal, celebrating a wedding in the forecourt of a home or leading a water buffalo into a field. As we came to the end of the village road where it re-connected with the highway, we paid another toll. This provided a way in which the village could earn a small payment for the many 'returning' to village life at the weekend. Many living in Jakarta buy land, which makes villagers vulnerable to competition for access to a patch of earth. Those who lose out to the weekenders who can afford to buy property are forced away from the land in order to make a living in the megacity of Jakarta.

The outcry about the transport of live cattle to Jakarta by the Greens and Animal Rights supporters is not shared up north—in Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal cattle country. The animal rights lobbyists (Sorensen and Watson 2011) are 'the bleeding-heart liberals from down south' according to those in the cattle country (Lynch 2011). New Zealand has already banned live meat transport—all its meat is refrigerated, but the poor in Jakarta, for example, have no refrigeration. A precedent has been set by the Lisbon Treaty to ensure that all farm animals are treated with dignity.<sup>13</sup> The EU already provides minimal conditions for the farming and transport of farm animals, and New Zealand has banned live meat transport. The social contract until recently has tended to focus on giving rights to those who meet limited criteria set by the state. The risk of limiting public policy to protect only those within the mantle of the state is problematic. Furthermore, contracts to protect non-human life and the land need to be given more attention in non-anthropocentric treaties signed by caretakers at the national and post-national level.<sup>14</sup> If the rights of the land and

---

<sup>13</sup> Sentient beings, including farm animals, need to be accorded rights rather than commodified, as suggested by European Commission working groups. The Treaty of Lisbon considers such basic quality of life concerns, such as the transport and farming of animals and the way in which they are slaughtered. 'EU legislation on slaughtering practices aims to minimise the pain and suffering of animals through the use of properly approved stunning and killing methods, based on scientific knowledge and practical experience. The first Council Directive 74/577/EC on stunning animals before slaughter was replaced in 1993 by Council Directive 93/119/EEC covering a wider range of animals and slaughter circumstances. The Commission adopted 18 September 2008 a proposal for a Council Regulation that aims at replacing the present legislation. The proposal was adopted by Council in June 2009 on Animal welfare legislation in particular concerning Farm animals (98/58 EC)—general rules for the protection of animals of all species during transport and at the time of slaughter or killing'. [http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/welfare/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/welfare/index_en.htm); URL accessed on 1 June 2011. In June 2013, abattoirs in Indonesia were given the all clear by Australian authorities. Cattle had been banned from being sold to Indonesia until they complied with Australian standards. Animals Australia stressed that the cruel treatment comprising gouging and prodding sensitive parts of the animal had been photographed. The response was that the authorities would investigate if they were 'Australian' cattle and whether compliance had been achieved!

<sup>14</sup> *Demographic transition through enhancing capabilities and empowering the strategic rights of women*. Through empowering women and accepting diversity within human relationships. This

Systemic Ethics and Non-Anthropocentric Stewardship  
Implications for Transdisciplinarity and Cosmopolitan  
Politics

McIntyre, J.

2014, XIX, 183 p. 9 illus. in color., Hardcover

ISBN: 978-3-319-07655-3