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Introduction

When all the trees have been cut down, when all the animals have been hunted, when all the waters are polluted, when all the air is unsafe to breathe, only then will you discover you cannot eat money.

—Cree prophecy

The root of happiness is ethical behaviour.

—Kamran Mofid

Indignez vous! (Cry Out!)
—Stéphane Frédéric Hessel, French wartime resistance hero, born in 1917, “cried out” against Nazism in the 1940s. Today, he calls on people to “cry out against the complicity between politicians and economic and financial powers” and to “defend our democratic rights.”

The first version of this manuscript was presented on August 20, 2009, at a conference in Honolulu, Hawai’I, and has been developed further since then almost daily (the first version was presented at the 13th Annual Conference of Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies, August 20-22, 2009).

In 2010, I wrote another book, about deep paradigm shift, about how we can dignify all relationships, from love, sex, and parenthood to world affairs. I had worked on that book for years. It starts with the following paragraph:

The economic crisis that broke in 2008 has changed the path of this book. The crisis has many labels ranging from “subprime crisis” to “credit crunch,” to “financial tsunami” or “economic Armageddon,” preceded by an “Enron crisis,” possibly leading up to a “credit default swap crisis.” But, around the world, people are coming to a single diagnosis: “Something is deeply unhealthy in our world.” Even one year earlier, most people I met were much more accepting: “The world is as it is, and if we want to be competitive, we should work harder and not complain!”

When I ask about the reasons for the crisis, people point to greed and lack of morality. However, let us ask: Is it greed? Is it immorality? The bank employees I know tell me that they are under extreme pressure to maximize profit and that this pressure has increased since the crisis began, to the point that some can no longer endure it. Managers report that they will lose their jobs if they do not place short-term shareholder value first. All seem to be victims to a mind-set that races toward crisis by default. If there is unethical behavior, it is nourished by the very design of our systems. It appears that the roots of our crises are more complex and systemic than one-dimensional and personal. Could lack of dignity be a systemic challenge?
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In spring 2011, I added the following paragraph to this manuscript:

We need a dignity revolution, and not just in Tunisia or Egypt. Now we need a global dignity revolution, a world dignity movement, a movement that creates inclusion, both locally and globally. We need a dignity movement that forges global public policies and institutions that help dignity to manifest in our realities. We need to transcend policies and institutions that cause the sellout of dignity, that “exclude people from access to dignified lives, both socially and economically,” and that environmental damage invisible by treating it as mere “externality.” If we do not succeed with such a dignity revolution (or refolution, the word that Timothy Ash coined), we might engineer yet another collapse, as Jared Diamond describes it, this time a global collapse of human civilization.

A few months later, the Occupy Wall Street movement may be just this refolution, at it looks like it for now, October 2011. As any paradigm shifting movement, it risks being co-opted into the old paradigm, and if this happens, it will have to be repeated. Politicians from all camps seem to have problems understanding it; they believe it is about frustrated voters, or the middle class losing jobs. Yet, much more is at stake. Dignity is at stake. The dignity of people, the dignity of all living beings, the dignity of our planet. We humans need to earn our welcome on our planet. And so far, we have blown it. So far, we are going down a ravaging path. Easter Island seems to be the model we follow, or how to deplete resources, get at each others’ throats, and destroy our social and ecological carrying capacity in the process.

Everybody asks is: But what do they want, these people who occupy Wall Street? What is their message? My advice: “Dreams come a size too big, so that you can grow into them.” This is a sentence that can serve as a common starting ground. Big paradigm shifts cannot be formulated as “small changes” within the old paradigm. What is needed is a joint brainstorming big scale.

We need new words, new language, new linguistic anchors for that refolution (Timothy Ash drew it together from revolution and reform). What about inclusionism (Linda Hartling’s coinage), or dignism (Evelin Lindner’s coinage), rather than communism or capitalism? What about “humanizing globalization with egalization”? What about globegalization (Evelin Lindner’s coinage)?

We all remember the stories of how native people were given shiny but worthless glass beads, and mind-fogging liquor, and how they gave away their valuables in exchange. It was a double raid, first their valuables were taken from them, second, even their souls were taken from them, since they were co-opted into agreeing to being raided.

This is what we do today, as humankind, we agree to being raided. Today, we are “the Indians.” We leave the world to speculators who make us believe their gambling is good for us.

As a result, we live in times of meltdowns—from the financial meltdown that shocked the world in 2008, to the Fukushima meltdown in Japan in 2011—all fully avoidable meltdowns if it were not for the profit maximizing motive. Such meltdowns are breathtaking. Yet, there are other meltdowns— less overtly shocking, more hideously creeping—that should alarm us even more: we witness the long-term global meltdown of
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our ecological and social carrying capacities. Our ecological habitats degrade together with our global social cohesion. Lack of global social cohesion can translate into global terrorism, and this, in turn, can combine all meltdowns in ways that dwarf September 11, 2010.

In the wake of the dignity revolutions in the Arab World and Osama bin Laden’s demise, many people in the West react with a triumphalism that reminds of the end of the Cold War and sometimes appears to reach back to colonialist sentiments of superiority. However, perhaps the West would benefit from more humility, warns journalist Matthias Matussek in May 2011: “If enlightenment is the way out of self-inflicted immaturity, we must admit: it has failed,” he writes, and continues:

The market has us in its grip more firmly than ever any church had. It has sewn price tags on us and removed the dignity of each of us. At the same time building this rational world is inextricably linked to a significant degree of irrationality. We breed the genetically improved potato turbo, but every day 30,000 people die of hunger. We drill into the seabed, we cut down the forests and exploit nature until ecosystems tip over, and species die out. Yes, what we do is that we subjugate nature to a degree that it breaks down panting under us. Or we deliver us to a technology that can destroy us, as we are seeing now in Fukushima. It is a mystery to me where the pride for this form of reason comes from.”

“The history of the world economy has proved that nothing is so reliable as the triumph of the free market – over reason,” unfortunately, this sentence by octogenarian speaker Dieter Hildebrandt in Germany, seems to be a fitting motto for current times. Nadine Gordimer, famous South African writer, describes how the same people who were brave in the struggle against apartheid, who were brave when in prison, fail to be brave in the face of money and have become corrupt.

Do we wish to live in a world were even the psyches of babies are manipulated for money? AdWeek reports that “desperate” marketers from Disney to Versace are aggressively targeting babies up to three years olds. Studies show that American children can recognize an average of 100 brand logos by the age of three, and that some babies “request brands as soon as they can speak.” And because 80% of children under the age of five surf the internet regularly, online advertisement campaigns are heavily investing in this new trend of advertising.

Must not we draw serious lessons? Must not we, as a human species, transcend our blind acceptance of self-destructive dogmas? Is it really necessary, for example, to maximize profit at all cost, even at the cost of meltdowns? If the current use of “reason” is unsustainable for our collective future as a human species, should we not envisage deep change rather than symptomatic placation?

What could be done? Clearly, we wish to steer clear of the oppressive communism of a North-Korea. We also wish to steer clear of the de-solidarization that flows from extreme Wallstreet capitalism. But what then? Linda Hartling suggests inclusionism. I suggest dignism (or dignitism, this is a term that starts with dignity, from there it goes to dignity-ism, then to dignitism, and at last, to the shortest form, namely, dignism). Both terms, inclusionism, and dignism, could also be called an “ethical economy” or a “plural
Unity in diversity and the subsidiarity principle are central to inclusionism and dignism. We, as humankind, should not allow for unity to degrade into uniformity (oppressive communism, for example), and we should not allow for diversity to degrade into the division of everybody-against-everybody and the extreme individualism that we see in de-solidarizing capitalist contexts. Subsidiarity is the suitable principle for making unity in diversity operational.

Is there any one model or initiative anywhere on the globe that could serve as a blueprint for a global system of inclusionism and dignism?

The first draft for this paper was written in the wake of the economic crisis that broke in 2008. Linda M. Hartling and I, we are transdisciplinary social scientists, drawing on many disciplines, ranging from anthropology to psychology to political science. We lead the Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies network (HumanDHS, www.humiliationstudies.org), a global transdisciplinary fellowship of concerned academics and practitioners who wish to promote dignity and transcend humiliation. Our network currently comprises around 1,000 personally invited members, and our website is being accessed by between 20,000 and 40,000 people from 160 to 180 countries per year.

With respect to the role of economy, Harsh Agarwal, member of the HumanDHS network from India, may speak for the innumerable accounts that reach us from all around the world: “Corporates have become the voice of the country on each and every issue while thinkers, philosophers and academicians have lost their voice and have been cornered” (personal communication on February 26, 2010). Our network members observe that the outfall of the economic crisis that broke in 2008 unmasks, more than in the past, the malign aspects and effects of global economic systems that provide the frame for almost all people on the globe. What we hear from all corners of the world is confirming that we need the great transition that Paul D. Raskin et al. (2002) call for. And a great transition means more than simply reforming the status quo.

Linda and I, since we are not economists, hesitate to analyze economic topics. On the other side, we cannot avoid witnessing the humiliating effects of existing economic practices and institutions. Furthermore, since economic structures represent the largest frames within which human activities play out, they are of utmost importance and cannot be overlooked. If the largest frames were to introduce systemic humiliation, in the way apartheid did, this would be extremely significant. Under apartheid, since it was an all-encompassing system, all lives and relationships were tainted with humiliation. It was impossible to dignify apartheid by merely being kinder to each other or creating well-intentioned small-scale initiatives: the entire system had to be dismantled at the appropriate large-scale level. What if today’s apartheid is represented by the fact that (exponential) growth is incompatible with sustainability?

We feel as helpless as the Archbishop of Canterbury, who called for a “rehumanising of economics”, and a “discussion on the relationship between wealth and well-being,” in a debate at the British Library on Tuesday evening, on October 1, 2010. “The Archbishop described himself as an ‘economic illiterate.’ He said the Church had been ‘hypnotised by the assertion of expertise’ on issues related to the economy.”

Linda and I, we try to live up to the words of Òle Danbolt Mjös, past chair of the
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Nobel Peace Prize Committee of the Norwegian Parliament, who wrote this for the book *Gender, Humiliation, and Global Security* (Evelin Gerda Lindner (2010b): “The future of humankind is at stake. In times of crisis, we need people of courage, people who step out of the beaten track of familiarity and look at the situation from a new perspective. Few people have the global experience and transdisciplinary background that Evelin Lindner brings to this task. This book is a wake-up call and a guideline for humanity to follow if it wishes to survive.”

Linda and I, we are encouraged whenever we see that also other people link economy with themes such as dignity or peace. We are encouraged, for example, by the work of The Institute for Economics and Peace (IEP) in Australia. It is “an international research institute dedicated to building a greater understanding of the key drivers and measures of peace and to identifying the economic benefits that increased peacefulness can deliver.”

The IEP institute’s research includes the Global Peace Index (GPI), that methodically ranks 153 countries on their peacefulness.

Michael Heilemann, expert in anti-aggression trainings, concludes from his work in prisons in Germany that present-day forms of casino capitalism have made it almost impossible for “normal people” to obtain an individual sense of worth. He writes, “What can the individual do at all? What is expected is good behavior. To insert oneself into the casting shows and the alimented systems so that one appears as a role model for the conformity of the others—this is rewarded... Otherwise there is little opportunity: a few extreme-charismatics from the under classes may succeed in climbing to the top—but once at the top, they remain cannon fodder. In such a situation, diving into revolution (returning humanity to humans) then remains the reserve of suicide ideas, or highly organized terrorist machineries. Little room for the ‘normal people’!”

For more than three decades, I have been asking people around the world the following question: “How do you think that we, as humankind, must change our world to make it worth living in?” Almost always, I reaped replies that flabbergasted me: “This is too big a question. I am a specialist, not a generalist. Sorry.” Specialization seems to be the shield behind which too many of our most highly knowledgeable experts retreat. In former times, powerful elites hid behind walls, like the Forbidden City in Beijing. Today, we meet smokescreens of complicated “expert language” that fragments reality so that no coherent overall picture can be discerned. There is so much “fog of war” that one is led to wonder whether there is not a covert war of domination going on, even though a visible war in the classical sense is absent.

When we step out of the beaten track and look at the world from a bird’s eye perspective, we find that one does not need to be an expert in economics to hear that critical voices get ever louder. Mainstream media write about “The Rise and Fall of the G.D.P.” and how “the economists messed everything up,” as Alex Michalos, a former chancellor at the University of Northern British Columbia, warns. Renowned scholars, such as Thomas Homer-Dixon, or Immanuel Wallerstein, caution that economies cannot just keep on growing, and that the global economy will not recover, now or ever.

Mervyn King, Head of the Bank of England, said in a speech in New York in 2009 that of the systems one might use to organize banks, “the worst is the one we have today.” He pointed out that Britain’s banks pose unusual risks because they have assets 4.5 times the size of the British economy.

It is, furthermore, illuminating to learn that the amount of pay, at least as it is practiced
at present, does not reflect the true value of a job, and that justifications for high pay may belong to the realm of myth:

- Elite City bankers (earning £1 million-plus bonuses) destroy £7 of value for every £1 they create.
- Hospital cleaners create over £10 in value for every £1 they receive in pay.
- Advertising executives destroy £11 of value for every £1 created.
- Child care workers generate between £7 and £9.50 for every £1 they are paid.
- Tax accountants destroy £47 for every £1 they create.
- Waste recycling workers generate £12 for every £1 spent on their wages.26

One does not need to be an expert in economics to observe the current power-imbalance between global financial markets and national politicians. The “Leaders’ Statement of the G-20 Pittsburgh Summit, September 24 – 25, 2009”27 was very impressive, starting with the sentence: “We meet in the midst of a critical transition from crisis to recovery to turn the page on an era of irresponsibility and to adopt a set of policies, regulations and reforms to meet the needs of the 21st century global economy.” However, after all such promising rhetoric, the disappointing results are for everyone to see.

The reasons are as evident. Financial speculators work as a global collective (The Wallstreet Journal, for example, openly reports how “Hedge Funds Try ‘Career Trade’ Against Euro”28), while national politicians are divided, and their collective action depends on tedious and ineffective processes of consensus-seeking. Evocative headings abound, such as “How Fear of Speculators Drives European Leaders.”29 Halldór Gudmundsson, in his book We Are All Icelanders, warns that the fate of Iceland will catch up with the rest of the world sooner or later, if not much more dramatic changes are implemented than is the case at present.30

One does not need to be an expert in economics to know that throughout history, always new and improved tools and weapons (or methods of making them) gave superior leverage. At present, collective action from the global financial market seems to be the most innovative “weapon” of our time, more effective for achieving domination than any national military equipment. Legendary investor Warren Buffett famously describes derivatives bought speculatively as “financial weapons of mass destruction”31 Buffet also lashes out against those who engineer this new kind of domination, namely “overpaid, unaccountable finance-industry bigwigs.”32

Why are those “bigwigs” still so influential? Bo Lundgren, Sweden’s minister for fiscal and financial affairs, who managed Sweden’s financial crisis in the 1990s, explains how Anglo-Saxon culture falls for dangerous definitions of liberty and freedom.33 As it seems, a culture that defines liberty as unrestrained freedom, including freedom for dominators, does keep precisely those dominators in power, and delivers the broader masses to the role of exploited victims. Only a culture that defines liberty as level playing field protected by appropriate regulations, can protect the common good for all.

Unsurprisingly, currently, collective action in the European Union to regulate financial markets is typically slowed down, for instance, by a veto from the United Kingdom to...
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To protect the City of London. Cultural transformation may be the order of the day.

To appreciate the background of cultural obstacles, it is important to understand how, for example, Anglo-Saxon culture, continental European, and Scandinavian culture differ. Everybody agrees that Anglo-Saxon victory over Nazi Germany was extremely important for the world. The Nazi belief system was enormously disastrous. However, confidence flowing from victory may be in danger of being “happily” misinvested later. It should not be misinvested into an alternative disastrous belief, namely that it could be feasible to define freedom as absence of regulations.

One does not need to be an expert in economics to see that economic crises cannot be remedied by unfettered growth by way of high throughput economies and a nexus of corporations and governments racing to the bottom, and all this at the price of ecological and social unsustainability. The Earth’s ongoing nature losses may soon begin to hit national economies, warns a major UN report, the third Global Biodiversity Outlook (GBO-3). It says that some ecosystems may soon reach “tipping points” where they rapidly become less useful to humanity. “Many economies remain blind to the huge value of the diversity of plants, animals, and other lifeforms and their role in healthy and functioning ecosystems,” said Achim Steiner, executive director of the UN Environment Programme (UNEP). “Happiness has fabricated the illusion that somehow we can get by without biodiversity, or that it is somehow peripheral to our contemporary world. The truth is we need it more than ever, and that we will not have enough of it by the year 2050.” The more that ecosystems become degraded, the UN says, the greater the risk that they will be pushed “over the edge” into a new stable state of much less utility to humankind. For example, freshwater systems polluted with excess agricultural fertiliser will suffocate with algae, killing off fish and making water unfit for human consumption.”

In our work in the Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies network, we always make an effort to understand all sides in an argument, including its extremes. In the case of economics, we began by looking at classics. Henry George (1839–1897), for example, was an American writer, politician and political economist, who was the most influential proponent of the land value tax. Or, Edwin Clarence (E. C.) Riegel (1879–1953), was praised for having delivered “the best explanation of the free market,” he promoted an alternative monetary theory and an early private enterprise currency alternative. Paul Anthony Samuelson (1915–2009) was an American economist, and the first American to win the Nobel Prize in Economics. He was author of the largest-selling economics textbook of all time, Economics: An Introductory Analysis, first published in 1948 and now in its 19th edition. Or, James E. Meade, was a British economist and Nobel Prize Laureate in Economics in 1977 (jointly with the Swedish economist Bertil Ohlin) for his contribution to the theory of international trade and international capital movements. As to the history of interest or usury, we looked at John M. Houkes, who, during his tenure as head of the Management and Economics Library at Purdue Libraries, compiled an exhaustive bibliographic work on this topic.

To acquire a sense of the contemporary Zeitgeist, we always tried to keep our fingers on the pulse of change, for example, how “greed is bad” ever could transmute into “greed is good.” We watched the conservative Americans for Prosperity Foundation’s annual RightOnline Conference as attentively as we read the blog of the recipient of the Nobel Memorial Prize in Economics in 2008, Paul Krugman. Or, we have followed the path.
of Ashoka: Innovators for the Public, a nonprofit organization supporting the field of social entrepreneurship, founded by Bill Drayton in 1981 to identify and support leading social entrepreneurs through a Social Venture Capital approach with the goal of elevating the citizen sector to a competitive level equal to the business sector. On July 25, 2009, we paid a visit to Canadian activist Paul Grignon on Gabriola Island, Canada; he is the author of the animated features *The Essence of Money*, and *Money As Debt I, II, and III*.46

We attended the Thirtieth Annual E. F. Schumacher Lectures in New York City, “Voices of a New Economics,” on November 20th, 2010, in New York City. Speakers were Gus Speth, prominent environmentalist who has been at the forefront of rethinking the connection between the health of the environment and the nature of our economic system, Neva Rockefeller Goodwin, pioneer of contextual economics education at the Global Development and Environment Institute at Tufts University, and Stewart Wallis, executive director of the influential New Economics Foundation (nef) of London.48

Over time, we came to resonate ever more with people who contend that all walks of life are currently “contaminated” by the outfall of harmful large-scale frames, and that a radical overhaul is needed. Margrit Kennedy, an architect who works internationally, is only one voice of many: She laments that her work on ecological architecture, already back in 1982, led her to the discovery that it is “virtually impossible to carry out sound ecological concepts on the scale required today, without fundamentally altering the present money system or creating new complementary currencies.”49

As noted earlier, Linda and I, we would very much have wished to find many experts who could explain the situation to us in an easily accessible way. To our dismay, most people, even people within the field of economy, confess to us that they themselves do not fully understand the workings of the overall economic and monetary systems. It seems that a veil of uncertainty keeps economic dealings in the dark.50

Neva Rockefeller Goodwin, in the above mentioned event on November 20th, 2010, in New York City, was asked by a young man, which business school she would recommend to him, or where he could learn about the real challenges of economy, those that were discussed during that event. She recommended that he should look outside of business schools or economy programs, at anthropology, for instance, or sociology.

Linda and I, we are very encouraged by economist Rodrigue Tremblay and his book on global ethics in 2010.51 He exposes the smokescreen of “expert terminology” in ways that make it less opaque for non-economists.52 We have written to Paul Krugman and others with the idea to create a *Dignity Bank*, a bank that puts money at the service of society and not at the service of profit maximization, a bank that also operates without interest, a bank that nurtures inclusionism and dignism, instead of oppressive communism or extreme Wallstreet capitalism.

However, perhaps it is impossible to put money at the service of society? Perhaps even the most well-meaning initiative in an apartheid-like system is futile? Howard Richards, scholar of peace and global studies and philosophy, for example, contends that the entire system must be dismantled and that all attempts to bring people out of poverty by bringing them into the money market as it is defined today, is doomed.53 The film *Caught in Micro Debt*, shown on Norwegian state television November 30, 2010, underpins Richards’ message, by shedding critical light on the practice of micro lending, which once was hailed as a way forward.54 Howard Richards writes:
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The bottom line, which marks modern civilization as fundamentally defective, as distinct from incidentally troubled, is, as Daniel Quinn, author of *Ishmael*, tells us, whether people share food. Amartya Sen corroborates Quinn’s point in his study of famines and entitlement. In the modern world people starve not because there is no food, but because there is no norm prescribing its sharing, while there are norms separating ownership from need. This is a bottom line that illustrates a key point; it describes not so much what we think as what we presuppose; not so much our scientific conclusions as the mythic normative framework that constitutes the paradigm within which mainstream social scientists do normal social science.55

Social entrepreneur William Drayton said the following about social entrepreneurship: “Our job is not to give people fish, it is not to teach them how to fish, it is to build a new and better fishing industry.”56 It seems that nowadays, more is needed than only a better fishing industry. Is it possible that the basic foundations of our economic structures and monetary systems (or their absence) are at fault?

Douglas Hurd, a former diplomat and conservative foreign secretary in the UK, explains in an interview,57 and in his new book,58 how multilateral institutions (UN, Bretton Woods institutions, NATO) are failing. The opportunity was missed in 1989 of recreating the big institutions of the world, he warns. The world community needs institutions that can deal with climate change, and institutions that can sort out when to intervene in other people’s affairs and when to stay out. These are the “loose canons” that were not settled at the last great settlement in 1945. They must be settled now, Hurd urges.

Paul Krugman and Robin Wells analyze the current situation as follows:

By the late 1940s, most important economies had tightly regulated banking systems, preventing a recurrence of old-fashioned banking crises. At the same time, widespread limitations on the international movement of capital made it difficult for nations to run up the kinds of large international debts that had previously led to frequent defaults. (These restrictions took various forms, including limits on purchases of foreign securities and limits on the purchase of foreign currency for investment purposes; even advanced nations like France and Italy retained these restrictions into the 1980s.) Basically, it was a constrained world that may have limited initiative, but also left little room for large-scale irresponsibility.

As memories of the 1930s faded, however, these constraints began to be lifted. Private international lending revived in the 1970s, making possible first the Latin American debt crisis of the 1980s, then the Asian crisis of the 1990s. Bank regulation was weakened, enabling the mid-1980s savings and loan debacle in the United States, the Swedish bank crisis of the early 1990s, and so on. By the early twenty-first century, the rapid growth of “shadow banks”—institutions like Lehman Brothers that didn’t accept deposits, and so were not covered by conventional banking regulations, but that in economic terms were carrying out banking functions—had recreated a financial system that was as vulnerable to panic and crisis as the banking system of 1930.

As all this happened, proponents of looser regulation extolled the virtues of a more
open system. Indeed, there were real advantages to laxer control: without question, some people, businesses, and governments that would not have had access to credit got it, and some used that credit well. Others, however, ran up dangerous levels of debt. And the old cycle of debt, crisis, and default returned.

Why didn’t more people see this coming? One answer, of course, lies in Reinhart and Rogoff’s title. There were superficial differences between debt now and debt three generations ago: more elaborate financial instruments, seemingly more sophisticated techniques of assessment, an apparent wider spreading of risks (which turned out to have been an illusion). So financial executives, policymakers, and many economists convinced themselves that the old rules didn’t apply.

We should not forget, too, that some people were making a lot of money from the explosive growth both of debt and of the financial industry, and money talks. The world’s two great financial centers, in New York and London, wielded vast influence over their respective governments, regardless of party. The Clinton administration in the US and the Labour government in Britain succumbed alike to the siren song of financial innovation—and were spurred in part by the competition between the two great centers, because politicians were all too easily convinced that having a large financial industry was a wonderful thing. Only when the crisis struck did it become clear that the growth of Wall Street and the City actually exposed their home nations to special risks, and that nations that missed out on the glamour of high finance, like Canada, also missed out on the worst of the crisis.59

A very cogent summary of the predicament of money is given by community economist Thomas Henry Greco, Jr.:

Money is said to serve several functions: it is (1) a generally accepted “medium of exchange,” (2) “a store of value,” (3) a “standard of deferred payment” and, most fundamentally, (4) “a unit of account” or “measure of value” (Dunkman, Wm. E., Money, Credit and Banking, Random House, New York, 1970.) We think we know what we are talking about when we use the word “money,” but in fact we do not. All of the orthodox definitions of money describe its supposed functions and not its essence. Further, because the term “money” is commonly applied to a diverse array of financial instruments which are created in a variety of ways, the whole subject has degenerated into a sea of confusion. It is a curious fact that the problems arising from these contradictory functions, while they have not gone completely unrecognized, have been so completely swept under the rug.60

Michael Hartmann, sociologist at the University of Darmstadt, examined the sociology of elites and came to the conclusion that not psychology (greed), nor the system (lack of regulations), but the interest of those who make the system deserves our attention.61 Indeed, if we were to believe scholar and strategist David J. Rothkopf, a small number (circa 6,000) of largely unelected powerful people around the globe have shaped the world during the past decades in ways that the financial meltdown became possible.62 In the United States, the state of inequality is medieval, says Gar Alperovitz,63 and he is interested to find out what the “prehistorical possibilities of the next great change may
be.” Gar Alperovitz is on the Board of Directors of the E. F. Schumacher Society. It works with the New Economics Foundation (nef) in London to form the New Economics Institute in North America.

When we look at history, then dictators always hijacked systems (Adolf Hitler hijacked the German state institutions, Siad Barre did the same in Somalia, to name just two examples) and, while doing so, they created smokescreens to hide their actions. The walls of the Forbidden City in Beijing represented a straightforward cover, at present, the cover seems to be provided by the complexity of “expert” language selling supposedly “modern innovation” and “progress” that leaves most citizens at a loss of understanding, even first-class thinkers. As reported earlier, when we asked around, during the past years, we were astonished to find only very few people able to provide coherent and comprehensive explanations of how current economic systems work and could lead to crisis.

Futurologist Robert Jungk (1913–1994) wrote about the link between large-scale economies, particularly that of atomic energy, and the danger of totalitarian statehood, contrasting this scenario with the hope that a new global movement will counteract it. Read Robert Jungk (1977), translated by the author:

It is not often that members of a profession warn the public against their own colleagues. That is what happened in August 1977, when over 28 outstanding physicists from 32 countries expressed the following opinions against the influence of physicists in the nuclear debate, after a colloquium of the “Scuola Internazionale Enrico Fermi” on Lake Como: “The most serious problem is that the discussion of these matters is not really taking place among citizens, but is dominated by an elite of professionals ... The operators of nuclear energy accept only those scientists who support the government’s nuclear program ... We urge the public to look at the views of these experts very critically, and not blindly follow the affirmations of all those who claim to know everything (p. 201).

In this new global movement, real participation is possible, as required by the anti-nuclear movement in political life. This includes mutual learning, thorough listening to one another and conversing with each other. In professional life and politics, the drafting of own proposals is encouraged, not just the parroting of others’. Everyone is an irreplaceable “expert” of their own needs and wants. “Participation” is understood not only as having a voice, but also as a co-creation. This takes time, which no longer exists in a society that is characterized by the clock, rationalization, the quest for speed, and the production of ever larger amounts of stuff (p. 208).

In this new movement, there will be no dominant opinion leaders and opinion makers, who, through their rule, cause the original creativity of their colleagues to disappear. A constant stream of energy, coming from many minds and hearts, is liberated: human creative power instead of nuclear power.

Modesty, justice, love of nature and beauty, acceptance of emotionality, participation and liberation of imagination, these are some of the values of a more humane future that are present in the supposedly “only negative” and “destructive” movement against
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nuclear industry and nuclear state (p. 209).

... New independent and self-governing cooperative forms of production that stay clear of artificially driven growth and profit, are emerging in many places, particularly where the failing old economy has led to unemployment.

It is, however, still possible that the penetration of the atomic state will force the new non-violent International [global movement] temporarily in the catacombs. But the technological tyranny is both more powerful and more vulnerable than previous tyrannies. Ultimately, water will be stronger than stone (p. 210).

While we learn that inequalities are unavoidable for “modern innovation” and “progress,” if people are asked directly, they prefer an equal distributions of resources to an unequal distribution. Michael I. Norton and Dan Ariely carried out a survey in the United States, where respondents “dramatically underestimated the current level of wealth inequality” in the U.S. Even more interesting, both republicans and liberals preferred a wealth distribution that resembles that of Sweden over that of the U.S. “All demographic groups—even those not usually associated with wealth redistribution such as Republicans and the wealthy—desired a more equal distribution of wealth than the status quo.”

Through his work in the impact of inequality, Richard G. Wilkinson, scholar of social epidemiology and expert in public health, provides an in-depth treatment of relevant research on the destructive consequences of inequality.

From the large-scale geohistorical perspective that I use in my work, I focus on the circumstances that stimulated raiding cultures to emerge. "When plunder becomes a way of life for a group of men living together in society, they create for themselves, in the course of time, a legal system that authorizes it and a moral code that glorifies it” said French economist Frederic Bastiat (1801-1850). European raiding culture has indeed been identified as backdrop for the current economic crisis. As is also evident from Hartmann’s interview, it is particularly Anglo-Saxon culture that has been the proactive force in this respect at the present point in history. It is telling that it is the business practice of corporate raid that has been associated with values of “greed is good.”

Incidentally, testosterone and money trading are linked in interesting ways, at the core of trading, and through investment bankers’ preference for expensive sex parties. The 2010 documentary Inside Job featured Jonathan Alpert, a New York therapist whose clients include many high-level wall street executives, saying: “These people are risk-takers; they’re impulsive. It’s part of their behavior, it’s part of their personality. And that manifests outside of work as well. It’s quite typical for the guys to go out, to go to strip bars, to use drugs. I see a lot of cocaine use, a lot of use of prostitution.”

In sum, a geohistorical cultural context that enables a raiding culture to flourish, gives space to elites to hijack institutions (the 6,000 people Rothkopf refers to, that Hartmann analyzes, using the strategies that Tremblay summarizes), so as to develop new innovate “weaponry” (CDOs and CDSs, see also Warren Buffett’s comments) to gain world-wide domination for the short-term benefit for those elites but at the long-term detriment of all, including those elites’ children and children’s children. Current economic crisis that further enriches a few creates utterly unsustainable conditions for the entirety of our
socio- and ecosphere.

A certain geohistorical cultural context
that enables a “raiding” culture to flourish
and to hijack institutions
with innovative tools and interventions
leads to domination and exploitation
and if this happens at a global scale, it means the destruction of the entire socio- and ecosphere.

The transition that is needed at the current historical juncture, requires two core loops (using the ideal-type approach
: a large enough group of committed citizens (1) at all levels, from civil society to the gatekeepers of political and economic institutions, must muster sufficient awareness of global responsibility to implement new global institutional frames of inclusionism and dignism (2), new frames that give new form to global institutions that is truly functional for an interdependent world and serves the interest of all of humankind, not the positions of a few.

Institutions (2) have preeminence because decent institutions can drive feedback loops that foster global cooperation in a systemic rather than haphazard way. Any subsequent loop will have the advantage of enjoying the support from the system, no longer only depending on a few gifted individuals.

In this paper, we wish to approach the role of economics and monetary structures for right relationships with the necessary humility, but also with due candidness. We begin with a brief analysis that lists some of the humiliating effects of contemporary economic and monetary arrangements, and end with a “global brainstorming” section.

In times of change, the learners inherit the world, while the learned find themselves beautifully equipped to deal with a world that no longer exists.
—Eric Hoffer, 1902–1983

Brief Analysis

None are more hopelessly enslaved than those who falsely believe they are free.
—Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, 1749–1832

Let us begin this section with a personal letter. It was penned by economy professor Kamran Mofid, founder of the Globalisation for the Common Good (GCG) initiative, on May 20, 2011, in a personal communication:
Dignism, Rather than Communism or Capitalism

Friends,
Do you remember that Margaret Thatcher, the so-called Iron Lady! She told the Brits that she was going to put the “Great” back into the “Great” Britain. Do you remember? Then, she told us this can only happen if we accept and implement the “Washington Consensus”, the so-called dreaded neo-liberalism. She told us that there was no alternative. She told us we will all prosper and develop more fairly and equitably. She won election after elections. Everything was privatised, deregulated, self-regulated. Industry, manufacturing, (the real economy) was destroyed. Instead, the banks and the bankers were encouraged to rule the world. The economists with no principles and values were “bought” and the business schools, such as Harvard and Columbia were showered with money to act as “Cheer Leaders” for the dreaded neo-liberalism (see the Inside Job for evidence). Communities were dis-mantled and dis-organised. We were told that there is nothing as a society and community. We are all in it just for ourselves, we were told. Destructive competition at the expense of life-enhancing cooperation, collaboration and dialogue was greatly prompted. We were told to say no to love, kindness, generosity, sympathy and empathy and say yes to selfishness, individualism and narcissism, as these values will fire the engine of capitalism and wealth creation! In short, the hell with the common good, we were encouraged to believe.\(^79\)

Three problematic practices seem to form the core of current economic difficulties from what we have understood so far:

1. The first problematic practice appears to be connected to the fact that money is created as debt. The United States government, for example, writes bonds. The Federal Reserve Bank, in its books, creates money to buy these bonds and the government promises to honor these bonds by paying back their debts over time. This creates several problems. A core difficulty is connected with what is called consideration. Consideration is a concept of legal value in contract law defined as a promised action or omission of action. A famous court case, the First National Bank of Montgomery versus Jerome Daly case, illustrates the problem. On December 9, 1968, in the Justice Court State of Minnesota, the judge ruled in favor of the debtor Jerome Daly, who had failed to honor his mortgage. Because of failure of a lawful consideration, the bank was prohibited from taking Daly’s assets. The judge deemed it to be illegal for a bank to lend money it does not have, but has simply created virtually in its books.
   “Another important problem with the government writing bonds is that doing so, the government/society consumes today the future surplus from economy (collected in form of taxes). That is like the farmer eating the grains he would need to seed next spring,” comments techno-economics analyst Ulrich Spalthoff.\(^80\)

2. A second difficulty seems to flow from the fractional-reserve system. This system is explained in the leaflet Modern Money Mechanics by the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago.\(^81\) Fractional-reserve banking is a banking practice in which banks keep only a fraction of their deposits in reserve. This practice is universal in
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modern banking.

3. The third problematic practice appears to have to do with how money and debt are connected. Paul Grignon explains: “In the debt money system, money is just a promise to pay the same or more money back. New money = new debt. Debt forces people to be productive and create value to pay off their debts, including the interest, but their new production does not create new money by some magic alchemy, as many people seem to believe. New value = new money makes intuitive sense and is how self-issued credit currencies work. But in our mainstream system new debt to a bank = new money. All money is bank credit, just a promise to pay fiat cash on demand. Therefore every dollar (or whatever currency) has an appointment to be paid back to the bank that created it (demand one). But if it has been loaned again or otherwise invested for gain, it is expected to grow forever (demand two). The two opposing demands can only be reconciled if, directly or indirectly, the investment money is spent to hire the borrower, the money is paid back to the bank, and the borrower’s productivity creates new money-value (not money) in the equity belonging to the investor. However, I think that there is an arithmetic problem here. This system is only compatible with endless growth. What happens is that bank credit money is loaned again either in hard returns as a loan or soft returns as an investment. This makes a perpetual debt as the bank can only be paid off by borrowing from the second lender, the second lender by another loan from a bank ad infinitum. This makes it impossible for this debt to ever be extinguished or even reduced without default. It can only grow. So any attempt to ‘live modestly’ by reducing economic throughput will cause financial collapse. We need to change the mathematics to a system that can adapt to shrinkage just as gracefully as to growth. I have a very detailed proposal how to do so.” Later, Grignon added that some Islamic countries, and some South American countries resist the current trend to global “debt slavery,” such as Malaysia, Brazil, Argentina, or Bolivia. Grignon’s Digital Coin concept has not been tried yet. Alternative currencies are widespread but as of yet, still marginal.

What are the historical roots of the present situation? Anthropologist William Ury drew up a simplified depiction of history (whose core elements are widely accepted in anthropology):

4. simple hunter-gatherers (first 95 percent of human history, if the starting point is set at 200,000 years ago)
5. complex agriculturists (last 10,000 years, evolving from around 12,000 BCE to 5,000 BCE, representing the recent 5 percent of human history)
6. knowledge society (presently in the making)

Human behavior is learned and can thus be unlearned when cultural contexts change (see a discussion of the argument of nature versus culture in chapter 3 of Gender, Humiliation, and Global Security). It is therefore important to analyze the interplay of context and human adaptations throughout human history:
Ad 2. During the past 10,000 years (very roughly), until recent times, the security dilemma was overwhelming and therefore definitorial. The term security dilemma is used in political science (John H. Herz (1950) to describe how mutual distrust can bring states that have no intention of harming one another into bloody war. The security dilemma is tragic because its “logic of mistrust and fear” is inescapable: “I have to amass power, because I am scared. When I amass weapons, you get scared. You amass weapons, I get more scared.”

The security dilemma was predicated on one duality and created a second:

2.1. the security dilemma is predicated on a horizontal duality of inside/outside: in-group (friends) are contrasted with out-group (potential enemies)

2.2. the security dilemma pushes for the vertical duality of up/down that underpins stratified male-dominant “strong-man” dominator models of collectivistic and ranked honor societies: domination/submission has characterized stratified societies of collectivist ranked honor (including gender segregation) throughout the past 10,000 years. The “art of domination” refined this system, with the result that the domination/submission structure became ever more covert, stealthily maintaining traditional elites and creating new elites, with the cultural imperative of profit maximization as its latest expression (see a discussion of the second tenet and its sub-points in Emotion and Conflict and Making Enemies, and further relevant publications listed on www.humiliationstudies.org).

Ad 3. In the English-speaking world, humiliation began to be seen as a hurtful violation of dignity in 1757. At the current point in history, humankind finds itself in the middle of a transition that is as radical as the one that occurred 10,000 years ago. Human rights ideals represent a normative u-turn against the culture of the past ten millennia. While the normative adaptation of the first transition ranked dignity, the second delegitimizes the first and unranks dignity. The human rights ideal of equality in dignity for all is an ethical frame that flows from and facilitates the emergence of an experience of One World.

It seems that the transition from the second to the third period that is unfolding at present, is fraught with confusion. In my book Making Enemies, I use traffic as a metaphor to illustrate this transition:

Using traffic as a metaphor to illustrate the historic evolution of the concept and practice of humiliation and human rights, we see that as long as there was ample space, everybody moved along without taking much notice of the other drivers. Under conditions of abundance, hunters and gatherers enjoyed pristine pride. In early agricultural empires with denser populations, however, the powerful usurped the right to pass first. Honor dictated that big vehicles drove through first at a crossroad, while
the smaller ones waited in due reverence. A master regarded it as legitimate to push out the smaller ones, who accepted this treatment as divinely ordained. Occasionally somebody attempted to acquire a larger vehicle. If he succeeded, he was the new master with all the rights of a master, since revolutions toppled the masters, but not the system. However, apart from the threat of revolution, a threat that required constant attention from the masters, this system rendered a certain extent of public stability, calm, and order. At some point, around the time the word humiliation began to connote violation, a discussion arose (to stay with the metaphor) about managing traffic more effectively by using traffic lights. Equal dignity for all means that every driver, irrespective of the size of the vehicle, has the same rights before the new traffic lights. The size of the vehicle, its color, and its price do not affect the driver’s status or rights.92

Human rights build on the French Revolution’s notion of liberty, equality, and fraternity (brotherhood and sisterhood). Freedom, or liberty, can be defined as “absence of restraint” (absence of traffic rules), or it can be interpreted as “level playing field” (traffic lights regulating crossroads). The first definition is prevalent, for example, in the United States of America, not least since it derives its national pride from rebellion against British control. Removing restraints, however, provides freedom only for a short while, before it undermines it. Freedom defined in such ways legitimizes might is right, which soon curtails freedom: those who are more successful and thus become more resourceful, instead of exposing themselves to free market forces, may invest their newly-won resources into protecting their advantages by coercing and co-opting the less mighty, including political actors (for example, through lobbying or funding political parties), with the aim to push for institutions (traffic rules and signs) that preserve their advantages. Thus the removal of restraints quickly leads to a playing field that is no longer level.

The difference between the hierarchical societies of the past millennia and present world-wide arrangements, as a result, are much less dramatic than human rights rhetoric indicates. Might in the past was only more “frozen” by way of fixed institutions (such as arrangements of feudalism, absolute rule, and so forth), while the modern legitimization is mainly scientific, or a selective use of science by those who benefit (such as Adam Smith’s “invisible hand”93 rather his reflections on “visible hands”94). Both approaches are often legitimized by invoking eternal divine forces—absolute rulers during past millennia claimed that their power was God-given, while the wealthy of today’s world not seldom trust that their wealth is a sign of approval from God. Sociologist Max Weber (1864–1920) connected the religious teachings of John Calvin directly with the rise of capitalism: “Calvin emphasized the doctrine of predestination—the belief that even before they are born, all people are divided into two groups, the saved and the damned, and only God knows who will go to heaven (the elect) and who will go to hell. Because people cannot know whether they will be saved, they tend to look for earthly signs that they are among the elect. According to the Protestant ethic, those who have faith, perform good works, and achieve economic success are more likely to be among the chosen of God…The wealthy can use religion to justify their power and privilege: It is a sign of God’s approval of their hard work and morality.”95

Professor of Philosophy and Religious Studies and Chairperson of the program in
Peace Studies at Radford University in Virginia, Glen T. Martin, comments on the traffic metaphor, specifically on the sentence: “Large and small vehicles (capitalism allows for such differences) all have to stop for the traffic light….the driver of the Rolls Royce as well as the pedestrian has a say (democracy)” as follows:

The model, of course, is an excellent one for democracy and the rule of law but it appears to ignore that fact that the political equality afforded in traditional liberal democracy (you cite Locke: one vote each for the driver of the Rolls Royce and the pedestrian) masks the fact that the driver of the Rolls Royce may have immense political power lacking to the pedestrian. This power is routinely and systematically used to manipulate the laws governing the economic system in his own interests in ways that result in the immense humiliation of global poverty.

The irony may be that the person controlling huge concentrations of private wealth may not be a racist or caught in cultural or other forms of in-group and out-group patterns of humiliation. Our world is dominated behind the scenes (see Ellen Brown’s book96) by immense structural forces of exploitation that have created the horrific world in which 50 percent of the global population live on less than $2 U.S. dollars per day and the richest 225 persons on Earth have a combined wealth equivalent to this bottom 50 percent. I realize that you know these facts well, but my question is how can they be integrated into the interpretative framework of dignity versus humiliation?

Is it possible that that a cultural and legal context that gives primacy to profit maximization intimately connected with the confusion about the term freedom? And is the need for profit maximization built into the monetary system as soon as this system is based on money as debt that needs to be repaid? The result of such a system is that the well-being of people is placed second to monetary gain by design, not by individual choice: an enterprise will go out of business if it foregrounds ethical considerations that hamper profitability. Trust is hence undermined systemically, since one can never be sure which products may be offered merely to fetch profit rather than protect the well-being of people and their environment. Furthermore, scarcity is created and maintained by design, since abundance is not saleable—only scarce products fetch payment.

Is it possible that the three practices listed above help historical pyramid systems evolve into a global one? Such a system gives power to a corporatocracy that is not designed for avoiding environmental destruction or human suffering. Such a system could be called monetary-ism, a covert form of coercion. True freedom and liberty would be illusionary in such a context. Dignity would be violated by default and the system be one of humiliation. No relationships within such a frame could escape its humiliating effects as long as no alternative system is on offer.

Article 1 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) begins with these sentences: “All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood.” As it seems, the human rights ideal of equality in dignity, its promise that all of humankind is part of one single family and that everybody deserves access to equal rights and dignity, is still waiting to be fully realized.

© Evelin G. Lindner, 2009-2011
A sustained level playing field may only be achievable through differentiating between legitimate and illegitimate restraints, and implementing the legitimate restraints that guarantee a level playing field for all. This would mean implementing the right amount and right kinds of societal institutions, including economic and monetary institutions (traffic rules and signs), rather than simply trying to avoid “too much” or “too little.”

Perhaps all can agree that a world of homeostasis can only survive if its balance is maintained and optimized, not its imbalance. Picking isolated aspects out of a world that must be in balance if it is to last, and maximizing them systemically, seems unsustainable per definition. Not greed as a psychological phenomenon may be the problem, but institutions that give greed priority in a systemic way over the common interest to maintain balance. Profit maximization as primary world-defining principle may be unsustainable.98

Renowned scientists Paul and Anna Ehrlich warn that the world’s population is undermining our life support—our ecosystems—in favor of enterprise. They point at Jared Diamond’s argument that for civilizations to collapse, the one factor that all had in common was mismanagement of natural resources.99

Unity in diversity is an appropriate motto for a balanced world.100 Unity in diversity means avoiding oppressive uniformity and violent division. When government gets too big, oppressive uniformity looms, and unity is lost. As examples North Korea may serve, or Burma, or an Orwellian global system. Oppressive uniformity is a degradation of the unity-pole of the unity-in-diversity principle that must be avoided. The degradation of the other pole, however, is as dangerous. When public institutions fail, then violent divisions threaten the potential of diversity to be enriching and inspirational. Examples are the war-torn Somalia of the past two decades where violent war-lords were allowed to abuse the country’s power vacuum; likewise, the power vacuum at global levels has been exploited by global finance players during the past years, and that led to the economic crisis that broke in 2008.

Intercultural communication scholar Muneo Yoshikawa has developed a nondualistic101 double swing model (unity is created out of the realization of differences), which shows how individuals, cultures, and intercultural concepts can blend in constructive ways.102 This model can be graphically visualized as the infinity symbol, or Möbius strip (∞). Yoshikawa brought together Western and Eastern thought by drawing on Martin Buber’s idea of “dialogical unity—the act of meeting between two different beings without eliminating the otherness or uniqueness of each”—and on Soku, the Buddhist nondualistic logic of “Not-One, Not-Two,” described as the twofold movement between the self and the other that allows for both unity and uniqueness.103 Yoshikawa calls the unity that is created out of such a realization of differences identity in unity: the dialogical unity does not eliminate the tension between basic potential unity and apparent duality.104

Linda and I, we first heard the term right relationships from Dorothy (Dot) J. Maver, Co-Director of the National Peace Academy, at the Hollyhock Summer Gathering, July 26–31, 2009, on Cortes Island, BC, Canada. Dorothy impressed us with particularly concise formulations, such as “Great turning points can be great learning points!” Here are some of Linda’s notes from meeting Dot Maver:
Dot is looking for signs of right relationships. She refers to the Earth Charter, entailing a message about living with oneself and others. She talks about transforming all system break-downs into all system break-throughs. Moving from safe and healthy communities to a safe and healthy planet. From stakeholder to careholder. WMD means: We Must Disarm!

Dot Maver explained that she works on “a science of right relationships.” She said: “I do not wish for peace, I live for peace. Peace is not the goal, it is the outcome. We are the connective tissue.” Yes, Linda says, “we need to transcend policies and institutions that cause the sellout of dignity, that ‘exclude people from access to dignified lives, both socially and economically.’”

Dot Maver reported to us on Senate Bill 263 in Vermont, a bill that addresses, what Paul Grignon describes as follows: “CEO’s are required by law to maximize returns for shareholders. They could even go to jail for purposely not doing so. Nothing else can trump this priority. Until this law is changed nothing else will.” Senate Bill 263 was approved on Friday, March 12, 2010, by the Committee on Economic Development, Housing and General Affairs. It might disrupt hundreds of years of corporate law and corporate culture, namely, by empowering domestic corporations to charter themselves as “for benefit” corporations.

The ratification of a new standard for urban and community accounting in early 2007 points into the same direction. United Nations and Local Governments for Sustainability (ICLEI) ratified the triple bottom line approach, abbreviated as “TBL” or “3BL,” and also known as “the three pillars” of “people, planet, profit” or “economic, ecological and social.” TBL became the dominant approach to public sector full cost accounting, see also the ecoBudget standard for reporting ecological footprint. In the private sector, a commitment to corporate social responsibility implies some form of TBL reporting.

There are many voices pointing into a similar direction. Business journalist Marjorie Kelly, for example, speaks of the transitioning to For-Benefit Business.

Linda and I, like Dot, are striving for “right relationships,” which we believe means ending humiliating practices and advancing human dignity. Like Dot, we are generating our own special HumanDHS-informed “science of right relationships.” However, what is a right relationship? This is Linda’s explanation of right relationships:

7. I think it is important to realize that we are not conceptualizing “right relationships” in Western, dualistic terms (good/bad relationships). We are striving for a more complex understanding of “right relationships.”

8. For me, right relationships are relationships that facilitate the healthy growth and development of all involved. Based on my work with Jean Baker Miller, I believe right relationships are characterized by mutual empathy, mutual empowerment, and movement toward mutuality. By “mutuality,” I do not mean relationships that involve exchange or reciprocity. Rather, mutuality means both or all people in the relationship are growing, even though they may be growing in very different ways. A lack of “movement toward mutuality” in a relationship is a clue that the relationship is not a right relationship.

9. I also think that right relationships are relationships characterized by a sense of
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equal dignity, equal worth. All people in the relationship feel valued and there is an understanding that everyone has something they can contribute to the other person, the relationship, or the situation, even though people contribute in different ways.

10. Right relationships make it safe enough for people to be real, to be authentic, to bring more of themselves into the relationship. In right relationships, people do not have to hide large parts of themselves in order to stay in the relationship.

11. In right relationships, all people in the relationship feel a sense of empowerment, empowerment means feeling that one can have an impact on the other person, the relationship, and the situation.

12. Right relationships energize both or all people in the relationship. This is in contrast to one-way relationships in which one person gains energy (power, benefits, etc.) at the expense of others.

13. Right relationships cultivate optimal function of both or all people in the relationship. Right relationships are not just a nice idea, they are a supremely practical way to build a better world for all of us. When people are not absorbed by protecting and defending themselves against hurtful relationships, they can use their energy to create solutions to address the enormous problems we are facing in the world today.

How can right relationships be crafted for humankind?

Howard Richards, scholar of peace and global studies and philosophy, suggests thinking in terms of basic cultural structures derived from Roman law to identify the specific features of global modern Western historical development that need to be corrected:

- **Suum cuique** needs to be corrected by socially functional forms of land tenancy and socially functional forms of property in general.
- **Pacta sunt servanda** needs to be corrected by reciprocity and responsibility for one another’s welfare regardless of whether there is a contract. Externalities need to be acknowledged as normal, not exceptional, and human action should seek to promote positive externalities and to avoid negative ones.
- **Honeste vivare** needs to be corrected by recognizing that our very identity is relational.
- **Alterum non laedere** needs to be corrected to promote an ideal of service to others, above and beyond the obligation not to harm them.

Richards posits that these corrections will not rebuild the present one-size-fits-all global regime of capital accumulation but will generate multiple ways of integrating factors of production to provide goods and services that support life.

The modern state system emerged from the 1648 Treaties of Osnabrück and Münster (better known as Peace of Westphalia), the relationship between citizens and the state have followed Thomas Hobbes, John Locke and Jean-Jacques Rousseau, and their ideas about a “social contract” between the ruler and the ruled. This contract
Dignism, Rather than Communism or Capitalism

revolved around rights and duties, with citizens as more or less passive objects and the state as active subject. A present, with the marginalization of the state in favor of markets, a passive citizenry and a passive state, are ruled by an active market.

As to global institution building, Adam Smith’s “invisible hand” needs “visible hands” to make the invisible hand useful in the long term and for all, rather than only for small elites for a short while. New peer-to-peer models (P2P) represent an interesting emergent field. They are supported by new information and communication technologies (ICTs) and part of a global reality of nonmarket practices—see, for example, Lawrence Lessig (2005), or Michael Bauwens (2008). These approaches re-arrange the order of priority of the relational models described by anthropologist Alan Page Fiske (1991). Fiske found that people, most of the time and in all cultures, use just four elementary and universal forms or models for organizing most aspects of sociality. These models are (1) communal sharing, CS, (2) authority ranking, AR, (3) equality matching, EM, and (4) market pricing, MP. Family life is often informed by communal sharing. Trust, love, care, and intimacy can prosper in this context. Authority ranking involves asymmetry among people who are ordered along vertical hierarchical social dimensions. Equality matching implies a model of balance such as in turn taking, for instance, in car pools or babysitting cooperatives. Market pricing builds on a model of proportionality with respect to ratios and rates.

Building a decent dignified world society means embedding Fiske’s four models in ways that unity in diversity is safeguarded. Unity in diversity means avoiding oppressive uniformity as much as divisive fragmentation. Unity in diversity protects dignity against big oppressive government that forces everybody to become the same, as much as against under-regulation that obliterates diversity through might-is-right freedom that re-introduces the humiliation of the abuse of rank, or rankism, a term coined by Robert W. Fuller (2003). Diversity can best be safeguarded through everybody uniting around the task of giving equal dignity to all. I have coined the term egalization to denote equality in dignity and the overcoming of rankism through unity in diversity. Since America emerged from resisting big British government and taxes, it is particularly in America that unity in diversity is misunderstood as advocating oppressive uniformity.

Not only local communities but also global society, to be harmonious, requires equal rather than unequal entitlement to dignity and respectful treatment for all its member, since, as discussed earlier, inequality is inherently instable, particularly when norms such as human rights advocate the opposite and the pressure of the security dilemma wanes. Table 1 brainstorms how the humanization of globalization through egalization, a process I call globegalization, could be envisaged through new ways of embedding Fiske’s CS, AR, EM, and MP.
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In practice, globegalization means creating institutions at the global level that safeguard space for diversity at local levels. Those institutions have the common good of humanity at large at heart and are informed by the communal sharing paradigm (CS). Within such a frame, authority ranking (AR) only allows for functional hierarchies, not for hierarchies built on the abuse of rank, or rankism. Equality matching (EM) and market pricing (MP) are embedded in ways that they serve the greater common good.

The knowledge needed for globegalization to be realized is already available. To name but a few, Gar Alperovitz, for example, professor of political economy, embarked on a quest to “harvest” the diversity of economic arrangements and practices that is, indeed, existing already.114 The same does Howard Richards, with his scholarship and activism.115 The most global level of engagement must be what environmental epidemiologist Rosialie Bertell focuses on, namely, the protection of the biosphere itself, the very basis of human life.116 See more further down in the section “Global Brainstorming.”

After this brief analysis, we list some of the humiliating effects of contemporary economic and monetary arrangements.

### Humiliating Effects

Since our work focuses on dignity and humiliation, in the following, I walk through some of the humiliating effects that seem to flow systemically from the present economic arrangements: (1) scarcity and environmental degradation, (2) mistrust becoming ubiquitous, (3) abuse as a means, (4) debilitating fear, (5) false choices, and (6) psychological damage.
(1) Scarcity and Environmental Degradation Are Systemic

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) is a scientific intergovernmental body that reviews and assesses scientific, technical, and socio-economic information relevant to understanding climate change. The IPCC shared the 2007 Nobel Peace Prize with former Vice President of the United States Al Gore. The Stern Review on the Economics of Climate Change is the largest and most widely known and discussed report of its kind. Economist Nicholas Stern is the chair of the Grantham Research Institute on Climate Change and the Environment at the London School of Economics and chair of the Centre for Climate Change Economics and Policy (CCCEP) at Leeds University and LSE. The review states that climate change is the greatest and widest-ranging market failure ever seen, presenting a unique challenge for economics.

Value in a market economy depends on scarcity. The air we breathe is not sold to us. As the Cree quote at the outset of this paper suggests, many indigenous peoples define the entire ecosphere as “not for sale.” “Living Well” is an indigenous social system that focuses on reciprocity between people and Earth. However, is that common goods can only be protected when all commit to share the burden of this protection and nobody is allowed to free-ride for personal gain.

Scarcity can be “engineered” artificially. Diamonds are a shiny example. Their hardness is natural, but not their value. “If you don’t support the price,” said Andrei V. Polyakov, a spokesman for Alrosa, “a diamond becomes a mere piece of carbon.” In 1888, the diamond company De Beers stockpiled diamonds to keep prices high. In 1938, De Beers hired American public-relations firm N. W. Ayer to sell the idea that “a diamond is forever” (entering the lexicon 1949) and a nonnegotiable symbol of courtship, prestige and love. Today, De Beers’ grip is broken by antitrust rulings. But Alrosa takes its place.

The Cochabamba protests of 2000, also known as the “Cochabamba Water Wars,” were a series of protests that took place in Cochabamba, Bolivia’s third largest city, between January and April 2000. The Government had sold the public water to Aguas del Tunari, a subsidiary of the transnational corporation Bechtel, in 1999. The company immediately announced an increase in water prices by up to 35 percent, which for many Bolivians meant that water was no longer affordable.

Thomas F. Valone, engineering physicist with twenty five years of experience in emerging energy sciences, identifies the profit motive as the culprit that cost humankind at least one hundred years of progress. If we are to believe historical sources (which are disputed), the profit motive hampered the work of, for instance, inventor and mechanical and electrical engineer Nikola Tesla (1856 – 1943). John Pierpont Morgan (father of today’s JPMorgan Chase financial institution) is reported to have refused to finance research on free energy. If reports are correct, he only wanted to finance research that would enable him to “put a meter” on a product and sell it. In other words, tapping free energy (as was Tesla’s aim) for the common good of all of humankind, if it had been at all possible (and it seems that this is extremely controversial among engineers), was not acceptable under the profit motive. Astrophysicist Adam Trombly in July 1988, at the International Tesla Symposium in Colorado Springs, pointed out that if society had followed up on the inventions Nikola Tesla envisioned at the turn of the century, there would be no fossil-fuel economy today. Valone: “The travesty is that the global
warming we are experiencing is entirely unnecessary—if we would but just pursue these alternatives that have been available for so long.”

Even if the details of Valone’s and Trombly’s analyses are subjected to the most rigorous reservations and discarded, the gist of their message remains valid. Artificial scarcity in the service of the profit motive forecloses appropriate technological adaptations and creates, perpetuates, and intensifies environmental degradation.

To me, personally, the mere thought that global warming could have been avoided if not for the profit motive, makes me feel deeply ashamed, and it humiliates my very humanity. A Zeitgeist that blindly adheres to solutions that might be destructive, deeply wounds my dignity.

It seems that academic research, including the field of economy, has a tendency to work within the confines of the Zeitgeist it is embedded in. In 2010, economist Richard T. Carson warned that environmental economists have “lost decade or more” on the assumption that increased wealth automatically leads to an improved environmental situation. The debate over the income–pollution relationship, he explains, made for example developing countries ignore their environmental problems until they develop and become wealthier, even though it is clear that developing countries can take many actions.

I can understand that it is difficult for proud proponents of a Zeitgeist that supports the profit motive and its maximization to acknowledge they are wrong. For some, the shame and humiliation of such an admittance may perhaps be too great. Herbert Marshall McLuhan is credited for saying, “Only the small secrets need to be protected. The big ones are kept secret by public incredulity.” Perhaps secrets are not only protected by incredulity, but also by unacknowledged shame and humiliation (see the research of Thomas Scheff). I suggest to overcome mutual finger pointing and shaming and jointly ponder David Korten’s words: “Today’s borderless global economy pits every person, community, and firm in a relentless race to the bottom, as private economic power extends out and governments compete to attract jobs and investment by offering the biggest subsidies and the lowest regulatory standards.”

As I said above, this state of current world affairs humiliates me personally. As a result, I wish to work for a new world. I make a point to work for new visions for a more viable future, rather than against outdated solutions of the past. I wish to invite everybody into this project. I believe that the future should not be sacrificed to combating wrongs and wrongdoers, but has to be won by prioritizing the creation of right relationships for the future.

To create a world of right relationships, it is time to act in concert. Morton Deutsch’s research on cooperation of over six decades has never been needed more than now.

(2) Mistrust Is Bound to Become Ubiquitous

Ralph Richard Banks, professor at Stanford Law School, wrote a book about marriage and why African American women have difficulties finding a partner. Banks explains, among others, that economically successful black men are relatively rare, and how this amplifies their “power” on the dating market so that they can “play the field” indefinitely,
Dignism, Rather than Communism or Capitalism

The book is being reviewed in the *New York Times Book Review* by Imani Perry, who observes that this book “is not a romanticization of the institution of marriage, but an alarm bell warning of the failure of American partnerships. He alerts us to the consequences for families, and I would add that the alarm rings beyond marriage, to a broader social collapse that includes distrust of neighbors, weakened social networks and community institutions, evictions, foreclosures, diminished opportunity, hostility toward those we deem different and skepticism toward enduring human connection. In short, the ties that bind need tightening.”

On July 20, 2011, Ireland’s prime minister accused the Vatican of downplaying the rape and torture of Irish children by clerical sex abusers. Kamran Mofid wrote (July 24, 2011, in a personal communication):

I have read these articles [137] with great sadness. I suppose it saddens anybody who wishes to believe in the wisdom, beauty and relevance of religion/Catholicism to everyday life. Very sad indeed. Who may have we trust in today? The politicians, the bankers, the media, the press, the police, the judges, the priest,...? Who? The teacher, the lecturer, the professor, the doctor, the surgeon, the dentist, the drug companies, the food suppliers and manufacturers, the car mechanic, the builder...? Why have we turned our world so untrustworthy and for what reason, and can we find happiness, joy and peace when we can trust nobody?

Indeed, what an important question: Who may we have trust in today?

Who is my doctor working for? Do I really need this medical treatment or drug, and is it really safe? How can I be sure that he does not put profit first? Why are baby bottles toxic? Why are baby food advertisements so misleading? Why do psychiatrists on drug makers’ payrolls promote bipolar disorder in young children, a condition that was once thought to affect only adults and adolescents? Why does nobody question the “medical community’s enthusiasm for pathologizing entirely natural emotional responses to (among other things) humiliating experiences”? The list is much much longer.

In a setting that gives primacy to profit maximization, mistrust is called for, systemically. A culture that gives primacy to maximizing profit undermines ethical behavior. It erodes the very reason for trust. And it does this systemically.

Yet, living in a world that forces mistrust upon its citizens by design, is an inhumane and humiliating world. It is destructive, not least since social trust is directly linked to health. Research shows that as the Western world has become wealthier, instances of clinical or major depression have grown. This suggests that a culture of ruthless individualism, where everybody races for maximum profit, brings more than what Forrester calls “economic horror.” It is an ultimate irony that the pharmaceutical industry maximizes profit by feeding on the damages that flow from a culture that gives priority to maximizing profit. Indignity and humiliation is compounded by bandages that deepen it. “The Illusions of Psychiatry,” is the title of a review of a number of related books.

How could such a rat race culture emerge? Author Philip Delve Broughton wrote a book about his two years at Harvard Business School:
In 1968, the *Harvard Business Review* published an article by Albert Z. Carr titled “Is Business Bluffing Ethical?” It generated a slew of critical letters. Carr compared business to poker, in which bluffing, short of outright cheating, was a perfectly legitimate activity. He said that many successful businesspeople lived by one set of ethical standards in their private lives and a quite different set in their professional lives. The explanation, he said, was that they perceived business not as an arena for the peacock-like displays of high ethical standards, but as a game with specific rules. Knowing that you could win the game of business playing all manner of tricks that you would never inflict on your spouse, children, or friends made for a calm, unstressed, uncomplicated life. But to some, it seemed to be an acknowledgment that business was fundamentally unethical.

During the past decades, a culture of cynicism was not just the preserve of business schools only in the United States. Lying and bluffing were increasingly regarded as “just a game” in many parts of the world, legitimized by the fact that all knew it was being played. As a result *just world thinking* (the belief that winners deserve to win and losers, to lose) and *blaming the victim* became rife and those who did not lie and bluff were simply disparaged as dim-witted.

In postmodern America and Britain, writes physicist Jeff Schmidt in *Disciplined Minds*, a new class of Americanized managers was bred, “to run the private and public sectors: the banks, the main parties, corporations, the BBC.” Professionals are said to be meritorious and non-ideological. Yet, in spite of their education, writes Schmidt, they think less independently than non-professionals. They use corporate jargon—“model,” “performance,” “targets,” “strategic oversight.” In *Disciplined Minds*, Schmidt argues that what makes the modern professional is not technical knowledge but “ideological discipline.” Those in higher education and the media do “political work” but in a way that is not seen as political.

Author and activist Raj Patel joins this discussion with his book, *The Value of Nothing: How to Reshape Market Society and Redefine Democracy*. “We’ve come to believe that the only way we can value things is by sticking them in a market,” Patel says. “The trouble is, as we’ve seen through this recession, that markets are a tremendously bad way of valuing things, tremendously fickle.”

Indeed, “sticking things in a market” has been a strong thrust throughout that past decades. James Murdoch, son of global media baron Rupert Murdoch, “in a lecture to the Edinburgh Television Festival in 2009, whilst attacking the publicly-owned BBC, declared that ‘the only guarantee of independence is profit.’”

Murdoch is right. If maximizing profit is given priority, this does lead to independence, however, only for a few, with dependence for the rest. In a setting of “freedom” by way of lack of regulations, profit compounds profit, and inequality ensues, trapping the majority in the power games of a few.

Richard G. Wilkinson has been mentioned earlier. Together with epidemiologist Kate Picket, he shows “why more equal societies almost always do better.” Their conclusion is that “bigger income differences lead to bigger social distances up and down
the status hierarchy, increasing feelings of superiority and inferiority and adding to status competition and insecurity. Some of the causal links are known: the effects of chronic stress on the immune and cardiovascular system are increasingly well understood and must underpin the relationship of income inequality to health. Similarly, the reason why violence increases in more unequal societies is because inequality makes status even more important and the most common triggers to violence are loss of face, disrespect, and humiliation.160

Wilkinson and Picket write further:

Although people have often regarded inequality as divisive and socially corrosive, that did not prepare us for what we found. The frequency of all these problems was systematically related to income inequality. The bigger the income differences between rich and poor in each society, the worse these health and social problems became. And rather than things being just a bit worse in more unequal countries, they were very much worse. More unequal countries tended to have three times the level of violence, of infant mortality and mental illness; teenage birth rates were six times as high, and rates of imprisonment increased eight-fold.

The sense that inequality is divisive was shown by the fact that in more unequal countries, only about 15 percent of the population feel they can trust others, compared to around two-thirds in the more equal ones. That evidence was supported by relationships with social capital and levels of violence – all showing that inequality damages the social fabric of society.161

Many argue that profit maximization and equality are not mutually exclusive, on the contrary. Since a wealthy person is able to do good and give to charity, she decreases inequality. Yet, headings such as “The Charitable-Giving Divide” point at a different reality: “For decades, surveys have shown that upper-income Americans don’t give away as much of their money as they might and are particularly undistinguished as givers when compared with the poor, who are strikingly generous. A number of other studies have shown that lower-income Americans give proportionally more of their incomes to charity than do upper-income Americans.”162 “Psychologist and social scientist Dacher Keltner says the rich really are different, and not in a good way: Their life experience makes them less empathetic, less altruistic, and generally more selfish.”163

John T. Cacioppo, Director of the University of Chicago Center for Cognitive and Social Neuroscience, found in his research that only people who feel socially isolated tend to behave in concord with the Homo economicus model of pure self-interest, while people who feel socially integrated, do not. People who feel socially integrated tend to forego pure self-interest when the common good is violated. “Altruistic punishment” is a term that signifies that “people are deriving personal pleasure from foregoing their rational self-interests and pursuing what is in the interest of the collective.”164

In other words, the “two cornerstones of classic economic theory,” namely the assumptions that individuals are “rational decision makers” and that individuals have “purely self-regarding preferences,” “fly in the face of most psychological theories, where individuals are depicted as characterized by bounded rationality if not also by bounded self-interests.”165
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In conclusion, economic theory builds on concepts of human nature that fit only those who, through a background of social isolation, fail to value and guard social cohesion. Current economic theory is hence misguided at best, or, at worst, it worsens social dissolution through rewarding behavior that exacerbates it. Social isolation and mistrust, in a malign spiral, are thus brought to the fore systemically.

Kamran Mofid asks the big questions that need to be asked in this situation:

What is education? What is knowledge? What is wisdom? What is a university? What is the source of true happiness and wellbeing? What is the good life? What is the purpose of economic life? What does it mean to be a human being living on a spaceship with finite resources? Is “sustainability” a buzz word? Is it simply in fashion to talk about a sustainable future, a sustainable education? How can the global financial system become more responsive and just? What paths can be recommended to shift the current destructive global political-economic order from one of unrestrained economic growth, profit maximisation and cost minimisation, targets and bonuses to one that embraces material wealth creation, yet also preserves and enhances social and ecological well-being and increases human happiness and contentment? How should we deal with individual and institutionalized greed? What are the requirements of a virtuous economy? What role should universities play in building an integrity-based model of business education? What should be the role of the youth? How might the training of young executives be directed with the intention of supplying insights into the nature of globalisation from its economic, technological and spiritual perspectives, to build supporting relationships among the participants that will lead toward action for the common good within their chosen careers? What needs to happen next for sustainability to become more integrated into the ethos of business schools? What distinct roles should students, business leaders and business schools themselves take in advancing this trend? Who is leading this agenda and what elements of best practice can be shared from their example?166

(3) People Are Abused as a Means, rather than Respected as an End in Themselves

Anthropologist William Ury drew up what he calls a simplified depiction of history whose core elements are widely accepted by the academic community: (1) simple hunter-gatherers, (2) complex agriculturists, and (3) knowledge society.

In Ury’s system, prior to 10,000 years ago, humans populated the world as wanderers and roammers, who, as simple hunter-gatherers, lived in coexistence and open networks, within which conflicts were negotiated, rather than settled through coercion. The abundance of wild food represented an expandable pie of resources that did not force opponents into win-lose paradigms.

Ten thousand years, ago, due to specific circumstances (such as circumscription167), complex agriculturalism emerged. Because land represents a fixed pie—land is either mine or yours—as soon as land became the basis of livelihood, a set of conditions arose that created a malign win-lose situation.168
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As a result, the security dilemma became definitorial. The term security dilemma was coined by international relations scholar John H. Herz\textsuperscript{169} (and has been expanded upon by many authors\textsuperscript{170}) to explain why states that have no intention of harming one another may end up in competition and war. The very essence of the security dilemma is one of tragedy, forcing bloody competition to emerge out of mutual (and inevitable) distrust. The threat of preemption with preemption is the ultimate and seemingly inevitable outcome.

The win-lose frame and the security dilemma pushed agriculturalists into closed hierarchical pyramids of power. Riane Eisler, social scientist and activist, describes how otherwise widely divergent societies followed what she calls a “dominator model” rather than a “partnership model” during the past ten millennia.\textsuperscript{171} From the samurai of Japan to the Aztecs of Meso-America, all lived in very similar hierarchies of domination and under a rigidly male-dominant “strong-man” rule, both in the family and state. Hierarchies of domination were maintained by a high degree of institutionalized and socially-accepted violence, ranging from wife- and child-beating within the family to aggressive warfare at the larger tribal or national level.

Hierarchical pyramids of power were kept in place by a code of honor, or, more precisely, of ranked honor. Each strata in such a pyramid has its own honor. The honor of aristocrats is different to the honor of underlings. In all cases superiors have rights that inferiors do not have.

A range of options is on offer when elites wish to subjugate underlings. For example, the use of brute force is one option. However, over the course of the past 10,000 years, more “artful” applications of domination evolved, replacing brute force by more subtle and covert approaches. One such art was for masters to let nobody forget the fear entailed in the security dilemma. They instrumentalized this fear for their advantage. Masters routinely instilled dread and apprehension in underlings and threatened them with violence and terror, from torture to killing. Over time, incessant humbling, shaming, and humiliating (honor humiliation, the form of humiliation that was seen as legitimate during the past millennia) became “sufficient,” namely, when underlings had learned to feel ashamed at failing their master’s expectations.

If we calculate that Homo sapiens emerged around 200,000 years ago, the era of complex agriculturalism represents the last 5 percent of human history, the past 10,000 years. At the current point in history, humankind finds itself in the middle of a second, similarly radical transition as the transition 10,000 years ago. For this transition, many factors flow together, factors that drive the transition and are being driven by it.

As part of this second transition, the normative adaptation of the first is delegitimized. Human rights represent a normative u-turn—no longer is the subjugation of the socio- and biosphere by small dominator elites regarded as “God-given”; the new ideal is respect, mutuality, balance, and dialogue among partners considering each other as equal in dignity.

Evidently, the transition toward a world informed by the human rights ideal of equality in dignity is still waiting to be fully achieved. Humankind finds itself in the middle of an unfinished paradigm shift that is sometimes proceeding one step forward, only to fall back again soon after. It is as if the world is hanging in-between, clinging to old practices, while trying to reach out to new ideals, sometimes caught in the double standards of empty human rights rhetoric that merely serves as a cover for human rights
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violations.

The Western culture of ruthless individualism, for example, can be conceptualized as an extension of the traditional hierarchical system, yet, this time under the cover of human rights rhetoric of individual freedom. Distorted and distorting human rights rhetoric represents the most covert application of the “art of domination” hitherto achieved. Co-opting underlings not only to accept and maintain their own bondage voluntarily, but to misrecognize it as “freedom” is the ultimate refinement of the art of domination. An analysis of Ronald Reagan’s policies in the United States of America can illustrate this strategy.

In contexts that promote extreme individualism, the boundaries of the security dilemma are shrunk down to each individual’s personal life. Through this shrinkage, every person is separated from her fellow beings. Everyone is forced into the Machiavellian “hominus hominem lupus est “relationships that in honor contexts are reserved to elites. Ruthless individualism, ironically, is a collectivist project, and this the more the stronger it is enforced by the overall cultural context. Freedom no longer entails the choice not to partake in this culture of individualism and to wish, for instance, for a society where people are encouraged to serve the collective. Freedom is shrunk down to the freedom to partake in individualism. I do admit that I smile when I hear Slovenian philosopher Slavoj Žižek use the close-door button in elevators as a symbol for the true range of freedom in the “political illusion-making machine” of Western individualism: the elevator doors do not shut faster, but the person who pushes this button has the illusion of using her freedom of choice.

Extreme individualism systemically creates narcissism, the narcissism of packaging oneself into a competitive saleable “product” in the spirit of “personal branding.” Hans-Jürgen Classen, international management consultant, comments on an article in Financial Times about the Narcissistic Personality Disorder (NPD) as follows: “Reading the article I found that this explains about all the things I have encountered in my job so far. My rough guess is that more than 50% of senior management in corporations is affected by this. In fact I now suspect that this disease is their primary motivational factor for climbing the corporate ladder. In politics, the ratio might be a lot higher still. If true, this is a scary thought, as I would mean that we are managed and governed mostly by people whose mental state is not appropriate to being in such positions in the first place.” In the article, Alice is quoted, a recruitment consultant for City of London companies, who actively profiles for narcissists. She explains: “Narcissists are prime candidates in finance, because they are able to make quick, bold decisions without any thought for the consequences these might have on other people.”

Faced with this situation, we may ask: How come that everybody nods when experts warn that “the best and brightest” will leave if they cannot amass money? Let them leave! They are not the best and brightest. We need to define excellence in entirely new ways.

Research shows that the damage that voluntary bondage inflicts on people, though not as directly traceable as the damage from open bondage, still makes itself amply felt. During the past millennia, people in servitude often suffered physical abuse—from beating to torture to killing. Indeed, as the gap between rich and poor has widened in the last two decades, poverty and environmental degradation are not irrelevant “externalities” for most people, but remain the physically and psychologically painful reality for the majority of the world’s population.
Unfortunately, the resources for change, and the motivation for change are being divorced in a culture of extreme individualism, particularly for those at the top of the global pyramid of wealth, where bruises are often less palpable, only felt in a negligible decrease in wealth. However, psychological bruises do occur. As mentioned earlier, clinical or major depression have grown as the Western world has become wealthier.\textsuperscript{180} Philosopher Charles Handy calls this “the corporate sin.”\textsuperscript{181} Richer countries do tend to have happier citizens than poor ones, but once people have a home, food, and clothes, extra money does not make them happier. Only understanding interdependence and filling it with true life makes for happiness; connectedness in mutually respectful relationships produces genuine satisfaction. A formula for the monetary equivalence of friendship indicates that £50,000 would be needed to compensate for not being socially connected with friends.\textsuperscript{182}

The U.S. National Bureau of Economic Research has just published data from a new survey showing that although many objective measures of the lives of women in the United States have improved over the past 35 years, measures of subjective well-being have declined both absolutely and relative to men.\textsuperscript{183} This result is found across various datasets, measures of subjective well-being and is pervasive across demographic groups and industrialized countries. A new gender gap is emerging, with higher subjective well-being for men, replacing the gap of the 1970s when women reported higher subjective well-being than did men.

A culture of extreme individualism causes character to corrode, as sociologist Richard Sennett explains.\textsuperscript{184} It weakens empathy—altogether the glue that keeps societies together, as psychologist Jean M. Twenge’s research shows.\textsuperscript{185}

To be used as a means, as pawns in a system that pretends to serve human well-being but does not, could be said to be profoundly humiliating for the humanity of all involved, even those who profit.

The guardian.co.uk asks: “What can the Ancient Greeks do for us?” And replies: “Socrates refused to be paid for his philosophical teachings. Just as charging for beauty, he argued, is prostitution, so it is that money cannot be exchanged for wisdom.”\textsuperscript{186}

Philosopher Immanuel Kant (1724–1804) formulated that a person must not be used as a means; a person must always be treated as an end in itself. He wrote in 1785: "Der Mensch aber ist keine Sache, mithin nicht etwas, das bloß als Mittel gebraucht werden kann, sondern muß bei allen seinen Handlungen jederzeit als Zweck an sich selbst betrachtet werden."\textsuperscript{187}

Philosopher Martin Buber (1878–1965) developed a philosophy of dialogue.\textsuperscript{188} It views human participation in two fundamentally different kinds of relationships—\textit{I-It} and \textit{I-Thou}. An I-It relationship is the normal everyday relation of a human being toward the things surrounding her. This can also include fellow human beings when they are used as means at a distance, or as parts of an environment. An I-Thou relationship, in contrast, is one into which a human being enters with her innermost and whole being, yielding genuine encounters and dialogues. The latter approach dovetails with Kant’s notion of treating other people as ends and not as means.

A culture of ruthless individualism undercuts all these reflections. It encourages a host of malign biases to inform mainstream culture. As soon as people adhere to a just world belief, for instance, they blame the victim. The belief in a just world provides an alibi to
be blind to the sufferings of others, because “everybody deserves what he gets.” Since they see no injustice, people who hold the just world belief are indifferent to social injustice, even if they are genuinely interested in issues of justice. Loss aversion, the tendency of people to dislike losses significantly more than they like gains, plays into these psychological preferences. People do not mind sharing equally in the future, but they do not like to lose what they have gained in the past—fairness in the future is judged differently from fairness in the past. Experiments show that, contrary to the assumption that it is the nature of human beings to grab as many resources as possible, people are willing to share resources equally. However, those who have more, tend to justify this inequality. People define fairness as equal sharing as long as the sharing lies in the future; when they have accumulated more than others, we tend to believe we deserve it. These psychological phenomena strengthen conservative stances, leading people to regard those as aggressors who argue for another distribution of resources.

The Irresistible Pull of Irrational Behavior is a telling title of a book by Ori and Rom Brafman, which shows how rational action is often undermined. In a system defined by the need to maximize profit, underpinned by a culture of ruthless individualism, it is to be expected that irrational behavior is portrayed as rational and realistic, while rational analysis is vilified as irrational and unrealistic.

Asymmetry, however, is inherently unstable. One set of players satisfies their desire for recognition by denying full recognition to another. In an asymmetric world, particularly when inequality is thrown into stark contrast by a concurrent promotion of human rights ideals of equal dignity, dynamics of humiliation permeate all aspects of social life.

Not only social asymmetry is unstable. The documentary Home has just carried the Green Party in France to unprecedented strength. The film served as a wake-up call not least because it uses breathtakingly beautiful imagery to depict the dire state of our planet. The film recommends a new culture of moderation, intelligence, and sharing.

The film underscores the message that stakeholder value must come first—involving all stakeholders of the entire socio- and biosphere. Shareholders must serve that primary value as careholders and sharegivers, because the inverse prioritization ultimately destroys everybody’s habitat. Nature does not negotiate. It acts. Nature does not care about the discussion as to whether shareholder value has lifted people out of poverty or only enriched a few for a short while.

The idea of stakeholder value, though it is old, has lost nothing of its relevance. Thirty years ago in Youngstown, Ohio, US Steel was going to shut down a major facility. Historian and civil rights activist Staughton Lynd led a protest movement by advocating the principle that stakeholders should have the highest priority. His efforts failed. New attempts are due now, globally and locally, carried forward jointly by all of the human family.

Another, more recent film, Inside Job by Charles Ferguson (2010), analyzes who caused the financial crisis and how, pointing at a cocktail of financial deregulation and near-psychotic behavior. It is the first comprehensive film about the economic crisis that broke in 2008.
(4) Fear Becomes Overwhelming and Debilitating

Vince Lombardi, professor of psychology and industrial relations for 45 years, wrote in a personal message (August 1, 2011):

After 45 years of teaching at Michigan State University and now professor emeritus, I see the growing fear, anger, and loss of hope among our youth. Generally, citizens are more and more deprived of all personal power over the material world of things necessary to sustain their lives and the lives of their families. No limits are placed on the pace of introducing new technology in the workplace, increasing economic efficiency by displacing labor and giving rise to increasing structural unemployment. At the same time, many hold a false ideology of an unlimited and absolute right to property that has given rise to pernicious levels of material inequalities. The loss of economic freedom in the lives of many is spawning a furtive revolutionary mentality suffused with confusion about the nature of social, economic, political, and moral reality. Envy, malice, and vindictiveness are rising. The crisis is worldwide.

The crisis is worldwide. And symptoms and evidence emerge from many sources and in many forms. Even if only half of what John Perkins writes in his book Confessions of an Economic Hit Man is true, it is profoundly worrying and reason for deep fear. If the profit motive is so strong that it spurs its adherents to walk over human lives, fear is called for qua system. For a drug addict, getting the next fix is paramount and even loved family members are betrayed. If this is the mindset that informs people in influential positions in this world, it must come as no surprise when the outcome is disastrous.

Former Federal Reserve chairman Alan Greenspan said that he was “in a state of shocked disbelief” and had been wrong in thinking that relying on banks to use their self-interest would be enough to protect shareholders and their equity.

If we were to believe scholar and strategist David J. Rothkopf, who has been referred to earlier, Alan Greenspan’s observation describes a system rather than individual aberrations. A small number (circa 6,000) of largely unelected powerful people around the globe have shaped the world during the past decades in ways that the financial meltdown became possible. Their power considerations have so far neglected long-term survival to the degree of self- and other-destruction.

Fear is mandatory in such a system.

While the need to be fearful increases, its legitimacy decreases, and its lifesaving utility goes unused. The problem is that fear, even the most lifesaving caution, in a context of domination and raiding, risks being denigrated as psychological problem, as personal weakness. Indeed, contemporary definitions of risk, courage, and rationality, indeed, betray that the human capacity to use fear for safety has been damaged, by the cultural training within the dominator societies of the past millennia. Male raiding culture means fearlessness, it means fearlessly engaging in casino capitalism or nuclear power, for example. Caution with respect to the risks flowing from casino approaches to economy, to the risks flowing from nuclear power, or also to the risks flowing from terrorism, are denigrated.

The case of terrorism is particularly interesting and complex. Taking the risk of
terrorism seriously is on one side denigrated as spineless fear, for example, when nuclear power plants are not sufficiently protected against terrorist attacks. At the same time, the risk of terrorism is blown up when it serves the aim to strengthen raiding culture, for example military expenditure. Thus the risk flowing from terrorism is both, dangerously played down, and dangerously played up. If the result were that this compensated for each other to form a reasonable balance, it would be acceptable. However, it is not. The result is that what should be done, is not done, and what should not be done, is done. What should be done is the weaving of global social cohesion, yet, this is neglected. While what should not be done, namely, instrumentalizing terrorism as a pretext for artificially re-invigorating the security dilemma so as to give legitimacy to raiding culture, is being done.

Speaking of terrorism, interestingly, the atmosphere in a raiding culture is that of terror.

I would like to quote from my doctoral dissertation and use the raiding culture of Somalia as illustration:

Consider an interview with Muusa Bihi Cabdi, Somaliland’s Interior Minister until 1995, a man in his fifties, a tough man with a life experience that hardly any Western man or woman would have survived. He is a former nomad who trained already as a small child to survive in one of the harshest environments of the world, Somali semi-desert. He recounted how he learned already as a six years old boy to never really sleep, to always be alert to danger, and how he learned to discern the traces of dangerous animals and enemy clans. Later on he left the desert and became a MIG airplane bombardier and studied in Russia. In the Ogaden war in 1978 he participated in the bombing of Ethiopia. As reported above, Russia abandoned Somalia during this war and sided with Ethiopia, inflicting a humiliating defeat on Somalia. Somalia was subsequently supported by the United States and he studied also there at a military academy. When his Isaaq clan was threatened with eradication in the 1980s, he joined the guerrilla forces and became a commander, responsible for the lives and deaths of many. Later he became a minister in the government of Somaliland. I ask him what he would change if he could live again. He answers that he would change everything: “I was always in war, tribal war; looting each others’ camels; as a kid I was raised in terror; I was six years old when I saw the first person being killed; when I joined army, there was always fighting, and I saw a lot of my friends being killed. If I could live again: not all these wars!”

This quote illustrates how a raiding culture leads to a psychological atmosphere of terror that permeates the entire society. Terror is not just felt by the farmers who are raided by pastoralists, but also within a pastoralist culture. Somalia is a useful example, also because it demonstrates that it is not the evil nature of its people—Somalis are wonderful people—but the overall cultural frame that is “guilty.” I felt this atmosphere of terror keenly when I did my doctoral research in Somalia. Alliances are fickle, promises are worth little, continuous mistrust is essential for survival. Nobody should be surprised that Somali culture provides the world with pirates. If all males are noble warriors and raiders, they are both perpetrators and victims, and both fear, and fearlessness are definitorial. Nobody can escape it. The security dilemma plays out not just between clans,
but between all adult males. And their women, even those who have a critical view on this kind of culture, have little room to escape and develop alternative cultural niches.

A culture of extreme Wallstreet capitalism has a similar effect. Continuous mutual mistrust and fear are called for, while it is taboo to draw the necessary consequences from this fear. The necessary consequence would be a joint effort to transform the entire cultural and institutional frame. What happens, instead, is that everybody participates “fearlessly,” thus increasing the terror instead of diminishing it.

(5) False Choices Crowd out Relevant Choices

Riane Eisler calls for new social categories. She advises to go beyond conventional dichotomies such as religious versus secular, right versus left, capitalist versus communist, Eastern versus Western or industrial versus pre- or post-industrial. We could extend this list with realism versus idealism, hatred versus love, altruism versus egoism, self-interest versus common interest, collectivist versus individualist, big versus small government, visible hand versus invisible hand,204 globalization versus localization205 and so forth.

Unsuitable dichotomies risk creating what psychologist Jean Baker Miller calls false choices.206 What is needed, instead, is what Miller calls alternative arrangements.207

False choices are created and kept alive, unfortunately, through dynamics of humiliation. Among the most glaring and most far-reaching recent examples—far-reaching with respect to cruelty and suffering—is the humiliation America was subjected to in Somalia in 1993. The dead body of the American soldier was dragged through the streets of Mogadishu by an angry crowd. Having their willingness to help humiliated, America pulled out.208 This humiliation cost more than 800,000 people their lives (the number could be much higher): when the genocide started in Rwanda in 1994, the international community left Rwandans to slaughter each other because nobody wanted a “second Somalia.”209 Intervention versus non-intervention became a false choice through dynamics of humiliation.

Feelings of humiliation caused a “white backlash—especially Southern white backlash—against the civil rights movement…creating the opportunity for a major push to undermine the New Deal.”210 Feelings of humiliation fueling the white backlash, together with feelings of humiliation flowing from the Cold War, may cost the future for all of humanity, if not the false choices, such as the alleged choice between socialism and capitalism, or between left and right, are transcended: as everybody would concede, while North Korea’s government is too big, Somalia’s government is too small. Clearly, both, too much and too little, must be avoided.

Incidentally, socialism and capitalism share considerable common ground, common ground that was underplayed when rivalry made commonalities seem too humiliating. Historian Thomas Parke Hughes has studied how the Soviet Union in the 1920s and 1930s based concepts such as the Five Year Plan and the centrally planned economy on American Fordism and Taylorism. Hughes describes how the common ground between America and the Soviet Union was later denied for the sake of the rivalry of who is better at humiliating the other.211
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Watching right-wing passion, in the speeches of American radio host and conservative political commentator Rush Limbaugh, or the earlier mentioned Americans for Prosperity Foundation’s annual RightOnline Conference, makes clear that deep venomous anger is fed by dynamics of humiliation of the past that are mis-projected onto present problems and future fears. Jean Hardisty is the Founder and President Emerita of Political Research Associates (PRA), a Boston-based research center that analyzes right wing, authoritarian, and anti-democratic trends and publishes educational materials for the general public. She found that conservatives yearn for one thing: respect. In other words, even though a sense of humiliation may flow from personal experiences—childhood experiences may have entailed humiliation that color subsequent experiences—backlashes may also flow from, for instance, liberal intellectuals looking down too arrogantly on conservatives and thus reviving memories of the mutual humiliation that permeated Cold War dynamics.

Dynamics of humiliation may also have informed the dynamics of “good” against “evil” that permeate American history from its early days. The personal reasons for why early immigrants left “Old Europe” may have flown from personal experiences of humiliation—not least American School children learn that the American Revolution was a liberation from British oppression. The civil war, in turn, may have been fed by, and still feeds the Southern Honor that historian Bertram Wyatt-Brown describes. Recent American foreign policy, from the Reagan administration to the George W. Bush administration, was legitimized by the American Southern honor or by “they want to humiliate us and we have to humiliate them” David Hackett Fischer reports that Southerners “strongly supported every American war no matter what it was about or who it was against.” Social psychologists Richard Nisbett and Dov Cohen explain the psychology of violence in the culture of honor in the southern part of the United States.

Unfortunately, the heat of humiliation dynamics is not amenable to balanced moderation. It foments hot feelings, and hot feelings lead to tunnel vision. In this way, past humiliation clouds contemporary deliberations and leads to faulty outcomes, which, in turn, have humiliating effects on everybody’s future.

(6) Psychological Damage Flows from the Imposition of the Homo Economicus Model

“Unfortunately, many companies now keep head count and resources to a minimum and this makes progress a struggle for employees. Most managers don’t understand the negative consequences of this struggle. When we asked 669 managers from companies around the world to rank five employee motivators in terms of importance, they ranked “supporting progress” dead last. Fully 95 percent of these managers failed to recognize that progress in meaningful work is the primary motivator, well ahead of traditional incentives like raises and bonuses.”

Allow me to use my own experience as an example to illustrate the psychological damage flowing from the present-day framing of the human condition.

I resonate with Mohammad Yunus when he says that the concept of the human being as a self-interested resource maximizing being is too narrow. This view is in line with philosophers Martin Buber’s work on the philosophy of dialogue, Emmanuel Lévinas.
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(1906–1995) work on the face of the other or Victor Frank’s emphasis on meaning.

People say that “incentive matters” and that nobody would work if not pushed or pulled—either humiliated into compliance or rewarded with incentives. This attitude, from my point of view, degrades the humanity of all involved.

I feel personally humiliated when I am expected to act one-dimensionally, as mere Homo economicus. I am multi-dimensional, and first and foremost I am Homo amans, a loving being. My happiness does not increase with more money. My psyche works according to the Easterlin Paradox (named after economist Richard Easterlin) that posits that ever more money does not necessarily make ever more happy. For me, it is sufficient to attend to basic needs and do not draw my motivation for what makes my life meaningful from striving for more status or more monetary remuneration. I work very hard, day and night, seven days a week. I receive neither conventional status nor salary for my efforts. My motivation is entirely independent from such rewards, and if it were otherwise, I would find the degradation and humiliation unbearable. Therefore, my path is not altruistic or egoistic; it is both, because I would not survive the humiliation of having to define myself as a status- or salary-making machine which endangers the common good. I am not a Pavlovian dog who needs status or monetary remuneration as incentive to work. I would not survive such emptiness of meaning and such poverty of spirit. If I accepted to merely exist as the supplier or target of the sales of products and services, be it expensive or discounted, I would get severely depressed. If I reduced my creativity to serve “personal branding” so as to become a product myself, I would feel like in Pleasantville. Allowing myself to feel deficient lest I buy or sell something, would humiliate my humanity at its core. “Cleverness” is repulsive to me—nothing of what I do is done because it is “smart”—and I draw no satisfaction from petty power games. I only engage in activities that are profoundly meaningful to me.

I respond to the fact that I have to eat, clothe myself, and have a roof over my head in ways that do not require me to compromise what I regard as meaningful, on the contrary, they contribute. I do not wish to have a job, I want to have a life. I am profoundly selfish in this point because I could not live otherwise.

Author Charles Eisenstein writes:

Wherever I go and ask people what is missing from their lives, the most common answer (if they are not impoverished or seriously ill) is “community.” What happened to community, and why don’t we have it any more? There are many reasons – the layout of suburbia, the disappearance of public space, the automobile and the television, the high mobility of people and jobs – and, if you trace the “why’s” a few levels down, they all implicate the money system.

Seymor Mike Miller, economic sociologist and organizational consultant, and Director of the Project on Inequality and Poverty at the Commonwealth Institute, Cambridge, Massachusetts, is deeply worried about his country, America:

If it is widely accepted that expanding one’s household’s consumption is the dominant need and goal, than aiding those less fortunate by paying taxes used for social programs gains less support. If a major concern is competitively out-doing one another
in home, furnishings, dress etc, then it is difficult to think about the deterioration that is occurring outside our somewhat privileged enclaves. If Americans aspire to buy more and more of personal things, they will be reluctant to support taxation to enhance the public structures and amenities of the nation.

The materialist urge is likely to overwhelm societal and thereby political attention to broad national needs and interests. Politicians are reluctant to draw attention to issues that will not receive high positive responses. Materialism focuses people away from national needs to personal acquisitions.

It contributes to the atmosphere of financial speculation and instability that economist Hyman Minsky stressed as one of the great dangers of the current stage of capitalism. The over-spent American, to use Juliet Schor’s phrase, may threaten the stability of the economy. The high-spending of materialist consumption may result not only in boom periods but in deep or prolonged recessions …

American life is distorted by dreams of McMansion life. Qualities of cooperation, mutual support, connections among people are driven to the background as people believe that the achievement of big money and luxury living resolves most issues. The accumulation of goods threatens the goal of lessening inequalities. For inter-household comparisons of accumulations do not promote the idea that all people should be more rather than less similar in conditions.

Particularly disturbing is that high consumption both of goods and popular culture concentrate so much attention that the likely result is diminishing action on important issues. That is the outlook challenged by Robert Putnam in his *Bowling Alone* where he charges television-watching (and now internet and cell phone addictions) as drawing people away from the civic involvement that characterized earlier generations.

High consumption of goods also interferes with efforts to improve environmental conditions, an important objective. It threatens the environment because of what and how goods are produced, distributed, serviced and disposed. High consumption resulting from materialist feelings is a major obstacle to improving the environment. Commercialism, merchandising, advertising are the off-spring of materialism. The flood of advertising, the reliance of the media on advertisers, the insidious penetration of commercial ways of thinking into all realms corrupt American society. (In the U.S. over a trillion dollars a year are devoted to advertising, a sizable slice of gdp.) It encourages thinking in terms of oneself and family, not of our joint needs, interests and obligations to others. (Poet John Milton in Il Penseroso: “Hence, vain deluding joys.”)

Are materialism, commercialism and popular culture rivaling ancient Rome’s use of “bread and circuses?” Are materialism and pervasive popular culture involvements dampening democratic, grass-roots actions? 232

Why do people accept a humiliating culture? Philosopher, sociologist, and historian. Michel Foucault coined the term *governmentality*, 233 describing a novel kind of governing that emerged in Europe during the sixteenth century when feudalism (an earlier form of governmentality) was failing. Governmentality was made possible again through the creation of specific (expert or professional) “knowledges” as well as the construction of experts, institutions and disciplines (for example, medicine, psychology,
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As it seems, governmentality proceeded from overt oppression to covert co-option, or the “art of domination” already mentioned above. Sociologist and economist Thorstein Veblen (1857–1929) coined the phrase “conspicuous consumption.” Writer, journalist, and political commentator Walter Lippmann (1889–1974) called the “manufacture of consent” a “new art” in the practice of democracy. His contemporary, Sigmund Freud’s nephew Edward Louis Bernays (1891–1995), called it “engineering of consent.” He combined Freud’s psychoanalytical concepts with the work of Gustave LeBon on crowd psychology and Wilfred Trotter’s ideas on the instincts of the “herd.” To expand the market for cigarettes, he co-opted women into smoking by way of the image of women smokers as torches of freedom. He became thus one of the founders of the PR industry.

In chapter 8 of my book Emotion and Conflict, I summarize as follows:

The success of covert manipulation rests on the human dependence on tacit knowledge, which, in turn, makes humans inherently vulnerable to méconnaissance. And méconnaissance can be efficiently enforced by the manipulation of emotions and meta-emotions. Whoever has sufficient power-over leverage will find it advantageous to introduce ranked honor as master manipulation, because it makes might seem right, and inferiors susceptible to more manipulation. If done cleverly, these manipulations will penetrate, and underlings will debase their dignity, damage their health, and risk death “voluntarily.” The overall strength of emotions and the human need for belonging and recognition figure as powerful liabilities in this process… This need makes people vulnerable to being malignly and stealthily turned into handicapped and thus harmless inferiors in ranked systems—if people believe that they can increase their sense of belonging by climbing up the ladder in a ranked system, even at the cost of mutilating themselves, they may fall for this trap and do so (foot binding as stark example). I call this process voluntary self-humiliation to highlight that it can be unmasked and undone, even though I am aware that it would be more correct to say that people are unwittingly manipulated into self-humiliation.239

Since the economic crisis that broke in 2008, it has expanded and affected many areas of the globe and of people’s lives in various ways.

Let us rephrase the situation. Children are taught by adults to forgo too short-term and too self-centered gratification and train to widen their horizon, both, think more socially inclusive and more long-term. Also in societies, this parental mentoring work is needed, and it is usually delegated to the judiciary and affiliated services. However, the judiciary needs support in society. During the Nazi years in Germany, society was being manipulated by a small group of people into believing that everybody had to sacrifice for the Endsieg (“final victory”). At some point also the judiciary was affected. From the population at large, to the legal system and willing judges, everybody and everything was manipulated into a malign direction. This direction was informed by the dominator culture of the past 10,000 years, where domination was valued as something brought recognition and victory was equivalent to having achieved domination.

Domination, at least in sedentary contexts (less in nomadic contexts), is best proven by
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showing off the dominator’s ability to accumulate resources, be it by building ever more and ever bigger palaces or filling a harem with ever more women.

In such a context, one way to participate is to topple one’s superiors and become the new top-dog. Another way is to imitate one’s dominators’ ways at least towards one’s own inferiors, for instance, beat one’s wife, children, and other subordinates. A third way is to obtain or imitate elite symbols. In all cases, one signals to be part of the elite and tries to participate in the recognition elites receive.240

Many examples illustrate how far imitation can go and how costly and futile it is. The now-outlawed Chinese tradition of foot binding is among the most evocative examples. It shows the price in terms of health and quality of life that people are willing to pay for status. Only because a ruler liked the lotus-shaped feet of one of his dancers, for an entire millennium, Chinese women suffered. I myself have witnessed many related examples during 35 years of global life. Let me recount one here. I lived in Egypt for seven years (1984–1991), where I had a neighbor, a woman with many children, who was very poor. She did not have sufficient resources to buy meat and would eat beans as protein source (as does the majority of Egyptians). She ate less beans, and let her children starve, in order to save money and buy a little bottle of Coca Cola once a month. Drinking this Coca Cola gave her the feeling of being part of the rich West. Coca Cola tastes sweet and it gives status, she explained to me. In her eyes, the satisfaction she gained from this monthly bottle of Coca Cola offset the damage she inflicted on her own health and the health of her children.

Something similar seems to have happened during the past decades (see Rodrigue Tremblay’s concise chronological summary241). What children wish for, namely quick gratification, is very tempting. It tastes sweet. Gamblers fall for that temptation. However, usually they know that gambling is unsustainable, as much as consuming too much sugar may trigger diabetes. World society, during the past decades, was manipulated into believing that gambling can be sustainable. This manipulation was brought about by the abuse of the term freedom or liberty (namely freedom for gamblers and their “innovative” financial “products”). As noted earlier, Oliver Stone’s film Wall Street made the motto of corporate raid known to the world: “Greed is good!”

The manipulation of the past three decades joined up with whatever remnants are left of the traditional dominator culture of the past millennia. In sum, as a result, we see now the success of (at least) two cultural manipulations:

- during the past 10,000 years, it was legitimate to try to gain recognition through domination by means of overt oppression and covert manipulation
- during the past 30 years, overt oppression is less legitimate, while covert manipulation has established a culture of “freedom for gambling”

The resulting set of values could be summarized as “domination is good,” and “domination achieved through gambling is even better,” which, in many ways, became the value guiding business schools and lobbyists who pushed it into law.242

Imitating elites with the aim to appear to be part of them, is as unwise as foot binding. It is doubly unwise. First, it damages health, and second, elites do not regard imitators as genuine elite members. Frantz Fanon, in his work, describes his path from trying to be
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more French than French to realizing that the French will never accept him even if his imitation is perfect. I discuss this in my doctoral dissertation. Imitation is not only costly, but also futile.

As soon as certain values, benign or malign, are enshrined in culture, and enough people are successfully co-opted, it is difficult to introduce change. It may take major downfalls to unmask malign values, such as the demise of Nazi Germany, or the present economic crisis. Therefore, the first sentence in my book *Gender, Humiliation, and Global Security* is as follows: “The economic crisis that broke in 2008 has changed the path of this book.”

To my view, there is no alternative—humankind needs to create new visions for how to arrange life on planet Earth in the future. David King, from 2000 to 2007 the UK’s Chief Scientific Adviser, now Director of the Smith School of Enterprise and Environment at the University of Oxford, emphasizes the uniqueness of this challenge, namely the need for global collective action.

Part of developing such visions could be to already now make a list of who will have to apologize in three hundred years. It took the Catholic Church three hundred years to apologize to Galileo Galilei (1564–1642). Only on October 31, 1992, did Pope John Paul II expressed regret for how the affair with Galileo and his heliocentric model had been handled, and officially conceded that the Earth was not stationary.

Who will apologize in the future, and for what? I suggest that for selling the profit maximizing paradigm under the guise of Adam Smith’s “invisible hand” an apology is due. Apologies are also due for inaccurate credit ratings. And apologies are due from bankers. UK City Minister Lord Myners said it was “unrealistic” that bankers should expect to be paid million pound bonuses. He told bankers “to come back into the real world” (after Royal Bank of Scotland directors threatened to resign over bonuses). In sum, apologies are due from all those who exploit the long-term common good for their own short-term gain and hinder alternative arrangements.

Stakeholder value must come first—involving all stakeholders of the entire socio- and biosphere. As discussed earlier, shareholders must serve that primary value as careholders and sharegivers, because otherwise everybody’s habitat is in danger.

Judith E. Glaser, author of *Creating We*, has just reviewed five “best books of 2010,” and concludes: “In the past, in mainstream publishing, you could not mix business topics with personal effectiveness topics. But these books confirm that the barrier has fallen. By integrating research from the fields of neuroscience and psychology into books about business challenges, their authors give us a new lens through which we can more effectively and successfully navigate our complex, unpredictable world.”

To extend Glaser’s conclusion, we will see more barriers falling in the future. Not only companies need to create inner cohesion and a sense of purpose, but society at large, and not just local communities, but the global human society. Companies are part of a larger context, and this is the capital *We* that will, in the future, be definitorial for every smaller unit within it.

James B. Quilligan was a policy advisor to former German Chancellor Willy Brandt. He has been an international economic consultant for three decades. As director of the Centre for Global Negotiations, he is the American coordinator for the Convention on the Global Commons. He shares the results of the UN Conference on the World Financial
and Economic Crisis, June 24–26, 2009,\textsuperscript{252} when he argues:

The immediate crisis we are facing is to shift from seeing energy, nature, food and water as monetized commodities to recognizing them as reserve values that are essential for our survival and well-being. Only then shall we understand that money is a cultural creation expressing the intrinsic value of these commons—and not a function of the marketplace or of a Central Bank. The creation of a new international monetary system is just around the corner and global value must be integrally informed by human beings, culture, the environment and energy, which means a complete rethinking of all our values for a fair, inclusive and sustainable globalization supported by an authentically new and resilient multilateralism.\textsuperscript{253}

Seymour Mike Miller’s advice for America is as follows, an advice that also other parts of the world could heed:

Politicians are more oriented to election and reelection than to supporting what is in the best interest of the nation. What structural changes in electioneering (e.g., limits on contributions, public finance of campaigns, free tv time for campaign presentations) might support moral behavior by politicians as well as deepen democracy? While there is “substantial evidence that post material value changes have occurred” (Anthony Giddens, \textit{The Third Way}, p. 20), will they flourish in economic difficulties as the 21st century is shaped? Or, are Fourth Way support and advocacy needed? Can anti-commercialism, anti-materialism, pro-environmental issues become political as well as moral questions? Involvements in activities, closer relations with others, may reduce the concern with buying, displaying, comparing, emulating. Can community activities build attachments to others?

The changing situation of the United States should lead to an even more challenging set of goals than extending, defending and improving New Deal and Great Society objectives and programs, important as they are. Floors, doors and connections—parts of the Fourth Way—point the way to new policies and a better America. Conservatives, progressives, independents, the Republican and Democratic parties--widen your sights! The quality of life counts. Even politically.\textsuperscript{254}

\textbf{Global Brainstorming on Solutions: A Campaign that Thinks Outside the Box}

We can’t solve problems by using the same kind of thinking we used when we created them.

—Albert Einstein, 1879–1955\textsuperscript{255}

\textit{The Warning} is a 2009 Frontline documentary on Brooksley Born’s thwarted efforts to regulate the derivatives market. From 1996 to 1999, Born was the chairperson of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC), the U.S. federal agency which oversees the futures and commodity options markets. Born’s predictions for the future are
a wake-up call: “I think we will have continuing danger from these markets and that we will have repeats of the financial crisis—may differ in details but there will be significant financial downturns and disasters attributed to this regulatory gap, over and over, until we learn from experience.”

Present-day institutions, not only in the United States, but particularly global institutions, are adapted to a bygone past, not fit for the interconnectedness of the present world, and not helpful for the creation of a socially and ecologically sustainable future. The ecosphere is troubled by dangerous climate change, while the sociosphere is troubled by debilitating inequality. The cumulative cost of climate change (the estimate is $3.75 trillion in the UK by 2050) and the cumulative cost of high levels of inequality (the estimate is $6.75 trillion for the UK in 2050) is prohibitive.

Dr. Vandana Shiva, scientist, environmentalist, and food justice activist, named one of the seven most influential women in the world by Forbes magazine, agrees with Albert Einstein that “problems cannot be solved with the kind of thinking that created them.” Her message is that apartheid was “the human relations version of classical physics,” and that we have to overcome it, just we have transcended classical physics.

Relationships, processes, resonance, everything being related, nothing being separate and separable, this is what we have to learn and respect. We have to overcome the “corporate state” and embed business into the human community and the Earth community. Gandhi’s key concepts of swaraj, swadeshi, and satyagraha are more relevant than ever for finding ways to live peacefully, equitably and sustainably on this fragile planet. Swaraj means “self governance,” swadeshi “the ability to make and to produce,” and satyagraha “the courage to say no to unjust law” (satyagraha is a term that is assembled from agraha (firmness/force) and satya (truth-love). Vandana Shiva has been “fighting corporate takeover in every area in her native India, combating a nuclear plant one week and patented, genetically modified seeds another,” and she calls on the American people to “see that corporations have abandoned them long ago” and that “the people will have to rebuild democracy as a living democracy.”

To conclude, in our present world, we give primacy to investors. Investors look for “being exited” about projects that offer prospects of good return on their investment. They look for “feeling the “kick” of opening up new horizons for new investment, i.e., investors get exited by maximizing profit. What if we all get exited, jointly, by the prospects of working together for maximizing the common good, for a worthy and dignified future for our children?

### The Economy Should Exist in Order to Serve Human Beings and not the Other Way Round

“The economy should exist in order to serve human beings and not the other way round”—this is an ethical claim. It is supported by ethical schools from all around the globe, present and past. It is supported, for instance, by the traditional African philosophy of ubuntu, ‘I am because you are: I am human because I belong, I participate, I share.’” It resonates with the integral human development of the social teachings of the Roman Catholic Church. Nobel Prize winning economist Amartya Sen confirms: The market is one instrument among others, and not always the best instrument, for achieving human
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Artur Manfred Max Neef is a Chilean economist and environmentalist. In an interview in 2010, he explains that “the more greed you have the more greedy you become,” and advises to teach the following principles to young economists:

1. The economy has to serve the people and not the people to serve the economy.
2. Development is about people and not about objects.
3. Growth is not the same as development, and development does not necessarily require growth.
4. No economy is possible in the absence of equal system services.
5. The economy is a subsystem of a larger finite system, the biosphere, hence permanent growth is impossible.

Economism is the belief in the primacy of economics. “Ensnared in an economic cosmos, we increasingly draw on economic theory, or economism, to explain reality and guide our choices. Indeed, economism even colors the language of science as researchers employ its terms to communicate concepts to the public.” This is what Richard B. Norgaard, Professor of Energy and Resources and of Agriculture and Resource Economics at the University of California, Berkeley, writes. His vision for the future is as follows:

Our challenge is to develop a new vision for the way we conduct ourselves on earth—something as different from industrial civilization as was agricultural civilization before it. A new ecological awareness is critical to this new vision, and for this reason the term ecological civilization resonates well. The concept of social justice has proven robust in spite of the spread of economism, and we need to maintain its centrality in our ecological civilization. While the notion of the public good has not withstood economism, the notion of "the commons" has, and it needs to be developed more fully as part of our new vision. The rise of ecological awareness has trained us to recognize complex systems, which are at the heart of a future ecological civilization. But complexity does not imbue us with the sense of humility and reverence we will also need to undertake the shaping of a new civilization—that reverence we experience on seeing the night sky in all its starry grandeur. In a sense, the whole effort to counter the devastating effects of economism is like searching through the smog for a clear expanse of night sky that enables us to witness once again the brilliant shining stars.

At the outset of this paper, Stéphane Frédéric Hessel, French wartime resistance hero, born in 1917, was quoted. He “cried out” against Nazism in the 1940s. Today, he calls on people to “cry out against the complicity between politicians and economic and financial powers” and to “defend our democratic rights.”

On February 8 and 9, 1943, members of the “Weiße Rose,” a group of young intellectuals who aimed to overthrow Hitler, formulated three principles theses:

- The war is lost for Germany.
• Hitler and his followers continue with the war only for the sake of their personal safety and are prepared to sacrifice the German people for that goal.
• All opposing forces must mobilize to end this war as fast as possible.\(^{264}\)

If we replace the word “war” with the phrase “onslaught on the world’s bio- and sociospheres,” and “Germany” with “humankind,” then we might have the description of current affairs that Hessel perceives.

Howard Richards (2011a) suggests an ethical economy or a plural economy. He writes: “Any ethical criterion defines what should be, and thus implies or states norms and goals. Norms and goals are at some times best served by one institutional form, and at other times best served by a different institutional form” (p. 20). He proposes:

Let us think about micro-enterprises, micro-credit, trainings, businesses owned and managed by their own employees, the social responsibility of business, stakeholders, socializing natural resources, popular education, education for peace and justice, the organization of grassroots communities one neighbourhood at a time, non profit day care centres, fair trade, organizing unions, permaculture, urban agriculture, social entrepreneurship, barter networks, local currencies, ethical banking, consumer cooperatives, credit unions, production cooperatives, health cooperatives, funeral and burial societies, joint buying, joint bread-baking, economic empowerment of women, municipal enterprises, NGOs and non-profit foundations, social movements, community gardening, public social safety nets, putting to use unused lands and buildings, recovering indigenous and peasant lands illegally stolen, restoring ancient traditional forms of cooperation and sharing, the defence of the public sector and in some cases reversing privatizations for example of water supplies. These are typical practices of social humanism in Latin America today (Howard Richards (2011a), p. 17).

Howard Richards (2010c) follows Charles Taylor in using the idea of constitutive rules—Charles Taylor (1993), see also John R. Searle (1969)—and characterizes the constitutive rules of the modern world-system—Immanuel Maurice Wallerstein (1974)—as the rules of a bargaining society. Richards summarizes:

Transformation as distinct from reform changes the constitutive rules. Ubuntu, a traditional philosophy of Africa which according to Desmond Tutu holds that “I am because you are: I am human because I belong, I participate, I share,” is cited as a source of different and transformed constitutive rules of a type badly needed to empower humanity escape the grip of systemic imperatives (Ellen Meiksins Wood (2003), irrational rationality (Herbert Marcuse (1968), and what John Maynard Keynes called “confidence” (John Maynard Keynes (1936), chapter 12). The very constitutive rules of our society drive us ever deeper into social chaos and ecological catastrophe because there is a rationality gap: a gap between a so-called “rationality” constrained by the laws of economics, and a wider rationality of cultural creativity constrained only by the physical laws of nature. These same points could be made in terms of “paradigm” (Thomas Samuel Kuhn (1962), or “basic cultural structure”\(^{1}\).
Howard Richards and Joanna Swanger (2006) but here I make them in terms of “constitutive rules.” Humanizing methodologies in teaching and in social research play an indispensable role in working for the deep culture shift that is needed” (Richards in a personal communication, July 23, 2010, italics added by Lindner).

**Form Must Follow Function**

How can a transition be brought about? *Form must follow function.* Or, as negotiation theory expresses it, *interest* must guide negotiations, not *positions.*

“Form must follow function” is the guiding principle for international environmental governance. *Decision 25/4* on international environmental governance was adopted by the Governing Council of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) on February 20, 2009.266 As a result of *Decision 25/4*, the Governing Council established a regionally representative, consultative group of ministers and high level representatives, which convened on June 27 and 28, 2009, in Belgrade, and on October, 28 and 29, 2009 in Rome. The meetings were co-chaired by Stefania Prestigiacomo, Minister for Environment, Land and Sea of Italy, and John Njoroge Michuki, Minister for Environment and Mineral Resources of Kenya. The co-chairs’ summary was titled “Belgrade Process: Moving Forward with Developing a Set of Options on International Environmental Governance.”

The work of the consultative group, was set out in paragraph 7 of the Belgrade Process, and was guided by the following basic concepts:

- Any reform to international environmental governance should be based on the principle that form should follow function;
- Consultations on functions will lead to a discussion on forms that could range from incremental changes to other broader institutional reforms;
- The international environmental governance debate should be addressed in the broader context of environmental sustainability and sustainable development;
- Developing a set of options for improving international environmental governance should follow from a fresh examination of multiple challenges and emerging opportunities;
- Incremental changes to international environmental governance can be considered alongside other more fundamental reforms;
- The work of the consultative group should continue to be political in nature.267

What the Belgrade Process illustrates is the need for more truly functional psychological, social, and cultural social mindsets on the part of world community, which, in turn, then needs to inform the implementation of systemic change that can provide the world with global decency.268

This transition requires two core loops (using the ideal-type approach269): a large enough group of committed citizens (1) at all levels, from civil society to the gatekeepers of political and economic institutions, must muster sufficient awareness of global
responsibility to implement new global institutional frames (2), new frames that give new form to global institutions that is truly functional for an interdependent world and serves the interest of all of humankind, not the positions of a few.

Institutions (2) have preeminence because decent institutions can drive feedback loops that foster global cooperation in a systemic rather than haphazard way. Any subsequent loop will have the advantage of enjoying the support from the system, no longer only depending on a few gifted individuals.

The first loop, the initial implementation of new institutions, would be helped if the world had more “non-violent revolutionaries,” or more Nelson Mandela–like individuals, who could “nudge” the world’s systems into more constructive frames in the spirit of Margaret Meads words “Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can change the world. Indeed, it is the only thing that ever has.” Nobel Peace Laureate Jody William’s campaign to ban personal landmines, for example, expressed this spirit. The International Campaign to Ban Landmines (ICBL) organization ultimately achieved its goal in 1997 when an international treaty (Ottawa Treaty) banning antipersonnel landmines was signed in Ottawa in 1997 (though some nations, notably the United States, China and Russia refrained).

The preeminent role of systemic structures is currently increasingly acknowledged. Peace psychologist Daniel J. Christie (2006) reports that peace psychology “emerged as a distinct area of research and practice during the Cold War, when the pre-eminent concern was the prevention of nuclear war” (Daniel J. Christie (2006), Abstract). “In particular, three themes are emerging in post-Cold War peace psychology: (1) greater sensitivity to geohistorical context, (2) a more differentiated perspective on the meanings and types of violence and peace, and (3) a systems view of the nature of violence and peace” (Daniel J. Christie (2006), p. 3).

Organizational analyst Peter M. Senge emphasizes that systems thinking has the distinction of being the “fifth discipline” since it serves to make the results of the other disciplines work together. His colleague Claus Otto Scharmer speaks to Margaret Mead’s adage when he emphasizes crystallizing as the process whereby a small group of key persons commits itself to a project that they have presenced. He explains that this core group functions as a vehicle for the whole to manifest, through the power of their intention, which will create an energy field that attracts people, opportunities, and resources that make things happen. The next steps in this process are prototyping, and performing.

In “How to Construct Stable Democracies,” Jack Goldstone and Jay Ulfelder explain that liberal democracy is a powerful means of enhancing a country’s political stability. Within nations, economic, ethnic, and regional effects have only modest impact on political stability. Rather, stability is determined by a country’s patterns of political competition and political authority. The authors stipulate that we have to learn more about “how some emerging democracies manage to foster free and open competition without descending into factionalism and why some leaders are more willing to accept meaningful constraints on their authority.” Goldstone and Ulfelder recommend (and this advice could be heeded also by global society) that “the focus must be shifted from arguments over which societies are ready for democracy toward how to build the specific institutions that reduce the risk of violent instability in countries where democracy is being established.”
Scholars such as Stanley Milgram and Philip Zimbardo underpin Goldstone and Ulfelder’s message. They have shown through their experiments how important it is to create systems that allow people to be good, rather than limit our efforts to attempts to reform individuals who have to function in less than nurturing systems. Zimbardo explained how “a system” creates “a situation,” which brings “good” people to behave “badly.” Since the Inquisition, he argues, we have been dealing with problems at an individual level—the individual only was addressed, with its propensities and culpability. The influence of the situation was neglected.

Peace psychologist Daniel J. Christie lays out the contemporary scope of peace psychology as follows: “In particular, three themes are emerging in post-Cold War peace psychology: (1) greater sensitivity to geohistorical context, (2) a more differentiated perspective on the meanings and types of violence and peace, and (3) a systems view of the nature of violence and peace.”

If we apply Milgram’s, Zimbardo’s, Christie’s and Goldstone’s insights to the real world, it is wiser to systematically nurture Mandela-like behavior than to wait for exceptional personalities to emerge against all odds and by chance. It is wiser to heed Jean Baker Miller’s advice and create alternative arrangements rather than accept false choices. It is wiser to systematically promote an alternative climate of trust rather than a climate of fear. Right relationships are needed, and they must be expressed in the right kind of institutions, not just locally, but globally. Too little institution building must be avoided as much as too much of it, oppressive uniformity must be prevented as much as destructive division, with the aim that a balance of unity in diversity can flourish.
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A Panoply of New Strategies for Inclusionism or Dignism

We wish to avoid oppressive communism, and of de-solidarizing Wallstreet capitalism, that both created exclusion on a large scale, what then? What about inclusionism (coined by Linda Hartling)? Or, what about dignism (coined by Evelin Lindner)?

A panoply of new strategies is needed to bring form and function into congruence. To briefly enumerate, as new philosophical foundation, we need the nondualistic principle of unity in diversity. It represents a helpful principle if two malign distortions of this principle are to be undone or prevented, namely, oppressive uniformity on one side (for example, oppressive communism), and unrestricted freedom to foment division at the other side (for example, cultures of ruthless individualism). To achieve this, the experience from past hyperpowers shows that the inclusivity of “tolerance” is a superior strategy. As to core guidelines and definitions, as mentioned above, function and interest rather than form and position, and output rather than input must be foregrounded. As to cultural and social practices and institutions, communal sharing needs to be given priority. Subsidiarity is the suitable guideline for forging complex syntheses that can express unity in diversity. A subsidiarity approach can help combine communal sharing with elements of market economy into new layers of local and global institutions. To bring about these changes and grasp the opportunities that typically are entailed in crisis, women and men must recalibrate their contributions to society.

A world of unity in diversity, implemented through the subsidiarity principle, requires that humankind builds new institutional layers at the global level, just as national institutions unite federal states without effacing their diversity. This requires a rethinking of the classical nation-state concept.

Yet, unfortunately, since states are hesitant to lose sovereignty, or, more precisely, since those who identify with the state system and earn their livelihoods through its existence resist the weakening of this system—among others due to the well-known human weakness of loss aversion—the necessary unifying process meets strong resistance whenever institution building is seriously considered.

Large-scale crises often help overcome this resistance and stimulate waves of changes, such as, for example, the founding of the United Nations after WWII and the Holocaust. However, such waves typically suffer from subsequent backlashes, as could be observed when a neoliberal rollback began around thirty years ago.

It seems that a long unfinished revolution cries out to be carried into the future. Today, the discourse on how to best build good world governance and institutions is in dire need of revival. The global economic crisis that broke in 2008 would be of great service if it could renew enthusiasm for the implementation of new global institutions.

John Maynard Keynes, at the UN Monetary and Financial Conference in Bretton Woods in July 1944, proposed to establish a world “reserve currency” administered by a global central bank. Keynes believed this would have created a more stable and fairer world economy by automatically recycling trade surpluses to finance trade deficits. Both deficit and surplus nations would take responsibility for trade imbalances.

Perhaps it is time to include idea like these into the brainstorming about the future of...
humankind?

Paul Grignon has developed a vision for a new monetary system:

My proposal is for a self-generating system that could arise spontaneously from a severe collapse of the existing system OR by voluntary acceptance, bottom-up, top-down or both at once. Many of these types of systems are operating now as community currencies, and particularly successful are the “business-to-business barter networks.” Businesses may not be 100% reliable but they are much more so than individuals, even if that is simply by being a collective enterprise not disabled by any event happening to a single person. That is why corporate self-issued credit that can be used as third party money by everyone is the essential backbone of my proposal, what I consider the realistic vision, although anyone, even the neighborhood babysitter, would be FREE to issue credit to those who would accept it. The movement for state banking led by Ellen Brown and for issuing Federal debt-free government money led by the American Monetary Institute are essentially about self-issued credit as well. But their vision is LIMITED to the state and federal levels respectively and are currently at odds with each other!!

Grignon believes that the “‘single uniform commodity in limited supply’ principle of money is the ROOT of all of our problems with money… We must change the paradigm of money from ‘debt of money as a thing in itself’ to ‘credit for real value expressed in money units.’” Grignon’s “Evolution BEYOND Money” is that “money becomes money as a ‘measuring unit of value’ for material redemption, like ‘minutes, meters and tons.’ It is money as a monetary language for everyone to use to express the value they produce, not money as a scarce commodity controlled by those who have the most of it.”

“Therefore, it is my contention that the solution is a transaction system that automates the application of a speculation-free value unit defined by formula.”

Currently, global institution building is far from being scrutinized as thoroughly as is done by Grignon and like-minded thinkers. Douglas Hurd, a former diplomat and conservative foreign secretary in the UK, explains in an interview and in his new book how multilateral institutions (UN, World Trade Organization, NATO) are failing. The opportunity was missed in 1989 of recreating the big institutions of the world, he warns. The world community needs institutions that can deal with climate change, and institutions that can sort out when to intervene in other people’s affairs and when to stay out. These are the “loose canons” that were not settled at the last great settlement in 1945. They must be settled now, Hurd urges.

On the website of the International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD) we read the following:

At present there are about 13 global Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs) and/or conventions and about 500 international treaties or other agreements related to the environment. This proliferation of agreements has created concern among international and national communities regarding overlap and duplication of goals and programs. Lack of coherence results in high transaction costs and inefficiencies in achieving convention objectives and the need for coherence is obvious. While several
MEAs have yielded a more integrated approach towards environmental management, little is currently being done to find coherence between environmental agreements and development initiatives, especially the recently designed Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).

What is needed at the current juncture in human history is a period of global brainstorming as to which large-scale global umbrella systems need to be put in place to make the future worth living in. The insight that “we sink or swim together” is not yet sufficiently expressed in institutions. Form does not reflect function.

Glimpses of global brainstorming on solutions are indeed emerging. This paper does not advocate any one solution, but wishes to contribute to a creative dialogue that considers all available ideas.

What is crucial at this juncture, however, as in any process of brainstorming, is to avoid introducing new dynamics of humiliation by maligning other people’s analyses and suggestions for solutions (see earlier discussion of humiliating effects).

Global Brainstorming

At present, increasingly, more people step up to the challenge and engage in creative analysis and tentative action. Where Good Ideas Come From: The Natural History of Innovation, by science writer Steven Johnson is one of the books that need to be read by all now, as is the work on tipping points and outliers by author Malcolm Gladwell. The reason is that we need to learn how to shift paradigms. Physicist Paul D. Raskin’s important essay on “Great Transition” is a must-read now.

On March 8, 2011, the Global Development and Environment Institute presented the 2011 Leontief Prize to Nicholas Stern. In his acceptance speech, he drew on the economic historian of technology Chris Freeman and his description of 5 past major technological transformations: mechanisation of textiles (late 18th century); steam and rail (mid 19th); steel and electricity (end 19th); oil, automobiles and mass production (early 20th); information and communication technologies, ICT (end of the 20th Century and continuing). “One can quibble with timings or definitions but this key aspect of the story is clear. We now require a sixth: to our advantage it will overlap with the fifth, ICT.”

The great transition that both Raskin and Stern call for can only be brought about by people pressure (see, among others, Paul Hawken, or Paul H. Ray and Sherry Ruth Anderson). Anthropologists Alan Page Fiske’s work on the four basic modes of sociality suggests how the new paradigm must look like: it must give pre-eminence to communal sharing over the other three modes. The authenticity of interdependence (rather than individual autonomy and independence or dependence on collective bondedness), quality (rather than quantity): the characteristics of the new paradigm are multifaceted and they represent the real wealth of nations described by a Riane Eisler. First, however, we have to recognize, how we “organize ourselves into a resource-hierarchy” (Michael Britton, in a personal communication on November 27, 2010, while reading Christopher Hedge’s work).
In the context of creative analysis and tentative action, global economic institutions are a particularly important topic, since they provide the largest global definitorial frame (both with their presence and absence).\textsuperscript{303}

The list of initiatives that can inform global brainstorming that follows is (roughly) chronological (well-known initiatives are listed without longer explanatory texts):

- About a century ago, theoretical economist and social activist Silvio Gesell thought that money is a public good—like the telephone or bus transport—and that a small fee should be charged for using it. Through such a “demurrage charge,” a monetary system could be designed that gives an incentive to long-term thinking, rather than a short-term exploitation of resources. He considered himself a world citizen and believed the Earth should belong to all people, regardless of race, gender, class, wealth, religion and age, and that borders should be made obsolete.\textsuperscript{304}

- “Living Well” is the indigenous social system that focuses on reciprocity between people and the Earth.\textsuperscript{305} Indeed, indigenous people can teach the world.\textsuperscript{306}

- In Scandinavia or Costa Rica alternative paths of economic and political have been tried, see more further down.\textsuperscript{307}

- An early initiative was \textit{Our Common Future}, a report of the World Commission on Environment and Development chaired by Norwegian prime minister Gro Harlem Brundtland in March 20, 1987.\textsuperscript{308}

- In 1994, Thai Buddhist monk Prayudh A. Payutto wrote: “It is well known that the study of economics has up till now avoided questions of moral values and considerations of ethics, which are abstract qualities. However, it is becoming obvious that in order to solve the problems that confront us in the world today it will be necessary to take into consideration both concrete and abstract factors, and as such it is impossible to avoid the subject of moral values. If the study of economics is to play any part in the solution of our problems, it can no longer evade the subject of ethics. Nowadays environmental factors are taken into account both in economic transactions and in solving economic problems, and the need for ethics in addressing the problem of conservation and the environment is becoming more and more apparent.”\textsuperscript{309}

Ove Jacobsen, professor at the Centre for Ecological Economics and Ethics in Bodø, North Norway, writes:

Payutto states that ethics is the connection between the inner and outer reality. He points to the wisdom, compassion and moderation are important characteristics of an economy that will promote individual and social development within the framework of a sustainable nature. Payutto explains Buddhist economics as based on the concepts Tanhã and Chanda. Tanhã refers to a selfish pursuit of material like experiences. As the needs of light experiences are endless, they often lead to greed, hatred and selfishness. Chanda represents wisdom and ethical values that are central to the quest for true happiness and quality of life. The road to Chanda goes through reflection on life experiences. According Payutto we will eventually discover that mental
condition, moral behavior and economics are linked together through a stream of actions. The goal is to develop an overall understanding that changes conflicts of interest to an experience of community of interest between individuals, society, and nature...In terms of economic value he distinguishes between true value (Chanda) leading to ‘wellbeing,’ and artificial value (Tanhā), which only helps selfish greed activities... Payutto differentiates dependent happiness, independent happiness and harmonious happiness. Dependent happiness is linked to external objects and is thus dependent on things in the material world. Independent happiness is linked to internal conditions such as ‘peace of mind’. Independent happiness is more stable than the happiness that is dependent on the presence of external objects. Harmonic happiness is based on an altruistic attitude where the goal is to help other peoples ‘well-being.’ Harmonic happiness is linked with Buddhism aims to cultivate the experience of the relationship between ‘I’ and ‘we’ or a ‘the extended self.’ Trust and solidarity (with all living creatures) are thus indicators of true happiness. The best interest of communities is associated with the absence of poverty more than with the maximization of production and consumption... In Buddhist economics work has intrinsic value because it is to seek common goals through collaboration with other people contributing to personal development while it combats selfishness (Chanda). Work that has been reduced to only be a means to raise money for consumption of goods and services are motivated by Tanhā. This means that we want to work at least possible and consume as much as possible. Also at this point Payutto recommends a balance between extremes... Payutto argues that competition is an effective means to maximize production and consumption of goods and services (Tanhā). When economic actors are working together to achieve greater market power, he uses the term ‘artificial cooperation.’ If the goal is to promote a development that leads to the community he recommends genuine cooperation. True collaboration occurs as a result of the insight that everything is connected and is motivated by Chanda."

- Plato (c.428–348 B.C.E.) recommended justice, wisdom, courage, and moderation (or sophrosyne, a sense of limit, moral sanity, self-control, and moderation guided by true self-knowledge). Faith, hope, and love were added later, together constituting the seven cardinal virtues. Aristotle highlighted phronesis (Latin prudentia), or “practical wisdom.” A longer, more recent list entails eight core values: love, truthfulness, fairness, freedom, unity, tolerance, responsibility and respect for life.

- Norway has emerged from the economic crisis that broke in 2008 relatively unscathed, not least due to its artful moderation. Philosopher Henrik Syse has advised Norwegian banks and emphasis moderation.

- Innovative initiatives emerged from conceptualizations that were developed in the past, such as the Rudolf Steiner Foundation, RSF Social Finance, and the Praxis Peace Institute. For twenty-five years, RSF Social Finance has been devoted to building the emerging field of social finance through investing, lending, and giving. RSF has been developing the Transforming Money Network, which
includes those working across the full spectrum of financial approaches, from private equity to complementary currencies. Several groups and initiatives have emerged as a result of this Network including: The Sequoia Principles for Transforming Money; the Fund for Complementary Currencies; Money, Race, and Class Conversations; and, Intuition and Money gatherings. RSF’s Fund for Complementary Currencies supports replicable pilot projects in new forms of currencies, including BerkShares, TimeBanks, and GETS (Global Exchange Trade System), and research and innovation in the means of economic exchange. The Praxis Peace Institute has established itself since its founding in 2001 as a vehicle for deep inquiry, practical workshops, and civic education.


> Unfortunately, according to my observation, this balanced approach suffered a rollback, as the notion of shareholder value dominated MBA courses. As we see now, this was highly devastating to the economy as well as to most people. The problem now is to find a new paradigm. Just starting again with the theories of some 20, 30 years ago in my opinion is not sufficient. This would pose a high risk that shareholders will continue to dominate economics. I would be highly interested in your thoughts about how to define an improved framework for quality organizations, which not only reduces the risk that usurpations seize too much power but also secures a good combination of economical efficiency, equal participation of all stakeholders and sustainable management of natural resources. The last point was somehow neglected in Aldridge and EFQM practices, but is crucial now.

- Mathematician, statistician and economist Nicholas Georgescu-Roegen introduced into economics, inter alia, the concept of entropy from thermodynamics (as distinguished from the mechanistic foundation of neoclassical economics drawn from Newtonian physics) and did foundational work, which later developed into evolutionary economics. His work contributed significantly to bioeconomics and to ecological economics.316

- Economic innovator Dee Ward Hock formed the nonprofit organization The Chaordic Commons to develop, disseminate, and implement new concepts of organization that result in more equitable sharing of power and wealth, improved health, and greater compatibility with the human spirit and biosphere.317

- As mentioned in the Introduction, Paul Anthony Samuelson (1915–2009) was an American economist, and the first American to win the Nobel Prize in Economics. He was author of the largest-selling economics textbook of all time, *Economics: An Introductory Analysis*, first published in 1948 and now in its 19th edition.318

- Economist Bernard Lietaer’s *The Future of Money* is by now a classic.319

- Monetary theory and history is explained by Stephen A. Zarlenga, director of the American Monetary Institute, an institute dedicated to monetary reform in the
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United States, in *The Lost Science of Money*. It is argued that Dignism, rather than Communism or Capitalism

- The Earth Charter provides a template for global analysis and action.

- The Caux Principles are grounded on two moral concepts, the Japanese concept of *kyosei* which means living and working together for the common good, and the concept of human dignity. Both these statements give a central place to respect for human rights in business activity.

- The European Business Ethics Network EBEN, founded in 1987 as a non-profit association, is a cross-national network dedicated to the promotion of business ethics, broadly defined, in academia, business, public sector and civil society.

- Global Corporate Citizenship (“GCC”) emerged in management and business scholarship in the 1990s. Similar terms are corporate social responsibility (“CSR”), corporate conscience, corporate social performance, or sustainable responsible business. It means the deliberate inclusion of public interest into corporate decision-making, and the honouring of a triple bottom line: people, planet, profit.

- The formulation of the Millennium Development Goals provides a guideline for global action.

- The United Nations Global Compact, also known as Compact or UNGC, is a United Nations initiative to encourage businesses worldwide to adopt sustainable and socially responsible policies, and to report on their implementation.

- The Model Economy Community is forum is intended for the rapidly growing group of people who believe that the dominant monetary systems need to be changed.

- ISO, the International Organization for Standardization, has decided to launch an International Standard providing guidelines for social responsibility (SR), named ISO 26000 or ISO SR, that is expected to be released in 2010.

- Nobel prize winning economist Robert Alexander Mundall, who laid the groundwork for the introduction of the Euro, advocates developing a world currency.

- PayPal is, in many ways, a new world currency. Peter Thiel, its founder, would merit to have his name alongside such names as Bill Gates. PayPal harnesses a global consciousness through the web, through a money service that allows to freely move money around the world. Money can be moved across national borders through abstract cyberspace. In 2008, it was handling 16 billion dollars in transactions per year. This gives people sovereignty over their money that they did not have before. Thiel was also a key early investor in Facebook, which, by now, has the third biggest population of the world if it were a country. Formerly constrained by history and geography, now people can reach across boundaries and challenge existing power structures of nation states.

- As mentioned earlier, David A. King, now Director of the Smith School of Enterprise and Environment at the University of Oxford, urges to be courageous enough to face the uniqueness of the need for global collective action, and to realize the feasibility of “green growth.”

- The discussion around the nascent P2P movement (that includes the Free Software
and Open Source, the open access, the free culture movements, among others) is interesting in this context. Peer-to-peer (P2P) processes represent an emerging field, supported by new information and communication technologies (ICTs) and part of a global reality of nonmarket practices. In the project Oekonux, for instance, the economic and political forms of Free Software are being discussed. People like Lawrence Lessig, founding board member of Creative Commons, and peer-to-peer theorist Michael Bauwens aim to develop a conceptual framework for these new social processes. Michael Bauwens writes that a Commons-based political economy would be centered around peer to peer, but it would co-exist with a powerful and re-invigorated sphere of reciprocity (gift-economy) centered around the introduction of time-based complementary currencies and a reformed sphere for market exchange, the kind of “natural capitalism” described by Paul Hawken, David C. Korten, and Hazel Henderson, where the costs for natural and social reproduction are no longer externalized, and which abandons the growth imperative for a throughput economy as described by Herman Daly.

- Britain’s New Economics Foundation publishes a “Happy Planet Index,” which “shows that it’s possible for a nation to have high well-being with a low ecological footprint.” And the nonprofit Center for the Advancement of the Steady State Economy, an Arlington, VA, USA, explains that “continuous economic growth on a finite planet is wishful thinking.” The first North American “De-Growth” conference took place in 2010 in Vancouver, BC. The goal of steady-state economics is, after all, reasonable incomes for all human beings in a more humane society that preserves the planet and promotes human happiness.

- The Beyond GDP conference in the European Parliament in 2009 discussed a new approach to measuring Quality of Life, beyond culturally biased “happiness” concepts.

- The Franco-German Ministerial Council decided on February 4, 2010, to ask the French Conseil d’Analyse Économique (CAE) and the German Council of Economic Experts (GCEE) to follow-up on the outcome of the “Commission on the Measurement of Economic Performance and Social Progress” (Stiglitz-Sen-Fitoussi Commission, or SSFC). In Germany, the Enquete-Kommission „Wachstum, Wohlstand, Lebensqualität“ began its work on January 17, 2011.

- The Green New Deal report was published on behalf of the Green New Deal Group by nef (the new economics foundation). The European Green Party (EGP) and the European Free Alliance (EFA) have developed a program for a New Green Deal: Climate Protection, New Jobs And Social Justice by Reinhard Buetikofer and Sven Giegold.

- The Commission on Key National Indicators was founded in 2010 by the United States Congress to provide oversight and advice for a new Key National Indicators System for the United States. The first ever bipartisan Commission on Key National Indicators is now complete, “following appointments by Speaker of the House Nancy Pelosi and Minority Leader John Boenher. The eight members of the bipartisan Commission on Key National Indicators have been selected by congressional leaders in the House and the Senate to oversee implementation of a
Key National Indicator System to help the American people better assess the nation’s progress. The KNIS -- enabled by an innovative public/private partnership -- will select a limited number of key measures on the most important issues facing the country and make them freely available via the web using the best quality public and private data sources. The system will be implemented by the National Academy of Sciences in partnership with a non-profit institute, the State of the USA. A total of $70 million in public financial support is authorized for KNIS over nine years to complement contributions by the private sector, which are nearing $15 million to date.”

- Paul Krugman received the Nobel Memorial Prize in Economics in 2008 for his contributions to new trade theory and new economic geography.
- The Declaration on Degrowth is the product of a workshop held at the Conference on Economic Degrowth for Ecological Sustainability and Social Equity held in Paris on 18-19 April 2008. It reflects the points of view of the conference participants and articulates the vision of the Decroissance movement. See also the Declaration of Tilburg. Both declarations call upon a radical re-orientation of our economies.
- Elinor Ostrom received the Nobel Prize for Economics 2009. She is considered one of the leading scholars in the study of common pool resources. Her work emphasizes the multifaceted nature of human–ecosystem interaction and argues against any singular “panacea” for individual social-ecological system problems.
- The global governance of financial systems is being discussed, among others, by John Leonard Eatwell, a British economist and the current President of Queens’ College, Cambridge.
- Berthold Huber, leader of the largest German union, IG-Metall, calls for truth commissions to work through the causes of the economic crisis that broke in 2008.
- Ellen Hodgson Brown wrote about the *Web of Debt*.
- Community economist Thomas Henry Greco, Jr. explains alternatives to “money” in *The End of Money and the Future of Civilization*.
- The work of independent scientist, environmentalist, and futurologist James Lovelock (2009) has been foundational. His work is carried forward, among others, at the Schumacher College, by Stephan Harding (2006). Ben Brangwyn and Rob Hopkins co-founded the Transition Network, aspiring to implement a fast developing transition model.
- As mentioned earlier, the documentary *Home* has been very influential in France’s last elections. Many more influential films would merit to be mentioned here, among them the recent documentary by Charles Ferguson *Inside Job* (2010).
- Concepts of cosmopolitan constitutionalism and cosmopolitan sovereignty are emerging. Cosmopolitanism transcends monism and dualism in allowing for differences in processes and procedures among states, while providing for graduated authority in judicial authority.
- An economic model for the future, Common Welfare Economy, is being
Dignism, Rather than Communism or Capitalism

• A total paradigm shift in economic arrangements it predicted by economy professor Franz Hörmann within less than three years. “The economic system of western societies (as the result of the so called “globalization” in fact nearly the economic system of the whole world) is the result of historically grown thought patterns that emerged around a few very limited premises at the core….We only need to learn how to change economic models and century old thought patterns that are so engraved on our minds (after all, we learn how to count money already in primary school), that those common believes are never questioned. “You can’t spend more money, than you’ve got!” and similar sayings transform economy in our minds into a zero-sum game. But zero-sum games can only be won by one player – his opponent is doomed to loose, and, most of all, he is doomed to be an opponent right from the start. If we succeed in changing the mental engrams of economy in the global mind, only then will humanity prosper and flourish again.”

• Economist Kamran Mofid founded the Globalisation for the Common Good (GCG) initiative.

• Götz Wolfgang Werner is the founder, co-owner, and member of the advisory board of dm-drogerie markt, a German drugstore chain, and, since October 2003, the head of Cross-Department Group for Entrepreneurial Studies at the Karlsruhe Institute of Technology. He is one of the most influential advocates of basic income in Germany.

• In Germany, a group of wealthy individuals calls for higher taxes for the wealthy. For retired doctor Dieter Lehmkuhl, 66, for example, “it is time the wealthy came to the aid of their country. He reckons that if the 2.2 million Germans who have personal fortunes of more than €500,000 ($750,000) paid a tax of five percent this year and next, it would provide the state with €100 billion.” In the United States, along with United for a Fair Economy, Responsible Wealth’s new Tax Wealth Like Work Campaign focuses attention on the discrepancies in the tax system that reward income from wealth over income from work. “As Congress and cash-strapped states struggle to balance budgets, these wealthy people are urging that the income from their investment portfolios be taxed at the same rate as work income. That was done in the late 1980s under Presidents Reagan and Bush, and restoring the rates would raise $84 billion in 2011. The campaign is also building support for Congresswoman Jan Schakowsky’s Fairness in Taxation Act which would tax capital gains and dividend income as ordinary income for taxpayers with income over $1 million, and create higher income tax brackets for millionaires and billionaires.”

• In May 2007, an Education Commission was created in Norway (Dannelsesutvalg) to examine international cutting edge thinking with respect to higher education, and to develop recommendations for Norway. The report was published in 2009. The commission argues that liberal arts education is of utmost significance for the creation of responsible citizenship. It explains why liberal arts education is not simply “a luxury for elites.” The commission therefore calls for liberal arts education to be strengthened in all relevant curricula.
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• Business journalist Marjorie Kelly speaks of the transitioning to For-Benefit Business.  

• Helena Norberg-Hodge is an analyst of the impact of the global economy on cultures and agriculture worldwide and a pioneer of the localisation movement.  

• Scholars and activists around the world promote and develop fair trade. A book by Joseph E. Stiglitz is only one manifestation of many. Mitch Teberg is a young activist writing a blog while conducting a 5-7 month research to write a book on Fair Trade. Ragnhild Nilsen, a writer, artist, and coach, and member of the Global Advisory Board of the Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies network, is part of this movement with her Global Fair Trade initiative.  

• As to the production of military equipment, even though it has risen dramatically after the end of the Cold War, countermovements do emerge. The international Global Zero movement, for instance, launched in December 2008, includes more than 300 political, military, business, faith and civic leaders—and hundreds of thousands of citizens—working for the phased, verified elimination of all nuclear weapons worldwide. The signatories of the declaration range from Hans Blix to Horst Teltschik, from Gro Harlem Brundtland to Jimmy Carter to Zbigniew Brzezinski.  

• The transdisciplinary field of ecological economics is an important emerging field of academic research that aims to address the interdependence and coevolution of human economies and natural ecosystems over time and space.  

• Behavioral game theory uses variations of the prisoner’s dilemma game to study human behaviors. It is a game where the participants have the choice to cooperate or to cheat on one another. Results show that humans are behaving in much more cooperative ways than the Homo economicus concept indicates. Results are relevant also for humiliation theory, namely, by demonstrating how people, in the face of humiliation, may want to pay back and retaliate, even at the cost of hurting themselves. Political scientist Robert Axelrod explored computer models of the iterated prisoner’s dilemma game (which gives two players the chance to cooperate or betray one another) and formalized the evolutionary tit-for-tat strategy. Axelrod’s key finding is that the evolutionary tit-for-tat strategy—also known as reciprocal altruism—is remarkably successful and defeats all other strategies, increasing the benefits of cooperation over time and protecting participants from predators. In the field of social psychology Morton Deutsch lays out what he calls Deutsch’s crude law of social relations. This law says that “characteristic processes and effects elicited by a given type of social relationship (cooperative or competitive) tend also to elicit that type of social relationship.” In short, “cooperation breeds cooperation, while competition breeds competition.”  

• Many environmental problems have been positively addressed by internalizing externalities (in many countries a decrease can be observed, for example, in acid rain, or in emissions of lead, mercury, copper, DDT, sulfur, etc). However, other problems, such as climate change, are more complex. To solve the prisoner’s dilemma in a cooperative way, at the level of local communities, people know each other and can communicate to achieve cooperation. At higher levels of
institutional organization, this can only be achieved when the mandate of an societal institution is relatively congruent with the scope and level of the problem. For example, noise pollution is usually comparatively easy to address, because political and institutional influence patterns coincide with the scope and level of the problem. As for climate change, global structures that could play this role are weak or lacking.

Economist Richard T. Carson has been quoted earlier. He concludes that there might have been “a lost decade or more during which environmental economists failed to focus on other potential driving forces behind changes in environmental quality within a country” than the income–pollution relationship. He warns that the debate over the income–pollution relationship made developing countries ignore their environmental problems until they develop and become wealthier, even though it is clear that developing countries can take many actions.

• The Centre of Equality, Social Organization, and Performance (ESOP) is a research centre funded by the Research Council of Norway (RCN) as a Centre of Excellence (CoE) at the Department of Economics of the University of Oslo, Norway. ESOP was established January 1, 2007. ESOP aims at exploring the links between equality, social organization, and economic performance, both in rich and poor countries. The ambitions are:
  • to confront economic theory with the Nordic lessons: Do we need to change the basic behavioral and institutional assumptions or can the Nordic lessons be explained in a standard economic approach when only the details get right?
  • to understand the linkages between economic performance, distribution, and social disparities: What are the costs and benefits of more equality?
  • to explore the sustainability of generous welfare states and the viability of egalitarian market economies: What determine their performance and their economic and political feasibility?
  • to understand the interaction between policies, institutions and long term development: What set of policies and institutions may generate an egalitarian development path within a consistent arrangement?
  • to bring these research topics to the international research frontier: What are the general lessons for economics?

Economists Karl Ove Moene leads ESOP. In his work, he explains that welfare spending and wage coordination both generate equality: “Equality can multiply due to the complementarity between wage determination and welfare spending. A more equal wage distribution fuels welfare generosity via political competition. A more generous welfare state fuels wage equality further via its support to weak groups in the labor market. Together the two effects generate a cumulative process that adds up to an important social multiplier. We focus on a political economic equilibrium which incorporates this mutual dependence between wage setting and welfare spending. It explains how almost equally rich countries differ in economic and social equality among their citizens and why countries cluster around different worlds of welfare capitalism—the Scandinavian model, the Anglo-Saxon model and the Continental model. Using data on 18 OECD countries over the period 1976-2002 we test the main predictions of the model and identify a sizeable magnitude of the equality multiplier. We obtain additional support for the
cumulative complementarity between social spending and wage equality by applying another data set for the US over the period 1945-2001.”

- BerkShares, the local currency for the Berkshire region of Massachusetts has garnered much new attention, largely due to the fact that it is one of the few privately issued scrips in the US. Hits to the BerkShares website in December averaged 21,000 daily.

- BitCoin is proof that a peer-to-peer money system is feasible. Yet, as Paul Grignon comments, “BitCoin is created as an unstable, unbacked single uniform commodity of limited quantity (20 million BitCoins). According to my analysis, which is presented in Money as Debt III, Evolution Beyond Money, the ‘single uniform commodity’ principle of money is the ROOT of all of our problems with money and therefore not the model I would endorse.” We must “change the paradigm of money from ‘debt of money as a thing in itself’ to ‘credit for real value expressed in money units’.”

- Digital Coin is a proposal developed by Paul Grignon. It has been recommended as follows: “I have an innate belief that the current system is the problem, though I can at times have great difficulty putting words (verbal or written) together to express such a belief. I think if we are to truly move this project forward to the point that it goes from an intellectual construct to an actual working system we need to be looking at the bigger picture. … One of the topics is how we convince people to adopt a new system. Of course … education is important. But I think sometimes we can get lost with all the safeguards we have inherited in modern society. We can discuss, debate and computer model just about anything, subject or topic. But at some point we must do. Bruce Lee uses to liken it to learning to swim on dry land. At some point you are going to have to get wet. At some point you either sink or swim. I believe that by getting the system operating people will intuitively be drawn to it. Money evolved because of a need, today we are at a stage again when there is a need, only this time the need is for equality and fairness and a fundamentally sound system. Even if Paul’s system is not fully complete or structurally not fully functional, I would argue that it’s a damn site better than what we currently have, and that maybe the only way it will eventually be able to address its flaws is to have it running in a live environment which allows it the ability to evolve.”

- Positive Money is a not-for-profit UK campaign group which aims to raise awareness of the fractional-reserve banking system and to lobby the UK government and parliament to introduce legislation to replace the existing banking system. The group has produced draft legislation for such a replacement.

- Individuals decide to live without money. See, for example, Heidemarie Schwermer. Note also Mark Boyle, who gave up using cash and is the founder of the Freeconomy Community.

- John Gerard Ruggie, the United Nations Special Representative of the Secretary-General on Human Rights and Transnational Corporations and Other Business Enterprises uses the approach of “principled pragmatism,” which means being guided by the principle to strengthen the current human rights regime, while, at the same, time, being pragmatic on how to get there. The Ruggie report, “Protect,
Respect and Remedy: A Framework for Business and Human Rights” was released in April 2008 and unanimously accepted by the Human Rights Council in June. It “rests on three core principles: the state duty to protect against human rights abuses by third parties, including business; the corporate responsibility to respect human rights; and greater access by victims to effective remedies. In less than a year after its release, the framework rapidly gained traction among business and human rights groups, corporations, and even governments."  

- The World Development Report 2011: Conflict, Security and Development calls for bringing security and development together to break the cycles of fragility and violence, as they affect more than one billion people. The report transcends current typologies of wars and violence and states that “organised violence” has become the major problem, such as civil wars, communal violence, gang-based violence, and organized crime. The distinction between political and criminal violence is no longer seen as valid and the relevant institutions are called on to collaborate in radically new and radically more effective ways, and envisage fundamental restructuring. The report warns that rebuilding a society from cycles of violence usually takes a generation, however, that at the program level, such long time frames are usually not considered.

- Martin Wolf, one of the world's most influential writers on economics, a member of the UK’s Independent Banking Commission, said in 2011 that having the average taxpayer underwrite the huge transactions by investment banks “is just insane.”

In his blog “Will China’s Rise Be Peaceful?” of November 16, 2010, Wolf draws attention to the potential advantages of the transformation now under way for the world population to share in prosperity and contribute its ideas and energy to securing a better future for everybody. He sees three possible scenarios (which resonate with the scenarios in Paul Raskin’s “Great Transition” essay):

First, the “positive sum” view wins out. Awareness of the absence of any deep ideological conflict, of mutual economic dependence, of a shared planetary destiny and of the impossibility of war in a nuclear age force adequate levels of global co-operation. For this to happen there must also be a profound commitment to co-operation, not much evident recently in such areas as climate change or global imbalances.

Second, the “negative sum” view wins out. Power is relative. The incumbent and the rising powers compete for dominance. Resources, similarly, are finite.

In this world, economic disarray and the struggle for scarce resources lead to a retreat from globalisation, while balance of power politics dominate international relations. We may see the emergence of a balancing coalition against China, consisting, at the least, of the US, Europe, India and Japan, possibly joined by other powers.

Third, we muddle through, with a mixture of the above two approaches: globalisation and a degree of economic co-operation survive, but classic balance of power politics become more significant, as China, in turn, becomes more assertive of its rank in the world system. This, roughly speaking, was the world before the first world war – not an encouraging precedent.
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- The Big Fix is a film by filmmakers Josh and Rebecca Harrell Tickell about the 2010 Deepwater Horizon oil spill and its aftermath.

Many more voices would merit to be heard at this point in this chapter. Let me choose a few more names in the following paragraphs.

Historian and founder of the Center for Global Community and World Law, Joseph Preston Baratta, is among those who have recently taken up the crucial discussion of global political structures.392

Professor of Philosophy and Religious Studies and Chairperson of the program in Peace Studies at Radford University in Virginia, Glen T. Martin provides a summary over the history of related initiatives in the A Constitution for the Federation of Earth - With Historical Introduction, Commentary, and Conclusion.393 Martin calls for “planetary maturity” that involves a general awakening of human beings to authentic communicative speech, compassion, and mutual respect. He doubts that this can evolve fast enough on a cultural level by trying to convince the peoples of the world to embrace a culture of holism (including the holisms of freedom, justice, and sustainable economic equity) and believes that a global body-politic of planetary democracy must be established.394

Martin writes, “Of all the constitutions written to date, and of all the world federalist initiatives undertaken during the past 60 years, none except the Earth Constitution comes even close to actualizing this “third generation of human rights” promised and “foreshadowed” by Article 28 of the U.N. Universal Declaration of Human Rights.”395 Unity in diversity is a major theme for the Earth Constitution that aims at creating the holistic dynamic of unity in diversity essential to our survival. To speak of a holism of human relationships on Earth without the universal democratic rule of law constitutes a naïve idealism of the worst kind. Holism must be institutionalized and embodied in our political and economic systems, just as presently fragmentation and division are institutionalized in our non-democratic planetary systems.”396 Martin’s book carries the title Triumph of Civilization. It means a conversion, not only of thought, but of economics and politics to holistic principles. It means the founding of an Earth community.

The Earth Federation Movement includes a worldwide association of World Constitution and Parliament Association (WCPA) Chapters and independent organizations, such as the Institute On World Problems, that affirm the creation of a non-military, democratic Earth Federation under the Constitution for the Federation of Earth. We have several web sites associated with our work for global peace with justice, environmental sustainability, and prosperity. Philosophy professor Glen T. Martin is the Secretary-General, WCPA President, IOWP.397

Glen Martin stands for many voices advocating a systems view of the global change that is required at the current juncture in human history. At the current point in history, humankind faces a unique window of opportunity. Never before has humankind understood how small and vulnerable their habitat is. Balance is needed, the balance of homeostasis, the balance that avoids too much and too little. To protect unity in diversity,
balanced layers of subsidiarity must inform how we design our global economic and political structures. Democratic world government might indeed be the solution.\textsuperscript{398}

Several movements and initiatives on world government would merit to be mentioned here. Already in the 1930s, Rosika Schwimmer (1877-1948) had set out to create a world government, co-founding the World Centre for Women’s Archives in 1935.

In 1948, Garry Davis became a peace activist and creator of the first “World Passport,” which he also kindly presented to me.\textsuperscript{399} Davis suggests that it is important to look into the writing of Emery Reves (Hungarian Révész Imre, 1904–1981), an advocate of world federalism, and the work of futurist R. Buckminster Fuller (1895–1983). He furthermore commends human rights activist and lawyer Luis Kutner (1908–1993), who helped found Amnesty International in 1961, Anthony Stafford Beer (1926–2002), best known for his work in the fields of operational research and management cybernetics, as well as Derek Benjamin Heater, co-founder of the Politics Association and author of many works on world citizenship. Davis is opposed to a world federalism of sovereign nation-states; see www.worldcitizen.com. He highlights the need for “enforceable world law as the corollary of world peace” (personal message from Garry Davis, November 1, 2009).

Linda M. Hartling wrote about the approach of the Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies network: “We dignify our work by practicing a ‘lean-green’ approach to finances in which economic resources serve, rather than lead our efforts. Moreover, we actively practice the principles of dignity and humiliation theory by appreciating the full value of both economic and relational resources. Indeed, our financial structure incorporates many aspects of what Manish Jain and Shilpa Jain describe as a ‘gift culture’.”\textsuperscript{400}

In these challenging times of dominating multinational corporations, collapsing neoliberal economies, and the commodification of everything, it seems vital to explore a different form of relationship and exchange. “Gifting”, and the culture it draws from as well as evokes, provides a welcome oasis of hope from the hackneyed debates around capitalism vs. communism and the paralysis of TINA (There Is No Alternative). We put this intercultural dialogue together to try to share some of the important concepts, beliefs, practices and dreams around reclaiming the gift culture in our different spaces and places.

This is perhaps our most critical and important work to-date. We have come to understand that the ideas and practices of deep learning, self-organizing learning communities and vibrant learning ecosystems are predicated on a culture of generosity, care, trust and friendship. The gift culture is critical to decommodifying education and the learning process, that is, removing it from the realm of artificial scarcity, monopolized production and distribution, and institutionalized hierarchy and discrimination. It is sad to witness that learning processes that are essential to being human like play, laughter, Nature, storytelling, care, etc. are being commercialized and as a result, are becoming accessible only to the elite. The gift culture inspires us to see our learning resources and relationships as part of the larger commons that is accessible to all and taken care of by all.\textsuperscript{401}
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Gift culture, this is one name for a dignified and dignifying future, as explained by Genevieve Vaughan.\textsuperscript{402} Howard Richards offers a list of alternative names for a global culture of solidarity, such as a culture of solidarity, solidarity economy, love ethic, servant leadership, production for use, de-alienation, mobilizing resources to meet needs, a higher form of pragmatism, or economic democracy.\textsuperscript{403}

“A world in balance is a world where the economy serves the people, where people respect and care for each other and live in accordance with the natural environment,” this is what we read on the web site of the Center for a World in Balance.\textsuperscript{404}

“As the world shrinks, so our capacity for effective moral action grows.
—Peter Singer\textsuperscript{405}

Quotes

Short quotes about the problems of the present monetary system

“Permit me to issue and control the money of a nation, and I care not who makes its laws” (international banker Mayer Amschel Rothschild, 1744 –1812\textsuperscript{406}).

“I am afraid that the ordinary citizen will not like to be told that banks can and do create money… And they who control the credit of the nation direct the policy of Governments and hold in the hollow of their hands the destiny of the people” (Reginald McKenna, past Chairman of the Board, Midlands Bank of England, 1863–1943\textsuperscript{407}).

“Money is a new form of slavery, and distinguishable from the old simply by the fact that it is impersonal, that there is no human relation between master and slave” (Leo Tolstoy, 1828–1910\textsuperscript{408}).

“All of the perplexities, confusion, and distress in America arises, not from the defects of the Constitution or Confederation, not from want of honor or virtue, so much as from downright ignorance of the nature of coin, credit, and circulation” (John Adams, founding father of the American Constitution, 1735–1826).

Short quotes about a monetary-based economy versus resource-based economy

“They hang the man and flog the woman
Who steals the goose from off the common
But leave the greater villain loose
Who steals the common from off the goose.”
Anonymous protest poem 1764 or 1821.

“The Government should create, issue, and circulate all the currency and credits
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needed to satisfy the spending power of the Government and the buying power of consumers. By the adoption of these principles, the taxpayers will be saved immense sums of interest. The privilege of creating and issuing money is not only the supreme prerogative of government, but it is the government’s greatest creative opportunity” (Abraham Lincoln, 1809–1865, 16th President of the United States, assassinated).  

“Once a nation parts with the control of its currency and credit, it matters not who makes the nations laws. Usury, once in control, will wreck any nation. Until the control of the issue of currency and credit is restored to government and recognised as its most sacred responsibility, all talk of the sovereignty of parliament and of democracy is idle and futile” (William Lyon Mackenzie King, tenth Prime Minister of Canada, 1874–July 22, 1950).  

**Longer Quotes, chronologically ordered**

“I believe that banking institutions are more dangerous to our liberties than standing armies. If the American people ever allow private banks to control the issue of their currency, first by inflation, then by deflation, the banks and corporations that will grow up around the banks will deprive the people of all property until their children wake-up homeless on the continent their fathers conquered” (Thomas Jefferson, 1743–1826, 3rd US President, in 1802).  

“If once [the people] become inattentive to the public affairs, you and I, and Congress and Assemblies, Judges and Governors, shall all become wolves. It seems to be the law of our general nature, in spite of individual exceptions.” (Thomas Jefferson, 1743-1826, 3rd US President)  

“Independence is my happiness and I view things as they are, without regard to place or person; my country is the world…” (Thomas Paine, one of the Founding Fathers of the United States, 1737–1809).  

[Corruption in high places would follow as] “all wealth is aggregated in a few hands and the Republic is destroyed.” Abraham Lincoln (1809-1865), 16th President of the United States, assassinated)  

“If you are familiar with the classical works of Adam Smith, you will know that there are two famous works of his. One is The Wealth of Nations; the other is the book on the morality and ethics. And, "The Wealth of Nations" deals more with the invisible hand that are the market forces. And the other book deals with social equity and justice. And in the other book he wrote, he stressed the importance of playing the regulatory role of the government to further distribute the wealth among the people. If in a country, most of the wealth is concentrated in the hands of the few, then this country can hardly witness harmony and stability. The same approach also applies to the current U.S. economy. To address the current economic and financial problems in this country, we need to apply not
only the visible hand but also the invisible hand (Chinese Premier Wen Jiabao, 2008). 

“Factoids” and Links

Miguel d’Escoto Brockmann is the President of the 63rd session of the United Nations General Assembly since September 16, 2008. He was tasked with organizing the UN High-Level Conference on the World Financial and Economic Crisis and Its Impact on Development, which was called for by participants at a financing for development meeting held in Qatar in late 2008. He emphasized that the outcome document “will make it or break it,” urging that the text should not be another kind of “international charade” that will come to nothing.

Banks have learned nothing from the economic crisis they unleashed, this is the result of an extensive survey of the quality of bank services carried out in 2009 in Germany. The results show that bank services are still catastrophically flawed despite the financial crisis, worse even, that bank employees are being pushed into unethical behavior more than before. Only one of 25 bank advisors tested in the survey succeeded in gathering the necessary information about the financial background of a potential customer and then advising correctly. Germany, in its urge to be competitive in the international market, sold so-called “structured products” that are even forbidden in the United States.

Investment bankers marketed these products to the wider clientele while taking great care never to place their own private capital into such products.

Sony Kapoor, ex-investment banker and derivatives trader, now analyst of the economic crisis, said in a keynote speech in May 2009: “To conclude, we must remember the story of emperor Midas, who had the famous ‘Midas touch,’ where everything he touched became gold. The only problem was, he couldn’t eat gold, he couldn’t drink gold. He tried sleeping on gold, it wasn’t very comfortable. I would say the same thing of the financial industry. Except it is more accurate to say that everything they have touched has become dust. But the fact remains, you cannot eat finance, you cannot drink finance, you cannot sleep on finance, you cannot drink and drive finance. Finance only exists to serve the real economy. Let us put it back, where it belongs, and make it work.”

In the Future of Market Capitalism HBS Centennial project has been exploring the evolution of capitalism—the value it has generated, and the threats that may be arising that could impede its future value creation. They have interviewed business leaders around the world to get their sense of what some of the potential threats are—and what to do about them. They invite the readers’ thoughts on the following issues:

1. In many countries, the gap between the rich and the poor has grown and will continue to widen. Some say growing inequality may be an unfortunate consequence of economic growth, but isn’t a real problem as long as everyone’s income is improving. Others say the growing inequality will undermine the foundations of our democracies and hence our economies. What is your opinion?
2. There has been a great deal of discussion recently about environmental degradation, and particularly about global climate change. Some believe that capitalism, by its nature, will seek to reduce or avoid environmental regulation, exacerbating environmental damage and endangering the future health of the planet. Others see for-profit firms as increasingly recognizing the importance of environmental issues, and as working to minimize their negative impacts on the environment and to invent new technologies that will make business more sustainable. How do you see it? Is market capitalism the problem - or the solution?
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21 Even though the feeling is very different in various world regions; Germans and Scandinavians, also people in China or India, for example, are less alarmed than, for instance, Americans or South Europeans.

22 Linda M. Hartling made us aware of Jon Gertner (2010).

23 Foreign Policy, January/February 2011, Unconventional Wisdom: A special anniversary report challenging the world's most dangerous thinking, www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2011/01/02/unconventional_wisdom?page=0.0.
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26 Eilis Lawlor, Helen Kersley, and Susan Steed (2009).


29 “Many European political leaders have blamed speculators for aggravating the rocky financial markets that forced them to agree a bumper emergency package for struggling countries on Sunday” Reuters, Brussels, May 10, 2010, www.reuters.com/article/idUSLDE6480EM20100510.

30 Halldór Gudmundsson (2010).


32 In his “Annual Letter to Berkshire Shareholders,” released on February 27, 2010; see www.berkshirehathaway.com.


34 See economist Karl Ove Moene’s work at Centre of Equality, Social Organization, and Performance (ESOP), where he differentiates these three cultures, see Karl Ove Moene and Erling Barth (2009). Whoever wishes to acquire an intuition for the Anglo-Saxon approach, is well advised to also read novelist Elizabeth Gaskell, who is is up-to-date with her piece North and South by Elizabeth Gaskell (1855), where one meets “gentlemen” in London who like to “double in cotton.” See also Evelin Gerda Lindner (2008b).

35 See a graphic illustration by Bhopal disaster campaigner Satinath Sarangi in the BBC World News HARDtalk interview with Jonathan Charles, March 17, 2010, where Sarangi warns that the present establishment of special economic zones, such as Chemicals and Petrochemical Investment Regions (PCPIR), where national laws do not apply, is in the service of profit maximization, is setting the scene for new Bhopal-like accidents (news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/programmes/hardtalk/8566937.stm).
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38 See, for instance, Henry George (1879). See also the Henry George School of Social Science, www.henrygeorgeschool.org. I thank Harvey Newman for making me aware of this school.

39 Edwin Clarence Riegel (1976). We thank Paul Grignonfor making us aware of Riegel’s work.

40 Paul Anthony Samuelson (1947).

41 James E. Meade (1965).


43 Wall Street is a 1987 American drama film released by 20th Century Fox. It was directed by Oliver Stone.
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47 Watch *The Essence of Money* at www.digitalcoin.info/The_Essence_of_Money.html. See then www.moneyasdebt.net. For *Money as Debt II: Promises Unleashed*, see also www.ustream.tv/recorded/4155763. For *Money as Debt I*, see also www.youtube.com/watch?v=GrO-7awnwGs&feature=player_embedded!1, and then read then about the disputed issues in this movie at paulgrignon.netfirms.com/MoneyasDebt/disputed_information.html. Read the pdf files on www.digitalcoin.info, for example, Paul Grignon (2009).


49 See Margrit Kennedy (1995), and Declan Kennedy and Margrit Kennedy (1997). See also the Gaia University (www.gaiauiversity.org/english), which “offers a unique approach to higher learning by offering students (called Associates) access to accredited Bachelors and Masters degrees and Graduate Diplomas whilst the Associate is actively engaged in self and planetary transformation. Linking your ideals with self-directed practical experience, you act as a world changer, by working for local and global sustainability and regeneration, justice and peace.”


51 Rodrigue Tremblay (2010b). See also his blog www.TheNewAmericanEmpire.com/blog.html which is being followed all around the world.


54 We were appalled when seeing the film *Caught in Micro Debt* on Norwegian state television November 30, 2010. See Brennpunkt: Fanget i mikrogjeld on the Norwegian video archive www.nrk.no/nettv/klipp/688333/. See also Milford Bateman (2010), and www.odi.org.uk/events/documents/2447-presentation-m-bateman.pdf, David Roodman and Jonathan Morduch (2009), Beatriz Armendariz and Jonathan Morduch (2010), Thomas W. Dichter (2003), Thomas W. Dichter and Malcolm Harper (2007), as well as Christa Wichterich (2000), Christa Wichterich (2011). Wichterich starts her 2011 paper as follows: “India is in the midst of a financial crisis that shows striking similarities to the US subprime crisis, both in its origins and the rescue strategies used. Just as the cheap mortgage granted to low-income households in the USA, the microcredits given to poor women in rural areas worked out as financialisation of everyday live and integration of the women into the global financial market with its return-based logic. This jeopardised the social processes and the very objectives at the heart of the initial non-profit microfinance model. The growth of this sector led to an over-supply of microcredits in villages and in turn to the over-indebtedness of women, the collapse of repayments and a capital shortage of the microfinance institutions. What seems at first sight to be a specifically Indian crisis results in fact from the market rationale of growth, overheating, and crisis” (Christa Wichterich (2011)).


56 See www.ashoka.org/entrepreneurforsociety and www.youtube.com/watch?v=Boh9zKQl5oc&feature=player_embedded. I thank Wilford Welch for this lead.
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78 See www.globalisationforthecommongood.info, and Kamran Mofid (2002), Kamran Mofid (2010), Kamran Mofid (2011a), Kamran Mofid (2011b). Watch the talk he gave on April 19, 2011, to the winners of the Endowment Association MGIMO student grants of the Moscow State Institute of International Relations (MGIMO-University), at their International Conference “Education of My Dream,” which was devoted to investments in education and human capital; see www.youtube.com/watch?feature=player_embedded&v=F8irN9kQuFs.
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82 Paul Grignon, personal communication, March 28, 2010. See also note 47.

83 Paul Grignon, personal communication, July 16, 2010. See also note 47.
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85 William Ury (1999), 108.

86 Evelin Gerda Lindner (2010b).
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100 See, for example, “Unity in Diversity” by Michael Harris Bond, and “Diversity within Unity” by James A. Banks: Michael Harris Bond (1998), and James A. Banks et al. (2001).
101 Philosophy of mind is the ontology of the mind, of mental events, mental functions, mental properties, consciousness and their relationship to the physical body. The dominant Western metaphysical orientation that underpinned its expansion during the past centuries was dualism. Dualism holds that ultimately there are two kinds of substance. René Descartes’ dualistic view of a mind-body dichotomy is perhaps the most widely known expression of dualism. Dualism is to be distinguished from pluralism, which claims that ultimately there are many kinds of substances, as well as from monism, which is the metaphysical and theological view that all is one, either the mental (idealism) or the physical (materialism and physicalism).
105 Linda Hartling, in a personal communication, September 18, 2011, in Portland, Oregon, USA.
106 Paul Grignon, personal communication, March 30, 2010. See also note 47.
108 See www.thelecturebureau.com/speakers/marjorie_kelly.html and Marjorie Kelly (2001). We thank Neva Goodwin for making us aware of Kelly’s work.
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111 John Locke (1689).
113 Alan Page Fiske (1991). I thank Finn Tschudi for making me aware of Fiske’s work.
114 Gar Alperovitz (2005); see also Evelin Gerda Lindner (2007a).
117 See www.ipcc.ch/.
118 Nicholas Stern (2006).
119 Ulrich Spalthoff, personal communication, March 19, 2010: “This is true, if one adds: ‘market economy in times of abundance.’ Not long ago (when I was a child), market economy was existing but there was no abundance. It was not a consumer economy, but a supply economy having the target to serve the needs of people. Basic needs from today’s point of view. I remember my mother saying: ‘There is a new stuff in store, called yoghurt. Comes from Bulgaria. But no one needs it.’ That was the time when economy turned from serving needs to creating demand. Today, marketing does not care to serve basic needs. It creates a demand, often by manipulating people psychologically. And scarcity helps always, as we all have in our
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On June 5, 2008, more than one thousand representatives from indigenous communities across the Americas gathered in Lima, Peru, and agreed on a new social system, called “Living Well.” See, among others, www.villageearth.org/pages/Projects/Peru/perublog/2008/06/living-well-development-alternative.html#.


Andrew E. Kramer (2009).


Ulrich Spalthoff, personal communication, March 19, 2010: “I do not believe the statements referred to about Nikolas Tesla. Tesla did not work on energy generation, except on generators using fossil fuels as source. All messages from Valone are very debatable. I refer to this report: www.pureenergysystems.com/events/conferences/2004/NewEnergyMovement/6900056_ThomasValone/ There he claims to know various solutions to the fossil energy problem and lists them… The argument of ‘artificial scarcity’ for me looks like a conspiracy theory. In an economy where competition is everywhere, excessive profits can be made only for limited time and mostly in some regions. It will not take long and someone—ironically usually a greedy corporation—will find ways to introduce another technology which has a little bit less profit, but allows the new entrant to take market share away from established players, as cogently described by Clay Christensen. There are many well documented examples for that. I am sure, there is no way to prevent any alternative technology which is capable to provide a service (a service like energy utilities) at lower cost.”
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“A more pessimistic view of the situation is that belief in an autonomous EKC relationship engendered an unfounded optimism that growth by itself would be helpful for the environment. As a result there was a lost decade or more during which environmental economists failed to focus on other potential driving forces behind changes in environmental quality within a country. The debate over the income–pollution relationship allowed us as a profession to take our eye off what really mattered. First, and perhaps foremost, it made it easy to believe that developing countries should be able to ignore their environmental problems until they develop and become wealthier. But we now know that developing countries can take many actions (Dasgupta et al. 2002) to improve their environmental conditions and that those actions can have enormously positive implications for societal welfare. Second, as a group, we largely ignored the role of population and technology, the other two factors in the IPAT equation. Third, for every dozen EKC papers, there might be one that seriously looked at how changes in the regulatory structures and incentive systems in place across different political jurisdictions could be used to improve environmental quality in places where population is increasing, income is improving, and technology from around the world is potentially available. What is needed now and in the future is work identifying factors that can translate some of the increased income from growth into improved environmental quality” (Richard T. Carson (2011), p. 20). I thank Karine Nyborg for making me aware of this article.

Susmita Dasgupta et al. (2002).
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174 „Der Denkautomat,” Der Spiegel, 5, July 5, 2010, p. 99: “His favorite form of thought is that of paradox, with the help of his psychoanalytic tools he tries to prove how liberal democracy is manipulating the people. One of his famous observations of everyday life concerns the close-door button in elevators. He has found out that they are placebos. The doors close not a second faster if you press the button. But they also do not have to; it is enough that the person who pushes the button has the illusion that she could influence something: This is precisely the way, says Žižek, functions the political illusion-making machine which is called Western democracy.” Original text. „Seine liebste Denkform ist die des Paradoxons, mit Hilfe seines psychoanalytischen Rüstzeugs versucht er nachzuweisen, wie die liberale Demokratie die Menschen manipuliert. Eine seiner berühmten Alltagsbeobachtungen dazu betrifft die Tür-zu-Knopfe in Fahrstühlen. Er hat herausgefunden, dass sie Placebos sind. Die Türen schließen keine Sekunde schneller, wenn man den Knopf drückt, aber das müssen sie auch nicht. Es reicht, dass der Drückende die Illusion hat, er könnte etwas beeinflussen: Genauso, sagt Žižek, funktioniere auch die politische Illusionsmaschine, die sich westliche Demokratie nennt.”
175 Introduction, note 45.
176 Adrian Tempany (2010).
178 Adrian Tempany (2010), p. 3.
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180. Robert E. Lane (2001). According to the World Health Organisation (WHO, www.who.int/), major depression (i.e. severe depressed mood that is episodic in nature and recurs in 75-80 percent of cases) is now the leading cause of disability world-wide with a lifetime prevalence of 17 percent in the western world, thus ranking fourth among the ten leading causes of global disease burden. In addition, the WHO states that depression is the most common mental disorder leading to suicide and they project that, at its present rate of growth, depression will be the second leading contributor to global disease burden by 2020.
181. “Here we are, we're supposed to be great, prosperous and successful countries and people are unhappy, not because they're badly treated, not because they're badly managed, but because they're actually not using their lives in the way that I think is fully productive. And I call this a sort of "corporate sin."—Charles Handy and Stephen Bernhut (2004), p. 4.
182. This information has already found its way into the public eye, see, for instance, Mark Honigsbaum (2004).
186. See www.guardian.co.uk/world/2011/aug/01/what-can-ancient-greeks. We thank Takis Ioannides for making us aware of this article.
187. Immanuel Kant (1785).
188. Martin Buber (1923).
189. See Melvin J. Lerner (1980), and for his later work Melvin J. Lerner (2003).
195. Ulrich Spalthoff, personal communication, March 19, 2010: “I like the notion of stakeholder value. This is the concept behind the Total Quality Management, practices by the methods of the European Foundation for Quality Management (EFQM, I am a certified EFQM assessor). 10 to 15 years ago stakeholder value was recognized a lot, afterwards the shareholder value became more fashionable. I am happy to see this fashion being over now.”
196. I thank Dorothy J. Maver for this coinage.
197. I thank Linda M. Hartling for this coinage.
204. Adam Smith (1776).
205. See, among others, Nanette S. Levinson (2004).
207. Choice is a RSAnimate, where Professor Renata Salecl explores the paralyzing anxiety and dissatisfaction surrounding limitless choice. Does the freedom to be the architects of our own lives actually hinder rather than help us? Does our preoccupation with choosing and consuming actually obstruct social
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change? See www.youtube.com/watch?v=1bqMY82xzWo and the RSA’s free public events programme www.thersa.org/events. See also Renata Salecl (2004).

208 On December 9, 1992, Operation Restore Hope had been launched, by the United States of America, as a response to the failure of the first United Nations operation UNOSOM. However, Operation Restore Hope failed, as did UNOSOM II.


211 See Thomas Parke Hughes (2004). This rivalry found many expressions. For example, the Socialist Unity Party of Germany (SED) of the German Democratic Republic, believed that communism would only be able to keep up with the capitalist West, if it entertained its citizens with what Romans called panem et circenses, or “bread and circuses” (or “bread and games”). Interestingly, East Germans continue to prefer this kind of entertainment also after the unification of Germany; see Werner Früh and Hans-Jörg Stiehler (2002).

212 Jean V. Hardisty (1999). I thank Linda M. Hartling for drawing my attention to Hardisty’s work.

213 I discuss this point in Evelin Gerda Lindner (2006b), in the section entitled “Why Do They Hate Us?,” pp. 98-105.

214 See, for example, the essay “British Oppression: The Cause of the American Revolution?” from February 3, 2004, for tenth grade High School students posted on www.cheathouse.com/essay/essay_view.php?p_essay_id=29116: “The American Revolution was costly and bloody war that granted the Americans the independence for which they fought. This 8-year-long revolutionary war from 1775 to 1783 is considered one of the greatest revolutions of all time in that the Americans had defeated the most powerful nation in the world at the time, Great Britain. The American Revolution is a critical event in the history of the United States and has been explored and evaluated by numerous historians of the 20th century. Whether or not the revolution is justifiable by the American colonists is a long, debatable subject. Some historians assume that the American Revolution is a result of colonial selfishness and ideology…”


216 Bertram Wyatt-Brown (1982).

217 Henry Kissinger said, “They want to humiliate us and we have to humiliate them,” see Mark Danner (2008), 3.


222 We were appalled when seeing the film Caught in Micro Debt on Norwegian state television November 30, 2010. See Brennpunkt: Fanget i mikrogjeld on the Norwegian video archive www.nrk.no/nettv/klipp/688333/. See also Milford Bateman (2010), and www.odi.org.uk/events/documents/2447-presentation-m-bateman.pdf, David Roodman and Jonathan Morduch (2009), Beatriz Armendariz and Jonathan Morduch (2010), Thomas W. Dichter (2003), Thomas W. Dichter and Malcolm Harper (2007), as well as Christa Wichterich (2000), Christa Wichterich (2011). Wichterich starts her 2011 paper as follows: “India is in the midst of a financial crisis that shows striking similarities to the US subprime crisis, both in its origins and the rescue strategies used. Just as the cheap mortgage granted to low-income households in the USA, the microcredits given to poor women in rural areas worked out as financialisation of everyday live and integration of the women into the global financial market with its return-based logic. This
jeopardised the social processes and the very objectives at the heart of the initial non-profit microfinance model. The growth of this sector led to an over-supply of microcredits in villages and in turn to the overindebtewness of women, the collapse of repayments and a capital shortage of the microfinance institutions. What seems at first sight to be a specifically Indian crisis results in fact from the market rationale of growth, overheating, and crisis” (Christa Wichterich (2011)).

224 Emmanuel Lévinas (1961).
227 Max Scheler (1923).
229 Pleasantville is an Academy Award-nominated 1998 film written, produced, and directed by Gary Ross. See also The Clonus Horror (1979) or The Island (2005). As to “personal branding,” see Daniel J. Lair, Katie Sullivan, and George Cheney (2005). I discussed this topic in January 29, 2007, in Harrania, near Cairo, Egypt, with Sophie Wissa-Wassef, who makes a point to protect her artists’ creativity by not disclosing to them whether their art sells or not; see www.humiliationstudies.org/intervention/art.php#ramseswissawassef or www.wissa-wassef-arts.com/intro.htm. See also Douglas Rushkoff (2009). I thank Keith Grennan for this link.
230 See previous note.
231 Charles Eisenstein (2010), see also Charles Eisenstein (2007).
233 Michel Foucault (1979), Michel Foucault (1991).
235 Thorstein Bunde Veblen (1899).
236 Walter Lippmann (1922).
237 Edward Bernays (1928).
238 See also Eric Clark (1988).
240 I analyze this dynamic, among others, in my doctoral dissertation, and in my work on subaltern genocide, see Evelin Gerda Lindner (2009b), Evelin Gerda Lindner (2000e).
241 See www.thenewamericanempire.com/tremblay=1123.
242 See, for example, P. D. Broughton, Ahead of the Curve: Two Years at Harvard Business School (New York: Penguin Press, 2008
243 Frantz Fanon (1963), Frantz Fanon (1986).
244 Evelin Gerda Lindner (2010b), xv.
247 On Wednesday, September 30, 2009, in Washington, Chairman Edolphus “Ed” Towns (D-NY) reconvened the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee’s hearing to examine what role inaccurate credit ratings played in the current financial crisis, and what regulatory changes need to be implemented to prevent a future collapse. Ilya Eric Kolchinsky, Former Managing Director, Moody’s Investors Service, appeared and spoke about the practices of credit rating agencies such as Standard & Poor’s, Moody’s or Fitch Ratings.
250 Judith E. Glaser (2010), the five books are Richard, Michael J. Mauboussin (2006), Michael J.
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255 See also Claus Otto Scharmer (2009).
256 wwpb.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/warning/interviews/born.html.
257 Stephen Spratt et al. (2009).
260 Manfred A. Max-Neef and Amy Goodman (2010). I thank Linda Hartling for making me aware of this interview.
263 Stéphane Hessel (2010). See also www.independent.co.uk/news/world/europe/the-little-red-book-that-swept-france-2174676.html#.

• Der Krieg ist für Deutschland verloren.
• Hitler und seine Clique setzen den Krieg nur für ihre persönliche Sicherheit fort und sind dafür bereit, das deutsche Volk zu opfern.
• Alle oppositionellen Kräfte sind zu mobilisieren, um den Krieg so schnell wie möglich zu beenden.”
266 Decision 25/4 followed a recommendation from informal consultations of the General Assembly of UNEP on the institutional framework for United Nations environment work, dated February 10, 2009. In these informal consultations, hope was expressed that ministers of environment would “find a political compromise and entrco
269 I use Weber’s third kind of ideal type when I focus on Mandela’s constructive core strategies, which are not minimized by otherwise possibly valid criticisms. Please read about ideal types in Coser: “Weber’s three kinds of ideal types are distinguished by their levels of abstraction. First are the ideal types rooted in historical particularities, such as the ‘western city,’ ‘the Protestant Ethic,’ or ‘modern capitalism,’ which refer to phenomena that appear only in specific historical periods and in particular cultural areas. A second kind involves abstract elements of social reality—such concepts as ‘bureaucracy’ or ‘feudalism’—that may be found in a variety of historical and cultural contexts. Finally, there is a third kind of ideal type, which Raymond Aron calls ‘rationalizing reconstructions of a particular kind of behavior.’ According to Weber, all propositions in economic theory, for example, fall into this category. They all refer to the ways in which men would behave were they actuated by purely economic motives, were they purely economic men.” Lewis A. Coser (1977), p. 224.
270 I thank Glen T. Martin for relating the phrase “nonviolent revolutionary” to me.
As to the concept of nudging, see Richard Thaler and Cass Sunstein (2008).

See, for example, Peter M. Senge (1990).

See, for example, Claus Otto Scharmer (2007).


Ibid., p. 20.


In BBC World HARDtalk with Stephen Sackur, on April 23, 2008.


Amy Chua (2008). Watch also the interview “The Moment of Empire” that Harry Kreisler conducted with Amy Chua November 21, 2007,” as part of the "Conversations with History," at the Institute of International Studies, University of California – Berkeley, at www.youtube.com/watch?v=QenLIFx4cCQ. In this interview, Chua explains most convincingly the advantages of the inclusivity of “tolerance”: the best and brightest will never be in one ethnicity! Tolerance is a necessary, not a sufficient element to become a hyperpowers (empires that dominated the world). What Chua found, was that hyperpowers, throughout history, to maximize power, made use of diversity through inclusive tolerance, rather than suppressing it. Tolerance was employed because it produced strategic advantages, not in the context of present-day Enlightenment-definitions of tolerance: slavery and persecution is simply too inefficient. It is easier to rule by the compliance of underlings. Chua describes the evolution of hyperpowerdom as evolving from personalities to processes, from conquest to commerce, from invasion to immigration, from autocracy to democracy. Nowadays, the relevant resources are innovation, commerce, trade, and attracting the best and brightest, for example, through immigration. The Dutch were the first, Chua points out. Scots, Huguenots, and Jews made the Britain empire possible, a development that was enabled through the Bill of Rights that was enacted by the Parliament of England in 1689. Hyperpowers fall with intolerance and xenophobia. Fear-driven chauvinism and ethnocentrism undercut tolerance and cause power to spiral downward. Too much tolerance however, too much diversity, is as subversive as too much intolerance. In the case of too much tolerance, unity lacks, or, what Chua calls “glue.” America was the first democratic hyperpower. According to a study, foreign-born entrepreneurs were behind one in four U.S. technology startups over the past decade; see Vivek Wadhwa et al. (2009). When military domination is no longer feasible, the question arises as to how to create the “glue” of good-will and loyalty. Persians, Mongols used military power, Rome granted citizenship also to non-Romans, however, the United States, if it wishes to preserve power, can do neither. Chua explained the advantages of building “glue” through immigration (incorporating the best and brightest from all around the world) and outsourcing (creating links of loyalty in other parts of the world). Chua predicts that China, since it is an ethnically defined society, will never become a hyperpower, even if the United States were to fall.

The advantage of inclusivity, one may argue, however, is not only apparent in the case of hyperpowers. A present-day example of less grand scale is, for instance, Indonesia. Mohammad Yazid, staff writer at the Jakarta Post, explains that the lesson for Indonesia is that “the majority needs to promote tolerance, mutual respect, protection and empathy for ethnic, religious and political minorities”; see Mohammad Yazid (2007).

Evelin Gerda Lindner (2010a).

The Relational Theory Model (RTM) was introduced by anthropologist Alan Page Fiske—see Alan Page Fiske (1991), and a useful introduction to the theory, overview of research, and a bibliography is found on www.rtm.ucla.edu. Fiske postulates that people, most of the time and in all cultures, use just four elementary and universal forms or models for organizing most aspects of sociality. These models are (1) communal sharing, (2) authority ranking, (3) equality matching and (4) market pricing. Communal sharing (CS) means that people are in some respects equivalent and treat each other as “all the same.” Family life is often informed by CS. It derives from the universal “need to belong,” and has a strong emotional appeal—
love, care and intimacy can prosper in this context, and equal dignity belongs with communal sharing. Authority ranking (AR) involves asymmetry among people who are linearly ordered along hierarchical social dimensions. Equality matching (EM) implies a model of balance such as exists when people take turns (for instance, in car pools or babysitting cooperatives). Market pricing (MP) builds on a model of proportionality, with relationships organized with respect to ratios and rates.

The European Union uses the subsidiarity principle (see europa.eu/scadplus/glossary/subsidiarity_en.htm). It means that local decision-making and local identities are retained to the greatest extent possible. Arthur Koestler’s theory of holons and holarchies and John Braithwaite’s notion of regulatory pyramids are similar concepts.

Raymond Williams, academic, novelist, and critic, in The Long Revolution, wrote: “It seems to me that we are living through a long revolution, which our best descriptions only partly interpret. It is a genuine revolution, transforming men and institutions; continually and variously opposed by explicit reaction and by pressure of habitual forms and ideas. Yet it is a difficult revolution to define, and its uneven action is taking place over so long a period that it is almost impossible not to get lost in its exceptionally complicated process” (Raymond Williams (1961), p. 10). I thank Tony Webb for making me aware of Williams’ discussion.

Tony Webb wrote further in December 20, 2009, in a personal message:

He [Williams] goes on to talk about some of its features: the “democratic revolution” with explicit conflicts of power; the industrial revolution—and the unequal “development” of rich and poor countries (we might consider shame/humiliation here); and the “cultural revolution”—especially in education/learning, literacy and communication. Williams spent years teaching literary criticism through the UK workers Education Association (he was a better critic than writer himself) and his ideas pained the “cultural studies” movement in the UK. He argued that the cultural revolution (long revolution and unfinished revolution) can be traced back to the work of people like Thomas Hardy who wrote novels depicting/set in the drawing room romantic dramas of the middle and upper classes. The idea was taken up by the UK left through the traumatic disconnections from the “hard left ideology of international Marxism that led to ‘Euro-communism,’” broad alliances of green/environment, women’s movement, peace and similar “broad left” ideologies (including the red-green politics in Europe, especially Germany) of the 1970s. It reclaimed as part of its origins theigger and leveller movements that ran under the “protestant” revolution in the UK where the Cromwell revolution cut of the head of one kind only to ask his successor the take the throne a few years later.

It can be seen in the “syndicalist” tendencies in trade unions—I looked particularly at the mid-war 1917 events that led to the creation of the “trade-based” union movement (and the post WW2 reinvention of industrial unionism in the USA)—only to be captured yet again by the “trades” that drive differences between workers and the form of “business unionism” we have to live with today that so weakens and subverts the values politics of the trade union movement worldwide. Incidentally my work in building the anti-nuclear campaign in the UK in the late 70s tapped into elements of the remnants of the syndicalist 'shop-stewards' movement in the UK as the basis for turning around union policy on nuclear energy (December 20, 2009, in a personal message).

The Levellers were members of a political movement during the English Civil Wars which emphasized popular sovereignty, extended suffrage, equality before the law, and religious tolerance, all of which were expressed in the manifesto “Agreement of the People” (issued between 1647 and 1649). See on the topic of the “unfinished revolution” also Martin Shaw (2000) and David Steele (2007).

Paul Grignon, personal communication, June 14, 2011. See also note 47.

Paul Grignon. See also note 47.

Paul Grignon, personal communication, July 29, 2011. See also note 47.


Douglas Hurd (2010).
Norbert Elias argues that what we experience as civilization is constituted by a particular habitus or psychic structure that is embedded within broader social relationships. For Pierre Bourdieu, habitus is socialized subjectivity, our second nature, the mass of conventions, beliefs, and attitudes which we share. Habitus is the part of culture which is so taken for granted that it is virtually invisible to its members. Rules are unnecessary in homogeneous societies, and are replaced by habitus, the “orchestrated improvisation of common dispositions.” Common sense as an “organized body of considered thought,” is a related concept. According to Peter L. Berger and Thomas Luckmann’s social constructionism, all knowledge, including the most basic, taken-for-granted common sense knowledge of everyday reality, results from social interactions, which, over time, are regarded to be “natural.” Michel Foucault’s discourse and discursive formation are related. Sociologist Talcott Parsons used the concept of gloss to discuss the idea how “reality” is constructed. Social constructionism is often regarded as a sociological construct because it conceptualizes the development of social phenomena in relation to social contexts, while social constructivism is a more psychological construct, addressing how the meaning of knowledge is relative to social contexts.

Terms such as horizon (Emmanuel Kant, Edmund Husserl, William James), tacit knowledge, zero-order beliefs, or the term truthiness, speak to the same phenomena. Hugh Mackay introduced the invisible cage as a metaphor for the tacit effects of life experience, cultural background, and current context on an individual’s view of the world. We have mental models on which we base “preferences without inferences,” and frames “that allow human beings to understand reality—and sometimes to create what we take to be reality.” We have cultural mindsets, or cultural scripts, which means that we have “structures within which we store scenes,” or “sets of rules for the ordering of information about Stimulus-Affect-Response Sequences (SARS).” Eric Berne illuminates script theory in his book What Do You Say After You Say Hello? Benedict Anderson explains how communities can be ideated and imagined. Zeitgeist and paradigm are important terms—Thomas S. Kuhn describes how paradigms can shift. Before they shift, they rigidify, with some people identifying with them strongly and standing up for them. Then they are toppled by a new generation of people who ask new questions that undermine the edifice. The already-mentioned psychological phenomenon of defensive avoidance plays a role here.

Howard Richards (2011a) makes a similar list when he writes (pp. 4-5): “Pierre Bourdieu says with habitus, what Margaret Mead says with customs, what John Maynard Keynes says with “institutions” and with “the psychology of the community” can also be said with the typical terminologies of ethics, such as “norm,” “rule,” “impertative” (Kant Immanuel Kant), “institutional fact” (John R. Searle), “moral authority,” and “ideal.” Ethics, in one of its dimensions, is neither more nor less than the norms that guide human action. According to a scholastic definition, ethics is the theory of human action; that is to say, that which explains it.”

Paul D. Raskin et al. (2002). See also Paul D. Raskin (2008) and Ben Brangwyn and Rob Hopkins (2011).


Riane Tennenhaus Eisler (2007).

See Christopher Lynn Hedge (2010). I thank Michael Britton for making me aware of Hedge’s work.
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301 Paper currency was a by-product of Chinese block-printing. It started in the Tang dynasty (618–907 C.E.) but did not become institutionalized as a governmental policy until Song dynasty (960–1279 C.E.). The first written insurance policy appeared in ancient times on a Babylonian obelisk monument with the code of King Hammurabi carved into it. The “Hammurabi Code” was one of the first forms of written laws. It offered basic insurance in that a debtor did not have to pay back his loans if some personal catastrophe made it impossible (such as disability, death, or flooding).


304 Eisler’s gender-holistic perspective draws attention to contemporary Scandinavian nations as well as to prehistoric, historic, and anthropological data, for instance, from the Ba’Mbuti and Tiruray; see Riane Tennenhaus Eisler (1995).

305 Norway is a strong basis for my work and in my book Gender, Humiliation, and Global Security, Evelin Gerda Lindner (2010b), I highlight the advantages of its system. See also Howard Richards and Joanna Swanger (2006). As to Costa Rica, I was privileged to listen to Victor M. Valle’s presentation on Costa Rica at the Expert Group Meeting on “Structural Threats to Social Integration” in December 2001 in New York, see Victor M. Valle (2001). See also Evelin Gerda Lindner (2001c).
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311 Aristotle (1980).
312 Rushworth M. Kidder (1994).
314 See www.rsfsocialfinance.org.
315 See their web site www.economicsofpeace.net/conveners.html: “Our goal is to understand the failed mechanisms of the old systems in order to avoid repetition, and to nurture the visions and alternative structures that support the evolution of systemic peace, social justice, and responsible stewardship of our planet. In collaborating with RSF Social Finance for our 5th conference, The Economics of Peace, we have an opportunity to reach many more people and organizations and to help network existing organizations. Our goal is to help transform an ailing economy into economic relationships that serve the well-being of all living creatures and our planet.”
318 Paul Anthony Samuelson (1947).
321 See www.eartcharter.org.
324 See, for example, Donna J. Wood (1991).
325 See www.un.org/millenniumgoals.
326 The Global Compact was first announced to The World Economic Forum on January 31, 1999, and was officially launched at UN Headquarters in New York on July 26, 2000. See www.unglobalcompact.org.
328 Robert A. Mundell, Paul J. Zak, and Derek M. Schaeffer (Eds.) 2005.
330 See www.oekonux.org.
331 Lawrence Lessig (2005).
332 Michael Bauwens (2008).
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336 Herman E. Daly and Kenneth N. Townsend (Eds.) 1993.
337 www.beyond-gdp.eu.
338 German Council of Economic Experts and Conseil d'Analyse Économique (2010). See also Dan O'Neill, Rob Dietz, and Nigel Jones (Eds.) 2010.
339 Enquete-Kommission „Wachstum, Wohlstand, Lebensqualität.“ www.bundestag.de/presse/hib/2011_01/2011_012/01.html, lead by politician Daniela Kolbe (SPD), and supported by, among others, economists Meinhard Miegel, see, for example, Meinhard Miegel and Axel Börsch-Supan (Eds.) 2001, and Henrik Enderlein, see, for example, Henrik Enderlein, Sonja Wälti, and Michael Zürn (Eds.) 2010.
341 Reinhard Butetikofer and Sven Giegold (2010).
342 See www.stateoftheusa.org/content/commission-on-key-national-ind.php.
345 Bob Rijnhout Leida Goudzwaard et al. (2008).
348 Berthold Huber (2010).
353 Some films that discuss the state of the Earth, particularly its economic frames, are listed here:

• Among the most prominent documentaries is An Inconvenient Truth of 2006 by Albert Arnold “Al” Gore, Jr., the 45th Vice President of the United States from 1993 to 2001 under President Bill Clinton; see www.climatecrisis.net.

• An early visualization of the discussion of themes of economy and sustainability was The Money Masters: How Banks Create 90% of the World's Money, a 3 1/2 hour non-fiction, historical documentary that traced the origins of the political power structure, directed by Bill Still and produced by Patrick Carmack, released in 1996; see www.themoneymasters.com.

• The New Rulers of the World is a 2001-2002 documentary film produced, written, and presented by investigative journalist and documentary film-maker John Pilger on the question “Who are the real beneficiaries of the globalized economy?”; see www.bullfrogfilms.com/catalog/new.html.

• The Corporation is a 2003 Canadian documentary film written by Joel Bakan, and directed by Mark Achbar and Jennifer Abbott; see www.thecorporation.com.

• The Yes Men was a documentary film of 2003 about the culture jamming exploits of The Yes Men; see www.unitedartists.com/yesmen.

• The Ascent of Money: The Financial History of the World was a book by Harvard professor Niall Ferguson; see Niall Ferguson (2008). The book was adapted into a 6 part television documentary
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with the new full title *Ascent of Money: Boom and Bust* for Channel 4 in the UK (UK, www.channel4.com) and an edited two-hour version was aired in January 2009 by PBS (US, www.pbs.org/wnet/ascentofmoney). A newer, reorganized four-hour version with the original full title *The Ascent of Money: The Financial History of the World* was aired in July 2009 by PBS.

- *The Future of Food* was directed, produced, and written by Deborah Koons in 2004; see www.thefutureoffood.com/synopsis.htm.
- In 2007, the *The Story of Stuff* by activist Annie Leonard was viewed by millions of people within a very short period of time; see www.storyofstuff.org.
- *The Day of the Dollar*, was a “what if” scenario presented by VPRO Backlight and Dutch national newspaper *NRC Handelsblad* in 2005. Do we live on a bubble? Is it possible for the heavily indebted American economy to collapse and take all of us down in a free fall with it? Have the days of the dollar been counted? Is it really unimaginable that we will see the time of the Great Depression repeating itself? The film includes interview with analist Stephen Roach, Andy Xie, Maarten Schinkel, Cees Maas, Rob de Wijk and Kees Vendrik; see www.youtube.com/watch?v=AuPgdZeAFjA and www.vpro.nl/backlight.
- In his 2008 documentary *Let’s Make Money*, Erwin Wagenhofer provides an impressive demonstration of the lack of appropriateness of the global money market that is made possible, among others, by the fact that the involved players have an outlook that is too local. Western investors (the clever speculator as much as the average consumer who merely keeps its money in a bank) see growth and dividend as positive phenomena. What they do not see is that they are complicit when a manager creates a dividend by pushing an already poor farmer in a remote region of the world still further down into poverty. In this way, the poorest are made poorer so that the wealthy can “make” money. The film shows how everybody is complicit, unwittingly, who has an account in a bank. Money deposited in a bank for safe-keeping does not stay there, but is circulated in the global money market, where enormous amounts of money collect at certain “hot spots” each day. The documentary lists many examples, for instance that of the Ghanaian cotton farmer who produces cotton of highest quality. Since the United States subsidizes its own cotton production, nobody buys the cotton from Ghana. In this way, the African farmer is compelled to deliver his product far under value. This leads to the West receiving best cotton at favorable prices, and the American cotton farmer having a decent living. Only the Ghanaian remains poor, even though he actually has the best cotton.
- Canadian activist Paul Grignon made a number of animated features. See also note 47.
- See also *The Epoch Times*, June 9, 2009, at www.theepochtimes.com/n2/content/view/17937.
- See, furthermore, a film that thematizes the system of fractional reserve lending, *The Secret of Oz*, 2009 (see secretofoz.com, and www.youtube.com/watch?v=D22T1T4Y8F2E, see also the earlier *The Money Master*, themoneymasters.com). The film *The Secret of Oz* was directed by Bill Still. Contributors are, among others, Quentin Taylor (assistant professor of history and political science), Joseph Farah (worldnetdaily.com), James Robertson and John Bunzl (2008) (The Interbank Organization), Peter D. Schiff and John Downes (2009), Ellen Hodgson Brown (2008), Byron Dale (www.wealthmoney.org), Michael Hudson (2003) (professor of economics), Karl Denninger (market-ticker.denninger.net), Milford Wriarson Howard (1895), and Theodore R. Thoren and Richard F. Warner (Eds.) 1980. The film highlights the importance of who is in control of the quantity of money, and tells the tale of the advantages of *fiat money*, or debt-free national
money, issued by the government. Examples presented are the fiat money used prior to Julius Caesar’s reign in Rome, the tally sticks used in England until the Bank of England was founded in 1695, and the Colonial Scrip given out in pre-revolutionary America until the Currency Act in 1764 forbade it. For Benjamin Franklin, the return to the gold-money system was the basic cause for the American revolution: “The colonies would gladly have borne the little tax on tea and other matters had it not been that England took away from the colonies their money, which created unemployment and dissatisfaction. The inability of colonists to get power to issue their own money permanently out of the hands of George the III and the international bankers was the PRIME reason for the Revolutionary War” (widely quoted statement on the reasons for the American War of Independence sometimes cited as being from Franklin’s autobiography, but this statement was never in any edition). In 1775, with the outbreak of the revolution, the American colonies started printing so-called Continental Currency, which was brought down by the British bringing massive amounts of counterfeited notes into the country and thus destabilizing this currency. In 1781, the congress in Philadelphia created the first privately owned central bank, the Bank of North America, modeled on the Bank of England. From then on, privately owned central banks were repeatedly chartered to create US money as monopolists, only to be un-chartered again following public protest. In 1789, debt-free national money was emitted in Sweden, the riksdaler riksgäld, however, this experiment failed because this money’s quantity was allowed to spiral out of control; King Gustav III was assassinated. The film states that the American Constitution, in 1787, should have allowed the Congress to “emit bills of credit,” or print debt-free national fiat paper money, but that this was omitted. Shortly after the constitution was written, the 1st Bank of the United States was created, yet another privately own central bank, this time at the federal level. In 1811, England threatened with war if the bank’s charter would not be renewed. Thomas Jefferson wrote to John Eppes in 1813, “Although we have so foolishly allowed the field of circulating medium to be filched from us by private individuals, I think we may recover it . . . . The states should be asked to transfer the right of issuing paper money to Congress, in perpetuity.” The burning of Washington took place on August 24, 1814, in the War of 1812 between the British Empire and the United States of America; the British army occupied Washington, D.C. and set fire to many public buildings. Andrew Jackson, seventh President of the United States (1829–1837), vetoed another renewal of the charter, saying, “It is easy to conceive that great evils to our country and its institutions might flow from such a concentration of power in the hands of a few men, irresponsible to the people… Controlling our currency, receiving our public moneys, and holding thousands of our citizens in dependence, it would be more formidable and dangerous than the naval and military power of the enemy.” He survived an assassination attempt and concluded: “The bold effort the present (central) bank had made to control the government ... are but premonitions of the fate that await the American people should they be deluded into a perpetuation of this institution or the establishment of another like it.” Abraham Lincoln later returned to government-issued debt-free money, the so-called Greenbacks. In 1876, the Chancellor of Germany, Otto von Bismarck, described the “divide and conquer” strategy that was devised in response in Europe and said “It is not to be doubted, I know with absolute certainty, that the separation of the United States into two federations of equal powers had been decided upon well in advance of the Civil War by the top financial power of Europe” (Journal of the Bar Association of the District of Columbia, 1947, Item Notes: v. 14, p. 150). Otto von Bismarck said upon President Abraham Lincoln’s assassination: “I fear that foreign bankers with their craftiness tortuous tricks will entirely control the exuberant riches of America and use it systematically to corrupt modern civilization. They will not hesitate to plunge the whole of Christendom into wars and chaos in order that the earth should become their inheritance.” The Coinage Act was passed in 1873, demonetizing silver and implementing a gold-only money system. General James A. Garfield, 20th President of the United States, was assassinated before he could change this. Later, William Jennings Bryan, “The Great Commoner” and three times candidate for President of the United States, was the leader of the silverite movement in the 1890s. The “Panic of 1893” began with European investors demanding repayment only in gold, thus draining gold reserves in America. Since gold is scarce, it is one of the easiest commodities to manipulate. With respect to solutions, the film gives the floor to James Robertson,
Ellen Hodgson Brown, refers to the Bank of North Dakota, which successfully operates since 90 years, mentions the Church Steeple Principle, and the creation of “Commonwealth.” Swedish saving banks are mentioned and Niklas Högbeg interviewed, the chairman of the Sound Banking Ethics Foundation in Stockholm. Iceland’s Icesave bank is presented as an example of how privatizing the national bank brought an entire country down. It is “essential” to change the current system if our species is to survive, says James Robertson. The film closes with saying that what happens now is a “world extortion” system being the “primary cause of the world’s hunger, poverty, misery and disease.” Humankind will need to escape from the debt-money system. Our children will no longer have to know the term “national debt.”

- *The Warning* is a 2009 Frontline documentary on Brooksly Born’s thwarted efforts to regulate the derivatives market. Born was the chairperson of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC), the U.S. federal agency which oversees the futures and commodity options markets, from August 26, 1996, to June 1, 1999. Born’s verdict for the future: “I think we will have continuing danger from these markets and that we will have repeats of the financial crisis—may differ in details but there will be significant financial downturns and disasters attributed to this regulatory gap, over and over, until we learn from experience” (www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/warning/interviews/born.html).
- *College, Inc*, is a 2010 documentary, in which correspondent Martin Smith investigates the for-profit higher education industry, see www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/collegeinc/.
- Read more: http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/collegeinc/view/#ixzz1YNA4f4e1
- Sophy Banks from Transition Town Totnes Heart and Soul group describes how it came about and why transitioning the inner self is crucial to the movement, see www.youtube.com/watch?v=GQHxRzBnTmU.
- *The Progressive* magazine produces a weekly, half-hour-long interview show called “Progressive Radio.” It is hosted by the magazine's editor, Matt Rothschild. David Harvey, the author of *The Enigma of Capital and the Crises of Capitalism*, was interviewed in February 2011. See progressive.org/radioharvey11.html.
- *Choice* is a RSAnimate, where Professor Renata Salecl explores the paralyzing anxiety and dissatisfaction surrounding limitless choice. Does the freedom to be the architects of our own lives actually hinder rather than help us? Does our preoccupation with choosing and consuming actually obstruct social change? See www.youtube.com/watch?v=1bqMY82xzWo and the RSA's free public events programme www.thersa.org/events. See also Renata Salecl (2004).

354 See, among others, Jeffrey L. Dunoff and Joel P. Trachtman (Eds.) 2009. We thank Ulrich Spalthoff for making us aware of this reference.
357 See www.basic-income.net, and Götz Wolfgang Werner and André Presse (Eds.) 2007.
358 See www.appell-vermoegensabgabe.de. For an English introduction, see www.thelocal.de/money/20091022-22755.html.
359 See www.thechannel.de/money/20091022-22755.html: “Wealthy Germans launch petition for higher taxes,” published October 22, 2009, www.thechannel.de/money/20091022-22755.html: “Some rich Germans have launched a web petition to call for the resumption of a wealth tax to help the country bounce back from an economic crisis, because, as one said, he had ‘a lot of money I do not need.’”
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361 See www.faireconomy.org/tax-fairness-pledge.
363 Dannelsesutvalg (2009). Several authors contributed to this report. Inga Bostad was the head of the commission. Other contributors were, among others, Bernt Hagtvet, Gunnar Skirbekk, Berit Rokne, Anders Lindseth, Lars Lvlie, and Roger Strand.

Bernt Hagtvet’s reflections open the report. He refers to classics such as the overview over American, English, and German university traditions by Abraham Flexner (1930). He then reports on the presently growing unease, in the United States, with the current trend toward commercialization in the educational sector.

Gunnar Skirbekk’s article emphasizes the significance of the Examen philosophicum (ex. phil.), which is an introductory course at Norwegian universities into philosophy and scientific method, and must be passed to receive a Bachelor's degree, thus supporting liberal arts education.

Berit Rokne and Inga Bostad and suggest a number of key issues to guide science and society (see further down in this paper).

Lars Lvlie discusses the paradox that pedagogy faces, namely that students must be nurtured in a context that offers sufficient freedom but also sufficient firmness for them to develop the maturity of responsible citizens.

Anders Lindseth emphasized that liberal arts are not an elite project. He calls for a new and deeper listening to students and faculty. He argues that the personal experience of scholars is of profound importance not only for their personal maturation, but also for their contribution to society at large.

Roger Strand highlights the last three points of the Dublin Descriptors of the Bologna Process.
364 In his contribution to Dannelsesutvalg (2009), Bernt Hagtvet documents the presently growing unease, in the United States, with the current trend toward commercialization in the educational sector. See, for example, the views expressed by Harvard’s former president Derek C. Bok, Universities in the Marketplace: The Commercialization of Higher Education, (Derek Curtis Bok (2003)).

The Education Commission report draws on a wide range of literature (among others, Theodor W. Adorno (1959); Allan Bloom (1987); Derek Curtis Bok (2003); Derek Curtis Bok (2006); John Dewey (1902); John Dewey (1916); Frank Donoghue (2008); Amitai Etzioni (1995); Hans Georg Gadamer and P. Christopher Smith (1986); Martin Heidegger (2006); Richard H. Hersh and John Merrow (Eds.) 2005; Wilhelm von Humboldt (1993); Wilhelm von Humboldt (2002); Immanuel Kant (1790), Immanuel Kant and Friedrich Theodor Rink (1803); Steven Koblak and Stephen Graubard (Eds.) 2000; Anthony T. Kronman (2007); Lewis 2006; John Stuart Mill (1873); John Stuart Mill (1859); Martha C. Nussbaum (1997); Ernest T. Pascarella et al. (2005); Robert David Putnam (1995); Bill Readings (1996); Richard Rorty (1979); Harold T. Shapiro (2005); Hans Skjervheim (2002); Sidney Verba, Kay Lehman Schlozman, and Henry E. Brady (1995); Michael Walzer (1992); Bruce Wilshire (1990); Michael Yudkin (Ed.) 1969).

365 See www.thelecturebureau.com/speakers/marjorie_kelly.html and Marjorie Kelly (2001). We thank Neva Goodwin for making us aware of Kelly’s work.
369 See www.humiliationstudies.org/whoweare/board03.php#nilsen.
370 See, among others, Catherine A. Lutz (2009), or Robert Green (2010). I thank Alexander Harang for
these references. For the Global Zero Movement, see www.globalzero.org/en/about-campaign.

371 See, among others, Herman E. Daly and Joshua C. Farley (2010). I thank Karine Nyborg for explaining current trends in economic research on January 17, 2011. See for her work, for example, Karine Nyborg (2007).

372 See, among others, Colin F. Camerer (2003). I thank Karine Nyborg, for making me aware of this reference.


374 Morton Deutsch (1973), 367.

375 I thank Karine Nyborg for explaining current trends in economic research on January 17, 2011. See for her work, for example, Karine Nyborg (2007).

376 “A more pessimistic view of the situation is that belief in an autonomous EKC relationship engendered an unfounded optimism that growth by itself would be helpful for the environment. As a result there was a lost decade or more during which environmental economists failed to focus on other potential driving forces behind changes in environmental quality within a country. The debate over the income–pollution relationship allowed us as a profession to take our eye off what really mattered. First, and perhaps foremost, it made it easy to believe that developing countries should be able to ignore their environmental problems until they develop and become wealthier. But we now know that developing countries can take many actions (Dasgupta et al. 2002) to improve their environmental conditions and that those actions can have enormously positive implications for societal welfare. Second, as a group, we largely ignored the role of population and technology, the other two factors in the IPAT equation. Third, for every dozen EKC papers, there might be one that seriously looked at how changes in the regulatory structures and incentive systems in place across different political jurisdictions could be used to improve environmental quality in places where population is increasing, income is improving, and technology from around the world is potentially available. What is needed now and in the future is work identifying factors that can translate some of the increased income from growth into improved environmental quality” (Richard T. Carson (2011), p. 20). I thank Karine Nyborg for making me aware of this article.

377 Susmita Dasgupta et al. (2002).

378 See www.esop.uio.no.

379 Karl Ove Moene and Erling Barth (2009), Abstract.

380 See www.berkshares.org.

381 See www.weusecoins.com.

382 Paul Grignon, personal communication, March 25, 2011, and June 3, 2011. See also note 47. Ulrich Spalthoff adds that BitCoin requires a large number of computers crunching numbers to create Bitcoins, something which can be questioned from an energy saving perspective. Furthermore, in this system of money generation , people who cannot afford a computer, are left aside in this system. They cannot generate Bitcoins but also cannot use them (Ulrich Spalthoff, personal communication, June 4, 2011).

383 Paul Grignon, personal communication, June 14, 2011. See also note 47..

384 Paul Grignon, www.digitalcoin.info/. See also note 47.

385 Shane in a personal message on the “beyond money” group of Paul Grignon.


390 Martin Wolf in “UK Banking industry to Be ‘ Completely Transformed ’,” BBC World News HARDtalk
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with Carrie Gracie, April 25, 2011, news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/programmes/hardtalk/9464876.stm. See also Martin Wolf (2009).

391 See blogs.ft.com/martin-wolf-exchange/.
393 Glen T. Martin (2010a).
394 Glen T. Martin (2010b).
397 Glen T. Martin (2010a), Glen T. Martin (2010b).
398 Errol E. Harris (2008).
400 Personal communication, June 9, 2009.
401 Manish Jain and Shilpa Jain (Eds.) 2008, p. 5.
403 See howardrichards.org, Howard Richards and Joanna Swanger (2006), Howard Richards (2011a), Howard Richards (2011b), Howard Richards (2010a), Howard Richards (2010c). Richards suggests thinking in terms of basic cultural structures derived from Roman law to identify the specific features of global modern western “development” that need to be corrected, see, for example, Howard Richards (2008a):

- *Suum cuique* needs to be corrected by socially functional forms of land tenancy and socially functional forms of property in general.
- *Pacta sunt servanda* needs to be corrected by reciprocity and responsibility for one another’s welfare regardless of whether there is a contract. Externalities need to be acknowledged as normal, not exceptional, and human action should seek to promote positive externalities and to avoid negative ones.
- *Honeste vivare* needs to be corrected by recognizing that our very identity is relational.
- *Alterum non laedere* needs to be corrected to promote an ideal of service to others, above and beyond the obligation not to harm them.

Richards posits that these corrections will not rebuild the present one-size-fits-all global regime of capital accumulation but will generate multiple ways of integrating factors of production to provide goods and services that support life.

404 See www.worldinbalance.net/home.php.
405 Peter Albert David Singer (1997).
406 See, for example, www.brainyquote.com/quotes/topics/m/mayeramsch170274.html.
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416 See www.hbs.edu/centennial/conversation/futureofmarketcap.