

# Living Globally: Global Citizenship of Dignity and Care as Personal Practice

Evelin Lindner, 2014

This is the long version of Lindner's contribution to the anthology *Global Citizen - Challenges and Responsibility in an Interconnected World* (A Global Citizen lecture series took place at the University of Oslo during fall 2012, see [www.uio.no/english/about/news-and-events/events/global-citizen/](http://www.uio.no/english/about/news-and-events/events/global-citizen/))

## Contents

Global citizenship of pillaging .....	3
Global citizenship: not possible, not defensible, not desirable .....	3
Global citizenship of family building: indispensable.....	5
Global citizenship of unity in diversity .....	11
Global citizenship of dignity and care: a profoundly personal practice.....	15
What do you need?.....	17
Reference List .....	19

## Introduction

I admit, I am a pioneer, almost too far ahead of my time—I have not yet met another person who intentionally develops a global life design like me. Yet, I am sure that many more people would derive great joy from trying my path.

Sadly, many stop at 'straw man' arguments. The ecological footprint of global citizenship, for instance, does not have to be large: I move about our planet slowly, since forty years, not just by plane but by foot, bus, ship, and train; I lived in the desert on foot, horse, donkey, and camel; I have even trained to build sailplanes and fly single motor planes. To be sure, one of the tasks of global citizenship is to globalise the insight that the burning of fossil fuel is outdated and irresponsible and has to be replaced by more intelligent solutions—and that burning biofuel from urgently needed food is even worse. There is no need to become a hyperglot like me either; I have successfully communicated by simply being human. And there is no necessary link between global citizenship and bulimic consumerism. On the contrary: global citizenship of care can also help globalise an indigenous gift economy. Refraining from accumulating possessions beyond what one can carry in a bag would be a good start. Last but not least, if we want to become better stewards of our world, we need a new kind of education, one that leads us out of artificial bubbles into real life. I am an avid learner, and the planet is my university—this is why I co-founded the World Dignity University initiative.

This is me:

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 (Lindner, 2010: xxiv).

Clearly, not everybody is in a position to live a global life, even if they wish to do so. Certain social, psychological, or health limitations may stand in the way. More importantly, so far only Western passports open doors also for those with few monetary resources—I was privileged enough to happen to be born with the right to such a passport—while the rest are trapped in their countries by the strict visa requirements to which they are subject. The human rights tenet that ‘every human being is born free and equal in dignity and rights’ has not yet been realised in practice.

This increases the responsibility for those who have the resources to stand *up* rather than stand *by* (Staub, 1989). Being born in Norway is a privilege that carries a responsibility. Henrik Wergeland has already pointed out that Norway’s disadvantages are now its advantages. Norway’s marginal location on the planet has protected it. Nobody has ‘bothered’ to conquer and force Norway into the kind of submission that underlings in hierarchical empires elsewhere had to endure. Norwegian cultural heritage of *likeverd* and *dugnad*, of equality in dignity and solidarity, together with the Viking experience of mobility, in my view, is worth more than all Norwegian oil. To hide it behind *janteloven* would be utterly negligent of this responsibility.

Norway is proud of its resistance movements against Nazi Germany. Global citizenship of care is today’s equivalent. *Indignez vous! Cry Out!* exclaims French wartime resistance hero Stéphane Frédéric Hessel, 2010. He calls on people to ‘cry out against the complicity between politicians and economic and financial powers’ and to ‘defend our democratic rights’. I say this forcefully, because Norwegians are lucky to live in a happy bubble just now, and I would like to invite them into the real world.

‘Business as usual’ is utopian in our times. What many belittle as idealism—noble but irrelevant—increasingly emerges to be the only realism. Ever more people believe that a ‘great transition’ is needed, more than mere business as usual, limping along with the help of some reforms (Raskin, 2012, Lindner, 2012a). Political economist Gar Alperovitz has worked for better regulations for decades; now his verdict is that deeper change is needed. Why? Because instability and inequality is not a short-term aberration but the long-term consequence of current economic arrangements (Alperovitz, 2009).

Future generations may call our era ‘the dark era of absurdities’. As Nina Witoszek succinctly formulates in this anthology, we are surrounded by paradoxical double binds. Here is one of them: Governments insist that we ought to consume ourselves out of economic recession, yet, such patriotic spending only increases global warming.

Every day, I receive messages such as this one: ‘The international order of things, so profitable for so many for so long, is under great stress now that oil has become expensive, the war system has been discredited by frivolous wars, our economy is working for the very rich but not the rest of us, crooked banks aren’t prosecuted, and government is more corrupt than ever. And ordinary people increasingly know about this because of the Internet’ (Hank Stone, personal communication from March 13, 2013).

Does this mean to deny progress? No. There is veritable progress with respect to what we do to each other, or what we could call social sustainability. New and important conventions have been adopted. Many human rights defenders work extremely hard and have grown to become a real challenge to power. Unsurprisingly, power fights back. ‘The space for human rights defenders to act and participate openly and actively in the society is reduced (Dahle,

2008: 2). ‘As civil society groups have become more sophisticated and effective in their advocacy efforts, many governments have also become more sophisticated in responding to their critics’ (Dahle, 2011: 2). Even worse, as the Human Rights House Foundation reports, throughout the past years, it has become increasingly difficult and even dangerous to be a human rights defender. And if we posit that peace means disarmament, then the balance is even more negative: The volume of international sales of conventional weapons has risen by 17 per cent in the period 2008–2012 as compared to the period 2003–2007 (SIPRI, 2013, [www.sipri.org](http://www.sipri.org)).

As to ecological sustainability, or what we do to our habitat, to our planet, short-term progress is not long-term progress. Pillaging the resources of our planet looks like a smart strategy to be proud of only as long as these resources are not yet depleted. Easter Island is a warning. Successes such as improved health and life expectancy are built on sand if we do not reverse this.

In balance, we, the human family, are triumphantly heading into a blind alley, faster than counterforces can establish alternative directions. A meta-transition is needed, away from rigid paradigms, away also from rigid strategies for change, away from finger-pointing, toward co-creating a new kind of continuous reflexive process, a globally collaborative dignifying process (Lindner, 2012b).

If we believe that *apartheid* was humiliation set into system, then we all are aware that it was insufficient to engage in charity or do good works locally (Lindner, 2006). The entire system needed to be transcended. In extension, from my point of view, today, all local challenges are embedded into global systemic frames of humiliation. This needs to be addressed by us all, the entire world community.

### **Global citizenship of pillaging**

Certain kinds of global citizenship make things worse. We hear that a small number (circa 6,000) of largely unelected powerful people around the globe, what David Rothkopf calls the ‘super class’, have shaped the world during the past decades in ways that the financial meltdown became possible (Rothkopf, 2008). We see many of them in annual gatherings such as the one in Davos in Switzerland. The ‘frequent traveller’ version of global citizenship (not to speak of global crime and terror), the dashing from one international hotel to the other, uses the planet as a leisure park for the few, served by the rest, and otherwise targets the commons of our world as unexploited market opportunities. And many in the Global North prefer to blindly imitate the superclass, rather than wake up and invest in a radical turnaround. Norwegians are not exempted. Many live in a ‘shopping-mall Kindergarten bubble’, which includes a selection of holiday resort beaches, and they mistake this bubble for the ‘normal’ reality of our world. And all around the globe many academics, rather than resisting this trend, currently turn themselves into its lackeys.

### **Global citizenship: not possible, not defensible, not desirable**

Global citizenship is neither universally accepted, nor easily defensible, nor desirable. I offer an emphatic ‘yes-and’ to all three arguments. Once more, Witoszek finds penetrating formulations: ‘The Chinese especially refuse to be global citizens in the Nussbaum sense and there is little we can do about it;’ ‘cosmopolitanism is in tension with deeply felt religion, patriotism and nationalism;’ and, ‘convinced environmentalists who hold dear such concepts as dwelling, bioregionalism, “erotics of place”, or land ethic, oppose a globalised, de-

territorialised identity'. 'The solution lies in small communities which are based on reciprocity and see concrete consequences of their actions', suggests Witoszek, since 'only small local communities able to beat the tragedy of the commons' and global citizens connected only via a virtual space suffer from 'shrunken souls and imaginations' as they are disconnected from the real world.

Andreas Føllesdal, in his contribution to this anthology, adds: 'It is unrealistic to believe that individuals globally will act on feelings of solidarity and charity across hundreds of miles'. Are not globally shared culture and common heritage too fragile to support the required trust?

There is more bad news. Humans share a tendency to split into in- and out-groups. Unfortunately, even the most innocent 'we', if it means 'we, as opposed to them', may end in the desperate question of 'why do they hate us?' This trend is intensified in a world that becomes confusing and fear-inducing for people with secure cultural roots when they feel that the ground beneath them is falling away through globalisation as it makes the world frightfully *liquid* (Bauman, 2010). Displaced people, refugees and many indigenous peoples have always tasted insecurity, the very insecurity that globalisation now brings to the rest. The *contact hypothesis*, or the hope that mere contact can foster friendship, is not necessarily true (Allport, 1954, Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). Where there is no contact, there is no humiliation. The world can even turn into a dangerously hostile place, a hotbed for terrorism, when contact creates new dynamics of humiliation. Remember the Danish cartoons (Hartling & Luchetta, 1999, Lindner, 2006 and Lindner, 2009).

Humiliation becomes particularly painful when human rights are preached with noble words that create high hopes, only to turn out as empty rhetoric: 'To recognise humanity hypocritically and betray the promise humiliates in the most devastating way by denying the humanity professed' (Stephan Feuchtwang, November 14, 2002, in a personal communication; see also Hartling & Luchetta, 1999, Lindner, 2006 and Lindner, 2009a).

Must we therefore forget about global citizenship?

Let me share some of my experiences. For many years, I have been working in situations where honour killing is practiced. Imagine a mother in front of you, crying, explaining that it is the family's duty to rescue the family's honour from humiliation, to save the family's body by 'amputating' a diseased limb. In this case, this limb is the daughter. She had been raped. She must be killed. While listening to the mother, you may feel your very humanity being humiliated by the mere suggestion that killing a raped girl could have any kind of healing effect. Now, what would happen if you expressed this feeling to the mother, bluntly, and called her a cruel, ignorant woman? She might feel humiliated by you, the decadent arrogant Westerner, who denigrates her culture.

What happens here? In the moral universe of honour and humiliation, the girl must die, in the universe of dignity and humiliation, the girl must live, and the discourse that addresses this irreconcilable difference is humiliating for all involved.

I ask you: why do you think you are right? Did you grow up in a context that holds the ideals of human rights dear? Should you not respect this mother's culture? For her, love means having the courage of the surgeon who rescues a body through amputation. For you, love means giving trauma therapy to the girl. Can you create universal harmony by simultaneously offering respect for the girl to be killed and not be killed?

Since the age of nine, such questions have been at the core of my life. As a child, I was unable to share my family's choice of religious dogma, because it forced me to separate those who are saved by God from those whose souls were lost if they resisted conversion. I could not endorse eternal condemnation for non-believers, something even more far-reaching than killing an earthly body.

What would be the path to global inclusiveness in this case? If not theism, then agnosticism or atheism? In my life, I came to transcend them all.

### **Global citizenship of family building: indispensable**

It has taken me a lifetime to develop the argument for why I think ‘I am right’ when I say that the girl must live and receive trauma therapy, and why and how, at the same time, the mother can and must be respected. Or why and how the China’s of this world can and must be invited to join in together with their religion, patriotism and nationalism. Or why and how the erotics of place can and must be both local and global. Or why and how self-reflexivity and radical humility can open space for religious experience beyond dogma. The same goes for the philosophy of science, metaphysics, ontology and epistemology. Humility is helpful also with respect to human rights ideals. Their roots go far back into Western and non-Western history, and they are part of many philosophies around the world, remember only *Ubuntu* in Africa.

Why am I right? Because we live in unique historical times. Traditional adaptations no longer fit when new connectedness and interdependence replace the traditional dependence-independence and domination-submission dichotomies. Old *Realpolitik* is different from new *Realpolitik*.

Clearly, globalisation, in its origins, is far from a charitable project. No doubt, the technology that now shrinks the world emerged from within the *dominator model* of society (a term coined by Riane Eisler, 1987). What is called globalisation is largely a ‘Davos’ inspired project, aiming at creating global domination and new dependencies for the benefit of investor confidence and shareholder value. Yet the same project also creates new interconnectedness, which carries the potential to undermine its original aims by opening doors for the solidarity of global *partnership* to transcend the traditional dominator model. The world shrinks, one single human family emerges, and its members increasingly believe that they deserve to be treated as equals in dignity and they learn to be aware of the pitfalls of humiliation.

When social psychologists ask students to play the prisoner’s dilemma game, and they tell them that this is a community game, the students cooperate. The students cheat on each other when told that the game is a Wall Street game. This is the power of framing: the same people can behave in radically different ways within different frameworks. ‘Good’ frameworks bring the ‘good’ in us to the fore, and vice versa. This means that we do not have to wait to become angels; we can gain much by working together to implement new frameworks, those that create a systemic push for our evolutionary inclinations to be social, connect and collaborate. Local versus global is therefore a false choice: the local needs appropriate global frameworks to be truly local, to be sufficiently protected from global pressures for uniformity so as to be able to celebrate local diversity (Lindner, 2012a). The local lacks the very space that it needs to celebrate its particular local expressions if exposed to global pressures that obliterate this space.

In other words, there is an alternative concept of global citizenship, one that inspires the creation of global frameworks of mutual care and stewardship rather than Wall Street frames. ‘Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can change the world. Indeed, it is the only thing that ever has’, said anthropologist Margaret Mead (1901–1978). While I write this, a message comes in from nef (the new economics foundation for economics as if people and the planet mattered), announcing their new report, titled, ‘Why We Need a New Macroeconomic Strategy’ ([www.neweconomics.org/publications/why-we-need-a-new-macroeconomic-strategy](http://www.neweconomics.org/publications/why-we-need-a-new-macroeconomic-strategy)). To be sure, donating more to charity is not enough.

And here are the good news: Realistic optimism is warranted. The present *ingathering* of humankind (a term used in anthropology) opens a window of opportunity for us, the human family, that none of our forefathers was ever given. Just now, there is space opening to co-create a global culture of unity in diversity that has never existed before. Let me take as an example the pictures of our Blue Planet from the perspective of an astronaut: our ancestors, were they able to see that? The Blue Planet image alone provides a powerful framework for collaboration. Were our forefathers able to see, as we do, that we humans are one single species living on one tiny planet? Did our grandparents have access to our vast knowledge about the universe and our place in it?

Yet we, the human family, can only achieve this if we understand how historically unparalleled this opportunity is. So far, I see us failing here. Also many of those who have the resources to do otherwise are overlooking the uniqueness of this opportunity. We are particularly overlooking the pivotal role that radical global citizenship of care must and can play.

Why are we overlooking it? Because we have a mortgage to pay off from a salaried employment in a local context. Because we hope that our politicians or at least the United Nations will understand and repair the global frameworks; these frameworks are too complicated for us to understand from our local perspective anyhow, we feel, and we hope that giving to charity will be enough. Because the deep practice of global citizenship of care is new and untested and requires too much restructuring of our assumptions and personal lives.

I remember Johan Galtung discussing why there are so very few peace scholars in the world (Lindner, 2009b). At the Higher Education for Peace Conference, 4th–6th May 2000, in Norway's far north, in Tromsø, he explained that only very few peace advocates live truly globally (as Galtung does)—most are bound to local contexts not least through such profane circumstances as having to pay off a mortgage—and this contrasts with those well-financed and well-travelled Pentagon experts who use the entire world as their basis for analysis and strategising. In other words, the lens of the average peace advocate is too narrow, both with respect to geopolitics and the historical backdrop, to outweigh those others who engage in traditional power politics.

I am among the very few who have tried, for the past 40 years. I do not ask everybody to follow my path, yet I call for humility. A non-global citizen can so far only theorise about global citizenship: lived global experience provides unexpected new insights.

Peter Svenonius, a theoretical linguist who is also based in Tromsø, at CASTL (Center for Advanced Study in Theoretical Linguistics—A Norwegian Center of Excellence), explains that language was not created for the goal of communicating; rather, language was created for use in thinking. The Western culture of *separate knowing* (Belenky, Bond, & Weinstock, 1997) aggravates this situation and turns it into a problem. Therefore I invite you to listen to my practice of global citizenship in the humble spirit of *connected knowing* (rather than only trying to find flaws to oppose).

In my view, only radical global citizenship of care can overcome the *security dilemma* as well as the *commons dilemma*. Global citizenship of care can help shift what I call *honour humiliation* toward *dignity humiliation*. Honour humiliation is part of humankind's cultural adaptations to the security dilemma. Humiliated honour requires revenge and the show of strength to achieve victory over the humiliator. The script of honour humiliation is the script of Adolf Hitler and Nazi Germany. Dignity humiliation, in contrast, calls for the *conscientisation* of Paulo Freire, to which Nelson Mandela so courageously dedicated his entire life (Freire, 1968, Freire, 1970).

The security dilemma is being described by international relations scholars (the term was coined by John Herz, 1950) and it means that in a fragmented world there is virtually no escape from the motto 'If you want peace, prepare for war'. Indeed, throughout the past

millennia, arms races, fuelled by fear of attack, often triggered the war they intended to avoid. Only global citizenship of care can open space for Gandhi's tenet that 'There is no path to peace. Peace is the path.'

And the commons dilemma means that commons (*almanning* in Norwegian) are always vulnerable to free-riders and raiders (Hardin, 1968). Throughout the past three decades, a culture of raiding has become the accepted global frame. Even the most robust alternative initiatives, such as the Mondragon cooperatives in Spain, for example, are not strong enough in the face of an antagonistic global context (Gar Alperovitz in his talk at the Thirty-First Annual E. F. Schumacher Lectures on 5th November 2011, in New York City). These days, I meet increasingly disillusioned idealists all around the world. Local community initiatives routinely falter when they collide with the larger global Wall Street frame. I see great civil society projects getting funded initially, but when they achieve real impact, funding is often cut. Funds have their origins in the context of business, and 'good works' are expected not to hurt business interests.

Who are investors? Who are donors? It is naïve to treat donor and investor interests as black boxes, as something that should not be questioned, because, supposedly 'it is the freedom of the rich to do as they please with their wealth, and nobody can expect them to act against their self-interest and give their hard-earned funds to initiatives that hurt them'. (See a discussion of freedom further down.) Consider the absurdity: 'Why must not-for-profit organizations beg for funds from for-profit organizations to do so-called *good* work to offset the freedom of for-profit organizations to do *bad* work?' (Lindner, 2012a: 209).

All around the world, wherever commons are successfully protected and enlarged locally, they risk being invaded and raided from outside. I meet many dedicated idealists who have given up, some end as cynics. Non-profits are increasingly selling out their ideals to for-profit thinking. Even humanitarian aid has become a business.

Maria Dahle is the Executive Director of the Human Rights House Foundation (HRHF), a non-governmental organisation established in 1989 and located at the Human Rights House in Oslo, Norway. She reports first-hand how human rights defenders are increasingly being constrained by the influence of 'bigger' interests of the government/corporate nexus:

The 90's were a 'decade of hope' for human rights. Around the world, civil society in general, and the human rights sector in particular, experienced an explosive growth. Since then, working with human rights has gradually required ever more specific expertise. In response, many organisations have become more professional. Their work is often donor driven, and therefore they have become more bureaucratic, less creative and spontaneous. Several of the human rights organisations, especially the international and those working in the capitals, have become part of a national and international elite and are often less connected—or not connected at all—to social movements. Hence, they lose support from their own people (Dahle, 2008: 3).

In 2011, Maria Dahle continues:

Tighter restrictions on holding peaceful demonstrations and gatherings have been introduced, often with reference to the need for increased security. Our partners in the Human Rights House Network report also here on increased sophisticated administrative and bureaucratic harassment of NGOs and activists planning peaceful demonstrations in OSCE participating states. The new laws and regulations legitimize the police' excessive use of violence against the demonstrators and massive arrest of participants. Journalists on duty covering the events are often beaten, detained, harassed and interrogated by national security forces (Dahle, 2011: 2).

Let me give you an example from my own experience. I spent four months in South America in 2012. Particularly eye-opening were my two weeks in Marabá, in the state of Pará, Brazil, the sad 'cradle' of the industrialisation of the Amazon. Pará is like another continent, compared with the rest of Brazil. It has the size of Western Europe and one landlord can own half a million of cattle. It has an inglorious reputation for its hired gunmen. The following article is illustrative: 'Brazil: Homage to the Victims of the Amazon in Washington, D.C.', in *Global Voices*, globalvoicesonline.org, by Georgi McCarthy on 16th April 2012.

My hosts were Dan Baron and his wife Manoela Souza, who live in the local community of Cabelo Seco and are the artistic-pedagogic coordinators of the Rivers of Meeting project. Cabelo Seco is an extremely vulnerable community. It is also a relatively poor community. The roof above me, for example, leaked when it rained and I had to cover my computer and all other valuables with plastic sheets.

Not only hired gunmen, also drugs are being used to weaken communities who stand in the way of 'progress', crack is given out for free until people are addicted, creating a toxic mixture of hopelessness and violence. Just when I was in Cabelo Seco, two people were killed in execution style a few houses away from where I were. Linda Hartling commented on 11th August 2012: 'In some ways, I think predatory capitalism offers a form of psychological "crack" until individuals and corporations become addicted to predatory capitalism, which is insatiable and unsustainable'.

As it turned out, my presence was extremely meaningful, much more than I initially thought. It made a difference that it could not have made in Rio + 20, where I was invited, too. Being alerted by my presence, the television came to interview us twice, my host and his community (see [youtu.be/a\\_y7G2KFeQo](http://youtu.be/a_y7G2KFeQo)). I chose Marabá over Rio + 20 because I had understood that the voices of the people in the Amazon are not heard, even not in Rio or Brasilia, and I wanted to hear them and bring their voices to larger audiences. Just to give one example: I saw first-hand that the river 10 meters away from the house where I stayed is being polluted with mercury; it is a dying river. Children in the Cabelo Seco community are blind because of the toxic particles in the water.

Sadly, also my worries about Rio + 20 turned out to be warranted. Rio + 20 provided much too little space for real transformation. Nnimmo Bassey, chairman of Friends of the Earth International, summarised the event as follows: 'Governmental positions have been hijacked by corporate interests linked to polluting industries'.

Pará is a lesson in predator economics, the Amazon is a frontier of raiding. The natural resources are being raided and whoever stands in the way has to fear for their life. The brutality of this state of our world is of omnipresent on our planet, however, more sharply visible at front-lines such as the Amazon. A consumer who revels in buying several cell phones, for example, usually spares herself the awareness that she uses up rare minerals that must be mined somewhere. The Amazon is one of the places where the mining is being done, and its ugliness and unsustainability is glaringly visible for those who refuse being complicit.

And, clearly, the raiding is happening everywhere, only less visible. With respect to South America as a whole, the Paraguayan coup was illustrative: 'How Agribusiness, Landowning and Media Elite, and the U.S. Are Paving a Way for Regional Destabilization', writes Francesca Fiorentini on 4th July 2012 in Buenos Aires, see [war-times.org](http://war-times.org). Or, here is an example from the United States of America: 'The Scam Wall Street Learned From the Mafia', is an article that describes how America's biggest banks took part in a nationwide bid-rigging conspiracy and systematically stole from schools, hospitals, libraries and nursing homes (by Matt Taibbi in *Rolling Stone Politics*, [rollingstone.com](http://rollingstone.com), 21st June 2012).

Nowadays, raiding is increasingly being facilitated by public policy. For instance, the same day I learned that the Brazilian Ministry of Culture no longer funds Living Culture projects



committed to harnessing popular culture for the development of sustainable communities (as the project by Dan and Mano does) but only ‘creative industry spectacles’, I also heard that in Norway long-term services for drug addicts will receive less funding and that short-term interventions will be given priority. These are only a few of innumerable examples.

I see social cohesion being weakened qua policy wherever I go. Solidarity is made ever more difficult, solidarity that could be a force for a more caring and dignifying way of relating to our planet’s resources and to each other. French economist Frédéric Bastiat (1801–1850) said: ‘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’.

As it seems, we, the human family, have a responsibility to think deeper. ‘There is a time for pessimism, that is, for considering worst-case scenarios in order to appropriately prepare for them. This does not mean one should not be hopeful, but only that one should be prepared for adverse outcomes rather than blithely assume that all will turn out well. Rather than being naively (indiscriminately) optimistic or pessimistic, it is better to be strategically optimistic and pessimistic’, this is a reflection attributed to psychologist Seymour Epstein.

As I remarked earlier, I posit that it is only global citizenship of dignity and care that can attenuate the security dilemma and open space for Gandhi’s tenet ‘There is no path to peace. Peace is the path’. And local commons are lost without suitable global frames.

During the past three decades, the global Wall Street frame has become so strong that even the most well-intentioned politician is no longer free enough to push for community framings. Investor confidence is what counts, what must be served. Local community initiatives falter when they collide with the larger global Wall Street frame. Only a massive bottom-up push can change this, a push from the consciousness and practice of caring global citizens who truly walk their talk. After living globally for almost four decades, I can attest that it can be done.

More good news. All identifications are fickle, except one. Sociologist Norbert Elias said it already in 1939: ‘Only the highest level of integration, belonging to humanity, is permanent and inescapable’ (Elias, 1991: 226–7). Examples from the Holocaust and the genocide in Rwanda show the force of this identification: some people protected potential victims at great personal risk because they saw them as ‘fellow human beings’ (Lindner, 2000). None other than philosopher and economist Amartya Sen singles out shared humanity as the most basic of shared identities (Sen, 2006).

Like me, Elias laments that too few understand the unique promise of global identification: ‘But our ties to this all-embracing we-unit are so loose that very few people, it seems, are aware of them as social bonds’ (Ibid.).

Hank Stone, to whom I referred to earlier, calls for *radical humility*. He calls on us to reclaim our positive future by setting aside the comforting certainties we grew up with, and to observe the world around us with innocent eyes:

- Because we can ‘know’ things that are not true, we must respect reason and the scientific method of observation and testable hypotheses.
- Because honest people can disagree, we must dialogue with people with differing ideas to find the truth.
- Because there are limits to what we can know, we must tolerate ambiguity.
- Because we share one Earth, we must cooperate with individuals, groups, humankind, and nature. (Hank Stone in *Radical Humility*, [philebersole.wordpress.com/2013/03/12/one-page-on-radical-humility/](http://philebersole.wordpress.com/2013/03/12/one-page-on-radical-humility/))

Stone reminds us that we have the unique opportunity, not least through the Internet, to become nodes in the web of the world and make ‘an idea whose time has come circle the world overnight’. We can make a new story, and new institutions for our positive future, ‘because we get to choose the stories we believe’. We can honour ‘the investment the universe has made in us when we humbly try to create a sustainable, just, and peaceful world’.

Stone asked me on 3rd April 2013 (in a personal communication): ‘Do you have a message in the spirit of outreach to people who don’t think your way? Our U.S. foreign policy of the moment seems to be taunting Iran and North Korea, as one might do to humiliate the other into precipitating a war, or something close enough to it to justify continuing high military spending. Have you arguments for people who think that way?’

What would you say? Perhaps the following?

In old times, aristocrats humiliated each other’s honour and then went to duel. One died, the other survived. This was the way of honour. Honour had to be preserved, even if at the price of one’s life. Also wars were often conducted in a duel-like manner. Indeed, throughout the past millennia, arms races, fuelled by fear of humiliation and annihilation, often triggered the war they intended to avoid. The security dilemma, as being described by international relations scholars, means that in a divided world there was virtually no escape from the motto ‘If you want peace, prepare for war’.

Today, duels are forbidden in most societies, however, the spirit of *honour humiliation* lives on, particularly in international relations. And it even becomes more attractive as profitable arms sales are on the rise. As reported above, the international sales of conventional weapons have risen by 17 per cent in the period 2008–2012 as compared to the period 2003–2007 (SIPRI, 2013, [www.sipri.org](http://www.sipri.org)). In that situation, it cannot come as a surprise that many conclude that the script of ‘one dies, the other survives’, if ever it promised wealth for the winner, has increased this attraction multifold today. Usually, people who hold such might-is-right views justify them by alluding to the supposed ‘killer ape’ nature of human beings and warn that soft-hearted liberals will only reap what they deserve, namely extinction.

Yet, today, ‘winning’ is no longer as sure a ‘winning strategy’ as it once was. We live in novel historical times and there are two problems. First, global interconnectedness is a problem, and, second, human rights values of equality in dignity stand in the way.

First, traditional adaptations no longer fit when new connectedness and interdependence replace the traditional world of dependence-independence and domination-submission. As mentioned earlier, old *Realpolitik* is not new *Realpolitik*. If deadly cycles of humiliation could be suppressed with sheer force in the past, this is much less obvious in modern times. Remember the Danish cartoons. Remember cyber war. The world is now so interconnected and so vulnerable that a few aggrieved individuals can disrupt it in ways that were not imaginable before. In the past, the game of honour humiliation was played between a few aristocrats, or diplomats on behalf of their masters; today the Internet draws the common citizen into this game. If leaders of movements or of nations, be it Al-Qaeda or Iran or North Korea, in their stand-off against ‘the West’, or Western leaders in their attempt to stay in top, create an arena for honour-humiliation scripts today, such aggrieved individuals can act out their fantasies of revenge in ways that make it irrelevant whether those leaders are only bluffing, and who has more weapons. Anders Behring Breivik, in Norway, for example, acted on fantasies of being a knight who rescued his people from unacceptable humiliation. Even if one believes that honour deserves to be paid for by life, or that profit from playing honour games is sweet, in a vulnerable interconnected world, inviting a broader public into games formerly played by a few elites, turns ‘noble deaths’ for a few into possible collective suicide. Games of honour humiliation, if they ever were meaningful, easily lose this meaning in a vulnerable interconnected world filled not only with ready-to-use weapons but also with easy-to-follow manuals for the construction of weapons of mass destruction. No fence around the

gated communities of those who profit from such strategies in the short term can be high enough in the long term.

Second, increasingly, a sense of what I call *dignity humiliation* is emerging all around the world. This means that not only is our world more interconnected, it is also in the process of losing its faith in the virtues of domination-submission. Article 1 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) begins: ‘All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights’. Humiliation was seen as a prosocial tool to humble underlings in the English language until 1757. From then onward, humiliation acquired the taste of being antisocial, *to humiliate* meant to mortify or to lower or to depress the dignity or self-respect of someone (Miller, 1993). Dignity humiliation is more intense, more painful, than honour humiliation. Dignity humiliation becomes particularly intense when human rights are preached with noble words that create high hopes, only to turn out as empty rhetoric. And the instrumentalisation of honour humiliation for profit and for new forms of domination—war on terror as excuse for undermining civil liberties, for example—is a particularly obscene form of dignity humiliation.

In conclusion, not only is it ethically preferable, it is also practically unavoidable, if humankind wishes to survive, to globalise the insight that the dominator model of society needs to transmute into the partnership model, globally and locally.

Norwegians are born into privileged responsibility to contribute significantly to this task, just by chance, by geohistorical luck, one might say. As mentioned above, already Henrik Wergeland has pointed out that Norway’s disadvantages are now its advantages. He wrote in 1843:

Haard er den Himmel, som bedækker Norge, Klimatet er strengt; vi ere Beboere af en hyperboræisk Afkrog paa Kloden, og Naturen har bestemt os til at savne saamange af de mildere Landes Fordele. Men Naturen, god midt i sin tilsyneladende Ubarmhertighed, og retfærdig midt i sin Uretfærdighed, har aabenbar villet levne os Erstatning for hine Savn, og derfor beskikket, at Norges, i nogle Henseender saa ufordeelagtige, Beliggenhed skulde i andre Henseender være saare velgjørende’ (Wergeland, 1843: 23, translated by the author into English: Hard is the sky that covers Norway, the climate is severe; we are the inhabitants of a hyperbaric corner of the globe, and nature has destined us to miss so many of the advantages of the more temperate countries. But nature, good in the midst of its seeming mercilessness, and just in the midst of its injustice, has apparently wanted to give us compensation for those disadvantages, and therefore arranged that Norway’s in some ways so disadvantaged location, should in other ways be so very blessed.)

### **Global citizenship of unity in diversity**

Nina Witoszek rightly asks: If we really are so dangerous for the planet, should we not rethink our idea of freedom? My answer: Yes!

The adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) in 1948 was a great achievement for humankind. Article 1 begins: ‘All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights’. Up to now, there has been a strong focus on freedom. Not that this is unimportant. Yet freedom, rights and dignity can slide into contradictions if we are not careful. Now the time has come to think more about dignity. About a dignified world, both socially and ecologically, about what philosopher Avishai Margalit calls a *decent* world (Margalit, 1996). For Amartya Sen the ‘ability to go without shame’ is a basic capability (Sen, 1985; the *capabilities approach* was developed by philosopher Martha Nussbaum & Sen, 1993). In his treatment of freedom, Sen identifies freedom’s constitutive role and instrumental role (Sen,

1999). A culture that defines liberty as unrestrained freedom, however, including freedom for dominators to make *might be right*, tends to keep those dominators in power, dooming the broader masses to the role of exploited victims (Lindner, 2012a: 11). Only when liberty is defined as a level playing field protected by appropriate frameworks can the common good for all be protected. ‘Between the weak and the strong, between the rich and the poor, between the lord and the slave, it is freedom which oppresses and the law which sets free’, said thinker Jean-Baptiste Henri-Dominique Lacordaire (1802–1861).

‘Multiculturalism has failed’ is the verdict in some European societies. Psychologist John Berry explains that ‘one difficulty in discussions of the meaning of multiculturalism, both in Canada and internationally, has been the simple equating of multiculturalism with cultural diversity’ (Berry, 2013: 4). In Berry’s view, the success of Canadian policies, in contrast to those in Europe, stems from the fact that Canada places joint value on cultural maintenance (the diversity element) and equitable participation (the intercultural element). ‘The Canadian policy has always been more than just the recognition, promotion and celebration of cultural diversity; intercultural sharing, equity and inclusion have been seen as being essential elements in the policy’ (Ibid.) In Berry’s view cultural pluralism—many independent cultural communities in a society—is not enough; intercultural interaction and equitable participation in the larger society is needed. What is necessary is a move from *ethnicity multiculturalism* (with a focus on cultural diversity), to *equity multiculturalism* (focus on equitable participation), to *civic multiculturalism* (focus on society building and inclusiveness) and finally to *integrative multiculturalism* (focus on identification with the larger society) (Fleras, 2009).

My favourite motto is *unity in diversity*. Most people misunderstand this motto as a zero sum game: they think that more unity must mean less diversity, and vice versa. This is true when unity is let loose to derail into uniformity, as happens within the dominator model of society, where ‘unity’ indeed often means the suppression of diversity for the sake of uniformity. We need only to think of North Korea. Wherever *might is right*, dominators will exercise their ‘right’ to enforce uniformity. Dominators will treat diversity as dangerous division and take this as an excuse to impose uniformity, a uniformity that is informed by their particular position within the diversity of available positions, and they will call this uniformity unity. It is true that unity let loose into uniformity has the potential to destroy diversity. It is also true that diversity let loose into division has the potential to destroy unity. This happens when diversity is blindly translated into ‘freedom’ for cultural and individual ‘rights,’ where freedom is defined as limitlessness. This can unleash destructive social division and ecological exploitation.

However, it would be a grave misunderstanding to believe that unity’s only and true meaning is uniformity and diversity’s only and true meaning is division. It is the opposite, if we think through it: uniformity is not the same as unity, and, albeit diversity can be divisive, it must not necessarily be so. In my view, the concept of unity in diversity is among the saddest casualties of what I call the single largest ‘master manipulation’ ever perpetrated in human history, namely the introduction of *ranked worthiness* (in contrast to *equality in worthiness* or *equality in dignity*). Riane Eisler calls it the dominator model of society. It has characterised human history and affected most world regions since the onset of the *Neolithic Era* (Lindner, 2009a, chapter 8).

There is widespread fear that global unity will lead to the dissolving of diverse cultural identities into oppressive global uniformity. This fear stems from within the dominator mind-set and it is blind to the fact that it is precisely the current lack of global unity that has produced global uniformity: the cities of our world today all look the same, *McDonaldization* is everywhere (Ritzer, 1993).

Let me ask: Are we not proud of the name *Homo sapiens* that we have given ourselves? Does not *sapiens* mean wise and knowledgeable? Is not creativity a core characteristic of our human species that we are proud of and cherish? Is not the diversity of cultural expressions a prime manifestation of human creativity? Should we not unite to protect this diversity? If we think through it, as soon as unity is grounded in our shared *sapientia humana*, it becomes a win-win game: more unity means more diversity. More unity means more attention to diversity and more cherishing and nurturing of diversity.

Unity is *not* necessarily the same as oppressive uniformity, and diversity is *not* the same as unrestricted freedom for divisiveness. It needs competency in *nondualist* thinking to grasp that unity in diversity can be a synergistic win-win game; nondualism means separation *and* connection; agreement *and* disagreement; one *and* two. With unity in diversity, both can both flourish if kept in mutual balance and magnified and celebrated simultaneously. Both can flourish if we unite in acknowledging our shared humanity on a tiny planet, if we recognise our core assets, such as the creativity manifested in our diversity. Unity is when we acknowledge our shared humanity on a tiny planet; unity is when we respect that we all are equal in dignity; unity is when we understand that this dignity is enriched by the creativity manifested in our diversity; unity is when we draw on our diversity to create a sustainable future for our children on planet Earth. If nurtured by enough people, a unity-in-diversity identity that is global in scope can foster a global unity-in-diversity culture and co-create institutional frameworks to support it. Unity in diversity is the stark opposite of dissolving diverse cultural identities into global uniformity; it is the opposite of getting uprooted or homeless. It is the building of a more secure sense of home, a home of which we are joint stewards, a home of local diversity in global unity.

Unity in diversity can be operationalised by ways of *subsidiarity*. Subsidiarity means that local decision-making and local identities are retained to the greatest extent possible, while allowing for national, regional and even international decision-making when needed. The European Union uses the subsidiarity principle. Governance systems for large-scale environmental problems, for instance, can only be effective through the subsidiarity principle or *nesting principle* of political economist Elinor Ostrom (Marshall, 2008).

Unity in diversity can also be operationalised by ways of nesting anthropologist Alan Page Fiske's basic *relational models* (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 taking turns, for instance, in car pools or babysitting cooperatives. Market pricing builds on a model of proportionality with respect to ratios and rates. All of Fiske's universal forms of social relations need to be nested into new global superordinate institutional structures: Communal sharing must take precedence, with authority ranking, equality matching, and market pricing serving it (indigenous psychology is of help here, see Sundararajan, 2012). Co-creating new global framings of communal sharing for our world—community game frames rather than Wall Street game frames—this is the single most important common superordinate goal and joint task for humankind at the present historical juncture.

Nesting, or subsidiarity, this is also the answer to the important point that Andreas Føllesdal raises in this anthology, namely, that historically, many states have prohibited multiple citizenships because they fear split loyalties. Indeed, as long as the world was compartmentalised and the security dilemma strong, independence-dependence was the name of the game, rather than interdependence. Føllesdal rightly asks: 'Should we fear that global

citizenship, instead of bolstering trust, will foster split loyalties?’ The European Union solves this problem by transcending either-or by supplementing rather than replacing citizenship in a member state.

What does this mean for social cohesion at a global level? It means that it can be attained if we create the right conditions through global civic incorporation as suggested by Fleras. Findings show that individuals have no problems in holding multiple and mutually compatible collective identities. Diversity and cohesion can go hand in hand. It is the context that makes the difference. An international study of immigrant youth found that national identity and ethnic identity go well together in ‘settler societies’ such as Australia, Canada, New Zealand and the USA, in contrast to societies such as France, Germany, Norway, Portugal and Sweden, where young immigrants feel they have to choose between possible identities (Berry, Phinney, Sam, & Vedder (Eds.) 2006). In other words, the relationship between individuals having dual identities (that is with one’s heritage group and the national society) and social cohesion, depends on the way a society deals with cultural diversity. ‘In societies that promote multiculturalism, these dual identities are secure and compatible, and do not undermine social cohesion. In contrast, in societies that are either new to dealing with cultural diversity, or where such diversity is not recognized or accommodated, there is a negative relationship’ (Berry, 2013: 25).

Anthropologist and philosopher Benjamin Lee speaks of *critical internationalism* (Lee, 1995). The field of *indigenous psychology* is on a similar path (Sundararajan, 2012). It asks mainstream psychology to muster the self-reflexivity of competent multiculturalism to see itself in a new light, namely, as an indigenous psychology rooted in the historical and cultural context of Europe and North America (Gergen et al., 1996). The *view from nowhere* that natural sciences claim (Nagel, 1986) must transmute into *local views from somewhere*. A synergy of multiculturalism and internationalism can create a shift from one somewhere to another somewhere. Together, the local construction of meaning and global consciousness can use *multiple somewheres* to arrive at shared visions and goals (Taylor in Lowman, 2013: 52, 53). I call this *harvesting* from all world cultures (Lindner, 2007).

A Scale of Global Identity has been developed by Salman Türken at the University of Oslo, together with Floyd Rudmin from the University of Tromsø, on the psychological aspects of globalisation. They found two clear orthogonal factors, one is ‘cultural openness’, and the other ‘non-nationalism’ (Türken & Rudmin, 2013).

*Sunflower identity* is the name I coined for my personal global unity-in-diversity identity (Lindner, 2012b). Through my global life, the core of my identity (the core of the sunflower, so to speak) is anchored in our shared humanity, not just in theory but in practice, and more securely than any human identity ever had the opportunity to be anchored before. Why? Because the technological tools to reach the limits of our globe are more advanced than ever. And my experience has shown me that it is psychologically perfectly feasible to relate to all human beings as fellow family members and that most people are able to respond in kind.

At the periphery of my identity (the nested petals of the sunflower, so to speak), it is profoundly enriching to find safety in learning to ‘swim’ in the flux of diversity rather than to ‘cling’ to fixed positions. The mastery of movement provides a greater sense of security than fortress walls. Rather than seeking safety in one particular local culture, what fulfils me, is safety through the building of loving relationships globally. It is a pleasure to continuously pendulate in the spirit of nondualism, to have a *protean self* (Lifton, 1993) and to be a *voyager* (Matsumoto, Yoo, & LeRoux, 2005). A voyager uses the challenge of cultural diversity and intercultural conflicts for forging new relationships and new ideas, while *vindicators* vindicate their pre-existing ethnocentrism and stereotypes.

### Global citizenship of dignity and care: a profoundly personal practice...

Andreas Føllesdal, in this anthology, suggests that altruism may not be needed for a satisfactory account of global citizenship, nor a ‘thick’ common basis of shared beliefs, values and traditions. What may be sufficient is a commitment to the equal dignity of all individuals, motivated by a sense of justice (Rawls, 1980: 540). Føllesdal points out that even existing nation states are usually too large to foster empathic and sympathetic concern for the well-being of all others and still they enjoy support from their citizens.

I have ‘tested’ the hypothesis of whether it is possible to approach all human beings on this planet as my own family for almost 40 years. I can attest that there are indeed ‘thicker’ attractors around (Coleman, Bui-Wrzosinska, & Nowak, 2008), namely, a profound human eagerness to connect, if met with respect.

I was born into a displaced family, into an identity of ‘here where we are, we are not at home, and there is no home for us to go to’, and I have healed the pain of displacement by living as a global citizen (Lindner, 2012b). I understand that many people suffer from the world becoming liquid, confusing and fear-inducing. Yet, through being embedded in many cultures on all continents, far beyond the ‘Western bubble’, I can attest that true global living provides the stark opposite of fear, namely a sense of security, trust and confidence. Our forefathers were continuously surprised by new discoveries and fearful of the unknown. I, in contrast, have the comforting lived experience of how small planet Earth is and how social human nature is.

I love Witoszek’s call that ‘the citizens of this new, green modernity no longer wish to be separated from the environment’, indeed I myself no longer wish to be separated from my planet by the kind of borders we have today.

As I said earlier, I am deeply connected to our environment at a planetary level. I am an avid learner, and the planet is my university. Therefore I am a co-founder of the World Dignity University initiative. With great delight, I listen to educator Satish Kumar calling for a more holistic approach to education, connecting our hands, hearts and heads (TEDxWhitechapel, [www.youtube.com/watch?v=VAz0bOtfVfE](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VAz0bOtfVfE)). Kumar reminds us that ecology and economy come from the same Greek word: *oikos*, meaning *home*. Ecology is the study of our home and economy is its management. Kumar faults our education systems for the pervasive lack of a genuine understanding of nature, which is contributing to the gross mismanagement of our planet.

To come back to the earlier mentioned Paulo Freire, one of the Freirean insights is that we need to recognise that education is ideological (*ensinar exige reconhecer que a educação é ideológica*) (Freire, 1996). In this spirit, Freire quotes 18 statements which reflect what Francisco Gomes de Matos would call violations of communicative dignity:

Here are two dehumanising statements, mentioned by Freire: *Você sabe com quem está falando?* (You can’t talk to me like that! Do you know who I am? (implicit: how important I am?)) *Você não precisa pensar. Vote em fulano, que pensa por você!* (When you vote, you don’t have to think. Vote for candidate X, who will think for you!) The instances of communicative humiliation pointed out by Paulo Freire can also be considered violations of the human right to cognitive dignity. Paulo Freire’s examples are revealing of the types of communicative humiliation to which people may be subjected. Although some of the statements may be said to originate in Brazilian culture, they may also be found in other cultural contexts, since they convey dehumanising, offensive attitudes. In short, Freire’s work is also precursory to what is now called Peace Linguistics (learning to communicate for the good of all Humankind). (Peace linguist Francisco Gomes de Matos in a personal message to Noam Chomsky, shared with Evelin Lindner, 30th April 2013).

I repeat, I am not saying that everybody has to live like me. Today, we need both, people who stay and people who move. We need bridge builders, like me, who are ‘unifiers of diversity’. I am the founding president of Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies (HumanDHS, [www.humiliationstudies.org](http://www.humiliationstudies.org)), a seedbed for an alternative global community of care (Lindner, Hartling, & Spalthoff, 2011). This effort has many aspects. For our conferences, for example, we have developed a *dignilogue* approach from the *open space* technology of Harrison Owen, 2009. Open space offers various roles to participants. The ‘butterflies’ or ‘bumble-bees’ provide cross-pollination by moving from flower to flower, while those who remain in place guarantee the continuity and stability necessary for the conversations to flourish. Both roles are important for a successful process.

I am a global bumble bee. I have no base of my own. The planet is my home, and the human family is my family. We invite our HumanDHS network members to declare their homes to be Dialogue Homes ([www.humiliationstudies.org/intervention/dialoguehome.php](http://www.humiliationstudies.org/intervention/dialoguehome.php)). Wherever I go, I search for three gifts: (1) a loving context in a family home (this is the most important aspect for me; I avoid hotels, since they alienate me into a ‘guest role’ while I want to be ‘family;’ there is no need for me to ‘be on my own’ or ‘undisturbed’), (2) a mattress (I work with my laptop on my knees, I avoid desks and chairs), (3) if possible, a reliable 24-hour online access (I am the web master of our HumanDHS website, and the nurturing of our work is done via email; I need to work through up to 250 emails per day; see more on [www.humiliationstudies.org/whoweare/evelin.php](http://www.humiliationstudies.org/whoweare/evelin.php)).

I ‘harvest’ those elements from all world cultures that foster relationships of loving mutuality and respect for equality in dignity—be it from the African philosophy of *Ubuntu* or indigenous knowledge about consensus building (Lindner, 2007). ‘Democracy’, as it stands now, for instance, is too rigid and risks undermining sustainable consensus building. There are many alternative cultural practices and concepts that merit further exploration if we want to improve democratic practices—from *ho’oponopono*, to *musyawarah*, *silaturahmi*, *asal ngumpul*, *palaver*, *shir*, *jirga*, *minga*, *dugnad*, to *sociocracy*.

New forms of collaborative leadership are the new pathway. I am a nurturer of a global family where everybody is invited to become a collaborative leader. I do so in practice, not just in theory. I engage in the cultural diffusion of the unity-in-diversity principle, and I strive to manifest it in every aspect of my life.

My life design represents a creative experiment for a future world culture of true shared humanity and equality in dignity. Creativity will be central to building a sustainable future for the bio- and sociosphere of our human family. Art is a field that fosters creativity and can help shift paradigms. My life could be called ‘a piece of social art’, an artistic experiment in serving humankind as a paradigm-shifting agent.

What is important for everybody, particularly for those with access to resources, in my view, is to make an effort, at least once in one’s life time, to seriously look beyond one’s own ‘bubble’ of living. Wherever I go on the planet, even the most well-intentioned people of means tend to believe that their reality is the normality of the majority of the rest. They have a faint idea, but they do not truly realise that other people live under dramatically different circumstances. The widespread belief in a *just world* that causes people to blame the victim intensifies this situation. This segregation, as I see it, endangers the survival of humankind on our planet more than anything else. The result is that those who have the resources to bring about deep systemic change are not sufficiently motivated to do so, whereas those who have the motivation lack the resources—both, motivation and resources are being wasted, the world is full of misinvested wealth on one side, and disappointed motivation on the other side. Since the powerful shape the world, their narrow perspective leads to overall short-sightedness with respect to how we humans arrange our affairs on our planet.



To remedy this situation, it is not sufficient for the wealthy to take regular vacations in extensions of their own bubbles somewhere else on the planet, however far away. Instead, any school, any higher education institution ought to have in their curriculum an adaptation of *Blood, Sweat and T-shirts*, a TV documentary series broadcast in 2008. The series was followed by *Blood, Sweat and Takeaways* in 2009 that addressed the food production in Asia, and *Blood, Sweat and Luxuries* in 2010, which targeted the production of luxury goods in Africa. In each series, young British consumers aged between 20 and 24 lived and worked alongside local workers for a short while, such as, in the first series, alongside Indian garment workers making clothes destined for sale in British high-street stores.

As mentioned above, the *contact hypothesis*, or the hope that mere contact will foster friendship, is not necessarily warranted. Contact can also create enmity. The aim of such a *global dignity and care* approach would be more modest, namely to transcend the self-righteousness that emanates from isolation and to create the first step to global care, namely humility.

To invite everybody into *global family care* means taking the best from sedentary life styles and merge it with my global life design.

### What do you need?

Here comes a global citizen's message to Norway: Norway is the only country where I do not have to explain what equality in dignity means and why it is important. Elsewhere, people are steeped in traditions of inequality. This is a Norwegian cultural heritage that I believe is more valuable than oil. And a resource entails responsibility, out of humility, rather than out of arrogance. Norwegians have a unique responsibility to humbly contribute to bringing the ideal of equality in dignity or *likeverd* into the world. This is why we launched the World Dignity University initiative from Norway. Many Norwegians are unaware of their unique heritage and its present-day significance in the global context and they fail to protect it. *Janteloven* should not darken this asset and thwart this responsibility.

As I wrote earlier, if we believe that *apartheid* was humiliation set into system, then we know that the entire system needed to be transcended; showing more kindness and doing good was important but not enough. If today's local challenges are embedded into global systemic frameworks of humiliation, then only a coordinated effort by the world community can solve this problem.

If you wish to become a global citizen like me, you need a considerable amount of courage and curiosity. The radical realism of idealism is not for the faint-hearted. You need to be able to stand in awe and wonderment before our world. You need to leave the Western shopping-mall Kindergarten bubble and discover the immense creativity and diversity in the favelas of our world, or among our indigenous peoples. You need to be exceptionally patient, while maintaining the integrity and authenticity of dignified humility. You need to radically walk your talk, while seeking safety in 'swimming' in the flow of life rather than 'clinging' to imaginary certainties. You need to strive for extreme humiliation awareness. You need neither hope nor optimism. You need love. Not just as a feeling, but as a decision. As in Gandhi's notion of *satyāgraha*, a term that is assembled from *agraha* (firmness/force) and *satya* (truth-love) (Lindner, 2010).

Here is an important trap to avoid as we walk: I call it our human propensity for *voluntary self-humiliation* (Lindner, 2009a, chapter 8). Political scientist Robert Jervis explains how 'over the past decade or so, psychologists and political psychologists have come to see ... that a sharp separation between cognition and affect is impossible and that a person who embodied pure rationality, undisturbed by emotion, would be a monster if she were not an impossibility'

(Jervis, 2006: 643). Beliefs can be understood as lived and embodied meaning, as feelings (John Cromby, 2012). Here is the trap: Beliefs do not only serve our reality testing and understanding of the world, but also our psychological and social needs to live with ourselves and others. The problem here is that both can slide into opposition in disastrous ways. Our emotional desire for belonging and recognition may entice us to bypass responsible reality testing and turn loose observations, reflections, and opinions into overly firm beliefs. One result may be that we create unnecessary, catastrophic scenarios, while leaving necessary problems unaddressed. A glaring example for the potency of this trap, and why it is so important to be aware of it, is Cambodia. Nicos Poulantzas (1936-1979), a Greco-French political sociologist in Paris, was one of Pol Pot's teachers. Seeing what he had set in motion, he committed suicide (personal communication with Kevin Clements, August 21, 2007). Pol Pot had turned Poulantzas' academic reflections into rigid ideology, ruthlessly implementing it in Cambodia, and in that way creating immense unnecessary suffering.

Only radically new approaches to learning, meaning making and knowledge can help. 'What we do know, we do not know in a way that serves our needs. So, we need to know in different ways, and we need to build new knowledge through new ways of knowing. The new knowledge is in the area of designing new realities, which is likely to be done by speculative and creative thinking that would be communally shared and reflected for common formulation that would be tested in a continual process of social invention' said the founder of the field of peace education, Betty Reardon (in a personal conversation, 6th July 2010, Melbu, Norway).

The world is the best university, the best arena for new approaches to meaning making. Why? Because 'disorienting dilemmas' are prime opportunities for learning; they unsettle fundamental beliefs and values and bring about transformation (Mezirow, 1991). Meeting other cultures through living globally introduces you to disorienting dilemmas. You can also offer disorienting dilemmas from your side. I do that, for example, when I reply to the question 'Where are you from?' by saying 'I am a member of our human family, like you—I am from planet Earth, with all its diversity, which I cherish' (or something in this line). I introduce a disorienting dilemma to promote a new global dignity culture. Also the launch of the World Dignity University initiative answers this call.

A sense of inner coherence, belonging and meaning can be achieved by finding the level of fixity for which one has the emotional and intellectual resources. I admit that it is not easy to become comfortable in constant flow, in continuously balancing unity in diversity, with unity encompassing all of humankind and its ecosphere. However, it is extremely fulfilling. And it honours and uses the window of opportunity that we, the human family, are being offered by history just now. As discussed above, to date, global Wall Street frameworks tend to undermine local community frameworks. We have to change this global framing.

Having trained as a medical doctor and psychologist, I am aware of the limitations of the Western view of healing as the removal of symptoms (Lindner, 2000, Lindner, 2006). I work for the healing of humankind's dire predicament through a transition toward meaning, synergy and balance, self-reflexive and self-reflective process, connectedness, wholeness and sharing.

I invest every minute of my life in nurturing a global movement of citizens with the aim to build institutions that end practices of humiliation and enable equality in dignity globally, as a framework for equal dignity to flourish locally also. My 40 years of global experience show me that my vision of a future world culture of dignity is feasible. It is possible to overcome what divides us and what forces us into uniformity. We can define ourselves first and foremost as members of the entire human family, with a shared responsibility for our home planet and its cultural and biological diversity.

I suggest that we all can benefit from trying global citizenship of dignity and care, so as to give Kurt Lewin's famous saying its due, namely that 'There is nothing so practical as a good theory' by marrying it with my conclusion after forty years of global experience, namely that 'There is nothing so enlightening as a good practice'.

## References

- Allport, Gordon Willard (1954). *The Nature of Prejudice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Alperovitz, Gar (2009). *The Long Term Norm of the Economy Is Great Instability and High Inequality*. Cambridge, MA: Presencing Institute, [tc.presencing.com/sites/default/files/Interview\\_Alperovitz\\_0.pdf](http://tc.presencing.com/sites/default/files/Interview_Alperovitz_0.pdf).
- Bauman, Zygmunt. (2010). *44 Letters from the Liquid Modern World*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Belenky, Mary Field, Bond, Lynne A., and Weinstock, Jacqueline S. (1997). *A Tradition That Has No Name: Nurturing the Development of People, Families, and Communities*. New York: Basic Books.
- Berry, John W. (2013). Research on Multiculturalism in Canada. In *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, Special Issue on Multiculturalism* In press.
- Berry, John W., Phinney, Jean S., Sam, David Lackland, and Vedder, Paul (Eds.) (2006). *Immigrant Youth in Cultural Transition: Acculturation, Identity and Adaptation Across National Contexts*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Coleman, Peter T., Bui-Wrzosinska, Lan, and Nowak, Andrzej (2008). *Toward a Dynamical Model of Power and Conflict*. Chicago, IL: Paper presented at the 21st Annual Conference of the International Association of Conflict Management, July, 2008, [www.tc.columbia.edu/i/a/document/9112\\_Toward.pdf](http://www.tc.columbia.edu/i/a/document/9112_Toward.pdf).
- Dahle, Maria (2008). *Human Rights Defenders - Do They Make a Difference?* Oslo, Norway: Presentation given at the Seminar "60th Anniversary of the Human Rights," at the Oslo Center for Peace and Human Rights, 24th November 2008, [www.oslocenter.no/en/2008/11/seminar-60th-anniversary-of-the-human-rights/](http://www.oslocenter.no/en/2008/11/seminar-60th-anniversary-of-the-human-rights/), published at Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies, [www.humiliationstudies.org/documents/DahleUN60years24Nov2008.pdf](http://www.humiliationstudies.org/documents/DahleUN60years24Nov2008.pdf).
- Dahle, Maria (2011). *Introduction to Working Session 3*. Warsaw, Poland: Introduction given on 27th September 2011 at the Human Dimension Implementation Meeting 2011, organised by the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR) of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE), 26th September-7th October 2011, [www.osce.org/event/hdim\\_2011](http://www.osce.org/event/hdim_2011), published at Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies, [www.humiliationstudies.org/documents/DahleOSCE27Sep2011.pdf](http://www.humiliationstudies.org/documents/DahleOSCE27Sep2011.pdf).
- Eisler, Riane Tennenhaus (1987). *The Chalice and the Blade: Our History, Our Future*. London: Unwin Hyman.

- Elias, Norbert (1991). Changes in the We-I Balance. *The Society of Individuals*. Oxford: Blackwell, translated from the German original *Die Gesellschaft der Individuen*, 1939.
- Fiske, Alan Page (1991). *Structures of Social Life: The Four Elementary Forms of Human Relations - Communal Sharing, Authority Ranking, Equality Matching, Market Pricing*. New York: Free Press.
- Fleras, Augie (2009). *The Politics of Multiculturalism: Multicultural Governance in Comparative Perspective*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Freire, Paulo (1968). *Educação e Conscientização: Extencionismo Rural*. Cuernavaca, México: CIDOC/Cuaderno, no. 25.
- Freire, Paulo (1970). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Continuum.
- Freire, Paulo. (1996). *Pedagogia da Autonomia - Saberes Necessários à Prática Educativa*. São Paulo, Brazil: Paz e Terra, [www.lettras.ufmg.br/espanhol/pdf%5Cpedagogia\\_da\\_autonomia\\_-\\_paulofreire.pdf](http://www.lettras.ufmg.br/espanhol/pdf%5Cpedagogia_da_autonomia_-_paulofreire.pdf).
- Türken, Salman, & Rudmin, Floyd W. (2013). On psychological effects of globalization: Development of a scale of global identity. *Psychology and Society*, 5(2), 63 - 89.
- Gergen, Kenneth J., Gulerce, Aydan, Lock, Andrew, and Misra, Girishwar (1996). Psychological Science in Cultural Context. In *American Psychologist*, 51 (5), pp. 496-503, doi: 10.1037//0003-066X.51.5.496.
- Hardin, Garrett James (1968). The Tragedy of the Commons. In *Science*, 162, pp. 1243-1248.
- Hartling, Linda M. and Luchetta, Tracy (1999). Humiliation: Assessing the Impact of Derision, Degradation, and Debasement. In *Journal of Primary Prevention*, 19 (5), pp. 259-278.
- Herz, John H. (1950). Idealist Internationalism and the Security Dilemma. In *World Politics*, II, pp. 157-180.
- Hessel, Stéphane (2010). *Indignez-Vous!* Montpellier, France: Indigène éditions.
- Jervis, Robert (2006). Understanding Beliefs. In *Political Psychology*, 27 (5), pp. 641-663.
- Lee, Benjamin (1995). Critical Internationalism. In *Public Culture*, 7 (3), pp. 559-592.
- Lifton, Robert Jay (1993). *The Protean Self: Human Resilience in the Age of Fragmentation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lindner, Evelin Gerda (2000). *The Psychology of Humiliation: Somalia, Rwanda / Burundi, and Hitler's Germany*. Oslo, Norway: University of Oslo, Department of Psychology, doctoral dissertation in psychology.
- Lindner, Evelin Gerda (2006). *Making Enemies: Humiliation and International Conflict*. Westport, CT: Praeger Security International, Greenwood.

- Lindner, Evelin Gerda (2007). Avoiding Humiliation - From Intercultural Communication to Global Interhuman Communication. In *Journal of Intercultural Communication, SIETAR Japan*, 10, pp. 21-38.
- Lindner, Evelin Gerda (2009a). *Emotion and Conflict: How Human Rights Can Dignify Emotion and Help Us Wage Good Conflict*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Lindner, Evelin Gerda (2009b). Why There Can Be No Conflict Resolution As Long As People Are Being Humiliated. In *International Review of Education*, 55 (May 2-3, Special Issue on Education for Reconciliation and Conflict Resolution), pp. 157-184, doi: 10.1007/s11159-008-9125-9, published OnlineFirst December 27, 2008, at [www.springerlink.com/content/bg5g32x832152953/?p=61dc6cf755b1443c83e89d49221b3e7a&pi=1](http://www.springerlink.com/content/bg5g32x832152953/?p=61dc6cf755b1443c83e89d49221b3e7a&pi=1), including the short version of Finn Tschudi's response and Evelin Lindner's rejoinder; long version at [humiliationstudies.org/documents/evelin/ReconciliationforBirgitFinnEvelinlonginterview.pdf](http://humiliationstudies.org/documents/evelin/ReconciliationforBirgitFinnEvelinlonginterview.pdf).
- Lindner, Evelin Gerda (2010). *Gender, Humiliation, and Global Security: Dignifying Relationships From Love, Sex, and Parenthood to World Affairs*. Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger, ABC-CLIO.
- Lindner, Evelin Gerda (2012a). *A Dignity Economy: Creating an Economy Which Serves Human Dignity and Preserves Our Planet*. Lake Oswego, OR: World Dignity University Press.
- Lindner, Evelin Gerda (2012b). Fostering Global Citizenship. In Deutsch, Morton and Coleman, Peter T. (Eds.), *The Psychological Components of Sustainable Peace*. (pp. 283-298) New York: Springer.
- Lindner, Evelin Gerda, Hartling, Linda M., and Spalthoff, Ulrich (2011). Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies: A Global Network Advancing Dignity Through Dialogue. In *Policy Futures in Education*, 9 (1, Special Issue: The Council of Europe's *White Paper on Intercultural Dialogue*), pp. 66-73, [www.wwwords.co.uk/PFIE](http://www.wwwords.co.uk/PFIE).
- Lowman, Rodney L. (2013). *Internationalizing Multiculturalism: Expanding Professional Competencies in a Globalized World*. Washington: American Psychological Association.
- Margalit, Avishai (1996). *The Decent Society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Marshall, Graham R. (2008). Nesting, Subsidiarity, and Community-Based Environmental Governance Beyond the Local Level. In *International Journal of the Commons*, 2 (1), pp. 75-97, [www.thecommonsjournal.org](http://www.thecommonsjournal.org).
- Matsumoto, David Ricky, Yoo, Hee Seung, and LeRoux, Jeffery A. (2005). Emotion and Intercultural Communication. In Kotthoff, Helga and Spencer-Oatley, Helen (Eds.), *Handbook of Applied Linguistics, Volume 7: Intercultural Communication*. The Hague, The Netherlands: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Mezirow, Jack (1991). *Transformative Dimensions of Adult Learning*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Miller, William Ian (1993). *Humiliation and Other Essays on Honor, Social Discomfort, and Violence*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Nagel, Thomas (1986). *The View From Nowhere*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Nussbaum, Martha C. and Sen, Amartya Kumar (1993). *The Quality of Life*. Oxford: Clarendon Press of Oxford University Press.
- Owen, Harrison (2009). *The Practice of Peace*. Circle Pines, MN: Human Systems Dynamics Institute.
- Pettigrew, Thomas F. and Tropp, Linda R. (2006). A Meta-Analytic Test of Intergroup Contact Theory. In *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 90 (5), pp. 751-783.
- Raskin, Paul D. (2012). Scenes From the Great Transition. In *Solutions for a Sustainable and Desirable Future*, 3 (4), pp. 11-17, [www.thesolutionsjournal.com/node/1140](http://www.thesolutionsjournal.com/node/1140).
- Rawls, John (1980). Kantian Constructivism in Moral Theory. In *Journal of Philosophy*, 77 (9), pp. 515-572.
- Ritzer, George (1993). *The McDonaldization of Society: An Investigation into the Changing Character of Contemporary Social Life*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Rothkopf, David J. (2008). *Superclass: The Global Power Elite and the World They Are Making*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Sen, Amartya Kumar (1985). *Commodities and Capabilities*. Oxford: Elsevier Science.
- Sen, Amartya Kumar (1999). *Development As Freedom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sen, Amartya Kumar (2006). *Identity and Violence: The Illusion of Destiny*. London: Allan Lane.
- Staub, Ervin (1989). *The Roots of Evil: The Origins of Genocide and Other Group Violence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sundararajan, Louise (2012). *Indigenous Psychology: Grounding Science in Culture, Why and How? Anthropology in China*, [www.cnanthropology.com/portal.php?mod=view&aid=380](http://www.cnanthropology.com/portal.php?mod=view&aid=380).
- Türken, Salman, & Rudmin, Floyd W. (2013). On Psychological Effects of Globalization: Development of a Scale of Global Identity. *Psychology and Society*, 5 (2), 63 - 89.
- Wergeland, Henrik (1843). *Henrik Wergeland, IV. Avhandlingar, Opplysnings skrifter: 5te Bind 1843 - 1845*. Oslo, Norway: Dokumentasjonsprosjekt (Universitetet i Bergen, Universitetet i Oslo, Universitetet i Trondheim, Universitetet i Tromsø), accessed on 28th April 2008 from [www.dokpro.uio.no/wergeland/WIV5/WIV5001.html](http://www.dokpro.uio.no/wergeland/WIV5/WIV5001.html).