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The past of Humanity?

Partly a history of humiliation

The future of Humanity?
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To the promise of DIGNITY let’s be committed!
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all future generations
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# Foreword by Howard Richards

Philosopher of social science and scholar of peace and global studies

The central message of this book emerges gradually as the confluence of many lines of research and reflection employing various methodologies, various conceptual schemes, various models, and various vocabularies. It cannot really be understood without reading through the evidence and argument that show not only what the central message is, but also that it is true. Nevertheless, I will begin this Foreword by trying as hard as I can to summarise it briefly. Then I will offer an opinion on how to get from here to there. ‘Here’ refers to the world as it is. ‘There’ refers to the world as it needs to be. Lastly, I will make a remark on method.

Emotions have histories. Our experiences today of shame or humiliation, or of the happier emotions associated with dignity, are present-day outcomes of centuries-long histories. If we include the long evolution of the human species, from the time of our common grandmother Mitochondrial Eve until now, then we can speak of the millennia-long histories of our emotions. We could go even farther back, all the way to the appearance of the first unicellular organisms on planet Earth, approximately 2.3 billion years ago.

This book breaks up history in a way that features two major periods in the history of emotions. The first, and by far the longest, began when our ancestors first crossed the somewhat arbitrary imaginary line that marked their passage from being pre-hominids to being hominids. It ended, after about 190,000 years, with what anthropologists call ‘circumscription’. During that time the deepest and most fundamental features in the human emotional repertory were composed.

‘Circumscription’ meant that around and about 10,000 years ago, the human population on planet Earth reached a point where humans ran out of space. You could no longer wander farther away whenever you needed to find more wild animals to hunt or plants to gather, because when you arrived where you were going you would find some other band or clan already there, already hunting the same animals or gathering the plants you wanted. Competition for scarce resources led to a sea-change in social structures and in emotional repertories.

The second, more recent and shorter, featured period began around 1757 and is not over yet. The year 1757 offers a marker for the beginning of a transition from honour-humiliation to dignity-humiliation. Otherwise put (regarding humiliation as an assault upon dignity): 1757 marked (again the exact date is somewhat arbitrary) the beginning of a transition toward equal dignity for all. Honour-humiliation corresponds to defining dignity as rank in a hierarchy. It functioned, and in many places still functions today, to maintain social structures that evolved to adapt to circumscription, originating in conquest and preserved by dominance and subordination.

Dignity-humiliation corresponds to a different way of understanding human beings. It corresponds to human rights anchored in equal dignity for all. The age we are living in can be thought of as a long and difficult transition. Sometimes one step forward is followed by two steps back. The moral compass of the transition points to its guiding star: equal dignity. Its ideal is a planetary civilisation whose ethical-juridical framework is founded on ‘recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family’.[[1]](#endnote-2)

An unintended consequence of today’s global culture formally committed to human rights ideals has been an epidemic of humiliation. The insight that this is the case first came to Evelin because of her experiences in the Middle East and Africa. However, once one sees that this is the case and why it is the case, it becomes evident that human rights ideals to a greater or lesser degree lead to humiliation everywhere. Here I omit anticipating this book’s extensive discussions of how to define humiliation and move straight to thumbnail sketches of two of the reasons why more proclamations of human rights have led to more humiliation.

The first is that people are no longer willing to accept being put down and kept down. Most people have come to feel that there is something wrong with them if they knuckle under and do not insist on being treated with the respect due to any human being. It was (and is) different in a society based on unequal dignity where humiliation is understood as failing to get the honour due to a person of one’s rank. People learn to know their place, even when their place is down. Putting them down by voice or by violence is regarded as a proper way to teach them their place.

The second is that proclamations of human rights, especially of the social rights proclaimed since 1948, as far as most people most places are concerned, are sheer hypocrisy and insult. They begin trails of broken promises leading to intolerable gaps between rhetoric and real life. The rhetoric says over and over again: You do not live up to expectations; you do not have what you are supposed to have; you are not what you are supposed to be. I will say more about this below under the heading ‘structural humiliation’.

The second of these two reasons tells us that to a large extent it is not human rights ideals per se that leads to massive humiliation and anger. It is promising them and then not delivering on the promises. To this extent we can still almost agree with the authors of the Universal Declaration and the diplomats who voted to approve it: Recognition of human rights ‘is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world’.[[2]](#endnote-3) We only need to rephrase their words to say: ‘Recognition of human rights would be the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world if human rights were recognised in fact and not only on paper’.

But wait. The first of the above two reasons does say that human rights ideals per se lead to massive humiliation and anger. Human rights ideals call for equal dignity, and equal dignity calls for new arrangements of all relationships, for dismantling traditional hierarchies. And in many cases dismantling customs that are deeply ingrained in the hearts and in the common-sense of the people leads to humiliation. It attacks their sense of who they are, their identity. But wait again. In many other cases — and often in the same cases seen from other perspectives — traditional hierarchies have been imposed on people who hate and resent them. And further — to add yet another layer of complication — nothing rules out the possibility that promoting human rights might serve as a cover for corruption and exploitation. This is not just a bare possibility. It has happened.

One might conclude that in principle it is a good thing when the modern kind of humiliation (dignity humiliation) motivates people to stand up for rights they previously did not know they had; but general principles need to be tempered to fit particular cases. One might also say that most traditions can be ‘harvested’ by finding the germs of equal dignity already in them. There is no need to be anti-tradition to be pro-dignity.

I wrote the preceding two paragraphs as short teasers. They are an invitation to read the long treatments of these and many other issues, in later pages of this book I am introducing.

### Getting from here to there

Let me overlook for now the complications just mentioned that will be taken up later, although not by me, and go back to my revised version of part of the preamble to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights: ‘Recognition of human rights would be the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world if human rights were recognised in fact and not only on paper’.

A threshold question is why the human family has failed so miserably to do what it officially intends to do. It has failed to assure the human rights of each of its members, including personal safety, freedom of speech, cultural identity, clean drinking water, dignity in old age, employment, health care, and others; even though such rights are solemnly declared in international treaties signed and ratified by nearly every nation. They are also included in most national constitutions that have been written in recent years. If we knew why we failed, then we could deduce from our failure a list of obstacles we need to clear out of the way before we can succeed.

I could make a long list of factors often cited that purport to explain but (in my view) do not explain the phenomena that are observed. There is not enough greed in the world, not enough callous indifference, not enough racial prejudice, and not enough general hostility and ill will to explain the precarious lives, the stress, and in general the exclusion from the joys of life of the majority of our cousins who, like you and me, are descendants of Mitochondrial Eve. Ignorance of the science of ecology (defined as a synthesis of the natural sciences) is (in my view) only a small part of the explanation of humanity’s lockstep death march leading straight to irreversible deviations from the delicate equilibria that make the biosphere possible. Further, it is not true that it is in the interest of a small elite, the famous 1%, to keep most of us on the ropes, living from pay check to pay check, or living without a pay check, in order to maximise their happiness and/or their power. It is certainly not in the interest of their descendants to bring human life to an end, nor is it in their interest to spend the time that remains between now and extinction in grossly unequal and grossly dysfunctional societies. What is true is that there are deep structures, analogous to DNA in biology, molecules in chemistry, and tectonic plates in geology, whose causal powers generate the main trends seen in the facts.[[3]](#endnote-4)

The phrase ‘deep structure’ came to me via my co-author Joanna Swanger. Joanna sometimes remarks that in our book The dilemmas of social democracies[[4]](#endnote-5) we analysed the deep structures of modern economies as Noam Chomsky analysed the deep structures of languages.[[5]](#endnote-6) Our case studies of Spain, Sweden, Austria, South Africa, Indonesia, Venezuela, and the World Bank echoed Jürgen Habermas’s point in Legitimation crisis that what he called ‘late capitalism’ must end in the fiscal crisis of the state.[[6]](#endnote-7) Habermas showed that as time goes by, it becomes more and more clear that a government’s obligations to promote economic growth and to pay for complying with human rights saddle it with obligations it cannot fund. Many writers who analyse the decline of social democracy stop here. Habermas, and Joanna and I, echoing him, go on to specify that human social rights cannot be funded within the constraints imposed by modernity’s neo-Roman rule of law; or, as Joanna would suggest, rephrasing the same point in more general terms, within the constraints imposed by the deep structure. For example, taxes must be low to avoid provoking capital flight and to promote growth, but taxes must be high to pay for a welfare state. Among the typical results of this dilemma are cynicism, unmet needs, low growth, and unpayable debt. The deep causes (the legal framework, but not only the legal framework) of such dilemmas of social democracies we have called ‘the basic cultural structure’ in our book. Joanna suggests that they could also be called à la Chomsky the ‘deep structure’.

I picked up the phrase ‘causal powers’ from one of my tutors at Oxford, the philosopher of science Rom Harré.[[7]](#endnote-8) Unlike philosophers of a positivist temper, who tend to see science as fitting mathematical models to data, Harré tends to see science as the discovery and the modelling of the underlying causal powers that produce the data.

If we now ask the question, ‘What are the deep structures whose causal powers generate the obstacles we need to clear out of the way before we can succeed in building a world where human rights are the foundation of freedom, justice, and peace?’ I would suggest reading this book as a giant step toward answering it. Let me say why. Unlike some other studies of the psychology of the emotions, this study sees the history of humiliation, and the history of dignity, as part and parcel of the history of social structures. It shows that the way the deep structure is, is not the way the deep structure has always been. It illuminates, as I will discuss in a little more detail shortly, and as I have already begun to illuminate by citing The dilemmas of social democracies and Legitimation crisis, why the particular historically evolved deep structures that most people take for granted today are simultaneously promises of equal dignity for all and obstacles in the way of achieving it.

This Foreword to this book has the peculiar characteristic that both the author being introduced, Evelin Lindner, and her introducer, myself, hold two earned doctorates. Hers are in medicine and psychology. Mine are in philosophy and law. She, in this remarkable book and in other works, has added a new dimension to understanding the historical genesis of the world we live in today, by studying it from the general point of view of the history of the emotions with a specific focus on the history of humiliation. In what follows, I seek to contribute to our partnership — and at the same time to diagnose some obstacles preventing humanity from carrying out what at this point in history are its official intentions — by restating some of her key points from the point of view of the history of law.

The transition from honour-humiliation to dignity-humiliation runs parallel to the transition the legal historian Sir Henry Maine called a transition from status to contract.[[8]](#endnote-9) For Maine, in a status society one’s social relations are determined principally by the Family into which one is born. This would correspond to being humiliated by being denied respect due to one’s inherited rank. In a contract society, social relations are determined principally by Free Agreements among individuals. This would correspond to being humiliated by being denied freedom of choice; for example, by being raped or groped. The parallel is not perfect, but it is close enough to make it clear that when we are talking about a society whose ethical ideal is equal dignity, when we are talking about a society where the principal social ties are established by free agreement — most fundamentally, free agreement among buyers and sellers in markets — we are talking about the same kind of society. Namely: modern society.

From a legal point of view, it is important to notice that because contracts are by definition free agreements, nobody has a duty to enter into a contract. Importantly: nobody has a duty to buy, just because someone else needs to sell to make a living. This deep structure generates what Lindner calls structural humiliation.[[9]](#endnote-10) It provides the legal basis for a society where everyone is expected to stand on their own two feet and make their own living; but making a living requires selling something. To earn money to live on, one must sell either one’s labour power or sell something else. Everybody has to sell, but nobody has to buy. Since everyone is in the business of trying to rake in more money than they pay out; it is a mathematical certainty that there will be people who fail to sell for lack of buyers. Whatever their good intentions and hard work may or may not be, it is structurally impossible to sell without a buyer. Many more will only be able to sell what they have to sell for sums so small that they live in poverty, and therefore live in embarrassment.

The opinion I offer on how to get from here to there is to take seriously the language in declarations of human rights that define humanity as a ‘the human family’ and calls for a ‘spirit of brotherhood’. Since 1948 we have learned to add ‘sisterhood’. My opinion complements the passages in the following pages by Evelin Lindner calling for conceiving human rights as those of a member of a family, and not just as those of individual buyers and sellers in markets where each is authorised by law to seek her or his own advantage, and nothing else. In the terms of Sir Henry Maine, the path to a sustainable future runs by way of a synthesis of Family and Free Agreement, and not by way of obliterating the first for the sake of maximising the second. It is true that the cultural structure Maine conceptualised as the Family principle was a principle of unequal dignity. But it was also a principle of mutual obligation. Maine did not even think about any laws more ancient than those of ancient Greece; he did not even consider human life prior to 10,000 years ago. If his knowledge base had been larger, he would have realised that the human body evolved as the body of an animal adapted to live in extended families.[[10]](#endnote-11)

A key and indispensable part of my advice is to build institutions that do something families — or at least those families that are reasonably functional — do: Share the surplus. Create surplus. Share it. Move resources from where they are not needed to where they are needed. Of course, it is impossible to share the surplus if there is no surplus; and impossible to move resources if there are no resources. Therefore, my simple advice to share the surplus implies complicated tasks for mission-driven organisations.

Let me say a few words in praise of the word ‘mission’. A great beauty of this book is that its call to complete the historical transition to equal dignity defines a mission for us all; rooted in science and ratified by a global consensus. I am praising the word ‘mission’ because I think it is a fine old word, capable of stirring the roots of fine old ancient emotions, and at the same time today it is a word strongly identified with systematic collective efforts to solve problems.

These abstract considerations have everything to do with such very concrete questions as: How to fund human social rights like health, education, and pensions? How to assure access to dignified livelihoods for the increasing numbers of people made redundant, or demoted to low-paying and precarious work, by the exponentially accelerating advance of sophisticated technologies that make human labour less and less marketable as a factor of production? How to get off the treadmill that requires ever more sales, and an ever-larger human population to do ever more buying and selling, to keep the economic machine going, killing life on this planet at the physical level while at the economic level growth (defined as increasing sales) is a systemic imperative? How do we defend social justice when its attackers are economic phenomena authorised by law like capital flight, disinvestment, budget cuts, rising prices, falling real wages set by market pricing, and layoffs?[[11]](#endnote-12)

### A remark on method

I began by saying, and still believe, that the central message of this book emerges gradually as the confluence of many lines of research and reflection employing various methodologies, various conceptual schemes, various models and various vocabularies. I suggest that the same can be said of Charles Darwin’s On the origin of species. The examples of these two books serve to illustrate an important point about scientific method.

Darwin described his masterpiece as ‘one long argument’,[[12]](#endnote-13) but he is far from following the scholarly tradition of writing at the end of his long argument, Q.E.D. (Quod erat demostrandum, ‘what was to be demonstrated’) and repeating at the end of the argument the exact statement that at the beginning he set out to prove, declaring it now proven. Instead, Darwin concedes that his theory can be countered with ‘many and grave objections’.[[13]](#endnote-14) He does not think of himself as having advanced logically irresistible arguments which all rational minds will be compelled to quickly accept; instead he expects the majority of scientists to disagree with his theory, and counts on ‘young and rising naturalists’[[14]](#endnote-15) to gradually change the status of his theory from that of a minority view to that of a generally accepted view.

Like the reasoning of Evelin Lindner, Darwin’s reasoning freely mixes what he has learned from personal experience and from travel with what he has learned from readings. Darwin expects the reader, like himself, to be persuaded not so much by a tight chain of abstract definitions, as by a summation of various reasonings from various sources. The weight of the evidence gradually shows what it is reasonable to believe and what it is not reasonable to believe.

Darwin writes instead of Q.E.D., ‘it may be convenient to the reader to have the leading facts and inferences briefly recapitulated’.[[15]](#endnote-16) What he then recapitulates are various lines of research and reflection. They are incurably miscellaneous. For example, numerous facts about the breeding of domesticated plants and animals are part of the same ‘one long argument’ as this inference: The existence on widely separated cold mountaintops of the same species of animals (and therefore, if his theory is true, of animals with common ancestors), while those same cold-weather animals are absent in the vast intervening lower and warmer spaces between one mountainous region and another, can be explained by geology. During the cold Pleistocene Epoch animals of the same gene pool with the same ancestors roamed both the mountains and the intervening plains. As the weather warmed up, they died out on the plains, leaving cousins of the same blood on separated mountaintops.[[16]](#endnote-17)

In the entire Origin of Species, Darwin gives not a single immutable precise definition. Questions about the proper classification of the species and varieties of living forms are always to be answered by decisions; and the decisions are always to be made and to be revised, in the light of evidence gathered in field work. Indeed, Darwin finds that scientists have no golden rule fundamentally distinguishing what is to be counted as a species from what is to be counted as a variety.[[17]](#endnote-18) To this day, biologists do not agree on exactly how to define evolution, or on exactly how it works; and nevertheless, it can truly be said that ‘in biology nothing makes sense except in the light of the theory of evolution’.[[18]](#endnote-19)

The important point about scientific method that I want to make with my comparison of Lindner and Darwin can also be made by a variation of the old story about the blind men and the elephant. In the standard version of the story, several blind men give different accounts of what an elephant is, depending on what part of the elephant they are touching. Now let us vary the story: Suppose we increase indefinitely the number of blind men touching the elephant, and then we synthesise the evidence coming from their diverse reports. We would then expect their numerous reports to converge toward a true account, and the reason why we would expect convergence toward truth is that there really is an elephant. In the language of Roy Bhaskar, the ontologies (the being and the causal powers) of the objects of scientific study stay the same while human researchers describe them in different ways.[[19]](#endnote-20)

Accordingly, living species really do evolve, and there really is a transition going on from honour-humiliation to dignity-humiliation in the period of history we are living in. Different authors approach the facts from different directions and describe them in different words, but regardless of how they are described drives toward equal dignity and respect for human rights are happening in Cairo and in New York and all over the planet. The scientific method in the last analysis is not about following any particular recipe for producing knowledge, or about describing data in some particular regimented format. It is about discovering the deep structures whose causal powers generate the events that happen and the phenomena that appear.[[20]](#endnote-21)

Howard Richards, Philosopher of Social Science and Scholar of Peace and Global Studies  
Limache, Chile, January 2018

# Preface

What is the language of dignity?

Is it...

• a language of listening, especially listening others into voice?

• a language of relationships and relational awareness?

• a language that includes silence?

• a language of words and deeds?

• a language of inclusivity?

• a language of working wisely with conflict?

• a language that cultivates authenticity?

• a language of many languages?

• a language that generates seeds of creativity?

• a language that has roots in all languages... (do we need a seed library of dignity)?

• a language carried in poetry, art, music, dance, artistic expression, etc.?

• a language that provides an inoculation and antidote to humiliation?

• a language that restores and replenishes the health of people and the planet?

• a language that encourages democracy?

• a language necessary to move us towards egalisation?

• a language that prevents, reduces, and defuses hostility?

• a language for everybody?

― Linda Hartling, director of Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies[[21]](#endnote-22)
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### This book takes its starting point in the historical challenges of our time

We, Homo sapiens sapiens, live in a historical moment that is unparalleled in terms of both crisis and opportunity. We live in times that are better than ever and at the same time worse than ever. History does not go in circles. Our crises inform us that we need to arrange our affairs on this planet in profoundly new ways. Some changes are overdue since decades, others since centuries or even millennia. Presently living generations have access to a knowledge base their forebears did not have, even their immediate grandparents knew much less. For the first time in our history, we, as humanity, have all the knowledge and skills required to bring about all necessary changes.

This book takes a step back to evaluate humanity’s situation in this unprecedented historical situation, and, equipped with the insights from this evaluation, the book makes suggestions for a roadmap into a future of global dignity in solidarity.

The most important novelty of our time is that we can appreciate our place in the cosmos. Unlike our ancestors, we can see pictures of our Blue Marble from the perspective of an astronaut. Unlike our forebears, we have the privilege of experiencing the overview effect with respect to our planet[[22]](#endnote-23) — we can see it from outside. This makes our horizon large enough to understand that we humans are only one species among many species who all share the same small planet and that only global cooperation can save us. We ‘earthlings’ can feel ‘the ecology of the living’ taking place within one circumscribed biopoetic space that is shared between all beings,[[23]](#endnote-24) we can embrace biophilia.[[24]](#endnote-25) For the first time, we are equipped to build the trust needed for solidarity at a global scale, we have all the resources required to reap the benefits that the global ingathering of humanity provides. We can draw on all experiences, past and present, from the oldest Indigenous wisdom to the newest scientific knowledge. Short, the co-creation of a decent global village is within our reach.

In this situation, where do we stand as humanity? Are we capable and willing to use the historical opportunity that stands open before us and cooperate globally? Or does our human nature condemn us to hate, fight, compete for dominance, and exploit each other and the planet? Reason tells us that no single country, no single region, can tackle global challenges alone, do we have the emotional resources to act on this insight? ‘It takes a village to raise a child’ is an African saying. Can our global village become a village that raises its children in dignity and keeps them safe? Or not? Is it a valid promise or empty rhetoric when we say, ‘All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights’? Can equal dignity and equal rights serve as a moral compass for a decent future in solidarity for humankind? Or not? Is there hope for a ‘global democracy and human self-transcendence’?[[25]](#endnote-26) Or will parochial pride always stand in the way? Will we be part of the mass extinction of species that we have unleashed in the past decades? Are we, as humanity, in ‘hospital’ or already in ‘hospice’? Is our only option a ramshackle global village?

If we wish for decent life on Earth, it is not enough to hope for hope, we have to take action to create this hope, and this book aims at inspiring this action. The book calls on the reader to let pessimism be the force that inspires the optimism that is needed to take this action. The best of optimism and the best of pessimism, when they combine, can bring about the best of action — the courage of pessimism to imagine the worst can inspire the optimism to aim for the best. Embracing the anxiety and despair that goes with being a vulnerable human being is the necessary precondition for the kind of dignifying constructive action that is needed to avoid the destructive kinds of optimism or pessimism. Optimism is destructive when it is just another word for self-congratulatory and delusionary hubris, and pessimism is destructive when it translates into faint-hearted and gloomy inertia. As we live in a world where hubris and gloom are increasingly being amplified for ulterior goals — ‘drama and fear sell’ — this book asks its readers to ‘cool down’ and come together as responsible visionary pragmatists in global solidarity, as equals in dignity, so that we all can lovingly co-create global unity in diversity.

The book aims at holding the space needed for a very large vision of a dignified future for humanity to flourish, space that can serve as an incubator for creative future-oriented ideas and action. The book refrains from spelling out in too many details how this future may be reached because the main aim is to inspire ideas and action to emerge that may be so innovative and novel that no one has thought of them so far, not even myself, the author of this book.

### The line of argument this book offers, in a short overview

My particular family background has inspired this book. As my family has lived through the most painful experiences in connection with German history, this has brought the vulnerability of our human-made world to me in the starkest of ways. As a result, I am sensitised to looming crises more than many others are, and also more aware of the need to prevent crises systemically rather than responding to them haphazardly and post-hoc.[[26]](#endnote-27) The point is to prevent the ‘Hitlers’ of this world from rising, rather than having to defeat them when they have become too powerful. In 1945, Germany was defeated — I wonder, is humanity defeating itself now?

Since childhood, my life mission has been to learn whether or not there is hope for ‘never again’, never again the mass destruction of war and genocide, never again systemic humiliation. Since childhood, I work to understand the range of what we humans are capable of, in terms of hatred and love, of violence and peace, of competition and cooperation, of shortsighted foolishness and farsighted wisdom.

At the age of twenty-one, I began my ‘global living’ project, immersing myself into different cultural realms all around the world, much more deeply than through mere ‘travel’, rather considering myself a sedentary citizen of the global village. Since I have not yet met another person who lives in this way, I have composed a longer explanation that can be downloaded from the web.[[27]](#endnote-28)

When I was forty years old, after twenty years of global living, I felt I had learned enough to embark on an ambitious plan. I wanted to outline in one single paragraph the path that would carry me until the end of my life. For three years, I reflected deeply and dialogued with many people. This is the paragraph:

We, the species Homo sapiens, face global challenges — from the destruction of our ecospheres to the degradation of our sociospheres — and we must cooperate globally if we want to address these challenges. Question: What is the most significant obstacle to successful global cooperation? Answer: Cycles of humiliation are the greatest obstacle, and this problem will increase the more the world interconnects, the more its finiteness will make itself palpable, and the more human rights ideals of equal dignity for all will become salient and create expectations that were absent before. For global cooperation in responsible solidarity to succeed, the highest goal must therefore be to dismantle existing systemic humiliation, to end and heal present cycles of humiliation, and to prevent new ones from emerging in the future.

I had two sources of information for my conclusion, first, my own experience, and, second, lessons from history. First, through working for many years as a clinical psychologist, both in Western and non-Western contexts, I had learned that humiliation has the potency to create the deepest of rifts between people, so deep that cooperation becomes impossible. I had learned that this effect amplifies when resources get scarcer and conflicts arise, and even more so when human rights ideals of equal dignity raise expectations as to how these conflicts ought to be addressed.

Second, the historical argument has found its way into common knowledge that the Versailles Treaties at the end of the First World War were intended to humiliate Germany to teach it humility, yet, that this ‘lesson’ backfired in the most horrible ways. After the Second World War, Germany was included as a respected member in the European family, and this led to peace.[[28]](#endnote-29) In short, history appears to hold the lesson that humiliation risks leading to war while respect can lead to peace.

With these pieces of information and intuition in mind, I went to the library expecting to find abundant literature on humiliation. This was in 1996. I found that the phenomenon of humiliation itself indeed was ubiquitous in all literature on war and aggression, yet, to my great surprise, there was almost nothing on humiliation as a separate theme. I found only one single academic book with the phrase ‘humiliation’ in its title, a book from 1993 by a professor of law, William Ian Miller, who explores ancient codes of honour and shows how virulent these codes still are.[[29]](#endnote-30)

While the psychological literature on emotions did mention humiliation, it subsumed it under the heading of shame, with humiliation as part of the shame continuum. To me, this felt wrong. Not least my many years of experience as a psychotherapist in diverse cultural realms had taught me that it is absolutely possible to feel humiliated without feeling shame. I had learned that humiliation and shame can only be placed in the same continuum as long as a mindset of honour reigns, and that this is no longer valid in a context where the ideal of equal dignity is salient.

Starting from these reflections and findings, I planned my doctoral research in social psychology with the title The psychology of humiliation: Somalia, Rwanda / Burundi, and Hitler’s Germany.[[30]](#endnote-31) I defended this doctorate in 2001.

By now, in 2022, my global ‘never again’ mission has provided me with more and deeper insights. After almost fifty years of global experience, I feel I can contribute with relevant reflections on humanity’s most existential questions. Therefore, I dare write this book, with love and passion, as my gift to humanity.

Even though it is not very advisable to provide overly simplified abbreviations, particularly not in times of polarisation, the following is a tentative summary of my view on big history. I will start by looking at where we stand, then ask how we got here, and end with what can and should be done.

**This is where we stand**

We, the species Homo sapiens, live at a historical turning point that is so important that only a long view on our history can help. We, as humankind, have dug ourselves into a multitude of perilous crises, both despite and because of what we call progress. We engage in systemic humiliation — ecocide and sociocide — we degrade our ecospheres and sociospheres at a global scale, we shred our relations with our habitat and with each other. The suffix –cide comes from caedere in Latin and means ‘cutting down, killing’.

We catalyse the degradation of our ecospheres and sociospheres by damaging our cogitosphere, the realm of thinking and reflection, and we damage it to the point of cogitocide. As a result, we risk sliding sightlessly into collective suicide as a species, more, even towards omnicide, the annihilation of all life on Earth. We as humanity stand at the edge of what is being called a Seneca cliff,[[31]](#endnote-32) the kind of rapid collapse that characterises the disintegration of complex systems.[[32]](#endnote-33)

If we, as humanity, wish to heal ecocide and sociocide and survive in dignity, the first step must be to overcome cogitocide, the destruction of our thinking. We need to face our calamity with an equanimous mind, not with panic nor with denial. Our scientists inform us that we have a window of opportunity of around ten years to step back from the edge,[[33]](#endnote-34) and that all the knowledge to do so is available.

Unfortunately, so far, instead of recognising the depth of our existential crises, and grasping the historic opportunity to exit, it seems that too many of us choose to stay myopic. This is why a look at big history is helpful.[[34]](#endnote-35) It provides a wide lens that makes primary problems visible that spawn secondary, tertiary, and quaternary problems.[[35]](#endnote-36)

**This is how we got here**

What is known as the Neolithic Revolution merits renewed attention. It was a turning point in human history that was as important as the present historical moment. Furthermore, it saw humankind’s primary problem emerge, namely, competition for domination and control as a strategy of survival. Due to its success, at least partially, this competition remained Homo sapiens’ master plan of action during the past millennia. It is a uni-dimensional and uni-lateral strategy that answers what political scientists call the security dilemma in that it seeks ‘negative’ peace by following the motto of ‘If you want peace, prepare for war’. It was in this context that the dominator model of society arose, with its double intervention, namely, keeping one’s ‘enemies’ out with weapons, while holding one’s own down with routine humiliation. Until now, all systems — feudalism, communism, capitalism, democracy, modernity, post-modernity, to name just a few catchwords — played out competition for domination in their practice, if only in different forms and to different degrees, and this even when promising the opposite in rhetoric. Equal dignity on the ground has been widely and systemically sold out, often even under the guise of dignity rhetoric.

Our Neolithic forebears could not know better, establishing a mindset of competition for domination was the best they could do. They did not yet have the information about the world that we have today. Over time, even a growth dilemma superimposed itself and merged with the classical security dilemma, and this is where we are today. The current motto is, ‘If you want prosperity, invest in exploitation’.

The situation we live in now, while it is a result of our forebears’ strategy of survival, becomes a strategy of collective suicide as the world interconnects and the Earth’s carrying capacity becomes overstretched. Competition for domination as a mindset and social and societal order has always been limited in its usefulness, but by now, it fully outlives this usefulness. Even colonising other planets would not help given this mindset, its resources would soon be depleted as well. This mindset drives systemic cogitocide and sociocide, it divides the global community just when it needs to come together, and by doing so, it hastens global ecocide. It manifests systemic humiliation.

As it stands now, the dominator mindset drives cycles of humiliation and systemic humiliation to hitherto unseen levels. This happens in a situation where human rights ideals promise equal dignity to all, which means that feelings of humiliation no longer translate into obedient humbleness but acquire hitherto unseen force. I call feelings of dignity humiliation the nuclear bomb of the emotions.

Clashes of civilisations are harmless compared with clashes of humiliation, because humiliation closes doors for cooperation that otherwise would stand open. In the absence of leaders of the calibre of a Nelson Mandela or Mahatma Gandhi, cycles of dignity humiliation have the potency to turn the global village into a global war zone. Nothing is therefore more important than halting and preventing these cycles of humiliation.

## What is the way out?

The situation is so new that ideas become realistic that hitherto were deemed unrealistic. Citizen-to-citizen trust building at a global scale is the only lifesaving strategy. Human rights ideals of global partnership in mutual solidarity that link back to conceptually pre-Neolithic Indigenous Knowledge Systems and models of gift economy offer the path to achieving lasting global dignity.

The traditional role description for maleness, namely, bravery in competing for domination, is now obsolete. Our planet is burning and drowning, and at the same time it is filled with deadly arms, and this means that all, men and women united, are called to embrace a new kind of bravery, namely, the bravery of building mutual trust, care, and solidarity in global partnership.

The call must be as follows: On this small and finite planet that is our common home, let us bring our forebears’ adaptations to a better completion. Nothing hinders us to honour our forebears’ legacy even while we unlearn their adaptations. There is no shame in accepting new learning when realities on the ground change. We have ten years to outgrow twelve thousand years of behaviour. We possess all the necessary knowledge and skills to succeed.

Let us nurture respect for equal dignity for all of us, as responsible individuals, free to engage in loving solidarity with each other and with our planet. Let us celebrate diversity without humiliating each other, let us protect unity in equality in dignity. Let us turn socio-cide and eco-cide into what I call socio-sanity and eco-sanity. Let us embrace socio-salvation and eco-salvation.

Let us humanise globalisation through egalisation, a word I coined to signify ‘equal dignity for all in freedom’, let us aim for globegalisation. More, let us do so in cooperation and solidarity, let us work for co-globegalisation. In this way we can co-create a decent global village.

We need the heroism of care, the heroism of dignity. We need what I call dignism as a vision for the future, dignism as a term formed from dignity and ‑ism (see more in chapter 11).

Dignism describes a world where every newborn finds space and is nurtured to unfold their highest and best, embedded in a social context of loving appreciation and connection, where the carrying capacity of the planet guides the ways in which basic needs are met.

As this simplified summary shows, this book calls on its readers to dare embrace eutopian imagination at an unparalleled scale, because the list of obstacles standing in the way is as unparalleled.

As for obstacles, the profit motive stands in the way when it fails to serve the common good and instead entraps the world in systemic humiliation. Academia becomes irrelevant and loses its ability to inspire new thinking when it allows itself to be blind, be it through siloisation or through letting market forces capture it, or both.[[36]](#endnote-37) Even the mindfulness movement — as valuable as its emphasis on the ‘present moment’ is — becomes counterproductive when it devolves into ‘McMindfulness’ and cultivates ‘social amnesia’ through ‘collective forgetting of historical memory’.[[37]](#endnote-38) Anger stands in the way when drama surrounding minor problems absorbs all energy and leaves urgent long-term systemic planning unattended.[[38]](#endnote-39) This is just the beginning of a long list of obstacles that stand in the way of a decent future (chapter 10 discusses these obstacles).

This book aims at showing a way out of gridlock into a decent future.

### How this book is structured

The first part of the book has the title ‘Humiliation and humility — A timeline from 1315 to 1948’. The second part looks at dignity under the heading ‘Equal dignity for all’. The third part wonders, ‘Where do we go from here?’, and discusses ways into the future and calls for action. The book weaves together a large number of diverse voices and offers an analytic overview over all of human history — where we come from, where we stand now, and where we go. It explores the notion of dignity, the opportunities it offers, and it delineates a decent path into the future. It approaches dignity from all directions, including from its violation, namely, humiliation.

These are the three parts:

Part I: Humiliation and humility — A timeline from 1315 to 1948

Part II: 1948 and beyond — Equal dignity for all!

Part III: Where do we go from here? A future of solidarity!

Half of the book is taken up by endnotes. As we live in times of ‘fake news’, it becomes ever more important to provide thick layers of references and links.[[39]](#endnote-40) In digital publications, length is not a problem, yet, this is different for printed volumes, and therefore the endnotes are shortened in the printed version of this book. The endnotes have two functions and address two readerships. Their first function is to embed the arguments presented in this book in their wider intellectual context and show their connections with the insights of other scholars. The second function is to interweave the book’s arguments so that it becomes clear that these arguments represent an interconnected web rather than a one-dimensional line. The first readership addressed in the endnotes are researchers who wish to understand the author’s particular path of investigation and who want to delve deeper into relevant academic research. The second readership addressed is a more general audience who might appreciate more accessible popularisations of the themes discussed. The book’s Appendix offers a condensed schematic overview over the flow of the argument in this book.

Since 2001, I have had the privilege of nurturing a global network of academics and practitioners who wish to bring more dignity into the world, and the name that emerged for this community is Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies (HumanDHS). It is important to clarify that I, while I am the founding president of this global fellowship, am also a researcher in my own right. What is presented in this book does not define any official position of the HumanDHS network. On the contrary, I wish to inspire my readers to forge their own pathways to exploring the themes of dignity and humiliation.

Together with Linda Hartling, who is the director of the HumanDHS community, I nurture unity in diversity by holding space for diversity in our global dignity community. Linda Hartling and I, we are also part of this diversity.

### The book draws attention to the core problem of our time

One of the core messages of this book, and its core cautionary, is that humiliation — the nuclear bomb of the emotions — will become more virulent in the future. The book calls for more attention for this challenge both within academia and among public policy planners. The current rise of violent polarisations and conspiracy narratives is one outfall of this predicament, it deepens existing geopolitical fault lines and undermines much needed future planning for global cooperation.

The reasons for why the phenomenon of humiliation becomes more relevant are manifold. Two factors stand out. First, people increasingly interconnect globally, and, second, the ideal of equal dignity for all becomes more salient. Everywhere on my global path I observe that wherever and whenever the awareness of ideals of equal dignity is on the rise, not only does this challenge traditional power arrangements, it also creates higher expectations than before. Potentially explosive expectation gaps emerge — dignity gaps — wherever and whenever these ideals remain unrealised, or, worse, when they are advocated only to be betrayed. Hitherto unseen cycles of humiliation emerge when the downtrodden want to close this gap by rising up while those at the top refuse to step down, either through open oppression or through double standards. As a result, everyone feels humiliated — people at the bottom of society feel humiliated when they are not elevated, and they collide with those at the top who got accustomed to what political economist Frédéric Bastiat observed most cogently already in 1848, ‘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 authorises it and a moral code that glorifies it’.[[40]](#endnote-41) The more the world interconnects, everything spreads out farther and faster, the nemesis of new viruses as much as promises of equal dignity, together with the pain and anger that emerges when dignity is promised yet unfulfilled or betrayed.[[41]](#endnote-42)

After living globally for more than four decades, being at home on all continents (except Antarctica), I can attest that the most far-reaching current manifestation of double standards is global and systemic. I will explain more in Part III in this book. The institutions of our world-system give priority to profit maximisation with the promise that this will protect the dignity and common good for all, and I meet many people on all continents who act on this promise with the best intentions. Yet, the reality I encounter on the ground, particularly in the Global South, tells another story. When the ideal of equal dignity is being abused to ‘glorify plunder’, when dignity is defined as equal entitlement to profiteering, when this entitlement informs all institutions that organise a society, when it legitimises free riding on the common good worldwide, the result is systemic humiliation at a global scale. I observe humiliation seeping into the smallest daily interactions in the farthest corner of the globe.

The coronavirus pandemic that unfolds while I write these lines speaks to this predicament. It was a ‘predicted crisis’ after decades of warnings that were overheard in the rush for profit at any cost.[[42]](#endnote-43) This rush brought humanity into overly close contact with novel pathogens that were then spreading around the world, killing thousands. The world community is fortunate that this particular virus is not as deadly as the Ebola virus or certain bird flu variants,[[43]](#endnote-44) because as it stands now, the pandemic imparts a wake-up call rather than a species-wide death sentence.[[44]](#endnote-45) The coronavirus pandemic throws into stark relief the need for global care for the common good, it shows the destructiveness of the profit motive when it rules instead of serving. It brings back the words that United States Supreme Court Justice Louis Brandeis said already eighty years ago, ‘We may have democracy, or we may have wealth concentrated in the hands of a few, but we can’t have both’.[[45]](#endnote-46) The crisis calls for an ‘economy of life’ rather than an ‘economy of death’ — it calls for a dignity economy.[[46]](#endnote-47)

Since 2003, the Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies community, together with the World Dignity University initiative that emerged from it, holds two conferences each year, one at Columbia University in New York City every December, and the other in a different location in the world every year, a pattern that was only interrupted by the coronavirus pandemic.[[47]](#endnote-48) The Dignity Conference we held just a few months before the coronavirus pandemic broke out, spoke directly to its causes and highlighted its significance as a wake-up-call. In August and September 2019, we gathered in the Amazon of Brazil, where we were reminded of the immense value of Indigenous knowledge systems and the enormous importance of knowing how to live in dialogue with nature. We learned at first hand about the disastrous consequences of overlooking, neglecting, and exterminating Indigenous peoples.[[48]](#endnote-49) Around sixty per cent of all infectious diseases in humans are zoonotic in origin, transmitted from animals due to destructive human activities.[[49]](#endnote-50) The fires that were set to the Amazon Rainforest, and that we saw on the horizon during our conference, represent only one of the many manifestations of the human-made destruction of our planetary resources.[[50]](#endnote-51)

This book calls on all of humanity — particularly its decision makers — to remember Bastiat’s and Brandeis’ warnings. Institutionalising plunder represents systemic humiliation and if this happens at a global scale, it affects every local life. The book calls on everyone to remember that humans are capable of solidarity, to take in that it is more fulfilling and meaningful to stand together in solidarity than to outcompete each other. It is more fulfilling to protect than destroy the social and ecological commons that are the foundation of all livelihood.

### The book invites into the historical journey of dignity and humiliation

In the first part of this book, I look at the captivating journey that the notions of dignity and humiliation have traversed throughout the past centuries in the English language. I look at ‘historical linguistics’ or philology.

A philologist is a person who is fond of studying literature and the historical growth and adaptation of languages. Greek philo-logos means ‘fond of words’, from phil, ‘fond of’, and logos for ‘words’ or ‘speech’. At present, philology gains significance in many fields of inquiry. Evolutionary biologists, for example, become philologists when they look at words and their patterns of transmission and replacement with the aim to gain better understanding of how genes enter and exit the genetic pool. Environmental activists discover Indigenous languages and the crucial knowledge they hold to avert environmental disaster.[[51]](#endnote-52)

I was greatly astonished when I first read in William Ian Miller’s book that ‘the earliest recorded use of to humiliate meaning to mortify or to lower or to depress the dignity or self-respect of someone does not occur until 1757’.[[52]](#endnote-53) In other words, since 1757, in the English language, humiliation is no longer connoted as a pro-social duty of superiors to show inferiors their due lowly place, it signifies the anti-social violation of dignity.

What happened in the years leading up to 1757? What made this period in history so special that it could ring in such a dramatic transition of the Zeitgeist, such a radical turnaround from pro- to anti-social? I wrote this book, among others, to understand why the year 1757 provides such an important historical linguistic marker, first within the European cultural realm, then spreading globally, and what we can learn for today.

If we look closer, we see that the linguistic surprise of the year 1757 signals two things, namely, a rejection and a turnaround. It represents the rejection of the hierarchical mindset that shaped social systems throughout the previous millennia, and it opens space for future-oriented mindsets and systems. The year 1757 signals the rejection of what I call ranked honour and it invites an ideal that still waits to be fully realised today, namely, the ideal of equal dignity. To be more precise, it marks the transition away from ranked honour in a collectivist context and the move towards an ideal of equal dignity for all as responsible individuals, free to engage in solidarity with each other and with our ecological foundations. The latter ideal links back to Indigenous mindsets of equal dignity in dialogue with nature that predate the Neolithic Revolution, thus bridging a bygone past with a not-yet realised future.

When I began researching for this book, I realised that in 1757, a new usage of the term decorum became prominent, a usage that, while it foregrounded the individual over the collective, still was far from present-day’s notion of equal dignity for all people, on the contrary, the individual’s worthiness remained starkly ranked. The significant step towards equality in dignity came in the year 1948, the year that saw the enshrinement of the right for all people to equal worthiness. In the years that followed 1948, more human rights conventions were added, for instance, conventions that highlighted mutual care and social responsibility, and by now, also ecological responsibility is being recognised, namely, our close connection with our larger planetary ecological context of which we are only a small part.

The linguistic marker of 1757 led up to the foundational sentences in the first paragraph of Article 1 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights that was adopted on 10th December 1948, ‘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’ (we add sisterhood today, and use solidarity as a more inclusive term[[53]](#endnote-54)). In bygone millennia, such sentences would have been unconceivable — and still they are unconceivable in many parts of world today. Most societies throughout the past millennia would have regarded very different sentences as divinely ordained or nature-given, perhaps sounding like this, ‘All human beings are born unequal in worthiness and rights. Some are endowed with more reason and conscience than others and should preside over inferiors in a spirit of supremacy’. Or, ‘All human beings are born unequal in worthiness and rights, because everyone is born into their rank and is meant to stay there, except for those few who might move up or down the status ladder due to their own doings or un-doings. As an unavoidable consequence, there will always be some who are freer than others are, and there will always be strongman elites who preside over collectives of subordinates’.

The generations born today will have to decide which sentence they wish to act on in the future. My global experience indicates that the only sentence that has the capacity to inform the coming into being of a decent global village is the sentence that ‘all human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights and should act towards one another in a spirit of solidarity’. However, this sentence is dignifying only under the condition that all mission creeps towards the first sentences are avoided (see more in chapter 6), that double standards and empty rhetoric are prevented, that it is put into practice in good faith, globally and locally.

### The book is written with love and as a gift of love

This book is not a stand-alone product but part of a larger dignity project. The way this book is written attempts to manifest how I conceive of dignity, namely, as a relational concept rather than a script for ‘lone hero’ self-sufficiency. The book is written with love and as a gift of love because for me, dignity speaks to Martin Buber’s I-Thou concept of dialogical relationships, it speaks to encounters that are larger than life and often so awe-inspiring that they warrant the word divine.[[54]](#endnote-55) Dignity, for me, is the opposite of monological individual autonomy. I resonate with all voices who propose that love is the very foundation for human dignity (see more in chapter 4). The only source of meaning that makes sense to me is my embeddedness in a global dignity community and my unconditional offering of love, always underpinned by my humble admission that even the strongest love will never suffice. This book is therefore an attempt to manifest a ‘dialogue of love’ with my readers.

The book is not a scholarly presentation of a theory, rather, it is a painting, a painting that paints itself with the painter’s humble and loving involvement.[[55]](#endnote-56) It is like a panorama painting,[[56]](#endnote-57) or a kaleidoscope, an associative report of the painter’s life journey. My life’s journey has been embedded in a global web of caring relationships with people from the most diverse cultural backgrounds, all of whom have influenced my life with their inspiring and nurturing support. Even the wording of the title of the book is the result of years of collective exploration.[[57]](#endnote-58)

In a world that becomes ever more complex, with knowledge that becomes ever more specialised, generalists are needed, and I am one of them.[[58]](#endnote-59) I accept all criticisms that accuse me of lacking specific specialised expertise, because I do. What I can offer is that I highlight ‘what works’ from my point of view.[[59]](#endnote-60) My work is an assemblage of what I have seen during the many decades of my global life, and this assemblage is per definition always inadequate, it is my personal humble attempt of meaning making. Many people have travelled the world, and they know much. What gives me courage to write this book is that almost five decades of being at home on all continents have provided me with experiences and insights that go deeper.

I am sad that philosopher Walter Benjamin cannot read this book. Like Benjamin, I create collections of dialectic images where past and present meet. Benjamin did not survive the Nazi regime — he had to take his own life in 1940 before he could finalise his Passagenwerk or Arcades project that he began in 1927, a vast collection of writings on the city life of Paris in its passages couverts.[[60]](#endnote-61) Many decades later, when I lived in Paris, I admired the same iron-and-glass covered arcades, and Benjamin’s words were always with me. In deep resonance with Benjamin’s thinking, I draw the legitimacy for my work from an ‘unborn future’ and bear the stigma that flows from lacking legitimacy in the present — in a commercialised world, my focus on love rather than on mainstream status markers is difficult to explain and justify. Benjamin would have understood my life choices, as he warned against the ‘necrophilic, globalising social system of neo-liberal capitalist domination that is invading every corner of the globe’.[[61]](#endnote-62)

Even more difficult to explain and justify is my decision to feel proud of achievements that are not mine, and ashamed of wrongdoings I have not committed. I feel proud of the human ability for loving care, and I feel ashamed of all atrocities we as humankind have ever perpetrated against our fellow human beings and our ecological habitat, both in the past and in the present. I feel shame for all brutal dictatorships humanity ever brought into power, I feel shame for how we, the human species, have devastated people, animals, and landscapes. As I see my self-interest coincide with the common interest of all of humanity, I take responsibility for all of us by dedicating my entire life to working for a dignified future for all. I see my role in foregrounding my ability for loving care as much as I can, to be a loving dignifier, to be a gardener and nurturer of dignity for the entire human family that I consider my family.

I have met people who have depreciated my choices by saying that I must be a sentimental ‘crybaby’, too weak to face the evilness of reality, or a do-gooder who collects points for history books or heaven, or a ‘crybully’ who indulges in alarmism, excessive pessimism, fanatical nihilism, or indignation entrepreneurship. All of this I am not. I am not a missionary of salvation either, I am not a New Age advocate, nor am I an Orwellian Silicon Valley techno-libertarian.[[62]](#endnote-63)

Rather, I wish to speak to you, the reader, in the spirit of Martin Buber’s concept of I-Thou relationships. I wish to speak to you about our shared responsibility for co-creating a dignified future for us, the species Homo sapiens, a species that is a recent newcomer on our planet and has still much to learn. Even though I personally choose to feel ashamed, I do not ask others to do the same. I wish to refrain from distributing blame or making us feel guilty or ashamed for what we did wrong in the past.

Instead, I invite all of us to learn about dignity, to discern patterns and draw lessons from the past, a past that is a treasure trove of lessons for the future. All living beings who have ever lived on our planet, since there was life on Earth, have manifested cultural traditions that contain an inestimable wealth of knowledge, and I want to open our eyes for that wealth.

### The book invites the reader to be a co-researcher

I once sailed around half the globe as a psychology student on a large cadet cargo ship. At night I often stood on the bow of the ship, alone, looking out on the ocean, thinking of the Titanic and how it must have felt to see the iceberg coming. Imagine you stand on a ship that risks hitting an iceberg and you try to move your fellow passengers to organise themselves to change the course of the ship and redo its design. Imagine all of humankind in this situation. What would you do? What should we as humanity do?

My aim is to invite us, as humanity, to sit together and reflect on the deeper patterns that make us the people we are, that brought us to where we are, and ask existential questions. Is it beneficial what we, the species Homo sapiens, do on this planet? Do we wish to continue with what we have done so far? Or do we want to change our course and the design of our systems? If yes, how do we respond to those who find change impossible or ridiculous, or too difficult to accomplish? How do we console and encourage those who fall into depression, apathy, or paralysis upon such impossibilities? How can we include those who feel humiliated by our call for change and who may want to lash out against us in anger? How can we reach out to those who answer with enraged finger-pointing and aggressive divisiveness? How can we move all of us to join hands in mutually beneficial future-oriented action?

The reader is invited to delve into this book as a co-researcher, invited to lovingly fill the gaps that I have left in my analysis. You will notice that I am a visual person. When I look at our world, I see theoretical concepts as topological spaces.[[63]](#endnote-64) My way of seeing resonates with sociologist Max Weber’s ideal-type approach that differentiates between distinct levels of abstraction.[[64]](#endnote-65) I have coined the phrase glob-egalisation because I see the world as a spherical container that is in motion, with globalisation as a horizontally shrinking movement, and egalisation — my word for equal dignity in freedom — as a flattening movement. I see the infinity symbol or Möbius strip ∞ when I think of nondualistic unity in diversity, of dialogue in partnership, of solidarity in equal dignity. I see the ∞ when I speak of dignism.

I am a humble and loving seeker more than a self-assured finder, and I like to invite you to be a co-seeker together with me. Given my training as a medical doctor, when I look at the world, I am like a physician who feels her way into diagnosis more than a judge who pronounces verdicts. I appreciate philosopher Ágnes Heller’s scepticism of ‘masculinist models of consciousness’ that objectify world order (see more in chapter 6).

The reader will notice that I feel uncomfortable with the combative academic practice of defending or rejecting theories or theoretical concepts, uneasy with dissecting concepts by agreeing or disagreeing with them as if academic inquiry were a war zone. Rather, I like to embrace and learn from all insights, I welcome whatever input might bring light into the blind spots of which I am unaware. Like everyone else, I am part of the cultural forces of our time, all of which shape our perceptions, thinking, and emotions, and this includes our blind spots. In the age of the Internet, like everyone else, I partake in ‘accelerating alterations of culture by human action’, where we all remake ‘our own being’.[[65]](#endnote-66)

My lived experience of seeing our world has always been the primary pathway into my research and this book attempts to make this pathway visible to the reader. As intuitive seeing is the starting point for my work, I like to decipher correspondences between my own intuitions and all symbolical ideas and strands of academic thinking that I encounter around the world. I welcome all information that helps me widen my horizon, everything that can sharpen and deepen my differentiations. When I have an intuition, I focus on all elements I feel worth adding to my narrative, I look for all theories and models that either resonate with my intuitions, put them in question, or transform them. The main point is that I always remain humble and open, always aware that all human knowledge is limited.

Already as a child, I used to ask those ‘big’ questions that have only intermediary answers given the finitude of human existence. How do we meet death? What is ‘the nature of loyalty and obligation, the character of tragedy, the definition of heroism, the redemptiveness of love’?[[66]](#endnote-67) Already as a child, I rejected mechanistic individualistic biomedical models of human nature and focussed on larger societal, systemic, and cultural processes.[[67]](#endnote-68) My intuitions foreshadowed psychology’s recent departure from the idea that culture is a compilation of traits or a set of norms or beliefs, I always saw ‘culture’ as ‘patterns of representations, actions, and artefacts that are distributed or spread by social interaction’.[[68]](#endnote-69) Culture, to me, is ‘a ricorso, returning, not in its forms but in its concerns, to the same essential modalities’.[[69]](#endnote-70)

When I was a child, my intuitions brought me into deep trouble. One problem was that I could not embrace the dogmatic religiosity of my family. It took me many decades to find scholars, thinkers, concepts, and theoretical models that helped me understand my intuitive resistance. Slowly, I found assurances that showed me that my childhood sensitivities had been valid. This experience has taught me to resist subscribing to any specific theory or model wholesale, to withstand being a disciple or promoter of any ‘school’. As a generalist, I resist the disciplining influence of academic disciplines.

My Chinese friends tell me that I am a Zhi Yin 知音, a listener who truly listens and understands where the speaker comes from, and my American friends tell me that I am ‘listening people into voice’ — that I strive for ‘connected knowing’, which is ‘women’s ways of knowing’, in contrast to the ‘separate knowing’ of ‘masculinist objectification’ (see more in chapter 6).[[70]](#endnote-71)

As I am more of a seeker than I finder, I like to remain in the state of listening and questioning as long as possible. This means that I often use academic terms as tentative pointers and provisional stand-in categories, eager to get more clarity, nuance, and context on my future path. For instance, when I use the phrase ‘Indigenous knowledge systems’, I see my father before my inner eye, who inspired me with his sense of embeddedness in a larger universe of meaning and who made me feel at home in all similar contexts around the world on my global path later in life.[[71]](#endnote-72) When I think of ‘collectivism’, I remember my years in Egypt and the great love and warmth with which my friends invited me with into the inner life of their large extended families, and at the same time, I also think of my doctoral research in Rwanda, where I learned about the dark sides of tightly knit communities. My American friends come to mind when I use the phrase ‘individualism’. I was able to gain a deep understanding of the desire for freedom from oppression, and I share it, yet, I also saw the dark sides of individualism when it is overdone, when disconnected individualism justifies the neglect of care and solidarity. This observation motivated me to suggest that only interconnected individuality can manifest dignity, that only interconnected individuality can combine the best from all worlds, namely, freedom and togetherness (see more in chapter 2).

Only when I use terms such as honour, dignity, humiliation, and humility, do I use more explicit definitions, and the entire book is dedicated to filling these definitions with meaning. I also have coined new words, such as dignism, egalisation, or ‘Sufi’ and ‘Pharisee’, and I will explain those phrases later.

I have studied medicine and have been holding the hands of people who were dying. Imagine you stand in front of a beloved person who is seriously ill, with shrinking chances to survive. How can you help your friend generate courage? How can you communicate the message that the situation is deadly serious without destroying hope? How can you respond to defensive denial, hopeless depression, passive inertia, how can you avoid aggression towards you for being the messenger of bad news? How can you help mobilise all reserves in your friend so she has a chance to turn the situation around even if only in the last moment?[[72]](#endnote-73) In this situation, it does not help to stare at the positive and close your eyes for the negative, nor does it help to do the inverse. It is no solution to say, ‘All is good, no need to do anything’, nor, ‘All is bad, no hope to do anything’. The coronavirus pandemic that unfolded while I finalised this book offered many opportunities to visit every little detail of these questions.

Whatever you do for your friend, it is irrelevant whether you are a gifted orator, or whether you formulate your message slick and smart as if you were an advertiser. Important is that your presence is a moving force, that you give of yourself, that you offer your loving and humble presence.[[73]](#endnote-74) Children often make little drawings as a gift of love and this is precisely the kind presence that is needed. The drawing will be imperfect, but this is irrelevant. The drawing is not meant for the receiver to formulate a critique of its artistic merits. It is meant to touch.

This book is created as such a gift. I give myself through this book to you as my beloved fellow human being, as my esteemed fellow citizen on a planet that we inhabit together. This book is part of a mission to which I dedicate my entire life, every detail of it, it is the mission of finding ways into a dignified and dignifying future for us all. I do this despite the fact that tenderness and sweetness elicit suspicion in parts of the academic arena, I am aware that many in the corporate world may deem me to be thoroughly naïve, and I also know that politics have the reputation of being a hardball game in need of hard currency rather than loving presence.

To me, only one currency is hard enough and has the strength to carry humanity into a dignified future, and this is the currency of steadfast love, the love of shared responsibility in loving connectedness and compassion — I call it big love in the book I wrote in 2010, to which Archbishop Desmond Tutu kindly wrote the Foreword precisely because of this love.[[74]](#endnote-75) This is my ‘religion’: Love, humility, and awe and wonderment.

I hope this book moves you so that together we can embrace a future that may seem impossible now. We live in ‘Dandelion times’. Dandelions are a member of the sunflower family that were valued as a desirable source of nutrition until the 1800s, only to be considered a pest later and sprayed with poisons or uprooted. In spite of this onslaught, they never give up being a healing influence wherever they grow. ‘We live in Dandelion times’ is the title of a text that calls out that ours ‘is not a time for nihilism or self-indulgence’, rather, it is a time to bring the best of what we have to offer to the world and give it harder than we ever gave before.[[75]](#endnote-76)

In these Dandelion times of cascading crises, the image of the Blue Planet from the astronaut’s perspective summarises, publicises, and symbolises an immense window of opportunity to create a dignified world, a window that is historically unparalleled and stands open as a gift to act on, a gift for us, the human family on this planet. We need a sense of emergency now that makes us truly see and use this window. After all, it will not remain open for long.

The Blue Planet image provides a powerful frame for collaboration that none of our ancestors was able to see. None of our forebears was able to fathom that we are one single family living on one small, vulnerable, and finite planet. None of our founders of religions, philosophies, or empires had access to the vast amount of knowledge that we possess about the universe and our place in it.

To come back to the first sentences of this Preface, namely, that history does not repeat itself, that history does not go in circles. We have all the knowledge and skills, for the first time in our human history, to transcend toxic competition for domination and arrange our affairs on planet Earth in the spirit of loving partnership and solidarity.

We need courage now, the heroism of dignity, the bravery of humble, caring, and loving dignity. If we need a new -ism as a vision for the future, then it is dignity and ‑ism, or dignism.

Dignism describes a world where every newborn finds space and is nurtured to unfold their highest and best, embedded in a social context of loving appreciation and connection, where the carrying capacity of the planet guides the ways in which basic needs are met.

Can it be?

That there is another speed

More humane than Western time

More loving than industrial time

More creative than academic time

More joyful than sports time

More healing than medical time

More heroic than military time

More peaceful that war time

Can it be?

Is this the speed of dignity?   
― Linda Hartling’s Poem of the Day, 4th January 2020

Wringing your hands just slows you down from pushing up your sleeves!

― Proverb

Pessimism is a luxury we can afford only in easy times, in difficult times it easily represents a self-inflicted, self-fulfilling death sentence.

― Evelin Lindner   
together with Jo Linser, Auschwitz survivor, 2004
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Howard Richards is a philosopher of social science, and a scholar of peace and global studies. I have no words to thank him for including me in his lifelong journey of reflection on how a dignified future for humankind may be possible. It is an enormous privilege to have Howard as esteemed member in the global advisory board of our HumanDHS community and as a core founder of our World Dignity University initiative. Howard Richards has taught and lectured all around the world, living in Chile and often working in South Africa. I had the privilege of joining him in both places, in 2012, he kindly invited me into his intellectual universe in Chile, and we worked together in South Africa in 2013. He generously declared his home in Chile to be one of the Dignity Dialogue Homes of the HumandDHS fellowship.[[78]](#endnote-79)

Thank you for writing the Foreword to this book, dear Howard, and for being with me throughout the entire book!

Together with Howard Richards, many others have accompanied the coming into being of this book. Allow me to name Zaynab El Bernoussi, a dignity scholar and professor of international studies in Morocco, who reviewed an early draft of the book manuscript. It was a privilege to have her with us in our 2017 Workshop on Transforming Humiliation and Violent Conflict at Columbia University in New York City, and in our 2018 Dignity Conference in Cairo, Egypt, and to welcome her as an esteemed member in our HumanDHS community.

Unfortunately, many of my beloved mentors who have inspired this book since 1997 have passed away by now — from our beloved Don Klein to our admired Bert Wyatt-Brown. On the webpage of our global advisory board, we honour the legacy of all of our late members.

Among them is Jean Baker Miller whose relational conceptualisation of human development has been central to understanding humiliation as a traumatic relational violation that too often drives people into a profoundly toxic state of what she has called ‘condemned isolation’. Jean challenged the hyper-individualistic, self-focused models of conventional Western psychology and proposed that humans are relational beings who grow through engaging in mutually empathic relationships, through mutually dignifying growth-fostering relationships. Though I only knew her through her writings and through her protégé, Linda Hartling, Jean’s work continually urged us all to reorganise our relationships — and society as a whole — to provide for the full development and participation of all people.

The late Lee Ross also significantly contributed to my work. I had three brilliant doctoral advisers, and Lee was one of them, together with Reidar Ommundsen and Jan Smedslund. My deep gratitude goes to all of them for being such extraordinary thinkers and generous nurturers of dignity, for being on the global advisory board of our Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies community since its inception. To our chagrin, Lee passed away on 14th May 2021 at the age of 78. His last book, published in 2016, was titled The wisest one in the room: How you can benefit from social psychology’s most powerful insights. I so much thank his wife for writing to me on 27th June 2021, ‘Thank you for the kind words you emailed about Lee. He talked about you often as someone “with the right values”. He appreciated your work and your friendship across the seas. We all miss him so much. Judy Ross’.

In 2001, it was an immense honour for me to meet Morton Deutsch, the father of the field of cooperation and conflict resolution. His mentorship has been crucial for me, his Forewords to my books were extraordinary, and his guidance invaluable. I learned immensely from him each time he invited me to contribute with a chapter to one of the books he edited. He worked until the last days of his life and I hope I can follow in his footsteps. It was a consolation to me that I was able to say good-bye to him and give him a final hug a few weeks before he passed away in 2017 at the age of 97.

I met Robert Carneiro, the father of circumscription theory, in 2009, and it was a great privilege for me to sit with him in his office in the American Museum of Natural History in New York City, near the former office of Margaret Mead, every year for ten years until his passing on 24th June 2020, a few days after his 95th birthday. I treasure the moment in his office on 8th November 2018, when he gave me his 2018 book and made a great effort, even though he could hardly see, to write with large letters a most touching dedication, ‘To the incomparable Evelin, who, with one cast of her net encompasses the world. With esteem and affection, Bob’.

My deepest gratitude goes to the core leadership team of the HumanDHS fellowship. Without their loving support, my life path and work would not be possible. Linda Hartling accompanies my work on a daily basis, with the collaborative encouragement of her husband Rick, who serves as a financial advisor to HumanDHS. You will hear Linda’s voice throughout the entire book. Linda and I, we are privileged to have the support of Michael Britton, another close companion in our shared dignity work. Many of the reflections you find in this book have emerged from our dialogues over many years.

I thank all our dignity network members for understanding that Linda and I wear two hats in our effort to build our work according to the maxim of unity in diversity. In our role as conveners, we attempt to nurture unity by holding space for the diversity of our community members’ views, and at the same time, in our role as researchers, we are also part of this diversity. I very much thank the reader of this book for bearing with me and accepting that the conclusions I draw are entirely mine and do not define any ‘official position’ of our dignity community.

Our dignity fellowship, of which I am the founding president with Linda Hartling as our director, has around 1,000 invited members and around 8,000 people on our address list. You are warmly invited to look at www.humiliationstudies.org to meet our global advisory board, global core team, global research team, and global education team. We have a very far-reaching time horizon for our work, we think of our dignity community as a seed for the global dignity family we hope humanity as a whole may want to become in the future. All our network members give us hope that our global dignity movement will continue to be more than a short-lived initiative and will have impact also after the elder among us have passed on. I thank all members for engaging in this ‘next generation nurturing work’ — our young members as much as those who dedicate the last decades of their lives to working for the common good.

I would like to thank the reader for opening her heart so she can appreciate the many gifts this book is comprised of, gifts of insights offered by a global network of dignity friends. Because of their gifts, this is not a book about a topic, it is a journey that is co-created together with hundreds of people who continuously extended their loving support to me as part of our global dignity family. Many endnotes in this book represent little love letters, and these love letters are meant for all of our members, not just for those mentioned by name. Expressing appreciation is central to my life and work, as I strive to dignify all relationships in this world, and it is therefore also central to this book.

My deepest gratitude goes to all friends who support my global life and welcome me into their homes as their family member. In our commercialised world, it is very difficult to explain that I protect the integrity of my mission by embracing an extremely austere path of walking the talk of global dignity, living almost without possessions and with as little money as possible. My global experience has shown that it would undermine the credibility of my dignity mission if I were employed at a national university, or were to receive major funding from one particular source, as my mission would be considered to be influenced or informed by national, political, or corporate interests. It is our dignity family around the world, those who courageously resonate with my radical life project, who give me the strength and energy to keep going. In our dignity network, all our works are a pro bono labour of love and entirely maintained by wealth measured in gifts of time, energy, and talent, all creatively shared by our members and supporters. I am part of our community in that I offer my life as a gift. I do not wish only to speak about dignity, solidarity, and love, but wish to live it by embodying dignity in every word, idea, and action. I am therefore deeply thankful to all friends who include me in their families, who accept me as a global ambassador of our HumanDHS network and as an educator at our World Dignity University initiative, and who understand that I consider the global village my university and see my global life as my research methodology. My research in war-torn countries has taught me that academic responsibility necessitates trust building as foundation for scientific inquiry and validity, trust building through deep listening, with humility and authenticity. I thank all my dear co-researchers for being in dialogue with me as a vulnerable human being among equally worthy fellow human beings. I would be nothing, had I not dear friends who let me listen to them. I thank all our dignity fellowship members most deeply for giving me the space to be me, for allowing me to be a person who lives a life that is far outside of the mainstream, a life that is rather experimental and sometimes even provocative. Thank you for allowing me to try out future-oriented approaches to how we humans may live on our home planet Earth, thank you for allowing me to follow my personal definition of religion of ‘love, humility, and awe for a universe too large for us to fathom’.

Finally, I would like to convey my profound love and gratitude to my family, both my bio-logical and logical family. Throughout the past decades many members in our dignity community have become more than family members to me. Linda Hartling, for instance, is more than a sister to me. My parents Gerda and Paul Lindner gave my work and life its direction and motivation through their immense personal courage in the midst of trauma. They survived the deeply humiliating trauma of war and displacement and I try to transform their wounds into dignity for all through my work.

My father is 95 years old now and I refuse to deliver him to the care of an institution during his final days. Over the past two years, throughout the global pandemic, I have kept my home office in his living room and stay by his side twenty-four hours every day in solidarity. I write these lines while looking at him. The loving labour of care that I offer to my father is equal to the caring I strive to realise in all of my work for global dignity.

In the spirit of ubuntu: I am because of all of you!

In the spirit of Gandhi: I am therefore you are and you are therefore I am.
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### This book is unlike most others

Scholarly work and lived experience are often kept separate. This book is unique insofar as it combines both and thus widens the concept of academic work.

As reported in the Preface, I was born into a family that was deeply affected by war and displacement, and therefore ‘never again’ became the motto of my life. I consider the world as my ‘university’ and look back on almost fifty years of living globally, at home on all continents (except Antarctica), always embedded in families and family-like contexts. I have yet to meet another person who has conducted a similar lifelong sense-making project. For the past twenty years, I have helped gather a global community of academics and practitioners dedicated to furthering dignity in the world. Through my global life, I have developed a big history view on the human condition, a view that embeds the current historical moment in the entire journey of our species Homo sapiens sapiens on planet Earth and extrapolates from there what we need to create a dignified future.

Recently, I gave a talk to students of the European Global Minds programme, and some students became angry with me for advocating dignity.[[79]](#endnote-80) They suspected that I might be peddling a ‘Western imperialistic view’, that I might be marketing dignity as a device to globalise anomic individualism and undermine global solidarity. After all, so my students admonished me, in cross-cultural psychology, Western dignity culture has been described as superior to non-Western face and honour cultures.[[80]](#endnote-81)

I was very thankful for my students’ criticism. It throws into stark relief that it is not enough to simply utter the word dignity in the hope to inspire common understanding. This is one reason for why I write this book.

My students are right. It is true that colonial powers appropriated theories — Darwin’s natural selection theory is but one example — it is true that they used these theories to justify a supposedly superior moral standing of Western ‘civilisation’. ‘Victorian moral propriety’ saw native peoples as lacking in ‘civil propriety’, allegedly in need of ‘correction’ through the ‘forceful and hostile application of British decency’, reports Steven Roach, expert in international relations.[[81]](#endnote-82) In Brazil, the five million Indigenous people who once lived there were reduced to what is now 930,000, and this happened as a result of ‘the systematic humiliation and denial of their identity’, deplores eco-theologian-philosopher Leonardo Boff — the Indigenous people were regarded as ‘barbarians’ who only have ‘the form of humans’.[[82]](#endnote-83)

My students’ criticism exposes that dignity joins the ranks of so many other words that carry diametrically opposed meanings at their core — peace, reconciliation, conflict resolution, coexistence, love — the list is long.[[83]](#endnote-84) In all cases, the same term covers definitions that can be so vastly apart that they exclude each other. Peace, for instance, many would say, is to be achieved through dialogical relationships in mutual solidarity in a context of respect for equality in dignity. Yet, there are people who contend that peace is when subordinates endure their subordination in quiet and obedient submission.[[84]](#endnote-85) Who is right? I am on the side of those who would call it violence and not peace when people are so oppressed or so manipulated that they no longer speak up,[[85]](#endnote-86) I would call such peace ‘slow structural violence’.[[86]](#endnote-87)

The notion of dignity is caught in a similar conundrum. For some people, dignity is simply another word for individual autonomy, it is the John Wayne notion of dignity through ‘pulling yourself up by your bootstraps’. I am on the side of those who are concerned that adherents of such views may be unaware, or may not want to admit, that the outcome of this definition, at least if it is applied widely and systemically, is the very opposite of individual autonomy, namely, undignified structural captivity. When ruthless individualists turn might into right in the spirit of self-serving autonomy, the endgame is vast inequality — what happens is that the space for individual autonomy widens for a few while it shrinks for the majority.[[87]](#endnote-88) ‘Freedom for the wolves has often meant death to the sheep’, philosopher Isaiah Berlin brought it to the point.[[88]](#endnote-89)

The phrase solidarity can lead astray as well. Only if certain conditions are fulfilled can this term set us on a path towards building cultural mindsets that support the well-being of all people across all difference. The first condition is that it must be global solidarity rather than local in-group solidarity for the sake of out-group enmity, and, second, it must be global common solidarity rather than simply the solidarity among ‘the rentiers, the plutocracy, and globalised finance’.[[89]](#endnote-90) Philosopher Howard Richards acknowledges that for some people, the word solidarity brings back nightmare memories of the Gulag — this word ‘has been the rhetoric of unworkable schemes that existed only on paper, while the reality has been inefficient bureaucracies, corruption, the silencing of dissent, and terror’.[[90]](#endnote-91)

Howard Richards published three books with the phrase solidarity in the title, Solidarity for full employment, Solidarity to raise wages, and Solidarity for forgiveness of debts.[[91]](#endnote-92) Richards defends the use of the word solidarity as follows:

The word began its career as a player in the discourse of modernity as solidarité. It was a watchword and an ideal of the French working class in the mid nineteenth century. The French delegation brought it into the first socialist international, the International Workingman’s Association, founded in London in 1861, and through it into the world’s main languages. Its main meanings were two: Stand Together United, and Mutual Aid. In the early days, it was used especially to raise funds for international aid sent to comrades in distress in other countries.[[92]](#endnote-93)

Howard Richards is in favour of the term solidarity because it was historically associated with questioning the system, both from a socialist point of view, and from a pre-modern religious traditionalist point of view. What motivates both Howard Richards and me to use this word is that it ‘puts structural change on the agenda by proposing — and often the proposals are made by people who practice what they preach — living by the rules of a different basic social structure’.[[93]](#endnote-94) Indeed, together with Howard Richards, I am embedded in global networks of people who attempt to walk their talk, who attempt to practice what they preach, not just in their work but also in their personal lives.

Howard Richards is deeply critical of certain aspects and scopes of Catholic teachings, yet, he deems the following words by Pope John Paul II to be relevant for all of humankind and not just for Catholics, words spoken at the headquarters of the UN Economic Commission for Latin America in Santiago de Chile on 3rd April 1987, ‘My call, then, takes the form of a moral imperative: Practice solidarity above all! Whatever may be your function in the fabric of economic and social life, construct in the region an economy of solidarity! With these words I propose for your consideration what in my recent message for the World Day of Peace I called a new type of relation: the social solidarity of all’.[[94]](#endnote-95)

This book is written, among others, to investigate how it is possible that the same words — in this case dignity and solidarity — can carry so radically different connotations. It is written to chart a path towards a world of dignity in solidarity, towards a world where all stand together in loving and wise humility, rather than a world where ‘honourable dignitaries’ use humiliation in the attempt to create submissive humbleness or blissful ignorance in their followers. The book is a call to accept that the advent of human rights ideals of equal dignity for all people turns humiliation from the pro-social status it once had into an entire unacceptable anti-social violation. The book draws attention to the fact that in a globally interconnected world, humiliation is more disruptive than before, and it warns that in times when dignified diversity in solidarity is urgently needed, it is more important than ever to avoid the hostile division that is caused by cycles of humiliation.

### To whom this book speaks

With my work, I wish to reach out to all people who might be interested, yet, one group stands out in particular, namely, those who ask deeper questions. Arne Næss, known as the father of *deep ecology*, has always urged us to continue asking questions at the point at which others stop asking. If he were still alive, he would be appalled by the many conspiracy entrepreneurs around today who promise ‘the truth behind the cover up’, and he would call on their followers to go one step further and ask about the truth behind the conspiracy entrepreneur.

Legal philosopher Duncan Kennedy called people who ask deeper questions ‘resisters’. Kennedy offers a beautiful description of the resisters he met in law school, and I share his analysis here even though this book is written for resisters everywhere in the world and not just in American law school. Later in this book, in chapter 5, Duncan Kennedy’s insights will be most helpful again, namely, when we look at the legal weight of the human rights promise of equal dignity for all.

Through teaching law students in the American ‘Ivy League’ academic context for many decades, Duncan Kennedy had ample opportunity to observe the motivations and backgrounds of those among his students who felt uneasy about the status quo of society, while not really knowing why and what to do about their ‘seeds of awareness’.[[95]](#endnote-96)

Duncan Kennedy observed that all resisters are bound together by something that sets them apart from the rest, at least in their own minds, something that aligns them with the victimised in this world. Some of these students become interested in doing international human rights work after having travelled outside of the United States, rather than doing what most other law students do, namely, work as paralegals in big city law firms. Through travelling, they became aware of the world outside of the U.S., a world full of extreme poverty and brutal oppression, ‘by states and by cultures, of the poor, of children, of women, of dissenters, of minorities’.[[96]](#endnote-97) These students are aware that people in the United States either ignore this calamity or think that it is the fault of the people who suffer it and ‘that we rich Americans are absolutely and unequivocally not implicated ourselves’.[[97]](#endnote-98) These students are, however, also cognisant of the fact that about everyone in the rest of the world thinks that Americans indeed ‘are implicated, or even ultimately responsible’, and this awareness sets them apart.[[98]](#endnote-99) To some of these students, studying international human rights means being committed to helping victims for the sake of helping.

Another group Kennedy observes are the American-born children of African American, Latino/a, Asian American, or Arab American middle-class parents, as these students have relatives, near or far, who actually are victims or risk becoming victims of mistreatment. These students split into several groups, and only some of them become resisters. Most of them simply try to work harder than everyone else to avoid appearing as an ‘angry brown person’, while others, especially after the events of 9/11, are busy with just surviving the feeling of alienation caused by their ‘brown skin’. Given that they are American-born, those who became resisters wish to distance themselves from past cultural-family traditions, for example, from parents who think that ‘an arranged marriage would be the perfect way to celebrate a graduate degree’.[[99]](#endnote-100)

Kennedy observes similar problems of disorientation and fledging resistance in students who are children of parents of ‘the sixties’, parents who exposed their offspring to alternative ideals through being ‘radicals, hippies, veterans, civil rights workers, musicians, poverty workers, social workers on reservations, or Peace Corps volunteers’.[[100]](#endnote-101) Yet other students are aware of violations such as sexual harassment or sex work because they volunteered in a shelter or similar institutions. Finally, there are those who secretly belong to an LGBTQ minority, and who do not expect for a moment that the majority would be stopped from mistreating them by the norms of non-discrimination they claim to believe in.

All in all, resisters are set apart from the rest by whatever is ‘marking or scarring or revelatory’, and this can involve everything from ‘mental illness’ to ‘disability, crime, alcoholism, drug addiction, AIDS, suicide, domestic abuse or other violence at close range, displacement, abandonment, frequent changes of school, poverty in the midst of plenty, or relative wealth amid crushing poverty’.[[101]](#endnote-102)

Another route to resistance that Kennedy observes is through post-modern critical stance cultural studies. A student who is familiar with catchwords such as ‘privileging’, ‘hegemony’, ‘the subaltern’, or ‘silencing’, or with names such as Foucault or Derrida, will feel utterly alien in the midst of a law class where those terms are completely unknown. If such a student is sincere, Kennedy advises, she has ‘to deconstruct law starting from scratch all by herself’.[[102]](#endnote-103) Mainstream law students, in contrast, focus on their careers, on getting a job, making money, and getting married, in other words, ‘getting through law school as trade school, with no intellectual, political, cultural agenda of any kind for their legal education, on the way to life in the mainstream afterward’.[[103]](#endnote-104)

Kennedy concludes that the ‘dominant student culture is Middle American on both coasts as well as in the middle’ and that it is ‘closer to jock or fraternity culture than to nerd or cool-people culture’.[[104]](#endnote-105) In recent years, Kennedy observed an increase in the number of conservative students, both social conservative and libertarian conservatives, all coming together in the Federalist Society of law school. Kennedy witnesses ‘right-wing econ jocks’ intimidating students and teachers alike now, even the liberals among the mainstream. He observes more and more ‘gunners’, students who talk all the time, who ‘brutally try to upstage or cut out their fellow students ... violating a norm held by everyone in the class: the norm of not grabbing’.[[105]](#endnote-106)

Resisters who need support from the faculty find only very few faculty members able to offer it, Kennedy reports. Most faculty members limit themselves to adjusting their students to reality ‘out there’, a reality from which the faculty members themselves are glad to be shielded. Only the occasional leftover sixties person in the faculty would ‘vaguely suggest’ that the whole student generation is ‘not up to whatever it is that they were, but no longer are, up to’.[[106]](#endnote-107)

Kennedy advises potential resisters to keep in mind that there are indeed progressive lawyers in the world who do interesting and ethically and politically valuable work, and that going to law school can be a path to building ‘a long-term life project that works against loss and injury and oppression’.[[107]](#endnote-108) Kennedy recommends that resisters join hands and protest inside law school, against law school.[[108]](#endnote-109)

Duncan Kennedy advocates ‘postmodernism-inspired rebellion against identity politics, not in the name of assimilation to the mainstream but in the name of a large countercultural project — cosmopolitan and original rather than inward-turning or backward-looking’.[[109]](#endnote-110) Kennedy advises people who wish to build their identity around healing and prevention to avoid clinging to the belief that they are ‘uniquely victimised, uniquely isolated, unintelligible to all the others’.[[110]](#endnote-111)

Duncan Kennedy is certain that ‘the time of analysis and protest will come around again’.[[111]](#endnote-112) This book is written in this spirit, it aims at working for dignity through overcoming humiliation together, rather than letting it divide us.

### How this book came into being

I have come to explore dignity through research on its violation, namely, humiliation. In 1996, I began to prepare my doctoral research on humiliation, one year after psychologist Linda Hartling had earned her Ph.D. on the same topic.[[112]](#endnote-113) As far as I am aware, at that time, Linda Hartling was the only other scholar who had focussed her doctoral research on humiliation, and in her work she explored the relational dynamics and the internal experience of humiliation. In my doctorate, I looked into the relationship of humiliation with war and genocide, with the history of genocidal mass violence in Somalia and Rwanda as cases, relating them to Nazi Germany’s history.[[113]](#endnote-114) Having grown up in Germany, I found many parallels between the dynamics of humiliation that unfolded in Somalia and Rwanda with those that fired up Nazi atrocities, and I see parallels also in presently unfolding dynamics worldwide.

I earned my doctorate in 2001, and in the same year, I was admonished by people who knew my work to take responsibility for humiliation research as a new transdisciplinary academic field and to do that by founding an academic institute or centre. Since 2003, Linda Hartling is the director of Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies, with me as founding president. Together, we attempt to manifest dignity in all aspects of our work, we give our time and energy as a gift, nurturing a ‘global dignity family’ entirely as a labour of love.[[114]](#endnote-115) At the end of this book, I will explain more about our work.

This book grew out of the astonishment that I felt in 1997 at the beginning of my doctoral work, when I read William Ian Miller’s volume on humiliation and found this sentence, ‘The earliest recorded use of to humiliate meaning to mortify or to lower or to depress the dignity or self-respect of someone does not occur until 1757’.[[115]](#endnote-116)

Since 1997, I have been intrigued by the period in human history that surrounds 1757, wondering why it spawned such an important transition. The first part of this book presents the exploration of humiliation and humility as notions that relate to dignity, it explores how these notions traversed an intriguing linguistic journey throughout the past centuries in the English language, a language that influenced also the rest of the world. Part II and Part III of the book proceed to place this journey into a larger psycho-geo-historical context. The book ends with a call to action.

Linda Hartling, together with many other members of Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies have accompanied the coming into being of this manuscript, and their voices will be heard throughout the entire book. Peace philosopher Howard Richards wrote the Foreword and peace linguist Francisco Gomes de Matos accompanied the linguistic analysis. I am deeply thankful to all who helped that this book is more than the work of one author, rather, it is brought together by a global network of authors and thus manifests the ‘new universalism of many voices’ that this book advocates.

### This book looks at big history

In the beginning of my work, I have sometimes been admonished to keep my analysis within the confines of the academic field of psychology. As I learned more, I understood that this is impossible. Let me explain.

In order to understand dignity and its violations, and in order to make this knowledge useful for humanity’s future planning, it is inevitable to look at all of human history. Phenomena such as shame, humility, and humiliation, as much as honour and dignity, are far from a-historic emotional processes that can be defined once and for all here and now. They are historical-cultural-social-emotional constructs that change over time and according to context. Each word we speak is full of history, history is always co-present, it is not the past, it is alive with us.[[116]](#endnote-117)

In my work, I therefore try to avoid ahistoricity and chronocentrism,[[117]](#endnote-118) and by doing so, I follow the advice of several psychologists, among them Michael Billig, Kenneth Gergen, and Serge Moscovici, all of whom have called on psychology to be more conscious of the historical contingency of psychological phenomena, to be more aware of the ways historical conditions, ideologies, and cultural traditions produce and sustain individual and collective thought and action.[[118]](#endnote-119) ‘History is far too important a matter to be left to the historians’.[[119]](#endnote-120)

Not all psychologists and historians have heard this call, and only a few have been ‘congenial companions’.[[120]](#endnote-121) Michael Billig explains that mainstream academic psychology often treats history ‘with little more than tolerant civility’, psychologists ‘scan accounts of earlier times’ only to find some ‘interesting hypotheses and anecdotes’, because history is messy and ‘cannot run experiments to test hypotheses’.[[121]](#endnote-122) I have had several points of contact with the field of psychohistory over the past decades, therefore I know how enriching it can be, and I have also seen it being humiliated as a field, just as Billig suggests.[[122]](#endnote-123)

Historians, as well, call on their own colleagues to broaden their horizon. Historian Hayden White, for example, asks present-day historians ‘to re-establish the dignity of historical studies on a basis that will make them consonant with the aims and purposes of the intellectual community at large, that is, transform historical studies in such a way as to allow the historian to participate positively in the liberation of the present from the burden of history’.[[123]](#endnote-124) I follow White in wishing for a more significant role for historical writing than simply to be undertaken for its own sake.[[124]](#endnote-125)

In my personal life, psychology and history are deeply intertwined, I live with history, continuously in dialogue with the paths travelled by historical movers and shakers on all continents, questioning them in my mind about which lessons their experiences may have to offer for a dignified future for humankind.[[125]](#endnote-126) I deeply resonate with Linda Hartling in her observation that ‘individualism allows people to forget about connections to the past and to people’, and I am with her that we should not let that happen.[[126]](#endnote-127)

It is therefore not just a marginal historical detail for me that the notion of humiliation saw a dramatic change in the English language in the year 1757, as William Ian Miller quoted in his book on humiliation[[127]](#endnote-128) from the Oxford Dictionary of English.[[128]](#endnote-129) It is more than an interesting historical detail that the verb to humiliate was used in the sense of the physical act of bowing and prostrating oneself, ‘to bring low’, for centuries, only to change as recently as the mid-eighteenth century.

When William Ian Miller wrote his book, his aim was to show how ancient codes of honour still function in contemporary life. He looked at the Sagas of Icelanders, the Middle English poem Sir Gawain and the Green Knight, and he touched upon the works of Shakespeare and Dostoyevsky. In my case, I wish to help us approach present-day crises in ways that are more constructive and more dignifying than what we, humankind, have achieved so far. I am very thankful to peace linguist Francisco Gomes de Matos and peace philosopher Howard Richards for their generous offerings of time and energy, because this enabled me to retrace philological journeys in this book that are relevant for the planning of roadmaps for humanity’s future.

As mentioned in the Preface, philology means the study of language, or, more precisely, the study of how languages or words develop. It comes from Greek philologos, phil- + logos, meaning love + word or speech, or ‘fond of learning and literature’. Philology, according to Merriam-Webster is ‘linguistics, especially historical and comparative linguistics’, and, second, ‘the study of human speech especially as the vehicle of literature and as a field of study that sheds light on cultural history’.[[129]](#endnote-130)

Francisco Gomes de Matos always tells his students that philology appeared in written English starting from 1350, whereas the concept-term linguistics appeared only from 1850. In his introductory courses on linguistics, Gomes de Matos explains that philology (1350–‍), anthropology (1585–‍), and psychology (1675‍–‍) preceded linguistics, and that each helped pave the way for a science of language. In short, philology came first, and together with anthropology and psychology, it prepared the path for the scientific study of language. Evidently, the study of linguistics will not stagnate either but continue to change in the future as it did since it first emerged.[[130]](#endnote-131)

The field of semiotics is the overarching field insofar as it studies signs and symbols in general. Both linguistic and non-linguistic are sign systems. One of the most basic insights of semiotics is that meanings do not reside in words. Words are associated with meanings largely through cultural codes — or socially constructed rules of correspondence between signifiers and meanings. I remember my years of reading the ideas of French thinkers — Jacques Derrida’s notion of différence, for instance, or the idea of our embeddedness in an ever shifting web of language.[[131]](#endnote-132) Culturally encoded meanings can be relatively fixed or relatively fluid across time, and they can be widely shared or widely contested among diverse people.

Philosopher John Dewey (1859–1952), whose bronze bust I greet every year when I am at his Teachers College at Columbia University in New York City,[[132]](#endnote-133) laughed at ‘the dogma of the immaculate conception of philosophical systems’.[[133]](#endnote-134)

William Ian Miller poses interesting questions concerning the shifting webs of language, for instance: Why do we need words such as embarrass, shame, or mortify? Would not words such as awkward or uncomfortable be able to fill in for them? No, Miller concludes, we would feel a loss if we did not have these words, as they are ‘getting at important features of our emotional life’.[[134]](#endnote-135) Is it not surprising therefore, he asks, that all three words were rather late additions to English, and is it not even more surprising that the metaphoric underpinnings of to humiliate initially connected it more with making humble than with what we now associate with humiliation, namely, a violation? This book fleshes out many fascinating answers to Miller’s questions.

The etymology of the various forms of humiliation goes back to Latin humilis or humble.[[135]](#endnote-136) Humus means ‘earth’ in Latin, suggesting that a spatial metaphor is at work, namely, a downward push to the ground, being brought down to earth, to humus.[[136]](#endnote-137) Whatever language we look at, we always find a downward spatial orientation, being pushed down and forcefully held down, down from great heights to the ground. I have not yet come across any language that does not use such spatial metaphors — in English we know words such as putting down, lowering, lessening, belittling, and then there are all words that contain the prefix de-, meaning ‘down from’ in Latin, such as de-grade, de-nigrate, de-base, de-mean, de-rogate. We have Er-niedrig-ung in German, or a-baisse-ment in French, where the syllables niedrig and bas also mean ‘down from’, ‘low’, or ‘below’. In Norwegian, the word ned-verdigelse follows the same pattern, with ned meaning ‘down’, while another Norwegian term for humiliation, ydmykelse, together with the verb ydmyke, comes from Norse auðmýkja or ‘gjøre myk’ or ‘bend, make soft’. In German, Demütigung, together with the verb demütigen, ultimately means turning somebody into a Diener, a servant, a slave.[[137]](#endnote-138)

The notion of humiliation is inscribed into an intricate web of related phenomena and concepts, with honour and dignity as cornerstones. When I began to study honour and dignity through researching humiliation, I did not yet understand the longer historical path in which humiliation is embedded, and how this path went from ‘mask-like’ collectivistic and ranked honour to the equal dignity for individuals. Only through writing this book did I come to appreciate the notion of decorum and how it forms a bridge between honour and dignity — in 1757, decorum began to be bestowed on the individual, while still remaining inscribed in the context of collectivistic ranked honour. Still today, the word dignitary signifies a ‘higher being’, and thus betrays the hierarchical root of dignity. Only after the Second World War did the Zeitgeist embrace the ideal of equal dignity for all individuals, as adopted in the Universal Declaration on Human Rights in 1948.

Nowadays, we could say that the Zeitgeist is divided: One group strives for equal dignity for all as responsible individuals, free to engage in loving mutual solidarity, while others aim to re-create a world where ‘dignitaries’ are granted ‘freedom’ to preside over lesser beings. Many members of the latter group openly reject the idea of equal dignity, for them it is a humiliating project — after all, it means that dignitaries lose their privileges — and all forms of open supremacy fall into this category. Other resisters of equal dignity use a more covert strategy and strive to preserve a might-is-right context through interpreting dignity as nothing more than individual autonomy — rugged individualism falls into that category.

The notion of humiliation follows the same division of the Zeitgeist insofar as it has a radically different meaning in a context where human rights ideals are salient as compared to honour contexts. There is a fundamental difference between what I call honour humiliation on one side, and dignity humiliation on the other side. The latter is more hurtful than the first because when equality in dignity is promised but withheld, recognition gaps open,[[138]](#endnote-139) dignity gaps — or indignity traps[[139]](#endnote-140) — that are more hurtful than ‘honour gaps’. A person who experiences being placed lower than expected in a ranked honour system may feel hurt, still, she is not immediately exiled from the human family.[[140]](#endnote-141) In contrast, being placed lower than expected in a context of equal dignity evicts one from the human family altogether, an experience that assaults one at the core of one’s being — one is no longer part of humanity. ‘To recognise humanity hypocritically, and betray the promise of equal dignity, humiliates in the most devastating way by denying the humanity professed’.[[141]](#endnote-142)

This is why the violation of dignity smarts so much more than the violation of honour: The promise of equal dignity is much higher than that of honour, human rights ideals offer everyone the unconditional right to be considered as equal in dignity just for the sake of being born as a human being, and the fall from grace is so much deeper than in an honour context.

What makes dignity humiliation so hurtful is the disappointment of a promise. If you are taught to believe the world around you is just and you wake up to the opposite reality, your disappointment goes deeper than if you had never heard of a just world.[[142]](#endnote-143) When you are taught by human rights advocates that you are a member of the human family, equally worthy as all others, and you wake up to the fact that this is empty rhetoric, you are doubly disappointed, both by the betrayal and the deprivation. This disappointment is amplified in a shrinking world that brings not only the human rights message to the outermost corners of the Earth, but also an unending stream of information about its many betrayals.

This double disappointment is the reason for why the phenomenon of humiliation is more salient nowadays than before and needs more attention from research and political planning. Wherever and whenever people accept their debasement, there is no apparent disruption. In a system of honour, it is often regarded as utterly legitimate to lower the rank of a person, and even the debased person may agree that it is legitimate — she may think of debasement as God’s due punishment or nature’s unshakable order. The situation changes radically, however, and becomes much more challenging for society at large, when human rights ideals become salient, because these ideals stand in the way of such legitimising interpretations of humiliation. There is no legitimate ‘excuse’ for dignity humiliation, while the world of honour provides innumerable justifications for honour humiliation.

As the violation of dignity carries the potential to lead to so much more intense hurt than the violation of honour, also the responses are likely to manifest in more extreme forms, both with respect to depression and violence. Feelings of dignity humiliation may lead to depression that is so deep that it is endured as ‘quietly’ as feelings of honour humiliation, only for a different reason: While people who subscribe to values of honour may tolerate honour humiliation in quiet acceptance because they think this is a legitimate arrangement of relationships, feelings of dignity humiliation stem from the betrayal of the promise of equal dignity in all relationships, so that the very intolerability of this betrayal may cause the quietness of depression, a quietness of deep despondence.

Feelings of dignity humiliation can also manifest in extreme hatred and violence and escalate to dangerous levels of terror, war, or genocide, if humiliation entrepreneurs, as I call them, are at work. Only Gandhi-like figures can inspire peaceful social action that is consistent with dignity.

### What makes reading this book worthwhile

For people who wish to ask deeper questions, who wish to open space for dignity, mutual respect, and esteem to take root and grow, this book will hopefully be worthwhile to read. It aims at helping with the goal to foster healing from cycles of humiliation throughout the world, ending systemic humiliation and humiliating practices, and preventing new ones from arising. It aims at helping to open space for feelings of humiliation to be transformed into action that dignifies the lives of all people and replenishes our planet. It aims at helping form a frame of cooperation and shared humility — rather than a mindset of humiliation — so we can build a better world, a world of equal dignity for all.

Human rights ideals are like a love marriage. Human rights ideals are a message of universal love, they represent humanity’s promise that there is only one human family and that all humans are equal members in this one family. Millions of people all around the globe take this promise seriously, and they respond with love.

Love, however, is known to turn into the bitterest of hatred when threatened or betrayed — we only need to look at domestic violence to know how deep the wounds can be that are inflicted by thwarted love, and how terrible the outcomes can be. Very often people cannot find words to speak about the humiliation of their dignity because it is such a deeply embodied experience, and therefore it is sometimes easier to express it in other mediums, such as drawings or photography.[[143]](#endnote-144) ‘Humiliation is hard to understand until one is humiliated’, but ‘then its impact can be devastating’.[[144]](#endnote-145)

Mohandas K. Gandhi and Nelson Mandela mobilised masses to rise from humiliation. The names of Gandhi and Mandela are known around the world for having inspired constructive social change — they resisted the temptation to counter humiliation through unleashing ever new and more destructive cycles of humiliation. Adolf Hitler, as well, mobilised masses, however, he mobilised them into mayhem. In all cases, the immense strength and force of feelings of humiliation became apparent and how this force can be used for con-struction, as by the Gandhis and Mandelas of this world, or for de-struction, as by the Hitlers of this world.

Feelings of humiliation represent what I call the nuclear bomb of the emotions, in particular feelings of dignity humiliation. This is independent of whether these feeling are being artificially fomented by humiliation entrepreneurs or arise from personal circumstances. The genocide that the Hutu perpetrated in Rwanda against their Tutsi neighbours in 1994 illustrated how a sense of humiliation could be whipped up and weaponised in ways that made traditional weapons seem pale. Some victims even paid for bullets to be shot dead rather than hacked to death by the machetes of their neighbours.

Apart from the humiliation of dignity being more hurtful than the humiliation of honour, other factors aggravate the situation further. First, the promise of equal dignity democratises the right to resist. In the past, only aristocrats could call for a duel in response to assaults on their honour, as the humiliation of honour could only be resisted with violence among fellow aristocrats, among those who held equally superior positions in the social order. Enslaved people, servants, ‘lesser beings’ in general, could not engage in duels with violent masters — a beaten wife could not go to duel with her violent husband. Human rights ideals, in contrast, grant the right to resist humiliation to every single person, to millions of people who did not have this right before. Whoever feels aggrieved or humiliated anywhere in the world may now ‘go to duel’.

Second, aspiring ‘duellists’ now have access to means of destruction that were previously unimaginable — a single angry hacker who feels entitled to seek retaliation for perceived humiliation can attack an entire country’s electronic infrastructure.[[145]](#endnote-146) Cheap drones can make the most expensive war equipment obsolete.[[146]](#endnote-147) Would-be Hitlers can establish global dictatorial mafia-like structures with hitherto unseen ease.[[147]](#endnote-148)

Only the Gandhis and Mandelas of this world can keep the duellists from plunging the planet into mayhem. Yet, precisely the paths of Gandhi and Mandela illustrate how difficult the rise of dignity awareness can be and how incoherent it can proceed. Outside of their countries, the names of Gandhi and Mandela are shining beacons of dignity, however, the situation becomes much more complicated the closer one gets to their inner circles. Whenever I refer to names such as Gandhi and Mandela in this book, I wish to highlight the hope they brought to the world without discounting the imperfections and shadows that are connected with their epochs as well.

As for Gandhi, inside India, many were deeply disappointed by his actions. Dalit participants in the dignity conference we held in India in 2017, for instance, made it a point to remind us of Bhimrao Ramji Ambedkar (1891–1956), the renowned Indian jurist, economist, politician, and social reformer, who inspired the Dalit Buddhist movement and supported the rights of women and labour.[[148]](#endnote-149) Many organisations, groups, and non-profit initiatives around the world continue to advocate in Ambedkar’s spirit. For them, the hoped-for dignity revolution has come half way only and still waits to be completed.

With respect to Mandela, also his dignity revolution has come half way only in many ways. As in India, where it once was unthinkable to criticise the caste system, in Afrikaans, apartheid means simply segregation, literally ‘aparthood’, and when it was devised after the trauma of the Boer Wars, it was seen as thoroughly legitimate solution void of any taste of violation, as painful as it was for those at the bottom. It was the global rise of the promise of equality in dignity that gave this pain legitimacy to the point that it could drive conscientisation — as Paulo Freire would formulate it — namely, the motivation to strive for social change.[[149]](#endnote-150) The anti-apartheid campaign led by African and Asian nations is often hailed as the earliest sustained international human rights struggle alongside decolonisation, ‘Human rights were embraced as a fundamental goal of the struggle for racial justice’.[[150]](#endnote-151)

The depth of the dignity humiliation that apartheid created could have led to horrific genocidal killings — similar to what happened in Rwanda — had not people such as Nelson Mandela channelled its force into constructive and dignified societal change.[[151]](#endnote-152) I am among those who greatly admire Nelson Mandela’s vision of uniting South Africa in dignity.

Yet, still, there were dark sides. Mandela’s path stands in stark contrast to the brutal concentration camps that his fellow freedom fighters implemented in their own backyard at the same time. As we read in Paul Trewhela’s book Inside Quatro: Uncovering the exile history of the ANC and SWAPO,[[152]](#endnote-153) we must conclude that brutality was perpetrated in the spirit of honour in stark betrayal of Mandela’s dignity message. This dark side of the South Africa’s liberation struggle has remained hidden for a long time — Trewhela’s book took until 2009 to come out.

What we learn is that victims of dignity humiliation — in this case, victims of apartheid — may fail to walk a path that is consistent with the struggle for dignity, instead, they may choose to inflict acts of honour humiliation on real or imagined opponents. Cross back is the term I use when I see feelings of dignity humiliation being acted on not with dignity but with the toolkit of revenge for honour humiliation that was formerly reserved for aristocrats.

Now, several decades later, South Africa would need a new Mandela to renew the vision of dignity in unity. Ampie Muller was the dean of several universities in South Africa and a member of the National Peace Committee after Nelson Mandela was released. In 2013, at the age of eighty three, he deplored the gap between the promises made by politicians prior to the first democratic election in 1994, promises of a wonderful ‘new South Africa’ that would meet all needs, and the harsh reality on the ground decades later — ‘In present-day South Africa we are daily confronted with individual or group scenes of violence in townships and “shanty-towns” where people live in poverty’.[[153]](#endnote-154)

Apartheid demonstrates not only how incoherent the rise of dignity awareness can unfold even among those who embrace it, it also shows the fierce resistance it can elicit. The very notion of equality in dignity feels humiliating for rankists, for those who have learned to essentialise socially constructed rankings.[[154]](#endnote-155) People who are beholden to a ranked honour system are likely to perceive it as humiliation and not as liberation when they are called to embrace the wise humility that is needed to embrace equal dignity. For many in the South African white elite, for instance, it felt humiliating to be asked to step down from arrogating superiority. Feelings of dignity humiliation professed by the downtrodden thus risk unleashing raging anger in masters who feel entitled to their privileged supremacy, emerging feelings of dignity humiliation in subordinates can trigger a strong sense of honour humiliation in masters and their successfully indoctrinated followers.

Examples are not confined to politics. A husband who feels justified in beating his wife to teach her humble respect for his superiority will get angry with the social worker who hinders him, and even his wife may agree. The social worker — or any defender of the ideal of equal dignity for that matter — risks being accused of being a humiliator who creates conflict where there was ‘peaceful order’ before.[[155]](#endnote-156)

At their core, honour and dignity are incompatible, and I have observed that human rights defenders in Western countries are often unprepared for the harshness of this antagonism. As a psychotherapist — for seven years in Egypt, for instance — I have always attempted to solve this antagonism in dignified ways, yet, this was only possible after I had gained a deep understanding of the honour codes’ inner logic.

One of the starkest illustrations is provided by what is called honour killing, a practice that can be found in many world regions.[[156]](#endnote-157) In an honour context, a raped girl might be perceived of having brought dishonour upon her family and she might be killed with the aim to restore humiliated family honour. In a dignity context, in contrast, the very idea that killing can heal humiliation is seen as humiliating for the dignity of all involved. At meta levels, a family who believes that the killing of the girl is a sacred customary duty will feel humiliated by the human rights defender who condemns this ‘duty’ as harmful traditional practice. At the same time, the human rights defender will feel humiliated by the very idea that killing shall heal. In sum, here the universes of dignity and honour clash head-on and exclude each other — the girl cannot die and live at the same time — while both universes are embedded in overlaying cycles of humiliation.[[157]](#endnote-158) It follows that if humankind wants to achieve a dignified future, there is a need to engage in much more inclusive and sophisticated peace making and bridge building practices than in the past.

As much as I observe human rights defenders in Western countries being unprepared for the harshness of the antagonism between honour and dignity, many are also insufficiently prepared to avoid what I call cross backs. Cross backs happen when the ‘Hitler path’ is chosen in response to feelings of dignity humiliation, even though dignity calls for the Mandela path. The Hitler path follows the traditional strategy of removing tyrants while keeping tyranny in place, of enthroning the formerly oppressed as new oppressor. Human rights ideals introduce a second transformation after the first — after deposing the tyrant, what must follow is the dismantling of the very system of tyranny, and this must be done with peaceful means, without violence and humiliation. The formerly oppressed cannot become the new oppressors. Oppressors and oppressed need to manifest a second order transformation, just like Nelson Mandela envisioned when he aimed at including all South Africans into their shared home country. The ANC concentration camps amply illustrate how humiliation cannot be the path when dignity is the aim.

Human rights defenders often speak about ‘empowerment’, yet, the lesson is that this can go too far. A social worker should not ‘empower’ a beaten wife to humiliate her husband — let alone kill him — even though the husband humiliates her. Instead, the social worker should encourage the wife to engage in constructive action, such as securing her personal safety and seeking support from surrounding social networks to change the husband’s outlook on honour and dignity. The self-esteem movement in Western societies may have suffered from an overshoot of empowerment. Some say it has created a social climate of solipsistic narcissism characterised by chronic indignation and anger entrepreneurship all against all. This is indeed the result when aggressive ways of turning the tables on humiliators are being democratised, when license is given to everyone to arrogate the former elite sense of entitlement to privilege.

Humiliation entrepreneurs often use the argument of empowerment when they exploit feelings of humiliation brewing in populations. They drive cross backs to perfection when they ‘empower’ people to follow the script of the heroic and glorious warrior, the script of aristocratic elites who have power over obedient underlings. In Norway, a young man, Anders Behring Breivik, felt he was a ‘Templar Knight’ when he shot his ‘enemies’, and his actions have since been copied as far away as in New Zealand. In Rwanda, radio propaganda from ‘above’ ‘empowered’ subservient masses to take their household machetes and commit horrific genocidal killings.

I avoid using the term ‘empowerment’ and replace it with entrustment and stewardship. Entrustment and stewardship suggest that there are limits to uprisings.[[158]](#endnote-159) ‘Lesser beings’ should not become ‘higher beings’. The traditional notions of ‘top’ and ‘bottom’ are to be transcended. Everyone is called to meet in the middle between the top and the bottom — at the level of equal dignity — and shoulder the responsibility for nurturing a better world together, in mutually dignifying humility.

Let me end this Introduction here, hoping that the reader feels inspired to delve deeper into this book. Allow me to list some of the many questions that have guided my research on humiliation and dignity since 1996. My hope is that you may feel moved by these questions to forge your own path and your own sense-making narratives. Here is an overview:[[159]](#endnote-160)

* How do you define humiliation?
* Have you yourself ever felt humiliated, and if yes, how?
* How is humiliation felt and acted upon in different cultural contexts?
* How is humiliation felt and acted upon in different historical periods?
* How do meta-emotions influence experiences of humiliation?
* Do feelings of humiliation always lead to violence? Or only under certain circumstances? If yes, under which circumstances?
* Do feelings of humiliation always entail feelings of shame? Is there a difference between humiliation and shame?
* What is the difference between humiliation and humility?
* What about the role of anger?
* Is there a difference between the humiliation of honour and the humiliation of dignity?
* Is there a difference between humiliation at a group level and humiliation at the individual level?
* Which humiliation is more salient, that of one’s reference group, or one’s own personal humiliation?
* Does it make a difference if the humiliation is witnessed by others, and, if so, by whom?
* Is there a difference between humiliations experienced during childhood as compared to adult life?
* Is there a gender perspective to how humiliation is felt, perceived, experienced, judged, and acted on?
* How does a terrorist/violent freedom fighter feel about the killing and maiming of people who have nothing to do, at least not directly and immediately, with his/her humiliation and pain?
* Does humiliation play a role in terrorism/violent freedom fighting?
* Is there an element of vengeance in actions that inflict terror?
* Can terror create a better world, either here or in the hereafter?
* Does violence beget violence?
* Are there more effective ways than violence for achieving political goals, even against ruthless opponents?
* What is needed to defuse terrorism that emerged from humiliation?

This introduction aimed to inspire you, the reader, to travel the journey that this book traverses. A simplified schematic overview over this journey is offered in the Appendix.

Peace linguist Francisco Gomes de Matos always admonishes us that ‘academic books tend to end their chapters too conventionally’.[[160]](#endnote-161) He likes to offer provocative ‘why’ questions for in-depth reflection and research to inspire dialogue that is both dignified and dignifying — dignilogue is a term he has coined. This book is meant to invite you, the reader, into such reflective dignilogues.

Imagine you sign up for our online doctoral course titled ‘Dignity studies: An introduction to the dynamics of dignity and its violation’, a course we offer with our World Dignity University initiative. On 11th June 2016, Linda Hartling devised the following questions for this course, and she wonders how you would approach them:

* How would you describe the relationship between human rights and human dignity?
* How would you analyse the relationship between human dignity and humiliation?
* How would you study the relationship between globalisation and humiliation/human dignity?
* What are the differences and similarities of the concepts of shame, humiliation, and dignity?
* How do the concepts of humility, humiliation, and dignity overlap and differ?
* How do you see the differences and similarities of concepts such as equality, egalitarianism, equity, and equal dignity?
* How do you see the interaction between human dignity and human resilience?

# Part I: Humiliation and humility — A timeline from 1315 to 1948

In the English language, the concept of humiliation has traversed a fascinating journey throughout the past centuries. It is a captivating story of ‘historical linguistics’, or philology. Philology means being fond of studying literature and the historical growth and adaptation of languages.

I am thankful to peace linguist Francisco Gomes de Matos for delving into his Random House Webster’s College dictionary (1995 edition), where he found that the verb to humble appears as early as 1200, the verb to degrade dates from 1275, while to humiliate occurs around 1525–1535.[[161]](#endnote-162) The noun humiliation emerged around 1350–1400.

Even though this timeline is only valid for the English language, I use it as a window into historical processes in general. Moreover, since the English language has been the global lingua franca for a considerable time now, its linguistic journey has had a widespread influence. Every reader with an interest in the philology of other linguistic realms is warmly invited to contribute with other languages’ timelines!

I am not a natural English speaker myself.[[162]](#endnote-163) Allow me to sketch my personal ‘linguistic journey’ for you. I grew up in Central Europe in what was West Germany at the time, and German was the language I heard when I was young — West Low German in the village where I lived, and High German when my family tried to hide their native Silesian German that marked them as displaced people who did not belong to Lower Saxony. Later, I had the privilege of a classical education at high school, with a focus on the natural sciences and on Latin, aside from lessons in English, French, and Russian — a kind teacher who hailed from East Prussia invited into Russian lessons as an optional subject in the zeroth hour early in the morning. I came to Norway in 1977, and now I am fluent in both written and oral German, English, French, and Norwegian. Mastering these languages implies a fair understanding of Dutch, Swedish, and Danish. My time on the Azores allowed me to delve deeper into the Latin languages and learn basic Portuguese, which — helped by French and Latin — opens for Italian and Spanish. Later this became useful when I spent time in South America. Due to the legacy of colonialism, my knowledge of these languages helped me to communicate in Africa, a world region that is close to my heart since 1976. In 1981, in Indonesia, I added an understanding of Bahasa Indonesia to my linguistic education. I began learning Chinese at the age of nineteen, in 1973, ten years before I went to China for the first time, travelling through the entire country by train in 1983. In 2004, I returned to Asia, this time to Japan, and began learning Japanese. During my work in Jerusalem in 1975, I began learning Modern Hebrew, and during my seven years in Egypt from 1984 to 1991, I learned to read and write the Arabic script and to speak Egyptian-Arabic.

As a result of this linguistic journey, the concept of a delineated language no longer exists for me. I think more in language families, as I am always aware of the many variations of a particular word within its language family — ‘a language is a dialect with an army and navy’.[[163]](#endnote-164) When I think or dream, it is always in a mixture of several languages rather than one single language — there is no mother tongue anymore for me and I cannot speak any language perfectly. At any given moment, every sentence I want to communicate to the outer world needs to be translated from the multilingual ‘salad of fragments’ that is in my head into the one language I want to use in that moment. Speaking and writing requires a continuous translation effort for me, and I am never sure as to whether or not a native speaker of any of the languages I know will understand me.

On my global path, I have become keenly aware of linguistic humiliation. All around the world, people have been prohibited — some still today — to speak their languages, and linguistic diversity is being reduced. I have learned that Indigenous languages hold crucial knowledge, all of which could help humanity now to avert disaster.[[164]](#endnote-165) The loss of Indigenous knowledge is a loss for all of humankind in times when its re-grounding in the Earth system is a pressing need. It is therefore a matter close to my heart to call on all of us to ‘harvest’ from all cultural realms those linguistic elements that foster long-term relationships of loving mutuality in respect for equality in dignity on our planet.[[165]](#endnote-166)

I appreciate the ability of Ngugi Wa Thiong’o, an East African author who grew up in colonial Kenya, to make the experience of linguistic humiliation palpable. Part of the colonial subjugation process was controlling the students’ language in school. In his book Decolonising the mind, Ngugi Wa Thiong’o describes how during early childhood the language of his immediate community was the same as the language spoken when they worked in the fields or had their informal evening teach-ins, but ‘then I went to school, a colonial school, and this harmony was broken. The language of my education was no longer the language of my culture’:

One of the most humiliating experiences was to be caught speaking Gikuyu in the vicinity of the school. The culprit was given corporal punishment — three to five strokes of the cane on bare buttocks — or was made to carry a metal plate around the neck with inscriptions such as I AM STUPID or I AM A DONKEY.[[166]](#endnote-167)

Dear reader, when you delve into this book, please feel invited to write your own account of phenomena such as humiliation, honour, dignity, and solidarity, and please explain to us how they relate to the cultural and linguistic realm you feel at home in.[[167]](#endnote-168) Maybe these English phrases cannot be translated into your linguistic realm at all? Perhaps related phenomena do exist? Please know that the last thing I wish to do is trigger feelings of linguistic humiliation in you by writing this book in English. Please just feel inspired to develop your own thinking. In this book, I open my heart for you as truthfully as I can, I invite you into shared exploration rather than into debate, critique, agreeing or disagreeing, believing or disbelieving.

I will explain later in this book that, even though I have white skin, I do not speak from a ‘white’ perspective. I was born into a situation that alienated me from majority society around me to the point that I would have been the proverbial child that points out that the emperor is naked had I not been too scared. I am still scared when I write this book. I simply do my best in understanding this world from the position of vulnerable wonderment. Like all of us, I am blind to my own blindness, please forgive me whenever you notice any blind spots.

This book is an invitation to you to help me avoid the refrigerator of self-righteous ‘dukes up’ combat that leaves a ravaged world behind, as rightful as the combat might be.

This book invites you, the reader, to embrace the warm, compassionate, and artful play of co-creativity in imagination that makes a decent future of loving solidarity in diversity for all possible.

## Chapter 1: 1315 — The journey of humility and humiliation begins

**Contents**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| • 1315 — The noun humility appears  • 1386 — The noun humiliation emerges  • 1525 to 1535 — The verb to humiliate is being used  • 1602 — The humiliation of honour is like a ‘mask’ | |
|  | • What is honour? Honour is for men... |

My interest to write this book began in 1997 and has been growing since. In 2015, peace linguist Francisco Gomes de Matos was so kind as to ask linguist David Crystal for help on my behalf. Very generously, David Crystal pointed out relevant entries in the Oxford English Dictionary (OED) to me.[[168]](#endnote-169) I follow his guidance in this book.

Linda Hartling invites you to wonder while reading the first chapters, ‘What would the linguistic history of humiliation be if women were holding the pen, writing the history, influencing the development of language?’[[169]](#endnote-170) Indeed, while reading, you will notice that men are ‘holding the pen’ in most entries. Women had few ways to participate, therefore, what we see is only half the history — HIStory.

### 1315 — The noun humility appears

According to the OED, the noun humility appears circa 1315, with the sense of ‘the quality of being humble or having a lowly opinion of oneself’, the quality of ‘meekness, lowliness, humbleness’, ‘the opposite of pride or haughtiness’.

If we follow the lead offered by the OED, we encounter William of Shoreham, or Willelmi de Schorham, a clergyman, poet, and vicar of Chart-Sutton in Kent during the reign of King Edward II of England (1284–1327). In a collection of seven poems, he spells out the Christian doctrine of the fourteenth century, and he does so in medieval Kentish, a southern dialect of Old English spoken in the Anglo-Saxon kingdom of Kent.[[170]](#endnote-171) A poem by Shoreham from 1315 is titled The five joys of the Virgin Mary. We read there that dignity is about purity and chastity (clennesse) and humility, ‘Cause of alle pyse dignyte, Thorȝ clennesse and humylyte’.[[171]](#endnote-172) This phrase is part of the following lines, as paraphrased by Matthias Konrath, one of the early European scholars interested in English vernacular pastoralia, ‘Mary is worth higher praise than all tongues on earth can bestow upon her. She is Queen of Heaven, Lady over all earth, and powerful in hell, because, by the grace of God, she bore the King of Heaven...’[[172]](#endnote-173)

Inspired by this entry in the OED, I set out to find later occurrences of humility and always found it at the core of the experience of being human, often connected with hot passions. Here is one example. Michelangelo da Caravaggio completed a fascinating painting around the year 1610, where he lets biblical David hold up the severed head of Goliath. Humilitus Occideit Superbium is written on David’s sword, meaning ‘humility conquers pride’. Caravaggio was known to be a man of violent egoism, and he painted this painting after he had to flee from Rome because his violent behaviour had brought him a death sentence. Perhaps, by choosing this inscription for his painting, he wanted to remind himself of having to learn humility?[[173]](#endnote-174)

Fast forward to January 2018, we hear Jorge Mario Bergoglio, the Catholic cardinal who became Pope Francis, connecting humility with humiliation in his daily homily in the Vatican:

Sometimes we think that humility is to move calmly, perhaps head-down looking at the floor... but even pigs walk with their heads down: this is not humility. This is that fake, ready-to-wear humility, which neither saves nor guards the heart. It’s good for us to be aware that: there is no true humility without humiliation, and if you are not able to tolerate, to carry humiliation on your shoulders, you are not truly humble: you pretend you are, but you are not.

There is always the temptation to counter slander and oppose anything that humiliates us or makes us feel ashamed — like Shimei. But David says ‘No’; the Lord says ‘No’, that is not the right path. The path is the one taken by Jesus and prophesied by David: bearing humiliation. ‘Perhaps the Lord will look upon my affliction and make it up to me with benefits for the curses he is uttering this day’: turning humiliation into hope.  
  
Let us ask the Lord for the grace of humility, with humiliations. There was a nun who used to say: ‘yes, I am humble, but never humiliated!’ No, no! There is no humility without humiliation. We are asking for this grace. And if someone is brave — just as St. Ignatius teaches us — he can even ask the Lord to send humiliations so he can be more like the Lord.[[174]](#endnote-175)

A friend of mine felt deeply offended when reading the Pope’s words, enraged and indignated. She would have liked to ask the Pope:

Perhaps the nun professes being free of humiliation only because she sees herself in the lowest possible position in the hierarchy already? Moreover, does the Pope really wish to invite more humiliations into Christianity just to build a ‘strongman humiliation muscle’? Or does he ask for more humiliations to strengthen humility to be like the Lord? Perhaps the Pope intends to ask for humiliation to strengthen humility — but does humiliation really strengthen humility? We can think of countless incidents where it does precisely the opposite. Humiliation strengthens defensiveness and retaliation. Finally, does the church walk its talk of humility?[[175]](#endnote-176)

Contemporary theologian and Franciscan friar Richard Rohr is on the side of the Pope when he teaches that we have a ‘false self’ that can only become mature through humiliation and that humiliation is needed for humility to emerge. He writes, ‘I have prayed for years for one good humiliation a day, and then, I must watch my reaction to it. I have no other way of spotting both my denied shadow self and my idealised persona’.[[176]](#endnote-177) My sceptical friend is dismayed, she thinks it is precisely the other way round, namely, the ‘false self’ is the reaction to humiliation:

Is the true nature of ‘man’ really characterised by arrogance? If it were the nature of men, what about the nature of women? I do not buy the idea that you cannot have humility without humiliation. I believe humility means understanding the truth of who you are, not above or below others. This kind of Christianity is constructing highly stratified relationships by subduing supposedly sinful humans and allegedly bad human nature. Rather than forcing people into humility through humiliation (which no longer works anyway in a dignity world), Christianity and humanity as a whole should recognise humility as a strength, as an honest assessment of one’s small part in the larger world. Humility is a realistic approach. Arrogance is unrealistic.[[177]](#endnote-178)

My friend commends the notion of relational humility, defined as ‘relational attunement with others and with the web of life’. She resonates with a description of humility as ‘multi-layered, including intrapersonal, interpersonal, community, and ecological humility’.[[178]](#endnote-179)

My friend’s reactions give a taste of the relevance of this book. It is written in times when feelings heat up in an increasingly polarised world, when ‘old’ meets ‘new’ and what is ‘right’ and what is ‘wrong’ is hotly debated. The ‘old’ approach to conceptualising the human place in the world appears in the views of the Pope and Richard Rohr, while my friend gives voice to the ‘new’ way. The ‘new’ way contrasts the ‘old’ way, and both are rather incompatible.

### 1386 — The noun humiliation emerges

The OED indicates that the noun humiliation appears in Geoffrey Chaucer’s Parson’s tale around the year 1386.[[179]](#endnote-180) It means ‘humbling, abasement’, ‘the action of humiliating’, the ‘condition of being humiliated’, or a ‘humbled or humble condition’, a condition of ‘humility’.

Geoffrey Chaucer was a poet and administrator, born in the early 1340s and known as the father of English Literature, widely considered the greatest English poet of the Middle Ages. Chaucer gave legitimacy to the vernacular Middle English at a time when French and Latin were the dominant literary languages in England. Between 1387 and 1400, he is reported to have written The Canterbury tales, a collection of stories of a group of thirty people who travelled as pilgrims to Canterbury in England. The pilgrims came from all walks of society and told stories to each other while they travelled.

Parson’s tale from 1390 is the longest of the surviving contributions to this collection, it is a long treatise on penance. In paragraph 406, we read, ‘the ferthe [manere of humylitee] is whan he nys nat sory of his humiliacion’,[[180]](#endnote-181) or ‘the thridde is / whan he ne rekketh nat, thogh men holde hym noght worth, the ferthe is / whan he nys nat sory of his humyliacioū’.[[181]](#endnote-182)

This is the full paragraph in a more modern translation:

Now be there three manners [kinds] of humility; as humility in heart, and another in the mouth, and the third in works. The humility in the heart is in four manners: the one is, when a man holdeth himself as nought worth before God of heaven; the second is, when he despiseth no other man; the third is, when he recketh not though men hold him nought worth; the fourth is, when he is not sorry of his humiliation. Also the humility of mouth is in four things: in temperate speech; in humility of speech; and when he confesseth with his own mouth that he is such as he thinketh that he is in his heart; another is, when he praiseth the bounte [goodness] of another man and nothing thereof diminisheth. Humility eke in works is in four manners: the first is, when he putteth other men before him; the second is, to choose the lowest place of all; the third is, gladly to assent to good counsel; the fourth is, to stand gladly by the award [judgement] of his sovereign, or of him that is higher in degree: certain this is a great work of humility.[[182]](#endnote-183)

### 1525 to 1535 — The verb to humiliate is being used

The 1995 edition of The Random House Webster’s College dictionary informs us that the verb to humiliate occurs around 1525–1535.[[183]](#endnote-184) According to the OED, it first emerged in 1533–1534, in the sense of ‘to make low or humble in position, condition, or feeling; to humble’ and in its reflexive form ‘to humble or abase oneself, to stoop; sometimes, to prostrate oneself, to bow’.

Antiquarian and writer Thomas Wright (1810–1877) documented the occurrence of this verb. He collected historical letters, among them letters relating to the suppression of monasteries. He included into his collection a letter titled ‘Petition of the monks of Canterbury to the King’, a petition ‘for the pardon of those who had been concerned in the affair of the Maid of Kent’.[[184]](#endnote-185)

The Maid of Kent, or Elizabeth Barton, was a woman famous for her prophecies, and her fate was similar to that of Joan of Arc, or the Maid of Orléans (circa 1412–1431), and both ended their lives through execution. In the case of the Maid of Kent, she fell out of grace when her prophecies turned against King Henry VIII of England (1491–1547). Her ‘crime’ was that she strongly opposed the English Reformation and the King’s severing the church in England from Rome. She was hanged for treason together with five of her chief supporters, four of whom were priests.[[185]](#endnote-186)

Fearing to be compromised by the affair of Elizabeth Barton, the monks of Christ’s Church in Canterbury wrote the following letter to the king:

But now, considering your gracis most benigne nature, moche more inclyned to mercy and pitie than to the rigour of justice, we be anymated and set in comforte to humyliate our selfes as prostrate afore your highnes, and to beseche the same to remitte and forget the necligences and offences committed ayenst your grace by certen persons of our congregacion and monestrie, which causith us all most woofullie to lamente and sorow.[[186]](#endnote-187)

It is a curious detail that the antiquarian Thomas Wright, the man who collected this letter many centuries later, hailed from a Quaker family, and that to him, the dissolution of the monasteries was ‘the greatest blessing conferred by Providence upon the country since the first introduction of Christianity’.[[187]](#endnote-188)

It is interesting to consider the wider historical context within which the letter to King Henry VIII of England was written, as it sheds light on the journey of the notion of humiliation. As this book chronicles, this journey started with self-effacing submissive supplication — ‘prostrating oneself’ — and the journey ends today in what most readers of this book presumably will resonate with, together with my sceptical friend introduced earlier, namely, a strong resistance to such kinds of utter submissiveness. Indeed, the ‘new’ contrasts the ‘old’, and both are rather incompatible.

The letter was written at a time when Protestantism emerged in Europe, bringing with it existential theological dilemmas. One of the most pressing problems was related to salvation. Salvation was taken extremely seriously by the people of the sixteenth century. The medieval Christian Church in Western Europe followed the maxim of Saint Cyprian of Carthage, a bishop of the [third century](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Christianity_in_the_3rd_century), who was of the opinion that ‘outside the Church, there is no salvation’ — extra Ecclesiam nulla salus. When fledgling Protestant churches began to detach themselves from the body of the Catholic church in the 1520s, the extremely serious theological question arose as to whether or not one could be sure of salvation if one became a member of a breakaway community. In other words, the fear was that submissiveness within the old system was perhaps needed for salvation and that any lack of submissiveness meant burning in hell, in short, the fear was that the ‘new’ may have to be paid for with eternal punishment.

Far from only being problems of the past, related questions are relevant also in present times. ‘Protestantism’s dangerous idea: How the reformation redefined the church’, is an article from 2017 by Alister McGrath, a Northern Irish theologian, priest, intellectual historian, and a defender of the unity of the Church. He acknowledges that the Protestant Reformation was deeply meaningful for its supporters as it rang in a long overdue renewal of the Christian faith, ‘preparing it for new challenges, as Western Europe emerged from the feudalism of the Middle Ages’.[[188]](#endnote-189) Still, he warns, Protestantism has ‘innate fissiparous tendencies’:

The absence of a universally accepted authority structure within Protestantism meant that enterprising individuals, often fired up by a vision for a specific form of ministry, could start their own congregations, or even their own denominations. The outcome of this was inevitable the emergence of a consumerist mentality, through which Protestants felt able to pick and choose the local church that suited their needs, beliefs or aspirations. And if they didn’t find one that was just right, they would establish their own.

In 2018, sociologist Francis Fukuyama went one step further and suggested that the idea of identity that is at the core of Protestantism’s message of the sixteenth century provides the fuel for populist nationalist movements in the twenty-first century.[[189]](#endnote-190)

If we accept McGrath and Fukuyama’s reflections, and inquire further into the suggestion that Protestantism seeded a trend that not only fissured the institution of the church in the past, but also contemporary society at large, and this in rather dangerous ways, we detect an interesting difference between Calvinism and Lutheranism — Calvinism seems to remain closer to the older way of ‘prostrating oneself’, and thus is likely to cause fissures in society that are different from Lutheranism, which opens up for new ways of ‘emancipating oneself’.

Sociologist Klaus Eder grew up in Europe, as I did, and he has intimate knowledge of the difference between Calvinism and Lutheranism. He describes how the Calvinist model of the Protestant ethic shaped culture in the United States and spread around the world from there, while in Europe, the German Protestant tradition of Lutheranism was more influential.[[190]](#endnote-191) Calvinism contains values such as ‘achievement for its own sake, the virtue of work over non-work, and the quest for excellence’,[[191]](#endnote-192) and, as Eder points out, as people typically are unsure as to whether their God has chosen them, this ethic helped them in their search for evidence. The same search for evidence continues also in secular extensions, Eder observes, only then in the cloak of possessive individualism with its clambering for ‘permanent proof of one’s own competitiveness in the market’.[[192]](#endnote-193) Neither Lutheran nor Calvinist ethics were originally intended to provide workers with intrinsic motivation — the aim was rather to control the work force — but Calvinism fashioned a coherent rational motivation for work. In contrast, Eder reports, Lutheranism produced an instrumentalist work ethic in which work can also be seen as amoral, namely, when it fails to offer an adequate path to self-realisation in the communion with God. While Calvinism validates work in a straightforward manner, a subversive force lies buried within Lutheranism — the genesis of an inner-worldly work ethic, a permanent self-observation to decipher God’s will. In other words, for Calvinism, work and its worldly remuneration is the path to God, while for Lutheranism work can also be a hindrance on the path to God.

Perhaps here lies the explanation for why a leader like Donald Trump did not find much resonance in Germany, why his flouting of his riches and promises to make everyone rich elicited disgust in Germany rather than enthusiasm. In its secular version, Eder suggests, the Lutheran spirit has the potential to guide people to take notice when the outer world is no longer creating inner meaning, and this, in turn, can legitimise social change that aims at resolving this dissonance by bringing the outer world into consonance with the inner world. Eder pledges to use the subversiveness of the Lutheran ethic and its power to create a new kind of unity through adequate social change.[[193]](#endnote-194)

When we look back to 1525 and the verb to humiliate, and follow Klaus Eder’s reasoning, the conclusion may be warranted that Calvinism is closer to the old interpretation of prostrating oneself than Lutheranism is with its emancipatory potential. Calvinism takes one step away from Catholicism by replacing one outer validation with another, namely, replacing priestly with monetary validation, while Lutheranism takes two steps away towards inner validation.

If we search for contemporary illustrations, we find them, for instance, in a paper that the World Bank published in 2018 and that analyses the link between economic systems and religious roots. It is written by two economists of Bulgarian background who grew up in the Soviet Bloc experiencing its abuse of the idea of altruism. They suggest that ‘communism is a successor of Orthodoxy’, since a strong government involvement in the economy resonates with Orthodox religious preferences for safe and predictable livelihoods, a preference that is underpinned by justifications such as that getting rich is immoral because it can ‘only happen at the expense of others’.[[194]](#endnote-195) According to the Eastern European authors, the rejection of ‘getting rich at the expense of others’ is an ‘old idea’ that is ‘left-leaning’, and they suggest that ‘Protestants’ would have less qualms with ‘getting rich’. In other words, here European authors from behind the former iron curtain, after having suffered from the abuse of the idea of self-sacrifice, turn against it altogether and align the World Bank with the Calvinist version of Protestantism that is salient in the Anglo-Saxon sphere, declaring this version to be ‘new’. They overlook the European Lutheran spirit, which might even be ‘newer’ in sharing the position that ‘getting rich at the expense of others is immoral’, and more helpful in overcoming the ‘immorality’ of worldwide rising economic inequality.

Further down in this book, in chapter 5, legal expert Duncan Kennedy will be introduced who explains the distinction between ‘inside’ and ‘outside’ rights in the sense that a person has rights even if the legal order does not recognise them or makes it even illegal to exercise them. In chapter 12, philosopher Howard Richards will call on the global community to bring inside and outside worlds into alignment by creating global legal frameworks that make a dignified life possible for all.

I was born into Lutheranism and can attest to its scepticism towards worldly riches as proof of godly acceptance, and I can also attest to its emphasis on an inner-worldly work ethic. In my case, it motivated me to relinquish my membership in all religious institutions, including those of Lutheranism, leaving behind its practice and its dogma. It motivated me to turn towards global dignity work that refrains from dividing the world into believers and non-believers and instead includes all as fellow human beings.

### 1602 — The humiliation of honour is like a ‘mask’

The Peace of Westphalia in 1648 marked the end of what has been called World War Zero. It was the end of the Thirty Years’ War, the Eighty Years’ War, the end of ‘a long period of other conflicts during which European powers, and the parts of the world they dominated, massacred each other for economic, political, and religious reasons. Christians brought hell to each other with staggering violence and unspeakable horrors’.[[195]](#endnote-196)

William Fulbecke was born during this long period of violence and horrors in the East Midlands of England around 1559–1560, and he died around 1602. He was a lawyer, legal scholar, and historian who did pioneering work in international law. He gave advice to religious men on what they may do or not do, for instance, in the rite of homage or hommage, a rite in the feudal system whereby a noble man became the ‘man’, ‘homme’, or vassal of another man. A lord promised to give his vassal protection and a fief (land providing a means of subsistence), and in return, the vassal promised annual military service to his lord. Fulbecke taught that a religious man first belongs to his God, and therefore has to avoid formulating his allegiance to his lord in ways that compromise his relationship with God. In short, a religious man should not say Ego deuenio homo vester (‘I am going to be your man’[[196]](#endnote-197)), he should not ‘humiliate himselfe to execute the rite of homage’. This is the counsel Fulbecke gave to religious men in 1602:

By our law he may do homage: but may not say to his Lord Ego deuenio homo vester, because he hath professed himselfe to be onely God his man, but he may say: I do vnto you homage, and to you shalbe faithfull and loyall.[[197]](#endnote-198)

When reading these lines, it becomes clear that it is not a personal emotion of humiliation that is at stake here, it is rather the description of a place in a ranking order, an order where divinity is at the top — divinity’s supremacy should be respected and humans should not elevate themselves to undue superiority.

The Quaker movement that emerged in the 1650s from the English Civil War offered similar advice to all people. If their influence had prevailed, we would not use the word you as we do today. Early Modern English used thee, thou, and thine (or thy) as second person singular pronouns, while you was reserved for people of higher social standing.[[198]](#endnote-199) Quakers opposed this usage. They engaged in ‘egalitarian social protest’ by refusing to doff their hats to those of higher standing and they said thee and thou to all of their fellow human beings without distinction.[[199]](#endnote-200) They abhorred the trend to replace those singular pronouns with the one honorific ‘royal’ second-person plural of you, since it represents a ‘levelling up’, the very sin of pride and idolatry. Quakers wanted to level down, to use ‘conscientious disrespect toward everyone’, they wanted to demonstrate ‘an equality of extreme humility and universally low status’.[[200]](#endnote-201) Quakers taught that the ‘dual demands of equality and respect’ are not always in perfect harmony, ‘sometimes they are even in conflict. Respect can require treating people unequally, and equality can mean treating everyone with disrespect’.[[201]](#endnote-202) In the twenty-first century, most of us, when we use you to address our fellow human beings, are unaware that we ‘level up’ and may thus commit ‘the sin of pride and idolatry’.

While William Fulbecke focussed on the societal ranking order and not on a personal emotion of humiliation, this changed soon after him — an interest in speaking about the psychology of inner life experiences began. Philosopher Owen Barfield suggests that it was in the seventeenth century that the word ‘feeling’ was invented.[[202]](#endnote-203) Before the days of Erasmus and Montaigne, very few people in Europe wrote about the inner experience of, for instance, pain. Historian Esther Cohen informs us that the experience of pain had a strong spiritual dimension and not a psychological one in late medieval culture, and that from the thirteenth until the fifteenth century, it was believed that pain was primarily lodged in the God-given soul rather than in the person’s experience of the body.[[203]](#endnote-204)

These are William Ian Miller’s reflections on the historical context at the time:

One could hazard the claim that as late as the seventeenth century the self did not feel emotions at all; instead the emotions were borne almost as a quasi-juridical status or as allegorical personae that the subject put on mask-like. When one was sad, one became the character Sadness in a moral and social drama, with its behaviour thus constrained by the role.[[204]](#endnote-205)

William Ian Miller suggests that the influence of Romanticism, industrialisation, and capitalism changed the articulation and conceptualisation of the individual and the self. Miller is intrigued that the OED does not treat humiliation as an emotion, it only makes links to emotions — links to emotions of self-attention such as mortification or the lowering of self-respect as in displays of humility or the humble condition in religious devotion. For humiliation proper, the OED prefers the state rather than the feeling in its illustrations of the use of to humiliate and its various forms, while refraining from defining humiliation or related words as an emotion per se. Emotion begins to shine through only in a few incidences, Miller observes, namely, under the entry for mortification, 6, and mortify, 8, where the gloss is ‘the feeling of humiliation’, ‘to feel humiliated’, indicating that ‘humiliation is impliedly understood as an emotion’.[[205]](#endnote-206) Miller reflects on the transition from a state to a feeling:

But when one could at last feel sad, sadness became a feeling, a perturbation of the nerves coupled with the effects of the thoughts one might have about that perturbation. The new self could thus be something more than its feelings; it could be more detached from them, more ironical, perhaps more restrained, and definitely more self-conscious. And this last characteristic — self-consciousness — might also tend to make this new self more likely to feel such emotions as humiliation and embarrassment than heretofore. This claim may seem a bit mystifying, but it is not without some reason. It is reasonably consistent with some of the drift of Norbert Elias’s work.[[206]](#endnote-207)

Miller wonders why ‘I feel sad’ is almost synonymous with ‘I am sad’, while this is not the case in ‘I feel guilty’ and ‘I am guilty’. Miller looks at the following two collocations, ‘I feel + emotion term’ (for example, guilty, embarrassed, ashamed, humiliated, and sad), and the similar one ‘I am + emotion term’.[[207]](#endnote-208) What puzzles Miller most is why the construction with ‘feel + emotion term’ could be encountered only rarely at first, becoming common only in the nineteenth century, and why, after that, both be and feel constructions became available for most emotions in regular usage. This is what Miller found, in more detail:

The OED, as well as some 220 titles from English and American fiction, belles-lettres, and philosophical texts, is available as part of a computer data base. Nearly 120 of these texts predate 1800, although they are mostly short, including plays and verse by Shakespeare and Marlowe; there are also works by Milton, Sterne, Fielding, Dryden, Defoe, Swift, and others. This is hardly a perfect sample, but it cannot be without some significance that the collection gives no uses of feel (felt) ashamed, feel (felt) shame, feel (felt) guilty, sad, aggrieved, etc. prior to the mid-nineteenth century. Yet feel plus an emotion word was not an impossible collocation before then: the OED lists Tyrwhyt in 1634 (s.v. feel, v. ga): ‘I have not at all felt the emotion I shewed’; the data base also yields ‘feel an emotion’ from Shamela, while Pope writes of woes being felt (Eloisa 366). But the preferred mode, and almost exclusively so, of expressing the thought of having an emotion was with the to be constructions. Even in the nineteenth century it is greatly preferred, and not until the twentieth century did ‘feeling’ emotions come into its own.[[208]](#endnote-209)

What may be the origin for these different ways of expressing the relation of the self to emotions? Miller sees changes in styles of religious devotion at the root. He notes that the notion of mortification — with its long-standing association with religious self-abasement and the denial of the pleasures of the flesh — has changed roughly concurrently with the semantic changes for humiliation.[[209]](#endnote-210) Mortification came to indicate the unpleasant feeling of humiliation and chagrin.

What Miller sees occurring is a secularisation or re-contextualisation of devotional diction in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries as part of major shifts in the styles of devotion. It goes together with the emergence of a closer look at the inner life, an extraordinary attention to manners and the emotions supporting them, at least in elite social circles in Europe, combined with philosophical or medical treatments of ‘the passions’, as shown, for instance, in the ‘sentimental novels’ of a Samuel Richardson or Laurence Sterne.[[210]](#endnote-211)

When we look into the evidence for Miller’s hypotheses, we find a novel by Samuel Richardson published in 1740 and titled Pamela; or, virtue rewarded.[[211]](#endnote-212) It is the story of the beautiful fifteen-year-old maidservant Pamela Andrews who faces her country landowner master, Mr. B, who tries to seduce and rape her. She successfully resists and her virtue is eventually rewarded when he proposes an equitable marriage to her. The readers of the novel became divided into ‘Pamelists’ and ‘Anti-Pamelists’. Anti-Pamelists were loyal to the Zeitgeist of the past and suspected her of cunning utilitarianism, tricking her master into marrying her. In the eighteenth century many thought that it was a servant’s duty to please her master and that virginity was not a value for a poor girl to defend. Pamelists, in contrast, reacted in the spirit of a new Zeitgeist — they acknowledged and valued a poor girl trying to keep herself honest and chaste. We see a related example later in Madame Bovary, where the rule breaking behaviour of a bourgeois woman was suddenly considered worthy of aesthetic treatment.[[212]](#endnote-213)

I admire William Ian Miller for tracing so meticulously the articulations and conceptualisations of the individual and the self, for dissecting so carefully how these articulations and conceptualisations changed in interrelationship with and as part of larger-scale historical trends. What I see him dissecting, essentially, is a historical path from rigidly defined ‘mask-like’ collectivistic and unequal ranked honour to the much more open and fluid concept of equality in dignity for each and every single individual, including their feelings — in short, he describes how the ‘mask’ got thinner as its fixed state dissolved into fluid feelings.

When we look into the large-scale historical trends in which the transformations of the self that Miller describes were embedded, we find, for instance, that travellers began to insert themselves openly as subjects into their travel reports with a personal perspective, following Michel de Montaigne’s pioneering ‘birth of the self’ in his Essays of 1575.[[213]](#endnote-214) Jacob Burckhardt was a historian of art and culture living from 1818 to 1897 and hailed as the ‘discoverer of the age of the Renaissance’, the age between the fourteenth to mid-sixteenth centuries in Italy. He describes how the modern spirit of individuality emerged, leaving behind the Middle Ages where it had been stifled.[[214]](#endnote-215) It was also the time when the self replaced the soul. ‘The idea of an immortal soul did not survive the Enlightenment unscathed’, explains author Barbara Ehrenreich, as ‘the soul depended on God to provide its immortality, and as his existence — or at least his attentiveness — was called into question, the immortal soul gave way to the far more secular notion of the self’.[[215]](#endnote-216) Ehrenreich continues, ‘While the soul was probably “discovered” by Christians (and Jews) reading Plato, the self was never discovered; it simply grew by accretion, apparently starting in Renaissance Europe’.[[216]](#endnote-217)

What was this self that accreted? Where is the place that we call ‘self’? Where is this place from where agency emerges and to which it is also represented? It would be interesting to know what Michel de Montaigne would say to William Ian Miller’s observations. It would be interesting to know Michel de Montaigne’s comments also on the critical thoughts of historian David Wootton, or on neuro-anthropologist Terrence Deacon’s reflections on the ‘possibility of explaining the existence of selves’?[[217]](#endnote-218) Is the self a millennia-long narrative construction?[[218]](#endnote-219)

David Wootton, in his work, is critical of the rise of the Enlightenment paradigm with its scientific revolution and its ‘possessive individualism’ project.[[219]](#endnote-220) For him, this was regress more than progress. Wootton focusses on the dark side of the scientific revolution that moved from Aristotelian qualities to mechanistic quantities, from Aristotelian causation to the laws of nature, from a responsible boundedness to an irresponsible unboundedness. Wootton, by dissecting these transitions, explains how a new social and intellectual order brought ‘the triumph of the idea that power, pleasure, and profit’ are goods that should be pursued ‘without end and without limit’.[[220]](#endnote-221) He describes a central shift from Aristotelian ethics and Christian morality to ‘a new type of decision-making which may be termed instrumental reasoning or cost-benefit analysis’.[[221]](#endnote-222) While virtue was the result of prudence for Aristotle, for eighteenth century economist Adam Smith, it is success. What had been regarded as vice — ambition, emulation (in the sense of consumer competition out of envy), and avarice — was now glorified. As the world of ideas changed, so did the lives and behaviours of all those who accepted ‘that virtue, honour, shame, and guilt counted for almost nothing; all that mattered was success’.[[222]](#endnote-223) To make this new arrangement work, explains Wootton, systems theories were developed so as to ‘provide the tools with which to understand what happens when people pursue power, pleasure, and profit without end and without limit’.[[223]](#endnote-224)

Terrence Deacon, in his quest to shed light on the concept of self, chimes in. The Aristotelian image of nature that informed thought until the Enlightenment and the seventeenth century, shifted towards a mechanistic view. According to Aristotle, ‘nature, like mind, always does whatever it does for the sake of something, which something is its end’.[[224]](#endnote-225) For instance, when a carpenter builds a table, he starts from a representation of the table in his mind, the table does not come into being by random human action. With the advent of modern science, however, an atomistic metaphysics was melded with Newtonian science, as expressed by thinkers such as Descartes, Hobbes, and Boyle. They taught that causation is nothing more than collision-like interactions between basic particles, that only the immediate contiguous past can cause change, not something in the future. For Aristotle, this kind of causation was only one aspect of what he considered as causation, namely, what he called efficient causation.

As a result, two views of the self compete now, explains Deacon, the self as fact and as fiction. We all have a phenomenological experience of having a self and this leads us to assume that the self is a brute fact of the world, yet, if we turn to the Enlightenment and listen, for instance, to philosopher David Hume, the self is nothing but a ‘useful fiction’ and there is no self separate from certain mental and physical processes.[[225]](#endnote-226)

How do the narratives of honour and dignity intertwine with these narratives of the self, which, in turn, are connected with large-scale psycho-geo-historical changes? We see that the new trend of giving priority to instrumental reasoning or cost-benefit analysis corresponded to a transition from Gemeinschaft (community) to Gesellschaft (society), together with the emergence of the Homo oeconomicus model of human nature, skilfully described by David Wootton as manifesting through criteria such as utility and social equality. Happiness could now be attained through wealth, or status (honours), or pleasure, or virtue, Wootton explains, whereby ‘wealth requires the freedoms of the marketplace; honours require a career open to talents and a public sphere; pleasure requires, among other things, sexual freedom; and virtue requires religious freedom’.[[226]](#endnote-227)

David Wootton chronicles that a severe problem that still afflicts present times was noticed already then, namely, that the legitimisation of selfishness risks removing all sympathy from the world. As a remedy, morality was re-defined as ‘an interested obligation through the theory of sympathy’, explains Wootton, and in this way sympathy was established as a core element of Enlightenment moral philosophy. Sympathy in this context meant engagement with the community as a duty and as part of self-interest, hoping that ‘sympathy and imagination may lead to fellow­feeling and compassion’, yet — and here is the problem — ‘if human beings are fundamentally selfish, the ties of affection are likely to be narrow and fragile’.[[227]](#endnote-228) Linda Hartling, after reading these lines, chimed in, faulting not human nature but systemic pressures when saying, ‘Yes, the problem is that self-realisation may devolve into selfish realisation and self-sufficiency into selfish sufficiency.[[228]](#endnote-229)

There is also another problem, which was understood already by philosopher Immanuel Kant, namely, the problem with machine analogies being insufficient for biological phenomena — to say it short, one table does not produce another table. An organism is a reflexively organised constellation of self-organising processes that are both ends and means for one another. Terrence Deacon details how each process generates intrinsic constraints that promote the generation of other intrinsic constraints by other processes. Teleological processes in nature can emerge from non-teleological precursors, and therefore, says Deacon, Descartes’ Cogito is an ill-advised approach — selves are implicitly embodying a self-other representation, they serve ends and contribute to the integrity of the whole.[[229]](#endnote-230)

Reading Deacon, I was reminded of Niels Bohr’s intra-actions, of the onto-epistem-ology of knowing-in-being.[[230]](#endnote-231) Perceptual control theory offers similar conceptualisations when it applies control systems theory to human psychology and behaviour, mirroring the feedback systems that the human body uses to control its inner coherence (see more in chapter 3).[[231]](#endnote-232)

Terrence Deacon, through his work, seeks to reconcile the seemingly incompatible phenomenological view of the self as fact with the Humean view of the self as fiction. Humans were separated from simpler organisms through the evolution of brains that complexified internal dynamics, and this provided a means for recursive self-reflection. In addition, humans are endowed with the evolutionary innovation of supra-individual symbolic tools that add more rungs to the evolutionary ladder, new discontinuous levels of self. Humans have the ability to construct narratives, for instance, they can construct the self-narrative of a higher purpose as a source of agency. There is no ‘Cartesian theatre’ there, there is only a circular dynamic where ends and means continuously transform from one to the other, where observing and observed are intricately connected.

Like Terrence Deacon, also David Wootton highlights the interconnectedness of processes. Present-day economy exists only insofar as Homo oeconomicus exists and vice versa, and ‘both the economy and Homo oeconomicus exist only if agents have some sort of understanding of what the economy is and how it functions’.[[232]](#endnote-233) None of them comes first, Wootton points out, not the chicken nor the egg. Wootton speaks of ‘bootstrapping’ and a ‘Tinker Bell effect’, namely, that ‘there are certain types of social activities that exist only because we bring them into existence through our own actions (bootstrapping) and our own beliefs (the Tinker Bell effect)’.[[233]](#endnote-234) Social systems are socially constructed and social conventions are self-reinforcing, ‘so that behaviours create beliefs and beliefs create behaviours, and both bring into existence new structures, which in turn shape behaviours and belief’.[[234]](#endnote-235) Causation proceeds around feedback loops, which, in turn, leads to the damning verdict that the Homo oeconomicus model ‘is incompatible with the non-linear nature of and the self-organising capability of living systems’.[[235]](#endnote-236)

To round off this section, allow me briefly to share some of my reflections, which resonate with many of the above chronicled insights. If we look at the historical journey from ‘mask-like’ honour to the more open and fluid individual equality in dignity that Miller describes, I welcome the liberation that this path entails, namely, the liberation from the oppressive aspects of the inequality of collectivistic ranked hierarchies. Yet, falling into the other extreme — ‘liberating’ individuals so as to deliver them into equality in isolation — means going too far and at the same time not going far enough.

As I see it, we as humanity ‘throw out the baby with the bath water’ when we give priority to French revolution’s liberté and égalité in the hope that fraternité, or solidarity, will manifest by way of the market’s invisible hand, abetted by a few rules and regulation.[[236]](#endnote-237) It is vain to hope that the Homo oeconomicus model will not undermine the human potential to be Homo amans, the loving being.[[237]](#endnote-238) Sociologist Émile Durkheim was right in 1893 when he worried about the lack of collective consciousness.[[238]](#endnote-239) Now, more than one hundred years later, we must admit that the market place’s call to be competitive undermines collective consciousness systemically.[[239]](#endnote-240)

What we have overlooked, furthermore, is that goals with no inherent endpoint are bound to lead to suicidal outcomes. In a finite world, it is impossible to pursue power, pleasure, and profit ‘without end and without limit’.[[240]](#endnote-241) Author Barbara Ehrenreich summarised the absurdity of the situation: In an epidemic of wellness, with the aim to live longer, we kill ourselves.[[241]](#endnote-242) In my words: In search for power, pleasure, and profit, we first lose our dignity and then our lives. Locusts demonstrate how one can destroy the very substrate of one’s survival.[[242]](#endnote-243)

What is the solution? In short (more further down): We need to preserve some aspects of the old Zeitgeist, we need to follow Deacon in forging not just a new and more comprehensive concept of self, but new and more comprehensive arrangements of our human condition on this planet altogether. As for now, direct mutual inter-human solidarity is sacrificed for the systemic primacy given to selfish interests, in the vain hope that solidarity can be rescued through meek calls for sympathy, indirect market incentives, and mere regulatory rules.[[243]](#endnote-244) New constitutive societal rules are needed that support sympathy qua system, sympathy among us and with our planet, with unity in diversity and non-dualism as guiding principles.

No longer can we allow the world to be filled with equals in competition, with people and strategies that compete to take the biggest bites out of our commons. The endgame must be a world where we take care of our commons — our planet and our human connections are our commons — as equals in solidarity.

#### What is honour? Honour is for men...

Allow me now to take a brief look at how honour is practiced in different cultural contexts, both in the past and at present, because honour is the very place where the mask-like features that Miller described play out.

Honour it is a mindset that can express itself at all levels, from the personal micro level to the social meso level to the societal macro level, and it is experienced and filled with life in many different ways, far from a fixed moral code. For instance, once it was honourable to enslave and ‘own’ people, and owners possessed them with pride, yet, at some point, it became more honourable to express shame about the suffering of enslaved people. In 1833, the Slavery Abolition Act abolished slavery throughout the British Empire.[[244]](#endnote-245)

When I speak about honour, I do so by using Max Weber’s ideal-type approach, which allows for analysis and action to proceed at different levels of abstraction, while acknowledging all the grey areas in between.[[245]](#endnote-246) After more than four decades of being embedded in many different cultural contexts around the world, I recognise myriad ‘grey areas’. At the same time, I also see two basic ways of appraising worthiness underlying them: worthiness can be ranked or unranked. I use the phrase honour to speak of the first approach, namely, that of ‘higher beings presiding over lesser beings’. I see honour as part and parcel of the dominator model of society that systems scientist Riane Eisler describes and that reigned almost everywhere on the globe for the past millennia.[[246]](#endnote-247) In its most extreme expression, ‘lesser beings’ were expected to give their lives for the honour of their superiors, and many subordinates internalised that readiness to die was their honourable duty and even their privilege.

Honour is typically reserved for men, while women are considered to be ‘too weak’ for it. In 1588, Queen Victoria of England made this clear when she called for war by highlighting her manly spirit as an exception, ‘I know I have the body of a weak, feeble woman; but I have the heart and stomach of a king...’[[247]](#endnote-248) Even the famous campaigner for the abolition of slavery, William Wilberforce (1759–1833), was opposed to women campaigning for this noble cause, ‘For ladies to meet, to publish, to go from house to house stirring up petitions. These appear to me unsuited to the female character as delineated in scripture’.[[248]](#endnote-249)

Typically, for honourable men, peace-loving individuals were ‘unpatriotic effeminate traitors’, at best misguided and ignorant souls permitting themselves to fall for ‘female weakness’, at worst peddling ill-intentioned and malicious ‘love for the enemy’. Bertha von Suttner dramatised this scenario most evocatively in her famous 1889 novel Lay down your arms.[[249]](#endnote-250)

In many world regions, still today, the honour of the male is linked to his ability to protect ‘his women’ from unauthorised men. Often, her intact hymen before marriage functions as proof. Women, if they resist, risk violence.[[250]](#endnote-251) In certain segments of world society, women are also today treated as chattel and as men’s property, an arrangement that was stable in dominator contexts throughout the past millennia.[[251]](#endnote-252) I wrote a book on this topic in 2010.[[252]](#endnote-253) I have dear female friends who remember vividly their childhood and adolescence and how their mother would check her daughter’s vagina when the child returned home after an excursion outside of the house, even though the vagina had already been ‘closed’ with stitches when the girl was small.

In a dominator context, women are expected to raise the next generation inside the private sphere, while men ‘go out’ and rule the public sphere. Women are often seen as genetically inferior, of weak intelligence, even as dangerously manipulative.[[253]](#endnote-254) The main task given to her is to cover herself to avoid tempting untoward men. A raped girl may go as far and ‘voluntarily’ choose to quietly take her own life rather than wait for her family to resort to ‘honour killing’, even though she is the victim of aggression and not the perpetrator.[[254]](#endnote-255) In Iraq — but also in many other world regions — ‘a woman who suffered rape is considered to be dead to society, as she is held responsible for having enticed males to abduct, rape or molest her’.[[255]](#endnote-256)

In contemporary Western contexts, people pride themselves of being more ‘evolved’ and, indeed, male honour may be less openly brandished, still, also here raped women tend to keep silent in shame.[[256]](#endnote-257) The Me Too movement that unfolded during the past years could make waves only because it broke this dam of society-wide shame. Highly educated women like me are not exempt from experiencing the influence of male honour even in the most ‘evolved’ contexts. After having worked hard to obtain a high level of education, women like me realise that we have not increased our chances to be accepted but even undermined them, ‘When a man says he can do the job, regardless of evidence, we believe him. We ask women to prove it, and then when she does, we don’t like her anymore’.[[257]](#endnote-258) Women of high education who desire to establish a family find that their education ‘repels’ potential male partners rather than attracting them. I have personally suffered profoundly from this set of circumstances.

Many conservatives, even while they officially subscribe to human rights ideals, use feminism as enemy image, many see women’s participation in the public sphere as oppressive imposition by liberals. Members of the LGBTQ community share the plight of women when its members are regarded not only as deviant but also as a threat to national customs, morality, and security, when their existence is branded as imperialist assault perpetrated by liberals.[[258]](#endnote-259)

Throughout history, not only raped girls, also male subordinates learned the lessons of honour so well that they ended their own lives when they brought shame upon themselves or their superiors. When I lived in Japan, I learned about the stories of samurai who took their own lives when they failed to defend their masters or otherwise fell into dishonour, if only by accident — in their case, they did not commit suicide quietly but in a public display of ritualised bravery.[[259]](#endnote-260) Until feudal Japan ended in 1868, samurai were the masters over life and death, masters over their own lives and that of others, the rules they followed were part of a rigidly ranked societal system. Under the Tokugawa shogunate — the last feudal Japanese military government that existed between 1603 and 1867 — a samurai had the right of to kill commoners for no reason, and it was called kiri-sute gomen, or ‘authorisation to cut and leave’ the body of the victim. Japanese language encodes this fear at the very core of its expressions of politeness, as it employs different personal pronouns for each person according to gender, age, rank, and degree of acquaintance, combined with several other cultural factors. Politeness in Japan is thus not so much based on individual traits or preferences, but on what is called wakimae, or ‘finding one’s place’ within prescribed social norms. During my time in Japan, I was very much reminded of what William Ian Miller would call ‘mask’. Whenever I met overly polite behaviour — in restaurants or shops — I felt that politeness was a mask that betrayed fear, the fear of being killed, the fear of kiri-sute gomen. I very much appreciate psychologist David Matsumoto and linguist Sachiko Ide’s descriptions of these traditional societal structures.[[260]](#endnote-261)

I have been interested in China since I began studying sinology in 1973 at the age of nineteen, and therefore I was particularly thankful to Litang Cui, an instructor in English, Chinese, and communication in China, for kindly sharing with me in 2013 his views on honour and dignity in China.[[261]](#endnote-262) He explained that as in other world regions, also in China the notion of honour came first and that of dignity much later, with linguistic expressions of human dignity arriving in Chinese only in the early years of last century.[[262]](#endnote-263) All the while, Cui reports, ‘the broad concept of human dignity has been around since Zhuang Zi (369–286 Before the Common Era, BCE[[263]](#endnote-264))’.[[264]](#endnote-265) Zhuang Zi (Master Zhuang, also Zhuangzi, Zhuang Zhou, or Chuang Tzu) was an influential Chinese philosopher during the period of the Hundred Schools of Thought, a peak time of Chinese philosophy, and he is credited with writing — in part or in whole — the foundational texts of Taoism. Zhuang Zi communicated an idea that is similar to the Western concept of human dignity, Cui explains, albeit with significant differences, as he is comparing ‘stems and branches as one relating to the other over the social distances between the mass and mandarin, the saint and the self-denied, the free and unfettered, and the lofty’.[[265]](#endnote-266) Cui also points at Confucius (551–479 BCE), the thinker who, deeply rooted in Chinese culture, shapes the Chinese mindset until today. Confucius is hailed as the first Chinese philosopher to address notions related to human worthiness comprehensively, namely, in his Analects. At the core of Confucian humanism ‘is the belief that human beings are teachable, improvable, and perfectible through personal and communal endeavour, especially through self-cultivation and self-creation, focussing on the cultivation of virtue and maintenance of ethics’.[[266]](#endnote-267)

The basics are centred on social codes represented in eight Chinese characters, Cui explains:

1. zhong (loyalty/commitment/devotion to family, friend, ruler, master, community, and country)
2. xiao (filial piety to one’s parents practiced by the young)
3. ren (virtuousness/kindness/benevolence/love as an obligation of altruism and humaneness for other individuals within a community)
4. ai (patience/love/tolerance)
5. li (ceremony/ritual/rites/posture/presents as a system of norms and propriety that determines how a person should properly act within a community, for example, ‘you can never be too polite’)
6. yi (posture/practice of benevolence/obligation of friendliness as the upholding of righteousness and moral disposition)
7. lian (straight/square/correctness/uncrooked as a quality of being honest, clean, righteous and uncorrupted: ‘if the upper beam is crooked, the one below is necessarily so’)
8. chi (shame/loss of face, ‘that might come on your ears and is felt at your heart’, as a complex resulting from the failure to practice the above of zhong, xiao, ren, ai, li, yi and lian — that is, ‘loss of face is loss of honour’)[[267]](#endnote-268)

Psychologist David Yau Fai Ho wrote to me later and added that in Chinese social relations and everyday speech, face refers to the social perceptions of a person’s prestige and authority — mianzi, Chinese 面子 — and to the confidence and trust in a person’s moral character within a social network — lian, in Traditional Chinese 臉, and in Simplified Chinese [脸](http://en.wiktionary.org/wiki/%E8%84%B8).[[268]](#endnote-269) Engaging in what is called polite lies is therefore not just acceptable behaviour but expected.

Chinese history and culture have always been close to my heart. Ten years after I began learning Chinese, I travelled through all of China, this was in 1983. Later, we held our 2007 Dignity Conference in Hangzhou.[[269]](#endnote-270) I am deeply grateful to my Chinese friends who translated my 2006 book on humiliation and international conflict in their free time until it finally came out in 2019.

Since 2001, every year, when I am at Teachers College in New York City, I admire the bust of philosopher and educator John Dewey, not least because I am impressed by the connections with China he was able to cultivate.[[270]](#endnote-271) Peng Chun Chang (1892–1957) was a Chinese diplomat and philosopher who studied with John Dewey,[[271]](#endnote-272) to later become one of the most important authors of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948 as vice chair of the Human Rights Commission under Eleanor Roosevelt. His role has been the focus of growing attention in recent years, as he is given credit for contributing with defining features to the declaration, its universality and religious ecumenism.[[272]](#endnote-273)

Not just in China, also in other cultural realms, we see that honour is being regarded as either derived from a lineage or gained through personal achievement, and often talked about in terms of saving face. In the Filipino language, for instance, humiliation means pagkapahiya or ‘being shamed’ or ‘being hurt’, connoting ‘losing one’s face’. For the Muslims living in the Philippines, given their particular religious, cultural, ethnic, and historical conditions, the concept of humiliation also includes ‘humiliation as an affront to their religion and culture’.[[273]](#endnote-274)

When I worked as a psychology student in the Alyn Hospital for physically handicapped youths in Jerusalem in 1975, my Palestinian patients taught me all about Arab honour, while I heard from my Jewish ones about the Hebrew concept of kavod. The Even-Shoshan dictionary translates kavod into three aspects in English, namely, ‘honour, respect, and dignity’. Only much later did I understand in more depth what kavod means, through Avi Shahaf, a scholar and practitioner in the field of dignity. Avi Shahaf introduced me to philosopher Jacques Schlanger, who describes the three aspects of kavod as follows: Honour ‘is shown to people in positions of authority simply because they hold the position’,[[274]](#endnote-275) it is about external signs, decent behaviour, etiquette, and if one wants to ‘honour’ a person, one has to display signs of esteem for that person. Respect, in contrast, is about inner feelings of admiration for the respected person, as in ‘I display honour, but I feel respect’.[[275]](#endnote-276) People who live remarkable lives often enjoy this kind of respect — artists, scientists, public officials, or righteous people. The third aspect, dignity, is about the worthiness of people simply for being members of the human family. It is a worthiness that is neither bestowed by society nor earned through praiseworthy conduct in life, as ‘dignity expresses an attitude toward the humanity in each and every one of us, and appertains to all human beings inasmuch as they are human beings’.[[276]](#endnote-277)

Victoria Fontan, scholar of conflict resolution and peace studies, reported to us at our Dignity Conference in 2003 on her fieldwork in Iraq, explaining that honour in Iraq can be described with three words, sharaf, ihtiram, and ird. Sharaf is honour bestowed on a man whose service or lineage are found deserving by his peers, ihtiram is the honour he can gain by imposing himself on others by force, while ird is the honour measured according to his success in protecting his women from intruders.[[277]](#endnote-278) Sharaf is something that is being given to a man — he can only invite it through benevolent actions — while ihtiram and ird depend on him and his ability to impose his will on his environment. Together, these three elements describe the stature a man can claim to have in his social context.[[278]](#endnote-279) Women are his substrate.

Tribal honour in Pakistan is known to manifest similar mindsets, and comparable manifestations can be found in many other world regions. Not least the mindset that informs Da’esh fighters who wish to re-instate a lost caliphate brings back related honour scripts.[[279]](#endnote-280)

During my seven years of becoming part of Egyptian society from 1984 to 1991, I met many variations of honour and face. I worked as a psychological counsellor and clinical psychologist, first at the American University in Cairo, and then in my own private practice in Cairo from 1987 to 1991. I remember counselling an Egyptian lawyer who had studied in Europe and had almost forgotten about his roots in the Upper Egyptian countryside where blood feuds were common. One day, to his great surprise and shock, people from his village of origin visited him and told him that he was next in line to be killed. He knew neither why nor by whom. He had done nothing to elicit other people’s wrath. His position in the genealogy of his extended family was sufficient to give him a place in the honour game.

All manifestations listed so far show how the collectivistic character of honour causes it to be worn like a mask-like armour. People may defend their group’s honour against humiliators merely out of imposed duty, without feeling any particular personal urge. Throughout history, many people found themselves caught in games of honour beyond their control like my client in Egypt — in affaires d’honneur that were important for their peers but not necessarily for themselves as individuals.

Albania can serve as an example of honour being like an armour that is put onto individuals by the collective. Blood feuds were officially banned during the forty-year long rule of Albania’s communist-era Enver Hoxha, but in the chaos that accompanied the fall of communism in the early 1990s, the practice resurfaced. Under the ancient Albanian code called kanun — or canon, meaning ‘the law’ — the victim’s family can invoke their right to take revenge on any male adult in the extended family who had caused the loss of one of their members. As a result, hundreds of males — even children — across Albania live virtually imprisoned in their homes for fear of being killed, even though they themselves wish for nothing more than being liberated from this collective yoke.[[280]](#endnote-281)

In Europe and the United States, duels of honour were long en vogue. ‘Pistols at ten paces’ and other forms of duelling were common,[[281]](#endnote-282) and two men whose portraits adorned American dollar bills were involved in duels.[[282]](#endnote-283) Famous political duels were fought in Missouri, for instance, where Thomas Hart Benton killed Charles Lucas in 1817. Interestingly, each of those two men was beholden to a different aspect of honour — for Lucas, honour was part of his descendance from Norman nobility, while Benton rather sought honour through his own actions.[[283]](#endnote-284) The practice of duelling faded in the north of the United States in the early nineteenth century, while it remained strong in the south and west. In some world regions, duelling persists in rural areas until the day today.

Nowadays, the lust for ‘dukes-up’ duel-like defence persists most strongly in national honour. Historian Donald Kagan found that at the national level, honour reigns in today’s world no less than it did in the past, only that it is now partly concealed by human rights rhetoric and no longer invoked as openly as before,[[284]](#endnote-285) as the spirit of honour still informs the deep structure of modern-day cultural scripts in all world regions.[[285]](#endnote-286) For instance, it seems that national honour has inspired Brexit, the exit of Great Britain from the European Union, ‘At its heart, Brexit depends on the idea that Britain cannot be an ordinary European country and, therefore, that equality within the EU is inherently humiliating’.[[286]](#endnote-287) When Britain was an imperial power, ‘it was always on the lookout for intolerable slights to the national honour — think of the War of Jenkins’ Ear in the 18th century when an assault on an English smuggler was the excuse for war with Spain’.[[287]](#endnote-288) Poet and critic Wayne Koestenbaum formulated it cogently, ‘Humiliation is bliss if the experience of largeness or magnitude has become overwhelming and unpleasant and you need relief’.[[288]](#endnote-289)

Historian Bertram Wyatt-Brown studied southern honour, the notion of honour in the south of the United States. He found that its ‘warrior ethic’ entails ‘a yearning for renown’, demanding ‘that the world should recognise a state’s high distinction’, followed by ‘a dread of humiliation if that claim is not provided sufficient respect’, and, finally, ‘a compulsion for revenge when, in issues of both personal leadership calculations and in collective or national terms, repute for one or another virtue and self-justified power is repudiated’.[[289]](#endnote-290) Historian David Hackett Fischer documented that the American South has ‘strongly supported every American war no matter what it was about or who it was against’, and that ‘the American military tradition, and a disproportionate number of its soldiers, emerged from the descendants of Scots-Irish warriors in the Appalachian highlands’.[[290]](#endnote-291) Cultural psychologists Richard Nisbett and Dov Cohen as well have studied the psychology of violence in the American South and its roots in a culture of honour,[[291]](#endnote-292) while taxation specialist Charles Adams chronicled the historical humiliation that unfolded around taxation prior to the Civil War that commenced in 1861.[[292]](#endnote-293) Adams’ findings underpin sociologist Arlie Hochschild’s conclusion from 2016 that people in the American South feel like ‘strangers in their own land’ due to challenges to their honour that congeal around issues such as taxation and religious convictions.[[293]](#endnote-294)

Relational psychologist Linda Hartling would have hoped that enthusiasm for national honour had been tempered in the United States after America’s failed involvement in the Vietnam War and the outcome of its involvement in Iraq.[[294]](#endnote-295) Yet, disillusionment can also lead to the opposite reaction, namely, a renewed effort to redeem honour. The slogan ‘make America great again’ by American president Donald Trump speaks to national honour, as does Prime Minister Boris Johnson when he echoes Trump with ‘I’ll make Britain great again’.[[295]](#endnote-296)

In 2019, I met Tim Guldiman, a Swiss diplomat, and he shared an experience he had in 2015 with his American friends when he suggested that they could easily defuse the Iran crisis simply by using three words, namely, ‘in mutual respect’. His American friends cried out in indignation, ‘But we do not respect them!’[[296]](#endnote-297) I have seldom heard a more concise summary of my 2006 book Making enemies: Humiliation and international conflict.

If we look for related conceptualisations in the social sciences and in philosophy, we meet sociologist Erving Goffman (1922–1982), who introduced the concept of face into social theory as a sociological universal. Face, according to him, is a mask that people strive to maintain in social situations.[[297]](#endnote-298) Research in social psychology has since confirmed that the social humiliation of losing face can lead to extreme forms of retaliation, even at the cost of self-damage.[[298]](#endnote-299)

Philosopher Emmanuel Lévinas (1906–1995), as well, speaks of face, yet, interestingly, for him it is no longer a mask. By applying the insights gathered so far in this chapter, we could say that Goffman interprets face as a mask on one’s face from within the Zeitgeist of collectivist honour, while Lévinas, by emphasising the face of the Other (autrui in French), dissolves the mask and expresses the new Zeitgeist of equal dignity for all as free individuals in solidarity.[[299]](#endnote-300)

This dissolution of identity masks is a gradual process that made itself palpable even during my own lifetime. Allow me to share one small illustration. I grew up in the countryside in Western Europe and do not remember ever having heard of transgender people when I was a child, except at school in biology lessons. When I began my life as a student in the city of Hamburg in Germany in 1974, travesty comedy was the closest I came to knowing about the fluidity of biological gender. When I studied psychology and medicine in the 1970s and 1980s, it was part of the curriculum to learn about the undeterminedness of biological gender, not to speak of the fluidity of the psychological and cultural construction of gender.[[300]](#endnote-301) Only now has this knowledge reached mainstream society.

To end this section, we can say that what was vibrant in 1602, namely, the mask-like character of honour, and, in extension, the mask-like character of humiliation, is still relevant today in many world regions and many segments of societies. Yet, by now, it lives alongside with, and sometimes in opposition to a new Zeitgeist that dissolves former mask-like rigidity of identity. Mask off: Masculinity redefined, is the title of a 2019 book by a young black writer.[[301]](#endnote-302)

Unsurprisingly, the dissolution of identity masks causes many to feel humiliated and elicits angry backlashes. Illiberal societies are now on the rise that re-impose rigid standards and restrict women’s autonomy. Masculine supremacists attempt to turn back from fluid dignity to rigid honour, they try to rebuild rigid gender role demarcations and reduce woman to ‘their reproductive or sexual function — with sex being something that women owe men and that can or even should be coerced out of them’.[[302]](#endnote-303)

All these arrangements are beholden to an honour system that I dare hope will become replaced in the future by a global vision of equality in dignity for all in solidarity. I join philosopher William Talbott in holding on to the standards of decency that remediate the effects of paternalism and protect the dignity of women.[[303]](#endnote-304)

More so, I would love us to protect the dignity of all men and women in the future, and more, the dignity of all living beings on our planet.

Despair repair

May you

Use your humiliation

To make you wise

To change the world

To save lives.

May you

Use your despair

To be aware

To deeply care

To renew and repair.

May you

Use your pain

To extinguish shame

To create a new frame

To sing in the rain.

May you

Use your fear

To hold those dear

To be crystal clear

Like a white-tailed deer  
Year after year.  
― Linda Hartling’s Poem of the Day, 14th April 2017
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### 1757 — A new sense of the verb to humiliate emerges

In 1757, a new sense of the verb to humiliate emerged in the English language, namely, ‘to lower or depress the dignity or self-respect of; to subject to humiliation; to mortify’.[[304]](#endnote-305)

It was in the writings of a man called Stentor Tell-Truth, Esq., that this new usage appeared. When we read Stentor Tell-Truth’s texts, we notice that the word decorum is central for him. ‘To humiliate’, for him, means ‘to violate the decorum of a dignitary’, it means ‘to violate the standing of a person of high rank’. In other words, it was not yet equality in dignity for everyone that Tell-Truth has in mind, on the contrary, for him, dignity was very unequal.

What we learn from reading Stentor Tell-Truth’s texts is that the notion of decorum formed a kind of bridge between honour and dignity, an intermediary element on the historical journey that went from the ‘mask-like’ collectivistic and ranked honour that was described in the previous chapter, to the equality in dignity for all individuals that is promised in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948. Tell-Truth’s notion of decorum forms a bridge in the sense that it already places the individual at the centre and bestows dignity on the individual, yet, it is still an unequal notion, it still follows the ranking script of honour. Only in the years that followed Tell-Truth’s lifetime did the historical path of the Zeitgeist proceed further, only then did it move from unequal to equal dignity for each individual. This in-between position of decorum is still relevant today, the word dignitary betrays this connection, as does the usage of the notion of decency — due to its double meaning it can be used by angry populists and liberal cosmopolitans alike to attract followers.[[305]](#endnote-306)

Stentor Tell-Truth could be described as a blogger of his time, proud and patriotic. He was a somewhat indignant writer, full of criticism for his own British Empire — sensing his ire, one gets the impression that he may have needed to compensate for a personal sense of insignificance. He wrote to The Herald in his letter X on Thursday, 10th November 1757, ‘It may here be worthwhile to enquire what foreign ministers there are at the court of Portugal to have demanded so humiliating a sacrifice of decorum’.[[306]](#endnote-307) He continued with a long list of these foreign ministers and lamented the humiliating treatment the envoy of Great Britain had received compared with them, ‘The whole of them are, the Pope’s Nuncio, a Spanish ambassador, an Hungarian, Neapolitan and Dutch minister, a Prussian resident, and a French chargé des affaires. With the first and last ours has at present nothing to do; and surely among the rest a British envoy extraordinary should figure high enough to require and receive the rights and preheminencies (sic) of his character’.[[307]](#endnote-308)

When we go through the entire letter, we understand that Tell-Truth’s biggest concern is Great Britain’s relationship with honour in general, not just with Portugal, and that letter X uses Portugal only to exemplify his complaints. He laments about the French ambassador to Portugal, Chavigny, who, when he first came to Lisbon, received a treatment much superior to the British envoy. Tell-Truth then explains in minute detail the ways in which the British envoy took revenge and tricked the Portuguese Minister of State and the French ambassador into giving him a more honourable treatment. Viewed from the perspective of an average citizen of the twenty-first century, his complaints seem incredibly detailed. Even the protocols of present-day foreign ministries or royal families may be more relaxed. Rank and ‘character’ were determined by looking at the tiniest detail, for instance, whether a person had the right to be greeted at the door of his carriage or inside the house in the anti-chambers.[[308]](#endnote-309) Altogether Tell-Truth admonishes his government for not being careful enough in considering the etiquette and ceremony of diplomatic interactions, as it would be a disservice to the entire country’s reputation if their representatives were treated with less honour than their country should expect. Tell-Truth bemoans his times for having become ‘tame’, he laments that ‘the intoxicating revelries of effeminating pleasures, money, and not honour, is become our object’.[[309]](#endnote-310) He wishes to resurrect old, more honourable and manly times — ‘It concerns all nations to regulate their proceedings by the same rigid rules of right, dignity and decorum’.[[310]](#endnote-311)

We understand that Tell-Truth speaks from the position of a traditional aristocrat, for whom humiliation is not a virtuous ‘condition of humility’ but a violation of the worthiness of a person, in this case, a person who represents a nation. He uses dignity in the sense of reputation, of how reputation determines rank — basically, for him, dignity is the honour of the proud nobleman. Tell-Truth’s concept of worthiness is ranked, he attributes more worth to dignitary elites than to their underlings, and he is angry when these elites fail to see it as their duty to protect their privileged superior position from debasement. He uses the notion of decorum to point at a person’s status in a hierarchical context more than at the concept of dignity as expressed in the sentence ‘All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights’ in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948. Tell-Truth’s dignity is far from the later formulated human rights ideal of equality in worthiness for all.

Whenever we use the term dignitary today, we are reminded that the notion of dignity first arose in a hierarchical context, because a dignitary is a person who is elevated over others, and this stands in direct opposition to the notion of equal dignity for all.

Steven Roach is an expert in international relations and he has looked deeply into the notion of decency in politics.[[311]](#endnote-312) According to the Oxford English dictionary, the phrase decency, Latin decēntia, appears for the first time in the English language in a 1567 commentary on Horace’s poetry, ‘Of sortes, and ages thou must note The manner and the guyse. A decensie for stirring youth, For elder folke likewise’.[[312]](#endnote-313) For Thomas Hobbes, decency was another word for ‘small morals’, for mere manners and tastes — in 1651, Hobbes explained that decency is ‘how one man should salute another, or how a man should wash his mouth, or pick his teeth before company, and such other points of the Small Morals’.[[313]](#endnote-314) Such finesse of manners, tastes, and decorum could only be maintained in daily life by privileged ecclesiastical, aristocratic, and middle classes of early modern Europe (1500–1800), explains Roach, and thus it ‘helped maintain the aristocracy’s virtual monopoly on honour, courage, and propriety in public’.[[314]](#endnote-315) Hobbes did not think highly of decency — it was ‘how the upper classes flaunted their moral tastes and showed an insouciance to the need for just laws and peace’, and if anything, ‘it expressed the sort of low-mindedness that reinforced an ecclesiastical and aristocratic order ruled by ignorance, corruption, and the vagaries of superstition’.[[315]](#endnote-316) Roach calls this kind of decency conservative decency or conservative propriety. This is where also Stentor Tell-Truth seems to come from.

Steven Roach differentiates conservative decency from basic and liberal decency. Liberal decency is the notion that arose with the Enlightenment in Europe, in the form of ‘individual liberty, equal dignity, autonomy, tolerance, and the rule of law’.[[316]](#endnote-317) ‘By the mid-eighteenth century, decency had come to mean something more than simply the public display of proper tastes and manners. It was now an emerging feature of a political consciousness that championed reason, virtuous sentiments (in justice), and the protection of individual dignity’.[[317]](#endnote-318) Liberal decency resonates with the definition of virtues to be found in many religions — it is in the Judeo-Christian commandment of thou shall not kill, and in the virtue of ahimsa in Hinduism, Jainism, and Buddhism — it speaks to the ‘intrinsic value we place on preserving and dignifying all human life’, and it ‘finds its deepest expression in the humane sentiment that we evoke to respect and protect all living beings, including non-human animals (and their feelings and cognitive abilities)’.[[318]](#endnote-319)

Basic decency is a value that only took root in the mid-twentieth century, Roach explains, namely, as the decency of protecting the essential needs and conditions of upholding the dignity of all persons ‘regardless of nationality, race, sex, or religion’, involving ‘the survival and security of persons, including adequate shelter, access to food and water, decent wages, a safe work environment, and free movement’.[[319]](#endnote-320) The historical journey of the notion of decency, as described by Roach, went thus from conservative decency to liberal decency, to be followed by a merger of liberal and basic decency, marking ‘a radical, political shift from the exclusionary morality of decency — in terms of maintaining class-based manners, tradition, and moral etiquette’.[[320]](#endnote-321) Through the enshrinement of basic human rights, liberal and basic decency became linked together into the rights that are considered essential to enjoy all other rights.

For a long time, liberal decency was expected to replace conservative decency, Roach reports, yet, this did not happen. The ‘reactionary elements of conservative decency’ are still virulent and even on the rise. Roach warns that present-day liberal multiculturalists underestimate ‘the problematic effect of extending liberal decency to identity politics’, he worries that they overlook how much ‘the reactionary elements of conservative decency can create disconnections between liberal and basic decency’.[[321]](#endnote-322) ‘Advancing liberal decency can be a perilous task’, Roach cautions, as it may not succeed in overcoming ‘the hostile emotions in identity politics’.[[322]](#endnote-323) Indeed, if Tell-Truth were alive today, he would most likely applaud present-day political leaders who draw on ‘anti-immigrant or anti-gay sentiment to angrily defend traditional values’.[[323]](#endnote-324)

The historical narrative that I use in my work resonates with Steven Roach’s, only that I use different terms. My notion of honour entails much of what Roach identifies as conservative decency, while I use the terminology of human rights when I think of liberal decency. When I want to merge liberal decency with basic decency, I add solidarity to rights and speak of ‘human rights ideals in solidarity’, or of ‘equal dignity for all in mutual solidarity’, or simply of human rights ideals. I consider the concept of decorum as a first step away from conservative decency.

When we look at the notion of dignity in the OED, we find it described as ‘the quality of being worthy or honourable; worthiness, worth, nobleness, excellence’.[[324]](#endnote-325) When we inquire into the etymology, we see Middle English dignitee, borrowed from Old French dignité, which, in turn, comes from Latin dignitas, dignitatem, dignatio, meaning ‘worthiness, merit, dignity, grandeur, authority, rank, office’, coming from dīgnus ‘worthy, appropriate’. All this hails from Proto-Italic \*degnos, which, in turn, stems from Proto-Indo-European \*dḱ-nos, from \*deḱ-, which means ‘to take’ or ‘to accept’.[[325]](#endnote-326) Dignity derives from the same root as decus and decorum, in Sanskrit dac-as or ‘fame’[[326]](#endnote-327) and decet ‘it is fitting’, a cognate to ‘deign’.[[327]](#endnote-328)

In other words, when we look at the historical development of the phrases dignity and decorum, we see that both have at their core the notion of ‘being acceptable’, of ‘worthy of being accepted by compeers’, which is a relational concept that depends on the acceptance in one’s community. While Stentor Tell-Truth is at home in a community that is organised as a hierarchy and he defines decorum and dignity accordingly, I am working for a world community that manifests solidarity in equal worthiness for all.

A large body of academic literature chronicles how the concept of dignity was discussed in classical and Christian antiquity and in the Latin Middle Ages in Europe. Roman statesman Marcus Tullius Cicero lived from 106 to 43 BCE (Before the Common Era), and he is credited with being the first to attach connotations to dignity that later became salient during the Renaissance, namely, dignity as an inner feature of human nature more than just a basic spiritual attitude, more than an outward appearance or political public position, more than social recognition earned through merit. Decorum was different for Cicero, decorum was close to what modern Westerners would call emotional intelligence, as in ‘speaking decorously’, for instance, or ‘saying precisely what the moment demands’.[[328]](#endnote-329) This notion can also be found in many other cultural realms — Korea may serve as one of many examples with its concept of nunchi or noonchi, which points at the refined art and ability to gauge others’ moods and to act accordingly.

For Cicero, dignity was first a quality of masculine beauty, then something that elevated the status of the human race above that of animals. He wrote in the year 44 BCE, ‘And if we will only bear in mind the superiority and dignity of our [human] nature, we shall realise how wrong it is to abandon ourselves to excess and to live in luxury and voluptuousness, and how right it is to live in thrift, self-denial, simplicity, and sobriety’.[[329]](#endnote-330) To say it differently, for Cicero, the elevated human position carried an obligation, namely, to be responsible for our actions, to cultivate self-knowledge as awareness of the ‘divine in us’, to live in harmony with our divine rational nature — all in line with what already late Platonic doctrine and Aristotle had indicated.

Theologian and philosopher Augustine of Hippo (354–430 CE) taught that while God had bestowed dignity on man, it was lost through what was called ‘the Fall’, and renewed through the incarnation of Christ. This justification of human dignity lasted throughout the Middle Ages. Philosopher Anicius Manlius Severinus Boëthius (around 480–524 CE) granted all human beings essential dignity by linking it to the realisation of one’s human nature, humanae naturae condicio — and if this nature recognises itself, it towers above everything else, if it ceases to recognise itself, it sinks below animals.

Late medieval Europe saw an increase in secularism, as manifested in expanding economic, political, and social activities that highlighted the human being’s this-worldly achievements and dignity before death rather than salvation after death. Francesco Petrarca (1304–1374) was an Italian scholar and poet whose re-discovery of Cicero’s letters is often credited with initiating the fourteenth-century Italian Renaissance and the founding of what has been called Renaissance humanism. Petrarca connected both lines of justification for human dignity, namely, the Christian anchoring of human dignity in the incarnation of Christ on one side, and the Platonic-Stoic line of thought on the other side.

With the advent of the Renaissance, dignity was forged into an internally consistent set of ideas in Europe. The beginning of the Renaissance is often set in the year 1415 in Italy’s Florence, in the wake of its liberating and energising experience of having become a republic. Giannozzo Manetti (1396–1459) was born in Florence as a son of a rich merchant and he gave this-worldly dignity a philosophical and theological form. He was followed by Marsilio Ficino (1433–1499), another Florentine humanist and nobleman, and by philosopher Giovanni Pico della Mirandola (1463–1494).[[330]](#endnote-331) Mirandola based human dignity in freedom, no longer in the human likeness of God. As philosopher Blaise Pascal (1623–1662) wrote, ‘It is not from space that I must seek my dignity, but from the government of my thought. I shall have no more if I possess worlds. By space the universe encompasses and swallows me up like an atom; by thought I comprehend the world’.[[331]](#endnote-332) Then came philosopher Immanuel Kant (1724–1804), and with him a peak in European interest in the notion of dignity. Kant anchored dignity not in God but in freedom through reason — away from Christian Wesenswürde towards Freiheitswürde — Kant saw a double being, an ‘earthly being endowed with reason’. After Kant, interest in the notion of dignity waned in the philosophy of German idealism.

When we look at the situation today, we see that dignity has no clear definition, or, more precisely, several definitions, some of which are so far apart that they easily slide into mutual opposition. This will be the topic of the subsequent chapters in this book. Two core connotations stand out today: On one side, there is the traditional emphasis on the embeddedness of the individual in a relational context, be it hierarchical or non-hierarchical, and on the other side there is a newer definition of dignity that focusses on individual autonomy. The latter, if it takes its most extreme ‘lone hero’ form, catapults the individual out of the community into anomie and isolation. While medieval dignity was made dependent on the Catholic church supporting God in saving his children from the Fall, ‘lone hero’ dignity depends on the market and consumerism.

Let us end this section with giving Zaynab El Bernoussi the floor. She is a dignity scholar from Morocco and a supporter of what has been called the Arab world’s dignity revolutions from 2010 to 2012. She comments in 2014:

In ancient times, Roman philosopher Cicero suggested the need for universal dignity in society. The history of humanity that ensued cumulated cases of betrayals of dignity in acts such as slavery and colonialism. Indeed, it seems that in the human experience it is hard to establish truly egalitarian systems. Dignitas, where dignity comes from, is by definition a ‘non-egalitarian’ signifier: it refers to an obtained rank. A discussion of rank and equality necessarily involves a debate around the concept of power: why are there systems of hierarchy given the risks of abuses of power? These transgressions often leave their victims devoid of their dignity.[[332]](#endnote-333)

### The context — War and earthquake

The year 1757 brought to the fore a new meaning of to humiliate, a meaning that, even though it appeared ‘suddenly’ in the encyclopaedia, must have been in the making long before. Why did this new meaning emerge? What was the historical context?

The entire historical period surrounding it is of interest. Let us look into this period more deeply and explore whether we can detect manifestations of humiliation that are still relevant today, humiliation in its embeddedness in the web of notions such as honour, decorum, and dignity.

Astonishingly, as we see Stentor Tell-Truth busying himself with the minutest details of decorum and the microscopic specifics of the honour of his country’s representatives, he seems to have been oblivious of the wars and disasters that unfolded around him at the same time. It is as if ‘small morals’ were more important to him than ‘big morals’ — in the midst of large-scale historic suffering, superficial formalities of rank were his priority.

While writing these sentences, I feel uneasy, because I want to avoid appearing arrogant in the sense of ‘are we not so much more civilised today’. Incidentally, I read about an even more extreme case in the city where I was born, Hamelin in Germany. At the end of World War II, when it was clear that defeat was near, a fanatical Nazi officer in Hamelin still punished wounded soldiers when they failed to perform military salutes perfectly even when they could hardly move.[[333]](#endnote-334) In other words, putting honourable formalities over real suffering is not a preserve of the past.

Stentor Tell-Truth wrote his letter X while the Seven Years’ War was fought between 1754 and 1763, which was the most significant European war since the Thirty Years War of the seventeenth century. In retrospect, the Seven Years’ War is widely regarded as one of the first true world wars, 160 years earlier than what is commonly known as World War I. The Seven Years’ War involved most of the great powers of the time and split Europe into two coalitions, one led by Great Britain, and the other by France. It affected Europe, North America, Central America, West Africa, India, and the Philippines. In 1763, victory in the Seven Years’ War led to the dominance of the British Empire, which became the leading global power for over a century, and the largest empire in history.

The Seven Years’ War had many ‘theatres’ and therefore many names, one of them was the Third Silesian War between Prussia and Austria (1756–1763). Since my family hails from Silesia, I have a special interest in this part of history. The historical chain of conflicts that began with this war led directly to my father’s doorsteps. If Prussia’s King Frederick the Great had not been so traumatised during his childhood and adolescence, it is possible that my father would have been spared the utter humiliation he had to endure during and after World War II. When young Frederick became king, after having suffered incessant and brutal humiliations at the hands of his father who wanted to make ‘a man’ of him, he would have had the opportunity to become different from his father and become a peace-loving leader, yet, this is not what he did. Frederick felt the need to prove his manly battle valour by inflicting humiliation on Austria’s young Empress Maria Theresa through ‘grabbing’ Silesia from her, and in this way, Silesia ended up as part of the German Empire and later of Hitler’s Nazi Germany, which ultimately led to my father becoming cannon fodder for Nazi-German hubris. I am writing these lines while taking care of him, and he shares stories of trauma with me every single day.

When Tell-Truth wrote his letter, it was not only a time of war, he wrote this letter also shortly after the monumental 1755 Lisbon Earthquake. At that time, Portugal was part of an alliance led by Great Britain,[[334]](#endnote-335) and Britain’s Protestant King George II promised immediate aid to King Jose for the victims of the earthquake, a sum equivalent to what would be 148 million Pounds in 2012. Interestingly, the Protestant Dutch government, guided by Calvinist religious thinking, manifested a very different view on dignity and refrained from offering relief aid to Portuguese victims.[[335]](#endnote-336) Historians explain that ‘in this strongly Calvinist community there seems to have been little doubt that the earthquake was an awesome example of the wrath of the Living God, and that Lisbon’s addiction to “Romish idolatry” had brought the visitation upon her’.[[336]](#endnote-337) In other words, from the Calvinist point of view, help in this case would not have a dignifying effect, on the contrary, help would be a sin, as it would mean undermining divine efforts of punishing idolatrous heretics.

The Calvinist attitude would later deeply affect cultural mindsets in North America and from there fan out globally. Every reader of this book is affected in some way or the other, wittingly or unwittingly, either as supporter or opponent. Russell Conwell was an American Baptist minister and ‘Temple University’ founder, and he was opposed to helping the poor as well. He gave his famous speech Acres of diamonds many times, beginning in 1913, where he states that helping the poor is wrong because to ‘sympathise with a man whom God has punished for his sins, thus to help him when God would still continue a just punishment, is to do wrong’.[[337]](#endnote-338) Conwell fused Christianity and capitalism into the message of economism by using religious explanations to deify economic activity and give it priority over everything else.[[338]](#endnote-339) This fusion is even more salient today, spreading from the United States of America out into the world, in the spirit of ‘to make money honestly is to preach the Gospel’, and to get rich ‘is our Christian and godly duty’.[[339]](#endnote-340)

The ‘church of economism’ — the reduction of all social relations to a market logic as a new belief system — has conquered hearts and minds all around the world by now.[[340]](#endnote-341) I have met people in the farthest corner of this planet who had embraced this mindset either knowingly or unknowingly, as willing enforcer or as willing victim. ‘Capitalism is probably the first instance of a cult that creates guilt, not atonement’, wrote philosopher Walter Benjamin already in 1921.[[341]](#endnote-342) On all continents, I meet ‘religiously’ money-minded individuals who reinforce existing power structures by individualising systemic problems through blaming the victims, accusing them of neglecting their ‘godly duties’ through being ‘lazy’ and lacking ‘entrepreneurship’ and ‘resilience’. Christian evangelicals believe in the centrality of the experience of being ‘born again’, and part of their worship is to share emotionally loaded accounts of the drama of the conversion. I see similar scripts being played out by young Silicon Valley admirers all around the world who dramatise their ‘resilience’ so as to become what I would call ‘the fastest rat in the rat race’ in the vain hope to win the race. (See more in Part III of this book.)

During my time in India in 2017, I was saddened by the fact that some defenders of the Indian caste system used terms such as karma to justify why they embrace Anglo-Saxon economism and amplify callousness. Well-articulated opposition is difficult, as it requires sufficient resources and confidence to reflect on its negative outfalls. Research shows that scarcity can compromise an individual’s cognitive function and that poor people are not inherently lazy, unmotivated, or stupid, but caught in mental overstretch due to poverty.[[342]](#endnote-343)

The coronavirus pandemic revealed a paradox. A survey carried out in the year 2020 on a representative group of 8,000 Americans showed that the pandemic had increased Americans’ feelings of solidarity with others, but had at the same time also increased their acceptance of inequalities due to luck.[[343]](#endnote-344) ‘A powerful form of spiritual capitalism seems to have become more visible through this pandemic’, comments Linda Hartling, ‘perhaps this is a specialised type of disaster capitalism’.[[344]](#endnote-345)

When we look back on the year 1757 and the innovation that it signals in the English language — namely, a move away from interdependent collectivistic mindsets towards more individualistic mindsets — then we could say that modern economism sanctions the darkest version of individualism, namely, disconnected individualism. This form of individualism justifies the neglect of care and solidarity, thus leading to grave violations of the dignity of basic decency. It is as if the Calvinist callousness after the 1755 Lisbon Earthquake is being institutionalised as global economic system.

I suggest that only interconnected individuality can manifest dignity, in the spirit of the British government’s support to Portugal at the time of the earthquake. I have coined the phrase interconnected individuality to describe the kind of individuality that liberates the individual from oppressive collectivism while avoiding going too far — it stops short of creating cruelly disconnected individualism.

As so many other terms, also the terminology of collectivism and individualism has a traversed a long journey throughout history, embedded as it is in social-economic structures and their transformations and transitions over time. Legal historian Sir Henry Maine began to describe the transition from status to contract in 1861,[[345]](#endnote-346) a transition that was later referred to by historical sociologist and political economist Karl Polanyi as the disintegration of the feudal Gemeinschaften of the Middle Ages and the emergence of capitalism as an economic system that dissolves personal bonds through arms-length contractual transactions.[[346]](#endnote-347) The more market relationships became disengaged from social relationships, a double movement was implemented — a term that Polanyi coined — to repair the harm caused. This term describes the project of first dis-embedding the economy from society so as to give market pricing priority, only to have to remedy the damage post hoc by re-embedding the economy into society through social interventions, for example, labour laws.[[347]](#endnote-348)

My global observations dovetail with Polanyi’s critical view on market pricing and the problems that occur when a society gives it priority over everything else. I resonate with Polanyi verdict that land, labour, and money are ‘false commodities’.[[348]](#endnote-349) Consequently, I do not share Conwell’s faith in money. On my global path, I have come across innumerable illustrations of how vain it is to hope that dis-embedding the individual from her relational context into money-based contracts may be ‘healed’ through bureaucratic regulations or through blaming the victims and holding them responsible for their misery.

A brief look at statistics suffices as proof. Eighty-five per cent of people worldwide today ‘hate their jobs’ in the sense of ‘I hate that which I can’t live without’.[[349]](#endnote-350) Twenty-two per cent of American men without college degree follow their hikikomori brothers in Japan in spending their days playing video games, while disease and death claim many of them.[[350]](#endnote-351) An epidemic of suicide unfolds, either directly in response to the economic system’s pressures[[351]](#endnote-352) or indirectly due to the social disconnection that this system creates, which in turn leads to loneliness that motivates suicide.[[352]](#endnote-353) Both Britain and Japan had to appoint special ministers recently to address their loneliness epidemic — ‘most doctors in Britain see between one and five patients a day who have come mainly because they are lonely’, according to the Campaign to End Loneliness.[[353]](#endnote-354)

The political consequences of loneliness and alienation are grave, not just for the affected individuals but also for society at large. As ‘isolated young people are vulnerable to extremism of every sort’, incels — men who claim to be ‘involuntarily celibate’ — inflict online hatred and real-life violence on society.[[354]](#endnote-355) In the United States, social atomisation affects entire families when the ‘neo-liberal family’ is expected to bear primary responsibility for the welfare of its members: through privatised risk and deficit spending, familial loyalty is used to guarantee loans, traditional family values burdened by shared debt bondage.[[355]](#endnote-356)

At the end of this section, allow me to offer a small personal experience. I am usually in New York in November and December each year (at least prior to the coronavirus pandemic), and I have often enjoyed the affordable seats under the roof of the Metropolitan Opera. Incidentally, the opera performances I saw in 2015 spoke directly to the themes of this book. On 31st October 2015, for instance, I saw the opera Tannhäuser by Richard Wagner, and it brought a very personal incident of humiliation to me from two fellow viewers who were ardent missionaries of Conwell’s gospel of economism (you can read more about this experience in my essay on Tannhäuser[[356]](#endnote-357)). Throughout the first break, I overheard how they busied themselves explaining to each other how they would have been able to afford the more expensive seats further down in the opera hall and that today’s choice of cheap seats was a rare exception. Then came the second break, and I dared to confess to them that I loved those ‘cheap seats’. They looked at me in utter disbelief when I explained my personal mission, namely, to reinvigorate direct solidarity between people — between all people and not just one’s immediate family — instead of the arm-length distance that arises when money mediates relationships. I explained that I had intentionally separated my personal sense of worth from money. They became very heated and accused me of wanting to re-introduce either the feudal Gemeinschaft or Soviet style communism. It was obvious that they had passionately fused personal worth with money, that they could not fathom my concept of interconnected individuality that takes the best from collectivism and individualism.[[357]](#endnote-358) They felt humiliated by me failing to admire what they were intensely proud of, namely, their ability to ‘make money’. In vain, I tried to make them understand that my mission is to work for a world where personal pride does not have to depend on a system that ultimately harms people and planet, a world where personal pride may flow from protecting people and planet.

On 7th November 2015, I saw another opera, Turandot by Giacomo Puccini, based on an earlier text by Carlo Gozzi. This opera also speaks to the themes of the year 1757 and sheds light on the transition from mask-like honour to less mask-like dignity.

The Venetian playwright Count Carlo Gozzi (1720–1806) was dedicated to preserving Tuscan literature from foreign (particularly French) influence. His ‘enemy’ was Carlo Osvaldo Goldoni (1707–1793), who admired French playwright Molière. In 1757, their dispute became very bitter and Goldoni left Venice subsequently and moved to Paris.

Carlo Gozzi stood for the tradition of the sixteenth-century Italian dramatic form of commedia dell’arte all’improvviso, or ‘comedy of the craft of improvisation’, which was vernacular and brought theatrical performances closer to the people than the traditional commedia erudita, which means ‘learned comedy’. The latter used scripts written in Latin or Italian that were based on the scholarly works of earlier Italian and ancient Roman authors, and as this was not easily comprehensible for the general public, it was reserved for the nobility. Commedia dell’arte, in contrast, was performed by professional actors (comici), who perfected a specific role or mask that represented fixed social types or stock characters, such as foolish old men, devious servants, or military officers full of false bravado.

If we define culture as art and manners of a particular social group, then we see here a transition from culture as a reserve for elites to culture being democratised, bringing notions such as dignity and humiliation ‘to the people’ so to speak. In a first step — and this was Gozzi’s mission — this was done by offering ‘bread and circus’ attractions, including fairy dramas (Turandot was one of them). Carlo Goldoni, on his part, was more radical and went one step further. He was inspired by the humanist movement and the study of philosophy, therefore his plays promoted rationality, civility, and humanism, they criticised arrogance, intolerance, and the abuse of power. To Goldoni, commedia dell’arte was ‘somewhat stale, too often dominated by crude humour and vulgarity ... too limited a means to give theatrical consideration to the world in which he and his audience lived’.[[358]](#endnote-359) He was disgusted by superficiality and therefore democratised elite culture in a more radical way by offering deep insights into the human psyche to a wider audience — sometimes he even turned these insights against elite arrogance itself. By fusing their missions, Goldoni went further than either form — Commedia erudita or Commedia dell’arte.

When we think back to our earlier discussion of Calvinism and Lutheranism, perhaps we see a similar split here. Bread and circuses builds on a superficial view on humanity by defining humans primarily as uncaring self-interested money-making creatures — similar to Calvinism’s scepticism of deep compassion — in contrast to views that see dignity as something that entails care in connectedness and compassion.[[359]](#endnote-360)

In 1765, Goldoni became a tutor at the court of Versailles and the Royal Civil List paid him a small state pension. By 1792, as the French revolution had broken out, this payment ended. Interestingly, the National Convention, the assembly that governed France during the most critical period of the French Revolution, voted to restore his pension. Even though this happened only the day after his death, this decision highlights Goldoni’s great achievement: He truly democratised elite culture — he was first recognised and remunerated by the royal court and then by the people.

Goldoni’s work is a worthy conclusion of this section as it illustrates the historical journey of the notion of human worthiness. This journey started from mask-like collectivistic ranked honour as part of the dominator context of the past millennia, and then it proceeded towards the ranked decorum of an individual ‘dignitary’. In a next step, it led to the undoing of the practice of ranking human worthiness altogether, thus liberating the individual from behind her mask and awarding equal dignity to all, as individuals. Even though honour and dignity are both about worthiness,[[360]](#endnote-361) the difference becomes clear: honour systems rank lineages hierarchically — some people are born higher than others — while human rights ideals bestow the same inherent dignity on everyone, just for belonging to the core lineage of Homo sapiens.

Nowadays, increasingly, human rights ideals also include the rest of the living beings that walk planet Earth, together with all of our ecological foundations. Our present challenge is to manifest universal solidarity with all sentient beings.

### The historical backdrop — The security dilemma

In the twenty-first century, we live in a world that is more interconnected than ever before. Until very recently, however, the situation was radically different, the world was compartmentalised and divided. As I see it, one of the most significant problems of our time is that we, as humankind, do not understand the novelty of our current situation and how different it is compared to just a few decades ago.

Several problems are connected with this oversight. First, we overlook that some of humanity’s past strategies of survival are now strategies of self-destruction. It is difficult for us to put ourselves into the position of our forebears and empathise with how it felt to live in a divided world, and therefore we fail to see why many of their solutions were adaptive for their situation while they are mis-adaptive or even dangerous today. Second, because it is new, we are mesmerised by the risks that global interconnectedness entails — rightly so — yet, we lack the courage to see the enormous opportunities that it also provides. Finally, we lack the vision to use these opportunities intentionally and purposefully. Instead we fall back on infeasible solutions of the past, we risk that the world re-divides exactly when it could and should unite. We overlook that the best local initiative has no chance to change a toxic global context as long as that context crushes it as soon as such an initiative has real impact.

The most important future-oriented solution in this situation, in my view, is for every single citizen to grasp that a world citizens movement is needed that uses the opportunities offered by global interconnectedness to build the global trust that is required for new global institutional systems to emerge. This is why I choose to work globally — Part III of this book focusses on this task.

How did people feel in a compartmentalised world? Which of their solutions are still feasible today and which are not?

Political scientists who study international relations theory speak of the security dilemma. Simplified, it means, ‘We have to amass weapons, because we are scared. When we amass weapons, you get scared. You amass weapons, we get more scared’.[[361]](#endnote-362) Hall Gardner, scholar of international politics, has a complex view of the security dilemma, he speaks of an insecurity-security dialectic:

The ‘insecurity-security dialectic’ is an inter-active process by which rival state leaderships act upon actual and potential domestic and international ‘threats’ and respond in ways that they believe, rightfully or wrongfully, best protect and sustain ‘national security’. Yet in the steps that are taken to protect ‘national security’ as defined by elites in power, the nature of the actions threatened, taken, or even not taken, may actually generate greater ‘insecurity’ for third parties, as well as for differing actors within states — thus widening the conflict and making the overall situation even more ‘insecure’.[[362]](#endnote-363)

Every historical period has its own ‘structure of feeling’.[[363]](#endnote-364) How did people feel in a context that is defined by an insecurity-security dialectic? Since the security dilemma represented a ‘temporarily stable context’ throughout the past millennia in many parts of the world, fear was all-definitorial, a sense of threat permeated all aspects of life in every community that was caught in this dilemma.

This sense of threat is expressed in stone all around the world — the world is dotted with human-made trenches, fences, walls, and fortresses. One of the most bizarre manifestations may be visited in the small country of Albania with its average of 5.7 bunkers for every square kilometre.[[364]](#endnote-365)

Where does the security dilemma come from? I have thought about this for many decades. Allow me to take you with me on a personal journey. From 1984 to 1991, I was embedded in Egyptian society at the edge between the Nile valley farmland and the desert. With great astonishment I observed how even highly educated friends of mine had their knees visibly shaking when I invited them to the edge of the desert — they had learned to see it filled with fear-inducing genie ghosts and threatening nomads. Arab means ‘nomad’ in Arabic, and, clearly, my sedentary farmer friends lived in fear of the very desert I loved. While in Egypt, I worked on a book on French structuralism, applying it to the Egyptian situation, and it seemed plausible to me what philosophers Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari concluded from anthropological, archaeological, and philosophical evidence, namely, that warfare was originally developed by nomadic anti-state forces and only later appropriated by states that turned it against its inventors.[[365]](#endnote-366) In 1998, when I conducted my doctoral research in Somalia, I was again struck by the stark structural antagonism between mobile and sedentary ways of living. I saw the deep wounds that sedentary people inflict with their enclosures on pastoralists who have a much more fluid relationship with nature, and how the mobility of these pastoralists in turn can facilitate vengeful raiding campaigns. Later, in 2009, I began my regular annual meetings in New York City with anthropologist Robert Carneiro, known as the father of circumscription theory, and he taught me even more about the significant role of enclosure and how it can lead to war (see more in chapter 9).

When we look at international relations theory, names such as Niccolò Machiavelli or Thomas Hobbes stand for classical realism and its tenet that states want to ensure their physical security and territorial integrity, and that uncertainty hinders them to escape from the security dilemma.[[366]](#endnote-367) The concept of ontological security in international relations adds the thought that a polity might seek not just physical but also ontological security. Ontological security relates to foundational questions of existence and finitude with regard to national self-conception, to the autobiography of a polity and its relations with others, with the result that seemingly irrational conflicts can occur when dangerous routines have become part of a self-concept.[[367]](#endnote-368)

As long as the world was not yet as interconnected as it is now, ideas of global peace were regarded as naïve idealism, if not as pure defeatism. Rational security-seekers could not escape the grip of the security dilemma. Liberalism was unthinkable, the school of thought in international relations theory that says that inter-state war may be avoidable through international trade, or through the spread of democracy, or through the ability of international institutions such as the United Nations to resolve disputes peacefully.[[368]](#endnote-369)

Relations with out-groups were defined by the motto of Roman thinker Vegetius that says, if you want peace, prepare for war,[[369]](#endnote-370) and by the advice from Prussian general Carl von Clausewitz that the best defence is a good offence. Still in the First World War of 1914–1918, the war to end all wars was a catchphrase that mobilised widespread war enthusiasm.[[370]](#endnote-371) The slogan war for peace was employed in 1991 by a political leader in Montenegro, Svetozar Marović, to justify the Montenegrin assault on Dubrovnik.[[371]](#endnote-372) Altogether, enormous resources have been invested into arms races throughout history, and this even though such races lead to war and not to peace — this is precisely why the security dilemma is called a dilemma.[[372]](#endnote-373)

In Part III of this book, I will shed light on why it is feasible in the twenty-first century, for the first time in human history, to transcend the security dilemma. This is possible through using the space that opens for the ‘diplomacy’ of citizen-to-citizen global trust building far beyond the dealings of states and their diplomats. Leaving this opportunity unused means needlessly stoking a dilemma that can be overcome. Discrediting this opportunity represents cogitocide — the killing of sound thinking (see more in chapter 7) — because in the interconnected world of today, seeking peace through armament amounts to sociocide at a global scale, the killing of the cohesion of the global community, and this, in turn, hastens global ecocide, the killing of our ecological habitat.

If we want to understand our forebears and discern which of the lessons they passed on to us are useful in our new situation, and which are not, we have to put ourselves into their shoes. How did it feel to live in the grip of the security dilemma? How did it feel to be a ruler in a situation where the security dilemma got stronger, how did it feel to be a subordinate?

The security dilemma enforces non-cooperation between hostile out-groups, while it imposes cooperation within in-groups. This means that a ruler had to aim at creating a tightly knit populace that could support a disciplined military that was better prepared to withstand ‘the enemy’ than an undisciplined military. Subordinates were required to trust their superiors and hate whomever superiors designated as enemy. The scope of justice ended where ‘we’ ended,[[373]](#endnote-374) justice was for ‘us’ within our in-group, demarcated by boundaries against the ‘non-we’ of the out-group. It was ‘the right within versus the wrong without’.[[374]](#endnote-375) Would-be peacemakers who wished to bridge the we-against-them cleavage were accused of being traitors and ‘in-group haters’.[[375]](#endnote-376) Christian teachings of ‘love your enemy’ were irrelevant in this situation.[[376]](#endnote-377) Up to the seventeenth century, Catholicism considered tolerance a moral vice because tolerance would ‘open the door for enemy forces’. In some world regions, this mindset is on the rise again today,[[377]](#endnote-378) and people with authoritarian leanings tend to blame victims rather than aid them.[[378]](#endnote-379)

In my 2017 book on terror, I explored how it feels to be in the grip of a strong security dilemma and found that ‘violence, hatred, and terror are deeply intertwined with honour, heroism, glory, and love’.[[379]](#endnote-380) Historian Claudia Koonz found related words, ‘Evil presents itself as unalloyed ethnic good ... ethnic fundamentalism merges politics and religion within a crusade to defend values and authentic traditions that appear to be endangered’.[[380]](#endnote-381) Psychologist Kenneth Gergen touches upon this predicament when he writes about ‘struggles of conscience’ and that they usually are not struggles between good and evil but between competing goods, ‘By far the most obvious and most deadly outcome of the urge to eliminate evil is the hardened shell separating relational clusters — families, communities, religions, nations, ethnic traditions, and so on’.[[381]](#endnote-382)

Whenever and wherever the security dilemma is strong, even the most peace-loving ruler is unable to escape it. The only way for a ruler to deal with it is to mitigate its outfalls through astute manoeuvring — deterring attacks through building alliances, for instance, while at the same time showing off weaponry. Ruler and ruled, all are caught inside the ‘shell’ of mistrust towards outsiders that is forced upon everyone by the security dilemma. Whenever dynamics of mutual radicalisation kick in, the shell becomes thicker, the security dilemma stronger, ‘we’ become the only ‘worthy humans’ while ‘they are horrible animals’.[[382]](#endnote-383) All involved are bound by the ethics and morals that are customary within this shell, all have to join preparations for hostilities and war, nobody can refuse to support enforcements of rigid military-style hierarchies within their in-group. Since these efforts are undertaken in the hope to create peace through war, pacifism is treason.

The term ethics comes from the Greek word ethos, or ‘customs of the people’, similar to the term morality that has its root in the Latin mos, or mores. In both cases, accepted conventions are taken as the basis for ‘the good’. The term religion stems from the Latin re-ligare, meaning to re-ligate, re-tie, or re-connect.[[383]](#endnote-384) A strong security dilemma creates a hard shell within which religion binds everyone with ties that present themselves as absolute truths so that in-group members are tightly kept within the ethos and mores of their shell, while people outside of the shell are turned into faceless and irrelevant beings or dangerous barbaric ‘infidels’. Hard shell thinking feeds the very ‘interpretive frames’ that are part of every discourse, that represent the ‘conceptual scaffoldings’ that everyone relies on to construct their understanding of the world.[[384]](#endnote-385) Within each shell, communities share the same discourse and have their own systems of categorisation, metaphors, narratives, frames, and other interpretive devices that influence cognition, perception, and action.[[385]](#endnote-386)

The attacks on the Twin Towers in New York in 2001 may serve as a contemporary illustration of how shells can harden. These attacks brought back a strong security dilemma mindset to many American politicians, a trend that was amplified during the administration of Donald Trump. As diplomacy is something that per definition produces solutions that are short of perfect, hard shell thinking became apparent when ‘Americans rarely appreciate imperfect solutions, at least until they’re gone’.[[386]](#endnote-387)

Just as I highlighted in my book on terror, also evolutionary biologist David Sloan Wilson and his colleagues point out that in a hard shell context calls for more altruism and empathy will not lead to world peace, on the contrary, they may lead to ‘humanity’s most troubled features’, ‘including genocide, suicide bombing, self-righteous political partisanship’.[[387]](#endnote-388) Wilson reminds us how hard shell systems once were regarded as ‘natural’ or ‘God-given’, how everyone accepted the models of social behaviour that these systems commanded, that no one contested them.[[388]](#endnote-389) Wherever domination and submission are core templates for social behaviour in a divided world, altruism and empathy will tend to harden the shell rather than soften it. Later in this book, I will introduce the Palestinian clients I had when I worked as a psychologist in Egypt. They felt empathy with the suffering of their families back home to the point of depression, so much so that they were willing to give their lives, altruistically, to protect their loved ones.

Literature often undergirds and fires up under hard shell dynamics. One example is British ‘invasion literature’ that fed fear of invasions of the British Isles from outside — The Battle of Dorking (1871), The seizure of the channel tunnel (1882), The capture of London (1887), or The invasion of 1910 (1906). The Brexit — the exit of Great Britain from the European Union that was voted for in 2016 — might not have happened in the absence of such literature, in the absence of the sense of threat that these books had cultivated for centuries, and the wish to seek protection in isolation.

Another illustration of literature’s influence is Adolf Hitler and his reverence for author Karl May, known for the characters of Winnetou and Old Shatterhand. Hitler wanted to stop the westward emigration of Europeans to America, instead, he looked eastwards to conquer Lebensraum there. He said about the Ukrainians, ‘There’s only one duty: to Germanise this country by the immigration of Germans, and to look upon the natives as Redskins’.[[389]](#endnote-390) Already as a child, I learned to understand from conversations with family and neighbours how this narrative caused some Germans to make the fatal mistake and think that Hitler cared about them, that Hitler had empathy with their struggles and yearnings, that Hitler wanted to altruistically dedicate his life to helping them.

The opera Turandot discussed earlier illustrates how limited the options were that people had if they wanted to resist the rules of the shell. This was particularly salient for gender relations, as in the context of a strong security dilemma, strongman political systems defined peace in terms of control, control over enemies and control over subordinates, including women. In 2010, I wrote a book on the link between gender, humiliation, and global security, where I focussed on the security dilemma’s relevance for gender.[[390]](#endnote-391) There was little room for women to resist their subordination wherever on the globe the security dilemma was strong throughout the past millennia. One way to defy those rules was through ‘crazy’ behaviour, and this was precisely what Turandot did. In the opera, she is a princess in China in some bygone century and she uses the few tools available in her time to deny her participation — first, she places the hurdles for suitors so high that no mortal can possibly gain her hand, and even when the last suitor finally does succeed, she implores her father to refrain from giving her away like chattel.

This situation has changed since the times of Turandot, at least in some segments of world society. Not only is it seen as obsolete to treat women like chattel, women and men are no longer deemed ‘crazy’ when they resist hard shell thinking. Already during the Napoleonic Wars, peace education driven by progressive intellectuals emerged in Europe.[[391]](#endnote-392) The Nobel Peace Prize is intended for people who work for ending war through global disarmament, rather than through local arms races in the futile hope of reaching a lasting balance of power.

Bertha von Suttner, the woman who inspired Alfred Nobel to establish the Nobel Peace Prize, was initially considered just as ‘crazy’ as Turandot. Finally, however, in 1905, she was honoured with the Nobel Peace Prize for her book Die Waffen nieder, or Lay down your arms! Bertha von Suttner spoke up for what I call big peace — long-term global human security through dissolving all shells — rather than small peace — short-term local military security between hard shells.[[392]](#endnote-393)

#### Important lessons for the future

The Oxford English dictionary entry on humiliation in 1757 is an instructive marker of a large-scale shift that affected many aspects of people’s lives. This shift signalled a profound change in how humiliation was perceived and used, and how related feelings were felt. Clearly, the year 1757 itself is of less importance, as Howard Richards, philosopher of social science and a scholar of peace and global studies, points out:

The year itself is not significant. The shift was in all likelihood no stronger than in 1756 or 1758. The OED entry does mark a significant shift, but the sudden appearance of a new meaning in the OED is not itself the shift, but only evidence of the shift. The significance of 1757 is that it was the year when a text was written that found its way in the OED that signifies a broad historical shift. The broad historical shift did not happen in 1757, and it did not happen only in England — but something signifying it did.[[393]](#endnote-394)

To repeat my warning from the beginning of this section, it is important to look back in history with great sincerity rather than treating this as a negligible hobby for historians, particularly for ‘progressives’, those who welcome the historic paradigm shift from local military to global human security — and I count myself in.[[394]](#endnote-395) It is paramount to understand the finer details of this shift because we are still in the middle of it and it will be disastrous if it goes wrong.

It can go wrong in many ways and the notion of dignity is at the core of this predicament. One way it can go wrong, as I see it, is by seeking the dignity of the individual in ruthless individualism. Psychologist Kenneth Gergen illustrates my point when he enumerates the enormous cost to be paid when the concept of the individual self is seen as a bounded unit, because this ‘invites a sense of fundamental separation and loneliness’, it ‘encourages narcissism at the expense of relationships’, it ‘generates unending threats to one’s person’, it ‘transforms the self into a marketable commodity’,[[395]](#endnote-396) and it makes relationships artificial and threatening.[[396]](#endnote-397)

I would add that it also invites ideologies that pretend to protect individual autonomy by discrediting demands for solidarity by declaring them to be infringements on individual autonomy — for instance, demands for solidarity to avert global pandemics or global ecocide. Lonely minds fall for totalitarian ideology, for its promise of ‘all-embracing omnipotence’, political theorist Hannah Arendt observed this already in 1951.[[397]](#endnote-398) When the discrediting of solidarity is adopted by entire nations, the result is alienation and distrust at the national level, and the endgame is global ecocide and global sociocide exacerbating each other (see more in chapter 7).

As I see it, progressives can only help fulfil the promise that the paradigm shift entails when they understand what psychologist Kenneth Gergen means when he says that ‘there are no acts of evil in themselves, for the meaning of all action is derived from relationship’ and therefore ‘holding single individuals responsible for untoward actions not only represents a failure to confront the relational conditions from which the act has emerged, but results in alienation and retaliation’.[[398]](#endnote-399)

Howard Richards adds that problems which may appear as pathologies of individuals ‘usually have roots in cultural rules that constitute social positions that establish material relationships’, as there are, for example, the social positions of an ‘owner’ or an ‘employee’ or an ‘unemployed’.[[399]](#endnote-400)

Sara Evans from the Dignity Rights Project at Delaware Law School chimes in by describing the limits imposed on the notion of dignity in the United States, where dignity is couched in terms of self-sufficiency. The backdrop, she explains, is ‘the romanticised version of the history of the United States’ with John Wayne as the quintessential swaggering American-no-nonsense-tough-guy-cowboy who ‘pulls himself up by the bootstraps’.[[400]](#endnote-401) There is a foundational sense that America was built through revolution, struggle, and hard work, and that everyone — not just royalty — could own land or property and could (and should) rise by virtue of one’s own efforts above a low status. In Evans’ words:

These attitudes still persist today — you can achieve the American Dream if you only work hard enough — even though nothing could be farther from reality. Unfortunately, because we view dignity through this limited lens of self-respect we place all of the responsibility for maintaining dignity on the individual. So that although someone may be born into and trapped in poverty for all of his life through no fault of his own, we treat that person as both the source of, and the cure for, his own condition. Because we don’t recognise dignity as representing the intrinsic and equal worth of every human being, we fail to recognise that no one deserves to be homeless, or to be hungry, or to be sick and not get the care she needs because she can’t afford it. Furthermore, we seem to accept these problems as just a part of life — things that happen to some unworthy or unsuccessful people in a large society, it is inevitable, but not unpalatable.[[401]](#endnote-402)

Sara Evans reports that ‘in American law, human dignity is generally not a factor unless an individual is part of a class of people which has been deemed to have an acceptable reason for finding their dignity at risk’.[[402]](#endnote-403) She adds that ‘dignity in the United States seems to be directly related to self-respect and self-sufficiency and tied into the notion that your dignity is at risk if you are unable to provide for yourself’, and it is here, where humiliation comes in — ‘dependency in the United States is considered a shameful and humiliating situation to be in and so when dignity is recognised under the law, it manifests as an attempt to restore lost or diminished autonomy; to enable living without humiliation’.[[403]](#endnote-404) Evans continues, ‘We separate people into those whose dignity/self-respect is harmed through no fault of their own and who are deserving of help (children, the disabled, the elderly), and those who have lost dignity due to their bad choices or laziness and are not deserving of help (the poor)’.[[404]](#endnote-405)

Political scientist Yascha Mounk is another voice who describes how the ‘duty to care’ in the United States of America became the ‘duty to care for oneself’.[[405]](#endnote-406) In the earlier part of the twentieth century in the U.S.A., ‘responsibility was more about responsibility for the community and care for the larger community, and it became individual responsibility and individual accountability later’, explains also relational psychologist Linda Hartling.[[406]](#endnote-407) In other words, Conwell’s gospel of economism that was referred to earlier in this chapter seems to have attracted ever more ardent followers over time.

Sara Evans is critical of the trend in the Western world to reduce moral demands to infringements on individual autonomy, feeding the preference for negative rights, negative rights understood as freedom from undue interference and repression by political authority. In other parts of the world, more comprehensive conceptions of rights have traditionally been prevalent, as we learn from Joseph Camilleri, expert on global governance, for instance, there are notions of ‘social and economic justice (hence the dual emphasis on rights and responsibilities), or collective entitlements (hence the emphasis on the rights of peoples, ethnic, religious and Indigenous communities, and other minorities)’.[[407]](#endnote-408)

Like Gergen, also I call on us, humankind, to co-create new levels of higher order morality. A unique historical window of opportunity is standing open — perhaps not for long — that invites us to ground a higher order morality in new meaning. This new meaning can only flow from relational responsibility shouldered by a united global human family, ‘a collective responsibility for sustaining the potentials of coordinated action’.[[408]](#endnote-409) I applaud Gergen when he says that care for relationships needs to become primary, that we need to step outside the individualistic view of the self/other split that the Western predilection for individual agency and entitlements has brought us. I concur that we need to step outside the ‘narcissism’ of ‘care of the self’ versus ‘care of the other’. This predilection ultimately facilitates domination/submission, as already philosopher Michel Foucault has warned, and as Gergen acknowledges.[[409]](#endnote-410)

Long before Gergen, already visionary thinker Jean Baker Miller emphasised the centrality of relationships throughout people’s lives. Earlier than others, she stood up against Western psychology’s focus on the development of an overly individualistic sense of a separate self. In the 1980s and 1990s, Miller and her colleagues transcended their time’s emphasis on the self by documenting the qualities of healthy relational development. Grounded in a deeper, more accurate understanding of women’s psychological development, they came to realise that participating in healthy relationships is necessary for all humans, men and women. Miller and her colleagues found that all people grow in and through relationships, and this throughout their entire lives and not just during childhood, and that these relationships are highly influenced by the cultural context in which they exist.[[410]](#endnote-411) Along the lines of Lev Vygotsky and cultural-historical activity theory,[[411]](#endnote-412) Miller examined the impact of power dynamics and dominant/subordinate relationships throughout history, showing how they obstruct the full participation and healthy development of all human beings.

Linda Hartling, before becoming the director of our Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies network, was the associate director of the Jean Baker Miller Trainings Institute, and I am very thankful to her for introducing me to Miller’s work on relational psychological development, known as relational-cultural theory. Please read more about Miller’s work at the end of this chapter.

In resonance with Miller and Gergen, Linda Hartling and I speak up for ‘strong relationality’ rather than the ‘weak relationality’ that sees a group as constituted simply of single individuals. Strong relationality means that there is no condition of independence anymore, it means moving from individual being to what Jean Baker Miller calls relational being.[[412]](#endnote-413) Relational being transcends the binary break between the person and the object (mind and world), and in this spirit, Linda Hartling and I regard ‘the relation’ itself as having causal effects.[[413]](#endnote-414) All-encompassing compassion presents itself as the only dignifying and dignified way forward in a world that faces multiple crises — ‘If I am in you, and you within me, then mutual caring should replace antagonism’.[[414]](#endnote-415)

Like Gergen, already as a young university student, I learned from philosophers such as Martin Heidegger, John Dewey, and Arthur Bentley, who all argued for replacing the traditional view of inter-action (independent objects in causal relationship with experience), with the concept of transaction. Later I learned from physicist Niels Bohr to go even further and speak of intra-actions, of the onto-epistem-ology of knowing-in-being.[[415]](#endnote-416)

When I was an adolescent and still went to school, I devoured the philosophical literature available in the small library of the city in Germany where my school was located, and this library carried books by Wilhelm Dilthey (1833–1911). Dilthey was a historian, psychologist, sociologist, and hermeneutic philosopher interested in scientific methodology, historical evidence, and history’s status as a science. Initially, he intrigued me because he had been a professor in Breslau, the town where my mother was born and from where she was displaced after WWII when Silesia became part of Poland. As soon as I began reading Dilthey, I became fascinated with his work. In 1911, Dilthey developed a typology of three basic [*Weltanschauungen*](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Weltanschauung), or worldviews, which he considered ‘typical’ (comparable to Max Weber’s notion of ideal types that I use in my work).[[416]](#endnote-417) First, Dilthey described the worldview of [*naturalism*](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Naturalism_(philosophy)), the view that holds that humans are determined by nature — he saw the [Epicureans](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Epicurean) of all times and places representing this view. Then he saw a counter-movement against this kind of deterministic materialism and its denial of the freedom of the mind or spirit, namely, the idealism of freedom that holds that the spirit of the free-acting person is independent of the mechanical laws of nature. Here, he counted [Friedrich Schiller](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Friedrich_Schiller) and [Immanuel Kant](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Immanuel_Kant) as representatives. The third worldview he conceptualised differed from the first two insofar as it emphasises the universal harmony of the world, the Zusammenschau of the whole — Zusammen + Schau means ‘viewing together’, as in Welt + Anschauung, meaning ‘viewing the world’. This ‘viewing together’ reveals how the whole lends space and meaning to the individual parts, aligning with the worldview of [*objective idealism*](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Objective_Idealism) held by those who are conscious of their harmony with nature — as represented, for instance, by [Hegel](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/G._W._F._Hegel), [Spinoza](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Baruch_Spinoza), or [Giordano Bruno](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Giordano_Bruno).

My intuition strongly resonated with Dilthey’s third type, that of ‘viewing everything together’. Soon after I left school, I began to learn Chinese, and I felt greatly inspired when I found the Chinese concept of harmony described as retaining ‘the integrity of the relationship unit without eliminating any of its constituents’.[[417]](#endnote-418) By now, I look back on soon five decades of global experience and wherever I found similar mindsets of ‘viewing everything together’, I was delighted.

Ending this section, allow me to revisit the reasons for why I think it is so important to understand the historical details of the paradigm shift that was marked linguistically in the year 1757. The act of understanding creates an inner distance, the very inner distance required to be able to separate understanding from condoning and to withstand the temptation to make judgments as long as one has not yet done the work of understanding.[[418]](#endnote-419)

This inner distance is necessary to muster the patience required to nurture the historical paradigm shift facing humanity with love rather than with hostility. This shift has split the world community into two by now — those who go with it and want to continue with it, and those who do not. Those who go with it — progressives, liberals, cultural creatives, all those who believe that the security dilemma can be overcome through global trust building and who trust that all humans can become the one family they are — are often appalled when they meet those who hold the mindset of a strong security dilemma. And vice versa. If both sides slide into too stark an opposition, the paradigm shift, as great as its potential may be to lead to world peace, risks fuelling lethal conflict instead.[[419]](#endnote-420)

Those who trust that human nature holds the potential to create a future of solidarity, receive support from latest developments in scientific evolutionary thought, as research highlights to what extent human nature is cooperative, altruist, and freedom seeking.[[420]](#endnote-421) It points at the considerable human capacity for love, friendship, cooperation, and learning.[[421]](#endnote-422)

I would like to conclude this section by sharing some of the ways in which I try to bring ‘everything together into harmony’ in my work. This section will be continued in Part III of this book, titled ‘Where do we go from here? A future of solidarity!’

I begin by calling on the field of inter-cultural communication to expand towards global inter-human communication.[[422]](#endnote-423) I was intrigued when I heard psychologist Fathali Moghaddam advocate omniculture in place of ‘assimilation’ or ‘multiculturalism’.[[423]](#endnote-424) Seeing how contemporary democratic institutions suffer from a kind of ‘myopic political presentism’[[424]](#endnote-425) that incentivises short-termism to the point of undermining long-term sustainable solutions and consensus building,[[425]](#endnote-426) I call on all of us to ‘harvest’ from all cultural realms those elements that foster long-term relationships of loving mutuality in respect for equality in dignity.[[426]](#endnote-427) On my global path, I came across astounding treasure troves of dignifying customs and traditions ‘out there’ in the world, all of which wait to be appreciated and nourished.[[427]](#endnote-428) In Africa, for instance, we find the philosophy of ubuntu,[[428]](#endnote-429) the concept of ‘good living’ has evolved in various cultural realms,[[429]](#endnote-430) and many Indigenous peoples hold immense knowledge about consensus building. Altogether, there are innumerable cultural practices and concepts on our globe that merit further exploration — from ho’oponopono, to musyawarah, silahturahmi, asal ngumpul, palaver, shir, jirga, minga, dugnad, to mini-publics,[[430]](#endnote-431) deliberative democracy,[[431]](#endnote-432) or sociocracy.[[432]](#endnote-433)

In 2019, we had our annual Dignity Conference in the Amazon of Brazil, where we were greeted with the Indigenous concept of bem viver — ‘good living’.[[433]](#endnote-434) I consider this knowledge to represent the true wealth of the Amazonian Rainforest, which is turned into ‘true poverty’ wherever the forest is destroyed. We were horrified when we saw with our own eyes how the forest was being removed for the sake of the production of soyabeans and meat for the barbecues of people in the Global North, or destroyed for the extraction of minerals for the Global North’s electronic devices.

In 2019, Brazilian liberation theologist Leonardo Boff deplored ‘the destruction of the Indians’ in Brazil as follows:

Still, the form of the Brazilian State, especially under the Bolsonaro government, is extremely offensive to their dignity. It threatens and mistreats them through its Indigenous policies, as if they were primitive and puerile. In fact, the Native people have an integrity that we Westerners, who are hostages to a paradigm of civilisation that divides, atomises and sets one against the other to totally dominate, have lost. The Indigenous people are the guardians of the sacred and complex unity of the human being with others, immersed in nature, of which we all are part and parcel. They preserve the happy consciousness of our belonging to the Whole and the eternal alliance between heaven and Earth, the origin of all things.[[434]](#endnote-435)

What I call big love in my book on gender and humiliation is meant to be more than just a personal experience, more than what love is for Turandot when she finally falls in love at the end of the opera.[[435]](#endnote-436) Big love is the manifestation of Homo amans, of the ‘loving being’ — amans is the present participle of Latin amare ‘to love’.[[436]](#endnote-437) Even more, big love manifests what we might call Homo amans relationalis, or the ‘loving relational being’,[[437]](#endnote-438) or Homo solidaricus.[[438]](#endnote-439) This is the only model of human nature that I see fit to become a global culture if we, as humankind, want to transcend the security dilemma with its endless deadly arms races, if we want to aim for big peace.

The Homo solidaricus model, if realised, can manifest the knowledge, values, attitudes, and behaviours, which, if shared by the entire global community — by Homo solidaricus globalis — can create a world worth living in, for all of us now and in the future.[[439]](#endnote-440)

### 1776 — Bankruptcy is a humiliating calamity

Moral philosopher and pioneer of political economy Adam Smith (1723–1790) uses the notion of humiliation in his 1776 classic Inquiry into the nature and causes of the wealth of nations. Smith describes bankruptcy as ‘perhaps the greatest and most humiliating calamity which can befal an innocent man’.[[440]](#endnote-441) Legal scholar William Ian Miller reflects on the context of Smith’s use of words:

Smith takes us into the world of finances and hence to the intimate association of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century embarrassment with money matters, either too much or (usually) too little. What linked an embarrassment of riches to being pecuniarily embarrassed was a shared notion that embarrassment’s root sense meant something encumbered or impeded. Unlike humiliation, which was floating around in English in devotional sense from the fourteenth century on, embarrass in its various forms in any sense made its presence felt only in the seventeenth century.[[441]](#endnote-442)

When we look at the larger historical context of this ‘most humiliating calamity’, then we see that the enclosure of the commons in England that had started during the sixteenth century meant that those who succeeded in getting common land under their control could intensify production, while those driven off their land had nowhere to go.[[442]](#endnote-443) Those put off their land first faced idleness, and then the outlawing of idleness, which pushed them into early capitalist manufacturing — what was called ‘bloody legislation’ forced people from serfdom into wage-labour.[[443]](#endnote-444) Sociologist Eric Mielants even speaks of ‘terroristic’ laws.[[444]](#endnote-445) It is argued that it was rather this ‘bloody legislation’ against those who had been put off their land that gave legitimacy to Protestant work ethics and not Protestantism itself.[[445]](#endnote-446)

In this dire situation, many families were ‘pecuniarily embarrassed’, and this manifested, not least, in stunted body size. Economist Richard Steckel has studied average heights and their fluctuations during the last millennium as an indicator of overall health and economic well-being. His research indicates that during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, people were worse off compared to their predecessors. Average height went down from 68.27 inches (173.4 centimetres) in the early Middle Ages to an average low of roughly 65.75 inches (167 cm) during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and Steckel hypothesises that it had to do with the increased stress from growing inequality.[[446]](#endnote-447)

The period following the Middle Ages in Europe has attracted attention from scholars in several academic fields, among them historical sociologist Karl Polanyi, who describes how state intervention made markets ‘internal’ to society, including its Homo oeconomicus way of feeling and acting.[[447]](#endnote-448) Anthropologist David Graeber reports how the criminalisation of debt, together with the enclosure movements, contributed to the destruction of English communities:

The criminalisation of debt, then, was the criminalisation of the very basis of human society. It cannot be overemphasised that in a small community, everyone normally was both lender and borrower. One can only imagine the tensions and temptations that must have existed in a community — and communities, much though they are based on love, in fact, because they are based on love, will always also be full of hatred, rivalry and passion — when it became clear that with sufficiently clever scheming, manipulation, and perhaps a bit of strategic bribery, they could arrange to have almost anyone they hated imprisoned or even hanged.[[448]](#endnote-449)

It would be interesting to hear what Adam Smith and Karl Polanyi would have to say if they heard that in the England of 2019 some women are so squeezed by the system that they have to turn to what is called survival sex — sex for money or shelter.[[449]](#endnote-450) Moreover, what would they say if they knew that in the Anglo-Saxon world of 2020, the coronavirus pandemic met a healthcare system that is crippled by the profit-motive — ‘this is not a healthcare system — it is atomised chaos’ is a contemporary verdict.[[450]](#endnote-451) What would they say if they learned that the whole world is affected and that the pandemic highlights how ‘the current world economic system has failed. It has revealed its great instability. It has shown its inadequacy. It has underlined its injustice. And its predatory attitude seems to be the main suspect in the pandemic’.[[451]](#endnote-452)

### 1782 — Being humiliatingly treated and in a humiliated state of mind

As the Oxford English dictionary reports, the expression ‘humiliated state of mind’ appeared for the first time in the English language in the writing of Elizabeth Blower (circa 1757/63–post-1816), an English poet, novelist, and actor, who initially commented on political and electoral matters. In her later novels focussed on sentiment, and in 1782, she used the adjective humiliated in one of her novels titled George Bateman that includes a dialogue in vernacular dialect giving a colourful description of electioneering. There she reports on a person who ‘was at that period in a humiliated state of mind’.[[452]](#endnote-453)

Then there is the usage of the adverb humiliatingly. It appears in A memoir of the right honourable Hugh Elliot that was compiled by his granddaughter Countess Emma Eleanor Elizabeth Elliot-Murray-Kynynmound Minto. ‘I was very humiliatingly treated’, is what Hugh Elliott laments in one of his letters to his sister in 1782.[[453]](#endnote-454)

Allow me to dwell on the story of this letter in more detail, as it illuminates several aspects of dignity and humiliation. Hugh Elliot was born in 1752, as the younger brother of Gilbert Elliot-Murray-Kynynmound, 1st Earl of Minto. The two brothers were educated together, first by a private tutor, and later, between 1764 and 1766, in Paris by Scottish philosopher and historian David Hume.

I must admit that I envied the brothers when I read that they had Hume as their mentor. Hume, while famous in his own time, was also ahead of his time, and I admire him also for that. In 1741, Hume applied for a chair at the University of Edinburgh, yet, he was rejected after Edinburgh ministers petitioned the town council to refrain from appointing him because he was regarded as an ‘atheist’. Today, his Treatise of human nature and Dialogues concerning natural religion are most known, while it was his History of England that was read ‘avidly by his contemporaries’ during his lifetime.[[454]](#endnote-455)

Hugh Elliott, in contrast to his brother Gilbert, was somewhat of a ‘tough guy’. At the age of eighteen, as an officer in the Russian army, Hugh fought against the Turks in the Balkans, and the tale is told that he was forced to swim in the Danube holding on to the tail of a horse ridden by a Cossack. Though they had the same teachers, the two brothers’ political stances could not have been more different. Hugh was much more conservative than his brother Gilbert, for instance, unlike his brother, Hugh was staunchly invested in keeping the British Empire mighty.

I must say that I was unconvinced of Hugh’s victimhood when I read his self-description as a victim of humiliation in his letters. While reading, I asked myself whether or not he indulges in some kind of addiction to humiliation as I would call it.[[455]](#endnote-456) I was also thinking of philosopher Avishai Margalit, who describes in his work how a victim may hold on to memories of humiliation to be able to maintain anger,[[456]](#endnote-457) and of James Jones, scholar of world religions, who has coined the phrase post-victim ethical exemption syndrome.[[457]](#endnote-458)

The expression ‘addiction to humiliation’ came to me during my time as a clinical psychologist when I saw how would-be victims could invent stories of humiliation to manoeuvre others into the role of loathsome perpetrators, be it out of unprocessed pain or as deliberate Machiavellian strategy. I saw that not all who regard themselves as victims of humiliation meet sympathy for their claims or even merit it. Those they accuse to be perpetrators are unconvinced, and even third observing parties like me may deem their alleged sense of humiliation to be unwarranted, to be unduly exaggerated.[[458]](#endnote-459)

I wonder what social psychologist Jonathan Haidt would have said if he had met Hugh Elliott. It is possible that Haidt would have diagnosed Hugh’s sense of victimhood as a sign of ‘skin being too thin’. Haidt accuses contemporary cultural trends in America of systematically creating young people whose ‘skin is too thin’ and who therefore cannot stand tall in the face of adversity and cannot process pain. In 2014, Haidt had an experience that alerted him to this problem — a gay student rebuffed Haidt for showing a video that the student found offensive.[[459]](#endnote-460) In 2018, Haidt co-authored a book titled The coddling of the American mind,[[460]](#endnote-461) and in this book, he argues that ‘the generation now coming of age has been taught three ‘great untruths’: their feelings are always right; they should avoid pain and discomfort; and they should look for faults in others and not themselves’.[[461]](#endnote-462) Unsurprisingly, Haidt’s allegations elicited hot controversies, they were both enthusiastically acclaimed and angrily rejected, basically triggering cycles of humiliation at meta levels — after all, who is to decide which sense of victimhood is warranted and which is not?[[462]](#endnote-463) ‘Generation snowflake: How we train our kids to be censorious cry-babies’, was the title of a 2016 article.[[463]](#endnote-464) Was Hugh a snowflake crybaby?

Perhaps Hugh suffered from a predicament that is even more complex. There is also the paradox situation that skin may be too thin due to being too thick. Psychologist Roy Baumeister found that contrary to the popular assumption that low self-esteem is a major source of criminality, perpetrators of violent crime often combine a high but brittle self-esteem with poor self-regulation, particularly when challenged.[[464]](#endnote-465)

Did Hugh suffer from skin being too thick and too thin at the same time? We know that he went to duel when his wife had a lover, even though duelling was no longer comme-il-faut and his action severely damaged his career prospects. To say it differently, while his skin was thin with respect to his own honour, his skin was thick with respect to the degree of violence he was willing to dispense to uphold it.

If we look closer, we see that this is precisely the mindset that arises within a context that is shaped by a strong security dilemma. As reported in the previous section of this chapter, in such a context, cruelty is regarded as a legitimate tool. Condoning cruelty requires thick skin from those in power — be it cruelty in form of duels or duel-like wars, or the violent oppression of underlings — while they need thin skin to guard their own honour. Hugh, as he was in a privileged social position, could indeed afford the thin skin of honour and to mete out thick-skinned cruelty in response.

The situation would have been different, obviously, had Hugh inhabited a less privileged rank, as those who are subordinate in a ranked system of honour depend on submissive humbleness to survive, they cannot afford the thin skin of honour and rather have to thicken their skin in the face of cruel superiors. Subordinates learn the Radfahrerprinzip as it is called in German, ‘the principle of bicycling’, meaning ‘nach oben buckeln, nach unten treten’, or ‘kiss-up-kick-down’. This principle requires thick skin to kick down without scruples, while subserviently enduring being kicked by superiors. At the same time it requires thin skin to read any warning signs from superiors who might kick down, so as to be able to decide when to remain meekly obedient and when to kick back to maintain one’s rank in a pecking order. Hugh kicked down a lot, as it seems from his letters, he appears to have been a rather arrogant nobleman.

Not just traditional systems of honour produce arrogance, also cultural mindsets of hyper-individualism do so. Psychologist Jean Twenge’s research partially aligns with Jonathan Haidt’s work. She has written about what she calls the ‘generation me’ and asks why ‘today’s young Americans are more confident, assertive, entitled — and more miserable than ever before’?[[465]](#endnote-466) What we understand is that hyper-individualism seems to fill the world with many arrogant Hughs so to speak, where there were only few before. Hyper-individualism ‘democratises’ the mindset of honourable aristocrats insofar as it ‘empowers’ people to believe that rising up from inferiority entitles everyone to behave in ways that formerly was accessible only to aristocrats. In that way, even the case of the ‘snowflake’ may be one of too thin and too thick skin.

Hugh’s brother Gilbert was much more future-oriented than his brother was. If I could talk to Gilbert, he might understand my call for a third way — no longer superiors presiding over underlings, neither all trying to become superiors — he would understand my call for superiors and inferiors to meet in the middle between top and bottom ranks, at a place where all are equal in dignity. Gilbert might resonate with the view that the self-esteem movement in the United States — laudable as it was in its aim to deliver people from too much self-shaming and self-criticism — failed due to an overshoot of arrogance and a lack of solidarity and relational humility.[[466]](#endnote-467) Gilbert would understand the spirit of human rights ideals and that they can only be realised when enough people develop the intrinsic motivation to embrace dignified humility, when enough people abandon kiss-up-kick-down mindsets as much as extrinsic stick and carrot tactics. Gilbert would join me in asking superiors to step down from haughty arrogance, he would help me encourage inferiors to stop accepting oppression in meek subservience and at the same time avoid embracing arrogance.[[467]](#endnote-468) He would understand that all involved will benefit from wise humility, and that self-compassion is what is needed as an antidote to both overblown self-esteem and out-of-range self-criticism.[[468]](#endnote-469)

It is interesting to note how times have changed when we consider that none of the contemporary scholars alluded to here — Jonathan Haidt as much as his critics — would agree with Hugh today. Haidt and his critics are united in rejecting the thin skin of honourable narcissist ‘snowflake’ reactions, and none would endorse the ‘resilience’ of thick-skinned violence. All wish to nurture the kind of dignified resilience that is not too sensitive while at the same time sensitive enough in the face of humiliation that calls for resistance and systemic transformation. To use a contemporary example, all will agree that a Nelson Mandela, who undoubtedly acted out of a deep sense of humiliation, was not a whining snowflake narcissist, on the contrary, it would have been a great loss for humanity if Mandela had been ‘resilient’ in the sense of meekly resigning himself to apartheid.

Let me share a bit more about the most colourful lives of Hugh and his brother Gilbert. When Hugh was the British ambassador to the Prussian King Frederick the Great in Berlin, Hugh married a young girl, Charlotte von Kraut, whom he tried to form and educate. Unfortunately, disaster was the result — she fell in love with another man, in other words, she committed adultery. Even though the Prussian court attempted to prevent him, Hugh challenged her lover to a duel. To his chagrin, probably due to this scandal, he never received the customary knighthood.

The Prussian king never liked Hugh. Therefore, Hugh expected that his superiors in London would give him a new post outside of Prussia. It was precisely in this period of need and transition, that Hugh felt that his superiors in London treated him humiliatingly. Ultimately, he was sent to Copenhagen, where he served from 1782 to 1791. In Copenhagen, he became known for helping Gustav III reintroduce absolutism in Sweden and stopping war between Sweden and Denmark.

Throughout all this time, Hugh’s brother Gilbert was in London. In 1776, Gilbert had entered parliament as an independent Whig Member of Parliament, contesting the Tories. Gilbert was close to Hugh’s superior, Charles James Fox, a famous champion of liberty who supported the French Revolution, the abolition of slavery, the American Patriots, and who saw King George III as an aspiring tyrant. Fox stood in opposition to people like statesman and philosopher Edmund Burke who thought that French revolutionaries went too far in their zeal for equality.[[469]](#endnote-470) We can assume that Hugh stood on Burke’s side and thus in opposition to his brother’s political camp. While Fox served as Britain’s first Foreign Secretary (1782, 1783, 1806), his career was ‘one of almost unrelieved failure’ — ‘he conducted against King George III a long and brilliant vendetta; for this reason he was almost always in political opposition and, in fact, held high office for less than a year altogether’.[[470]](#endnote-471)

Times were turbulent and the ultimate result was the end of the First British Empire, as marked by the Peace of Paris in 1783. It was the time when Britain’s military became increasingly overstretched and two more of the West Indian islands were lost. In January 1782, the Parliament began with its warnings that Great Britain had no more confidence in its government. In that situation, the King wanted to instate Lord Shelburne as Prime Minister, whose initial position was that an independent America should never be accepted. But Shelburne refused that post, and a new government constellation was nominally led by Lord Rockingham, who was hated by the King, with Shelburne and Charles James Fox as Secretaries of State, who, in turn, hated each other.

In other words, highly troubled times formed the backdrop for diplomat Hugh Elliott’s humiliation. In the astounding cabals of his time, whoever was Foreign Secretary was the person in charge of deciding the fate of Hugh. Since the political scene was in such continuous shift and turmoil, and, on top of this, Hugh and his brother Gilbert were affiliated with opposing political camps, it is perhaps not surprising that Hugh felt humiliated whenever he sensed that his career was not promoted as he thought he was entitled to. The situation was aggravated by the fact that Hugh held on to old-school values of honour more than his peers did, that he was always ready for a fight, as shown by his duelling and his sympathy for preserving national grandeur.

Interestingly, however, even though the brothers diverged in their political preferences so starkly, Gilbert’s letters attest that he always did his best to support Hugh and calm his brother’s fears. This was the exact formulation from Hugh, ‘I was very humiliatingly treated by the demigod of the blackguards’. Blackguard (pronounced blaggard) was a term of the time for a scoundrel. The full quote by Countess Minto goes as follows, ‘Early in September Lord Grantham notified to Mr. Elliot his appointment to the Mission at Copenhagen, and on the 29th Hugh wrote to his sister Isabella that he had accepted “an offer which, considering the circumstances of the times and my brother’s political line, I think exceedingly handsome on the part of those who made it. I was very humiliatingly treated by the demigod of the blackguards”.’[[471]](#endnote-472)

When I read these sentences, I was eager to find out who this ‘topmost scoundrel’ might have been by whom Hugh felt so humiliated. Thomas Robinson, 2nd Baron Grantham PC, was the Foreign Secretary between 1782 and 1783 under the Earl of Shelburne, and he was preceded and succeeded by Charles James Fox. In other words, we can conclude that in Hugh’s eyes, his brother’s close friend Fox most likely was this ‘demigod of the blackguards’, the very scoundrel that treated Hugh so humiliatingly.

In conclusion, we might be correct in interpreting Hugh’s concept of humiliation as linked to his honourable decorum. Even though he holds an individualistic mindset more than a collectivistic one, his sense of decorum is in resonance with ranked honour more than it is with ideals of equal dignity. His individualism is the individualism of the aristocrat who stands above the masses.

To conclude this section, if we imagine Hugh alive today, he would perhaps vote for a right wing party. He might give us a resounding ‘yes’ to arguments such as ‘war is useful because it makes you hard’. He might endorse black pedagogy,[[472]](#endnote-473) or the strict father model of parenting that cognitive linguists Lakoff and Johnson describe. After all, this was what he applied to his young bride — and what failed so miserably. It is a pedagogical framework that produces obedient inferiors at best, in contrast to the nurturant parent model that fosters responsible and aware citizens.[[473]](#endnote-474) Hugh would presumably laugh about psychologist Anthony Marsella’s claim that ‘all psychologies are indigenous psychologies’.[[474]](#endnote-475) We can assume that in Hugh’s eyes ‘native peoples’ were lacking in civil propriety, needing ‘to be corrected through the forceful and hostile application of British decency’.[[475]](#endnote-476)

Gilbert, in contrast, together with his mentor David Hume, would perhaps applaud Marsella’s suggestion that we have to move beyond our focus on ourselves, ‘even beyond our identification and pre-occupation with humanity altogether (such as humanism, humanitarian, or humanistic)’, that we need to move to an identity with life in general, that all living beings deserve to have their dignity respected.[[476]](#endnote-477)

Both Hugh and Gilbert could most probably not have imagined the ideas that I put forward in this book. What would they say to my message that all of world society, the entire global village, must shoulder the responsibility expressed in the adage that ‘it takes a village to raise a child’? What would they say to my call that the global community needs to think about ways of living together that offer dignifying opportunities to present and future generations of all living beings? What would they say to my call to abandon local competition for domination and instead engage in global healing-centred care,[[477]](#endnote-478) in global connectedness and compassion?[[478]](#endnote-479)

### 1865 — Humiliation and humility separate into opposite directions

In 1865, for the first time, we find a clear differentiation between humiliation and humility, namely, under the entry humiliate in the Oxford English dictionary. We also learn from William Ian Miller that under the entry humiliating, the earliest recorded instances appear of usages that strongly imply an emotion. In other words, we witness a gradual drift of the notion of humiliation over time, a movement both towards emotion and towards a greater differentiation. Later in the book, we will see that humiliation will move out of the shame continuum entirely at some point.

This is what the Scottish author George MacDonald (1824–1905) wrote in his novel Annals of a quiet neighbourhood, first published in 1865 as a serial in the Sunday Magazine in England:

Now I think humiliation is a very different condition of mind from humility. Humiliation no man can desire: it is shame and torture. Humility is the true, right condition of humanity — peaceful, divine. And yet a man may gladly welcome humiliation when it comes, if he finds that with fierce shock and rude revulsion it has turned him right round, with his face away from pride, whither he was travelling, and towards humility, however far away upon the horizon’s verge she may sit waiting for him. To me, however, there came a gentle and not therefore less effective dissolution of the bonds both of pride and humiliation; and before Weir and I met, I was nearly as anxious to heal his wounded spirit, as I was to work justice for his son.[[479]](#endnote-480)

Annals of a quiet neighbourhood is a novel ‘of faith and hope, repentance and redemption’ set in a rural location in Victorian England. The author was a Christian minister and poet who pioneered fantasy literature and influenced fellow writer Lewis Carroll. The story of his novel revolves around a young vicar, Harry Walton, who begins work in his first parish alongside a young woman in stately Oldcastle Hall, a place of hidden secrets.

George MacDonald had interesting contemporaries, also outside of Britain, who dealt with related themes. I wonder whether they were aware of each other. There was, for instance, Sigmund Freud (1856–1939), the founder of psychoanalysis, philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche (1844–1900), who introduced the term ressentiment into the German-speaking philosophical debate, and philosopher Max Scheler (1874–1928), who felt provoked by Nietzsche’s interpretation of ressentiment.

Friedrich Nietzsche hailed the noble, affirmative morality of the Romans, he despised what in his eyes was Jewish and Christian reactive, negating, resentful ‘slave morality’. In Nietzsche’s classic study of resentment of 1887, he lamented that sufferers tend to seek a ‘guilty’ agent on whom they can vent their feelings directly or in effigy.[[480]](#endnote-481) As remedy for this calamity, Nietzsche proposed the final triumph of the Übermensch dominator. Anyone who knows history is aware that Adolf Hitler’s Nazi regime used the trope of the Herrenmensch half a century later to commit unspeakable atrocities.[[481]](#endnote-482)

Max Scheler attempted to rescue Christian ethics from Nietzsche’s critique.[[482]](#endnote-483) As for Nietzsche, also for Scheler ressentiment was deplorable, a kind of self-poisoning.[[483]](#endnote-484) For Scheler, however, the culprit were not Christian values, even though he admitted that they could be perverted into ressentiment easily. For Scheler, bourgeois morality was the offender, having grown out of ressentiment since the thirteenth century, it pushed aside Christian morality and finally culminated in the French Revolution. Scheler dismissed the French Revolution as having engineered ressentiment at a grand scale.

As it seems, a whole cluster of notions surrounding humiliation was ‘in the air’ in Europe at the time. I wonder what George MacDonald would have said to Nietzsche and Scheler had they met. Did MacDonald have a chance to read his contemporaries in translation, and vice versa? I wonder. I was born 130 years after George MacDonald in Germany and even I had limited access to non-German literature, and MacDonald’s work was completely unknown to me until now. I learned very little about English literature at school, it was only much later that I read authors such as, for instance, Jane Austen or Elizabeth Gaskell. At school, I was mainly introduced to the German heritage — everything from Schiller to Goethe — in French class we read Balzac and Flaubert, and in Russian class it was Dostoevsky, Tolstoy, and Pushkin. Each afternoon after school I went to the local city library, starting from the age of twelve, and even though at the age of eighteen I had read most of the books they had, it was all in German. The internet age was still far away.

If I could, I would ask MacDonald whether he, like me, resonates with some of the first parts of Nietzsche and Scheler’s arguments — poisoning one’s mind is indeed an unadvisable thing to do. ‘Resentment is like drinking poison and then hoping it will kill your enemies’, is Nelson Mandela’s frequently cited insight. If we assume that resentment resembles the feeling of humiliation, then Nietzsche’s and Scheler’s resentment links to humiliation as an emotion, an emotion of suffering, as MacDonald so succinctly describes when he writes that ‘humiliation no man can desire: it is shame and torture’. What Nietzsche and Scheler lament, and I think rightly so, is what I call addiction to humiliation, namely, that ‘some men do desire humiliation’, because suffering can also be gratifying.[[484]](#endnote-485) I resonate with Scheler also insofar as I have witnessed the call for liberté and égalité fire up feelings of humiliation that were not present before, and this to the point of violence and mayhem — this is precisely why I recommend the use of the term entrustment[[485]](#endnote-486) and stewardship[[486]](#endnote-487) in place of ‘empowerment’. Moreover, who would disagree with Scheler that the reign of terror during the French Revolution was deplorable? Terror and violence is the ‘Hitler path’ out of humiliation.

Clearly, however, I do not resonate with Nietzsche and Scheler’s conclusions. They overlook the Mandela path out of resentment. If I could talk to Scheler, I would say that no horror warrants the dismissal and rejection of the paradigm shift that became visible linguistically around 1757, and that led up to the French Revolution and to the human rights ideal of equal dignity. The Mandela path can bring this paradigm shift to its true fruition, because he stepped outside of the master-slave dynamic that Nietzsche so cogently describes in his work, they acted, rather than merely re-acting. By doing so, he acted on precisely the split between humiliation and humility that MacDonald so well formulates: in contrast to humiliation, ‘humility is the true, right condition of humanity — peaceful, divine’.

With humility, people like Gandhi and Mandela attempted to heal the suffering from feelings of humiliation, and I applaud Nelson Mandela for addressing his black sisters and brothers by explaining to them that they were entitled to resent their oppression. Nietzsche and Scheler could perhaps not have imagined the next step that Mandela took. Mandela was wise enough to refrain from asking his black compatriots to take revenge and hack their former masters to death, as happened in Rwanda at the same time. South Africa and the world have ample reason to praise Mandela for this, and Desmond Tutu expresses exactly this point in the Foreword to my 2010 book.[[487]](#endnote-488) In short, relinquishing revenge is not the same as succumbing to cowardly passivity.

The future that I work for is therefore not a world where the Übermensch triumphs. I work for a dignified path, a path where we, the global community, protect our ecological and social commons in a joint effort so that diversity can enrich us all, no longer allowing competition for domination to impoverish us all. What would MacDonald, Nietzsche, and Scheler say to that?

#### The field of psychology

If we consider humiliation to be an emotion, or a set of emotions, and therefore a trope that can be anchored in the field of psychology, it is time to consider how this field evolved. As I studied psychology and medicine, these disciplines affected my life very directly. Furthermore, even though the field of psychology emerged in Europe, I have met academics and therapists in the farthest corner of the planet who accept it as a universal approach more than an approach that is indigenous to Europe and its history. Allow me therefore to dedicate this section to the academic field of psychology.

Psychology was ‘a mistake waiting to happen’, we hear from psychologist Alan Costall, ‘when physical science has promoted its methodology (of atomism, mechanism, and quantification) to an exclusive ontology, psychology (so conceived) was a pretty obvious mistake just waiting to happen — an essentially derivative science modelled on physics, yet having as its subject the very realm that physics rendered utterly obscure’.[[488]](#endnote-489) Philosopher Michel Foucault warned that psychology has inherited from the Enlightenment a misplaced desire to align itself with the natural sciences and to find in human beings the prolongation of the laws that govern natural phenomena.[[489]](#endnote-490) Psychologist Anthony Marsella calls for a new psychology for the future — a global-community psychology, a ‘meta-discipline’, a ‘superordinate discipline’ characterised by ‘a set of premises, methods, and practices for psychology based on multicultural, multidisciplinary, multisectoral, and multinational foundations global in interest, scope, relevance, and applicability’.[[490]](#endnote-491)

Philosopher David Hartley (1705–1757) was the first person known to have used the word psychology in English, it was in a work published in 1748 in which he developed an associationist theory of the mind. Already before him, early empiricists such as John Locke (1632–1704) and David Hume (1711–1776), even though they did not use the term psychology, responded to Isaac Newton’s mechanical physics for the ‘outer’ extended world, with what Hume thought of as a corresponding physics of the ‘inner world’ of the mind. Locke differentiated primary and secondary qualities, whereby primary qualities comprised everything that is independent of the observer, such as extension, number, and solidity, in short, the ‘objective reality’ that natural scientists like Galileo and Newton had demonstrated to be nothing but matter in motion. Locke’s secondary qualities pointed at the subjective mind, the subjective effects in an observer in the form of experienced colours, tastes, and smells.

The clarity of Newton’s mechanical physics inspired great hopes for a better society, and this had a deep influence on the notion of morality. Philosopher Baruch Spinoza (1632–1677), for instance, inspired the materialist ideas of French Enlightenment philosophers to base law on science and reason, to forge an objective foundation for the promotion of a humane and egalitarian society — the hope was that this would eliminate oppressive laws informed by the prejudices of clergy and aristocrats.[[491]](#endnote-492)

Unfortunately, however, the successes of Newton’s physics raised hopes too high, and the detrimental outcomes are felt until the day today. Since its inception, the academic discipline of psychology committed a scientific error, an error of blind ambition one may say, namely, it tried to present itself as if it were as purely quantitative as physics. It fell for the psychological trap also known as ‘physics envy’, and this even though psychology’s very raison-d’être is to study such traps rather than fall for them.

Qualitative psychologists, even though they were around, were marginal, chronicles psychologist Svend Brinkmann, co-director of the Center for Qualitative Studies at Aalborg University in Denmark.[[492]](#endnote-493) This was ironic, because qualitative methods in psychology ‘meet the demands of the methodology of the natural sciences more truly than do the methods of mainstream quantitative methodology’.[[493]](#endnote-494)

Early foundational qualitative studies in psychology were conducted, for instance, by Wilhelm Wundt, who established the first psychological laboratory in Leipzig in 1879, where he studied the mind in its historical and cultural manifestations. Then there was ‘James’s study of religious experience’, Brinkmann reports, there were ‘Freud’s investigations of dreams and his clinical method more broadly’, there was ‘Gestalt psychologists’ research on perception, Piaget’s interviews with children, Bartlett’s studies of remembering, and Merleau-Ponty’s phenomenology of the body’.[[494]](#endnote-495) As time went by, however, qualitative psychologists were increasingly marginalised by quantitative oriented researchers who represented the mainstream positivist view of psychology.

Only in the 1970s was qualitative psychology able to come more to the fore again, be more appreciated, and Brinkmann suspects that this was due to the arrival of ‘liquid modernity’,[[495]](#endnote-496) as this meant the ‘emergence of a new dynamic, multiperspectival, and emergent social complexity that cannot easily be captured with the use of quantitative methods’.[[496]](#endnote-497)

Fast forward to present time, criticism is mounting within the field, and a critical ‘revisionist view’ of psychology opposes the mainstream positivist view of psychology. Psychologists Jeroen Jansz and Peter van Drunen summarise:

The positivist view of psychology was based on three basic assumptions: (a) Practical psychology is believed to rest on scientific knowledge developed within academic psychology, (b) this knowledge is further thought to be progressive and value-free, and (c) the application of this psychological knowledge is generally perceived as being beneficial for society and humankind.[[497]](#endnote-498) The opposite view, ‘the revisionist view’, holds three different basic assumptions: (a) Practical psychology originates from societal forces rather than from academic psychology, (b) psychological knowledge does not necessarily imply progress and is never value-free, and (c) psychology often represses or conceals society’s real conflicts.[[498]](#endnote-499)

If we follow the revisionist view of psychology, the positivist view is an article of faith more than an accurate reflection of the history of psychology, and ‘psychology’s utility and role in society has been oppressive just as often as it has fostered social progress’.[[499]](#endnote-500)

Psychologist Jaan Valsiner has traced how psychology emerged in the post-Napoleonic era in Germany as a discipline tasked to keep order in communities and order in the minds of people, and how the notion of science emerged later.[[500]](#endnote-501) Somewhere on this path, psychology lost its subject, says Valsiner, namely, the person. The person was the core of developmental psychology only from the 1920s to the 1930s, then rats, pigeons, monkeys, and crowds of human beings became substitutes for persons, ‘as if they represent the intricacies of the human psyche’:[[501]](#endnote-502)

The invention of the notion of correlation in the history of statistics by Francis Galton, Charles Spearman, Felix Krueger, and Karl Pearson at the end of the 19th century has done a major disservice for psychology to transpose real relationships into formal ones. Psychological generalisation becomes moot — any discovery of ‘relationships’ between ‘variable X’ and ‘variable Y’ in a correlational analysis reveals little about the actual functioning of the system in which whatever X and Y represent are systemically linked. Correlational data do not explain — they need explanation themselves! This claim has dramatic implications for the standard practices in psychology of our days where correlational evidence — generalised to discourse about ‘signiﬁcant relations’ between ‘variables’ — is usually viewed as the ﬁnal result of investigation.[[502]](#endnote-503)

In the 1970s, the situation began to open up, as manifested, among others, in the establishment of the Journal of Person-Oriented Research, based on the Person-Oriented Approach that ‘breaks out of the confines of the practice of substituting the person by a rat, a pigeon, a well-educated bonobo, a crowd (called “a sample”), or a computer’.[[503]](#endnote-504)

By now, twenty-first century psychology is still in need of opening up, says Valsiner. The self — with innumerable possible personality traits — has taken the place of the soul as scientifically acceptable causal agent, Valsiner explains, and the outcome is that ‘psychology has lost its soul in the fight against the soul — resulting in legitimisation of mechanistic terms as explanatory agents’.[[504]](#endnote-505) All this happened despite the fact that human beings are not marbles one can draw from an urn at one’s will, they are ‘wilful, desirous, reﬂective, and at times resistant individuals who are tied to their peers by kinship, friendship, and proﬁt relationships’.[[505]](#endnote-506)

Recent post-quantitative thinking in psychology goes along three lines, Brinkmann explains. First, matter (or nature) is understood as agentic and always changing, thus deconstructing the constructed opposition between a sphere of passive and inert matter on the one hand and a sphere of meaningful human experiences, discourses, and actions on the other.[[506]](#endnote-507) Second, theorising is seen as generative, with new words and concepts aiming to erode the established binaries that formed the foundation of the distinction between qualitative and quantitative research — why, Brinkmann asks, are empirical data seen as material to be coded, categorised, and analysed, using theoretical concepts supposedly on a higher level? Why should what informants say be coded and not what scholars such as Gilles Deleuze or Jacques Derrida say? Third, the philosophy of representation in general is being critiqued and rejected insofar as recent qualitative inquiry breaks with ‘the humanist, modernist, imperialist, representationalist, objectivist, rationalist, epistemological, ontological, and methodological assumptions of Western Enlightenment thought and practice’.[[507]](#endnote-508)

Jaan Valsiner explains that from the viewpoint of semiotics — the study of signs and symbols as elements of communicative behaviour — there is a controlling meta-sign called scientific that denotes the common sense legitimacy of science, and that this legitimacy is subject to historically changing social constraints, meaning that any search for attributions is a form of sign construction aiming to pass through this gate.[[508]](#endnote-509)

Further down, I will report on my own experiences with my research on humiliation, and how the very phrase humiliation initially failed to pass the ‘controlling meta-sign of science’. Publishers did not want to have the word humiliation in the title of an academic book — it simply seemed too ‘unscientific’. After my first book came out in 2006, titled Making enemies: Humiliation and international conflict, critical voices in the United States of America honoured it as one of the best academic books of the year, thus illustrating how the ‘common sense legitimacy of science’ changes over time.[[509]](#endnote-510) I am gratified when I read that also other academics now stand up for definitions of science that are more relevant to present-day reality in the world.[[510]](#endnote-511)

‘Science starts from intuition’, this is Jaan Valsiner’s message. It starts from the kind of intuition that is ‘educated in the process of initiation into social practices of science’, in other words, it is not some kind of naïve or ‘pure’ intuition — ‘the educated intuition is in the very core of all science’.[[511]](#endnote-512) Frames of reference are meta-cognitive models, they are ‘intellectual telescopes’, or windows of opportunity ‘to see some features of the object more clearly than others’.[[512]](#endnote-513) Valsiner speaks of the individual-socioecological frame as the only frame of reference suitable for psychology.[[513]](#endnote-514) This frame, even though it complicates the elaboration of methodology, ﬁts the human condition best, because it adds the role of ‘external guidance by goals-oriented others’, persons or institutions, to the individual-ecological frame that ﬁts ‘biological phenomena and the study of most nonhuman species’.[[514]](#endnote-515)

Rather than simply accumulating data, Valsiner recommends Albert Einstein’s approach to cultural psychology, namely, the search for the experimentum crucis — for an experiment that, if true, rules out all other hypotheses or theories.[[515]](#endnote-516)

Insights like these have guided my research since its inception, and I have drawn radical consequences even for my personal life. It is clear that the complex of phenomena that surrounds humiliation, honour, and dignity, and how we speak about them, represents a showcase example for the role that societal forces play. This entire complex offers a prime illustration of how these forces are far from value-free, and, furthermore, to what extent society’s conflicts may be exposed by psychology, but also concealed.

As mentioned before, not least the way this book is written is a consequence of the insights shared above. It is written as a painting more than as a scholarly presentation of a theory, as a painting that paints itself with the painter’s humble and loving involvement[[516]](#endnote-517) as a kaleidoscope or panorama painting,[[517]](#endnote-518) as an associative report of my personal life journey from intuition to understanding,[[518]](#endnote-519) in its loving embeddedness in a global network of relationships with all the people and ideas who have impacted my life.[[519]](#endnote-520)

In other words, I enact a relational approach to psychology and method that does not reject quantitative methodologies, yet, it embeds them within qualitative frames. Similarly, I do not reject the mindset of individualism that forms an important backdrop for quantitative approaches, I only embed it in a more relational construction of the self. Sociologist George Herbert Mead (1863–1931) proposed this relational construction already long ago,[[520]](#endnote-521) and I regret that his views have failed to become dominant, particularly in North America, where the stark opposite became prevalent, namely, the ‘lone hero’ version of individualism. This highly individualised mindset has influenced the field of psychology and was influenced by it, and, according to my view, this went too far.

I am glad that pioneers such as Jean Baker Miller began to turn the tide in North America in the 1970s. Miller was an early leader who emphasised the role of relationships and community, and I am grateful to Linda Hartling for introducing me to Miller’s relational-cultural theory.[[521]](#endnote-522) Miller’s insights helped me understand my own practice, they helped me understand what I do since I can remember, namely, enact the person-oriented approach that also Valsiner speaks of, heeding the Gestalt nature of personal encounters with the external world and appreciating the person as a Gestalt-maker. ‘The basic human psychological development is centred in the personal innovation of one’s unique life course. Generalisation becomes re-inserted into the never-ending particularities that are created as the person moves towards his or her future, from birth to death’, formulates Valsiner.[[522]](#endnote-523)

All my life I have felt that the ‘hierarchy of knowing’ with the ‘expert’ as ‘the knower’ and the objects of research being ‘the known’ could also be reversed. Just like Kenneth Gergen, I have always been distrustful of the claim to objectivity in method that ‘permits the researcher to dismiss the knowledge claims of the “objects of research” as biased and ignorant’.

I have therefore taken the standpoint of a relational being — ‘I speak with others, and therefore I can know’.[[523]](#endnote-524)

#### Relational-cultural psychology

Jean Baker Miller’s relational-cultural theory, together with the Gestalt-maker approach, offers a relational definition of dignity as a moral concept that is at the same time ‘radical individualised and radical socialised’ as it is embedded in its social, political, and cultural context. Relational-cultural theory aligns with dignity when we regard dignity as both ‘inherent to every human being’ and requiring ‘affirmative action and therefore recognition from others’.[[524]](#endnote-525) As Linda Hartling formulates it, ‘dignity is both inherent and relationally developed through the recognition and participation of others’, and ‘it is authenticity, not autonomy that we need to strive for, as Jean Baker Miller would say, as we all depend on each other’s care’.[[525]](#endnote-526)

In this book, I attempt to be true to this conceptualisation of dignity by being personal and relational at the same time, by letting the many voices that came to me throughout my lifetime be heard. I would find it humiliating and lacking humility, were I to offer my conclusions without sharing the rich context from where they grew. I regard my global living practice as a methodology where ‘speaking with others’ as a vulnerable fellow human being in authentic humility not only allows me ‘to know’, it also dignifies my research, and gives it validity.[[526]](#endnote-527)

As attentive readers will notice, I speak with everyone, not just with the ‘big names’ of ‘dignitaries’, I avoid identifying scholars by their ‘prestigious’ institutions, be it Harvard, for instance, or other American Ivy League schools, or the United Nations, or any similar ‘dignitary’ institution. I also avoid highlighting the nationality of a person, except when it is relevant for the context, and I do so to avoid giving the impression that certain voices may be worth more than others. ‘Borrowing’ status for my arguments from ‘Harvard’ or ‘the United Nations’ would be humiliating to me. It would violate my personal sense of dignity and would betray poor judgement — also the captain of the Titanic was a highly reputable man, to say it bluntly.

We can look back on too many examples of ‘big names’ failing. For everyone to be seen, the United Nations often act as disunited nations, despite individual representatives — and I know many — who most admirably try to hold up the original ideals.[[527]](#endnote-528) Also the ‘big name’ of science itself has been widely abused. The dogma, for example, that the Soviet Union would dignify the world with its version of communism was presented as the ultimate science. ‘Murderous professors’ was the title of an article that chronicles the influence of academia on the genocide in Rwanda in 1994.[[528]](#endnote-529) Many academic institutions known as elite universities in North America have created enthusiasm for ideologies that betrayed their own ideals, again, notwithstanding admirable individual faculty members trying to sustain those ideals.[[529]](#endnote-530) I am glad to see academics now cautioning against the ‘tyranny of neo-liberalism’ also in academia,[[530]](#endnote-531) — as a Western economy professor warns in 2018, ‘Socialism at its best for the Capitalists and Capitalism at its worst for us, the People’.[[531]](#endnote-532)

I began living globally when I was twenty-one years old and decades of global experience have made me increasingly critical of mainstream Western armchair research. For the past twenty years, I have intentionally refined my global life design so as to walk the talk of validity in dignity both globally and locally. I have designed a form of life that allows me to do even more than speak with others, I strive to live with others and be with others, so as to open space for the emergence of new understandings and for new forms of speaking and action. I have learned that there is no guarantee for ‘truth’,[[532]](#endnote-533) there is only the experience of ‘I understand’.[[533]](#endnote-534) With this caveat in mind, I allow myself to be drawn into ‘truth events’ all around the world, humbly acknowledging that I will always be too late to know what to believe. In this way, I live a life of inter-being.[[534]](#endnote-535) I attempt to search for and nurture what physicists call ‘coherence domains’, meaning that I search for places where hearts and minds align, not just locally, but at a global level.[[535]](#endnote-536) By engaging in ‘living translation’,[[536]](#endnote-537) I follow my teacher philosopher Dagfinn Føllesdal, who advised me already back in 1996 that the phenomenon of humiliation could only be illuminated by rich descriptive studies.[[537]](#endnote-538)

The planet and its living creatures are my university. As its student, I am a voyager who uses the challenges of cultural diversity and intercultural conflicts for forging new relationships and new ideas — I avoid being a vindicator who vindicates pre-existing ethnocentrism and stereotypes.[[538]](#endnote-539) I do not speak of people as ‘samples’, I abstain from research about ‘objects’, I see everyone as co-researcher with whom I co-create conjoint narrations.[[539]](#endnote-540) I find it utterly humiliating when people are turned into objects of ‘scientific’ characterisations of which they are unaware. I prefer participatory action research approaches that aim at including all involved, entrusting them with the shared search for knowledge.

Particularly Indigenous communities have for too long been treated as if they are some exhibit in a living museum, bombarded with scientists seeking to learn how early humans might have lived. I am glad that some of these communities are now pushing back, no longer open to be studied without consultation by scientists, researchers, and corporate interests. In 2017, three groups of San people in South Africa established guidelines for researchers saying that researchers should not ‘sneak through the window!’ ‘They must knock on the front door and wait to be let in!’ ‘That’s what this code is about. It’s for us to decide to open the door. It’s to stop exploitation’.[[540]](#endnote-541) I am glad to see Indigenous peoples in North America and Australia following suite and developing similar codes.[[541]](#endnote-542)

I resonate with all voices who speak up for more transdisciplinary and triangulated approaches and appreciate social anthropologist Thomas Hylland Eriksen calling on ethnographers to recognise that, even though ethnography is ‘enormously deep and broad in its command of human life-worlds’, it lacks ‘historical depth and societal breadth’ and therefore ‘needs help from historians, sociologists and others’.[[542]](#endnote-543) Sociologist Maggie O’Neill bases her work on the theoretical concept of ethno-mimesis, an inter-connection of sensitive ethnographic work and visual re-presentations, a methodological tool and a process for exploring lived experiences, including those of displacement, exile, belonging, and humiliation.[[543]](#endnote-544)

Like Eriksen, I have mixed feelings when I read literature about globalisation where the authors ‘seem to be hovering above the planet in a helicopter with a pair of binoculars’.[[544]](#endnote-545) The resulting picture may be flawless, yet, where are people’s lives? ‘Zooming out’ is important, because the ‘local reality in itself says little about the system of which it is a part’, yet, it must be complemented with ‘zooming in’, ‘since humans always lead local lives, no account of globalisation is complete unless it is anchored in a local life-world’.[[545]](#endnote-546) Eriksen reminds of mathematician Benoît Mandelbrot’s article ‘How long is the coast of Britain?’ where he highlights that the length of the jagged British coast depends on the scale of the map.[[546]](#endnote-547) Eriksen explains:

If you read the general overviews about globalisation and identity with the mindset of an anthropologist, there is a chance that you end up with the somewhat unsatisfactory feeling that you have been offered a three-course dinner, and were duly served a sumptuous starter and delicious dessert, but no main course. With anthropologists, the problem is generally the opposite: They describe local life-worlds in meticulous detail, crawling, as it were, on all fours with a magnifying glass, but rarely attempt the global analysis.[[547]](#endnote-548)

Thomas Hylland Eriksen, in his work, moves up and down the scales, zooming in and out, relating everything to each other. This is precisely what I attempt to do with my global life design. I go from one dignity dialogue home to the next, in all world regions, with the aim to become part of each particular place as if I were born there.[[548]](#endnote-549) In other words, I ‘zoom in’ very deeply, looking at the smallest details, and at the same time, I ‘zoom out’, looking at the largest patterns that often become visible only from afar. ‘For a perspective on the contemporary world to be convincing and comprehensive, it needs the view from the helicopter circling the world just as much as it needs the details that can only be discovered with a magnifying glass’, Eriksen explains, ‘the macro and the micro, the universal and the particular must be seen as two sides of the same coin’.[[549]](#endnote-550)

I have yet to meet another person who has carved out a similar life design or path as I have done, another person who practices global citizenship in daily life, not just as a theoretical concept. I like anthropologist Michel-Rolph Trouillot’s formulation that scholarship is an intimate interrogation informed by personal history and political commitments, ‘where the truly important questions’ are never answered, as they are ‘lifelong pursuits, lifelong passions’.[[550]](#endnote-551) In this spirit, also autoethnography is part of my journey, meaning that I am also my own ‘case study’.[[551]](#endnote-552) Political thinker Hannah Arendt once said in an interview conducted in German, ‘Ich glaube nicht, daß es irgendeinen Denkvorgang gibt, der ohne persönliche Erfahrung möglich ist. Alles Denken ist Nachdenken, der Sache nachdenken’, translated into English, ‘I don’t think there is any thought process that is possible without personal experience. All thought is afterthought, thinking back on things’.[[552]](#endnote-553)

Apart from scientific considerations, this way of life is the only way for me to stay sane and survive the sense of humiliation that haunts me when I see how dignity is being trampled on in today’s dominator world, and the casualness and contempt with which arrogant and self-righteous ‘experts’ walk over life on Earth. Only through offering my lifetime as a gift, with loving humility, can I carry our dignity work forward.

Concluding this section and this chapter, I would like to invite everyone to strive for understanding of the world, and to seek guidance for action, through taking a relational liberation psychology approach.[[553]](#endnote-554) The paths of a Bertha von Suttner, Mohandas K. Gandhi, Dietrich Bonhoeffer,[[554]](#endnote-555) Eleanor Roosevelt, Rachel Carson, Paulo Freire, or Nelson Mandela are examples. I would like to invite everyone to consider this saying, ‘To get something you never had, you have to do something you never did’.[[555]](#endnote-556)

In our times of crisis, I see the need for humankind as a whole to do something that we never did, at least not intentionally and comprehensively enough, namely, engage in a global relational approach. The world is interconnected more than ever before in human history now, and if we succeed in global cooperation, and do so fast, we can achieve long-lasting global peace and global health. There is no need any more to settle for brief absences of war and disease in a few privileged world regions. Together, we can reach long-lasting dignified and dignifying global well-being.[[556]](#endnote-557)

The 8 ‘Rs’ of Replenishing

1. Revising

2. Reimagining

3. Repairing

4. Renewing

5. Refocusing

6. Recycling

7. Recalibrating
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― Linda Hartling, written on 30th September 2014
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Many have read journalist Thomas Friedman’s statement in 2003 in New York Times, ‘If I’ve learned one thing covering world affairs, it’s this: The single most underappreciated force in international relations is humiliation’.[[557]](#endnote-558) In 2020, he added, ‘The poverty of dignity explains so much more behaviour than the poverty of money’.[[558]](#endnote-559) Psychiatrist James Gilligan said this in 1997, ‘I have yet to see a serious act of violence that was not provoked by the experience of feeling shamed and humiliated, disrespected and ridiculed’.[[559]](#endnote-560) In 2020, my assertion that humiliation is like the ‘nuclear bomb of the emotions’ found its way into the Washington Post in the context of the conflict between Iran and the U.S.A.[[560]](#endnote-561)

### What is humiliation?

Scholars have long treated the terms humiliation and shame as interchangeable or as intertwined, as part of the same continuum, with humiliation as a severe form of shame and humility. Psychologist Silvan Solomon Tomkins (1911–1991) was one of these scholars,[[561]](#endnote-562) and Donald Nathanson has carried his work forward.[[562]](#endnote-563) Nathanson describes humiliation as a combination of three innate affects, out of a total of nine: shame, disgust, and dissmell, whereby dis-smell is Tomkins’ coinage.[[563]](#endnote-564) Tomkins argued that, while emotions are complex and muddled, nine affects are discrete and represent a human biological heritage that is shared with emotions in animals. Tomkins described these basic affects in pairs, whereby the first part of each pair reflects its mild manifestation while the second refers to the more intense expression. The two positive affects in his list are interest-excitement and enjoyment-joy, there is a neutral affect, namely, surprise-startle, followed by six negative affects. The first three negative affects are distress-anguish, anger-rage, and fear-terror, with shame-humiliation being added to the list later, and the final two additions being dissmell and disgust.

Psychologists Jon Trygve Monsen and Ole André Solbakken, together with their colleagues at the University of Oslo in Norway, build on Tomkins’s work with their affect awareness theory.[[564]](#endnote-565) Affect awareness theory includes eleven affect categories — interest/excitement, enjoyment/joy, fear/panic, anger/rage, shame/humiliation, contempt/condescension, disgust/revulsion, sadness/despair, envy/jealousy, guilt/remorse, and tenderness/care. Monsen, Solbakken, and their colleagues highlight all those elements that are needed for well-adjusted psychological functioning — as there is awareness of affect, tolerance, emotional (nonverbal) expression, and conceptual (verbal) expression.

In my work, I focus on the influence from historical changes in the Zeitgeist on emotions and meta-emotions — the Zeitgeist affects not just how people manifest feelings and emotions, it also guides how they feel about feelings and emotions.[[565]](#endnote-566) I found that notions such as humility, shame, and humiliation are deeply affected by the advent of the ideal of equality in dignity for all people, this ideal has profoundly altered the relationship that these phenomena have with each other.[[566]](#endnote-567) Whenever and wherever human rights ideals become salient, these three notions seize to be interchangeable, no longer are they always on the same continuum, nor are they automatically intertwined. On top of this, the new normative context infuses humiliation with a degree of intensity and potential explosiveness that it did not have before, and globalisation intensifies this effect. More even, the new meaning of humiliation clashes head-on with its old meaning, which, in turn, sets in motion cycles of humiliation at meta levels. (See more in chapter 5, where I illustrate this clash with the example of femicide, also called honour killing).

As far as I can see, my family’s experience with war and displacement and my subsequent global life have allowed me to be ahead of my time in observing this new constellation.[[567]](#endnote-568) Due to my particular biographical background and the practice of global citizenship that emerged from it, I have stumbled earlier than others over the fact that globalisation and human rights ideals affect the significance of humiliation.

How do I see humiliation? Here is a first a caveat, because this can be easily misunderstood. I do not claim that humiliation always leads to violence, nor do I claim that violence always originates in humiliation.[[568]](#endnote-569) I also acknowledge that the argument that ‘humiliation may lead to atrocities such as genocide and terrorism’ can be used to legitimise or delegitimise, rightly or wrongly, claims that terrorists are in fact heroic freedom fighters, or, on the other hand, that acts of terror represent a declaration of war that requires war-like responses. I explain more in my 2017 book on terror and terrorism.[[569]](#endnote-570)

How do I see humiliation? As this book chronicles, shame, humility, and humiliation are far from a-historic emotional processes that can be defined once and for all. They are historical-cultural-social-emotional constructs that change over time and according to context. As I have explored in the previous chapter, humiliation began to separate out from the humility-shame-humiliation continuum around three hundred years ago, with the year 1757 as a linguistic marker. As a result, two concepts of humiliation are in use in today’s world, two concepts that are mutually exclusive at their core, one that is ‘older’ and one that is ‘newer’. The older one has established itself throughout the past millennia, while the newer one bridges back to an even older one, namely, a Palaeolithic past.

On my global path, I have often observed that people who treat humiliation and shame as part of overlapping innate categories, people who wrap humility, shame, and humiliation into ‘the same package’ so to speak, are unwittingly operating within the ‘old’ mindset, which is still widely held in many cultural realms around the world.[[570]](#endnote-571) Sometimes this takes the form of presenting the humility-shame-humiliation continuum as a universally valid fact, sometimes it appears in the works of scholars or practitioners who suggest that humiliation is useful and pro-social as a tool for social control.[[571]](#endnote-572) I have met these views in all contexts informed by the spirit of competition for domination, be it in its authoritarian or market-driven manifestations.

I myself am anchored in the ‘new’ worldview. I see humiliation unequivocally as an anti-social violation, humiliating people is not ‘useful’ in any situation, for me, only the dignified, loving, and relational kinds of shame and humility are ‘useful’. I do not regard the submissive versions of shame and humility that stems from humiliation as a virtue.

In whatever expression, humiliation is always an interpersonal act, an emotional state, and a social mechanism. I predict that it will become a much more explosive force in the future and that it therefore needs to be explored by a wide range of academic fields, among them history, social philosophy, political science, sociology, global studies, anthropology, neuroscience, and, not least, psychology. Humiliation is relevant for all branches of psychology — clinical, health, developmental, cultural, community, social, and political psychology — altogether for all integral psychological perspectives whose theoretical lenses span all ‘life-centred psychologies’.[[572]](#endnote-573) All perspectives are important that allow ‘for consciousness in all its forms, flavours and shades, for our embodied humanness and unavoidable finiteness, and for our inescapable responsibility to all living beings’.[[573]](#endnote-574)

It may have been precisely this need for trans‑, multi‑, and cross-disciplinary approaches that stood in the way for the notion of humiliation to be studied on its own account before Linda Hartling and I began with our work, despite the fact that the phenomenon of humiliation plays out as hatred, aggression, and violence and needs urgent attention. In my writing, I attempt to bridge separate disciplines and overcome academia’s siloisation by striving to understand the core messages of various fields of academic inquiry, then bring these messages together on different levels of abstraction, using the ideal-type approach of sociologist Max Weber,[[574]](#endnote-575) so as to reconstruct them from the perspective of dignity and humiliation. So far, I have done this with war, genocide, and terrorism (2000, 2017),[[575]](#endnote-576) international conflict (2006 and 2009, translated into Chinese in 2019),[[576]](#endnote-577) gender and security (2010),[[577]](#endnote-578) and economics (2012, translated into Brazilian-Portuguese in 2016).[[578]](#endnote-579)

As reported in the previous chapter, the notion of humiliation has the potential to elicit scepticism in certain segments of academia. In the eyes of some, it appears to be lacking academic neutrality, detachment, and objectivity, humiliation seems to be a notion that is scientifically too ‘soft’ while at the same time politically too ‘hot’. This has at least been my experience since I began with my research on humiliation in 1996 — humiliation appears to be like ‘dirt’ that ‘soils’ those who touch it.[[579]](#endnote-580)

The political significance of the word humiliation becomes palpable when we read the words of Upendra Baxi, eminent legal scholar from India:

The Alpha and the Omega of Dalit humiliation studies consists precisely in the practice of resistance against the ‘castration’ of the very word ‘humiliation’. The word and the idea of humiliation has to serve as the agent of the Great Refusal, the force that symbolises the Dalit right to be, and to remain, human, as historically and for the future defined by them.[[580]](#endnote-581)

Linda Hartling observes that, indeed, ‘it is often felt to be humiliating to talk about humiliation; people do not like to talk about their feelings of humiliation because there is a sense of powerlessness involved with not being able to prevent these types of experiences’.[[581]](#endnote-582) As to the alleged scientific ‘softness’ of the notion of humiliation, Hartling adds that ‘humiliation has always been a relational phenomenon. Academia prefers discreet units of study. Humiliation does not fit’.[[582]](#endnote-583) Indeed, also I observe that despite the rising acceptance of qualitative research approaches in the past years, it still is widely seen as an intellectual virtue to define ‘hard’ categories with a definite technical meaning and psychometric reliability and validity, and then to impose these categories diachronically and synchronically on changing historical realities and on the world’s diverse cultural mindsets.

Time and again, I am astonished how it is possible to regard humiliation as too ‘soft’ a concept and too ‘soft’ a field of study, in the glaring light that humiliation entails the potential to create the ‘hardest’ of facts at all levels, macro, meso, and micro, from war to domestic violence to self-harm. Many scholars in the peace and conflict research field prefer vocabularies such as ‘cultural relative deprivation’, a terminology that overlooks the very the core of the problem, namely, the explosiveness of the emotional reactions to this deprivation and its potentially dire real life consequences. To me, such an approach to ‘neutrality and objectivity’ amounts to sacrificing scientific validity for an illusion of scientific rationality.

The impact of humiliation, unfortunately, does not spare the field of psychology itself. As has been laid out in the previous chapter, its history could be recounted as a story of efforts to avoid humiliation, precisely through appearing just as ‘scientific’ as the natural sciences — a condition also known as ‘physics envy’. In other words, the field of psychology succumbs to the very psychological problems it is meant to elucidate and solve.[[583]](#endnote-584) As a result, the natural sciences’ number-crunching calculus-based style is being imitated in the field of psychology even where it is not necessary or even misleading, and fluid phenomena that would be best described with verbs are being objectified in stilted substantives. Psychology is caught in the contradiction between on one side its own purpose — namely, understanding human beings — and postulates of anti-historical positivism on the other side.[[584]](#endnote-585) In the formal sciences of mathematics, geometry, and logic, certainty and replication may be achievable, while the fallibility inherent in the social sciences renders it fundamentally different.[[585]](#endnote-586) More even, while psychology remains ‘trapped by its adherence to causal attributions’, its neighbouring disciplines of chemistry and biology ‘have already long time moved into noncausal systems of explanation’.[[586]](#endnote-587) It is not surprising, therefore, that research findings in the field of psychology are much ‘weaker’ than claimed — only a third of original studies published in top tier psychology journals can be replicated.[[587]](#endnote-588) Psychologist Jaan Valsiner warns:

Psychology has become an arena for a complex social game of a fashion of appearing ‘scientiﬁc’ at the expense of alienation of the data from the phenomena and the data makers from the theoretical and philosophical issues...[[588]](#endnote-589)

Jan Smedslund is another psychologist who warns social scientists against trying to appear ‘scientific’ by mistaking ‘scientifically looking’ methods for sound science in places where core rules are blatantly apparent and studying ‘infinite objects’ would be silly. Jan Smedslund was the head of my doctoral committee and my gratitude to him and his colleague, my doctoral adviser Reidar Ommundsen, is immense.[[589]](#endnote-590) Smedslund warns that a lot of psychological research is as pointless as trying to conduct surveys with the aim to find out whether bachelors really are unmarried males.[[590]](#endnote-591) He argues that human beings create meta-myths that are explicable in terms of common-sense psychology or psycho-logic.[[591]](#endnote-592) In his work, Smedslund focusses on stable core meanings, rules, and elements that are entailed in ordinary words, and he cautions psychological research against overlooking them.[[592]](#endnote-593) Psychologist Jaan Valsiner comments in 2014, ‘Smedslund has been criticising this aspect of psychology’s methodology — its pseudo-empiricism — systematically over the past 40 years — but to no avail. The factory of “measurement” in psychology guarantees its continued pseudo-empiricism well into the 21st century’.[[593]](#endnote-594)

The field of psychology has difficulty relating to other fields of exploration, and it is possible that psychology’s insistence on respectability through mathematical modelling is part of dynamics of humiliation in its relationship with, for instance, the field of history. Mainstream academic psychology treats history ‘with little more than tolerant civility’, are the words of Michael Billig, and he suggests as reason that history is messy and ‘cannot run experiments to test hypotheses’.[[594]](#endnote-595) I deeply resonate with Billig’s admonishment that psychology ought to take history more seriously, and the field of psychohistory has always been of interest to me. It has not escaped me that this field was exposed to what might be called ‘academic humiliation’.[[595]](#endnote-596)

The field of psychology does not only suffer from physics envy, to my immense astonishment, I have observed renowned psychologists humiliate each other, or at least feel humiliated by each other. For instance, I had the privilege of becoming affiliated with the Maison des Sciences de l’Homme in Paris through Serge Moscovici,[[596]](#endnote-597) the founder of social representations theory.[[597]](#endnote-598) He deplored most bitterly that he was not quoted in the English literature as much as he felt entitled to. In 1997, a student of the field asked why social constructionism and social representations do not get closer to each other, and Moscovici responded, ‘I wonder why Gergen, Ibanez, Potter and others attack us wherever they can...’[[598]](#endnote-599) For years, I tried to understand what might lie behind this case of humiliation in the midst of the field of psychology. I sensed that the wounds of humiliation went deeper than pure academic disagreement. Since I am also a clinical psychologist, I almost felt called to offer psychological counselling.[[599]](#endnote-600) I asked myself whether indeed the conceptual differences between social constructionism and social representations are significant enough to engender such bitter feelings? As a psychotherapist, I know how humiliation dynamics often have deep layers that play out behind the façade of surface disagreements that seem minute or even have nothing to do with the real cause of the distress. Humiliation has enough force to make disagreements unbridgeable that otherwise would be easily bridgeable — humiliation can harden the softest of facts.

The reader may judge this particular case for herself: For Kenneth Gergen, social constructionism is about social relationships. Gergen (as Jaan Valsiner) resonates with Lev Vygotsky, for whom social learning precedes development, in contrast to Jean Piaget’s theory, where development precedes learning.[[600]](#endnote-601) Serge Moscovici was closer to Piaget and doubted Vygotsky’s notion of internalisation. ‘Vygotsky’s formula suggests a direct relationship between social practices and individual functioning. In Vygotsky’s work there is no reference to any structures or processes mediating between the inter-psychological and the intra-psychological, yet, as our research has indicated, something does mediate between these two planes of development’, explains Gerard Duveen, who had Jean Piaget and Serge Moscovici as his intellectual mentors.[[601]](#endnote-602) Jean Baker Miller, the advocate of ‘waging good conflict’, would perhaps have been able to heal this case of humiliation, as she speaks of relational images. ‘A relational approach to psychological development proposes that people create internal relational images built upon their experiences in relationships’.[[602]](#endnote-603)

Humiliation has made itself felt not only within the field of psychology, or in rivalries between academic disciplines. The world of politics is another arena that demonstrates the ‘hardness’ of humiliation. Not least the ‘hard facts’ that American president Donald Trump introduced into the reigning Zeitgeist demonstrated the power of humiliation. His ‘politics of emotions’ — ‘politics of grandiosity, self-interest, shamelessness, humiliation, coercion, manipulation’[[603]](#endnote-604) — challenged the ‘distribution of the sensible’ and moved the boundaries between what is thinkable and unthinkable, between what is accepted as rational or irrational.[[604]](#endnote-605) It is undoubtedly a very hard fact that a master of humiliation entrepreneurship, as Donald Trump may be characterised, had the power to press ‘The button’ and literally ‘blow up’ the world.

While studying humiliation has been criticised for being too ‘soft’ a field of research, at times, it has also been met with direct hostility. Some people get very angry when they hear that violence may be explainable with feelings of humiliation, even if only a little fraction of violence. I have been accused of excusing perpetrators and turning them into victims, of blaming the victims for being the perpetrators through my humiliation argument.[[605]](#endnote-606) When I worked on my book on terror, I was reprimanded that wishing to understand the un-understandable condones evil, that aiming to understand terrorism is to serve terrorists as their lackey and do their bidding.[[606]](#endnote-607) From March to May 2015, when I returned to Rwanda after I had spent time there for my doctoral research in 1999, my doctoral dissertation was gravely misunderstood in the same way, even as a justification of genocide. Luckily, I was able to rectify this dangerous misunderstanding and explain to everyone that my entire life mission embodies the opposite, namely, that I wish to prevent future genocide by understanding past genocide, and that understanding is not the same as condoning, that describing is not the same as prescribing.[[607]](#endnote-608)

The phenomenon of humiliation is very complex indeed. Understanding it requires a great amount of effort. The act of humiliation entails demeaning treatment, the enforced lowering of a person or group, a process of subjugation that damages or strips away their sense of worthiness.[[608]](#endnote-609) To be humiliated is to be placed, usually against one’s will, and often in deeply hurtful ways, in a situation that is inferior to what one feels entitled to. It may involve acts of force, including violence. At the heart of humiliation is the idea of pinning down, putting down, or holding to the ground. One of the most defining characteristics of humiliation as a process is that the victim is forced into passivity, acted upon, made to feel helpless.

Broadly speaking, humiliation can be studied in three parts, as feeling, as act, and as system. First, humiliation can be described as an internal experience, it is something we feel. Second, it is an act coming from outside, may be that one is exposed to degrading interpersonal interactions such as bullying and discrimination, it can also mean being victimised by large-scale onslaughts from terrorism and genocide. Third, it can be a systemic condition of institutionalised inequality or discrimination — South Africa’s apartheid regime can serve as one example,[[609]](#endnote-610) another is the treatment of Indigenous populations around the world.[[610]](#endnote-611)

In other words, the same word, humiliation, is used to describe the act of humiliation perpetrated by a perpetrator as well as the feeling of humiliation felt by the victim. In this situation, the perpetrator may just want to help, yet, the receiver of this help may feel humiliated. Thus, even the best-intended help may humiliate, a case where only the receiver interprets a situation as humiliating and not the giver — ‘gut gemeint ist nicht gut gemacht’ is a saying in German, ‘well meant is not the same as well done’. Alternatively, neither of them, not perpetrator nor victim, may define a situation as humiliating, only a third party. For instance, the social worker may want to rescue a battered wife, yet, she may claim that beating her is her husband’s way of loving her, a situation that evokes the notion of ‘false consciousness’.[[611]](#endnote-612) A further complication is that, even though most people want to avoid humiliation, some people seek it, in some cases in an attempt to heal from having been exposed to acts of humiliation earlier in life — psychotherapists know that practices such as sadomasochism may represent such a survival strategy.[[612]](#endnote-613) Other people may whip and humiliate themselves in religious rites to praise God, as suggested by the ‘old’ notion of humiliation still to be found, for instance, in the homily of Pope Francis that was quoted earlier.[[613]](#endnote-614)

When we look at humiliation and its connection to shame, we can say that humiliation is the lowering of a person beyond justifiable shaming — it entails the transgression of the shaming limit. A person may deserve being shamed, she may have brought it upon herself, she may, for example, have failed to keep promises, whereas a person who is humiliated is demeaned and lowered beyond that point.

Humiliator and humiliatee (the victim, the target, or the recipient of humiliation) have three main options. First, they may agree that the act of lowering, though painful, is necessary and beneficial, like a medicine whose bitter taste is proof of its healing effects — this is the case when followers of religious beliefs engage in humiliating themselves. Second, both sides may concur that this lowering, while legitimate, is cruel and excessive. History offers many examples where a conquering army not only pillaged a defeated city but felt entitled to even raze it to the ground and massacre all citizens. Third, both sides may disagree. The feudal lord, for instance, may believe that the humiliation he inflicts on his underlings is beneficial, while his underlings may bitterly object. Similarly, an employer may happily apply humiliation to increase profit, while the employees may wish to be treated with respect.[[614]](#endnote-615) The Me Too movement that began to unfold in 2017 illustrated the latter case, it exposed to what extent and for how long victims of sexual harassment were expected to interpret such treatment as ‘normal part of the game’ or even as pleasurable experience.[[615]](#endnote-616) In the same spirit, victims of work place bullying, if they complain, risk being accused of being ‘oversensitive’ until a new Zeitgeist encourages them to speak up.[[616]](#endnote-617) The list of more examples is long.

While the role of the perpetrator is complicated, the role of the victim is not unambiguous either. A victim may feel humiliated in the absence of any humiliating act, for example, due to plain misunderstandings, or as the result of personal and cultural differences concerning what respectful treatment ought to entail. As mentioned before, even well-intended help can humiliate. Alternatively, as has been alluded to in the previous chapter in the case of Hugh Elliott, a victim may hold on to memories of humiliation[[617]](#endnote-618) so as to maintain a post-victim ethical exemption syndrome.[[618]](#endnote-619) A would-be victim may even go one step further and invent stories of humiliation to manoeuvre others into the role of loathsome perpetrators — ‘false flag victimhood’ so to speak.[[619]](#endnote-620) The phrase crybully is a blend of crybaby +‎ bully, applied to people who engage in intimidation, harassment, or other abusive behaviour while claiming to be the victims.[[620]](#endnote-621) In my work, I commonly speak of humiliation entrepreneurship and the addiction to humiliation.[[621]](#endnote-622) Linda Hartling uses the term humiliation trap to avoid putting all blame on the addicted person, for instance, for lacking will power, strength, or fortitude.[[622]](#endnote-623)

The arrival of human rights ideals had a profound impact on all conceptualisations and practices of humiliation. These ideals turn humiliation into an unequivocally hurtful and negative practice and experience. In a context that subscribes to human rights ideals of equality in dignity for all, humiliation can no longer be conceptualised as beneficial treatment that needs to be endured in meek obedience. Equality in dignity means that nobody ought to be degraded and this turns humiliation unambiguously into a violation, no longer can it be defended or accepted as well-deserved ‘lesson’. In a human rights context, victims of humiliation cannot ease their pain by saying that humiliation is a medicine that tastes bitter but is necessary, or that it is a justified divine punishment. Even people who engage in consensual sexual practices that entail humiliation usually carefully treat it as ‘as-if’ humiliation by embedding it in frames of dignity.[[623]](#endnote-624)

Research shows that humiliation is the most intense human emotion — it leads to the mobilisation of more processing power and a greater consumption of mental resources than any other emotions. ‘Humiliation is a particularly intense and cognitively demanding negative emotional experience that has far-reaching consequences for individuals and groups alike’.[[624]](#endnote-625) Research also shows that the combination of loss and humiliation is the strongest predictor of major depression.[[625]](#endnote-626) Research on childhood trauma found that ‘recurrent chronic humiliation’ is the most damaging childhood experience.[[626]](#endnote-627) The Suicide Narrative Inventory captures interpersonal risk factors for suicide, whereby humiliation is one of the factors, alongside factors such as ‘thwarted belongingness’, ‘perceived burdensomeness’, and ‘social defeat’.[[627]](#endnote-628) Humiliation-attrition can wear people down to the point of apathy and depression[[628]](#endnote-629) and deep inertia,[[629]](#endnote-630) protracted cycles of humiliation can create the kind of paralysis and apathy also known from learned helplessness.[[630]](#endnote-631) A seemingly ‘peaceful’ society may be the outcome, peaceful through structural violence,[[631]](#endnote-632) since the price for this ‘peace’ is being paid for by the victims’ pain.[[632]](#endnote-633) This is peace paid for with humiliation.

While feelings of humiliation may result in apathy and depression, they may also lead to ‘going black’, or, as psychologist Helen Lewis called it, to humiliated fury.[[633]](#endnote-634) This can be highly dramatic, it can de-subjectivise the body, ‘a body left without a self-conscious agent’.[[634]](#endnote-635) This is also why I speak of humiliation as the nuclear bomb of the emotions.

This fury can express itself in many ways. It may find its way into domestic violence, it can express itself in frenzied fist pumping and calling for violence in mass rallies, regardless of any ideological orientation, or it can find its way into large-scale atrocities, such as terrorism or genocide, in cases where humiliation entrepreneurs succeed in stoking feelings of humiliation in their followers.[[635]](#endnote-636) Entire social movements can be driven by a ‘primal force of exclusion that operates at both the unconscious and conscious realms of experience’[[636]](#endnote-637) through the fluid ‘transpersonal circulation’ of political affect.[[637]](#endnote-638)

Examples abound for how such dynamics can unfold and how they can be instrumentalised. Rape as a weapon is one example. During my fieldwork in Somalia and Rwanda, I learned that rape in front of husband, children, and neighbours during genocidal onslaughts was employed and perceived as the apex of humiliation, as the most ‘efficient weapon’ of retaliation and aggression.[[638]](#endnote-639) In Hargeisa, the capital of Somaliland, I was frequently told that ‘ordinary’ violence could be forgiven, but not this public rape, and that it was therefore that Somalilanders could never reunite with the perpetrators of this abomination in the south of Somalia. The Balkans saw similar atrocities in the 1990s, when wartime rape was used as a systematic weapon to harm the honour and dignity of war adversaries.[[639]](#endnote-640) This is what I call the Hitler path out of humiliation.

Yet, there is also the Mandela path out of humiliation, the Suttner-Gandhi-Bonhoeffer-Roosevelt-Carson-Freire path. Feelings of humiliation can awaken what educator Paulo Freire called conscientisation, meaning that people can motivate themselves to work for constructive social change.[[640]](#endnote-641) This is the path of transforming humiliating systems without using humiliation as a tool. This is the path of dignity, and this is also my path.

Linda Hartling suggests that dignity, or, more specifically, equal dignity, is an inoculation and an antidote to feelings of humiliation, that dignity provides the strength that is needed for choosing the Suttner-Gandhi-Bonhoeffer-Roosevelt-Carson-Freire-Mandela path. ‘When we create relationships characterised by mutual dignity’, she explains, ‘we are simultaneously reducing the risk of humiliation impacting relationships. Parents need to inoculate their children to the risk of humiliation. They need to create mutually empathic “growth-fostering relationships” with their children that will strengthen their resilience in the face of humiliating experiences’.[[641]](#endnote-642)

Philosopher Avishai Margalit defines humiliation as the ‘rejection of persons of the Family of Man’, as injury to self-respect, or more precisely, as the failure of respect, combined with loss of control.[[642]](#endnote-643) For Margalit, humiliation means deliberately overlooking the humanness of people, treating them as if they were non-human, either through dehumanising people, through ignoring them, or through negating their self-control. This humiliation can be perpetrated at all levels, including the level of foreign policy, for instance, when one political entity regards another as nothing more than a source of resources, when involved parties are written off as untrustworthy authors of promises and agreements.[[643]](#endnote-644) As I read Margalit, I thought of Immanuel Kant, Martin Buber, and Emmanuel Lévinas, of the line they draw between a human Thou that has a face and is priceless on one side, and a non-living It on the other side that has no face and can be quantified by a price.

The complexity of the phenomenon of humiliation becomes even more palpable when we read how philosopher Anthony Quinton rejects Margalit’s position. Quinton argues that self-respect ‘has nothing much to do with humiliation’,[[644]](#endnote-645) because victims ‘do not need to take the opinion of them held by their tormentors as their own’.[[645]](#endnote-646)

Since its inception in 2003, our annual Workshop on Transforming Humiliation and Violent Conflict at Columbia University in New York City has been a rich source of reflections on humiliation and its complexity. Let me share one contribution to illustrate the richness of thoughts and questions. Psychologist Clark McCauley, editor of the journal Dynamics of Asymmetric Conflict: Pathways toward Terrorism and Genocide, spoke of humiliation as a toxic mix of anger and shame, which, however, is difficult to acknowledge. In our 2006 workshop, he shared the following thoughts, after having read my 2006 book on humiliation:

When I started thinking about humiliation, it occurred to me to ask: 1) is this an emotion? 2) is it a new emotion, or a blend of emotions that we already know about?

My first thought is that it’s a forced lowering, seen as illegitimate. In Aristotle’s theory on anger, disrespect produces anger and a tendency toward vengeance. But in humiliation, anger has to be suppressed because of imbalance. The victim is not able to respond with anger or vengeance.

Reading Evelin’s book, there’s a heavy burden of shame in these stories. A woman connived her boyfriend’s bad treatment, felt ashamed of the role she played in her own abasement. Maybe humiliation is more than a sub-case of anger, more than suppressed anger: maybe it’s a blend of suppressed anger and shame. The whole focus of anger is to triumph over another. The good thing about anger as an emotion is that it’s a net transfer of power from perpetrator to victim in the long haul. In Evelin’s book, a reference to Aristotle, it is a slavish and ignoble person who doesn’t respond with anger. Yes, humiliation is suppressed anger but there’s shame, too; a ‘real’ man is going to strike back despite the cost. So humiliation might fit into the existing psychology of emotions.

The levels are an empirical issue individual and intergroup levels. This person humiliated me as an individual; this group humiliated my group. It’s not the same thing. We can’t project the individual on the intergroup level.

Then there’s another ugly problem: emotions are transitory; they go by in a hurry. You would never try to measure the eliciting of emotion more than three to four minutes after it’s happened. Humiliation and anger aren’t chronic conditions; we have to worry about the time signature. The psychology of emotions has to work toward longer-term understanding. Or those working on intergroup emotions will have to cut loose of the psychology of emotions.[[646]](#endnote-647)

As far as I am aware, psychologist Linda Hartling, director of our Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies community, was the very first to write a doctoral dissertation on humiliation, on humiliation on its own account and as something that is not part of the shame continuum. She finalised her work in 1995, two years before I began with my doctoral research on humiliation.[[647]](#endnote-648) She developed a Humiliation Inventory, a scale from 1 to 5 that assesses the internal experience of derision and degradation, gauging the extent to which a person feels harmed by humiliating incidents throughout her life, how much she fears ‘being teased, bullied, scorned, excluded, laughed at, or, harassed’.[[648]](#endnote-649) This inventory has so far been translated into Italian, French, Japanese, Portuguese, Russian, Korean, and Norwegian, and it has been an important tool to help extend the research on humiliation globally, and explore the universality and diversity of the concept of humiliation. This inventory has been used in research on the link between humiliation and social and psychological concerns such as global poverty, immigration, depression, eating disorders, emotional isolation, and narcissism.

Linda Hartling suggests that psychoanalyst Karen Horney (1885–1952) may have been the first personality theorist who spoke directly about the experience of humiliation — Hartling wonders whether ‘this was due to the many degrading experiences’ that Horney endured ‘while becoming a physician in a system and society that disapproved of women pursuing medical careers’.[[649]](#endnote-650) Indeed, several biographies describe the various humiliations Horney encountered because of gender discrimination.

Linda Hartling has listed some of the ways in which humiliation can be assessed:

1. from the perspective of the victim
2. from the perspective of the witness
3. from the perspective of the humiliator[[650]](#endnote-651)
4. from any combination of the these relationships
5. as an individual internal experience
6. as a relational external experience
7. as a traumatic relational violation
8. as a narrative or reflection in response to an acute or a chronic experience of humiliation
9. as a culturally dependent behaviour or social practice (for instance, discrimination, micro-aggressions) in obvious or subtle forms
10. as in individual incident or a systemic dynamic
11. as an atmosphere or environment characterised by contempt, devaluation, denigration
12. as a tool of social control, a tool of domination, a power-over tool
13. from the perspective of a specific practice (for example, using a single letter grade to describe the quality of a child’s academic performance on a topic or using a number to signify a child’s lifelong intellectual capacity)
14. as a ‘resilience-triggering’ experience.[[651]](#endnote-652)

I wrote my doctoral thesis in the year 2000,[[652]](#endnote-653) and I have since published many papers, many jointly with Linda Hartling and other core members of our dignity group, among them Michael Britton, Ulrich Spalthoff,[[653]](#endnote-654) and Howard Richards.[[654]](#endnote-655) We all share the view that in a context where human rights ideals are salient, only dignified humility and salutogenic shame can hold pro-social connotations, while the act of humiliation is an anti-social violation that cannot be applied pro-socially under any circumstances. We observe that it is possible for humiliation to be experienced entirely without shame, an indication that in a context informed by human rights ideals, the humility-shame-humiliation continuum no longer holds.

When Linda Hartling and I look back on the beginnings of our doctoral studies, when we searched for the term humiliation on the web, we found primarily pornographical material.[[655]](#endnote-656) When I began my work on humiliation in 1996, I knew only of one serious academic book with the term humiliation in the title, namely, the book by William Ian Miller that is the starting point of this book.[[656]](#endnote-657) Aside from this book, there was the pioneer of community psychology, Donald Klein, who had edited three special issues on the topic of humiliation for the Journal of Primary Prevention, in 1991,[[657]](#endnote-658) 1992,[[658]](#endnote-659) and 1999, with Linda Hartling and Tracy Luchetta among the contributors.[[659]](#endnote-660)

As noted before, philosopher Avishai Margalit advocated a decent society, a society that does not humiliate or condone humiliation, a society in which institutions do not humiliate citizens and citizens do not humiliate each other, at least not with the tacit or explicit encouragement of the state.[[660]](#endnote-661) Related appeals come from philosopher of criminal justice John Kleinig who calls for non-degradation,[[661]](#endnote-662) from philosopher and political theorist Philip Pettit who pleads for non-domination,[[662]](#endnote-663) and from physicist and educational reformer Robert Fuller who rejects rankism.[[663]](#endnote-664)

A number of publications on humiliation that were published between the years 1990 and 2000 came to my attention only later (see a compilation in the endnote[[664]](#endnote-665)), see also a selection of publications from 2000 to 2010,[[665]](#endnote-666) and, finally, after 2010.[[666]](#endnote-667) A more comprehensive list of relevant references can be found on the Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies website,[[667]](#endnote-668) as can be papers, texts, and comments prepared for Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies (HumanDHS) and its conferences.[[668]](#endnote-669) There is, for instance, a special issue compiled by HumanDHS members on ‘Humiliation and history in global perspectives’, published by Social Alternatives, edited by Ralph Summy in Australia, with guest editor Bertram Wyatt-Brown.[[669]](#endnote-670) Then there is the special issue titled ‘Humiliation in the academic setting’ as part of the series Experiments in Education, coordinated by D. Raja Ganesan in India.[[670]](#endnote-671)

Even though humiliation as a concept has not received much attention on its own account before Linda Hartling and I began our work, a literature overviews shows that the phenomenon itself plays a role in many fields of inquiry. The relationship between guilt, shame, and aggression, for instance, has been addressed in many publications,[[671]](#endnote-672) as has the relationship between anger and aggression.[[672]](#endnote-673) Hazing and bullying have humiliation at their core.[[673]](#endnote-674) Cultural differences and their potential to humiliate have been highlighted widely in the literature.[[674]](#endnote-675) Evidently, much literature on violence and war is implicitly about the phenomenon of humiliation.[[675]](#endnote-676) The notion of oppression is related to humiliation,[[676]](#endnote-677) as is the notion of domination.[[677]](#endnote-678)

Social psychology textbooks teach their students a large portfolio of conceptualisations and research that shed light on the process of humiliation. Abraham Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs became widely known since its inception in 1943, suggesting that we need to satisfy our physiological needs first, and only then can we attend to our needs for safety, belongingness and love, esteem, and self-actualisation.[[678]](#endnote-679) This pyramid has been ‘renovated’ since,[[679]](#endnote-680) and newer research suggests that the need for safety may be more fundamental than physiological needs.[[680]](#endnote-681) Humiliation’s potency shines through when it ‘violates’ Maslow’s pyramid, for example, when people go on hunger strike in response to humiliation, thus putting their physiological needs last.

Social identity theory and self-categorisation theory as developed by social psychologists Henri Tajfel and John Turner come to mind when we encounter people who humiliate out-groups with the aim to elevate their own in-group.[[681]](#endnote-682) Then there is identity process theory as introduced by psychologist Glynis Breakwell, which looks into the ways people cope with threats to their identities[[682]](#endnote-683) and the socio-psychological processes that underlie identity construction and change.[[683]](#endnote-684) Humiliation can also be inscribed into psychologist Urie Bronfenbrenner’s ecological systems theory that emphasises the person-context interrelatedness, as humiliation can be found at all levels, from abuse in families to systemic humiliation in apartheid-like contexts.[[684]](#endnote-685) Furthermore, the work on topics such as salutogenesis and sense of coherence is relevant,[[685]](#endnote-686) as is research on resilience.[[686]](#endnote-687)

A large body of research on grounded theory, symbolic interactionism, and ethnography could be reconceptualised in terms of dignity and humiliation. For example, sociologist Kathy Charmaz, in her book on grounded theory, reviewed research on the sense of worth, showing how it changes when chronic illness strikes, or how homeless people maintain a sense of worth as human beings while struggling to survive economically. After reading Charmaz, philosopher Howard Richards wrote to me, ‘It occurs to me that much of this large body of research might be rephrased in terms of dignity and humiliation. They seem to be alternate vocabularies for similar or identical phenomena. I would hypothesise that human beings evolved needing dignity or a sense of worth because they evolved as social beings playing social roles’.[[687]](#endnote-688)

Through our work on humiliation since 1995, Linda Hartling and I have inspired others, sometimes directly, sometimes indirectly, simply through bringing the terminology of humiliation more into mainstream attention. For example, I have observed with interest the journey of Ute Frevert, whom I met at Columbia University in New York City in 2006 and who is the director of the Centre for the History of Emotions in Berlin.[[688]](#endnote-689) In 1991, she wrote a book about honour and men of honour who go to duel,[[689]](#endnote-690) and in 2017, I was delighted to see her publication on the politics of humiliation.[[690]](#endnote-691)

### Humiliation is part of big history

The title of this chapter is ‘Human rights ideals separate humiliation from humility and shame’. The years 1757 and 1948 play a significant role in this process that inscribes itself into a much larger journey that encompasses all of Homo sapiens’ history. The year 1757 offers a linguistic marker in the English language for the beginning of a profound transition from one era in human history, the dominator world of the past millennia, to a new era, the partnership world hoped for in the future. In 1948, the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights lifted this transition to a hitherto unseen global level, it was a strong appeal to translate it into action.

As I see it, if we, as humanity, want to guide this transition in constructive ways, it is crucial to take a step back so we can see a big history timeline of human history. When we do that, we can understand that this transition represents a turning point that is as significant as the Neolithic Revolution that began to unfold in the geological epoch of the Holocene 11,700 years ago. We, the species Homo sapiens, are in the middle of our second major historical transition, with the years 1757 and 1948 as important markers, and we do not know yet whether we will succeed or fail in moving towards a global partnership world. When the Cold War ended in the year 1991, many people were hopeful,[[691]](#endnote-692) unfortunately, as of now, in the year 2022, many see failure loom.[[692]](#endnote-693)

#### 1948 — From the dominator model of society to the mutuality model

Let us recapitulate: The past twelve millennia, roughly the past three per cent of human history, most societies on our planet manifested what Riane Eisler calls the dominator model of society.[[693]](#endnote-694) Eisler is a systems scientist and activist, and she has developed a cultural transformation theory through which she describes how during the past millennia otherwise widely divergent societies all over the globe followed coercion- and authority-based models of society with alpha males dominating and leading the pack. From the samurai of Japan to the Aztecs of Meso-America, people lived in hierarchies of domination under a rigidly male-dominant strongman rule, in both family and state. Hierarchies of domination were maintained by a high degree of institutionalised and socially accepted violence, ranging from wife- and child-beating within the family to aggressive warfare at the larger tribal or national level.

Riane Eisler contrasts the dominator model with the collaboration-based partnership model of society, or, as psychologist Linda Hartling prefers to call it, the mutuality model of society, meaning ‘movement towards mutuality in all relationships’.[[694]](#endnote-695) When we look at the past millennia, then we see that Eisler’s dominator model was enacted almost everywhere on the globe, with the exception of a few isolated Indigenous populations. Indeed, the major ‘civilisations’ of the past saw one violent ‘alpha male’ ruler following the next, with anger, ‘wrath’, aggression, brutality, and terror as their ‘badges of honour’.

Roughly six thousand years ago, Uruk, the first known city emerged, and one its rulers depicted himself feeding bloodthirsty gods by killing his enemies. Domination reached new levels with the Bronze Age,[[695]](#endnote-696) that collapsed into a ‘dark period’ only to be succeeded by the Iron Age, which is often regarded as the beginning of modernity because iron ‘democratised’ violence. The Phoenicians were traders and pioneer seafarers — on the sarcophagus of a Phoenician king of Byblos (circa one thousand years Before the Common Era), the first alphabet appeared, another democratising invention. In the time of the Iron Age, when Jews ruled Jerusalem, Assyrian King Shalmaneser III (reigning from 858 to 824 BCE) destroyed Jehu (Israel), proudly depicting his brutal exploits on the Black Obelisk of Shalmaneser III. Sennacherib, king of Assyria from 705 BCE to 681 BCE was as cruel as his predecessors and contemporaries. Seafaring Assyrians went as far as Spain where they found silver, only to be taken down by Cyrus the Great, Cyrus II of Persia (circa 600–530 BCE).

During all these times, fear and terror remained the foundation of power. The Iliad by Homer — the ‘Bible’ of the Greek-speaking world, with its written version dating from around the eighth century BCE — begins with the word μῆνιν (mēnin), meaning wrath, divine anger. The Iliad tells the stories of men who are ‘professionally violent’, with violence being regarded as entirely legitimate and even the only honourable way to resolve disputes. The Iliad’s principal theme is ‘the wrath of Achilles’, with Achilles epitomising the ideal of an enraged man fighting for honour, vengeance, personal gain, victory, survival, and ‘the intoxicating adrenalin rush of licensed savagery’.[[696]](#endnote-697)

Riane Eisler herself does not inscribe her theory as explicitly into a historical process as I do, however, she mentions elements of it. She describes the state of the contemporary world as follows:

To briefly illustrate, we see the domination configuration in the most repressive and violent societies of modern times — from Hitler’s Germany, Stalin’s USSR, and Kim Jong Un’s North Korea to the Taliban, Isis, and other fundamentalist cultures (societies that include secular and religious, Eastern and Western, and rightist and leftist regimes). In all these societies, the ideal norm is authoritarianism, a high degree of punitiveness, and rigid male-dominance in both the family and the state. In other words, what we see are interconnections: mutually reinforcing dynamics between what happens in the so-called private and public spheres of life.

Societies that orient more to the partnership configuration also transcend conventional categories such as religious or secular, Eastern or Western, and technologically developed/less developed. They include Indigenous societies such as the Indonesian Minankabao, the Chinese Mouso, and the La Paz Zapotec of Mexico from one side of the technological spectrum, as well as technologically advanced societies such as Sweden, Finland, and Norway. In these cultures, we again see feedback loops between family and other intimate relations, on the one hand, and whether a society is more peaceful, equitable, and democratic, on the other.

From this perspective, we see that expanding the purview and reach of respect for human rights is part of the contemporary movement toward the partnership side of the social scale. Indeed, if we look at modern history from this new perspective, we see that the modern progressive social movements have in one way or another challenged traditions of domination.[[697]](#endnote-698)

I became interested in Eisler’s dominator versus partnership dichotomy when I saw that it resonates with the analysis of the human condition that I had developed over the many decades of global experience, only that I use a different terminology. I speak of systems of unequal worthiness where Eisler speaks of dominator societies, while what I call systems of equal worthiness fits into Eisler’s partnership model of society. My experience has taught me that there is a profound and often unbridgeable gulf between societal contexts that ascribe unequal worthiness to its members as compared to contexts that define their members as equal in worthiness. I point at the first configuration when I speak of honour, and when speak of dignity, I refer to the second. To be more precise, it is ranked honour in a collectivist context versus equal dignity for each individual in freedom and solidarity.

Over time, I found that other thinkers have formulated similar conceptualisations. Wear Burton (1915–2010), for instance, was an Australian public servant, High Commissioner, and international affairs expert, and he differentiates a power-and-war paradigm from a dialogue paradigm.[[698]](#endnote-699) Philosopher Karl Popper (1902–1994) comes to mind, who spoke of irrational tribal emotions, wondering about the adoration that strongmen often receive and the hatred often directed at people of different ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, or political ideology.[[699]](#endnote-700) Indigenous scholar Don ‘Four Arrows’ Jacobs, of Cherokee and Muscogee Creek ancestry, contrasts two worldviews that he calls indigenous versus colonial, whereby the first speaks to harmony, while the second assumes dominion.[[700]](#endnote-701) To say it in my words, the Indigenous paradigm promotes individual-ity in service of the common good through action that flows from direct experience rather than external authority, whereas the colonial mindset promotes individual-ism in competition against the common good driven by top-down totalitarianism.

Historian Richard Landes offered a related typology, speaking of a prime-divider polity in contrast to a civil polity.[[701]](#endnote-702) The ‘overwhelming majority of civilised polities for the last 5,000 years, from the ancient empires of the iron age to the early modern period in Europe to today’s conditions in much of the world, are structured along a fundamental fissure — a prime divider — between elites and commoners that structures most of the features of political and social life in basic ways’.[[702]](#endnote-703) A prime-divider polity is based on the political axiom of ‘rule or be ruled’ and it permits and requires the use of violence in defence of honour. Richard Landes’ prime-divider polity contains the following main features:

* legal privilege for the elites, including exemption from taxation, lighter sentences for their misdeeds and heavier penalties for offenses against them
* self-help justice in which clans defend their members regardless of legal issues (like intent), such as in blood revenge, vendetta, feud, or duel
* mystery surrounds political authority, for example, monarchy is above the law
* commoner populations are illiterate and controlled by intimidation — see Machiavelli’s ruler, who should be feared not loved
* manual labour is stigmatised, the vast majority, the masses, are excluded from the public sphere, except on choreographed occasions
* elites have a monopoly on literacy, weaponry, rapid transportation, and political power.

Richard Landes’ civil polity entails the following interlocking elements:

* same rules for all, equality before the law, what the ancient Greeks called isonomia
* independent law courts determine fair judgements and pre-empt private self-help justice
* public transparency and accountability of people in power through freedom of speech
* commoner populations are empowered by education to assert and protect their own legislated rights
* commitment to voluntarism as a principle form of social interaction and political organisation, emphasising mutual trust, contractual obligations, and moral autonomy
* manual labour is not stigmatised and manual labourers and their children can participate in public discourse and, if sufficiently successful, enter the elite.[[703]](#endnote-704)

#### Humiliation becomes anti-social

Whatever names we use — if we speak of the power-and-war paradigm, of the colonial worldview, or the prime-divider polity, or the dominator model of society — it always provides the scaffolding for the honour mindset, it is like the ‘bone’ on which the honour mindset ‘sits like a skin’.[[704]](#endnote-705) This is also the place where humiliation is normalised, where it is legitimate to humiliate inferiors routinely to ‘show them their due lowly place’. Inferiors and superiors can become equals only in societal models of mutuality, partnership, civil dialogue, non-degradation,[[705]](#endnote-706) and non-domination.[[706]](#endnote-707) Only when this happens, can formerly legitimate acts of humiliation acquire the suffix ‑ism and transmute into objectionable attitudes of racism or sexism or ageism, altogether rankism.[[707]](#endnote-708) This is why I speak of ranked honour in a collectivist context on one side, and of equal dignity for each individual in freedom and solidarity on the other side.

Looking at the big history timeline, to say it extremely simplified, the dominator model of society reigned from the Neolithic Revolution until 1757 (in many world regions still today), and during that period, humiliation was seen as a legitimate tool in the relationship between superiors and inferiors, which meant that humiliation was simply an intense form of shame on a continuum starting with mild embarrassment.[[708]](#endnote-709) It was an accepted practice for superiors to use routine acts of humiliation to enforce subservient humbleness in underlings to keep domination in place, as it was the role of superiors to humiliate inferiors to produce chronic feelings of shame and humiliation in them so they would never ‘forget’ their ‘due’ place. It was seen as pro-social to repress any ‘shameless’ desire in inferiors for a rank higher than their superiors deemed they deserved — nobody was allowed to aspire to an undeserving rank, all were to behave according to their rank. Superiors themselves displayed humbleness in the face of the divine higher beings they worshipped, while they humiliated their inferiors to ensure their submission.

Inferiors, on their part, often accepted humiliation to the point that some humiliated themselves pre-emptively to avoid punishment from superiors, many prided themselves on their ability to debase themselves in reverence for their superiors, many also punished compeers who dared indulge in ‘undue’ arrogance or ‘shameless’ cravings for higher status.

The dominator model was transgenerationally maintained by inflicting humiliation already on young children by way of a pedagogical style that cognitive scientists George Lakoff and Mark Johnson call the strict father pedagogical framework, in contrast to the nurturant parent model of parenting.[[709]](#endnote-710) The strict father approach produces adults who place hierarchy, order, and conformity over other values, and who enforce these values on others.[[710]](#endnote-711) ‘Breaking the will’ was a practice to produce ‘real men’ and ‘submissive women’ — which in effect meant breaking their humanity and producing ‘efficient’ humiliators of self and others as they grew up.[[711]](#endnote-712)

The advent of human rights ideals brought deep changes into the conceptualisations and manifestations of shame, humility, and humiliation. Wherever these ideals became salient, humiliation lost the status of pro-sociality and was deemed anti-social. After the Universal Declaration of Human Rights was adopted in 1948, in 1949, standards of international law for humanitarian treatment in war were enshrined that prohibited ‘outrages upon personal dignity, in particular, humiliating and degrading treatment’ against ‘persons taking no active part in the hostilities’.[[712]](#endnote-713) In 1984, ‘torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment’ were declared to be illegitimate.[[713]](#endnote-714)

While the Declaration of Human Rights made acts of humiliation illegitimate in theory, this did not necessarily translate into practice. The practice of torture can illustrate the fragility of the breaking point between the old and the new and how easily this point can move back and forth.

Torture works with shame and humiliation to break the victim’s sense of worth and ability to resist, and this was seen as thoroughly legitimate and pro-social in the past, independent of the fact that the information gleaned by way of torture has low validity.[[714]](#endnote-715) According to the 2014 U.S. Senate report on the C.I.A. torture programme, James Elmer Mitchell was one of two psychologists involved in designing interrogation methods for the American secret service.[[715]](#endnote-716) Mitchell and his colleagues built on psychologist Martin Seligman’s research on learned helplessness,[[716]](#endnote-717) and they studied Chinese interrogation methods that had been used on American soldiers during the Korean War.[[717]](#endnote-718) ‘Humiliation, painful stress positions, confinement, sleep deprivation — and waterboarding’, this Mitchell recommended to use on suspected terrorists in Afghanistan.[[718]](#endnote-719) The aim was to give the captive a ‘sense of hopelessness’.[[719]](#endnote-720)

The breaking point between old and new became visible as the American Psychiatric Association refused to be part of such interrogations, while the American Psychological Association supported the involvement of psychologists.[[720]](#endnote-721) Directly after the 9/11 attacks, the majority of Americans thought that torture was justified,[[721]](#endnote-722) followed by a period where acceptance decreased, only to increase again after 2016 with the administration of Donald Trump.[[722]](#endnote-723) Condoners of torture stood in opposition to contestants — condoners were proud of James Mitchell for shaming and humiliating enemies, while contestants thought that Mitchell and his colleagues themselves ought to feel ashamed and humiliated by their very own actions.[[723]](#endnote-724) In 2018, several Catholic groups opposed American president Trump’s nomination of a certain candidate, Gina Haspel, for director of the Central Intelligence Agency, saying that her ‘role in overseeing torture’ disqualified her according to ‘basic moral standards for human dignity’.[[724]](#endnote-725) They feared that ‘Haspel’s confirmation could send a message of U.S. support for previously banned interrogation techniques’, not least since ‘President Donald Trump had expressed interest in lifting current restrictions on torture’.[[725]](#endnote-726)

This short overview illustrates the movability, delicacy, and fragility of conceptualisations and manifestations of shame, humility, and humiliation, as it zooms in on the very breaking point between the old and the new.

#### Dignified humility becomes pro-social

Torture is only one of many examples that illustrate how deep and at the same time fragile the ‘breaking’ effect is that human rights ideals introduce. In chapter 5, I offer the example of femicide, also called honour killing, to show how intercultural settings can be affected by the fact that old and new conceptualisations are irreconcilable at their core — two positions stand in unbridgeable opposition to each other, namely, ‘killing is a duty to remedy humiliated honour’, and ‘the very idea that killing could remedy humiliation represents unforgivable humiliation’.

Also within the Western world, all segments of society are affected by this difficult historical transition. The social worker who visits a home where a wife is beaten by her husband faces the task of explaining to the couple that, indeed, in the past, only small elites could remove shame from humiliation through duels or duel-like responses, it was their privilege and duty to do so, while a beaten wife could not challenge her husband to duel. A beaten wife had to learn subservient humbleness, she had to learn to feel ashamed for failing to respect his superiority.[[726]](#endnote-727) In a human rights based context, in contrast, she can liberate herself from shame and accuse her husband of unduly humiliating her, she can exit from the humiliating situation entirely, and she can do so proudly, entirely unashamedly.[[727]](#endnote-728)

Just like in the case of torture, the social worker cannot be sure to be heard. Both husband and wife may insist that she deserves to be beaten whenever she fails to accept her husband’s superiority. The social worker will attempt to convince the couple to embrace dignified shame and dignified humility in mutual respect for each other’s equal dignity, no longer should the husband shame his wife into submissive humbleness.

Not just the cooperation between wife and husband is affected by the advent of ideals of equal dignity, cooperation in society in general is impacted in the same way. While Riane Eisler contrasts the dominator model with the collaboration-based partnership model of society, psychologist Linda Hartling calls it the mutuality model of society because collaboration occurs also in the dominator context, only in a different form. While the partnership model facilitates the kind of cooperation that arises from an authentic mutual desire to collaborate, in a dominator context, superiors force their inferiors into cooperation that serves the superiors’ interests. In a dominator context, inferiors have little space for self-determined cooperation, they are lucky if they have superiors benevolent enough to inspire their authentic support. The only space for inferiors to freely choose collaboration is either in niches outside of their superiors’ range of interest, or in clandestine cooperation in opposition to unloved superiors. The mutuality model of society, in contrast, has as its defining feature to open space for all to collaborate and cooperate freely for the common good rather than in the service of power holders who compete with each other for domination.

Contemporary psychology based on human rights ideals therefore goes too far when it portrays shame as a strictly negative emotion. While shame resulting from humiliation is indeed negative, not all expressions of shame are anti-social, there is also dignified and dignifying shame. A society of shamelessly narcissistic people is not desirable in any case. Human rights activists themselves regard shaming as pro-social when they shame companies who do not fulfil their promises. In 1958, sociologist Helen Merrell Lynd (1896–1982), in her analysis of concepts of shame and guilt and how they evolved historically and across cultures, explained that in her view, guilt functions as a reminder that we need to change our behaviour, while shame can also hide something beautiful, something that we ought to lovingly understand and embrace rather than allow society to restrict it.[[728]](#endnote-729)

The example of the wife and the husband is particularly suitable to show that the shame continuum was created by those in power for the powerless throughout the past millennia, while the powerful exempted themselves — aristocratic elites could remove shame from humiliation through duels, not the beaten wife. Human rights ideals thus ‘democratise’ a privilege previously provided only to elites — in the new context, not just the ‘top dog’ is allowed to feel humiliation without shame, everyone has this privilege. Under the influence of human rights ideals, humiliation becomes anti-social entirely, while shame and humility split into two, shedding their anti-social expressions while maintaining pro-social features, moving from humiliation-induced shame and humbleness to dignified and dignifying shame and humility.

#### Humiliation can occur without shame, and shame can be salutogenic

If humiliation were simply a severe form of shame and humility, it should be impossible for feelings of humiliation to occur without shame. Indeed, this is what torturers aim to achieve, they inflict humiliation with the aim to create debilitating shame in their victims. Yet, as I have learned from torture victims, some succeed in insulating their inner selves from such onslaughts, they succeed in refraining from feeling shame while still feeling humiliated. Many think of Nelson Mandela, who felt humiliated but not ashamed.

I have met people who went one step further and perceived humiliation even as a victory. A young man — call him Ahmed — told me that he felt pure triumph, without any sense of shame, when he was beaten and humiliated, almost killed, by the military. This sensation, he shared with me, had a triumphant quality because it proved to him that he was courageous enough to openly see oppression in its face and resist it. As long as he meekly bowed to the humiliation meted out by oppressors and tried to hide from it, out of fear of more humiliation, he felt unbearable shame and guilt.[[729]](#endnote-730) He explained that feeling shame-free humiliation liberated him, made him resilient, and gave him new pride.

Uri Avnery passed away recently, he was a journalist, writer, peace activist, a former member of the Israeli parliament Knesset, and founder of the peace activist group Gush Shalom. He was born in Germany, not far from where I was born. He and his family had to flee Nazi Germany in 1933, while my parents were forcibly displaced to this region in 1946.

In 2017, Avnery recounted how a friend sent him an article written by a highly respected elder Palestinian. In this article, the Palestinian described his first protest demonstration when he was fifteen years old and lived in a village under Israeli occupation, and all villagers hated Israeli soldiers. The young boy went out with a group of other boys to the centre of their village where a line of Israeli soldiers were waiting for them, and each boy picked up a stone to throw at the soldiers. The stones fell short and caused no harm, yet, still now, as an old man, he remembered how wonderful the feeling was. Avnery felt moved to comment as follows:

For the first time in his life the boy felt that he was hitting back! He was no longer a despised, helpless Palestinian! He was upholding the dignity of his people! The old leaders may be subservient! Not he, not his friends! For the first time in his life he was proud, proud to be a Palestinian, proud to be a courageous human being. What a wonderful feeling! For this feeling he was ready to risk his life, again and again, ready to become a Shaheed, a witness, a martyr.[[730]](#endnote-731)

Through reading the Palestinian testimony, Avnery was reminded of his own youth when he was a fifteen year old living under the British colonial regime that had just hanged a Jewish ‘terrorist’. Avnery remembers how he was part of a group of youth who marched to the British administration’s district offices, only to run away when shots were fired. ‘We were ecstatic, happy beyond measure. We had shown those bloody British that Jews could fight back. We had risked our lives for our fatherland. We had made our people proud of us’. Even decades later, Avnery remembers every detail as if it had happened yesterday, ‘I completely understand the ecstasy of the Palestinian boys, the “children of the stones”, who today risk their lives, throwing stones in futile demonstrations... The heavier the hand of the oppressor, the stronger the determination of the oppressed. It’s a law of nature’, wrote Avnery in the same comment.

When we look back to Nelson Mandela, and remember that also he refused to feel ashamed when humiliated, we become aware that Mandela, had he chosen the path of Ahmed in the next step, might have brought genocidal killing to South Africa in 1994, just as what happened in Rwanda at the same time. Mandela’s path after he liberated himself from shame was very different, it was the path of constructive social change. In my work, clearly, I walk the Mandela-path. In the Foreword to my 2010 book, Desmond Tutu expresses how lucky South Africa was.

Young Ahmed ‘went black’ when he could not endure his own shame anymore, when he threw himself at highly armed soldiers knowing that he would be put to the ground, perhaps even killed. Perhaps he was ready to participate in terrorist attacks and die in them, I do not know. I was reminded of him many years later when I spoke with representatives of the Security Services in Norway who talked about ‘going black’, suggesting that lack of choices may contribute to ‘phylogenetically old strategies of survival’.[[731]](#endnote-732)

As reported earlier, in 1971, psychologist Helen Block Lewis coined the phrase humiliated fury, a term that captures the spirit of ‘going black’.[[732]](#endnote-733) Psychologist Thomas Scheff built on Lewis’ work in his analysis of unacknowledged ‘bypassed’ shame as source of humiliated fury and motor of violence.[[733]](#endnote-734) As Scheff explains, if not acknowledged and worked through constructively, if bypassed, feelings of shame can maintain and even intensify destructive conflict. Scheff also builds on philosopher Bertrand Russell (1872–1970), who once wrote, ‘Men ... fear the sense of humiliation they would have in yielding to the demands of another nation. Rather ... than endure the humiliation, they are willing to inflict upon the world all those disasters which it is now [in 1915] suffering and all that exhaustion and impoverishment which it must long continue to suffer’.[[734]](#endnote-735)

In my 2010 book on gender, humiliation, and global security, I describe how in contexts of honour, shame is the duty of females, proof of female modesty, while for males, particularly those in power positions, shame is shameful. This script is also what inferiors may imitate in case they rise up and come into power positions. When I did my doctoral research on the genocide that was perpetrated by Hutu (meaning ‘servant’) against their former ruling Tutsi elite in Rwanda in 1994, I sensed that the Hutu perpetrators of ‘ethnic cleansing’ not only ‘cleansed’ an ‘ethnic group’, namely, the Tutsi, through humiliating and killing them, they ‘cleansed’ their very own shame. Hutu felt ashamed that they had ever been submissive to their Tutsi superiors, that they had ever looked up to Tutsi as benevolent patrons, that they had failed to despise them as malevolent oppressors in the past.[[735]](#endnote-736)

What these examples show is that rising up from the bottom is a complex and difficult psychological process that can create shame that can become pathogenic when one is ashamed of it. While humiliation can occur without shame, as in the case of Mandela, this does not mean that shame is something to be ashamed of — shame can also be salutogenic. Obviously, it would not be legitimate for the wife to retaliate with violence — no social worker would advise a beaten wife to follow the Hutu example and cleanse her shame over her former subservience by humiliating and killing her husband. The Hutu genocidaire, through humiliating and killing their victims, humiliated also their very own humanity.

While traditional honour contexts teach males to suppress and bypass shame, this may also happen in contexts where dignity is understood as ‘lone hero autonomy’. ‘American psychology has promoted shame-free self-esteem, which ultimately grew into shamelessness’, is the observation of psychologist Linda Hartling.[[736]](#endnote-737) Both mindsets, that of traditional honour and that of ‘lone hero’ dignity, by hiding shame, narrow space for shame to be salutogenic.

Hiding shame forecloses the opportunity to find out whether one’s shame is appropriate or not, and to attend to it accordingly. One’s shame may be a thoroughly appropriate response to one’s own inappropriate or hurtful actions, or it may be totally misplaced and unnecessary shame that rather should be replaced with self-compassion.[[737]](#endnote-738) For Hutu, or the beaten wife, for instance, self-compassion would be more appropriate than shame, because in former times, everyone was bound in a Zeitgeist where ‘servants’ and ‘women’ were expected to be submissive to their superiors. Shame individualises and psychologises systemic damage to the soul that self-compassion can soothe. This would also apply to cases where shame is artificially instigated through manipulation and propaganda aimed at mobilising susceptible victims for ulterior political goals.

Salutogenic shame inspires reflection and compassion and this can flourish only where mindsets of relational dignity reign rather than ‘lone hero’ concepts of dignity. A relational dignity mindset moves shame from pathogenic to salutogenic.[[738]](#endnote-739) It is only in such a context that males can liberate themselves from the need to have to bypass shame as a precondition for feeling they own ‘maleness’. This is also the very context in which human rights activists act when they shame corporations for failing ethical standards, they do so in the hope that reflection and change will be the outcome rather than violent backlashes.

Humiliators want their victims to feel ashamed. As Nelson Mandela showed, resilience in the face of humiliation means resisting feeling shame while retaining one’s sense of worth even while being subjected to humiliation and feeling humiliated. This is not the same as suppressing shame or bypassing shame, rather, it means judging degrading mistreatment correctly as unjust, understanding that there is no need to accept feelings of shame in an unjust system. It means accepting shame only when one brought it upon oneself, when one violated one’s own values and standards.

Linda Hartling wonders about Thomas Scheff’s observation that some of his working-class clients have more difficulty acknowledging shame than others, and she offers a hypothesis, ‘Perhaps the reason why Scheff believes that members of the working classes have difficulty acknowledging shame is because their shame is in reality humiliation, the daily humiliation and demoralisation of living in a society that exploits the working class and the poor? Perhaps it is the upper social classes who are more likely in need of “acknowledging their shame”?’[[739]](#endnote-740)

As alluded to before, I am impressed by the way how Nelson Mandela approached Frederik Willem de Klerk and explained that the ‘old order was dying’, I am impressed despite the dark sides that also accompanied the struggle against apartheid (see more in the Introduction).[[740]](#endnote-741) Mandela called for mutually shared dignified humility without humiliation. As he did not feel ashamed, he did not have to acknowledge suppressed or bypassed shame even though he had been systematically debased and humiliated. Mandela liberated himself from the master’s intentions to instil shame in him, and rather than meekly bowing down in shame, he carried his head high and refused to translate his sense of humiliation into shame.[[741]](#endnote-742) Mandela rejected the intent to break him through humiliation, he acted in ways a nobleman would act who is accustomed to being the active agent in defining a situation rather than having it defined for him. Mandela did not act as an enslaved man who is used to being the object of others’ definitions — it might have helped him that he hailed from an aristocratic family.

Despite his aristocratic background, however, Mandela refrained from walking the traditional aristocratic path of honour in his response to humiliation. He did not call upon his black brothers and sisters to follow the Rwandan example and kill all former oppressors. He refrained from turning the tables, he abstained from humiliating the white elite of South Africa into submission. Rather, he humbled them into equality in dignity, he invited them into the humility of shared dignity.

Mandela stood tall in the face of the humiliation that was inflicted on him and his black brothers and sisters, he translated humiliation into a mission for profound constructive social change guided by the human rights ideals of equal dignity for all.

In 2013, we held our Dignity Conference in South Africa, and we were saddened by the fact that Nelson Mandela’s legacy seemed to be in great difficulty.[[742]](#endnote-743) We hope for his example to inspire the future of South Africa again, and, indeed, that of the world.

Social psychologist Morton Deutsch, known as the father of the field of conflict resolution, and one of my most important mentors, reflected a lot about Mandela and how he ‘kept his self undistorted by preserving his dignity and refusing to submit, psychologically, to the definition of self that the oppressors tried to force upon him’.[[743]](#endnote-744) Mandela described the following incident after landing on Robben Island:

We were met by a group of burly white wardens shouting: ‘Dis die Eiland! Hier gaan jiell vrek! (This is the island! Here you will die!)’ ... As we walked toward the prison, the guards shouted ‘Two-two! Two-two!’ — meaning we should walk in pairs ... I linked up with Tefu. The guards started screaming, ‘Haas! ... Haas!’ The word haas means ‘move’ in Afrikaans, but it is commonly reserved for cattle. ‘The wardens were demanding that we jog, and I turned to Tefu and under my breath said that we must set an example; if we give in now we would be at their mercy ... I mentioned to Tefu that we should walk in front, and we took the lead. Once in front, we actually decreased the pace, walking slowly and deliberately. The guards were incredulous (and said)’ ... we will tolerate no insubordination here. Haas! Haas!’ But we continued at our stately pace. (The head guard) ordered us to halt and stood in front of us: ‘Look, man, we will kill you, we are not fooling around ... This the last warning. Haas! Haas!’ ‘To this, I said: ‘You have your duty and we have ours’. I was determined that we would not give in, and we did not, for we were already at the cells.[[744]](#endnote-745)

Morton Deutsch concluded, ‘By his persistent public refusal to be humiliated or to feel humiliated, Mandela rejected the distorted, self-debilitating relationship that the oppressor sought to impose upon him. Doing so enhanced his leadership among his fellow political prisoners and the respect he was accorded by the less sadistic guards and wardens of the prison’.[[745]](#endnote-746)

Indeed, when Mandela left prison, some of his guards had become his friends.

### What about ‘cultures’ of shame, guilt, honour, face, humility, and dignity?

As mentioned in the Introduction to this book, students of the European Global Minds programme at the University in Oslo in Norway became angry with me for advocating dignity.[[746]](#endnote-747) They suspected me of peddling a ‘Western’ imperialistic view, of marketing dignity as a device to globalise anomic individualism and undermine global solidarity. Their evidence was that in cross-cultural psychology, Western dignity culture has been described as superior to non-Western face and honour cultures.[[747]](#endnote-748)

This happened in 2018, and since then, I observe waves of angry voices getting ever louder in many discourse spaces, voices that condemn theories, frameworks, perspectives, and practices for being Eurocentric and European-American centred, Whitestream, WEIRD, settler-colonial.

Allow me to thank my esteemed students and friends for their candidness, and offer them in return a brief overview over research on what has been called ‘cultures’ of shame, of guilt, of honour, of face, humility, and dignity. At the end, I will include notions such as conservative authoritarianism and liberal progressiveness. In the course of this review, it will become clear that my work on humiliation has always come from the subaltern perspective.

Anthony Marsella is a cross-cultural psychopathologist, psychotherapist, clinical, cultural, and multicultural psychologist, and he spent a lifetime collecting cultural typologies. The making of cultural typologies has a long history in the social sciences, and it was embarked on by cultural anthropologists, psychologists, psychiatrists, and sociologists, based on cultural, psychological, psychiatric, and sociological dimensions. Here is Marsella’s list (cited in no order) of attempts to place culture into dichotomous mental maps:[[748]](#endnote-749)

* Collectivistic versus Individualistic
* Indigenous versus Non-Indigenous
* Traditional versus Modern
* Western versus Non-Western
* First World versus Third World
* Urban versus Rural (Sociology)
* Post Modern Versus Non-Post Modern (Critical Psychology)
* Shame versus Guilt (Cultural Anthropology)
* Normal versus Abnormal Cultures (Ruth Benedict)
* Apollonian versus Dionysian (Ruth Benedict)
* Continuous versus Discontinuous Cultures (Ruth Benedict/Margaret Mead)
* Integrated versus Disintegrated Cultures (Alexander Leighton[[749]](#endnote-750))
* Tough versus Easy Cultures (Arsenian and Arsenian[[750]](#endnote-751))
* Oppressive versus Suppressive (Francis L. K. Hsu[[751]](#endnote-752))
* Gemeinschaft versus Gesellschaft (Ferdinand Tönnies[[752]](#endnote-753))

In cultural anthropology, shame and guilt have often been described as methods of social control. Anthropologist Ruth Benedict (1887–1948) described American (Christian) culture as a guilt culture, in which the individual’s internal conscience counts most. She deemed this to be superior to Japanese culture, which she described as shame culture, a culture where the emphasis lies on how outsiders perceive one’s moral conduct.[[753]](#endnote-754)

When I lived in Japan, I was saddened by the consequences of Benedict’s ranking, namely, feelings of humiliation on the Japanese side — Japanese psychoanalyst Takeo Doi was one of those who felt disparaged.[[754]](#endnote-755) Everyone I met told me about the merits of Japanese culture, and this made me understand Benedict’s critics and their wish to re-calibrate her ranking.[[755]](#endnote-756) Among others, there is the notion of amae, or ‘sweetness in interdependence’, and the notion of Ba no Kuuki wo Yomu, or ‘understanding the situation without words’, literally meaning ‘reading air’. Ideally, I would contend that all sides could learn from each other — Western culture could benefit from incorporating a bit of amae, while Japanese culture may need more shutaisei (read more further down).

Knowing Ruth Benedict’s work, we can be certain that she did not develop her analysis with the intent to bolster Western arrogance. This, however, might not apply to others, who might indeed be less interested in ensuring that academia serves all of humanity equally and fairly rather than serving particular agendas. Lately, ‘Arab culture’ has been subsumed into the honour-shame category, and allegedly, even torture methods have been shaped with the help of this categorisation.[[756]](#endnote-757) For Africa, a power-fear category has been added, and Christian missionaries have used it.[[757]](#endnote-758)

Gilda Graff, a psychotherapist and psychohistorian, has analysed shame and guilt within the American context.[[758]](#endnote-759) Graff writes that ‘guilt tends to focus on a harmful action or omission, a deed that causes pain to another, while shame is a feeling which arises when we are convinced that there is something about ourselves that is wrong, inferior, flawed, weak, or dirty’.[[759]](#endnote-760) Graff explains that while guilt is a feeling, a feeling of having made a mistake, shame is an identity, an identity of not just making a mistake but being a mistake.[[760]](#endnote-761) Guilt, according to her, is something that is easier to reflect on than shame, because shame is a much more searing and painful experience, something to conceal from others as well as from oneself.[[761]](#endnote-762) In her therapy sessions, Graff observes that, unlike guilt, shame tends not to be confessed — shame is hidden behind anger, contempt, depression, superiority, or personal achievement. Therefore, shame is more difficult to treat in a client, its cognitive content is too diffuse, too hard to pinpoint. Then there is also the challenge for the psychotherapist herself, since the wounds of the psychotherapist’s own shame experiences may open when she encounters shame in others, something even a therapist may wish to avoid.

Like Graff, also Linda Hartling has an American cultural background, and she proposes a somewhat different conceptualisation. She distinguishes between state guilt and trait guilt on one side, and the state of shame and the trait of shame on the other side, and from her point of view, also the trait of guilt can be kept hidden and may be enduring.[[762]](#endnote-763) Hartling defines a state of guilt as response to a specific incident that is limited in time, while it becomes a trait of guilt when one looks back on past life events and believes one could have solved certain situations better. With regard to shame, Linda Hartling agrees that shame also has merits and that we do not wish to live in a shameless society.

Growing up in Central Europe, I experienced shame and guilt in yet another way. I was born into what could be called a hybrid situation of collectivism and individualism, where humiliation had legitimacy as a pro-social tool for shaming, while it affected me as an anti-social violation. One of the areas where this conundrum played out for me was religion. As a child, I was told that I had the freedom to choose or un-choose to partake in the religious orientation of the social context into which I was born. Soon, however, I found out that I was expected to make the ‘correct’ decision, that the one and only truth would reveal itself to me and elate me if I decided to open up to it.[[763]](#endnote-764) Being a child, I wished for nothing more than that this would succeed, as only in this way could I continue to belong to my social context. While doing my best to ‘open up’, I observed with dread that I was unable to develop the required feelings of elation. I could not bring myself to accept what was regarded as the only true dogma, I could not divide the world into believers and infidels. As a result, I felt deep guilt and even deeper shame for being so guilty, indeed, I felt I was a mistake due to my own personal guilt. It was a humiliating experience and it shamed me far beyond any earthly existence, even before the heavens. However, at the same time, I also felt that this humiliation was undue, since, to me, it seemed wrong to embrace a religion that required that I save my own soul at the price of ‘infidels’ being doomed to go to hell. Today, I am proud of my resistance as a child, I see that I had no reason to feel ashamed, and, since I was also not guilty, there is no need for me to ask anyone for forgiveness. In short, my predicament illustrates how a situation may be much more complex and intertwined than clear-cut guilt versus shame differentiations.

Whenever I meet the accusation that I am an imperialist for speaking up for dignity, whenever I am suspected of ‘placing Western dignity culture above non-Western face and honour cultures’,[[764]](#endnote-765) I respond by saying that I reject the notion of monolithic ‘cultures’ altogether, let alone ranking them. I also explain that understanding does not mean condoning and that I like to learn from all approaches, including those I may not condone in all their aspects. My main interest is to ‘harvest’ from all lines of thought and practice whatever insights they may offer for nurturing a dignified future for all of humanity. For instance, I am interested in social psychology’s scrutiny of mechanisms ‘whereby nation-level context could influence individual level behaviours’,[[765]](#endnote-766) or in the work of scholars who theorise that the United States made the transition from an honour culture to a dignity culture in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, even if I may not resonate with all conceptualisations.[[766]](#endnote-767)

Whenever I am accused of being an imperialist, I also explain that everything depends on how dignity is being conceptualised. I would indeed act as a Western imperialist if I were to proselytise the view of dignity as competition between disconnected autonomous individuals.[[767]](#endnote-768) I would even partake in a self-defeating paradox if I held such views, in unforgivably shortsighted thinking. In hyper-individualistic Western contexts, where freedom means that might is right and dignity means autonomy, feudal-like hierarchies enter through the back door. When modern-day ‘dignitaries’ try to preserve their standing in duel-like confrontations, dignity becomes almost indistinguishable from traditional honour — leaders of giants such as Google, Facebook, or Apple often behave in ways reminiscent of feudal lords.

Therefore, I always explain to my students, my definition of dignity is different. I see dignity as interconnected individuality — I see people being connected in equality in worthiness and in loving mutual solidarity and responsibility. This concept of dignity not only frees me from their accusations, it even works as a bridge builder, because it includes the best from all mindsets, including those of face and honour — saving face means avoiding to humiliate others, it means rejecting violent vindications of honour.[[768]](#endnote-769)

The most relevant typology that I observe all around the world is the difference between equal and unequal worthiness. Everything — from dignity to face to honour — can be conceptualised in terms of unequal or equal worthiness, worthiness can either be ranked hierarchically or deemed to be at the same level, it can either be ‘I am above you or below you’ or ‘we are on the same level’.

Let me share some examples from my research. A mindset of honour is one in which everyone accepts that it is divinely ordained or nature’s order that superior ‘dignitaries’ preside over inferiors, where unequal worthiness is manifested in the overall hierarchical social system, and equal worthiness can only be found within each rank. Such a system is usually unstable, particularly at its outset, while it can become more rigid over time. Warrior-like settings like Somalia, for example, are fickle, because any attempt by aspiring superiors to create subservient humbleness in subordinates will be responded to with staunch resistance and only direct coercion can enforce it. My doctoral research among proud Somali warriors brought this mindset of ‘always ready to fight’ to me most poignantly — including with the gun to my head.[[769]](#endnote-770) My seven years of working as a psychologist in Egypt taught me about it as well, because several mindsets clash there — as the nomadic culture of the Arab Peninsula came to Upper Egypt from the seventh century CE onwards , it brought with it a high level of ‘readiness for duel’, of ‘shoot first, talk later’, in contrast to Lower Egypt, where I observed a much more consensual ethos. My years in Japan and China acquainted me with rather stable and rigid hierarchical cultural contexts, due to a long undisturbed duration and a larger group size that enabled power elites to establish obedient humbleness among subordinates as an ingrained long-term cultural mindset, no longer just through ad hoc direct coercion as in Somalia.[[770]](#endnote-771)

Despite much dignity rhetoric, no single place in the world can serve as a perfect example for equal worthiness for all, at least I have not found any place manifesting it consistently in all of its social relationships and societal structures. In traditional hierarchies, only people of the same rank are on the same level of worthiness and it is a big step to equal worthiness for all, as this means that all people on Earth are on the same level of worthiness and that there is no higher and lower level anymore. Norway comes to mind, but even Norway is being ‘colonised’ now, for the first time in its history, namely, by globalisation. I am aware that many of my Western friends get angry at me for saying this, at least those who pride themselves on living in the ‘free world’, free from oppressive hierarchy, those who believe that combative competition is the best way to secure this freedom. Unfortunately, however, wherever dignity is defined as disconnected autonomy in a combative might-is-right context, the reality on the ground contradicts them, as this reality is one of increasing inequality.[[771]](#endnote-772) The John Wayne notion of dignity as ‘pull yourself up by your bootstraps’ renders very sad results, it makes disconnected citizens lose their grounding in their authenticity as they try to fake autonomy, and this, in turn, makes them vulnerable to ‘honourable dignitaries’ who lure them into the indignities of ‘rat races’, while those dignitaries secure ‘velvet ropes’ for themselves.[[772]](#endnote-773) This is what Martin Luther King said, ‘It’s all right to tell a man to lift himself by his own bootstraps, but it is a cruel jest to say to a bootless man that he ought to lift himself by his own bootstraps’.[[773]](#endnote-774)

Particularly my young male students dream of liberation from oppression through combat, and I always explain to them that true liberation and true equality in worthiness is only achievable when dignity is defined as equality in dignity for all, and freedom is conceptualised as responsibility to accept that we all depend on each other and need to protect our social and ecological commons in mutual solidarity. I do not see this ideal being realised in any polity on the globe as of yet. In other words, cross-cultural psychologies that place ‘Western dignity culture’ above ‘non-Western face and honour cultures’ are triply unconvincing, first, through conceiving of monolithic ‘cultures’, second, through ranking cultures, and, third, through overlooking that the ideal of a dignity culture has not yet been fully realised on the ground anywhere, neither in the West nor in the non-West.

Allow me to introduce some more studies that work with typologies so the intricacies of this research become visible. Social psychologist Peter B. Smith and his colleagues have studied all three, honour, face, and dignity mindsets.[[774]](#endnote-775) They conducted surveys where they used the following description for a dignity orientation, ‘How much a person respects himself is far more important than how much others respect him’. They chose the sentence ‘People should minimise conflict in social relationships at all costs’ to capture a face orientation, and the phrase ‘You must punish people who insult you’ to characterise an honour mindset. Respondents in the United Kingdom and Finland were selected to serve as informants from dignity cultures, and the results showed that they perceived dignity values as incompatible with face and honour values. Respondents from China and Malaysia were included as representatives of harmony and face cultures, and they welcomed dignity values of equality as a basis for interpersonal harmony, while rejecting the emphasis on assertion and defence against threat entailed in honour values. Respondents from Lebanon, Turkey, Brazil, and Mexico rejected reliance on both face and dignity values for being ineffective to uphold honour.

Psychologist Dov Cohen and his colleagues, as well, have carried out research on honour, face, and dignity, for instance, they studied the psychology of violence in the culture of honour in the south of the United States.[[775]](#endnote-776) They also explored ‘the self in face and dignity culture’ by comparing Hong Kong and the United States, concluding that ‘people from a face culture absorb the judgements of other people into their private self-definitions’, while ‘people from a dignity culture try to preserve the sovereign self by not letting others define them’.[[776]](#endnote-777)

Sociologists Bradley Campbell and Jason Manning describe how aggrieved parties in honour cultures such as the American Old West or the street gangs of West Side Story would engage in duels or physical fights in response to conflict, while in dignity cultures insults no longer have the same impact on one’s reputation of bravery.[[777]](#endnote-778) In a dignity culture, people are expected to tolerate accidental personal injuries, and, rather than taking the law into their own hands, they are encouraged to choose non-violent responses — which may range from covert avoidance to quietly cutting off relations with the offender, or seeking harmony without passing judgement, or, in the most serious cases, calling the police.[[778]](#endnote-779)

Social anthropologist Michael Minkov introduced the term monumentalism for cultural realms in which the ‘human self’ manifests itself as invariant, proud, and stable like a monolithic monument, while he applied the term flexumility (flexibility + humility) to cultural contexts in which the focus is on adaptability and imitation.[[779]](#endnote-780) Peter B. Smith commends Minkov’s monumentalism versus flexumility dimension for its ability to differentiate honour cultures from face cultures insofar as honour cultures distinguish sharply between what is approved and what is disapproved, while face cultures are more flexible. East Asian nations, for instance, manifest flexibility and humility when they adopt Western names, rituals, customs, and other practices, and what they gain is high school success in mathematics and modern science together with high economic growth, while paying with high suicide rates. Some Arab nations, in contrast, could be seen as monumentalist to the extent that their citizens see it as treason to allow Western education to erode time-honoured values and beliefs, with the advantage that suicide rates are low, as pride and self-stability appear to protect against suicidal tendencies.

Earlier, I referred to research carried out by psychologist David Matsumoto and his colleagues who distinguish the vindicator from the voyager,[[780]](#endnote-781) a contrast that appears to align with the monumentalism versus flexumility dimensions. A vindicator defends pre-existing ethnocentrism and stereotypes, while a voyager uses cultural diversity and intercultural conflicts for forging new relationships, new arrangements for relationships, and new ideas. I have lived all my life as such a voyager.

When we look at Europe and America, we find early sociologist David Riesman (1909–2002) and his colleagues distinguishing three cultural types, tradition-directed, inner-directed, and other-directed.[[781]](#endnote-782) They describe a tradition-directed culture as one that follows the directions given by preceding generations, whereas inner-directed people discover their own potential within themselves, while other-directedness emerged after the Industrial Revolution when the growing ability to consume goods and afford material abundance led the new middle class to define themselves in comparison to the way others lived. As I have observed on my global path, it is definitely the latter mindset that has permeated ‘world culture’ throughout the past decades, thus bringing back the inequality associated with the first, while the inner-directed orientation loses out, the orientation I feel most at home in and that I see foster equal dignity best.

Over many decades, social scientists Paul Ray and Sherry Ruth Anderson have carried out surveys in United States and Europe, and they identified three main cultural trends, first, the moderns, the cultural movement that started about five hundred years ago and that endorses the ‘realist’ worldview of either big business, big government, big media, or past socialist, communist, or fascist movements.[[782]](#endnote-783) Second, a counter-movement against moderns arose, namely, the traditionals, as Ray and Anderson call them, the religious right and rural populations seeking refuge in the honour of the past. Third, the most recent counter-movement are the cultural creatives, those who value strong ecological sustainability for the planet, those who support women’s issues, personal growth, authenticity, and are wary of big business, in short, those who seek a dignified future. The cultural creatives movement started around 1960 with two branches which initially antagonised each other and only later began to merge, namely, the consciousness movement, an inward-oriented movement that focusses on the inner state of the psyche, and the social movement, an outward-oriented movement focussing on action for peace in the streets. When Ray and Anderson published their work in 2000, their research indicated that traditionals comprised about 24 to 26 per cent of the adult population in the United States (approximately 48 million people), moderns about 47 to 49 per cent (approximately 95 million), and cultural creatives about 26 to 28 per cent (approximately 50 million). In the European Union, the cultural creatives represented about 30 to 35 per cent of the adult population.

Guy Standing, known for having coined the term precariat,[[783]](#endnote-784) offers a somewhat related categorisation. As he sees it, the precariat cannot become a class-for-itself because it is split into three factions that are partly antagonistic. The first faction is comprised of what he calls the atavists, those with a lost past, those who vote for leaders like Trump, Putin, Orban, Marine Le Pen, Farage and other Brexiteers, or the Lega in Italy. The first faction demonises the second, namely, the nostalgics, the migrants and minorities who have no present. The third faction, the progressives, are those with no sense of future.[[784]](#endnote-785)

Let me end this listing here and turn to the concept of authoritarianism.

#### From conservative authoritarianism to liberal progressiveness

A large body of research addresses the concept of authoritarianism. Humanistic philosopher Erich Fromm laid its groundwork at the Institute for Social Research in the 1930s,[[785]](#endnote-786) with sociologist and philosopher Theodor Adorno and his colleagues developing it further in their 1950 study The authoritarian personality, and many successors building on it since.[[786]](#endnote-787) The field of political psychology has spawned many related personality constructs and ideological concepts, including ‘Dogmatism, Machiavellianism, Right Wing Authoritarianism, The Tompkins Polarity Scale, Power, Tough Mindedness, Compensatory Masculinity, Warfare Personality, and Social Dominance Orientation’.[[787]](#endnote-788)

As for me, perceptual control theory may be the best candidate to guide future empirical research, as it applies control systems theory to human psychology and behaviour, mirroring the feedback systems that also the human body uses to control its inner coherence.[[788]](#endnote-789) When I was a medical students, I learned about these feedback systems in the first years of my training.

Theodor Adorno and his colleagues initially thought authoritarianism was an aspect of personality. Later, the role of the context came more into focus, in particular, the role of threat, as authoritarianism increases under circumstances of social threat.[[789]](#endnote-790) Social psychology experiments confirm that authoritarian collectivists tend to ‘close the door’ and blame victims rather than aiding them.[[790]](#endnote-791) Conflict hardens the matrix — hardens the shell, as Kenneth Gergen formulates it[[791]](#endnote-792) — making the shell ‘water-tight’ and impossible to think beyond the shell.

This focus on threat from the larger context supports my big history narrative that authoritarianism was pushed to the forefront by the continuous sense of threat flowing from the security dilemma wherever and whenever it was strong throughout the past millennia (see more in chapter 9). It also supports the insight that it is unsurprising that authoritarian tendencies of the past re-emerge now, as the entire world community is engulfed by a growing sense of threat flowing from social and ecological insecurities.

Political scientist Jan-Werner Müller is one of the many voices who observe that authoritarian populists capitalise on contemporary threats and amplify them for their own gain. Müller warns that, if such populists were to gather enough power, they may end up creating regimes that exclude all those not considered part of ‘the proper people’. At the core of such populism is a rejection of pluralism, as populists claim to speak exclusively for ‘the silent majority’ or ‘the real people’.[[792]](#endnote-793)

When we look deeper into the phenomenon of authoritarian populism, we find moral foundations theory explaining that there are (at least) six innate moral foundations of cultural mindsets, namely, care/harm, fairness (equality)/cheating, liberty/oppression, loyalty/betrayal, authority/subversion, and sanctity (purity)/degradation. Liberals, or ‘leftists’, as they are called in the Anglo-Saxon world, primarily endorse care and equality, whereas conservatives or ‘rightists’ condone all six foundations more equally, and, so goes the theory, this difference can be found across cultures, nationalities, and ethnicity.[[793]](#endnote-794) (The labels ‘left’ and ‘right’ stem from the accidental seating of the parties in the French National Assembly more than two hundred years ago.)

Social psychologists Jonathan Haidt and his colleagues, after having explored the psychology that informs morality, explain that humans are not ‘scientists discovering the truth’, rather, we are like lawyers arguing for positions that we had arrived at long before and by other means.[[794]](#endnote-795) Haidt suggests that we have in-born ‘moral receptors’ and that what we perceive as our defining moral values is unconsciously reflexive, whereby our social relationships are more decisive for our moral matrix than the message. Haidt explains that conservatives are better than liberals in keeping a group together and accomplish shared goals, while liberals are more effective in achieving justice within the group. While liberals are universalists and try to balance compassion and fairness, conservatives are more parochial.

I very much resonate with Haidt’s point that it is important for liberals to be aware that conservatives can easily describe liberal views — and that they are taken aback by what they see as liberals’ lack of respect for ‘the natural’ order and hierarchy — while liberals cannot as easily put themselves into the shoes of conservatives.[[795]](#endnote-796) To avoid that dependency on social relationships leads to groupthink, Haidt recommends widening one’s horizon, for instance, through travel. This is also what this book aims for, namely, widening the horizon of its readers.

As to the nature of threat, right wing and left wing orientations differ in what they single out as threat. From a right wing or authoritarian perspective, ‘the enemy’ is personalised, whereas left wing opposition is directed against socio-economic structures:

The right, in a tradition stemming back to [Hobbes](https://www.gutenberg.org/files/3207/3207-h/3207-h.htm), takes insecurity and anxiety as the necessary, unavoidable, and indeed perhaps even favourable product of capitalist social relations. It transforms such insecurity and anxiety into the fear of the stranger and an argument for a punitive state. In contrast, the left seeks to provide an account of the sources of such insecurity in the processes that have led to the dismantling of the welfare state, and corresponding phenomena such as ‘zero-hours’ contracts, the casualisation of labour, and generalised precarity. It then proposes transformative and egalitarian solutions to these problems.[[796]](#endnote-797)

While I write these lines, I receive a message that may serve as an illustration, a message about American president Donald Trump visiting London and walking in front of Queen Elizabeth as they inspect the Coldstream Guards. ‘The queen was forced to bob and weave as she caught up to walk alongside him. His numerous protocol gaffes left many feeling that his behaviour was an insult to Britain and lacked the respect that should be shown the monarch. Trump was late when meeting the queen, causing her to check her watch, on camera, several times. He declined to bow, but shook hands instead. His overall behaviour was disrespectful and thoughtless towards an elderly woman, queen or not’.[[797]](#endnote-798) The contrast between the responses from both political camps is striking. First, ‘left wing’ voices:

Tweet #1: I’m not a monarchist by any stretch of the imagination but this is such an insult to Britain. Absolutely clueless, classless, thoughtless, lacking in any dignity and without a shred of respect.

Tweet #2: Did he walk in front of the Queen?

Tweet #3: Well, Trump should be ashamed of how he behaved in front of the queen. No respect for protocol or even decent manners. She’s an elderly lady and the way he behaved is arrogant and disgusting.

Tweet #4: Even if she wasn’t the Queen, what a way to treat a 92-year-old woman acting as your host. He acts like he was raised by the son of a bordello owner.

Tweet #5: Or just general politeness being with an elderly lady and making sure she goes first and is ok.

Tweet #6: And a very old lady also. No class, no decorum, no integrity.  
Tweet #7: It’s also misogynistic, because there is no way that his complete lack of respect is unrelated to her being a woman. The extra disrespect he shows to people like her and Angela Merkel is infuriating.

Tweet #8: He’s vile to Theresa May too. At the end of the day he’s exactly who we thought he was.

Tweet #9: The lack of respect especially for female foreign leaders and officials is pretty consistent.

The supporters of Donald Trump in America came to his defence:

1776, the first Brexit.

God bless America!

Trump reminding the Crown who won 1776.

Where was the respect for our president?

Never a nice word about our president.

Make America Great Again, not Britain. Trump 2020!

He’s her equal not her subject — no bowing here.

England’s phone system: Press one for Arabic, press two for English

The future ruler of the UK will be wearing either a beard or a hijab.

London has a Muslim mayor, enough said.

We don’t answer to a Queen.

Which country saved England not one but twice during the 20th century? Otherwise Brits today would all be speaking German.

America first.

To the victor goes the spoils.

God bless President Trump.

Best President ever.

We love Trump.

Winning since 1776.

Vote in November ONLY Republican!!!

President Trump is definitely a genius, and a wise genius, which is unusual for geniuses. We are very lucky to have President Trump. MAGA 2020!

Remember, he is highly intelligent and he doesn’t need to be briefed on anything.[[798]](#endnote-799)

#### From lone male invulnerability to shared human vulnerability

Throughout all my life, I have wondered how honour and dignity relate to gender. In 2010, I wrote a book on this topic.[[799]](#endnote-800) I have always asked myself why it is that so many men are reluctant to take female views on life and the world seriously.[[800]](#endnote-801) I read Simone de Beauvoir as a young adolescent but initially could not believe that men would be so foolish and use the sight of a female body as a pretext to trap her in the role of ‘the other to the centrality of men’.[[801]](#endnote-802) Later, as I understood more, I witnessed with sadness the sense of threat that many men harbour, the fear of losing their masculinity through becoming wo-men = no-men. ‘If you want to insult a woman, call her prostitute — if you want to insult a man, call him a woman’, is a sentence I heard often. ‘Men are afraid that women will laugh at them. Women are afraid that men will kill them’, is a related quote, attributed to writer and activist Margaret Atwood.[[802]](#endnote-803) Author Peggy Orenstein concluded from her research that girls are ‘systematically disconnected from their bodies’, while boys are ‘systematically disconnected from their hearts’ and feel driven by an obsession with status.[[803]](#endnote-804)

In his research on militarism, psychohistorian Brian D’Agostino compared the ‘macho’ profile of ‘hawks’ with the profile of ‘doves’. He found that hawks, male or female, identify with ‘masculine’ traits such as ‘competitive, aggressive, ambitious, masculine, assertive, bossy, and tough’, while they reject ‘feminine’ traits such as ‘sympathetic, feeling vulnerable and tender’. Male ‘doves’ show androgynous tendencies.[[804]](#endnote-805) D’Agostino used perceptual control theory to explain what it is that ‘macho’ hawks do, namely, they control the image of themselves as ‘not feminine’.[[805]](#endnote-806)

The separation of human beings into ‘men’ and ‘not-men’ has always saddened me. I have never stopped being horrified by so many men and also many women trying to impose male versus not-male sex-role constraints on the world. On my part, I wish to relate to everyone around me simply as fellow human being, as fellow sentient creature.[[806]](#endnote-807) ‘Cages are no doorways to freedom’ is a formulation I cherish.[[807]](#endnote-808) How sad that throughout history so many of my peer pioneer women and men were punished and demonised for violating that cage.[[808]](#endnote-809) In my life, also I had to pay a high price for being ‘different’, for ‘living like a male explorer’.[[809]](#endnote-810) This price, I feel, is so unnecessary.

Some thinkers suggest that the ‘dominance of men endangers the survival of humanity’.[[810]](#endnote-811) The idea is that change can only come when men and women share childcare more equally, because then can men are freed from having to incessantly ‘prove their masculinity’, free from the double bind of having to be what they are not, namely, invulnerable dominators.[[811]](#endnote-812)

I would add that the entire world-system needs changing, away from the threat of the security dilemma and the idea of military security in a world where one dominator society is pitted against the other, towards global human security in a world that unites its diversity in global partnership (see more in Part III in this book). As long as the world is divided, men will need to deny their vulnerability as humans. They will live with a double threat, the threat from the security dilemma and the threat from their own vulnerability. This will cause them to overlook systemic socio-economic causes and rather personalise ‘the enemy’, be it rival strongmen or women as carriers of ‘female’ vulnerability. The answer must be to move away from local collectivist dominator societies of ranked honour towards global partnership in equal dignity for all humans in freedom and solidarity.

#### A personal note on dignified humility in action

Allow me to end this chapter with sharing a few aspects of my ‘global living’ practice, a practice that soon has spanned five decades. Wherever I go on this planet, I offer myself with all my vulnerabilities, as a fellow human being, more, as fellow sentient being. I attempt to approach whatever I see and whomever I meet with a deep, sincere, and loving openness. As much as possible, I abstain from pre-formed judgements, rigid categorisations, or blind adherence to the theoretical frameworks that I became acquainted with as a youth in school, at university, or through ideological influences from society at large, while at the same time always keeping in mind that no one can fully escape one’s socialisation and educational backgrounds. As mentioned earlier, I use Max Weber’s ideal-type approach,[[812]](#endnote-813) which allows for analysis and action to proceed at different levels of abstraction, thus combining what philosophers Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari have called rhizomatic and arborescent.[[813]](#endnote-814) In the spirit of Weber’s approach, I go to the abstract level when I feel it can be useful, while at the same time always heeding the spirit of philosopher Isaiah Berlin, and never taking classifications overly seriously, including my own.[[814]](#endnote-815)

After many years of walking the planet, certain personal narratives emerged in me, narratives of how the world functions and how we human beings operate. I see two dichotomies that cross-cut each other. As reported before, I perceive a foundational difference between a mindset that deems all humans as equal in worthiness and a mindset that ranks them as unequal. On top of this, I see two basic ways of being-in-the-world that cut across the equal-unequal dichotomy, and these two ways that are in resonance with many of the classifications discussed above. I have dubbed these two ways or groups ‘Pharisees’ and ‘Sufis’.

Let me explain. First a caveat. These phrases came to me simply because of my particular personal biography. By choosing this terminology, I do not wish to point at any particular religion. I do not refer to any Christian or Sufi community around the world, present or past, and how they define themselves. I came across the Pharisee orientation as a child since I grew up in a Christian context in Europe, and later, when I lived in Egypt, the Sufi orientation became known to me. Slowly, throughout decades of living on all continents, I saw these two orientations manifest everywhere, irrespective of religion — all religions seem to offer both paths, and also atheists and even equality activists follow either path.[[815]](#endnote-816)

I myself belong to the second group. Sufi is my way to describe people who are rooted organically in larger contexts of meaning, similar to Indigenous peoples who are in deep dialogue with nature and each other.[[816]](#endnote-817) My father is such a person. He feels deep sympathy and love for all living beings, he regards himself as a living organism with the humble specificity of being human. I follow my father’s example in that my love excludes no one, it includes also those who hold Pharisee orientations, even though I fear that their orientations will endanger our species’ survival on planet Earth if they were to become prevalent.

I meet Pharisees everywhere, people who cling to the letter, to dogmatic fixedness, be it religious or secular.[[817]](#endnote-818) Mostly, they align with mindsets of ranked honour, yet, sometimes also with mindsets of equal dignity. If we look at implicit theories of intelligence, Pharisees are entity theorists who see intelligence as finite, while Sufis are incremental theorists who regard intelligence as malleable and elastic, or as Linda Hartling would say, incremental theorists have a mindset of personal growth.[[818]](#endnote-819) From the point of brain research, we could say that Pharisees allow the left brain to be dominant, while the right brain, the hemisphere of presence and context, is more active in Sufis, expressing their embeddedness in the world.[[819]](#endnote-820)

What I mean by Sufi or Pharisee ways of being in the world resonates also with the being versus having dichotomy that humanist philosopher Erich Fromm proposed. I read him avidly when I was a young psychology student. According to Fromm, this dichotomy describes ‘two fundamental modes of existence, or two different kinds of orientation towards self and the world, two different types of character structure whose respective dominance determines the totality of how a person thinks, feels, and acts’.[[820]](#endnote-821) Later, I came across the dichotomy of Indigenous versus dominant worldviews described by Indigenous scholar Don ‘Four Arrows’ Jacobs of Cherokee and Muscogee Creek ancestry.[[821]](#endnote-822) I also understood that I had spent my childhood years in the substantivist economic model conceptualised by economist Karl Polanyi, rather than the formalist model.[[822]](#endnote-823)

David Riesman’s inner-directed way resonates with what I call the Sufi mode, as does the way of the flexible and humble voyager, and that of the liberal nurturant parent. The Pharisee mode, in contrast, goes with Riesman’s tradition- and other-directed ways of being, as well as with the ways of the monumentalist vindicator and that of the strict conservative authoritarian father.[[823]](#endnote-824)

Whoever has a tendency towards perfectionism usually also leans towards the Pharisee mode, including its self- and other-destructive aspects, as perfectionism tends to be self-undermining, betraying its very own professed goals — it is well known that ‘striving for the best often destroys the good’.[[824]](#endnote-825) Even the best-intended ‘Sufi’ intervention, if driven by perfectionism, carries the risk of going down this path. This plays out in many arenas, not least in the field of religion. When Glauben is practiced dogmatically — Glauben is the German word for belief in the sense of ‘having a faith’ or of adhering to a dogma — the result will soon drift away from wise equanimity and come closer to small-minded combative Aberglauben or superstition. Secularism could be described as a well-intended ‘Sufi’ attempt to keep religiously oriented people from excluding non-believers and people of other religions from participation in society. Yet, also secularism ‘can be used as a tool to exclude and humiliate’, as Linda Hartling observes,[[825]](#endnote-826) since ‘secularism and religions can both be used to define who the out-group is and who should be humiliated’.[[826]](#endnote-827) As Hartling suggests, ‘rather than the dualism of religiosity versus secularism, there is a third way of creating healthy, equally dignifying human relationships and activity that transcends the baggage associated with both of these traditions/words’.[[827]](#endnote-828) Political theorist William Connolly chimes in with his criticism of conventional secularism and his proposal of ‘deep pluralism’ for the exploration of layered conceptions of thinking, ethos, and public life.[[828]](#endnote-829) Scholar Steven Roach was introduced before, and he goes even beyond deep pluralism by calling for a ‘pluralistic, open-ended global moral propriety’.[[829]](#endnote-830)

As much as perfectionism breeds the Pharisee orientation, the inverse is also true. Wherever I observe the Pharisee orientation manifesting, I see that it is prone to sow frustration, invite fanatical behaviour, and foreclose psychological and spiritual growth and fulfilment, because it is inherently impossible to follow all rules and requirements of the letter perfectly. Perfectionism lacks an inherent endpoint per definition — perfection always calls for more perfection. If Pharisees in addition are committed to competition for domination and control, they face a two-fold dilemma — as also domination lacks an inherent endpoint and being a Pharisee means lacking the flexibility and humility to understand this, if Pharisees stay on course, they will not stop before their own survival substrate is destroyed.[[830]](#endnote-831) They will behave as locusts do when they ravage their food supply wherever they set foot, bound to die out when they have used up all untouched spaces.[[831]](#endnote-832)

Nazi Germany can illustrate this path towards the destruction of self and others. On 18th February 1943, propaganda minister Joseph Goebbels held the Sportpalastrede in the Berlin Sports Palace, a speech in which he called for ‘total war’. With exalted pathos, he roared, ‘The English claim that the German people are resisting the government’s total war efforts. It [the German government] does not want the total war, say the English, but surrender. I ask you: Do you want total war? Do you want it, if necessary, more total and more radical than we can imagine today?’[[832]](#endnote-833) The resounding answer from the more than ten thousand Nazi followers present in the sports arena was ‘Yes!’ As history shows, it was a yes to collective mayhem.

Japan offers another example for the danger that is entailed in blindly following fanatical dominators who know no endpoint. Earlier, I referred to the notion of amae, or ‘sweetness in interdependence’.[[833]](#endnote-834) Amae appears to have gone too far in the Second World War, at least if we accept that it was rigid collective self-effacement in the face of authority that led to massive defeat. Historian John Dower, in his book Embracing defeat: Japan in the wake of World War II, introduces several Japanese philosophers who decry this effacement and call for a turnaround, for shutaisei, or true subjectivity and autonomy at the individual level, so that people can resist the indoctrinating power of the state.[[834]](#endnote-835) Natsume Soseki (1867–1916) was one of the premier philosophers and novelists of modern Japan, and he called for a spirit of individualism vis-à-vis the state, as did novelist and essayist Sakaguchi Ango (1906–1955), who affirmed the need for genuine shutaisei, the need for each individual to create his or her own ‘samurai ethic’, his or her own ‘emperor system’.[[835]](#endnote-836) If I were allowed to add my voice, after living in Japan for three years, I would call not for a complete turnaround, not for a rejection of amae, I would call for imbuing amae with shutaisei, not just in Japan, but everywhere in the world.

What these Japanese philosophers pointed at after WWII, was discussed also by their contemporaries in other world regions, for instance, by American philosopher John Dewey (1859–1952). Dewey warned against the practice of schools to produce passive docile pupils who are compliant with authoritarian social and societal structures, while we live in a world where the opposite is needed, namely, schools that prepare students to be reflective, autonomous, and ethical beings, capable of arriving at social truths through critical and intersubjective discourse.[[836]](#endnote-837)

I found the Sufi orientation wherever cultural rules foregrounded solidarity in equal dignity, as they seem to act like a ‘school of life’ that nurtures Sufi rather than Pharisee orientations. Over the years, my intuition grew that values of equal dignity in solidarity are more than a particular variation in values on a par with other variations, they are the very life-enhancing ‘default’ of the human orientation. My understanding grew that ranked honour values were pushed onto people in contexts of threat, such as that which flows from the security dilemma. As the security dilemma was strong throughout the past millennia, I see it as the main driver for elevating authoritarian honour mindsets to the level of a cultural norm, and as reason for why the past millennia saw so many leaders with authoritarian leanings. It is only when the security dilemma ‘thaws’ that ‘Sufi’ inclinations find more space to be expressed. Such thawing happened, for instance, at the end of the World Wars and also at the end of the Cold War. As of now, in the beginning of the twenty-first century, it is getting ‘colder’ again, as we live in times of social and ecological hyper-threat, as we live in times where new cold or hot wars loom.[[837]](#endnote-838)

As referred to before, research underpins my intuitions, as cross-cultural studies suggest that life satisfaction is highest in dignity cultures,[[838]](#endnote-839) and that there is a pan-cultural correlation between higher satisfaction with life and the perception that one’s nation favours dignity values.[[839]](#endnote-840) Authoritarianism, in contrast, emerges under circumstances of social threat.[[840]](#endnote-841)

The connection between authoritarianism and a sense of threat is particularly important to understand for readers of this book who live in contemporary Western contexts and might not be able to imagine the level of fear with which the security dilemma ‘infected’ every nook and cranny of social relations throughout the past millennia. I frequently observe a lack of awareness among my friends in Western contexts of their responsibility to create global conditions that make dignified lives possible, that make the Sufi approach to life feasible so to speak. Fighting against authoritarian Pharisees tends to bring back the very threat that is responsible for facilitating their rise.

Author Yossi Klein Halevi makes this threat palpable when he describes the two biblical commands that Jewish history offers to Jews. On one side, he explains, Jews are always being reminded that they were strangers in the land of Egypt, and the lesson drawn is ‘don’t be brutal’. On the other side, Jews are being warned that while they were wandering in the desert, the tribe of Amalek attacked them without any reason, and the lesson for today is ‘don’t be naïve’. The ‘Pesach Jews’ hear the first lesson, Klein Halevi observes, while ‘Purim Jews’ hear the second.[[841]](#endnote-842) Historian Tom Segev shows how these two messages have played out in recent Israeli history — after the Eichmann process in 1962, for instance, when the Holocaust no longer was a taboo topic in Israel, the political left used it to underpin the argument of ‘look, we treat the Palestinians similarly!’ while the right camp countered with ‘look, they want to kill us!’[[842]](#endnote-843)

If we apply these lessons to human history as a whole, we could say that ‘don’t be naïve’ was the maxim of power elites throughout the past millennia in most parts of the world, while their subordinates had to keep their heads down and follow the rule of ‘don’t be brutal’, unless ordered and legitimised to be brutal by superiors. Applying these lessons to our present time, it would be ‘naïve’ to overlook the fact that we live in historical times that are radically new, as it is per definition naïve to blindly approach new situations with solutions from the past. The only non-naïve way forward in a globally interdependent world is to build global trust and governing institutions that prevent surprise ‘Amalek attacks’ from occurring altogether.

Unfortunately, my advice is too complex and too new for many, and thus not convincing enough to be widely heard. On the contrary, ‘Purim’ notions of honour are backlashing all around the world now, both overtly and covertly. I have keenly felt the covert beginnings of this trend during the past decades, I have seen how dominators exploited Sufis’ tolerant humility, flexible openness, and preference of dialogue. I have done my best to send out warnings with my books and talks. I can only hope that the coronavirus crisis that engulfed the planet from 2020 onwards may act as a wake-up call.

What worries me most is that the promise of dignity and the emancipative thrust of the maxim of the French revolution — liberté, égalité, fraternité — has throughout the past decades turned into its opposite, particularly in economic contexts that are called neo-liberal. In its most extreme form, liberty has come to mean freedom for might to become right, while equality translates into a sense of entitlement for all to be equally narcissistic and greedy, and the solidarity of fraternity means cooperation within streamlined corporations or nations that aim at bolstering their domination over rivals. Already during the French revolution, only égalité and liberté were solidly connected, while fraternité was sometimes left out, and even when it was included, it often carried a ‘death threat’: ‘brother or foe’.[[843]](#endnote-844) When the solidarity of fraternité is sold out for misguided definitions of liberté with the result that solidarity is seen as nemesis for individual freedom, and when solidarity is merely used as a weapon against ‘the enemy’, égalité is lost as well.[[844]](#endnote-845) On all continents, I observe with deep concern the misery that flows from double standards, false promises, and empty rhetoric, followed by the widespread loss of dignity, and how this triggers overt honour backlashes of right wing movements. My experience indicates that many readers of this book, those who live in relatively safe Western contexts, are not aware of the suffering I have witnessed through my global living practice, and they therefore tend to overlook their responsibility to work for global systemic change.

The very notion of decency is at the core of these backlashes. Steven Roach, scholar of the politics of decency, distinguishes an ontological concept of decency from a normative concept, he differentiates basic decency from conservative and liberal decency (see chapter 2). He calls it ‘the reactionary politics of conservative decency’ when political leaders angrily defend traditional values under the banner of decency.[[845]](#endnote-846) The emergence of global populism, he argues, reflects the ‘stark tension and growing political chasm between conservative and liberal decency’, and it is precisely the erosion of basic decency that creates this chasm.[[846]](#endnote-847) As a result, society is being divided by ‘competing moral and emotive claims to decency’,[[847]](#endnote-848) which grow the ‘rift between liberal and conservative decency’,[[848]](#endnote-849) and thus expose the pitfalls of ‘decency’s dual, universal role of including and excluding identity claims’.[[849]](#endnote-850) Looking at the dual function of decency, Roach wonders how we can ‘reconfigure the dense chunks of connective sensations, habits, and feelings, which work below the consciousness of dispositions...?’[[850]](#endnote-851)

In his work, Steven Roach assigns different roles to affect and emotion, he sees affect bringing emotions into existence through an unconscious, presocial mode of cognition. Affect, for Roach, is what happens ‘below the threshold of consciousness and cognition’, it ‘is rooted in the body’,[[851]](#endnote-852) it is what happens in the limbic system and its unconscious instincts. Emotions, on the other hand, are rational judgements that connect us with values. Roach refers to Martha Nussbaum and her view that compassion and love are universal emotions that help cultivate our social connections with others, including those from other cultures, which help us overcome emotions of fear, anger, and shame.[[852]](#endnote-853) By distinguishing between emotion and affect, Roach attempts to shed light on ‘the ontological problem of universalising decency or proclaiming the freedom of being protected against all forms of humiliation’.[[853]](#endnote-854)

To come to the end of this chapter and bring the thoughts together that were touched upon so far, when we look around in today’s world, we see that still many people adhere to what Riane Eisler calls the dominator mindset, leaning towards authoritarianism and preferring the strict father pedagogical framework that George Lakoff and Mark Johnson describe.[[854]](#endnote-855) For them, dignity is close to the traditional notion of ranked honour with ‘dignitaries’ at the top, their notion of dignity is close to the kind of autonomous decorum that was described in the previous chapter, and their affects are more in tune with what Roach calls conservative decency or what I call the ‘Pharisee mode of being’. On the other side, we have the ‘Sufis’, those who have a sense of Eisler’s partnership model of society and are less authoritarian, those who adopt the nurturant parent model, who resonate with compassionate liberal decency and aim to manifest basic decency through the human rights ideal of equal dignity for all in mutual solidarity.

While the human ‘default’ orientation is the latter, whenever and wherever threat is looming, it brings the parochial conservatism of the dominator mindset to the fore. Since a strong security dilemma was definitorial for most populations on the globe throughout the past millennia, it was bound to push the moral matrix towards conservatism. The presently unfolding ingathering of the human tribes — the coming together of humankind through globalisation — opens space for the attenuation of the security dilemma and for the human default orientation to resurface and flourish again. However, this space is rapidly closing again these days, even while I write this book, as the security dilemma is being reactivated by cycles of humiliation that sour the process of ingathering. The windows of opportunity that stood open in 1948 and again in 1991 risk closing as we speak wherever authoritarianism takes over.

Global change is the name of a role play that researchers use in socio-psychological research on authoritarianism.[[855]](#endnote-856) When people with a strong sense of authoritarianism play the same game, the outcome is dramatic: The simulated future of the world becomes highly militarised and eventually enters the stage of nuclear war until the entire population of the Earth has to be declared dead.[[856]](#endnote-857) Such an outcome seems closer than ever in present-day’s real world.[[857]](#endnote-858) Only when people of less authoritarianism play the game, the result is world peace and global cooperation.

If we apply the lessons from this research to real life, then the only endgame that promises survival for humanity is to bridge the cleavage between conservatives and liberals. Liberals have the task to convince conservatives to embrace all of humanity as their in-group and to invest their preferences for loyalty, authority, and sense of sanctity into protecting unity in diversity in the entire global village.

Before I end this chapter, to prevent misunderstandings, let me briefly remind of the Weberian ideal-type approach and that it is obvious that categorisations risk being too simplistic, including my Pharisee-Sufi dichotomy. I take it as self-evident that simplified categorisations should always be complemented by highlighting complexity and diversity at other levels.[[858]](#endnote-859) This book attempts to ‘zoom out’ and ‘zoom in’, it aims to shed light on both, on patterns of abstraction on one side and rich and detailed complexity on the other side.

To conclude this chapter, I would like to come back to my students and thank them for reminding me that my advocacy of dignity might be misinterpreted as Western imperialism, given that some cross-cultural psychologies describe Western dignity culture as superior to non-Western face and honour cultures.[[859]](#endnote-860) ‘Understanding other cultures’ is not my personal preference, I am more interested to ‘be with my fellow human beings’ and to understand how ‘we, humankind as a whole’ may unite so that our diversity can enrich us rather than leading us into hostile division. I am inspired by the diversity I encounter around the globe, both by our cultural and biological diversity, and I feel profoundly encouraged by the potential for loving connection that I observe in all humans, the potential for loving unity in diversity. I expect that if hostile divisions were to take over, it would spell the extinction of our species. Due to the fact that I hail from a family that was forcibly displaced, I never developed a sense of ‘my culture’, and therefore the notion of ‘understanding other cultures’ was always alien to me, let alone the practice of placing labels on them, be it labels of face, honour, or dignity. For me, humanity does not include ‘other’, it only includes ‘us’.

I would also like to thank other friends who supported me in my scepticism of the concept of culture as a monolithic entity, and who reminded me that I should make this scepticism more visible through using the term mindset instead of culture wherever possible.[[860]](#endnote-861) I appreciate Anthony Marsella’s explanation that it is fundamental to human nature to try to make meaning, that ‘psychologies are shaped and formed in cultural contexts’, and that ‘cultures’ represent ‘templates’ through which ‘we order the world about us’.[[861]](#endnote-862) I also appreciate Howard Richard’s formulation that ‘humans are the animals whose ecological niche is culture. Humans are creators of culture’.[[862]](#endnote-863) Richards explains that ‘biologically, our bodies have evolved to be the bodies of cultural animals. Our bodies do not function properly when deprived of society — as is seen perhaps most dramatically when newborns are not welcomed into a loving environment and they fail to develop basic trust in the first few months of life. Culture is passed on by upbringing in interaction with genetics’.[[863]](#endnote-864)

When I speak of culture in this book, sometimes I point at mindsets, sometimes, however, I follow Howard Richards and his admonition that we ought to focus more on the power of cultural rules, cultural structures, and cultural norms than on people having power. ‘The rules take on a life of their own. They persist from generation to generation as biological individuals are born and die. Cultural structures have power in the literal sense that they cause effects. They explain what happens’.[[864]](#endnote-865) I resonate with Richards’ words that ‘it is misleading to regard culture as an ideal superstructure built on a material base; it fits the facts better to say that cultural rules constitute the material positions that organise the production that makes life possible’.[[865]](#endnote-866)

I am intrigued by the position of anthropologist James Boggs, who defends anthropology’s culture concept as a scientific theory, acknowledging the irony that anthropology’s culture concept disturbs its very liberal tradition and its dominant social/political theory of Western modernity in which anthropology is located as an academic field.[[866]](#endnote-867)

With Howard Richards, I conclude that a focus on basic cultural structures (BCS) adds a third dimension of causal analysis on top of the struggle between those in power who wish to stay in power and those at the bottom who wish to rise up. ‘There is a third set of causal powers ... that happens because the BCS work that way. An example of the latter is the destruction of the biosphere. Ecocide is not to the interest of any human being. No, not one. Still less is it in the interest of anybody’s grandchildren. And yet humanity remains locked in a death march to a destination where nobody wants to go’.[[867]](#endnote-868)

Psychologist Kenneth Gergen’s formulation can serve as a closing point for this chapter and a starting point from where global unity in diversity may emerge:

Relations between groups — religious, political, tribal, ethnic — have brought untold misery in the history of civilisation, and the future hangs in the balance. The route from separation to alienation, and then mutual destruction, is a route to the demise of meaning altogether. Dialogic practices that restore the flow of productive meaning are vitally needed. Similarly honoured are practices that bring humans and their environment together into a mutually sustainable world. All such actions are realisations of second-order morality — a revitalising of the relationship among relationships. All harbour sacred potential...[[868]](#endnote-869)

My biographical background from a family traumatised by war and displacement, together with my global citizen experience, have motivated me to dedicate my life in all humility to a mission that is larger than a lifetime. I strive to help opening space, locally and globally, for global cultural structures to emerge that avoid offloading guilt and shame onto the individual when it is the larger group that fails its responsibility to create dignifying structural frames for its members. I work for cultural structures and mindsets that emphasise responsibility, the responsibility to extend mutual care beyond legal obligations and beyond calculations of possible remuneration. I work for rules that make it possible for responsibility to be shouldered by individuals and society alike. I work for a global culture where salutogenic shame is being valued, I do not wish to live in a shameless society.

More, we as humankind as a whole may want to learn to feel ashamed of ourselves for exploiting the ecological and social resources of our planet beyond its carrying capacity. I work for a world culture where humble pride is nurtured rather than haughty pride, where dignified humility is fostered rather than servile humbleness. I work for a global culture where feelings of humiliation are healed, and where practices and systems of humiliation are regarded as anti-social violation and relinquished and prevented. No longer can humiliation be employed as a supposedly pro-social path to instilling shame.

After a lifetime of observation, research, and reflection, I conclude that humanity’s greatest problem — and it might mean our demise — is our current inability to unlearn the dominator mindset and leave behind the dominator model of society. I suggest that there is no shame in accepting, with deep compassion, that our ancestors learned this mindset during the past millennia because they faced the unforgiving systemic threat called security dilemma. Our ancestors could not do better, they did not yet have our knowledge of the world. We can do better.

There is no shame in accepting that new realities call for new learning. I work for a world culture of unity in diversity, of dialogue and partnership in equal dignity, a world culture that transcends any dependence versus independence dichotomy and lets us join hands in turning our global social and ecological interdependence into loving mutual interconnectedness. .

Vend i tide, det er ingen skam å snu  
Turn in time, there is no shame in turning around

― Norwegian mountain weather rule 8

## Chapter 4: 1948 — In awe of inherent dignity

Seeds of Dignity

Glittering with possibilities,

May we carry these seeds,

Guided by wisdom and the wind,

Reforesting lives,

Replenishing the planet,

So all can breathe

Dignity.

― Linda Hartling, director of Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies[[869]](#endnote-870)
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Dignity cannot be defined. Just like any other human experience, also the experience of dignity does not have a clear academic definition, it is not a law of nature that can be harnessed by language or mathematical formulas. Dignity resides in the body, in the bodymind.[[870]](#endnote-871)

Many are taken aback by this insight. People get angry and say, ‘If dignity cannot be defined, it is useless’. They get angrier when they hear that the fact that dignity cannot be defined in the same way as a law of nature does not diminish the significance of the experience. Legal philosopher and international law scholar Oscar Schachter comments:

We do not find an explicit definition of the expression — dignity of the human person — in international instruments or (as far as I know) in national law. Its intrinsic meaning has been left to intuitive understanding, conditioned in large measure by cultural factors. When it has been invoked in concrete situations, it has been generally assumed that a violation of human dignity can be recognised even if the abstract term cannot be defined.[[871]](#endnote-872)

Language hollows being into desire — this is one of psychiatrist Jacques Lacan’s famous insights — the very operation of language makes a hole in ‘the real’, he says, it implicates that desire is the Other’s desire rather than one’s own need.[[872]](#endnote-873)

For me, the best way to describe dignity is to say that it is embodied. When we see a person who keeps her head down in pained meekness, we see humiliation. We see arrogance when a person sticks her ‘nose’ up too high. Equality in dignity is somewhere in the middle, neither above nor below others, it is when we look each other into the eyes in dignified humility as fellow human beings who share the same home planet.

Prior to the arrival of human rights ideals, dignity was something that was ascribed to ‘higher beings’, to dignitaries, who were entitled to carry their heads higher than others. Still today, this practice can be found in many places. ‘Dignitaries’ often perceive it as humiliating to be asked to lower their heads and meet everyone else on an equal par. Inversely, ‘lesser beings’, those who chose to accept that it is nature’s order or God’s will for them to be at the bottom of the social ranking order, may associate their very dignity with keeping their heads down. The beaten wife may not want to raise her head, while her husband may regard it as an insult to be asked to lower his head and see her in the eyes as an equal. This is what human rights defenders do when they advocate for their ideals, they encourage ‘lesser beings’ to lift their heads up from coerced humbleness, they invite ‘higher beings’ to lower their heads from arrogance, and they invite all to look straight into each other’s eyes as fellow humans in equal worthiness.

The arrival of the human rights ideal of equality in dignity is a transition from a normative universe of unequal worthiness towards a normative universe of equal worthiness, and it can be illustrated with the postures and movements of the body. In the language of the body, this transition goes from a scenario where superiors and inferiors look up or down at each other, towards a scenario where everyone looks into everyone else’s eyes as equals. In my work, I use the phrase of honour for the scenario of unequal worthiness, and I speak of dignity when I see the scenario of equal worthiness. A ‘dignitary’ who regards herself as a ‘higher being’ belongs more into the world of honour than into the world of dignity. My mission is to call on all to manifest equality in dignity through keeping our heads at the same level as our fellow human beings at all times, not too high and not too low, and concurrently, I call on all to open their arms and connect with each other in mutual care, because the aim is for unity in diversity to flourish.[[873]](#endnote-874)

While some people get angry at the lack of definiteness in the notion of dignity, others have shared with me that it is not a problem for them that their intellectual concept of dignity is fuzzy because they know instinctively when their dignity is violated (see the previous chapter for what I call ‘Sufi’ orientation). I resonate with the message of epidemiologist Jonathan Mann, founder of the health and human rights movement, who says that the reason for the depth of this experience is that we are all explorers in the larger world of human suffering and well-being:

The definition of dignity itself is complex and thus far elusive and unsatisfying. While the Universal Declaration of Human Rights starts by placing dignity first, ‘all people are born equal in dignity and rights’, we do not yet have a vocabulary, or taxonomy, let alone an epidemiology of dignity violations. Yet it seems we all know when our dignity is violated or impugned.[[874]](#endnote-875)

### What if dignity is a useless concept?

Philosopher Arthur Schopenhauer (1788–1860) characterised dignity as ‘the shibboleth of all perplexed and empty-headed moralists’.[[875]](#endnote-876) Ruth Macklin is a contemporary philosopher and professor of bioethics, and also in her eyes, dignity is a rather useless concept. For her, dignity ‘seems to have no meaning beyond what is implied by the principle of medical ethics, no meaning beyond respect for persons and the need to obtain voluntary and informed consent, plus the requirement to protect confidentiality’.[[876]](#endnote-877) Psychologist Steven Pinker suggests that autonomy is a much more practical and specific term than dignity.[[877]](#endnote-878)

Natalie Porter, past president of the International Council of Psychology, asks the ultimate question, ‘What if people feel humiliated by others’ definitions of dignity?’[[878]](#endnote-879) Indeed, is not her question the ultimate proof of the uselessness of the concept of dignity, when the range of its definitions is so large that it not only becomes empty but its adherents even may feel humiliated by each other?

Dignity sceptics can be found in all world regions. Dignity seems to be caught between needs and rights, between peace and justice, and between integrity and power. In India, for instance, ‘the liberty restricting potential of dignity, and its indeterminacy’ is pointed out as problematic.[[879]](#endnote-880)

Even countries such as Norway are not exempted, despite the fact that Norway is known for its cultural heritage of likeverd, which means equal worth or equal dignity in Norwegian. In 2014, the Norwegian Constitution was about to receive a new human rights chapter and the committee recommended that economic, social, and cultural rights should be included.[[880]](#endnote-881) Conservative committee member Carl I. Hagen disagreed. He and his party colleagues made clear that they only accept the UN Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which aims at preventing authoritarian and dictatorial regimes from controlling and keeping their citizens down. They reject the secondary or 2nd generation rights of the Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights, because, as they warned, those rights risk establishing a basis for a very expensive welfare state that imposes high taxes and fees that stifle sensible economic development. Furthermore, so their argument, if a constitution is filled with idealistic goals and proclamations that most people would consider to be unrealistic dreams without legal effects, it may weaken the core rights both in repute and in real legal effect.[[881]](#endnote-882)

The case of Norway exposes many foundational questions: How should dignity be operationalised? Which concept of human nature should underpin it? Which economic systems do we think are desirable and doable? For Carl I. Hagen, it is undesirable that social and economic equality should be nurtured by the state, so he declares it to be undoable. Is he right? Which concept of human nature is correct? Do people need competition to be motivated because humans are lazy if not pushed, or do people have an inborn desire to live in harmony and contribute with care to their community? Is equal dignity therefore to be defined as combative autonomy in a context of inequality, or can it be defined as responsible solidarity in a context of equality? Is poverty a necessary stimulus to motivate lazy people to work harder for their dignity, or is poverty a sign that society fails to offer its citizens’ dignifying opportunities to contribute? If the latter, is poverty removable through ‘trickling down’ or redistribution within existing socio-economic systems, or should notions such a poverty be made redundant altogether with new systems that nurture equal dignity through social and economic equality at the system level? In the case of Norway, is likeverd possible without likestilling, for instance, which means gender equality in Norwegian, or not? Is dignity realised when women and men are equally represented in a paid labour market? Yet, what if this is an undignifying system in itself, unable to bring dignity to people and planet in the longer term?

Clearly, the concept of human nature lies at the core of all questions. As long as a society does not decide which concept of human nature to embrace, all other debates will be stuck in mutual accusations — those who believe that human nature is inherently ‘evil’ will accuse those who believe in the ‘goodness’ of human nature of wishful naïvité, and both sides will overlook that human nature is relational and expresses itself differently in different socio-political frames. The solution will remain wanting, namely, to use the historically unprecedented degree of global interconnectedness as an opportunity to co-create systemic frames that ensure global human security and protect the planet as humanity’s commons, so that it becomes feasible to define dignity as responsible solidarity and parents can safely nurture the inborn desire to care already in their smallest children. (See more on the concept of human nature in chapter 10.)

I had the privilege of attending a book panel titled Human rights futures at Columbia University in New York City on 9th November 2017.[[882]](#endnote-883) Co-founder of Human Rights Watch, Aryeh Neier, more than eighty years old, chaired the panel. Like Carl I. Hagen, also Neier argued that economic rights ought to be regarded as public policies and not as part of human rights. He illustrated his point with an example from China, where the right to certain standards of living collides with the right to health — people are ‘lifted out of poverty’ through the burning of fossil coal, a practice that is detrimental to health as it makes air unbreathable. In Neier’s view, only political and civil rights, such as the right not to be tortured, can be enshrined as rights.

Shareen Hertel, political scientist and editor of The Journal of Human Rights, looking at Neier spoke up for the reframing of economic rights by using the ‘right to equal access’ as a ‘wedge’, or a ‘Trojan Horse’. I was delighted to hear her say that, as also I use the term ‘Trojan Horse’ for my hope that we can adapt human-made reality to our ideals, instead of sacrificing ideals for badly designed reality.[[883]](#endnote-884) Philosopher Howard Richards expresses similar thoughts in his search for ‘levers’ and ‘fulcrums’ that have the power ‘to move theory’ — Richards speaks of ‘growth points’ when he observes practices that provide ‘accounts of facts on the ground’, which, even though they may not precisely ‘falsify theoretical claims as stated in their own terms’, at least ‘cast them in a different light’.[[884]](#endnote-885) Other scholars use different terms for the same line of thought, for instance, environmental scientist Donella Meadows sees ‘leverage points’ to intervene in a system,[[885]](#endnote-886) while Erik Olin Wright puts his hopes on ‘changes in the interstices’, places in the institutional structures that are largely overlooked and have therefore better chances to persist than those aimed at higher-level structure.[[886]](#endnote-887) Paulo Freire used the phrase of temas bisagra or ‘hinge themes’ that can serve as wedges or hinges, while systems theorist Buckminster Fuller thought of ‘trimtabs’, the miniature rudders in front of ocean liners that help the main rudder to shift direction almost effortlessly by changing the pressure in front of it.[[887]](#endnote-888) Philosopher Roy Bhaskar speaks of the ‘transcendental argument’,[[888]](#endnote-889) while Steven Cohen, executive director of Columbia University’s Earth Institute, simply calls it ‘reasons for hope’.[[889]](#endnote-890) We may expect that Aryeh Neier would respond by saying that trimtabs can also point into the wrong direction and become ‘reasons for despair’.

At the book panel, Shareen Hertel presented an example for a successful wedge, namely, India’s ‘hunger belt’ that includes the drought-afflicted state of Rajasthan. In December 2000, three hundred organisations from across the state of Rajasthan participated in an ‘information sharing meeting’ aimed at highlighting the paradox of pervasive starvation in a drought-ridden state while government food stocks were overflowing, yet undistributed.[[890]](#endnote-891) Hertel explained how this initiative became a wedge issue for advocacy for the broader problem of food insecurity in all of India.[[891]](#endnote-892)

Jack Snyder, expert on international relations, spoke to the panel about the capacity of mass movements and of religions to empower rights. He pointed at discussions within the Democratic Party in the United States about which focus would be preferable — a focus on the most vulnerable, based on the language of access and need, or a focus on everyone, using the language of rights.[[892]](#endnote-893)

Priscilla Hayner, member of the United Nations’ standby team of mediation advisers, asked Sarah Leah Whitson, Director of the Middle East and North Africa division of Human Rights Watch, about the role of Human Rights Watch in Columbia — did Human Rights Watch’s insistence on ‘more prisons’ cause the rejection of the peace agreement? Sarah Leah Whitson responded by explaining that such questions are indeed being discussed continuously in her organisation, given the fact that peace and justice have a very difficult relationship and that Human Rights Watch does not define itself as a peace organisation, and that their compromise is to persecute the significant perpetrators and suggest alternative solutions such as truth-telling forums for the rest.

Leslie Vinjamuri, director of the Centre on Conflict, Rights, and Justice at the School of Oriental and African Studies at the University of London, rounded up the discussion with perhaps the most crucial question. She warned that there is an ‘elephant in the room’, namely, the fact that organisations with headquarters in the United States of America are regarded as potentially humiliating arms of the American government and its foreign intelligence services, and that therefore doubt regarding their integrity will always undermine the very basis of the credibility for all deliberations presented in the panel.

### What about ‘false dignity’?

Even those among my readers who regard the notion of dignity as useful will agree that it has been diluted, displaced, perverted, instrumentalised, and abused. One of the most shocking examples of abuse comes from a group of people from Germany who went to Chile to establish a cult community called ‘Colonia-Dignidad’, where people were mistreated and tortured under the very banner of dignity.[[893]](#endnote-894) More generally, particularly in the Anglo-Saxon world, dignity has become a deceptive cover for ‘making more money’ in the spirit of Russell Conwell (see chapter 2) — business consultants advise ‘when you make your employees believe you love them and they feel dignified, they will work better for you, and you will get rich’.[[894]](#endnote-895)

The ‘falsification of dignity’ is a formulation used by Achankeng Fonkem, a scholar hailing from British Southern Cameroon. He laments that dignity is abused as a shield for imperialist policies that engage in domination for access to cheap natural resources.[[895]](#endnote-896)

Christina Mason is a provider of palliative care in London and she speaks of ‘false dignity’ in situations where the ‘dignity of role’ is ‘carried too far’ so that it acts ‘as a cloak or mask behind which to hide’, ‘a mask that impedes human connectedness’ rather than furthering it.[[896]](#endnote-897) Mason formulates this in her chapter in a book that resulted from a dignity colloquium. She reports that in this colloquium, dignity was discussed ‘from all our different perspectives’, still, ‘not one of us was able to capture the experience, known throughout time and throughout the world; the experience of suffering that comes to people when they are not accorded the dignity that is, l believe, their right’.[[897]](#endnote-898) Mason uses an example from paediatric medicine to illustrate her point of false dignity, ‘The isolation of the enzyme deficiency responsible for Tay Sach’s disease is a biological finding; it says nothing, since it intends to say nothing, about the suffering attendant on that disease’.[[898]](#endnote-899) Mason’s message is that much more effort must be extended to manifesting dignity than simply informing patients coldly of complicated medical diagnoses.

There is a growing discussion as to whether ‘artificial intelligence’ technology destroys dignity or helps to further it. Computer scientist Joseph Weizenbaum warns that this technology represents a threat to human dignity when it is allowed to replace people in positions where authentic feelings of empathy, respect, and care should inform choice rather than just decision.[[899]](#endnote-900) Others hold the opposite view and see impartial computers as superior to partial enforcers, while yet others go one step further in that they trust that artificial intelligence will promote dignity by helping us understand the very nature of existence.[[900]](#endnote-901)

Then there are those who warn that the notion of dignity has been applied too one-sidedly, particularly in recent years in Western societies, insofar as it has been overly linked to the diversity of certain minorities. Indeed, if we accept that equal dignity can and should be manifested through unity in diversity, then it is crucial to maintain the balance between ‘too much’ and ‘too little’ — whenever the celebration of diversity becomes too one-sided, it can cause diversity to become divisive, thus undermining the entire dignity project. Not least the election of Donald Trump as president of the United States threw this danger into stark relief. Political scientist Mark Lilla warned:

The fixation on diversity in our schools and in the press has produced a generation of liberals and progressives narcissistically unaware of conditions outside their self-defined groups and indifferent to the task of reaching out to Americans in every walk of life... At a very young age our children are being encouraged to talk about their individual identities, even before they have them. By the time they reach college many assume that diversity discourse exhausts political discourse, and have shockingly little to say about such perennial questions as class, war, the economy and the common good.[[901]](#endnote-902)

The case of ‘Trumpism’ illustrates how the desire to dignify certain groups may cause other groups to feel humiliated — in this case, voters in Middle America — and how this can result in a considerable backlash.[[902]](#endnote-903) The humiliated — the ‘deplorables’[[903]](#endnote-904) — were willing to tolerate Trump’s ‘juvenile viciousness’, because ‘the narcissism of prevailing closed-minded progressive ideology was no longer to be tolerated. In the end, the alternative was worse than Trump’.[[904]](#endnote-905) The rhetoric of diversity — with its attention to the experience of African-American, Latino, L.G.B.T. and women voters — seems to have elicited feelings of exclusion and humiliation in those left out, warns Mark Lilla, ‘If you are going to mention groups in America, you had better mention all of them. If you don’t, those left out will notice and feel excluded’.[[905]](#endnote-906) Those who felt excluded began to rage against ‘political correctness’.[[906]](#endnote-907) Later, as the coronavirus pandemic unfolded, this predicament became even more apparent, it became a question of life and death when wearing face masks or opposing them became political statements, when those who wore them were ridiculed as ‘liberal pussies’ and asked to ‘man up’.[[907]](#endnote-908)

Indeed, dignity is at the core of the balance of unity in diversity. Psychologist Jean Twenge has studied the self-esteem movement in the United States for many years, and she warns that it has led to a kind of ‘dukes up’ narcissism of entitlement.[[908]](#endnote-909) Sociologists Bradley Campbell and Jason Manning fear that the overuse of the notion of dignity has turned victimhood into entitlement — according to them, the culture of dignity became a culture of victimhood.[[909]](#endnote-910) They conceptualise the transition from honour culture to dignity culture as occurring in the United States during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and see this dignity culture now culminating in a culture of victimhood. Social psychologist Jonathan Haidt chimes in — when progressives lament fake news and ‘alternative facts’, he admonishes, they should acknowledge their own role in introducing the elevation of emotion over reason in the first place, after all, they were the ones who began to permit feelings to guide reality. Haidt has been quoted earlier, in the context of Hugh Elliott’s story, on his lamentation that young people now learn that ‘feelings are always right’.[[910]](#endnote-911) Haidt thinks that a cult of victimhood in law and process ‘causes a downward spiral of competitive victimhood’ and the creation of a ‘vortex of grievance’[[911]](#endnote-912) — no wonder that men accused of sexism now turn the tables and feel entitled to take the position of victims of ­reverse ­sexism, no wonder that the ‘forgotten people’ who have voted for Donald Trump as president of the United States feel they are the victims of ‘the devil’ (aka socialism, Obama, Hillary, and so forth). All this is amplified, we may add, by a ‘free market’ that makes victimhood culture ‘lucrative’.[[912]](#endnote-913) ‘Stop hate for profit’ is a slogan of a recent movement that aims at regaining dignity.[[913]](#endnote-914)

As much as Campbell, Manning, and Haidt bemoan the unsettling of the balance of unity in diversity through overemphasising diversity, others feel the opposite — what is too much for one side, is not enough for the other. Marginalised and oppressed people experience real victimhood and not a ‘culture of victimhood’, contend other voices, and this experience drives a legitimate revolution to challenge the status quo:

The new ‘culture’ is not rooted in the wish to have victimhood — where the ‘honour culture’ is rooted in a wish for ‘honour’ and ‘dignity culture’ is rooted in a wish for ‘dignity’ — rather, the new ‘culture’ is rooted in a wish for greater empathy for one another. Thus, I think it is best to refer to it as the ‘empathy culture’.[[914]](#endnote-915)

What we learn is that what is a culture of self-serving victimhood for one side is a culture of empathic revolution for the other side. Those speaking up against what they see as a culture of victimhood feel that diversity is overemphasised and unity endangered, while those who praise what they see as a culture of empathic revolution appeal to society to include more diversity into their overall scope of unity.

Jonathan Haidt reports how everything was about diversity for him at the beginning of his career, until he understood how divisive diversity can be, and that it must be reined in to preserve unity, to preserve what we have in common.[[915]](#endnote-916) Therefore, he explains, he became more of a conservative and began to speak up against diversity, in other words, he switched from one side to the other side of the unity-in-diversity double swing rather than concentrating on balancing it.

Similar problems with balance can we observe in all spheres of life in many parts of the world, including in Europe. The European Union, for instance, is always divided over whether its member nations should merge into one single European state into complete unity, or the opposite should happen, namely, that separate nation states should re-emerge.[[916]](#endnote-917)

What is the solution? Political scientist Mark Lilla draws on past successes of pre-identity liberalism and suggests a ‘post-identity liberalism’ — ‘such a liberalism would concentrate on widening its base by appealing to Americans as Americans and emphasising the issues that affect a vast majority of them’.[[917]](#endnote-918)

I would follow Lilla and then go one step further. As I see it, we live in times where we have to widen the scope to all humanity, not just to all Americans, we live in times where all people need to see themselves as fellow human beings who share a small vulnerable planet. In times of global challenges, it is a dangerous waste of time and energy to pit unity against diversity or diversity against unity. Both — unity and diversity — are important if we want to manifest a dignifying future, and both need to be balanced. It is an inherent characteristic of unity in diversity that unity can slide into oppressive uniformity and that diversity can devolve into hostile division. Yet, this in-built risk does not warrant the rejection of either unity or diversity, rather, it calls for harnessing the very balance (see more in chapters 10 and 11). Like in love relationships, while a certain degree of closeness is necessary, ‘all inspiration is lost if there is only closeness. Being too far apart or too close together, both extremes impede the dynamic tension that is needed to create a forceful beam of light between the two poles’.[[918]](#endnote-919)

A young sociologist hailing from Syria and living in Germany, Aladin El-Mafaalani, expresses views that resonate with mine. When integration succeeds, society will not become more homogeneous, harmonious, or have less conflict, he writes in an article titled ‘Streitkultur ist die beste Leitkultur’, German for ‘dispute culture is the best leading culture’, on the contrary, he says, ‘ever more, and ever more different people are sitting at the table and want a piece of the cake. Why should it be harmonious now? Conflicts arise when communities grow together and many more people than before express their needs, as well as discuss and argue’.[[919]](#endnote-920)

Aladin El-Mafaalani’s message brings the contact hypothesis to mind, first proposed by psychologist Gordon Allport in 1954, suggesting that contact fosters friendship. This hypothesis is not always valid, as contact can also worsen relations — the internet can serve as an example, as it is connecting people, ‘but it isn’t necessarily creating fellow feeling. At its worst, it can resemble a vast machine for the production of mutual antipathy’.[[920]](#endnote-921) The hypothesis becomes only valid at the aggregate level, and it needs four conditions to succeed, namely, (1) equal status, (2) cooperation, (3) common goals, and (4) institutional support.[[921]](#endnote-922) In conclusion, unity can succeed even where it seems to fail at first glance, just as El-Mafaalani notes, yet, it can only succeed in a humiliation-free environment.

The message of this book builds on precisely these insights when it calls for the creation of global institutional support (4) for the citizens of this world to cooperate (2) as equals in dignity (1) on the unifying common goal (3) of a dignifying future for people and planet with all its biological and cultural diversity.

To come back to the sense of victimhood — be it victimhood that flows from too little unity or too little diversity — it can indeed manifest as ‘false dignity’ and cause serious harm to individuals and society, particularly when pursued in an obsessive manner and instrumentalised for ulterior goals — I speak of humiliation entrepreneurship or addiction to humiliation.[[922]](#endnote-923) Over the years, I have regularly studied email messages intended for supporters of Donald Trump and have acquired a deep understanding for the burning intensity of their bitterness. This bitterness reminds of philosopher Avishai Margalit and his work on memory, where he explains how a victim may actively keep memories of humiliation alive so she can hold on to anger.[[923]](#endnote-924) Indeed, we saw Donald Trump cultivating a language of heroic martyrdom,[[924]](#endnote-925) stirring up what interfaith scholar James Edward Jones calls the post-victim ethical exemption syndrome.[[925]](#endnote-926)

Through my work as a psychotherapist, I have observed that some ‘victims’ go even further than holding on to memories of past humiliations, they invent new stories of humiliation so as to manoeuvre others into the role of loathsome perpetrators. A crybully is a blend of crybaby +‎ bully.

Memory is a complex field, open to ‘false dignity’ activism in many ways. ‘There is a difference between remembrance of history and reverence for it’, says Mitchell Joseph Landrieu, who was the mayor of New Orleans in 2017 when he took down four Confederate monuments, including the statue of Robert E. Lee, a Confederate soldier revered by supporters of the Confederacy. The removal of the statues sparked a controversy that at times brought back the divisiveness of the war that was fought from 1861 to 1865 between the nationalists of the Union, those who proclaimed loyalty to the U.S. Constitution, and the secessionists of the Confederate States, those who supported the rights of states to expand slavery.[[926]](#endnote-927) In 2017, a provocative question caused heated controversy, namely, whether the old emblems of the South represented abominable racism or an honourable heritage. Mayor Mitch Landrieu, himself a white person, argued that the statues celebrated white supremacy and that their final removal would allow New Orleans to ‘heal and become the city we always should have been had we gotten this right the first time’.[[927]](#endnote-928) These are his words, ‘It’s not good to continue to revere a false version of history and put the Confederacy on a pedestal... We as a nation are far enough from this that we ought to acknowledge that the Confederacy was on the wrong side of history’.[[928]](#endnote-929) Some of Landrieu’s white compeers supported the removal by saying, ‘it’s my history, but it’s not my heritage’, others thought that the statues could have remained simply because they represent the truth of history, while white supremacists opposed the removal with a view to the future.[[929]](#endnote-930)

The list of related examples is long and can be found everywhere on the globe. The Reichserntedankfest — the Reich Harvest Thanksgiving Festival — was a monumental Nazi celebration between 1933 and 1937 on the Bückeberg, a small hill near the town of Hamelin. I was born in Hamelin many years later, in 1954, after my parents had been forcibly displaced to this region in 1946 from their homeland in Silesia. The Reichserntedankfest was part of a cycle of Nazi celebrations of grand pathos, celebrations ranged from the annual Nuremberg rally of the Nazi party to Hitler’s birthday festivities. Whenever I visit my parents in Hamelin now, I sometimes pass in front of the Bückeberg, and I am amazed how forlorn it looks, lost in a forgotten corner in Central Europe, where a nuclear power plant has been built precisely because it is such a remote region. It is almost unbelievable that Hamelin and the Weserbergland once were enthusiastic core Nazi country,[[930]](#endnote-931) and that more than one million people attended the festival in 1937, all feeling greatly elated when Hitler, with the exalted grandiose pathos that Charlie Chaplin caricatured so well, walked up the Führerweg (Führer’s parade route) to the harvest monument. Plans are under way now to turn the hill into a place of documentation and learning, and this sparks the very same kinds of controversy that Mayor Landrieu experienced in New Orleans.[[931]](#endnote-932)

Then there is the controversial Yasukuni Shrine in Tokyo. I spent altogether three years in Japan and it was highly educational for me to visit this shrine. For many Japanese, the military leaders buried there are patriots who deserve to be honoured, while for China and Korea, the same people are war criminals who perpetrated unspeakable atrocities and should be despised. The Nanjing Massacre in 1937, when Japanese soldiers captured Nanjing, was a horrific outrage. The Japanese desire to honour their ‘patriotic’ war criminals is therefore felt to be deeply humiliating in China and Korea, while Japanese nationalists, on their side, perceive the very protests from their former enemies as source of humiliation.[[932]](#endnote-933)

History is rich with similar examples as well. Bildersturm (literally ‘image/statue storm’), or great iconoclasm, is a word for the spates of iconoclastic fury that were part of the Protestant Reformation in Europe when Catholic art and Catholic church fittings were destroyed in mob actions. Another example is the French Revolution that saw numerous monuments, religious works, and other historically significant pieces demolished in an attempt to eradicate any memory of the Old Regime. When I lived in Paris from 2001 to 2004, I was stunned to learn that the royal tombs in the Basilica of St. Denis had been key targets of such iconoclasm, as they were brandished as ‘monuments of idolatry’ and suspected of nourishing ‘the superstition of some Frenchmen’.[[933]](#endnote-934) Some fifty of the tombs were desecrated, an act that was captured in the famous painting titled ‘La violation des caveaux des rois dans la basilique Saint-Denis’.[[934]](#endnote-935)

More recent examples are the Buddhas of Bamyan in Afghanistan that were dynamited by the Taliban in 2001,[[935]](#endnote-936) or the two thousand-year-old temple of Baal Shamin in the historic Syrian city of Palmyra that was damaged by Da’esh in 2015.[[936]](#endnote-937)

As a way out of these conundrums, I suggest that we, the entire world community, learn to conceptualise remembrance in the context of the balance of unity in diversity. It amounts to dangerous humiliation entrepreneurship when the removal or the preservation of symbols — be they religious symbols or symbols of war — aims at undermining unity in diversity, while it is healing humiliation remembrance when removal or preservation aim at strengthening unity in diversity. We have on one side aggressive humiliation entrepreneurship that destroys the balance of unity in diversity, and on the other side peace inducing and humble humiliation remembrance that keeps the balance. Humiliation entrepreneurship reigns when the intention of remembering is to return to ‘past in-group uniformity in a world of hostile division’, while it is humiliation remembrance when the purpose is ‘wanting to remember where we come from, wanting to learn what furthers unity in diversity in the future, never to return to oppressive uniformity in hostile division again’. Unity in diversity depends on the word and instead of either/or to remain in balance, it depends on the principle of subsidiarity. Unity in diversity is not about rejecting the diversity of identities and their remembrance, rather, it is about preventing diversity from becoming divisive to the point that it tears apart all unity. Unity in diversity is also not about rejecting unity, it is about preventing unity from becoming oppressive uniformity.

The critical task at hand for humanity at this historical point in time, to say it in the words of international relations expert Steven Roach, is to engage in ‘relational modesty’.[[937]](#endnote-938) It is to synergise or recombine ‘decency’s basic, liberal, and conservative features through participation and open-ended, intercultural dialogue’,[[938]](#endnote-939) with the aim to nurture a ‘pluralist ethos in which people learn (sensibly) to manage the pressures by openly engaging each other through dialogue and participation’.[[939]](#endnote-940)

To say it in my words, the task of our time is for all humans walking planet Earth to come together as members of one in-group, look at the diversity of all cultural traditions that ever manifested on this planet and ‘harvest’ whatever is dignifying rather than pitting those traditions against each other. The task of our time is to nurture and cherish all the knowledge of this world that has the potential to promote solidarity remembrance in dignity, be it lessons from the past, be it insights from the present, or ideas for future eutopias.[[940]](#endnote-941)

### What if different concepts of dignity are incompatible with each other?

Allow me to share my favourite conceptualisation of dignity and demonstrate how different definitions of dignity can slide into opposition to each other.

Bioethics philosopher Richard Ashcroft offers a fourfold classification of the various ways in which human dignity can be conceptualised.[[941]](#endnote-942) People who regard ‘dignity talk’ as incoherent and misleading talk hold the first position — Ruth Macklin was quoted earlier.[[942]](#endnote-943) Then, there is the notion of dignity as strictly reducible to autonomy, as we have heard from Steven Pinker.[[943]](#endnote-944) Third, thinkers such as Amartya Sen and Martha Nussbaum focus on capabilities, functionings, and social interactions.[[944]](#endnote-945) Fourth, dignity can be conceptualised as a metaphysical property possessed by all human beings, a position mainly found in European bioethics and in theological writings.[[945]](#endnote-946)

Other thinkers offer slightly different categorisations, some make a distinction between dignity as a general category, dignity as an inherent and universal essential attribute of human beings, and dignity needing to be earned and contingent on actions.[[946]](#endnote-947) We can take the views of philosopher Immanuel Kant (1724–1804) as an example for the general category, his explanation that ‘everything has either a price or a dignity’ and that ‘whatever has a price can be replaced by something else as its equivalent; on the other hand, whatever is above all price, and therefore admits of no equivalent, has dignity’.[[947]](#endnote-948) For Kant, human beings have dignity on the grounds of the freedom they enjoy through the rationality with which human nature is endowed.[[948]](#endnote-949) Following Kant, dignity is a category of all non-market goods — be it aesthetics, nature, compassion, forgiveness, or certain institutions, be it institutions of marriage or institutions like the Supreme Court.[[949]](#endnote-950) Poet and philosopher Friedrich Schiller (1759–1805) built on Kant and linked dignity to grace, connecting morality with aesthetics so as to bring duty and nature into harmony.[[950]](#endnote-951)

My favourite conceptualisation of dignity is that of discourse analyst Michael Karlberg, and I will use his classification throughout the rest of this book. He offers three interpretive frames for human dignity, first, the social command frame, second, the social contest frame, and, third, the social body frame.[[951]](#endnote-952) Karlberg sees the social command frame as a legacy of patriarchal and authoritarian modes of thought — indeed, I see it fitting into Riane Eisler’s dominator model of society, and into what I call the normative universe of unequal honour that contrasts equal dignity.

Karlberg theorises that the second, the social contest frame, emerged historically in response to the injustice and oppression that the social command frame caused — collective well-being was at some point no longer seen as achievable through oppressive power hierarchies but through the structuring of all social institutions as a contest of power, based on metaphors of war, sports, fighting, and market competition.[[952]](#endnote-953) I speak of competition between disconnected autonomous individuals. Like me, Karlberg determines that this frame draws on a misperception of the social Darwinist metaphor of the ‘survival of the fittest’ insofar as it misinterprets it as ‘might makes right’. The normative assumption that underlies the social contest frame is that society just needs to harness everyone’s self-interested and competitive energy into competitive contests, that this will produce winners and losers, and, in the long term, the (surviving) populations will ‘be better off’.[[953]](#endnote-954)

My definition of dignity follows Karlberg’s third frame, the social body frame, I see dignity as interconnected individuality — I see people being connected in equality in worthiness and in loving mutual solidarity and responsibility. Many decades of global experience have shown me that this frame is not an ‘imperialist Western idea’ but has its roots in the many diverse cultural realms around the world — and that it has re-emerged, as also Karlberg observes, ‘in a modern form over the past century in response to the ever-increasing social and ecological interdependence humanity is now experiencing on a global scale’.[[954]](#endnote-955) At the core of this frame is an understanding of society as an integrated organic body where the well-being of every individual or group depends upon the well-being of the entire body. This well-being is achieved within social relationships and institutional structures that foster and guide human capacities in dignifying ways and maximise the possibilities for every individual to realise their potential to contribute to the common good.

I share Michael Karlberg’s insight that human beings are capable of competition as much as of cooperation, of egoism as much as of altruism, and that it is our cultural environment, our education and training, our opportunities for moral development, and the institutional structures within which we act that guide which way we go.[[955]](#endnote-956)

Let us round off this section by listening to Howard Richards, philosopher of social science and a scholar of peace and global studies who has lectured and taught all around the world, living mainly in Chile and often working in South Africa. He ties dignity to the notion of a caring family, he views dignity in terms of social rights such as food, shelter, medical care, or pensions.[[956]](#endnote-957) ‘Here in Chile and in the rest of Latin America the social doctrine of the Catholic church uses family talk: the source of dignity is being hijos e hijas de Dios, con la misma padre y madre, or sons and daughters of God, with the same father and mother. The alternative to being hijos is just being things, a particular type of molecular structure that happened to succeed’.[[957]](#endnote-958) Alicia Cabezudo, a peace and human rights educator in South America, joins Howard Richards and warns that dignity cannot be realised without solidarity economics.[[958]](#endnote-959) I could not agree more.[[959]](#endnote-960)

In times of global crises, this is my conclusion after being at home on all continents for many decades, it is imperative for humankind to embrace the social body frame of dignity and learn to cultivate the capacity for cooperation and altruism every single individual is endowed with already at birth. It is vital to do so widely, effectively, systematically and systemically, through building systemic structures for the global village that reflect the oneness of the species Homo sapiens sapiens and realise its potential for global connectedness, so that the consciousness of this oneness can be fostered already in the smallest children.[[960]](#endnote-961) ‘Such a consciousness entails a radical reconception of the relationship between the individual and society’, Karlberg observes, ‘the implications of which are conveyed in a compelling manner by the social body metaphor’.[[961]](#endnote-962)

The coronavirus pandemic, we could say, is a prime illustrator of the validity of this conclusion, and of this conceptualisation of dignity, at least if we wish for a dignified survival of the species Homo sapiens in company with, and as member of, all other species on planet Earth.

### The aftermath of World War II — Dignity’s window of opportunity

The Second World War opened a unique historical window of opportunity for pro-human rights actors. Fortunately, they also mustered the courage to use this opportunity — in February 1947, a group chaired by Eleanor Roosevelt began drafting the International Bill of Human Rights. Many of my friends say that our generation wasted the opportunity that opened after the end of the Cold War, when global unity in diversity was waiting in vain to be elevated to a new level.

Kathryn Sikkink, expert of international norms and institutions, offers a concise recapitulation of the chronology that led up to the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) in 1948.[[962]](#endnote-963)

It started with an unkept promise. In 1941, the president of the United States Franklin D. Roosevelt held his famous Four Freedoms Speech, in which he encouraged U.S. civil society organisations to trust that war was being fought for freedom and rights. In other words, human rights were part of war aims, the war aims of the Allied forces in the Second World War. Yet, in 1944, when it was time to keep this promise and prepare for the actual legal protection of individual rights, Allied enthusiasm waned. They feared that they themselves and their very own practices would become the target of such international law. The United Kingdom was still an empire that held vast colonies in subjugation, the United States was racially disunited under Jim Crow, while Stalin held USSR’s citizens in a brutal iron grip. Thus, when the Big Four (the U.K., the U.S., the USSR, and China) met in Dumbarton Oaks in 1944 to draft a charter for the United Nations, they excluded all but one mention of human rights from the draft charter for the United Nations. China, the weakest of the four, famously tried to include a statement against racial discrimination in the draft United Nations Charter, while the other three rejected it.

This could have been the end of human rights declarations, had it not been for a sufficiently large number of pro-human-rights advocates being courageous enough to take on the challenge. Latin American countries were much more democratic at that time than in later years, and they organised the Inter-American Conference on Problems of War and Peace in Mexico City in February 1945. They succeeded in influencing the San Francisco Conference that took place a few weeks later, in collaboration with U.S. civil society organisations who were as disappointed by the neglect of human rights in the Dumbarton Oaks draft. Forty civil society groups were allowed to serve as consultants to the U.S. delegation in San Francisco, among them women’s organisations, religious organisations, labour groups, and academics.

Although an exact definition of human rights remained wanting, the forty civil society groups, together with a number of small states, were able to convince the U.S.A. to agree to making human rights a major focus of the United Nations. It was in this way that the United Nations Charter that was drafted in the San Francisco Conference of 1945 could become the launch pad of the international protection of human rights through law.

One lesson to be learned from this historical moment is that norms need not come from powerful states, as shown by the emergence of human rights norms in Latin America and other Global South countries. While Eleanor Roosevelt chaired the new United Nations Human Rights Commission, French jurist René Cassin was a member of the Commission, and deeply involved in writing the UDHR was also Charles Malik from Lebanon, Peng Chun Chang from China — a student of John Dewey — together with Hernán Santa Cruz from Chile, who worked to include economic, social, and cultural rights. People like Bertha Lutz, a Brazilian biologist, feminist, and lawyer, and Hansa Mehta, an Indian delegate and independence activist, insisted on the explicit recognition of equal rights of women and men in the UN Charter and the UDHR.

It is interesting to ponder whether such an ‘Eleanor Roosevelt moment’ would be possible today. In our global dignity movement, we hear from our friends in civil society groups from all around the world that their activities are increasingly being curtailed — in the Global South many have to fear for their lives,[[963]](#endnote-964) while in the Global North pressure creeps in more covertly, not least under the banner of calls for more ‘efficiency’ in society.

While I worry about the lives of our friends in the Global South, calls for efficiency worry me sometimes even more, not least because they are so effective. Legal philosopher Duncan Kennedy explains (read more in chapter 5), that while ‘the left’ relies on rights since the 1970s as the principal basis for universalising its positions, for the conservative ideological intelligentsia, efficiency has become the alternative to rights. ‘An efficiency claim has many of the same mediating properties as a rights claim: it is a value judgement that is universal (who can be opposed to making everyone better off according to their own understanding of better-offness?) and factoid (efficiency arguments are nothing if not technical and they are supposedly empirically based)’.[[964]](#endnote-965)

While pro-human rights advocates were brave and enlightened enough to use the unique historical window of opportunity that opened after the Second World War, and while many universal human rights instruments have been added since 1948 through the unremitting efforts of many courageous individual activists, unfortunately, however, the world community as a whole has squandered the window of opportunity that was offered by the end of the Cold War.[[965]](#endnote-966) Until 2006, the number of true democracies increased around the world, while this number declines since then. The twenty-first century may one day become known for a rather undignified ‘rise of the autocrat’.[[966]](#endnote-967)

Will the coronavirus pandemic make us pause? Will the anthro-pause, which the worldwide lockdowns imposed on us, finally open a new ‘Eleanor Roosevelt moment’ for a major re-orientation?[[967]](#endnote-968)

### The case of Norway — A cultural heritage of solidarity in equal dignity

When we look for dignity, Norway is a place in the world worth paying attention to. Norwegian thinkers and scholars deserve having their voice heard. The reason is that Norway was capable, throughout the past centuries, to emerge from a culture of proud, independent, and at times violent Viking warriors and adventurers, and to move towards a culture of likeverd (equality in dignity), dugnad (communal cooperation, local solidarity) and global solidarity (note the Nansen passport). In Norway, equal dignity, solidarity, and global responsibility manifest liberté, égalité, and fraternité as a lived heritage.

Norwegians have a strong embodied sense of the right of every human to be respected as equal in worthiness. In other parts of the world, I observe an embodied sense of unequal worthiness as a norm, even where human rights ideals are subscribed to in theory, even among human rights activists themselves. This includes places like France, despite its authorship of the maxim of liberté, égalité, and fraternité, and also the cultural heritage in neighbouring Germany is characterised by a rather stark social hierarchy. The term likeverdighet (or ligeværdighed, as it is in Danish) can therefore not be translated into the German word of Gleichwertigkeit, because Wertigkeit in German is a much more ranked concept than its counterparts in the more egalitarian Nordic countries are. The solution a Danish family therapist found was to create a neologism in German, namely, Gleichwürdigkeit.[[968]](#endnote-969)

Let me explain this situation graphically, in an idealised form. I observe many Norwegians relating to their fellow citizens in mainly two dimensions — right, left, front, back. In contrast, most other people I meet around the world deal with intricate three-dimensional ranking systems — in addition to right, left, front, back, they have to look up and down. Meeting a fellow person in a three-dimensional social space is highly complex, it requires one to find out whether this person is equal, superior, or inferior. In many languages, these notions are embedded even linguistically. Such a three-dimensional scenario is meant to be a space of respect, as in the case of benevolent elders caring for younger generations, yet, very often, it is a space of terror, as in the case of oppressive superiors. All around the world, I observe how the space of terror increases and the space for solidarity shrinks when rankism[[969]](#endnote-970) combines with profitism (the maximisation of profit). Increasingly, people ‘defend’ their boundaries in malign downward spirals — be it their personal or in-group boundaries — by throwing themselves ‘into battle’, ‘ready to shoot’ as soon as they believe their boundaries to be violated, desperately defending their territory against infringements (real or imagined) in all three directions, up, down, and sideways.

One of the objectives of my global living project has always been to identify communities around the world where equal dignity is not just spoken about but also truly manifested, and I highlight them when I see them. This is where Norway comes in, and this is why I describe myself as an ambassador for the Norwegian cultural heritage. To be true to this mission, I model likeverd and dugnad in whatever context I find myself, I emphasise that my life achievements — my academic titles, for instance — give me no higher rank, no right to ‘shoot’ at every turn, instead, my mission is to nurture equal dignity with generosity and loving inclusivity.

The cultural heritage of Norway is also the reason for why Norway is one of the main platforms and starting points for the global work of the Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies community, and why we have launched the idea of the World Dignity University initiative in 2011 from the University of Oslo.[[970]](#endnote-971)

Why is Norway special? As early as 1843, celebrated writer and poet Henrik Wergeland (1808–1845) pointed out that Norway’s disadvantages are now its advantages. Norway’s marginal geopolitical location on the planet, and its poverty, have long protected it, as its oil wealth is of very recent date.[[971]](#endnote-972) In the past, no empire even ‘bothered’ to thoroughly conquer Norway, no empire bothered to force the kind of submission on Norwegians that they otherwise visited upon their subordinates — Norway was simply too poor and too far away. When Denmark ruled Norway, only very few Danes felt drawn to live in Norway. In other words, Norwegians never had their heads forced as far down by superiors as was the case in most other world regions, and they could therefore maintain a tradition of treating each other as equals more than elsewhere. Not by accident did Norway abolish the institution of aristocracy by law in 1821.

In short, in Norway, people ‘still remember what freedom is’, to say it in the spirit of freedom warrior queen Boudica, who tried in vain to save Britain from Roman domination in the iron age and would perhaps be happy to read this book.[[972]](#endnote-973)

My research in Somalia made me aware that there are remarkable parallels between present-day Somali culture and past-day Viking culture, both having emerged in a harsh and unforgiving natural environment — vast semi-deserts in Somalia and rocky mountains in Norway. The difference is that Norway has succeeded to add dugnad — solidarity — to equality and liberty at a national and even international level, while this is mainly restricted to the clan level in Somalia. Despite this difference, socio-cultural commonalities are discernible still today, while proud Somali warriors have built a remarkable pastoral democracy,[[973]](#endnote-974) Norwegian democracy has maintained Viking pride, as expressed, for instance, in a rather high prevalence of conflicts between neighbours.[[974]](#endnote-975)

Personally, I cherish many aspects in Norwegian cultural mindsets that Norwegians may not see themselves. In the past, its immediate neighbours looked down on Norway — Denmark and Sweden were more powerful for a long time. Even today there are people, and I have met them, who speak condescendingly about Norway as a country of poor farmers and fishers, as a place lacking the trappings of a modern civilised society. To me, this is precisely what I cherish. I find a kind of wisdom in Norway that is lost in countries that call themselves ‘developed’, a wisdom that stems from being close to an often unforgiving nature and remaining in respectful dialogue with its forces. University professors in other countries are usually trapped in their book-filled offices far removed from nature, while university professors in Norway, at least of the older generation, still know how to live without electricity in the mountains and melt ice to get drinking water. This closeness to nature deeply enriches their thinking in my view, it makes them rich in wisdom.

During the past decades, after Norway found oil and became rich in money, the younger generation is no longer exposed to the forces of nature as much, no longer accustomed to simple life, and this deprives them of the experiences shared by their parents and grandparents. In addition, while Norway was never colonised before, its newfound riches make it attractive to being colonised for the first time now, colonised by the forces of globalisation.[[975]](#endnote-976) This worries me.

The name of Arne Næss, considered the father of deep ecology, is just one name in a long list of thinkers who hold the wisdom of the older generation — Næss came to one of our inaugural Dignity Conferences, which took place in 2003 in Paris.[[976]](#endnote-977) I am equally proud of the support of social anthropologist Thomas Hylland Eriksen, who developed the ‘anthropology of accelerated change’.[[977]](#endnote-978) Then there is the encouragement from philosopher Henrik Syse who taught Norwegian banks moderation, or sophrosyne.[[978]](#endnote-979) I am as thankful for the crucial help from philosopher Inga Bostad, and many other iconic Norwegian names who value compassionate humanity, or medmenneskelighet, who manifest Homo solidaricus[[979]](#endnote-980) — be it Asbjørn Eide, Nils Butenschøn, Øyvind Østerud, Magnus Haavelsrud, Bernt Hagtvet, Jorunn Økland, Ingeborg Breines, Mai-Bente Bonnevie, Hroar Klempe, Kjell Skyllstad, to name but a few, in addition to Jan Smedslund, Reidar Ommundsen, Hilde Nafstad, Nora Sveaass, Sigrun Moss, and all their colleagues at the Department of Psychology of the University in Oslo.[[980]](#endnote-981)

What impresses me most in Norway is the depth of awareness of the fact that we all are fellow human beings, that we are not just professional role bearers. ‘This is not my responsibility because it is not my job!’ is an outcry I hear in other world regions much more than in Norway. Recently, Norway mourned the passing of an exemplary holder of this spirit, namely, eminent Norwegian politician Thorvald Stoltenberg (1931–2018).[[981]](#endnote-982) The same awareness is also enshrined in general societal rules. People who are caught in a snowstorm in the mountains, for example, are entitled to seek refuge in any of the many vacation homes that dot Norwegian high plateaus and that are usually uninhabited during most of the year. In other words, the need for emergency aid trumps the property rights of the owners of these places in Norway. In highly differentiated societies this would be unthinkable, they are usually much more invested in the Roman law maxim of ‘there is no responsibility unless there is a contract’, which would translate into ‘if you have not entered into a contract with me to use my house, you can’t use it, even if there is a snowstorm’.

It worries me when I see that this spirit of solidarity is being hollowed out by globalisation even in Norway. I often think of political theorist Hannah Arendt and her notion of the banality of evil when I hear people say, ‘Sorry, but my professional role forbids me to take the responsibility that may be mine as a fellow human being’.[[982]](#endnote-983) British psychologists Alexander Haslam and Stephen Reicher have thought much about the banality of evil and have developed a three-step ‘interactionist explanation of tyranny’. It begins with people being drawn to extreme and oppressive groups, then the experience of membership in these groups transforms them, and, finally, when they gain influence over others, they normalise oppression.[[983]](#endnote-984) I see the stipulation that ‘there is no responsibility if there is no contract’ act as an insidiously ‘banal’ enabler for toxic dynamics that undermine solidarity. Unfortunately, these dynamics are seeping into cultural mindsets and practices even in Norway these days.

My father’s traumatic war experiences made me develop a high sensitivity for the evils that hide in seemingly banal dynamics and how they can seep in almost unnoticeably.[[984]](#endnote-985) During the many conversations I had with my father over the years, he explained to me in minute detail how Adolf Hitler and his entourage managed to come to power. Consequently, I react even to the slightest sign that betrays that dynamics may be at work that are almost invisible but innocuous, and I wish to warn those who think that everything is still ‘normal’. A person born in Norway who was lucky enough to be spared the immersion in such ‘banality’ cannot grasp this experience — it requires a person like me to explain it.[[985]](#endnote-986) This is why I speak also to my Norwegian readers in this section, wishing to remind them to protect their precious heritage of solidarity in equal dignity.[[986]](#endnote-987)

What most Norwegians are unaware of, among others, is to what extent a woman feels different inside Norway as compared to outside of Norway. Well-established research shows that the same message if conveyed by a male voice, is listened to more attentively as if it is delivered by a female voice.[[987]](#endnote-988) This effect feels less salient in Norway, and my friends explain to me that historically, men were often away while their women remained responsible for the homestead. Whenever I arrive in Norway from outside, I observe an astonishing change in me — a psychological alarm signal goes off, usually during the first hours, saying something like, ‘Attention! You are now in Norway! Here people listen to what women say more than elsewhere! You must increase the level of quality control over what you are saying!’ In the days that follow, I observe my subjective personal space expand, my spine straighten, and my breath deepen, not just metaphorically but in my body. Outside of Norway, I shrink, in every respect of the word, and I have to make an effort to re-create artificially an imaginary Norwegian cultural atmosphere around me to maintain the same level of confidence. When in Norway, I often think of Börte, the wife of Genghis Khan, and of Sorghaghtani Beki, the wife of one of Genghis Khan’s sons, both known to be among the most influential women who ever lived in history.

I remember an incident in 2010, when renowned Norwegian intellectual Nils Christie criticised me for praising Norway.[[988]](#endnote-989) I replied, ‘I do not idealise Norway. I praise it because I meet people like you. I meet independent thinkers, intellectuals like you who do not need to read books to understand grounded theory, because you are close to the ground always. You do not need long explanations to understand what it means to be a fellow human being who is equal in dignity, because you have a sense of it under your skin, you refuse to bow to anyone’. In the same spirit, I answered an immigrant to Norway who rightly pointed out to me that Norway’s contemporary actions frequently betray its own noble heritage. I wrote a long letter to him, explaining that I am not saying that Norway is a paradise that should preach to the rest of the world, what I am rather saying to Norway, and to the world, is, ‘Look, Norway, look, humankind, here we have an important heritage, let us learn from it, let us together reinvigorate it! Let us disallow any influences, from whatever sources, global or local, to push such heritages aside!’[[989]](#endnote-990)

I profoundly appreciate all the scholars in Norway who keep a keen and critical eye on their own country’s path. In 2002, social anthropologist Thomas Hylland Eriksen warned, ‘My impression is that the political elites have a very poor understanding of ... the kind of civilising cultural values that are at stake. There is a very strong utilitarian vibe in Norwegian politics at the moment where immediate use-value seems to be the only thing that matters’.[[990]](#endnote-991) In 2016, Eriksen wondered how it is possible that ‘the same policy makers who express concern about environmental problems’ promote continued economic growth, ‘which so far has presupposed the growing utilisation of fossil fuels and other non-renewable resources, thereby contradicting another fundamental value and contributing to undermining the conditions for its own continued existence’.[[991]](#endnote-992)

Thomas Hylland Eriksen sees three autonomous and interconnected globalisation-driven transformations at work — that of the environment, the economy, and identity — with the most fundamental contradiction being the conflict between growth and sustainability.[[992]](#endnote-993) Any one-sided focus on statistical numbers, such as ‘the proportion of the world’s population who are below the UN poverty limit’, is detrimental unless these figures are related to people’s actual lives. ‘Seven per cent economic growth in, say, Ethiopia does not automatically mean that all Ethiopians are 7 per cent better off (whatever that means)’.[[993]](#endnote-994)

Another Norwegian thinker, professor of education Magnus Haavelsrud, observes with great concern how Norway has followed ‘the principles of market economy’ informed by ‘the neo-liberal epoch with roots in Reagan and Thatcher and efficiently embraced by New Labour leaders like Tony Blair in the U.K. and Gro Harlem Brundtland, and later followed up by Jens Stoltenberg’, and how ‘New Public Management became the motto and ... has become a straightjacket even in our educational institutions — including universities’.[[994]](#endnote-995)

Social psychologists Hilde Nafstad, Rolv Blakar, and their colleagues carried out a longitudinal analysis of the media language in Norwegian public discourse from 1984 to 2005, and also they found that the prevailing ‘globalised capitalist market ideology’ has increasingly permeated the long-established Scandinavian welfare state.[[995]](#endnote-996) The usage of the Norwegian equivalents of ‘I’/’me’ has increased, together with words such as ‘right/entitlement’, ‘optional’ and ‘freedom to choose’. In contrast, words such as ‘solidarity’, ‘common/communal/shared’, ‘welfare society’, ‘duty/obligation’, and ‘equality’ are used less. In other words, even in a country like Norway, the power of the currently reigning global ideology has influenced intra-personal, inter-personal, inter-group levels through the ideological level, and has increased individualism at the cost of communal values.

Norway is by now an active exporter of weapons and this overshadows its reputation as a peace broker. When Norway debuted on the global arena in the beginning of the 1960s, the Norwegian state began to build a humanitarian policy with the aim to become a ‘humanitarian superpower’ out in the world. Norway gained a solid reputation of being a peace-builder and I indeed meet people all around the world who appreciate and admire this engagement — the world still comes to Norway for peace mediation. In his book I am no racist, but, sociologist Ottar Brox describes the election campaign of 1987, and how Norway’s will to help the world’s poor was expressed in the slogan ‘One million refugees to Norway!’ Only very few people in the Norway of 1987 doubted the wisdom of such a policy, Brox reports, and those who did, risked being brandished as racist in what Brox calls uttrykkskonkurranse or ‘expression contest’.[[996]](#endnote-997) By now, however, the situation is different entirely, nobody would call for ‘one million refugees to Norway!’ today anymore. After the first Pakistanis came to Norway a few decades ago, migrants and refugees flocked to Norway from Asia, Latin America, and Africa, driven by economic globalisation. This led to radical changes in the country’s population, religion, and culture, and it brought back foundational questions that were asked during Norway’s time of national awakening in the nineteenth century, ‘Are there Norwegian values? ‘Is there a Norwegian culture?’ ‘Does “Norway” exist?’[[997]](#endnote-998)

As mentioned above, I define myself as a global ambassador of the Norwegian cultural heritage of likeverd, dugnad, and global responsibility, and I do so to bolster these values, not to bolster Norwegian national power. Furthermore, I am not naïve, I know that what I consider as great gifts — ideals such as likeverd and dugnad — are hotly rejected in other world regions and that imposing them would mean to violate them. I am aware of the frelse-til-helse shift, the trend to move from a missionary focus on salvation to a missionary focus on medication and ‘development’. I have put these temptations behind me long ago and refrain from any missionary zeal, I avoid personifying any ‘mother Theresa’ template, I abstain from acting as guru-like ‘good doer’, it would humiliate my own humanity were I to ‘help the sick and the poor’ only to earn myself a place in heaven or to bolster my own sense of worth.[[998]](#endnote-999) I refrain from all messages such as ‘Jesus loves you’, or ‘Jesus loves capitalism’, or ‘Western values will save you’, or ‘faith in this or that ideology, religion, or lifestyle will save you’, even ‘dignity will save you’.

What I rather strive for is to invite all of us to reflect on the systemic roots of predicaments such as ‘poverty’, ‘inequality’, or ‘insecurity’, and to inquire whether it is possible to co-create a world where these social dilemmas are effectively addressed at the systems level. Is it true that the answer to military insecurity is more weapons, and that the answer to social insecurity is more market?[[999]](#endnote-1000) The coronavirus helps my argument, I observe with gratitude that even icons of market ideology in Norway now warn against ‘capitalism on steroids’ and ask ‘when is enough enough?’[[1000]](#endnote-1001) I want to inspire the creation of new futures through my concept of dignism (see chapter 11).

Norway can help with the currently most pressing task for humankind, namely, to learn how to act together in dialogue within our social and ecological habitat. Global all-encompassing solidarity is needed — the present coronavirus pandemic acts like a teacher of humility sent by nature. This effort is doomed, however, when global division reigns instead of global solidarity, when trauma flowing from cycles of humiliation divides the world. Such divisions can occur between equals, ‘horizontally’ so to speak, or ‘vertically’ between unequals. Vertical cleavages emerge when superiors keep inferiors down so cruelly that nothing can heal the rift ever again, while horizontal division plays out when one group antagonises another. The antidote against the first is likeverd, and against the second is the kind of dugnad that can encompass the entire ‘global village’.

When I am in Norway, I try to explain to my friends that their heritage offers unique tools to help salvage the human condition of our day. The horizontal predicament is driven by the fact that human nature is relational, that we humans are neither ‘good by nature’ nor ‘bad by nature’,[[1001]](#endnote-1002) that we simply tend to embrace the reference group in which we wish to belong. Our yearning for connection can lead us to perpetrate the most horrific atrocities — out of love for ‘our people’ we are able to resort to the most extreme violence when we think it can protect ‘us from enemies’. Furthermore, we have a tendency to use enemy out-group imagery to create in-group cohesion and this can create wounds of humiliation in out-groups that go so deep that overarching solidarity between out-groups is impossible — in-group solidarity that is built on out-group enmity undermines future efforts to build solidarity between groups. Cocooning within one’s in-group in the face of global challenges is illusionary in an interconnected world, even if out-group enmity is avoided — as cultural anthropology rightly warns, ‘self-contained, concentric memory constructs’, that are fed by dogmatic or laissez-faire relativism, create ‘detrimental consequences for ... a shared “historical consciousness” of events and their causal connections’.[[1002]](#endnote-1003)

In this dire situation, the same sociality that has the potential to divide us into ‘us versus them’, can also inspire us to develop a historical consciousness that unifies ‘all of us’ around our diversity in this global village, it can lead us to give true life to likeverd and dugnad with all members of our human family.

We can make likeverd, dugnad, égalité, liberté, and fraternité possible worldwide, all in the spirit of African ubuntu that says, ‘I am because of all of you’. We as humankind, if we wish to survive as a species in a dignified way, are tasked to let these ideals inform global institutional frames for the one and single interconnected global in-group that we live in, in loving solidarity with our planet and everything it comprises.

For psychologist Kenneth Gergen, ‘the impossibility of grasping the nature of relational process invites both awe and humility’, as ‘all that we hold dear cannot be owned, penetrated, or articulated’, therefore, ‘let us replace the Hobbesian dystopia of “all against all,” with a vision of “all with all”. Only when relational well-being is the centre of our concern we approach a life-giving future’.[[1003]](#endnote-1004)

### In awe of inherent dignity

Norwegian philosopher Tore Frost has studied with great interest how the notion of inherence of dignity entered Article 1 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. It is a novel notion, and it seems to have arisen suddenly, almost from nowhere, becoming prominent through the declaration of 1948.[[1004]](#endnote-1005) Frost thinks that Eleanor Roosevelt in her role as an influential ‘norm entrepreneur’[[1005]](#endnote-1006) was the author of the inclusion of the phrase inherent.[[1006]](#endnote-1007) She wrote in 1948, ‘If the Declaration is accepted by the Assembly, it will mean that all the nations accepting it hope that the day will come when these rights are considered inherent rights belonging to every human being’.[[1007]](#endnote-1008)

Georg Lohmann is a philosopher who hails from Germany, a country that looks back on abysmal war crimes, and he resonates with Frost’s reflections.[[1008]](#endnote-1009) In Lohmann’s view, there is no need to draw on any natural law to understand the historically ‘new’ concept of human dignity, no need to see it as inherent by virtue of human nature. Rather, what happened, he suggests, is that the international community was so horrified by the twentieth century’s mayhem of the two world wars and of colonial oppression, that it simply declared, as a political act, that human rights derive from inherent human dignity, and then enshrined it in international law and later in national law. For instance, Article 1 of the post-war German constitution of 1949 states that ‘human dignity is inviolable’, and this even before the ‘right to life’.

Late Polish scholar Zbigniew Piotrowski made it graphic and vivid. ‘The silver lining of the WWII tragedy, and in particular the Jewish loss thereof, was that the world reset how it operates; post-WWII, international law became the order of the day to avert a repeat of history. It was as if all the nations of the world pressed the reset button and rebooted with this new operating system, one that obligated all states to respect a set of collective rules and regulations’.[[1009]](#endnote-1010)

Scholar Steven Roach chimes in by saying that the new international human rights regime helped standardise decency through rules and norms designed to overcome many ‘of the exclusionary effects of national ideology and civilisation standards’.[[1010]](#endnote-1011) Roach reports on how the declaration adopted the word ‘persons’ to avoid the natural rights of individuals on one side and the materialism of group rights on the other, so as to ‘appeal to both sides and to promote equal dignity’.[[1011]](#endnote-1012)

Until the Second World War, the historical discourses on human dignity and human rights proceeded separately, observes Lohmann. In the eighteenth century, the justifications and political declarations of human rights still lacked reference to a concept of dignity. Furthermore, historical concepts of dignitas and dignity were connected with obligations rather than with the possession of rights. It was only in the founding acts of the United Nations in 1945, and in their human rights policies following the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948, that increasingly complex relationships were forged between the newly determined human dignity and the possession of human rights. These connections were not arbitrary, they were not merely the result of political-pragmatic compromises, they sought to satisfy the general normative demands of rights, namely, that they must be morally justified, legally legitimate, and politically supported by a majority consensus among the states and citizens involved.[[1012]](#endnote-1013) The use of the word inherent therefore obscures what happened in reality, Lohmann observes, namely, a performative act by which a politically announced contract law was created that authorises the appreciation of every person and guarantees human rights without further conditions.

Philosopher Howard Richards disagrees with Lohmann insofar as the connection between dignity and rights is not as new, this connection was already clear in philosopher Immanuel Kant’s Rechtslehre and Tugendlehre from 1797.[[1013]](#endnote-1014) When philosophers Johann Gottlieb Fichte (1762–1814) and Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (1770–1831) developed their ethics, they followed the pattern of Kant’s treatises, Richards explains, as did many lesser-known figures, and the conceptual connection was the concept of freedom, Freiheit, of liberty, liberté.[[1014]](#endnote-1015) Richards lays out:

It is true that it was a performative act, but it was a performative act that drew on an intellectual traditions, advised by three philosophers familiar with those traditions, and it was a performative act in a context where Keynesian economics taught the feasibility of realising social rights, and in which the political power of the working class had been enhanced by the war. The soldiers who were sent to fight in World War II were promised by American president Franklin Delano Roosevelt and others that they were not fighting to return to the depression of the thirties but for the four freedoms. After the war, nearly every country wrote into law — and in cases like Italy into the Constitution — that the government would act to provide full employment. These and other measures were implemented to keep promises that had earlier been made to the troops.[[1015]](#endnote-1016)

Howard Richards concludes that ‘natural’ human rights were not created by nature nor by a social contract — they were created by history.[[1016]](#endnote-1017) Human rights are historically constructed social realities with two long key historical periods of gestation that culminated in the declarations of rights, first, the time of the French Revolution, and, second, the time of the Second World War. The first engendered the Déclaration des Droits de l’Homme et du Citoyen, or the Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen of 1789, while the second brought the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948.

Georg Lohmann sees human rights as a self-binding act between peers in accordance with a horizontal justification model, in other words, with no need for any higher power to justify it.[[1017]](#endnote-1018) When human dignity is being violated, three kinds of dignity are violated, first, general moral dignity, second, social worthiness conceptions, including traditional ideas of honour, and, third, human dignity as a novel legal concept of the human rights regimes established since 1945.[[1018]](#endnote-1019)

Georg Lohmann agrees with Tore Frost that images and metaphors are more suitable to describe dignity than theories, because imageries make meaning palpable in an interpretative way rather than a logical way.[[1019]](#endnote-1020) Like Howard Richards, also Frost locates the Kantian justification for inherent dignity in the premise of human freedom, with equal rights following from this freedom. Frost suggests that the phrase in Article 1, if it were complete, would go as follows, ‘All human beings are born free in (their inherent) dignity and (therefore) they are equal in (their) human rights’.[[1020]](#endnote-1021) Howard Richards replies:

This is true. However, for Kant himself, property rights, and therefore unequal rights, also follow from freedom, as Hegel commented at great length.[[1021]](#endnote-1022) Kant introduces each section of the Rechtslehre,[[1022]](#endnote-1023) where he deduces legal principles from freedom, with the citation of a Roman legal maxim. In this way, Kant gave philosophical support to the reception of Roman law and its adaptation to be the framework of modern commercial society, as also Max Weber in Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft,[[1023]](#endnote-1024) and many others note. There is a reason why Kant’s Freiheit perfectly matches Roman law. It is that Kant treats freedom as an exception to Newtonian laws. Everything in nature is Newtonian. Freedom is absolute because it is independent from the laws that govern all things perceived by the senses. Similarly, in Roman law, emancipation (becoming free) meant gaining the exceptional status formerly held only by the pater familias, who was a petty military chief with absolute power within his petty kingdom as far as the law was concerned. The pater familias was defined by law as he who has absolute command in the famiglia, the family household (including slaves, animals, equipment and the land).[[1024]](#endnote-1025)

The introduction of the idea of an inherent dignity is revolutionary, Frost points out, because it places dignity inside the human being and liberates it from outside guarantors such as divinity or rationality. Richards concurs, ‘Frost is right to see this as different from Kant and Kantism, since for Kant dignity depends on rationality’.[[1025]](#endnote-1026) Equal dignity is a quality, not a quantifiable ‘value’, and not something that can be ranked.[[1026]](#endnote-1027) Frost warns against any attempt to formulate definitive justifications of the inherence of dignity in human nature, on the contrary, he states, the demand to recognise inherent dignity is a demand that needs to be without content.[[1027]](#endnote-1028)

I would like to ask Richards, Frost, and Lohmann what they think about dignity in the context of Immanuel Kant’s elusive Ding an sich (thing in itself), a thing that remains unknowable whether experienced or not. In addition, what do they think about dignity in the context of Kant’s notion of ‘religious Schwärmerei’?[[1028]](#endnote-1029) Their responses will be fascinating and fill another book.

Allow me to invite a few additional voices before I present my views. Political scientist Francis Fukuyama was once associated with the rise of the neo-conservative movement, yet, he has since distanced himself.[[1029]](#endnote-1030) He came to Norway to give a lecture in February 2018 and dedicated the first half hour of his talk to thinkers like Martin Luther, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, and Simone de Beauvoir. These thinkers, Fukuyama explained, have shaped the idea that all people and groups have an inherently valuable identity. The idea of identity went from the core of Protestantism’s message in the sixteenth century and now becomes a toxic influence, warns Fukuyama, a toxic fuel for the populist nationalist movements of the twenty-first century.[[1030]](#endnote-1031) According to Fukuyama, liberal democracy faces a new threat now, one that does not originate from outside, from ideological enemies east or south, but from political forces that challenge democracy from within.

Zuzana Lučkay Mihalčinová from Slovakia has a degree in English linguistics and literature and a Ph.D. on dignity in post-apartheid South Africa.[[1031]](#endnote-1032) In her doctoral research, she explored foundational questions contrasting the abstract notion of dignity with the dignity of humanity as a species. Is dignity part of human nature, or perhaps not? Do human beings have dignity, or perhaps not? Is it possible to regain dignity? If we hold it to be true that human dignity is inherent to the human being, that all people have dignity, then it follows that dignity cannot be taken away nor regained. What about voices then who state that if dignity is already inherently given, there can be no ‘right to dignity’?[[1032]](#endnote-1033) What happens when a person feels that her dignity has been taken from her? Who are we to claim that her feelings are invalid? As we understand from these questions, Lučkay’s research focusses on the correlation between the abstract notion of human dignity on one side, and on dignity at the personal level on the other side, the level of individual qualitative descriptive analysis, the level where dignity can be taken away or regained, where it is mutable through interaction rather than immutable. In her conclusions, Lučkay warns that dignity, even though it has become part of our anchoring in the world, always needs to be nurtured intentionally and pro-actively, rather than being taken for granted as inherent. The space of dignity is a virtual space where the recognition of mutual worth takes place, it is a personal space, an imaginary and invisible blanket of respect — dignity is not monolithic, she explains, it is not an objectified space. How is it possible, for example, she asks, that the value of a person can depend on the GDP of the country of which she holds a passport? ‘Simply put, objectification or reduction of a person to a place happens in the invisible cloak of worth which surrounds a person. When subjectivity is denied, we do not recognise worth when we deny the mental space to someone, we inhibit the process of worth recognition’.[[1033]](#endnote-1034)

Recapitulating the voices that were lined up so far in this section, the historical path becomes apparent that is the overall focus of this book. To use Martin Buber’s vocabulary, we witness a journey of the Zeitgeist that may have embraced I-Thou in the distant past, then it moved to I-It in the near past, and now it is returning to I-Thou. Prior to the Neolithic Revolution, in the Palaeolithic era, at least if we follow the available research, there was I-Thou dialogue and everything had dignity — stones, trees, rivers, animals, people. Then, during the past millennia, everything became ‘a thing’.[[1034]](#endnote-1035) In Christianity, dignity was associated with the belief that God had given the natural world to his followers as a thing to be managed, in particular to ‘dignitaries’ such as the bishop or the king.[[1035]](#endnote-1036) Then, very recently, a historical turnaround made dignity inherent and equal to all humans, and now — and I am a messenger of this plea — it is humanity’s collective responsibility to nurture this dignity not just in humans but also include all sentient beings. Humanity is tasked to leave behind haughty pride and re-learn humble I-Thou dialogue with our social and natural world, no longer rejecting due humility as undue humiliation.[[1036]](#endnote-1037)

Human rights advocates travel this historical path each time they speak up. The social worker who approaches a wife who is beaten by her husband says to her, ‘The new Zeitgeist gives me the responsibility to approach you, because I see that you have been led to think that your husband is above you. This is not true. Let me inform you that you have always been equally worthy, you have equal dignity, and this dignity is inherent in you. Your husband has no right to arrogate superiority over you! I invite both of you into dialogue in mutual humility’.

Evidently, the historical path had many more intricacies and facets than included here. Howard Richards observes that it ‘is not an accident that historically the first generation human rights were installed by a triumphant third estate,[[1037]](#endnote-1038) while the social rights were installed in the heyday of social democracy, during les trente glorieuses, or glorious thirty, the thirty years from 1945 to 1975, following the end of the Second World War’.[[1038]](#endnote-1039)

Here is the voice of another scholar who, like me, strives to discern large-scale historical trends. For philosopher Glen Martin, justice, freedom, truth, beauty, and goodness, all are ideals inherent in our ‘utopian conscience-and-knowledge’:

The perpetually transcending quality of our human existence places us above the circumstances of our lives and the contemporary world and allows us to judge these circumstances precisely as departure from what should be. In producing human beings, the cosmos has created a creature capable of perpetual transcendence, that is, capable of continuously transforming existence under the ever-transcendent ideals of the true, the good, and the beautiful. Our dignity lies both in these inherent capacities and in the ever-greater actualisation of the true, the good, and the beautiful that results from the temporalised human journey.[[1039]](#endnote-1040)

Glen Martin explains how Plato saw human dignity as arising from our common capacity to care actively for ‘wisdom, truth, and the improvement of the soul’, and from being capable of moving up the ‘ladder of love’ linking earth and heaven.[[1040]](#endnote-1041) Martin describes how for many of the ancient Greek and Roman thinkers, the human capacity for reasoning revealed human beings as microcosms of the macrocosm, of ‘the logos in us’ being ‘capable of reflecting the logos that informed the cosmos’. While the Platonic and Aristotelian tradition saw law as a vehicle for fostering virtue and happiness, the Stoics saw it also ‘as a vehicle for fostering human equality and dignity’.[[1041]](#endnote-1042) For Roman leader Marcus Tullius Cicero, all human beings were equal, potentially free, and rational.[[1042]](#endnote-1043)

Glen Martin draws particular attention to one thinker whom I appreciated already as an adolescent, namely, fourteenth century mystic Meister Eckhart, who said about the notion of God that ‘you should love him as he is a non-God, a nonspirit, a nonperson, a nonimage, but as he is a pure unmixed, bright “One”, separated from all duality; and in that One we should eternally sink down, out of “something” into “nothing”.’[[1043]](#endnote-1044) Martin also reminds of Giovanni Pico della Mirandola and his Oration on the dignity of man, written at the time of the Renaissance in the fifteenth century, highlighting the human capacity for self-transcendence into the deeper dimensions of existence — dignity lies in the freedom of humans to rise up to the eternal and divine, or descend into brutishness.[[1044]](#endnote-1045) Seventeenth century philosopher Blaise Pascal, in his Pensées, saw dignity as intrinsic to human self-awareness and actualisable through self-surpassing, through seeking the good beyond and above of oneself.[[1045]](#endnote-1046) Jean-Jacques Rousseau, in the eighteenth century, saw human dignity flowing from the synergy of moral relationships as the basis of civil society and confirmed through a social contract. Karl Marx, in the nineteenth century, located the dignity of human beings in their capacity to proceed from illusory communities to real communities of freedom, justice, and mutual recognition. In the twentieth century, philosopher Jürgen Habermas acknowledged that human beings are language-constituted beings whose dignity manifests through communicative discourse among equals in a moral community. For the twenty-first century, Glen Martin draws attention to Swami Agnivesh and his call for ‘love to supersede power as the shaping paradigm for the human species’.[[1046]](#endnote-1047) Martin himself works for a ‘holistic planetary transformation through a global social contract’.[[1047]](#endnote-1048)

My path resonates with many of the above listed voices. It is a path towards a new global social contract of ‘all with all’, as Kenneth Gergen formulated it. I follow Michael Karlberg in embracing the social body frame of dignity, as it highlights the intrinsic worth of every human being as a member of the social body in an interconnected community. This intrinsic value is realised through each individual developing the capacities upon which the well-being of the social body depends, the capacity for ‘honesty and trustworthiness, for cooperation and reciprocity, for empathy and compassion, for fairness and justice, for altruism and selflessness, for discipline and moderation, for learning and the investigation of reality, for creativity and productivity’.[[1048]](#endnote-1049) It is my life mission to invite every individual to help realise the well-being of the entire social body so that everyone’s personal potential can flourish.

I also follow Tore Frost, for whom love is the very foundation for human dignity. ‘Our emotional life, in the tension between passion and suffering, confronts us with love as the basic premise of human life in all its complexity. Love is what life is about’.[[1049]](#endnote-1050) Tore Frost goes even further and I follow him here, too. In his endeavour to avoid overly abstract and lifeless humanisms, he asks whether the term respect, as in ‘respect for inherent dignity’, is sufficient. After all, respect is something humans should demonstrate for all life, not just for human life. Therefore, what about ‘awe of life’? Frost recommends the term awe because it can serve as a reminder that humans are living creatures, both to be honoured and to be feared. He speaks up for awe and reverence for the human being including all its bright sides and its dark sides — after all, a shaken love life characterises human faring.[[1050]](#endnote-1051)

By using the word shaken (rysted in Norwegian), Frost draws on philosopher Jan Patočka (1907–1977), who was one of the original signatories and main spokespersons for Charter 77, the human rights movement in Czechoslovakia in 1977. As fellow dissident Václav Havel (1936–2011) explains, ‘When Jan Patočka wrote about Charter 77, he used the term “solidarity of the shaken”. He was thinking of those who dared resist impersonal power and confront it with the only thing at their disposal, their own humanity’.[[1051]](#endnote-1052)

I follow Jan Patočka in that I stand up for dignity in a way that could be described as ‘naked’, meaning that I am unprotected, unprotected by institutions, with nothing but my loving shaken humanity. I follow also protestant theologian Paul Tillich, for whom love is the fundamental ethical commandment — I follow Martin Luther King Jr. who developed Tillich’s ideas further in his doctoral dissertation. For Tillich, love has being, while justice has no separate being apart from being a way to put love into practice.[[1052]](#endnote-1053)

Philosopher Martha Nussbaum sees love as a universal emotion that gives us the strength to embrace justice principles and nurture social ties, including relations with people from other cultural realms. Compassion and love are more than irrational desires for Nussbaum, they are judgements that ‘involve cognitive appraisals’, ‘value-laden perception and/or thought’.[[1053]](#endnote-1054) Love can overcome anger, including that between hostile out-groups, love can help universalise standards of fairness. In this way, and in contrast to philosophers such as Kant and Nietzsche, Nussbaum leans towards a ‘positive’ view of human nature, she sees the appraisal of fair treatment arising from a maturing sensibility about dignity protection, a sensibility that proceeds from ‘primitive’ early childlike impulses to the secondary emotions of learned emotive states. For Nussbaum, equal access to resources is the precondition for this love and compassion, for building greater awareness and solidarity around the principle of equal dignity.

When we put Nussbaum’s conceptualisation in relation to Kant and Nietzsche, then we see that Kant thought we humans cannot help being unsocial, Nietzsche thought we should not help it, while Nussbaum thinks we can and should help it. Kant saw humans suffer from ‘ungeselliger Geselligkeit’ or ‘unsocial sociability’ — he saw humans betraying each other for the sake of self-advancement despite the fact that they need each other for survival.[[1054]](#endnote-1055) For Nietzsche, humans ‘abuse’ compassion and love, to suppress their rancorous ressentiment.[[1055]](#endnote-1056) I follow Nussbaum in many of her points, and I assume she will resonate with me when I say that ‘childlike impulses’ are not necessarily ‘primitively unsocial’ (see more the concept of human nature in chapter 10).

Love is also what philosopher Howard Richards speaks of when he explains that ‘natural’ human rights were not created by nature or by a social contract, but by history:

Human rights, then, are a gift of history that help us to put into practice the fundamental ethic of love, also known as solidarity. Rights give love the force of law. For those who are not religious, Mahatma Gandhi offered a secular argument for a love ethic: if love were not the law of our species, our species would never have survived and we would not be here today.[[1056]](#endnote-1057)

Through my work, I strive to let a literacy of love flourish,[[1057]](#endnote-1058) and I see the Lévinasian-Buberian interpretation of dignity fitting this path better than the Kantian interpretation. While Kant emphasises the individual’s rationality, Lévinas highlights the face of the Other as Thou — to use Martin Buber’s formulation — rather than the Other as It. The Lévinasian view helps preserve the cohesion of the social fabric within a community, while the Kantian version could be simplified as saying that ‘although you are poor, you can have equal dignity’. Kant would say that ‘in order to have dignity you need a societal framework that gives you political rights, such as the right of free speech, and if you work hard, you may even be able to rise from poverty’. The Lévinasian-Buberian version, again simplified, could go as follows, ‘You are poor, others are rich, and this is because all live under circumstances that violate everybody’s human dignity. It is the responsibility of the entire community to create circumstances that help ensure equal dignity for all. A dignified quality of life depends on a sense of personal responsibility for the common good in a web of supportive relationships of mutual care and solidarity’. Lévinas would agree that ‘dignity is a relational term and concept; inherent to every human being it requires affirmative action and therefore recognition from others. In this sense it is at the same time a radical individualised and a socialised moral concept’.[[1058]](#endnote-1059)

We could say that Kant adapted his dignity concept to the Zeitgeist and systemic frames of his time, while Lévinas did the inverse, he aimed at adapting the Zeitgeist and systemic frames to dignity. Kant was ahead of his time in leaving behind the notion of dignity as something that gives dignitaries higher status, and Lévinas was ahead of his time when he surpassed Kant. I often meet people who discuss negative and positive (or ‘welfare’) rights as if they are separate, and, as has been discussed at the beginning of this chapter, many who welcome negative rights reject positive rights. The Lévinasian ideal of equal dignity entails a hidden bridge to on-the-ground social and economic equality. I see his notion of equal dignity ‘sneaking’ into the Kantian view as a pro-social Lévinasian ‘Trojan horse’. The ‘Trojan’ connection is implicated in the human rights stipulation that also Martha Nussbaum acknowledges, namely, that equal opportunities and nurturing environments for all are a necessary precondition for protecting human dignity.

Poet Victor Hugo said it already in 1890 in his Les Misérables, ‘Remember this, my friends: there are no such things as bad plants or bad men. There are only bad cultivators’.[[1059]](#endnote-1060) The presently unfolding coronavirus pandemic brings this insight to the fore starkly.[[1060]](#endnote-1061)

Dignity is an existential value we must uphold with decency, says international relations expert Steven Roach, who describes decency as a moral value and dignity as an existential value. Both are norms that are constructed by different cultural understandings and practices, whereby dignity ‘aligns itself with the core elements of decency’.[[1061]](#endnote-1062) Dignity ‘can be thought of as the metaphysical value we assign to human existence or the inherent capacity of humans to feel and reason’, while decency ‘expresses the value placed on the proper moral conduct needed to uphold such standards’.[[1062]](#endnote-1063)

I was born into a geographical and linguistic context that connected me very early on with the biographies of all three above-mentioned thinkers — Kant, Lévinas, and Buber — including their often painful life experiences. I was born into a German-speaking family that had been forcibly displaced in 1946 from Silesia to a city near Hannover in Lower Saxony (spelled Hanover in English), where I learned Latin, French, English, and Russian at school and was surrounded by displaced people who hailed, among others, from East Prussia. Kant’s name will forever be connected with Königsberg in East Prussia, Emmanuel Lévinas suffered the painful fate of being a prisoner of war in Hannover in 1942, and Martin Buber had to flee Germany in 1938 after Hitler’s rise to power, when Buber was dismissed from his post teaching philosophy at the University of Mannheim south of Hannover.

The context of my upbringing filled me with awe already as a child, awe for us humans ‘as living creatures, both to be honoured and to be feared’, as philosopher Tore Frost formulated it. Donald Klein as well, pioneer in the field of community psychology and founding pillar of the global dignity fellowship I am part of, always spoke about the human ability to feel ‘awe and wonderment’ in the face of this world with all of its living creatures.[[1063]](#endnote-1064) I follow both. In my book on the satyāgraha approach of Mohandas K. Gandhi, I speak up for big love as antidote against ‘big hate’.[[1064]](#endnote-1065)

My definition of my personal meaning of life, my personal ‘religion’ is therefore — love, humility, and awe for a universe too large for us to fathom.[[1065]](#endnote-1066)

I say yes to psychologist Kirk Schneider’s call for an ‘awe-based’ consciousness of daily life in the face of the encroachment of mechanisation on our most intimate human engagements, I agree that ‘we need to deepen — and perhaps even institutionalise — a sense of awe, both in our religious outlooks and individual lives’.[[1066]](#endnote-1067) Already as a small child, I asked ‘What does it mean to be spiritual?’ even before I knew about the approach to spirituality by philosopher David Hume,[[1067]](#endnote-1068) and it was immediately clear to me that the only answer can be that ‘love is the only rational act’.[[1068]](#endnote-1069) I survived the ‘search for meaning’ throughout my adolescence, among others, by reading Holocaust survivor Victor Frankl’s reflections on meaning.[[1069]](#endnote-1070) My personal ‘worship’ is through my relationships, ‘where unique beauty fills the senses each day for those with eyes to see it’, as Kenneth Gergen formulates it.[[1070]](#endnote-1071)

In this spirit, I regard the dignity work that I do as sacred work, as part of my path from local war trauma to global healing. In resonance with the analysis of historian Morris Berman, I am at home ‘in the world’ rather than in a particular ‘homestead’, just like our Palaeolithic forebears were at home in vast stretches of land.[[1071]](#endnote-1072) I am always open to experience and surprise, perceiving the divine as a process from which we cannot separate, recognising the sacred as immanent in all human affairs. With Berman, I am aware of the disastrous results for the planet and for human relationships if we continue believing that nature is independent from humans and that ‘we can use nature for our own purposes’. Through my work, I try to save us from our ‘nature-deficit disorder’[[1072]](#endnote-1073) by helping us move towards mutualism.[[1073]](#endnote-1074)

I see my work as sacred because relational processes carry a sacred dimension, following psychologist Jean Baker Miller and her successors, among them Kenneth Gergen, in that ‘which contributes to the growth and extension of relational process acquires aspects of the divine’.[[1074]](#endnote-1075) In Gergen’s words, ‘we are invited, then, to view the divine as a process within which we exist and from which we cannot be separated. The sacred is not distinct and distant, but immanent in all human affairs’.[[1075]](#endnote-1076)

I am very fortunate to be affiliated, among others, with the Department of Psychology and the University of Oslo in Norway, and gratified to see that my colleagues there work on kama muta, which is Sanskrit for ‘moved by love’.[[1076]](#endnote-1077) Based on Alan Page Fiske’s relational models theory, the kama muta framework posits ‘that being moved induces communal sharing and increases feelings of warmth’, and that ‘being moved is a culturally dependent positive affective state that often includes tears, goose bumps or chills and informs the experiencing, engaging, reinforcement, and building of communal sharing relationships’.[[1077]](#endnote-1078) Here is an explanation:

In English, people speak of being moved, touched, or overwhelmed with emotion, having a heart-warming, tear-jerking, or poignant experience, feeling nostalgia or sweet sorrow, and the rapture of divine love. People also have feelings evoked by cute babies or adorable kittens, and feelings that occur when feeling one with nature or the cosmos — neither of which feelings has a clear and definite name in English. Three years ago, we began exploring what seems to be the emotion common to these experiences. To avoid the ambiguity and unwanted connotations of vernacular terms varying across languages, we call this emotion kama muta (Sanskrit for `moved by love’). We also coin this scientific term because we think that people are not entirely consistent in their use of any vernacular term, so that sometimes, for example, a person says they are moved when they are feeling awe or sadness, not kama muta. And because we believe that people feel kama muta about kittens and the cosmos, without being able to give their feeling a name. Moreover, being moved denotes approximately the same set of experiences as gǎn dòng (Mandarin 感动), Malayan-Indonesian terharu, Estonia olema puudutatud and olema liigutatud — but not exactly. These vernacular lexemes are the best translations for each other, but do not have precisely the same prototypes or fields of reference; so which term would we use? And while English speakers who say they are moved, touched, overwhelmed with emotion, having a heart-warming, tear-jerking, or poignant experience, feeling nostalgia or sweet sorrow, and rapture usually are referring to the same emotion, each of these lexemes encompasses some relationship-specific and context-specific aspects of experiences; which English term would we select to denote the intersection of these terms? So we call the emotion we are studying ‘kama muta’.[[1078]](#endnote-1079)

Taking historian Morris Berman and anthropologist Alan Page Fiske’s reflections together, I can say that my home is planet Earth, this is where I have my roots. Many think that I am a nomad, but no, I am sedentary on planet Earth as a whole, rather than in one locality of it. While most people have a ‘home’ surrounded by ‘not home’, my home is all of planet Earth. My only not-home may be planet Mars, or planet Venus, or any other place outside of planet Earth — admittedly, the ghettos of the Global North often feel like planet Mars to me.

I perceive my global mobility as sacred because it aims to bring back what the Palaeolithic period appears to have offered, namely, space for meaning that is grounded in being moved by love, moved by the kama of unbounded ‘we’ relationships. I cherish all Indigenous peoples who live in dialogue with their land and who call a particular place their home, I deem economic systems dangerous for human life on Earth that allow people to use land as an object of speculation — land is a ‘false commodity’.[[1079]](#endnote-1080) Wherever I find genuine practices of true guardianship of our Earth, I try to give its practitioners strength by connecting them through my global life, by strengthening them through global connectivity.

Wherever I go, I observe that it causes immeasurable misery when meaning is sought in ‘we versus them’ oppositions, in ‘we in our in-group tribe are right’, whereas ‘they, all those out-groups, are foreign or wrong’. It becomes even more hurtful when ‘a culture of the market’ mediates relationships, as this creates an arm-length distance between people also within in-groups, it sacrifices the direct solidarity that otherwise could occur within a ‘we in our in-group tribe’. I am not surprised that right wing groups now reach back to the solidarity of the tribal ‘we against you’ to regain lost solidarity (see more in chapter 7).

My mission is to make known that there is another solidarity on the table now, namely, the global solidarity of we and you, of all with all, and this is because what anthropologists call the ingathering of the human tribes is reality now. My experience of more than four decades of global living has given me the confidence to assert that we humans are indeed capable of manifesting this global solidarity, that we do not need outer enemies to feel that we belong together.[[1080]](#endnote-1081) Global solidarity is like a seed waiting to be nurtured — nurtured by taking it seriously that the yearning for equal dignity in global solidarity is universal, that is not simply a Western idea.[[1081]](#endnote-1082)

We live in a historical time that offers us the extraordinary opportunity to leave behind all forms of hostile configurations based on ‘we as demarcated from not-we’. For the first time, we can co-create one single unbounded global in-group that manifests the unity in diversity of ‘we together, all of us’. The first step for us to take is to embrace what we are, namely, one single family of high diversity as integral part of nature. As soon as we embrace this insight, the very ‘we together, all of us’ can emerge that provides the kind of solidarity that no longer depends on a not-we. Gergen is right, if ‘no/thing truly or fundamentally exists for us outside our immersion in relational processes’[[1082]](#endnote-1083) and all individual action emerges from a matrix of relationships, then it is our highest duty to nurture relational processes that create dialogical bridges, and it is our highest duty to do so globally. It is time to build connecting bridges in our global village instead of alienating fences.

I meet many people who get angry at me and say that human nature stands in the way of such ambitious visions of the future. I can attest to the opposite. I have given my entire life to test this hypothesis by way of several decades of global living, and increasingly more research is on my side. There is, for instance, research on equity, on the question as to whether people are willing to share equally or not.[[1083]](#endnote-1084) My dear friend and doctoral advisor, social psychologist Lee Ross, who sadly passed away recently, always encouraged me on my path. He and his colleagues found that the myth that ‘humans are greedy by nature’ is inaccurate.[[1084]](#endnote-1085) They found a strong tendency to share equally, yet, only within in-groups, not with out-groups. Human nature has two faces, there is a strong scope of justice within in-groups, and this ends where the out-group begins.[[1085]](#endnote-1086) ‘The right within versus the wrong without’[[1086]](#endnote-1087) — in other words, there are in-group ethics and out-group ethics.

Today, there is only one single global village left. This is a fundamental ‘game changer’. As long as the world was divided into ‘many villages’, each village lived in fear of the other villages and they had no choice but to complement their in-group ethics of inclusion with hostile out-group ethics of exclusion. The ethics of each village had to serve the dominator model of society that had emerged in response to this fear, a model of society where honour and decorum meant that ‘dignitaries’ presided over lesser beings. Today, as there is only one single global village left, this has two highly beneficial consequences — first, out-group ethics become redundant when there is no out-group, second, the dominator model of society can be abandoned and it becomes feasible to manifest the partnership model of equal dignity for all.[[1087]](#endnote-1088)

In a global village that is united in diversity, each ‘villager’ can find space to be equal in dignity in connectedness and compassion[[1088]](#endnote-1089) and collaborate with all others in mutual solidarity, care, and responsibility.[[1089]](#endnote-1090) The literacy of love, as I call it, can finally flourish on the entire globe.

Human rights ideals are the only suitable and logical ethics for the global village. In 1948, it was the growing consciousness of the oneness of the human family that enabled the international community to declare human dignity as inherent to every human being, and, by doing so, they widened the scope of in-group ethics to include all of humanity. They declared traditional hostile out-group ethics to be illegitimate, leaving only in-group ethics on the table. We, as humanity, decided to surpass the past’s haughty decorum of ‘dignitaries’ and committed ourselves to the notion of equality in dignity as the moral core of human rights ideals. The term ‘dignity’ came to be placed before the phrase ‘rights’ in the foundational sentence, ‘All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights’, and this highlighted that the equality in rights is a speciﬁcation of equality in dignity.[[1090]](#endnote-1091)

If we accept equal dignity in solidarity as the moral compass for a decent future for all of humanity in our global village, then the task at hand is to bring this compass out of the realm of theory into the realm of practice, and to do so more effectively and intentionally than before. Manifesting these ethics means offering to all people on planet Earth, to all living beings, the same care and loyalty, the same communal sharing, that many of us are used to offer to all of our family-like relations, and that is practiced in many traditional tribes and local villages.[[1091]](#endnote-1092) The ethics of the global village are the same ethics that any local village, any local community, is familiar with that ever prided itself to be a decent village, with the added bonus that from now on there is no need for out-group ethics anymore — to keep an interconnected world artificially divided is foolish, there is no need to accept a divided world where honour and decorum are reserved for in-groups and indignity and humiliation are meted out against out-groups. In a first step, we can look into all in-group ethics that ever manifested in our planet’s diverse cultural realms, identify those codes that foster dignity, ‘harvest’ them, and then expand them so that all of humankind can enjoy them.[[1092]](#endnote-1093)

The concept of a ‘global village’, if we fill it with life, is thus revolutionary. For the first time in human history can we have one single in-group without out-groups. Equal dignity can be extended to all corners of the world, human rights ideals can form our global in-group ethics. All members of the global family can be moved by Kama muta to embrace our diversity with love. It is my life mission to work for this goal, and my global life experience indicates that human nature does not stand in the way, on the contrary, our inborn desire for relationships makes it possible, under the condition that we overcome our belief in and practice of keeping our world politically divided.[[1093]](#endnote-1094)

Throughout this book, and also in this chapter, I give the floor to many diverse voices and views. In this way, this book is true to interconnected individuality as a path to dignity. This path means leaving behind the indignities oppressive collectivism ever inflicted, as much as transcending the indignities of present-day’s ruthless individualism.[[1094]](#endnote-1095) Kenneth Gergen formulates it more beautifully than I could:

Relations between groups — religious, political, tribal, ethnic — have brought untold misery in the history of civilisation, and the future hangs in the balance. The route from separation to alienation, and then mutual destruction, is a route to the demise of meaning altogether. Dialogic practices that restore the flow of productive meaning are vitally needed. Similarly honoured are practices that bring humans and their environment together into a mutually sustainable world. All such actions are realisations of second-order morality — a revitalising of the relationship among relationships. All harbour sacred potential...[[1095]](#endnote-1096)

All human beings are members of one frame,

Since all, at first, from the same essence came.

When time afflicts a limb with pain

The other limbs at rest cannot remain.

If thou feel not for other’s misery

A human being is no name for thee.

― Inscription at the entrance of the general assembly hall in the United Nations building, by Persian poet Sa’dī Shīrāzī (1210–1291/1292)[[1096]](#endnote-1097)

# Part II: 1948 and beyond — Equal dignity for all!

The dignifying power of poetry

by Kim Stafford, poet laureate of Oregon,  
relating a story once told by poet Li-Young Lee

My wife said to me, ‘Li-Young, you need to be active, get out and do something. All you do is sit and read and write. Go’. So I went to study martial arts. I have a friend who teaches, and I told him I wanted to learn. But my teacher said to me: ‘You do not need to study with me. You are already a poet’. ’But I wish to learn the physical arts you might teach me’. ‘You do not understand. It’s like this:

1. At the first level for the martial artist, an opponent comes to you with ill will, and with the decision to attack you. You must defeat this person with physical skill. But once you do this, there is no security. He may come back with his friends any time, and overwhelm you.

2. At the next level, an opponent comes to you with ill will, but there is something about you that makes him hesitate to attack you. He may then retreat, and so you have overcome him without needing physical force. But still there is no security, for he may come back with his friends and overwhelm you.

3. At the next level, an opponent comes to you with ill will, but there is something about you that leads him to engage you with words instead of blows, and in time you may be able to have a dialog, and come to understand one another, and ill will is dissipated. Then there is some safety.

4. At the fourth level, there is something about you that makes you invisible. If an opponent approaches, he can’t even see you. You are so calm, so self-possessed, you are not to be seen. No harm is done.

5. But at the fifth level, through long practice, you live in keeping with the Dao, and you move through the world strewing beauty before you. Is this coming from within you? Or is this beauty the Dao moving through you, strewing good wherever you go? You can’t tell. But know this, Li-Young: the only way to cultivate this ability is through the practice of poetry, or painting’.

— Kim Stafford on his father William and the dignifying power of poetry.[[1097]](#endnote-1098)

## Chapter 5: Dignity is yearned for all around the world

Throughout history, any profound political and social change was preceded by a philosophical revolution, at least among a significant section of the population.

― Manbendra Nath Roy, Indian humanist and political theorist, 1950[[1098]](#endnote-1099)
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The word dignity comes before rights in the foundational sentence ‘All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights’. Is this an accident? Why then has the term human rights been normalised much more than the phrase human dignity? Why have rights been foregrounded since 1948?

In my work, I speak of human rights ideals precisely because I want to point at both, dignity and rights. Looking at the motto of the French Revolution, I want to include not just liberté and égalité but also the solidarity of fraternité.

The central message of this book is this: We live in historical times in which it is not enough to speak of human rights. ‘Dignity is a concept whose time has come’.[[1099]](#endnote-1100) More precisely, time has come for equality in dignity in solidarity.

Undeniably, rights have the advantage of being more easily definable and pragmatically applicable than dignity, particularly negative rights that guarantee ‘freedom from...’ more so than positive ‘rights to...’. Indeed, the political context of 1948 favoured negative rights over solidarity.[[1100]](#endnote-1101)

Despite all advantages, however, the notion of rights is not without problems. Some prefer the idea of human needs to rights, as needs are biologically anchored and socially and culturally emergent, whereas rights draw on conceptual authority that is disputable.[[1101]](#endnote-1102) Some argue that it is even worse, that the officialisation, professionalisation, and institutionalisation of dignity as an international and universal human right may even undermine the essential sense of dignity, if only unintentionally.[[1102]](#endnote-1103)

The situation is indeed complicated. Dignity can be violated by heeding rights that are insufficiently anchored in dignity, but dignity can also be violated through the neglect of rights. In short, while observing rights may violate dignity, neglecting rights may do the same.

Philosophers such as Jürgen Habermas point out that human dignity represents the moral source of human rights, which are merely speciﬁcations of human dignity.[[1103]](#endnote-1104) The purpose of human rights and liberties should be ‘to protect the inherent dignity of all people and serve as a foundation for freedom, justice and world peace’.[[1104]](#endnote-1105) Morality and humanity are the basis of our existence, and human rights are about bringing morality into human relationships.[[1105]](#endnote-1106)

As mentioned earlier, political scientist Francis Fukuyama was once associated with the rise of the neo-conservative movement, but has since distanced himself.[[1106]](#endnote-1107) In 2018, he wrote a book titled Identity: The demand for dignity and the politics of resentment. There he warns that unless we forge a universal understanding of human dignity, we will doom ourselves to never-ending conflict.[[1107]](#endnote-1108)

If we look back, we observe that not just rights and dignity have a difficult relationship, also rights and equality never had an easy rapport. They were tied together only very gradually over time, against the resistance of power elites. In all ages, founders of religions and philosophies ask questions that power elites dislike. Are not all people equally worthy? Is it legitimate to oppress people in the name of God? Is not the degradation of our environment a violation?[[1108]](#endnote-1109)

Many consider the Magna Carta of the year 1215 as a precursor to human rights.[[1109]](#endnote-1110) The Magna Carta was a peace treaty between an unpopular king, the King of England, and rebel barons. The rights it recognised were mainly feudal privileges of stark inequality. Later, French and American revolutionary regimes, even though they used the word equality, left many status differentials untouched, such as fixed property rights, or slavery in the case of the U.S., altogether patriarchal structures remained untouched. American revolutionaries got their law from English jurist William Blackstone, a man who devoted one of the four volumes of his summary of law to categories of inequality, for example, the inequality between master and servant.[[1110]](#endnote-1111) It was only in 1948 and 1966 that contemporary concepts of equal rights became more relevant. It started with the 1948 Human Rights Declaration, where political rights were emphasised and social rights guaranteed, and then, in 1966, the International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights was signed, coming into force from 1976.

Over time, however, despite all of its complexity, the notion of dignity rose to considerable fame. Dignity has found its way not just into the hearts and minds of people but also into the core of constitutional texts, even though with meanings that sometimes are mutually contradictory. Since the end of the Second World War, human dignity has become the foundational principle of international human rights law and of several domestic constitutional rights provisions. The European Union’s Charter of Fundamental Rights is one of many examples. In Article 1 it declares, ‘Human dignity is inviolable. It must be respected and protected’.[[1111]](#endnote-1112) The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization UNESCO says in Article I of its Declaration of Principles of International Cultural Co-operation, ‘Each culture has a dignity and value which must be respected and preserved’.[[1112]](#endnote-1113) The 1990 World Ecumenical Assembly has issued Ten Affirmations on Justice, Peace and the Integrity of Creation, pledging to commit itself to supporting the ‘struggle for human dignity’.[[1113]](#endnote-1114) In 1993, the Declaration Toward a Global Ethic was formulated by the Parliament of the World’s Religions, where they commit themselves to respecting ‘life and dignity’.[[1114]](#endnote-1115) The Catholic Church created a Charter of the Rights of the Family in 1999 that states that the right to life is directly implied by human dignity.[[1115]](#endnote-1116) The Universal Declaration of Human Responsibilities was issued by the InterAction Council in 1997, recognising the ‘inherent dignity’ of ‘all members of the human family’.[[1116]](#endnote-1117) The Sphere Charter lays down standards for humanitarian help during disaster response, and it speaks of the ‘right to life with dignity’.[[1117]](#endnote-1118)

The ways in which dignity is being defined and included in law have profound consequences for society. In Germany, for instance, abortion was legalised at first, yet, it was later declared unconstitutional and a new law on abortion was developed, following the court’s ruling that already embryos have human dignity.[[1118]](#endnote-1119)

By now, the notion of dignity receives increasing attention in all spheres of life and inquiry,[[1119]](#endnote-1120) and this includes the field of philosophy. ‘Why are philosophers invoking the notion of human dignity to revitalise theories of political ethics?’ wonders professor of law and history Samuel Moyn.[[1120]](#endnote-1121)

I look back on almost five decades of global experience — at home on all continents and embedded in many cultural contexts — and I have witnessed first-hand how dignity and respect are being yearned for by a rising number of people all around the globe.[[1121]](#endnote-1122) Not by accident have recent revolutions received the label ‘dignity revolutions’. The ‘Arab Spring’ of 2011 has been described as a ‘dignity revolution’,[[1122]](#endnote-1123) and just recently, on 18th October 2019, Chilean society ‘exploded as it had never done, unleashing social energy accumulated by decades of injustice and abuse summed up in two words: inequality and dignity’.[[1123]](#endnote-1124)

Shibley Telhami, Anwar Sadat Professor for Peace and Development of the University of Maryland, wrote to me in a personal communication on 16th May 2013:

Considerable evidence through public opinion research over a period of two decades confirms what ordinary citizens across the Arab world chanted during their revolts: One of the central driving forces behind the Arab uprising is the pursuit of dignity and overcoming a pervasive sense of humiliation not only in the relationship between rulers and ruled but also between Arabs and the rest of the world.

Nayef Al-Rodhan, a philosopher, neuroscientist, and expert of the geopolitics of globalisation and transnational security with a background from Saudi Arabia, observes that ‘what drives history is not primarily the search for freedom, but rather the profound human quest for dignity’.[[1124]](#endnote-1125) He wrote in 2013:

Dignity, more than the absence of humiliation, is a holistic set of criteria indispensable for decent governance: reason, security, human rights, accountability, transparency, justice, opportunity, innovation, and inclusiveness. Indeed, the call for dignity has been the theme of the Arab Spring. The revolutions were prompted by leaders’ failure to respect and ensure the dignity of their citizens. The protesters were driven by underlying discontent and frustration with arbitrary and disrespectful security forces, lack of economic opportunities, malfunctioning public services, and the arrogance as well as corruption of an affluent ruling class. The numerous failings in governance of incumbent regimes thus culminated in collective dignity deficits that made a critical turning point for the region inevitable. The question was not if, but when. Therefore, both the Arab Spring and its aftermath need to be dissociated from the overly-repeated dictum of liberal democracy, as it was not rooted in freedom but rather in a search for dignity.[[1125]](#endnote-1126)

Nawal El Sadaawi (1931–2021) was an Egyptian feminist author whom I had the privilege of meeting for the first time in 1985 when she supported me in my work with young Egyptian women. In 2011, at an age of 80, she joined the demonstrations on Tahrir Square and was surrounded by young people who protected her from physical attacks. She wrote to me in a personal communication on 4th February 2015:

Dear Evelin... Reading your message I think you are doing a great job in relation to human dignity. The Egyptian revolution in January 2011 has three goals: Freedom, Justice and Dignity. I think they are very connected and we cannot have dignity without justice and freedom.[[1126]](#endnote-1127)

Zaynab El Bernoussi, professor of international studies in Morocco, wonders whether dignity should not become a constitutional right. What would it take to enshrine dignity in a constitution? What might be the ‘side-effects’? This is her view:

At times of political turmoil, fundamental human rights are often at stake; the popular uprisings that have shaken the Arab world since the late 2010, known as the ‘Arab Spring’, are a prime example of political turmoil. In Tunisia, the Arab Spring upheaval in which the contested President Zine El Abidine Ben Ali fled the country was even coined ‘Dignity Revolution’ to emphasise the popular demands for dignity in hopes for a new constitution and political regime. One of those changes in the case of Tunisia concerns the constitutional process that led to the adoption of the current 2014 Tunisian Constitution.[[1127]](#endnote-1128)

I encounter the notion of dignity in all spheres of life and on all continents. Here is another voice:

The world is revolting. Italy, Germany, Hungary, Poland, Turkey, America — just a few places where extremism is not just ‘on the rise’, but ascendant. What was once the fringe is now shaping the destinies of nations. It’s often asked: what is the world revolting against? The answer is simple: neo-liberalism. But what is the world revolting for? The more I’ve come to think about, the more I believe the answer is: dignity.[[1128]](#endnote-1129)

Allow me to end this short listing of glimpses intended to show the relevance of the notion of dignity with two experiences from India, one from the sphere of architecture and the other from the sphere of politics. We had our 2017 Dignity Conference in the city of Indore in Madhya Pradesh,[[1129]](#endnote-1130) and I became aware of Balkrishna Vithaldas Doshi, the architect of the Aranya Low Cost Housing development in that city. In 2018, he became the first Indian architect to receive the ‘Nobel prize of architecture’, the Pritzker Architecture Prize. He is noted for his contributions to the evolution of architectural discourse in India and this is his message to architects and urban planners who are involved in low-income housing projects and in architectural education: Please move away from your focus on being individual designers, please become ‘far more collaborative, compassionate, and invested in the dignity’ of those you house.[[1130]](#endnote-1131)

The other story concerns Dalit participants in our conference who reminded us of Bhimrao Ramji Ambedkar (1891–1956), the renowned Indian jurist, economist, politician, and social reformer who inspired the Dalit Buddhist movement and supported the rights of women and labour. Ambedkar sought to put India’s diverse cultural, linguistic, and caste-divided groups into relations of political humility. Humility, as he understood it, is the opposite of meek deference to authority. Political humility speaks to equal dignity, as ‘an acknowledgment of the equal moral standing of others, an openness to input from them, and an intellectual modesty about the finality and accuracy of the moral and empirical claims one can offer, including on the final shape of rights to be enshrined in constitutions or legislation’.[[1131]](#endnote-1132)

### How dignity can be violated by rights

If human dignity represents the moral grounding of human rights, then this implies that human rights have the potential to violate human dignity if rights are designed without regard to dignity. Some thinkers contend that even the mere emphasis on rights throughout the past centuries may have done grave damage to dignity. Historian Henrik Jensen, for instance, warns that the world we live in may feel like freedom, but increasingly, it is a world of manipulated, atomised masses of individuals in eternal competition, a world of rights-holders, including all those disappointed rights-holders and their sense of victimhood that now sends the world into hateful polarisation.[[1132]](#endnote-1133)

Henrik Jensen sees two normative complexes in the history of Western culture, each with its own values, norms, dogmas, incentives, and prohibitions — a duty culture that has its deepest roots in Christianity and the ancient agrarian world, and a culture of rights that celebrates the individual. The culture of rights as guideline for the relationship between individual and society began to be dominant in the Renaissance period in Europe, growing into an emancipatory counter-culture through the Enlightenment, the French Revolution, and Romanticism, and, so Jensen warns, it ended in the disasters of the twentieth century, culminating in present-day’s hate-filled polarisations.

Philosopher Howard Richards, in commenting on Jensen’s position, draws our attention to thinkers such as John Dewey and James Hayden Tufts, and to their distinction between reflective and customary morality.[[1133]](#endnote-1134) In reflective morality, manners are separated from morals, while customary morality combines both, as happens in traditional societies.[[1134]](#endnote-1135) Both forms of morality have upsides and downsides. One of the downsides of customary morality is that it is hard to make changes even if changes are needed. The reflective mindset, in contrast, facilitates reform because it separates act and behaviour from culture and custom and seeks its grounding in active reflection. Even though the latter sounds like progress, the downside of current modernity is that an ethical void opens when customs get weaker while due reflective ethics are lacking. If one wants to make the detachment of the functions of law and government from the kinship group fruitful, Dewey and Tufts argue, it is necessary to first bring the concepts of authority and duty to consciousness, only then can concepts such as freedom and rights be introduced in a next step. Only in this way, Dewey and Tufts reason, can the universality and impartiality of law be established — in other words, Dewey and Tufts contend that in modernity, we have either reflective ethics or none. Dewey warned against schools teaching compliance with authoritarian work and political structures, he warned against cultivating docile compliance in passive pupils, given that the historical situation requires the opposite, namely, students being prepared to be reflective ethical beings capable of arriving at social truths through critical and intersubjective discourse.[[1135]](#endnote-1136)

Howard Richards illustrates these reflections with an example. ‘Initiatives such as anti-corruption efforts cannot possibly work without moral education. People might fear getting caught, but they will not act in a way that Kant said was essential to morals, namely, aus Pflicht (out of duty), they will not act from motives associated with respect for law’.[[1136]](#endnote-1137) Richards is sympathetic to the Kantian duty idea, even though he is ‘on the whole more against than for a Kantian approach to ethics’.[[1137]](#endnote-1138)

Richards’ example of corruption is apt. What do we mean when we speak of corruption? What if corruption is simply the logical utilisation of the space opened by freedom and rights in absence of reflective ethics? The world teems of examples. In Italy, Tangentopoli, or ‘Bribesville’, or ‘Kickback City’, was the name given to a nationwide judicial investigation in the 1990s, where at one point more than half of the members of the Italian Parliament were under indictment. Saudi-hired lobbyists have spent millions of dollars to influence the U.S. Congress without meeting much resistance from that Congress.[[1138]](#endnote-1139) Facebook representatives assert that their company’s mission is connecting people, that their platform is a force for good with some unforeseen side effects, yet, at the same time, in the service of profit maximisation, it connects ‘some of the most odious and hateful individuals with like-minded people’, suggesting the conclusion that ‘hate on the platform isn’t so much things going wrong on Facebook as it is the platform doing exactly what it’s designed to do’.[[1139]](#endnote-1140)

We could say that these parliamentarians and Facebook representatives are nothing else but ‘smart’, given that the most admired achievement in society is the accumulation of monetary resources. Nobody should be surprised that ‘privatisation increases corruption’.[[1140]](#endnote-1141) If we want to place blame, then not on individuals but on society as a whole. Society is guilty of systemic corruption through choosing to give priority to monetary accumulation as a foundation of society and thus institutionalising the lack of reflective ethics. Such a choice could be called systemic political corrumpalism. Corrumpalism is perhaps the true face of what we call capitalism, it is the system doing what it is designed to do. Instead of replenishing, as capitalism’s first authors once hoped for, it is extractive and pulls all other spheres of life down with it, thus validating Dewey’s warnings.

Corrumpalism has been described as the corruption and destruction of ‘the integrity of a social system and its biophysical foundation by perverting all forms of development via the use of mis-information, falsehoods, money and/or violence to achieve self-interested outcomes that are the opposite of cultural and ecological interests’.[[1141]](#endnote-1142) Corrumpalism has a global outreach now, as global institutional and cultural frames shape and constrain all local levels around the world. Loopholes in the global system offer opportunities for monetary gain that are much more lucrative than ethical choices aiming to protect the common good.[[1142]](#endnote-1143) Worse, when lobbyists and influencers have enough power, they can push lawmakers to turn loopholes into legal opportunities.[[1143]](#endnote-1144) The coronavirus crisis lays bare the price that has to be paid for systemic corrumpalism: it is paid for in coffins.

When I look at the motto of unity in diversity, then my observation is that we live in a world-system of money-driven uniformity. As an ‘ethical being capable of arriving at social truths’ as Dewey would say, I feel compelled to refrain from partaking in this money-driven uniformity, to refrain as much as I can, and in as ethically defendable and constructive ways as possible. I applaud Howard Richards for proposing a world-system built on a moral economy, which I have called a dignity economy.[[1144]](#endnote-1145)

### Is it possible to describe dignity?

As soon as we have a serious look at dignity, we are in trouble. Granted that dignity needs to inform rights, the next question comes up: What is dignity? What is its definition? How shall we describe it?

Considering dignity as basis for the formulation of rights is indeed a highly demanding task. Jacob Weinrib studies the intersection of legal philosophy and public law, and he observes that the idea of human dignity is invoked everywhere in the legal world, ‘as a matter of constitutional theory, however, the idea of human dignity remains enigmatic’.[[1145]](#endnote-1146) Christopher McCrudden is a global law professor and a professor of human rights and equality law, and also he acknowledges that the Universal Declaration on Human Rights was pivotal in popularising the use of ‘dignity’ or ‘human dignity’, however, he admits, ‘there is little common understanding of what dignity requires substantively within or across jurisdictions’, because dignity, ‘beyond a basic minimum core, does not provide a universalistic, principled basis for judicial decision-making in the human rights context’.[[1146]](#endnote-1147) Christopher McCrudden continues:

The meaning of dignity is therefore context-speciﬁc, varying signiﬁcantly from jurisdiction to jurisdiction and (often) over time within particular jurisdictions. Indeed, instead of providing a basis for principled decision-making, dignity seems open to signiﬁcant judicial manipulation, increasing rather than decreasing judicial discretion. That is one of its signiﬁcant attractions to both judges and litigators alike. Dignity provides a convenient language for the adoption of substantive interpretations of human rights guarantees which appear to be intentionally, not just coincidentally, highly contingent on local circumstances. Despite that, however, I argue that the concept of ‘human dignity’ plays an important role in the development of human rights adjudication, not in providing an agreed content to human rights but in contributing to particular methods of human rights interpretation and adjudication.[[1147]](#endnote-1148)

If we accept that human dignity should represent the moral foundation for human rights, then dignity itself should perhaps be a right? Indeed, both the American Declaration of Rights and Duties of Man and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948 stipulate that human rights include and guarantee the right of all humans to dignity. In South African jurisprudence, the right to dignity has been directly applied in a number of cases relating to criminal punishment, the law of defamation, and the right to marriage and family life.[[1148]](#endnote-1149) In the field of therapeutic jurisprudence, dignity is regarded as foundational for ending toxic shame and humiliation.[[1149]](#endnote-1150)

Political theorist Michael Rosen, however, is unsure as to whether turning dignity into a right is a feasible path. Rosen’s scepticism was alluded to earlier. He admits that rights have the advantage of being more easily definable and pragmatically applicable than the notion of dignity, however, he wonders whether the officialisation and institutionalisation of dignity as an international and universal human right has not done it a disservice, perhaps it has even damaged the essential sense of dignity, namely, dignity as the right to be treated with proper respect.[[1150]](#endnote-1151)

Does Michael Rosen have a point? Indeed, as also Christopher McCrudden has remarked, the concept of human dignity provides a rather uncertain ground for legal deliberations, it increases the space for unconstrained judicial discretion rather than decreasing it.[[1151]](#endnote-1152) The concept of human dignity was initially absent, for instance, from the European Convention on Human rights.[[1152]](#endnote-1153) Perhaps ‘there is no such thing as a right to dignity’?

Many people feel that autonomy is so fundamental to the human condition that it is, essentially, a facet of our human dignity. Many people also feel that the idea of human dignity is so fundamental that we should have a right to dignity. While superficially appealing, both of these viewpoints are essentially inconsistent with the concept of inherent human dignity as an underlying foundation and basis of international human rights law.[[1153]](#endnote-1154)

Given its indistinctness, perhaps it would be better to abandon the concept of human dignity altogether?[[1154]](#endnote-1155) Would it help to focus only on rights? As it seems, this is not a solution either. It would offer only a short-term way out, lasting merely until problems occur with one claim to rights sliding into contradiction to another rights claim. ‘By now almost any imaginable rights claim by one group of individuals will almost inevitably contravene or contradict the established or potential rights claims of others. The student’s right to live free in a peaceful, gun-free environment contravenes the gun-owner’s right to bear arms. The tenant’s right to affordable, rent-controlled housing contravenes the landlord’s right to extract rent at the market rate. The mother’s right to choose contravenes the foetus’s right to life, and so forth’.[[1155]](#endnote-1156)

Sociologist Miki Kashtan sees only one solution, namely, to let go of any overemphasis on rights. As reported before, she says, ‘I find the notion of human rights deeply problematic. I prefer human needs. Human needs are biologically given, also socially and culturally emergent. Human rights are conceptual. Needs are indisputable, even if someone will dispute, because their authority is lived experience. Human rights are disputable because their authority is conceptual. They separate’.[[1156]](#endnote-1157) Kashtan sees the language of rights being caught ‘within the paradigm of separation and scarcity: my rights give me a claim, and you and I can debate and ultimately go to war about whose rights are the most fair. Rights don’t open our hearts and don’t restore the flow of generosity’.[[1157]](#endnote-1158) If we want to exit from ‘the perpetual fight about who deserves what’, Kashtan suggests, we need to ‘transcend the language of civil or human rights and re-embrace the awareness of needs’.[[1158]](#endnote-1159)

Is this the solution — needs instead of dignity or rights? Unsurprisingly, Kashtan’s propositions elicit dismay in libertarians. Whoever is interested in an illustration, does only have to listen to debates around the topic of Universal Basic Income, also called Universal Basic Assets, as these ideas receive support and resistance from all political camps, albeit with different justifications and sometimes diametrically opposing aims.[[1159]](#endnote-1160)

Catherine Dupré, professor in comparative constitutional law, suggests that it is the notion of dignity itself that offers the way out.[[1160]](#endnote-1161) A focus on dignity, she suggests, helps re-orient constitutionalism as a new form of humanism. The notion of human dignity can contribute to the re-construction of time by re-formulating it as open futures, she proposes, rather than rejecting an unwanted past.

Howard Richards supports an emphasis on needs and dignity. ‘There is a universal ethic. It starts with universal needs. It commands respect for every human being. Each person has a right to confirmation of his or her worth. But the universal ethic can only be implemented in the life-worlds of diverse groups and individuals’. Richards explains further:

Central to any ethical foundation for a political philosophy must be a respect for human dignity. Everybody needs dignity; or, put otherwise, the word ‘dignity’ names a need every normal human being has. In Maslow’s terminology, dignity is the same as, or similar to, self-esteem, where it is understood that to have self-esteem a normal person needs some confirmation of her or his worth from others (Kant’s German, translated ‘dignity’ is Würde, a cognate of the English ‘worth’). Human dignity is a universal human need, and therefore (following the first of my two principles) having it is a universal human right, i.e. something that universally should be. Some say dignity is the first premise from which all the other human rights can be deduced. However, what confirms or confers dignity, varies enormously from culture to culture, from family to family, and from person to person.[[1161]](#endnote-1162)

Richards concludes that a one-size-fits-all approach to honouring the dignity of every person is a non-starter, rather, if every human being is to be respected for her or his inherent worth, it must be the particular kind of respect that is meaningful to and valued by the person being respected. To reach this goal, and to do so globally, Richards is sympathetic to the idea that, under the condition that it has a compelling political philosophy, a ‘world political party’ could be created.[[1162]](#endnote-1163)

### Dignity is an enthymeme...

If dignity is such a difficult concept, should we perhaps use other words? Ruth Mackins and Steven Pinker have already been quoted earlier on their preference for the notion of autonomy — the John Wayne version of dignity of ‘pull yourself up by your bootstraps’. Others have suggested that it would be better to speak of pride or of respect.[[1163]](#endnote-1164)

When I think of respect, the following question comes to my mind: Respect for what? Respect can also be connected with ranked honour. A man who beats his wife, for instance, may do so to force her to respect his supremacy. Apartheid was a system where respect was enforced for systemic humiliation. In other words, the unqualified term of ‘respect’ does not suffice.

Would the problem be solved by making the phrase longer by saying ‘respect for dignity’? Even this phrase would be incomplete. After all, the notion of dignity emerged in historical times when ranked honour was the reigning cultural paradigm — the notions of decorum and dignitary betray this heritage.[[1164]](#endnote-1165) Still today, the concept of a dignitary points at a person who deserves being respected as higher in rank than others are. I therefore suggest the following formulation: Respect for the equality in dignity of all individuals as free persons, free to engage in solidarity with each other and with our natural surroundings (not free to engage in exploitation).

Earlier, we heard about the Hebrew term kavod and that it is being translated into English as honour, respect, and dignity. The honour of kavod is about external signs of regard, ‘shown to people in positions of authority simply because they hold the position’, while respect is about inner feelings of admiration for the respected person as in ‘I display honour, but I feel respect’.[[1165]](#endnote-1166) The third aspect of kavod, namely, dignity, is about the worthiness of people simply for being members of the human family, worthiness that is neither bestowed by society nor earned through praiseworthy conduct in life.

When we look at the three aspects of kavod, we recognise that they are like a history book. First, there is the ‘mask-like’ nature of honour (see chapters 1 and 2), then the mask is removed so that the individual’s inner feelings can come to the fore, and, third, there is the inherent character of dignity. We notice also the well-known problems that arise in this historical timeline, namely, that honour and respect can slide into opposition. Honourable rank does not guarantee that the holder of this rank inspires authentic admiration, on the contrary, subordinates might feel hatred more than respect when asked to honour a person due to her rank while they despise that person’s behaviour. Throughout history, dominators have frequently recognised this contradiction, and, in order to bring honour and respect into alignment, have attempted to manipulate or even force their subordinates into developing feelings of admiration and respect for them irrespective of their often abusive actions. If those leaders also saw themselves as dignitaries by God’s grace — thinking that their elevated position had divine legitimacy — they anchored dignity even more firmly within a ranked system, the very opposite of allowing dignity to be equal for all.

Again, we see that the word dignity alone is insufficient if we want to express the spirit of human rights ideals. Dignity is an enthymeme (Greek: ἐνθύμημα, enthumēma). Enthymeme means that a speaker spells out only certain aspects of an argument and leaves other parts out because she assumes that the audience holds those parts in their minds (en thymo). In a narrow sense, an enthymeme is an informally stated three-part deductive argument, with an unstated assumption that must be true for the premises to lead to the conclusion. In a broader usage, the term enthymeme describes all incomplete arguments.

Philosopher Hubert Schleichert wrote a book on ‘how you can discuss with fundamentalists without losing your mind — instructions for subversive thinking’.[[1166]](#endnote-1167) In this book, he illustrates the enthymeme phenomenon with the following example:

Meier says: I think X should be prime minister again; times are difficult, and X has ruled for ten years. But Müller replies: I think X should not be prime minister again; times are difficult, and X has ruled for ten years. These two enthymematic arguments look alike but lead to opposite theses. The reason is clear: the two arguments use two different, unspoken arguments. For the analysis, it is necessary to make the unspoken arguments explicit; often it is here that the real bone of contention lies. Meier goes by the sentence: When times are difficult, a veteran leader should not be replaced. Müller, on the other hand, takes the exact opposite position.[[1167]](#endnote-1168)

It becomes clear that people who call for respect or for dignity do not necessarily talk about the same things. Acts of terrorism offer an extreme illustration: Those who engage in acts of terrorism often justify them by saying that there is no other way to gain respect and dignity. Their victims, however, will have the opposite view and feel that precisely everybody’s dignity is being violated. The notion of freedom poses similar problems. Many of those who call for freedom expect that freedom will render equality, yet, the opposite will be the outcome when freedom is taken to mean ‘freedom for might-to-become-right’ rather than ‘freedom for everyone in a level playing field’. In the first case, particularly when it is institutionalised, stark inequality will be the end result, only the second case renders equality in dignity in the long term.[[1168]](#endnote-1169) Already theorist Isaiah Berlin (1909–1997) brought it to the point, ‘Freedom for the wolves has often meant death to the sheep’.[[1169]](#endnote-1170)

For economist Ernst Friedrich Schumacher the ‘free’ market was ‘institutionalised individualism and irresponsibility’, bound to lead to an ungovernable economy.[[1170]](#endnote-1171) It is no sign of liberation when authoritarian power is simply replaced by money power. Already humanistic philosopher Erich Fromm criticised notions of liberation that are exclusively defined as liberation from outside forces — liberation by the middle class from feudalism, liberation by the working class from capitalism, liberation by the peoples in Africa and Asia from imperialism — while overlooking that outside chains can also be put inside of people.[[1171]](#endnote-1172) Fromm saw the idea of freedom in Western democracy as a warped pseudo-liberation that obscures everyone’s entrapment within the political system.[[1172]](#endnote-1173) If Fromm were still alive, he would find the presently unfolding coronavirus pandemic underpinning his argument, as it exposes the deadliness of freedom whenever it plays out as ‘malignant entitlement’.[[1173]](#endnote-1174)

In 1944, economist Friedrich von Hayek wrote a book that still today complicates views on liberty, equality, and solidarity, particularly in the United States — it was titled The road to serfdom. Hayek argued that all freedom will be lost if the state assumes power under the pretext of wanting to contribute to the common good and the welfare of citizens.[[1174]](#endnote-1175) Hayek warned that social democracy, though perhaps looking good at the outset, would end in Stalin- or Hitler-like regimes. Hayek’s predictions of 1944, however, have not come true. Loss of freedom was not among the defects of European social democracies that created benefactor states.[[1175]](#endnote-1176) On the contrary, ‘the imposition of the economic theories of the Austrian and Chicago schools has led more than once to the loss of liberties’, while research shows that the ‘most solidary people are also the people most respectful people of diversity, of the rights of others, and in the end of freedom’.[[1176]](#endnote-1177) The United States are now one of the places from where surveillance technologies originate that would have delighted a Stalin or Hitler.[[1177]](#endnote-1178)

Political scientist Patrick Deneen concludes that the definition of liberty as the most extensive possible expansion of the human sphere of autonomous activity has failed.[[1178]](#endnote-1179) Author Umair Haque chimes in by describing the systemic destruction of dignity:

The average American lives abysmally, shockingly, utterly without dignity. Not only must he choose between healthcare and food, or education and lifelong debt, or retirement, savings, and a home, for example — but at work, he must force others to make that choice, too, as a ‘manager’ or as an ‘executive’ and so on. That is the truest loss of dignity — not just being dehumanised, but dehumanising, because when one becomes one’s own oppressor, one can no longer change the system, but has become it. This too is a dilemma: join the system of taking dignity away from everyone else, and get a few crumbs of it, or lose it all.[[1179]](#endnote-1180)

What is the solution? Philosopher Amartya Sen recommends ‘freedom to live up to one’s capabilities, and an understanding that we humans are “of nature” and hence intimately bound to her’.[[1180]](#endnote-1181) It would be more beneficial to define freedom in terms of dignity than in terms of choice, suggests Umair Haque, ‘because dignity is the end, and choices only means — yet choices alone are an incomplete means to that end’:

You have endless choices today — Tinder dates, people to follow and friend on Twitter and Facebook, healthcare plans, cars to buy, jobs to apply for, things to buy on Amazon. But do you have dignity? Do any of these things give you more of it — or take it away from you? That is why the world is crashing the fortress of neo-liberalism.[[1181]](#endnote-1182)

What is the path out of the fortress of neo-liberalism? Again, we encounter problems. Even the most well-intentioned supporters of the idea of equal dignity can end up in unintended traps of indignity. Philosopher Elizabeth Anderson warns against fixating equality on distribution, on ‘moving resources from lucky-seeming people to unlucky-seeming people, as if trying to spread the luck around’, and therefore recommends relational equality.[[1182]](#endnote-1183) By categorising people as lucky or unlucky, Anderson cautions, bleeding-heart egalitarians set up a moralising hierarchy and do the wolf’s work in shepherds’ dress. Imagine, she writes, some citizens getting a state check with a bureaucratic letter, along the lines of messages such as this:

To the disabled: Your defective native endowments or current disabilities, alas, make your life less worth living than the lives of normal people... To the stupid and untalented: Unfortunately, other people don’t value what little you have to offer in the system of production... Because of the misfortune that you were born so poorly endowed with talents, we productive ones will make it up to you: we’ll let you share in the bounty of what we have produced with our vastly superior and highly valued abilities... To the ugly and socially awkward: ...Maybe you won’t be such a loser in love once potential dates see how rich you are.[[1183]](#endnote-1184)

In Anderson’s view, it is a libertarian misconception to think of freedom only within the frame of one’s own actions, while forgetting that if one person’s supposed freedom will result in someone else’s subjugation, the outcome is hierarchy in disguise rather than a free society in action. It is therefore that distributive equality needs to be replaced by relational or democratic equality. To be truly free, people have to be able to function as human beings, and this means, among others, having access to food, shelter, and medical care. They have to be able to participate in production through education, fair-value pay, and entrepreneurial opportunity, she suggests. They have to be able to execute their role as citizens, such as the freedom to speak and to vote, and they must be able to move freely through all segments of society, from parks to restaurants, workplaces, or markets. Viewed like this, being homeless is an unfree condition, society is morally bound to remedy that problem, and for people in a wheel chair, buildings require ramps. Consequently, simply giving equal material assistance to everyone falls short, equalising wealth is not the answer, the answer is having all people be equally free, regardless of their differences. Anderson advocates the concept of integration to address the challenges of pluralism, for maintaining equality amidst difference in a culture that is given to constant and unpredictable change. To use my words, what Anderson does, is conceptualising dignity as realisable through unity in diversity, and through her examples she makes palpable how challenging it is to manifest this in practice.[[1184]](#endnote-1185)

Amartya Sen and Elizabeth Anderson’s insights are not yet mainstream. Hayek’s teachings are still predominant, as can be observed, for example, when corporate leaders denounce measures to protect dignity as ‘a dangerous Left plot’ aiming to bring ‘the nanny state’ to the corporate world.[[1185]](#endnote-1186) In a similar vein, hate speech is sometimes defended as ‘free speech’. Hate speech is not free speech, reminds linguist George Lakoff.[[1186]](#endnote-1187)

What we learn is that it is not autonomy, nor respect, nor pride, nor simply dignity alone that describes the core of the moral universe built on human rights ideals. Dignity is a lived experience along the lines of respect for the equality in dignity of all individuals as free persons, free to engage in loving dialogue and responsible mutual solidarity with each other and with our ecological foundations (not free to humiliate people or exploit our natural surroundings).

This equal dignity is an embodied sense. Many thinkers have emphasised the significance of the body, ranging from phenomenological philosopher Maurice Merleau-Ponty (1908–1961), who saw the body as the primary site of knowing the world, influenced by Edmund Husserl and Martin Heidegger,[[1187]](#endnote-1188) to cognitive linguists Lakoff and Johnson, who wrote a book on ‘the embodied mind’.[[1188]](#endnote-1189)

This equal dignity is the embodied sense of being able to stand tall and hold one’s head up high. It means looking into the eyes of one’s fellow human beings as equals, rather than being humiliated and bowing down in submissive humbleness, or sticking one’s nose up in haughty arrogance (see also chapter 4).[[1189]](#endnote-1190) It is a posture of dignified humility — of humble pride[[1190]](#endnote-1191) — neither looking up to others from humiliated inferiority nor looking down on others from arrogant superiority. Equal dignity means for inferiors to become aware that they need no longer accept humiliation in docile meekness, and for superiors to learn to refrain from arrogating supremacy, to refrain from treating inferiors with humiliation. Equal dignity and self-respect are ‘orthopaedic challenges’, they are the art of walking upright.[[1191]](#endnote-1192) Equal dignity is thus a posture, a Haltung, in German.[[1192]](#endnote-1193) Uppity was once a derogatory word to describe black persons who held their heads ‘too high’ and ‘didn’t know their place’ in the ranking order.[[1193]](#endnote-1194) Today, equal dignity invites everyone to reject not just ‘uppity’, but to abandon the entire ranking order from superiority to inferiority. Equal dignity is an existential given that is universal, irrespective of the fact that it is being experienced and expressed differently in each cultural context and by each individual.[[1194]](#endnote-1195)

Earlier, I mentioned the Quaker movement and their abhorrence of the modern trend to replace the singular pronouns of thee and thou with the one honorific ‘royal’ second-person plural of you. For Quakers, this represented the very sin of pride and idolatry, the sin of ‘levelling up’. They wanted to level down, to use ‘conscientious disrespect toward everyone’, to demonstrate ‘an equality of extreme humility and universally low status’.[[1195]](#endnote-1196) In other words, Quakers wanted to bring everyone together in equal humility at the bottom of the status ladder rather than in equally shared arrogance at the top. In my work, I call on all of us to meet in the middle and dismantle the very ranking scale.

Many will respond that levelling up is not a problem, that it does not hurt anyone, on the contrary, it is like a compliment to everyone.[[1196]](#endnote-1197) However, the situation might be more complicated than that, and certain realms of daily life may shed unexpected light on this. The original purpose of chairs, for instance, was to manifest status, chairs originate from thrones. The chairperson, after all, leads the meeting, and a professor ‘holds a chair’. The problem with chairs today is that its original function to elevate a person is lost when everyone is sitting on a chair — with the result that we are all left with back pain.[[1197]](#endnote-1198) The failure of the self-esteem movement discussed earlier could be seen as a social-psychological equivalent of that back pain.

There is more to it still. Mere equality is not enough — be it equality by way of levelling up or down. Human rights ideals represent more than an invitation to keep our heads straight so we are equals, they invite us to open our arms and offer respectful solidarity to the world. They ask us to refrain from sticking our elbows out in divisive competition, just as much as we should not smother others with choking embraces. Everyone is invited to protect unity in diversity through avoiding hostile division as much as refraining from suffocating uniformity. All are invited to meet in the middle between top and bottom, at the level of equal dignity in shared humility and solidarity, so that we all can join hands in building a decent future together.[[1198]](#endnote-1199) Dignity is the ability to stand upright with open arms, lovingly welcoming all others into mutual responsibility as equals in worthiness.

Like dignity, also humiliation is an embodied concept to the extent that people very often cannot find words to speak about it and it is easier to express it in other mediums, such as drawings or photography.[[1199]](#endnote-1200) ‘Humiliation is hard to understand until one is humiliated’, but ‘then its impact can be devastating’.[[1200]](#endnote-1201)

Allow me to share an example from my work. In 1999, I was in Rwanda for my doctoral research. Before travelling, I was admonished never to ask whether a person was of Hutu or Tutsi origin, always keeping in mind that everyone living in Rwanda is now regarded as citizen of Rwanda and no longer identified as Hutu or Tutsi.[[1201]](#endnote-1202) Rather, I was to proceed indirectly — like asking, ‘Where have you been in 1994?’ However, I was told — notably ‘unofficially’ — that hundreds of years of subservience had marked Hutu body language to the extent that many would continue to display a tendency to hold their bodies slightly bent in a humble bow to the day today, whereas Tutsi would stand proudly upright, sometimes even haughtily. During the 1994 genocide, as Human Rights Watch reported and as I was told many times, tall Tutsi had parts of their legs hacked off to shorten not only their bodies but to ‘bring down’ their alleged arrogance.[[1202]](#endnote-1203) In this way, the Rwandan genocide provided a gruesome catalogue of intricate practices designed to ‘bring down’ victims’ dignity by literally cutting down their physical bodies. During my fieldwork in Rwanda and Somalia, I came to see genocide primarily as an act of ‘cutting down’ — why else were victims being humiliated in time-consuming procedures rather than brought to death quickly? The final aim was to exterminate Tutsi to the last person, to the last baby even, in this way following the path of Nazi redemptive anti-Semitism.[[1203]](#endnote-1204)

In 2014, in a gathering with a group of youth, Rwandan president Kagame spoke about dignity, or agaciro:

Agaciro is about creating a sense of self-worth. And self-worth is only achieved if all of us together value one another... And for us Rwandans we understand that, from our history, from our tragedy of 20 years ago, and the history of that. We are able to understand the full meaning of self-worth; because, for so long, we never had that. Being deprived of a sense of self-worth taught us and gave us the full meaning of it. That’s why whatever we do; we have at the back of our mind this sense of self-worth: its dignity, its agaciro.[[1204]](#endnote-1205)

Edna Adan was the first lady of Somalia during its short democratic period after independence in 1960, and I interviewed her in December 1998 in Hargeisa, the capital of Somaliland. We sat under a tree on a plot of land that had been used for executions during the genocidal onslaught on the Isaaq clan between 1987 and 1989. It was on this land that she built a hospital, which was under construction when we spoke. For Edna Adan, humiliation ‘is when someone tries to bring someone down to their level’, when ‘they think that you are above them and they want to hurt you, humiliate you, bring you down to their level, so that you have no more self-respect, so that you lose the respect you have for yourself and others lose the respect they have for you’.[[1205]](#endnote-1206) What Edna Adan described was indeed an appropriate description of the tragedy in Rwanda, namely, the strategy of ‘pushing another person down to pull yourself up’.

In 2009, we held our Dignity Conference in Hawai’i, where we met a member of the former royal family in the small local library in the town of Lahaina on Maui, the first capital of the Kingdom of Hawai’i.[[1206]](#endnote-1207) Princess Lehu’anani described the ‘practices of a Hawai’ian’ to us, and the ‘spirit and practice of aloha’:

* Being aware of others and recognising that there is value in everyone
* Developing a feeling for another’s needs, having the sensitivity and awareness to assist without being asked
* Not pushing another down to pull yourself up
* Forgiving a person who has injured you, and then dropping the issue permanently.

We can conclude that human rights ideals cannot be substantiated by simply mentioning the word dignity. ‘For meaningful dialogue on the subject, it is necessary to listen carefully and ascertain whether or not conversation partners use the same or at least similar concepts of dignity. If not, fundamental disagreements can remain hidden to the detriment of constructive consensus’.[[1207]](#endnote-1208)

Said differently, even while dignity is foundational, the word dignity alone is not enough. It needs to be embedded in narrative, in experience, in lived life.[[1208]](#endnote-1209) Dignity is more than merely a philosophical abstraction or a legal construct, ‘it is a phenomenological reality that has its basis in human consciousness’[[1209]](#endnote-1210) and in the body, more precisely, in the bodymind.[[1210]](#endnote-1211) Human dignity, rather than a justification for norms, is a common good that, if it is to last, must be preserved and, if need be, regained.[[1211]](#endnote-1212) Dignity is a sense of worthiness, ‘which we have a duty to develop and respect in ourselves and a duty to protect in others’, while acknowledging that there are diverse interpretations of dignity.[[1212]](#endnote-1213)

The African ubuntu philosophy summarises it in Umunthu ngamunthu ngabantu — ‘A person is a person through other people’.[[1213]](#endnote-1214)

### Dignity instead of honour

During my many decades of global experience, I have observed human worthiness being appraised in two profoundly different ways all around the world, which, if applied rigorously, are mutually exclusive. The difference lies between equal and unequal worthiness, between ranking the worthiness and value of people in higher and lesser, and not ranking it.[[1214]](#endnote-1215)

Ranking people’s worthiness requires the concept of a ranking scale, a ranking order that ranges from high to low. The great chain of being is such a scale, with divinity at the top and dirt at the bottom.[[1215]](#endnote-1216) On this scale, people have been ranked into higher and lesser beings, however, one can also reject this practice and decide to align all human worthiness at the same level. This could be done by lining up all people’s worthiness either at the bottom, top, or middle of the scale, yet, the more radical solution is to reject the use of ranking scales for human worthiness altogether.[[1216]](#endnote-1217) In my work, I have chosen to apply the label honour to the first practice — that of ranking human worth into higher or lesser value — and I reserve the phrase dignity for the second practice, namely, the un-ranking of human worth, the collapsing of the gradient of high and low into one single line in the middle, so that everyone is at the same level.

Already philosopher Jean-Jacques Rousseau differentiated dignity and honour in similar ways, and philosopher Charles Taylor followed him in speaking of two moral universes: dignity as a necessary recognition, and honour as a non-egalitarian value within systems of preference.[[1217]](#endnote-1218) The first arrangement, that of honour, is aligned with what systems scientist Riane Eisler calls the dominator model of society, while the second fits into Eisler’s partnership model of society,[[1218]](#endnote-1219) or, as psychologist Linda Hartling would call it, the mutuality model of society.[[1219]](#endnote-1220)

By giving the phrases honour and dignity such a central place in my work, I exercise my linguistic right to label cultural codes as I see them work in the world. By exercising this right, I draw on the most basic insights of semiotics, namely, that meanings do not reside in words. Philosopher Jacques Derrida spoke of différence.[[1220]](#endnote-1221) Words are associated with meanings through socially constructed rules of correspondence between signifiers and meanings, and ‘culturally encoded meanings can be widely shared or contested among diverse people, and they can be relatively fixed or relatively fluid across time’.[[1221]](#endnote-1222) While I use the substantive honour in the circumscribed way explained here, I continue to use the verb to honour in less specific ways, for instance, when I say that I want ‘to honour people whom I respect’.

Even though honour mindsets are usually associated with collectivism, and ideals of equal dignity are closer to individualism, both are collective phenomena.[[1222]](#endnote-1223) Particularly people who adhere to extreme ‘lone hero’ versions of individualism usually overlook — or deny — that also they are the product of group influence, that the ‘lone hero’ way of individualism is as collectively anchored and as collectively prescribed as community-oriented mindsets. In 1932, humanistic philosopher Erich Fromm coined the term Individualcharacter, or the individual character of a person, in contrast to the Sozialcharacter, or social character, whereby the latter encompasses those qualities that are determined by societal expectations, the demands for adapted behaviour, and the sanctioning of deviant behaviour.[[1223]](#endnote-1224) The lone hero character is a Sozialcharacter.

Normative paradigms are sets of informal values that contain intellectual and affective elements that inform codes of law and keep people who subscribe to these values engaged in them.[[1224]](#endnote-1225) Concepts of honour and dignity represent such normative paradigms that operate as interpretive frames of discourse.[[1225]](#endnote-1226) Both honour and dignity mindsets shape and are shaped collectively at all levels, from the micro to the meso to the macro level, from emotions to societal structures. Both come into being through group processes that affect the meta-emotions of a community, the very ways in which people manifest feelings.[[1226]](#endnote-1227)

Interpretative frames of honour rank human worthiness from high to low, while those of equal dignity reject the ranking of human worthiness and invite everyone to meet in shared humility in the middle, so that no one has to look up to others anymore in meekness or looks down on others in condescension. When I speak of honour, this is shorthand for ‘un-equally ranked worthiness ascribed to people who are wedged into their particular rank within their local collective in-group, an in-group that defines itself in contrast to out-groups’. When I speak of dignity, I point at ‘un-ranked equal worthiness for everyone who inhabits a globalised planet as member of one single human family that forms one single in-group without out-groups, in this way giving each family member more freedom than before but also more responsibility, namely, responsibility for the common good’. Said differently, ‘dignity is respect for the equality in dignity of all human beings on Earth, respect for their freedom to act as responsible individuals connected in loving mutual solidarity, while they are not free to humiliate other people or exploit our natural surroundings’. For the dignity scenario, I have coined the word globegalisation, composed of globalisation and egalisation, which is short for equal dignity and the undoing of humiliation (read more in chapter 11).

As mentioned earlier, if applied rigorously, honour and dignity mindsets are mutually exclusive. I sometimes use the example of honour killing to illustrate how far these two moral universes can slide into irreconcilable positions.[[1227]](#endnote-1228) Honour killing is a term often used for a certain kind of femicide, namely, the killing of a girl by her family with the aim to remedy humiliated family honour.[[1228]](#endnote-1229) In a context of dignity, this narrative describes a stark violation, since killing the girl compounds humiliation rather than remedying it — the girl deserves trauma therapy rather than death. Human rights defenders facing cases of honour killing are caught between their desire ‘to respect other cultures’ and their wish ‘to respect the dignity of the girl’[[1229]](#endnote-1230) — a human rights defender cannot concurrently say, ‘I respect the dignity of the girl, therefore she must live’, and ‘I respect all cultures, including honour cultures, and therefore, if this is what honour culture prescribes, I respect that the girl must die’. ‘The girl must die’ and ‘the girl must live’ are two mutually exclusive positions.

Here is another example. I once sat in a conference between a Somali man and a Somali woman. Like many of my Somali sisters, also this woman shunned the practice of female genital cutting, she called it ‘mutilation’, and she cried out to me, ‘Evelin, do not respect Somali culture, it humiliates us!’[[1230]](#endnote-1231) The Somali man sitting on my other side urged me to do exactly the opposite, namely, to respect Somali culture, including a ‘tradition’ he called ‘important’, namely, to ‘protect’ girls by ‘closing’ them. What we meet here is the problem of ‘intersectionality’, namely, when ‘rights that supposedly flow from a particular group identity may be oppression for subgroups that have a crosscutting allegiance’, explains legal philosopher Duncan Kennedy.[[1231]](#endnote-1232)

A human rights defender can also not say, ‘As long as you are in my country, you have to accept our rules and refrain from honour killing and female genital cutting. You can do what you want in your country’. Such a position would mean to betray the claim of human rights ideals of being valid for all human beings, not just for those living in ‘my country’. The only way forward I see is to invite all citizens of planet Earth to embrace the insight that human rights ideals are the only feasible ethical compass for a globally interconnected world, at least if we wish for its citizens to live in dignity. In an interconnected world, values of honour, with their roots in a compartmentalised world in the grip of the security dilemma, are a path to collectively suicidal honour killing.

What is at stake is the problem of normativity and relativism. Early anthropologists studied faraway people who lived in separate moral communities, and it would indeed have been wrong to approach them with moral judgements stemming from the anthropologists’ own cultural background. Furthermore, it would have been impossible to adequately describe and analyse such communities without the suspension of judgement. Since the turn of the millennium, however, few untouched tribal peoples are left on the planet. As the world shrank, ‘it increasingly became epistemologically and morally difficult to place “the others” on a different moral scale than oneself’, explains anthropologist Thomas Hylland Eriksen.[[1232]](#endnote-1233) De facto cultural differences shrank as well, as peoples across the world began ‘to partake in a bumpy, unequal but seamless global conversation’.[[1233]](#endnote-1234) In an interconnected world, pretending that what anthropologists do is simply study ‘remote cultures’, would be ‘disingenuous and intellectually misleading’, argues Eriksen:

In this increasingly interconnected world, cultural relativism can no longer be an excuse for not engaging with the victims of patriarchal violence in India, human rights lawyers in African prisons, minorities demanding not just cultural survival but fair representation in the parliament. Were one to refer to ‘African values’ in an assessment of a particular practice, the only possible follow-up question would be ‘whose African values’? In this world, there is friction between systems of value and morality. There can be no retreat into the rarefied world of radical cultural difference when, all of a sudden, some of the ‘radically culturally different’ ask how they can obtain wage work, so that they can begin to buy things. The suture between the old and the new can be studied by anthropologists, but it must be negotiated by those caught on the frontier, and in this world, the anthropologist, the ‘peddler of the ecstatic’ in Geertz’s (1986) words, cannot withdraw or claim professional immunity, since the word of the remote native is now his own.[[1234]](#endnote-1235)

As I have explained before, both approaches — that of honour and that of dignity — depend on social collectives to hold them. The difference is that honour fixes the individual in ‘her place’ in a ranked local collective with attributes of more or less worthiness, while in an ideal dignity context individuals no longer are fixed in a particular ranked local collective. In an ideal dignity universe, the individual is liberated from ‘her place’ and given space to move in the much larger in-group of all of humankind, a humankind that is now free of the yoke of having to fear hostile out-groups. The ideal is unity amidst diversity, the ideal is a global human family that is united in offering space for diversity to flourish for all. Glocalisation in the service of unity in diversity is the most beneficial harvest we can reap from globalisation.

Clearly, all these lofty ideals are being ubiquitously betrayed these days. They are betrayed, for instance, when liberation means nothing but the loss of one’s place in a caring in-group to be turned into a cog in an anonymous and exploitative machine-like cogwheel where diversity plays out as division between isolated individuals.[[1235]](#endnote-1236) Wendell Berry, a novelist, poet, essayist, environmental activist, cultural critic, and farmer, once commented, ‘The world is being destroyed, no doubt about it, by the greed of the rich and powerful. It is also being destroyed by popular demand. There are not enough rich and powerful people to consume the whole world; for that, the rich and powerful need the help of countless ordinary people’.[[1236]](#endnote-1237)

One way to describe the transition from honour to dignity is to use traffic as a metaphor, following the spirit of Max Weber’s ideal-type approach. Each society has to decide on whether to go for left hand or right hand driving. A society that allows for ‘freedom’ to mean that everybody can drive as they like — left or right — will head towards messy chaos and countless accidents. The decision of either left hand or right hand driving is one on which society has to unite. Diversity can only reign for the kinds of vehicles and driving styles that people might want to use. These are different levels of abstraction and action and when they are confounded, accidents are the result (see also the section ‘Transitions between irreconcilable systems need to be instant’ in chapter 10).

The transition from unequal honour to equal dignity resembles this situation insofar as they cannot coexist in the same space. Honour means that larger vehicles have the right of way at every intersection and that smaller vehicles watch out for them in deference. We could call this system left hand driving. If we say that dignity stands for right hand driving, then this requires a superordinate authority to ensure that all vehicles are equal in front of red and green traffic lights, large and small vehicles alike.[[1237]](#endnote-1238)

The transition from left hand to right hand driving is vulnerable in many ways and on many levels. A society must first decide on which side they prefer and then implement the transition in one single minute — if a society remains undecided or implements the transition slowly and uncoordinatedly, accidents will ensue. This is what happens with the transition from unequal honour to equal dignity in contemporary world society — some people hold on to unequal honour, others accept that there should be a transition and enact equal dignity, with the result that left hand and right hand driving exist alongside or in opposition to each other, while moral relativists indulge in defining freedom as ‘anything goes’. This is an untenable situation.

Another danger looms when owners of large vehicles hollow out dignity from within by hijacking the superordinate authorities — bribing the traffic police so to speak and rigging the traffic lights. This means a return to left hand driving in practice even while it remains officially labelled as right hand driving. When this happens, when traffic lights are rigged, they work as humiliation devices, and this is precisely what we observe nowadays in many world regions.[[1238]](#endnote-1239) The victims of this covert betrayal, in dismay, may mistake right hand driving for the culprit, wanting to return to left hand driving — ‘Make America great again’ is a slogan that speaks to this predicament, at least when greatness means supremacy in a divided world.[[1239]](#endnote-1240) The solution, rather than abandoning the concept of traffic lights, is to repair them, in other words, when egalitarian partnership fails because it is hollowed out from within, the remedy is not the return to the old dominator system but to repair the superordinate frames of the partnership system.

Staunch individualists and advocates of ‘freedom from all restrictions’ do not like to acknowledge that also they depend on superordinate frames, and that these frames guide their behaviour and form their preferences — in their case, they depend on ‘Wall Street’ frames. Moreover, they are oblivious of the fact that these frames are rigged insofar as they undermine the very aims they profess in the long term, namely, well-being and freedom for all.

Social psychologists have devised experiments to demonstrate the power of frames to influence behaviour. They let students play the prisoner’s dilemma game by telling them that this is a Wall Street game, and the typical result was that the players cheated on each other. When students were informed that the very same game is a community game, they usually cooperated.[[1240]](#endnote-1241) If the researchers would have announced that this is a game of slavery, the players would presumably have set out to oppress each other. When the students were asked to predict what other players would do in the next round, their predictions went wrong when they overlooked the frames and assumed that people’s decisions were driven by personal inclinations only.[[1241]](#endnote-1242)

To use the traffic metaphor, both the frame of slavery and that of Wall Street create a world of left hand driving where the powerful own the streets, while only the community frame can create a world of well-being and freedom for all, a world of right hand driving collaborators. Slave owners once argued that the abolition of slavery would make the economy collapse and that ‘slaves’ would be unsuited for freedom anyhow. Even many enslaved people accepted the legitimacy of their status to the point that ‘honest slaves’ would refuse to run away because this would mean stealing their masters’ property.[[1242]](#endnote-1243) Similar mindsets support the Wall Street frame also nowadays, its legitimacy is accepted even by many of its victims. I observe this phenomenon everywhere, be it in India, China, Africa, South America, or the Anglo-Saxon world.

For society’s transition towards equal dignity in a partnership and community frame to succeed — the transition from left hand to right hand driving so to speak — ‘dense chunks of connective sensations, habits, and feelings, which work below the consciousness of disposition’ need to be reconfigured.[[1243]](#endnote-1244)

Ironically, it is the very notion of decency that hampers this undertaking, warns Steven Roach, scholar of global studies who was introduced earlier and who has thought for many years about decency in world politics. The obstacle lies in the ‘dual function of decency’, because all frames can include and exclude identity claims under the banner of decency,[[1244]](#endnote-1245) and this makes ‘any uniform and concerted attempt to extend decency a perilous task of securing identity in the world’ — in short, promoting liberal decency too fervently can provoke relapses into conservative decency that undermine basic decency.[[1245]](#endnote-1246)

### Honour leads to hubris

When ‘dense chunks of connective sensations, habits, and feelings’ wait to be reconfigured, it is prudent to explore where we stand and where we come from.

Humans need connection, and some seek it in recognition, others in security, explains psychologist Linda Hartling. In the past, women used to struggle to find a secure environment for themselves and their children in a context shaped by men who, on their part, sought recognition, particularly from other men, as a way to feel connected — community psychologist Don Klein would say that men desire significance in the world.[[1246]](#endnote-1247)

The struggle for recognition has been well described, not least by philosophers Kant and Hegel. Philosopher Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (1770–1831) made the concept of recognition (Anerkennung) fundamental to his philosophy and taught that a fulfilled life is dependent on being held in regard by others. Human self-consciousness, he argued, depends on being recognised by others as a person who possesses worth. Hegel’s discussion of the struggle for recognition has inspired an extensive literature in contemporary political theory. Moral philosopher Axel Honneth, for instance, follows both Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, George Herbert Mead, and Ernst Bloch.[[1247]](#endnote-1248)

Philosopher Max Scheler (1874–1928) explored related issues in his classic book Ressentiment.[[1248]](#endnote-1249) Scheler stated that a person is a loving being at her core, an ens amans, a being who is prone to feel ressentiment (comparable to resentment) when not recognised.[[1249]](#endnote-1250) Scheler saw ressentiment as a kind of self-poisoning of the mind.[[1250]](#endnote-1251) As mentioned before, he dismissed the French Revolution as having engineered ressentiment at a grand scale — we could say that he held the humiliated responsible for their feelings of humiliation and not the humiliators.

The philosophy on the politics of recognition builds on Scheler and suggests that violence may ensue when people suffer the humiliation of non-recognition. Philosopher Charles Taylor describes identity politics as being motivated by a deep human need for recognition, with misrecognition causing severe injuries.[[1251]](#endnote-1252) Taylor puts the blame on the humiliator rather than the humiliated when he says that it is particularly injurious when victims learn to internalise their own self-deprecation. Taylor sees in the modern notions of equality and dignity the Romantic idea of authenticity and the authentic self, linked with Kantian ideas Enlightenment.[[1252]](#endnote-1253) Authenticity is something that is inwardly generated, it comes from the heart, in contrast to the ‘mask’ of identity that is constructed through social roles. Taylor credits Rousseau with being the originator of the notion of equal recognition as a path to amour-propre (self-love). As reported before, Taylor follows Rousseau in differentiating dignity from honour — the idea of dignity ascends wherever hierarchical societal structures descend.

The need for recognition is acknowledged in many fields of inquiry. Political scientist Neera Chandhoke from the University of Delhi in India is inspired by European thinkers and summarises, ‘If, for Kant, the idea of Achtung or respect contains the nucleus of his Categorical Imperative, for the Scottish moralists, recognition or disapproval motivates individuals towards the attainment of desirable virtues’.[[1253]](#endnote-1254) Political scientist, sociologist, and social anthropologist Liah Greenfeld uses Ethiopia and Eritrea as a case to show the central role that ressentiment plays in nation building.[[1254]](#endnote-1255) Political scientist Alexander Wendt suggests that the struggle for recognition and ‘need for positive self-regard’ on the part of the United States of America,[[1255]](#endnote-1256) may actually ‘explain much of the Realpolitik behaviour, including war, which Neorealists have attributed to the struggle for security’.[[1256]](#endnote-1257) Sociologist Zygmunt Bauman fears that ‘wars of recognition’ will be a ‘perpetual condition of modernity’.[[1257]](#endnote-1258) Linda Hartling sees nations inflate national posturing to maintain global recognition, as the greatest humiliation flows from being treated as insignificant or invisible.[[1258]](#endnote-1259)

Charles Taylor puts his finger on two problems that are connected with recognition and universal dignity and that merit particular attention. First, Taylor warns that the politics of universal dignity inevitably lead to politics of difference and ultimately to division, because marginalised groups who seek to attain universal rights can do so only by emphasising their difference, which, in turn, may create backlashes rather than recognition. The polarisation afflicting many societies in present-day’s world appear to confirm Taylor’s warnings.[[1259]](#endnote-1260) Indeed, unity in diversity is being hollowed out when diversity turns into division and a counterforce is lacking that holds diversity together, a force that protects unity from being divided when diversity slides into hostility.

Second, there is a problem with the need for recognition itself. Taylor rightly acknowledges that it is ‘particularly injurious when victims learn to internalise their own self-deprecation’, and we could add that it may even be life-threatening not just for individuals but for entire groups when their members internalise toxic beliefs. Political scientist Robert Jervis explains how this internalisation can come about — the entry point is the dual function of beliefs.[[1260]](#endnote-1261) Beliefs help us test reality, however, beliefs also help us live with ourselves and with others and thus satisfy our need for recognition. In a context where beliefs are not in synchrony with reality, we may accept toxic beliefs simply to belong, simply to achieve recognition. Every person who is born or introduced into a particular community is usually expected to accept the existing norms and institutions and adopt the behaviours of the members of this community in return for recognition. If these norms, institutions, and behaviours are dysfunctional for the individual and/or for society at large, this person faces the dire situation of the child that sees the emperor naked and may decide to pretend he is not.[[1261]](#endnote-1262)

The end of the Second World War provides a striking example. Around 1944 and 1945, German citizens, if they opened their eyes, could have understood that there was no Endsieg (final victory) in sight. Yet, as the majority of Germans fervently believed in victory, disbelievers often doubted their own sanity, or they risked execution, even until the very last moment before defeat. The outcome of this illusionary world was an extent of destruction that devastated not just Germany but half of the world. As to contemporary parallels, if the majority of world society continues to believe in the ‘final victory’ of human domination over nature, if too many people continue to deny human-made environmental degradation, this time, the price to be paid may be the demise of humankind as a whole.[[1262]](#endnote-1263)

Concepts such as méconnaissance (misrecognition) and naturalisation speak to this predicament, used by thinkers such as Roland Barthes, Pierre Bourdieu, and Michel Foucault (among others). These terms describe how power holders use the concealed nature of habitus to manipulate people covertly and stealthily into embracing beliefs that may not benefit them.[[1263]](#endnote-1264)

Psychologist John Jost and his colleagues have developed system justification theory, and they include social identity theory and social dominance theory as well as notions such as self-interest, inter-group conflict, ethnocentrism, homophily, in-group bias, out-group antipathy, dominance, and resistance.[[1264]](#endnote-1265) They found that there is a general ideological motive to justify the existing social order and that this motive is partially responsible for the astonishing fact that subordinates so often fail to rise up even if they suffer. They may even internalise their own inferiority, if only at an implicit non-conscious level of awareness. Paradoxically, this psychological dynamic is sometimes strongest among those who are harmed the most by the status quo.[[1265]](#endnote-1266)

Our need for recognition, including our readiness to endanger even our own survival by holding on to dysfunctional beliefs, is more than a social-psychological surface phenomenon, it is deeply anchored in our psyches. Sociologist Donald Carveth contrasts two forms of conscience, one born of identification with nurturing, the other born of identification with aggressors and ideologies of domination[[1266]](#endnote-1267) — an ‘unconscionable superego’ is the outcome of being born into an ‘unconscionable society’ and having internalised its beliefs.[[1267]](#endnote-1268)

Peace researcher Johan Galtung forged a related notion, namely, that of penetration, or ‘implanting the top-dog inside the under-dog’.[[1268]](#endnote-1269) Penetration describes the fact that the acceptance of subjugation may become a culture of its own, a collective way of managing the cognitive dissonance between commands coming from above and feelings coming from one’s heart. Michel Foucault’s idea of governmentality — the manipulation of populations — has also its place here.[[1269]](#endnote-1270)

The colonisation of the lifeworld is a phrase coined by sociologist and philosopher Jürgen Habermas, and is fitting as well, as it describes the ‘seduction to accept domination’.[[1270]](#endnote-1271) African-American sociologist Patricia Hill Collins speaks of controlling images that are being imposed by a dominant culture, images that are accepted by disempowered subordinate groups either voluntarily or involuntarily.[[1271]](#endnote-1272) Historian Ranajit Guha and literary theorist Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak use the term subaltern[[1272]](#endnote-1273) to conceptualise history from ‘below’.[[1273]](#endnote-1274) The concept of the Stockholm syndrome[[1274]](#endnote-1275) describes the emotional bond that sometimes emerges between hostages and their captors ‘when the hostages are held for long periods of time under emotionally straining circumstances’.[[1275]](#endnote-1276) In the words of Black psychology, this is an alien-self disorder.[[1276]](#endnote-1277)

What we learn from this overview is that we humans can be taught to act against our own self-interest relatively easily, and that we can even learn to perpetrate our own self-deprecation — a potent pathway into our own oppression. I call it self-humiliation.[[1277]](#endnote-1278)

Honour, and the honour code, are at the very core of this dynamic. I regard the concept of ranked honour as the single largest ‘master manipulation’ of governmentality ever perpetrated, as it gives ruling elites unlimited definition power.[[1278]](#endnote-1279)

Here is my overview over the historical timeline. The honour code is part of the dominator model of society that grew out of circumscription and the security dilemma (see more in chapters 2 and 9). The very fear and sense of threat congealed the term security dilemma made the honour mindset possible, so that domination over each other and over nature became pursued in the name of honour. The Neolithic Revolution’s ‘invention’ of complex agriculture marked the launch of human domination over nature, and with war and oppression we also sought to dominate over each other.

Throughout the past millennia, enemies could arrive almost out of the blue at any time. Archaeology suggests that systematic war began after the Neolithic Revolution and from then on reached ever new levels of military sophistication. The infamous Sea Peoples destroyed flourishing cultures in the East Mediterranean at the time of the Late Bronze Age collapse (1200–900 BCE), Mongols overran Europe, Vikings brought terror. The list of names is endless that spelled horror and dread wherever people survived the onslaught and could pass on the memories. Fear was definitorial, necessarily so. Using this fear as a ‘substrate’, power elites could readily convince their subordinates of the concept of honour, superiors could ask whatever they wanted from their followers, including their inferiors’ honourable death in battle — today we speak of ‘shockvertising’ as a business model in modern advertising, a method that is also used in the marketing of conspiracy narratives.[[1279]](#endnote-1280) Fear gave the honour mindset its strong anchoring.

During the past millennia, only those strongmen leaders survived who were able to respond to cruelty with more cruelty, and in this way, it became legitimate to develop the capacity for mercilessness and link this to honour. Strongmen who promised protection from enemy onslaughts were hailed and if they were wise patrons who had the common good of their people at heart, they kept their deal insofar as they helped their subordinates to protect themselves in exchange for being obedient, In that case, honour connoted integrity. If strongmen, however, instrumentalised their inferiors’ sense of threat for ulterior motives — and this happened often — they broke this contract and honour connoted betrayal. In that case, the ‘false consciousness’ that flows from the identification with the aggressor became ‘normality’, and mercilessness became a ‘normal’ way of being.[[1280]](#endnote-1281)

In these times of fear, war preparations were continuous. The reigning maxim was If you want peace, prepare for war.[[1281]](#endnote-1282) What we call patriarchy arose, and I dissect this connection in my 2010 book titled Gender, humiliation, and global security.[[1282]](#endnote-1283) While the strongman dominator model of society with its honour ranking order was ‘the solution’ in times of fear and not the problem, it becomes a problem now, in times of global interconnectedness — as the dominator model and patriarchy are no longer the solution, patriarchy is even being called ‘the oldest global pandemic’.[[1283]](#endnote-1284)

The security dilemma made competition for domination feasible and desirable, after all, victory meant successful domination, and it was in this context that the worthiness of people became ranked. Lords, kings, and emperors kept their followers in line with rigorous domination with the goal to be victorious in their competition for domination with rivals threatening from outside. It became regarded as unavoidable, either as divinely ordained or as nature’s order, to deem that human worthiness is not equal, that ‘higher’ beings should be allowed to preside over ‘lesser’ beings, and that lesser beings should subject themselves to their masters’ beliefs and decisions.

I meet many people on my global path who think that the honour code is in alignment with ‘human nature’. Yet, I contend that it is rather the other way round, namely, that the honour code was forced on humans against their nature, by way of overruling and violating basic human inclinations.[[1284]](#endnote-1285) My global experience of soon fifty years supports this view.

Evolutionary biologist Edward O. Wilson has studied eusociality (Greek eu ‘good/real’ and ‘social’), the highest level of organisation of animal sociality, which includes, among others, cooperative care for the young.[[1285]](#endnote-1286) Wilson makes the argument that among humans, there is no ‘naturally’ isolated selfish individual who needs to be pressured by religious, moral, or abstract ideas to abstain from anti-social behaviour and from violently defending pure self-interest.[[1286]](#endnote-1287) On the contrary, all human pro-social talents — solidarity, altruism, care, and compassion — have evolved throughout evolution. Pro-social virtues emerged through human natural and cultural evolution, therefore they are an integral part of human nature. No ‘primitive’ human nature needs to be ‘civilised’. Our ‘primitive’ reactive ‘fast thinking’ gives us cooperative impulses, while slower and deliberative thinking may push us towards selfish choices.[[1287]](#endnote-1288)

If we follow Wilson, there is no need to look down in arrogance on our Stone Age forebears as barbaric and uncivilised.[[1288]](#endnote-1289) It may be the other way round, namely, that we have been successfully misled, throughout the past millennia, into conceiving of human nature as something that needs to be protected from itself by a dominator system.

The problem is thus not any lack of pro-social inclinations in humans. The problem is the anchoring and scope of these inclinations. Our need to belong and be recognised holds a group together in solidarity and this is a great asset. In a world in the grip of the security dilemma, this solidarity became reserved for ‘us’, whom we defended against ‘them’, if necessary with violence. Over the past millennia, millions of soldiers sacrificed limbs and health for the sake of protecting loved ones, and their willingness to sacrifice was of great value, male valour represented a crucial form of life insurance for their populations. The statue of the mythological mediaeval knight Roland is a telling symbol for this appreciation, and it can be seen in many city centres in Europe and in other world regions in gratitude for the male prowess that secured the freedom of the city.[[1289]](#endnote-1290) When we had our Dignity Conference in the city of Dubrovnik in 2016, I often sat under its Roland statue and was deeply touched by the gratefulness its citizens felt for their young men who stood up for them when the city was under siege in 1991 and 1992.[[1290]](#endnote-1291)

For young men to learn to kill and die in fending off enemies, heroic psychological self-mutilation is required, the mutilation of their very humanity. Active-duty military personnel and war veterans commit suicide precisely because it is not ‘in the blood’ of a soldier to kill — it is as absent from their ‘blood’ as it is from the blood of any civilian.[[1291]](#endnote-1292) In 2016, I met a former U.S.A. soldier who had killed a man in Afghanistan while on duty. He reported how he initially felt very pleased and proud. His superiors praised him for being a ‘real man, a killer’, and he valued this praise, as recognition was something he had yearned for all his life. Then his mood changed. He felt moved to embark on a daring project, namely, to make ‘friends’ with the dead man he had killed. He looked at the pictures on the man’s cell phone he had found, pictures of his face, he inquired about his name, he learned about his biography and his family. In short, he transformed the man he had killed post-mortem from a faceless enemy into a fellow human being with a face.[[1292]](#endnote-1293) By doing so, he recovered his own humanity from military mutilation.

As long as the security dilemma was strong, heroic self-mutilation was a price that young men were asked to pay, and their families were proud of their veterans and their badges of honour. Injury and death were seen to be worth it when the goals of combat were in line with the common good.

Yet, the situation was not always that clear. Sometimes, willingness to sacrifice was abused, frequently, leaders used their soldiers’ lives merely as cannon fodder. My own father was a victim of this dynamic. He is now 95 years old and I have interviewed him each year over a period of ten years, asking him to share with me his painful journey. Old photos show him as a happy young man, all bright-eyed and bushy-tailed on his horse on the estate he was to inherit from his father in Silesia. Then came the war and he was forced to become cannon fodder for ambitions he never shared. Subsequently, he lost his beloved brothers, his farm, his homeland, and even parts of his body — his left arm — all to megalomaniac Nazi ambitions. My mother, as well, suffered terribly during the Nazi period. Her dream to become a teacher marked her as a traitor, a traitor of her role as a mother. She was hit by the fact that whenever war is imminent, the male body becomes the soldier’s body and the female body becomes the reproductive body of preferably male offspring,[[1293]](#endnote-1294) something Michel Foucault called biopolitique.[[1294]](#endnote-1295)

The extent of destruction brought by Nazi Germany represents a warning. It seems that the more sophisticated the strategies are that leaders employ to manipulate followers into holding beliefs that are incompatible with the common good, the more fanatical will their followers become, pulling with them those who acquiesce simply for fear of being outcasts. The need to belong made too many Germans vulnerable to believing in what the majority around them had subscribed to, irrespective of the dysfunctionality of those beliefs.

In sum, if we look closely, we see that the honour mindset has always been harmful to human nature, yet, as long as the security dilemma was strong, this damage was regarded as a price that had to be paid. Strict gender categories were enforced — men out in the world and women inside the house — both were given role descriptions they were taught to be proud of even while these scripts mutilated their bodies and souls.[[1295]](#endnote-1296)

Only now, in a situation where we, as humanity, have the chance to attenuate the security dilemma in a globally interconnected world, can we liberate us from such costly role enforcements. Now we can forge a global culture for Homo sapiens that is more functional and benign — that is truly sapiens. No longer must we perpetrate other- and self-harm in the name of honour, we can build a world where all can flourish in the name of dignity. After all, our species is very new to this planet compared with other species, so there is still room for growing up.[[1296]](#endnote-1297)

### Hubris comes before the fall...

During the millennia that followed the Neolithic Revolution, most of our forebears became the victim of what I call ‘millennia-long systemic war injury’ caused by the honour mindset. Building ranking orders of who rules and who serves by competing for domination is harmful to the human psyche, harmful even to those who ‘win’ in this competition. It ‘endangers the soul’ of winners and losers alike.[[1297]](#endnote-1298) This injury was accepted by our forebears because the security dilemma compelled them to do so.

I often use the image of the human body to illustrate why this predicament is so damaging. In an honour culture, elites — usually men — are allowed to use their right arm, the sword arm, to devise strategies and give orders, to prepare for war if needed. This represents the sympathetic system of the body that prepares for flight or fight. Their left arm, the one that stands for replenishment and care, akin to the parasympathetic system of the body, is bound behind their backs. Their subordinates — women and men of low rank — suffer the inverse infliction, they are expected to exhaust themselves in ‘covering the back’ of their superiors. None can use both arms, none can reach an inner balance, none can unfold their full potential.

During the past millennia, as reported in the previous section, in the context of the security dilemma, inferiors were often misled by superiors under the banner of honour, and this was harmful to all. Yet, as harmful as this was, the situation is even more serious — all of humanity is being misled, including the overlords themselves, and this in at least two ways.

First, the handicap inflicted on men by the mindset of honour injures them emotionally to the point that they need the intensity of competition for domination to feel alive and thus may become addicted to combat, in this way increasing the level of threat around them rather than decreasing it. Second, when we look at human history throughout the past millennia, we see that the most ruthless dominators were usually also the most successful victors. It is therefore unsurprising that the belief arose that competition for dominance is the only path to success and that it is impossible to create a world of dialogue — philosopher Thomas Hobbes seemed to be right with his view that the ‘anarchy’ of the ‘state of nature’ is all there is.[[1298]](#endnote-1299) People became proud of the human to capability to dominate both over each other and nature and regarded this as a badge of honour. Some went further, they believed that the existence of a capability indicated that there is an inborn human desire to dominate, others went further and thought that humans also have a right to dominate, more even, that humans have the duty to dominate.

In the past, competition for domination was useful at least sometimes and for a while, it brought victory and peace until the next dominator came along who was stronger. We live in a radically new reality now, our world is so interconnected that competition for domination over each other and over nature becomes self-destructive. In this new context, the belief that competition for domination is a path to success represents hubris, and hubris is known to come before the fall.

The fall took many millennia to show up. This moment is now. The moment has come to realise that we will soon be ‘hitting the ground’ to use the metaphor of the skyscraper: ‘Heard about the guy who fell off a skyscraper? On his way down past each floor, he kept saying to reassure himself: So far so good... so far so good... so far so good’. The lesson: ‘How you fall doesn’t matter. It’s how you land!’[[1299]](#endnote-1300)

The coronavirus is a small challenge compared with those that loom. Several tipping points have already been passed, the state of the Earth systems has already been irreversibly altered.[[1300]](#endnote-1301) As the world grows ever more interconnected and overstretched, it becomes apparent that the belief in the unlimited feasibility of competition for domination is misguided. Moreover, the fall does not exempt the overlords themselves, all fall together — if we switch to the metaphor of the Titanic, the luxurious first floor also sank.[[1301]](#endnote-1302) While competition for dominance sometimes served the interests of victors in the short term, in an interconnected world all-encompassing defeat is guaranteed. Humanity as a species cannot survive in a globally interconnected world full of weapons operated by the honour mindset. This mindset needs to be left behind, honourably, without humiliating its adherents, without triggering new cycles of humiliation.

To come back to the body as metaphor, heart attack — the typical emergency trouble-shooter disease — is the outcome when adrenaline rushes through the blood stream and the replenishment tasks of the body are delayed for too long. This is tolerable only for a short while until the body breaks down. Whenever we pass social and ecological tipping points on our planet now — these are our global and systemic heart attacks.

Wherever I go on my global path, I notice that we, as humanity, have not yet properly understood the advantages of leaving behind the old world, we have not yet understood how beneficial it would be if everyone learned to use ‘both arms’. Gender relations offer one of many illustrations. Male homemakers should be hailed for using both arms, yet, they risk being ridiculed as ‘sissies’ for using their left arm. Inversely, ‘When a man says he can do the job, regardless of evidence, we believe him. We ask women to prove it, and then we she does, we don’t like her anymore’.[[1302]](#endnote-1303) In other words, rather than praising women and men for using both arms, their ability to do so is doubted and disparaged, and even when they succeed, success risks harming them.

Philosopher Howard Richards hopes that today’s rich and powerful will realise — and realise very quickly — that they are safer in a world where they are less privileged. He hopes that ‘they see that the ship is sinking, that keeping the poor down by force cannot prevent it from sinking, and that when it goes down, the first-class passengers will end up with everybody else at the bottom of the ocean’.[[1303]](#endnote-1304)

What is at the core of hubris? It may be the belief in belief. Since childhood, I wonder how it is possible that we humans ascribe ultimate truth to the letters of our self-made ideological and religious dogmas, even if they capture a glimpse of divinity. Many would reply that everyone should have the freedom to choose whether to have a dogmatic belief or not. I suspect that the act of believing itself, the very belief in the legitimacy of dogma, is an expression of the dominator mindset.

I fear we commit the fallacy of elevating what is a psychological need to the level of law. Admittedly, we have the need to belong, the need to be recognised and safe, yet, does that warrant clinging to dogmas that speak to these needs? Worse, a person who believes to be in the possession of the ultimate truth may feel dutifully compelled to force others into adherence, and this will set in motion ever-new rounds of competition for domination and control. Even worse, since domination has no inherent endpoint, adherents of such dogmas will never relax, never relent in their missionary zeal. They will cling to dogma as a strategy of survival and suppress any inner doubt to secure this survival. It will be a survival through disconnection, through the maintenance of a kind of ‘personal security dilemma’, this is Linda Hartling’s insight.[[1304]](#endnote-1305) Adherents of dogma will never know about the advantages of non-dogmatic intuition, never experience the liberation of not having to believe, never taste the delight of mindfully relenting, of being humbly embedded in a larger universe of possible meanings.

Of course, also believing in non-belief is a belief. Is there a kind of loss of belief that opens space for more beneficial ways of handling belief? In my work, I have given the name ‘Pharisees’ to people who cling to the letter, in contrast to ‘Sufis’ who are organically and fluidly embedded in a larger universe of meaning (see chapter 3). As mentioned before, these labels are not meant to point at any religion, they simply grew out of my personal path towards what legal philosopher Duncan Kennedy describes as ‘loss of faith’, loss of faith both in gods and in rights.[[1305]](#endnote-1306)

I follow Kennedy when he suggests that losing faith is better than investing in bad faith, and that full loss of faith is preferable to the ‘half faith’ of being ‘in favour of religious faith for the masses, no matter how delusive, on the ground of its beneficial consequences’.[[1306]](#endnote-1307) Kennedy suggests that we should refrain from clinging to beliefs only because they seem useful, we should not ‘prefer error to enlightenment when enlightenment is at the cost of beliefs that seemed useful when we still believed in them’.[[1307]](#endnote-1308) Some are afraid that loss of faith will lead to demoralisation or nihilism, to a new Hitler or Stalin — but the argument that Hitler and Stalin were able to do what they did ‘because they were nihilist, meaning that they denied the validity of fundamental human rights’, can also be turned around, Kennedy suggests: Hitler or Stalin were able to do what they did ‘because they were totalitarian, meaning that they proclaimed the absolute truth of their theories’.[[1308]](#endnote-1309)

Duncan Kennedy shared a touching personal story of how he lost faith. When he was working for a law firm as a student, he helped defend a client against hostile takeover by saying it would violate the antitrust laws, and he defended this position with fervent conviction. Then something happened that shocked him. Suddenly the client changed his mind and decided to go along with the takeover. Kennedy’s lead lawyer said to him, ‘You know the argument so well, it should be easy to turn it around’.[[1309]](#endnote-1310) Young Kennedy was so visibly shocked that his boss patted his arm saying — ‘On second thought, we’ll get someone else to do it’. In that moment, Kennedy learned, very painfully, that believing in the validity of law was like believing in fairy tales, something an innocent youth could fall for, but not an informed adult.

According to Kennedy, the loss of faith in legal reasoning, something that struck him so hard as a young man, did not just mark his own life, it marked the entire legal field at least since Jeremy Bentham’s critique of Blackstone.[[1310]](#endnote-1311) Similarly painful moments have occurred many times throughout history, Kennedy reports, and in looking back, he wonders ‘how abolitionist litigators dealt with their own dramatic shift, from nationalists to states’ rights advocates, after the Fugitive Slave Law put the federal government on the side of the South against resisting Northern state governments’.[[1311]](#endnote-1312)

In my case, I began to lose faith when I was nine years old, when I noticed the high price that we, as humans, pay for the solace that fundamentalist religious dogma offers to its adherents. Such dogma rips the world apart into believers and infidels, it separates the salvaged from the doomed. Already as a child, I felt that true religiousness would mean to abstain from believing in any dogma that excludes other dogmas, that it would mean to even abstain from the concept of believing itself. One cannot buy, bribe, or possess God, one cannot connect with divinity through clinging to the letter of faith, this was my personal intuition as a nine-year-old child — I felt that one could only connect with divinity through surrendering to love, humility, and awe and wonderment. Later in life, I met many people with religious backgrounds who became disenchanted with their particular religious upbringing, yet, they tried to hold on to faith by moving from one belief system to another — some moved from one religion to the next religion, others to psychotherapeutic New Age practices, yet others to atheism, or to supposedly ‘scientific’ ‘communism’, ‘socialism’, ‘capitalism’,[[1312]](#endnote-1313) or, finally, to believing in rights in the legal field.[[1313]](#endnote-1314)

I have always thought that we, as humans, need to evolve beyond clinging to the illusion of absolute truths and rather embrace living experience and responsibility, that it is better to be in experience, including the experience of uncertainty, than to have faith.[[1314]](#endnote-1315) Admittedly, it needs courage to see the emperor naked, to understand that we all are naked, and then to live with our shared vulnerable nakedness in mutual loving care and solidarity, in connectedness and compassion.[[1315]](#endnote-1316) This, for me, is the difference between what I call ‘Pharisees’ and ‘Sufis’. In this way, for me, loss of faith is a blessing and not a curse.

I was therefore delighted to find Duncan Kennedy’s insightful reflections, delighted so see his argument that it is beneficial to remain in ‘critique’ as a path to living in flux, rather than using critique to return to new rounds of clinging to potentially deadly ‘reification or fetishism of theory, in a mode parallel to the fetishism of God, the market class, law, and rights’.[[1316]](#endnote-1317) I go one step further and refrain even from critique, following theorist Karen Barad who builds on physicist Niels Bohr’s work and warns that we humans cannot inter-act with the world, we intra-act, since we are part of it (see more in chapter 7).

I was equally delighted when I listened to philosopher Dagfinn Føllesdal and his explanation of the reflective equilibrium, an approach employed in philosopher John Rawls’s Theory of justice,[[1317]](#endnote-1318) and defended by his colleague Nelson Goodman. The reflective equilibrium is an epistemological orientation that recommends going around in loops in never-ending circles to arrive at ever-denser understandings, something that philosopher Aristotle still would have rejected as circular fallacy. Føllesdal explained his point so impressively at the Norwegian Academy of Science in 1996 that he left his audience, including me, in awe.[[1318]](#endnote-1319)

We find similar conceptualisations also in cultural psychology, where Jaan Valsiner speaks of the methodology cycle when he describes human activities as being in constant movement rather than in static position as presupposed in psychology laboratories. ‘Our psychological functions operate as we move — walk, run, drive, dance, or even sleep’.[[1319]](#endnote-1320) Our human existence is like ‘building a ship while at sea’, these were the words of philosopher Otto Neurath (1882–1945),[[1320]](#endnote-1321) or, perhaps even better, ‘we are building a raft while swimming together’.[[1321]](#endnote-1322)

Duncan Kennedy describes in minute detail how loss of faith has occurred in recent legal history — mainly in the Anglo-Saxon sphere, since this is where he is based — and he calls on us to embrace this loss responsibly rather than bemoan it. He begins by explaining how legal discourse is based on the distinction between value judgements, which are subjective philosophical preferences, and factual judgements, or objective empirical scientific judgements, with rights as ‘mediators between the domain of pure value judgements and the domain of factual judgements’.[[1322]](#endnote-1323) The distinction between inside and outside rights means that a person has rights even if the legal order does not recognise them or makes it even illegal to exercise them — ‘slavery denies the right to personal freedom, which exists in spite of and above the law of slave states’.[[1323]](#endnote-1324) In classic liberal political theory, Kennedy explains, the world was simple — there were ‘natural rights’ enacted into law by us the people, and there was the judiciary as a ‘translator’ to give those rights two existences: rights were ‘natural, existing independently of any legal regime’, and at the same time, ‘they were also legal’.[[1324]](#endnote-1325) Even though the language of natural rights is by now ‘out of fashion’, liberal theory still aims to protect outside rights against the ‘invasion by private and public violence’.[[1325]](#endnote-1326)

However, here is the problem, Kennedy explains: Inside and outside rights can slide into opposition with each other, and, as a result, ‘the positivists celebrate judicial method and denigrate rights theory, while the interpretivists do the opposite’.[[1326]](#endnote-1327)

When reading Kennedy’s words, I cannot but think of the issue of torture, namely, the debate as to whether torture is ethically acceptable or even required under certain circumstances, or not, and whether practicing torture protects civilisation or destroys it. Conservatives, those who still feel embedded in the culture that emerged during the past millennia in a divided world with a strong security dilemma, say that torture protects. In contrast, those who see the opportunity for a united world to emerge that is free of the security dilemma, say that torture destroys.

I also think of the claim that polluting the Earth is acceptable when no law forbids it. I am perhaps both a positivist and an interpretivist when I say that we engage in suicidal strategies when we torture each other and torture nature, and that we, as humankind as a whole, have the ethical obligation to reform our global legal frameworks. I thank peace philosopher Howard Richards for having dedicated the past decades to getting to the core of this predicament. I follow him in warning that superficial technological and regulatory solutions, even though they are welcome, are insufficient, and that the core pillars of the constitutive rules of our modern world-system await change,[[1327]](#endnote-1328) the core pillars that date back to two thousand years old Roman law principles (read more in chapter 12).[[1328]](#endnote-1329)

If we want to apply the terminology of dignity, humiliation, and humility on this situation, we can say that cycles of humiliation are set in motion on the back of rights claims whenever ‘ideological intelligentsias of all stripes’ use rights as key elements in their universalisation projects, and we can say that dignity is lost whenever the resulting loss of faith is allowed to seep in stealthily rather than being harnessed openly and in responsible humility. When ideological intelligentsias use rights claims against each other, this leads to the unwitting destruction of faith in rights despite all involved parties desiring the exact opposite. When this happens unintentionally and stealthily, everybody is being left alone to cope, and those with the least resources might be trapped in conspiracy narratives or worse.

Loss of faith is pre-programmed when all, liberal and conservative intelligentsias, believe in the ‘mana of the judge’ and instrumentalise it for their particular group interests. Kennedy offers many examples. A gay person’s interest in the legalisation of homosexual intercourse, for instance, can be formulated as the right to sexual autonomy, so that the moment this legal enshrinement has succeeded, deniers of the validity of these particular rules become not just ‘selfish and powerful’ but wrong.[[1329]](#endnote-1330) Kennedy warns that all sides can use this strategy, that liberals cannot expect that conservatives refrain from using it, too. Soon both sides ‘claim a whole history of triumph over the other side under the banner of rights. Each recognises that the other holds some territory, but interprets this as manipulation of legal reasoning, or wrong legal reasoning, to conclusions that violate outside rights’.[[1330]](#endnote-1331) At the end, the loss of faith in reasoning about legal rights undermines even ‘outside’ normative rights.

To say it simplified, when God is dead and rights are dead, cynicism can gain a foothold in the crevice, while what is needed is the emergence of mindful humility.

Kennedy, in looking back in time, chronicles the fact that ‘the left’ relies on the rights strategy only since the 1970s. Prior to that time, ‘there had always been a lively controversy between Marxists hostile to the whole rights formulation’ on one side, on the other side ‘social democratic progressive planners with a universalisation project based on savings from eliminating wasteful and chaotic markets’, and, as a third party, ‘civil libertarians’.[[1331]](#endnote-1332) For the left, as Kennedy sees it, the move to rights rhetoric signified their abandonment of any claim to represent a working-class majority against a minoritarian ‘bourgeoisie’. In the United States, ‘by the end of the 1970s, with the rise of identity politics, left discourse merged with liberal discourse, and the two ideas of the rights of the oppressed and the constitutional validity of their legal claims superseded all earlier versions of rightness’.[[1332]](#endnote-1333) The background for this development, according to Kennedy, were three disappointments afflicting the left project, first, ‘there were no longer “popular movements” aggressively raising rights claims’, second, ‘there were no longer federal courts willing to invalidate legislation and regulations in the interests of oppressed groups’, and, third, ‘there was no longer the sense of the undeniable moral/philosophical correctness and ineluctable coherence of left constitutional theory’.[[1333]](#endnote-1334)

At this point, Linda Hartling adds her intuition that this change may have been galvanised by biologist Rachel Carson and her 1962 book Silent spring, as this book unleashed a global environmental movement followed by a strong corporate backlash.[[1334]](#endnote-1335)

Duncan Kennedy sees also advantages in the new situation. The remaining left intelligentsia was not only ‘freed of the white male working class’, but also ‘rid of the radicals who had made their lives miserable throughout the 1960s’ when they exposed everybody to the horrible dialectic of ‘taking up the gun’ or ‘selling out’.[[1335]](#endnote-1336) The disadvantage, however, is that the left has now only rights as their ‘weapon’, while the conservative ideological intelligentsia has two ‘weapons’ in their arsenal. They always had — and still have — efficiency as an alternative to rights. Efficiency claims, just like rights claims, are universal, nobody can oppose the aim to make everyone better off, and efficiency claims are factoid, supposedly scientifically and empirically based. This brings with it, Kennedy observes, that for the left, loss of faith is more significant than for their rivals.

Loss of faith is neither a theory nor the outcome of a theory, Kennedy points out.[[1336]](#endnote-1337) Those who lost faith in divinity in the past did so not because someone proved to them that God did not exist. They may still have experienced divine intimations, ‘but somehow the combination — the processes of critique and reconstruction of rational demonstrations, along with the process of doubt and reaffirmation — “ended badly”.’[[1337]](#endnote-1338) The result is neither a position of certainty nor one of uncertainty, it is simply a position ‘post-God’, or, in the case of rights, ‘post-rights’. This position is, however, not necessarily a bad one, ‘The critique and loss of faith in legal rights reasoning does not necessarily imply a loss of faith in normativity in general, or in the use of rights and rights reasoning to decide what we leftists think the law should be’.[[1338]](#endnote-1339)

Encouraged by Duncan Kennedy’s reasoning, we can keep a critical ‘faithless’ stance and at the same time welcome efforts to make new laws, as, for instance, laws to protect the planet — ecocide law.[[1339]](#endnote-1340) Similarly, we can return to the old critique of social inequality.[[1340]](#endnote-1341)

Costas Douzinas is an expert in critical legal studies, and also he has ‘lost faith’, to use Kennedy’s words. He describes the dismembering of the subjected subject through the action of human rights in post-modern times, the continuous flight of meaning that creates ever-new rights. He acknowledges that ‘universalism and cultural relativism, the intertwined strands of humanism, are unable to understand human rights as the legalisation of individual desire’.[[1341]](#endnote-1342) There is only one solution, in his view, ‘Only if we conceive of human rights as dependent on the other can they return to their original end and become the postmodern principle of justice’.[[1342]](#endnote-1343) In resonance with philosopher Emmanuel Lévinas’ emphasis on the face of the Other, Douzinas points at the uniqueness of the other as path for a post-modern principle of justice.[[1343]](#endnote-1344) ‘The other is always a unique, singular person who has place and time, gender and history, needs and desires. If there is something truly “universal” in the discourse of human rights, if a metaphysical trait survives their deconstruction, this could perhaps be the recognition of the absolute uniqueness of the other person and of my moral duty to save and protect her’.[[1344]](#endnote-1345) Here is the role for dignity:

The (right of the) other comes first; before my right and before my identity as organised by rights, comes my obligation, my radical turn towards the claim to respect the dignity of the other. The non-essential essence of human rights, the fleeting universal involved in all particular right-claims, could be the recognition of the priority of the other person whose existence before mine makes me ethically bound and opens to me the domain of language, inter-subjectivity and right. This other cannot be the universal ‘man’ of liberalism nor the abstract and formalistic ‘subject’ of law.[[1345]](#endnote-1346)

Social justice advocate John A. Powell suggests targeted universalism as path forward, setting universal goals while achieving them through targeted interventions that take into account the ways in which historical injustices have distorted present capacities.[[1346]](#endnote-1347) It is a kind of ‘reverse colonialism’, philosopher Hale Hendlin explains, ‘Just as the globalised Western homogenisation got this way through a death of a thousand cuts, so too must an unravelling of constrictions be done through a thousand well-planned acts of intentional social and ecological justice’.[[1347]](#endnote-1348)

As I have explained earlier, the label ‘Pharisee’ comes to my mind whenever I meet people who cling to the letter, be it the letter of ‘the universal “man” of liberalism’ or ‘the abstract and formalistic “subject” of law’. I think of the label ‘Sufi’ when I meet people who are embedded organically and humbly in a larger universe of meaning that includes the other in the form of all sentient beings and beyond, so that there is even no otherness anymore.

Let me end this section with yet another way we may speak about issues of clinging or not clinging, about opposing doubt or using doubt as space for meaning. We can think in ways of coherence, we can speak in terms of tying or untying of knots. Christoph von der Marlsburg is a physicist and neuroscientist, and the defining feature of consciousness, in his view, is coherence.[[1348]](#endnote-1349) More coherence means more alertness, more focus, and the higher the degree of this coherence across regions of the brain, the ‘higher’ the state of consciousness. Brian Lancaster is a psychologist and researcher of consciousness and he observes parallels ‘between what science can reveal about the brain code and more mystical notions of resonance and binding operating at a level beyond the brain’.[[1349]](#endnote-1350) Lancaster sees similarities between the ‘neural binding in identifying and categorising images’ and the knots that bind us ‘to objects of this world’, knots that need to be untied, so that ‘the re-tying entails establishing connection to the highest level, that of the divine’.[[1350]](#endnote-1351) The knot is indeed a powerful symbol of binding that plays a role in spiritual and mystical traditions, for example, in Jewish mysticism. ‘The process of loosening and tying is identified with enlightenment’, historian Moshe Idel formulates.[[1351]](#endnote-1352)

I hope these reflections can help us ponder why it is so difficult to forego hubris and embrace the blessings of the ‘loss of faith’ with loving humility. I hope these thoughts can assist us in respectfully understanding why what I call ‘the Pharisee way of life’ is so persistent, why people cling to the letter, and why there are so few ‘Sufis’ around. I would like to invite everyone into the permanent ‘untying’ of those rigid ‘knots’ that bind us to this world, and to embark on re-tying loose knots with larger universes of meaning.

‘Hubris comes before the fall’ was the title of this section. It is a warning that should encourage us to lose faith in instruments of domination, and it should invite us to respect the dignity of the other, the dignity of us all, and let rights serve this aim.

### Trauma maintains the honour mindset

How is the honour mindset reproduced, and why do so many people cling to it even when the world of dignity would serve their interests so much better?

Wiederholungszwang is a term that was coined by Sigmund Freud, in English repetition compulsion, describing an obsessive repetition of destructive behaviour. Freud was so taken aback by the self-destructiveness he observed in his patients that he even suggested calling it a ‘death drive’.[[1352]](#endnote-1353) Many of Freud’s successors have since rejected this idea, others have built on it with new viewpoints.[[1353]](#endnote-1354) I use the phrase humiliation addiction when I see people repeating scenarios of humiliation throughout their lifetimes that they were unable to process during childhood.[[1354]](#endnote-1355) Linda Hartling prefers to speak of humiliation traps to avoid putting all the blame on the addicted person for lacking will power, strength, or fortitude.[[1355]](#endnote-1356)

My experience suggests that the honour mindset is maintained precisely by such mechanisms.[[1356]](#endnote-1357) Trauma is a communal experience[[1357]](#endnote-1358) that can be handed down from generation to generation,[[1358]](#endnote-1359) and my analysis is that this trauma is ‘a war injury inflicted by the security dilemma’. The security dilemma engendered a collective ‘obsession’ with inflicting trauma as a cultural practice, a practice that was transgenerationally maintained through approaches to childrearing that produce childhood trauma per design, among others, by stunting the capability for empathy already in small children.[[1359]](#endnote-1360)

The strict father model of parenting described by cognitive linguists Lakoff and Johnson is such a practice,[[1360]](#endnote-1361) as is the ‘black pedagogy’ that became known in Germany as preparatory ground for the Nazi regime.[[1361]](#endnote-1362) It is a practice of ‘breaking the will’ of the youngest children, and the aim is to break their humanity. Girls are meant to become ‘submissive women’, boys are destined to become ‘real men’, and both are tasked to turn into ‘efficient humiliators’ of the next generation.[[1362]](#endnote-1363) Indeed, political scientist Stanley Feldman found that authoritarianism can be measured simply by asking four questions about parenting, as the answers reveal to what extent a person places hierarchy, order, and conformity over other values.[[1363]](#endnote-1364)

Concepts such as ‘domestic violence’ or ‘child abuse’[[1364]](#endnote-1365) would not have been thinkable in the past, in a world of superiors, inferiors, and ‘enemies’, on the contrary, being unable to treat one’s children harshly would have been regarded as weakness, as being guilty of spoiling them. It is only now, in the context of a shrinking world, in which space opens for the attenuation of the security dilemma, that the detrimental effects of trauma can be fully appreciated, including childhood trauma and the transgenerational transmission of such trauma.

Poisonous pedagogy first produces the brutal world it then says it is preparing for, it functions as a driving belt for the repetition of traumatic experiences as a cultural trait. I have observed poisonous pedagogy all around the world in cultural settings that were otherwise very different. As a clinical and social psychologist, people sought my help who had been subjected to authoritarian parenting, so I have observed up close the deleterious effects on the victims in their adult lives, aside from the negative effects on society as a whole. Children who are denied the experience of being welcomed into the human family just for the sake of being born, may want to earn this welcome later in life through quantifiable achievements. Even the gods may be regarded as authoritarian contract enforcers who reward obedience and punish non-compliance, and this mindset can form the foundation of whole communities and societies.[[1365]](#endnote-1366) This is the mindset I call the ‘Pharisee’ way of being. Many of those who came to me for help were caught in continuous calculations of punishment and reward, some had even developed an obsession with it to the point that they could never relax.

Historical examples of such calculations and their traumatising outcomes abound as well. As reported earlier, Calvinists saw the devastating 1755 Lisbon Earthquake as proof of the Calvinist God’s wrath in response to Lisbon’s addiction to ‘Romish idolatry’, and they drew the conclusion that Lisbon did not deserve any help as she must have brought this horrible ‘visitation’ upon herself.[[1366]](#endnote-1367) Baptist minister Russell Herman Conwell (1843–1925) preached that helping the poor would be wrong, since to ‘sympathise with a man whom God has punished for his sins, thus to help him when God would still continue a just punishment, is to do wrong’.[[1367]](#endnote-1368) As for a more recent example for this kind of just world thinking, some believers were convinced that Prime Minister of Israel Yitzhak Rabin was murdered in fulfilment of God’s will in 1995,[[1368]](#endnote-1369) and when Prime Minister Ariel Sharon unilaterally removed Israeli settlements from the Gaza Strip in 2005 and then fell into coma, he was judged with a similar verdict from orthodox Israelis — ‘God gave him what he deserved’.[[1369]](#endnote-1370) Religious fundamentalists from all three major faiths — Christian, Jewish, and Muslims — regarded Hurricane Katrina’s destruction on the southern coast of the United States of America in 2005 as ‘part of God’s punishment on America’.[[1370]](#endnote-1371) On all continents, terrorist acts are committed by people who feel that divine or historical providence mandates them to punish the disobedient, and they expect due reward for their service after death in heaven and in history books.[[1371]](#endnote-1372)

What this kind of calculations throws by the wayside is the loving compassion and care that nurturant ways of parenting stand for. ‘Love is intertwined with gifting, and thus withers away in transactional contexts’.[[1372]](#endnote-1373) Throughout the 1960s and 1970s, a short window of opportunity stood open in certain segments of Western societies for the nurturant ways of parenting to come to the fore — the Summerhill schools were one example[[1373]](#endnote-1374) — a window that has been closing since.[[1374]](#endnote-1375)

Present-day trends in child rearing return children to less nurturing parenting methods in the spirit of ‘making the child fit for a brutal world out there’. I am horrified to see parents exposing even their smallest babies to supposedly ‘modern’ strategies such as ‘controlled crying’ now.[[1375]](#endnote-1376) The brutality that was meted out in former times by authoritarian dictators with the aim to mould compliant inferiors, returns in new wrappings, conditioning even the smallest children to serve as cogs in the large cogwheels that are turned by global corporate players, a conditioning that leads to the lifelong repetition of trauma. It saddens me deeply to see American religious fundamentalism following Russell Conwell and imbuing corporate fundamentalism with a ‘missionary-like zeal’ to the point of even ‘commercialising childhood’,[[1376]](#endnote-1377) that advertisers capitalise on studies that show that children can recognise around one hundred brand logos already by the age of three and that some babies ‘request brands as soon as they can speak’.[[1377]](#endnote-1378)

Allegedly modern childrearing methods thus bring back the old clinging to the letter of dogma through the backdoor. As soon as these children grow up and become parents themselves, they will have lost the ability for nurturant parental care, at least they will have lost faith in these abilities. They will be too stressed anyway[[1378]](#endnote-1379) — young mothers are now sitting in front of their crying offspring with their cell phones, not knowing what to do with their baby.[[1379]](#endnote-1380)

I had to explain these intricacies many times during my time as a psychological counsellor in Egypt beginning in 1984. Egyptian parents asked me to help them with sending their children to the German school in Cairo, saying, ‘I feel ashamed that I am not tough enough with my children. I am sure the Germans will be better in preparing them for the international business world that is so much more brutal than what we are used to here in Egypt’. In other words, the German reputation of harshness, its history of callousness in meting out brutality, was looked up to as ‘progress’. Nowhere else on the globe had I encountered as much warmth as in the families of the Nile Delta, despite all otherwise existing problems, and this is a treasure that is unique, I answered. It is this very special Egyptian lovingness that represents progress, not German brutality.

At the present historical juncture, we observe obscene inequalities increasing globally and locally, we see global players being disconnected from the masses ever further[[1380]](#endnote-1381) — a small leisure class engages in conspicuous consumption and moves from one St. Moritz-like context to the next in private jets or even aims at space travel, or, alternatively, engages in ostentatiously inconspicuous consumption.[[1381]](#endnote-1382) Many of them hold the belief that the poor are simply too lazy and therefore are to blame for their own misfortune.[[1382]](#endnote-1383) In this way, this leisure class continues giving tribute to Russell Conwell, the fuser of Christianity and capitalism, they follow his counsel that ‘to make money honestly is to preach the Gospel’, and to get rich ‘is our Christian and godly duty’.[[1383]](#endnote-1384) Together with feudal inequality, they bring back the most callous blaming of the victim — a bootless man cannot lift himself by his bootstraps, said Martin Luther King Jr. in 1968 not long before he was assassinated.

Not just in the Anglo-Saxon world, also in countries like Germany, the belief that the poor are afflicted by laziness and suffer from envy has seeped into mainstream culture and has gained traction to the point that critics feel pressed to begin every argument they make by ascertaining that they are neither lazy nor envious.[[1384]](#endnote-1385) The blaming of the victims for systemic inequality and the shaming of critics as being envious has reached even Scandinavia, a former heaven of equality.[[1385]](#endnote-1386) As Linda Hartling’s comments, this is the globalisation of the just world theory, the globalisation of self-justifying greed and self-interest over the common good.[[1386]](#endnote-1387) Hartling asks, ‘At what point does self-sufficiency become selfish sufficiency?’[[1387]](#endnote-1388)

‘Honourable’ just world thinking creates trauma and at the same time covers up for it, and also my life is increasingly affected. I feel compelled to begin any statement I make by confirming that I am not lazy — indeed, I work more than twelve hours per day, seven days a week — and that I am not given to envy either, on the contrary, I always celebrate others for their achievements. I feel compelled to explain that I am extremely highly educated, with two doctorates, that I could very well have ‘succeeded in making money’ and buying impressive status symbols, in short, that my rejection of the purchase of status markers — be it in the form of material objects or thrilling experiences — does not come from any lack of effort or ‘sour grapes’ envy.[[1388]](#endnote-1389) In some ways I resemble those among the super-rich for whom ‘prestige, power, a sense of purpose’ are ‘incentives enough’, for whom money is meaningless except as a score for their success in competition with others,[[1389]](#endnote-1390) yet, I go one step further and altogether reject using a monetary scale to measure the ‘success’ of my dignity work.

Occasionally, I have been invited into contexts of monetary wealth — from Champagne flowing in penthouses to horse races — and I felt sad because the St. Moritz lifestyle represents an artificial kind of existence that separates its practitioners from authentic relationships, while defensive self-righteousness hinders them from understanding this predicament and getting out into the real world, a world that offers so much worthier and richer experiences. As in the famous fable of the naked emperor, on certain occasions I felt surrounded by naked people believing they were luxuriously dressed. I also felt humiliated, humiliated on behalf of people who have such low levels of independent thinking and are so gullible that they fall for the cheapest myths of luxury. Champagne is a telling example of the lack of due critical appraisal, as Champagne could simply be described as ‘bad wine’ from a region too far in the North to be sweet, only having succeeded in becoming part of celebration rituals with the help of aristocratic marketing,[[1390]](#endnote-1391) not to mention that alcohol is a rather unadvisable drug altogether.[[1391]](#endnote-1392) In addition to feeling sad and humiliated, I felt terrified, because this lifestyle abuses the world as a leisure park while gambling away the human and natural resources of the world.

Here the Titanic is sinking, yet, some continue dancing to the tune of the orchestra, haughtily believing, until the very last moment, that they can keep celebrating while everybody else goes down.[[1392]](#endnote-1393) The old joke is at its place here: A drunken British lady stands on the deck of the Titanic with a glass of whisky in her hand and sees the iceberg approaching, ‘I did ask for some ice’, she exclaims, ‘but this is ridiculous!’[[1393]](#endnote-1394)

Whenever and wherever I encounter people of such mindsets, I invite them to use their resources to assume their responsibility, namely, to go to the bridge of our Titanic and help us change the course and the design of the ship so it becomes seaworthy.

### The task at hand — From the heroism of honour to the heroism of dignity

This is the message I would like everyone to hear: For the first time in human history, space opens for solidarity in equal dignity for all to manifest, for global unity in diversity to arise, because for the first time, we can harness the coming-together of humankind in dignifying ways, we can harness what anthropologists call the ingathering of the human tribes. As anthropologist William Ury said, ‘For the first time since the origin of our species, humanity is in touch with itself’.[[1394]](#endnote-1395)

Two dilemmas stand in the way of a dignified future, and, for the first time, both can now be solved. One is the security dilemma — humanity is one single family — and the other is the commons dilemma — our planet is our commons. For the first time in human history, we can liberate ourselves from these two tragic dilemmas because global interconnectedness is a radical game changer.

For the past millennia, a strong security dilemma brought a sense of threat to most human communities living on Earth, fear represented an all-encompassing frame for their lives — ‘enemies’ could appear unexpectedly on the horizon at any time, history books are full of stories of ransacked cities and massacred citizens. Today, we are in a position where we can create a much more benign frame. The security dilemma made the script of honour definitorial for the past millennia and it created a world of victors and vanquished, of dominators triumphing over fellow people and nature. In the new context, such strategies no longer lead to ‘victory’, what was victory in the past, now translates into the suicidal shredding of our sociosphere and ecosphere.[[1395]](#endnote-1396) We are in the lucky situation that we have all the knowledge and skills now that are needed to replace competition for domination with partnership.[[1396]](#endnote-1397) We have everything required to understand that it is absurd in an interconnected world to continue with competition for domination of any kind, be it in preparation for war against people or against nature.[[1397]](#endnote-1398)

Unfortunately, however, since preparing for war was the only way to protect security while the security dilemma was strong, people still continue with preparations for war as before — ‘war preparation is our default, which is encouraged by the war industry’[[1398]](#endnote-1399) — and we overlook that the reality around us has dramatically changed. Too few people understand that we live in a new world, too many still continue believing that war is unavoidable, too many hold on to the glorification of war and domination, too many still believe in the heroism of honour. Everyone on this planet is at risk now, because what is most needed remains most wanting: the heroism of dignity as the highest form of ‘personal meaning making’.[[1399]](#endnote-1400)

In an interconnected world, problems become apparent that we used to overlook before, among others, the problem that domination has no inherent endpoint except for the total destruction of its substrate. Locusts survive only as long as they can fly to the next pasture, if they could ravage all surfaces on the planet at the same time, they would bring about their own extinction. This is precisely the trajectory humankind is currently set on. Present-day global and local constitutive rules, together with the local cultural institutions they inform, lack inbuilt mechanisms that would avert domination from being driven to the point of self-destruction. Historian Gareth Porter speaks of the ‘perils of dominance’.[[1400]](#endnote-1401) Native American scholar Jack Forbes denounces the Western ‘compulsion to consume the Earth’ as ‘cannibalism’ — ‘Brutality knows no boundaries. Greed knows no limits. Perversion knows no borders’.[[1401]](#endnote-1402) Philosopher Eric Hoffer adds, ‘You can never get enough of what you don’t really need’.[[1402]](#endnote-1403)

Consequently, the security dilemma, instead of being solved, is being compounded by what I call a growth dilemma — and in combination both amplify the commons dilemma and anti-commons dilemma.[[1403]](#endnote-1404) It becomes ever more difficult to keep shared-resource systems available for the common good, because, in the words of philosopher Howard Richards, ‘Life depends on production. Production depends on profit. Therefore, life depends on profit. Ergo, life depends on the accumulation of capital. The dependence of life on accumulation implies that every feature of society — education, religion, art, sports, media, family, taxes, wages, police, courts, music, architecture, agriculture and so on and on — must be compatible with accumulation’.[[1404]](#endnote-1405) Richards reminds us that accumulation was a linchpin already of early forms of market exchange and that it has produced a system driven by capital accumulation — Karl Marx was correct in saying that one form of exchange leads to another.[[1405]](#endnote-1406) The outcome is that it is now a physical necessity to keep the accumulation of capital going even at the price of sociocide and ecocide (see more in chapter 7).

We are a species that destroys itself and its habitat for our inability to see the door that stands open to exit the deadly dilemmas in which we have trapped ourselves. As long as we are blind to the fact that these dilemmas can and must be overcome, disaster is unavoidable.

What keeps us trapped? Our emotions keep us trapped, our need to belong, to belong to a majority who says, ‘I know, but I can’t believe it’. Anthropologist Arturo Escobar joins me in warning that ‘patriarchal modern societies fail to understand that it is emotioning that constitutes human history, not reason or the economy, because it is our desires that determine the kinds of world we create’.[[1406]](#endnote-1407) Our current mindset is characterised ‘by actions and emotions that value competition, hierarchies, power, growth, appropriation, procreation, the domination of others, violence, and war, combined with the rational justification of it all in the name of truth’, explains Escobar.[[1407]](#endnote-1408) ‘In this culture, which engulfs most modern humans, we live in mistrust and seek certitude through control, including the control of the natural world’,[[1408]](#endnote-1409) and as a result, ‘pecking orders of violence’ keep people within cultures of competition for domination, and constant violence ‘structurates’ the structures that bond them together in hierarchies.[[1409]](#endnote-1410)

It is a mistake to think that the way out, the way to ‘goodness’, can be found in overcoming ‘beastly evil’ with ‘good rationality’, this is also the warning of sociologist Donald Carveth who was introduced earlier. He finds the roots of morality not in reason, but in feeling, in sympathetic identification, in ‘pity’. Listening to Carveth, humankind needs to start feeling pity, pity both with ourselves and with our planet that has fallen victim to such a super-predator species. Der Erdzerstörer, ‘the Earth destroyer’, is the title of a 2019 documentary film.[[1410]](#endnote-1411)

Arturo Escobar calls for historical matristic cultures to be returned, as they are ‘characterised by conversations highlighting inclusion, participation, collaboration, understanding, respect, sacredness, and the always recurrent cyclic renovation of life’.[[1411]](#endnote-1412) The antidote to destruction is love, he says. Not love as a moral value or a sentimental feeling, not blind and naïve love, but steadfast visionary love, love as a basic fact of biological and cultural existence, love that ‘liberates intelligence and expands coexistence in cooperation as it expands the domain in which our nervous system operates’.[[1412]](#endnote-1413) In my work, I call this big love.

It is gratifying to see Escobar’s views resembling my big history analysis (see more in chapter 9) as he says that ‘with the rise of pastoral societies, the transition from one culture to the other started and has not ceased ever since’, and that there is still hope, as ‘matristic practices persist in contemporary cultures, despite prevailing patriarchal ways... however partially and contradictorily, in mother or parent-child relations, in love relations, and in democracy’.[[1413]](#endnote-1414) Matristic practices are independent from men and women, adds author John Bunzl, ‘The problem isn’t a lack of women at the top, but a market system that degrades both men and women. If there’s a “patriarchy” at all, it’s the market, not the men’.[[1414]](#endnote-1415) ‘The market as a product of patriarchy’, concludes Linda Hartling.[[1415]](#endnote-1416)

Linda Hartling and I, we act on these insights by attempting to manifest alternative models of being in this world through our work, not least by trying out alternative ways of being ‘women at the top’. We do so, among others, by using new definitions of what ‘top’ means, we define it as ‘holding hands in mutual solidarity’ rather than maintaining a destructive system through what is often characterised as ‘professional’ behaviour — in this way, we are proud of being ‘unprofessional’. ‘Why are women-led nations doing better with Covid-19? A new leadership style offers promise for a new era of global threats’, is the title of an article in 2020 that highlights the potency of the ‘holding hands’ approach.[[1416]](#endnote-1417)

In 1999, I wrote a chapter for a UNESCO book titled Towards a women’s agenda for a culture of peace, where I suggested that globalisation widens the traditional female domestic ‘inside’ sphere and narrows the traditional male public ‘outside’ sphere, pointing at the trend that women’s traditional role description of sustaining social cohesion inside a group is increasingly in demand.[[1417]](#endnote-1418) The global village can be seen as a single ‘inside sphere’, where sustaining social cohesion means applying complex, relational, multilateral, foresighted, integrative, and holistic strategies. Mediation and alternative dispute resolution are such strategies, or police operations that resemble peacekeeping operations rather than traditional military combat campaigns. Subsidiarity, quality of life, a culture of peace, all these are conceptually female approaches. In the global village, the traditional male role script of ‘going out’ into the world — a uni-dimensional and uni-lateral script of strategies such as ‘fighting the enemy’ or ‘conquering the unknown’ — loses its anchoring as a single global village no longer provides an ‘outside’. Men themselves, as travellers and explorers, brought the global village into being and they become victims of their own success when formerly ‘outside’ spheres move ‘inside’, when traditional strategies destined to deal with ‘outside’ spheres become inappropriate and dysfunctional.

I ended my UNESCO chapter by saying that a better quality of life is likely to result if a culture of peace includes not just peace among ourselves, but also peace with our planet. A culture of peace, to me, is a multifaceted and creative combination of all aspects of traditional male and female role strategies that have the potential to dignify the socio- and ecospheres of the only ‘inside sphere’ that we are left with now, namely, the global village. A culture of peace needs to combine the courageous heroism that was formerly reserved for males with the care work that was formerly delegated to women.

In my book on gender, humiliation, and global security, I introduced my notion of big love, the steadfast love of Gandhi’s satyāgraha (non-violent action), a term that is assembled from agraha (firmness/force) and satya (truth-love).[[1418]](#endnote-1419) This concept of love points at values such as ‘honesty, truthfulness, respect, loyalty, devotion, faithfulness, recognition, acceptance, appreciation, validation, discretion, patience, forbearance, forgiveness, authenticity, vulnerability, genuineness, listening, supporting, sharing, consulting, confiding, caring, tenderness and many more’.[[1419]](#endnote-1420)

### The crucial difference between honour humiliation and dignity humiliation

One way of approaching a deeper understanding of equality in dignity is through exploring its violations.[[1420]](#endnote-1421) I wrote my doctoral dissertation in social psychology on the role of humiliation in the genocidal killings in Rwanda and Somalia, and I related them to the dynamics of humiliation in Nazi Germany.[[1421]](#endnote-1422) This research made me understand the difference between honour humiliation and dignity humiliation, and it made me see why dignity humiliation is so much more hurtful than honour humiliation. It led me to the conclusion that clashes of civilisations[[1422]](#endnote-1423) are not the problem, but clashes of humiliation are. Clashes of humiliation represent the most significant threat of our time, and this is due, not least, and ironically, to the rise of the notion of equality in dignity.[[1423]](#endnote-1424) My warning is that feelings of dignity humiliation, more so than the feelings connected with honour humiliation, can become so strong that they merit to be called the nuclear bomb of the emotions.[[1424]](#endnote-1425)

This is an adaptation of my overview over the phenomenon of humiliation from 2006:

Based on many years of research on humiliation, I suggest that feelings of humiliation arise when deprivation is perceived as an illegitimate imposition of lowering, as a degradation that cannot be explained in constructive terms. All human beings yearn for recognition and respect. When they perceive that due recognition and respect are withdrawn or denied, they may feel humiliated. For that to happen, it does not matter whether the withdrawal of recognition is real or misread. Both the violation of ranked honour and of equal dignity can elicit feelings of humiliation, yet, diametrically opposed meta-scripts are activated for how humiliation is felt and acted on in each case. The strongest force for creating rifts and destroying relationships is dignity humiliation, or, more precisely, the violation of the promise entailed in the human rights ideal that all people are part of one family, where all members are entitled to enjoy equal dignity.[[1425]](#endnote-1426)

The human rights proclamation of 1948 states that all human beings — not just all Americans or all French citizens or any other privileged group — deserve to be respected as equals in dignity in the one and single global family that inhabits this planet. This proclamation represents a revolutionary promise — it promises a better and happier world through liberating everyone from humiliating oppression.

This promise represents very ‘good news’ for millions of people all around the world. Ironically, however, instead of increasing the level of joy in the world, wherever I go on our planet, I see feelings of humiliation on the rise. On one side, I meet power elites who dislike being asked to give up their supremacy they tell me that they feel humiliated by such insinuations. The most painful feelings of humiliation, however, arise in those at the bottom, those who hear the promise and accept it as a declaration of love, those who have their hopes raised only to have them betrayed in the next moment — thwarted love hurts doubly.

This betrayal has many facets and origins. One is that dignity means very different things to different people.[[1426]](#endnote-1427) ‘Dignitaries’ take it as an attack on their decorum when asked to embrace the notion of equal dignity — we just have to remember dignity’s roots in the decorum of decency. As a result, on one side, ‘right wing’ populists use the argument of decency against the call that dignity should be equal for all, while on the other side, well-intentioned human rights entrepreneurs overlook the sense of exclusion their message creates in those who feel their customs and memories of inequality disrespected. ‘The problematic outcome of the polarising politics of decency is thus the affective disinvestment of global populist movements and the gaps in moral and cultural sensibility’, comments Steven Roach.[[1427]](#endnote-1428)

Betrayal is also what happens when human rights ‘antipreneurs’ undermine the mission of human rights ‘entrepreneurs’. This can happen both overtly and covertly, and it is difficult to say what is more destructive, overt assault or covert sabotage. Many say that it is a sign of progress when dominators feel the need to hide behind human rights rhetoric so they can undermine those rights stealthily. This is possible. Yet, it is also possible that double standards damage the human rights message more than open assault. Empty human rights rhetoric, mixed messages, and double standards are insidiously destructive.[[1428]](#endnote-1429) Empty human-rights rhetoric creates a deeply humiliating expectation gap between talk and practice. Scholar Stephan Feuchtwang formulated it succinctly, ‘To recognise humanity hypocritically and betray the promise, humiliates in the most devastating way by denying the humanity professed’.[[1429]](#endnote-1430)

On my global path, it always astonishes me to see how much the promise entailed in the sentence that ‘all human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights’ has strength despite having been undermined and violated so ruthlessly over such a long time. The promise seems to be a genie that, once unleashed, cannot be put back into the bottle anymore. It has force now. It induces hope and has become a foundational value far beyond mere legal concepts. The reason for the strength of this promise, even in the face of the most callous betrayals, appears to be that the promise speaks to a deep human desire, the desire to rise from being pushed down, the desire to stand upright — it is an embodied longing, beyond language, beyond legal instruments. It is the simple and straightforward yearning to be respected as an equal fellow human being among fellow human beings.[[1430]](#endnote-1431)

The strength of this yearning is also the reason for why breaking the promise of equal dignity humiliates so much more than when honour is being infringed. It is the reason for why the violation of dignity carries the potential to lead to so much stronger reactions than the violation of honour. Not enough, the promise of equal dignity also democratises the right to resist and gives it to millions of people who did not have it before. On top of this, we live in a world where technology is global now, so that a single lone hacker who feels humiliated can terrorise entire countries,[[1431]](#endnote-1432) and would-be Hitlers can establish global dictatorial mafia-like structures with hitherto unseen ease.[[1432]](#endnote-1433) All these factors together have the power to fill the world with hot cycles of humiliation.

Honour humiliation can be categorised in four variants, see Table 1.[[1433]](#endnote-1434) A master can use conquest humiliation to subjugate formerly equal neighbours into a position of inferiority. When the hierarchy is in place, reinforcement humiliation keeps it in place, whereby reinforcement can range from simple seating orders and bowing rules to brutal measures such as customary beatings and exemplary executions. Relegation humiliation is used to push an already low-ranking underling even further down, while exclusion humiliation means excluding victims altogether, exiling, or even killing them. The last is the worst fate imaginable.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Honour Humiliation | Dignity Humiliation |
| (1) Conquest humiliation: A strong power reduces the relative autonomy of rivals who were previously regarded as equals, and forces them into a position of long-term subordination. A new hierarchy is created, or a new upper tier is forced upon an existing hierarchical order. | X | – |
| (2) Relegation humiliation: An individual or group is forcefully pushed downward within an existing status hierarchy. | X | – |
| (3) Reinforcement humiliation: The less powerful are routinely abused in order to maintain their self-perception of inferiority. | X | – |
| (4) Exclusion humiliation: An individual or a group is forcefully ejected from society, for instance, through banishment, exile, or physical extermination. | X | X |

Table 1: Four variants of humiliation   
I thank sociologist Dennis Smith for developing this conceptualisation together with me in 1997

As has been laid out in the first part of this book, in an intermediary historical phase, the notion of decorum opened space for a person’s worthiness to become less mask-like, less like an armour. This happened as part of large-scale changes in the global geo-political situation and it did not yet mean equal dignity. It foregrounded the individual while preserving the ranked system — individual dignitaries presided over commoners. It was in a final phase, when human rights ideals were officially enshrined, that all four types of honour humiliation turned into the last one, namely, exclusion humiliation. All acts of humiliation in a human rights based context have the psychological impact of excluding the victim from the human family, all human rights violations immediately exile the victim from humanity. Since being evicted from the human family altogether is the worst fate imaginable, this violation produces the gravest pain. It is a deeply hurtful experience to be deemed unworthy of being part of humanity, it assaults people at the core of their being. I call this type of humiliation human rights humiliation or dignity humiliation, or, more precisely, equal dignity humiliation (to distinguish equal dignity from unequal decorum).[[1434]](#endnote-1435)

Feelings of equal dignity humiliation are profoundly hurtful not least because they align with something that arose far back in the evolution of humans — not only in humans, also in other species — something that is therefore deeply embedded in the human psyche, and this is inequity aversion.[[1435]](#endnote-1436) This aversion was overruled, antagonised, and suppressed for the past millennia in dominator contexts all around the world, and finally now, after so many years of suffering, human rights ideals grant legitimacy to this age-old sense of disgust in the face of inequality.[[1436]](#endnote-1437)

Power elites, those who were accustomed to achieving obedient humbleness in their inferiors through honour humiliation in the past, may need time to understand that the arrival of dignity humiliation means that humiliation is now more likely to lead to hatred than to humbleness. The founder of political philosophy, Renaissance thinker Niccolò Machiavelli (1469–1527), knew this. He taught that instilling hate is incompatible with a ruler’s survival. It is better to be feared than loved (if one must choose), but it is still crucial not to be hated, this was his advice, ‘The prince, nevertheless, ought to make himself feared in such a mode that if he does not acquire love, he then avoids hatred; for being feared and not hated can go very well together’.[[1437]](#endnote-1438)

In the context of dignity, practices of humiliation once considered normal, such as beating and ‘breaking the will’, acquire the label of abuse that inflicts trauma on victims, in other words, legitimate honour humiliation that was deemed to be pro-social transmutes into illegitimate dignity humiliation considered to be anti-social.[[1438]](#endnote-1439) The Me Too movement that began in 2017 provides a recent example. Men in power positions suffer from ‘sexual overperception’, meaning that they erroneously believe that women around them are attracted to them and feel sexually aroused, even though the woman is repulsed.[[1439]](#endnote-1440) Power deactivates the brain’s frontal lobes that are needed to empathise with other people and to find out what they are thinking. Power has similar effects as brain trauma on the frontal lobes.[[1440]](#endnote-1441) In the past, this predicament was accepted as unavoidable and normal, as something women had to live with. What is new now is that this overperception is deemed condemnable.

Personally, I have struggled with this overperception throughout all my life and have written about my #MeToo experiences long before the Me Too movement unfolded.[[1441]](#endnote-1442) Whenever I came across this overperception, it saddened me deeply, because I do not wish to give up behaving friendly with everyone as fellow human being, including my male counterparts. It has often come as a great shock to me when my smile was misunderstood as an invitation to sex, and I am glad that this painful dilemma is coming into the open now.

Along similar lines, also religious institutions are now waking up to the abuse perpetrated under their roofs. Recently, the archdiocese of Naples sent the Vatican a 1,200-page dossier compiled by a male escort, a young man who had the courage to expose what happens behind closed doors in the Vatican, and he did so by identifying forty actively gay priests and seminarians in Italy.[[1442]](#endnote-1443) The level of courage and consciousness that this escort manifested outdid that of his priestly clients by far, as none of these priests had qualms about their double life, namely, that they condemned homosexuality in public while living it in private. As the young escort reports, ‘No, they think that they deserve it. That made me angry, since, after all, I had to fight for my sexual freedom. They exempt themselves, out of arrogance, even though they condemn others’. When asked whether he tried to talk to the priests, he replied, ‘Yes, of course, but that was useless. They say things like: Do not worry, Jesus knows how much I love him’.[[1443]](#endnote-1444)

Dignity humiliation can take many forms, it can be perpetrated in brutal and open ways or covert and hidden. Individuals as much as entire societies can inflict it. Impunity, for instance, can be considered as systemic humiliation perpetrated by entire societies. This is what psychologists and physicians say in Chile, Argentina, Uruguay, and Peru. I had the privilege of spending time in South America in 2012 and 2019, and I could learn from people who work with torture survivors and families of disappeared per­sons.[[1444]](#endnote-1445) My colleague Nora Sveaass is one of their messengers,[[1445]](#endnote-1446) and she chairs the board of the Health and Human Rights Info platform,[[1446]](#endnote-1447) an initiative working to bridge the gap between health care professionals and human rights activists.[[1447]](#endnote-1448) Then there is the International Center for Transitional Justice that operates under the maxim ‘justice, truth, dignity’ and states their mission as follows, ‘We strive for societies to regain humanity in the wake of mass atrocity. For societies in which impunity is rejected, dignity of victims is upheld, and trust is restored; where truth is the basis of history. We believe that this is an ethical, legal, and political imperative and the cornerstone of lasting peace’.[[1448]](#endnote-1449)

Everything that is announced in theory takes time to be enacted on the ground. In 1948, the United Nations General Assembly declared that the practice of honour humiliation could no longer be considered a legitimate tool, that it was to be considered an illegitimate violation of dignity. The enactment of this transition on the ground made significant strides from then on for a few years, however, then it began to fall behind. Wherever I go on the globe, I meet human rights defenders whose mood has become dark.[[1449]](#endnote-1450) There was a brief return of optimism after the end of the Cold War, but this optimism has waned. As the race for power and resources within and among states continues, states tend to use human-rights rhetoric only when it fits their interests, and this undermines the legitimacy of human rights ideals.[[1450]](#endnote-1451) On all continents, I meet formerly idealistic helpers who are now depressed or even cynical, after their idealism was broken by betrayal, betrayal at the hand of power structures that globalisation brought to every corner of the globe.[[1451]](#endnote-1452) The coronavirus crisis now exposes the helplessness even of the helper system itself.[[1452]](#endnote-1453)

Particularly those in the Global South feel betrayed, and this since quite a while, however, largely invisible to the Global North. Through my global life, I became acquainted with the bitterness felt in the Global South earlier than many of my peers in the Global North. I have learned to understand young voices such as that of Noha Tarek — she is particularly wary when people of the North avoid looking into the face of their own betrayals and instead blame foreign religious scriptures for fundamentalism. She laments that ‘wars, poverty, and the deterioration of the human living conditions turn the human’s psyche into a violent domineering unstable mind’.[[1453]](#endnote-1454) The depth of Noha Tarek’s sense of scepticism and even humiliation becomes palpable when she calls out emphatically:

And guess who’s causing this war and poverty in the South? It’s the governments, militaries, and corporations of the North! But sadly, human rights organisations tend to focus the blame on the ‘weaker’ party, those fundamentalists of the un-modernised societies of the South, but they never direct any blaming finger to those parties who ‘created’ those fundamentalists, who committed genocides and brought about the death and destruction and deterioration that created those fundamentalists. Perhaps it is because those parties are too strong and powerful and internationally-domineering to be blamed![[1454]](#endnote-1455)

Political scientist and rights advocate Kathryn Sikkink, based in the U.S., acknowledges such criticisms, yet, like me, she urges to continue giving credit to human rights and their advocates. In her 2011 book titled The justice cascade, she lauds the power of human rights prosecutions as a political tool.[[1455]](#endnote-1456) ‘Since World War II, and in particular since the formation of the International Criminal Court in 1998, a dramatic new trend in world politics towards holding individual state officials, including heads of state, criminally accountable for human rights violations has emerged’.[[1456]](#endnote-1457) Sikkink highlights that this is ‘not to say that perfect justice has been done or will be done, or that most perpetrators of human rights violations, particularly among the state’s most powerful actors, will be held criminally accountable’.[[1457]](#endnote-1458) Rather, this justice cascade ‘entails a shift in what is considered the legitimate norm of individual criminal accountability for human rights violations and an increase in criminal prosecutions reflecting that norm’.[[1458]](#endnote-1459)

I deeply resonate with Sikkink’s defence of human rights prosecutions, yet, what needs to be acknowledged more in the West, this is my observation, is that Noha Tarek and her friends might not be as lenient as Sikkink in their evaluations — Tarek and her friends might feel profoundly hurt by ‘imperfect justice’ and even feel humiliated by this imperfection being taken so lightly. When human rights adherents like Tarek want to defend human rights ideals and convince their dominator compeers — their Taliban brothers so to speak — they face an uphill struggle, as they must first agree with all lamentations about the West’s double standards and then explain why those ideals are still worth pursuing.

International relations scholar Joseph Camilleri acknowledges that the current international legal order ‘is a function of the West’s technological, economic, and military supremacy’, and ‘until recently, this legal order was international only in name’.[[1459]](#endnote-1460) The West has used its supremacy throughout the past decades in ways that too often were detrimental to the human-rights message — the image of the Abu Ghraib prison in Iraq is a poignant illustration, and its warnings are still valid. An image from the Abu Ghraib prison is on the cover of my book from 2006, Making enemies: Humiliation and international conflict.[[1460]](#endnote-1461)

My global life has taught me to what extent people in Western countries are shielded from experiencing the impact of their own governments’ actions on the rest of the world, how many people in the West are oblivious of the immensely humiliating effects of their own governments’ ‘too casual display of power’.[[1461]](#endnote-1462) Noha Tarek gives voice to the devastating results of the Global North’s blindness to its own double standards. It is this blindness that makes citizens of the West ask, shocked and bewildered, ‘Why do they hate us so much?’

One illustrative case for ‘too casual a display of power’ dates back to the early 1990s, and I find it to be valid still today, with Afghanistan as its most recent manifestation. Sam Engelstad, the UN’s Chief of Humanitarian Affairs, and on several occasions Acting Humanitarian Coordinator in Mogadishu in 1994,[[1462]](#endnote-1463) wrote to me in 1999 (I quote with his permission):

During my time in Somalia in 1994, humiliation was never far from the surface. Indeed, it pretty much suffused the relationship between members of the UN community and the general Somali population. In the day-to-day interaction between the Somalis and UN relief workers like ourselves, it enveloped our work like a grey cloud. Yet, the process was not well understood, and rarely intended to be malevolent... Among the political and administrative leadership of the UN mission, however, humiliation and its consequences were far better understood and were frequently used as policy tools. Regardless of intent, it was pernicious and offensive to many of us.[[1463]](#endnote-1464)

The kind of power hubris that Engelstad describes I still find it everywhere I go. I resonate with journalist Gerard Horton when he says that the 2018 annual human rights report of the State Department of the U.S.A. sounds ‘hollow’ when it states, ‘Our foreign policy reflects who we are and promotes freedom as a matter of principle and interest. We seek to lead other nations by example in promoting just and effective governance based on the rule of law and respect for human rights. The United States will continue to support those around the world struggling for human dignity and liberty’.[[1464]](#endnote-1465)

As the international legal order has been international ‘only in name’, it is understandable that ‘many radicals eschew human rights language, associating it with liberal and imperialist traditions’, observes sociologist Jackie Smith from the Human Rights City Alliance.[[1465]](#endnote-1466) What Smith sees missing, like me, is ‘political imagination’, space for new options to go beyond mainstream policy debates, processes, and elections, as they merely ‘channel our political energies in a direction that can only lead to a very narrow set of possible outcomes — none of which can help stem our society’s ecological collapse or polarisation and violence’.[[1466]](#endnote-1467) Democracy needs foundational renewal if it is nothing but the tokenistic ‘symbolic pretend’ involvement of the demos, the people.

I try to support my sceptical friends in the Global South by reminding them that ‘universality is not the same as uniformity’, that there are affective communities that connect dissidents across borders,[[1467]](#endnote-1468) and that human rights can very well be embedded in local practice, priorities and actions. Many of my friends in the Global South are surprised when they learn that in 1948 ‘the shift from national to international protection of human rights was championed by many activists, diplomats, and jurists from the Global South’.[[1468]](#endnote-1469) People such as Charles Malik from Lebanon were involved in writing the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, as was Peng Chun Chang from China, Hernán Santa Cruz from Chile, and Bertha Lutz, a Brazilian biologist, feminist, and lawyer. I often highlight the role of Hansa Mehta, an Indian delegate and independence activist, who emphasised gender equality and was responsible for changing the language of the declaration from ‘all men are created equal’, the phrase Eleanor Roosevelt preferred, to ‘all human beings’.[[1469]](#endnote-1470)

Admittedly, many contributors from the Global South had been educated in Western institutions — geographical origin does not automatically make a person a legitimate representative of the concerns of the Global South. Still, this does not necessarily undermine their integrity. Every year in November, I greet the bust of Peng Chun’s mentor, John Dewey, at Teachers College at Columbia University in New York City, and I also hail the ‘father’ of the academic field of postcolonial studies, Edward W. Said, professor of literature at Columbia University, who established orientalism as a critical concept to describe the West’s contemptuous portrayal of ‘The East’.[[1470]](#endnote-1471)

It is important to remember that most of the criticisms directed at human rights ideals ‘come from conservative groups, for example, in Russia and elsewhere in the world’, more than from the left side of the political spectrum.[[1471]](#endnote-1472)

Historian Jean Quataert has chronicled the tensions that accompanied the negotiations that led up to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) in 1948. She reports how Charles Malik proposed a significant compromise when he suggested replacing the word ‘individual’ with the term ‘person’. ‘While seemingly splitting hairs, Malik made an important distinction that found wide support. In his view, a person was more than an individual; a person was someone in constant interaction with his or her social world, both shaped by and shaping it. Persons were social beings’.[[1472]](#endnote-1473) Speaking of ‘social beings’ indicated that dignity refers to a common humanity, a value for all peoples, encompassing also ‘collectivist or alternative critiques of naturalist philosophy on behalf of oppressed groups such as women and former colonial peoples’, explains Steven Roach.[[1473]](#endnote-1474) Malik thus secured ‘the acceptance of all parties that had opposed the Western conception of natural rights out of fear that it would lead to the imposition of Western values and individualism’ — under his compromise, human rights were considered a practice, defining basic decency as ‘neither strictly individualist nor collectivist but seen as essential to both of these approaches at the international level’.[[1474]](#endnote-1475)

Jean Quataert concludes that ‘while multivalent’, the concept of dignity ‘captured the change in consciousness that had underpinned the widespread resonance of universal human rights by the end of World War II’.[[1475]](#endnote-1476)

### Can the coronavirus pandemic open a new ‘Eleanor Roosevelt window’?

The end of the Second World War with its unparalleled atrocities opened a unique historical window of opportunity for human rights promoters to come to the fore, and they had, in addition, the strength and courage to make use of this opening. The situation is very different now — one window after the other seems to close. Particularly in the Global South, many human rights supporters now fear for their lives. Can the coronavirus pandemic open a new ‘Eleanor Roosevelt window’?

Critical legal studies provide many insights into the past and the traps that need to be avoided in the future. Law and development is an interdisciplinary study of law and economic and social development. Looking back, we see that in the 1960s, the law and development movement saw leading legal scholars from American law schools write many articles discussing law reform in developing countries, sponsored by American organisations such as the U.S. Agency for International Development and the Ford Foundation. It took only one decade, however, before key scholars and former Ford Foundation officials declared that their efforts had failed.[[1476]](#endnote-1477) The movement was revived in the 1980s, this time supported by the World Bank, USAID, and other public agencies and private foundations, and now with law reform projects being based on neo-liberal ideals such as privatisation and trade liberalisation. Soon, also these efforts were deemed ineffective and even counterproductive.[[1477]](#endnote-1478)

Paulo Barrozo is an expert on the nature and evolution of law. He asks, ‘But can we silence the longing for deeper and more universal emancipation in justice, equality, freedom, dignity, and reason? Should we? I do not think we can or should’.[[1478]](#endnote-1479) He continues, ‘Given the limits it inevitably encounters, the Great Alliance model of moral imagination may not last forever. And the masses, from Rio and New York to Cairo, Tehran, and Kiev, seem to be returning to the world stage, again challenging legal philosophy to imagine their place in contemporary law, but this time not out of fear, but out of hope’.[[1479]](#endnote-1480) Barrozo explains that ‘law is, and will always be, the creation and the institutional expression of moral imagination’:

The dispute is over the type of moral imagination that will influence law and legal thought. Will law and legal thought become the terrain of open and reflective moral imagination or will they continue to function as a limited space for creative problem solving? ... We are challenged to imagine a new covenant between history, reason, and will, one that is able to further expand authentic and recognised freedom in evolving social orders without failing to provide for the functions of social integration and cultural reproduction. Second, we are challenged to imagine a new covenant able to serve the expansion and deepening of the human capacities to learn, reason, create, judge, invent, connect, and act.[[1480]](#endnote-1481)

What does Barrozo mean by the ‘Great Alliance model of moral imagination’, and how was it detrimental? Barrozo describes jurists as a class that is ‘peculiarly sensitive to social change’, and in the face of challenges what they do best is creating legal doctrines.[[1481]](#endnote-1482) Barrozo goes back to the revolutionary events of 1848 in Europe and the Civil War in the United States, times when ‘entrenched-interest holders’ tried to ‘tame the wild surges of mass politics once and for all’ through ‘the creation of a form of consciousness capable of limiting reform while speaking in the language of the revolutionary reformers’.[[1482]](#endnote-1483) Barrozo reports that in the eighteenth century, there were on one side those who thought that ‘law could be conquered through reason’, while others put their hopes on history. Nineteenth-century jurists then concluded that ‘only the combined insights of historicism and rationalism could forge the kind of legal consciousness capable of reining in and corralling modern popular “will”.’[[1483]](#endnote-1484) Barrozo explains:

The mission assigned to (or the function assumed by or the elective affinities of) legal thought in this context was to subdue popular will through a jurisprudence serving a preservationist ethos, while paying due homage to reason and incremental reform. Here lies the birth of the Great Alliance between historicism, rationalism, and will.[[1484]](#endnote-1485)

The nineteenth century Great Alliance amalgamation of ‘utopian rationalism’, ‘consequentialist historicism’, and ‘popular will’, however, had a sad outcome, observes Barrozo, namely, that philosophical hope and political enthusiasm were stifled and ‘a period of mysticism, empiricism, naturalism, positivism, irrationalism, and pragmatism ensued’.[[1485]](#endnote-1486) Still today, the detrimental consequences are felt. ‘The legal and institutional framework of contemporary Western democracies is left overlegitimised and substantially shielded from deep-cutting rational challenge and reimagination’.[[1486]](#endnote-1487) If we want to manifest ‘the role of law as a broker between the past and the future of social orders and the social functions of legal doctrine’, advises Barrozo, we should have the courage, today, ‘to rekindle and transform the utopian rationalism’.[[1487]](#endnote-1488)

Barrozo follows legal philosopher Duncan Kennedy in differentiating three waves of legal consciousness in jurisprudence, mainly in the Anglo-Saxon sphere and from there trickling out into the rest of the world. Each wave cast ‘its own cognitive-normative-practical plan onto the world’ — first, classical legal thought (between 1850 and 1914), second, social legal consciousness (between 1900 and 1968), and, third, modern legal consciousness, or what Barrozo calls idealising reflective equilibrium or reflective equilibrium idealism (post-World War II).[[1488]](#endnote-1489) The first wave was ‘centred on the aspirations of science and on the ideas of rights-holding legal subjects and insulated spheres of autonomy of the will within which private and public actors could operate in socially unconditioned ways’.[[1489]](#endnote-1490) In the second wave, sociological sensibility was inserted into legal thought, recognising ‘the interdependence of social spheres and actors, to which it reacted with a mosaic of compromises and policies protective of privileged private interests’.[[1490]](#endnote-1491) The result, however, was highly problematic. A host of distributive and regulatory conflicts arose, so that a higher level of rationalising abstraction was needed to solve them. ‘Idealising reflective equilibrium scaled these heights on the back of American post-war constitutional law. The ever-elusive but continually reassured equilibrium to be achieved was that between socioeconomic expediencies and the idea of individual rights’.[[1491]](#endnote-1492)

Following Barrozo’s account, we could say that the coronavirus pandemic that spreads out while this book is written, provides the ultimate test for the equilibrium that he so cogently describes.

We are still shackled in the Great Alliance, warns Barrozo, even the critique of contemporary legal thought (what Barrozo calls idealising reflective-equilibrium) is still imprisoned within it.[[1492]](#endnote-1493) The way out, Barrozo suggests, is for us to have a renewed look at utopian rationalism.[[1493]](#endnote-1494) In legal doctrine and thought, three kinds of reason — instrumental, cognitive, and idealist reason — appeal to the faculty of reason to ‘chart broad directions of development for the law’.[[1494]](#endnote-1495) Instrumental reason is the ‘concern with consequences, expediency, cost-benefit analysis’, cognitive reason means ‘science and expertise’, now is the time for the idealist reason that refers to the ‘revelation of the true meaning and the legitimate forms of social manifestation of values such as freedom, equality, justice, and dignity’.[[1495]](#endnote-1496)

If we heed Barrozo’s advice, many challenges lie ahead. Among them are the notions of dignity and freedom themselves and how we define them. Barrozo cautions that ‘freedom as dignity demands recognition by others and responsiveness on the part of institutions of governance’,[[1496]](#endnote-1497) he warns that it is insufficient to merely ‘grant’ freedom of conscience and expression, because freedom is autonomy only when qualified by authenticity. ‘Freedom as autonomy demands that the content of conscience be, in matters of the greatest import, experienced as authored, or at least willingly and reflectively accepted, by the self. Only then does the self mean what it says, creates, feels, and does’.[[1497]](#endnote-1498)

Barrozo calls on us to recognise to which extent we still are captive of ‘the nineteenth-century elites’ anxieties’ and their ‘theoretical and argumentative manoeuvres’,[[1498]](#endnote-1499) and he asks us to dare embrace more courageous analysis and action.

This book is written to support Barrozo’s call. In my work, I follow Barrozo’s advice and attempt to engage in courageous analysis and action. I start by looking at the human desire for social connection and I find it promising.[[1499]](#endnote-1500) It unites us and thereby provides us with a platform for contact and cooperation in the spirit of the message of human rights ideals, namely, the message that we all are equally worthy members of the same human family. Ethnic, religious, and cultural differences, even conflicts of interests and struggles over scarce resources, all carry the potential to engender creative cooperation and problem solving. Diversity can be a source of mutual enrichment. Bridge building is possible even in law, as shown by conservative judge Anthony Kennedy in the United States who developed the legal notion of ‘equal dignity’ to ‘bridge the doctrinal gap between the right to privacy on the one hand, and the equal protection of the laws on the other’.[[1500]](#endnote-1501)

My many decades of global living have shown me over and over again that the message of equality in dignity for all members of the human family is not a message that is ‘owned’ by the West. It is a profoundly welcome message all around the world. The desire for dignity and respect offers a unique starting point for building ‘conversations across differences’, for enabling ‘conversations among groups that have become dangerously polarised’, for gathering ‘people as human beings rather than as holders of particular national identities’, and for ‘local residents thinking about their connections with people outside their own country and seeing possibilities for solidarity’.[[1501]](#endnote-1502) Despite all scepticism, human rights language does have ‘resonance with frontline communities who are most harmed by economic globalisation’, reports also Jackie Smith from the Human Rights City Alliance.[[1502]](#endnote-1503) All of us ‘seek to be treated with dignity and respect, and if we want that, we have to treat others that way’.[[1503]](#endnote-1504)

Through my global life, I have personally ‘tested’ the hypothesis as to whether it is possible to approach all human beings on this planet as equally worthy members of the same family. I have witnessed the strength of the human eagerness to connect as equal fellow human beings on all continents at close hold. These are thick attractors, to use the language from dynamical systems theory.[[1504]](#endnote-1505)

Yet, now comes the caveat: Connection can only be fruitful when respect for equality in dignity for all is authentic, when this respect is expressed in actually walking the talk of equal dignity in solidarity, when double standards are avoided.[[1505]](#endnote-1506) I have adapted the smallest detail of my personal life to this insight, as otherwise my global work would be impossible (see my personal notes in chapters 3, 10, and 11).

When authentic respect is missing, those who feel victimised are prone to highlight whatever differences there are — religious, ethnic, racial — to ‘justify’ rifts, rifts that could easily be bridged were it not for the barriers of humiliation. This is my observation based on nearly fifty years of global experience. It is also what psychologist Fathali Moghaddam wrote in his 2018 book on mutual radicalisation, ‘The “causes” of conflict can shift over time: a conflict that began as a fight over water can become a fight about identity and collective humiliation, then about land and other resources, then more about religious values’.[[1506]](#endnote-1507)

While clashes of civilisations can be enriching, clashes of humiliation are dangerous because they can reverse existing global interconnectedness that carries the potential to attenuate the security dilemma, they can re-divide the world and re-instigate the security dilemma.

Political scientist and international relations expert Bertrand Badie speaks to this danger when he reports that humiliation becomes ever more prominent in international relations now, both as a concept and as a practice.[[1507]](#endnote-1508) Increasingly, humiliation is referred to when the international arena is analysed, he reports, and it shapes diplomacies and foreign policies also as a practice. Humiliation has become an ‘instrument of domination and a pretext for contesting hegemony and producing a deviant diplomacy’ and ‘this change is beyond crucial: it is at the heart of one of the most important sources of violence in our contemporary world, but it is also triggering a deep transformation within the discipline of international relations’.[[1508]](#endnote-1509) Gone are the times when Max Weber and his science of power shaped international relations, by now the discipline of international relations morphs into a Durkheimian science of social integration. The reason for the rise of the significance of humiliation, Badie agrees with me, is that the world is no longer a compartmentalised world, it is a one-world system, yet, since it is so unequal, it can only be called a frustration-making machine. Through his work, Badie aims to establish humiliation as a major concept in the discipline of international relations.

When I had the privilege of sitting with Bertrand Badie in Paris once each year, I shared with him my global experiences with this ‘frustration-making machine’. I told him how I came to Egypt in 1984 and looked at the family photo albums of my friends and their pictures of the past. I was amazed: I saw miniskirts! I lived in Egypt until 1991 and witnessed with my own eyes what also historian Bernard Lewis reported in 1990, namely, that the West was once highly admired and eagerly emulated by many Muslims, yet, over time, admiration gave way to ‘hostility and rejection’. ‘In part this mood is due to feelings of humiliation’, Lewis observed, to ‘a growing awareness, among the heirs of an old, proud, and long dominant civilisation, of having been overtaken, overborne, and overwhelmed by those whom they regarded as their inferiors’.[[1509]](#endnote-1510) Political scientist Dominique Moïsi chimes in with his observation that a culture of humiliation ‘helps unite the Muslim world around its most radical forces and has led to a culture of hatred’.[[1510]](#endnote-1511) Moïsi describes a worldwide clash of emotions between a culture of humiliation in the Middle East, and a culture of hope in central Asia. In the West, he identifies a culture of fear, fear of loss of identity and control, fear of economic instability, fear of immigration driven by violence and poverty, and fear of terrorism.

During my years in Egypt, I acquired a deep understanding of the impact the West’s invitation into a better life had, I saw with my own eyes how much it was welcomed. To say it short, there was once a ‘love story’.[[1511]](#endnote-1512) Yet, love stories are known to turn sour when betrayed, so sour that desperate disappointment may look like hatred, regretted later when this reaction destroys the entire relationship rather than restarting the love story on a higher level of mutual understanding.[[1512]](#endnote-1513) In my 2006 book titled How to make enemies, I explain how a humiliated lover’s hatred can be fiercer than any other hatred, and how all involved may end up retreating into the trenches of bygone honour instead of embarking on a new and mutually dignifying love story.[[1513]](#endnote-1514)

When we look around the world, we see that the Arab world is not the only one to turn to the past for ways to regain honour, we see similar dynamics play out also in the rest of the world. It seems that political-economic elites have alienated their fellow citizens to the point that many now embrace past-oriented extremism.

As has been discussed at the beginning of this chapter, equality in dignity is what informs human rights ideals, and thus, human dignity has to guide human rights. Neglecting rights can violate dignity, yet, it can also be the other way round, rights can violate dignity when they are insufficiently anchored in dignity. The result is that both neglecting and heeding rights can violate dignity. This indicates that we cannot leave the nurturing of dignity to the legal field and its professionals alone, dignity needs intentional and pro-active conceptualising and nurturing. Every single citizen who subscribes to human rights ideals, every community, every society, carries the responsibility to nurture dignity. Everyone has the duty to remain alert that rights have the potential to violate dignity in case rights are designed without regard to dignity.

Many scholars were given the floor in this chapter who can offer insights and guidance on the path to this aim. Philosopher Avishai Margalit and his work on the notion of non-humiliation speaks to this aim,[[1514]](#endnote-1515) also philosopher of criminal justice John Kleinig speaks to it with his concept of non-degradation,[[1515]](#endnote-1516) philosopher and political theorist Philip Pettit points at it with his call for non-domination,[[1516]](#endnote-1517) as much as physicist and educational reformer Robert Fuller who warns against rankism.[[1517]](#endnote-1518)

Our Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies (HumanDHS) fellowship is part of this concert of voices. We forge new pathways into the future by convening a global dignity community. Rather than falling back on old ways of organising a movement, ways that are informed by a dominator history, we do our best to create a relational climate characterised by equal dignity not just in theory but in practice. For more than a decade, our relational approach has remained sustainable, it has offered a new model of collaborative action, it has nurtured a replenishing relational-organisational climate that is constantly evolving and growing with — rather than at the expense of — the people involved in our work.[[1518]](#endnote-1519)

Peace psychologist Michael Britton wrote on 18th July 2015, ‘I feel fortunate to have found a home in HumanDHS where the labours of inquiry, honesty, integrity, dignity, trust and trustworthiness, humility are at the heart of who we are and what we do’.

We are currently around 1,000 personally invited members, with more than 2,000 people supporting our work and more than 8,000 friends on our address list, while our website is being accessed by thousands of people from all over the world since the site’s inception in 2003. The nomination for the Nobel Peace Prize in 2015, 2016, and 2017 gave our members great courage and has already been life saving for many. Ours is a unique community that acts as a collaborative incubator and generator for new ideas that are designed to foster a world that dignifies the lives of all people and the planet.

The members of our dignity community look forward to the day when all communities of this planet can share in a world with equal dignity in shared responsibility and solidarity.

In response to the coronavirus crisis

And the people stayed home.  
And read books, and listened, and rested, and exercised, and made art, and played games, and learned new ways of being, and were still.

And listened more deeply.

Some meditated, some prayed, some danced.

Some met their shadows.

And the people began to think differently.

And the people healed.

And, in the absence of people living in ignorant, dangerous, mindless, and heartless ways, the earth began to heal.

And when the danger passed, and the people joined together again, they grieved their losses, and made new choices, and dreamed new images, and created new ways to live and heal the earth fully, as they had been healed.

― Poet Kitty O’Meara in response to the coronavirus crisis in March 2020,  
shared by Ingeborg Breines

## Chapter 6: Beware of dignity mission creeps

Aly Juuju and the 54 Thieves

In the Africa unlimited scheme of things

A dark, deeply entrenched Orwellian cabal

Holds sway.

Sovereignty is majestic void

Predation is power

Tyranny is liberty

Bondage is freedom

Poverty is progress

Violence is peace

Reign of terror is rule of law

Humiliation is dignity.

― © Hassan Keynan, formerly UNESCO  
Hassan Keynan wrote this poem in Nairobi in January 2018, as a ‘manifestation of a raw and rumbling African cry for dignity and freedom’, in the aftermath of the 2018 Heads of State of the African Union meeting in Addis Ababa for their 30th summit on the theme of fighting and ending corruption and promoting sustainable transformation.   
Aly Juuju and the 54 thieves is an African fairy tale modelled on the Arabian fable of Ali Baba and the 40 thieves that featured in the magical One thousand and one nights. In Africa, there are 54 countries, explains Hassan Keynan, and there always comes one guy who pretends to be the good guy who will deal with the evil 54 thieves — unfortunately, however, this fantastic illusion exits only in the realm of imagination...[[1519]](#endnote-1520)
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### What is dignity? If dignity, then which kind of dignity?

Sociologist Mark Regnerus observes a ‘mission creep’ of dignity, an almost invisible shift, a stealthy move, from what he calls Dignity 1.0 to Dignity 2.0.[[1520]](#endnote-1521) Regnerus explains that Dignity 1.0 held sway from the times of Catholic Pope Leo I (circa 400–461) to philosopher Immanuel Kant (1724–1824), and up to the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Thereafter, during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the notion of dignity was used less, only to re-emerge in the 1990s, but this time as Dignity 2.0.[[1521]](#endnote-1522)

Dignity 2.0 aligns with its predecessor Dignity 1.0 insofar as both have to do with inherent worth, the reality of the good, and with rights seen to be flowing from dignity. However, as Regnerus argues, while Dignity 1.0 pointed at the ability to ‘flourish as the person one is and should become’, and to help other persons to do the same, Dignity 2.0 appears to disregard flourishing in favour of freedom, autonomy, and independence.[[1522]](#endnote-1523)

Social theorist Margaret Archer worries about dignity’s mission creep as well.[[1523]](#endnote-1524) Peace linguist Francisco Gomes de Matos chimes in, too, and he warns, ‘Beware of indignity-promoters/planters or, more DIGNIcreatively, beware of INDIGNIfiers!’[[1524]](#endnote-1525) Sociologist Christian Smith, also, cautions that for ‘flourishing personhood’ to manifest truly, societies must take real action to nurture it by social practices, institutions, and structures, because otherwise, it will be damaged and indignity will reign.[[1525]](#endnote-1526)

If we look at the backgrounds of the three sociologists, Regnerus, Smith, and Archer, and that of linguist Gomes de Matos, we notice that all draw on a Catholic heritage. Margaret Archer emphasises the four pillars of Catholic social teaching — human dignity, solidarity, subsidiarity, and the common good — and calls for the transformation of late modernity into a ‘civilisation of love’.[[1526]](#endnote-1527) Tina Beattie is a professor of Catholic Studies, and this is how she explains the Catholic approach to defining dignity: There is intrinsic dignity that pertains to the nature of our being, while extrinsic dignity refers to how we live. Intrinsic dignity comes with ‘being made in the image of God with a capacity for rationality and freedom that is accorded to no other species’,[[1527]](#endnote-1528) so that not even murderers lose their personal dignity.[[1528]](#endnote-1529) Extrinsic dignity, in contrast, can be undermined or violated ‘by the selfishness, consumerism and freneticism of modern life, by the exploitation, abuse and marginalisation of those who are poor, and by neglect and violence towards those who are vulnerable, particularly the unborn and the elderly’, whereby ‘to trample on the dignity of another is to trample on one’s own dignity’.[[1529]](#endnote-1530) We can assume that all these authors are dismayed by how many Catholic priests have trampled on dignity by sexually abusing those in their care.

The message of these Catholic authors is also expressed in Catholic liberation theology.[[1530]](#endnote-1531) By drawing on Augustine of Hippo and Thomas Aquinas, liberation theology has expanded the notion of the common good, or bonum commune in Latin, to bonum commune humanitatis, Weltgemeinwohl in German, or the common good of all of humanity.[[1531]](#endnote-1532) Catholic development organisations such as Misereor now emphasise Weltgemeinwohl as global social and ecological responsibility.[[1532]](#endnote-1533)

At the end of the nineteenth century, with Pope Leo XIII’s encyclical Rerum Novarum, the magisterium of the Catholic Church adopted ‘human dignity’ as a fundamental principle, developing it further in 1931 with Pius XI, and once again in the 1960s with John XXIII. This was done in response to two threats, we learn from Christopher McCrudden, professor of human rights and equality law — one threat was feared from a communist push towards radical redistribution, class war, and totalitarianism, and the other from ‘radical individualism, in particular an individualism that was seen as supporting unbridled capitalism’.[[1533]](#endnote-1534) In 2016, Pope Francis called on his followers to ‘renew their commitment to defending the most vulnerable in society, to promoting human dignity, and to preserving Christian principles in the public square’.[[1534]](#endnote-1535) The Dignitatis Humanae Institute, also known as the Institute for Human Dignity or L’Istituto Dignitatis Humanae, a Catholic-inspired NGO based in Rome, is working for the establishment of parliamentary working groups on human dignity in various legislatures around the world, all drawing on the principles enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Dignity.[[1535]](#endnote-1536) This declaration was launched by the International Committee on Human Dignity on 8th December 2008, with the aim to codify their definition of human dignity, namely, ‘that man is made in the image and likeness of God; that this image and likeness proceeds in every single human being without exception from conception until natural death; and that the most effective means of safeguarding this recognition is through the active participation of the Christian faith in the public square’.[[1536]](#endnote-1537)

Earlier, in chapter 4, we looked at large-scale systematisations of views on dignity and we met Richard Ashcroft and his fourfold systematisation — dignity as incoherent talk, dignity as reducible to autonomy, dignity as space for capabilities, and dignity as a metaphysical property. We concluded that thinkers such as Ruth Mackins and Steven Pinker would fall into the first category, and now we can place Regnerus, Smith, Archer, Gomes de Matos, and Beattie into the fourth category. In chapter 4, we also met discourse analyst Michael Karlberg, who provides a threefold systematisation — the social command frame of dignity in contrast to the social contest frame and the social body frame. As we see now, Mark Regnerus’ Dignity 1.0 with its inherent worth fits the social body frame, while Dignity 2.0 and its emphasis on autonomy belongs more into the social contest frame.[[1537]](#endnote-1538)

When I consider my work, then his social command frame overlaps with my conceptualisation of honour, I see his social contest frame at work when I speak of human rights that highlight rights over dignity, while my view on human rights ideals in their embeddedness in dignity fits into Karlberg’s social body frame. If philosopher Emanuel Lévinas were still alive, he might chime in and say that his approach to dignity — highlighting the face of the Other — fits into the social body frame, while the Kantian approach seems more solipsistic and closer to the social contest frame (see chapter 4).

Michael Karlberg himself is an adherent of the social body frame, and he recommends considering not just Catholicism and Christianity, but also other philosophical and religious traditions, that of the Baha’i community, for instance, ‘which has over a century of experience applying non-adversarial models... in an integrated and mutually reinforcing manner’.[[1538]](#endnote-1539)

Adherents of the contest frame, those who define autonomy as separation rather than as connection, balk at the social body frame. As Linda Hartling observes, connecting to the world, developing a sense of relationship with all people and the planet, gets in the way of libertarians’ loyalty to a definition of free will and autonomy, as their worldview ‘frees them from responsibility to care for others outside of their family/political circle’.[[1539]](#endnote-1540) Hartling sees libertarians endorsing ‘safety through separation, which they describe as autonomy’, striving for dignity by investing in ever ‘better’ separation.[[1540]](#endnote-1541) Hartling considers them ‘the deadbeat dads of the political landscape’ because they first let the social fabric of the family and society disintegrate and ‘then they self-justify their claim of not being responsible for this disintegration’.[[1541]](#endnote-1542) Hartling considers this kind of autonomy to be ‘a convenient, pro laissez-faire capitalist philosophy’, and reminds of Jean Baker Miller’s admonition that ‘it is authenticity, not autonomy that we need to strive for, as we all depend on each other’s care’.[[1542]](#endnote-1543)

When we have a closer look at the notion of autonomy, we see that the social body frame of Dignity 1.0 does not exclude or neglect it, it only embeds it different ways compared to the social contest frame of Dignity 2.0. Karlberg explains:

The social body frame thereby entails respect for individual agency and autonomy (within the bounds of moderation). This is because the development of an individual’s latent potential, and the direction of that potential toward the common good, cannot be imposed on an individual against their will. Rather, it can only emerge as an expression of a will that is informed by a consciousness of the essential unity and interdependence of humanity. Therein lies the key to human dignity within the social body frame: it is achieved through the voluntary subordination of self-centred instincts and appetites to the well-being of the entire social body.[[1543]](#endnote-1544)

Michael Karlberg emphasises the responsibility of social institutions — families, schools, media, corporations, the state — to foster and protect the development of the human potential and guide it towards the common good. This implies more than merely guaranteeing individual liberty, ‘it implies fostering the consciousness of the oneness of humanity and providing a framework for acting upon this consciousness in our private and public lives’.[[1544]](#endnote-1545)

Philosopher Thaddeus Metz is a professor at the University of Pretoria in South Africa, and he connects cooperation and dignity in ways reminiscent of Regnerus’ Dignity 1.0.[[1545]](#endnote-1546) Metz offers an alternative to the Western Dignity 2.0 approach and its conceptualisation of dignity as inhering in Kantian forms of rationality related to autonomy. Metz invokes an Afro-communitarian conception of human dignity that is closer to Lévinas’ view in that it develops the idea that human beings have dignity in virtue of their communal nature, in virtue of their capacity for what Metz calls ‘identity’ and ‘solidarity’.[[1546]](#endnote-1547) The foundation of communal practice is consensus rather than the will of a monarch or a majority, Metz explains, and even when retributive punishment is meted out after a violation, it contains elements of reconciliation between the offender, his family, the immediate victim, and the broader community. ‘The dignity of human beings emanates from the network of relationships, from being in community; in an African view, it cannot be reduced to a unique, competitive, and free personal ego’, says also South African theologian and academic leader H. Russel Botman.[[1547]](#endnote-1548)

Thaddeus Metz points out that sub-Saharan thought brings together two different sorts of relationships, those of identity and those of solidarity. Identity is the sharing of a way of life, it means identifying with each other and conceiving of each other as ‘we’, while solidarity is the caring for others’ quality of life, or what English speakers would call love or friendship. ‘One could identify with others but not exhibit solidarity with them — probably workers in relation to management in a capitalist firm. One could also exhibit solidarity with others but not identify with them, e.g. by making anonymous donations to a charity’.[[1548]](#endnote-1549) African thought combines those two logically distinct kinds of relationship.[[1549]](#endnote-1550) Metz lays out:

To exhibit solidarity with one another is for people to care about each other’s quality of life, in two senses. First, it means that they engage in mutual aid, acting in ways that are expected to benefit each other (ideally, repeatedly over time). Second, caring is a matter of people’s attitudes such as emotions and motives being positively oriented toward others, say, by sympathising with them and helping them for their sake. For people to fail to exhibit solidarity could be for them to be indifferent to each other’s flourishing or to exhibit ill will in the form of hostility and cruelty.[[1550]](#endnote-1551)

Thaddeus Metz lines up a number of sub-Saharan thinkers and their views on community. ‘Every member is expected to consider him/herself an integral part of the whole and to play an appropriate role towards achieving the good of all’.[[1551]](#endnote-1552) ‘Harmony is achieved through close and sympathetic social relations within the group’.[[1552]](#endnote-1553) ‘The fundamental meaning of community is the sharing of an overall way of life, inspired by the notion of the common good’.[[1553]](#endnote-1554) ‘The purpose of our life is community-service and community-belongingness’.[[1554]](#endnote-1555)

Metz argues that when our dignity is grounded in our capacity for communal relationships, then to degrade this capacity means violating human rights — the innocent have the right not to be killed, enslaved, or tortured because such actions disrespect the capacity for community of all involved, victims and perpetrators. Metz predicts that if the project of the West is to destroy communal practice and the dignity connected with it, it will do so at its own peril.

When I look at the scholars introduced above, I recognise that they are all bridge builders — they build the same bridges that also I attempt to build with my work. There are many bridges waiting to be built in a world where hateful polarisation increasingly divides societies. In 2000, social scientists Paul Ray and Sherry Ruth Anderson published research on cleavages in society, and these cleavages have become more relevant twenty years later rather than less.[[1555]](#endnote-1556) In their work, Ray and Anderson described fault lines between people subscribing to modernity, they called this group the moderns, and then they saw two counter-movements that often are hostile to moderns, but also to each other. First, there is the counter-movement of the traditionals, those who wish to turn away from modernity back into an imagined golden past, and, second, there is the counter-movement of cultural creatives, those who turn their eyes towards a new future of dignity. In the beginning, the cultural creatives movement was divided into an inward and an outward orientation, however, this division increasingly disappears now (see also chapter 3).

Looking at Michael Karlberg’s categorisation of dignity, traditionals appear to fit into the social command frame or what I conceptualise as the world of honour, moderns would have their place in Karlberg’s social contest frame and in my notion of rights trumping dignity, while the views of many cultural creatives resonate with Karlberg’s social body frame and my concept of the full spectrum of human rights ideals.

If we apply Ray and Anderson’s terminology to the current political situation in the United States of America, we could identify the traditionals’ retreat into an imagined golden honourable past of a ‘great America’ as a backlash against acts of humiliation at the hands of moderns. For quite a while, moderns seem to have been successful in channelling this backlash away from themselves towards scapegoats, as there are, for instance, migrants or ‘dangerous’ cultural creatives.[[1556]](#endnote-1557) As a result, in 2016, many evangelical Christians felt so humiliated[[1557]](#endnote-1558) that they chose to elect a master of humiliation entrepreneurship as president, Donald Trump, who raged against cultural creatives, and who promised to curtail the power of ‘moderns’ even while consolidating their power on the ground. ‘Two flags that we thought had been discarded by history are making a comeback’, observes veteran political commentator Roberto Savio, and one is the flag ‘in the name of God’ — ‘the use of religion by the right wing has been able to rally the poor’.[[1558]](#endnote-1559)

In other parts of the world as well, we meet many leaders who attract followers with the promise to overcome humiliation by turning back into a supposedly golden past. Movements such as Da’esh, Al Qaeda, or the Taliban represent extreme examples. When we listen to leaders such as Putin, Orban, Trump, Bolsonaro, or Salvini, we see traditionals use ‘the name of God’ to re-divide the world into proud ‘we against them’ entities. In all cases, honour is sought while dignity is lost.

From my perspective, all groups and all trends described by Ray and Anderson — moderns, traditionals, and cultural creatives (of both inward and outward orientation) — have something to offer that can build bridges and jointly manifest the kind of dignity that nourishes unity in diversity. Dignity does not need to be sacrificed to preserve honour, as all sides can contribute to a dignified future for all: We can all turn inwards and liberate ourselves from all dogmas of the past that are no longer suitable in an interconnected world, we can invite everyone — moderns, traditionals, and cultural creatives alike — to co-create visions for a dignified future for our children, and, finally, we can go out into the ‘global street’ together and become activists for global dignity.

### The concept of dignity is part of large-scale mission creeps

The mission creep of the concept of dignity is inscribed into much larger mission creeps that currently affect all spheres of life. The vision of laissez faire — commonly associated with the label of ‘liberal’[[1559]](#endnote-1560) — was once intended to foster individual freedom and international harmony. Regrettably, however, it has ‘transmuted into the sorry realities of an international capitalism which recognised neither moral scruples nor political restraints in expanding its power over the world’, were the words of ethicist Reinhold Niebuhr as far back as 1944.[[1560]](#endnote-1561) ‘Through cycle after cycle, humanity has been whittling away at oligarchic power and prerogative with reforms such as written laws, civil rights, and democracy’, yet, ‘unfortunately, oligarchic systems tend to re-group, using new rationales to rescind those reforms’, is a related verdict uttered in 2019.[[1561]](#endnote-1562) Neo-liberalism in free-market clothing has since its rise in the late 1970s ‘reversed many of the gains made by the New Deal — destroying unions, privatising Commons, and corrupting politics with train loads of money’.[[1562]](#endnote-1563) ‘The economic power of the state comes from its sovereignty — its ruling power to command and allocate resources. Money is a convenient mechanism to do so. Capitalism has captured this power and privatised it’.[[1563]](#endnote-1564)

While the promise of equal dignity was for a while undermined by double standards rather stealthily, by now, in the twenty-first century, money is pushing dignity to the wayside so openly that many of those standards are no longer even double in the sense of being promised but not delivered — increasingly, violation is being accepted as status quo and the Zeitgeist slides back into a position where it was prior to the promise of equal human dignity for all.

When we look at contemporary trends in the light of a longer historical time frame, then we see that Indigenous foragers did not ‘go to work’ — they had ‘a life’.[[1564]](#endnote-1565) As we learn from research, theirs was the most comprehensive way of being on this planet — living in communion with nature, approaching life on this planet with dignifying humility.[[1565]](#endnote-1566) Anthropologist Alan Page Fiske calls this way of organising communal life communal sharing. Nowadays, every aspect of life is moving into the opposite direction, into the least comprehensive way of being, namely, what Fiske calls market pricing, reducing the fullness of the quality of life on this planet into mere quantity calculations. The healthy and peaceful Indigenous cycle of cooperative companionship that characterised the first 97 per cent of our human history, is turned into competitive detachment, as indigenous psychologist Darcia Narváez would say.[[1566]](#endnote-1567)

Alan Page Fiske has built a theory of meta-relational models that acknowledges that ‘human social relationships affect each other and form stable configurations that have important behavioural and societal consequences’ (see more in the section titled ‘Some definitions of dignity undermine dignity’ in chapter 10).[[1567]](#endnote-1568) Various subfields of psychology, sociology, political science, economics, and cultural anthropology have independently developed similar concepts, as Fiske notes, ‘Freudian theorists and cultural anthropologists came right to the verge of recognising that people have directively potent culturally informed cognitive models of configurations of relationships’.[[1568]](#endnote-1569)

Through his research, Alan Page Fiske found that people, most of the time and in all cultures, use just four elementary and universal forms or models for organising most aspects of sociality. Interaction can be structured according to what people have in common, Fiske calls this form of sociality communal sharing, second, according to ordered differences or what Fiske calls authority ranking, third, according to additive imbalances or Fiske’s equality matching, and, finally, according to ratios or Fiske’s market pricing.[[1569]](#endnote-1570) These four social models follow the four scales of measurement — nominal, ordinal, interval, and ratio — the first of which is the most comprehensive and qualitative, while the last is the least comprehensive and most quantitative.[[1570]](#endnote-1571) There is maybe also a fifth basic type of scale, a discrete interval scale that is intermediate between interval and ratio scales, which, Fiske suggests, could inspire also future research on forms of sociality as it might represent a fifth fundamental model.[[1571]](#endnote-1572)

When people emphasise what they have in common, they give priority to Fiske’s model of communal sharing. Family life often embraces the motto of ‘one for all and all for one’, where ‘every family member gives what she can and gets what she needs’. Communal sharing comes from the heart, it is voluntary, it is not something that is, or should be, incentivised or enforced by monetary rewards. It is like the difference between love-based marriage and coercion-based marriage — trust, love, care, and intimacy can prosper only in love-based marriage. ‘Communal Sharing relationships are formed among people who are considered and who consider themselves equal (in one or more aspects). The participants in this relationship feel togetherness; they are bounded; they have something in common (interest, origin, blood, etc.), and refer to themselves as “we”.’[[1572]](#endnote-1573) Communal sharing overlaps with the notion of Gemeinschaft (community) more than with that of Gesellschaft (society),[[1573]](#endnote-1574) and it resonates with the African philosophy of ubuntu more than with Western individualism.[[1574]](#endnote-1575) Communal sharing is the space in which the dignity of Homo amans can unfold, the ‘loving being’,[[1575]](#endnote-1576) or better, Homo amans relationalis, the ‘loving relational being’,[[1576]](#endnote-1577) or Homo solidaricus, the ‘solidary person’[[1577]](#endnote-1578) (see more in chapter 2).

When people set out to create ordered differences, they use Fiske’s second model. Authority ranking involves asymmetry among people, it means that people are ranked along vertical hierarchical social dimensions. In practice, this can manifest in many ways, ranging from Homo amans to Homo dominans — a nurturant teacher manifests the Homo amans version of authority ranking, whereas an oppressive dominator walks the Homo dominans path.[[1578]](#endnote-1579)

Equality matching is the third model, implying a balance of taking turns, for instance, in car pools or babysitting cooperatives. The fourth, the market-pricing model, views relationships as defined by proportions or ratios, as ‘markets only value what is priced, and they only work for those who can pay’.[[1579]](#endnote-1580) The latter two models are the arena of Homo oeconomicus.

Dominators who wish to enforce a hierarchy have several options. They can employ open violence, yet, they can also use the other three forms of sociality as a cover. Throughout history, dominators frequently asked their people to sacrifice for allegedly noble goals that turned out to be exploitative at the end. History is full of examples where soldiers were asked to give their lives for high goals, for instance, only to realise that they were merely used as cannon fodder, left alone after battle with their war injuries and depression. Another example is the Soviet Union, which became known for abusing the argument of altruistic communal sharing — the state asked people to sacrifice for the common good only to abuse this sacrifice. The presently unfolding coronavirus crisis exposes the degree to which caring professions remain undervalued despite their efforts, a hint that the ‘trickle down’ argument may be used in ‘capitalism’ as much in bad faith as the altruism argument was abused in what is known as ‘communism’.

Often it starts with people having the best intentions, while the situation slides into exploitation only over time as the overall frame changes.[[1580]](#endnote-1581) At the present juncture in history, and I observe this at close hold on my global path on all continents, every aspect of life is veering towards the least comprehensive model, namely, that of market pricing. On the surface, in official rhetoric, this is accompanied by the promise that it will serve everybody’s interest and will benefit all — that the market’s ‘invisible hand’ will provide a level of quality of life higher than what direct communal sharing could achieve.[[1581]](#endnote-1582) Yet, reality on the ground very often tells a different story. ‘Neo-liberal governmentality’ does not need open domination and oppression of citizens as in the past, observes Indigenous psychologist Louise Sundararajan, it works ‘by making their subjectivity a target of influence’.[[1582]](#endnote-1583) Indigenous communities typically give primacy to communal sharing as guiding principle for their social and societal life,[[1583]](#endnote-1584) and in the twenty-first century, in the face of worldwide ecological and social crises, future-oriented initiatives increasingly call for the re-invigoration of economic thinking inspired by cooperative traditions in Indigenous peoples.[[1584]](#endnote-1585)

Statistics of rising inequality reveal that a large-scale mission shift is at work that benefits only a few, at the price of wearing down the social and ecological fabric of the rest — in short, it is a mission shift towards systemic humiliation.[[1585]](#endnote-1586) Market pricing is the narrowest, the most quantitative, and most humiliating frame, as every living being and the planet become a commodity and the person vanishes — no money, no existence. Already in 1992, sociologist Zygmunt Bauman described how nature — the entire unprocessed, pristine world — became an ‘enemy’, and this starting from the time humans began to practice agriculture:

...the world of nature ... had to be beheaded and deprived of autonomous will and power of resistance... The world was an object of willed action: a raw material in the work guided and given form by human designs. ... Left to itself, the world had no meaning. It was solely the human design that injected it with a sense of purpose. So the earth became a repository of ores and other ‘natural resources’, wood turned into timber and water — depending on circumstances — into an energy source, waterway or the solvent of waste.[[1586]](#endnote-1587)

By now, most people are aware of the warning that while we may think we use social media, social media use us, and while we may think that we search Google, Google searches us.[[1587]](#endnote-1588) Historians have long recognised ‘that capitalism evolves by claiming things that live outside the market dynamic and bringing them into the market dynamic so that they can be turned into commodities for sale and purchase’.[[1588]](#endnote-1589) Shoshana Zuboff researches emerging surveillance capitalism and she describes how industrial capitalism has claimed nature for the market dynamic, how nature was ‘reborn’ as ‘real estate, as land that could be sold and purchased’:

Similarly, industrial capitalism claimed work for the market dynamic, so activities that people did in their fields, in their gardens, in their homes, in their cottages, now subordinated to the market, reborn as labour that could be sold and purchased. Surveillance capitalism follows this pattern but with what I would call a kind of dark twist. And that is it claims private human experience as a source of free raw material, subordinated to the market dynamic and reborn as behavioural data. Those behavioural data are then combined with advanced computational capabilities in order to produce predictions of human behaviour. So all of these behavioural data now streamed into our 21st-century dark satanic mills, which are what we call machine intelligence, machine learning, artificial intelligence, in order to spew out predictions. These are a new kind of product.[[1589]](#endnote-1590)

At the core of the current mission creep towards systemic humiliation is how the institution of money is being defined and organised — the fact that money is not just as a measure of value but a commodity in itself that can be accumulated, and how money is brought into being and disseminated.[[1590]](#endnote-1591) It is ‘a myth that money originated as precious metal coinage in market exchanges’ and that it is ‘intrinsically scarce’, explains Mary Mellor, author of the book The future of money, as ‘money is mainly numbers in an account, and leading monetary regimes have abandoned any notion of a reserve of “real” money’.[[1591]](#endnote-1592) Philosopher Howard Richards adds:

The past ended and the present began in England in 1689 when William and Mary ascended the throne on terms dictated by Parliament, and in 1694 when the Bank of England was chartered as a private bank authorised to create money. In other places, traditional financial privileges of rulers ended at various dates, usually gradually and incompletely. A modern state is a state that has lost control over money. It lives on taxes granted by its parliaments. Nowadays it competes with 195 other states to attract investments by lowering taxes. As Jürgen Habermas showed in the Legitimation crisis, the Steuerstaat of late capitalism inevitably loses legitimacy. Its obligations include steering the economy to profitability. They include serving the welfare of the people. Now they include obligations to save the biosphere. The expenses of doing its duties properly far exceed its resources.[[1592]](#endnote-1593)

We could say that the institution of money now works like a drug. Drugs first hook their victims, only to destroy them later, while at the same time the drug barons profit. Bringing millions of people into a monetised world and hailing this as ‘lifting them out of poverty’, this may be called the ‘hooking stage’, as it is bound to be a short-lived upswing, achieved through resource overuse.[[1593]](#endnote-1594) Clearly, inviting ever more people into a feast that is thrown on credit cannot be a path to long-term success, irrespective of how many people welcome the initial invitation.[[1594]](#endnote-1595)

The presently prevailing ideology of economism can be interpreted as a success only if viewed from within the narrow Homo oeconomicus model, and only as long as present and future externalities are disregarded. As soon as we use the Homo amans model, it is no longer a success but a failure.[[1595]](#endnote-1596) Peace poet William Stafford once warned, ‘success may not mean we did right’.[[1596]](#endnote-1597) During the past decades, the motto ‘all is fair in love and war’ was expanded to include ‘all is fair in business’, with the result that deception has become normalised and standardised as a practice in business.[[1597]](#endnote-1598) Unsurprisingly, by now, ‘the world is off-track to meet most food and agriculture-related Sustainable Development Goals’, and philosopher of global justice Thomas Pogge concludes that ‘our generation is doing worse than any in human history’.[[1598]](#endnote-1599)

Wherever my global path brings me on our planet, I observe humanity being in the grip of large-scale self-deception. We are usually quick in laughing about the foolishness of certain ideas when they are far removed in time and place — how could people ever believe that planet Earth is a flat disc? We look back on misguided beliefs and actions of bygone times or remote locations and feel pity, at least when they no longer affect us. It is much more difficult to face ‘the insidious ideas of the present’.[[1599]](#endnote-1600) When people say, ‘Germans ought to have stood up against Hitler!’ and ‘How come so many Germans said they did not know about the concentration camps! How could they be so blind!’ my answer is, ‘If we look back in history, and we are horrified by the blindness of Germans under Hitler — rightly so! — should we then not do our utmost to avoid being blind today? How can we point at the blindness of yesterday with indignation, while overlooking our blindness of today?’ I am horrified when conspiracy and indignation entrepreneurs abuse this very argument for their benefit in the context of the coronavirus pandemic and thus make the situation worse.

Terms such as ‘poverty’ and ‘inequality’ are no longer adequate, observes Saskia Sassen, a scholar of globalisation and migration, ‘While the visible narrative is one of progress and growing wealth, much of the tragedies are invisible: the expulsion of entire populations from their living spaces and unspoilt nature itself’.[[1600]](#endnote-1601) The new invading weapon is not banking; it is finance ‘extracting value from very modest assets’.[[1601]](#endnote-1602) ‘Why we should bulldoze the business school’, is the catch title of an article in 2018.[[1602]](#endnote-1603)

Indeed, everywhere on this planet, I witness how societies and their members are being lured into money systems at first, only to be trapped the moment these systems slide towards exploitation. People are hooked when they associate dignity with monetary wealth and accept to express all details of their lives in terms of market pricing as if this were a law of nature. They are hooked when they stop speaking of ‘students’, ‘patients’, or ‘passengers’ in trains or planes’ and instead reduce everyone to a ‘client and customer of services’. They are hooked when they agree to replace direct solidarity with money-based contracts, when they turn fellow human beings into ‘contract holders’ and ‘stakeholders’.[[1603]](#endnote-1604) They are hooked when they categorise Indigenous peoples who live without money and of wild food as ‘poor’.[[1604]](#endnote-1605) They are hooked when they regard the commons of this world — the social and ecological resources of this world — as business opportunities.[[1605]](#endnote-1606)

As soon as an entire community is hooked, its members have no choice anymore but to elbow their way through life to protect their contracts — spitze Ellenbogen is the literal German expression, or spisse elbuer in Norwegian — because going through life with open arms would be utterly foolish in a world filled with exploiters lying in wait on all sides. When dignity is money, and money is a commodity that can be accumulated — together with other ‘false commodities’ such as land and labour[[1606]](#endnote-1607) — it would be foolishly naïve to trust anyone, trust transmutes into a grave weakness. Holding hands in loving solidarity is ill advised in a world that is filled with tricksters and manipulators who aim at exploiting those who dare believe that dignity is something that can be realised through mutual care and solidarity. Dignity-through-money turns the world cold like a refrigerator, emptying it of all loving warmth.

In this situation, as I see it, societies that wish to be sustainable need to turn their attention to what Fiske describes as the most comprehensive model of collaboration, namely, communal sharing. Market pricing, the narrowest model of social interaction, can no longer be allowed to hollow out social and ecological resources. Many hail market pricing as a path to equal dignity in freedom, yet, it creates the very opposite the more it penetrates society. A culture of ranked honour — the opposite of equal dignity — is the end result when the accumulation of money represents easily quantifiable stepping stones to higher rank, while the quality of life attained through wisdom, knowledge, and the loving nurturing of relationships falls by the wayside. Defenders of what is called neo-liberalism contend that it aims at a goal that is shared by most people, namely, the liberation of the individual from bondage in a collective, and that this aim is achievable through putting contractual freedom in the place of inherited status. Unfortunately, this goal is missed when the result is just a new kind of bondage, namely, contractual bondage for ‘neo-serfs’.[[1607]](#endnote-1608) As it stands now, atomised individualism has replaced traditional community solidarity and has brought back inherited bondage by way of contractual bondage. In the United States, whole families are being bonded, bearing the burden that society as a whole ought to shoulder.[[1608]](#endnote-1609)

In the face of rising contractual bondage, increasingly, people acknowledge that the status-quo is unacceptable and that it has to be transcended. Many have a vague intuition that ‘something is wrong’, yet, with dismay I observe that too many of them then fall into the hands of conspiracy and indignation entrepreneurs who exploit this intuition. If we wish to create a decent world, a world, where individuals connect in solidarity and free of bondage, new arrangements need to be tested and implemented without indignation and in good faith. Equal dignity, I suggest, can only thrive in contexts where quality is protected from being overly quantified. Equal dignity can only emerge in contexts of communal sharing, in combination with authority ranking that nurtures — from parent to teacher to political leader. What political economist Karl Polanyi called the substantivist model of economy can serve as an inspiration for transcending the formalist model, I can attest to this from my personal experience.[[1609]](#endnote-1610)

The task at hand for humanity is to exit from the grip of exploitative systems, it is to define dignity and wealth as mutual solidarity and care, care for each other as responsible members of a global human family, and care for our planet in connectedness and compassion — we need to go from a hyper-market of competition to a hyper-fellowship of solidarity.[[1610]](#endnote-1611) Direct solidarity waits to be nurtured and prioritised wherever possible, while money-based contracts need to be de-emphasised. This is my conclusion after several decades of experience on all continents.

Everyone’s contribution is needed now, this is not a task reserved to politicians or exclusive think tanks. Societies who want to give communal sharing pre-eminence need ‘better parenting’ at all levels, starting with young people. Young people living in today’s industrialised world face harsher social and economic conditions than their parents. Recent historical changes in parent-child relationships have caused significant youth conduct problems.[[1611]](#endnote-1612) A meta-analysis of birth cohort differences from 1989 to 2016, for instance, shows that ‘self-oriented perfectionism, socially prescribed perfectionism, and other-oriented perfectionism have increased over the last 27 years’:

We speculate that this may be because, generally, American, Canadian, and British cultures have become more individualistic, materialistic, and socially antagonistic over this period, with young people now facing more competitive environments, more unrealistic expectations, and more anxious and controlling parents than generations before.[[1612]](#endnote-1613)

Researchers see youth conduct problems unfold in tandem with the overall historical changes that began in the late 1970s in the United States, Canada, and the United Kingdom, when laissez-faire governance and the advancement of market-based competition and reward began to replace earlier interventionist governance that focussed on social equity.[[1613]](#endnote-1614) In the new context, the behaviour of social and civic institutions puts a heavy burden on young people, the burden ‘to strive against one another under the auspices of meritocracy and under the watchful eye of increasingly demanding parents’.[[1614]](#endnote-1615)

In this situation, research is helpful that shows that the challenges of life are best approached with a task-oriented learning-mastery orientation rather than with an ego-oriented performance orientation, and that a personal growth mindset is superior to a fixed mindset.[[1615]](#endnote-1616) As the trend towards market-based competition incentivises the least advantageous orientation, clearly, this will need to be reversed, and this in a joint effort by all societal forces, from parents to teachers to society at large.

To use health challenges as a metaphor, the coronavirus pandemic could be compared with a hangover after a party with too much alcohol consumption, as a warning that alcohol is harmful to health. Humanity needs such a warning so it can correct its behaviour. In case the virus were to mutate more, it could become much more serious than a mere hangover, more like lung cancer after too much smoking. The right to the pursuit of happiness, we may conclude, has been misunderstood by many as a right to drug intoxication without consequences.

Many revolutions, movements, and trends began with a sense of enthusiasm and promise, only to end in disappointment. The ‘party’ currently thrown with great enthusiasm by believers in economism wherever social and ecological resources are still available to be exploited, is part of a large-scale mission creep that echoes and out-paces all past ones. If not turned around in the last minute, it will be the first mission failure that is destructive at a global scale and it may also be the last one.

### From mission creep even to mission loss

Composer Ludwig van Beethoven dedicated his Eroica to Napoléon Bonaparte, as he admired him as a shining hero of the French Revolution’s ideal of égalité. When Napoléon made himself emperor, Beethoven took the scissors and cut the dedication out from the score.[[1616]](#endnote-1617)

Historical examples for mission losses abound. Iran’s uprising in 1979 against a brutal and authoritarian rulership was originally set off by secular Iranians, by students who thought that Ayatollah Khomeini was only a figurehead and that secular groups would get into power after the revolution.[[1617]](#endnote-1618) In the same year, 1979, Nicaragua’s Daniel Ortega brought down a dictator, only to come to resemble him later.[[1618]](#endnote-1619) After Egypt’s 2011 dignity revolution has ended, many have put hope on hold.[[1619]](#endnote-1620) In short, we have seen many false dawns.[[1620]](#endnote-1621)

Vladimir Ilyich Lenin ended a promising February Revolution and turned it into an authoritarian October Revolution, only to give it over to Joseph Stalin, an even more ruthless despot. The mission loss of the Russian revolution affected also the West, and it did so in ways that drive the West’s own mission losses until today. Influential author Ayn Rand appears to have learned the wrong lessons from the Russian revolution, lessons she imported to America, where they eventually brought the entire Western economic system almost to its knees (see more in chapter 7). Alan Greenspan, chairperson of the Federal Reserve Board of the United States from 1987 to 2006, was one of many who were impressed by Ayn Rand. In 2008, when systemic financial failure hit full force, he had the stature to admit that the dogma was flawed and that the entire intellectual edifice had collapsed. He professed that he was ‘in a state of shocked disbelief’, and that he had been wrong in thinking that relying on banks to act on self-interest would be enough to protect shareholders and their equity.[[1621]](#endnote-1622) In short, he had transformed American economy and society into a kind of ‘euphoric dystopia’. By now, not only is trust in economism being shattered, the entire once-so-proud American democracy has lost trust. Under the Trump presidency, America saw a backlash in the form of an ‘authoritarian project to transform a democratic government into a set of institutions more like the fiefdoms of an empire, by first starving, suffocating, and destroying those institutions’.[[1622]](#endnote-1623)

What all these cases have in common is the enthusiasm and hope felt by idealists at first, until they were replaced by dominators, with the result that the initial mission was lost. By now we live in a world where dominators capture what is called modernity, and the same fate looms on the horizon that so many earlier emancipation efforts have suffered before, despite modernity’s great promise to emancipate and illuminate. The endgame may be open violence — it would not be the first time that pitchforks mark the end of a mission loss.[[1623]](#endnote-1624) Alternatively, a global surveillance state could emerge, as it is already in the making, accelerated by the coronavirus pandemic.[[1624]](#endnote-1625) Peace researcher Johan Galtung calls this cultural violence,[[1625]](#endnote-1626) and it is brought about by what I call the ‘art’ of humiliation.[[1626]](#endnote-1627)

All-out collapse is the most likely scenario if we, the human species, fail to learn wise humility, if we instead hold on to the hubris of competition for domination. Ruben Nelson of Foresight Canada offers a big history narrative that is similar to mine (see more in chapter 9) in that also he identifies the beginning of hubris with the settled local/regional agricultural cultures that emerged from small groups in nomadic cultures. From there hubris increased as history proceeded to regional agriculture-based empires such as China, Egypt, and the Incas, all with deep arrogance built into them. The final culmination is our current Modern/Industrial form of civilisation. With this civilisation, Nelson warns, we are now heading straight for the Seneca cliff,[[1627]](#endnote-1628) the kind of rapid collapse that was already described by Roman philosopher and writer Seneca in 65 CE when he said that ‘increases are of sluggish growth, but the way to ruin is rapid’.[[1628]](#endnote-1629)

Sociologist Zygmunt Bauman, as well, held a dark view of what we call Modernity, he deemed it to be genocidal at its core rather than to be a force for liberation and illumination. He saw the climax of Modernity not in emancipation or enlightenment but in the Holocaust.[[1629]](#endnote-1630)

In the view of Luciano Floridi, philosopher of digital ethics, we have entered what he calls the era of hyperhistory. His conceptualisation of history starts with the invention of writing in the fourth millennium BCE, with information and communication technologies becoming mature in the centuries between Guttenberg and Turing. By now, human societies are dependent on information and communication technologies to the extent that ‘we can no longer unplug our world from ICTs without turning it off’, ‘we are playing an environmental gambit with ICTs, and we have only a short time to win the game, for the future of our planet is at stake’.[[1630]](#endnote-1631)

I resonate with those who warn that if we continue to think of solutions inside the first Enlightenment context, namely, inside the STEMxM frame — the frame of Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics, and Money — then Modernity itself may be our demise.[[1631]](#endnote-1632) STEMxM will hinder us to recognise, cultivate, and act on the wisdom and humility of biophilia, the felt connection to life.[[1632]](#endnote-1633)

Present day’s large-scale mission creeps and mission losses have many micro-aspects. The notion of ‘work’ is one example, and, as far as I can see, among the least understood. This notion needs serious attention if we want to transition to a more dignified economy. In former times, enslaved people were beaten to work,[[1633]](#endnote-1634) then, slavery was abolished and ‘slaves’ became ‘workers’. It became a virtue to ‘self-mutilate’ one’s talents to fit into ‘wage slavery’ so as to ‘earn’ one’s livelihood, always fearing ‘no job, no food’. Over time, in some Western countries, labour movements fought for improved conditions and workers could go to well-deserved retirement in old age. What remained was fear of humiliation — whenever a job had become the path to earn the respect of society, losing the job meant losing respect. In recent decades, however, labour movement achievements have been rolled back for the majority of workers, some workers literally work themselves to death now,[[1634]](#endnote-1635) and the increase of precarious employment has made the path to respect through work stonier.[[1635]](#endnote-1636) If meaningfulness ‘has since chattel slavery and factory servitude disappeared from many people’s work, then it is only as a result of vocations transforming into jobs — the declension of life’s purpose into drudgery, the replacement of realising one’s potential into the slave-like consignation to ... “bare life”.’[[1636]](#endnote-1637)

This is the verdict of economist Kamran Mofid in 2018: We have to restructure everything, from ‘work’ to ‘education’[[1637]](#endnote-1638) — ‘values-less education for profit is the passport to slavery’,[[1638]](#endnote-1639) and miseducation produces nothing but ‘excellent sheep’.[[1639]](#endnote-1640)

Looking back in historical time, journalist Jonathan Cook concludes that each historical period’s elite has ‘produced justifications to placate the masses who were being exploited’, to manipulate them into believing that ‘the system existed as part of a natural order or even for their benefit’ — ‘the aristocracy relied on a divine right of kings, the capitalist class on the guiding hand of the free market and bogus claims of equality of opportunity’.[[1640]](#endnote-1641)

Indeed, and I observe this all around the globe, the Zeitgeist has been ‘captured’ to a degree that most people I meet regard employers and investors as unequivocally ‘good’ people who need to be ‘attracted’ because they ‘create’ and ‘offer’ opportunities through jobs.[[1641]](#endnote-1642) Philosopher Howard Richards warns, ‘The proposition that more investor-friendly reforms will serve the common good is treated as a given needing no proof; as if it were a joke that had already been told; as if those who did not understand the joke and did not know when to laugh, or did not know whether to laugh or cry, were not so much mistaken as left out of the conversation, deprived of voice’.[[1642]](#endnote-1643) All this happens, while modern economy is a recent invention.[[1643]](#endnote-1644) As Richards informs, ‘the historical conditions of the possibility of unemployment did not exist until Africa was conquered by Europeans’.[[1644]](#endnote-1645)

In the mid-nineteenth-century, economist Henry George noted that ‘the deepest poverty, the hardest struggle for existence’ can be found not in pre-capitalist states, but ‘wherever material progress is most advanced ... where population is densest, wealth greatest, and production and exchange most highly developed’.[[1645]](#endnote-1646) Already during the enclosure movements in Europe and the colonisation of the Global South, ‘a process of dispossession ... bulldozed people into the capitalist labour system’.[[1646]](#endnote-1647) Scholar Silvia Federici speaks of ‘enclosure’ as the process whereby not just property and land became divided and contained for profit, also our bodies, our time, our modes of education, our health, our relationships, our attention, and our minds.[[1647]](#endnote-1648)

Particularly after the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989, ‘the world embarked on an orgy of private over public... The tide was so strong that it was called pensée unique’, the ‘one single thought’ around, observes economist and veteran political commentator Roberto Savio.[[1648]](#endnote-1649) ‘The thirty years between the fall of the Berlin Wall and the financial crisis left a culture of competition, individualism and loss of values — a culture of greed. And the ten years between that crisis and our incoming decade saw the rise of a culture of fear’.[[1649]](#endnote-1650) By now, inequality has reached such absurd levels, locally and globally[[1650]](#endnote-1651) that a new precariat has emerged, a term coined by economist Guy Standing, basically meaning life in fear.[[1651]](#endnote-1652) In short, first came greed, then came fear.

All around the world also I observe since many years what Roberto Savio describes, namely, the rise of fear, fear that is felt deep in the gut, not just fear incited by fear entrepreneurs for ulterior motives. Even though I still meet many people who hail ‘self-mutilation into wage slavery’ as a virtue, especially older generations, younger people often see the futility of this path. I am dismayed, however, when they overlook the need for systemic change and instead channel their fear into the supposedly thrilling adventure of self-sacrificing entrepreneurship.[[1652]](#endnote-1653) My ‘cool’ missionary techno-friends are proud of their ‘resilience’ and how ‘modern’ and ‘streetwise’ they are, and I try to explain to them that the most dedicated entrepreneurship risks ending in self-exploitation and self-humiliation when it happens within a system that is skewed.[[1653]](#endnote-1654) Manipulating people into what I call ‘proud self-humiliation’ — telling a slave to be resilient and see this as a source of pride — does not undo slavery.

The contemporary culture of market pricing is a ‘systemic skewing device’, it has brought back levels of inequality that formerly were reserved for feudal societies, and I encounter the detrimental and fear-inducing outfalls on all continents. While the argument is still around that inequality is a useful way to motivate people to earn their dignity through honest hard work, and that wealth and well-being will trickle down from above, what trickles down instead is callousness, amplified by self-appointed would-be saviours on un-social media platforms or political arenas. ‘Employees need to be humiliated, otherwise they do not work! Humiliation is an important tool in the workplace! It teaches people the right work ethics! Don’t take this tool away from us!’ I was reprimanded in this way by a celebrated Indian economy professor in the United States and by a renowned Chinese organisational consultant.[[1654]](#endnote-1655) While these economists still see humiliation as a useful tool to achieve higher efficiency in a market economy, adherents of the traditional order of honour are still around, too, those who make no secret that they regard the overt application of humiliation as pro-social per se — the Taliban may serve as an example.

I myself could be called a dignity entrepreneur. I find it to be true that a ‘slavish’ mind cannot contribute to society with the creativity needed. My warning is that humanity can no longer afford producing slavish minds who follow ‘fake’ saviours and are proud of their resilience in a context that needs change.

### What is academia’s responsibility?

Academia carries a particular responsibility to protect society from destructive mission creeps and I am among those who fear that academia is increasingly failing this responsibility. Former economy professor and founder of the Globalisation for the Common Good Initiative, Kamran Mofid, finds candid words:

The neo-liberal charlatans made the students customers, universities the service providers and the vice-chancellors the Deans and Heads of Departments of a better understanding of greed and ‘thieving’. And all along silly me was thinking that teaching was a vocation for the common good.[[1655]](#endnote-1656)

Throughout the past years, higher education has increasingly prioritised its training functions and certification processes, while neglecting its most important raison d’être, namely, its critical thinking function, ‘the liberation of the human mind to think about the needs of society and engage the capacities of the individual to address those needs’.[[1656]](#endnote-1657) Recently, the coronavirus pandemic has exacerbated the problems that flow from the capture of education by the market mindset.[[1657]](#endnote-1658)

Since many years, I observe academic institutions failing their duties all around the world. I see this trend intensifying on all continents, I see it undermining academia’s relevance for ‘real life’ — life outside of the market mindset — thus also undermining the very scientificity of science.[[1658]](#endnote-1659) Since its inception, the field of psychology is particularly vulnerable to these influences as it is a relatively young discipline that still strives for respect in the scientific community. As a result, many of its researchers were tempted to demonstrate scientific ‘hardness’ through ‘pseudo-hard’ quantification just for the sake of quantification (see more in chapters 2 and 3).[[1659]](#endnote-1660)

When I wrote my book on honour and terror, I understood that this trend has affected terrorism research in particular. Funding agencies were biased in favour of philosophically indefensible quantitative methodologies, while what they hoped to achieve was bound to fail, namely, that social sciences should provide them with ‘hard’ explanatory models fashioned on the positivistic interpretations of the natural sciences.[[1660]](#endnote-1661) The currently unfolding coronavirus pandemic, as well, exposes the weaknesses of overreliance on quantification, as it brings potentially destructive social-psychological dynamics to the fore — from hazardous scapegoating to dangerous conspiracy narratives[[1661]](#endnote-1662) — that require not just sound quantitative but also prudent qualitative psychological analysis.

In my 2009 book on emotion and conflict, and in my 2010 book on gender and humiliation, I discuss the reasons for why the role of emotions has been understudied for so long, why it was regarded as too ‘soft’ a topic for ‘hard’ science, even though its consequences can create the hardest of facts — from hostile polarisation to terrorism to genocide to war.[[1662]](#endnote-1663) It is telling that emotions become more visible in present-day’s research, as ‘hard’ technology, the neuroimaging technique of functional MRI, can now study the brain areas that are involved in emotions the ‘hard’ way.

When we look for the roots of this yearning for ‘hardness’, philosopher Ágnes Heller explains that ‘masculinist models of consciousness objectify world order, obfuscating how fluid and continuously malleable it in reality is’.[[1663]](#endnote-1664) Masculinist models of consciousness, in turn, have their roots in big history (I explain more in chapters 2 and 9). The security dilemma ‘hardened the shell’, as psychologist Kenneth Gergen would formulate it, and it tasked men to be the shell’s guardians, thus giving priority to everything that speaks to ‘male’ rationality, while whatever is ‘soft’ smacks of ‘female’ irrationality.[[1664]](#endnote-1665)

Scientist and novelist C. P. Snow may have had a point in 1959, when he said that it was a mistake to split the intellectual life of Western society into the sciences and the humanities.[[1665]](#endnote-1666) This split may have served governmentality, as Michel Foucault called it, the systemic manipulation of populations.[[1666]](#endnote-1667) Philosopher Jürgen Habermas speaks of scientism as ‘science’s belief in itself, or the conviction that we can no longer understand science as one form of possible knowledge, but rather must identify knowledge with science’.[[1667]](#endnote-1668)

Social psychologist Michael Billig wrote a book titled Learn to write badly: How to succeed in the social sciences, where he laments the current trend towards mediocre technocratic thinking and writing in academia, all driven by an increasing push towards competition, a push that forces scholars to build self-importance, even if only achievable through overly technical terminology.[[1668]](#endnote-1669) Kenneth Gergen chimes in, warning that ‘academic discourse typically fails to be intelligible or commanding to anyone who is not a member of the academic guild. As often said, it is “elitist” in character’.[[1669]](#endnote-1670) As the pressure to publish keeps researchers from doing out-of-the-box science,[[1670]](#endnote-1671) Gergen encourages them to dare explore their potential of multi-being and even expand their forms of expression to poetry, music, dance, theatre, multi-media, and more.[[1671]](#endnote-1672)

I deeply resonate with Billig and Gergen and get wary when I see ever-new jargon being invented, new nouns being created that code the illusion that a new fact has been discovered. Such practices may justify the right of existence of a researcher and attract funding agencies who might want to pay for research on this allegedly new fact, while the fact in question may be old and enough language may already exist to describe it. ‘The greatest enemy of intellectual curiosity isn’t boredom, but needless complexity’.[[1672]](#endnote-1673)

In my work, I do my best to refrain from needless complexity and redundant neologisms, even though I remain an advocate of linguistic freedom and creative linguistics. I admire coinages that distil important insights down to their essence, for instance, the notion of cogitocide as a catalyst for ecocide and sociocide. The concept of cogitocide was suggested in 2020 by the former head of the Club of Rome, El Hassan bin Talal, important thinker with a global outreach and member of the Jordanian royal family (see more in chapter 7).[[1673]](#endnote-1674) When I create new words, I do so with utmost caution — egalisation and dignism, for instance, are two of my creations.

The present ‘captor’ of society, of which also academia is a victim, appears to be a nexus of corporate and national interests. All around the world, I observe how quantifiable ‘hardness’ is being pushed by this nexus, sometimes cloaked in the language of honour and status, but increasingly in the language of dignity defined as modernisation and efficiency.

What is sold out, literally, is academic freedom and integrity, what is being sacrificed are invaluable academic traditions, as there is, for instance, the tradition of valuing uncertainties and questions as much as answers, and the tradition of transparent cooperation and free sharing of information for the sake of jointly gaining new insights. The result is a kind of ‘academentia’,[[1674]](#endnote-1675) with tremendous amounts of energy being invested into competing for funding and scrambling for the best path to monetisation.[[1675]](#endnote-1676) ‘The current system of research funding and publication not only fails to safeguard us from blunders but actively encourages bad science — with sometimes deadly consequences’.[[1676]](#endnote-1677) Male-exclusive networks prevail in science, revealing that academia, like the corporate sector, still follows the age-old practice of soldiers who cooperate within their own battalion so as to better outcompete the ‘enemy’.[[1677]](#endnote-1678) Conspiracy entrepreneurs profit from this predicament, they can surf on the widespread intuition that ‘scientists cannot be trusted’ and that ‘we, the people, are not told the truth’, and then they promise ‘rescue’ through maligning science wholesale.

The trend of hollowing out quality for the sake of quantity in the academic world hinges on the fact that also scientists, as most others, depend on their ‘job’ for financial stability. Not just in society as a whole, also in academia there is a trend towards precariatisation, as ‘those who stand up are tossed out of the system, today more than ever before, few get tenure, everyone is an adjunct’, observes Linda Hartling.[[1678]](#endnote-1679) As this trend increases, I observe that my strategy of remaining independent of large sponsors through operating on a minimum budget proves to be of ever greater value.

I know many academics who uphold academic ideals against all odds, yet, I know also others who are complicit in keeping society in what I call a state of self-humiliation, or, to use another name, a collective Stockholm syndrome.[[1679]](#endnote-1680) This syndrome was first conceptualised after robbers held a group of hostages in a Stockholm bank, and it describes the identification with the oppressor as ‘an emotional bond between hostages and their captors, frequently observed when the hostages are held for long periods of time under emotionally straining circumstances’.[[1680]](#endnote-1681)

Many academics, for the sake of securing a career, fail to appreciate the immense responsibility they carry. I try to remind my academic friends to take this responsibility seriously, to be mindful of how academic legitimacy has been used and abused by political power holders throughout history. Cambodia’s Pol Pot, for instance, studied with Nicos Poulantzas (1936–1979), a Greco-French political sociologist in Paris, before he turned Poulantzas’ academic reflections into deadly ideology in his homeland, bringing immense suffering upon his fellow citizens. As Poulantzas began to realise the horror he had set in motion, he committed suicide.[[1681]](#endnote-1682) Hitler’s philosophers is the title of a book that dissects which philosophers have intentionally supported fascism.[[1682]](#endnote-1683) ‘Murderous professors’ promoted the Rwandan genocide in 1994.[[1683]](#endnote-1684) The documentary Inside job exposes the degree to which academic influence contributed to preparing the ground for what later turned into the economic crisis of 2007–2009.[[1684]](#endnote-1685) States, international financial institutions, and NGOs now engage in what is called ‘new managerialism’, and ‘all of these share a lack of humility, a keynote of the development power/knowledge complex’.[[1685]](#endnote-1686)

I often meet corporate entrepreneurs who look down on academics with the words, ‘Academics are cowards and clever rationalisers, they present cowardice as a virtue necessary for “objective detachment”.’ I must admit that I sometimes feel compelled to agree with such harsh judgements, even though I am an academic myself. While humility is a virtue that is indispensable for true integrity — not just for scientific integrity — I fear that humility turns into an ethical violation when it translates into cowardice in the face of abusive power, when it represents ‘cowardly compliance’.

On my part, I try to do my utmost to use academia’s potential to influence society in responsible ways, I wish to promote dignity for all, dignity defined as authenticity, integrity, and responsibility. I cherish the Humboldtian model of higher education — it signifies comprehensive Bildung rather than mere Ausbildung or training — and it is therefore that I developed the ideas for a World Dignity University.[[1686]](#endnote-1687) I also follow Michael Billig and his warnings that technical terminology is often less precise than ‘simpler’ language. It is also less scientific and less relevant for life outside of the laboratory when the belief remains unquestioned that reality consists of variables waiting to be measured in experiments or surveys. I think of Billig’s warnings often when I say that ‘the world is my university’. In this spirit I use the word humiliation even though at first glance it seems rather ‘unacademic’, and even though academic publishers have initially balked at it. I follow Upendra Baxi, professor of law from India, in his defense of Dalit humiliation studies and his call to resist the ‘castration’ of the very word ‘humiliation’.[[1687]](#endnote-1688)

Wherever I go on my global path, I look for pioneers and visionaries of Bildung. Joni Odochaw is one of them. His vision I deem to be even more farsighted than the famous outdoor experiential learning imagined by philosopher Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712–1778), the Erlebnispädagogik pioneered by Kurt Hahn (1886–1974),[[1688]](#endnote-1689) the presently unfolding Social and Emotional Learning trend, or concepts such as ‘inter-generational learning spaces’, ‘schools without classroom’, and forest kindergartens.[[1689]](#endnote-1690)

Joni Odochaw is a wisdom teacher in the field of natural resources and environmental management in the Karen village of Ban Nong Thao in Northern Thailand. I was introduced to him by Chayan Vaddhanaphuti, founding director of the Regional Center for Social Science and Sustainable Development at Chiang Mai University, who hosted our 2014 Dignity Conference.[[1690]](#endnote-1691) Together with three colleagues, I had the privilege of living in Joni Odochaw’s village for a few days after our conference and recording his insights on video.[[1691]](#endnote-1692)

Join Odochaw and his son and nephew explained to us the dilemmas brought to their villages by education, television, and the digital world, and detailed how destructive these influences are for sustainable ways of living. Odochaw and his colleagues laid out their ideas of how to turn these dilemmas into opportunities, and they called their concept ‘Lazy School’. They showed us how community learning traditionally used to function in a Karen village — everyone had the skills to be both student and teacher for village life, everyone knew how to care for buffaloes, everyone knew where to plant which plants to protect the village from fire, and so forth — it was an inter-generational co-learning environment.

Sadly, Odochaw reported, all this is interrupted now. As soon as children are obliged to spend their days in schools where they learn to sit still on chairs or march to military tunes in the courtyard, they are lost for village life when they leave school at the age of twelve — instead, they are forced to join the flood of poor young people into the cities, hoping in vain for well paid jobs and a ‘better life’. The outcome is that Joni Odochaw has to use much of his time now in communal meetings addressing the rise of drug addiction and domestic violence in society.[[1692]](#endnote-1693)

During our visit, we met the first student of the Lazy School, a young man from the United States, Peter Dering, and he gave the following advice to us and the world, ‘Our vision for the future must be to expand community learning to include modern knowledge through technology, rather than lose community learning!’[[1693]](#endnote-1694) The vision of this Karen community is to install computer technology in all the village homes and integrate the window to the world that this technology offers into traditional community learning, in this way no longer removing the children from the village.

In short, the solution they suggest is to bring learning to the children in their communities, rather than to cut their children off from their communities by bringing them to learning. Luckily, I had the privilege of spending my first six years in an intact rural community, and I can say from own experience, ‘Bring learning to lived community life, do not cut life into pieces for the sake of learning’.

Survival International is a human rights organisation formed in 1969 that campaigns for the rights of Indigenous, tribal, and uncontacted peoples. They echo Joni Odochaw’s views when they write:

This contempt for indigenous knowledge and culture ends up destroying tribal peoples and their unique cultures and knowledge. At home, tribal children learn complex and sophisticated skills and knowledge which allow them to live well on their land and nurture it for the future. Tribal peoples are the best conservationists and guardians of the natural world. Thousands of years of collective wisdom, understanding, and insight can be lost within one generation when children are not learning in their communities and languages.[[1694]](#endnote-1695)

The loss of Indigenous knowledge is a loss for all humanity in times when humankind’s re-grounding in the Earth system is a pressing need. As anthropologist Marshall Sahlins pointed out, ‘individualism, self-interest, linear progress, centrality and superiority of human beings, positivism (the need for an experiment to know anything), and belief in an insensate natural world are all considered strange by human societies around the world’.[[1695]](#endnote-1696) Indeed, the loss of community learning in ‘humanity’s evolved nest’ is perhaps the most significant loss.[[1696]](#endnote-1697) ‘Humanity’s future depends on re-embracing the Indigenous worldview, its grounding in connectedness and its foundational love for all diversity’.[[1697]](#endnote-1698) The ways the next generation is educated await radical transformation everywhere.[[1698]](#endnote-1699) We need many more ‘schools without classes’.[[1699]](#endnote-1700)

While mainstream education still aims at optimising Ausbildung rather than Bildung, affective neuroscience is now capable of affirming old insights, among them the insight that emotions are indispensable for learning.[[1700]](#endnote-1701) As a consequence, SEL, Social and Emotional Learning is now becoming a buzzword.[[1701]](#endnote-1702) Experts warn, however, that this may happen for the wrong reasons, they warn that the necessary consequences fail to be drawn from these findings, and if this is not rectified, Alexa-type surveillance will soon drive the ‘SEL fad’.[[1702]](#endnote-1703)

In this situation, I wish to highlight two insights. First, precisely due to the role of emotions in learning, real-life communities offer the deepest learning, much deeper than what spaces that are artificially created, such a schools or Kindergartens, can provide. Whatever a child learns in a community is so deeply ingrained that it is very difficult to ‘unlearn’ again later. Psychologist Kenneth Gergen speaks of a student’s relationships as ‘multiple circles of participation’, comprising mother, father, siblings, friends, and so on, where each of these circles is educational.[[1703]](#endnote-1704) Each circle can increase a student’s capacities, sensitivities, and skills for relating, each can generate opportunities (or limitations), each can teach their own ways of ‘doing knowledge’.

Second, learning can also be harmful and unethical. Students can be indoctrinated into ignorance, indifference, or even violent sectarianism, rather than being guided into enlightened empathy in the spirit of unity in diversity. In other words, SEL is not enough, SEE Learning is needed, Social, Emotional, and Ethical Learning.[[1704]](#endnote-1705)

Taken both insights together, in times of global challenges, it falls on the shoulders of the entire global village as a community to offer an ethical learning environment to all of its children — after all, ‘it takes a village to raise a child’. We need the entire global village to become Joni Odochaw’s Lazy School community. This is why I sacrifice the privileged life that I could lead in the Global North for the difficult path of global living, of taking the entire global village as my university and my global life as my methodology, why I give everything I have to build a global dignity community. ‘Theory yields practical implications, and practice yields theoretical implications’.[[1705]](#endnote-1706)

In 2019, we had our annual Dignity Conference in the Amazon in Brazil, and this happened at a moment when the Rainforest had just been set on fire on a massive scale. In the spirit of Joni Odochaw and SEE Learning, we proposed that the entire Amazon ought to be declared as part of our World Dignity University initiative.[[1706]](#endnote-1707) The knowledge held in the Amazon is a form of wealth that so-called developed countries have lost. Why not declare the Rainforest the world’s most important ‘analogue university’? Why not invite the students of the world to flock to it? Why not invite all rainforest dwellers to become world dignity professors who still have the skills to live sustainably within a complex system such as the Rainforest? This is the idea behind the World Dignity University initiative since we launched it in 2011.[[1707]](#endnote-1708)

‘Lazy’ solutions will soon be highly sought after in all spheres of life, as ‘recent trends towards globalisation and urbanisation will reach natural limits and be reversed’.[[1708]](#endnote-1709) The ‘inflection point may not be far in the future’, predicts environmentalist Richard Heinberg, as ‘factors potentially leading to a loss of connectivity are growing in number’.[[1709]](#endnote-1710) They ‘include environmental degradation (climate change, biodiversity loss, widespread plastics and petrochemical pollution), resource depletion (topsoil, fresh water, minerals), and over-reliance on debt to maintain economic growth’.[[1710]](#endnote-1711)

The coronavirus pandemic that began in December 2019 is only a beginning, next may be a global hunger pandemic, as we already see a ‘rapid emergence of pathogens in agro-ecosystems’ affecting our industrial agricultural monocultures that are infeasible in the long term even without the additional challenge of climate change.[[1711]](#endnote-1712)

Can the anthropause the coronavirus pandemic provides to us just now open the space needed for new thinking?[[1712]](#endnote-1713) ‘Lazy’ solutions will be required in the future not just in the realm of education. All other spheres of life wait to become ‘schools’ that dignify. Altogether, ‘our relationships between place, nature, and each other’ await re-constructing.[[1713]](#endnote-1714)

Just like we have to bring learning into living communities and stop dividing communities into artificial learning spaces, the living architecture approach, for instance, asks us to invite natural cycles into housing instead of keeping nature out. The biophilic cities approach aims to connect cities and nature, seeing nature as ‘an element of a meaningful urban life, as well as the ethical responsibility that cities have to conserve global nature as shared habitat for non-human life and people’.[[1714]](#endnote-1715)

In conclusion, we need to let nature be our teacher, our guiding master, our professor, our school, our university, rather than the other way round.

### How can we regain dignity in education and research?

During the many decades of global living, I have learned to resonate with sociologist S. Mike Miller’s warning to be extremely careful with the practice of debate and argument. More often than not, this practice creates the very problems it aims at solving, or at least it aggravates them. Debate closes the focus, it risks neglecting the broader context, and it polarises. It invites mutual negation as it pits one side against another, because the moment a person has committed to a given side, participants transmute into combatants, relationships are threatened, and the ‘opposition’ will be targeted with a gamut of devaluation biases. Seldom will one side congratulate the other on making a worthwhile point.

To ‘do knowledge’ successfully together, Kenneth Gergen suggests four ‘foci of attention’ for educators. His first advice is to include all students and to disallow that only a few dominate conversations. Second, to allow student concerns to determine topics, rather than offering ‘canned lectures’ and lock-step power-point presentations. Third, to credit the students’ capacity to understand, rather than to focus on correcting them. Fourth, Gergen encourages teachers ‘to risk their status as ultimate knowers’ by ‘replacing the goal of Truth with that of expanding the range of intelligible realities’[[1715]](#endnote-1716) — or, as Mike Miller would say, ‘looking for who has a good idea and building on that idea’.[[1716]](#endnote-1717) Gergen promises that, as soon as teachers dare to ‘thrust themselves into the collective process’, the results will be ‘more intense engagement, flourishing of ideas and insights, affirming of supportive relationships, and a reduction in alienation and resistance’.[[1717]](#endnote-1718) Ultimately, this will prepare students for ‘democratic participation, it will enable them to master multiple points of view and invite a deeper probing of moral issues’.[[1718]](#endnote-1719)

In our Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies network, we do precisely that, we strive to invite everyone into mutually enriching co-reflection rather than offering rigid statements of alleged truths for others to either conform or oppose. We do everything in our power to inscribe our work into a culture of deliberative discourse, in Aristotle’s terminology, rather than a culture of debate.[[1719]](#endnote-1720) We seek constructive controversy, and our many years of experience have shown that this is more beneficial than confrontation. When Aristotle spoke of deliberative discourse, he thought of jointly conversing about the advantages and disadvantages of proposed actions with the aim to synthesise novel solutions embedded in creative problem solving.[[1720]](#endnote-1721) Philosopher Jürgen Habermas calls this public deliberation.[[1721]](#endnote-1722)

When I look back, I came across similar voices already early in my life. As a child, my father made me aware of the Buberian I-Thou orientation.[[1722]](#endnote-1723) Then, as a young psychology student, I studied psychologist Carl Rogers’s client-centred therapy and student-centred learning that stipulates that one should not judge or teach other people but rather facilitate one another’s learning.[[1723]](#endnote-1724) The concept of dialogue by educator Paulo Freire was brought to me as well when I was a student, and I became more acquainted with it during my time in South America in 2012 and 2019.[[1724]](#endnote-1725) Finally, through Linda Hartling, I learned about researcher Mary Belenky who calls for ‘connected knowing’ rather than ‘separate knowing’.[[1725]](#endnote-1726) Connected knowing means that ‘one attempts to enter another person’s frame of reference to discover the premises for the person’s point of view’.[[1726]](#endnote-1727) Connected knowing can also be called ‘women’s ways of knowing’ in contrast to ‘masculinist objectification’.[[1727]](#endnote-1728)

Philosopher Ágnes Heller was quoted earlier with her observation that masculinist models of consciousness objectify world order, that they obfuscate how fluid and continuously malleable the world in reality is. With her theory of the consciousness of everyday life, Heller describes how masculinity reproduces itself at an ordinary everyday level through the interplay of individual consciousness and social structures.[[1728]](#endnote-1729) The very idea of categorising human beings into ‘races’, for instance, ‘must be rejected as racist and masculinist in its inception and its uses’, warns psychologist Ellyn Kaschak.[[1729]](#endnote-1730) Moral philosopher Elizabeth Minnich as well reminds that the prevailing systems of knowledge, morality, and politics are rooted in views that legitimatise injustice, patriarchy, and violence,[[1730]](#endnote-1731) which, in turn, leads to the perversion of entire systems, normalising damage to the point that it may appear banal, as it persists over time through the participation of large enough numbers of people.[[1731]](#endnote-1732) Political thinker Hannah Arendt comes to mind with her coinage of the phrase of the banality of evil for this kind of damage.[[1732]](#endnote-1733) In my terminology, this damage is ‘a war injury inflicted by the security dilemma’.

Minnich recommends ‘philosophical fieldwork’ — ‘thinking with others out and about in the agora and then reflecting in solitude with them in mind’, a way of thinking that is ‘neither deductive nor inductive, nor is it held within any other single logic. Rather, it is about listening and hearing, looking and seeing, taking in and trying to comprehend without rushing to interpret, to translate into familiar terms, to explain’.[[1733]](#endnote-1734)

On my global path over the past decades, I have met many scholars and practitioners with similar messages. We should grapple with issues — peace educator Janet Gerson spoke to me about grappling in 2011 when she brought me to the Zuccotti Park in New York where the Occupy Movement met.[[1734]](#endnote-1735) Gerson spoke warmly about capabilities and human flourishing, the terminology used by Martha Nussbaum and Amartya Sen.[[1735]](#endnote-1736) The concept of nudging can be helpful as well, at least as long as it simultaneously teaches how to resist paternalistic manipulation.[[1736]](#endnote-1737) I often reflected together with my mentor Morton Deutsch on strategies of persuasion and non-violent power.[[1737]](#endnote-1738)

Inga Bostad was the vice-rector of the University in Oslo when she created a video message for us in 2011, just after the 22/7 terror attacks in Norway, a message in which she urged everyone to listen and engage in dialogue, particularly with people one would otherwise disagree with.[[1738]](#endnote-1739) The lack of listening is the ‘new democratic deficit’, warns social scientist Andrew Dobson.[[1739]](#endnote-1740) S. Mike Miller recommends ‘let-it-flow thinking’ instead of ‘verdict thinking’.[[1740]](#endnote-1741) Anatol Rapaport,[[1741]](#endnote-1742) David Bohm,[[1742]](#endnote-1743) Otto Scharmer,[[1743]](#endnote-1744) Leonard Swidler,[[1744]](#endnote-1745) are all thinkers who highlight listening for the sake of listening rather than listening for the sake of responding. Linda Hartling’s mentor Jean Baker Miller, recommended ‘waging good conflict’.[[1745]](#endnote-1746) My friends in China tells me that I am a Zhi Yin 知音, a listener who understands not just the surface of a message but its deep meaning, a listener who engages in the kind of deep listening that reminds of Linda Hartling’s practice of ‘listening each other into voice’:

The expression ‘listening into voice’ draws our attention to the fact that human communication is a bi-directional experience. It is a phrase that encourages us to attune to the fundamental relational nature of speaking. It reminds us to look beyond the individualist myth that speaking is a one-way experience in which the speaker is solely responsible for communicating effectively. Speaking is interactive. It is a two-way experience in which both (or all) people participating in the relationship can choose to listen and engage in a way that will help others to effectively express and clarify their ideas.[[1746]](#endnote-1747)

Deep listening is a way to healing humiliation. The mental health care sector is a major arena for this healing, yet, the past decades’ ‘concept creep’ has also affected this arena. We hear, for instance, that ‘normal sadness, worry, and fear’ have become exaggerated so they can be labelled as mental disorders and be overmedicated.[[1747]](#endnote-1748) This has impacted even my own professional life — I could not bring myself to begin working in this field after I finished my studies due to this predicament. I resonate with all voices that say that the idea of neo-liberal individualism, ‘where free agents’ supposedly ‘navigate free markets in pursuit of happiness, success, and productivity’, leads the mental health profession astray, namely, into engaging in ‘person-blaming explanations’.[[1748]](#endnote-1749) The remedy I see is to ‘re-socialise a series of issues that have been medicalised’ and to stop believing that ‘only the individual is the site of therapeutic engagement’.[[1749]](#endnote-1750) I welcome alternatives to mainstream psychiatric diagnoses such as the Power Threat Meaning Framework developed by a group of psychologists as an innovative approach to regaining dignity for victims of power abuse in mental health institutions,[[1750]](#endnote-1751) aiming to help people ‘create more hopeful narratives or stories about their lives and the difficulties they have faced or are still facing’ instead of seeing themselves as ‘blameworthy, weak, deficient, or “mentally ill”.’[[1751]](#endnote-1752)

Allow me to close this section with a personal witness account of how regaining dignity through deep listening helped me in my own scientific inquiry. Already in the first years of my global living project — living in the most diverse cultural contexts — almost fifty years ago, I had to learn to listen and observe carefully, not least because my personal safety often depended on it. Without this training, my doctoral research at the Horn of Africa twenty years later would have been impossible. Not even humanitarian workers such as Red Cross and Red Crescent staff were safe from being kidnapped at that time — in April 1998, for instance, eight Red Cross and Red Crescent staff were kidnapped at the airport in Mogadishu, Somalia’s capital.[[1752]](#endnote-1753)

I came to Somaliland with plans to carry out semi-structured interviews, even though I knew from my previous experience that this was a near impossible task. When I arrived, the impossibility became ever clearer to me, and I had to totally revise my approach. I sat down and collected reflections for an article that I finally titled ‘How research can humiliate’, and in that article, I speak up for a ‘trust-based person-centred psychology’ rather than a ‘psycho-demography paradigm’ that overlooks the role of trust.[[1753]](#endnote-1754)

I would like to share some of these reflections here, all pertaining to deep listening, the status of science, and the role of humility, authenticity, trust, and academic responsibility. When a researcher in a Western university context enters a classroom and distributes a questionnaire, this implies a clear message that does not need to be spelled out because it is accepted as a given, ‘This study is carried out for the sake of science, please offer your knowledge as a free gift!’ All students in the room will have an idea of what ‘science’ means, they will know that science ideally is an endeavour for the benefit of all of humankind rather than something that serves only the individual scientist’s personal gains.

The situation is radically different when a researcher enters a war-torn context. The first thought on the mind of certain people may be, ‘Can we kidnap this Westerner? Will her university pay a ransom?’ Or, ‘How high will the remuneration be if we agree to an interview?’ Or, ‘Can we at least manipulate this researcher to serve our interests?’

Indeed, I have encountered all these situations, not just in the Horn of Africa. I am always extremely careful, I am not a gambler, as I said, my safety is important to me. Still, I found myself with a gun to my head in the Horn of Africa, or trapped in a remote corner of South America where I moved from place to place by bus — long is the list of incidents over the span of soon five decades of global living. The core lesson I learned over and over again was that loving humility and deep listening must come first, because in an unknown context, I may not even know that I have a problem, and even if I sense that something is wrong, I might not be able to discern the kind of problem I have, let alone the solution. Often my situation resembled that of an insect at night that is attracted to the light bulb unaware that this may be suicidal. Lovingly and humbly living with uncertainty, always being ready for deep listening and trust building, this is the only lifesaving practice.

Many questions arise as soon as a trust-based person-centred psychology is the aim. After all, what is a trust-based person-centred relationship? As soon as I began with my research on humiliation in Somalia, I was asked to support certain political causes with my message of humiliation. When I arrived in Somaliland, I was urged by Somalilanders to promote their dream of becoming an internationally recognised independent state. They explained to me that they had been humiliated by their Somali brothers and sisters from the south to the extent that they could no longer be part of a united Somalia. They insisted that the ‘cultural differences’ between them and their Somali brothers and sisters were too significant, despite the fact that they shared the same language, religion, ethnic background, cultural heritage, and history. Sheikh Ibrahim Sheikh Yussuf Sheikh Mader, the religious head of Somaliland who carried the title of King of Somaliland, gave me the privilege of an audience and asked me in the most dignified way to become an international ambassador for this plight.

A few months later, when I met Somalis from southern regions, they reproached me by calling out, ‘This north Somali talk about humiliation is just political manipulation, and they want to impress you, a naïve lady with human rights ideals and a soft heart! You know, these people from the north, they were humiliating others first, this they do not tell you! They behaved arrogantly and humiliated us!’

A few years later, a somewhat related reproach came from an American reviewer of an early draft of my book on humiliation and international conflict, as he felt that the Somali claim that the American presence in Somalia had a humiliating effect on Somalis was simply propaganda that I ought to have omitted from my book.[[1754]](#endnote-1755)

All the above enumerated incidents taught me much about the emotional depth of cycles of humiliation. In all these cases, my aim was to create dignified and dignifying outcomes without becoming part of the cycles of humiliation myself, and I think I succeeded.

Some cases, however, were more difficult to handle. Some people in Somaliland dedicate themselves to digging out graves from the genocidal onslaught their region suffered, and I was deeply moved when I met them. They invited me in into their homes, gave me a cup of tea that might have cost them more than they could afford, and this because they hoped that I had the capacity to bring them funds that would enable them to continue their documenting work. What about situations like this? Or, what about young people desperately wanting an education and hoping I would be able to provide them with stipends?

Allow me to share one experience in particular. I had the privilege of interviewing a man in his fifties, a brave, courageous, wise, and very tough man with a life experience that hardly any Western man or woman would survive. He was a former nomad who trained already as a small child to stay alive in the Somali semi-desert, one of the harshest environments of the world. I listened intensely when he recalled how he, as a six-year-old boy, learned to never really sleep, to always be alert to danger, to discern the traces of dangerous animals or enemy clans. Later, he left the desert, he studied in Russia and became a MIG airplane bombardier. Then, in the Ogaden war in 1978, he participated in the bombing of Ethiopia. After Russia abandoned Somalia and sided with Ethiopia — thus inflicting a humiliating defeat on Somalia — Somalia was supported by the United States. Now he went to the U.S.A. to study at a military academy. When his Isaaq clan was threatened with eradication by dictator Siad Barre and his government in Mogadishu in the 1980s, he joined the guerrilla forces and became a commander, responsible for the lives of many fellow freedom fighters. Finally, he became a minister in the government of Somaliland. At the end of our meeting, he said to me, ‘I spent my life in danger, war, and fighting. I saw so many of my friends die. If I could live again: No to all these wars!’

How could I dare call a conversation with such a man ‘data collection’ from an ‘informant’? How could I entertain theoretical reflections about using a structured or semi-structured interview? How could I ask this man pre-meditated questions from a ‘structured’ interview guideline? I felt humbled, even humiliated.

Somaliland is poor, people sell livestock and many get financial support from their diaspora family members who are dispersed in the whole world, in Norway, Canada, or the United States. In other words, this man lived in a poor country with few resources to provide a dignified life to him, or all the other brave fighters who had proudly put their lives on line against the dictator Siad Barre and ousted him.

Initially, I did not really know why I felt humiliated. Did I feel humiliated by my own belief in an inflated importance of ‘scientific’ method? I made a protocol of my feelings. Was it not ridiculous? Here I came from abroad to apply Western theory and ‘collect data’ on its basis, here I had the intention to make academic data out of the experiences of a warrior who knew more about life, death, strategy, responsibility, and a thousand other things, all under the most life-threatening conditions that no one living in the rich West would ever survive, given their ‘cute little theories’...

I concluded that my initial intuition was correct, namely, that it is not just a sound ethical choice to aim at building trust and avoid humiliating methodologies, it is also the only path to valid science, the only path to achieving a deeper understanding of the topic at hand, in this case the process and experiences of humiliation. I felt confirmed that humility is the central requirement, respectful humility in the face of people with experiences to which most researchers are novices. For this humility to manifest, I had to engage in authentic dialogue between equal fellow humans, rather than in inauthentic patronising role-play by a scientist. ‘Data’ elicited in return for monetary remuneration, or through clever manipulation, risk having little trustworthy validity, even if those data are reproducible and thus have reliability.[[1755]](#endnote-1756)

Humility and authenticity, so that mutual trust can emerge, this is the only method that can provide true validity in real world settings and that deserves the label ‘science’, this was my conclusion.[[1756]](#endnote-1757) Yet, and here came the next question, what does authenticity mean? Philosopher Charles Taylor has written about the ethics of authenticity.[[1757]](#endnote-1758) In my case, in the middle of a war-torn context, the only path to being authentic meant to disclose my own biography. I explained why I was in Africa and how the idea for my doctoral project had evolved. I revealed that I had been deeply affected by the aftermath of World Wars I and II in Europe. I told the story of my father who had lost one arm as a young adolescent when he was forced to become a soldier. I recounted how my father wanted to make friends with the people his country regarded as ‘enemies’, how he resisted being an oppressor of other people, and how he was punished for that. I explained how I had grown up in my father’s imagination of his lost homeland, how I had built my ‘virtual’ home in his memories of the farm he was to inherit but lost because his homeland was handed over to another country. I shared how my father had no Heimat anymore, no homeland, not even the hope to return to any home in the future. I explained that after the Second World War, my family had been forcibly displaced from Eastern to Western Europe and I described how this experience had almost destroyed my father, how he could hardly smile for many decades afterwards. I shared my experience of growing up in a family who always felt like a guest in their host environment, always foreign, certainly not belonging to the rich West — a surprise to many Somalis who believed that all Europeans are carefree and well moneyed. I disclosed that I knew what hunger was as a child. Then I told the story of my lifelong dignity mission and explained that I dedicate my entire life to ‘never again’, and that for this goal, I had been living and working in as many world regions and cultures as possible with the aim to acquire a deep gut feeling for how people in different cultural realms view life and death, love and hatred, peace and war, and whether our species is an anti-social or a pro-social animal.[[1758]](#endnote-1759) I explained that I live almost without possessions, with as little money as possible, to protect the integrity of my mission. I concluded by explaining how all this led up to my interest in researching dignity and humiliation and that I would like to invite everyone I meet to be my fellow co-researcher.

This account dramatically changed the relations I had in Africa. Prior to my opening up, I met polite faces, if they gave me their time at all, people told me what they thought I wanted to hear. Deep down they did not believe for a minute that I could understand even a tiny part of their reality. This was disclosed to me later.

After opening up, I learned many things. I learned how easily I might be perceived as one of those ‘duplicitous, overeducated, white supremacist, colonialist, paternalist sissies who pretend to care about the hopes of others’, but only as long as they are ‘pretty sure’ that they can keep their position, their property, their pension plan, and the rest of their ‘packages of privilege’.[[1759]](#endnote-1760) Critical African intellectuals introduced me to their opinion of Western visitors, and I summarise their views from several sources:

First, you colonise us. Then you leave us with a so-called democratic state that is alien to us. After that, you watch us getting dictatorial leaders. Then you give them weapons to kill half of us. Finally, you come along to ‘measure’ our suffering and claim that this will help us!? Are you crazy?

You Westerners get a kick out of our problems. You have everything back home, you live in luxury, and you are blind to that. You think you are suffering when you cannot take a shower or have to wait for the bus for more than two hours! Your four-wheel drive cars cover our people with dust! You enjoy being a king in our country, while you are just average at home! All you want is to have fun, get a good salary, write empty reports to your organisation back home or publish some articles, so you can continue this fraud. You are a hypocrite! You know that we need help. How glad we would be not to need it! It would be great if you would really listen to us once, not just to the greedy ones among us who exploit your arrogant stupidity for their own good! We feel deeply humiliated by your arrogant and self-congratulating help!

You helpers come along, build wells (or some other installations or services liable to be ecologically unsound or unmanageable in the longer run), you create a few short-term jobs for chauffeurs, secretaries, and security personnel, and then you disappear again!

Not only recipients of humanitarian help in Africa felt betrayed, indeed, as I found out, all sides felt abused, misled, and humiliated. Providers of humanitarian help, particularly those I met who authentically wanted to help, felt that their willingness to help was caught in power traps that left them helpless, depressed, disillusioned, and cynical.[[1760]](#endnote-1761)

What I saw and what I heard reconfirmed my lifelong desire to abstain from treating other people as ‘cases’, ‘objects’, ‘samples’, ‘patients’, ‘clients’, or ‘customers’. My sense of uncertainty with regard to ‘scientific requirements’ was put at rest, I was sure that I could not ‘study’ people like they were in a zoo, I could not write ‘about’ people. My scepticism with respect to ‘help’ and ‘development’ was affirmed, I wanted to be with my fellow human beings in the shared awareness that we are all on a joint explorative journey in a world that none of us can fully grasp.[[1761]](#endnote-1762) I remembered that already Socrates said that he deemed himself wise because ‘what I do not know I do not think I know’.[[1762]](#endnote-1763) At the end of my doctoral research period in Africa, I could finally complete my article ‘How research can humiliate’.[[1763]](#endnote-1764)

After having defended humility and authenticity as path to scientific inquiry and validity, let me conclude this section and this chapter with a letter from Michael Karlberg.[[1764]](#endnote-1765) He formulates better than I could that respect for human dignity arises from an emergent consciousness of the oneness of humanity, a consciousness of the essential unity and interdependence of humanity. The emergence of this consciousness depends on education in the broadest sense of the word — it depends on ‘the ways we are nurtured, socialised, encouraged, trained and empowered, within our families, our schools, our media environment, and the many other social institutions we participate in’.[[1765]](#endnote-1766) This is Karlberg’s letter:

I’ve worked in higher education for twenty years now. Universities have made important contributions to human progress yet they are in need of profound transformation at this critical juncture in history. Towards this end, I agree with Cristina that universities must create more space for holistic and integrative knowledge generation, must rethink the core learning outcomes of their graduates in light of the exigencies of this age, and must reorient research priorities in more socially and environmentally responsible ways.

The obstacles to change are, of course, many. In my experience, modern universities tend to be characterised by a culture of individualism and self-promotion, scarce-resource mentalities and interest-group competition, ideological conflicts and divisive politics. The net result is profound inertia and a relative inability to respond to the exigencies of the age. There are, of course, many outstanding individuals pursuing critically important and progressive work within every university. But this rarely translates to vision, focus, and transformative impact at the level of the university as a whole.

One of the reasons for this, as Herman Daly pointed out, is that the ‘higher’ in ‘higher education’ has no normative meaning today. Daly traces the origins of Euro-American higher education to Christian clerical traditions. The origins actually trace back even further to the height of Islamic civilisation and the emergence of the first universities in Cairo, Baghdad, Cordoba, and other centres of integrated religious, scientific, and philosophical learning that gave rise, in turn, to the European Renaissance and Enlightenment.

The anti-science stance of late medieval Christianity, combined with the subsequent wars of religion that decimated Europe, led, not surprisingly, to the gradual secularisation of higher education in much of the West. At the same time positivist philosophies of science constructed a false dichotomy between facts and values that contributed to the rise of normative relativism in the modern university and to the hegemony of physicalism across the natural and social sciences. This trend was reinforced by other factors such as the cultural relativism that emerged in response to the Euro-centrism of the early social/human sciences, as well as post-modern reactions across the arts and humanities to oppressive structures of modernist knowledge.

There are, of course, many other factors that contributed to the secularisation of higher education and the ascendancy of normative relativism within it. These trends represent important historical advancements in many respects. At the same time, this historical trajectory has left higher education with all but the most skeletal normative foundations. Intellectual freedom and intellectual honesty are the only normative principles most people can agree on. But these principles do not constitute a normative framework adequate to the exigencies of the age. On the contrary, when these minimalist principles operate within an institutional culture of individualism and self-promotion, scarce-resource mentalities and interest-group competition, ideological conflicts and divisive politics, they paralyse higher education in relation to the challenges of the twenty-first century.

Higher education cannot navigate its way through this impasse unless and until it begins to take seriously the need for systematic inquiry into the normative foundations of social reality. If we uncritically assume, as so many academics do today, that social reality has no normative foundations on an ontological level, or that human beings can never gain insights into them on an epistemological level, or that we can never learn to collectively apply foundational normative principles to the betterment of our condition, then there is no reason to take seriously the analysis Cristina offers in her essay. Indeed, there is little reason to care about distant others or unborn generations as long as privileged segments of society, including most academics alive today, can fend for themselves in the uncertain times ahead. Thus, within the normative vacuum of contemporary higher education, Cristina’s essay is easily dismissed as little more than an individual expression of subjective normative preferences that are hopelessly idealistic.

This is one of the reasons the ‘higher’ in ‘higher education’ has lost its meaning and universities struggle to find their role in the great transition. It would be wonderful if Cristina could comment on how we might move beyond the impasse of normative relativism in higher education so that arguments like hers might be taken more seriously by academic institutions.

Respectfully,

Michael Karlberg 13th May 2016.[[1766]](#endnote-1767)

Practicing the complex yes

When you disagree with a friend,

a stranger, or a foe, how do you

reply but not say simply No?

For No can stop the conversation

or turn it into argument or worse —

the conversation that must go on, as a river

must, a friendship, a troubled nation.

So may we practice the repertoire

of the complex yes:

Yes, and in what you say I see...

Yes, and at the same time...

Yes, and what if...?

Yes, I hear you, and how...?

Yes, and there’s an old story...

Yes, and as the old song goes...

Yes, and as a child told me once...

Yes. Yes, tell me more. I want to understand...

and then I want to tell you how it is for me...

― Oregon peace poet Kim Stafford[[1767]](#endnote-1768)

## Chapter 7: Beware of systemic humiliation — Cogitocide, sociocide, and ecocide

or the shredding of the social fabric and the plundering of the planet

Freedom for the wolves has often meant death to the sheep.

― Isaiah Berlin, (1909–1997), philosopher[[1768]](#endnote-1769)

A man with a conviction is a hard man to change. Tell him you disagree and he turns away. Show him facts or figures and he questions your sources. Appeal to logic and he fails to see your point ...

― Leon Festinger et al., social psychologist, When prophecy fails, 1956[[1769]](#endnote-1770)

When language and peace interact, Peace linguistics becomes a fact

When language and nature interact, Ecolinguistics becomes a fact

When Peace linguistically we represent, a linguopeaceful world do we present?

When Nature linguistically we represent, an ecolinguistic world do we present?

— Francisco Gomes de Matos, peace linguist, 2019[[1770]](#endnote-1771)
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### How we undermine our own basis of existence

‘Right now, we are facing a man-made disaster of global scale. Our greatest threat in thousands of years’. These were the words of natural historian Sir David Attenborough at the opening ceremony of United Nations-sponsored climate talks in Katowice, Poland, in 2018.[[1771]](#endnote-1772)

We live in times in which sociocide and ecocide are systemic. The suffix ‑cide means ‘killing’. Words such as genocide, suicide, or pesticide all end on ‑cide, stemming from Latin -cida and the verb caedo, caedes, caedere, caedi, caedum.

Ecocide is the killing of our ecosphere, of our ecological world,[[1772]](#endnote-1773) of which we only are a small part, despite our belief to be its masters.[[1773]](#endnote-1774) Sociocide is the killing of our sociosphere, of the cohesion in our human communities, local and global.[[1774]](#endnote-1775) Sociocide and ecocide together are the outcome of humiliation that has been congealed into systems, just as South Africa was in the grip of humiliation congealed into a system called apartheid. Present-day military-corporate-political systems that drive global races for arms and resources are the most recent expression.[[1775]](#endnote-1776) Sociocide and ecocide together, as they afflict an entire planet, drive systemic humiliation to hitherto unattained levels.

When I wrote these sentences in 2017, many readers of the first drafts of this book shook their heads and called my words hyperbole. This has changed in 2022 as I finalise the book. The cumulative facts that lead to ecocide and sociocide are much more widely known in 2022 than in 2017, and this chapter could therefore be left out of the book. Yet, I decided to keep the chapter in, first, because blindness still prevails and due alarm is still being denigrated as psychological weakness, and, second, because conspiracy narrators are on the rise who abuse the realisation of vulnerability and diffuse sensation of doom for ulterior motives. The coronavirus pandemic magnifies this effect as it adds a more acute layer of vulnerability. What particularly worries me is that many green new deal proposals aim at implementing public policies that are built on the same economic principles that led to ecocide and sociocide in the first place.

### Cogitocide, or the degradation of our thinking

Ecocide and sociocide are facilitated by the same underlying catalyst, namely, cogitocide — the very ‘weapon of mass destruction’ that systems of humiliation use. The term cogitocide was coined in 2020 by the former head of the Club of Rome, Prince El Hassan bin Talal, important international thinker and member of the Jordanian royal family.[[1776]](#endnote-1777) Cogito comes from cogitare in Latin, ‘to think’,[[1777]](#endnote-1778) and cogitocide means the killing of our cogitosphere, the killing of ‘the realm of thinking and reflection’,[[1778]](#endnote-1779) the drowning of humanity in a sightless infosphere.[[1779]](#endnote-1780) It is the misuse of cogens, our ability to think.[[1780]](#endnote-1781)

All those ‑cides, all those killings, amplify each other. As a result, omnicide looms ­— the killing of everything, the annihilation of all life on Earth. It would be the first time in this planet’s history that one species alone would have caused a mass extinction — in this case, the newly arrived species of Homo sapiens. This species succeeded to raid an entire planet within a historically extremely short time span, and, more even, to do so in proud blindness.[[1781]](#endnote-1782) We are at the end of a lavish party of exploitation,[[1782]](#endnote-1783) for which our children will have to pay. We ended the party with fireworks, literally, by burning our fossil fuels. We live in times of systemic decline where the old order is disintegrating and environmental and political disruptions augment each other. The world risks descending into gloom and despair, while what is needed are solutions that are sober, practical, and fundamentally new in substance.

In this situation, many pin their hopes on artificial intelligence. I fear it may be a misnomer — it may rather be artificial sightlessness, it may be the digitalisation of a kind of cogitocidal sightlessness that in former times was called fog of war, only taking on new shapes and reaching new levels now.[[1783]](#endnote-1784) Big data, instead of becoming big success, could also turn into big disaster.[[1784]](#endnote-1785)

What is needed is a sober and focussed mind that can think outside of the box. Unfortunately, and this is my conclusion after several decades of global experience on all continents, what stands most in the way are not our crises, but our present-day economic arrangements and the mindset on which they are founded and which they maintain. I wrote a book on this topic in 2012, where I walk through some of the detrimental outfalls of these economic arrangements.[[1785]](#endnote-1786) Sober and focussed thinking finds little space to flourish in a world where people are under increasing pressure, where stress and nervousness are on the rise. People in the Global South struggle for daily survival, while in the Global North, where resources would be available for sober reflection, people are being squeezed between an ever-increasing productivity and efficiency pressure on one side, and an overload of consumer choices on the other side, both of which crowd out clear-headed deliberation on important choices. The injurious consequences, from burnout to depression, instead of leading to a reversal of these practices, are being monetised as well, thus adding a socio-psychological-spiritual divide to the ecological and social divide.[[1786]](#endnote-1787)

Since I wrote my book in 2012, the reality of ecocide and sociocide has become ever more apparent and I observe the socio-psychological-spiritual divide growing ever more sharply and polarised. I am unsurprised by the rise in conspiracy narratives, after all, a sense of alarm among people represents a prime resource for people to monetise — in a humiliating economic system, humiliators profit. There is an apt word in German, Scharfmacher, ‘sharp maker’, for people who make polarisations sharper and more confrontational. I see cogitocide afflicting the entire realm of thinking and feeling at the individual level as much as at the societal level.

We live in what has been called the Capitalocene,[[1787]](#endnote-1788) the back loop of the Anthropocene, where ‘the claims to human mastery over the world are being literally washed away by rising seas and unprecedentedly powerful storms, while terminal diagnoses of Western civilisation proliferate as quickly as fantasies of the end’.[[1788]](#endnote-1789) The list of crises gets longer by the day — from financial crisis to credit and banking crisis, to environmental and ecological crisis, biodiversity crisis, housing crisis, health and well-being crisis, education crisis, spiritual and moral crisis, trust and trusting crisis, indifference crisis, fake news and faking crisis, reality crisis, populism and fascism crisis, and coronavirus crisis... all leading to a generalised ‘time of crisis’.[[1789]](#endnote-1790) When we add ‘climate denialism and uncritical belief in technofixes and geoengineering’,[[1790]](#endnote-1791) we can call it the obscene epoch.[[1791]](#endnote-1792) To complete absurdity, people who suffer and who protest are told they lack ‘resilience’ — the call for resilience is used ‘to justify the ongoing existence of processes and activities that are driving humans to extinction’.[[1792]](#endnote-1793)

Already in 1948, conservationist Fairfield Osborn and ecologist William Vogt warned against the excessive exploitation of planet Earth, foreseeing that war would be the result of a consumption-driven world order, rather than peace and prosperity.[[1793]](#endnote-1794) In 2019, a respected economist followed up and predicted that the disintegration of global capitalism has the potency to unleash World War III, after all, current global conditions parallel the situation before the outbreak of the first and second world wars — there is rising military spending, democracies disintegrating into authoritarian police states with populism mounting, geopolitical tensions heightening, while global institutions get weaker and inequalities widen.[[1794]](#endnote-1795)

The list is long of anthropogenic-induced tipping points that are being crossed or are growing nearer. Biodiversity is lost, fisheries collapse, the ice caps melt, and the sea acidifies and rises, while ‘we are also in an era of riots, revolutions, local experiments, and social movements from left to right’, which ‘may look insane, but that are very real’.[[1795]](#endnote-1796)

In 2018, we learned something interesting. Media theorist Douglas Rushkoff reported that a group of billionaires invited him to a meeting, and he describes how he realised, to his astonishment, that they believed that what they called the event was unavoidable. ‘The event’ was their euphemism for ‘the environmental collapse, social unrest, nuclear explosion, unstoppable virus, or Mr. Robot hack that takes everything down’.[[1796]](#endnote-1797) This is Rushkoff’s report of what happened in the meeting:

They were not interested in how to avoid a calamity; they’re convinced we are too far gone. For all their wealth and power, they don’t believe they can affect the future. They are simply accepting the darkest of all scenarios and then bringing whatever money and technology they can employ to insulate themselves — especially if they can’t get a seat on the rocket to Mars.[[1797]](#endnote-1798)

In 2018, when Rushkoff described this meeting, some of his readers might have thought that expecting ‘the event’ was unfounded paranoia by a few ‘neurotic princes’.[[1798]](#endnote-1799) Only two years later, they were taught better, as the coronavirus pandemic shows the price humanity has to pay for overtaxing its environment.[[1799]](#endnote-1800) ‘Covid-19 may be our final, last-gasp revolt’, wrote Douglas Rushkoff in April 2020.[[1800]](#endnote-1801)

I am among those academics who have designed their research outside of the ‘ivory tower’, in the reality on the ground on all continents, by now looking back on forty-seven years of global experience. What I have seen, with my own eyes, is that we, humanity, are travelling down many dead-end roads simultaneously. When we look at environmental collapse, then global climate degradation is most probably not the most significant threat, let alone a coronavirus. The ‘alarming loss of insects will likely take down humanity before global warming hits maximum velocity’.[[1801]](#endnote-1802) Three-quarters of flying insects in nature reserves across countries like Germany have vanished in the last two decades.[[1802]](#endnote-1803) In North America, three billion birds have disappeared since the 1970s.[[1803]](#endnote-1804) Many younger people, those born after 1960, have no idea of the ‘normality’ of planet Earth that I still had the privilege of seeing as a child, they cannot know that there should be many more insects, many more butterflies, many more birds. Young people are born into an artificially impoverished world and may think that this is normality, overlooking that what they are part of are catastrophes that so far were more or less silent — called ‘progress’ and ‘development’ — but that will have serious implications for all life on Earth. When highly complex systems disintegrate, they do so fast — this is known as the Seneca cliff — highly responsible scientists therefore predict the possible extinction of the human species not just in the far future but already within a few years’ time.[[1804]](#endnote-1805)

All this is part of ecocide, or the killing of our ecosphere. The Earth Overshoot Day comes earlier and earlier each year, it is the day on which humanity’s resource consumption for the year exceeds Earth’s capacity to regenerate those resources during that year. In 2018, it was on the 1st of August, in 2019 on 29th July, and in 2020, this progression slowed down only due to the coronavirus pandemic.[[1805]](#endnote-1806)

Let me now turn to sociocide, or the killing of our sociosphere. Inequality is at such obscene levels that the word ‘inequality’ is a cynical trivialisation. What happens is the ‘expulsion of entire populations from their living spaces and unspoilt nature itself’.[[1806]](#endnote-1807) In countries of the Global North, and I am writing these lines in Germany, many citizens are proud of having ‘earned’ their monetary wealth, unaware that each of them, statistically, holds what would be the equivalent of enslaving sixty peoples in other world regions.[[1807]](#endnote-1808) For a long time, people of the Global North insulated themselves from the sociocidal outfalls by exporting them elsewhere, so they could close their eyes to the fact that pride is misplaced when affluence is built on exploitation. This ‘self-soothing self-congratulatory illusion of goodness’ as I call it, is ending now, as inequality weakens also the social web of relationships within the Global North.

Inequality is not the only social problem. Communities in the Global North become increasingly atomised as well, to the point that a ‘minister for suicide prevention’[[1808]](#endnote-1809) and a ‘minister for loneliness’[[1809]](#endnote-1810) had to be appointed in countries like Britain. Social isolation reigns, meaningfully connective social ties are lacking, there is a sense of ‘historical underdosing’, a sense of an ‘end of history’, a view that major institutions such as family, work, and politics are corrupt and no longer salvable.[[1810]](#endnote-1811) Condemned isolation is a phrase coined by pioneer thinker Jean Baker Miller to describe ‘the most terrifying and destructive feeling that a person can experience’, a feeling that is not the same as ‘being alone’, but means ‘feeling locked out of the possibility of human connection’.[[1811]](#endnote-1812)

All these are wounds that ‘monopoly capitalism’ inflicts on psychological well-being, as systems fail ‘to provide the foundations of a society capable of promoting the healthy and happy development of its members’.[[1812]](#endnote-1813) Humanistic philosopher Erich Fromm once distinguished the ‘having mode of existence’ from the ‘being mode’ in a book that I read in German in 1976 as a young student.[[1813]](#endnote-1814) He wrote:

A person who has not been completely alienated, who has remained sensitive and able to feel, who has not lost the sense of dignity, who is not yet ‘for sale’, who can still suffer over the suffering of others, who has not acquired fully the having mode of existence — briefly, a person who has remained a person and not become a thing — cannot help feeling lonely, powerless, isolated in present-day society.[[1814]](#endnote-1815)

Fromm observed that ‘the fact that millions of people share the same vices does not make these vices virtues, the fact that they share so many errors does not make the errors to be truths, and the fact that millions of people share the same forms of mental pathology does not make these people sane’.[[1815]](#endnote-1816)

All this is just the beginning of a long list of aspects of sociocide. All these are dangers all of humanity faces at our current juncture in history, dangers that may foreclose a dignified future for coming generations — if not the survival of the species Homo sapiens altogether.

In this dire situation, it is not as if nothing is being done to turn it around. Many individuals and groups engage in projects that promote dignity and I meet them all around the world, yet, the problem is that their efforts are weakened by fragmentation — people who work for dignity in the ecological realm, for instance, often do not know about those who work for dignity in the social realm, and vice versa.[[1816]](#endnote-1817) What is waiting to happen is that all dignifying forces come together and prevent cogitocidal entrepreneurship, prevent entrepreneurship that suppresses sustainable solutions in favour of ulterior power and profit interests. A coalition of all dignifying forces is needed to avert that ecopaths and sociopaths take power, to prevent that those who have no ‘twinge of conscience’ over the destruction of the social and natural environments cause ever more socio- and ecocide.[[1817]](#endnote-1818)

The phenomenon that ulterior interests trump reasonable solutions is not new, yet, the detrimental consequences become fully apparent only now, only now is the full bill being presented. Henry Ford, for instance, first designed his cars to run on alcohol from biofuels, ‘but the criminalisation of both alcohol and hemp forced him to switch to the dirtier, less efficient fossil fuels that dominate the industry today’.[[1818]](#endnote-1819) The sales of sugar, with its addictive qualities, has undermined the health of many while bringing profits to a few, including from the sales of treatments for obesity and diabetes, such as diets or medical drugs.[[1819]](#endnote-1820) Or, global farm subsidies amount to $1m per minute and prop up factory farming that costs more than it brings in.[[1820]](#endnote-1821) This increases not least the risk for pandemics — ‘perverse subsidies need to be rapidly redirected or phased out’, is the conclusion of a global study from 2019.[[1821]](#endnote-1822) Increasingly, profits are channelled to a select few, while the majority lives on an ‘mental hunger diet’ that makes them ever more vulnerable to the wrong remedies — be they overdoses of psychotropic drugs[[1822]](#endnote-1823) or opioids.[[1823]](#endnote-1824) Cogitocidal right wing populism and conspiracy narratives as well work as potent drugs, ‘overdosing’ entire societies with fake ‘highs’, and also these highs usually increase profits for the few.

‘The opposite of addiction is not sobriety, the opposite of addiction is connection’.[[1824]](#endnote-1825) We can predict that hunger of the stomach will join hunger of the soul for ever more people in the years to come, and crises such as the coronavirus pandemic will accelerate this trend. What humankind needs most now are people, organisational practices, and institutional frames that connect to nurture global well-being, global in the widest sense, not just geographically, also conceptually. The anthropause caused by global lockdowns due to the pandemic offers an opportunity to pause and rethink the ways we arrange our affairs on planet Earth, to ponder what being human means, what it means to be woven into the larger organism of planet Earth and depend on it just as every other living creature.[[1825]](#endnote-1826)

Unfortunately, as everyone can observe, instead of healing past eco- and sociocide and avoiding future eco- and sociocide, people and organisations are caught in systemic frames that make it extremely hard even for the most well-intentioned leader or citizen to heed these insights, to protect the well-being of people and planet and refrain from violating dignity. The most well-intentioned business manager or city mayor is caught in systemic imperatives that stand in the way, to use the terminology of political scientist Ellen Meiksins Wood.[[1826]](#endnote-1827) ‘Investor confidence’ is a central keyword.[[1827]](#endnote-1828)

In the midst of these dilemmas, many people remain ‘comfortably unaware’ of global depletion running amok.[[1828]](#endnote-1829) They display an approach to life that has been called normopathology — maintaining the appearance of being normal and adjusted, over-correct and over-compliant, even though the compulsiveness with which they attempt to meet normal expectations often betrays that they are basically living ‘fake lives’.[[1829]](#endnote-1830) Unsurprisingly, a sixteen-year-old Swede, Greta Thunberg, became the victim of vicious attacks for failing to be ‘normal’ as she began to inspire a worldwide environmental movement of high school and college students in 2019.[[1830]](#endnote-1831) Normopathology has been studied, among others, in the field of evacuation psychology, a field of research that explores how people evaluate risks, for instance, from approaching hurricanes or floods. It shows that ‘no matter the severity, many residents won’t heed orders to evacuate’.[[1831]](#endnote-1832)

In this situation, how does it feel to be young and grow up in a context of existential threats? How does it feel to be surrounded by threats that are sometimes denied and sometimes overblown, both in the service of ulterior interests? On the other side, how does it feel to be old and be accused of having destroyed the future of the young? Can we humans perhaps no longer be proud of ourselves as the superior species on planet Earth? We all face these fundamental questions and the humiliating downfall from arrogance they foreshadow.

All around the world, I observe the effects of these questions as they add one more dimension to sociocide, namely, a highly psychological dimension. In some, a sense of helplessness arises, in others cynicism. Ethologist Michael Fox explains that ‘observing another’s suffering, and being unable to do anything to help, leads to learned helplessness by proxy’.[[1832]](#endnote-1833) When the situation is too terrifying, we ‘shut down’ and the result may be bystander apathy, the total disconnect of empathy, or even ‘vicarious pleasure in witnessing another’s plight’.[[1833]](#endnote-1834) What we see around us, says Fox ‘is but one small step away from deliberate torture and calculated cruelty either perpetrated alone, or in participation with others in the name of entertainment, sport, quasi-religious or cult ritual’.[[1834]](#endnote-1835)

Allow me to share my personal feelings in the face of the existential threats in front of us. During the past decades, everywhere on the globe, I have seen callous sociocidal behaviour seeping into even the smallest nooks and crannies of ordinary life, including where I least expected it. Let me report two micro-incidents, because they offer glimpses into how even the most privileged neighbourhoods can become affected, neighbourhoods that once were proud of their communal spirit.

Two dear friends shared their experiences with me in New York City in November 2017. This is what the first friend described to me. She came to New York as a young woman and has been renting the same small flat in a building in the Upper West End for decades. This is her only home. She and her landlord had been friendly neighbours for half a lifetime, she helped him through various life crises, and he has never been in a situation where he needed money. Still, for the past fifteen months, he harassed her, accosting her in the corridor, pushing her against the wall, shouting into her face, all with the aim to get her to move out so he could sell the building without tenants. As she refused to move, he finally sold the building for a slightly reduced price.

Only a few days later, another friend reported to me a related story. She and her husband were looking for an apartment in the north of New York City and they were being humiliated at every step of this process. First, they had to submit their most intimate financial information, and then they were subjected to humiliating interviews where they were told that ‘this is a flat only for lawyers and doctors, not for you!’ When my friend replied, ‘But I work at Columbia University, and my husband is a social worker!’ the interviewer, pointing at her, turned to her husband and told him, ‘If you get this flat, then it is only because of her!’

Let me ask: If people treat each other so disrespectfully even in situations where it would cost them nothing to behave decently, in situations where they could easily withstand the society-wide glorification of arrogance and cold-heartedness, how can animals and our natural environment expect to be treated with respect by humans? When I am near my father’s home in Germany, I take the bicycle for twenty minutes every day and collect the garbage that people drop in the midst of nature. While doing so, I think of my doctoral research on the genocide in Rwanda and I ponder: How it is possible that I can understand the underlying motives of genocide better than the motives of saturated people in Germany who punish nature as if it were their enemy?

The cogitocidal thoughtlessness of everyday sociocide and ecocide that I observe all around the world, the facileness with which we, the human species, destroy our planet, all this saddens me more than many of the singular events that attract feverish media attention. While I do recognise that there is ‘moneyed nihilism’ among elites, and while it does shock me, what shocks me more is that we, the rest, abet it.[[1835]](#endnote-1836) All of us together, we perpetrate in our everyday ‘normal lives’ what political thinker Hannah Arendt once called the banality of evil.[[1836]](#endnote-1837) This is why I cannot live a ‘normal life’ — with my two doctorates, I could even live a privileged life — this is why I dedicate my life to a mission of large-scale global systemic change.

I ask you: Does the world progress? Or are we on a Titanic? For me, these are reasonable questions, not meant to attack anyone. Simply having faith in Titanic being unsinkable was not enough, sober reality testing would have been needed. Yet, my experience shows that my questions bruise egos and cause indignant reactions. Asking them clearly offends those who believe to be entitled to be proud of presently existing paradigms. Where does this anger come from?

The answer is: Beliefs.[[1837]](#endnote-1838) Beliefs have two functions, and, unfortunately, the first one often undermines the second one — ‘I know, but I can’t believe it’. The first function of beliefs is to help us live with ourselves and the people around us, the second is to help us navigate the natural world. Beliefs guide our relationship with our personal sociosphere and with the ecosphere around us, and the problem is that we neglect sound reality testing in the natural world in case this would threaten our relationship with ourselves and the people we depend on. The people who built the Titanic and who travelled on it had a relationship with each other and with the ship, and, as it appeared, the first relationship clouded their view on the second. In short, ‘What should not be, cannot be’. ‘The Titanic should not sink, therefore she cannot sink’. ‘The emperor cannot be naked’.

As I observe, this problem is magnified when dynamics of humiliation are involved (see more in chapter 5). On all continents, I observe that even the hardest of facts can get caught in cycles of humiliation that polarise communities, and this to the point that people interpret the most valid dent on their beliefs as a personal humiliation, as a violation of their personal identity, a violation they are willing to fight until death.[[1838]](#endnote-1839) Not least the death toll of the coronavirus pandemic exposes the fatality of polarised communities who disregard facts — ‘Their last dying words are, “This can’t be happening. It’s not real”,’ reports a nurse who treats dying patients.[[1839]](#endnote-1840)

Polarised communities filled with cycles of humiliation seem to be the prime victims and perpetrators of cogitocide, the are willing to ‘kill the ability to think’.[[1840]](#endnote-1841) Cycles of humiliation create the proverbial fog of war that darkens our view on reality, and I see the densest fog arising when these cycles are fed by an amalgamation of hate and profit.[[1841]](#endnote-1842) When this happens, everything is in danger, from democracy to the environment. Veteran political commentator Roberto Savio puts cogent words to it, ‘There is no ability and will among populists to reach any internal agreement’, and thus ‘democracy is in danger, for the same reasons that the environment is also in danger’.[[1842]](#endnote-1843) Instead, old-fashioned traditions of ‘going to duel’ in ego-driven confrontations suddenly become astonishingly alive again.[[1843]](#endnote-1844) Like me, Savio wonders, ‘Would it be possible today to create the United Nations, or sign the Declaration on Human Rights? Certainly not, just as there is no will to fight climate change’.[[1844]](#endnote-1845)

With sadness I observe that the cultural script of combative duelling between alpha-leaders afflicts even some academic contexts now, crowding out mutually enlightening scientific curiosity. Some scientists engage in ego-driven intellectual combat despite the fact that their professional identity ought to be grounded in sound reality testing. When I listen to scientists speak, I am amazed at the amount of spiteful denigration even some very renowned ones mete out against those who think differently, far beyond what the scientific discourse warrants. On top of this, wherever business interests are amalgamated with academic inquiry — through corporate underwriting, research funding, or other forms of what could be called institutional bribery — duelling interests are compounded.[[1845]](#endnote-1846)

All this has daunted many scientists, it is the reason for why gloom has set in among many climate scientists. ‘It is worse, much worse, than you think’, they say, and ‘if your anxiety about global warming is dominated by fears of sea-level rise, you are barely scratching the surface of what terrors are possible’.[[1846]](#endnote-1847) As environmentalist Al Gore once pointed out, ‘instead of having a well-informed electorate, we have a well-amused audience’.[[1847]](#endnote-1848) By now, we have more than a well-amused audience, we also have a furious audience, furious deniers of the looming danger who fight furious denouncers of that denial.

I observe these dynamics unfolding more ruthlessly in individualised Western cultures in which the myth of ‘lone hero’ independence leads people to throw their weight around, while they are more covert in collectivistic cultures, where the focus lies on communal interdependence and saving face, where social control dampens individual self-righteousness. Furthermore, an individualistic lone hero mindset also increases the psychological need to shield oneself from any awareness of vulnerability, including awareness of human nature as ‘animal nature’, it invites an ecocidal dominator mindset as a defensive measure.[[1848]](#endnote-1849) Animal protection and rights advocate Michael Mountain explains:

To alleviate the anxiety we feel over our animal nature, we try to separate ourselves from our fellow animals and to exert control over the natural world. We tell ourselves that we’re superior to them and that they exist for our benefit. We treat them as commodities and resources, use them as biomedical ‘models’ or ‘systems’ in research, and force them to perform for our entertainment.[[1849]](#endnote-1850)

At this point, allow me to offer another personal story. The following words have been levelled also at me and they are emblematic of the currently reigning ideological polarisations in many parts of the world. These are the words of an influential psychologist in Germany, ‘The left has never forgiven capitalism for not collapsing — that it was socialism that collapsed. Rather than take note of what economic research has shown to the point of weariness, namely, that capitalism is the only economic form that promotes mass prosperity, the left denies that until today there is not a single socialist welfare society or democracy around’.[[1850]](#endnote-1851) In other words, this psychologist claims it to be a historical truth that ‘capitalism’ per definition is an antidote against ‘socialism’s’ economic misery and political oppression, and he calls on ‘the left’ to ‘mourn the loss of their ideal’, to mourn ‘the impossibility and the horrors of its implementation’.[[1851]](#endnote-1852) ‘The left’, as he sees it, entertains ‘a kind of post-traumatic bitterness syndrome, it charges capitalism for all kinds of supposedly alarming conditions in a supposedly dramatically unfair country’.[[1852]](#endnote-1853) He rejects the observation that the mental health of the population in Germany declines and suggests that this is only due to the increase in attention given to psychological problems. He furthermore deems the Wilkinson hypothesis to be invalid, a hypothesis that posits that inequality in income distribution is associated with psychosocial ills, and he also rejects the Easterlin-paradox that states that after a certain level of prosperity no increase in life satisfaction is to be expected from further economic growth.

To avoid having my message being dismissed in similar ways, I wish to shed some light on my personal life path, so that it becomes transparent how I arrived at the positions that I hold today. As I have shared before, I was born into a displaced family, and, like many displaced people, my prime desire was to become a respected member of my majority host society. I studied medicine and psychology out of the duty-bound wish to contribute to everyone’s well-being in a world I felt was ‘on the right track’, notwithstanding some defects. I felt confident that I could help remedy these defects as a medical doctor and psychologist. I was in no way politically active, not part of any political ‘left’ or ‘right’ ideology. I would never have imagined that I would see the world as being ‘on the wrong track’ at the age of sixty-seven, it was unthinkable for me that I would ever speak of cogitocide, sociocide, and ecocide.

In other words, my path in life was one of slow learning, even though there were also a few sudden wake-up calls. I remember one such wake-up call when I was thirty years old. For the first time, I became truly aware of the extent to which my personal life choices had been informed by the traumatic experiences of my family. It took me another decade to truly appreciate the lessons my family background taught me about war and displacement. In 1939, my parents were hopeful youths, and only seven years later, they had lost everything they had, from family to property, to homeland, and my father even lost one arm. The lesson I learned was that a seemingly safe ground can turn into treacherous sand in a very short time span.

At the age of around forty, in the beginning of the 1990s, the next wake-up call came. After twenty years of global living, including seven years as a psychotherapist in Egypt, I found myself in Hamburg, one of the most well-off cities in Europe. I wrote my doctoral thesis in medicine on the theme of quality of life, comparing the views of German and Egyptian intellectuals on what constitutes ‘a good life’.[[1853]](#endnote-1854) Through my interviews in Hamburg, I noticed to my great astonishment that a certain gut feeling had been growing in me during the previous twenty years without me noticing, namely, a sense of global responsibility. My interview partners in Hamburg did not share this sense and it set me apart from them more than I had expected — what appeared self-evident to me was not self-evident for them. I anticipated them to know that even the richest German citizen cannot survive on an uninhabitable planet. I also expected them to be aware that monetary wealth carries the duty to be conscious of the fragility of our world, and that those who have many material resources should shoulder more global responsibility than the poor farmer in Bangladesh who has to run from the next flood.

In this moment of astonishment, I wondered how I should proceed, how I could best communicate my gut feeling of global responsibility — was the best path within academia, or was it to be an activist, or a politician? In the following years, I tried all three paths. As for politics, for a few years, I joined a small political party in Germany mainly for affluent people, a party that had re-assessed its policies in the 1990s to emphasise environmental issues, supported by scholars such as Ralf Dahrendorf, whom I highly respected.[[1854]](#endnote-1855) I felt that this party had precisely the influence and means to inspire people with material resources to shoulder the responsibility of bringing the kind of social-relational wealth into the world that I saw was needed. I became a candidate for the European Parliament for that party in 1994, but left the party soon after, as it increasingly slipped into supporting only the shortsighted material self-interests of their electorate, failing to call on their voters to use their resources for the common good. Now, thirty years later, it is gratifying for me to observe that Ralf Dahrendorf’s party finally sees what I saw thirty years ago, namely, their common ground with the Green Party.[[1855]](#endnote-1856)

Aside from of politics, I also tried out the path of activism. I initiated and organised a large festival for global responsibility titled ‘Hamburger Ideenkette’ in 1993.[[1856]](#endnote-1857) In the years that followed I returned to academic work and combined it with the kind of activism that also this book represents.

I report these personal details to demonstrate that I have never been an ideologue, certainly not one who abuses ideologies as enemy effigy. I have always been a bridge builder rather than entering the trenches of either ideological side. I am certainly not a bad loser or a ‘crybaby’, and my views are not clouded by post-traumatic bitterness. I am simply a curious human being who has charted a very independent life path, starting from a family background characterised by trauma from war and displacement, with a deep awareness that what we think to be certain may very quickly vanish. In this way, I became an observer from afar, a chronicler, very much like the journalist in the famous Hitchhiker’s guide who is tasked to make an annual report on life on planet Earth.[[1857]](#endnote-1858) For some, the following sentence might be true, ‘If you’re not a socialist before you’re twenty-five, you have no heart; if you are a socialist after twenty-five, you have no head’.[[1858]](#endnote-1859) It might be true that young age makes vulnerable for blind system criticism and older age makes for reasonable system compliance. My life trajectory has in many ways been the inverse, not least because ecocide and sociocide accelerated during my lifetime. I have grown more critical over time, including critical of many mainstream forms of critique, and the result is my ‘reasonable system non-compliance’.

After more than four decades of global living, my experience lets me conclude that all conflicts — be they conflicts over resources or over the question of which systemic should organise life on Earth — could be addressed in cooperation if it were not for cycles of humiliation. Cycles of humiliation represent the most significant obstacle of our time, both to the willingness to cooperate and to reality testing. I see feelings of victimhood play out on all political sides, be they left or right, irrespective of the facts on the ground, a sense of victimhood from the humiliation perceived to come from a presumed ‘arrogant majority’ on ‘the other side’. In situations where cooperation is the only path to survival, this is a life-threatening problem, and this is precisely the predicament humankind finds itself in now. My specific family background appears to have made me notice this quandary very early on as it sensitised me to the occurrences of humiliation. My background also nudged me to adapt my personal life to my desire to be of help in this dire situation.

Whenever I see arguments brought forward in enmity rather than for the sake of clarity, I wonder whether not personal humiliation is at play. Indeed, when I look at involved people, I often find hints of personal experiences of humiliation in their biographies. The psychologist from Germany quoted above, the one who suggests that ‘the left’ suffers from feelings of humiliation and therefore cannot see reality as it is, might serve as an example. Many of the points that he highlights are thoroughly valid. For instance, children who live on the margins of society where poverty meets family neglect and school failure certainly deserve much more attention.[[1859]](#endnote-1860) He surely is correct in observing that people who idealise an ideology often have problems accepting its failings. Yet, I contend that in no case is it necessary to package a message as a derisive and arrogant attack. When I look for hints in this psychologist’s his personal life, I notice something significant in his biography, namely, what Lakoff and Johnson describe as the strict father model of parenting — I note that this psychologist had a father who used to discipline him by beating him.[[1860]](#endnote-1861) Angry finger-pointing might have been an infliction that overshadowed already his childhood.

Angry finger-pointing is something I wish to avoid. In my work, I aim for loving care, always reminiscent of the fact that what binds us humans together, per definition, is our shared vulnerability — we are all blind to our blindness. Furthermore, I find the Wilkinson hypothesis and the Easterlin-paradox useful as instruments to map sociocide and ecocide.

As to the Wilkinson hypothesis, renowned economists such as Daniel Cohen are on my side — the psychological phenomenon of habituation does exist, and there is the sense of ‘relative deprivation’ that befalls even the richest when they have less than their compeers do.[[1861]](#endnote-1862) As to sociocide in relation to the Wilkinson hypothesis, Nobel Prize winner Joseph Stiglitz supports this hypothesis when he warns that the economy, through being dominated by large corporations, has ‘failed the many and enriched the few’.[[1862]](#endnote-1863) Madeleine Albright, former United States Secretary of State, certainly no soft-hearted leftist, sees the social contract broken, the contract that used to keep societies together, she observes that ‘the state has neglected its citizens, and the citizens evade taxes and are willing to be seduced by populists’.[[1863]](#endnote-1864) Albright sees fascism on the rise, employing the same old recipe that already Italian fascist leader Benito Mussolini used, namely, ‘If you pluck the chicken one feather at a time people won’t notice’.[[1864]](#endnote-1865) Following Madeleine Albright, also I observe ‘salami tactics’ all around the world, fomenting a devious cogitocide that produces passive bystanding[[1865]](#endnote-1866) in the face of authoritarianism and extremism,[[1866]](#endnote-1867) a cogitocide that allows social contracts to degrade under the influence of backward looking authoritarian populists.

As to the Easterlin-paradox, I have observed with my own eyes that no one is made happier by accumulating material possessions above a certain level of saturation. Worse even, ‘the rich’ face a number of additional problems, and I have become acquainted with them as their psychotherapist. There is, for instance, the predicament that many live in fortresses of mistrust and misinformation with respect to the rest of the world’s population, fortresses within which they feel beleaguered by what they perceive as pitchfork-wielding hostile masses driven by envy. Some engage in charity to buy themselves a better image, often charity that does not hurt them, charity that avoids true sacrificial giving and thus opens the door for conspiracy narratives, which, in turn, damage the image even more.[[1867]](#endnote-1868) Others, those who wish to use their funds for more than superficial charity, those who desire to enter into true relationships of equal dignity with the ‘have-nots’, live in permanent uncertainty as to whether their intentions are genuinely appreciated or whether the sympathy and gratitude they meet is faked for the sake of their financial means. On the other side, ‘rich people’ are often also part of peer groups whose respect they might wish to gain and keep, so they might be tempted to emulate those among their peers who have acquired riches by following the inherently destabilising ‘logic of incessant escalation’ that sociologist Hartmut Rosa and colleagues describe as one of the three ‘motors’ of the ‘dynamisation’ of domination. There is the mechanism of (socio-economic) appropriation, then there is (socio-cultural) acceleration, and, third, (socio-political) activation.[[1868]](#endnote-1869) This ‘triple-A-mode’ is ‘a logic of incessant escalation which eventually threatens to undermine itself, leading to a multifaceted process of destabilisation’.[[1869]](#endnote-1870) I have had clients in my therapy room who came with a ‘multifaceted destabilisation’ of their lives, with deep depression, for example, because they could no longer afford a private plane and suddenly had to adapt to an intolerable ‘normal life’. Indeed, strategies of domination have no inherent endpoint — enough is never enough — and this can easily escalate to the point of self-destruction. This is why people call out, ‘The global elite is insane!’[[1870]](#endnote-1871)

What worries me more than an ‘insane elite’ is that a majority of the people I meet all around the world fails to grasp the ecocidal and sociocidal effects of what is called progress and development. Humankind currently throws a party at the expense of future generations and the planet, a party to which only a few privileged are invited, while the rest hopes to pass through the door soon. It is a party thrown on the luxury floor of the Titanic. The majority falls for the temptation to mistake a feast for ordinary life. As long as a party lasts, this mistake might be easy to commit, even though we all should know that throwing a party cannot last forever. As any cheque made out to the future, ‘success’ that is achieved by way of overuse of resources is short-term and cannot be mistaken as true progress.[[1871]](#endnote-1872) Selling out one’s heirlooms and consuming one’s reserves for times to come is no strategy for long-term planning.

I have learned from my father’s vivid reports how Adolf Hitler was hailed for the economic upswing he brought to Germany, and how he established Nazi power by manipulating the hopes and enthusiasm that this seeming success created among the German population. Nobody knew, or wanted to know, that this upsurge was hollow, that it had to be paid for by going to war and pillaging the coffers of yet to be subjugated neighbours.[[1872]](#endnote-1873) Today’s upswings are as hollow, they will have to be paid for by coming generations who will find a pillaged planet.[[1873]](#endnote-1874) In the last years, many people have become ‘healthier, live longer, are more secure, richer, freer, more intelligent, and educated’, yet, so far, this trend is built on sand, on unsustainable material growth.[[1874]](#endnote-1875) These achievements can only be rescued through a fundamental turnaround in how we humans arrange our affairs on this planet.

In response to this monumental task for humanity, many Greta Thunbergs are needed, and many Eleanor Roosevelts, not just a few. Positive change ‘requires mutuality in movement’, it requires that ‘all people in the relationship must be willing to change’, this is what we learn from pioneers such as Linda Hartling and Jean Baker Miller.[[1875]](#endnote-1876) My personal contribution is to dedicate my entire life to gathering the seeds for a future global dignity community that is united in loving care for our ecological and social commons in respect for our diversity in equality in dignity for all. The most promising future-oriented asset that I can identify on our globe for this task to succeed lies in Indigenous knowledge systems.[[1876]](#endnote-1877) With their seven-generation time horizon, these knowledge systems have the highest potential to nurture long-term biological and cultural diversity. My choice to work globally builds on the insight that this diversity needs global unity to be fruitful, not global division nor global uniformity.

Can the media be of help, at least the media in the West, wherever they are allowed to be independent? I am writing these lines in Europe and I am appalled by the increasing pressure put on public broadcasting, which, as I see it, are a bulwark against American-style polarisation and conspiracy propagation. Parts of the journalistic elite may be too heavily involved in a wider elite milieu and therefore be unable to act as advocates of the public interest,[[1877]](#endnote-1878) yet, more harmful are ‘un-social’ media platforms that increase cogitocidal polarisation through profit-driven algorithms.[[1878]](#endnote-1879) The consequence is that profit replaces politics,[[1879]](#endnote-1880) when qualitatively ‘good news’ hide behind pay-walls, while fake ‘bad news’ thrive ‘for free’, so that the ills of the world, rather than being decreased, are being increased for the sake of monetisation. ‘Corporate influence threatens human rights in communities’,[[1880]](#endnote-1881) and social media technology will only deserve the qualification ‘social’, if it becomes non-commercial.[[1881]](#endnote-1882) ‘Stop hate for profit’ is the name of a recently emerging movement.[[1882]](#endnote-1883)

In this situation, I applaud all journalists and all concerned citizens who dare speak out against corporate influence, who dare say loud what scholars like me say since decades, and who do so without sliding into conspiracy narratives. I applaud Thomas Pogge, philosopher of global justice, who warns since a long time that it is morally unconscientious to compare existing poverty ‘with historical benchmarks’, instead, one should compare it with ‘present possibilities’ — ‘How much of this poverty is really unavoidable today?’[[1883]](#endnote-1884) Pogge concludes that ‘by this standard, our generation is doing worse than any in human history’.[[1884]](#endnote-1885) This, to me, is one of the most important insights of our century.

Jeremy Hobbs, executive director of Oxfam International, chimes in when he warns that ‘we can no longer pretend that the creation of wealth for a few will inevitably benefit the many — too often the reverse is true’,[[1885]](#endnote-1886) and when he informs that the annual income of the richest one hundred people is enough to end global poverty four times over.[[1886]](#endnote-1887) The precariat is growing, while the salariat is shrinking.[[1887]](#endnote-1888) Political scientist Ian Bremmer speaks of ‘the failure of globalism’.[[1888]](#endnote-1889)

I note with interest that even people voice doubts now from whom one might least expect it. The insight seems to slowly seep in that wealth and income extremes are far from ‘healthy inducements for the lazy to work harder’, on the contrary, they hurt everyone, they represent a social and ecological time bomb.[[1889]](#endnote-1890) Whenever I am in the United States of America, I listen with interest to people like conservative American politicians Paul Rand, who admitted in 2019 that not only has ‘socialism’ failed, but also what he calls ‘crony capitalism’.[[1890]](#endnote-1891) Others confess that they have falsely succumbed to ‘we are the best!’, with that joining psychiatrist Robert Jay Lifton in calling America’s mindset ‘apocalyptic’.[[1891]](#endnote-1892) Yet others resonate with me when I say that small elites have so far indeed been ‘the best’ in hijacking systems that once were well-intended, be they called communism or capitalism, and they are also the best in ‘ghosting’ the rest. ‘Capitalism’ has turned out to be the ‘better’ robber baron system, and nature itself answers back with pandemics and environmental collapse.

On a panel for the Financial Times, the chairwoman of Santander UK, former minister Baroness Shriti Vadera, sounded like Oxfam when she warned that ‘the underlying promise of Western capitalist economies — that a rising tide lifts all boats — has been broken’ and a ‘better model’ is needed.[[1892]](#endnote-1893) Robert Swannell, former chairman of retailer Marks and Spencer, warns that capitalism has ‘lost its way’, that companies and their investors have become much too focussed on short-termism.[[1893]](#endnote-1894)

More and more people begin to understand that it is no measure of success to ‘lift people out of poverty’ in the short term, when this means inviting them into a system that drives collective degradation in the long term. ‘Climate change is destroying the livelihoods of the global South... global poverty will increase enormously... Climate change is a question of justice... It is mainly caused by industrialised countries, while poor countries have much fewer resources to adapt to’, warns the president of the organisation Brot für die Welt (Bread for the World) in 2019.[[1894]](#endnote-1895) Philip Alston, United Nations special rapporteur on extreme poverty and human rights from 2014 to 2020, adds that ‘the poverty pandemic will long outlive coronavirus’, and he calls for the immediate abandonment of ‘triumphalism about the imminent end of poverty’.[[1895]](#endnote-1896) Ian Gough, scholar on human needs theory, tells us that ‘economic growth does not contribute to well-being and may undermine it’, it ‘degrades the inner boundary and the social conditions for human well-being’, and it destroys our outer planetary boundary.[[1896]](#endnote-1897) Economist and political commentator Roberto Savio chimes in, asserting that economic growth is neither ‘a rising tide lifting all boats’, nor is capital ‘trickling down to everybody’ — instead, social and ecological resources are hollowed out and plundered, with current consumption patterns rapidly depleting the world’s non-renewable resources.[[1897]](#endnote-1898) Differently formulated, ‘some boats are falling to pieces while others are accruing new decks’.[[1898]](#endnote-1899)

Just like some terrorists call it ‘wedding’ when they rape and enslave women,[[1899]](#endnote-1900) the rape of nature has been called ‘development’. The list is long of phrases that highlight the kind of ‘rape’ that is being perpetrated by ‘really existing’ carbon capitalism[[1900]](#endnote-1901) — phrases range from disaster capitalism[[1901]](#endnote-1902) monopoly capitalism,[[1902]](#endnote-1903) extractive predator capitalism,[[1903]](#endnote-1904) looting capitalism,[[1904]](#endnote-1905) robbery capitalism,[[1905]](#endnote-1906) disintegrating capitalism,[[1906]](#endnote-1907) bulimic capitalism,[[1907]](#endnote-1908) cheater capitalism,[[1908]](#endnote-1909) and hitchless capitalism.[[1909]](#endnote-1910) We can also call it ‘unfettered and unbridled throughput capitalism’ or ‘corporate globalisation’, ‘shareholder primacy doctrine’ or ‘market fundamentalism’, ‘market triumphalism’ or rücksichtsloser Gigantismus, translatable from German into English as ‘rapacious gigantism’. Linda Hartling adds terms such as ‘corporate manslaughter’ and ‘organisational humiliation entrepreneurship’.[[1910]](#endnote-1911) It is casino capitalism, the economy as a giant Ponzi scheme, where the lines between gaming, gambling, and investing are increasingly blurring.[[1911]](#endnote-1912)

It worries me is that the suffering created by these kinds of economic activities so far does not translate into widespread readiness for future-oriented renewal. In the ‘homeland of capitalism’, the United States of America, those who feel humiliated when they are called ‘deplorables’ launch angry attacks against ‘meritocracy’, against the ‘tyranny of merit’, against the tyranny of university degree holders.[[1912]](#endnote-1913) What worries me more than these violent attacks, are the people outside of the Anglo-Saxon sphere who have not yet understood that the Homo oeconomicus concept of human nature is a ‘mindset of the past’ rather than a ‘mindset of the future’. Economists began to justify economic arrangements that fit the Homo oeconomicus image of human nature a few decades ago, inspiring a reverence for Anglo-Saxon overshoot-individualism, and it worries me that this reverence has still not finished rolling out into rest of the world. This mindset is still welcomed as ‘new and modern’ by many, who, far from being angry, desperately try to manifest it, feeling deficient when they can’t. I still hear the Homo oeconomicus version of ‘freedom’ being defended as the only ‘natural’ one, ‘the market’ being expected to provide well-being and quality of life for planet and people, except for those ‘lazy people’ who need to feel ashamed and deserve to be stigmatised. Even psychology and sociology departments at universities in Europe and elsewhere are afflicted, places where it should be well understood that this is a mindset of the past.

Wherever I go, I try to explain that current research in ecological and mental health exposes that individualised Western psychology is too limited, that it dangerously crowds out communal solidarity. I suggest that we, as world community, need to establish new constitutive rules so that our economic systems can nurture what I call a Homo amans relationalis or Homo solidaricus concept of human nature (see chapters 2, 4, 6, or 11). Overlooking the externalities of presently existing arrangements is counterproductive, and simply monetising them is insufficient, be it through Carbon emissions trading or through the commercial exploitation of the mental sufferings of the stranded victims of these arrangements.[[1913]](#endnote-1914)

Towards the end of this section, let me repeat the ultimate questions that many people ask me and that I ask them. Does the world progress? Is there hope? Or is the situation hopeless? I am told that people need hope to be resilient, otherwise they will not want to continue.

In my response, I always highlight that not all kinds of hope are hopeful. ‘Close your eyes and be hopeful while being robbed’, is a destructive kind of hope, it is the abuse of hope as a license and path to passivity in the face of exploitation and destruction, it is hope prescribed as opium for the people (not of the people), prescribed to the exploited so that they accept exploitation with ‘resilience’. Throughout the past decades, I saw optimistic ‘yes we can’ moments pass unused not least due to such false hopes.

We need another kind of hope. Physicist Paul Raskin calls for ‘citizens without borders’ to come together in pragmatic hope — neither naïve optimism nor dystopian despair — as the ‘challenge is extraordinary, but so are the times’.[[1914]](#endnote-1915) Paul Raskin is the author of the widely known 2002 essay titled Great transition, and, like me, two decades later, he looks back in disappointment on ‘too many moments of false hope’.[[1915]](#endnote-1916) The Brundtland Commission brought its ‘yes we can’ moment in 1987,[[1916]](#endnote-1917) and, Raskin reports, many policy and academic circles adopted sustainability as a concept. Yet, and here comes the problem, at the same time, ‘a neo-liberal political-economic philosophy consolidated in centres of power, unleashing a highly unsustainable form of market-led globalisation’.[[1917]](#endnote-1918)

Raskin sums up that the world became rich in sustainability action plans, of which he wrote a number himself, but poor in meaningful action. By now, science can brilliantly illuminate the challenges at hand, and civil action can win this or that battle, he explains, but systemic deterioration outpaces piecemeal progress. In other words, what we see unfold is what sociologist Pierre Bourdieu calls deferred elimination (see more in chapter 10). In balance, Raskin concludes that we, the human family on planet Earth, are triumphantly marching into dead ends, faster than alternative directions can be established.

What Raskin describes has been identified by others as ‘humiliation of the word’. For sociologist Jacques Ellul it is the humiliation of the essence of being human when important words such as, for instance, ‘quality of life’, are being denigrated as nothing more than philosophical pastime without practical significance, when important words are taken to simply stand in the way of ‘growth’ and ‘development’:

Who among us has not talked with developers and builders and been struck by their irritation

when we speak about a term like ‘the quality of life’, not in vague terms, but saying exactly

what the expression means. ‘You’re a humanist’, they respond. Such a response communicates

clearly how much language is despised. When an expression such as ‘quality of life’ or

‘environmental protection’ catches on, they say ‘of course!’ They take over the expression and

apply it to any effort to ‘develop’ land, to destroy genuinely human life and landscape, or to

change the environment. ‘Why not? These are just words, and therefore nothing. They are just

popular expressions Let us put serious ideas into practice, such as growth and development’.

And when you show that these ‘expressions’ have vast content and value, and that they involve

basic choices, these people reject what you say. They refuse to be directed by words or

references to values. ‘Practical matters are completely different from your talk’, they say. And

under the thin, icy politeness of the chief engineer of the Highway Commission, his scorn for

the philosopher and the humanist immediately shows: ‘Go ahead and play with words: we’ll

choose a few to use for decoration; but leave practical matters to us’.[[1918]](#endnote-1919)

Paul Raskin’s account and Jacques Ellul’s verdict affirm my experience of the past decades. Let me use the Earth Summit Rio+20 in 2012 as an example. I was invited to Rio de Janeiro for this event, however, our Amazonian dignity network members called out by saying, ‘Evelin, come to the Amazon, do not go to Rio, the summit people in Rio have no idea of what is happening in the Amazon!’[[1919]](#endnote-1920) Hence, I went to Marabá in the Amazonian State of Pará of Brazil instead, where we co-created an ‘alternative’ summit.[[1920]](#endnote-1921) At the same time, a forerunner of Greta Thunberg spoke in Rio de Janeiro, her name was Severn Suzuki, she was a twelve year old girl when she delivered her first message to the leaders of the world at the Rio92 Summit. After listening to her in 1992, all the heads of state who sat in the first row promised change. Yet, twenty years later, when Severn Suzuki came back to Rio in 2012, her message was the following: Nothing has happened! Almost no progress has been made in the decades after 1992, on the contrary![[1921]](#endnote-1922) Fast forward to 2019, when we held our annual Dignity Conference in the Amazon,[[1922]](#endnote-1923) we had to admit that the situation there had deteriorated even further. When I arrived in August 2019, the destruction of the Amazon had entered unprecedented levels,[[1923]](#endnote-1924) while most politicians in Europe remained inactive.[[1924]](#endnote-1925) Some even abetted the destruction,[[1925]](#endnote-1926) while the World Bank continued to support environmentally destructive projects despite rhetoric affirming the opposite.[[1926]](#endnote-1927)

Does the world progress? What happens when young climate activists protest? As it seems, what happens is that ‘the climate denial machine’ is put in a gear, an engine that is ‘well-funded and well-established’,[[1927]](#endnote-1928) and which is ‘now connected to right wing nationalist political agendas’.[[1928]](#endnote-1929) In other words, cogitocidal entrepreneurship launches campaigns of humiliation to create systems of humiliation.

Does the world progress? When I was in Chile in 2012, I put this question also to Pablo Razeto-Barry, a researcher of complex systems.[[1929]](#endnote-1930) Razeto-Barry and his colleagues study what happens when systems are forced across critical thresholds and they show that systems can shift from one state to another rather suddenly and irreversibly.[[1930]](#endnote-1931) They conclude that local ecological systems now reach tipping points in ways that the entire global ecosystem is approaching a planetary-scale tipping point. Interestingly, Pablo’s father Luis Razeto has the solution — he is a founder of solidarity economics. I had the privilege of being invited into the Razeto family home and their intellectual universe near Santiago de Chile in 2012 through philosopher Howard Richards who had welcomed me into the Dignity Dialogue Home that he and his family had kindly created in Limache, Chile.[[1931]](#endnote-1932)

Chile has other treasures to offer to the world, too. It was a great inspiration for me to learn about the work of Iván Labra and the organisation workshop, based on Clodomir Santos de Morais’ concepts.[[1932]](#endnote-1933) Altogether, I was astonished how little is known in the English-speaking world of South American initiatives. When I was in Brazil, Paul Singer impressed me, together with Eduardo Suplicy and David Calderoni, who collaborated with Guy Standing on the concept of the precariat.[[1933]](#endnote-1934) I admired David Calderoni’s aim to connect a solidarity economy with the basic income concept.[[1934]](#endnote-1935) I was happy to learn about the Pastorals of the Catholic Church and its liberation theology branch, the original force behind most social movements in Brazil — the Pastoral da Crianças, the Pastoral da Saúde, or the Pastoral da Terra.

Whenever I spoke with my friends in South America, I expressed my appreciation for the fact that the vision to build a human economy rather than a neo-liberal one, was a project that began at the first World Social Forum in Brazil’s Porto Alegre in 2001.[[1935]](#endnote-1936) Many of my friends did not remember that South America’s influence was crucial to make the Universal Declaration of Human Rights possible in 1948 (see chapter 4).

Does the world progress? In 1962, biologist Rachel Carson shook the world with her message of a ‘silent spring’,[[1936]](#endnote-1937) and Earth Day 1970 helped spark a popular citizen’s movement. Why did it not succeed? How come that scientists now predict the extinction of the human species to be possible already in this decade?[[1937]](#endnote-1938) As it seems, Carson’s message caught polluters off guard only for a short while, and they very quickly mounted a counter-attack to undermine effective new laws, and to establish today’s sophisticated ‘climate denial machine’. Ronald Reagan and Margaret Thatcher followed up in institutionalising this corporate backlash.

If we accept that the world does not progress enough with regard to ecological rights, what about human rights? Does the world progress with regard to human rights?

Maria Dahle is the director of the Human Rights House Foundation in Oslo, Norway, and she looks back on many decades of experience in the field. Yes, she says, we can determine that the systematic internationalisation of human rights has indeed seen important progress over the last fifty years. Yet, like Paul Raskin, also Maria Dahle reports that worrying developments are under way now. Around 1980, civil society flourished, while at the same time neo-liberalism began to rise, followed by a wave of ‘privatisations’. Already ten years later, civil society began to face serious restrictions.[[1938]](#endnote-1939) Since then, civil society is being counteracted by government-corporate alliances around the world through a plethora of interferences, be they legal or practical. The United Nations and other organisations report alarming levels of reprisals against activists, human rights defenders, and victims in 2018 and 2019.[[1939]](#endnote-1940) Maria Dahle wonders: Is civil society perceived as having become too confrontational? Is it perceived to stand in the way of profit interests?[[1940]](#endnote-1941)

In its 2017 World Report, Human Rights Watch warned that demagogues increasingly threaten human rights and that populists ‘foster bigotry and discrimination’.[[1941]](#endnote-1942) Economist Kamran Mofid, founder of the Globalisation for the Common Good Initiative, summarises the situation as follows:

Populists want to replace freedom with control, justice and equality with priority being given to ‘the true people’, peace with polarisation, caring for the Earth with short-term benefits for their own nations, honesty with shameless manipulation, integrity with ‘power at all costs’, respect with aggression.[[1942]](#endnote-1943)

I am writing these lines in Germany, and I can’t help being reminded of the desire for illusionary greatness that was once encapsulated in the term Gröfaz or GröFaZ, a mocking acronym for ‘Größter Feldherr aller Zeiten’ or ‘greatest general of all time’, a designation given to Adolf Hitler after the disastrous Battle of Stalingrad in 1943.[[1943]](#endnote-1944) The coronavirus pandemic that unfolds while I finalise this book amplifies and hastens this trend, followed by social messaging applications that democratise demagogy.[[1944]](#endnote-1945)

John Y. Jones is the director of the Dag Hammarskjöld Program in Oslo. As Maria Dahle, he played an important part in the Scandinavian civil society movement during the past decades. Like Dahle, he reports on the increased marginalisation of those who defend the ideal of equality in dignity in the world, and that the opposite seeps in instead, namely, inequality — the interest of a few replaces the interest of all.[[1945]](#endnote-1946) This happens so slowly and parenthetically that it is difficult to notice, particularly for ordinary citizens. One of the prime tools in this process is the seemingly innocuous establishment of new institutions. Jones reminds of former UN Secretary-General Dag Hammarskjöld and how prescient he was fifty years ago when he warned that the establishment of the Development Assistance Committee by the OECD would have a negative impact on the United Nations and the African continent.[[1946]](#endnote-1947)

By now, this seeping in of exploitative inequality reaches the very heartlands of the originators of this trend. In the 1960s, Americans worked fewer hours than their counterparts in Europe and Japan did, whereas by 2000, the situation was inverse. Many low-income workers in the U.S.A. are now compelled to work more than one job to get by — and even gender equality has stalled.[[1947]](#endnote-1948) Europe is no longer spared either. Takis Ioannides is a researcher of Greek philosophy and identifies as a ‘citizen of Planet Earth’. In April 2014, he wrote to me in desperation, saying that what happens with his country is not simply an economic crisis, it is terror — what happens is a civilisation crisis, and it ‘terrorises the citizens of my birth-country!’[[1948]](#endnote-1949)

A succinct summary of the many crises that humankind now faces is given by Otto Scharmer, originator of the concept of ‘presencing’, of learning from an emerging future.[[1949]](#endnote-1950) He points at three divides that separate us from our primary sources of life, namely, an ecological divide, a social divide, and, a spiritual divide.[[1950]](#endnote-1951) As to the ecological divide, humankind currently uses 1.5 planets while we only have one, the social divide manifests in rising poverty, inequity, fragmentation, and polarisation, and the spiritual divide creates burnout and depression in conjunction with a widening gap between the GDP and the actual well-being of people.[[1951]](#endnote-1952)

There was a chance for a turnaround in the aftermath of the financialised over-accumulation crisis of 2007–2009. Why was there no massive upturn in left populism? Sociologist Francis Fukuyama was one of those who asked this question.[[1952]](#endnote-1953) The ‘greedy’ capitalists and banks had been exposed, so why was it the right wing populism of the Tea Party movement that became powerful? The problem, says Fukuyama, was that the political left had made peace with capitalism in the 1990s and did not differ significantly from the right side since then, and that this backfires now. It is ‘the end of illusions’, we hear also from France and Germany.[[1953]](#endnote-1954) American presidential candidate Bernie Sanders tried to harness this illusion and was defeated. He was defeated even though ‘nobody should want an economy’ where ‘growth comes at the expense of life expectancy, health, and happiness, every single year’,[[1954]](#endnote-1955) young journalist Umair Haque cries out. This kind of ‘growth’ is predatory, ‘it’s only really self-destruction by any other name’, while what we should want is ‘an economy where growth and public health march hand in hand — where as the economy grows, people live longer, healthier, happier, saner lives’.[[1955]](#endnote-1956)

Philosopher Howard Richards’ conclusion is that there is a generative causal power at work pushing toward the downside, even while other generative causal powers are pushing on the upside.[[1956]](#endnote-1957) This downward trend squeezes the last resource out of people and the planet and has brought leaders to power who promise solutions. Yet, as Richards warns, neither a figure like Donald Trump nor a Bernie Sanders has the tools to succeed.[[1957]](#endnote-1958) ‘Trump is not the problem’, was the title of an article that spoke to Richards’ insight, ‘think of him... as a summons to address the real problem’, namely, ‘the collective responsibility of the people themselves’, as ‘for Americans to shirk that responsibility further will almost surely pave the way for more Trumps — or someone worse — to come’.[[1958]](#endnote-1959)

Let me end this section with the passionate voice of young Umair Haque introduced above. Should we all follow the model of ‘extreme capitalism, no public investment, cruelty as a way of life, the perversion of everyday virtue’? [[1959]](#endnote-1960) If the world did that, he presages, then a host of social pathologies would follow the ones we already see unfolding in the United States. He calls them ‘new diseases of the body social that have emerged from the diet of junk food — junk media, junk science, junk culture, junk punditry, junk economics, people treating one another and their society like junk...’[[1960]](#endnote-1961)

To say it in my words, in the twenty-first century, dignity has been sacrificed and systemic humiliation has been institutionalised. We, the human species, particularly what is called the Global North, are in the process of burning the planet and drowning it, while provoking pandemics when we invade wild animals’ habitat. As the planet gets sick and this affects us, some among us cry like small children who want their toys back. The coronavirus crisis is insignificant compared with what will come. As sociocide and ecocide intensify, worse Hitlers may rise to power who promise salvation while at the same time accelerating ruin.[[1961]](#endnote-1962)

We need to evolve, become responsible adult stewards of our shared world, and we need to do that fast. We need to move away from the ego-centric hubris of systemic humiliation towards the commons-centric humility of systemic dignity. Mutual solidarity awaits to manifest so we can together forge a new relationship with each other and with our planet. We are not the masters of our planet, we are part of the inter-being of everything in everything else.

### Ecocide, or the destruction of our ecosphere

How best to live or not

Bearing witness to the Holocaust

Of the animals — their extinction

And their suffering we cause?

To feel their pain and helplessness

And to grieve their fate,

Be it on someone’s trophy wall —   
Yet another species forever gone.

― Michael W. Fox, veterinarian and animal rights advocate[[1962]](#endnote-1963)

Questionnaire

How much poison are you willing

to eat for the success of the free

market and global trade?   
Please name your preferred poisons...  
― Wendell Berry, environmental activist[[1963]](#endnote-1964)

Does the world progress? Every single day, letters, emails, and calls reach me that decry the plunder of our planet. I could fill an entire book with these messages. There is ‘the demand problem, the growth problem, the complexity problem, the cost-benefit problem, the industry problem, the political problem, the generational-delay problem, the denial problem’, and this is just the beginning of the list.[[1964]](#endnote-1965)

The ‘fiesta’ sponsored by us, humankind, or, more precisely, by the Global North, causes both ecocide and sociocide, which mutually exacerbate each other and degrade all socio-ecological systems.[[1965]](#endnote-1966) The sixth mass extinction of species is human-induced,[[1966]](#endnote-1967) so that by the end of this century, flora and fauna loss is predicted to be between 20 to 50 per cent of all living species on Earth.[[1967]](#endnote-1968) As reported before, in a situation where insects play a crucial role in ecosystem functioning, for instance, in pollination, a decline of more than 75 per cent in total flying insect biomass has been measured just over the past three decades.[[1968]](#endnote-1969) The World Health Organisation lists ten significant threats to global health, of which pandemics are only one,[[1969]](#endnote-1970) and the rise of certain chronic diseases will continue.[[1970]](#endnote-1971) New antibiotics are not being developed as needed, as antibiotics are less profitable than drugs for chronic diseases.[[1971]](#endnote-1972)

Even statistician Hans Rosling, whose life mission was to highlight optimism, listed five risks that even he would ‘worry about’, all of which have either arrived or are looming: global pandemic, financial collapse, a new world war, climate change, and extreme poverty.[[1972]](#endnote-1973)

When we look back, we remember the year 1962, when biologist Rachel Carson called out that ecocide is happening.[[1973]](#endnote-1974) What followed were fifty years of overt and covert backlashes and obstruction, fifty years of the corporate world blockading the changes that would have been needed (see also chapter 12).[[1974]](#endnote-1975) In 2012, the Chatham report, after analysing the global trends of key raw materials, described how governments and other stakeholders worsened the situation rather than bettering it through both their defensive and offensive moves, how they created ‘new fault lines on top of existing weaknesses and uncertainties’.[[1975]](#endnote-1976) The plundered planet was the title of the 2013 report to the Club of Rome,[[1976]](#endnote-1977) where its author, Ugo Bardi, a physical chemist from the University of Florence in Italy, described the unsustainability of the current exploitation of the last natural resources — fracking, for instance — as a sad symbol of desperation, ‘it is an impotent attempt to keep going at all costs, even though you know exactly: it’s a dead end’.[[1977]](#endnote-1978) In May 2014, two teams of scientists reported that the Thwaites Glacier, a keystone holding the massive West Antarctic Ice Sheet together, is starting to collapse, so that so much meltwater will be released that sea levels will rise by more than three meters.[[1978]](#endnote-1979) In 2016, it became clear that perilous climate shift will happen within decades, not centuries.[[1979]](#endnote-1980) In 2018, an ‘ear-splitting wake-up call’ informed the world that ‘climate change is running faster than we are — and we are running out of time’,[[1980]](#endnote-1981) with the prediction that 140 million people will be fleeing from climate degradation by 2050.[[1981]](#endnote-1982) In 2018, highly responsible scholars ask, [‘Will humans be extinct by 2026?’](http://arctic-news.blogspot.com/p/extinction.html)[[1982]](#endnote-1983)

The climate apocalypse is already upon us, this message has reached mainstream audiences in 2019,[[1983]](#endnote-1984) as the United Nations hit the alarm as the extraction and depletion of the planet’s resources skyrocketed.[[1984]](#endnote-1985) The sixth Global Environmental Outlook report, produced by 250 scientists and experts from more than seventy countries, warned that cities and regions in Asia, the Middle East, and Africa could see millions of premature deaths by mid-century if environmental protections are not scaled up drastically.[[1985]](#endnote-1986) Pollutants in our freshwater systems will cause anti-microbial resistance as a major cause of death by 2050, they will damage children’s brains and reduce IQ,[[1986]](#endnote-1987) and endocrine disruptors will affect neurodevelopment, fertility, and health.[[1987]](#endnote-1988) As Joyce Msuya, Acting Executive Director of United Nations Environment Programme explains, ‘We are at a crossroads. If we continue on our current path, it will lead to a bleak future for humankind. Can we pivot to a more sustainable development pathway? That is the choice our political leaders must make, now’.[[1988]](#endnote-1989)

‘Food is the new oil; land, the new gold’, is new catch phrase. Already the Sumerians were brought down by rising salt levels in the soil and the Mayans by soil erosion,[[1989]](#endnote-1990) and several such overstretches combine in our time. Between 1950 and 1990, one third of all fertile soils have been severely degraded or destroyed,[[1990]](#endnote-1991) the most severe soil erosion in human history.[[1991]](#endnote-1992) The depletion of aquifers combines with rising temperatures, while the grain yields in the more agriculturally advanced countries have plateaued, with 800 million people chronically undernourished due to land degradation.[[1992]](#endnote-1993)

Not only food is the new gold, water follows suit. Access to clean water and adequate sanitation is a human right, yet, ‘each year 1.7 million people die as a result of poor access to water and sanitation services. Half of the world’s hospital beds are occupied with people suffering from diseases related to dirty water’.[[1993]](#endnote-1994) Even though Indigenous peoples only represent close to three per cent of the world’s population, they ‘care for an estimated 22 per cent of the Earth’s surface, and protect nearly 80 per cent of the remaining biodiversity on the planet’, according to the 2018 World water development report.[[1994]](#endnote-1995) Loss of biodiversity is lethal to the entire ecosystem, as loss of biodiversity of trees and plants makes forests less stable and less resilient to storms and disease, while loss of biodiversity in agriculture fields leads to depleted soils that can no longer hold water. In spite of this, ‘Indigenous voices have long been shut out from urban and rural planning, and from basic social services’.[[1995]](#endnote-1996) Instead, extractive predator capitalism dominates.[[1996]](#endnote-1997) It is therefore imperative, warns the water report, that the socio-economic and environmental vulnerabilities of Indigenous and tribal peoples are addressed and their rights respected. ‘Strengthening indigenous food systems is key to achieving a zero-hunger world’, adds the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations,[[1997]](#endnote-1998) it is also key to removing carbon dioxide from the atmosphere.[[1998]](#endnote-1999)

As discussed earlier, there is a preference for negative rights in the West, rights understood as freedom from undue interference or repression by political authority. This stands in the way of conceptions of rights traditionally far more prevalent in other parts of the world, namely, rights that ‘privilege notions of social and economic justice (hence the dual emphasis on rights and responsibilities) or collective entitlements (hence the emphasis on the rights of peoples, ethnic, religious and indigenous communities, and other minorities)’.[[1999]](#endnote-2000)

Ecocide and sociocide are interconnected in many ways. The currently unfolding climate crisis is intricately linked, for instance, to the financial crash that unfolded in 2007–2008.[[2000]](#endnote-2001) Fracking, for example, is an outcome of the financial crisis insofar as investment in fracking activities became lucrative only in the aftermath of that crisis.[[2001]](#endnote-2002)

Stephen Purdey, international relations specialist and research affiliate of the Waterloo Institute for Complexity and Innovation at the University of Waterloo in Ontario, Canada, summarises:

Climate change is the biggest but only one entry in what Herman Greene calls a ‘parade of horribles’. There’s no need to list population increase, soil degradation, loss of fresh water, deforestation, ocean acidification, species extermination and so forth. The point is that humanity is rushing headlong into tremendous socio-ecological turbulence which may or may not be survivable. These are not avoidable fictions.[[2002]](#endnote-2003)

As alluded to earlier, ‘among many climate scientists, gloom has set in. Things are worse than we think, but they can’t really talk about it’.[[2003]](#endnote-2004) Yield-driven neo-liberal capitalism is a model that drives the world against the wall, it is ‘not only unsustainable and immoral, but will eventually lead to the self-extinction of humanity through the ecological crisis. The model has been refuted also economically, since the costs of the 2008 financial crisis and the 2020 corona crisis amount to a multitude of what the neo-liberal economic regime has brought in’.[[2004]](#endnote-2005)

It is hard to understand why so many among us, the human species, fail to heed all this information. Is it the Dunning-Kruger effect? Is it this cognitive bias that leads the most incompetent people to be the most confident, while the intelligent ones doubt their own abilities?[[2005]](#endnote-2006) Philosopher Bertrand Russell summed it up already in 1933, ‘The fundamental cause of the trouble is that in the modern world the stupid are cocksure while the intelligent are full of doubt’.[[2006]](#endnote-2007) Hans Joachim Schellnhuber is considered one of Europe’s leading climate science authorities, and for him climate change is like an asteroid strike and our ignorance like a collective suicide attempt.[[2007]](#endnote-2008) Asked how this widespread lack of concern is possible, he replies that it happens ‘through cognitive dissonance’:

If I have a huge problem that I do not know how to get a grip on, I’ll suppress it. Or I even intensify my dangerous conduct. Throughout history, the moment systems fell into crisis, they often amplified the fatal mistakes that had put them into the mess in the first place. So, now the world economy has to continue to grow, even if that is exactly what will destroy the world.[[2008]](#endnote-2009)

Following the template of the tobacco, sugar, and junk food industries,[[2009]](#endnote-2010) the fossil fuel industry appears to ‘employ a range of tactics to deflect attention from their primary responsibility for a problem and to delay action on it’:

These well-worn tactics include suggesting that the research is incomplete and more research needs to be done, funding ‘research’ to come up with ‘evidence’ to counter the climate science, employing scholars to present this ‘research’, discrediting honest climate scientists, infiltrating regulatory bodies to water down (or reverse) decisions and recommendations that would adversely impact profits, setting up ‘concerned’ groups to act as ‘fronts’ for the industry, making generous political donations to individuals and political parties as well as employing lobbyists.[[2010]](#endnote-2011)

Unsurprisingly, Schellnhuber did not have to wait long for climate emergency deniers to begin ridiculing him as ‘going off the rails’.[[2011]](#endnote-2012) As I would formulate it, he became the victim not just of others’ cognitive dissonance, but also of a ‘humiliating categorisation threat’ — people who self-categorise as heroes of modernity feel humiliated when others categorise them as fools of modernity.[[2012]](#endnote-2013)

My conclusion after forty-seven years of global experience is the following: We as humankind throw a party, and we do so on credit. It is a feast for the privileged few at the expense of the many, of future generations, and of the planet.[[2013]](#endnote-2014) Many are so mesmerised by the glitz of the party, so impressed by the promise of glitz, that they try to work even harder or cheat even smarter in the hope to be let through the door soon. Understandably, those who are in the party room, those who benefit from the feast, praise it as if it were sustainable. They want to prolong the party so that they can ride the surf of overindulgence a bit longer, just like banks use to sell customers bad deals as long as possible in the hope that the bubble will burst a little later.[[2014]](#endnote-2015) ‘Incumbents will not easily give up on status quo solutions’.[[2015]](#endnote-2016) Meanwhile the majority is being invited to support what has been called a positivity bias.[[2016]](#endnote-2017) Names such as Hans Rosling and Steven Pinker have been associated with Pollyannaism, which means remembering pleasant items more accurately than unpleasant ones.[[2017]](#endnote-2018) Steven Pinker’s public influence has even inspired a new term, ‘Pinkering’.[[2018]](#endnote-2019)

I must confess that I have a personal weakness for Pollyannaism. Still, I predict that our time may once be called ‘the dark era of the twenty-first century’, an era when the dominator approach to our human condition overstayed its raison-d’être, when social and ecological resources were sold out, often even under the cover of human rights rhetoric. I see the generations alive now carry more responsibility on their shoulders than any generation before.

In feudalism, communal resources were appropriated for an aristocracy who relied on what they perceived as divine right of kings. Then came entrepreneurs who did the same, only that they relied on the guiding hand of the free market and on claims of equality of opportunity. ‘In another hundred years, if we still exist as a species, our system will look no less corrupt — probably more so — than its predecessors’, forecasts journalist Jonathan Cook in 2018, and he adds, ‘Neo-liberalism, late-stage capitalism, plutocratic rule by corporations — whatever you wish to call it — has allowed a tiny elite to stash away more wealth and accrue more power than any feudal monarch could ever have dreamt of. And because of the global reach of this elite, its corruption is more endemic, more complete, more destructive than any ever known to mankind’.[[2019]](#endnote-2020)

In this situation, conspiracy entrepreneurs profit from the diffuse sense of gloom and mistrust that builds up in populations, populists gain visibility who write on their banners ‘we fight corruption’, even though once in power they will engage in corruption just like their predecessors and in addition weaken democratic institutions.[[2020]](#endnote-2021) As a result, ever more people ‘know enough to prefer not to know’.[[2021]](#endnote-2022) This is a voice from Australia:

If you feel as I do, some days you’ll see no hope for humanity. We’ve destroyed much of the planet already and seem hell-bent on continuing that destruction. People all over the world suffer unspeakable violence and deprivation. We in affluent countries seem unwilling to share our wealth with others, and we spend our time and money on pursuits that wreak ever more environmental destruction.[[2022]](#endnote-2023)

I write these lines in Germany. Adolf Hitler initially attracted massive support through an economic upswing. Yet, this upswing was nothing but a ‘glitzy party’ that had to be paid for later, and it was paid for by war loot.[[2023]](#endnote-2024) Towards the end of the 1930s, when Germany’s foreign reserves were depleted, Nazi Germany plundered assets from annexed Austria, occupied Czechoslovakia, and Nazi-governed Danzig. Then, Hitler started a war and continued the same practice on an even larger scale, expropriating millions in gold from foreign governments and stealing gold and other valuables from private citizens or companies.[[2024]](#endnote-2025) A campaign of theft on an almost unimaginable scale channelled the proceeds into generous social programs for those who were loyal to Hitler — Hitler literally ‘bought’ his people’s consent.[[2025]](#endnote-2026) At present, humankind follows a similar script, only that the victims of this plunder — a plunder also known as ‘development’ — are ‘the forgotten’ of this Earth, future generations, and all life on the planet.

The metaphor of the canary in the coalmine tells us that sometimes there are first warning signs. Mining workers took caged canary birds with them into mine tunnels because the birds would die if dangerous gases such as methane or carbon monoxide leaked into the mine. Thus, dying birds were a warning that allowed workers to leave the tunnels in time.[[2026]](#endnote-2027) ‘We are the canaries!’ warns Steven Cohen, executive director of Columbia University’s Earth Institute, in resonance with his colleague Ester Fuchs, director of the Urban and Social Policy Program at Columbia University.[[2027]](#endnote-2028) In their view, it is not a sensible practice to release products and substances into the world — plastic, for instance — include them into mainstream daily life and make people desire and depend on them, only to have to rein all this in again later. ‘Ready, fire, aim’ may be a strategy to gain short-term profits, yet, it comes at the price of long-term survival.[[2028]](#endnote-2029)

Cohen and Fuchs laud the precautionary principle and recommend that it should be used also in America whenever there are questions about the risks of products that cause social harm. The precautionary principle is a statutory requirement written into European Union law for substances such as plastic, while the U.S. Chamber of Commerce rejects it.[[2029]](#endnote-2030) This principle has four central components: ‘taking preventive action in the face of uncertainty’, ‘shifting the burden of proof to the proponents of an activity’, ‘exploring a wide range of alternatives to possibly harmful actions’, and ‘increasing public participation in decision making’.[[2030]](#endnote-2031) Clearly, more has to be done than writing the precautionary principle into law, as demonstrated by the European Union, which has not solved the plastic problem either.

Since the 2007–2008 economic crisis began, books by Karl Marx are being sold again in Germany — people remember that he himself ascertained ‘I am not a Marxist’[[2031]](#endnote-2032) I assume that he would be horrified if he knew how his thoughts were abused by oppressive dictators after his lifetime. In 2018, people like economist Kamran Mofid, founder of the Globalisation for the Common Good Initiative, refer to Marx by saying that in the future, ‘from the standpoint of a higher economic formation, the private property of particular individuals in the earth will appear just as absurd as the private property of one man in other men’.[[2032]](#endnote-2033)

What I observe personally, on all continents, is that the exploitation of nature is being intensified in ways that are so ruthless that I wonder what the exploiters themselves think of their own children. I am unafraid for myself, and I have no children. I also perfectly understand that those among my acquaintances who believe in Rapture — the future event Christian believers await when they are removed from the Earth before the second coming of Christ — are undisturbed by the destruction of planet Earth, or that those who plan for planet Mars to become their home see little reason to protect Earth.[[2033]](#endnote-2034) I also see that people who live in social bubbles of material privileges suffer from blindness, that they cannot see what others see. I do know some of the privileged of this planet personally, and I ask them: Can you really be so blind to the fact that you sacrifice not just the future of some far removed generations on far removed continents, but also your own children’s future?[[2034]](#endnote-2035) To speak with the image of sinking Titanic, it is as if the rich of this world entertain the illusion that their luxury top floor can remain afloat even after the ship’s hull with all the poor people has sunk.[[2035]](#endnote-2036) I do meet some ‘openhearted wealthy people’, but too many of them seem unaware that it is not enough to build gated fortress-communities on hills or have one’s villa on isolated luxury islands such as tiny Maui with as many art galleries as in New York City.[[2036]](#endnote-2037) I am flabbergasted when I see that some seem to believe that protected enclaves will wait for them when the rest of the ecosphere goes down, that a Fortress World scenario will be feasible for them in the long term.[[2037]](#endnote-2038)

Clearly, what is needed now is a global meta-movement of citizens, a movement-of-all-movements, where also those among the moneyed elites are invited who ‘understand that their genuine self-interest is inextricably linked to the rest of humanity and our ability to fix the future’.[[2038]](#endnote-2039) People are needed now who are willing to join hands to turn around the course of Titanic and change its design.

Unfortunately, this is not what is happening. Carol Smaldino is a member in our dignity community since many years, and she has worked as a social work psychotherapist for over twenty-five years in the United States and in Italy. She feels thoroughly discouraged when she observes how ‘rich people increasingly care less, while poorer minorities feel ever more helpless’.[[2039]](#endnote-2040) Indeed, research supports Smaldino’s intuition that ‘rich people just care less’.[[2040]](#endnote-2041) As reported earlier in this book, power has effects on the frontal lobes that are similar to brain trauma,[[2041]](#endnote-2042) power deactivates the brain’s frontal lobes that are needed to empathise with other people and detect what they are thinking. Furthermore, research shows that power amplifies a person’s pre-existing tendencies, which means that men in power positions tend to drift towards an aggressive ‘top-down Machiavellian’ understanding of power, while the style of [leadership associated with women](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/07/21/sunday-review/women-ceos-glass-ceiling.html) often evolves to be more collaborative and even-handed.[[2042]](#endnote-2043)

In other words, it is understandable when people who live in bubbles of privilege develop blind spots with respect to their compassionate empathy, and that they fall for illusions, even with regard to their own children’s future.[[2043]](#endnote-2044)

What is hard to understand is that we, the rest of humankind, let this happen. It is hard to understand that we are willing to gamble away our last chances to change course for the sake of the blind spots and illusions of a small group of privileged elites. This, to me, is self-inflicted collective humiliation and terror.

Arne Næss, known as the father of deep ecology, was also a founding pillar of our Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies community. Whenever we sat with him, he urged us to continue asking questions at the point at which others stop asking. By now, as this book is being published, I think he would be proud of us.

Late Polly Higgins held the Arne Næss Chair at the University of Oslo in Norway in 2013 and 2014, and she used to ask deeper questions. Her topic was leadership crime and ecocide law, and she asked, ‘When leaders fail to act or make decisions that lead to mass damage and destruction, that surely can only be called a crime’?[[2044]](#endnote-2045) Other concerned climate experts chime in, ‘These wilful crimes against life itself by negligent governments, the oblivious media, and an insouciant civil society are crimes that everyday citizens can readily grasp — and then take to the streets and to the courts to protest on behalf of their children and grand-children’.[[2045]](#endnote-2046)

Lawyers around the world are now advocating the introduction of a legal duty of care of the natural world.[[2046]](#endnote-2047) Climate change litigation is actively pursued, with climate lawsuits being brought against fossil fuel companies around the world, alongside non-judicial initiatives, such as, for instance, shareholder activism. In 2017, the Enviro Rights Map v4.0 was launched, a visualisation tool for locating constitutional environmental rights around the world.[[2047]](#endnote-2048) ‘Turning up the heat: Corporate legal accountability for climate change’, is the title of a 2018 report.[[2048]](#endnote-2049)

Unfortunately, in spite of the promising increase in laws to protect the environment during the past years, the hoped-for results are so far too small. What we find is ‘widespread failure to enforce’.[[2049]](#endnote-2050) Linda Sheehan of the Earth Law Center in Redwood City, California, summarises, ‘We have taken great strides in the last century to recognise the inherent rights and dignity of people. The next step is to expand our recognised community further, to embrace the inherent rights and dignity of the natural world’.[[2050]](#endnote-2051)

Humanity’s task of the future, clearly, is to turn this tragic situation around.

### Sociocide, or the wearing down of our sociosphere

Late modern society is systematically based on immunisation against social relations and leads to the repression of social relations. The inability of individuals to acknowledge social relations has become the illness of the century (the endemic disease of self-referentiality). The absence of social relations ‘retaliates’ by causing distress and disorientation for the self, which increasingly experiences isolation, poverty (in a vital sense), and a lack of support in everyday life. To emerge out of loneliness becomes an enormous enterprise — and often a hopeless one. When we become aware of all this, social change can begin.

― Pierpaolo Donati and Margaret Archer, relational sociologists[[2051]](#endnote-2052)

While ecocide is the wearing down and destruction of the ecological fabric of our planet, sociocide is the wearing down and destruction of the quality of our human relations on Earth, of the social fabric of our societies.

Where does sociocide come from? Allow me to offer a simplified summary in two paragraphs — following sociologist Max Weber’s ideal-type approach — of my view on this moment in human history. We live in times of enormous opportunities, if we grasp them. All intellectual and technological tools needed are available to overcome the classical security dilemma and create global human security rather than military security. In other words, for the first time in human history, we can make war a strategy of the past. We have all the necessary resources to effectively build global trust and unite humanity in shared respect for the world’s cultural and biological diversity. Obscene hunger and abject inequality can be overcome — both socio-cide and eco-cide can be turned into what I call socio-sanity and eco-sanity, socio-salvation and eco-salvation.

Unfortunately, what stands in the way of these enormous opportunities is cogitocide, the degradation of our cogitosphere, of ‘the realm of thinking and reflection’,[[2052]](#endnote-2053) which, in turn, spawns both sociocide and ecocide, the degradation of our relationships with each other and with nature. Cogitocide is sustained by, and it sustains a growth dilemma, a dilemma driven by economic imperatives that require growth qua system. This growth benefits the proverbial ‘1 per cent’ and feeds a variant of the security dilemma, this time not between states but between the few with moneyed power and the many without — in short, we could call it a new asymmetrical ‘global economic security dilemma’.[[2053]](#endnote-2054) The word economy comes from Ancient Greek and means ‘managing a household’, yet, it has increasingly become the waging of economic warfare. This has normalised a combative mindset of aggressive competitiveness that spawns the very cogitocide that stands in the way of the trust building that would be needed. Whenever those in power see armament and war as being in their interest, if only to turn potential ‘pitchforks’ against each other and away from themselves, even the classical security dilemma is brought back. This is systemic humiliation, systemic ‘dignity taking’, and the outcome ranges from cogitocide to sociocide and ecocide, potentially ending in collective suicide — in sum, in omnicide.[[2054]](#endnote-2055)

When we look for evidence for my bleak analysis, we find many examples. In 2015, hopes were high that the 2016 Doomsday clock could be moved back significantly, given that the Iran nuclear deal and the Paris Climate Agreement had been concluded. Yet, these successes were soon offset ‘by negative events in the nuclear and climate arenas’, with the result that the 2016 Doomsday Clock had to remain where it was before, namely, at three minutes to midnight.[[2055]](#endnote-2056) In 2017, hopes waned even further, and those three minutes could not be held. Nuclear threat remained high also in 2019, as nuclear programmes continued to be pursued and nuclear arsenals enhanced, with military and security expenditures reaching record levels,[[2056]](#endnote-2057) not to speak of new cyber-security challenges and the existence of new weapons systems and technologies.[[2057]](#endnote-2058) The year 2020 brings global war even closer[[2058]](#endnote-2059) and nobody dares forecast the coming years.

The motto of the classical security dilemma is If you want peace, prepare for war. I formulate the motto of the growth dilemma as If you want prosperity, invest in exploitation — the dilemma is that just as war preparation produces destruction more than peace, exploitation produces ruin more than prosperity. I see that both mottos can be combined into If you want prosperity and enjoy it in peace, invest in war-like exploitation. ‘Owners’ are in fact ‘enslavers’,[[2059]](#endnote-2060) we hear, as ‘neo-liberalism is the successor to geographical imperialism’ as the ‘most extreme form of capitalism’:

It used to be that someone with a small fortune to invest could secure the biggest return by paying someone else to sail overseas, subjugate or kill people (usually people of colour), and steal them and/or their stuff. But they couldn’t keep expanding forever — the world is only so big. And so eventually, wealthy Western investors started to shift much of their focus from opening new markets in ‘far off lands’ to marketising new parts of life at home. Neo-liberalism is also therefore this process of marketisation: of shifting decisions from one person one vote, to one pound (or dollar or Yen or Euro) one vote.[[2060]](#endnote-2061)

Political economist Will Davies speaks of ‘the disenchantment of politics by economics’.[[2061]](#endnote-2062) Tools that once were developed to subjugate people elsewhere in the world, are now ‘being used on the domestic populations of the Western countries in which they were built’, and this ‘marks the point at which neo-liberal capitalism reaches its zenith, and ascends to surveillance capitalism’.[[2062]](#endnote-2063)

In other words, while colonisers once colonised others, we all now participate in colonising also ourselves, whether we want it or not, simply by living in today’s world — even uncontacted tribes in the Amazon will most probably soon be contacted. I resonate with all efforts that aim at decolonising economics, all efforts that aim at giving priority to dignity over profit.[[2063]](#endnote-2064)

Until recently, the ‘name of the game’ was neo-liberalism, by now, we increasingly see neo-illiberalism arise in the name of an ‘oligarchic enmeshment of the super-rich and state power’ based on ‘global, offshore, digitised and financialised hyper capitalism’.[[2064]](#endnote-2065) We can say that the rise of illiberalism is unsurprising, it is the logical outcome when freedom is misunderstood as might is right, as we see when the winners of neo-liberalism buy up and privatise government as ‘neoliberalism’s final frontier’, while surveillance capitalism goes for direct domination where the neo-liberal text book spoke of freedom.[[2065]](#endnote-2066)

Business magnate, investor, and philanthropist Warren Buffett declared, ‘It’s class warfare. My class is winning, but they shouldn’t be’.[[2066]](#endnote-2067) Every day I observe through my global contact network how this warfare affects every aspect of life in every corner of the globe without respite. The new variation of the security dilemma, the one that separates the ‘1 per cent’ from the rest in the name of the growth dilemma, shreds the social fabric of the global village perhaps more than the classical security dilemma ever did.

In 2012, I wrote a book on this topic because I wanted to understand how this systemic humiliation is possible.[[2067]](#endnote-2068) I note with interest that critical voices become louder since then. Many experts now warn that the current monetary systems built on bank debt and scarcity are unsustainable, as they cause boom and bust cycles in the economy, produce short-term thinking, require unending economic growth, concentrate wealth in the hands of small elites, and destroy social capital.[[2068]](#endnote-2069) Even the International Monetary Fund re-examines its actions of the past several decades — Neoliberalism, oversold? is the title of a publication that admits that ‘instead of delivering growth, some neo-liberal policies have increased inequality, in turn jeopardising durable expansion’.[[2069]](#endnote-2070) Many politicians are no longer sure that it was wise to allow what is called neo-liberalism to take pre-eminence. ‘We need a full break with what happened before, both because the times are different and because the recent solutions — whatever word you use to describe them — aren’t cutting it anymore’.[[2070]](#endnote-2071) Even conservative politicians admit to this today.[[2071]](#endnote-2072) ‘When 37% of children are brought up poor, that’s a national humiliation’, is the title of an article in the British press, lamenting that while Brexit and sex scandals receive all attention, shameful political choices do not.[[2072]](#endnote-2073) ‘Central banks have gone rogue, putting us all at risk’, is an article by Ellen Brown, attorney and chair of the Public Banking Institute in the U.S.A.[[2073]](#endnote-2074)

‘Wall Street today is like war — violence but without the guns’, reports John Fullerton, a financial expert who worked at JPMorgan for nearly two decades.[[2074]](#endnote-2075) ‘Ready, fire, aim’ is a strategy that, rather than being warned against, is being recommended.[[2075]](#endnote-2076) Strategic warfare for managers is the title of a book[[2076]](#endnote-2077) written to help managers apply power-over strategies in a ‘mercenary corporate culture’.[[2077]](#endnote-2078) In 2016, this mindset was elevated to the highest level of statehood in the form of the ‘Trump Doctrine’ built on Donald Trump’s experience in the corporate world, where he acquired the belief that competing with rivals for dominance and market shares is the natural ‘way of life’.[[2078]](#endnote-2079)

The more the classical security dilemma is brought back by the exploitation caused by the growth dilemma, space shrinks for Gandhi’s maxim There is no path to peace. Peace is the path.[[2079]](#endnote-2080) ‘From a security [dilemma] towards a survival dilemma’ is the title of a chapter that analyses the linkage between the ‘duet’ of peace and security in the Covenant (1919) and in the UN Charter (1945),[[2080]](#endnote-2081) and it sees the odds decrease for this duet to be expanded into the ‘quartet’ of ‘peace, security, development, and environment’.[[2081]](#endnote-2082)

Timocracy comes from Greek timē, ‘price, worth’ and -kratia, ‘rule’. Hall Gardner, scholar of international politics explains:

Timocrats represent mediocre, yet highly motivated and self-proclaimed ‘patriotic’, political leaders who generally believe that many of the world’s major problems cannot be resolved by diplomacy, but by the use of force, repression, and military intervention. These leaders claim that they act in accord with ‘honour’ and ‘national values’... In the contemporary era, these kind of highly passionate, warlike, individuals have been dubbed ‘neo-conservatives’. ... As compared to the patriotic and moralistic pretentions of Timocrats, Plutocrats are ‘amoral’ and are less interested in ‘honour’ and ‘values’.[[2082]](#endnote-2083)

When Hall Gardner analysed the American Trump administration, he identified a mix of timocrats (such as former National Security Advisor John Bolton) and plutocrats (such as Donald Trump), and he saw them flip-flopping ‘between isolationist policies and threats of military interventionism, without a clearly defined global strategy’.[[2083]](#endnote-2084)

Two years after Tim Berners-Lee had invented the World Wide Web, he lamented that ‘just as wealth is no longer measured by the ostentation of wealth but by the secret circulation of capital, so war is not measured by being unleashed but by its speculative unfolding in an abstract, electronic, and informational space’.[[2084]](#endnote-2085) The solution he recommends for this kind of degradation of sober thinking — this kind of cogitocide — is the re-decentralisation of the internet, an internet that is more individually owned.[[2085]](#endnote-2086)

Cogitocide, sociocide, and ecocide aggravate each other. The degradation of the ecosphere works as a ‘threat multiplier’[[2086]](#endnote-2087) for the cogito- and sociosphere. Climate change will lead to widespread social disconnection, warns Dan Smith, now director of the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, former director of the Peace Research Institute Oslo PRIO, and of International Alert in London:

A demographic shift of unprecedented scale is under way. As people change habitat and ways of life, they face potential disconnection from norms that previously helped them manage relations within their communities and sustain the group’s well-being. As these changes unfold, there will be some winners and more losers, with more again in between, getting by. Among the winners will be the conflict entrepreneurs, the gang leaders, the under bosses, while the foot soldiers will be recruited from among those young men who see little other (or, at least, no better) way of avoiding being losers. With most people caught in between.

Unless there is dramatic change in how economies run, population growth and fast-paced urbanisation will help drive continually increasing demand for [natural resources across the next 20 years](http://www.chathamhouse.org/publications/papers/view/187947). This combines with rising prices to equate to growing competition for access to natural resources. There is an unmistakeable risk here of big power rivalry; there also exists an international institutional framework able safely to contain exactly this kind of rivalry and reduce to negligible the risk of disputes turning violent.[[2087]](#endnote-2088)

I met Dan Smith for the first time in 1994, and I resonate with his insights and warnings since. He is right about ’those young men who see little other (or, at least, no better) way of avoiding being losers’. In my 2017 book on humiliation and terror, I highlight research that shows that particularly fatherless youths who suffer from a sense of humiliation are vulnerable to fall for promises of honour and heroism, vulnerable to being recruited to become the foot soldiers of humiliation entrepreneurs.[[2088]](#endnote-2089) The majority of the population is usually caught in between, suffering indignities from all sides, both from the ecological and the social damage caused by malign economic systems. The worst-case scenario is that the world turns into many small-scale off-limits war zones, further amplifying ecocide with sociocide. In 2020, forced displacement stood at a global 82.4 million.[[2089]](#endnote-2090) Over 130 million people are in need of humanitarian assistance due to conflict, natural disasters, and other complex global challenges.[[2090]](#endnote-2091) These numbers are likely to increase in the future, as over 1 billion people are predicted to be on the move by 2050.[[2091]](#endnote-2092)

If we heed the African adage that ‘it takes a village to raise a child’, then the global village must prepare for the numbers of disaffected ‘children’ to rise, youths who are willing to follow warlords who have agendas that will further ravage this village. Preparing is urgent, because ‘it is easier to build strong children than it is to repair broken men’, a saying attributed to Frederick Douglass, the legendary social reformer who escaped from slavery. As feminist writer Thomas Millar put it, ‘It takes one rapist to commit a rape, but it takes a village to create an environment where it happens over and over’.[[2092]](#endnote-2093) ‘Children grow into healthy men and women only through loving relationships’, adds relational psychologist Linda Hartling.[[2093]](#endnote-2094)

#### The dominator concept of masculinity drives sociocide

The global village would greatly benefit from father figures like Nelson Mandela now, men who have the ability to be healers, older men who have the stature and standing to help younger men overcome the dominator concept of masculinity.

Back in the 1970s, the men’s rights movement embraced female liberation and its critique of gender roles and sought to ‘free men from the constraints associated with the male gender role, which removed men from the home, precluded male emotional intimacy, and made men their family’s exclusive provider’.[[2094]](#endnote-2095) Unfortunately, as sociologist Michael Kimmel has chronicled,[[2095]](#endnote-2096) in the late 1980s and 1990s, this critique ‘morphed into a celebration of all things masculine and a near infatuation with the traditional masculine role itself’, so that ‘women’s equality, women’s empowerment, and feminism’ became the enemy.[[2096]](#endnote-2097) The myth of male power published in 1993 by Warren Farrell, the ‘father’ of the Men’s Rights Movement, became the movement’s bible.[[2097]](#endnote-2098) By now, a point has been reached where some men even fear a ‘malign female take-over of the world’, an ‘oppressive matriarchy’.[[2098]](#endnote-2099)

As relational psychologist Linda Hartling notes, it seems that what began as a liberation of men has been hijacked by ‘dominator-opportunists who discovered a way to capitalise on male fears of humiliation — fears of being more like women, fears of being engaged in a full human experience of emotions, empathy, and caring connections’.[[2099]](#endnote-2100) These dominators sold the idea that being a ‘softer’ male — a more fully realised human being — means humiliation, observes Hartling. Men have been socialised to be proud of their ability to compete for so long that it is difficult for them to see the destructiveness of this mindset out in the world, moreover, they crave the intensity of competition to feel alive, given that this mindset has also injured their own inner emotional world. Not enough with that, ‘dominator entrepreneurs have realised that their efforts could be turned into a lucrative economic opportunity’.[[2100]](#endnote-2101) Sadly, even gay men fall for the idolisation of androcentricity when they demonise and humiliate transgender people in just the same way gay men once were treated.[[2101]](#endnote-2102)

All around the world, the hikikomori phenomenon is on the rise — young men retreating from society into dream worlds, at best, or even taking revenge on the world they feel has rejected them. Such revenge may include acts of humiliation, including the pornographic humiliation of women,[[2102]](#endnote-2103) and acts of violence, such as what has become known as school shootings. Online communities go by many names — the alt-right, the manosphere, men going their own way, pickup artists — and exist under the larger umbrella of what is known as the red pill, ‘a group of men connected by common resentments against women, immigrants, people of colour, and the liberal elite’.[[2103]](#endnote-2104) Proponents of this trend depict consciousness as something that is symbolically masculine, while the ‘Terrible Mother’ is feared as the ‘spirit of careless unconsciousness, tempting the ever-striving spirit of awareness and enlightenment down into the protective womb-like embrace of the underworld’.[[2104]](#endnote-2105) Young males celebrate masculine ‘heroism’ when they blend out risks and indulge in ‘bad boy’ competitions of ‘who has the longest penis’.[[2105]](#endnote-2106) In all statistics, from road accidents to violence, young males stand out.

Going back to the adage that ‘it takes a village to raise a child’, an intact local ‘village’ can afford to laugh about a few ‘bad boys’ when they are young and the destructiveness of their actions is limited.[[2106]](#endnote-2107) It becomes dangerous, however, when this destructiveness is raised up to the level of mainstream culture, worse even when it is adopted and promoted by the ‘1 per cent’. This is what happens when sexually loaded language becomes a badge of power, when ‘wealth porn’ attracts large audiences, when Silicon Valley ‘Superman investors’ are admired for accompanying offers of funding with sentences such as, ‘I’m going to lock you in a golden cage, f\*\*k you with a silver dildo, and pay you so much you sing whatever song I want’.[[2107]](#endnote-2108) It is no accident that women are rather unwelcome in this context, as ‘investors prefer entrepreneurial ventures pitched by attractive men’, and that even women try to ‘wave with their penisses’, figuratively speaking, to ‘lean in’.[[2108]](#endnote-2109)

It is unsurprising that in contexts like this, the triumphalist belief of infinite economic growth thrives despite the environment ringing alarm bells of finiteness. ‘Business is no charity’ means that a ‘man’ accumulates riches by taking ‘hard decisions’ in an ‘unforgiving world’, so that he can protect ‘his women’ from the harsh reality out there so she can indulge in being ‘soft’ and feel important through putting charitable Band-Aids on the wounds he had inflicted. Women who point at the destructiveness of this kind of risk-denying ‘heroism’ — women like Greta Thunberg — are being harassed with threats of rape, aka ‘penis power’.[[2109]](#endnote-2110)

With today’s technology handy, a single angry pro-extinction young male is able to extinguish all life on Earth — if not tyrannical totalitarian ‘algocracy’ has achieved that result before him.[[2110]](#endnote-2111)

‘Soft men’ have few choices in such ‘hard’ environments. Luckily, I have a father who is among the few who are brave enough to be a soft man. He learned it from seeing through the pathetic falseness of male ‘toughness’ and its disastrous consequences in senseless war and mayhem. He once was a happy seventeen years-old boy — loving his family, his farm, his horses, his homeland — only to be drafted into the Nazi army at gun-point against his will, and to subsequently lose everything, family, farm, and homeland. He was a young boy when he was sent to a Nazi Wehrertüchtigungslager (military training camp), where he had a friend, a sensitive young musician, who could not keep up with the Nazi motto that young males had to be ‘flink wie Windhunde, zäh wie Leder, hart wie Kruppstahl’ (fast as greyhounds, tough as leather, hard as Kruppstahl). My father carried his friend’s backpack on forced marches, and by now, at the age of 95, my father wakes up at night, thinking of the moment when he failed to keep his friend from committing suicide — his friend threw himself off the train that brought them to Normandy just before D-Day.

Earlier, I told the story of Prussia’s King Frederick the Great, whose father wanted to make ‘a man’ of him by exposing him to brutality. Young Frederick may have contemplated suicide at some point as well, yet, the moment he became king, instead of turning into a peaceful leader, he started a war.

In other words, the choices ‘soft men’ have in a ‘hard’ context are few — suicide, the quiet resistance of my father, or identifying with the aggressor, falling for the ‘Stockholm syndrome’, as the Prussian king did. Fast forward to present times, if we follow Mary Trump’s account of her uncle, also Donald Trump’s father used humiliation as a tactic to make his son ‘tough’.[[2111]](#endnote-2112)

All too often throughout history, all-out destruction was the endgame for ‘real men’ who ‘went West’ in fulfilling the ‘manifest destiny’ of conquering ever new frontiers — they followed Hitler’s path towards total defeat. In today’s world that is so interconnected that no frontier is really new anymore and no war can have winners, a world where victory over people is as unachievable in the long term as victory over nature, the path of Gandhi is the only option.

In 2016, in America, an audience enwrapped by so-called reality shows that dramatised male humiliation techniques, turned democracy into a real reality show that humiliated society as a whole, not just American society but world society. In 2019, disaster played out in Iran, Iraq, Syria, and Yemen, where world leaders out-did each other in masculine posturing.[[2112]](#endnote-2113) In 2021, news about Afghanistan filled the headlines, where cyborg soldiers were defeated by plain mountain warriors. The coronavirus pandemic is emblematic insofar as a tiny virus put itself in the way of the proverbial man who goes West, ultimately letting him ‘go West’ in the sense of dying.[[2113]](#endnote-2114)

It seems that for the human psyche, particularly for those identifying with scripts of traditional masculinity, it is too humiliating to learn the lesson that ‘we, the human race’ may not be the ‘winners’ we thought we were — perhaps we are rather ‘losers’, destined to die out rather fast in evolutionary terms, not farsighted enough for a longer sojourn on our planet.[[2114]](#endnote-2115) To say it short, by blindly clinging to wanting to ‘go West’ ever further — whereby the West includes the moon and planet Mars by now — our androcentric world ultimately makes us all ‘go West’.

How could we end up in such a dire situation? Enlightenment and ‘capitalism’ made an unholy alliance, we hear, ‘in the West, we are stuck in the mentality that comes from capitalism: Markets are always expanding, whether in space or in scope’, and this ‘melds neatly with an idea of social progress that comes a lot from Enlightenment thinking and scientific thought, where the idea is that we just keep getting more and more information that makes us smarter and better able to exploit resources or build governments’, yet, so is the conclusion, ‘it is an illusion’.[[2115]](#endnote-2116) The original aim of Enlightenment thinkers was to liberate the world from illusion and cruelty, and here we are, in the twenty-first century, stuck with the illusion that simply generating enough mastery knowledge will engender dignified practice. Society ‘is stuck in a way of life that cannot be continued’, and we need to ‘found a new way of life, in terms of ecology, and also in terms of politics’, with ‘knowledge that does not lead to mastery of humans over humans and not to mastery of humans over nature’.[[2116]](#endnote-2117)

In an interconnected and finite world, this is a toxic mix — first the Enlightenment’s progress belief, second, economic systems that require growth, third, masculine risk and thrill seeking, which, fourth, operates on the script of seeking honour in conquering new frontiers and, fifth, goes to duel or duel-like wars in response to the humiliation of honour.

In my book on gender and humiliation, I tried to dissect how the glorification of masculine honour lends itself to irrational and ultimately self-destructive outcomes, while most women I meet around the world try to keep a clear head and attempt to prevent their men from doing harm to themselves and others for the sake of honour.[[2117]](#endnote-2118) Numerous studies have shown that most women, when they are able to earn their own income, unlike many men invest the majority of their earnings back in their families — on nutrition, food, healthcare, schooling, and farming activities.[[2118]](#endnote-2119) Feminist economists show that economies depend entirely on the invisible work of women, they show that autonomy is a myth while dependency is the reality — one economist asked a fitting question, ‘Who cooked Adam Smith’s dinner?’[[2119]](#endnote-2120) The presently unfolding coronavirus pandemic makes society’s dependency on care work unmistakably obvious.

The destructiveness of masculinist self-perceptions is thrown into stark relief in the slums of this world where young men demonstrate sexual prowess through high-risk behaviour. In the slums of Africa, for instance, this behaviour undermines the successful management of HIV risk, as ‘for young people, especially young men seeking honour among peers, long-term consequences are sacrificed for short-term gain’ (see more in chapter 10).[[2120]](#endnote-2121)

Online platforms for right wing extremists represent a growing danger. In 2011, just after terror had hit Norway, we had our annual dignity conference in New Zealand.[[2121]](#endnote-2122) We could not imagine that the terror in Norway would inspire terror in New Zealand eight years later and that the gunman who killed 50 people on 15th March 2019 in New Zealand’s Christchurch would be ‘celebrated by right wing extremists around the world’ by ‘people on 8chan, an online message board’, who watched mass murder unfold.[[2122]](#endnote-2123) The internet enables a new kind of right wing terrorist threat, ‘an increasingly emboldened network of radicals’.[[2123]](#endnote-2124) Google and Facebook are accused in a report by Amnesty International of ‘enabling human rights harm at a population scale’.[[2124]](#endnote-2125)

At macro levels, arms races create more threats.[[2125]](#endnote-2126) Already in 1955, on 9th July, with physicist Józef Rotblat in the chair, philosopher Bertrand Russell read the warnings of the Russell-Einstein Manifesto to a packed press conference:

Here then is the problem that we present to you, stark and dreadful and inescapable: Shall we put an end to the human race, or shall mankind renounce war? ... There lies before us, if we choose, continual progress in happiness, knowledge, and wisdom. Shall we, instead, choose death because we cannot forget our quarrels? We appeal as human beings to human beings: Remember your humanity, and forget the rest. If you can do so, the way lies open to a new Paradise; if you cannot, there lies before you the risk of universal death.[[2126]](#endnote-2127)

Bertrand Russell would be shocked to see that the ‘way of the knife’ that once was a reserve of Japan’s samurai warrior class is now being employed as a strategy of American special operations troops who operate drones.[[2127]](#endnote-2128) Russell would join me in warning that the ‘way of the knife’ could easily ‘democratise’ just as guns have found their way from the battlefield into private homes. If weaponised drones were indeed to become ‘house hold items’, all our local skies could turn into battlefields. Neighbours of nuclear installations, once designed to be peaceful energy supplying devices, would look into the skies with dread, because harmless looking play-drones could easily transmute such installations into explosive bombs.[[2128]](#endnote-2129)

Psychologist Anthony Marsella sees contemporary mass shootings as a sign of a ‘trickle-down effect’ — not the trickling down of wealth and well-being, but the trickling down of violence and pathology, in short, of sociocide. We are all socialised by the culture in which we live, Marsella explains, and ‘socialisation can prepare us for becoming productive and responsible citizens, or demented and sociopathic persons committed to violence and destruction, driven by an ends justifies the means mentality’.[[2129]](#endnote-2130) The ‘cult of capitalism’ makes us believe ‘that competitiveness is hardwired into us to the exclusion of all other virtues’, while there is ample evidence that our ability to share and cooperate has played ‘a formative role in our evolutionary development’.[[2130]](#endnote-2131)

To come back to the image of the Titanic, what will happen when it starts to sink, when our world begins to fall apart, and competitiveness is our solution, rather than solidarity?[[2131]](#endnote-2132) Norwegian author Maja Lunde wrote a novel that transports the reader into such a scenario. She shows the future of a drought-ridden Southern Europe from which people are fleeing — first, the rich flee, those who can afford reaching safer grounds, while the rest has their families torn apart when refugee camps transform formerly proud citizens into struggling migrants.[[2132]](#endnote-2133) If competitiveness continues to reign, we will all become refugees without refuge.

#### Relational malnutrition perpetuates sociocide

Political analyst Naomi Klein describes the situation in ways that profoundly resonate with my observations, at local levels as much as at the global level, ‘Just when we needed to gather, our public sphere was disintegrating; just when we needed to consume less, consumerism took over virtually every aspect of our lives; just when we needed to slow down and notice, we sped up; and just when we needed longer time horizons, we were able to see only the immediate present’.[[2133]](#endnote-2134)

Indeed, at the present juncture in history, all around the world — and the presently unfolding coronavirus pandemic amplifies this — we observe the shattering of the social contract as it was envisioned from the eighteenth through the twentieth centuries to mean that the laws and institutions of government should function to protect the equality, freedom, human rights, and life-possibilities of citizens.[[2134]](#endnote-2135) Philosopher for peace Glen Martin sees this contract being replaced with an economic Darwinism, with ‘a predatory society in which law and government operate to promote the callous exploitation of the majority by the super-wealthy few, and in which everything is commodified — from human beings to natural resources to the environment — everything is subject to merciless exploitation without regard to human welfare, the common good, or the future of our planet’.[[2135]](#endnote-2136)

The loss of happiness in market democracies is the title of a book by political scientist Robert Lane, who spells out the ways in which monetary wealth fails its promise — as material prosperity in Western countries increased throughout the past decades, family solidarity and community integration eroded, and people became increasingly suspicious of their political institutions and each other.[[2136]](#endnote-2137) ‘Competent communities have been invaded and colonised by professionalised services — often with devastating results’[[2137]](#endnote-2138) — drug addiction has increased dramatically in some Western countries, particularly in the United States of America.[[2138]](#endnote-2139)

Robert Lane urges people in the West to increase companionship even if it means decreasing income. Psychologist Linda Hartling supports his view, saying that, indeed, ‘the existing economic systems are rigged against connection, leading to relational malnutrition, breaking down the fabric of society’.[[2139]](#endnote-2140) The impersonal bureaucracy of what is called public sector, in concert with the profit orientation of what is known as corporate sector, degrade the social fabric — and this while the only viable ‘currency’ is the currency of appreciation.[[2140]](#endnote-2141)

Voices from Europe offer a similar analysis. For a long time, Hartmut Rosa, a German sociologist, has wondered why so many people in contemporary Western societies fail to lead a ‘good life’ even though they enjoy more freedoms than any generation before. He identifies the acceleration of social life under what we call capitalism as the problem, a regime of deadlines that has caused a widespread sense of alienation.[[2141]](#endnote-2142) Norwegian social anthropologist Thomas Hylland Eriksen offers a similar analysis, he speaks of a world that is overheating — too full and too fast, uneven, and unequal.[[2142]](#endnote-2143) French cultural theorist Paul Virilio identifies a media-driven acceleration that results in an infosphere that engulfs the entire political subject.[[2143]](#endnote-2144)

Another German sociologist, Werner Seppmann, describes the current increase in violence and irrationalism as a de-civilisation driven by business-styled social systems that imply that the satisfaction of human needs is to be hoped for as a secondary consequence of economic growth, rather than sought as a deliberate aim.[[2144]](#endnote-2145) Yet another European writer, Ilija Trojanow, warns that those who produce nothing and consume nothing will soon become superfluous given the murderous logic of late capitalism.[[2145]](#endnote-2146) He warns that those who continue to believe themselves to be the winners in this context are deceiving themselves — they will become victims as well. In the end, there will be no safe distance anymore from where anyone can watch unscathed the news of the ravages of climate degradation and the mercilessness of neo-liberal labour market policies — the coronavirus pandemic is the ultimate messenger of the insight that at the end there will be no safe place to hide, no place where to seek asylum.

Already in 2018, long before the coronavirus pandemic unfolded, the ‘School of Life’ headquartered in London warned that the modern world is ‘powerfully and tragically geared to causing a high background level of anxiety and widespread low-level depression’.[[2146]](#endnote-2147) In their book of life, the school lists six features of modernity that have psychologically disturbing effects. First, there is meritocracy, or the blaming of the victim, despite the fact that also ‘good, decent people can fail and deserve compassion, rather than contempt’.[[2147]](#endnote-2148) Second, there is individualism, everyone supposedly being capable of a special destiny while the community does not matter. The antidote, so the school advises, is the ‘quiet heroism of the everyday’.[[2148]](#endnote-2149) Third, something bigger than human is needed to induce humility. ‘Religions used to perform the useful service of keeping our petty ways and status battles in perspective. But now there is nothing to awe or relativise humans, whose triumphs and mishaps end up feeling like the be all and end all’.[[2149]](#endnote-2150) As a cure, the school suggests using ‘sources of transcendence to generate a benign, relativising perspective on our personal sorrows: music, the stars at night, the vast spaces of the desert or the ocean would humble us all in consoling ways’.[[2150]](#endnote-2151) Fourth, the school lists romanticism, or the idea that it is a disaster if one does not live together with the one and only person who makes one ‘completely happy’. The antidote is to let go of this ‘improbable dream’ and rather ‘build up ambitions around friendship and non-sexual love’.[[2151]](#endnote-2152) Fifth, there are the media and their profit-driven inclination to focus on ‘things that scare, worry, panic and enrage us, while denying us agency or any chance for effective personal action’.[[2152]](#endnote-2153) The cure would be news that expose ‘systemic problems rather than gleefully emphasising scapegoats and emblematic monsters’.[[2153]](#endnote-2154) Last, there is perfectibility, or the illusion that one has wasted one’s life if one is not perfectly accomplished. The antidote is a culture that promotes ‘the idea that perfection is not within our grasp’ and ‘that what we need above all are good friends with whom we can sit and honestly discuss our real fears and vulnerabilities’.[[2154]](#endnote-2155) The authors of this book of life denounce the widespread conception that things or experiences that are rare, expensive, famous, or large in scale per definition provide more satisfaction than small and simple things and experiences — ‘if someone says they’ve been on a trip to Belize by private jet we automatically assume they had a better time than someone who went to the local park by bike’, and ‘we imagine that visiting the Uffizi gallery in Florence is always going to be nicer than reading a paperback novel in the back garden’.[[2155]](#endnote-2156)

I profoundly resonate with the school of life’s insight that ‘more is not better’, because ‘more’ can also mean ‘too much’. Examples abound. The self-esteem movement is one of them — more empowerment can also mean too much empowerment. Linda Hartling observes that the self-esteem movement has failed because the cure became a disease, and this helped by ‘the field of psychology’s efforts to completely extinguish feelings of shame — while neglecting to examine the pro-social function of shame — may have contributed to social shamelessness in society’.[[2156]](#endnote-2157) Empowerment goes too far and is sociocidal when it produces a narcissistic society, a society where hubris and callousness are being democratised instead of responsible humility — this is why I avoid the phrase ‘empowerment’ and prefer the term entrustment.[[2157]](#endnote-2158) By now, we see sociocide entering ever-new levels — we see shameless shaming — practices such as body shaming can even drive victims into suicide.

Sociocide goes deepest when it affects children and not just adults or adolescents. Children’s minds are the most vulnerable, they are open to embracing pro-social behaviour as much as anti-social behaviour. Not just in war-torn countries where the young are recruited as child soldiers, also in Western countries, this openness is being abused as an entry point for toxic manipulations. Babies less than three years old, for instance, are targeted by advertisers who capitalise on studies that show that children can recognise around one hundred brand logos by the age of three, and, even more importantly, that some babies ‘request brands as soon as they can speak’.[[2158]](#endnote-2159) These advertisers act in the spirit of retail analyst Victor Lebow, who wrote in his infamous 1955 paper that Americans should ‘make consumption their way of life’.[[2159]](#endnote-2160) He thought that buying and using goods could be made into a kind of ritual, that things would be ‘consumed, burned up, worn out, replaced and discarded at an ever-increasing rate’.[[2160]](#endnote-2161) In his view, this would not just keep the economy going, people would also find ‘spiritual satisfaction and ego gratification in consumption’.[[2161]](#endnote-2162)

Many readers may deem manipulating children into violence as anti-social, and manipulating children to engage in consumption to boost the economy as pro-social. Yet, one may argue that both manipulations are anti-social, only at a different degree and speed. Present-time economic arrangements, with their emphasis on unbridled consumption, lead to sociocide and ecocide as surely as violence, war, and terrorism, only slower.

Chirevo Kwenda, expert on African traditional religion in South Africa, describes the sociocidal influences of Lebow’s strategy in Africa.[[2162]](#endnote-2163) Kwenda explains that social cohesion in Africa does not flow from state sovereignty, liberal democracy, the advance of modernity, or the global economy. Rather, it is paid for by the suffering of millions of African people, as they are forced to live alienated lives.

My global experience has indeed shown that Kwenda’s observation is relevant not just for Africa. It is relevant also in the very heartland of those who originated this experiment, namely, the West. The fault line no longer runs between the West and the non-West — by now, everywhere in the world, the majority of people pays the price of ritualised overconsumption that results in psychological alienation, social fragmentation, and ecological disintegration. These conditions are creeping into Western societies just as everywhere else, feeding ‘markets’ that offer Band Aids rather than inspiring systemic change. The coronavirus pandemic only throws this predicament into starker relief.

In my view, ‘going shopping’ ought to be removed from the list of cultural-economical ‘duties’, just as much as ‘mowing the lawn’ ought to be removed from the list of ecological duties. I call it ‘murdering the lawn’.

Slowly, more and more of us realise that we, the human inhabitants of this planet, are on the wrong path. Phrases such as vivir bien have become known worldwide, the Andean version of swaraj (India) or ubuntu (South Africa) — to mention just a few of the better known expressions (see more in chapter 11).[[2163]](#endnote-2164) The global Network of Indigenous and Community Conservation Areas[[2164]](#endnote-2165) convenes more than one hundred communities in seventy countries around the world, and it reports:

There are hundreds of millions of people who suffered the horrors of exclusion or, even worse, subjugated inclusion as colonialism and capitalism expanded around the globe. Yet, quite miraculously, many have jealously guarded their heritages and traditions, demonstrating a resilience that is now so apparent that we are obliged to recognise them as peoples capable of governing themselves and treasuring valuable knowledge and ways of living that are contributing to a better understanding of the planet as a dynamic system. The international community recognised their importance with the belated adoption of the UN Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (2004), following on the ILO’s Convention 169 on Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Rights to Informed, Prior and Free Consent on development projects that might affect them or their territories (1991).[[2165]](#endnote-2166)

Throughout the past fifty years, many of my friends in the non-Western world shared with me their disgust of what they called Western decadence. I share some of this disgust — it did not surprise me when the Muslim Brotherhood organisation won the elections in Egypt in 2012 for promising relief from decadence, for example, or when the Taliban takeover in 2021 was welcomed by many Afghans. From my point of view, many aspects of Western culture deserve being called ‘decadent’ — ‘corruption’, for instance, is not an externality, it is not a vice that should be psychologised or individualised, it is at the core of the economic rules imposed by the West on the world-system — Louis Brandeis was right when he said, ‘We may have democracy, or we may have wealth concentrated in the hands of a few, but we can’t have both’. In the book that I wrote in 2012 to explore the possibilities for a dignity economy, I describe the undignifying effects of the economic frameworks that the West has imposed on the world throughout the past centuries.[[2166]](#endnote-2167) With chagrin, I observe the ‘loss of happiness’ bemoaned by Robert Lane not just in the West but all around the world, long before the coronavirus pandemic unfolded, usually followed by insufficient or misguided compensation attempts. Since many years, I see an ubiquitous cogitocidal fog of war arise, to use the words of Carl von Clausewitz, when I hear big promises proclaimed — for instance, that we will heroically technologise us out of our problems — while at the same time social and ecological disintegrations continues.[[2167]](#endnote-2168) Seeing big aims being missed so systematically, I understand those who ask whether not those aims were professed in bad faith in the first place.[[2168]](#endnote-2169)

As a psychologist, I wonder how it was possible ever to expect that the social-psychological ‘glue’ that traditionally was provided by the extended family could be provided by the abstract contracts of the market. New research in relational neuroscience confirms that the human brain and physiology flourish best when people are embedded in webs of caring relationships and that isolation and exclusion activate the same neural pathways as physical pain.[[2169]](#endnote-2170) Feeling loved is the only way to long-term physical and mental health benefits, and neglect results in lifelong mental damage. A study on adult development that started in 1938 tracked the lives of 724 men for 75 years and found that nourishing relationships were the key factor for long-lasting happiness.[[2170]](#endnote-2171) Nature and nurture are not separate, they are interwoven and mutually interdependent — human nature can only flourish when loving relationships are nurtured, while cold and competitive markets have the opposite effect, an effect that is aggravated when Band Aids are offered that do not heal the wounds but only ‘heal’ the market.

While injuries in otherwise healthy adults may be overcome, in children, they can become structural. The brains of neglected children, for instance, are smaller than those of loved children are, as brain cells grow and cerebral circuits develop in response to infants’ interactions with their main caregivers. The genes for brain function, including intelligence, may not even become functional if a newborn is neglected during the first two years of life.[[2171]](#endnote-2172) In case the brain has not developed properly because of neglect in the first two years of life, the child, when growing up, may be incapable of responding to the incentives and disincentives meant to guide society away from crime, and they may even end up as persistent offenders.[[2172]](#endnote-2173) Worse, the degradation of the social web affects not just present generations but also future generations. New research shows that violence experienced by expecting mothers is detectable even in the DNA of their grandchildren.[[2173]](#endnote-2174)

In other words, sociocide goes deepest when it affects children, when the very care is missing that is needed to nurture a healthy next generation.[[2174]](#endnote-2175) Unfortunately, this is precisely what happens now, particularly in the West. Young mothers sit in front of their crying offspring with their cell phones, not knowing what to do with their babies, as we hear from a consultant in early childhood development in Germany.[[2175]](#endnote-2176) She observes that parents are no longer able to understand their offspring’s signals and that the number of babies and young children with insecure attachment is on the increase. She calls on society to recognise its responsibility to create contexts that allow parents to give their children an adequate start in life — what is needed in educational settings is attention to the fostering of connection, rather than merely delivering instruction. My observations from around the world coincide with her observations, analysis, and recommendations. If a society wishes to maintain its social-psychological health over several generations, it needs to nurture psychological growth through the quality — rather than quantity — of relationships.[[2176]](#endnote-2177) There is only one way to achieve this, namely, through fostering nurturant parenting.[[2177]](#endnote-2178)

Sadly, at this point in historical time, most people I meet around the world seem to have been co-opted rather successfully into participating in the weakening of the social fabric of their communities — very often, they are not aware of this, and particularly men are even proud of their personal mastery of individualised competitiveness, overlooking the detrimental consequences that typically are being picked up by women. It seems that most of us partake in cogitocide rather voluntarily, the very reason for why the shredding of the socio- and ecospheres can go so unnoticed, or, if noticed, is analysed and treated in ways that avoid asking deep enough questions. It remains to be seen whether the coronavirus pandemic can change this predicament. Too many among us may simply continue believing that dignity is to be gained through assertive economic domination, through the accumulation of possessions, through high-priced experiences, all flashed and branded on un-social media. Even mindfulness has been reduced to McMindfulness now, ‘a commodified and instrumental self-help technique that unwittingly reinforces neo-liberal imperatives’.[[2178]](#endnote-2179)

Georg Schramm is a German intellectual comedian who felt inspired by investor Warren Buffet calling financial products (such as derivatives) ‘weapons of mass destruction’ in the ‘war of the rich against the poor’.[[2179]](#endnote-2180) Schramm created a parody that describes countries as junkies who are being hooked with cheap money, only for the dealers to raise the prices shortly after. Then comes the billing company and takes everything, from water, gas, and electricity to retirement pensions, and the global collection company is represented by the IMF. The ‘drug dealer’ itself is also an addict, and, as all junkies do, he throws huge parties whenever drugs are secured for a few days. Billions of dollars of cheap money have been delivered to the dealers by now, a tiny group of the richest possesses almost everything while many others live on ration cards. Given that this is a drug problem, Schramm asks satirically, how are wars on drugs usually won? They are won, among others, by dismantling syndicates and drug cartels, he replies. Yet, this is not what happens. Governments are inactive because they are customers of the dealers themselves. Instead, the end users must go cold turkey whenever they rampage or attack one another.[[2180]](#endnote-2181) Clearly, Schramm’s parody entails much realism, and the coronavirus pandemic adds relevance to it.[[2181]](#endnote-2182)

Recently, it became known that online retailers destroy large amounts of essentially new goods because it is more profitable to destroy returned goods than to repackage them or donate them.[[2182]](#endnote-2183) We could say that this practice exemplifies the state of the world, and the coronavirus pandemic underlines it: Given the presently existing systemic rules, it is more profitable to ravage the world than to protect it.

Even remedies meant to alleviate risks are increasingly instrumentalised for profit by now, ultimately increasing risks rather than decreasing them. The climate crisis is an example, as many investors simply see it as another profit opportunity.[[2183]](#endnote-2184) MetLife Insurance Portfolio Manager Lawrence Oxley wrote a book on how extreme climate events represent major investing opportunities for the stock, bond, and futures markets.[[2184]](#endnote-2185) ‘Africa could be gone but global GDP may still increase’, as banks and the financial sector are mainly worried about how climate protection policies may negatively affect the stability of the financial system [[2185]](#endnote-2186) — ‘financial markets are completely ignoring the Paris Agreement and investing in fossil fuels’.[[2186]](#endnote-2187) In other words, as long as this trend continues,[[2187]](#endnote-2188) as long as it remains profitable to destroy the planet, we can expect that risks will be denied, neglected, or covered up — worse, risks may even be amplified to exploit their potential for monetary gain.[[2188]](#endnote-2189)

In short, as long as people hold key positions in society who are mainly interested in maintaining their privileged status, and the rest tries to climb the ladder of moneyed status, risks will be viewed through the narrow lens of short-term interests. There will soon be no human sociosphere left anymore if we degrade our cogitosphere to the point of blindly allowing ecocide. As long as we, as humanity, arrange our affairs on planet Earth in ways that the degradation of the ecosphere improves business opportunities, not just humanity’s well-being is at risk, our very survival is at stake.

### Systemic imperatives drive ecocide and sociocide

We may have democracy, or we may have wealth concentrated in the hands of a few, but we can’t have both.  
― Louis Brandeis (1856–1941), lawyer and associate justice on the Supreme Court of the United States from 1916 to 1939[[2189]](#endnote-2190)

Where do all these problems come from? Are malevolent intentions the culprit? Are we victims of evil, selfish, and shortsighted conspiracies? Not necessarily, asserts social anthropologist Thomas Hylland Eriksen. He faults clashing scales. He points at the clashing scales of globalisation, or, more precisely, the particular expression of globalisation that has shaped the past decades. ‘If you are in a powerful position, you can change thousands of people’s lives far away with a stroke of a pen; but if you spent time with them first, that is likely to influence your decision’.[[2190]](#endnote-2191) The tangibly lived life at the small-scale clashes with large-scale decisions, ‘and you come to realise that what is good for Sweden is not necessarily good for the residents of the village of north of Ystad’.[[2191]](#endnote-2192)

Thomas Hylland Eriksen continues by saying that we live in a world ‘where modernity has shifted to a higher gear, were there is full speed ahead in most areas’, we live in ‘a volatile and ultimately self-destructive situation’, where world society ‘seems to have locked itself to a path which is bound to end with collapse’.[[2192]](#endnote-2193) He said this in 2016. A few years later, the coronavirus pandemic looks like a confirmation of his predictions, and it remains to be seen whether the anthropause caused by worldwide lockdowns will accelerate this trend or slow it down.[[2193]](#endnote-2194) Eriksen looks back to 1800, when world population stood at one billion, and each human used on an average twenty Gigajoules of energy a year. In 1920, we were two billion people on the planet, and by now we are seven billion, seven times as many as in 1800, and we use each eighty Gigajoules, amounting to a growth in energy consumption by a factor of twenty-eight. Populations living in what is called ‘rich’ countries have access to much more machine power than the rest, as if each of them enslaved the equivalent of sixty people in the rest of the world.[[2194]](#endnote-2195) By now, this glaring difference slowly becomes more visible to everyone, as ‘we are increasingly aware of each other’.[[2195]](#endnote-2196) The side effects of these ‘riches’ are well known, notes Erikson, they range from pollution to environmental degradation, and, given the fact that unlimited growth is impossible, ‘conventional Enlightenment-industrial ideas of progress and development are far more difficult to defend now than just a generation ago’.[[2196]](#endnote-2197)

Again, it falls short to merely individualise and psychologise the problem. The problem is not the greed of individual people. We face a runaway dynamic that is systemic, this is also the diagnosis of Duncan Austin, expert in sustainable investment. There is the ‘profit enforcement’ dynamic of financial markets that combines with corporate influence over politics under the motto that ‘to maximise profits is a social responsibility’, a combination that has ‘transformed a more balanced earlier form of capitalism’ into today’s ‘runaway corporatism’.[[2197]](#endnote-2198) In this situation, it is futile to simply ‘pursue individual elements of the socio-economic system’, because ‘the relationship between the corporation and government is now the key challenge facing the sustainability movement’.[[2198]](#endnote-2199)

This is also Howard Richards’ view. ‘The dynamic of capital accumulation has been a major, perhaps the major, dynamic of modern history; as has social exclusion, which is another consequence of the same normative structure’.[[2199]](#endnote-2200) After having analysed these issues for many decades, Richards joins Eriksen’s conclusion that the problem is not a psychological one, it is not greed among certain elites, it is not the lack of regulations — implementing more regulations will not turn the situation around.[[2200]](#endnote-2201) Like me, like Eriksen, and like many others, also Richards is convinced that deeper change is needed.

Before we can rectify something, we have to understand how it works. Howard Richards brings us back two thousand years to understand the central pillars of our economic institutions, namely, to the Roman Empire and its laws, more specifically, to jus gentium (see more in chapter 12). The ground pillars of the modern world are provided by successors of this law, and Richards offers an elaborate overview over the evolution of Roman law, how it marched into its present feat of defining the ethics of our time and ‘ruling the world’ whether its populations identify with these rules or not.[[2201]](#endnote-2202) Already Roman emperor Justinian (circa 482–565) stipulated the three precepts that form the basis for the law, honeste vivere or ‘to live honestly’, alterum non laedere or ‘to injure no one’, and suum cuique tribuere or ‘to give to each his or her own’.[[2202]](#endnote-2203) These rules helped the Roman Empire collect tributes and protect merchants because it abstracted from the empire’s multicultural diversity — under the Roman Empire, citizenship became to mean the legal status of a rights holder.[[2203]](#endnote-2204) An ancient Roman magistrate, the praetor, was tasked with settling the disputes within jus gentium. The principle pacta sunt servanda, meaning ‘agreements are to be kept’, grew out of Roman law later.[[2204]](#endnote-2205)

Unfortunately, however, as Howard Richards observes, the pillars of Roman law are precisely what contributes to the shredding of our social fabric today, and the most unmitigated version is enacted in the Anglo-Saxon world, as it remained largely untouched by the legal reforms that were introduced on the European continent around two hundred years ago.[[2205]](#endnote-2206) Richards’ main point of criticism is that these rules allow people to believe that there is no responsibility when there is no contract — the alterum non laedere rule imposes a duty not to harm but no duty to help and it combines with civil law designed on the Roman distinction between private law and public law (now global).[[2206]](#endnote-2207) The combination of these rules delegitimises solidarity and promotes an impersonal way of relating to other people as mere abstract role-bearers in contracts, and it allows relating to nature as a mere free service provider.

When I heard Richards’ analysis for the first time many years ago, I began to see the world through his eyes, and, indeed, I encountered ever more examples underlining how Roman law rules serve the interest of a few in the short term, while the price is being paid by the rest in the long term. ‘Since I have no contract with nature and no contract with the next generation, why should I care?’ is an attitude I meet all over the world. These rules are highly effective in delegitimising any desire to engage in direct unconditional face-to-face solidarity, they weaken the traditional family spirit of communal sharing, a spirit that says that everyone should ‘receive according to need and give according to ability’.[[2207]](#endnote-2208) Worse even, they underpin the myth that individual independence is the path to health, both the health of a person and that of society, and that this health is achievable through an abstract societal system of contracts, a system to which everyone ought to turn for livelihood and social connection. Solidarity is expected to be administrable through that system, supported through the paying of taxes or the giving to charity.

People like me, who value unconditional solidarity — solidarity with fellow human beings, solidarity with animals, solidarity with nature in general, of which we humans are only a small part — people like me are rebuked with the argument that unconditional solidarity would ‘hurt the job market’ if it were to become a rule, that it would ‘undermine individual independence’, that it would undercut the goal that everyone must ‘stand on their own feet’, worse, it would ‘enable losers who live off others’. As a result, and I observe this the world around, unconditional loving connection is increasingly replaced by the purchase of products or services, and this includes intimate relationships and sexual encounters.[[2208]](#endnote-2209) Even dignity has joined the list of ‘commodities’ believed to be purchasable.[[2209]](#endnote-2210)

As reported earlier, historian Henrik Jensen sees two normative complexes in the history of Western culture, a duty culture of authority and guilt that has its deepest roots in Christianity and in the ancient agrarian world, and a culture of rights that celebrates the individual.[[2210]](#endnote-2211) Jensen dissects how the culture of rights became the dominant principle in the relationship between individual and society in the Renaissance period, how this grew into a counter-culture through the Enlightenment, the French Revolution, and Romanticism, only to end in the disasters of the twentieth century. By now, Jensen argues, the result is that we live in a world of manipulated and atomised masses of individualised and disconnected rights-holders in eternal mutual competition.

If we were to bring Richards’ and Jensen’s views together, we may say that simply returning to a world of duty, authority, and guilt would not be a desirable solution. We do not wish to follow Marshal Philippe Pétain, the leader of collaborationist France under Nazi Germany, who replaced liberté, égalité, fraternité with travail, famille, patrie, ‘work, family, fatherland’, so as to bring back the social hierarchy of order, tradition, and religion.[[2211]](#endnote-2212) Again, the problem does not lie in individual rights per se, it lies in the fact that we fail to bring Roman law and human dignity into synchrony.

Earlier, we heard from legal expert Duncan Kennedy about the distinction between ‘inside’ and ‘outside’ rights, or that rights exist even if the legal order does not recognise them or makes it even illegal to exercise them — ‘slavery denies the right to personal freedom, which exists in spite of and above the law of slave states’.[[2212]](#endnote-2213) If we say that the requirements of dignity represent outside rights, and the problem lies in dignity failing to inform inside rights, how could dignity and rights be brought into better consonance?

We may want to follow Riane Eisler suggestion to regard the emerging principle of Responsibility to Protect (R2P) as a start for the dignity of need, trust, duty, and mutual care to inspire also legal instruments of rights — of course, under the condition that we heed Duncan Kennedy’s caveat, namely, to refrain from putting our entire faith in rights, and, second, to refrain from humiliating protection in the spirit of colonialists who thought they had to protect their victims from ‘barbarism’. First steps were taken, for instance, in 1997, when a Universal Declaration of Human Responsibilities was issued by the InterAction Council,[[2213]](#endnote-2214) and in 2017, when a Universal Declaration of Responsibility in an Interdependent World was stipulated by the Alliance for Responsible and Sustainable Societies.[[2214]](#endnote-2215)

Individual rights and human dignity have a complicated relationship. Human rights expert Kathryn Sikkink explains the ways in which the individual is being conceptualised within a human rights frame, in contrast to how a neo-liberalism or capitalism frame conceives of the individual:

Human rights law and the human rights movement has treated the individual as a normative and legal matter — that is, human rights ideas stress that the well-being of the individual in the broadest sense should be the main object of our concern and that individual human rights should legally and morally take precedence over other policy matters or concerns. This makes the individual focus of human rights not at all like the methodological individualism of neo-liberal or capitalist economics, which focusses on the individual as a rational, self-maximising actor in a model where self-interest provides the motivation for economic production. The human rights agenda, on the other hand, often requires us to limit self-interest to take into account the needs of others.[[2215]](#endnote-2216)

All over the world, I observe how young people who grow up in a world driven by the ‘methodological individualism of neo-liberal economics’ are prevented from learning the most fulfilling forms of interpersonal interdependence, namely, the Buberian meeting of souls in I-Thou relationships,[[2216]](#endnote-2217) they are prevented from learning to merge dependence and independence into the rich interdependence of mutual interconnection. The methodological individualism of neo-liberal economics brings everyone into solipsistic monological relationships with self and others and curtails the relational space that humans need to unfold their potential, and in this way, it inflicts profound psychological damage on individuals and society — in short, it perpetrates sociocide.[[2217]](#endnote-2218)

Howard Richards observes an overstretch of this monological trend even in philosophy — from Kant to Charles Taylor’s notion of authenticity — at the cost of the dialogical embeddedness of human life. Already sociologist George Herbert Mead saw this danger when he conceived of the notion of the self as a relational construction.[[2218]](#endnote-2219) Monological overstretch hurts individuals and damages society as a whole, and examples are easily found — for instance, when problems for which politicians ought to take responsibility are being redefined as mere technical problems.[[2219]](#endnote-2220) Richards gives this historical overview:

It was the time when the Gemeinschaften of the Middle Ages were disintegrating; the time when the evils of feudalism were being superseded by the evils of capitalism; a time, one of many times, when the dominium of some meant the exclusion of many, when the consensual contract facilitated the commercial transactions of those who offered products that somebody else wanted to buy, while the dissolution of personal bonds, and their replacement by the arms-length transactions defined by the jus gentium isolated those who had only labour power to sell, inspiring fear in those who succeeded in selling their labour power today but who knew they might not succeed tomorrow, and despair in those who did not succeed.[[2220]](#endnote-2221)

The same systemic imperatives that once formed the backdrop for colonialism with its massive deconstruction of Indigenous cultures[[2221]](#endnote-2222) now drive what is known as neo-liberalism, which, Richards suggests, should therefore be called neo-Romanism. The same imperatives, we could say, drive also what is called war on terror in its thrust to target not just people identified as extremists, but generally, all traditional ways of life that resist the ethics of modernity.[[2222]](#endnote-2223)

My seven years of working as a psychotherapist in Egypt’s capital Cairo taught me many lessons that relate to Howard Richards’ diagnosis of our time. I learned to value the capacity of traditional collectivistic family networks to create social glue among its members. At the same time, I was not blind to the dark sides of collectivism, after all, its victims came as clients to me as a therapist. They taught me everything about the harmfulness of collectivism, for instance, that it can turn into division and oppression, and that the formation of trust in larger society is impeded when social bonds are limited to tribal settings.[[2223]](#endnote-2224) I am therefore well aware of the advantages of larger and more abstract networks of relationships, I am an admirer of Paulo Freire’s colleague Clodomir de Morais who calls it the ‘artisan weakness’ not to let go of control,[[2224]](#endnote-2225) I value Mark Granovetter’s ‘weak ties’.[[2225]](#endnote-2226) Altogether, I welcome the liberation from all oppressive and divisive aspects of traditional collectivistic mindsets and society models. Neither Howard Richards nor I wish to return to any idealisation of the past.

Yet, there is a ‘too little’ and a ‘too much’, and what I see individualistic orientations doing in Western societies is ‘too much’.[[2226]](#endnote-2227) Driven by the promise of equal dignity, they go too far. They sacrifice the solidarity that is embedded in collectivistic settings, a solidarity that exists despite all oppressive and divisive aspects.[[2227]](#endnote-2228) In 1929, Virginia Woolf was right that ‘a woman must have money and a room of her own if she is to write fiction’, yet, sitting there alone for too long leads to anomie, a generalised state of alienation and atomisation.[[2228]](#endnote-2229) By ripping the individual out from the collective, Western societies have thrown out the baby with the bath water so to speak, so that anomie reigns instead of the hoped-for equal dignity for all in solidarity,[[2229]](#endnote-2230) a predicament that is exacerbated by rising inequality.[[2230]](#endnote-2231) As this anomic mindset is now part of a global ‘colonisation campaign’ originating from the West, it empties the world of its social and ecological resources and leaves behind a ravaged habitat where disconnected lonely ‘losers’ are blinded by the illusion that they can become ‘winners’ if only they work hard enough so they can ‘buy the right kind of life’.[[2231]](#endnote-2232)

What is overlooked, and I observe this everywhere, are the benefits of collectivistic arrangements, their ability to create relationships that provide society with social glue — freedom does not have to end in anomic loneliness. Collectivistic arrangements do not have to be authoritarian hierarchies that exclude equal dignity, they can also foster relationships in which each person is valued, protected, and nurtured rather than sacrificed for the sake of a global monetary system. In the global dignity movement that we began building twenty years ago — our global Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies network — we nurture precisely this kind of togetherness in freedom. There is a pro-liberal, pro-multicultural kind of communitarianism and collectivism that theorists such as Michael Walzer and Charles Taylor stand for.[[2232]](#endnote-2233) Geopolitologist and philosopher Pierre Hassner was the Alexis de Tocqueville award recipient of 2003 and an esteemed member in our global advisory board until his passing, and he rightly observed that ‘the yearning for community and identity on the one hand, and that for equality and solidarity on the other, will always come back’.[[2233]](#endnote-2234)

Non-Western communities hail traditions such as filial piety, and certain aspects of it deserve to be maintained rather than thrown out wholesale. The reciprocal aspect of filial piety, for instance, is worth nurturing, what needs to be left behind is the oppressive authoritarian aspect.[[2234]](#endnote-2235) The non-Western diaspora in Western countries is currently building these bridges, for example, people of Iranian and other Middle Eastern origins based in America appreciate the Iranian veneration of the elderly while they have ‘turned their backs on the other main Iranian cultural marker, namely, control over women and their sexuality’.[[2235]](#endnote-2236) Even radical feminists who believe in women’s social and sexual self-determination are ‘proud of the Iranian esteem for parents’.[[2236]](#endnote-2237) These are bridge builders who, like me, validate and nurture the benign horizontal aspects of collectivism, while avoiding the malign vertical aspects.[[2237]](#endnote-2238) This is why I am writing these lines in the house of my father, now 95 years old, because caring for him is an integral part of my dignity work.

This brings us back to the distinction between customary and reflective morality by philosophers John Dewey (1859–1952) and James Tufts (1862–1942),[[2238]](#endnote-2239) and to sociologist Ferdinand Tönnies (1855–1936) and the difference between Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft.[[2239]](#endnote-2240) Historical sociologist and political economist Karl Polanyi (1886–1964) has analysed how market relationships became disconnected from social relationships as the feudal Gemeinschaften of the Middle Ages disintegrated and capitalism dissolved personal bonds through arms-length transactions.[[2240]](#endnote-2241) Later, sociologist Mark Granovetter (born 1943) built on Tönnies’ differentiation in his research on the question whether strong or weak social ties are more useful — in a Gemeinschaft, people have strong ties and thoroughly share norms, a setting that is easily disrupted by even minimal dissent, while having many weak ties to a number of people, as in a Gesellschaft, provides more space for individual autonomy and diversity.[[2241]](#endnote-2242)

The work of Ferdinand Tönnies, followed by Mark Granovetter’s network theory of ‘the strength of weak ties’, has inspired many scholars since. Recent examples are, for instance, the notion of relational mobility developed by Masaki Yuki’s cultural psychology research group,[[2242]](#endnote-2243) or the theory of social change and human development by cross-cultural psychologist Patricia Marks Greenfield: When people move from a rural Gemeinschaft — with its informal education at home, its subsistence economy, and low-technology environments — to urban Gesellschaft and its formal schooling, market relationships, and high-technology environments, their cultural values and behaviours shift in an individualistic direction towards more independent social behaviour and more abstract cognition.[[2243]](#endnote-2244)

Tönnies and Granovetter’s lens of strong versus weak ties has also inspired me. My personal life path confirms that it is worth having many weak ties, weak in the sense of flexibility, while at the same time making them stronger in the sense of loving solidarity. I value independent social behaviour and abstract cognition (Morais), yet, as emphasised before, there is a ‘too much’ and a ‘too little’. I avoid making weak ties with other people weaker through turning my fellow humans into mere contract holders — I avoid what Martin Buber calls I-It relationships — instead, I strive to make weak ties stronger through loving solidarity — I strive for I-Thou relationships — always protecting the flexibility and freedom entailed in weak ties from oppressive hierarchy. This is precisely what we do in our Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies community, we do whatever we can to honour both difference and similarity by bringing them into loving resonance, we attempt to combine strong and weak ties in ways that ensure that the advantages of both are foregrounded and nurtured and their disadvantages avoided.

Author Frank Schirrmacher is another voice who, like me, warns against a ‘too much’, who admonishes that the weakening of ties can go too far.[[2244]](#endnote-2245) Schirrmacher points at the shrinking of social relationships to a minimum and is wary of the dissolution of the family in its function as ‘survival factory’. Schirrmacher uses the tragedy of the settlers of the Donner Party to illustrate the danger of this dissolution. A group of American pioneers set out for California in a wagon train in May 1846 and ended up having to spend the winter of 1846 to 1847 snowbound in the Sierra Nevada. Those who were alone, without family, died in the snowstorms, while those who were with family survived. We could add another example, namely, that of the children who stranded on the Pacific island of Ata in 1965 and who survived through cooperation. The sailor who accidently found them recounted later, ‘I was amazed to see running towards me six naked young men with long, matted hair, shouting, waving and crying, saying that they were Tongans and wanted to be taken aboard. They told me they’d been shipwrecked there 18 months earlier’.[[2245]](#endnote-2246)

Anne Grethe Solberg is a Norwegian sociologist, organisational consultant, former recruiter and researcher, and she works with gender balance in organisations.[[2246]](#endnote-2247) She became disabled after her ex-husband shot at her. She wrote a book on her coping strategies, explaining why she is not to be pitied, describing how proud she is of her independence, how healing it was for her to recognise that she could find all the strength she needed within herself alone, and, in extension, how healing it would be for society as a whole to embrace this kind of individualism.[[2247]](#endnote-2248) Listening to her, we notice several problems related to ‘too much’ and ‘too little’. As important as it is to learn to mobilise one’s own inner strength, even Solberg will age and will have to learn to be more dependent, and when this time comes, she can only hope to find a society that has not heeded her message too thoroughly and rather allows her to be dependent in dignity. Furthermore, not everyone has Solberg’s ability to develop her sort of survival strategies, and as the ‘therapy’ she recommends downplays the human need for connection, she might drive less resourceful people into the hands of manipulators who offer that connection, yet, at the price of ideological and religious delusions. In sum, driving people into solipsism, into the philosophical assumption that the self is all there is, is not a healing therapy.

This is the ‘Ayn Rand strategy of survival’ and it is ultimately destructive.[[2248]](#endnote-2249) Novelist Ayn Rand hailed from Russia and had many enthusiastic followers in the United States of America.[[2249]](#endnote-2250) The 1917 February Revolution in Russia was carried by a high spirit of liberation from oppression, yet, this spirit was hijacked by the October Revolution that co-opted people back into oppression, and it did so, among others, by abusing the argument of altruism. The state first asked people to offer themselves for the common good and then, instead of honouring this gift and its givers, proceeded to abuse both. In her public appearances, Ayn Rand praised the 1917 February Revolution, but then she went too far, we could say, she rejected altruism wholesale, highlighting the virtue of uninhibited self-interest instead.[[2250]](#endnote-2251) In her personal life, Ayn Rand had suffered from a painfully oppressive mother, and this may have added an extra defensive and hard layer of opposition in her, not just against oppression but also against solidarity. As a result, Ayn Rand went too far in her resistance against the bondage of hierarchy, she created solipsistic monological relationships around herself — a kind of solipsistic arrogance — delegitimising loving mutual connection among people. Her followers took her views to a new level by misperceiving arrogance as mastery, and wherever this misperception became mainstreamed, it lent legitimacy to a cold and callous atmosphere in society as a whole.

Ayn Rand is quoted as saying, ‘We can evade reality, but we cannot evade the consequences of evading reality’. This lesson has indeed been inflicted on her followers and on the world as a whole, not least since the 2007/2008 economic crisis. As reported earlier, Alan Greenspan, chairman of the Federal Reserve Board of the United States from 1987 to 2006 and one of many who had been influenced by Ayn Rand, admitted in 2008 that he had ‘been wrong’.[[2251]](#endnote-2252)

Interestingly, Russia did not only bring Ayn Rand to the English-speaking world, it also brought Peter Kropotkin. His 1892 book Conquest of bread has recently influenced the Occupy movement and is now inspiring the Philosophy Tube, which is part of LeftTube, or BreadTube (named after Kropotkin’s book) that aims ‘to counter the rise of the far-right online’.[[2252]](#endnote-2253) Kropotkin, like Ayn Rand, rejected centralised state communism — soon after the 1917 revolution in Russia, he predicted that party dictatorship would fail. On the other side, he was also opposed to individual and no-laws anarchism, rather, he was impressed by the cooperative tendencies he observed in Indigenous peoples. He concluded that human societies do not necessarily have to base themselves on the kind of competition seen in industrialised Europe, rather, that cooperation among individuals and groups should and could be elevated to the norm. On his list of obstacles to human well-being were the state’s protection of private ownership of productive resources, and, not least, the very institution of money.[[2253]](#endnote-2254)

Yet another Russian import to America was psychologist Urie Bronfenbrenner, who, like Kropotkin, was opposed to reductionist individualism and highlighted that interpersonal relationships are embedded in larger social structures — they do not exist in a social vacuum.[[2254]](#endnote-2255)

Juliet Schor is a sociologist who wishes to bring the American Dream back to its full meaning.[[2255]](#endnote-2256) She wishes to rescue it from its current manifestation where people are caught in rat races that lead to anomie in the midst of inequality. I had the privilege of hearing Juliet Schor explain her views in the Thirty-First Annual E. F. Schumacher Lectures in New York City on 5th November 2011. In her lecture, Schor shared with us how she joined the Harvard Business School faculty back in 1984 expecting to teach the radical economics part of the introductory economics class ‘Social Analysis 10: Principles of Economics’ commonly referred to by Harvard students as Ec 10, however, how this part of the curriculum was abolished as the business school was just being taken over by Martin Feldstein, a man who had served in the Ronald Reagan administration before.[[2256]](#endnote-2257) As a result, from 1984 onwards, young economy students could no longer learn about the entire breadth of the spectrum of economic systems and thoughts.[[2257]](#endnote-2258) This experience motivated her to denounce the ‘captured state’ and call on everyone to ‘re-capture’ it.

We can conclude that those who believe that everyone should ‘stand on their own feet’ and be independent from any support, overlook their own dependency. They overlook that they depend on human-made systems — ultimately on ‘the market’ over which they have little control, and which, on top of this, serves the interests of a global minority, a minority who may want to leave the majority behind rather than show solidarity should the systems break.[[2258]](#endnote-2259) The coronavirus crisis exposes the risks entailed in a setup that on one side prescribes global interdependence for just-in-time supply chains, while on the other side advocating independence for its users. Nobody should be surprised by the rise of conspiracy theories under such circumstances, after decades of hidden agendas and open lies being maintained behind empty corporate promises.

In this situation, it seems to me, all of us need to recognise that neither independence nor interdependence are worth striving for if they mean disconnected individualism in the midst of a sea of mistrust. Both, independence and interdependence are toxic when they are part of systemic frames that destroy mutual trust in society for the sake of ‘efficiency’ or investor interests. It is time to leave behind all illusions of independence — after all, the choice between several toothpaste varieties in a shop is no real independence. We need to find the courage to formulate new definitions of dependency, namely, dependency in the sense of interconnectedness embedded in mutual support and responsibility.

Where sociocide and ecocide are the outcome, where omnicide is looming, interconnectedness is the answer, interconnectedness in mutual support and responsibility.

### Dominator systems are incompatible with equal dignity

History shows that many systems of thought, many religious movements, many ideologies and ‑isms, which promised more equality in dignity when they arose, could eventually not deliver on their promises.[[2259]](#endnote-2260) Usually, the endgame was — and still is — the stark opposite of equality, namely, deep hierarchy. Most of the thought systems tried out on Earth so far have failed to deliver equality in dignity, at least throughout the millennia following the Neolithic Revolution, and only our Palaeolithic ancestors and some of their present-day successors may have been exceptions.[[2260]](#endnote-2261)

The Catholic Church is one of countless examples of highly patriarchal and hierarchical systems built on an initial message of equality. Even though Protestantism aimed to liberate Christian faith and Christian practice from this hierarchy, I can attest that also it failed to some extent — I was born into Protestantism. Already as a small child, I was personally thrown into deep agony by the contradiction between message and practice, and it would have saved me many years of inner struggle had I met women like Josephine Butler earlier, as she would have been able to validate my desperate attempts to be true to the promise of equal dignity.[[2261]](#endnote-2262)

When we look at recent history, we learn that also ‘capitalism brought forward the meme of equality, but has been unable to achieve it’, this is the verdict of economy professor Julie Matthaei.[[2262]](#endnote-2263) The democratisation of the profit motive was meant to solve the abuse of the altruism motive at the hands of ‘actually existing communism’,[[2263]](#endnote-2264) yet, also the profit motive does not render equal dignity.

The betrayal of capitalism’s promise is exposed not least by the term economy itself. It originally meant ‘household management’, from Greek oikos ‘house, abode, dwelling’, and nomos ‘managing’. In the 1650s, the word acquired the sense of ‘wealth and resources of a country’ (short for political economy), while the sense of ‘frugality, judicious use of resources’ came in the 1660s.[[2264]](#endnote-2265) By now, all over the world, even though many countries’ constitutions stipulate that the economy ought to serve the common good, as the ‘wealth of a country’ is measured in terms of monetary growth, the ‘judicious use of resources’ is sacrificed wherever it hinders growth.[[2265]](#endnote-2266)

Initially, whenever a new ideological movement arose throughout the past millennia that promised a more free an equal society, it had idealistic supporters. Usually, however, even the most well-intended endeavour was soon taken over by dominators and the original mission was lost. Whenever that happened, hopeful supporters found themselves in a painful bind — should they go along and betray their initial ideals or should they oppose the new power holders? I am writing these lines in Germany, which looks back on two such agonising timelines only within the past ninety years. Admitting failure is humbling, even humiliating, and many simply become defensive, even aggressive, when they are caught in this dilemma. Political scientist Aaron Karp compares nationalism, communism, and capitalism in the following way:

Nationalism represents elites’ use of a symbol, the nation, to distract from their own exercise of self-interested power. Communism as an ideal is based on an egalitarian society with workers owning and managing the economy, but in practice, like nationalism, simply represented an idea used to cover dictatorship with a ‘revolutionary’ veneer. And ‘anticommunism’, or, stated more plainly, capitalism, is simply another form of hierarchy that set out to destroy not communism — because it didn’t actually exist — but any threats of economic development that didn’t cater to the interests of large capitalist states like the U.S. If we recognise nationalism, communism (as it was historically implemented), and ‘anticommunism’ as various forms of hierarchy, then the destruction of innocent lives in their pursuit is expected. That’s how power systems work.[[2266]](#endnote-2267)

Aaron Karp compares the princes and nobilities of feudal times with present-day corporations, or, more precisely, the widespread tacit assumption — then and now — of their right to rule. The first radical Enlightenment thinkers faced fierce opposition to their fight for democracy from those who felt that the right to rule should exclusively be held by princes and nobilities. Nowadays, few would defend the right to rule of princes, however, even if unwittingly, we do the same when we treat matters of collective freedom and determination as issues of individual liberty in a market economy.[[2267]](#endnote-2268) It becomes even worse when this includes the right for corporations to act against the common good — for instance, ‘if a fossil fuel company plans to build a pipeline that will expand our carbon emissions just as humanity must do everything possible to rapidly reduce them, the public has no direct ability to intervene. This is an issue of property’.[[2268]](#endnote-2269)

Karp cautions that it is not sufficient for human rights proclamations like the Universal Declaration of Human Rights to prohibit discrimination based on ‘race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status’.[[2269]](#endnote-2270) ‘If the right to own property extends beyond personal objects to include the institutions that make up the economy’, Karp warns, ‘then human rights could be said to defend a power system based on private wealth and top-down control’.[[2270]](#endnote-2271) In that case, powerful owners act like princes and nobilities who in effect defend their exclusive right to rule when they argue against democratic control of the economy and overlook that ‘just as human equality makes political democracy necessary, the same justification extends towards economic democracy’.[[2271]](#endnote-2272)

We are blind to the system that destroys us, warns also journalist Jonathan Cook, and power — not just the people in the system, but the system itself — ‘will use whatever tools it has to protect itself’.[[2272]](#endnote-2273) Cook warns, ‘Just as a feudal elite was driven not by ethics but by the pursuit of power and wealth through the control of land; just as early capitalists were driven not by ethics but by the pursuit of power and wealth through the control of mechanisation; so neo-liberalism is driven not by ethics but the pursuit of power and wealth through the control of the planet. ... And because of that it is structurally bound to undermine or discredit anyone, any group, any state that stands in the way of achieving its absolute dominion’.[[2273]](#endnote-2274)

All these warnings amount to ‘unhappy news’, so unhappy that they cannot be solved by happiness programmes. The ‘emotional turn’ that is presently unfolding in several academic disciplines, including in the field of psychology itself, but also in areas such as international relations theory,[[2274]](#endnote-2275) goes astray when it simply means that systemic problems are psychologised and culturalised. Liberal democracy’s aim to protect minorities from abuse by the majority is not a cultural-psychological caprice.[[2275]](#endnote-2276) Ashley Frawley is a lecturer in public health, policy, and social sciences, and she offers a searing analysis of programmes designed to instil happiness and well-being.[[2276]](#endnote-2277) Frawley describes what also I encounter around the world, namely, that ‘the unchallenged ascendency of the market’ has ‘effectively restricted the scope of the political imagination’, and, as meaningful alternatives are lacking, ‘therapeutics becomes one way of attempting to imbue politics with meaning, bypassing uncertain political identities and connecting with people at the individual level’.[[2277]](#endnote-2278) Meta-narratives are viewed with scepticism, Frawley observes, particularly those that ‘promise to explain societies and which could be wielded to radically change them for the better’.[[2278]](#endnote-2279) Instead, there is a shift ‘from politics to the personal’, because in the restricted context of the individual, ‘big ideas must be small enough to fit into the constricted space left behind’.[[2279]](#endnote-2280) In short, happiness programmes represent an admission of failure — or, in my words, it does not ennoble slavery to make enslaved people happier. Frawley looks into the future:

Future research may consider the apparent growing centrality of emotional signifiers in the framing of new social problems. Happiness itself appears to have given way to other signs. This may be because all social problems eventually run their course. There is also evidence that while retaining many of the same features of the problematisation of happiness, the discourse of well-being began to supersede it. This is partially because, while having many benefits, it also has a number of drawbacks which ‘well-being’ circumvents. It is possible that the discourse of well-being too will give way to a new emotional idiom.[[2280]](#endnote-2281)

I follow pioneer thinker Jean Baker Miller in her relational-cultural theory that signals an emotional-relational turn, more than just an emotional turn that still is beholden to Western ‘lone hero’ individualism. ‘It is not just an emotional turn’, explains Linda Hartling, ‘it is an emotional-relational turn because emotions are the guardians of healthy relationships and healthy relationships are the pathway to a healthier world’, and this emotional-relational turn is carried forward by particularly clear- and farsighted women.[[2281]](#endnote-2282) Relational-cultural theory calls for large-scale systemic paradigm and structural changes, as Miller suggests — we need new arrangements of power and relationships that will provide for a healthy psychological development and participation of all people.

Wherever I go, I observe that people are increasingly unable to envision ‘new arrangements of power and relationships’, as they are being dislodged from their relationships too far — ‘unfrozen’ too far — a trend that began in the West and is since globalising. Terrorism experts speak of ‘unfreezing’ when young people become dislodged — unmoored[[2282]](#endnote-2283) — from their familiar social contexts and fall prey to terrorism entrepreneurs.[[2283]](#endnote-2284) Similarly, whole societies can unmoore their members, disconnect them to the point that they willingly abandon independent thinking and fall, not least, for populist conspiracy entrepreneurs, even by the millions. Large-scale ‘rat races’ have come to define societies all over the world by now, and they have ‘trapped’ most people. As these treadmills become ever more brutal, they will finally also devour their originators.[[2284]](#endnote-2285)

No happiness programme can smooth over this path of self-destruction or turn it around. What is needed is a deep paradigm shift away from the adoration of competition for domination, the veneration of competitiveness, dominance, and control, a shift towards a collaborative partnership and mutuality model of global society,[[2285]](#endnote-2286) a shift towards responsible planetary stewardship.

Clearly, such a paradigm shift will be hard to bring about, harder than the abolition of slavery. When we look back in time, we remember how stony the path was that led away from slavery. In Britain, the path to ‘freedom’ went first into an intermediary stage that was euphemistically called ‘apprenticeship’:

Punishments were doled out according to a standardised formula, and often involved the most ‘modern’ punishment device of those times: the treadmill. This torture device, which was supposed to inculcate a work ethic, was a huge turning wheel with thick, splintering wooden slats. Apprentices accused of laziness — what slave owners called the ‘negro disease’ — were hung by their hands from a plank and forced to ‘dance’ the treadmill barefoot, often for hours. If they fell or lost their step, they would be battered on their chest, feet and shins by the wooden planks. The punishment was often combined with whippings. The treadmill was used more during the apprenticeship period than it ever was under slavery, precisely because it was said to be a scientific, measurable and modern form of disciplinary re-education, in line with bureaucratic oversight. One apprentice, James Williams, in an account of his life published in 1837, recalled he was punished much more after 1834 than before. Indeed, it is likely that slave-owners sweated their labour under apprenticeship, in order to squeeze out the last ounces of unpaid labour before full emancipation finally came in 1838.[[2286]](#endnote-2287)

Only in 2015 did Britain pay off the amount of money that it had borrowed for the Slavery Abolition Act. In 1833, Britain had used £20 million, 40 per cent of its national budget, to buy freedom for all enslaved people in the Empire, paying millions in compensation to their owners — because they had a right to property, in this case the property of human beings — while nothing was paid to those who had been enslaved.[[2287]](#endnote-2288) In 2020, protests raged against the ‘internal colonialism’ through ‘systematic impoverishment, exploitation, humiliation, and neglect of minority communities by white governments and businesses’.[[2288]](#endnote-2289)

All this indicates that caution is prudent whenever we hear calls to support solutions — they may be worthy solutions like the abolition of slavery that deserved all effort, yet, they may also be solutions that must be discarded after being tried out, they may be half-solutions, pseudo-solutions, or even disastrous counterproductive solutions. ‘Please support our political or corporate strategy’ is a call that may start from a valid problem but may represent a misleading manipulation into solutions that are detrimental to collective well-being and to sustainable long-term survival. Particularly in dilemma situations prudence is called for, because in such cases usually only a second-order transition that transcends the very dilemma represents a true solution.

History offers countless examples of real problems that were responded to with perilous solutions. Adolf Hitler offered ‘solutions’ to Germans who lived under harsh economic conditions and with a sense of humiliated national honour, yet, his ‘solutions’ led to mass homicide and collective suicide. Later, in the Cold War, people with the legitimate desire for security welcomed nuclear weapons as a solution, and as a result, humankind has escaped the loss of most of life on Earth so far only by sheer luck.[[2289]](#endnote-2290) While massive retaliation through nuclear war was envisioned at first, later came ‘flexible retaliation’ with tactical nuclear weapons,[[2290]](#endnote-2291) and the danger of nuclear war has not diminished since, including the danger that it may be triggered accidentally.[[2291]](#endnote-2292)

The absurdity of the nuclear ‘solution’ highlights how fitting the word ‘dilemma’ is for the security dilemma, because as long as military security is sought, all solutions end in a dilemma. This is why the message of this book is that there is only one way to a true solution, namely, a world that unites in mutual trust and overcomes the security dilemma so that human security can flourish and national security means Earthland security.[[2292]](#endnote-2293) Despite the fact that it is difficult to attain, this is the only solution, and this book makes clear that never in human history has it been more possible to attain than now. This book enumerates the misunderstandings that stand in the way and makes clear that for the first time in human history, a unique window of opportunity stands open to put this solution into hands-on practice on the ground.

Nuclear weapons represent obvious threats and it is easy to see that they are double-edged dilemma-infested solutions. Other solutions are less easily identifiable as double-edged. ‘The need for jobs’ may lead to a similar annihilation of life on Earth, this time not through one big catastrophe like a nuclear disaster, but through many slowly emerging catastrophes. In this case, the problem is our limited understanding of what livelihood means. As long as livelihood depends on the sales of services or products, resources will be depleted for the sake of job creation, and this depletion undermines human survival on Earth. The true solution is to eliminate the concept of ‘job’, to free economic systems from having to depend on sales, and to think more creatively about how people can sustain themselves and their families through activities that are healthy for them and at the same time replenish society and the planet.[[2293]](#endnote-2294)

Among the detrimental consequences of systems where livelihood depends on sales is that of rising inequality.[[2294]](#endnote-2295) Inequality has many harmful effects that can spiral out of control — it can unleash waves of migrants fleeing poverty and violence and it can stoke religious and ideological terror and extremism.[[2295]](#endnote-2296) As long as international crime gangs can amass ‘staggering’ profits in conflict zones,[[2296]](#endnote-2297) terror networks will link up with organised crime.[[2297]](#endnote-2298) All these problems represent ‘invitations’ for demagogic populists to offer dangerous simplistic ‘solutions’ built on even more manipulation and propaganda.[[2298]](#endnote-2299)

Many pin their hopes on civil society — I do, too. The purpose of charitable organisations is to strengthen social connectivity in societies. Yet, as we see, even charitable endeavours become increasingly co-opted, non-profit organisations are being hijacked, and even the most well-intended green certification label can fall prey to corrumpalism. Corrumpalism is the corruption and destruction of ‘the integrity of a social system and its biophysical foundation by perverting all forms of development via the use of mis-information, falsehoods, money and/or violence to achieve self-interested outcomes that are the opposite of cultural and ecological interests’.[[2299]](#endnote-2300) I come across many charitable organisations all around the world that have become ‘profiteering non-profits’, I observe non-governmental organisations (NGOs) increasingly adopt for-profit ‘philanthrocapitalism’ and thus being complicit in spreading the corrosive social disease of distrust.[[2300]](#endnote-2301) I see the terminology of ‘customer experience management’ emerge everywhere. The neo-liberal development paradigm has restructured social activities through the instrument of external funding so that NGOs turn into ‘missionaries of the new era’ of economism.[[2301]](#endnote-2302) I predict that civil society will lose its mission and significance if it continues down this path of allowing co-option into ‘present-day neo-liberal rationality’, as this ‘weakens the collective spirit by transforming societies and subjectivities around the notion of enterprise’.[[2302]](#endnote-2303)

Linda Hartling explains why civil society may be more vulnerable than others to ‘hostile take-over’. ‘Dominators would hesitate to hijack initiatives led by other dominators. Instead, initiatives that manifest the partnership approach may be viewed as a fresh opportunity, as new territory for dominators looking for low hanging fruit. The strengths of a nurturing community practicing mutual solidarity may be seen by them as “weakness” that can easily be exploited with more aggressive business methods’.[[2303]](#endnote-2304)

Examples abound. The charity organisation Save the Children may serve as one. Sir Alan Parker was the founder and head of a corporate public relations firm before he was appointed as chairman of Save the Children U.K. in 2008:

Current and former employees say the charity, under the leadership of Mr. Parker, created an adrenalised culture more suited to a battle-ready business than a charity. They describe a place gripped by a desire to win, with victory defined as raising more money and then spending it on splashier projects than other charities did. There were boasts about reaching more children. Dollars and headlines were key metrics. Beating Oxfam, a U.K.-based charity that fights poverty, was the goal. Mr. Parker ‘was putting growth above all’, said Jonathan Glennie, former director of policy and research. ‘And the cost was that anything that got in the way of growth was ignored’.[[2304]](#endnote-2305)

Microfinancing and loans can serve as another example. Microfinance efforts were once greeted as miracle solutions, offering small loans was seen as a noble path to dignifying the lives of disadvantaged people and reduce poverty around the world. The argument went that dignity is violated when unconditional charity is extended to poor people, that it is more dignifying for them to be enabled to repay loans with interest — people need to learn how to fish rather than simply be given fish, the saying went. Yet, as this ‘do good’ methodology has been sliding down rather unethical paths, it demonstrates that it is rather the fishing industry itself that needs help, more, the very concept of industry and economy is in need of deep rescue.[[2305]](#endnote-2306)

Few people recall that also the sub-prime crisis in America started with the laudable intention to dignify poor people through enabling them to own their own homes. Many were given loans they could not repay, and when banks repackaged these loans, they made sizable profits. When the bubble burst, many people lost their homes and were worse off than before — not only had they lost the roof over their heads, they had also to unlearn to link dignity with owning a home. The result was double humiliation. Legal expert Bernadette Atuahene speaks of ‘dignity taking’ when people not only lose their property but also have their dignity removed — in this case, ‘dignity restoration’ is much more demanding than mere material reparation.[[2306]](#endnote-2307) Triple humiliation is the outcome when ‘Wall Street’ becomes the landlord[[2307]](#endnote-2308) and the fundamental human right to housing is undermined by large global corporations.[[2308]](#endnote-2309)

Many pioneers of the sharing economy have slipped down similarly unethical paths. Sharing was supposed to enable ‘cleaner and lighter living’ through platform technology, yet, some such platforms rather operated as ‘a Trojan horse for a precarious economic future’, so that ‘capitalism wasn’t tamed... it was stoked’.[[2309]](#endnote-2310)

Dignity taking is now a global phenomenon, dignity is taken from people and nature. ‘The quaint term “capitalism” is no longer apt for the conditions prevailing today, since debt has replaced real capital as the engine of the alleged economic well-being. “Financialisation” — or perhaps “debitisation” — is a better description. Toxic financialised economics tear societies apart; the best and the brightest now only learn how to suck life out of communities’.[[2310]](#endnote-2311)

De nye gigantene, ‘the new giants’, is a formulation by Bent Sofus Tranøy, professor of political science in Norway. These new giants stand for dignity taking at a grand scale — the world’s economy has stumbled from crisis to crisis during the past years, inequality has been on the rise, the financial sector is as rich, powerful, and risky as it was — not least thanks to various state subsidies — and, while some of the debt burden has been moved onto public balance sheets, the overall burden has not shrunk.[[2311]](#endnote-2312) This sad state of affairs should have moved political elites to engage in new and more future-oriented thinking, yet, it did not.

I am proud that our Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies initiative is ‘capitalisation resistant’, as Linda Hartling formulates it, resistant to the ‘capitalisation through the conversion of income or assets into capital in the form of money or property, resistant to being owned or employed in business by an individual, firm, or corporation’.[[2312]](#endnote-2313) We have protected ourselves and our community from being bought or sold — this is ‘an enormously important invisible sign of our “success”, of our relentless devotion to cultivating mutual dignity’, explains Hartling.[[2313]](#endnote-2314) Dominators are not likely to be interested in embarking on an opportunistic take-over of an organisation like ours, an organisation ‘that prides itself of not being interested in accumulating “non-profit” profits, of not being interested in capitalising on our area of study, nor in capitalising on the size of our community connections’.[[2314]](#endnote-2315) We work for a world of ‘fellow human beings’ rather than a world of ‘stakeholders’ and ‘customers’ of ‘goods and services’, we work for a world of sharegivers rather than shareholders.

Whenever and wherever I see alternative thinking within the field of economics, I feel encouraged. When I wrote my book on a dignity economy in 2012, alternative thinking was still much more marginal than now. Alternative thinking makes its way into public consciousness these days, albeit slowly, and one example is the work of economist Thomas Piketty.[[2315]](#endnote-2316) In his book Capital in the twenty-first century, Piketty shows that throughout the past hundreds of years, the dominating trend has always been that capital grew faster than the economy in general, and that the years directly after WWII with their higher economic equality were only a historical exception — the dominating trend was simply interrupted for a while by capital shocks caused by two world wars and the ending of colonies. In the course of the last thirty years, however, the dominating trend has become visible again, as neo-liberal deregulation, tax cuts, and lower economic growth have brought back levels of inequality that are comparable with the eighteenth century. The coronavirus pandemic magnifies this trend.[[2316]](#endnote-2317)

Thomas Piketty is not the only voice to sound alarm. Time Magazine has honoured Andy Haldane from the Bank of England as the world’s most influential person in 2013 for speaking out about these topics.[[2317]](#endnote-2318) Veteran political commentator Roberto Savio speaks up as well, spelling out the core steps in the timeline that ended in today’s politics becoming ‘subservient to economic interests’ to the point that ‘social and ecological resources are hollowed out and plundered’, as ‘current consumption patterns rapidly deplete the world’s non-renewable resources’.[[2318]](#endnote-2319) It started with ‘the rich not paying taxes as before, because of a large number of fiscal benefits and fiscal paradises’ and proceeded to inequality ‘with extreme wealth for a few, the middle class shrinking in rich countries, and permanent unemployment for ever more’.[[2319]](#endnote-2320)

‘Permanent unemployment for ever more’ can turn into terror. The story of the boy Sherzai illustrates this. He was thirteen years old when poverty made his uncle sell him to Taliban insurgents for 15,000 Pakistani rupees (170 U.S. dollars), ‘then the Taliban told me to carry out a suicide attack’, the boy reports when interviewed in a juvenile correctional facility in Kabul in 2011, ‘they said I would be a martyr and I would go to paradise’.[[2320]](#endnote-2321) Asia is not the only world region that is afflicted, also ‘Africa’s angry young men’ choose militias when there is ‘no school, no job, no future’.[[2321]](#endnote-2322)

If historical sociologist and political economist Karl Polanyi were still alive, he would be fascinated to see how the double movement he described in 1944 is now being driven to ever-extremer expressions.[[2322]](#endnote-2323) On one side of this double movement we find people who fervently believe in the blessings of a self-regulating market system and feel ashamed of themselves if they cannot adapt to it — on my global path, from Central and Eastern Europe to Asia, Africa, and South America, I have ample opportunity to observe this view, as historical Anglo-Saxon supremacy clearly still inspires great awe in the rest of the world.[[2323]](#endnote-2324) On the other side we find the happiness programmes alluded to above that attempt to repair the damage inflicted by those ‘blessings’. On the third side, we increasingly find counter-movements against the first two, albeit still weak in comparison, movements that call for a complete turnaround as a way to protect our cogito-, eco-, and sociospheres from the harm done by both sides of this double movement.[[2324]](#endnote-2325)

How would a complete turnaround look like? If dominator systems are ‘dignity takers’, would it be a solution to simply remove the institution of government altogether and opt for complete laissez faire? Political economist Frédéric Bastiat (1801–1850) is often quoted with the following sentences, ‘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 authorises it and a moral code that glorifies it’.[[2325]](#endnote-2326) Bastiat was a leader of the French laissez-faire tradition in the first half of the nineteenth century. He thought that laissez faire would serve the well-being, safety, independence, education, and dignity of all best,[[2326]](#endnote-2327) that society would be best off with no laws rather than with powerful men forcing bad laws upon society.[[2327]](#endnote-2328) Bastiat was not alone. Philosopher Michel Foucault, for example, held anti-power positions as well, at least initially, believing that no power is better than bad power.[[2328]](#endnote-2329)

Both overlooked that good laws may be the solution, rather than no laws or bad laws.[[2329]](#endnote-2330) Philosopher Howard Richards faults precisely post-modernist critics like Foucault for leaving us with a cruel choice nowadays: either no meta-narrative or a toxic meta-narrative. Richards’ fear is that the discrediting of modernity has favoured the rise of fundamentalisms that are fatally hostile to the Enlightenment.[[2330]](#endnote-2331) Today, Bastiat would perhaps vote for laws that are appropriately designed rather than for no laws, just as Foucault eventually moved from an anti-power stance to embracing positive power. Richards has chronicled in his work how Foucault’s thinking evolved over time, ‘and then, having carried the logic of revolt against le pouvoir to the extreme point where not only all social norms but logic itself became enemies, because they are inevitably accomplices of power, in the latter part of the mid-1970s, Foucault reversed engines once again. Power is good, not bad. Power is productive; without power nothing is produced, nothing is’.[[2331]](#endnote-2332)

‘Power is where natural and human energy meet. For better or for worse’, these are also the words of Rowan Williams, former archbishop of Canterbury.[[2332]](#endnote-2333) Linda Hartling’s mentor Jean Baker Miller, pioneer in women’s psychology, would say that ‘power is the ability to create change, good or ill’.[[2333]](#endnote-2334)

Howard Richards, being a philosopher of social science and a scholar of peace and global studies, sympathises with philosopher John Dewey’s naturalistic pragmatism[[2334]](#endnote-2335) and with the more recently developed philosophical approach to understanding science called critical realism. Critical realism connects Enlightenment with post-modernism insofar as it concurs with the Enlightenment position that not everything is self-referencing text, while at the same time appreciating post-modernism for exposing that the Enlightenment was not a discovery of eternal truth but a moment in the history of culture. Critical realism is associated with names such as philosopher Roy Bhaskar and philosopher and psychologist Horace Romano Harré — known as Rom Harré — together with sociologist Margaret Archer and Heikki Patomäki, scholar of world politics.[[2335]](#endnote-2336)

The field of psychology was influenced by John Dewey as well, and this as far back as 1894, when Dewey offered insights such as ‘emotions are bodily processes like breathing’,[[2336]](#endnote-2337) which shaped the work of pioneers in body psychotherapy already in the 1950s.[[2337]](#endnote-2338) Contemporary psychologist Svend Brinkmann as well follows pragmatists such as William James and John Dewey in his reflections on ‘humanism after posthumanism’ where he proposes ‘that qualitative psychologists can accept much of the ontological theorising developed by posthuman and postqualitative scholars, and yet advocate a humanist agenda for both scientific and ethical reasons’.[[2338]](#endnote-2339)

In January 2018, I wrote to Howard Richards, asking him how he sees critical realism in relation to post-critical approaches, and I shared with him Karen Barad’s insights on ‘how matter comes to matter’.[[2339]](#endnote-2340) Barad is a theorist who builds on physicist Niels Bohr’s work and, like me, she is not interested in ‘critique’, she sees critique as ‘over-rated, over-emphasised, and over-utilised’.[[2340]](#endnote-2341) Barad warns that we humans cannot inter-act with the world, we intra-act, since we are part of it — humans are part of the ‘worldbody space in its dynamic structuration’.[[2341]](#endnote-2342) ‘In its causal intra-activity, “part” of the world becomes determinately bounded and propertied in its emergent intelligibility to another “part” of the world. Discursive practices are boundary-making practices that have no finality in the ongoing dynamics of agential intra-activity’.[[2342]](#endnote-2343) In her reflections on new materialisms, Maggie MacLure, scholar of theory and research methodology, concurs with Barad that ‘discourse does not discipline matter but tangles with it in shifting assemblages’.[[2343]](#endnote-2344)

Like Karen Barad, also philosopher Gerhard Stamer draws on the work of physicists — among others, on Roger Penrose and Stephen Hawking and their oeuvre The large, the small and the human mind. Stamer rejects the kind of materialism that characterises present-day practice and says that ‘only a theory of the mind can correctly determine the relation of humans to the social reality in which artificial intelligence has become the leading factor of production’:[[2344]](#endnote-2345)

All attempts to explain knowledge through something that is not knowledge, for instance, by tracing back to processes in the brain, must fail. Such explanations can only be considered true as long as the paradigm of empiricism remains a universal prejudice. ... Artificial intelligence is and remains a computing device. Human intelligence, on the other hand, is existence. This distinguishes information from living intelligence. ... The prevailing economism of capitalism, which has spread across all continents, blocks the development of science. It holds it firmly on the level of technical usability on which profit can be made with science. ... What is feasible and promises profit, is done.[[2345]](#endnote-2346)

To my query about post-critical approaches, Howard Richards responded with saying that he appreciates the early work on critical realism by philosopher Roy Bhaskar, and that he continues to think in terms of ‘basic cultural structures’ as ‘regimes of accumulation, constitutive rules, speech acts, and more recently social structure’.[[2346]](#endnote-2347) Richards remembers how he once attended the lectures by critical realist Rom Harré at Oxford University on the philosophy of social science — it was in 1970, together with his wife Caroline — Harré’s lectures have later been published as The explanation of social behaviour. Richards thinks back:

I remember Rom used to say that he was concentrating on social psychology because social psychology is the key link. It is built on natural science. Once you build it, you can build social science. Economics and politics cannot get off the ground until you get psychology right. One of the points I make in my book Economic theory and community development[[2347]](#endnote-2348) is that I would not be an optimist if I had just studied economics and politics. It is psychology that makes it possible to be an optimist. That is one reason why I see what Evelin, Linda, and Humiliation Studies are doing as key.[[2348]](#endnote-2349)

My next question to Howard Richards was, ‘So, is calling for moralising international relations the same as calling for seeing it in psychological terms?’ This was his answer:

It depends on how you see social psychology. I agree with John Dewey when he says that the central fact about social psychology is that most human behaviour is conventional, in other words customary. In other words, ethical. The word ethics comes from a Greek word meaning custom or habit. Morals comes from a similar word in Latin, mores. So, if you do what Harré recommends, you have to do economics and politics over again, starting with ethics. That is what I do in several books, one of which is Understanding the global economy.[[2349]](#endnote-2350) It shows that when economists make causal explanations of why the global economy is as it is, they appeal to cultural (i.e. ethical) principles as premises of their explanations — most frequently to the principle of liberty and the principle of property. To make a long story short, seen in this light, the play of nations and of political regimes becomes a sort of shadow play (like the shadows on the walls of Plato’s cave).

Governments do not govern. Somewhat as in Marxism and in Neo-liberalism (but drawing different conclusions), the constitutive ethics of markets are taken to define the fundamental causes of what should not be (according to Marxists) and of what should be (according to neo-liberals). At a deeper level, ethics and psychology are (should be) about the interface between the natural and the social sciences. In this respect I recommend the book by the biologist David Sloan Wilson, Darwin’s cathedral.[[2350]](#endnote-2351) It is about the biology of religion, showing how humans were moral animals even before they developed language, as a condition for the possibility of language, vindicating Gandhi’s claim that love is the law of our species.[[2351]](#endnote-2352)

It would be interesting to see Howard Richards in dialogue with anthropologists Robert Boyd and Peter Richerson about their multilevel selection theory (including their support for structural functionalism), and their view on culture and social structure as a Darwinian (biological or cultural) adaptation at the group level.[[2352]](#endnote-2353) Richards’ answers would fill another book, just as his conversation with sociologist Lewis Coser and his distinction of realistic and unrealistic conflict would fill yet another book.[[2353]](#endnote-2354)

In his work, Howard Richards draws together the insights from many fields, from philosophy, sociology, political science, and many more. He builds on philosopher Roy Bhaskar when he points out that generative mechanisms produce the phenomena we observe,[[2354]](#endnote-2355) and he draws on philosophers Charles Taylor and John Searle when he states that constitutive rules govern our bargaining society.[[2355]](#endnote-2356) He resonates with sociologist Anthony Giddens in stating that today’s post-modern condition is one of radicalised modernity,[[2356]](#endnote-2357) and he agrees with sociologist Douglas Porpora that ‘cultural rules constitute the material positions that are social structure’.[[2357]](#endnote-2358) He adopts the analysis of historical social scientist Immanuel Wallerstein when he speaks of a modern world-system,[[2358]](#endnote-2359) which is by now defined and structured by one single set of constitutive rules, namely, successors of Roman law principles,[[2359]](#endnote-2360) the very systemic imperatives of our time, to speak with political scientist Ellen Meiksins Wood.[[2360]](#endnote-2361)

Richards comes out in favour of moral authority, in favour of Émile Durkheim’s thesis that every human group generates norms because the existence of social norms is a physical necessity.[[2361]](#endnote-2362) He also comes out in favour of Jean Piaget’s thesis that human children are biologically predisposed to form groups governed by rules.[[2362]](#endnote-2363)

Richards’ central category in his metaphysics is culture-in-ecology, meaning that humans create cultures, which then represent more or less successful adaptations to physical reality. ‘We are still living in the pre-history of humanity’, is Richards’ concluding verdict, ‘The history of humanity properly so called will not begin until we are free to create institutions that actually solve our problems’.[[2363]](#endnote-2364) Richards calls for a new logic of cooperation and solidarity to become strong enough to limit the running amok of present-day destructive imperatives.

How can a new logic of cooperation and solidarity become strong enough? What about legal instruments? Legal expert Duncan Kennedy was introduced in chapter 5 and his answer would be, ‘Yes, but only if we avoid putting too much faith in rights’.[[2364]](#endnote-2365)

The Joinet/Orentlicher principles deserve attention, as they stipulate the right to know, the right to justice, the right to reparation, and, fourth, the guarantee of non-recurrence.[[2365]](#endnote-2366) Entirely new kinds of human rights may be needed in an age of neuroscience and neurotechnology, the right to cognitive liberty, the right to mental privacy, the right to mental integrity, and the right to psychological continuity.[[2366]](#endnote-2367) Then there is the right to livelihood for all, including that of other species,[[2367]](#endnote-2368) and, finally, what about the rights of machines?[[2368]](#endnote-2369)

Systems scientist Riane Eisler has a legal background, and she urges the legal field to be much more aware of the foundational role that women and children play in society. ‘If we do nothing to end the widespread, systemic, and atrocious crimes against women and children that continue worldwide, we will not have foundations for a more just and caring world’, she warns.[[2369]](#endnote-2370) ‘We will not have the foundations for more equitable and peaceful relations — be it in families or in the family of nations’ — unless particular attention is paid to the human rights violation against women and children.[[2370]](#endnote-2371) Eisler calls on all involved, from universities to law firms, to provide the leadership and resources to bring a reinterpretation and amendment of international law on its way, together with a global educational campaign on the issue of violence and abuse against women and children. The treaty that established the International Criminal Court in 1998, known as the Rome Statute, focusses on the protection of people against genocide and widespread, abhorrent, and systemic violations of human rights, and Eisler demands the inclusion of women and children under ‘groups to be protected’.[[2371]](#endnote-2372) Eisler proposes the following:

1. Expanding the interpretation of relevant sections of the Rome Statute, particularly sections of Article 7 Crimes against Humanity, to include widespread and systemic practices that cause women and children great suffering or serious injury to physical or mental health but are not punishable under a state’s laws or, if there are laws, they are not being enforced.
2. Where necessary, amending the Rome Statute to include (in addition to nationality, race, ethnicity, and religion) gender and childhood under protected groups. The emerging principle of Responsibility to Protect (R2P) can also play a role, as it strengthens the interpretation of the Crimes against Humanity Section of the Rome Statute to hold those officially or unofficially acting for governments responsible when practices are well-known, widespread, large-scale abuses against civilian populations that cause great suffering or serious injury to physical or mental health, but are not included in a state’s laws, or, if there are laws, they are not enforced.[[2372]](#endnote-2373)

Let me end this section and this chapter here. I call on all proponents of Western individualism to take in that in an interconnected world, mutual solidarity is not only in the best interest of each individual, it is mandatory if humankind wants to survive in dignity and avoid further ecocide and sociocide. I call on all proponents of Western individualism who hope that teaching mindfulness to everyone will suffice, that I have met too many of their students who have simply perfected their solipsistic self-absorption.[[2373]](#endnote-2374)

I call for a new concept that allows for a middle way between disconnected individualism on one side and oppressive collectivism on the other side — I advocate interconnected individuality.[[2374]](#endnote-2375) I call on us to heed that humans are far from mere self-interest maximising machines, on the contrary, we can find deep fulfilment and meaning in standing together, we are capable of solidarity in connectedness and compassion.[[2375]](#endnote-2376)

We live in the back loop of the Anthropocene, and as the old order disintegrates, I call on everyone to use the space that opens for an entirely new ethos and practice, far beyond old infrastructures, beyond old political ideologies, and ‘assumed philosophical realities’.[[2376]](#endnote-2377) The coronavirus crisis is a perfect test case, and, hopefully, a wake-up call.[[2377]](#endnote-2378) As long as the virus is treated as an ‘enemy’ to be fought, however, as long as it is being approached with a mentality of war and crusading, as long as we look for villains to blame, we overlook our complicity with the conditions that made society a fertile ground in the first place, we evade our responsibility to do something about these conditions. A virus cannot be shot, it cannot be bribed with money, it is not part of a cosmic Manichaean struggle between ‘good and evil’.[[2378]](#endnote-2379) We need to overcome all myth-symbol complexes that open the door for the mobilisation of violence around them,[[2379]](#endnote-2380) we need to leave behind all social codes that support ‘militant, aggressive or violent customs and norms of action’, to leave behind all that is ‘connected to patriarchy and honour codes’.[[2380]](#endnote-2381)

I call on us to protect our cogitosphere, our realm of thinking and reflections, and to understand that it is futile and misguided to want to ‘go to war against’ ecocide and sociocide.

Linda Hartling concurs, ‘Framing the problem as a war serves to keep the hierarchy, the dominator system in place. It diverts attention from finding the most ecological and socially sustainable solutions, when, for example, environmental protections are rolled back, watered down, or discarded, rather than sustained and strengthened for the welfare of future generations’.[[2381]](#endnote-2382) Beware of dominator systems — they swallow dignity.

The coronavirus pandemic exposes how human activities have robbed wild animals of their habitat, bringing them into overly close contact with humans,[[2382]](#endnote-2383) a problem of which Indigenous peoples have been aware since a long time.[[2383]](#endnote-2384) This is just one more reason for why Indigenous habitats need protection against the currently practiced resource extraction, one more proof for why extraction driven by the profit motive rather than the care motive is dangerous.[[2384]](#endnote-2385) The pandemic highlights the need for collective sacrifice for communal care rather than investment in individual profit,[[2385]](#endnote-2386) it calls for sacrifice for the sake of dignifying societal institutions that have care at their heart rather than making dignity dependent on the hope that some soft-hearted individuals will offer charity in the midst of undignifying systems.[[2386]](#endnote-2387) The pandemic highlights the deadliness of ‘disaster capitalism’,[[2387]](#endnote-2388) the deadliness of the denial of reality for the sake of short-term profit,[[2388]](#endnote-2389) it shows the deadliness of right wing hate entrepreneurship.[[2389]](#endnote-2390) The crisis calls for an ‘economy of life’ rather than an ‘economy of death’[[2390]](#endnote-2391) — it calls for a dignity economy.[[2391]](#endnote-2392) Linda Hartling sums up:

Rather than underreacting with half measures or overacting with aggressive protection, moving towards a dignity economy will create a new space for creative, collaborative, effective global action. Working together, humanity can move in a life-replenishing direction. It can develop systems and institutions that support the long-term, regenerative, and mutually beneficial health and well-being of all people and planet.[[2392]](#endnote-2393)

This is my plea: Now is the time to nurture solidarity in dignified humility, to embrace the vulnerability that humility entails. Now is the time to nurture loving dialogical connection among fellow human beings and with the nature that surrounds us, of which we are only a small part. Now is the time to direct all energies into the ‘globalisation for the common good’, to remove the profit motive ‘from determining production in human society’, it is time for systems of ‘participatory democracy’ to rise.[[2393]](#endnote-2394) Now is the time to rescue the notion of freedom from the loneliness that ‘lone hero’ individualism has created, while continuing with our efforts to liberate collectivistic societies from forced togetherness.

Now is the time to go beyond ‘freedom without togetherness’ in Western societies as much as beyond ‘togetherness without freedom’ in traditional dominator contexts. It is time to convoke the best from all worlds by connecting freedom with togetherness, in short, our aim must be togetherness in freedom and dignity.[[2394]](#endnote-2395)

Human health, animal health, and environmental health are inseparable, there is only one health.[[2395]](#endnote-2396) Humanity pays a high price for the illusion that different aspects of health can be separated. Is this the kind of world that we, the presently living generations, want to hand over to future generations? More and more children develop eco-anxiety now, and some even consider suicide as they ‘wake up’ to the climate and ecological problems that humanity faces, frightened even more when their parents live in blissful ignorance or in staunch denial.[[2396]](#endnote-2397) A psychotherapist who receives these children in her clinic, reports, ‘It is not just anxiety: people also experience feelings of grief, anger, guilt, fear, shame and panic — sometimes all in one day. This can be confusing, and create even more anxiety’.[[2397]](#endnote-2398)

It is high time to protect planet Earth as our shared commons.[[2398]](#endnote-2399) What is freedom? Does freedom mean that the generations who live now are free to destroy the freedom of future generations? The public trust doctrine stipulates that a sovereign can hold certain resources in trust for public use regardless of private property ownership. What if we, humankind, go one step further now and hold the entire planet as our global trust? Should not all living beings have the constitutional right to a liveable planet?[[2399]](#endnote-2400)

We are in a radically new situation now. We understand that it is an illusion to treat our world as if it were a cruise ship. In reality, we are all together in a lifeboat. In a lifeboat, profit seeking and money have very limited functionality — as we have learned from Indigenous peoples, ‘you cannot eat money’. Internal fighting is even more damaging — in a lifeboat it is suicidal. Peace poet William Stafford taught us that ‘every war has two losers’, and in an interconnected world, ‘all are losers’. The ultimate lesson about the uselessness of our weapons is now taught by a tiny coronavirus — we simply cannot shoot the ‘empire of all viruses’.

Direct solidarity is the way forward, solidarity that is free from the barriers that are erected between people — be it that oppressive hierarchies erect them or money-based contracts. The way forward is solidarity in loving humility, the very humility needed to heed that we humans are nothing more than a small part of nature.

I use dignity as a word to connote the answer to the challenges humanity faces in this radically new situation.

Smoke Signs

‘Stakeholders’ — ‘Cost-Benefit’ — ‘Consumer’ — ‘Social Capital’

‘Economic growth’ is all good.

These are the smoke signs

Telling us

We are listening to the indoctrinated

Economism, individualism, consumerism, dualism.

Dominators, overseers, and handmaidens of

Power through plunder

The modern day plague

Developing guilds and groupies of

Thought-pollution.  
Remember to read the smoke signs.  
― Linda Hartling’s Poem of the Day, 7th Ocober 2017

A world without Dignity? A preventive checklist

by peace linguist Francisco Gomes de Matos, Recife, 23rd January 2019  
Dear reader,

Please add to the list. Do your share as a Dignifier and help fill gaps in dignity:  
Life without dignity?

Biolethality

Healthcare without dignity?

Epidemic inhumanity

Economy without dignity?

Econinequality

Nature without dignity?

Environmental nonsustainability

Faith without dignity?

Nonspirituality

Immigration without dignity?

Abominable marginality

Communication without dignity?

Communicative indignity

Intercultural relations without dignity?

Diversity insensitivity

Justice without dignity?

Iniquity demonstrability

Education without dignity?

Character deformity

## Chapter 8: Can we rise from humiliation?

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.

― Betty A. Reardon, ‘mother’ of peace education[[2400]](#endnote-2401)
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### Unfulfilled hopes feed feelings of humiliation

In 1856, French aristocrat and historian Alexis de Tocqueville (1805–1859) authored the classic text The Ancien Regime and the revolution. He observed that the danger of revolution is greatest not when poverty is so severe that it causes apathy and despair, but when conditions had been improving, yet, when this improvement benefitted just a privileged few while the rest remained excluded.[[2401]](#endnote-2402) What Tocqueville alluded to was the expectation gap that opens when the improvement of conditions raises hopes without fulfilling them. When raised hopes get disappointed, anger is likely to ensue, and due to improved conditions and better access to resources, resulting violent uprisings can have significant force.[[2402]](#endnote-2403)

By now, we can say that disappointment has globalised, and we live in an age of anger.[[2403]](#endnote-2404) Essayist Pankaj Mishra sees parallels to earlier ages of anger, such as the eighteenth century, when the world became modern and those, who were unable to enjoy its promises of freedom, stability, and prosperity, became increasingly susceptible to demagogues:

The many who came late to this new world — or were left, or pushed, behind — reacted in horrifyingly similar ways: intense hatred of invented enemies, attempts to re-create an imaginary golden age, and self-empowerment through spectacular violence. It was from among the ranks of the disaffected that the militants of the 19th century arose — angry young men who became cultural nationalists in Germany, messianic revolutionaries in Russia, bellicose chauvinists in Italy, and anarchist terrorists internationally. Today, just as then, the wide embrace of mass politics and technology and the pursuit of wealth and individualism have cast many more billions adrift in a literally demoralised world, uprooted from tradition but still far from modernity — with the same terrible results.[[2404]](#endnote-2405)

Unfulfilled hopes can engender feelings of humiliation at all levels, at macro, meso, and micro levels. Having one’s hopes dashed can even lead to suicide. In India, for instance, female suicide rates are highest in those parts of the country with the best education and economy, ‘probably because women grow up with greater aspirations only to find their social milieu limits them’, explains psychiatrist and researcher Vikram Patel.[[2405]](#endnote-2406)

Since Alexis de Tocqueville’s time, social mobilisation theory has flourished. Social scientist Gustave Le Bon (1841–1931) wrote about the psychology of the crowd in 1895.[[2406]](#endnote-2407) In 1950, sociologist David Riesman spoke about the lonely crowd.[[2407]](#endnote-2408) From then on, sociology spawned a rich plethora of terminologies, all mostly built on rational choice approaches[[2408]](#endnote-2409) — and much of its terminology is now in use far beyond the academic world — relative deprivation,[[2409]](#endnote-2410) for instance, or framing.[[2410]](#endnote-2411)

Alexis de Tocqueville did not live to see labour movements engage in class conflict. He did not see how the class struggle later faded as new ‘middle-class’ identities came to the fore that inspired campaigns opposing war as well as movements to protect the environment and civil rights. Many scholars followed in Tocqueville’s footsteps, among them Alain Touraine,[[2411]](#endnote-2412) Ronald Inglehart,[[2412]](#endnote-2413) Jürgen Habermas,[[2413]](#endnote-2414) Charles Tilly,[[2414]](#endnote-2415) Thomas Kuhn,[[2415]](#endnote-2416) Jim Sidanius and Felicia Pratto,[[2416]](#endnote-2417) John Jost,[[2417]](#endnote-2418) and Peter Coleman.[[2418]](#endnote-2419)

Early scholars usually did not consider emotions to be important for social mobilisation. Recently, this has changed. I trust that Linda Hartling and I have contributed to this change through our research, starting with our doctoral projects on humiliation. Linda Hartling submitted her dissertation titled Humiliation: Assessing the specter of derision, degradation, and debasement in 1995,[[2419]](#endnote-2420) and I began my doctoral research in 1996, initially without knowledge of Hartling’s work. The first tentative title for my doctorate in 1997 was The feeling of being humiliated: A central theme in armed conflicts.[[2420]](#endnote-2421) The final title was The psychology of humiliation: Somalia, Rwanda / Burundi, and Hitler’s Germany.[[2421]](#endnote-2422) Linda Hartling and I were introduced to each other through electronic mail in 1999 by her doctoral advisor Don Klein, one of the fathers of community psychology, and all three of us met for the first time in person in Paris in 2003, in one of our foundational dignity conferences. From then on, we work together closely.

We were delighted when we saw also sociologist James Jasper recognise the role of emotions in his theorising on moral shock in 2011. He wrote that for social movements, ‘especially after humiliations, revenge can become a primary goal’.[[2422]](#endnote-2423) Moral shock is a term that describes visceral unease and outrage triggered by events that combine emotional, moral, and cognitive elements and that may be personal or public. Even a film can trigger this shock when it depicts stark images of injustice and cruelty. Through mediums such as films, a person may become inclined towards political action even from afar, even ‘without the network of personal contacts’ that is often postulated ‘in mobilisation and process theories’.[[2423]](#endnote-2424)

Moral shock can inspire terrorist acts that add new cycles of humiliation and violence to the existing ones — this was the topic of my 2017 book on honour, humiliation, and terror. In that book, I made clear that moral shock does not have to lead to terror acts, it can also motivate peace work that heals existing cycles of humiliation and prevents new ones from occurring. This is what moral shock does for me.

Holocaust survivor Elie Wiesel solidified the term Holocaust as a word that is associated with Nazi atrocities against Jews. In 2019, Holocaust survivor Marian Turski shared Wiesel’s extraordinary story of survival and called on the world to act with ‘empathy and compassion’ — he explained that the worst part of surviving the Nazi death camps was not the extreme hunger, the coldness or the deteriorating living conditions, the worst part was humiliation, ‘humiliation, just because you were Jewish, you were treated not like a human being, you were treated like a louse, a bed bug, like a cockroach’.[[2424]](#endnote-2425) Elie Wiesel was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize for his role in speaking up against violence, repression, and racism in 1986. When accepting the prize, he said:

I swore never to be silent whenever and wherever human beings endure suffering and humiliation. We must always take sides. Neutrality helps the oppressor, never the victim. Silence encourages the tormentor, never the tormented. Sometimes we must interfere. When human lives are endangered, when human dignity is in jeopardy, national borders and sensitivities become irrelevant. Wherever men or women are persecuted because of their race, religion, or political views, that place must — at that moment — become the centre of the universe.[[2425]](#endnote-2426)

Like Elie Wiesel, also psychologist Ervin Staub has urged us to stand up rather than stand by — Staub analysed in minute detail how the Nazi regime became possible because so many people stood by.[[2426]](#endnote-2427) My entire work for dignity is inspired by my desire to stand up in the face of the many ways in which humiliation is being perpetrated around the world not just in the past but also today — whereby my particular focus is long-standing systemic humiliation — and I stand up constructively with loving care rather than with hatred and violence. I use my privileges and resources to stand up for those who do not have the resources.

Why do so many people usually stand by in the face of humiliation rather than standing up? Standing up for oneself and for others seems to be more difficult than we may expect, even if there is glaring urgency, and even if there is a will. As it seems, there is a human need to maintain a familiar ‘map of the world’ even if it does no longer ‘fit’ the reality of this world. A new situation with new information, however significant and pressing, does not mean that one takes it in, let alone reacts on it. Even people who live in great agony may choose familiarity over rebellion and prefer to live in pain. As Tocqueville cogently observed, there is little danger of revolution ‘when poverty is so severe that it causes apathy and despair’.

Altogether, rebellion is difficult, for individuals as much as for groups. Even if anger does reach a boiling point, it may derail into violence that makes the situation worse rather than peace work that makes it better. Mobilising an entire population into productive change is the most challenging task, nothing is more difficult than forging farsighted and constructive collective transformation strategies in the midst of heated passions — sober thinking and hot feelings often do not go well together. This is why I refrain from front-line activism, precisely to fill the gap between inertia and activism by calmly developing, envisioning, and trying out long-term eutopian strategies.

Uncertainty and information ambiguity amplify the difficulties. Uncertainty is per definition difficult to bear and even the most painful certainty may sometimes seem preferable to change, even if change would decrease suffering. Uncertainty can harden existing belief systems, even the most dysfunctional ones. When uncertainty combines with loss aversion, this can override the most relevant new information, and destructiveness escalates into its worst form when learned helplessness transmutes into what I call learned perpetration.

Both the coronavirus pandemic that unfolds while I write these lines and the climate crisis bring many aspects of these dynamics to the fore. The uncertainty entailed in the coronavirus crisis demonstrates how frustration can easily be manipulated and channelled into anger, and how anger can then feed dangerous conspiracy theories, which, in turn, can ‘empower’ helpless victims to become perpetrators[[2427]](#endnote-2428) — this is precisely why I avoid the phrase ‘empowerment’ and prefer the term entrustment.

Allow me to end this introduction to this chapter with a note of assurance. Even though it is difficult to leave behind all-too-familiar yet unfitting or even destructive maps of the world, it is possible. Classical social psychology research suggests that ambiguous and conflicting information can also engender new interpretations and new attitudes, and this at the level of the individual as much as of the collective.[[2428]](#endnote-2429) Intercultural research shows that when cultural assumptions are called into question, a ‘stress-adaptation-growth’ process can unfold.[[2429]](#endnote-2430) Creativity can be enhanced through interactions of mutually contradictory but equally compelling forces.[[2430]](#endnote-2431) Disorienting dilemmas have the potential to unsettle fundamental beliefs and call dearly held values into question, and this can bring about transformative learning.[[2431]](#endnote-2432) Epistemic crisis is what philosopher Alasdair MacIntyre calls ‘the moment in which we must say: If this is true, then everything else that I have thought was true up until now is not. I need to revise everything’.[[2432]](#endnote-2433)

Through my work, I wish for epistemic crises and moral shock to manifest, and this in ways that inspire dignified systemic change. I am lucky to be old enough to have spent the first six years of my life in a village community in Central Europe that was still self-sustaining, still free of the kind of ecocide and sociocide that unfolded throughout the later years of my lifetime. This community taught me that ‘the new normal’ of the decades that followed — a world filled with pesticides and plastic hailed as ‘prosperity’ and ‘progress’ — is not normal, on the contrary, in many ways, it represents regress. Sadly, my childhood village community does not exist anymore today — like all other such communities in Central Europe, it could not withstand ‘the new normal’. Given this background, I have always been the proverbial child that wondered why nobody called out that the emperor is naked — I even doubted my own eyes — and I have tried everything in my power during my lifetime to create constructive epistemic crises around me. I have often suffered moral shock when I saw that cognitive dissonance was not sufficient to engender change — how is it possible to see the emperor naked and at the same time be blind to it? How could triumphalist illusion be held in such arrogant self-righteousness? Likewise, I also suffered moral shock when I saw fellow ‘children who understood that the emperor is naked’ wanting to ‘take up the gun’ and shoot at everyone in anger. How could they be so blind and not see that their actions manifested the very same arrogant self-righteousness they intended to oppose?

‘Unwittingly manipulated into self-humiliation’ is the title of a section in the book I wrote on emotion and conflict in 2009, and there I offer a list of concepts and words that capture the dynamics of what I call voluntary self-humiliation.[[2433]](#endnote-2434)

### Can we rise from voluntary self-humiliation?

Always and everywhere on the earth, the same drama, on the same narrow stage — a clamorous humanity, intoxicated with its greatness. Always and everywhere it believes itself the universe, living in its prison as if it were immeasurable, only to sink — along with the terrestrial globe itself — into the shadows which soon put an end to its arrogance...

― Louis Auguste Blanqui (1805–1881), political activist[[2434]](#endnote-2435)

How is it possible that a person agrees with her own oppression? How is it possible that a person may even fall for the ‘banality of learned perpetration’ as I call it, following Hannah Arendt’s formulation of the banality of evil?[[2435]](#endnote-2436)

It seems that two sources are relevant. First, there is the basic human need for coherence, familiarity, recognition, connection, and belonging. Second, during the past millennia, the majority of the human population on the globe lived in dominator contexts where they systematically unlearned the Urgrund des Fühlens, the ‘very basis of feeling’.[[2436]](#endnote-2437) Fritz Bauer used this expression, a judge and prosecutor who played an essential role in starting the Frankfurt Auschwitz trials in Germany in the 1960s. Lofty rational principles are insufficient, Bauer warned, they have to be anchored in the emotional support of solidary people. William Wilberforce, leader of the movement to abolish the slave trade, would have applauded Fritz Bauer — Wilberforce would never have succeeded with his mission had he not been held by a loving community of supporters.[[2437]](#endnote-2438) When we think of the traditional dominator model of society, as well as of the modern market-based model, then it is precisely this kind of emotional support that is usually impeded. This, in turn, opens the door for the ‘banality of learned perpetration’.

As mentioned earlier, systems scientist Riane Eisler has developed a cultural transformation theory through which she describes how during the past millennia otherwise widely divergent societies all over the globe formed what she calls the dominator model of society. She contrasts this with the partnership model,[[2438]](#endnote-2439) or, as psychologist Linda Hartling prefers to call it, the mutuality model of society.[[2439]](#endnote-2440) The dominator model turns people into tools in the hands of their superiors, it reduces living people to non-living instruments, thus mutilating living people’s bodies and souls. The ‘art’ of humiliation, as I call it, takes this mutilation further — it turns involuntary mutilation into voluntary mutilation. It victimises victims doubly when it co-opts them into becoming co-perpetrators, co-oppressors, not only of others but even of themselves. I see the ultimate refinement of the art of domination when people are brought into voluntary self-humiliation, when they are co-opted to maintain their own bondage voluntarily and to misrecognise this as ‘honour’, or ‘heroism’, or even ‘freedom’.[[2440]](#endnote-2441)

An ‘artful’ strongman leader will know his ‘social psychology’ and aptly use it in sophisticated ways to turn his underlings into a homogenous group of obediently self-humiliating followers. He will suppress conflicts among them that might undermine this homogeneity,[[2441]](#endnote-2442) except for those conflicts that help him rule better — the famous divide-and-rule strategy. He will engage in the de-categorisation and re-categorisation of identities to form his subordinates’ identities according to his needs,[[2442]](#endnote-2443) and then use the contact hypothesis to make underlings accept their lowliness.[[2443]](#endnote-2444) He will frame history in ways that make it appear as if his version of reality has always existed and will always exist.[[2444]](#endnote-2445)

Many thinkers have used concepts such as méconnaissance (misrecognition) and naturalisation, among them were Roland Barthes, Pierre Bourdieu, and Michel Foucault.[[2445]](#endnote-2446) These terms point at the inculcation of what philosopher Immanuel Kant called selbst verschuldete Unmündigkeit.[[2446]](#endnote-2447) Selbst verschuldete Unmündigkeit has often been translated as ‘self-incurred immaturity’. I would translate it as ‘voluntarily relinquishing independent critical thinking’.[[2447]](#endnote-2448)

Long before it became a common term in the media, I have looked into the phenomenon of fake news.[[2448]](#endnote-2449) Fake news spread best when their creators take advantage of the illusory truth effect, an effect that is generated through repeating lies. ‘Want to make a lie seem rue? Say it again. And again. And again’.[[2449]](#endnote-2450) Author Kurt Anderson explains:

...mix epic individualism with extreme religion; mix show business with everything else; let all that steep and simmer for a few centuries; run it through the anything-goes 1960s and the Internet age; the result is the America we inhabit today, where reality and fantasy are weirdly and dangerously blurred and commingled.[[2450]](#endnote-2451)

Already in 1962, philosopher of science Thomas Kuhn observed how we tend to hold on to maps of the world we are familiar with even when the territory is changing and new information should make us adapt our maps. Even highly scientific paradigms resist change, despite the fact that it is the very essence of scientific methodology to be open to new evidence.[[2451]](#endnote-2452) Psychologist Kenneth Gergen illustrates what happens:

Although departments of knowledge are social creations, once they are established as departments, strong survival motives are set in motion. On the one hand, this means protecting one’s traditions of study — including subject matter, methodology, and forms of expression. In spite of major changes in the global context, most departments of knowledge remain weighted by these traditions. Their practices were established long ago, and there is little room for challenges that fall outside the perimeter. And... there is also competition with other departments. Each demands its share of the economic pie. As a result, there is virtually no pie remaining for potential newcomers. In both respects, there is little room for new topics, concerns, or challenges to enter the establishment. If they do not fit within the established departments, they may go unaddressed.[[2452]](#endnote-2453)

Before paradigms do shift — not just in academia but in general — they tend to rigidify, not least due to the incumbents who identify with and benefit from them. Incumbents have an immediate personal interest to defend established paradigms rather than consider alternatives. In this way, paradigms are sustained even in the face of the most ‘stubborn facts’ that cast doubt on them — ‘I know, but I can’t believe it’. This situation persists until a tipping point opens space for a new paradigm.

Massive tipping points can move even large-scale paradigms that define an entire Zeitgeist, they can open new space outside of traditional disciplines and worldviews so that rebels can come with new approaches that were unthinkable before. ‘First they ignore you, then they ridicule you, then they fight you, then you win’, is a quote associated with Mohandas K. Gandhi. It may be futile to try to convince the guardians of a dominant paradigm to learn new ways of being, change may only be fully realised when the next generation is able to ‘rebel’ and ask radically new questions that undermine the old edifice.[[2453]](#endnote-2454)

As it seems, such a moment may be upon us now. The presently unfolding coronavirus crisis may hasten such a tipping point, as it amplifies anger that had accumulated already before the pandemic. In order to avoid rebellion that simply leads to chaos, trailblazers are needed now who act in the spirit of Mohandas Gandhi and channel brewing anger into productive directions. Otherwise, we risk falling back into paradigms that may be even more anachronistic and dysfunctional than the existing ones.

Social psychology research sheds light on many factors that increase such risks. For instance, certain cognitive biases harden cleavages and increase the rigidification and polarisation of attitudes.[[2454]](#endnote-2455) It usually begins with people overestimating their knowledge of factual evidence and thus underestimating their own ignorance.[[2455]](#endnote-2456) The next step is to seek out information that resonates with one’s existing preferences,[[2456]](#endnote-2457) and even when new information is encountered, to incorporate it in ways so biased that even the most contradictory information will strengthen one’s existing preferences.[[2457]](#endnote-2458) People will associate with like-minded people[[2458]](#endnote-2459) and they will expect other people to go along.[[2459]](#endnote-2460) Missionary cults represent extreme manifestations of such mechanisms.

Sociologist Amitai Etzioni has reflected deeply on the reasons for the persistence of outdated mindsets. One problem is the amount of effort and investment that is required to first form a normative paradigm and then to establish the legal code that underpins it:

Decades of moral dialogue, consensus building, legislation, court cases, and public education slowly build such a paradigm. Millions of people come to believe in it, weave it into their worldview and political preferences, and even intertwine it with their personal identities. Hence the strain of dissonance between the paradigm and reality may be high before one can expect a paradigm to break down and it be replaced with a new one.[[2460]](#endnote-2461)

At the core of normative paradigms, we find legitimising myths. Often, they entail chosen traumas, and this can be so compelling that it leads to trust being so blind that it overrides any critical inquiry. Psychiatrist Vamik Volkan wrote a book with the title Blind trust,[[2461]](#endnote-2462) where he lays out a theory of collective violence and chosen trauma. When a chosen trauma is experienced as humiliation and not mourned, he warns, this can lead to a sense of entitlement to take revenge, and, under the pressure of fear and anxiety, may end in collective regression and ultimately in violence.[[2462]](#endnote-2463)

Political scientist Stuart Kaufman speaks of myth-symbol complexes around which populations can be mobilised and which may end in violence.[[2463]](#endnote-2464) Psychologists Jim Sidanius and Felicia Pratto explain the role of compelling cultural ideologies by showing how these ideologies can be taken as self-evident and true, how they can disguise even the use of force and make unacceptable behaviour acceptable.[[2464]](#endnote-2465)

Sidanius and Pratto list three mechanisms with which such myths maintain inequality between different groups in society. Slavery exemplifies the first mechanism, the ‘official terror’ of institutional discrimination. Second, there is the aggregated individual discrimination of one individual against another, an effect that becomes palpable at a larger scale when many people commit it and not just a few. Third, there is the behavioural asymmetry of keeping people in ‘their place’, an asymmetry that is accepted and upheld by superiors and inferiors alike. The passive and active cooperation of subordinates with their own oppression is what ‘provides systems of group-based social hierarchy with their remarkable degrees of resiliency, robustness, and stability’.[[2465]](#endnote-2466)

System justification theory, as developed by psychologist John Jost and his colleagues, has been mentioned earlier,[[2466]](#endnote-2467) and related concepts are offered in fields such as philosophy, sociology, and psychology. Philosopher Peter Strawson, for instance, speaks of shared conceptual schemes that form an interconnected web of our conceptions of the world, determining how we think about reality.[[2467]](#endnote-2468) Horizon is a term used by philosophers Immanuel Kant, Edmund Husserl, and William James. Philosopher John Searle’s concept of background speaks to the same topic,[[2468]](#endnote-2469) as does the tacit knowledge of philosopher Michael Polanyi,[[2469]](#endnote-2470) or zero-order beliefs by social psychologist Daryl Bem.[[2470]](#endnote-2471) Social researcher Hugh Mackay introduced the invisible cage as a metaphor for the tacit effects on an individual’s view of the world from life experience, cultural background, and current context.[[2471]](#endnote-2472) People have mental models,[[2472]](#endnote-2473) on which they base ‘preferences without inferences’, says social psychologist Robert Zajonc,[[2473]](#endnote-2474) while linguist George Lakoff speaks of frames ‘that allow human beings to understand reality — and sometimes also to create what we take to be reality’.[[2474]](#endnote-2475)

Interpretive frames have surface frames and deep frames, explains Lakoff, whereby deep frames shape our deepest assumptions about human nature and the social order. ‘Without the deep frames, there is nothing for the surface message frames to hang on’.[[2475]](#endnote-2476) This situation becomes particularly problematic, sociolinguist Basil Bernstein warns, when a conflict ‘is framed by the structure’, yet ‘the structural aspects of the conflict remain invisible’ to the conflict parties.[[2476]](#endnote-2477) Peace researcher Johan Galtung points at deep culture or deep cosmology as something that contains codes and building blocks that may predispose for, or even legitimise, violence.[[2477]](#endnote-2478)

Psychologist and educator Peter Coleman and his colleagues — the hosts of the annual HumanDHS December workshop — have developed dynamical systems theory, where they include, among others, social dominance theory[[2478]](#endnote-2479) and system justification theory.[[2479]](#endnote-2480) Coleman added the dynamical aspect of systems, taking into account that systems are not static but always are on the move. Coleman identifies attractors, or dominant mental and behavioural patterns that offer a coherent map of the world to people and a stable platform for action.[[2480]](#endnote-2481) Like Tocqueville and his successors, Coleman observes the counterintuitive effect that members of disadvantaged groups often agree with their own oppression and discrimination and even justify a status quo that blatantly hurts them.[[2481]](#endnote-2482)

Critical discourse analysists show how power dynamics produce dominant discourses and vice versa.[[2482]](#endnote-2483) Elites, as they have disproportionate access to the means of cultural production, can shape dominant discourses in accordance with their interests — be it wittingly or unwittingly. As a result, social realities are constructed and taken for granted that advantage ‘some participants at the expense of others’.[[2483]](#endnote-2484)

The aforementioned term subaltern has its place here, used by Ranajit Guha and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak.[[2484]](#endnote-2485) Then there is Jürgen Habermas’ notion of the colonisation of the lifeworld,[[2485]](#endnote-2486) Patricia Hill Collins’ controlling images,[[2486]](#endnote-2487) Jean Baker Miller’s relational images,[[2487]](#endnote-2488) and Johan Galtung’s term of penetration.[[2488]](#endnote-2489) Michel Foucault’s idea of governmentality fits here, as do the earlier mentioned concepts of méconnaissance (misrecognition) and naturalisation. The Stockholm syndrome was referred to before as well, another name for capture bonding, when captives identify with their captors.[[2489]](#endnote-2490)

Human beings are social and cultural beings, and they yearn to connect and belong. Beliefs guide not just our relationship with our ecosphere, they also guide our relationship with our sociosphere — we need to live with ourselves and with others and this makes us vulnerable to manipulation.[[2490]](#endnote-2491) In absence of healthy relational alternatives, we may adopt and internalise oppressive ideologies simply to belong and feel connected, and this may include adopting ideologies of submission and domination that provide us with justifications for our own abdication.[[2491]](#endnote-2492) Social psychologist Erich Fromm spoke of the ‘escape from freedom’.[[2492]](#endnote-2493) I speak of the art of domination that aims at engendering self-humiliation in its victims.[[2493]](#endnote-2494)

Real-life examples of such processes are many. Nanci Adler is a Russianist who has studied the Soviet terror and the fate of Gulag returnees. She explored how Russian society comes to terms with its Communist past and how the institutional aftermath of mass victimisation unfolds. Soviet terror was a system that enforced its ideology by executing, imprisoning, and exploiting dissenters, alleged dissenters, and suspected associates of dissenters. To Adler’s great astonishment, she found a great paradox: still today, many Gulag victims retain their allegiance with this system and still venerate its former leaders.[[2494]](#endnote-2495)

Psychological phenomena such as defensive avoidance play a role in this paradox.[[2495]](#endnote-2496) Psychotherapist Carol Smaldino knows a lot about mechanisms of denial and resistance. ‘When people in general cannot change focus or perspective in the midst of seeing the facts of any matter, statistically, educationally, and in the flesh, we have what you might call a serious resistance. And when there is a resistance that insists on denial at any cost, we have a clinical problem that is both pervasive and alarming’.[[2496]](#endnote-2497) Smaldino sees the mental health of world society as a whole in danger now, she sees it as an alarm signal when scientists get tired of explaining the dangers of ‘present ways of mining, and farming and fracking’ because their information falls on deaf ears. Smaldino wishes to send a message to therapists like her, to all those who know that where there is resistance to information, there are underlying reasons such as fear, greed, desperation, or panic. ‘When people are afraid to change, they have reasons, which also deserve respect, not pummelling with repetitions of the same information again and again. We know this: we know addicts don’t change in response to nagging, and that many of us in general have an allergy to being lectured’. Smaldino hopes that society can heal, so we can remember the lessons we learn from the sciences, from history, and from our own imagination, namely, ‘that the ways of studying and the ways of implementing information can be experimental, can be new, and can involve the energy of people who are witness to a difficulty they care about’.[[2497]](#endnote-2498)

Jennifer Atkinson is a senior lecturer in environmental humanities and it is as if she had read Smaldino’s reflections. She created a seminar titled ‘Environmental grief and anxiety: Building hope in the age of climate consequences’, where she argues that ‘we can’t afford to educate a generation of young people who aren’t emotionally prepared for what’s coming, what’s already here’.[[2498]](#endnote-2499)

To come back to the beginning of this chapter, we can conclude that people may not wake to crucial new information up even if it provides new platforms for action. Even if an all-too-familiar attractor loses its pull, to use Peter Coleman’s terminology, even if reinforcing feedback loops among elements within a dominant attractor become weakened, still, appropriate action may remain missing. Only those with particular resources will act, the proverbial child who sees the emperor without clothes, and, who, in addition, also has the courage to speak up aloud.

A caveat at the end of this section: We must not forget that there is a ‘too little’ and a ‘too much’. As was discussed at the beginning of the chapter, not only can people fail to rise up — ‘too little’ — they can also fall into the opposite trap of ‘too much’. They can go from bowing too far down to rising too high up. Former willingness to bow down may turn into its opposite, into sticking one’s nose up too high, so far that the golden rule is turned on its head, according to the motto ‘do bad unto others because they (or someone else) did something bad to you’. James Jones, African-American scholar of world religions and African studies, has called this the post-victim ethical exemption syndrome.[[2499]](#endnote-2500) The Rwandan genocide offered a terrifying example. Subordinates (Hutu means ‘servant’) overrode all inner barriers and meted out unspeakable cruelty on their former masters, the Tutsi. Many present-day authoritarian leaders and conspiracy entrepreneurs are steeped in this syndrome.

### Is there hope for liberation?

Objectivity is the subjectivity of the dominant group.

― Laura S. Brown, psychologist[[2500]](#endnote-2501)

Unfortunately, we live in times where the likelihood for clashes of humiliation is on the increase. On my global path, which soon stretches over five decades, I have witnessed many incidents that indicate how two new forces create expectation gaps — or dignity gaps, or indignity traps[[2501]](#endnote-2502) — which heat up feelings of humiliation as never before in human history.[[2502]](#endnote-2503) These two forces are globalisation and human rights ideals. Globalisation increases interconnectedness, which, in turn, brings the promise of human rights ideals to the last corner of the globe, together with the violent backlashes from authoritarian regimes against these ideals on one side, and deep disappointment on the other side when hopeful novices to this promise realise how often these ideals are betrayed by the very people who advocate them. Political philosopher Michael Sandel found cogent words, ‘Resentment borne of humiliation is the most potent political sentiment of all’.[[2503]](#endnote-2504)

Globalisation, as it stands now, has two core expressions. First, there is the ingathering of the human tribes, or the coming-together of humankind into ‘one family’. Second, there is the global exploitation of social and ecological resources. Wherever these two forms of globalisation meet the promise of human rights ideals — the promise of equality in dignity for all members of this one human family — feelings of humiliation are bound to heat up wherever and whenever this promise is betrayed. These feelings, in turn, can become the fuel for anger that may be instrumentalised by humiliation entrepreneurs for uprisings that are not necessarily constructive, they may rather take the Hitler path so to speak. Only if a large enough number of people like Bertha von Suttner and Eleanor Roosevelt get involved, enough Gandhis, Bonhoeffers,[[2504]](#endnote-2505) Carsons, and Freires, enough Mandelas, can transformation move into productive directions.[[2505]](#endnote-2506)

When we look at ingathering — the coming together of the human tribes, the ‘shrinking of the world’ — and its interaction with the currently unfolding ecological emergencies, then the situation is well summarised by social anthropologist Thomas Hylland Eriksen when he says, ‘People now build relationships which can just as well be transnational as local, and we are connected through the increasingly integrated global economy, the planetary threat of climate change, the hopes and fears of virulent identity politics, consumerism, tourism, and media consumption’.[[2506]](#endnote-2507)

If we look at the rise of human rights ideals, then systems scientist Riane Eisler gives us an overview. Progressive social movements have always challenged the dominator model of society in favour of the partnership model, and Eisler sees the contemporary expansion of respect for human rights ideals and the movement towards the partnership side of the social scale as part of this age-old liberation tradition:

During the 1700s, the ‘rights of man’ movement that emerged during the European Enlightenment challenged the ‘divinely ordained’ right of despotic kings to rule their ‘subjects’. This was followed by the feminist movement, which challenged the ‘divinely ordained’ right of men to rule the women and children in the ‘castles’ of their homes. The abolitionist, civil rights, and anticolonial movements challenged the ‘divinely ordained’ right of one race or nation to rule over another. The pacifist and then peace movements challenged the use of force to impose rankings of domination. The movement for social and economic justice, and later the human rights movement, challenged traditions of violence and injustice. The environmental movement challenged man’s ‘divinely ordained’ right to dominate and conquer nature.[[2507]](#endnote-2508)

At the present point in time, Riane Eisler sees an urgent need for attention to particular human rights violations that have so far been overlooked, namely, violence against women and children.[[2508]](#endnote-2509)

If we now look at globalisation and human rights ideals together, we detect that hitherto unknown interactions enter the equation. In former times, it was relatively easy to hush up unsightly social or ecological conditions in one locality, simply because information streams were not yet as globalised as now. Poverty, or absolute deprivation, existed in many parts of the world, yet, as long as people lived in isolation, far apart from each other, its victims had no way to understand it as relative deprivation. Nowadays, not least Western soap operas and Western tourists walking about with cameras on their well-fed stomachs, are teaching the less privileged in the most far-flung regions of the world to recognise their own deprivation. At the same time, the promise is heard all over the world that all human beings are part of one single family and that all members are entitled to equal dignity. The underprivileged of this world, and those who identify with them, thus learn that poverty and exploitation are far from divinely ordained karma, on the contrary, poverty and exploitation represent an unacceptable deprivation, a violation of human rights, a violation of the very humanity of the human family. Those who are deprived, those who watch how the gap between the poor and the rich currently grows ever wider, both locally and globally, those who feel sociocide and ecocide impacting their lives, learn to suspect that the elites’ rhetoric of human rights may be empty. They have reason to think that the rich and powerful peddle human rights rhetoric only to maintain or even increase their dominant position. This is the moment when life at the bottom seizes to be seen as divinely ordained providence, it turns into relative deprivation, and more, it turns into humiliating victimhood at the hands of the rich and powerful of the world. The proverbial ‘1 per cent’ transmute from envied Rajas into cruel humiliators. This is the moment for the pitchforks of the French revolution.

In short, globalisation connects people so they are better informed of how globalisation exploits them, and in the light of human rights ideals, this exploitation transmutes from divinely ordained fate that has to be endured into human-made humiliation that has to be fought.

In this situation, it would be a mistake to believe that the solution would simply lie in offering the poor more material support. Even though this is an important aspect, it can only be one element. Even a world of equal material wealth for all would be inadequate. The reason is that material provisions without respect may humiliate even more. It could be perceived as being paid off for relinquishing dignity, it could feel like losing face, losing the face of honour and dignity.[[2509]](#endnote-2510) When a wealth gap closes, a recognition gap might open even wider.[[2510]](#endnote-2511) Moreover, this wealth may provide the very means to act on this disaffection in ways that are more violent than otherwise possible. This was Tocqueville’s insight.

Erik Solheim was Minister of International Development in Norway when our conversation took place in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Oslo on 10th January 2011.[[2511]](#endnote-2512) He recounted how a high Norwegian diplomat, an ambassador, once told him, ‘You must never humiliate anyone! You make enemies for life. Whatever you think about a person, never humiliate them!’[[2512]](#endnote-2513) Like me, Solheim observes that people all around the world feel humiliation in very similar ways, irrespective of the fact that the details of humiliation vary from person to person and culture to culture. Solheim thinks of Gandhi and apartheid as an example for humiliation trumping material wealth. ‘When Gandhi was not allowed to sit in the first class on the train, it was about humiliation, not the third class’s poor conditions. He was not afraid of simple life, it was the humiliation that was at stake’.[[2513]](#endnote-2514) The colonial period was perceived as most humiliating at the end of the colonial era, not at the beginning, precisely at a point when those who had been colonised enjoyed much better conditions, particularly in Africa (with China and India as exceptions, since they were already wealthier before). Tibet can serve as another example, as ‘it would be much poorer without China. Tibet would be the poorest place in the region without China. Yet, many Tibetans perceive it as humiliating to be “forced” into prosperity by China’.[[2514]](#endnote-2515)

Norbert Müller was a member of the board of Schura, a merger of mosque associations in Hamburg, Germany, when we met on 22nd October 2010. He shared with me his views on the reasons for why highly educated young men from Hamburg set out to commit terror in New York on 9/11 in 2001:

Those, who came from Hamburg and participated in the 9/11 attacks in New York, were highly educated and academically successful. They did not experience social, but discursive humiliation. As academics, they had success, but as people of faith, they felt, ‘I can make a good career here, but only if I abrogate my heritage and my religion, for my Muslim identity is always degraded. There is a dominant culture here that is Western, and if I am living my religious identity, I experience condescension. And I feel this disdain all the more, since I also see myself as a successful graduate’. In this way, humiliation is amplified: ‘I expect recognition and respect, but experience degradation’, this is psychologically disparaging.[[2515]](#endnote-2516)

I have observed similar dynamics among displaced people all around the world, ‘discursive humiliation’ makes many susceptible to being recruited into sects. When millions of displaced people flooded into Germany in the years after WWII, sects succeeded in enlisting many of them, and approximately one thousand sectarian groups exist in Germany today. My own family was heavily affected after being displaced from Silesia — after losing their previous anchorings in their homeland, some of my relatives found a new home in a sect community, in their case, they joined the Jehovah’s Witness sect. I have later met many similarly ‘lost souls’ in Africa and South America, where I heard evangelical preachers cry out in ecstasy ‘Jesus loves you!’ and their congregations respond with an emphatic ‘Yes!’[[2516]](#endnote-2517) I noticed with horror how some [evangelists](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Televangelism) enriched themselves by abusing the faith of their followers,[[2517]](#endnote-2518) how some preachers even targeted the poorest of the poor by manipulating them into sacrificing their last penny in exchange for the promise that God would reward them hundredfold,[[2518]](#endnote-2519) and I have watched with horror the blindness of believers when they overlooked the psychological violence perpetrated on them.[[2519]](#endnote-2520) ‘Religion is the opium of the people’, is one of the most cited statements of philosopher and economist Karl Marx. It is also the most misquoted statement, namely, when it is rendered as ‘Religion ist Opium für das Volk’ or ‘opiate for the people’, while Marx meant to say that religion is a strategy struggling masses choose to survive, that it is ‘des Volkes’ or ‘of the people.[[2520]](#endnote-2521)

If we follow Marx’s view that religion is a strategy of survival, then the popularity of these evangelists — indeed of all populist leaders — reveals that present-day’s world population harbours an enormous revolutionary potential, a potential that could be guided into constructive change, that waits for attention from the Mandelas of this world, from the healers of this world’s wounds. If not, a ‘dangerous class’ may arise — when the new precariat suffers from ever more relative deprivation at systemic levels, it may become dangerous for itself if it self-destructs and dangerous for others if it lashes out in violence.[[2521]](#endnote-2522) Merely condemning violence is insufficient in this case, understanding-without-condoning is the pathway. Jumping to conclusions before having understood a situation is the opposite of pragmatic prudence and responsible moral action. Not least this prudence is this book’s goal and raison-d’être.

At the current point in history, most liberation initiatives seem ‘stuck’ in the dominator paradigm. All around the world, new dominators are welcomed to out-dominate unwelcome old dominators where healers would be needed. Leaders are given power who implement strategies that are more authoritarian and corrupt than those of their predecessors, preachers cry out ‘Jesus will save you from oppression’ just to enrich themselves, and ‘we against the elites’ is the battle cry of ‘revolutionaries’ just before they become the new elite themselves. This is the traditional template for revolutions, this is how uprisings always unfolded in dominator contexts, namely, that new dominators replaced old ones, that tyrants were toppled while the tyrannical systems remained.

Human rights ideals and the partnership model of society, in contrast, call for one more step, namely, the dismantling of the very system of tyranny. They call for bringing back long forgotten historical times before the dominator system came into existence. If we want to get a sense of this long lost world, it helps to imagine how Palaeolithic animists might have reacted to the message ‘Jesus loves you’. Perhaps they would have wondered, ‘Who is Jesus? Do we know him? How does he know us? If he loves us, we are glad for him. If he were to hate us, we would be concerned for him. His love or hatred does not concern us very much, as his feelings do not define us. The news that he loves us would represent good news for us only in case our identity were defined by fear of his hatred. You say that Jesus is the son of God? God is the only higher power who decides what happens with us after death? We don’t think so. The entire spirited world is our family, we are part of a long line of ancestors who are always with us, and we will gladly join them with our death. If we find God and his son in their company, we will be happy to greet them, and we will be pleased to know that they love us’. What we intuit from this thought experiment is that the message ‘Jesus loves you’ is a liberating message only for people whose identity starts out from being unloved, unwanted, rejected, and scorned, in other words, it requires the dominator system and its downtrodden masses for this message to have a liberating effect.

Religious sects and ideological populist movements are not the only indication that there is an enormous revolutionary potential in the world. Migration could be taken as another example. Tourism is one form of migration. Usually, it is hailed as a useful activity. However, tourism has many harmful aspects that are currently underplayed by those who profit most from it, such as big international tour operators and local power elites. They succeed in disseminating the argument that the entire local population benefits. On my global path, I have had many opportunities to feel disgusted when encountering people from the Global North who abuse the Global South as ‘safari park’.[[2522]](#endnote-2523) ‘Tourism is our terrorism, and we feel deeply humiliated by it’, this was the outcry of Dubrovnik’s citizens in our 2017 Dignity Conference in Dubrovnik.[[2523]](#endnote-2524)

While tourism typically is regarded as useful while it can humiliate, the situation is the inverse for those who have to flee from their homes or are displaced. Unspeakable humiliation afflicts desperate refugees when they have to depend on ruthless traffickers, when they are stuck in desolate camps, when some of them are even blackmailed and tortured.[[2524]](#endnote-2525) Yet, still, migration can also liberate from humiliation. For political scientist Luis Cabrera, migration represents a form of ‘global civil disobedience’ that challenges the exclusionary norms of a sovereign states system.[[2525]](#endnote-2526) Cabrera spent several years interviewing more than two hundred unauthorised migrants, border agents, civilian border patrollers, and migrant-rights activists in Mexico, the United States, and Europe.[[2526]](#endnote-2527) He concludes that unauthorised migrants ‘challenge the exclusionary norms of a sovereign states system as few actors can. They starkly highlight ways in which especially the economic rights pledged to all in binding treaties signed by the large majority of countries remain available to relatively few’.[[2527]](#endnote-2528) The extreme tension that arises ‘can create a border-hardening backlash’, but, so Cabrera suggests, it can also push us to realise ‘that the economic forces partly driving such migration demand more attention’.[[2528]](#endnote-2529)

My own family’s traumatic experience with displacement lets me conclude that all of us will become refugees without refuge if we fail to heed this call. In other words, both tourism and forced migration have dark and light sides and both wait to be guided in ways that are more constructive than now, both could serve as reservoirs for dignified and dignifying human rights initiatives, both could become a force for good, a force that nurtures a global dignity family.[[2529]](#endnote-2530)

Rising from humiliation in dignity begins with acknowledging the historical fact that during the past millennia new masters usually simply replaced old masters, a script typically applied in response to honour humiliation. In a human rights context, in contrast, turning the tables is no longer a viable strategy, doing so humiliates the humanity even of the revolutionaries themselves. When the aim is to heal dignity humiliation, it is counterproductive to apply traditional scripts of violence that were once designed to avenge honour humiliation. Only dignified and dignifying remedies can heal dignity humiliation. I call it cross back when people fall back on scripts from honour humiliation in their response to dignity humiliation (see more in chapter 5 and 10). In Rwanda, former subordinates who had risen to power ‘crossed back’ to the old script when they attempted to eradicate their former masters, the Tutsi, in a genocide, with the aim to secure their own position as new masters.

Human rights defenders need to be aware that empowerment can go too far. The social worker may try to empower the beaten wife so she can feel humiliated by her violent husband and muster the courage to liberate herself from humiliation, yet, the social worker ought not encourage the wife to humiliate her husband in return, or even kill him. The self-esteem movement in Western societies might have fallen precisely into this trap, at least wherever it simply meant that arrogance was democratised, wherever license was given to everyone to arrogate the former elites’ sense of entitlement. By now, a society-wide narcissism epidemic[[2530]](#endnote-2531) creates a societal climate of chronic indignation and anger entrepreneurship by all against all.[[2531]](#endnote-2532)

In my work, I avoid using the term ‘empowerment’ and replace it with entrustment, as entrustment suggests that there are limits to uprisings.[[2532]](#endnote-2533) When I think of empowerment, Adolf Hitler’s rise to dictatorial power or Machtergreifung comes to mind, as it is connected with terms such as Ermächtigungsgesetz (literally translated ‘empowerment law’).[[2533]](#endnote-2534) By using entrustment, I wish to suggest that all participants have to meet in the middle between the top and the bottom of society and shoulder the responsibility for the world together.

I also follow Jean Baker Miller and Linda Hartling in using the phrase sense of worth in the place of self-esteem.[[2534]](#endnote-2535) Furthermore, I resonate with family therapist Jesper Juul in his scepticism of the notion of self-confidence.[[2535]](#endnote-2536) Through my work, I aim to invite all people into mutual entrustment in the spirit of equal worth. I invite those who come from a mindset of traditional collectivistic honour as lovingly as those who embrace more recent mindsets of individualism. I invite those who got used to their debasement at the bottom of society as lovingly as those who feel entitled to arrogate superiority. I dedicate my entire life to enabling future generations to embrace our shared responsibility of mutual entrustment and stewardship.[[2536]](#endnote-2537)

When a terrorist act hits the news, many exclaim, ‘How can people be so cruel! These terrorists are monsters, not humans!’[[2537]](#endnote-2538) Many speak of extremists as ‘evil people’ and proclaim that those terrorists must ‘hate freedom’, or at least they are hapless purveyors of a ‘hateful ideology’.[[2538]](#endnote-2539) When I wrote my book on terrorism and reflected on the role of humiliation,[[2539]](#endnote-2540) I was accused of doing the bidding of terrorists and serving as their lackey, because, as I was told, ‘terrorists do not merit understanding, even not understanding without condoning’. As I see it, such accusations overlook that even among ‘terrorists’ it is possible to find revolutionary potential that can be guided towards mutual entrustment and stewardship.[[2540]](#endnote-2541)

The story of Wafa Idriss is one of many that challenge commonly held beliefs about people who commit political violence.[[2541]](#endnote-2542) Wafa Idriss grew up in Palestine and dedicated her life to helping families in need, for instance, she volunteered for the Red Crescent Society. Then, to everybody’s shock, in 2002, during the Second Intifada, she became the first Palestinian female suicide bomber. She detonated a bomb in central Jerusalem that wounded an Israeli man and one hundred others. She herself was killed. She did this, and these are the words of Emile Bruneau, expert on the neuroscience of peace and conflict, even though ‘she was not part of an ideologically driven organisation. She was not bloodthirsty or psychologically damaged. She was not a sociopath. In fact, her life choices flowed from empathy, and her primary motivation to commit political violence seemed to be driven by her compassion for Palestinian children who had been shot and killed during confrontations with the Israeli military in Ramallah’.[[2542]](#endnote-2543) I repeat, understanding is not condoning.

The story of Wafa Idriss is not an exception. Research confirms that many of those who have attempted suicide bombings did not act out of ideological hatred or from a deranged mind, but were driven by compassion and caring for their respective in-group.[[2543]](#endnote-2544) Wafa Idriss belonged to the caring-compelled individuals that social psychologists Clark McCauley and Sophia Moskalenko identified, people ‘who strongly feel the suffering of others and feel a personal responsibility to reduce or avenge this suffering’ — they are the opposite of those disconnected-disordered individuals ‘with a grievance and weapons experience who are social loners and often show signs of psychological disorder’.[[2544]](#endnote-2545)

It is not necessary to experience humiliation on one’s own skin to feel humiliated. People may respond with violence simply after watching humiliation from afar. Many of my friends who are willing to emphathise with people who translate their despair about humiliation into violence are unaware of this fact. They denounce the vicarious experience of humiliation as fake, as a lie, as self-deception at best. Research confirms, however, that it is possible to feel as humiliated on behalf of faraway victims in case one identifies with them, just as one would feel if one were to suffer the same affliction oneself,[[2545]](#endnote-2546) and this phenomenon is magnified when quota driven media sensationalise the drama entailed in the suffering of people, and even more so when they frame it as war.[[2546]](#endnote-2547) As has been discussed in the beginning of this chapter, even a film can trigger moral shock. This effect cannot entirely be avoided even by the most responsible media outlet, as it also has the responsibility to provide the public with news information.

When I was working as a clinical psychologist in Egypt from 1984 to 1991, young Palestinian clients came to me because they felt depressed. They felt they should help their suffering families in Palestine rather than study at a university in safe distance, namely, in Cairo, preparing for a happy life.

Farida, a young woman, not yet twenty years old, cried heart-wrenchingly:[[2547]](#endnote-2548)

My father wants me to study, get married, and have a normal life. But I cannot smile and laugh and think of happy things, when my aunts and uncles, my nieces and other family members face suffering in Palestine. Their suffering is a heavy burden on me. I feel it in my body. Sometimes I cannot sleep. I feel tortured.

I know Palestinians of my age who do not care. They go to the discotheque and dance — they even drink alcohol. I think this is disgusting. Our people are suffering, and we should stand by them. If we cannot help them directly, we should at least not mock them by living immoral lives or be heartless and forget them altogether. I feel I have no right to enjoy life as long as my people suffer.

I respect my father and I try to obey him and concentrate on my studies. If it were not for him, I would go to my homeland, get married, have as many sons as possible, and educate them in the right spirit. I would be overjoyed to have a martyr as a son, a son who sacrifices his life for his people.

I feel that suicide bombers are heroes, because it is hard to give your life. I want to give my life. I want to do something. I cannot just sit here in Cairo and watch my people suffer and be humiliated. I feel humiliated in their place and feel that I humiliate them more by not helping them. I feel so powerless, so heavy; sometimes I can hardly walk.[[2548]](#endnote-2549)

Farida’s involvement was of profound sincerity. It was intense, pure, deep, and selfless. She was a highly intelligent and strong woman, with a deeply sensitive awareness of justice. Her future could only be bright. Yet, here she was in danger of wasting her entire future, overwhelmed as she was by the neglect, humiliation, and violence she saw her people suffering. It gave her consolation to dream of sacrificing her life as the mother of sons who would give their lives to defend her people. Some of my male Palestinian clients had similar dreams, only that they wanted to give their own lives in violent resistance. Both girls and boys were appalled by those among their peers who chose to ‘forget’ about their people’s suffering and instead ‘enjoyed life’ by feasting and drinking.

None of these young people was driven by any ‘will to power’ or inherent ‘hatred of enemies’, nor were they motivated by religious fervour, nor did they mistake intifada to be a fun adrenaline kick, and they did not expect sexual gratifications either, not before death and not afterwards. They were simply overwhelmed by despair. They suffered from empathy. They deeply empathised with their people’s pain from humiliation — they felt noble, sincere, and valuable commiseration. Like Wafa Idriss, my clients belonged to the caring-compelled individuals that Clark McCauley and Sophia Moskalenko have described.[[2549]](#endnote-2550)

Evidently, my young clients were vulnerable to being recruited by humiliation entrepreneurs who would instrumentalise their empathy for acts of destruction.[[2550]](#endnote-2551) I always explained to them that also my personal life path was inspired by their desire to transcend personal material interests and dedicate my life to the common good. I tried everything in my power to convince them of the advantages of the path of a Bertha von Suttner, Mohandas K. Gandhi, Dietrich Bonhoeffer, Eleanor Roosevelt, Rachel Carson, Paulo Freire, or Nelson Mandela. As far as I could follow their path, I succeeded to protect them from violent humiliation entrepreneurs.

Our conversations took place in a consultation room not far from the famous Tahrir Square in Cairo. It was as if a number of widely beloved novelists secretly listened in on us and later wrote gripping novels about the painful dilemmas and emotional journeys that tormented my young clients. There was Alaa Al-Aswany, for instance, who worked in his dental clinic a few streets away from my consultation room,[[2551]](#endnote-2552) novelist Mohsin Hamid from Pakistan seemed to have listened in as well,[[2552]](#endnote-2553) as much as Orhan Pamuk from Turkey.[[2553]](#endnote-2554)

I thought of my clients when I heard about a letter a young man from Marseilles wrote to his mother in 2015 just before he died in Syria as what is called ‘foreign fighter’:

When you read these words, then I have left life on this toilsome world behind me, this very troublesome world, especially since I left you. I hope you understand why I did all this, why I left everything, even though I lived in a stable situation, a wonderful family, and had a job. Why all these sacrifices? Because the community of Mohammed was humiliated. Allah has rewarded us with the reconstruction of the Caliphate. Finally, Muslims have regained their pride. A successful life is not only to work, having a house, a car, a wife and children. A successful life is to worship Allah and to have his blessing.[[2554]](#endnote-2555)

Many of my Western friends feel personally attacked when they hear that foreign fighters with a high education and promising career prospects claim to be motivated by humiliation. My Western friends feel that a person with a stable career in ‘our society’ ought not feel humiliated, after all, ‘we’ offer ‘them’ the best of all worlds.

Through my work and life path, I sometimes trigger a similar sense of offence. I hear people ask, ‘Why does Evelin not live a “normal” life? She has everything, two doctorates! What does she sacrifice her life for?’ In my response, I remind them that the white apartheid elite in South Africa once cried out, ‘We treat our black people much better than others! Look at the beautiful lives our black people live in our country compared to other African countries!’ When slavery still was an accepted practice, slave owners as well were convinced, ‘Our slaves have a good life with us, they would not know how to live free lives anyway, we must protect them from freedom!’[[2555]](#endnote-2556) In today’s Global North, many live in bubbles of relative financial safety with the effect that they can shield themselves from knowing to which extent they are rich because others are not. Each German citizen, for instance, simply by living a normal life in Germany, statistically enslaves the equivalent of sixty people in the rest of the world.[[2556]](#endnote-2557) I observe that those who are most unaware of these connections are also those who are most offended by my work.

The letter from Marseilles shows that the young man felt a lack of meaning in life. Consumerism is indeed a false marker of dignity. It failed him, and it fails me. In search of meaning, he turned to an honour-oriented past and tried to re-create it. This is a disastrous path, more now than ever before, as we live in a world that is globally interconnected. The difference between him and me is that I try to create a future where worthiness, dignity, and the making of meaning does not depend on honour and neither on consumption, where it depends on what I call big love.[[2557]](#endnote-2558)

As mentioned before, I do not claim that humiliation always leads to violence and terrorism, nor that violence and terrorism always originate in humiliation. I also acknowledge that the humiliation-terrorism argument is being used to legitimise or to delegitimise, rightly or falsely, claims that terrorists are in reality heroic freedom fighters, or, inversely, that terror represents a declaration of war that requires war-like responses. I have frequently been misunderstood on these points.[[2558]](#endnote-2559) I have discussed and explained the link between honour, humiliation, and terror at length in my 2017 book on terror.[[2559]](#endnote-2560)

Let me end this section by briefly highlighting a few more aspects of terrorism. ‘The foreign fighter phenomenon should be viewed as an Islamist masculinity performance’, is the conclusion of a scholar from Kosovo.[[2560]](#endnote-2561) Scott Atran, an anthropologist who conducted research in Britain, found that it was neither direct humiliation nor religion, but jihadi cool and camaraderie among comrades that inspired foreign fighters to travel from Britain to Syria. Humiliation was even a negative predictor for violence, according to Atran, as humiliation tended to produce submissiveness rather than the urge for retaliation.[[2561]](#endnote-2562) Humiliation did play a role, however — very much in line with Alexis de Tocqueville’s predictions — for second or third generations of immigrants to Britain who, feeling that their parents had been humiliated, had the resources to rebel. Religion seemed to play no significant role either.[[2562]](#endnote-2563) Atran found that most young fighters initially had no idea of religion and that religious education even was a negative predictor for support for ‘jihad’, and even madrassas had little influence.[[2563]](#endnote-2564) Jihadi cool was what propelled those young men in self-organised, self-motivating, self-sustaining, and primarily social ways — simply, friends, who played soccer together, radicalised together.[[2564]](#endnote-2565) Many became foreign fighters just for ‘the fun of jihadi cool’,[[2565]](#endnote-2566) or for the ‘pleasure of terror’.[[2566]](#endnote-2567)

In other words, not all terrorism has its roots in experiences of humiliation, even though all terror has humiliating effects on its victims and ultimately also on its perpetrators. Plain sexual appetite could be a motivation to travel to Raqqa when it still was Da’esh’s capital,[[2567]](#endnote-2568) where a young man could get easy access to women — he could marry several wives and possess sex slaves — while in the West, he could perhaps only watch pornography on his mobile phone. This is what happens when young men adopt the Western way of consumption as a way to masculine honour — such ambitions could be better fulfilled in Syria by serving Da’esh than in a London suburb.

I see systemic humiliation being inflicted all around the world the more people embrace the Homo oeconomicus model of human nature. Global Islam in its McDonaldised version could be seen as a macro-political expression of the consumerist trap.[[2568]](#endnote-2569) It is unsurprising when terrorism turns out to be the easiest way to satisfy the profit motive, not to speak of global corrumpalism and the terror it inflicts.[[2569]](#endnote-2570) The profit motive’s insidious influence doubles when it monetises terrorist acts — wherever terrorism is given media prominence for the sake of profit, media represent ‘an instant distribution system for its actual intent — Terror’.[[2570]](#endnote-2571)

The heading of this section was, ‘Where do we stand with our liberation movements?’ To say it short, globalisation first brings people together, then it exposes the exploitative sides of globalisation to them, and in the light of human rights ideals, this exploitation seizes to be accepted as suffering ordained by God, it transmutes into hurtful humiliation inflicted by other humans. In this situation, dignity cannot be paid for or bought with money, humiliation can only be remedied with respect. The fact that this respect is lacking all around the globe represents an enormous revolutionary potential. Unfortunately, we, the world community, instead of nurturing worldwide mutual respect, seem to remain ‘stuck’ in the dominator paradigm — tyrants are toppled, while the tyrannical system remains, and new tyrants take power.

Liberation movements and uprisings can only truly achieve dignity if they dismantle the very system of tyranny and do so in dignified and dignifying ways. A second order transition is needed.

I cherish the promises made by human rights ideals. From what I see, these ideals are far from just a Western idea, they are the only script that can secure a dignified future for humankind.[[2571]](#endnote-2572) To me, these ideals speak to the capability of human beings to be humane in the best sense of the word. To be human ‘is to know your own sense of exclusion and insecurity in the world’, while to be humane ‘means employing compassion and empathy to assist in and stop the suffering of others’.[[2572]](#endnote-2573) I experience this capability when I meet people on all continents — I can attest that human rights ideals are not simply Western ideals.

I feel my own humanity being terrorised, tortured, and humiliated on my global path wherever I watch dignity being violated. What humiliates and enrages me most is when I meet self-righteousness blindness to one’s own self-humiliation and particularly the arrogant self-soothing and self-congratulatory illusion of goodness and righteousness that I meet in the Global North. To me, decency is an ‘intense feeling and belief in the idea of connecting with something more basic about humanity’,[[2573]](#endnote-2574) connecting with the utter vulnerability of our human existence and the sense of inner terror that we all feel when we confront it.[[2574]](#endnote-2575)

I highly value the privileges that fate offered me — I was born into a societal context that gave me a high quality education and a passport that enables global citizenship — and I follow Alexis de Tocqueville, Peter Kropotkin, and Bertha von Suttner in that I use my privileges to respond to humiliation not just for my own benefit but on behalf of those who are too downtrodden, too depressed, and too overwhelmed by their struggle for mere survival.[[2575]](#endnote-2576) I refrain from following terrorism entrepreneurs, those who simply keep perpetuating cycles of humiliation. Instead, I strive to wake up those who are too disconnected to stand up and who therefore stand by. In this way, I follow psychologist Ervin Staub who has shown that the Nazi regime was possible only because so many people stood by.[[2576]](#endnote-2577) Finally, I follow Nelson Mandela wherever he worked to transform humiliation into dignity. I am an advocate of the second order transition, away from self-righteousness, irrespective of who displays it, be it oppressors or liberators.

At this point, allow me to revisit the question: What is humiliation?

### A world without humiliation dignifies us all

Variations on humiliation

discrimination

degradation

dehumanisation

devaluation

incrimination

demoralisation

subjugation

intimidation

objectification

dislocation

deprivation

mortification

― Linda Hartling, adapted from Francisco Gomes de Matos, 13th June 2012

A world without humiliation dignifies us all, this is the sentence with which Linda Hartling ends all her electronic messages.

But what is humiliation? Do we understand it well enough to be able to heal and prevent it? What is humiliation? This question has been discussed earlier in the first section of chapter 3. Allow me to continue here.

Community psychologist Linda Hartling, director of our global Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies (HumanDHS) network, explains that humiliation can lead to very different outcomes — from being cast down to wanting to rise up, either violently or peacefully. Broadly speaking, humiliation can be examined as:

1. an internal experience (a feeling, an emotion)
2. an external event (such as a degrading interpersonal interaction, bullying, abuse, violent conflict, and genocide)
3. as systemic social conditions (such as intractable inequality, discrimination, or forced dislocation)[[2577]](#endnote-2578)

Peace psychologist Michael Britton, a core member of our HumanDHS fellowship, formulates it as follows:

1. Humiliation is a destructive but widely practiced part of relationships on levels from micro intimacy to macro-economic and geopolitical relationships.
2. Humiliation converts conflicts into violence and leads to their becoming intractable.
3. All problems are easier to solve if concern for the dignity of all parties is present.
4. Conversion from the globalisation of humiliation to the globalisation of dignity is essential if humankind is to have a decent future, perhaps any future at all... The HumanDHS network’s objective is fostering networks of practitioners dedicated to de-escalating humiliation and promoting human dignity.[[2578]](#endnote-2579)

Humiliation is a word that is used for a very complex set of conditions. The same word is typically used for the act of humiliation perpetrated by an offender as for the emotion felt by a victim. The word is also used for humiliation built into a system — apartheid is an example. An offender, accused of inflicting humiliation, might simply want to help, however, in other words, there are cases where only the recipient defines a situation as humiliating and not the perpetrator. Sometimes only a third party applies the term humiliation — the social worker, for example, who wants to save a beaten wife from humiliation might be rebuked by her, she may claim that her husband simply expresses his love by beating her, in the spirit of ‘whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth’.[[2579]](#endnote-2580) ‘False consciousness’ is a term that has been used for people who fail to feel humiliated and rebel.[[2580]](#endnote-2581)

Humiliation can be overt or covert. Humiliation is what gives the master-slave dyad its fragility, philosopher Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel observed this long ago.[[2581]](#endnote-2582) The master-slave dyad is relatively stable as long as underlings admire their masters, and also fear provides a certain stability. In contradistinction to Niccolò Machiavelli, even hatred still binds (see more in chapter 11).

The dyad is ready to fall, however, and I observe this all around the world, when masters walk into the trap of the following dynamic. Let me explain. In contexts of large power differentials, fake sweetness is a subtle way of paying back, it is a covert way of counter-humiliating self-absorbed superiors who are blind to the impact of their abuse. Inferiors often smile at their superiors while secretly despising them for their arrogant behaviour or even plotting against them behind their backs. Employees who hate their abrasive boss may provide him with fake adulation and feign admiration. If superiors are conceited enough to take such fakeness at face value, if they think that their inferiors’ submissiveness reflects authentic feelings of love for them, if they even base their own sense of honour and dignity on such feigned admiration, then they humiliate even themselves by their own blindness and gullibility. This is the moment, when they lose also the hatred of their subordinates, this is when their inferiors will simply feel a kind of bored contempt for them.

The pronoun ‘he’ for the boss is at its place here, because, indeed, power gradients are often gendered. The Me Too movement that began in October 2017 has exposed several layers of the humiliation dynamic that are relate to gender. While the Me Too movement uncovered humiliation of rather covert nature, prostitution represents humiliation that is more overt, humiliation of both others and self. Men who believe that ‘juicy girls’ are authentically ‘juicy’, and that ‘playing hard with them’ is ‘cool and manly’, are looked down upon with a mixture of pity and contempt by most women and many men, as these men are not only blind to how they humiliate these girls, and women in general, they are even blind to their own self-humiliation.[[2582]](#endnote-2583) I have had ample opportunity to witness these dynamics not least when I worked as a medical student in Thailand and saw the sex tourists’ victims in my clinic.[[2583]](#endnote-2584)

If we want to condense the complexity of acts of humiliation into a few sentences, this may be the right formulation: At the centre of humiliation is the idea of pushing down, pressing down, and holding down to the ground. A definitional characteristic of the process of humiliation is that victims are forced into a subordinate and degrading position where they are helpless and condemned to passivity. Humiliation is the enforced lowering of a person or a group, it is a process of submission that violates or robs the victim of their core sense of worth, their basic sense of honour or dignity. The act of humiliation entails demeaning behaviour, behaviour that transgresses established limits and expectations, it often involves coercion, including violence. To be humiliated means to be brought, often in a painful manner, into a situation that is below of what one feels is just.

Acts of humiliation have many starting points. In traditional dominator societies, superiors usually humiliate inferiors more or less casually as a matter of routine. Superiors may become indignant and angry only when underlings try to rise up. The fiercest acts of humiliation may be expected from subordinates who have risen to power and have access to resources they did not have before. The Rwandan genocide can serve as a harrowing example. The legs of Tutsi were hacked short by their former underlings, the Hutu, to bring their former masters down literally.[[2584]](#endnote-2585) Cruelty was amplified by a sense of shame among Hutu, shame over ever having admired their Tutsi masters, more, shame over still feeling inferior to them in certain respects.[[2585]](#endnote-2586) Last, one can also humiliate oneself, even without being aware of it, for instance, as mentioned above, by being blind to the traps of the master-slave dyad. Not only masters can be blind to it and humiliate themselves when they take feigned admiration at face value, also the enslaved person humiliates herself when she is blind to the manipulations masters typically use to make underlings compliant.

The reactions of victims of humiliation are as complex. One might expect that people want to avoid humiliation, yet, some look for humiliation, for example, in sadomasochistic contexts or in religious rites where people flagellate and humiliate themselves to praise divinity.[[2586]](#endnote-2587) Other may simply laugh off attempts to humiliate them, yet others will proudly refuse to feel humiliated. Some victims may feel humiliated in the absence of any intentional humiliating acts, simply because of misunderstandings, or because of individual or cultural differences in the definition of what respectful behaviour ought to entail. The very notion of equal dignity, for instance, is perceived as humiliating by those who believe in ranked honour. Last, a self-proclaimed victim may go as far and invent false stories of humiliation to manoeuvre counterparts into the role of contemptible perpetrators — the proverbial cry-bully is among them, the combination of a cry-baby and a bully.

Feelings of humiliation can come to expression in many ways. Some people react with depression and inertia, others develop open aggression, still others contain their acute anger and plan for long-term revenge. There is a popular saying that ‘revenge is a dish best served cold’.[[2587]](#endnote-2588) Someone who plans for revenge may amplify its impact by becoming the leader of a movement — this is the Hitler path out of humiliation. This contrasts the Suttner-Gandhi-Bonhoeffer-Roosevelt-Carson-Freire-Mandela path, which transcends and transforms anger through nurturing constructive social change.

In short, a perpetrator may have the intention to humiliate others without necessarily succeeding, humiliation may be desired rather than rejected, helpers may humiliate those they want to help without being aware of it, a third party may identify victims who themselves do not define themselves as victims, or, inversely, third parties may overlook actual victims. Last, a ‘crybully’ may fabricate accusations of humiliation.

Complex as it is, the concept of humiliation can be systematically analysed. One way to analyse it is to deconstruct it into layers — I differentiate seven layers, following sociologist Max Weber’s ideal-type approach.[[2588]](#endnote-2589) First, there is a spatial movement at the core of the phenomenon of humiliation that expresses the universal idea of putting down and holding down. Then there is a middle layer that entails two opposing appraisals of this practice of putting down, namely, either treating it as legitimate and routine as in the world of ranked honour, or as illegitimate and traumatising as in the world of equal dignity. Then, the first peripheral layer pertains to differences in cultural mindsets between groups, and here it is important to keep in mind the extent to which even emotions that seem to be basic can vary. For instance, the Ifaluk language in Micronesia has no word for anger, even the experience of anger seems to be absent, while there is an emotion called ‘fago’ that points at interpersonal kindness in the face of suffering.[[2589]](#endnote-2590) Another four layers relate to differences in individual personality and variations in individual experiences of humiliation. Even genetic differences may play a role at the individual level as some people seem to be more prone to feeling humiliated than others are.[[2590]](#endnote-2591) The layered conceptualisation may be visualised as in Table 2.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **The concept of humiliation** | | |
| 1 | Humiliation as a spatial movement of putting down and holding down | |
|  | 🡯 🡮 | |
| 2 | legitimate (in a ranked honour context) | illegitimate (in an equal dignity context) |
|  | 🡯 🡮 | |
| 3 | many cultural mindset differences between groups | |
|  | 🡯 🡮 | |
| 4–7 | at least four layers of individual differences | |

Table 2: The concept of humiliation in seven layers

Recent neuroscientific research has explored the links between aggression, rejection, and revenge, indicating that humiliation is experienced as a particularly strong form of rejection,[[2591]](#endnote-2592) and that humiliation is as hurtful as physical pain.[[2592]](#endnote-2593) Humiliation is the most intense human emotion, leading to the mobilisation of more processing power and a greater consumption of mental resources than other emotions. ‘Humiliation is a particularly intense and cognitively demanding negative emotional experience that has far-reaching consequences for individuals and groups alike’.[[2593]](#endnote-2594) Research shows that the combination of loss and humiliation is the strongest predictor of major depression.[[2594]](#endnote-2595)

Feelings of humiliation, when they are accompanied by helplessness, by the inability to redress the degradation that is felt to be undeserved, can generate shame and anger. This is why the social humiliation of losing face has such force, why it can lead to such extreme forms of retaliation, even at the cost of self-damage.[[2595]](#endnote-2596) A Somali proverb says, ‘A man deserves to be killed and not to be humiliated’, implying that a proud and noble warrior mindset does not allow humiliation to take hold and would rather choose death than the shame of meek submission.[[2596]](#endnote-2597) Norway incidentally looks back on a similarly proud legacy, in this case it was the Viking past. It still shines through in contemporary Norway, whose citizens have an ‘alarming tendency to quarrel with their neighbours’, as a Norwegian insurance company reports, ‘It’s seen as a matter of honour not to give in to a neighbour’s demands, and we expect or hope that the other side will take the initiative for some sort of reconciliation’.[[2597]](#endnote-2598)

Warrior cultures of proud equals are, however, a rarity on the globe — Norway and Somalia are rare exceptions, ‘hardened’ by their extraordinarily harsh natural conditions, so barren that no neighbouring empire really desired to conquer them. Therefore, by and large, the dominator model of society became prevalent throughout the past millennia all over the globe.[[2598]](#endnote-2599) As discussed before, protracted humiliation tends to lead to paralysis, apathy, and ‘learned helplessness’,[[2599]](#endnote-2600) and this is precisely what the dominator model achieves, it wears its citizens down by way of humiliation-attrition to the point that they either become so numb that they no longer feel any rage, or they turn it against themselves.[[2600]](#endnote-2601) Some descend into apathy, depression, inertia, or cynicism,[[2601]](#endnote-2602) others even learn to identify with their humiliators and become their facilitators — the German word is Obrigkeitsgläubigkeit — so that whole societies can develop what is called the Stockholm syndrome.[[2602]](#endnote-2603) Such settings usually render a seemingly ‘peaceful’ society, yet, the calm and quiet is paid for with structural violence.[[2603]](#endnote-2604) It is peace at the price of the pain endured by the members of such a society.[[2604]](#endnote-2605) When we look at history, the longer a dominator system had time to shape such a society undisrupted — long-standing empires such as China and also Egypt, for instance — the deeper these effects became embedded in the psyches of its citizens (see also chapter 3). I have acquired a deep embodied sense of these differences through the many years I spent both in old civilisations such as China and Egypt, and could compare them with places such as Norway or Somalia.

Not just in the past, also today, in many world regions and many segments of world society, power elites use humiliation to enforce subservient humility in their subordinates, and very often they succeed in engendering apathy, depression, they succeed in coercing servility, they create willing and unwilling compliance and more or less reluctant submissiveness. Yet, there are limits. Even my most peace-loving friends admit that it is possible to drive them into explosions of violence — some call it ‘madness’, losing one’s mind’, or ‘going black’ — when they are subjected to continuous experiences of humiliation. While apathy and depression may be a most common responses to protracted humiliation, there comes a point where feelings of humiliation may explode into violence. Rage can turn outwards and become hot, desperate, and destructive, it can burst into humiliated fury, as psychologist Helen Block Lewis called it.[[2605]](#endnote-2606) Earlier, I told the story of young Ahmed, who felt that violent retaliation for humiliation gave him a sense of ultimate liberation even if it meant risking his life, it liberated him from the shame he had felt over his helplessness at the hands of his humiliators. Passionate murder or suicide may occur in such situations.

As mentioned before, experiences like Ahmed’s show that humiliation cannot be conceptualised simply as part of a shame continuum, in particular not in contexts where the promise of equality in dignity is salient. When such ideals are promised and at the same time betrayed, feelings of humiliation are likely to occur without feelings of shame, not just in proud Somali warriors but in everyone.[[2606]](#endnote-2607) Nelson Mandela, for instance, refused to feel ashamed even though he was subjected to humiliating treatment and felt humiliated.[[2607]](#endnote-2608)

Ahmed was only one single young man among many, and his acts of violence were of little consequence for society as a whole. Yet, it is a different situation when humiliation entrepreneurs mobilise entire societies, when they use latent feelings of humiliation brewing in masses to incite collective violent action. This was precisely the path of Adolf Hitler, he called on his followers to refuse feeling ashamed — he told them that they should not be ashamed of Germany’s defeat in World War I, nor should their economic misery make them feel ashamed — rather, so his message went, they were entitled to feel wrongly humiliated.[[2608]](#endnote-2609) His ‘method’ for redressing this humiliation was to inflict unspeakable humiliation on alleged humiliators — scapegoats he had pointed out. In this way, Hitler offered horrific ‘healing’ for the collective unconscious of the German people,[[2609]](#endnote-2610) and continued the cycles of national humiliation that had begun already long before WWI’s Versailles Treaties.

Abu Bakr al Baghdadi, when he declared a Caliphate in 2014, did something very similar when he said, ‘Terrorism is to refuse humiliation, subjugation, and subordination [to the kuffār — the infidels]. Terrorism is for the Muslim to live as a Muslim, honourably with might and freedom. Terrorism is to insist upon your rights and not give them up’.[[2610]](#endnote-2611) Adolf Hitler and Abu Bakr al Baghdadi mobilised their followers into mayhem. Hitler sought to gain Lebensraum for his nation, while Baghdadi sought to create a new nation.

Mohandas K. Gandhi and Nelson Mandela, as well, mobilised masses to rise up from humiliation. Yet, they mobilised them into constructive social change, they aimed at ending cycles of humiliation rather than continuing with the tit-for-tat of ever-new cycles of humiliation.[[2611]](#endnote-2612)

These cases show the enormous force of feelings of humiliation and how this force can be used for de-struction, as by the Hitlers of this world, or for con-struction, as by the Mandelas of this world. They show that humiliation can be used as a weapon to perpetrate mayhem, or it can serve as energy source for the conscientisation that educator Paulo Freire taught.[[2612]](#endnote-2613) Only the latter path leads to dignity for all people.[[2613]](#endnote-2614) Because of their immense strength, I call feelings of humiliation the nuclear bomb of the emotions.

The genocide against the Tutsi in Rwanda demonstrated the force of humiliation in the most gruesome way, it showed how feelings of humiliation could be weaponised to perpetrate acts of humiliation at a grand scale. This genocide showed also how ‘cost-effective’ this weapon is — the machetes that were used to kill almost one million people were household items that were turned into deadly weapons by propaganda that was disseminated from a simple radio station. Already Hitler’s propaganda minister Joseph Goebbels had used the same method. Those who attempted to bring back a glorious caliphate employed it as well — Internet platforms do not need much funding — when they recruited the humiliated of the world to weaponise their feelings — the force entailed in humiliation became apparent when their recruits went ahead to become ‘foreign fighters’ and perpetrate violent acts of terror.[[2614]](#endnote-2615)

Humiliation can be weaponised even as a meta-weapon. The terror meted out by Da’esh, for instance, served as a weapon in cycles of humiliation between Saudi Arabia and Iran — as it seems, Saudi Arabia supported terror with the aim to weaken Iran’s strongest ally in the region, namely, Syria’s regime.[[2615]](#endnote-2616)

The lesson to be learned is that cycles of humiliation destroy the social fabric of communities wherever they occur, locally and globally. As long as the world was not yet as interconnected as now, as long as it was still compartmentalised and divided, as long as more or less homogenous dominator polities were pitted against each other in mutual fear, rulers could regard it as a useful strategy to instigate ever-new cycles of humiliation. During the past millennia, such strategies had some degree of utility, at least sometimes, and they were an integral part of all ‘art of warfare’ handbooks. Ruthless humiliation practices could turn strongmen into victors over their enemies and cement their power over their own people.

This is, however, no longer the case now. In a highly interconnected world, a world in which, furthermore, human rights ideals have become salient, whoever uses humiliation entrepreneurship as a strategy is guaranteed defeat. The noblest liberators, the noblest defenders of human rights ideals, cause their own defeat the moment they betray their own values and use humiliation. In an interconnected world, their defeat will, however, not remain limited to them, it will risk drawing everyone into the abyss.

All witnesses and bystanders around the world, every single citizen, the international community as a whole, everyone therefore carries the responsibility to stand up in the face of humiliation rather than stand by. Everyone who values social cohesion is called to halt cycles of humiliation.[[2616]](#endnote-2617) The way to end cycles of humiliation, in a world where the promise of equal dignity is salient, is by keeping this promise, is by actually delivering dignity.

Keeping the promise means for the global village’s inhabitants to co-create institutional structures for this village that ensure a decent and dignified life for all.[[2617]](#endnote-2618) The Mandelas and Eleanor Roosevelts of the future are called to transform the force of humiliation into encouragement for constructive action. Mountains can be moved when a large enough number of people is inspired to pour feelings of humiliation into Paulo Freire’s conscientisation.

Keeping the promise of dignity requires new levels of sensitivity for feelings of humiliation. The recent rise in popularity of authoritarianism in many parts of the world shows that this sensitivity exists, yet, not where it should be. It should be highest among those who pride themselves of being human rights advocates — their task is to no longer overlook their own double standards.

Let me end this chapter with an illustration from Europe. Back in 2004, no one was more enthusiastic than the Poles, the Czechs, and the Hungarians about becoming members of the European Union, and they significantly benefitted financially from joining. By now, however, the citizens of these countries elect populists who rage against Brussels. Feelings of humiliation are the driving force.[[2618]](#endnote-2619) Karel Schwarzenberg was the foreign minister of the Czech Republic when his country joined, and he worked hard to transform his country into a reliable European partner. In 2017, he sees his life’s work falling apart, ‘We Czechs know what we owe the EU, but we do not feel at home’. Too often, Schwarzenberg reports, Eastern Europeans were treated condescendingly by Brussels, ‘When we disagreed, we were told: Become real Europeans first’. Eastern Europeans are particularly sensitive to such a tone, he explains, ‘We do not appreciate being treated as minors forever, because this is reminiscent of the Soviet era when we always were on the receiving end of directives’.[[2619]](#endnote-2620)

As it seems, arrogant Western elitist know-it-all dominators perpetrate humiliation, be it wittingly or unwittingly, sometimes simply by being too casual in their display of power. This predicament, clearly, is not just relevant in Europe. Old Cold War fault lines have recently been brought back at a global scale, after the U.S.A. mistook the collapse of the Soviet Union as American victory, after it entertained ‘a spirit of triumphalism and a feeling of omnipotence as the “sole superpower”.’[[2620]](#endnote-2621) The result by now is that the humiliated ‘loser’ — Russia — attempts to rise from below — not as a friend in good faith but as a distrustful rival, culminating in warfare in the Ukraine just in the days when this book went into print,[[2621]](#endnote-2622) not to speak of China, which had to suffer the most ruthless humiliation at the hands of the West around one hundred years earlier.[[2622]](#endnote-2623)

Then there is something called inferiority complex — I prefer to speak of internalised humiliation.[[2623]](#endnote-2624) As Polish author Ziemowit Szczerek reports, ‘the West has always been richer and more powerful’, and this has created a sense of inferiority in Eastern Europeans. ‘We still see ourselves as Westerners look on us: a little poor, a bit backward, and less efficient’.[[2624]](#endnote-2625) This sense of humiliation is what a rightist PiS voter in Poland and a rightist AfD voter in Germany have in common: He is male and ‘he lives in the countryside or in a small town, and even though his income has grown in recent years, he feels that he is under threat. He sees his traditional attachment to religion and his homeland put in question, even his traditional understanding of the role of women and men. Globalisation, immigration, the pluralisation of lifestyles, everything appears as a threat from a liberal elite’.[[2625]](#endnote-2626)

Finally, humiliating experiences also flow from systemic humiliation. Polish Piotr Buras is an expert in European politics, and in 2017 he reports that ‘the reform ideology of the nineties and early noughties has hit us particularly hard: unlike the West, the East has been given neo-liberalism without having gone through a social democratic era’, as there was a lack of institutions that could cushion the hardships of capitalist restructuring, privatisation, and unemployment.[[2626]](#endnote-2627)

Many in the West are unaware of these facts. Still in 2017, German journalists diagnosed Eastern Europe’s newly emerging nationalisms as a ‘fear reaction’ by implying that ‘the enemy is no longer the neighbouring country. It is now against those up there’.[[2627]](#endnote-2628) In this way, the journalists blamed the victims and psychologised systemic problems. Another journalist, Jonathan Chait, warned that for many in the West, neo-liberalism simply means ‘superior capitalism versus inferior socialism’, and he asked, ‘What kind of capitalism are we talking about?’ The Washington Consensus represents an extreme laissez-faire approach that changed the lives in many countries not necessarily for the better, and ‘the shock therapy of mass privatisation applied to Russia after the Soviet collapsed, for example, reduced life expectancy in that country by five years and ensured that Russia was taken over by strongmen and oligarchs’.[[2628]](#endnote-2629) No wonder that Poland’s PiS party is applauded for introducing a child allowance and lowering the retirement age.[[2629]](#endnote-2630) No wonder that Hungarian leader Viktor Orbán is applauded when he speaks of ‘recapturing politics’ and of ‘illiberal democracy’.

The two world wars saw the struggle for supremacy of traditional nationalisms being fought out on the battlefields of the European continent. The European unification grew out of the insight that such mayhem should never happen again. Today this achievement risks being gambled away, and this, not least, by insensitive and humiliating displays of power.

What is the solution?

The solution is to heal past cycles of humiliation and prevent new ones from emerging.

Identifying types of humiliation: A checklist

by peace linguist Francisco Gomes de Matos, Recife, 4th December 2010

HUMILIATORS commit human rights violations, especially violations of HUMAN DIGNITY. Here is a list. You are asked to add to it, reflect thereon, discuss it with members of your family, your class at school, workmates, and in other contexts:

A VIOLATION of the Right to DIGNITY takes place when a person, a group is

denigrated

depreciated

deprecated

marginalised

calumniated

disheartened

mocked, made fun of, ridiculed in public

oppressed (economically, politically, etc.)

minimised

discriminated (ethnically, educationally, etc.)

debased (morally)

treated with affront, indignity

insulted

...

Humiliators are perpetrators of Human Rights Violations, yet the term ‘humiliator’ seems to be less used than ‘offender’, for instance. May this also be a plea for a global effort aimed at RE-educating HUMILIATORS (actual and potential), so they can learn to play a much-needed role, namely, that of DIGNIFIERS!

# Part III: Where do we go from here? A future of solidarity!

Applying the methods of the so-called hard sciences to human affairs, the rationalists demonstrated (to their satisfaction) that there was no epistemological stance from which to derive natural law or moral principle. Instead of a sentient universe charged with moral meaning, science found only a machine — dead matter to be exploited by economists and engineers to make us wealthier and more powerful, not better. And what does a machine governed by mathematical formulas and physical laws have to teach us about how we should live? Nothing.

― William Ophuls, ecologist[[2630]](#endnote-2631)

Is there a dignified way forward into the future? If we recapitulate what has been discussed so far in this book — what can we learn for the future?

In the year 1757, a new meaning of the verb to humiliate became visible in the English language, a meaning that ultimately led up to a new concept of the social contract for society, a concept based on the idea of equal dignity for all as free individuals.[[2631]](#endnote-2632) As this book has tried to show so far, it began with the individual being detached from the collective and humiliation becoming a violation, and, in a next round, each individual was endowed with equal dignity, no longer ranked within a system of unequal honour.

Many psychological, social, societal, and political transitions have accompanied, mirrored, and highlighted this trend, and many scholars have described the intellectual transformations that unfolded in the years surrounding 1757.[[2632]](#endnote-2633) Legal scholar William Ian Miller has traced the changes in Europe in minute detail, changes in the articulation and conceptualisation of the individual and the self in the contexts of Romanticism, industrialisation, and capitalism.[[2633]](#endnote-2634) For instance, it was the time when travellers began to insert themselves more openly as subjects with a personal perspective into their travel reports, following Michel de Montaigne’s pioneering ‘birth of the self’ essays in 1575.[[2634]](#endnote-2635) The late eighteenth century saw the rise of the abolitionist movement that aimed at setting slaves free and ending the Atlantic slave trade. The list of changes, clearly, is much longer. Chapter 9 will discuss the deeper transformations underlying the many surface changes.

Soon after 1757, on 4th July 1776, the American Declaration of Independence was adopted, the French Revolution’s Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen followed on 4th August 1789. On 9th November 1863, the promise was made of ‘government of the people, by the people, for the people’,[[2635]](#endnote-2636) in August 1928 war was outlawed,[[2636]](#endnote-2637) and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights was adopted on 10th December 1948.

The message of the American Declaration of Independence and the French Revolution was so revolutionary and controversial at the time that only very few dared to open up to it. The governments of Europe and the Church were hostile to the United States of America and hoped that it would soon collapse. The French king clamped down so violently on the first attempts to bring about reforms that he inflicted a psychological trauma on the revolutionaries that was so severe — they were all respected and law-abiding citizens for whom such humiliating treatment was new — that it fuelled their terrifying Reign of Terror, le Terreur.[[2637]](#endnote-2638) It took a long time before these new ideas could flourish in relative peace. Fast forward to the twenty-first century, it is not certain whether or not new terror looms, some people fear that what has been achieved so far may be lost again now.

Article 1 of the 1948 Human Rights Declaration states that ‘All human beings are born with equal rights and dignity. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood’ (we would add sisterhood today and rather speak of solidarity). The declaration stipulates that individual rights should apply not just to a given country but be universal, and that governments should secure these rights.

In former times, such utterances would have been unconceivable — and still they are unconceivable in many segments of world society in our time. Wherever the hierarchical dominator model of society is prevalent, very different sentences feel ‘right’, and I have heard them in many variations. I have listed two examples in the Preface, for instance, ‘All human beings are born unequal in worthiness and rights. Some are endowed with more reason and conscience than others and should preside over inferiors in a spirit of supremacy’. Or, ‘All human beings are born unequal in worthiness and rights, because everyone is born into their rank and is meant to stay there, except for those few who might move up or down the status ladder due to their own doings or un-doings. As an unavoidable consequence, there will always be some who are freer than others are, and there will always be strongman elites who preside over collectives of subordinates. Slavery is therefore legitimate and not a human rights violation’. Utterances such as this are not uncommon also in the twenty-first century, yet, they are no longer undisputed and often only a cover for ulterior motives.[[2638]](#endnote-2639)

Until a few hundred years ago, the humiliation of subordinates was not regarded as hurtful in most societies on the globe, on the contrary, to humiliate inferiors was seen as the superiors’ duty, far from a violation. To humiliate meant to lower or to humble, ‘to remind underlings of their due place’, to ‘teach them humility’, and this was widely regarded as pro-social.

Over time, however, and this became visible in the year 1757 in the English language, the connotations of humiliation and humility parted, they separated into two opposite directions: humility stayed pro-social, while humiliation became anti-social.[[2639]](#endnote-2640) The concept of humility split into two as well, namely, submissive humility and dignified humility. While submissive humility pointed at meekness and docile compliance, at the kind of humility that is the result of ‘successful’ humiliation, dignified humility is the opposite, it points at wise humility born out of a voluntary decision grounded in a sense of freedom. Dignified humility connotes humility that is loving, responsible, respectful, mindful, self-reflective, informed, intellectual, and enlightened — short, it signifies relational humility, humility that is shared.[[2640]](#endnote-2641) Political humility is one of its aspects.[[2641]](#endnote-2642)

The human rights revolution thus transforms the legitimate humbling of underlings into the illegitimate humiliation of equals, it rejects the dominator model of society and endorses the partnership model. Human rights ideals of equal dignity democratise a particular right that in the world of honour was reserved only for elites, namely, the right to interpret humiliation as a violation and fight back — go to duel so to speak. A beaten wife could never challenge her husband to duel, she was expected to learn respect for his supremacy and adopt docile humility. Human rights ideals reject this rule and allow the beaten wife to get angry with her humiliator. More even, this right is not only given to the beaten wife, it is given to millions of downtrodden people, to all of those who formerly endured humiliation in subservient humility.

As human rights ideals democratise the right to become angry when put down and give it to everyone, they bring forth anger where there was quiet docility before, and this is one reason for why humiliation is so much more virulent nowadays, why it becomes such an important topic for research and political action.

The list is long of examples that illustrate the transition from a world of honour, where holding down underlings is a right and a duty, to the world of equal dignity for all, where the very same behaviour is deemed to be a violation. Every single aspect of human life is affected by this transformation, at micro, meso, and macro levels. In the new context, the duty of ‘domestic chastisement’ transmutes into ‘domestic violence’, the ‘customary duty of genital cutting’ becomes the ‘cultural violence of genital mutilation’, and the child-rearing practice of ‘breaking the will of the child’ goes from ‘white pedagogy’ to ‘black pedagogy’.[[2642]](#endnote-2643) Human rights ideals endow every single human being with equal dignity that ought not to be held down, that ought not to be humiliated under any circumstances.

Human rights ideals call for entirely new arrangements of relationships on planet Earth, both between its inhabitants and between them and their habitat. Competition for domination, competition for dominance and control, is to be replaced with partnership and collaboration, with mutuality and dialogue. This means that even revolutions can no longer be carried out as before. In former times, tyrants were toppled but not the system, with the result that after victory, rebels and revolutionaries typically became the new tyrants. Human rights ideals introduce a second order transformation after the first, no longer does it suffice to depose a tyrant, the very system of tyranny must be taken down as well, and this must be done with peaceful and dignifying means, without violence. In short, wherever human rights ideals are established as a norm, underlings are invited to abandon submissive humility, superiors are asked to let go of haughty arrogance, and all are tasked to come together in the middle between ‘up’ and ‘down’, in a spirit of responsible mutual care and dignified and shared humility.

Human rights ideals represent an invitation and a promise. They invite all human beings to consider themselves as members of one single human family, where all join hands in a spirit of solidarity and are promised equality in dignity. This is a message of joy for all the downtrodden in the world, they feel elated and liberated from having to swallow humiliation in meek humility — suddenly, they are allowed to feel hurt when treated with humiliation, they can reject such treatment. Superiors on their part, however, often feel the stark opposite. For many of them, this invitation represents a threat. They want to resist the loss of their privileges, they feel humiliated by the invitation and the promise, so they seek ways to betray both.

This is another reason for why dynamics of humiliation are so much more relevant in our times than before. By now, the world is filled with feelings of humiliation on all sides — invitation and promise are so new and controversial that all involved feel humiliated, and cycles of humiliation ensue.

Humiliation and anger among the downtrodden intensify when human rights ideals are preached with noble pathos only to turn out to be empty rhetoric. ‘To recognise humanity hypocritically and betray the promise humiliates in the most devastating way by denying the humanity professed’.[[2643]](#endnote-2644) Together with international relations scholar Steven Roach, I therefore decry the ‘cant of decency (as a virtue): that is, the insincere, hypocritical, and even scandalous talk of morality in politics’.[[2644]](#endnote-2645)

In the language of political science, expectation gaps open — perhaps better called anticipation gaps[[2645]](#endnote-2646) — when hopes are created only to be disappointed.[[2646]](#endnote-2647) When this happens, those who have sufficient psychological and material resources and the necessary inclination, may set out to channel their disappointment into violence. This is what French aristocrat and historian Alexis de Tocqueville observed in his classic works in 1856.[[2647]](#endnote-2648)

Human rights advocates need to be aware that the promise they offer to the downtrodden of this world opens a very specific expectation gap, namely, a dignity gap, a dignity chasm,[[2648]](#endnote-2649) an indignity trap.[[2649]](#endnote-2650) Since dignity humiliation hurts more than honour humiliation, this gap feeds feelings of humiliation that are much stronger than in the past.

This is perhaps the most important reason for why dynamics of humiliation are so much more relevant in our times than before.

The situation will only remain peaceful, at least on the surface, as long as enough people fail to take in the fullness of the message of human rights, as long as they continue to react with submissive humility just as in former times when most people still were accustomed to accept it to be true that ‘higher’ beings had the right to humiliate ‘lesser’ ones, either because this was divinely ordained or nature’s order. The situation will also remain peaceful as long as those who have internalised the human rights message and who therefore refuse to feel submissive humility are too afraid to turn their rage outwards and instead transform their disappointment into apathy and depression.

Rage, however, may also turn outwards, and this is when danger looms. For many, the traditional rebel script of arrogating elite superiority still feels more familiar than the sense of wise humility that human rights ideals intend to inspire. They have learned only the first half of the human rights lesson, not the second half that indicates that human rights ideals call for a second order transformation, namely, to channel anger into peaceful systemic change. They may not be ready for the path of a Bertha von Suttner, Mohandas K. Gandhi, Dietrich Bonhoeffer, Eleanor Roosevelt, Rachel Carson, Paulo Freire, or Nelson Mandela. We only have to look at the self-esteem movement in Western societies,[[2650]](#endnote-2651) which may have unintentionally democratised and legitimised the former elite sense of entitlement but failed to teach the spirit of humility of a Mandela, with the result that anger feeds a society-wide narcissism epidemic of indignation.

Anger may even explode into acute episodes of violence, such as, for instance, in school shootings. In the worst case, anger might be incited and channelled by humiliation entrepreneurs into mass violence. In Rwanda, for instance, former Hutu subordinates humiliated their former masters, the Tutsi, in elaborate torture rituals before killing them, all in an attempt not just to ‘cleanse’ their former masters physically from society, but also to cleanse themselves from their own shame over ever having been submissive to these masters.[[2651]](#endnote-2652)

History offers many more examples, from Adolf Hitler as humiliation entrepreneur, to contemporary terror recruiters who lure youths into perpetrating violence. The Hitlers of the world find ample ‘material’ to mobilise masses into mayhem when feelings of humiliation brew in populations, when a sense of frustration smoulders that waits to be manipulated into feelings of humiliation. When this happens, the main task for human rights defenders is to channel these feelings into constructive change rather than into violence and mayhem.

Cross back is the term I use when feelings of dignity humiliation are acted on with tools from the toolkit of honour humiliation instead. Cross back is when honour strategies — the Hitler path — are chosen to act on feelings of dignity humiliation, when only the first part of the dignity uprising is carried out, while the second part falls by the wayside, the peace inducing and dignifying part — the Mandela path. In the divided world of the past millennia, as it was ruled by codes of honour, strategies of honour did possess a certain internal consistency. In the new context of human rights ideals, however, in a world that is globally interconnected, the very same strategies become other- and self-destructive. Writer and civil rights activist Audre Lorde most cogently observed this already several decades ago when she said that ‘the master’s tools will never dismantle the master’s house’.[[2652]](#endnote-2653)

Throughout the past decades, a new and insidious systemic betrayal of the human rights promise has emerged. The short-term interests of small global elites — often described as the Global North vis-à-vis the Global South — have captured global institutional structures that are supposed to protect the common good, and this leads to processes of cogitocide, sociocide, and ecocide (see chapter 7). In the long term, the consequences are devastating, including for those who benefit in the short term — nobody is safe from cascading global crises in the long term.[[2653]](#endnote-2654)

In this context, unsurprisingly, feelings of humiliation arise all around the world more than ever before.

Illustrations are many. Allow me to share some personal encounters. As already mentioned in chapters 2 and 3, the field of psychology may serve as one example. When short-term psychological advice is marketed to individuals who suffer from humiliation in situations where structural problems ought to be addressed, then the very field — psychology — that prides itself of contributing to healing, betrays its own mission — instead of decreasing sociocide, it increases it by bowing to the profit-motive.

Another example is development, or the strategies that are implemented to help societies achieve desired change. In 2002, I sat in Paris together with Jan Nederveen Pieterse, professor of global studies and sociology, and I was delighted to hear him ask the same burning questions that were also on my mind after twenty-five years of global experience, namely, ‘development is the management of a promise — and what if the promise does not deliver?’[[2654]](#endnote-2655) Critical post-development voices warn that ‘it is not the failure of development which has to be feared, but its success’.[[2655]](#endnote-2656) Even critical post-development anti-standpoints get trapped, Pieterse observed, by ‘a double hijacking dynamic’, namely, when they arrive ‘at development agnosticism by a different route’ as neo-liberalism, while still aligning ‘the abdication of development with neo-liberalism’.[[2656]](#endnote-2657) Pieterse calls for reflexive modernity as a more enabling position, and for reflexive development as a corollary in relation to development.[[2657]](#endnote-2658) ‘From development to dignity!’ is the call of our time that I strongly support.[[2658]](#endnote-2659)

Norwegian development specialist and scholar Benedicte Bull sheds light on the decades between 1980 and 2000, and on what she calls a ‘perverse twist’:

On the one hand, from the 1980s, there were governments, businesses, international organisations and intellectuals — often lumped into the neo-liberal category — that argued for a continued focus on growth and modernisation, but rejected the developmentalists’ focus on knowledge, technology and industrialisation. Moreover, in a perverse twist on the modernisation schools’ belief in linear evolution, they saw development as an immanent process in all societies that would naturally take place if hindrances were removed. They thus rejected the developmentalists’ notion of development as a purposeful process pursued by development actors, primarily the state, and considered it rather a natural process that would unfold if state interventions were removed and the market were allowed to regulate prices and encourage entrepreneurship.[[2659]](#endnote-2660)

I regret that I did not meet Claude Ake in 1976 when I travelled along the coast of West Africa coast from Morocco to Cameroon as a young psychology student and was near him in Port Harcourt. Claude Ake was one of Africa’s most distinguished political and social scientists of the twentieth century. He was a staunch critic of the military junta that ruled Nigeria and a mentor of Ken Saro-Wiwa and the Ogoni protests against exploitation, and he died at the age of 57 in 1996 in a plane crash widely believed to have been directed by the junta. In his work, he condemned ‘Western development studies as worse than useless’, and suggested a new model of social sciences for the African continent.[[2660]](#endnote-2661) I was delighted to have the privilege of sitting together with another equally critical thinker, Hussein Bulhan, in Hargeisa, Somaliland many years later, in 1998.[[2661]](#endnote-2662)

Development is not the only field affected by ‘perverse twists’, all aspects of global and local life are impacted. Environmentalism was greeted with great enthusiasm in the 1960s, only to be counteracted by ‘profit versus planet’ and turned into ‘sustainability’, ending in the ‘market environmentalism’ of the past twenty years. ‘The market’ was to make everyone better off, yet, the price to be paid now is ecocide and sociocide. Unions once had as their goal to ‘tame capitalism’, with the result that capitalism has tamed the unions. The call for ‘love and peace’ of the nineteen sixties ended in sexual predation and violent terrorism. In short, wherever the ideal of caring partnership arose, it was hijacked by a mindset of competition for domination, wherever the traditional female role description of cooperative care gained visibility, the male script of combat soon came back. Wherever dignity was defined as mutual solidarity, it was redefined as competitive autonomy.

Democratisation projects have followed similar ‘perverse twists’. Afghanistan expert Kristian Berg Harpviken, another Norwegian scholar and colleague of Benedicte Bull, offered a critical political economy analysis of the situation in Afghanistan already long before the Taliban returned to power in 2021.[[2662]](#endnote-2663) He and his colleagues had followed the situation in Afghanistan for many years and reported that ‘what began as a radical state-building and democratisation project in 2001 was soon captured by elites’.[[2663]](#endnote-2664) The results are devastating: After 2014, the security situation deteriorated, the government controlled less than sixty per cent of the country, civilian causalities were steadily increasing, corruption and poverty were on the rise, the government lost legitimacy, and, fast forward to 2021, Afghanistan is back in the hands of the Taliban, teaching the world that Louis Brandeis was right when he said, ‘We may have democracy, or we may have wealth concentrated in the hands of a few, but we can’t have both’.[[2664]](#endnote-2665)

In my beloved Egypt, where I lived and worked for seven years from 1984 to 1991, I saw with my own eyes how disappointment seeped in. Since I left in 1991, I returned several times and remained in close contact with my Egyptian friends, witnessing the dark clouds that gathered over their heads as inequality increased in their society. Many of my friends live in despair over their shrinking prospects for a decent life and decent livelihood. In 2011, the Egyptian avant-garde stood up, in confirmation of Alexis de Tocqueville’s observation that the danger of revolution is greatest not when poverty is so severe that it incapacitates people but when conditions are somewhat better, at least for a few, while the rest is left behind.[[2665]](#endnote-2666) The Egyptian avant-garde had the emotional and material resources to resist, and they toppled Hosni Mubarak.[[2666]](#endnote-2667) During the revolution, I noticed with dread, in resonance with sociologist Amitai Etzioni, how ‘the Western media faithfully reports every twist and turn in the evolution of the Egyptian democracy’, because Western media assumed that what the Egyptian people ‘really’ wanted was a secular and ‘Western-minted democracy’, whereas the ‘main dynamic in Egypt at this stage is an economic one’.[[2667]](#endnote-2668) The revolutionaries named their revolution dignity revolution because they yearned for the dignity of a decent livelihood, of decent jobs and affordable goods and services. After Hosni Mubarak was gone, in the next round, the Egyptian masses elected a religious leader, and, again, they wanted only one thing — a decent livelihood. The religious leadership failed to improve livelihoods, instead, it imposed their version of Sharia on the nation. By now, a strict military government is in power that is not very different from Mubarak’s rule, many would say that it is even more severe.

Unfortunately, and I tried to explain this to my Egyptian friends, people all over the world overlook that present-day global economic structures stand in the way of hopes for dignified livelihoods for the masses. No national regime, and Egypt is no exception, can offer the jobs and decent livelihoods that their people yearn for, no regime can withstand global institutional frameworks.[[2668]](#endnote-2669) Hopes for dignity are bound to be unrealisable in a world of rising inequality within and between societies. In the Global North, decent livelihoods have the semblance of being sustainable only as long as they are built on the unsustainable exploitation of the Global South.[[2669]](#endnote-2670)

Author Amin Maalouf summarises the situation better than I could, a situation that unfolds not just in Egypt. While the discourses of both Islam and the West have the necessary internal theoretical consistency to create hope, in practice, both betray their own ideals — the Arab-Muslim world has neither the legitimacy of the family nor the patriotic legitimacy around which it was historically structured anymore, and also the West is unfaithful to its own values, which disqualifies it in the eyes of the people it claims to acculturate to democracy.[[2670]](#endnote-2671)

In 2021, the Taliban of Afghanistan came to power precisely because the West was unfaithful to its own ideals. Just like the Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood government in Egypt, the Taliban promise patriotic legitimacy in the face of a disqualified West. Yet, new disappointments might be in store.

The only solution, and this is my message in the Global North as much as in the Global South, is for all to join hands in leaving behind hubris and toxic economic rules and to turn to the task of co-creating global constitutive rules that make global and local dignity possible.[[2671]](#endnote-2672)

The West, given its global outreach, has degraded global governing structures to the point that no nation has the power to save itself alone now, as much as dignity revolutionaries might hope they can, and as much authoritarian leaders and conspiracy entrepreneurs may pretend they can. Only a globally concerted turnaround towards global unity in diversity and equal dignity can avert global sociocide and ecocide.

This book could end here. However, there is more to say. There are a more ideas to share. In the next chapter, let me take a step back into early history and reflect on its relevance for contemporary problems. I will explore how competition for domination could become such an all-encompassing mainstream strategy and will highlight the experience of circumscription. In the chapters that follow, I will look towards the future. At the end of the book, I will consider pathways to future dignity — egalisation, dignism, and unity in diversity. The book will end with a call to action.

## Chapter 9: How we got here

If the soul is left in darkness, sins will be committed. The guilty one is not he who commits the sin, but the one who causes the darkness.

― Victor Hugo, Monseigneur Bienvenu in Les Misérables, 1890[[2672]](#endnote-2673)

The problem lies not so much in developing new ideas, but in escaping from old ones.

― John Maynard Keynes (1883–1946), economist
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### Our human experiment requires a radical overhaul

We live in historically unprecedented times. Many changes are first-time changes. Humankind is in the process of awakening to its place in a larger cosmic context, as one single species on one tiny planet in a vast universe. We also live in a shrinking world — anthropologists call it the ingathering of the human tribes — for the first time in its history, all of humanity is in touch with itself. On top of this, we also reach the limits of the resource and carrying capacity of our planet.[[2673]](#endnote-2674) Not enough, in this interconnected and finite world, human rights ideals promise equal dignity to everyone. As a consequence, everyone who does not receive an equal share may feel humiliated, and, when this happens, humiliation is no longer endured in quiet subservience as before. Dignity becomes the battle cry for uprisings against humiliation, and violent cycles of humiliation are the outcome when this meets opposition and suppression. In this way, energy is absorbed that would better be invested in overcoming humiliation, energy that should be directed towards the co-creation of a decent future world.

Humiliation has ‘won out’ when it becomes normalised at the systems level and is cloaked in dignity rhetoric to cover for dignity being crowded out in practice. Just as apartheid was humiliation as a system, we, the human species, now exploit our social resources to the point of sociocide, just as we exploit the ecological resources of our planet to the point of ecocide. Soon we will face what has become known as Seneca cliff — the rapid collapse that over-complex systems typically experience when they degrade.[[2674]](#endnote-2675) It was not least due to this over-complexity, that ‘covid crushed the world’.[[2675]](#endnote-2676)

The list of warnings is long. Heavyweight scientist Stephen Hawking warned just before he died that humankind must prepare for moving to other planets already within the next one hundred years.[[2676]](#endnote-2677) Serious scientists predict that due to out-of-control run-away climate degradation, the human species might go extinct already in this decade.[[2677]](#endnote-2678) A species that takes entire control over its planet, we learn, may already be on the path to self-destruction.[[2678]](#endnote-2679) The concentration of power in the hands of a few ‘inevitably destroys the societies that endure it for too long’.[[2679]](#endnote-2680) During the past critical twenty-five years of unprecedented growth in carbon emissions, ‘the richest one per cent of the world’s population are responsible for more than twice as much carbon pollution as the three billion people who made up the poorest half of humanity’.[[2680]](#endnote-2681)

Our global challenges force us, humankind, to lift our eyes beyond our cultural and national particularities, no longer is one local problem here or there in need to be solved, the survival of all of humankind is at stake.[[2681]](#endnote-2682)

Luckily, we get unprecedented help in this difficult situation, help that even our grandparents could not enjoy, let alone our great-grandparents. First, we have a paradigm-shifting view that has the potential to unite us, namely, the view on our small and vulnerable Blue Planet from outside — we have the privilege of experiencing the overview effect with respect to our planet.[[2682]](#endnote-2683) Second, we possess all the knowledge needed for a radical turnaround if we combine modern science with age-old Indigenous knowledge systems, draw on our inborn ability to cooperate, and on human rights ideals as a compass into a future of dignity. Third, the coronavirus pandemic has shown us that societies with a high level of trust can turn around effectively, concerted, and fast — Norway can serve as an example.

It is now or never. Scientists inform us that we have a time window of about ten years, within which we still can act purposefully and make useful impact.

Dignity will have to be at the forefront of the fundamental turnaround that is needed in this situation. Colonisation and its successor globalisation made global interconnectedness more visible and palpable than before and thus facilitated the rise of the ideal of a united human family in equal dignity. Now, however, the time has come for dignity to save globalisation from itself. What is needed is the social body frame of dignity, as formulated by discourse analyst Michael Karlberg (introduced in chapter 4).

I began to propose and discuss this view in 1994 when I was in Oslo at the Peace Institute PRIO, and I was delighted when I saw what Michael Karlberg wrote in 2013, namely, that dignity ‘has been re-emerging in a modern form over the past century in response to the ever-increasing social and ecological interdependence humanity is now experiencing on a global scale’.[[2683]](#endnote-2684) As it turned out, Karlberg’s social body concept of dignity speaks exactly to the understanding of dignity that grew out of my global experience of many decades, namely, that dignity goes far beyond individual autonomy, that it is solidarity in freedom. This concept has roots that reach far back in human history, yet, was obfuscated in the past millennia’s dominator contexts, and I am delighted to see that it finds its way forward again into public consciousness through the process of global ingathering.

Michael Karlberg’s insights confirm my conclusion that human rights ideals are far from just a Western idea, rather, a large-scale historical trend towards ingathering opened space for this particular interpretation of dignity to come to the fore. The historical linguistic journey that the notion of humiliation traversed and that has been discussed in the first two parts of this book — with the year 1757 as a linguistic marker — is not limited to the English language. I have found core elements everywhere on this globe, as universal values of psychological support such as ‘protection’, ‘concerned recovery’, and ‘respect for human dignity’.[[2684]](#endnote-2685)

In my work, I offer a big history view as a compass, a blueprint, or a roadmap for humanity to build a decent world.[[2685]](#endnote-2686) In times of crises that are as deep as now, I regard a long view as the most helpful navigational aid for the human journey into the future.[[2686]](#endnote-2687) Only a wide lens that captures long stretches of history makes primary problems visible, which then spawn secondary, tertiary, and quaternary problems. This does not mean overlooking or neglecting the more immediate historical events and periods that bring social and economic change, it is only that I zoom in and out and look at each level separately before connecting them again.[[2687]](#endnote-2688) For this purpose, I use sociologist Max Weber’s ideal-type approach that differentiates between distinct levels of abstraction.[[2688]](#endnote-2689)

When I zoom out, and I do this after almost fifty years of global experience and decades of analysing relevant research, I conclude that the most important inflection point for human history lies long before the twentieth century, and even long before the present capitalist world system took hold, namely, in what is known as Neolithic Revolution. I profoundly resonate with the historical analysis of anthropologist William Ury, and I thank him for his inspiration since I first met him in 1999. He formulated a ‘simplified depiction of history’ where he pulls together elements from anthropology, game theory, and conflict studies (see more further down in this chapter).[[2689]](#endnote-2690) Last year, I learned about economist Lisi Krall and her work and I appreciate her formulation that ‘from the perspective of social evolution, it is fair to say that capitalism is a system within a system. It is the legacy and apogee of a system change that took hold beginning some 10,000 years ago. ... Can we change the trajectory of our social evolution now embodied in the present variant of the economic superorganism? We are moved by this question from hubris to humility’.[[2690]](#endnote-2691) As we face Holocene problems with our Pleistocene genome, we ‘have to respect our Pleistocene genome and recognises the problems of our Holocene social evolution’.[[2691]](#endnote-2692)

Allow me introduce my ‘blueprint’. First a summary in four sentences: I see humanity standing in the middle of the second major turning point in our history, a turning point that is as important as the first one. The first one began to unfold circa twelve thousand years ago, at the onset of what we call Neolithic Revolution, a time that I conceptualise as the endpoint of our first round of globalisation. Our task now, as we reach our final rounds of globalisation, is to look back twelve thousand years, rethink our adaptations of the past millennia, and then forge better ones for the future. We can describe the past millennia’s activities of our species on this planet as a human experiment that now requires a radically overhaul. It is like with a house that has structural problems and needs to be re-built from scratch. The cracks in the foundation need to be attended to first, only then can otherwise intact elements be reused.

Let me explain more. Prior to the Neolithic Revolution, for the first 97 per cent of our species Homo sapiens sapiens’ history (if we calculate that modern humans began to walk planet Earth around three hundred thousand years ago), our forebears were fortunate enough to live in abundance, in what game theorists call a win-win context.[[2692]](#endnote-2693) This allowed them to populate all accessible lands on planet Earth at ease. Since a context of abundance makes mutually beneficial arrangements of relationships relatively easy to establish,[[2693]](#endnote-2694) our forebears had ample opportunity to learn cooperation, dialogue, and partnership with each other.[[2694]](#endnote-2695) They also learned partnership with nature, even though we must admit that they must have underestimated their impact, because already around sixty thousand years ago human activity seems to have contributed to the disappearance of the megafauna, the world’s largest animals.[[2695]](#endnote-2696)

Around twelve thousand years ago, significant changes happened. It began 11,700 years ago with an abrupt warming that led to a rapid melting of the remaining ice sheets of North America and Europe. It was also the first time that Homo sapiens sapiens walked on all continents. Our ancestors had completed their campaign of populating all easily accessible lands on planet Earth and had arrived on the last so far untouched continent, South America. I call this short moment in history — short in historical terms — ‘the end of our first globalisation campaign’, the ‘first major turning point in human history’, the first time that living conditions for humans on Earth changed radically and globally. From that moment onwards, the win-win contexts that had reigned prior to this turning point began to transmute into win-lose contexts[[2696]](#endnote-2697) — to say it short, the banquet of unlimited abundance was over.

Compared with a win-win context, a win-lose context is much harder to live with. Reaching cooperation is more difficult, much more careful negotiation is needed to build alliances. Perhaps anthropologists are right who suggest that making alliances with neighbours was not just difficult but also unwelcome, particularly for men who, deprived of their former hunting grounds, welcomed having ‘enemies’ they could hunt down.[[2697]](#endnote-2698) Whatever happened, we can say that from then on our forebears began to adopt strategies of competition for domination, from then on competition between out-groups became more important than cooperation between them, from then on cooperation became limited to making in-groups fit for competition.

By now, as we stand at the end of our second round of globalisation and in the middle of the second major turning point in our history, we are in a situation where we have to prepare for lose-lose impasses and will face a lose-all future if we fail to create new kinds of win-win opportunities. This is our final round of globalisation, we have reached all limits, the limits of minerals, clean air, clean water, healthy soils, and the limits of our planet’s digestive capacities. We will have to find solutions that are superior to the competition for domination strategies that we used for the win-lose dilemmas of the past millennia.[[2698]](#endnote-2699) We will have to understand that we cause omnicide — the killing of everything — if we continue with competition for domination, because this strategy is now cogitocidal, sociocidal, and ecocidal.[[2699]](#endnote-2700) During the past millennia, competition for domination and control had some utility, but only at first glance. In the long run, competition for domination makes the problems worse it aims to solve.

The long run has arrived now.

The core problem that we made worse throughout the past millennia follows from the fact that planet Earth has a limited size. Circumscription means limitation, enclosure, or confinement — from Latin circum ‘around’, and scribere ‘to write’ — it can express itself as territorial, social, or resource circumscription.[[2700]](#endnote-2701) In my work, I use circumscription theory to capture the astonishment that arises when something that hitherto was believed to be unlimited, suddenly reveals itself to be limited.

Anthropologist Robert Carneiro is known as the father of circumscription theory.[[2701]](#endnote-2702) It was a great privilege for me to meet him for the first time in 2009 and from then on to sit with him once every year to discuss how I use his theory in my work, always finding him in his office just across Margaret Mead’s former office.[[2702]](#endnote-2703) His theory explains how multi-village polities, chiefdoms, and states emerged, how ‘successively larger political units’ formed ‘until one of sufficient size and complexity had emerged to which the term “state” could be applied’.[[2703]](#endnote-2704) Carneiro’s theory replaced the formerly reigning ‘automatic’ theory that suggested that the invention of agriculture made the production of a food surplus possible, thus permitting ‘certain individuals to be withdrawn from primary food production so they could devote themselves to non-subsistence activities’, so they could become ‘specialists in all manner of arts and crafts, as well as in other sorts of activities such as those that developed into the political and religious institutions characterising the early state’.[[2704]](#endnote-2705)

Through his work, Carneiro showed that food surplus is not a viable explanation for the formation of states. The manioc cultivation in Amazonia, for instance, produced a much greater surplus than the maize cultivation of the Inca, but the Inca were the ones to proceed towards state formation. When working in Amazonia, Carneiro observed how ‘a defeated village could avoid subjugation by its stronger enemies simply by moving away and establishing itself in a new location, continuing to live much as before’, as there was enough space for ‘flight rather than fight’ to preserve ‘a regimen of village autonomy’.[[2705]](#endnote-2706) In the Andean region, in contrast, narrow valleys were flanked by the driest desert in the world. ‘With the desert providing no refuge, defeated groups were forced to stay in place and be subjugated by their stronger neighbours’, which gradually led to the defeated polities losing their sovereignty to the larger unit.[[2706]](#endnote-2707) Thus, the pertinent driving factor for state formation is circumscription, not agriculture.

Like Carneiro, also anthropologist William Ury found that the human species’ ‘default’ way of solving conflict is for opponents to move away from each other in peace — Ury studied the San Bushmen in South Africa.[[2707]](#endnote-2708) Similarly, world-systems scholar Christopher Chase-Dunn, when he looked at human history, observed that, as long as there was sufficient space, migration was the preferred strategy to solve conflicts and ease the consequences of population pressure.[[2708]](#endnote-2709)

We can conclude that humankind’s default choice to solve conflicts, accommodate newcomers, and maintain peace is to preserve inclusiveness, and to do so by widening the inhabited space. There is a Swahili proverb, ‘Host your guest for two days, and on the third day give him a hoe’, and then give him a piece of land so he can cultivate his own food. Precisely this solution becomes infeasible, however, when there is no ‘empty land’ available anymore, be it that landscape stands in the way as in territorial circumscription, or that other people block this solution as in social circumscription.[[2709]](#endnote-2710)

In my work, I use circumscription theory in ways that Robert Carneiro did not initially intend, yet, my views resonated with his insights and conclusions when I began to explain them to him in our annual conversations. I like to speak of a Circumscription Revolution rather than of a Neolithic Revolution, not least because the circumscription concept, besides explaining the past, has the advantage of also showing pathways into the future. Furthermore, it inspires the humility that is needed to accept the fact that we humans are far from triumphant masters — rather, we are fumbling seekers of adaptions. Highlighting circumscription helps reconnecting with humility to the Palaeolithic mutuality models that reigned in the far past, while letting go without grudge of the dominator models of the near past.

As mentioned before, I use the term circumscription to capture the astonishment that arises when something that was hitherto believed to be unlimited reveals itself to be limited. If we look at the human campaign to populate the planet, at some point it was bound to run up against the fact that our planet is limited in size. Around the time of the Neolithic Revolution, this began to happen. If planet Earth were smaller, this moment would have come faster. If planet Earth were larger, we would still live as migrant foragers and follow the wild plants and animals that nature provides, we would still populate one new continent after the other — only a few places would make us stay longer and in larger groups, places of natural abundance of food, for instance.[[2710]](#endnote-2711) We would still move on to the next valley to solve conflicts and maintain peace, there would be enough space to absorb population increase, and we could perhaps even waste minerals and pollute water and air without overly adverse consequences.

By highlighting circumscription in the context of the Neolithic Revolution, I do not overlook other influences. As mentioned before, glaciers began to retreat around 11,700 years ago and this affected climate at a global scale.[[2711]](#endnote-2712) Scholars who study the Neolithic Revolution agree that global dynamics must have underpinned the changes that began to occur around twelve millennia ago — what is hotly debated is only what might have been the cause and what the effect.[[2712]](#endnote-2713) What is clear is that complex agriculture emerged from the previously existing foraging ways of life that were less controlling of nature, and that this happened in widely separate world regions independently from each other — in some world regions rice was cultivated, in others grains, in yet others corn.[[2713]](#endnote-2714)

Many see the invention of agriculture as a triumph of human inventiveness. I tend to resonate with geographer Jared Diamond who says that it was ‘the worst mistake in the history of the human race’, as it brought ‘starvation, warfare, and tyranny’.[[2714]](#endnote-2715) It certainly brought unprecedented health problems.[[2715]](#endnote-2716) I resonate with all those who suggest that sedentary lifestyle and extractivist agriculture in many ways represent regress rather than progress from earlier forms of sustainable foraging and gardening — after all, this ‘progress’ brought us the dominator mindset that now risks destroying us.[[2716]](#endnote-2717) By saying that, I do not want to advocate that we should turn ‘back into stone age’, on the contrary, I advocate a wiser forward.

Around twelve millennia ago, our forebears could not know better. They could not see our Blue Marble from outside. They could not know that they lived on a spherical globe and had reached the last continent with their population campaign, that they stood at the end of a first round of globalisation. The fact that planet Earth’s surface is finite could only make itself ‘known’ to them indirectly through the experience of circumscription. We are in a much more privileged situation now, we are aware of the facts of our planet, so we can react much more purposefully. We know that not only is our planet’s surface limited, we know we live in times of ‘peak everything’, from minerals to clean water and clean air to biodiversity.

I compare the inflection point of the Neolithic Revolution with the Great Divide that separated two of Homo sapiens’ close relatives. Until the Pleistocene, apes of the genus Pan lived only on one side of the Congo River in Africa, yet, at some point, a small group crossed the river and were lucky enough to find abundant resources. They evolved to prioritise friendly cooperation and became what we know as bonobos. Their less fortunate brothers and sisters on the other side of the river, the chimpanzees, adapted to their much scarcer and circumscribed resources with aggressively misogynist male dominator behaviour.[[2717]](#endnote-2718) As I see it, the task that lies ahead of our species, Homo sapiens, is to leave behind the way of the chimpanzee, no longer can we force our creativity and ability to cooperate into competitions for domination that cause global socio-cide and eco-cide. Rather, the task ahead is to purposefully co-create conditions for the way of the bonobo to flourish, for eco-sanity and socio-sanity, and this can be done by establishing global frames that allow for creativity and cooperation to nurture the common good. As we cannot replicate the bonobos’ environment of material abundance — after all, we cannot make our planet larger — our task is to co-create non-material abundance that replenishes the planet. Co-creating a global dignified and dignifying knowledge society where knowledge is shared freely is the only lifesaving roadmap for the future.

Acting purposefully means taking in that planetary conditions have an impact that is global per definition, and that it is vain to hope that local interventions can suffice. Global problems require global solutions, it is not enough for individuals to meditate or for nations to solve only their national problems, as important as this is. ‘Faithful’ ‘techno-centrists’ and fervent ‘eco-centrists’, even though they are opponents, both fail to understand the need for global solidarity.[[2718]](#endnote-2719) Whenever I meet them, I offer my narrative of global circumscription as an analytic lens to help circumvent the cycles of humiliation that separate them, and to invite all of them into global responsible solidarity.

Robert Carneiro once shared with me that his politically progressive colleagues initially resisted his theory. If I could, I would talk to them about the advantages of my use of his circumscription concept. I suggested to Robert Carneiro that humiliation might have played a role in his colleagues’ resistance, in two ways. First, I assume they did not like the idea that the supposedly civilising process of state formation might have resulted from something as uncivilised as war.[[2719]](#endnote-2720) For ‘eco-centrists’, who think that sapiens means ‘wise’ in the sense of ‘peaceful’, it may be too humiliating to admit that we, species Homo, may be much less sapiens than we like to believe, that civilisation might be much less a product of peaceful progress in dialogue with nature than we might wish for. Second, progressives may want to avoid facing humiliation from conservative colleagues who would welcome Carneiro’s views as a confirmation of the conceptualisation of human nature as essentially competitive, combative, and belligerent.[[2720]](#endnote-2721) Terms such as civilisation in the sense of ‘not barbarous’ betray pride in ‘hominid exceptionalism’, pride in ‘us humans’ as a species that is more ‘successful’ than other species and thus superior to all. The self-aggrandisement of modern-day ‘techno-centrists’ and their ‘techno-scientific salvationism’ feeds on precisely this unbroken pride in human exceptionality, in the human ability to control nature rather than having to dialogue with it.[[2721]](#endnote-2722)

With my circumscription concept in mind, I ask ‘techno-centrists’ who are proud of their competitiveness and control over nature to give up the idea of ‘hominid exceptionalism’, and I invite ‘eco-centrists’ who are proud of dialogue with nature to think more globally. I remind both that we might have given ourselves the name sapiens in its Latin sense of ‘wisely judicious’ prematurely so far, and rather haughtily, and that we still have to earn this adjective. Looking at the world through the lens of the circumscription concept, we could say that our forebears indeed had a chance to learn to be sapiens prior to the onset of circumscription. Throughout the past millennia, we fought wars, however, not because we are Homo belligerens but because this was the best we could do to protect our loved ones under circumstances of circumscription. Our ancestors simply did not know better. They did not have the information we have, so they settled for suboptimal solutions, solutions so ‘primitive’ as waging war on each other and on nature. They settled on solutions that mutilate nature, including human nature, solutions that vastly undervalue human ingenuity.

We are in a different situation now. We have the opportunity to regain our status as sapiens by embarking on a new and more informed path of solving the problems presented to us by circumscription. This time the solution is no longer competition for domination but global solidarity.

Clearly, let me repeat, this narrative is highly simplified, it follows Max Weber’s ideal-type approach. Reality on the ground is much more complex, incoherent, and nuanced. The experience of circumscription took long time to affect all world regions — for instance, for a long time, people were spared who lived very isolated, on islands or in other remote locations, and some were shielded until the time of colonisation.[[2722]](#endnote-2723) Still today, uncontacted tribes live in rainforests from where they presumably perceive the world around them as limitless.

In 1944, political economist Karl Polanyi (1886–1964) could still find peasant and tribal societies that lived in dialogue with nature, and Polanyi called their way of life the substantivist economic model, in contrast to the ‘production of crops’ or formalist model.[[2723]](#endnote-2724) Polanyi described the substantivist model as the way early humans made a living from their social and natural environments, without rational decision-making or conditions of scarcity. The formalist model, on the other hand, describes the more recent model of economics that is defined along the logic of rational action and decision-making. According to Polanyi, these two types — ‘production for use’ or subsistence production on one side, and production for exchange with profit maximisation as its chief aim on the other side — differ so radically that no single theory can describe them all.[[2724]](#endnote-2725)

By now, waves of globalisation have affected most people on the globe, and even uncontacted tribes may not remain uncontacted for long.[[2725]](#endnote-2726) Wherever substantivist approaches still prevail, they are systemically forced into the formalist model. During our 2019 Dignity Conference in the Brazilian Amazon, we witnessed the pain that is inflicted on traditional substantivists when corporations and authorities force them into the formalist model — we heard the accusation thrown at them, ‘You stand in the way of progress!’[[2726]](#endnote-2727)

As we were sitting in the midst of the Amazon together with our desperate friends who faced the loss of their livelihoods, I would have loved being able to offer more substantive help, yet, they did appreciate my narrative of circumscription, as it helped them to place their suffering into a greater context. Over the past millennia, circumscription tightened its grip worldwide — it became increasingly impossible to roam freely, there was simply less ‘empty land’. What emerged was the kind of political integration that Robert Carneiro described in his work — dominator societies led by strongmen subjugated ever-larger territories, they formed ever-larger political entities, and today we call them ‘civilisations’. The resulting win-lose situation of ‘this is either my land or your land’ brought the security dilemma to the fore, so that If you want peace, prepare for war became the dominant maxim.[[2727]](#endnote-2728) In this context, where there was substantivist cooperation in dialogical partnership before, the power balance shifted to those who succeeded in channelling cooperation into hierarchical dominance structures, into patriarchal dominator societies, and ultimately into formalist ways of living. Brief, cooperation in dialogue transmuted into cooperation in the service of competition for domination and control.[[2728]](#endnote-2729)

Riane Eisler was introduced earlier, the social scientist and activist, who, in her cultural transformation theory, has described how otherwise widely divergent societies throughout the past millennia manifested what she calls the dominator model of society in contrast to the partnership model[[2729]](#endnote-2730) — or, as psychologist Linda Hartling prefers to describe it, the mutuality model of society.[[2730]](#endnote-2731) In the aftermath of the Circumscription Revolution, the world increasingly filled with dominator societies who then began to outcompete each other. Within a dominator society, typically, it was regarded as normal and morally correct for overlords to keep underlings down ‘where they belonged’, overlords had the duty to humiliate underlings routinely so they would ‘know their place’. The duty of underlings, on the other hand, was to respectfully react with submissive humility when humiliated. In the case of our friends in the Amazon, this was what pained them most: that they were told that something was wrong with them psychologically if they failed to learn submissive humility in the face of humiliation aka progress.

Not just our friends in the Amazon have a problem, though, the entire world has a problem with this approach now. By out-competing each other within the confines of circumscription throughout the past millennia, dominators unwittingly tightened the grip of circumscription. By now, the final acts of circumscription have arrived and further domination no longer means progress or victory. Now it only translates into collective demise. Humanity’s domination campaign has reached its limits in all spheres of life, no longer can the illusion of unbounded abundance on planet Earth be maintained.

As it stands now, many people still overlook the signs on the wall. Planet Earth continues to be ravaged for the sake of what is called investors, while the rest of humanity is complicit — having a job means having something to eat. The last Indigenous populations that continue to engage in ‘production for use’ through foraging and gardening, and through unconditional sharing and ‘giving forward’ — such as our dignity friends in the Amazon — are labelled ‘poor’ and coerced into systems where ‘no job’ means ‘no money’ and ‘no life’.[[2731]](#endnote-2732)

Lately, however, more and more people begin to understand that time is over for ‘victory over enemies and nature’ and that ‘lifting people out of poverty’ through ravaging the planet does not represent progress. We begin to understand that we must rethink millennia-old adaptations and shape our future by inventing entirely new ways of arranging our affairs on this planet. After millennia of believing that competition for domination and control is ‘the right path’ into the future, we understand that the right path requires that we reform and replace practices of domination and subjugation. We understand that strategies of ‘pushing down and holding down’ people and nature are obsolete — such practices represent violations and need to be left behind.

Allegedly ‘higher’ beings need to step down, no longer can they oppress and exploit supposedly ‘lesser’ beings and nature. Much of what once was portrayed as benevolent patronage is in fact humiliating domination.[[2732]](#endnote-2733) In the future, we need to limit ourselves to hierarchies that are truly benevolent. We will always need truly caring parents, supportive teachers, and nurturant gardeners. What becomes injurious is rankism, the essentialisation of hierarchy.[[2733]](#endnote-2734) Global solidarity in equal dignity is the call of the day, global unity in diversity (more in chapter 11).

For all these new adaptations to succeed, inventiveness is urgently needed. We can only hope that economist Ester Boserup (1910–1999) was right with her prediction that population growth with larger numbers of individuals increases the potential for inventiveness,[[2734]](#endnote-2735) meaning that there is a ‘demographic dividend’.[[2735]](#endnote-2736) The problem with population numbers, however, is that they do not just grow linearly, they grow like a nuclear reaction with the rate of growth itself increasing, so that the planet’s population will rather become an ever-increasing mass of starving people, if we fail to bring to the table the necessary inventiveness.[[2736]](#endnote-2737)

As mentioned at the outset of this chapter, I find anthropologist William Ury’s long view on history helpful in this situation. He drew up a ‘simplified depiction of history’ where he pulled together elements from anthropology, game theory, and conflict studies. He describes three major types of society in chronological order, namely, simple foragers, complex agriculturists, and knowledge society.[[2737]](#endnote-2738) I use Ury’s historical periods as a frame to insert the historical and social development of pride, honour, and dignity as follows:

* I call the first 97 per cent of human history the era of pride, or, more precisely, the era of pristine humble and dignified pride, pristine because it is not yet touched by systemic humiliation. It was the time when foraging and small-scale gardening was prevalent and circumscription had not yet set limits for migration, when the few people walking the planet still had enough space to follow wild food relatively freely and sustainably.
* The past three per cent of human history, the period of complex agriculturalism since the Neolithic Revolution, was the era of honour, or, more precisely, the era of collectivistic ranked honour, the era of systemic humiliation and arrogant pride.
* I dedicate my life to working for a return to dignified humble pride, for an era of dignity, or, more precisely, for a future of equality in dignity for all as responsible individuals, free to engage in loving solidarity with each other and in mutually dignifying connection with all life on planet Earth.[[2738]](#endnote-2739)

This categorisation is my attempt to make the journey of Homo sapiens through time and space explicit to all now living generations, especially to younger people. My aim is to inspire them to unleash all inventiveness they are able to summon and embark on an era of dignity with intentionality and purpose, rather than simply letting this transition grow and shrink haphazardly, or, worse, letting it be captured by ulterior interests.[[2739]](#endnote-2740)

Are we, as humanity, equipped with the right kinds of abilities? Is there a chance that humankind can create an era of dignity and avoid the Seneca cliff? Many young people ask me these questions. I have dedicated my entire life to finding out what we need to know for a purposeful transition.

The short answer to all these questions is a ‘Yes, but’. We can all agree that humans are able to cooperate.[[2740]](#endnote-2741) During the first 97 per cent of human history, and thus the most significant period during which our bodyminds evolved, we learned to cooperate in small egalitarian groups. This is an invaluable asset. We can also agree that our planet Earth is finite in its surface, that population growth was bound to reach its limits at some point, and that our first round of globalisation was the starting point for ever-increasing rounds and degrees of territorial, social, and resource circumscription. We know that the final rounds of globalisation reach their endpoint now, several thousand years later, we know that we are facing global limits on all fronts, not just with regard to the Earth’s land surface but also with respect to minerals, clean water, and clean air. We also know that reaching limits that hitherto were overlooked leads to sudden tipping points and changes conditions so drastically that radically new adaptations are needed.

Thus, we know that humanity stands at a crossroads and that it is urgent to rethink the adaptations we created when we began to face circumscription at the time of the Neolithic Revolution. The year 1757 is a linguistic marker in the English language for this historical moment of reckoning, of which we are still part. From now onwards, we have the choice of continuing with business as usual, which most probably means proceeding towards a global dictatorship that removes sovereignty from all inhabitants and depletes the last resources, or we can co-create completely new global systems of production and economic participation that nurture the common good of this planet’s inhabitants, be they human or other animals.[[2741]](#endnote-2742)

This is my answer to young people: We, as human species, risk going extinct if we choose the wrong path now. A few of us may make it to Mars,[[2742]](#endnote-2743) and they will die out there as soon as Mars’ resources are ravaged by the same behaviour we have practiced on Earth. Global solidarity in dignity is the only solution.

Usually, I receive an indignated outcry in response, ‘But global solidarity is impossible!’ I ask back, ‘Is it?’ Evolutionary biologist Edward O. Wilson was introduced earlier, as he offers relevant reflections. Wilson makes the argument that humans have pro-social talents — solidarity, altruism, care, and compassion — all of which evolved throughout our evolution and are deeply embedded in the human psyche.[[2743]](#endnote-2744) The work of psychologist Daniel Kahneman speaks to these insights as well.[[2744]](#endnote-2745) Primatologist and ethologist Frans de Waal found a strong inequity aversion in humans and other species, and he proposes that it arose to make cooperation possible, that it functions as a reinforcement of social contracts founded on fairness. If the social contract is broken, unfairness elicits a sense of disgust that is so strong that it motivates the punishment of violators.[[2745]](#endnote-2746) Then there is cultural anthropologist Christopher Boehm who suspects that far back in time there might indeed have been a human inclination towards domination, traceable to our closest relatives, the chimpanzees and their social systems of strict dominance orders.[[2746]](#endnote-2747) Yet, Boehm was surprised when he tried to reconstruct the social system of our Pleistocene ancestors and did not find similar orders of dominance, on the contrary, the ‘vast majority of indigenous societies living in bands today are characterised by a strongly egalitarian structure’.[[2747]](#endnote-2748) Boehm concluded that ‘egalitarianism and the rejection of strong dominance hierarchies is a basic attribute of human sociality’.[[2748]](#endnote-2749) His hunch was that due to growing cognitive abilities, early humans might have realised that, if they themselves could not dominate, it would be best to prevent also others from doing so. As brainpower in humans increased, ‘strategic thinking, proto-political ﬁnessing, and coalition-seeking behaviour’ became feasible, which meant that wherever certain group members attempted to impose themselves on the group, the group collectively ‘tamed’ such dominance strivings.[[2749]](#endnote-2750)

When we look at the evidence that is accessible for observation today, expert views differ widely on how our early forebears actually lived, what was the cause and what was the effect. Literature is vast, new publications come in daily. Let me offer a small glimpse of the kinds of dissent that are relevant. According to anthropologist Robin Dunbar, the human preference for social connections caused the brain to consume more energy and grow, which made foetal heads too big for mature birth.[[2750]](#endnote-2751) Linguistic anthropologist Daniel Everett, on the other side, in his book How language began, questioned this view and pointed out that it may have been precisely the other way round, namely, that the increase of brain size and greater intelligence enabled the growth in social relationships among humans. Eventually, Everett came down on Dunbar’s side, concluding that social engagement affected brain size rather than vice versa.[[2751]](#endnote-2752) Everett suggests that humans banded together and that the first groups of humans were viable through cooperative work, because, ‘of course, in any group effort there will usually be a passenger or two, those who are content to reap full benefits of the efforts of others while failing to provide full efforts themselves. For group relationships to work more effectively, therefore, natural selection would have favoured improved intelligence in order to detect cheaters’.[[2752]](#endnote-2753)

After having studied this field for many years, and after having been embedded in many different cultural realms all around the world for decades, I very much resonate with the hypothesising that Wilson, de Waal, Boehm, Dunbar, and Everett offer for the period up to the Neolithic Revolution. I see remnants of this period wherever I go on our planet still today. It is after decades of reflection and observation that I reply with a resounding ‘Yes’ to the question ‘Is human nature equipped for global solidarity?’

My conclusion is ‘Yes’, given the right frame. The onset of circumscription and the transition from a win-win frame to a win-lose situation, followed by the security dilemma, brought dominator structures to the fore that undermined pre-existing egalitarian coalition-seeking strategies, communal traditions, and pro-social skills. In other words, human nature is not inherently belligerent, we have no psychological need for enemies, on the contrary, we need to feel that we belong, we have a need for friends, and we will cooperate to protect them in a divided world, even if this means war. The solution is to un-divide the world.

This hugely simplified narrative has several advantages, even though this storyline is distilled to its bones and history has many more shades and nothing happens as sharply, coherently, and concurrently. Still, I appreciate this storyline because it can give us the courage and compass to succeed in co-creating a decent future, and at the same time inspire us with the necessary humility.[[2753]](#endnote-2754) It shows us why free-riding ‘passengers’ have become our rulers throughout the past millennia, and why dominator systems and their executers and supporters now free ride on the planet’s social and ecological resources, endangering human survival on planet Earth. As crises accumulate and scared people follow populists and conspiracy entrepreneurs who free ride on this fear, this storyline can encourage us to trust our ability to cooperate and collectively prevent this from continuing. This storyline can give us the courage to ‘liberate’ ourselves from the suboptimal adaptations that followed the Neolithic Revolution and rekindle the egalitarian pro-social strategies, traditions, skills, and sensibilities that represent the true treasure of human nature. This liberation is also my life mission.

Is there anything we can learn from the past? The dominator mindset that was introduced by the Neolithic Revolution grew in salience in the years that followed — roughly seven thousand five hundred years ago, the first chiefdoms in West Asia began to institute it more firmly than before, and this trend continued with the first archaic states two and a half millennia later. The pressing question now, as we need to regain and reinvigorate age-old egalitarian coalition-seeking strategies, is the following: Could remnants of these strategies survive until today, or were they completely destroyed? Could memories of egalitarian times prior to the Neolithic transition endure in the past millennia’s dominator contexts?

Indeed, subaltern resistance always persisted as the art of not being governed.[[2754]](#endnote-2755) Long before today’s concepts of human rights began to be articulated, the awareness that every person deserves to be treated as equal in worthiness provided the starting point for many world philosophies. ‘The strong shall not abuse the weak’ is a maxim known from Sumer, the first permanently settled region of southern Mesopotamia that emerged between the sixth and fifth millennium Before the Common Era (BCE). It is also known from the Code of Hammurabi, named after Babylonian king Hammurabi, who lived circa 1810 to 1750 BCE, a code that was later followed by the [Law of Moses](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Law_of_Moses) in the [Torah](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Torah). The charter of Cyrus the Great (580–529 BCE) is often hailed as the first statement of human rights.[[2755]](#endnote-2756)

In his work, philosopher and sociologist Jürgen Habermas highlights the ‘legitimation crisis of the early state’[[2756]](#endnote-2757) and how ‘prophet-like’ figures emerged who risked their lives to hold existing power structures accountable to a universally egalitarian ethic.[[2757]](#endnote-2758) The axial age is a term that philosopher Karl Jaspers coined sixty years ago for the philosophical, religious, and technical developments that arose in relatively independent cultural regions around the world in a comparatively short period of time, starting eight hundred years BCE and lasting until around two hundred years BCE.[[2758]](#endnote-2759) Even though the assumption of an axial period could not stand up to subsequent historical scrutiny in exactly the way Jaspers formulated it, it became a founding myth of modernity, and it can still serve to overcome Eurocentric views of history today.[[2759]](#endnote-2760) This period saw Confucius and Laozi in China, the Brahmins in late Vedic India, Buddha’s teachings in India, Israel’s biblical prophets, Zoroaster in Iran, as well the epic poems Iliad and Odyssey in Greece, with natural philosophers Thales, Anaximander, and Anaximenes, followed by Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle.[[2760]](#endnote-2761) All these influences often cross-fertilised each other, for instance, important parallels exist between Buddhism and classical Greek philosophy — indeed, Greek sculptors gave Buddha his human face.[[2761]](#endnote-2762)

Many founders of religions and philosophies were ‘renouncers’, which means ‘critics of power’.[[2762]](#endnote-2763) They had followers precisely because they rekindled the revolutionary message of equality in worthiness, because they rejected the idea that higher-placed ‘dignitaries’ should have the sole access to divinity. They asked questions such as — Are not all people equally worthy? Is it legitimate to oppress people in the name of divinity? They even asked a very modern question — Is not also the degradation of our environment a violation?[[2763]](#endnote-2764) Buddhism has a claim of having pioneered ideals of equal dignity, as has Islam, and the Sikh religion, to name just a few. Orthodox Confucianism regards all people as being equally morally good by nature — ‘Just as all water has a down-going tendency, all people have a tendency toward goodness’, were the words of Chinese philosopher Mencius, also called Mengzi (372–289 BCE; or 385–303/302 BCE).[[2764]](#endnote-2765) Mencius was known to be a humble person, he taught that even though there might be differences in professional rank, the ranking of human value should be rejected.[[2765]](#endnote-2766) Political thinker Mo Di (or Moti or MoTse or Mozi), a rival of Confucius in the fifth century BCE, advocated universal love and non-violent communal and collective self-defence.[[2766]](#endnote-2767)

In the Bible’s New Testament, a divine love relationship was ‘democratised’ — the message was that God sacrificed his son out of love for all of humankind, not just for a few followers or leaders.[[2767]](#endnote-2768) This was why the claim of the Pope in Rome to be the only mediator between the Christian God and his subjects was always doubted,[[2768]](#endnote-2769) first by secular rivals for power, then by the Protestant Reformation. Secular opposition to the Pope in Rome came, for instance, from Emperor Henry IV (1050–1106), and later from Frederick I Barbarossa (1122–1190), who added the term sacrum (holy, in the sense of consecrated) to his Empire’s name, calling it the ‘Holy Roman Empire’ with the aim to protect honor imperii, the ‘honour of the empire’, and signal that God himself had given him his crown, not the Pope.[[2769]](#endnote-2770) Through his [Acts of Supremacy](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Act_of_Supremacy) (1534 and 1559), [King Henry VIII](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/King_Henry_VIII) of England went as far as declare English religious and political independence from Rome. Theologian Martin Luther (1483–1546) took resistance a step further by protesting against the ‘humiliation of papal tyranny’ not just on behalf of rival rulers to the Pope, but also on behalf of ordinary people.[[2770]](#endnote-2771) Martin Luther himself is being taken down from his pedestal now, no longer portrayed as the one and only ‘correct’ theologian in Protestant teachings — today’s theology students are allowed to form their own opinions.[[2771]](#endnote-2772) Philosopher René Girard calls Christianity ‘the religion of the exit from religion’, seeding democracy, civil rights, the free market, and individual freedoms.[[2772]](#endnote-2773)

In Africa, we find the traditional ubuntu philosophy that emphasises living together and solving conflicts in an atmosphere of shared humility under the maxim of ‘I am because of you’.[[2773]](#endnote-2774) The Arabic word for dignity, karama, comes from the word karam or generosity, reflecting the centrality of generosity in the arid deserts of North Africa and the Near East, all places where generosity was not a luxury but a matter of survival.[[2774]](#endnote-2775)

This is the context from where many of my Islamic feminist friends get angry when the West monopolises the idea of equality. Amal Al-Malki, for instance, writes, ‘The Muslim woman who criticises Muslim practices is not usually rebuking her heritage in favour of Western ideals — the kind of rebuke that hits best-seller lists in the West and that feeds Western stereotypes about the religion — but is instead encouraging other Muslims claiming allegiance to Qur’anic teachings to live up to its highest principles’.[[2775]](#endnote-2776)

We can conclude that throughout the past millennia, many religious movements were imbued with the message of equality at their outset, or, at a minimum, they resisted oppressive hierarchy. However, this message usually did not survive long, because as soon as such religious or philosophical awakenings of equality became institutionalised, they were swallowed by the hierarchical structures that surrounded them, they were co-opted by the larger dominator context. When that happened, they usually turned against their own message and became complicit in maintaining rigidly stratified hierarchical structures that normalised humiliation. There is a German saying, ‘Sagt der König zum Bischof: Halt Du sie dumm, ich halte sie arm’, translated, ‘Says the king to the bishop: You keep them dumb, I keep them poor’.

One way to remain faithful to the message of equality in the midst of a dominator context was always to stay in hiding. Freemasonry, for instance, with roots going back to the thirteenth century, sees itself as an ethical union of free people, and they succeeded to ensure their union’s survival through secretiveness.[[2776]](#endnote-2777) Unsurprisingly, Holy Roman Empress Maria Theresa (1717–1780), in her loyalty to a class society, prohibited Freemasonry, since the five basic ideals of Freemasonry — freedom, equality, brotherhood, tolerance and humaneness — are incompatible with class society. Until the day today, the Catholic Church, unlike the Protestant church, does not allow its members to be Freemasons, as the principles of Freemasonry are not regarded as compatible with the doctrines of the church.[[2777]](#endnote-2778)

Why and how, we may ask, was it then possible for the message of equal dignity for each individual to return to visibility in our historical time? What is so special about the period that led up to the year 1757 and the years thereafter that this could happen? As I mentioned in the beginning of this chapter, my conclusion is that the ingathering of humanity in a finite geopolitical space changed the large-scale context to the extent that space opened for the support of such ideas rather than to keep them firmly underground.

Historian Victor Lieberman has studied the Eurasian patterns that were at play between the years 1450 and 1830, when ‘localised societies in widely separated regions coalesced into larger units — politically, culturally, and commercially’.[[2778]](#endnote-2779) Lieberman offers a condensed description of what happened as states expanded, and war, disease, and competition surged — alongside innovation. ‘Rival powers competed globally, ethnicities blended, and religions clashed, merged, splintered, and disappeared. Money and goods were exchanged on an unprecedented scale, and the profits paid armies, explorers, and missionaries, while merchants, princes, and pirates looked for new ways to get rich, generate taxes, and maintain power’.[[2779]](#endnote-2780)

The year 1757 falls into a time when the First British Empire took shape, when English settlements were established in North America and in smaller islands of the Caribbean, and joint-stock companies as the East India Company administered colonies and overseas trade. The British Empire reached a territorial size larger than that of any other empire in history, an ‘empire in which the sun never sets’. It was in this period that it became obvious to ever more people that planet Earth is a shared and finite homestead — the cabinets of curiosities in the colonisers’ manor houses filled up with encyclopaedic collections of objects from all corners of the world.[[2780]](#endnote-2781) Even though global social and ecological interdependence had been palpable years earlier, the emergence of the British Empire significantly accelerated the ingathering of all human tribes and increased both global interdependence and the awareness and knowledge of it.

As a kind of unintended consequence, we could say, the global outreach of the British Empire created space for the age-old ideals of equality in freedom and dignity to come to the surface more openly, not knowing that these very ideals ultimately would undo the Empire.

A similar trajectory could very well have originated from China, had a Chinese emperor in the sixteenth century had different preferences. By the 1400s, China was in many ways economically and technologically more advanced than Europe. China owned the greatest seagoing fleet in the world with up to 3,500 ships at its peak, while the U.S. Navy of today has only 430 ships. Some of the Chinese ships were five times larger than the ships that were built in Europe at the time. From 1405 to 1433, Admiral Zheng He travelled as far as the Indian Ocean with his large fleets.[[2781]](#endnote-2782) By 1525, however, all the ships were gone — they had been destroyed. Why? Reasons are hotly debated, but one explanation is that China’s emperor and political elites were afraid of trade and the power of rival merchants.[[2782]](#endnote-2783)

What we learn is that it would have required no more than a Chinese emperor with slightly different priorities and China would have ruled the waves in place of the British Empire. We could call it a historical accident that the West was at the forefront and not China or any other world region. Both China and the West practiced the very same dominator model of society, only with slightly different preferences — Admiral Zheng He and British traders and officers both acted on the honourable male script of conquering new horizons. In the case of China, the emperor stopped this campaign because he thought that his power was better protected by hindering global trade, while Britain sought power by maximising and controlling global trade.

We can summarise that the globalisation we see today was driven by the inner logic of the dominator model that encourages men to conquer and compete for domination. Males as travellers, explorers, and conquerors of new worlds created the global village. By now, the campaign of expansion is being halted again, this time not by an emperor — but by the finiteness of planet Earth. The template of male heroism and honour becomes a victim of its own success on a fully globalised planet where there are no new worlds to be conquered and few new mineable resources to be discovered. Many traditional strategies for proving maleness become dysfunctional when wars devour everything and only render losers instead of heroic victors, when exploitation overstretches the ecological carrying capacity of the planet and brings ruin instead of glory.

This situation affects the entire planet and not just the West, and, as we understand, it could also have been a China-driven globalisation, or any other dominator-driven globalisation for that matter. China wakes up to precisely this prospect only now. Chinese culture has, however, also inspired the human rights revolution — after all, Peng Chun Chang (1892–1957), a Chinese diplomat and philosopher, was one of the most influential authors of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948 in his capacity as vice chair of the Human Rights Commission under Eleanor Roosevelt.[[2783]](#endnote-2784)

Coming back to the question as to why and how ideals of freedom for individuals in equal dignity and global solidarity were able to move to the forefront following the year 1757, we can confirm that large-scale geopolitical transitions made it possible. It was in the new context of ingathering within a finite geopolitical space that humiliation turned from useful pro-social treatment of subordinates into an anti-social abuse, that meek humility lost its reputation of being pro-social and dignified humility took its place. This is also the very context that puts humanity before two basic choices, namely, either to turn the clock back, follow the script of unequal honour and aim for a global dominator society, or become a global partnership society by manifesting the script of equal dignity in solidarity.

In 1948, the international community opted for the second choice by officially adopting human rights ideals. Since 1948, the ingathering of the human population accelerated so that we find ourselves in what we call ‘liquid modernity’ now.[[2784]](#endnote-2785)

At the same time, the dignity refolution — refolution is a term coined by Timothy Garton Ash to connote a mix of reform and revolution — proceeds a few steps forward only to fall many steps back again. Sometimes, it is thrown back by those who would have preferred the first choice, at other times refolutionaries themselves hinder it when they betray their own message and lapse into old practices of violent revolutions with ‘v’, when they seek violent revenge for honour humiliation instead of healing cure for dignity humiliation.

This dignity refolution is history’s first continuous revolution, a refolution that will never ‘finish’ and will always be precarious, as it depends on being kept alive by a large enough number of people from one generation to the next. I wrote this in my 2006 book:

...underlings are constantly rising up in different parts of the world. Masters (dictators and other supremacists) are asked, by the human rights call, to step down from their illegitimate positions of superiority and underlings (the poor, low castes, and underprivileged individuals in general) are encouraged to view themselves as illegitimately humiliated and entitled to better circumstances. Both, former masters and former underlings are invited to meet and connect at the line of equal dignity and humility. Feelings of humiliation — the fuel that drives this continuous revolution — might be thought of as the ‘red thread’ that binds all rising underlings together, be they the colonised, people of colour, women, or advocates for nature, feelings, creativity, or individual freedom.[[2785]](#endnote-2786)

### How we learned angst

Are human rights ideals an expression of wise humility? Or, perhaps they are a sign of haughty arrogance? Is it a humbling or a humiliating process when new space opens for ideals that seemed forgotten, in this case ideals of solidarity in equal dignity?

For me, the rise of human rights ideals is a humbling process that I welcome. The spirit of human rights ideals represents a message of basic decency and dignified humility. They denote the return of humanity to itself as an interconnected species practicing humanity in wise and humble modesty, they signify stepping down from the hubris of arrogating superiority, they mean embracing the fact that we are sentient beings in deep dependency on other sentient beings, all united on a wonderful blue planet — we humans would be nothing without the bees pollinating our fruit trees!

For many, however, the lesson of humility is difficult to accept. Warnings that planet Earth is small and fragile, as science-based as these warnings may be, have a humiliating effect on those who hold on to a sense of exceptionalism. Stephen Purdey, scholar of complexity and innovation, describes the ‘paradox of exceptionalism’:

We are at once Earthbound and transcendental beings, wonderfully alive to a morally charged universe yet grounded in a mortal physicality. These two features of our existence should be harmonious, but our sense of exceptionalism has made us arrogant, imperiously dismissing any dependence on our natural setting.[[2786]](#endnote-2787)

In the seventeenth century, spiritual angst struck Europe — it was called the crisis of the ‘European conscience’.[[2787]](#endnote-2788) The reason was that people feared that life would not be worth living if ‘deprived of the divine promise of salvation’.[[2788]](#endnote-2789) In 1867, Charles Kingsley, professor of modern history at Cambridge, observed that ‘Inductive Physical Science, which helped more than all to break up the superstitions of the Ancien Regime ... set man face to face with the facts of the universe’.[[2789]](#endnote-2790)

What were the facts of the universe? Nicolaus Copernicus (1473–1543) developed a heliocentric model, which implies that planet Earth is not the centre of the universe. This view was outrageous at the time and collided with the existing consensus. Even when more evidence began to support Copernicus’ findings, produced by Galileo Galilei (1564–1642), Tycho Brahe (1546–1601), and Johannes Kepler (1571–1630), it was not enough to convince the doubters. Only on 31st October 1992 did [Pope John Paul II](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pope_John_Paul_II) express regret for how the Galileo affair had been handled, only then did he officially concede that the Earth was not stationary.[[2790]](#endnote-2791) After Galileo, Charles Darwin (1809–1882), and also Sigmund Freud (1856–1939) added more disconcerting news, Darwin suggested that Homo sapiens is just another animal, and Freud demonstrated that we are not even in control of ourselves — dreams and hypnosis indicate that there is life in human souls we know little about. It is humiliating to learn that our species Homo sapiens may be of rather limited sapientia (Latin ‘wisdom’).

Sociologist Michael Ott summarises how modern enlighteners such as Nicolaus Copernicus, Galileo Galilei, Charles Darwin, Karl Marx, Friedrich Nietzsche, and Sigmund Freud, with their discoveries, ‘inflicted the deepest wounds on the narcissism of the human species, and thus produced the inversion of the theoretical focus from self-love to object-love’:

The Earth is not the centre of the universe; humanity is not high above the animals; human beings are not equal but organised into antagonistic social classes that have fought each other throughout history; moral values are not higher than values of vitality; Ego is not the master in its own psychic house.[[2791]](#endnote-2792)

In European antiquity, people were assured of their cosmic significance. Cicero wrote about it in 44 BCE, ‘And if we will only bear in mind the superiority and dignity of our [human] nature, we shall realise how wrong it is to abandon ourselves to excess and to live in luxury and voluptuousness, and how right it is to live in thrift, self-denial, simplicity, and sobriety’. Later, in medieval times, people were promised that God created the world for humans as the pinnacle of creation, that humans existed by God’s will.

Then, however, came the big shock, and philosopher Blaise Pascal was among the first to express it. Before he died in 1662, he wrote:

For in fact what is man in nature? A Nothing in comparison with the Infinite, an All in comparison with the Nothing, a mean between nothing and everything. Since he is infinitely removed from comprehending the extremes, the end of things and their beginning are hopelessly hidden from him in an impenetrable secret, he is equally incapable of seeing the Nothing from which he was made, and the Infinite in which he is swallowed up.[[2792]](#endnote-2793)

This process — humbling as it was for some and humiliating for others — continues until the day today in all spheres of life. The sense of humiliation that creeps in when Homo sapiens’ privileged position in the world is no longer sure is no preserve of the past. In 2019, a young leader of the Christian Party in Norway, for instance, accused the ‘green movement’ of violating dignity by disrespecting the Christian tenet that the human being stands above animals. He said, ‘The idea that there is no qualitative difference between animals and humans, an idea that is part of the animal welfare movement, I think, is dangerous. It involves not only an appreciation of the value of the animals, but a downgrading of the unique and infinite value of the human being’.[[2793]](#endnote-2794)

Luciano Floridi, philosopher of digital ethics, suggests that we live in a fourth revolution that changes once again our sense of our ‘exceptional centrality’.[[2794]](#endnote-2795) The Copernican revolution displaced us from the centre of the universe, the Darwinian revolution from the centre of the biological kingdom, the Freudian revolution from the centre of our mental lives, and now Computer Science and digital ICTs show us that we are also ‘not at the centre of the infosphere, we are not standalone entities’.[[2795]](#endnote-2796) Rather, we are ‘interconnected informational agents, sharing with other biological agents and smart artefacts a global environment ultimately made of information’.[[2796]](#endnote-2797)

Academia is heavily affected when ‘liquid modernity’ creates ever new rounds of angst. Scholars face ‘new dynamic, multiperspectival, and emergent social complexity that cannot easily be captured with the use of quantitative methods’.[[2797]](#endnote-2798)

In my case, I am glad when space opens for qualitative psychology and qualitative meaning formation in general to be taken more seriously. I am happy when my generalist approach gains legitimacy, when my mission to bridge academic silos and create large-scale narratives of the human condition becomes more acceptable. I am proud when I am called ‘an ambitious peacemaker and a broad-minded sense-maker’.[[2798]](#endnote-2799) I call on all scholars, particularly on economists, to overcome former obsessions with quantification.[[2799]](#endnote-2800) I am saddened, however, when I see qualitative sense-making being hijacked by ulterior interests, when the psychological vacuum that opens up when not even the purpose of life is certain is filled with self-help entrepreneurship that is often profitable but unhelpful, or, worse, with conspiracy entrepreneurship that is even more profitable and more unhelpful.

I welcome all changes that liberate us from haughty illusions of mastery and teach us to hold hands in loving humility, so that we can stand tall in uncertain times and withstand angst. My entire life’s work responds to this new situation.

### We are caught between wise humility and god-like hubris

Did humankind become more humble or more arrogant in response to the new horizons that opened up throughout the past centuries? Are human rights ideals an expression of wise humility or of ignorant hubris? Which interpretation is correct?

The message of human rights is for humans to assume responsibilities that were formerly placed on the shoulders of divinity. My sense is that it is high time for us to do precisely that — we have to stop offloading everything onto strongmen or divine patrons like little children. Yet, perhaps I am wrong? Perhaps it is the other way round? Perhaps this call represents an undue arrogation of god-like status after all? Historian Henrik Jensen was mentioned earlier, he seems to think so when he commends the sense of duty, authority, and guilt that held Europe’s societies together prior to the Enlightenment. Jensen faults the hubris of secular rights with having caused the ‘disasters of the twentieth century’, and that they even created a world of manipulated, atomised masses of individualised and disconnected rights-holders trapped in eternal competition.[[2800]](#endnote-2801) Self-described anti-humanists Jean-François Lyotard and Michel Foucault saw in humanism the dark side of the Enlightenment, namely, concepts of human nature that serve as pretext to humiliate those considered as less than human.[[2801]](#endnote-2802)

Again, are human rights ideals an expression of wise humility, or of the opposite, a sign of haughty arrogance?

The short answer may be ‘Both’. These ideals can be tweaked in many ways, all depending on how they are defined and put into practice.

On one side, we see the narcissistic cyborgs who bend human rights ideals to justify disconnected autonomy, we see the arrogant supremacists who look down on ‘losers’ in a context of stark inequality, the ‘lone hero’ individualists for whom dignity means competing for the glitziest decorum so they can become the most admired dignitaries. Those who choose this path resist what they should embrace, we could say, they fail dignified humility by clinging to an inflated anthropocentric sense of superior worthiness. They actualise the ‘Promethean creature Anthropos’, as physicist Paul Raskin would say.[[2802]](#endnote-2803) In a way, they follow the Catholic Church that condemned Galileo Galilei for heresy because his heliocentric view was too humiliating to consider. They go too far when they reject due humility as if it were undue humiliation — theirs could be said to be a sociocidal and ecocidal definition of dignity.

On the other side, the same ideals can also provide a frame for freedom and solidarity among fellow human beings in a context of equal dignity and shared humility, they can inspire individuals to humbly engage in mutual care. The same ideals can move us to dignify our relationships with each other in connectedness and compassion,[[2803]](#endnote-2804) to acknowledge that our planet is no more than a small speck in a vast universe and that humanity is no more than a small morsel in our ecosphere. This is what these ideals mean to me. They inspire me to embrace the kind of ‘fertile humanism’ that ‘celebrates human dignity without idolising human powers’, the kind of humanism that ‘steers away both from the perception of humans as a maladapted species and the delirium of the super-rational and the superhuman’.[[2804]](#endnote-2805) This is why I use the phrase entrustment in the place of ‘empowerment’, why I remind fellow human rights defenders that it is not enough to reject humiliation and abandon the kind of humiliated humility that it can create, we must also nurture the blessings of dignity and of dignified and dignifying humility.

If we look at our forebears prior to the Neolithic Revolution, they still practiced ‘fertile humanism’, they lived in small egalitarian groups in dialogue with their environment. ‘Egalitarian hunter-gatherers, especially the animists, are the best societies this world has ever witnessed’, these were the words of my friend archaeologist Ingrid Fuglestvedt, and she added, ‘This is not a reference to the Garden of Eden; it is to acknowledge that some systems are better than others in taking care of everybody’s integrity, both human and animal’.[[2805]](#endnote-2806)

I deeply resonate with Fuglestvedt’s evaluation, and, together with political scientist and anthropologist James C. Scott, I applaud our pre-Neolithic ancestors who resisted sedentism and plough agriculture and tried to hold on to their mobile subsistence.[[2806]](#endnote-2807)

What made the rest of us lose the wisdom of ‘fertile humanism’? Sedentism and plough agriculture took over and conquered the planet, people were pressed into dominator systems, and this began around twelve thousand years ago, when the first round of globalisation ended and circumscription began. Since then, the ‘wisdom of the elders’ could only survive in small pockets of what we call Indigenous populations.[[2807]](#endnote-2808) Resistance could only express itself as the subaltern ‘art of not being governed’.[[2808]](#endnote-2809)

We could say that a kind of infantilisation set in some twelve millennia ago. Most people were turned into the ‘children’ of their respective overlords, and, with the arrival of monotheism, they also became ‘the children of one God’.[[2809]](#endnote-2810) Their relationship with divinity began to be shaped according to the strict father model of parenting,[[2810]](#endnote-2811) where ‘child’ means obedient underling.[[2811]](#endnote-2812)

The presently unfolding rounds of globalisation, in which we all participate, offer an opportunity for us, the former ‘children’ of overlords, to reach adulthood again, an opportunity for humanity to evolve and grow up, figuratively speaking.[[2812]](#endnote-2813) We can become responsible parents rather than remaining underage children, we can embrace the nurturant parenting model that fosters equality in dignity, we can grow in depth and scope of wisdom and love.[[2813]](#endnote-2814)

If we choose to become nurturant parents, this will have far-reaching consequences, as it means questioning many assumptions. We may need to let go of the well-loved narrative that the domestication of plants and animals was a ‘great achievement’, which ‘allowed humans to settle down’. ‘Settling down’ may not represent more ‘civilisation’ and security than what nomadic roaming can offer. We may need to leave behind the ‘superiority complex’ so well described in an article titled ‘Neandertal demise: An archaeological analysis of the modern human superiority complex’.[[2814]](#endnote-2815) We may need to take in that archaeological and historical evidence challenges our narratives of triumphalism.[[2815]](#endnote-2816) These narratives may rather be the legacy of highly skilled manipulations of public opinion employed by the rulers of already the earliest dominator societies. Ethnohistorian Bruce Trigger reports that such mindsets reigned already in the earliest civilisations, ‘If egalitarianism was known, it was as a feature of some of the despised, barbarian societies that existed beyond the borders of the “civilised” world’.[[2816]](#endnote-2817)

Growing up and becoming nurturant parents means letting go of our sense of superiority. Instead, it means applauding our early foragers for their reluctance to give up their freedom. It means protecting present-day’s nomadic and foraging people around the world from state pressure that forces them to settle down so as to keep them under more control. It means questioning the concept of ‘lifting poor people out of poverty’, instead it means protecting people who are skilled survivors in free nature from being pushed into living on money.

The winner of the 2006 essay competition of the journal The Ecologist lamented:

Agriculture has disinherited us from our hunter-gatherer heritage and made it impossible for us to live in the egalitarian, consensus-based societies of our ancestors.[[2817]](#endnote-2818) Instead, it forces on us a new set of social structures; structures of alienation and dominance which both support, and are supported by, the continuation and spread of agriculture. Our utopian visions of the future, freed from present problems by human ingenuity and technical competence, might be possible on paper, but they are unlikely in reality. We have already made the biggest mistake, and spent 10,000 years perfecting a disastrous invention, then making ourselves ever more reliant on it. However, the archaeologists who give us glimpses of our ancestors, and the anthropologists who introduce us to our cousins, have been able to show us why we dream what we do. What we yearn for is not just our imagined future; it is our very real past.[[2818]](#endnote-2819)

The School of Life headquartered in London was introduced in chapter 7. This school asks why the modern world, albeit so successful in many ways, at the same time manifests such ‘a high background level of anxiety and widespread low-level depression’.[[2819]](#endnote-2820) Their Book of life lists six features of modernity that have psychologically disturbing effects, and one is the lack of ‘something bigger than human’ that could induce humility.[[2820]](#endnote-2821) As an antidote, the school suggests the use of ‘sources of transcendence to generate a benign, relativising perspective on our personal sorrows: music, the stars at night, the vast spaces of the desert or the ocean would humble us all in consoling ways’.[[2821]](#endnote-2822)

I resonate with such suggestions. In my life, I try to re-create the lifestyle of our Palaeolithic ancestors as mobile nurturer and gardener as much as is possible in present times, and I can attest to the deeply fulfilling meaningfulness of this approach.[[2822]](#endnote-2823) Like James Scott, I deplore the historical timeline of ‘gaining control over reproduction’ that started from the first agrarian states as they emanated from an accumulation of domestications — first the domestication of fire, then of plants and livestock, then of subjects of the state, then of captives, and finally of women in the patriarchal family.[[2823]](#endnote-2824)

This does not mean that I cannot admire the achievements of this timeline — be it the pyramids of Giza or the Chinese wall. What I wish to avoid is uncritical triumphalism. I value all dignifying aspects in all cultural arrangements ever actualised on planet Earth and recommend ‘harvesting’ the best from all of them.[[2824]](#endnote-2825) I am encouraged whenever I encounter what James Scott calls the ‘infrapolitics’ of ‘hidden transcripts’ with which subordinate groups resist the dominant ‘public transcript’.[[2825]](#endnote-2826) I am glad that the master-slave dyad is fragile, as already philosopher Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel pointed out.[[2826]](#endnote-2827) I admire the resistance and resilience of ‘slave cultures’ that carved out ‘niches of liveability’ for their members.[[2827]](#endnote-2828) The spirit of Czech Good Soldier Schweik, a figure created by Jaroslav Hašek (1983–1923), epitomises subtle resistance through humour as a disguise for obstructive subversion.[[2828]](#endnote-2829) I met this kind of humour when I lived in Egypt, it gives Lower Egyptians their reputation of being the ‘Czechs’ of the Middle East. The profound warmth, humanity, and wisdom entailed in this humour made me fall in love with my adopted Egyptian family.

Unfortunately, however, throughout the past millennia, most people could not resist the dominator culture. On the contrary, they even learned to become proud of it. I cringe when I see agricultural equipment that has the word ‘dominator’ written in huge letters on it, while what we need is agroecology.[[2829]](#endnote-2830) Such a ‘dominator’ label on agricultural machines betrays a view on nature as a slave, an enemy, nature as something to be raped like women in war, it betrays the neglect of the fact that both nature and women are life-givers of which everything else is but a humble part. I am frightened when I encounter Obrigkeitsgläubigkeit, a German word for ‘uncritical acceptance of authority’, another word for what could be called a ‘generalised Stockholm syndrome’.[[2830]](#endnote-2831) Obrigkeitsgläubigkeit means that subordinates are co-opted by superiors to the point that they turn into executors of their own oppressors’ cruelty and subjugation, that they impose oppression on others and on themselves. Adolf Hitler profited from German Obrigkeitsgläubigkeit. Present-day conspiracy theorists profit from it when they seize on brewing discontent in a complex world by offering simplified we-against-them narratives.[[2831]](#endnote-2832)

After spending many millennia in Obrigkeitsgläubigkeit in dominator societies, humanity stands at a crossroads now. Global interconnectedness and global circumscription are radical game changers. We have the opportunity now to liberate ourselves from the manipulations of the past millennia. We can evolve and become responsible adults. We can retrieve the best practices of ‘the lost worlds of the past’, we can engage in a ‘radical ontological turn’.[[2832]](#endnote-2833) We can listen to historian Greg Anderson who urges us to produce histories that are ‘more ethical, more theoretically defensible, and more historically meaningful’ than the ‘standard analytical approach’, which ‘unwittingly imposes modern ontological presuppositions regarding materialism ... anthropocentrism, and individualism upon non-modern lifeworlds’.[[2833]](#endnote-2834) We can bring back to life ‘extinct forms of subjectivity and sociality, agency and authority, freedom and equality, temporality and spatiality’, forms of engagement that until now have been obscured systematically.[[2834]](#endnote-2835) We can analyse non-modern worlds in their own metaphysical environments and according to their own particular ‘standards of truth and realness’.[[2835]](#endnote-2836) We can liberate ourselves from anthropocentrism and ask, together with Linda Hartling, ‘Who gave rain a bad name?’[[2836]](#endnote-2837)

Growing up and becoming responsible adults sounds like a straightforward positive endeavour. However, there is a catch: To some parents, their children’s growth feels disempowering. The introduction of the heliocentric model, while it was an empowering idea for some, disempowered elites who had built their superiority on the assumption of geocentrism. The new model undermined the elites’ justification that divine forces had put them into power, it undermined the ‘parent role’ they thought they were entitled to inhabit. As a result, it took three hundred years for the Catholic Church to acknowledge the new idea and come to terms with the fact that many of the church’s ‘children’ had become rather rebellious. It required a considerable effort by the ‘parent’ church to translate its initial sense of humiliation into mindful and informed humility.

Parents, or parentified institutions for that matter, that are locked into rigid systems of power and unwilling to facilitate the growth of their children are not the only hurdle requiring attention. Even with well-intentioned parents, growing up still does not necessarily result in dignified and wisely humble adulthood. Some children remain stuck in indignant adolescence, stuck in rage against parent figures, unable to become nurturant parents for their own children. Revolutions fail when revolutionaries cannot let go of the adrenalin rush of fighting against authorities, when they have to be a responsible authority and work for a functioning community.[[2837]](#endnote-2838) ‘In general, the qualifications required to gain power and keep it have almost no connection with those required to govern with competence and impartiality’, observed philosopher Jean-François Revel.[[2838]](#endnote-2839) Rivalries among revolutionaries have often undermined the primary mission of the revolution. Discourse analyst Michael Karlberg has this warning:

What if the confrontational posture is, in fact, one of the reasons most social movements fracture through the centrifugal forces of infighting, turf battles, and identity wars, thus undermining their progress? What if the culture of protest merely reinforces the prevailing culture of contest (including capitalism) that is an underlying cause of injustice, oppression, and ecological destruction?[[2839]](#endnote-2840)

Arrogant adults who maintain the narcissistic exceptionalism of early childhood are likely to reject the humbling lessons of wise adulthood as too humiliating. Psychoanalysts like Heinz Kohut have identified the ‘narcissistic phase’ of childhood development between the age of about two to three or four. The child develops a sense of ‘I’ and begins to say with authority ‘mine!’ and ‘me’ — it becomes ‘egocentric’ and relates to the world as being only about ‘me’. ‘It is all about them in this phase, and this is healthy at this age’, Kohut teaches — ‘The child must develop a strong sense of agency before it can relax that demanding sense of “I” and feel secure realising he or she is embedded in a web of responsive relationships. The child must then become aware of the need for a “we” or social engagement with others as a way of being in life’.[[2840]](#endnote-2841)

The transition to a ‘we’ may fail to take place, however, particularly when children have parents who themselves have narcissistic tendencies. Researchers have studied the roots of narcissism in children and have found that their parents often had over-valuated them.[[2841]](#endnote-2842) Children who grow up under such circumstances suffer severe trauma as they struggle with covert insecurity the rest of their lives,[[2842]](#endnote-2843) always hiding it behind an overt display of very high self-esteem.[[2843]](#endnote-2844) When these children, after having internalised their parents’ inflated ideas of them, grow up to become parents themselves, this predicament can extend into the next generation. Moreover, narcissistic parents affect not only their own children, they also ‘contaminate’ the rest of society, as they compete with other parents on whose children are best.[[2844]](#endnote-2845)

When we look at human history, ‘contamination’ by transgenerational narcissistic over-inflation seems to have extended far beyond individual parent-child relationships. It has heavily affected entire human populations throughout the past millennia insofar as individuals with leanings towards narcissistic exceptionalism benefitted from systemic advantages. The effects of circumscription and the security dilemma have been widely discussed in this book, and why ruthless dominators usually were victorious and wise and humble collaborators lost out. Those who had transcended the dominator mindset, such as the truly wise elders in Indigenous populations, were systemically disadvantaged throughout the past millennia. Research shows that still today, people with narcissistic psychopathic traits are more common at higher levels of organisations than in the average population.[[2845]](#endnote-2846)

At this juncture in history, as we find ourselves in our last rounds of globalisation, if narcissistic dominators were to continue to rule with child-like arrogance and exceptionalist hubris, the outcome will no longer be victory but generalised demise.[[2846]](#endnote-2847) Ever new campaigns of global domination create ever new levels of circumscription, exceeding the planet’s carrying capacity on all fronts, and ever new rounds of competition for domination and control aggravate this situation further. Not only is the surface of planet Earth finite, most of its resources are limited as well, as is the planet’s ability to digest the human-made waste.[[2847]](#endnote-2848)

At the present point in history, as ruthless competitors continue to gamble away human survival, it is time for the collaborators to come together for rescue. The good news is that empathic identification throughout the entire world is possible if we guide the ingathering of the human tribes in wise ways. Author Charles Eisenstein explains:

The horror we feel at the prospect of, say, nuking Pyongyang or Tehran is not the dread of radioactive blowback or retributive terror. It arises, I claim, from our empathic identification with the victims. As the consciousness of interbeing grows, we can no longer easily wave off their suffering as the just deserts of their wickedness or the regrettable but necessary price of freedom. It as if, on some level, it would be happening to ourselves.[[2848]](#endnote-2849)

What Charles Eisenstein calls empathic identification describes the very moral sentiment that gives emotional force to human rights ideals, the sentiment that also creates feelings of disgust when fellow human beings are being treated in ways that degrade their worthiness. Empathic individuals feel humiliated when dignity is violated, they feel justified to become angry, and they stand up in civil disobedience. As explained before, the right to feel violated by humiliation has been democratised by human rights ideals, no longer is it only the privilege of aristocrats to resist the humiliation of their honour. Human rights ideals endow everyone with the right to resist the humiliation of dignity. This means also that every reader of this book is called to assume part of this global responsibility.

During the past decades, I have met many ambassadors, diplomats, and international relations experts. I have watched at close hold how the coming into being of a global village slowly transformed inter-national relations into what I call inter-human relations. This has impacted not least international relations theory itself — ‘empathic identification’ let it move from realism and liberalism to constructivism. Realism used to focus on security and material power, liberalism on economic interdependence and domestic-level factors, while constructivist theory criticises its forerunners for being too static and instead emphasises international relations as social constructions.[[2849]](#endnote-2850) When we look at the context in which realism emerged, we see that it was inscribed in the cruel security dilemma that was inescapable during the past millennia. Wherever the security dilemma was strong, fear of being attacked and destroyed, of being dominated and humiliated, was bound to push aside all considerations except for patriotic self-defence. Solidarity, loving kindness, and the altruistic love of caritas could only be extended to one’s own and one’s allies, not to ‘enemies’. As the world began to shrink, liberalism became feasible, and by now, as inter-national relations are in the process of transmuting into internal relations within a global village, the constructivist approach is feasible. It is in our hands, including the hands of every reader of this book, to form, shape, and co-create a unified global village planfully and intentionally. This is also why diplomats tell me that they find many international relations theorists being too ‘substantialist’, while ‘diplomats tend to think more in terms of relations’.[[2850]](#endnote-2851)

Not only international relations theory moves from being static and dogmatic towards acknowledging the significance of social construction. This trend shows up in many places, and many examples have already been touched upon in this book. As the assumption of objectivity is met with increasing doubt, and the belief in the certainty of human knowledge is shaken, more sophisticated knowledge creation is called for.

I welcome this trend as long as it avoids derailing into nihilistic irresponsibility or worse, into conspiracy entrepreneurship. I follow philosopher Howard Richards in his preference for critical realism as philosophical approach to understanding science.[[2851]](#endnote-2852) I welcome old wisdom being rescued, be it the notion of the reflective equilibrium or new materialism that reminds us that we intra-act rather than inter-acting with our environments.[[2852]](#endnote-2853) I welcome linking back to Indigenous and other animist ontologies that have held notions of vibrancy of matter since time immemorial.[[2853]](#endnote-2854) I welcome the growing Western attention to Eastern notions of non-dualism.[[2854]](#endnote-2855) The concept of information now lets us understand life as a novel state of matter emerging at higher levels of reality — who knows, perhaps life has the aim to understand the universe.[[2855]](#endnote-2856)

As I see it, human rights ideals represent global in-group ethics, the very ethics that the global village needs if it wants to create a decent future. On my global path, I had the privilege of observing in minute detail how the scope of ethics and empathic identification that a local village usually reserves for itself within its borders slowly included more and more of our entire global village.

Anthropologist Alan Page Fiske chose kama muta, Sanskrit for ‘moved by love’, to connote what Charles Eisenstein calls empathic identification, namely, the heart-warming feelings of being moved and touched, the sympathy and empathic concern that can arise when people feel close to others.[[2856]](#endnote-2857) Kama muta is the emotional glue that connects people and induces communal sharing.[[2857]](#endnote-2858) Kama muta speaks to the Lévinasian way of understanding human rights ideals, more so than to the much colder rational Kantian definition.[[2858]](#endnote-2859)

Let me wrap up this section. The Zeitgeist that allowed for ideals of equal dignity for all people to move to the fore, grew out of an increase in the reality and awareness of global interconnectedness, later supplemented with a growing experience of planetary finiteness. This new Zeitgeist could be called an unintended consequence of Western global domination, as it began with the West proudly setting in motion many rounds of exploitative globalisation and thus reaching the limits of the globe. This, to the originators’ surprise, opened space for ideas that went counter to the very activities of which they were so proud — the new reality simply made the traditional moral universe of honour increasingly redundant and dysfunctional. Traditional collectivistic norms of ranked and ‘mask-like’ honour had their place in a politically divided world, in times when it was not yet understood to which degree the planet is ecologically interconnected, and nobody could yet foresee to what degree the planet would at some point interconnect also politically and socially. The West, due to its ‘success’ in colonising the entire world, was thus affected earlier than the rest by realities that opened space for a Zeitgeist that ultimately turned against Europe’s very own pursuit of power. To the chagrin of the British Empire, Indian intellectuals, for example, after being educated in London, asked for independence — altogether, the colonised learned a lot from their colonisers about how to justify their desire for emancipation and liberation.[[2859]](#endnote-2860)

Equal dignity in freedom and solidarity is not a recent Western invention, on the contrary, it has global roots that reach far back into our shared history as Homo sapiens. It is the ‘fertile humanism’ that predates the Neolithic Revolution and that survived as ‘the art of not being governed’ for the past millennia, to finally return with all its strength now.

This book has zoomed in on the historical moment that was marked by the year 1757, it has chronicled how the individual first became detached from the collective and was provided with a sense of ranked decorum, and how human worthiness later became un-ranked, until finally equal dignity in freedom and solidarity was promised to all members of the human family. First it was promised to certain individuals in this family, then to all, and, more recently, the invitation is being extended to all life on Earth.

So far, largely, it is an invitation only in theory, it is a promise undermined with double standards and often even made in bad faith. Still, the news of this invitation reaches ever more people in all corners of the world, as ever more people begin to sense that the dominator strategies that our ancestors invented during the past millennia in their effort to adapt to a global win-lose frame, are no longer feasible and even collectively suicidal in an interconnected and finite world. Despite ardent resistance from the dominators, ever more people recognise that respectful dialogue among people is needed, more even, that also nature must be treated with respect. In the face of sociocide and ecocide, the world has to come together and bridge all existing divisions with the global empathic identification of kama muta.

My entire life project has as its aim to build loving bridges of kama muta across all differences that separate people in our emerging global village. I work to avert cogitocide, to ward off the destruction of our ability to think. I try to remove whatever hurdle stands in the way of what I call socio-sanity and eco-sanity, of what I call socio-salvation and eco-salvation.

### Our challenge — Embracing dignified humility

Some of my friends among human rights defenders in modern-day Western societies take a position of moral high ground and look down on the ‘barbarism’ and ‘backwardness’ of the dominator mindset that our past millennia’s ancestors adhered to, and, as these habits of thought are still virulent in many parts of the world today, they look down on those who espouse them.

I would like to ask my friends to rethink their position and extend more respect to our forebears and all those who still today feel at home in their habits of thought. Extending respect is crucial, I argue, if we wish to transcend the war paradigm and attain a more united, dignified, and peaceful world. I see respectful empathy for our forebears as the only way to overcome the belief that war is unavoidable or even useful.

The reason is that people who still hold such beliefs today, when they feel looked down upon, are likely to ‘weaponise’ their sense of humiliation and continue with circles of humiliation, and this, in turn, may reactivate the security dilemma at a time when its attenuation is possible. Human rights defenders’ highest duty is to prevent such outcomes with loving perspective taking, through understanding hatred and violence without condoning it.[[2860]](#endnote-2861) This book is a small contribution — it tries to show, in the way it is written, that condemning without understanding is as unhelpful as condoning without understanding. It is important to understand that it is possible to oppose violence and war and at the same time acknowledge that sincerity and ‘goodness’ rather than ‘evil primitiveness’ motivated many of our ancestors when they tried to protect their ‘own people’ against ‘enemies’, even if this meant violence and war.

In its historically new situation of global ingathering, humanity is called to learn radically new ways of arranging its affairs on this planet, and this means leaving behind all remnants of traditional dominator habits of thought, all remnants of divided-world thinking, including all approaches to effecting change that employ the dominator mindset. No longer can it be ‘we against them’, rather, it must be all of us working together for a new future. The task is to foster hitherto unseen levels of local and global cohesion,[[2861]](#endnote-2862) the task is to ‘harvest’ and gather, in a joint global effort, from all cultural realms on this planet those practices and skills that have the potential to nurture a future of equality in dignity for all in freedom and solidarity.[[2862]](#endnote-2863) The African adage ‘It takes a village to raise a child’ applies to the global village now. This village needs nurturant, responsible, adult parents who can forge unity in diversity.

The world is full of examples that illustrate that only unity can give strength, while division weakens — a planetary community like ours in the face of major crises is no exception. Even the most ardent adherents of divided-world thinking will know their history. They will know, for instance, that the Inca Empire may have been able to survive in 1532 if not the two brothers Atahualpa and Huascar had engaged in bitter civil war just before the Spanish conquistadors arrived in their territory. Atahualpa had army of 80,000 troops, while the Spanish had only 169 men and 69 horses. Still, Atahualpa was captured and later executed and his entire empire annihilated.[[2863]](#endnote-2864) If we could time travel to Atahualpa, we could tell him: Forget all the quarrels of the past, now you face a completely new situation, and if you do not adapt fast and unite with your brother, you will lose everything. Similarly, the human family will only survive the difficulties we must expect from the ecological crises that loom if we unite now. The coronavirus pandemic is just a small prelude. No weapons offer safety, only global solidarity.

Globalisation affects all aspects of life, not just economics and politics, it also affects feelings, emotions, and meta-emotions.[[2864]](#endnote-2865) It is therefore surprising that globalisation has only relatively recently become the object of serious theoretical engagement by social scientists.[[2865]](#endnote-2866) The new individualism: The emotional costs of globalisation is the title of a publication of 2006, where we read that ‘globalisation and its offspring, the new individualism’, involve ‘ongoing emotional struggles to relate internal and external experience in which both processes and structures of self-definition are explicitly examined, revised and transformed’.[[2866]](#endnote-2867)

My own life has been profoundly affected by globalisation. My life path has in many ways recapitulated and mirrored humanity’s historical path, including the human search for a worthy purpose to live for. Philosopher Albert Camus put cogent words to my path, ‘There is no love of life without despair of life’.[[2867]](#endnote-2868) ‘In a world whose absurdity appears to be so impenetrable, we simply must reach a greater degree of understanding among men, a greater sincerity. We must achieve this or perish’.[[2868]](#endnote-2869)

My global citizen project began during the first six years of my life, when I was lucky enough to grow up in the communitarian rural context of a self-sustaining village, a setting that still today informs my vision of a ‘good life’.[[2869]](#endnote-2870) When I was six years old, my parents moved house and I suddenly found myself confined in the nuclear family structure that arose with the industrial revolution in Europe. At nine, I was put before a terrible choice, a choice that generations of humans have faced before me: In response to the trauma of war and displacement, my family had embraced the sense of ontological safety that religion offers when it promises eternal salvation to believers. My intellectual curiosity forced me to prefer the angst that flows from doubt, which meant that I had to inflict deep disappointment on my family — I thought often of Galileo and how he disappointed the Catholic Church. From then on, I abstained from seeking safety in fixed dogma and embarked on a life project that aims at minimising the need for divisive dogmas through creating common ground.[[2870]](#endnote-2871) In this way, I found a worthy purpose to live for, namely, taking the African adage seriously that ‘it takes a village to raise a child’ and trying to be a nurturant parent for the children of our global village that became my personal home village.

In my effort to find answers to the question ‘Who are we, Homo sapiens?’ I began what I call my global living project in 1975, at the age of twenty-one, and I made my first attempt to write about it in 1994.[[2871]](#endnote-2872) During the first period of this experience, I did not yet see the dignifying potential entailed in globalisation, I mainly saw its negative sides. I witnessed globalisation being driven by the spirit of traditional ranking systems — the global ‘jet set’ simply added a new elite layer on top of local elite cultures. I saw how global jet-set ‘super-dignitary’ status could simply be achieved through accumulating money, no longer only through hard-earned local reputation. During my time as a psychological counsellor in Egypt, I encountered stark illustrations of this new lifestyle. In 1985, for instance, I counselled a young student from Libya who felt depressed because his father had lost his oil riches through no fault of his own and the son could no longer afford to be part of his global peer group who had the means to hire a private jet for an evening in New York’s top discotheque in the blink of an eye. After speaking with him in the morning in my office, it could happen that I met the poorest of the poor out in the streets in the afternoon, and they were as hurt by the jet-set image of globalisation, only in different ways. Some of my friends in the street would forego buying affordable local healthy food just to save up for one bottle of Coca Cola per month, willing to sacrifice their health and that of their children to get imaginary access to global glitz culture no matter how illusory this dream was. During the weekend, when I was on my way to the oases in the Egyptian desert, it could happen that I came across backpacking global floaters from the West who were in search of cheap drugs in untouched world regions, and who, in an attempt to appear as ‘cool’ as super-rich global ‘dignitaries’, would blissfully exploit the hospitality of the poorest among the locals — today we call them beg-packers.

Luckily, I also met people who embraced human rights ideals and stepped out of the race for glitz, so I could understand the dignifying potential of the ingathering of humanity, its potential for responsibility to embrace the entire global village. I met people who earnestly tried to manifest equality in dignity in freedom and solidarity for all of humanity, who were serious about shouldering the responsibility of becoming nurturant parents for the global village. A decade ago, I still hoped that this trend would prevail and amplify.

Unfortunately, by now, I observe how the dignity pro-preneurs of this world increasingly lose out to dignity anti-preneurs, how nurturant parents lose out to abusive parents so to speak. As retrograde trends are on the rise, with sadness I see that statements that idolise ‘the old Adam of strife’ become more frequent instead of less.[[2872]](#endnote-2873)

What worries me more than blatant attacks on human rights propreneurs by antipreneurs, are insidious strategies. Initially, anti- and pro-preneurs often gravitate to the same analysis of the problem, it is only when it comes to the solutions that their paths part. So-called prepper communities can serve as an example. They emerge on all political sides, yet, they part when it comes to the remedy — those on the left side of the political spectrum strive to do ‘deep psychological and social work’, while those on the right side buy ‘their generator and their guns and store food for three months’.[[2873]](#endnote-2874) Or, to take the field of psychology, many agree that much of the recent ‘therapeutic turn’ that provides psychologists with customers of self-help books and workshops is far from an enlightened shift towards emotions but more of a misguided individualisation and monetisation of systemic problems.[[2874]](#endnote-2875) Many agree that psychotherapy ‘should not be promoting knowledge as a consolation prize for injustice’.[[2875]](#endnote-2876) From this point onwards, however, the paths of anti- and pro-preneurs will part. Antipreneurs will denounce seekers of solidarity and fairness with disparaging terms such as neurocrat and emotocracy,[[2876]](#endnote-2877) they will use their critique of science as a pretext for a generalised anti-science stance. Human dignity pro-preneurs, in contrast, will try to save the field of psychology — and science in general — from abuse. They will refrain from branding psychologists as willing perpetrators and rather view them as well-intentioned but sometimes unwittingly co-opted actors, they will abstain from using the abuse of psychology as an excuse to jettison its mission.[[2877]](#endnote-2878) I stand by the latter position, by all those who call on scientists to reinvigorate their emancipatory mission. I want to help rescue the original mandate of academia, rather than suspecting abuse to be the mandate.

Another case is that of progress. All sides may agree that much of what is called progress is simply another word for a false sense of control, yet, they will disagree on who are the victims and what are the solutions. It is obvious to everyone that the progress that economist John Maynard Keynes foresaw in 1932 has not manifested, even though it would be feasible today, namely, a fifteen hours work week, three hours a day.[[2878]](#endnote-2879) Many will agree that what we see instead is systemic humiliation flowing from the capture of the institutions of the state and the world-system by unbridled profit maximisation. In the face of this failure of progress, ideas for solutions, however, differ widely. Many of those who are still socialised into the dominator system seek out new dominators as saviours, rather than embarking on the path of responsible leadership in mutual partnership. I meet many who place their hopes on a brave new world built on what is called artificial intelligence, and who overlook that this process needs to be guided extremely wisely to avoid that it devolves into a less than intelligent cogitocidal data dictatorship.[[2879]](#endnote-2880) I meet many who embrace the positivity bias of Pollyannaism[[2880]](#endnote-2881) with respect to robots, not even considering predictions from experts who say that those robots may treat us humans in the future no better than we treat ants today, that we may count us lucky if robots have the mercy of letting us live.[[2881]](#endnote-2882)

This is the world we live in now. Metaphorically speaking, populist leaders promise to turn on green traffic lights for everyone, while they clandestinely bribe the traffic police to give green lights only to them and not to the rest. Once in power, populists typically cooperate with each other to monopolise resources, while at the same time applying divide-and-rule strategies on the rest, sending them into all-out competition so that solidarity among subordinates is undermined and cooperation against exploiters prevented. Resisters are branded as lazy, envious, uncompetitive, ineffective, or lacking resilience, and, as a result, trust is eroded and replaced with anomic isolation and feelings of shame over humiliation. In this situation, many of those who search for better alternatives fall for worse alternatives instead. Some escape into ‘conspirituality’, ‘the overlap between the New Age and conspiracy beliefs’,[[2882]](#endnote-2883) or they become cynical anger entrepreneurs, seeing themselves entitled to engage in corruption, aggressive scapegoating, or hateful parochialism.[[2883]](#endnote-2884) Yet others buy guns to guard their food reserves against the hungry hordes they expect to overrun them when the world descends into bloody mayhem.[[2884]](#endnote-2885)

It is now or never for us, humanity. Time has come to evolve, to ‘grow up’, to leave behind the expectation that strongmen will save us, be they saviours from heaven or from Earth. Shame and hatred wait to be healed through all-out empathic identification and compassion. Human dignity pro-preneurs like me applaud the words of writer Charles Eisenstein who was introduced before:

To be sure, there is no shortage of human rights abuses, death squads, torture, domestic violence, military violence, and violent crime still in the world today. To observe, in the midst of it, a rising tide of compassion is not a whitewash of the ugliness, but a call for fuller participation in a movement. On the personal level, it is a movement of kindness, compassion, empathy, taking ownership of one’s judgements and projections, and — not contradictorily — of bravely speaking uncomfortable truths, exposing what was hidden, bringing violence and injustice to light, telling the stories that need to be heard. Together, these two threads of compassion and truth might weave a politics in which we call out the iniquity without judging the perpetrator, but instead seek to understand and change the circumstances of the perpetration. From empathy, we seek not to punish criminals, but to understand the circumstances that breed crime. We seek not to fight terrorism, but to understand and change the conditions that generate it. We seek not to wall out immigrants, but to understand why people are so desperate in the first place to leave their homes and lands, and how we might be contributing to their desperation.[[2885]](#endnote-2886)

I hope that brain surgeon James Doty is right when he predicts that ‘we are at the beginning of an age of compassion’ — this is his explanation:

As you know, we had an age of enlightenment, which had a profound effect on our human species. And I believe that with the knowledge that we are gaining through neuroscience, through a variety of technologies, we’re seeing the effect, the positive effect, of compassion in little pockets in society and how profound it can be. Again, I believe that as we experience, as we see, as we manifest these little pockets of compassion and caring for the other occurring, it is ultimately going to be recognised that this is the path that will lead us out of darkness into light.[[2886]](#endnote-2887)

We had our 31st Annual Dignity Conference in 2018 in the Sekem ecovillage in Egypt, where we were privileged to witness an economy of love.[[2887]](#endnote-2888) The name Sekem comes from an ancient Egyptian hieroglyph that means ‘vitality of the sun’. Sekem stands for a solidarity economy, for a social economy with and for the people rather than for profit, it stands for a future-oriented visionary economy.[[2888]](#endnote-2889) In the face of a ‘global capitalist system’ that has caused a huge crisis and ‘will cause many more to come’, the Sekem leadership understands and shows that the ‘spirit of love’ needs to be ‘expressed in our consciousness, actions, and world’.[[2889]](#endnote-2890)

Let me summarise and round off this chapter. During the past millennia, the security dilemma was part of a divided world, where polities were pitted against each other in mutual fear and distrust, a world where armament provided short-term military security at the price of undermining long-term human security. We, or, more precisely, our forebears, were caught in this dilemma, and without us intending it, our solutions always engendered new problems. Now that our formerly divided world is in the process of ‘shrinking’ and coming together, we have the chance to exit from the security dilemma. To succeed, careful guidance is needed from a responsible leadership, to avoid that cycles of humiliation halt or even reverse this process. We are in the privileged position now that we can co-create long-term human security by building global trust and respect for equal dignity for all in freedom and solidarity, no longer is our only option short-term military security.[[2890]](#endnote-2891) We can nurture a dignity transition and solve the dignity dilemma that occurs when in-groups bolster their sense of dignity by humiliating out-groups. We can co-create a world where all people feel part of one global in-group, of one global human family, a world where dignity flows from global unity in diversity.

Nurturing global unity in diversity is key (see more in chapter 11). I have dedicated my entire life, several decades as a project spanning the globe, to explore whether this assertion is correct and feasible. We are in the privileged situation that we can foster global unity intentionally and purposefully, instead of letting it descend into uniform monopolies of power. Equally, we can celebrate the diversity of our world by complementing each other, no longer do we have to uphold division by competing against each other. We can build global economic systems that serve the common good in the spirit of communal sharing, rather than allowing systemic imperatives to damage the common good and divide us all. We can draw on the wide range of inspirations from enterprises and organisations that have already been tried out, be they cooperatives, mutuals, associations, foundations, social enterprises, or paritarian institutions.[[2891]](#endnote-2892) We can draw, not least, on the research of economist Elinor Ostrom who has shown that commons can be protected also in larger groups — for this work, she received the Nobel Prize for Economics 2009.[[2892]](#endnote-2893)

At the core of the new future of dignity stands non-domination, to use the words of philosopher and political theorist Philip Pettit,[[2893]](#endnote-2894) non-humiliation, as philosopher Avishai Margalit calls it,[[2894]](#endnote-2895) and non-degradation, to quote philosopher of criminal justice John Kleinig.[[2895]](#endnote-2896) What needs to happen is the dismantling of dominator structures, to use Riane Eisler’s terminology, the de-legitimisation of all practices of ranking people into higher and lesser beings, short, the rejection of rankism.[[2896]](#endnote-2897) New arrangements wait to be co-created, of all relationships, new partnership structures, so we can become a non-dominant species again, so we can become ‘servants of life’,[[2897]](#endnote-2898) so we can become nurturant parents who raise our global village’s children in dignity.

Human dignity advocators like me remind us that it is not respect, nor pride, nor honour, nor simply dignity alone that makes for a compassionate world. It is respect for the equality in dignity of all individuals as free persons, free to engage in loving dialogue and responsible mutual solidarity with each other and with our ecological foundations (not free to humiliate other people or exploit our natural surroundings). A dignity transition will liberate us from the dilemmas of the past, it will provide true solutions. Peace psychologist Michael Britton may have the last word:

A world divided in so many ways is also divided by deeply entrenched/experienced templates of having humiliated, having been humiliated, or being threatened with humiliation. To come together into cooperative unity cannot be achieved with humiliation-centred feelings being activated in the very act of coming together. The coming together into one world cannot happen unless there is a transition for every party into dignity, out of humiliation-focussed responses. The dignity dilemma is this: acting on the very desire to come together can trigger unresolved humiliation dynamics that cause the effort to blow apart. Trying to join in solidarity can trigger hostility instead — this is the dilemma if there is no dignity transition. In contrast, with a transition into dignity on everyone’s part, coming together can produce the solidarity everyone wishes for. A global dignity transition means everyone finds dignity in being themselves while also uniting in focussing on solving the problems before us all, as there are challenges such as climate change or failing biodiversity. This is the path to unity of focus on common problems while retaining dignity in our diversity. To achieve this is to be a global dignity community.[[2898]](#endnote-2899)

Being Indigenous is ultimately more than a colour, race or type of blood

It is a state of mind to live in deep and consistent communion with Mother Nature and her laws.   
From that standpoint, all of us come from being indigenous on account of our common origin that connects us with Mother Nature.   
And Indigenous we should all today be, as a vital issue for the real defense and salvation of Humanity and the Planet.  
― Frank Bracho, former Ambassador of Venezuela to India[[2899]](#endnote-2900)

## Chapter 10: What makes the present historical juncture so challenging

We will be known forever by the tracks we leave.

― Native American Proverb[[2900]](#endnote-2901)

Our present historical time may once be called ‘the dark era of the twenty-first century’, an era where a ‘doughnut’ of ecological overshoot and social shortfall manifested,[[2901]](#endnote-2902) and this often even under the cover of human rights rhetoric. It is uncertain what kind of future humanity will face. The twentieth century saw two world wars, and now, at the beginning of the twenty-first century, we see fires, storms, droughts, floods, massive forced displacements — all alarm signals that the millennia-old strategy of competing for domination over people and nature has reached the end of its usefulness, has overstayed its raison-d’être, not least after we drove it to absurd culminations during the past decades with what we call neo-liberalism. The generations presently alive carry more responsibility on their shoulders than any generation before. This is the ultimate test, it is about the survival of life on Earth, including human life.

Can the next era become an age of existential global awakening and critical Earth-saving change?

In this chapter, short summaries will be offered that shed light on the obstacles that humankind faces in case it is serious about wanting to work for a dignified future. The chapter lists factors and circumstances that make the present historical juncture more challenging than any other time in human history, and suggests what can be done about it.

At the end of the chapter, I share a longer personal reflection. Many of the arguments made earlier in this book are briefly taken up again and placed into this list:

• The challenge of learning dignified humility

• Supremacists feel humiliated by human rights ideals

• Dignity humiliation is more painful than honour humiliation

• Feelings of humiliation represent the nuclear bomb of the emotions

• The security dilemma and the dignity dilemma wait to be transcended

• More people than before get angry and might unleash violence

• Cross back — The dangerous combination of dignity humiliation and honour revenge

• More weapons are in the hands of more potential humiliators

• Dominator prowess, a core marker of masculinity, is too humiliating to relinquish for some

• When the feminine is repressed, collapse is the outcome

• What once was called realism is now illusionary utopism

• Transitions between irreconcilable systems need to be quick

• Dialogue is more complex than domination/submission

• Unity in diversity — a vitally important but unfamiliar principle

• New conflicting fault lines emerge on top of old ones

• Some human rights defenders betray their own values

• Some definitions of dignity undermine dignity

• Some definitions of human nature threaten human survival

• The human need for belonging has dark sides

• Cognitive bias is a double-edged sword

• Humans fall for manipulation

• Indignation entrepreneurship hinders sober and constructive action

• The commons dilemma — The problem of self-destructive short-sightedness

• Economic systems are human-made and not laws of nature

• Solidarity is not the same as free riding

• Double standards and mixed messages undermine human rights ideals

• Domination has no inherent endpoint except for total destruction

• Well-intended solutions have often unintended consequences

• Pro-social creativity should not be wasted

• Rationality has limits and world healers are needed

• Long unfinished revolutions wait to be carried out, and this in completely new ways

• Competition for domination is the core problem and only a second order transition can solve it

• What when the lifeboat is full?

• The problem with the sceptics and the naysayers

• Without global cooperation, there will be no decent future

• A personal note

### The challenge of learning dignified humility

This book calls on us, the citizens of this world, to learn something that is long overdue, namely, enlightened and dignified humility. It means accepting necessary humbling without feeling humiliated.

The year 1757 has been widely discussed in this book, as it offers a linguistic marker, a linguistic signal, for humanity’s journey towards this humility, a journey that will reach its intended goal only if we take it more seriously. The year 1757 highlights the rise of the individual over the collective, it highlights that the individual is responsible for protecting her decorum from humiliation, and it opens the door for the subsequent call for equality in dignity and solidarity for all individuals. The destination of the journey is for all citizens on this planet to unite in humble recognition of the fact that we all are part of an interconnected finite world.

At the present historical moment, it is uncertain where the journey will go. We are in limbo. Many wonder where this uncertainty comes from and who is responsible.

My answer: Unintended consequences are responsible, unintended consequences of solutions that were less than optimal from the beginning. Unintended consequences can be a blessing, yet, often they are a curse, at times, they are both. Colonisation and globalisation are such cases.

Here is my story (see more in chapter 9). In my work, I highlight the experience of circumscription and the introduction of complex agriculture as drivers for competition for domination, which subsequently became the prevailing strategy in most parts of the world and lasted throughout the past millennia. This strategy engendered what I call ‘an arrogant illusion of mastery and goodness’, particularly in Europe. ‘Mankind’ — indeed, usually men — regarded themselves as divinely ordained dominators over the abundance of planet Earth, men competed for dominance, men conquered and colonised the world, and this lead to what we have now, namely, a globalised the world. This globalisation, however, had unexpected consequences. It brought to light deeply humbling facts, among them the fact that our planet is small and vulnerable and that humankind is only one among many species, far from nature’s master. Circumscription is a term used in anthropology for limitation, and at the current point in human history we see global hyper-circumscription unfold — we realise that our earthly resources cannot be exploited ad infinitum.[[2902]](#endnote-2903) We begin to understand that the dominator model of society that emerged in response to circumscription and that reigned throughout the past millennia was not our best adaptation.

In this situation, the solution is the partnership model for world society as described by systems scientist Riane Eisler,[[2903]](#endnote-2904) or, as psychologist Linda Hartling prefers to call it, the mutuality model.[[2904]](#endnote-2905) The shrinking of the world will be a blessing if it motivates humanity to create a global community of partnership and mutuality in dignified humility. Globalisation is a curse and will continue to be a curse, however, as long as most people perceive partnership as humiliating and persist with strategies of domination over people and nature. These two irreconcilable alternatives make the situation explosive, and this in the literal sense of the word, as the world is at the same time filled to the brim with deadly weapons. We live in limbo between two possible outcomes — global domination and exploitation with demise as endgame on one side, and on the other side global mutuality and partnership.

This is the call: No longer can Homo sapiens hold on to the arrogant illusion that our species can or should stand above ‘nature’ and conquer it.[[2905]](#endnote-2906) We need to abandon this illusion and accept that nature is us, that we are a highly vulnerable part of nature. It is a completely misguided ‘self-congratulatory and self-righteous illusion of mastery and goodness’. Likewise, wanting to conquer other people is foolish in a globalised world — ‘every war has two losers’ — William Stafford’s insight has never had more validity than in times of globalisation. The call is to give up fighting for domination, to stop competing for dominance, as this will be deadly for all life on Earth. Instead, let us talk, let us find the courage, strength, and endurance to replace competitive domineering with mutual dignifying.

The globalisation of exploitation has been destructive. In this situation, ‘helping the poor’ is not enough, and ‘empowering the poor’ falls short as well. All of us have to change, this, to me, is true ‘goodness’, the only remedy for the ‘illusion of goodness’.

I dedicate my life to the blessing that globalisation holds in store as a potential, namely, global solidarity. Global solidarity means that all of us have to change.

### Supremacists feel humiliated by human rights ideals

During the past millennia, the dominator model of society prevailed all over the world. A dominator society is a context where people’s worthiness is tied to a scale of ranked honour, where those who hold power typically are given the task to routinely humiliate their inferiors so as to instil subservient humility in them. Anger in response to humiliation is not an option for inferiors, anger is legitimate only among elite members who are equals. Only aristocrats can respond to humiliated honour with going for duel or duel-like wars. Inferiors cannot challenge their superiors to duel.

The arrival of human rights ideals changes this situation fundamentally. These ideals encourage inferiors to break these rules and rise up. Predictably, supremacists perceive this as undue debasement, as a humiliation in need of being rejected, they are hostile to the invitation to join everyone else in the realm of equal dignity. Supporters and opponents of human rights ideals thus hold irreconcilable positions, entrepreneurs face antipreneurs.

Superiors who wish to retain their privileges and prevent inferiors from rising up have two basic options in this situation, they can either act openly or covertly, they can reject human rights ideals squarely, or they can cover up for unequal practices on the ground with a rhetoric of equal dignity at the surface. Both options are being enacted all around the world these days.

We witness the first approach when people cry loud ‘Foul!’ and ‘Humiliation!’ in response to the call for humility. They declare that they are entitled to their privileges, that they have the right to arrogate superiority, that they cannot accept the humiliation of joining others in humility. They argue that they are benevolent patrons who deserve gratitude from their underlings instead of anger. The malevolent among them pretend to be benevolent, while the benevolent overlook the systemic problems entailed in the dominator model of society.

The second group, the covert resisters, use strategies that are more sophisticated. Some distort human rights ideals into strawmen so they can make these ideals appear impracticable, others ridicule and disqualify ideals altogether, or they use seemingly benevolent rhetoric to make them irrelevant. Examples abound, both in the past and at present. If we go back to the time when the call for the abolishment of slavery became louder, for instance, slave owners predicted that such abolishment would lead to the breakdown of society, and, aside from that, ‘slaves’ would be psychologically unable to handle freedom anyway.[[2906]](#endnote-2907) Alternatively, enslaved people were told that they were equal in dignity to their masters, only unequal in status, and that they should therefore ‘coexist peacefully’ with their masters and refrain from demanding the abolishment of slavery.[[2907]](#endnote-2908) The situation is not very different with regard to contemporary work conditions, which resemble slavery in many parts of the world. These conditions persist under seemingly bland labels such as ‘competitive human resource management’.[[2908]](#endnote-2909) Another example is the concept of freedom. Those who hail economic inequality as proof of society’s heroism, define freedom as ‘freedom for the wolves’,[[2909]](#endnote-2910) and even seemingly benevolent ideas such as universal basic income can be co-opted to serve the wolves.[[2910]](#endnote-2911)

Entrepreneurs and antipreneurs of human rights ideals clash head on when it comes to globalisation. Human rights and globalisation could very well have evolved in consonance, yet, this did not happen. Globalisation of exploitation evolved, and this is irreconcilable with ideals of equal dignity for all. People find themselves caught in the middle when human rights ideals are promoted and opposed, and even where these ideals are implemented without opposition, they introduce unfamiliar change that is difficult to adjust to. The outcome is widespread global ‘acculturative stress’.[[2911]](#endnote-2912)

I can offer advice for acculturative stress from my professional experience. During the seven years I worked in Egypt as a clinical psychologist and counsellor, many expatriates came to my door, shaken by what they called ‘culture shock’.[[2912]](#endnote-2913) Most affected were those who had placed their confidence in ‘intercultural training’ seminars or How-to-do in X-Land handbooks, as this had given them the illusion of being able to behave perfectly with all people in all situations. I explained to them that their idea of mastery had their roots in bygone times when people were less mobile and spent their lives within homogenous cultural contexts among people who mutually defined each other as ‘us’. Times have changed, and even though encyclopaedic knowledge is still useful, when cultural realms coalesce, relational skills are more important, and not just any superficially learned skills, but relational openness, willing to be vulnerable. Before any other communication can follow, relational bridges need to be built that form the very ‘us’ that is not yet there, to create the very trust that is the precondition for any authentic communication. The first step must therefore be a step out of one’s comfort zone, a step into vulnerability, daring to connect with other people in shared vulnerability, daring to touch the heart of the other person with one’s own.[[2913]](#endnote-2914)

When I speak with human rights antipreneurs, I lovingly explain to them that also their children will lose the foundation for their lives in case global exploitation makes our planet uninhabitable, and that supporting one another as equals in solidarity is therefore not just a noble idea but also prudent.[[2914]](#endnote-2915) My message to my fellow human rights entrepreneurs is to be courageous and bear the uncertainty, fear, and sense of vulnerability that accompany acculturative stress, to use it as an opportunity to learn mindful humility, to use it to reach across all ideological and cultural fault lines.[[2915]](#endnote-2916)

I sometimes offer the image of divorced parents who share the custody for their children and collaborate as parents despite mutual antipathy as a couple. ‘Humankind has joint custody for the planet — irrespective of any inter-personal or inter-national falling out’.[[2916]](#endnote-2917)

### Dignity humiliation is more painful than honour humiliation

It lies in human nature to wish to be seen,[[2917]](#endnote-2918) to belong, to feel connected, and to feel significant.[[2918]](#endnote-2919) Given this proclivity, human rights ideals provide something extraordinary, namely, a hitherto unknown level of belonging. Wherever human rights ideals are established as a norm, a level of inclusiveness is promised and expected that is unprecedented — people learn that they are part of the one human family that walks planet Earth, a family where everyone has the right to be treated as equal in worthiness.

Whenever and wherever this promise is betrayed, a dignity gap opens between expectation and experience, and this creates a sense of humiliation that is different from what occurs in ranked honour contexts. Human rights ideals lend legitimacy to the human inequity aversion more than before, they make it legitimate to be repulsed by inequality — no longer is inequality justifiable as a result of divine will or part of nature’s order.[[2919]](#endnote-2920) With the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the sense of disgust in the face of inequality that is deeply embedded in the human psyche, obtained full legitimacy after having been overruled and antagonised for many millennia.

We can call the new form of humiliation dignity humiliation, it is the sense of humiliation that originates from not being treated as an equal in a world that subscribes to ideals of equal dignity. Dignity humiliation causes much greater pain than honour humiliation because dignity humiliation excludes the victim from the human family entirely, whereas honour humiliation only moves the victim somewhat further down within a stratified system (see more in chapter 5).

Human rights defenders need to be aware that human rights ideals create expectations that are much higher than before, and that this has significant consequences. The betrayal of these expectations hurts deeper than before. Avoiding this betrayal is therefore of utmost importance.

### Feelings of humiliation represent the nuclear bomb of the emotions

Feelings of humiliation are the nuclear bomb of the emotions. Many historical examples illustrate the power that these feelings can develop. Germany and Rwanda are two such cases. Joseph Goebbels was a master of propaganda in Nazi Germany and he used narratives of humiliation to rouse enthusiasm for war in the German people.[[2920]](#endnote-2921) In Rwanda, Radio Télévision Libre des Mille Collines broadcasted a similar message, and in both cases, it was reinforced by printed publications.[[2921]](#endnote-2922) The combined message was, ‘All Jews/Tutsi must be killed to prevent them from humiliating us in the future as we feel they did in the past’. In other words, mass killings were incited as supposedly due punishment for past humiliation, and as prevention for future humiliation. The consequence was all-out mayhem.

The genocide against the Tutsi in 1994 was particularly indicative of the force of feelings of humiliation. It showed how ‘cost-effective’ it can be to prime people with feelings of humiliation — the instigators of the genocide had to invest in nothing more than a radio station. Hutu who were infused with the humiliation narrative used their own weapons, the household machetes they had at home, to hack their Tutsi neighbours to death. Tutsi had to pay for the bullets themselves when they wanted to be shot instead of hacked to death.[[2922]](#endnote-2923)

Human rights defenders need to be highly aware of these dynamics and exercise great caution when they bring the message of human rights ideals to oppressed people. Feelings of humiliation can end in mayhem, and this is particularly relevant for dignity humiliation. Dignity humiliation is more painful than honour humiliation because, as alluded to above, the promise of equal dignity — the promise that affirms one’s equal membership in the family of humankind — is higher than the promise of ranked honour, and therefore its betrayal hurts deeper.

To avoid mayhem, human rights defenders need to do more than simply ‘empower the downtrodden of the world’. Empowered victims may turn into gruesome perpetrators. Empowered Hutu (meaning ‘servant’), instead of healing their own feelings of humiliation, inflicted the horrors of genocidal killings on their former Tutsi masters, and thus they humiliated the humanity of all involved, including the humanity of themselves.[[2923]](#endnote-2924) To use an example from family life, it would be ill advised for the social worker to counsel a wife who is being beaten by her husband to turn the tables and retaliate by becoming the new abuser in the house.

Human rights ideals introduce two transformations, no longer just one as in the past. In former times, empowered victims used the violent methods of their masters until they either became the new masters themselves or were defeated. Violence was legitimate. Now, a second order transition needs to accompany the first. The second order transition means dismantling the very dominator system and to do so by peaceful means. In the context of human rights ideals, perpetrators humiliate also themselves when they omit the second transition.

Humiliation must be avoided at all cost if a dignified future for humanity shall be possible. Even the most well-intended strategies, if they create feelings of humiliation, will fail this aim. Sometimes human rights defenders are guilty of such violations themselves — the environmental movement can serve as an example. Any Green New Deal, for example, falls short if it only aims at protecting the climate. What is needed is a just transition that also protects the people.[[2924]](#endnote-2925) Workers will reject solutions for the protection of the environment when these solutions humiliate them. As environmental activists often hail from socio-cultural backgrounds that imbue them with a certain arrogant contempt for the working class, this can constitute a serious hindrance. To transcend it, the environmental movement is well advised to invite all sides into cooperating for a more dignified world. For example, the call for the protection of the environment could be combined with a call for shared work, for less power to money, and for more time for the breadth and diversity of life. I have been inspired by related ideas emerging particularly in the peripheries of the world’s power centres — be it in Norway or the Amazon in Brazil.[[2925]](#endnote-2926)

Equal dignity needs equal playing fields to flourish. This is a tall order after millennia during which inequality was heralded as divinely ordained, and particularly now, when inequality is defended as supposedly beneficial motor for economic growth.

### The security dilemma and the dignity dilemma wait to be transcended

As long as the world was not yet as interconnected as it is now, as long as it was still more compartmentalised and divided, nobody could escape the deep sense of fear and threat that formed the background of human life on Earth. The threat originated from the security dilemma — also called the insecurity-security dialectic[[2926]](#endnote-2927) — that represented an almost unsurmountable obstacle to peace. The label ‘dilemma’ indicates the problem: When walls, fences, and fortresses failed, arms were procured, yet, there is a problem with arms races: even though they mean to avert war, ultimately they facilitate war. In other words, the solution causes the problem.

We live in new times now. We live in a time where we can no longer afford to let this dilemma fester. In an interconnected and increasingly overstretched world, war creates more than victors and losers, it creates the demise of all. Therefore, human survival depends on the human family’s ability to overcome the security dilemma through global trust building and cooperation. A global dignity transition waits to manifest so we can exit from the security dilemma.

In this situation, we are extremely fortunate that our grandparents enshrined human rights ideals. These ideals offer a pathway to survival on Earth in dignity, a pathway to unite as a human family of equally respectful and responsible members who jointly address the challenges we face that threaten life at a global scale. These ideals offer the compass needed when war means all-out destruction, when the dominator mindset overstays its viability, when competition for domination over people and nature proves more than ever that it is infeasible practically, psychologically, and ethically, when the only feasible solution is global cooperation.

The strongest obstacle on the path to global cooperation are feelings of humiliation, they are the ultimate destroyer of trust. Unfortunately, the introduction of human rights ideals increases precisely this problem. The reason has been widely discussed in this book — feelings of dignity humiliation hurt deeper than those that flow from honour humiliation, and therefore these feelings entail the potential to create deeper pain and thus deeper polarisations and divisions.[[2927]](#endnote-2928) In a world where human rights ideals have touched hearts and minds, the most significant barrier to global cooperation is therefore the sense of humiliation that arises when dignity is perceived to be violated. This is strongest in the face of double standards, when equal dignity is promised while a callous honour mindset is enacted. Falsely professed love can have devastating consequences — anyone who has ever believed in and returned love only to find out that it was falsely professed, will know the depth of the shock, shame, and humiliation involved.

Violent cycles of humiliation follow three main trajectories in this historically new situation. First, some dominators will be oblivious of the new Zeitgeist, they will continue imposing humiliation as if it were still legitimate routine, and they will be surprised when people no longer succumb in submissive humility but react with anger or even violence. It is the responsibility of the global community to convince the world’s dominators to abandon this path and turn to global cooperation. Second, as referred to above, empty promises and double standards are particularly hurtful, and, again, the global community is called to prevent double standards. Third, what I call a dignity dilemma arises when in-groups want to strengthen in-group dignity by way of out-group humiliation — ‘we against them’. By doing so, they hinder global dignity, they undermine the co-creation of the very cohesion that is needed to arrive at global unity in diversity. I have lived on all continents of our planet (except Antarctica) for almost fifty years, and I dare refute the argument that ‘human nature’ needs an outer enemy to feel a sense of in-group cohesion.[[2928]](#endnote-2929) We, as humanity, have enough global challenges waiting to be solved, there is no need to invest energy in the artificial creation of enemy imageries that humanity can very well do without.

During the past years, I observe with great concern a sense of humiliation growing in populations all around the world, sometimes authentically felt, other times artificially stirred up by humiliation entrepreneurs. Unfortunately, some victims call for old-type dominators to return to ‘good-old victories’, so, as a result, we see dominators coming to power now who want to undo human rights ideals again and re-divide the world. With dread I observe that even human rights violations like starving enemies with artificially created hunger has become a weapon in war again.[[2929]](#endnote-2930)

Since human survival is at stake in our interconnected world, the security dilemma must be overcome, and cycles of humiliation must be healed and prevented at all cost. We have to stop playing with fire.

### More people than before get angry and might unleash violence

Wherever human rights ideals are established as a norm, while remaining unrealised on the ground, anger is not only amplified but also democratised. First, as explained before, wherever human rights ideals give legitimacy to what is known as inequity aversion, anger becomes more intense than before.[[2930]](#endnote-2931) Second, all those who in former times would accept their lowliness in quiet subservience as divinely ordained or as nature’s order, now learn that they have the right to become angry, that anger is a legitimate response. This means that millions of formerly silent subordinates become angry. On top of this, due to new technologies, access to the most devastating means of retaliation is also democratised — a lone hacker or Jihadist,[[2931]](#endnote-2932) or a lone genome manipulator,[[2932]](#endnote-2933) can now unleash hitherto unseen global mayhem.

Human rights defenders have to be keenly aware of the fact that their otherwise well-intended message may unleash anger on an unprecedented scale, not only with regard to intensity, but also with regard to outreach and opportunities for enactment. If this anger is channelled into what I call the Hitler path of action, ubiquitous destruction is likely to be the outcome.

This does not mean that anger should be suppressed. Anger represents a strong force that can serve not only de-struction but also con-struction. Anger is an important driving force for what educator Paulo Freire calls conscientisation.[[2933]](#endnote-2934) Anger is a force for construction when the path of a Bertha von Suttner is chosen, the path of a Mohandas K. Gandhi, Dietrich Bonhoeffer, Eleanor Roosevelt, Rachel Carson, or Nelson Mandela.

The human rights revolution depends on loving anger (see more further down). Therefore, peace education already for the youngest is the requirement of the day, peace education that is idealistic, scientific, critical, and political.[[2934]](#endnote-2935)

### Cross back — The dangerous combination of dignity humiliation and honour revenge

Ideally, anger in response to dignity humiliation, to be consistent, should give rise to conscientisation, and then be invested in trust-building dialogue that fosters the partnership model of society. Yet, there is a problem: People who suffer from dignity humiliation may not have the strength or the knowledge to be consistent and engage in the very kind of trust-building dialogue that dignity requires. They may revert to the retaliatory toolkit of honour humiliation, the toolkit of duel-like violence and thus be inconsistent. Instead of healing dignity humiliation through dignifying dialogue, they may cross back to the path of honour and unleash violent revenge. (In the past I used the term ‘cross over’, Linda Hartling recommended ‘cross back’.)

When such cross backs happen, the outcome is potentially more destructive than ever before in human history, because, as explained before, not only is dignity humiliation more painful than honour humiliation, also the enactment of violent responses is easier realisable than before, and such responses can be more devastating in a world of democratised access to weaponisable equipment.

As laid out before, human rights defenders need to be aware that even the most well-intended empowerment of victims can have consequences that are destructive. The well-intentioned social worker who attempts to awaken feelings of humiliation in a wife who is beaten by her husband, for instance, who calls on the wife to rise up from this humiliation, ought not to encourage her to engage in counter-humiliation against her husband.

When we look around in the world, then we see that precisely this cross back happens frequently and sometimes in the least expected contexts. The self-esteem movement in Western societies is one example. It intended to help young people with low self-esteem to rise from humiliation and shame, and it invited them to embrace equal dignity in loving mutuality. What happened, however, was that some chose to embrace a solipsistic sense of grandeur, they began to arrogate the very sense of entitlement that was formerly reserved to elites. As a result, a society-wide narcissism epidemic[[2935]](#endnote-2936) created a social climate of chronic indignation and anger entrepreneurship all against all.[[2936]](#endnote-2937)

This is the reason for why I avoid using the term ‘empowerment’ in my work and replace it with entrustment. Entrustment suggests a larger obligation, it suggests that emancipation movements and uprisings need careful limits. It indicates that all involved need to meet in the middle between up and down, between the top and the bottom of society, that all should shoulder the responsibility of creating a better world together in mutually dignifying and united humility.[[2937]](#endnote-2938)

Human rights defenders need to be aware that the toolkit of dialogue is very new to people. The toolkit that was formerly reserved for aristocrats, the toolkit for revenge that grew out of honour humiliation, is still more familiar to many people. After all, ranked honour was the norm during the past millennia in most societies. It is therefore easier for populist demagogues to mobilise people, particularly men, by promising them more firearms for new ‘victories’, than it is for a Gandhi or Mandela to mobilise people to engage in arrangements of relationships that nurture mutuality.[[2938]](#endnote-2939)

When people who smart from feelings of dignity humiliation fail to turn to dignifying action and instead revert to the modus of honour revenge, extreme levels of violence can be the outcome. Such cross backs can even drive genocidal killings and inform acts of terror. In 2011, a young man, Anders Behring Breivik, after having endured many humiliating experiences in his personal life, perpetrated a mass shooting in Norway. He was filled with the strong sense of mission of embodying a ‘Templar Knight’ tasked with taking revenge for what he perceived as ‘unpatriotic behaviour’ on the part of the politicians of his country. His path has become romanticised and glorified all over the world by now. In times of global connectivity, a single imitator of Anders Behring Breivik can unleash mayhem wherever he lives on the planet. Not least the Christchurch mosque shootings in New Zealand in 2019 demonstrated the global outreach of the narrative of the humiliated vengeful knight.[[2939]](#endnote-2940) Even schoolchildren have hacked their way into sensitive national data from the basement of their mother’s house.[[2940]](#endnote-2941)

Danger increases exponentially when humiliation entrepreneurs succeed in mobilising not only loners, but masses. Such entrepreneurs usually begin by amplifying emergent feelings of humiliation in their populations and then they instrumentalise these feelings by offering ‘healing’ through ‘heroic and glorious warriorship’. This happened in Nazi Germany, and it happened in Rwanda, where radio propaganda and household machetes sufficed to turn obedient Hutu ‘servants’ into foot soldiers for horrific genocidal killings. This can even encompass the entire globe. The path from dignity humiliation to honour revenge, if walked at a global level, is deadly for the future of life on Earth. Wherever mafia-like strategies infiltrate the structures of our interconnected world, this is the level of danger in store.[[2941]](#endnote-2942)

The coronavirus pandemic that unfolds while I write these lines throws this situation into stark relief. It uncovers to which extent the human ‘sense of exceptionalism has made us arrogant, imperiously dismissing our dependence on our natural setting’.[[2942]](#endnote-2943) The virus requires humility in the face of nature, yet, this is difficult to accept for angry adherents of a masculinist script for whom enemies need to be heroically defeated or at least treated with heroic contempt, and who wish to treat even a virus this way. In this situation, level-headed moderate authorities who appeal for solidarity in humility in their attempt to contain the virus, risk being denounced as cowards or even attacked as enemies. In the West, this trend is amplified by a self-esteem movement that has failed to teach entrustment and has ‘empowered’ people so inclined to use ‘freedom of speech’ as a cover to act as ‘crybullies’. This happens after decades of sociocidal trust erosion, after decades during which trust was eroded by society’s profit orientation, and media amplified the voices of the loudest.

In such a world, self-righteous ‘manly’ hatred is an opportunity particularly for men who felt humiliated earlier in their personal lives to express their personal sense of pain. By doing so, they play into the hands of authoritarian leaders-in-waiting who are delighted when freedom means that the loudest is right, when moderate voices are weakened, and when society gets ever more polarised. When calls for ‘law and order’ get louder, these leaders offer to step in as ‘saviours’.

We can call this downward spiral necropolitics, to use a term coined by African thinker Achille Mbembe.[[2943]](#endnote-2944)

### More weapons are in the hands of more potential humiliators

Feelings of humiliation operate as a ‘nuclear bomb of the emotions’ not least because they have the power to bring people to weaponise civilian technologies. The case of Rwanda demonstrated how household items such as machetes could become effective weapons of mass killings simply because their owners were moved by narratives of humiliation disseminated by way of extremely low-cost radio propaganda. Terror attacks with trucks or airplanes are other examples.[[2944]](#endnote-2945) Any lone hacker can now bring down entire countries’ infrastructures without the need of expensive equipment if so inspired, and this in times where humiliation narratives are broadcasted worldwide, not least through the internet.[[2945]](#endnote-2946) Similarly, anyone familiar with the new genome editing tools can now easily produce deadly bioterrorist weapons.[[2946]](#endnote-2947)

The use of weapons designed for war can be democratised as well. Guns have found their way from the battlefield into gun safes in private homes — would-be school shooters can simply go to their fathers’ armouries. This danger amplifies in present-day’s world in many ways. We only have to consider the use of drones. As already harmless looking play-drones can threaten civilian targets,[[2947]](#endnote-2948) how much more of a threat will drones be that are only used by special operations troops until now[[2948]](#endnote-2949) but may one day find their way into civilian skies and turn them into battlefields.

Historian Yuval Harari identifies three serious challenges for humankind in the twenty-first century: first nuclear war, second climate change, and, third, technological disruption. For Harari, the rise of artificial intelligence and bioengineering is the most significant a danger of the three. When computers and robots [replace humans](https://www.aljazeera.com/programmes/countingthecost/2017/04/robots-job-terminators-simply-misunderstood-170408083129352.html), the outcome may be ‘an extremely unequal society in which an elite segment of society controls all of the economy and makes all the profits’, while the rest of humanity becomes more or less useless.[[2949]](#endnote-2950) Humans may become ‘hackable’ and replaceable,[[2950]](#endnote-2951) warns Harari, and past systems of slavery and apartheid may be eclipsed by hi-tech systems of systemic humiliation if elites monopolise these new technologies.[[2951]](#endnote-2952)

The ‘father of (modern) AI’, Jürgen Schmidhuber, predicts that future humans may count themselves lucky if robots allow them to continue being alive, the best hope might be that robots will treat future humans in the same way humans treat ants today.[[2952]](#endnote-2953) A young German journalist predicts that such a future may precisely be the outcome of Silicon Valley innovationism, ‘where the billionaires’ delusions of God have merged with the hippiesque promises of salvation of the Californian can-do spirit, where politics, laws and social discourse are only seen as regional brake blocks on the way to a digital utopia’.[[2953]](#endnote-2954)

The only constructive path into a future of global dignity, we may conclude, is the Suttner-Gandhi-Bonhoeffer-Roosevelt-Carson-Freire-Mandela path.

### Dominator prowess, a core marker of masculinity, is too humiliating to relinquish for some

Throughout the past millennia, the lives of most people in most world regions were defined by the security dilemma. This dilemma was a geopolitical imperative from which nobody could escape. It gave rise to the androcentric dominator model of society and it socialised men and women into very different role scripts. Men were tasked to occupy the public sphere and guard the frontiers of their tribe, their city, or their state, in other words, to attend to the security dilemma, while women were sent into the private sphere to raise the next generation.[[2954]](#endnote-2955) ‘Triumph’ and ‘victory’ in competition for domination became core identity markers for ‘being a man’. Young men learned to equate maleness with the honour and the valour of battle, with bravery in the face of the enemy, with the ability to outcompete and overpower opponents, with the ability to take risks that seemed impossible.

During the past millennia, male valour represented a form of ‘life insurance’ for their people. Without the Samurai, Japan would have been conquered by the troops of Kublai Khan in the thirteenth century. Nazi concentrations camps would not have been liberated in 1945, had it not been for young men in the allied forces sacrificing their lives. The list of examples fills many books. Without brave young men, the city of Dubrovnik would have succumbed to the siege of 1991 and 1992, and its population would have been evicted or slaughtered. I was deeply touched to see the gratitude of Dubrovnik’s citizens when I spent time there in 2016, sitting under the statue of the mythological protector knight Roland.[[2955]](#endnote-2956)

Male readiness for combat, however, has also dark sides. In times of increasing global interconnectedness and rising social and ecological circumscription, the more strategies of domination lose their usefulness, those dark sides become unacceptable. The dark sides were always there, yet, in the past, the need for protection outweighed them so they were downplayed, denied, or accepted as inevitable. Dark sides were many, from damaged family relations to weakened community health, to mutilated bodies and souls.[[2956]](#endnote-2957) To be a man was a precarious role assignment.[[2957]](#endnote-2958) The security dilemma inflicted what I call ‘a millennia-long war injury’ on humanity — men learned to expose themselves and others to impossible risks, while women learned that they should suffer in silence.

One of the dark sides was that the emotional war injury could become so severe that the intensity of combat could be felt as a relief, a way for men to feel alive — readiness for glorious combat could become a need so that war was sought rather than avoided. While this risk was accepted in the past, in the contemporary world, in a situation where the ultimate result of global war is global defeat rather than global victory, it endangers the survival of all. When in addition nature is being attacked as if it were an enemy, the global ecological equilibrium is in danger as well. Neither global sociocide nor global ecocide represent victories. The dark sides can no longer be downplayed, denied, or accepted.

The situation becomes even more precarious when humiliated men attempt to remedy dark sides with darker sides. Many men feel humiliated by the fact that the entire project of manhood is in crisis in a world where arenas for combat shrink — while being a firefighter is increasingly in demand and requires enormous courage, it is much less glorious than the role of the knight in shining armour who fights evil enemies. For some men, the call for humility represents undue humiliation, humble equality in dignity is nothing they would want to embrace, it is only something to be resisted.[[2958]](#endnote-2959)

In Africa, there is a saying, ‘Men are depressed and women are oppressed’. I first came to Africa in 1976, and I saw young men sitting in teahouses or bars, yearning for honour and glory, while their women provided for the community. In 1998, for my doctoral research, I participated in khat-chewing sessions in the Horn of Africa, and also there I got a taste of how men dream of glory while women toil for their families.[[2959]](#endnote-2960) Variations of this predicament can be found all over the world. During my years in Japan, I became acquainted with the hikikomori phenomenon and have since watched how this trend increasingly emerged also in the West, where incels escape into artificial arenas for glory in video games, while others create artificial arenas for glory in real life, ranging from simple ‘mansplaining’ to posturing with cars or even rockets, to hooliganism. The list is long and it is global (see more about the manosphere in chapter 7). I have written a book about this in 2010, Gender, humiliation, and global security.

Allow me to share a case study that throws this predicament into particularly stark relief. It is a study by Gary Page Jones, a humanitarian aid expert specialised on HIV/AIDS in Africa. He studied the slums of Nairobi in Kenya, but the lessons we can learn from it are relevant for the world at large. My own experiences in the slums of Nairobi, as well as in other world regions, are entirely in line with Jones’ findings.[[2960]](#endnote-2961)

Gary Page Jones carried out his doctoral research project in the slums of Nairobi in 2019, and he found that ‘unequal gender power dynamics are a key factor in driving the HIV epidemic’.[[2961]](#endnote-2962) He interviewed female slum dwellers who made ends meet with whatever resources they could find, while their brothers entertained unattainable dreams of positions of social and economic prestige — such as being a taxi driver or a politician.[[2962]](#endnote-2963) While hoping for a better future, young men were otherwise busy proving their sexual prowess, and they did so through high-risk behaviour that increased the prevalence of HIV/AIDS infections. The hunt is a word that male slum dwellers used for ‘chasing money’ as well as for ‘hunting women’, as both money and women were seen as prizes to increase masculine honour.[[2963]](#endnote-2964) ‘Hunting’ women and impregnating them represented a prize for young males, a behaviour that caused pregnancy and HIV/AIDS infection, which, in turn, became a blemish for the female who was ‘invariably culpable’, as Jones reported.[[2964]](#endnote-2965)

Gary Page Jones found that young male slum dwellers consider the sexual coercion of women as justified, they believe that coercion is ‘the natural order’ and an ‘expression of the innate rights of men to determine rules of sexuality’.[[2965]](#endnote-2966) Male dominance is seen as a rite of passage for young men, ‘and impregnating a young woman ... is a sure way to demonstrate manhood’, while the subsequent pregnancy and child rearing is left on the shoulders of the woman.[[2966]](#endnote-2967) In other words, in the harsh reality of the slum, where it would be crucial for males to act responsibly, their need to bolster prowess through conquest and infidelity bred the opposite, namely, irresponsibility.[[2967]](#endnote-2968) Jones’ work thus sheds a unique light on how ‘masculinity is defined by building sexual experience-cum-conquests’ and how sexual prowess can be a ‘flight from the fear of humiliation’.[[2968]](#endnote-2969)

Male attitudes and behaviour represent ‘the major challenge in staying HIV free’, is Jones’ conclusion, as young slum-dwelling women are left to having to devise creative coping strategies to counter male behaviour — it is a case of ‘us’ against ‘them’.[[2969]](#endnote-2970) When Jones’ research team spoke with young women on their views on sex, they listed ‘pleasure, risk, and consequences of sex’, while young men solely focussed on ‘pleasure gained from a sexual experience’.[[2970]](#endnote-2971) In discussions of family life, slum dwellers spoke of mothers, sisters, and daughters, while male figures were largely absent — males were described as ‘fleeting figures posing as much threat as support’.[[2971]](#endnote-2972) While women maintained community life in cooperation with other women, it was rare to see men ‘organising around a common purpose’, and when it happened — for example, in the context of a savings scheme — the initiative invariably ‘crumbles after a relatively short time’.[[2972]](#endnote-2973) Women never have free time, their day is ‘relentlessly busy from start to finish’, while the inverse is true for young males.[[2973]](#endnote-2974) Women ‘do everything’, they carry triple roles: reproductive (domestic, child caring and rearing, adult care, nursing of dependents, providing sustenance), productive (subsistence work including income generation), and community engagement (community-level work involving provision of items for collective consumption).[[2974]](#endnote-2975) For women to care for themselves and their dependents, they have to take risks, ‘including risking contracting HIV’.[[2975]](#endnote-2976) To get access to resources, women have no choice but to do ‘what a woman has to do’, including offering their bodies for transactional sex, while having to endure that men accuse them of ‘just wanting money’[[2976]](#endnote-2977) — for women, survival justifies even de-humanising themselves.[[2977]](#endnote-2978)

The predicament of young slum dwellers in Nairobi that Gary Page Jones documented offers a prime illustration of the ways in which honour and dignity differ, even though both connote a sense of personal worth. For a young woman in her role of being tasked with maintaining family and communal life, risk taking represents a path to dignity, namely, the dignity of being able to perform those tasks. A woman might sell her body to pay for HIV testing and feed her children whom she conceived through rape.[[2978]](#endnote-2979) Female slum dwellers face the cruel dilemma that they must access dignity through risk taking in a situation where this risk is being increased by their fellow males who on their part strive for honour in fear of honour humiliation. If males were to seek dignity, they would join their women in maintaining community life, yet, by striving for honour, they undermine the dignity of their women and of the entire community. Taking the risk of being infected is a survival path towards dignity in the lives of women, and a path towards masculine honour for men. Male risk taking is a path to their honour, yet, it spreads disease and unplanned pregnancies, thus endangering the dignity of all.

Sexual coercion as part of social mores of male dominance is, however, not limited to the slums of Nairobi, it is prevalent in all of Kenya.[[2979]](#endnote-2980) Females find themselves in a double bind everywhere — they are expected to bolster male honour through unprotected sex, only to find themselves left stranded with pregnancy and HIV infection. In this situation, it would be helpful if the internet were of support, yet, it only offers mixed messages, as sites with HIV messages on safe sex are posted alongside advertisements that provide pornography ‘with ample scenes glorifying “free sex”.’[[2980]](#endnote-2981) On top of this, the church inculcates ‘a fatalism in that one’s life has already been planned’, which, in turn, leads to ‘reluctance in attempting to reshape the natural order’.[[2981]](#endnote-2982) In sum, Kenyan society at large, both its women and its men, are the ultimate victims of patriarchal cultural-social-psychological mindsets and structures.

Gary Page Jones’ insights are relevant not just in Kenya — all over the world, men accept long-term adverse consequences for short-term proof of prowess.[[2982]](#endnote-2983) In the West as well, we encounter men who seek to manifest the glory of male prowess and honour among peers through ‘hunting’ — many follow the ‘four stereotypically masculine skills’ of ‘punching, drinking, fucking, and money’.[[2983]](#endnote-2984) The bulk of the perpetrators of the ‘child-rape epidemic’ that is increasingly being exposed, are men,[[2984]](#endnote-2985) and they are mainly to be found in professions such as ‘military, national security agencies, local police, state and federal law enforcement, judges, prosecutors, lawyers and educators’.[[2985]](#endnote-2986)

Arenas for ‘hunting’ and ‘glorious’ posturing and combat can be wilfully created at all levels, micro, meso, and macro. At micro levels, we see domestic violence, at meso levels, such arenas are created when hooligans provoke battle where there is none, and also when young men are recruited into war. ‘Young men are instrumentalised by the state using their energy and aggression, and that energy is about defining themselves as men. And they’re willing to risk a lot to define themselves as men’.[[2986]](#endnote-2987) At macro levels, politicians create these arenas when they reactivate the security dilemma by firing up conditions of war, be it to secure their position of power or to bolster their chances of getting re-elected by voters who value male honour.[[2987]](#endnote-2988) These politicians commit global honour killing, we may say, as they are killing for honour. Or, one could also say that they suffer from a Münchhausen syndrome by proxy, a phrase that describes caregivers who fabricate, exaggerate, or even induce health problems in those who are in their care with the aim to gain attention and recognition for themselves.

To summarise, we can say that duel-like violence and readiness to take impossible risks once promised male glory, and thus had a prominent place in dominator systems, a system that prevailed almost everywhere in the world during the past millennia. Still today, it draws men who embrace traditional masculinity scripts to aggressive posturing, and many feel that letting go of these scripts is too painful a sacrifice, even if the gains would be so much greater.[[2988]](#endnote-2989) Rather than allowing caring partnership to grow, some men prefer to engage in humiliation entrepreneurship to keep arenas for triumphant domination open. In times of global interconnectedness, this is not a small problem. A few honour-driven ‘heroic’ leaders can destroy all opportunities to have a decent life for future generations for the sake of their short-term personal aggrandisement and glory.

Peace psychologist Michael Britton has been a keen long-time observer of the men’s and women’s movements in the United States of America. He saw how women’s movements initially wanted to overcome the dominator system, aware that it harms men and women alike, an aim shared by early men’s movements. It ended, however, with adding yet another layer of destructive competition for domination. By now, backlashes come from all sides, the entire project of emancipation is being attacked and discredited by both men and women. Women discredit it when they betray the initial aim and adopt male dominator behaviour rather than transcending it, and men denounce the entire project by pointing at these women’s betrayal. ‘The women’s movement posed an alternative way of being human and running organisations’, Britton reports, however, only in the beginning, then this movement ‘largely became about joining the system as it was on an equal basis, as the civil rights and women’s movements essentially wanted in on the game’.[[2989]](#endnote-2990) Britton thinks that ‘for a men’s movement to mean anything to men it would have had to be about changing the game itself — as many of the women originally wanted’. However, there was no model of an alternative that most men were aware of or interested in at that time, as ‘the pressure to make a living within the system as it existed was great, and change was not something popularly being considered’.[[2990]](#endnote-2991)

Michael Britton predicted early on that the men’s movement would not catch on, and indeed it did not, rather, ‘while it did exist, the men’s movement splintered into sub-movements’.[[2991]](#endnote-2992) There was the promising ‘mytho-poetic’ sub-movement of Robert Bly, James Hillman, and Michael Mead, yet, other sub-movements ‘made a practice of berating men for character flaws’, while yet others ‘centred on a sense of being under assault by women and made denouncing the women’s movement their reason for being’.[[2992]](#endnote-2993) By now, two phenomena coexist in the broader culture, Britton explains:

First, valuing male dominant leadership has returned to prominence, with power-men wanting to keep empathy subordinate to power as the driver of relationships. Partly this is cultural and partly, for many men and some women, a kind of alarm reaction within to their own experience of empathy-vulnerability which they cannot tolerate within. Likewise, when empathy blossoms around them in organisational settings or the culture, they do to the people it blossoms in what they do to it when it comes up inside themselves: overpower it with power tactics and competence-claims logic.[[2993]](#endnote-2994)

Alongside the hardening of lines between gender-roles, however, Michael Britton also observes their softening. Some men are now ‘more actively concerned with their children, play more of a role in their children’s lives, and are more concerned to be considerate and attuned to their wives/partners’.[[2994]](#endnote-2995) Britton sees some within the upcoming generations ‘trying to break through the categories that allowed only certain features of humanness to be owned by men while others had to only belong to women’.[[2995]](#endnote-2996) In many parts of the U.S., Britton now observes ‘a trending among younger people to want all the features of humanness that previously were kept in separate boxes’.[[2996]](#endnote-2997) Michael Britton hopes that the U.S.A. is ‘on a multi-generational sociocultural journey towards everyone doing well with loving and being loved’.[[2997]](#endnote-2998) A young man from Congo, raised in London, seems to have heard Michael’s call, as he wrote a book in 2019 titled Mask off: Masculinity redefined.[[2998]](#endnote-2999)

When I look at my personal situation, I was lucky to have a father who had overcome toxic masculinity early in his life.[[2999]](#endnote-3000) Horrifying experiences of war in Nazi Germany, followed by post-war displacement, opened his eyes to the hollowness of macho posturing. Even though my father could not heal his body from war injury — his left arm was irretrievably lost — he had the stature and maturity to heal his soul from war injury. Until the day today, my father remembers how Hermann Göring, head of the Luftwaffe in WWII, once touted that he would take the name ‘Meier’ if a single enemy airplane were to enter German airspace.[[3000]](#endnote-3001) When enemy airplanes filled German airspace in the hundreds, my father, a young man then, wondered, ‘Where are you, Göring?’ When I was a young woman, I thought that most men resembled my father in the way he combines courage with wisdom, and this gave me a positive image of men. Over time, I had to realise, to my chagrin, that many men, while they may have courage, fail to invest it in wisdom. I learned, painfully, how some men, unlike my father, have to shred a woman ‘down to the last atom’ in order to protect their own sense of maleness. This is the famous Thucydides trap, only this time playing out at the personal and not at the international level — when an emerging power threatens an existing power, the latter might go to war.

German political scientist Herfried Münkler, in his work, chronicles how the notion of heroism (versus cowardice) of opponents facing each other in duel was hollowed out in the First World War when young heroic men were slaughtered like animals. The result by now, says Münkler, is a kind of systemic society-wide cowardice, as drones are used as weapons for targeted killings in a world of permanent war-like activities, a world far removed from the traditional sequence that once proceeded from war to negotiation to peace treaty to peace. Post-heroic societies still admire heroism, observes Münkler, except for the burden that heroism entails — ‘others should sacrifice, not me’ — and therefore, such societies opt for a kind of collective schizophrenia — indifference to their own indifference. Such post-heroic mindsets could indeed facilitate peace, Münkler argues, were it not for angry young men who feel that indifference is decadence, men who want to fight the ‘cowardice of non-violence’ by going on the barricades and heroically ‘take up the gun’.[[3001]](#endnote-3002) ‘The dominance of men endangers the survival of humanity’, is the verdict of a criminologist in Germany.[[3002]](#endnote-3003)

This is my conclusion: The masculinist script has always been dangerous, yet, in an interconnected world it becomes suicidal and omnicidal. This independent from whether this mindset is promoted and acted on by men or by women — I do not consider it progress that also women can take up leadership roles in the Mafia now. In an interconnected world, aspiring tyrants only create all-out defeat when they fight for victory, and even freedom from tyranny cannot be achieved through taking down the tyrant while leaving the system of tyranny and its tyrannical methods in place — even liberation movements only facilitate global tyranny when they employ past millennia’s practices. Writer and civil rights activist Audre Lorde was quoted before as saying that ‘the master’s tools will never dismantle the master’s house’.[[3003]](#endnote-3004)

Martial arts may offer a better script, as they combine ‘violence’ and ‘non-violence’ insofar as they let ‘the tyranny’ fall by its own force without getting crushed under it when it falls, at the same time planting seeds for a more nurturing future.

This is my call: If we want the global village to become a place of dignity in the future, men and women need to join hands and combine the best of traditional male and female role descriptions. In my personal life, I strive to bring together the virtues that are usually ascribed to femaleness — as there is, for example, sensitivity, softness, tenderness, and care — with the virtues that are typically associated with maleness — such as force, strength, braveness, and courage. I consider myself to be a human being first, and a woman second, and I strive to transcend outdated scripts of both femininity and masculinity. I reject the idea that gender equality is to be attained by women having to join a male world of competition for domination — for me, equality within a toxic context is not a worthy aim. In a game that ultimately damages all players, the entire game must be changed, it is not a solution for the players to adapt better to the hazardous rules of the game. Everyone benefits from co-creating a less damaging world.

As human rights ideals indicate that halting aggression with aggression is obsolete, the solution is the ‘firm love’ of the twenty-to-two approach to nurturing care (see chapter 12). The African proverb that indicates that ‘it takes a village to raises its children’ applies to the global village now. This village must follow the path of nurturing care rather than that of indifference or coercive force. It is in mortal danger when there are only two interpretations of masculinity on the table, either post-heroic indifference or violent honour. In this village, both men and women are called to leave behind the role of the violent ‘male dominator’ as much as the role of the indifferent bystander. What is needed is heroic love.

The better alternative for the future of all of us, irrespective of our sexual orientation, is to envision new ways of manifesting the dignity of unity in diversity. All of humanity needs to strive for mutually dignifying solidarity rather than mutual humiliation. We need a new kind of heroism, braveness, and courage, for the dignity work that is waiting to be done. Heroic courage of mutual care is required if we want to prevent our ‘Titanic Earth’ from sinking, and all passengers are called to engage in it. This is the deep adaptation that awaits to be manifested now, it is the creation of a non-toxic world for all living beings.[[3004]](#endnote-3005)

Danger looms wherever ‘manly courage’ is contrasted with the alleged cowardice of ‘female harmonising’, and ‘heroic fighting’ is set up against the purported weakness of ‘female care’. True courage asks for new manifestations of heroism, manifestations that pave the way to a tyranny-free future. Men and women need to dedicate themselves to the path of ‘female nurturing’, and this at a global scale. No longer can we accept a world with men in power who are proud of taking impossible risks. No longer can we wait until angry men from the bottom might wield their pitchforks.

In our history, we, as humankind, went from heroic-versus-unheroic to post-heroic, and now it is time to realise heroic willingness to sacrifice for the common good.[[3005]](#endnote-3006) The world needs courageous heroism and nurturing care, it needs the heroism of care and the heroism of dignity.

### When the feminine is repressed, collapse is the outcome

Humanity’s most damaging legacy of the past millennia is the preference given to ‘winning’ and ‘domineering’, while what is needed is nurturing. When nurturing is seen as negligible because it is ‘feminine’ and winning as desirable because it is ‘masculine’, collapse is bound to be the long-term outcome. When ‘the feminine’ in a society is repressed for the sake of competition for domination, defeat is the endgame, not victory.

Negligence and disregard for replenishment is a hideous killer, and not least the human body can illustrate this.[[3006]](#endnote-3007) When people are in danger, adrenaline rushes into their blood stream and the replenishment tasks of the body are put on hold. For a short while, this is tolerable, however, not for too long. Under conditions of continuous strain, when essential replenishment is neglected in never-ending states of emergency, the body breaks down. Heart attack — the typical emergency trouble-shooter collapse — is the outcome.[[3007]](#endnote-3008) In extension, when the nurturing of the relationships between us and nature remains unattended for too long, the result is ecological collapse. It is the kind of rapid breakdown that occurs when complex systems disintegrate — we call it Seneca cliff. Roman philosopher and writer Seneca wrote already in 65 CE that ‘increases are of sluggish growth, but the way to ruin is rapid’.[[3008]](#endnote-3009) Likewise, when the nurturing of the relationships in our communities is neglected and social cohesion is worn out, social collapse is the outcome.

The body collapses even faster when cancerous growth is promoted in an already weakened organism.[[3009]](#endnote-3010) Overload and undersupply are a recipe for demise also for the global village. When economic growth builds on the neglect of replenishment then the global village turns from a potentially decent village into a ramshackle village.

The coronavirus pandemic highlights how shortsighted it is to build economic growth on the neglect of care work. Images of nurses wearing trash bags as personal protective equipment during the virus outbreak in New York City in 2020 highlighted this predicament.[[3010]](#endnote-3011) Political analyst Naomi Klein reacted by saying that ‘the pivot here, the transformative moment here, has to do with grounding whatever is next in a valuing of that labour of care. We can never discard and devalue that labour ever again’.[[3011]](#endnote-3012)

Male supremacy was a pillar of the dominator model of society for so many millennia that it became normalised as ‘nature’s order’ to the point that many — men and women alike — perceive it as a humiliating violation of this order when women wish to be respected as equals. In recent years, this humiliation became compounded by ‘late capitalism’ insofar as ‘men see themselves called to greater things in life but are constantly reminded that they are mere worms in the compost of late capitalism — and that’s devastating’, writes sociologist Michael Kimmel, who attests that this humiliation is perceived as a form of emasculation.[[3012]](#endnote-3013) ‘Anti-genderism is the new right’s way of critiquing neoliberalism’.[[3013]](#endnote-3014) ‘Himpathy’ is rampant.[[3014]](#endnote-3015)

In a context where women are regarded as a threat, it is bound to become a problem that male children are of the opposite sex from their mother. The result is an unresolved conflict between the man’s need for and dependence upon women and a vague sense of threat and fear of a mystified image of WOMAN.[[3015]](#endnote-3016) We learn from the alt-right ‘red pill’ manosphere and the ‘black pill’ of ‘involuntary celibate’ incels that many heterosexual males perceive female sexuality as a humiliating threat (see also chapter 7).[[3016]](#endnote-3017)

The dominator model of society became so normalised that not only men, also many women wanted men at the top and women at the bottom. When I worked in Egypt as a psychological counsellor in the 1980s, I learned that for most women it was unthinkable to question this order. Eighty-six per cent of Egyptian women surveyed in 1995 thought that husbands were justified to hit their wife if she failed to put meals on the table in time or ‘refused sex’.[[3017]](#endnote-3018) Even though in most Western regions such drastic measures have lost their legitimacy — in Norway, for example, men lost the legal right to beat their disobedient wife in 1868 — there are still many women also today ‘who won’t move forward’, to use the words of historian Judith Allen.[[3018]](#endnote-3019) I have met many women, not least in my capacity as a psychotherapist, who continue to be impressed by ‘male master suppression techniques’, who still allow men to abuse them — the range of male techniques is wide, telling the woman she should ‘stop drama’ or ‘liberate herself from her ego’ are only two examples of many.[[3019]](#endnote-3020) Women who conceive of emancipation as a project where females should fill the role of the male dominator are also among those who fall short of true emancipation, as also they support a masculinist model of society.

Feminist Audre Lorde formulates my experience from all around the world better than I could ever express it:

As women, we have come to distrust that power which rises from our deepest and non-rational knowledge. We have been warned against it all our lives by the male world, which values this depth of feeling enough to keep women around in order to exercise it in the service of men, but which fears this same depth too much to examine the possibilities of it within themselves. So women are maintained at a distant/inferior position to be psychically milked, much the same way ants maintain colonies of aphids to provide a life-giving substance to their masters.[[3020]](#endnote-3021)

Veteran anti-apartheid activist Mamphela Ramphele calls on the world to understand that huge benefits flow from the leadership of progressive women, of women who demonstrate the power of the conceptually female values framework that ‘emphasises interconnectedness, interdependence, reciprocity, and intergenerational responsibilities and complementarities’.[[3021]](#endnote-3022) Both men and women can embrace this values framework.

‘The verdict of history will be harsh’, warns Jan Egeland, Secretary General of the Norwegian Refugee Council, pointing at the coronavirus pandemic and how it exposes the neglect of global care, as ‘wealthy nations leave millions behind with alarming funding disparities’.[[3022]](#endnote-3023)

I would add that the profit-driven amplification of vaccine hesitancy, together with the profit-driven failure to provide the entire world with sufficient vaccine doses, amounts to a crime against humanity perpetrated by all power holders and their supporters who still cling to the mindset of competition for domination.

More even, it amounts to a crime against humanity perpetrated by all power holders and their supporters to keep the planet awash in weapons and to drown and burn it.

### What once was called realism is now illusionary utopism

People who think and act from within the paradigm of a strong security dilemma often use the terminology of Realpolitik and pride themselves of being ‘realistic’. From their point of view, it is an inextricable part of human nature to want to fight and be violent, to prefer competition for dominance over peace, and that only dreamers can waste time on hoping that war and exploitation can be avoided. I meet this kind of realism often on my global path, it has found its way from the academic field of international relations theory into mainstream society — names such as Niccolò Machiavelli and Thomas Hobbes have become household names. Many ‘realists’ despair at people like me, who, in their eyes, succumb to what they see as effeminate and delusional ‘utopism’. They believe to be the only ones who are ‘realistic’ in the sense of accurate and that their way is the only reasonable way of seeing the world.

In international relations theory, realism is a school of thought that ranges from classical realism to neoclassical realism, with ‘offensive’ and ‘defensive’ versions. These theories see the state as the main actor in an anarchic international political system that has no supranational authority to enforce rules, leaving states that want to ensure self-preservation no choice but to strive for power.[[3023]](#endnote-3024) Realists have little sympathy for those other international relations theorists who espouse liberalism, who believe that inter-state war may be averted through international trade, the spread of democracy, or the ability of international institutions such as the United Nations to resolve disputes peacefully.

In the past, we could say, realism was ‘realistic’. As long as global trust building was not possible, the security dilemma was inescapable. However, we live in new times now, reality has overtaken realists and turned what they see as realism into illusionary utopism. ‘Those who are late will be punished by life’ is a sentence ascribed to Russian leader Mikhail Gorbachev, uttered in East Berlin in 1988 — in the German original, ‘Wer zu spät kommt, den bestraft das Leben’.[[3024]](#endnote-3025) By now, humanity as a whole risks being too late, as realities arrive on the horizon that are so new that traditional realism fails.

When global interconnectedness and ecological exhaustion introduce hitherto unknown risks, it is no longer feasible to keep the world politically divided. When one single angry hacker can bring down entire infrastructures from the farthest corner of the world, preparations for traditional warfare are no longer ‘realistic’. Such preparations resemble slag i luften, as one would say in Norway, or ‘blows in the air’, ‘air punches’. Such air punches characterise much of contemporary planning in the realms of both military and economic security, particularly after the futility of military and economic ‘air punches’ was shown to the world by Afghan Taliban in 2021.

Examples for air punches abound. After Donald Trump was elected as president of the United States in 2016, he ‘has taken steps to strengthen what President Eisenhower in his 1960 Farewell Address called the U.S. military-industrial-congressional-university complex’.[[3025]](#endnote-3026) Trump expanded on former President Obama’s defence programme and engaged ‘in the greatest conventional and nuclear weapons build-up in world history’, and this in the absence of a ‘clearly articulated diplomatic strategy aimed at the peaceful resolution of conflicts throughout the world’.[[3026]](#endnote-3027) It remains to be seen, how the successor of Donald Trump in 2021, Joseph Biden, will shape the military strategies of his country.

The African adage ‘It takes a village to raise a child’ needs to be paraphrased into ‘It takes the global village to unite in diversity to safeguard a dignified future for all’.[[3027]](#endnote-3028) Every citizen is called to help building global trust now. The global village is on call to provide itself with institutions that enable it to truly shoulder its responsibilities. Military security has to become human security as part of planetary ecological security.

I suggest that the academic field of inter-national relations theory be supplanted by global internal theory, or global inter-human relations theory.[[3028]](#endnote-3029)

### Transitions between irreconcilable systems need to be quick

Sociologist Max Weber’s notion of ideal types has been mentioned many times in this book. It operates with different layers of abstraction and action. Each level of abstraction and action has its own rules. Traffic is a metaphor that can illustrate these layers. It would be dictatorship to decree that all vehicles have to be black or green, for instance, while it is not dictatorship to decree a particular rule of the road, namely, on which side of the road vehicles should drive. Cultural differences and hot cycles of humiliation play out with regard to which rules belong to which level. For example, the wearing of seat belts in cars is no longer seen as dictatorship in Germany nor in the United States of America, while it would be considered dictatorship by many Americans to forbid the right to own a gun or to have universal health coverage. In Germany health coverage is like wearing a seat belt while the right to drive without speed limit on German highways is the equivalent to the American right to own a gun. In times of pandemic, is vaccination like a seat belt?

The traffic metaphor can highlight also why norms and mindsets of unequal worthiness are irreconcilable with those of equal worthiness, at least at their core, just like right hand driving cannot coexist with left hand driving in the same space (see also chapter 5). In the world of honour, freedom means that the strongest vehicles can do as they please while the weaker ones have to get out of the way. Human rights ideals, in contrast, require that all vehicles are treated equally and freedom is only granted with respect to the diversity of vehicle types and sizes — it is not necessary that all cars look alike, yet, it is necessary that all stop in front of red traffic lights. The aim of the human rights revolution is the transition from ‘the law of the strongest’ to ‘the law of the traffic light’. Just like left hand driving and right hand driving cannot coexist in the same space, also ‘the law of the strongest’ and ‘the law of the traffic light’ cannot coexist in the same space — every society must make a choice which rule of the road should apply.

There are many other ways to illustrate the core irreconcilability of equal and unequal worthiness. One is to look at a real-life situation that throws it into stark relief. I sometimes refer to my experience as a psychotherapist and report on what is known as honour killing or femicide. Honour killing is a term often used for the killing of a girl by her family with the aim to remedy humiliated family honour. A society cannot concurrently say, ‘We respect the dignity of the girl, therefore honour killing is wrong and she must live’ and ‘We respect all cultures, including honour cultures, and therefore, if killing the girl is what honour culture prescribes, we respect that the girl must die’. ‘The girl must die’ and ‘the girl must live’ are two mutually exclusive positions (see also chapter 5, note the case of Banaz in England[[3029]](#endnote-3030)).

To go back to the traffic metaphor, a society that wishes to transit from one rule of the road to the other, must do so preferably at one specific minute known to all, because otherwise accidents are pre-programmed. When we look at world society, we see that the transition from unequal to equal worthiness proceeds precisely in ways that are so uncoordinated that accidents are bound to happen. Even though all 193 member states of the United Nations have ratified at least one of the nine binding treaties following the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the situation on the ground is unclear. To use the traffic as illustration again, some people drive on the left side, others on the right side, and on top of this, many of those who preach right hand driving, practice left hand driving on the ground. They do so, for instance, when they define freedom to mean that everyone should be allowed to drive as they please, while overlooking that this finally translates into large vehicles dominating all crossroads. True human rights ideals require space for freedom to be carefully circumscribed, to be defined as space protected by rules that apply to all. They do so when they use the ‘social contest frame of dignity’ that defines dignity as ‘autonomy in a world of competition for domination’, whereas true human rights ideals require the use of the ‘social body frame of dignity’ of ‘equal dignity in a world of solidarity’ (see Michael Karlberg’s conceptualisation of different dignity frames in chapter 4).

As we see accidents increasing all around the world, many blame human rights ideals and call for a return to the old honourable dominator system. Human rights advocates have the enormous task of explaining to local and global communities that most accidents do not arise from within the new frame of human rights ideals, rather, they arise from the uncoordinated implementation of these ideals, from the fact that two irreconcilable moral universes are allowed to persist in the same space.

The solution is to implement the social body frame of equal dignity, and this very fast and with global coordination.

### Dialogue is more complex than domination/submission

Educator Paul Barnwell asks, ‘Is there any 21st-century skill more important than being able to sustain coherent, confident conversation?’[[3030]](#endnote-3031) Barnwell warns that ‘conversational competence is the single most overlooked skill we fail to teach’, as ‘kids spend hours each day engaging with ideas and each other through screens, but rarely do they have an opportunity to hone their interpersonal communications skills’.[[3031]](#endnote-3032)

In a dominator context, people learn how to issue and obey orders. Those who are in power positions need no justification except for ‘I dominate because I can’ when they apply overt and covert force on those at the bottom to keep them in submission. Those at the bottom are expected to reduce themselves to nothing more than obedience. A dominator system does not teach skills of mutually dignifying dialogue, it does not teach dignity communication, and therefore this is unfamiliar to most people.

In addition to being unfamiliar, dignifying dialogue among equals is also inherently more complicated than giving or obeying orders. It is much easier to simply perpetuate status-quo arrangements of domination and submission. The complexity of constructive dialogue becomes palpable when we look at the seven stages of the reconciliation pyramid that has been constructed as a heuristic tool for exploring reconciliation processes. These stages range from ‘narrative acquaintance’ to ‘narrative acknowledgement’, to ‘expressing empathy’, ‘the assumption of responsibility’, ‘readiness for restitution’, ‘asking and granting forgiveness’, and, finally, to ‘narrative integration’.[[3032]](#endnote-3033) Such complex stages require high levels of expertise in dignity communication to be accomplished, as there is ‘listening into voice’, ‘deliberative discourse and dialogue’, ‘constructive controversy’, ‘public deliberation’, ‘grappling with issues’, ‘connected knowing’, ‘let-it-flow thinking’, the Buberian ‘I-Thou orientation’, ‘waging good conflict’, and an emphasis on capabilities and human flourishing (see more in chapter 6).

Dialogue with nature is as difficult to manifest as dialogue among humans. Organic gardening, for instance, is a much more complex undertaking than maintaining monocultures, just as much as dignified dialogue among people is more complex than issuing commands or obeying them. Pesticide-controlled monocultures are easy to establish and seem very ‘efficient’ at first, yet, in the end, they destroy their own substrate, both soil and biodiversity.

We live in a world now that is filled with disconnected social and ecological monocultures, a world where nature is cut up into extractable resources, where people are separated from each other and from nature. While I write this book, a tiny coronavirus acts as a teacher. It is stronger than the strongest dominator, making blatantly clear that dominators are wrong about their assumption that they can dominate ‘because they can’, at least with respect to nature. The laws of nature ‘can more’ — they can crush human hubris.

The entire global community is now tasked with reaching new levels of expertise if it wants to shape a dignified future for people and planet. The responsibility lies on the shoulders of all of us. The adage that ‘it takes a village to raise a child’ applies to the entire global village more than ever before.[[3033]](#endnote-3034) This village needs to heed that holding its children with love and to teach them ‘conversational competence’ is more important than all modern amenities.[[3034]](#endnote-3035)

### Unity in diversity — a vitally important but unfamiliar principle

When we look up unity in diversity in the library or on the internet, we come across names such as Alexis de Tocqueville, Isaiah Berlin, Adam Smith, David Hume, Charles Sanders Peirce, Bernard Williams, and Hannah Arendt. We read that for the political philosophy of pluralism ‘to function and to be successful in defining the common good, all groups have to agree to a minimal consensus that shared values are at least worth pursuing. The most important baseline value is that of mutual respect or tolerance. If no such dialogue is possible, extremism and physical coercion are likely to be inevitable’.[[3035]](#endnote-3036)

Unity in diversity is the principle that makes equal dignity work. Yet, unfortunately, it is a rather unfamiliar principle. As most people are socialised into the mindset of domination and submission, they see unity in diversity as a zero-sum win-lose frame and think that unity is only achievable through sacrificing diversity and vice versa. I encounter this misunderstanding on all continents (read more in chapter 11).

What needs to be understood is that unity can be increased alongside with diversity, and, on top of this, that doing so creates a much higher level of quality of life than clinging to uniformity without diversity or to division without unity. The lying eight of the Möbius strip ∞ is an apt visualisation of unity in diversity as it makes visible that unity can be created out of diversity. It shows that the two sides of the eight, which represent diversity, can flourish without leading to division if the connection is nurtured at the same time.

Perhaps the most difficult insight to grasp is that this connection can never be made static once and for all. The continuous balancing of this connection is the most demanding skill to learn. Unity in diversity can only succeed through continuous re-calibration and re-adaptation, it requires a deep understanding of the ‘affective limitations and potential’ of the two mechanisms of consensus and complementarity.[[3036]](#endnote-3037)

It helps to know that the need for continuous balancing is an advantage rather than a disadvantage, that it is not a sign of failure nor weakness, on the contrary, embracing it is a sign of strength. A ‘strong leader’ is one who allows for dissent and then balances it, who nurtures consensus through relational care, in contrast to a leader who enforces consensus ‘with a strong hand’. This is perhaps why women-led countries fared better in the coronavirus pandemic that rages while I write these lines. Women’s traditional role description is that of nurturing balance, seemingly ‘weak’ at first, yet, at the end, it is often stronger than the patriarchal role description of strength.[[3037]](#endnote-3038)

Young sociologist Aladin El-Mafaalani was introduced in chapter 4. He hails from Syria and lives in Germany. He makes the point that integration can become successful even where it seems to fail at first glance. When integration succeeds, it does not mean that society will become more homogeneous, harmonious, or conflict-free. On the contrary, new conflicts arise when society grows together and people become included who were not part of the discourse before.[[3038]](#endnote-3039) The result is peace built on lively dialogue rather than peace built on people being silenced into uniformity through the suppression of diversity. In other words, it is hard work for a society to unite in diversity — it is hard work to make the connection between the two sides of the Möbius strip stronger while both sides grow bigger — yet, the resulting integration is worth it. Bumps on the way can be a sign of success rather than failure.

The contact hypothesis was first proposed by psychologist Gordon Allport in 1954, suggesting that contact between people will foster friendship.[[3039]](#endnote-3040) As Aladin El-Mafaalani’s remarks suggest, this hypothesis is overly optimistic, because bringing people together can also worsen relationships. Simply bringing the two sides of the Möbius strip into proximity without nurturing the connection is unwise. More effort is needed. The minimal group paradigm is a methodology employed in social psychology showing the fragility of that connection and how easily it can break. Even the most banal in-group/out-group differences can divide a group,[[3040]](#endnote-3041) and even the most coherent in-groups can fracture when resources become scarce or rank is contested.[[3041]](#endnote-3042) Similarly, as long as all involved hold the belief that uniformity without diversity is the ideal condition for a group — that there should only be one large sphere and no Möbius strip with two spheres — unity across differences will remain wanting.

The contact hypothesis needs very specific conditions to do what it promises. It needs (1) equal status, (2) cooperation, (3) common goals, and (4) institutional support.[[3042]](#endnote-3043) To say it differently, contact fosters friendship only when common superordinate goals are in place that have institutional support, goals that are attainable and determined by consenting equals.[[3043]](#endnote-3044) Incidentally, for the first time in human history, all these conditions are met, locally and globally. We, as humankind, can create ‘local and global friendship’ if we embrace the survival of all in dignity as our unifying common superordinate goal (3), if we furthermore use the knowledge we possess to attain this goal by creating the kind of global institutions (4) that manifest human rights ideals of respect for diversity in equal dignity (1), and if we cooperate in solidarity to balance unity in diversity (2).[[3044]](#endnote-3045)

Subsidiarity is the way to operationalise unity in diversity — it means centralising as little as possible and localising as much as possible. The European Union — notwithstanding its many flaws and failures — has so far succeeded in safeguarding relative continental peace after centuries of mayhem by using this principle.[[3045]](#endnote-3046) Applied to the global level, it means that global challenges require centralised institutional frames while other aspects of life need to be dealt with at local levels. The cultural traditions of the Sami in the north of Scandinavia, for instance, or any other local tradition, cannot be directed from New York or Brussels, while the climate crisis cannot be successfully addressed without global solutions.

At the current point in historical time, the greatest hurdle for subsidiarity to succeed globally is the lack of supranational political structures capable of attending to the supranational ecological, economic, and scientific challenges the world faces. Either we have to globalise our politics, or we have to de-globalise ecology, economy, and science, is the conclusion of historian Yuval Harari.[[3046]](#endnote-3047) Since the latter is impossible, there is no alternative to doing the first, and to do so by following the principle of unity in diversity, at least if humankind wishes to survive in dignity — rather than only survive or demise in indignity. The globality of life-threatening challenges leaves no other choice than to make it our common superordinate goal to globalise our politics.[[3047]](#endnote-3048)

How can global unity in diversity look like? International relations scholar Steven Roach discusses the fragile relationship between the kind of unity envisioned by liberal internationalism and the kind of diversity embraced by cultural pluralism. He warns that liberal multiculturalism unintentionally opens the door for diversity to degrade into division when it seeks to overcome the us-versus-them dichotomy by way of group-differentiated rights designed to empower minority groups — autonomy, polyethnic rights, and special representational rights.[[3048]](#endnote-3049) The danger with this approach, he warns, is that illiberal forces — strongmen who incite hostile right wing nationalist sentiment — can easily capture the very infrastructure of multiculturalism and use it retrogressively to limit civil liberties and individual autonomy.[[3049]](#endnote-3050) ‘Think globally and act locally’ fails when localism becomes parochialism, and this is precisely the case now, as ‘many of the world’s current counter-globalisation trends appear steeped in parochialism, right wing populism, and racism’.[[3050]](#endnote-3051)

Steven Roach puts important questions on the table. What if the liberal international order is in trouble not in spite of decency but because of it? In our struggle to conduct ourselves morally in relation to others, to act with integrity, tolerance, and courage in protecting the dignity of all persons, what if the notion of decency is caught in a ‘moral silo’ where its ideological strands contradict basic decency? What if notions of decency mirror our biases and incite divisive identity politics rather than neutralising them? What if managing diversity from above, from the state and from global levels, is perilous? If we wish to create global unity through spreading the message of decency, if we wish ‘to resolve the cultural, social, and political sources of group and individual humiliation and exclusion’, what should we do?[[3051]](#endnote-3052)

Lately, I met Natalie Porter, past president of the International Council of Psychology, and she asked me the core question, ‘What if people feel humiliated by others’ definition of dignity?’[[3052]](#endnote-3053)

To solve this quandary, Steven Roach advises to heed the diverse sensibilities of what fair treatment represents, as these sensibilities were shaped by the contradictory forces of the historical trajectory of notions such as honour and dignity. If not, Roach warns, moral progression may spawn backlashes of political retrogression. Roach suggests averting the threat of political retrogression by defining basic decency as a ‘pluralistic, open-ended global moral propriety’,[[3053]](#endnote-3054) he opts for ‘diversifying decency rather than merely seeking to restore it through the revamping of the existing liberal rules and principles of the global order’.[[3054]](#endnote-3055)

We can formulate Roach’s advice also in terms of unity in diversity by saying that even decency can fall into the traps of oppressive uniformity, and when this happens, diversity needs to be rescued so that unity can re-emerge and basic decency be protected. Or, to use the image of the Möbius strip and connect it with the contact hypothesis, we can say that basic decency is only attainable when all participants agree to the supranational goal of nurturing the connection between different definitions of decency, rather than one side trying to swallow the other.

Anthropologist Arturo Escobar offers similar advice when he suggests that we should say ‘Many Yeses’ to multiple transformative alternatives while saying ‘One No’ to neo-liberal globalisation as a path to ‘designs for the pluriverse’.[[3055]](#endnote-3056) If ‘the global’ is going to be anything at all, Escobar advises, ‘it should be the result of a politics of solidarity across place-based and regional struggles, in all directions (south, north, east, west), more than up/down’.[[3056]](#endnote-3057) International relations scholar Matthew Weinert chimes in by proposing a world order and global governance structures of human dignity in which differences between human beings are no longer used to justify humiliating, exclusionary, and murderous practices that strip people of their humanity and dignity.[[3057]](#endnote-3058) Arthur Dahl, president of the International Environment Forum, speaks up for the kind of global governance that ‘can ensure world peace, protect and manage the global environmental commons, eliminate corruption, and extreme inequality, and ensure national autonomy and diversity in a spirit of subsidiarity’.[[3058]](#endnote-3059)

The United Nations organisation could be seen as a worthy starting point for the supranational goal of building a dignified global future, yet, as for now, it only represents the secretariat of a ‘club of nations’, which are disunited more often than they are united — some call the United Nations the ‘united necrologists’, or even the creators of death.[[3059]](#endnote-3060) Experts working in global settings criticise ‘that the UN has very little understanding of what tools might initiate or drive reconciliation’.[[3060]](#endnote-3061)

The United Nations are caught in all the problems discussed earlier, most importantly the uncoordinated and slow implementation of the social body frame of equal dignity. The United Nations Sustainable Development Goals may serve as an example, as they comprise internally contradicting goals.[[3061]](#endnote-3062) Goal 8, for instance, has the potential to undermine all other goals in that it ‘lumps together important need-related goals — participation in work and acceptable conditions in work — with economic growth, a questionable means to achieving these goals’.[[3062]](#endnote-3063) ‘The UN’s sustainable development goals... are clearly not going to be met without drastic recalibration’, warns Philip Alston, outgoing UN special rapporteur on extreme poverty and human rights, as ‘the SDG framework places immense and mistaken faith in growth and the private sector’.[[3063]](#endnote-3064)

We held our 2017 Dignity Conference in Indore in India, and I reminded everyone of philosopher Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan, post-war president of India and former Oxford University professor. In 1931, he took part in the planning of the predecessor of UNESCO, the League of Nations’ International Commission on Intellectual Cooperation. It would be nice to have him with us now, I said, as he could bring the panchayati raj system of self-government to today’s world, a system practiced in Indian villages that could serve as a model to inspire worldwide unity in diversity.[[3064]](#endnote-3065) Radhakrishnan could surely also help small populations who formerly had no voice to claim their unique cultural and geographical spaces, and this without endangering overall unity.[[3065]](#endnote-3066)

To conclude, in an interconnected finite world, all are called to unite as equals in diversity and help co-create global constitutive rules that enable global politics to work for basic decency for all, globally as much as locally.

### New conflicting fault lines emerge on top of old ones

People who live far away from each other and are unaware of each other’s existence have no reason to be afraid of being conquered or raided. Many early foragers were lucky enough to live under such circumstances, they were simply too isolated. Even those who were less isolated were able to migrate relatively unimpeded as long as they were few and the wild food that surrounded them was abundant. Largely, this was the case during roughly the first 97 per cent of human history.[[3066]](#endnote-3067) Archaeologists tell us that Late-Pleistocene foragers led remarkably healthy lives and were able to connect over vast areas — settlement patterns and rock art demonstrate that all of Northern Europe, for instance, up to the high north of Scandinavia, was once one single mutually connected social territory without borders.[[3067]](#endnote-3068)

For the past decades, I have followed the large body of research that looks into what happened with our ancestors as time went forward, and my aim was to distil out those lessons that can be helpful in our present time of crises. The most fruitful approach, in my view, and I have widely discussed this elsewhere in this book, is to focus on the phenomenon of circumscription.

A few thousand years ago, around the time of what we call the Neolithic Revolution, the world of Late-Pleistocene foragers began to change drastically.[[3068]](#endnote-3069) If planet Earth were larger, we would still be free to follow wild food, yet, the surface of planet Earth is limited. At some point, this circumscription was bound to affect our forebears’ population campaign. To say it very simplified, at some point, beginning roughly twelve thousand years ago, the human condition transmuted from a win-win into the win-lose situation of ‘either we have this valley or they have it’.[[3069]](#endnote-3070) This set of circumstances solidified throughout the past millennia, so it became increasingly harder to uphold the kind of unbounded cooperation that our foraging predecessors once practiced. As the world filled up and one group became pitted against the other, cooperation became subservient to competition for domination against out-groups — increasingly, ‘we cooperated against them’, no longer ‘we cooperate with you’.

Deep fault lines began to divide one group from its neighbouring group — the security dilemma emerged.[[3070]](#endnote-3071) Arms races were unleashed in the hope for lasting peace and prosperity through winning victories over others. Unfortunately, the outcome was never-ending insecurity, only the borders between opponents shifted continuously. Within borders, over time, new kinds of citizenship evolved, from early city-states of ancient Greece that defined citizenship in terms of biology — by one’s parents, gender, and age — to the Roman Empire that conceived of citizenship as the legal status of rights holders, and, finally, fast forward, the modern state issue passports that link a citizen’s nationality with a geographic locality. The coronavirus pandemic reminded everyone that passports work like ‘elastic bands’ that tie ‘the holder to a geographical point’.[[3071]](#endnote-3072)

At the current point in history, as the world interconnects globally as never before, humanity faces yet another turning point, as dramatic as twelve thousand years ago. We face more than just win-lose conditions, we face the historical challenge of potential lose-lose outcomes. While cooperation in a win-win context is relatively easy to accomplish, and a win-lose situation requires already much more effort,[[3072]](#endnote-3073) this is nothing compared with the challenges of a lose-all situation. In a globally interconnected world ‘every war has two losers’.[[3073]](#endnote-3074) On a planet where resources become depleted beyond repair when their finiteness is overlooked,[[3074]](#endnote-3075) the only solution is to abandon the illusion of winning peace and prosperity through victories, be it victories over people or nature. The only solution is to nurture cooperation, trust, and solidarity at a global scale.[[3075]](#endnote-3076)

Remarkably, for the first time in human history, it is feasible to do just that, to nurture global cooperation, trust, and solidarity. Globalisation — or, more precisely, the shrinking of the world, the ingathering of humanity — opens a pathway for a global citizens movement to emerge and undo the security dilemma. Never before did humankind inhabit a single global village where nothing is ‘foreign’ anymore. A ministry for global internal affairs — a ministry for global trust building — is viable, it can replace local ministries of foreign affairs and local ministries of defence.[[3076]](#endnote-3077) Through a ministry for internal global affairs, Gandhi’s maxim There is no path to peace. Peace is the path can flourish, and it is high time to achieve this — after all, 2019 was the 150th anniversary of Gandhi’s birth.

Unfortunately, in the twenty-first century, several new cleavages make it difficult to travel this promising road towards global unity in diversity. Even if the classical security dilemma were successfully undone, a new split runs between the proverbial global ‘superclass’ and the rest of the planet’s population now, subsumed in the phrase ‘extractive globalisation’.[[3077]](#endnote-3078) While the tenet of the classical security dilemma was If you want peace, prepare for war, the tenet of the new dilemma is If you want prosperity, invest in exploitation. Strongmen often merge those two tenets into If you want prosperity and consume it in peace, invest in war-like exploitation.

Regrettably, as it stands now, ‘strongmen’ exhaust planet Earth’s resources and weaken the capacity of local communities to stay connected in mutual solidarity. The promotion of fake news and hate speech is one of their rather successful tools.[[3078]](#endnote-3079) This tool provides all advantages of divide-and-rule strategies and thus facilitates the plunder of the ecological and social-psychological commons. Fake news strategies follow ancient Chinese general Sun Tzu’s advice that ‘the supreme art of war is to subdue the enemy without fighting’,[[3079]](#endnote-3080) and they follow the method of Nazi leaders to ‘surf’ on the sense of fear, frustration, and humiliation in a population. The result is the rise of global mistrust rather than trust.

Another fault line divides those who want to ‘save the world’ internally. In former times, when people staged liberation movements and uprisings, dominators were toppled and the dominator system was kept in place. In contrast, in an interconnected world informed by human rights ideals, the system of domination itself needs to be transcended. Dangerous cleavages arise between those who want to take only the first step and those who aim at taking both steps. It is the fault line that separates those wo want to ‘take up the gun’ and ‘rise to the top’ in a new dominator system from those who wish to build a world where all meet as equal partners ‘in the middle’. The ‘gunners’ typically accuse the ‘builders’ of ‘selling out’, while overlooking that in an interconnected world it is rather the path of the gun that will sell out humanity’s future and spell global collective suicide.

The latter fault line can also go deeper. Some people aim at more than domination, they attempt to unravel the present level of global interconnectedness, they aim to re-divide the world. The likelihood of this to succeed increases with the perceived level of threat in the world. Research in the field of ‘disgustology’ can shed light on this predicament. This research shows that progressive social liberals are rather universalists, while threat breeds more parochialism in conservatives.[[3080]](#endnote-3081) Of six moral foundations — care/harm, fairness (equality)/cheating, liberty/oppression, loyalty/betrayal, authority/subversion, and sanctity/degradation — liberals tend to endorse care and equality primarily, whereas conservatives resonate with all six moral foundations.[[3081]](#endnote-3082) This difference can be found across cultures, nationalities, and ethnicities, replicating what in Anglo-Saxon terminology is identified as ‘liberals’ versus ‘conservatives’. This difference manifests even in the body, as persons with more taste receptors on their tongue tend to be more conservative, while those with less receptors lean towards stances that are more progressive. Authoritarians have strong gag reflexes and react with disgust, for instance to homosexual orientations.[[3082]](#endnote-3083) Moral disgust is deeply related to the body’s food rejection system, meaning that ‘there is quite a bit of oral in moral experience, almost certainly for divinity violations and perhaps even for autonomy violations’.[[3083]](#endnote-3084) ‘Disgustology’ has therefore become the nickname for this field of research.[[3084]](#endnote-3085) As reported earlier, psychologist Silvan Tomkins’ has described humiliation as a combination of three affects: shame, disgust, and ‘dissmell’.[[3085]](#endnote-3086) While liberals have problems putting themselves into the shoes of conservatives, conservatives can easily describe liberal views, and they are disgusted by what they see.

If we map these insights onto the past millennia of human history, we understand why most people still today feel at home in the conservative moral matrix of the dominator model of society and have problems with the idea of partnership, let alone global partnership. Given that a context of threat brings parochial conservatism to the fore,[[3086]](#endnote-3087) and given that people lived in the grip of threat throughout the past millennia due to the security dilemma, we understand that conservative parochialism was bound to be the norm. This is why I posit that the human ‘default’ orientation is ‘liberal’ (chapter 3), but was forced into a ‘conservative’ direction by adverse circumstances. This is what I call the war injury caused by the security dilemma, an assault on human nature by the threat generated by the perpetual possibility of attack from outside.[[3087]](#endnote-3088) The dominator model of society thus represents an ‘abnormal normality’, it was abnormal for human nature, it was only normal due to the acute sense of fear the security dilemma infused into all societies as a background constant.[[3088]](#endnote-3089)

Immediately before and after the Second World War, the dominator mindset briefly softened, it was during the ‘golden twenties’ and the ‘make love not war’ counter-culture of the 1960s, which inspired people in many world regions, not just in Western societies. Hope for a peacefully united human family found a short time window to flourish. This hope is waning now. We live in a time where the level of perceived threat is on the rise again and anger and disgust increase. In many parts of the world, ‘rightists’ go on the barricades, raging against ‘liberal’ universalism, angered by ‘liberal’ emphasis on diversity.[[3089]](#endnote-3090) In Germany, rightists accuse progressives of running what they call an ‘Umvolkung’, a ‘permanent replacement of the German people by illegal intruders’.[[3090]](#endnote-3091) In Norway in 2011, a young man, Anders Behring Breivik, killed the youngest members of the country’s social democratic party because he believed they were part of a Cultural Marxist plot to undermine the traditional values of his fatherland.[[3091]](#endnote-3092)

We are at a point in historical time where all cleavages need urgent healing, those between states caused by the age-old security dilemma, as much as the cleavage between the proverbial global ‘superclass’ and the rest, as well as all fault lines for which conservative and progressive revolutionaries alike are responsible when they use outdated dominator methods.

My conclusion is that progressives bear the responsibility to explain to their friends who wish to ‘take up the gun’ that this is a method derived from the very dominator system they want to overcome. Likewise, progressives bear the responsibility to explain to conservatives that re-dividing an interconnected world, as attractive as it may seem at first glance in times of rising fear, is bound to have disastrous collectively suicidal consequences. Social psychologists simulate the future of the world with an experiment called the global change game. They found that the world became highly militarised and eventually entered the stage of nuclear war until the entire population of the Earth had to be declared dead if authoritarians played the game.[[3092]](#endnote-3093) In an interconnected world, strategies of ‘we against them’ are suicidal at the end.

Both conservatives and progressives need to move towards mutual trust building by reaching out to each other — ‘understanding the enemy’ so as to overcome enmity is now obligatory. Understanding an adversary’s views does not mean that one sympathises with the adversary or condones their behaviour, one will not be ‘tainted’ by the experience.[[3093]](#endnote-3094) ‘Understanding is not the same as condoning’ and ‘describing is not the same as prescribing’.[[3094]](#endnote-3095) Even disgust can be overcome. Many will be astonished to hear that people once reacted with disgust to the teachings of Copernicus, as his thoughts were regarded as a violation of the beauty of the divine order. Today, people enjoy the very beauty of Copernicus’ insights.[[3095]](#endnote-3096)

The coronavirus pandemic that unfolds while I write these sentences, entails both, the potential to heal fault lines and the risk to deepen them. New global institutions built on solidarity economics can overcome present-day small-state neo-liberalism, they can avert that the world descends into ‘authoritarian capitalism’, into a combination of racist authoritarian nationalism and unbridled neo-liberal globalisation that destroys all chances for a dignified future.[[3096]](#endnote-3097) If this fails, the security dilemma will re-emerge and further deepen the commons dilemma, and vice versa, and also the new cleavages will sharpen. This will have suicidal consequences.

Planet Earth is our lifeboat, we either all swim together or all sink together, and those who think they will be safe on the luxury top floor of Titanic are mistaken.[[3097]](#endnote-3098) A world of global unity in diversity is the solution. Unity in diversity can be nurtured in synchrony, it is a win-all game, local loyalty and global responsibility in combination can heal all fault lines.[[3098]](#endnote-3099) All people can unite in a shared effort to protect cultural and biological diversity in dignity.

### Some human rights defenders betray their own values

Throughout the past decades, human rights ideals of equal dignity in solidarity were often promoted only in rhetoric, while betrayal was the practice on the ground. Particularly guilty of this betrayal is the privileged Global North, and from there it spread into the rest of the world.[[3099]](#endnote-3100)

On my global path, I observe that most people, both in the Global North and in the Global South, treat present-day global economic arrangements as if they represent a law of nature that only needs to be left to its own devices to fulfil all human rights ideals. Many regard it as a given that the correct path to achieving freedom and well-being for all is through investors creating ‘jobs’, so that people can ‘earn a living’ and, if possible, pay some taxes to finance governments and make necessary state institutions viable. ‘We are no charity’ has become the motto of corporations, ‘profit is our raison-d’être’, and many enact the motto, ‘If you want prosperity, invest in exploitation’. Problems are being individualised and psychologised — corrupt individuals are blamed, not the logic of the system. Conspiracy narrators profit from this arrangement when they channel growing frustration and distrust away from the system into anger against a few individuals.

Extreme climate crises, even though they hold the potential to be wake-up calls, are welcomed by many as major investing opportunities for the stock, bond, and futures markets.[[3100]](#endnote-3101) Even the coronavirus pandemic that unfolds while I write these lines, fills certain coffers.[[3101]](#endnote-3102) The harm that these arrangements create could motivate more care and responsibility, yet, it spurs even more competition for domination and exploitation, if it is not simply overlooked or denied. Economic systems are applauded for ‘lifting people out of poverty’ while in plain text they invite people into a consumerist lifestyle that the planet cannot sustain and push those who are left behind into even more precariousness.

Many alleged ‘successes’ are short-lived and paid for by long-term sociocide and ecocide, by the destruction of the foundations of life for all in the end. This state of affairs has been called ‘systemic madness’ — making a living through destroying the planet.[[3102]](#endnote-3103)

For a long time, most Westerners were blind to their complicity in the betrayal their path entailed, they could uphold a self-soothing illusion of superiority not least because they outsourced the consequences of their exploitation out of sight so that only people and nature on other continents were exposed.[[3103]](#endnote-3104) Most Westerners are still today unaware that each of them, simply by leading a normal life in the West, statistically enslaves the equivalent of sixty people in the rest of the world.[[3104]](#endnote-3105) When the rainforests of this world are on fire, when storms and floods ravage distant continents, dramatic imageries reach Western media outlets soon to be forgotten, while what remains unseen is the slower and more subtle destruction caused by their own complicity in activities such as agribusiness or mass tourism. Worse, dramatic pictures are often followed by messages of exculpation for the West, withholding information about the West’s involvement in amplifying these problems in the first place. Western audiences are misled to believe that the problems with fires and floods in far-flung places can and will be solved by the local victims, while the Global North can remain blind to its own responsibility. I observe this gap wherever I go on my global path and it pains me hugely.

I noted with respect that the former German environment minister understood this situation, yet, I also observed how his warnings went largely unheard, when he complained that his ministry for development cannot undo the damage caused by the same government’s ministry of economic affairs — the term ‘trade agreement’ sounds like fairness while it may entail extortion.[[3105]](#endnote-3106) Similarly, I meet the most disbelieving eyes among my well-settled Western friends when I talk about their responsibility, some even accuse me of humiliating them and diminishing their achievements of which they are proud. They believe in their own ‘hard work’ as the sole source of their ‘imperial way of living’, they overlook that it may be hubris built on the exploitation of others who have to work much harder.

To say it short, first, the Global North aggravates problems by incentivising exploitation, and then, when the damage becomes apparent, the exploiters continue to blissfully indulge in the self-righteous belief of being ‘immaculate’ human rights defenders, while leaving it to the exploited to mitigate the outfall.

This is triple humiliation. I made this argument in my talk in the parliament of the Amazonian state of Pará in Belém, the capital of Pará, on the Amazon Day, the 5th of September 2019.[[3106]](#endnote-3107) The Amazon rainforest had just been set on fire and German media absolved their shocked readers by placing all hopes for rescue on the local victims.[[3107]](#endnote-3108) In Belém, I apologised to my Brazilian friends.

When the victims of exploitation take to their heels and migrate, or even turn to terror, many in the West react with astonishment. It comes as a surprise to them when backlashes come their way and they react with indignation when they are reminded of their complicity. When they ultimately are negatively impacted themselves — when sociocide and ecocide affect the West as well — many choose to scapegoat the worse-off victims, precisely the refugees and migrants.

Not just the rainforests of the world are on fire by now. Half of the planet is on fire while the other half drowns in floods. The image of a burning Titanic on its way down is apt. Why are not more people rushing to rescue? Are they simply blind, or is there more to it? Perhaps it is active unawareness? Perhaps it is fear of having to let go of an immaculate sense of self-righteousness? How did ‘the economy of spoilage and mass consumption’ begin, how did the ‘imperial model of living’ start?[[3108]](#endnote-3109) Why is it so difficult to end it?

It helps to go back to the year 1845 to see how the present industrial order of throughput began and why it is so difficult to halt it. It was the time when the guano era began, the exploitation of Peruvian guano and nitrates. From then on, ‘the interests of capital and sections of labour in the exploitation of nature were increasingly aligned’:

A profound tension arose between workers who developed a masculine pride in being at the forefront of the conquest of nature and the expansion of ‘civilisation’ and the workers in the colonial and neo-colonial zones who maintained a relation to the land as they were asked to degrade it...[[3109]](#endnote-3110)

This is what I said in 2019 in the Brazilian Amazon, invited by farsighted young politician Dirceu Ten Caten: As long as the interests of workers in the West ‘remain aligned with capitalist profitability’ and thus with ‘extractive and polluting industries’, the result will be that these workers ‘are likely to use their power to demand a greater share of the spoils’.[[3110]](#endnote-3111) Workers may even call for ‘eco-nationalism’, they may support the development of green national economies that ‘effectively outsource environmental harm to the countries that supply the indium for solar panels, the lithium for batteries, the neodymium for turbines, etc., while hoarding green tech patents and know-how’.[[3111]](#endnote-3112)

In this situation, even the use of notions such as decency can worsen the situation, as scholar Steven Roach has warned, namely, when decency is associated with the emotive justice of compassion and love, and then ‘prescribed’ and ‘imposed’ as a liberal standard ideal, while overlooking the mistreatment people experience in the global system.[[3112]](#endnote-3113) Roach, in his chronicle of decency’s complex evolution and contradictions, therefore proposes a heterodox idea of decency as a way forward, a plurality of ways of practicing decency to protect dignity outside of the liberal world order.[[3113]](#endnote-3114)

To return to the metaphor of the burning and sinking ship, we could say that the privileged inhabitants on the luxury first floor are still somewhat less affected — in places like Germany, for instance, where I am writing these lines. While people work hard in their jobs, convinced of being on the right side of human rights ideals and decency, they are ignorant of the fact that many of their jobs put fuel into the fire. When they are tired from work, they go on vacation in parts of the hull of the ship that are still relatively unaffected, tourist beaches, for instance. They may throw some ice cubes on the fire, yet, they keep the fire hoses safely stored in the museum section of the ship and accuse whoever wants to take them out of spoiling the fun. Future generations — if there will be future generations — will accuse their parents and grandparents: Why did you support such a system? How could you not have known about the destruction you were complicit in?

Particularly young Germans should know better. When Adolf Hitler was at the peak of his power, he plundered the coffers of the countries he had subdued and thus financed favours for the German population to keep them placated. Kraft durch Freude (Strength through Joy) was a large state-operated leisure organisation in Nazi Germany, the world’s largest tourism operator of the 1930s.[[3114]](#endnote-3115) It was part of the German Labour Front, the national German labour organisation at the time, set up as a tool to promote the advantages of National Socialism to an ‘Aryan’ population. When it all ended in collapse, older Germans faced the same accusation from their offspring: How could you not have known about the destruction you were complicit in?

Even the coronavirus crisis does not seem to awaken the West. Many simply want to ‘go back to normality’, oblivious of the fact that this normality brought the crisis. They waste the opportunity offered by the current anthropause to rethink the ways we arrange our affairs on planet Earth.[[3115]](#endnote-3116) My message is therefore: If we continue in this way, all of us will become refugees without refuge, humanity will be a ship in distress without lifeboats.

The way out of this predicament is to begin with engaging in more intellectual humility and self-reflection.[[3116]](#endnote-3117) It is to go beyond the ‘masculinist’ vision of people as ‘separate, self-contained, economic and merely self-interested subjects’,[[3117]](#endnote-3118) it is to treat all people as whole human beings in networks of interdependency in all three ecologies, social, subjective, and natural.[[3118]](#endnote-3119) It is to use the ‘social body frame of dignity’ that is defined as ‘equal dignity in a world of solidarity’.[[3119]](#endnote-3120) It is to listen to ethicists such as Martha Nussbaum who goes beyond philosopher John Rawls and his concept of a decent society when she emphasises the important role of love for a shared moral commitment to justice that is global.[[3120]](#endnote-3121)

Love awaits to be manifested in our global systems in a plurality of ways, so that the dignity of mutual care and solidarity can flourish in all aspects of life.

### Some definitions of dignity undermine dignity

What is dignity? Author Umair Haque has this to say, Dignity is ‘hard to pin down, define, fill in. But we all know what it means when we see it’.[[3121]](#endnote-3122) Haque defines dignity as follows:

Dignity is a minimum level of well-being below which one’s life cannot fall. There are many kinds of well-being — the strength and breadth of one’s relationships, one’s financial security, one’s intelligence and wisdom, one’s empathy and courage, one’s happiness and meaning. When one is shielded from losing all these things below some level, then one has dignity. What is the shield? The job of a social contract is to ensure that the average person can be rich in all these things — genuinely, not just materially, rich. And that is what dignity is.[[3122]](#endnote-3123)

Bonnie Selterman has been teaching human communication and culture at New York University for many years.[[3123]](#endnote-3124) She has many questions about dignity: If dignity is inherent, she asks, it must be inviolable, is not this true? How can we then claim it is violable? Is dignity a state of mind, is one’s dignity violated if one feels and experiences one’s dignity has been violated? If the violation of dignity were a purely subjective state of mind, there would be no outside objective metric for determining the violation of dignity. In addition, if someone for some reason does not ‘know’ that her dignity has been violated, it must not have been violated. For example, what about women who simply accept their submissive status?

Indeed, when I worked in Egypt from 1984 to 1991, I asked myself the same questions. As reported earlier, eighty-six per cent of Egyptian women surveyed in 1995 thought that a husband was justified in hitting his wife when she failed to put meals on the table in time, for instance, or if she refused sex.[[3124]](#endnote-3125) For many of these women, male violence was similar to a natural disaster — hurtful but unavoidable — these women did not regard beatings as a personal humiliation.[[3125]](#endnote-3126) Only through being given space for deeper reflection did they come to understand that domestic violence may rather be a human-made disaster.[[3126]](#endnote-3127)

Zuzana Lučkay Mihalčinová has been mentioned before, and also she asks pertinent questions.[[3127]](#endnote-3128) Lučkay warns that dignity, even though it has become part of our anchorings in the world, needs to be intentionally and pro-actively nurtured rather than taken for granted and regarded as inherent. Erin Daly, co-founder of the Dignity Rights Project, chimes in as well, ‘Human dignity is both a source and an aspiration of rights ... once you have understood human dignity you cannot undo it’.[[3128]](#endnote-3129)

Anthropologist Alan Page Fiske has been introduced earlier. He teaches that people create relationships that are ‘not simply combinations of the characteristics of the individuals that engage in them’, rather, they follow ‘shared models of how people should coordinate with each other’.[[3129]](#endnote-3130) Anthropologists have listed many systems, but Fiske found that people, most of the time and in all cultures, use just four elementary and universal forms or models for organising most aspects of sociality, four ‘structures out of which people construct, understand, evaluate, sanction, and motivate most joint activities’.[[3130]](#endnote-3131) First, people have the option to structure an interaction according to what they have in common, Fiske calls this mode communal sharing, second, they can highlight ordered differences and engage in authority ranking, third, they may use additive imbalances or equality matching, and, fourth, they can structure their interaction according to ratios or market pricing.[[3131]](#endnote-3132) These four social models follow the well-known four mathematical scales of measurement of nominal, ordinal, interval, and ratio, the first of which is the most comprehensive and qualitative, while the last is the most quantitative and least comprehensive.[[3132]](#endnote-3133)

Ideally, family life is informed by communal sharing, it embraces the motto of ‘one for all and all for one’. Authority ranking involves asymmetrically ordering people along vertical hierarchical social dimensions — nurturant teachers manifest it when they follow the Homo amans concept of human nature, and brutal dictators manifest it when they walk the Homo dominans path. Equality matching implies taking turns, as, for instance, in car pools or babysitting cooperatives. The fourth, the market-pricing model, views relationships as defined by proportions or ratios and this is the arena of the strict cost-benefit calculations of Homo oeconomicus, the least comprehensive anchoring of human interactions. While communal sharing is a mindset of love that aims at protecting dignity, dignity is undermined when the fullness of quality is straightjacketed into strict quantity calculations of cost-benefit analysis, when a mindset of calculated entitlement moves to the forefront and market pricing becomes predominant.

We can place the concepts of many other thinkers into Fiske’s model. For instance, we could say that the substantivist model described by political economist Karl Polanyi offers space for Homo amans to unfold, while the formalist economic model gives preference to Homo oeconomicus et dominans.[[3133]](#endnote-3134) Economist Peter Kropotkin (whose work enjoys a comeback now, see chapter 11), thought that a society that is sufficiently developed could build an economical system based entirely on the communal concept of mutual exchanges and voluntary cooperation.[[3134]](#endnote-3135)

Let me use Fiske’s system to differentiate possible definitions of dignity:

* Communal Sharing (CS) — or mutuality, as psychologist Linda Hartling prefers to call it[[3135]](#endnote-3136) — is a mode of collaboration that highlights what we have in common. It is the most comprehensive, qualitative, and least humiliating frame of social life. It emphasises unconditional ‘giving forward’ from the heart, from a place of loving generosity where there is no quantity calculation, no tit-for-tat requirement, and no material incentives.[[3136]](#endnote-3137) What is thought of as a ‘good family’ usually follows this script — all members give what they can and receive what they need[[3137]](#endnote-3138) so that the solidarity and unity of ‘all for one, and one for all’ can constitute strong connective relationships.[[3138]](#endnote-3139) Differences do not divide, they strengthen the community, everyone counts, everyone develops a feeling for what others need and everyone shares the responsibility to offer it. It is an approach that resembles love marriage more than convenience marriage or forced marriage, it is the realm of Martin Buber’s I-Thou dialogue in contrast to I-It instrumentalisations.  
  When we ask how dignity manifests in such a context, then it does so through individuals connecting in solidarity and care. Dignity is enacted when people cooperate with each other to create a world of unity in equal dignity for all in their diversity while honouring the inherent human desire ‘to walk upright’ — in short, when the ‘social body frame of dignity’ is used.[[3139]](#endnote-3140)   
  My conclusion is that this is the only way forward for the dignity of the entire human family, of the entire global village. It is to give priority to communal sharing, to maximise its space, and to demote authority ranking, equality matching, and market pricing to the role of its servants. Never should life be sacrificed for power and profit. I therefore dedicate my entire life to work for this goal.
* Authority Ranking (AR) describes ordered differences in authority. In a context where authority ranking is given priority, people are lucky if they have benevolent leaders who strive to meet everyone’s needs, and in this way, will nurture communal sharing. Less benevolent leaders, in contrast, will demand that subordinates give more than they can, while the leaders themselves take more than they need, while maintaining this asymmetry through manipulation and systems of routine humiliation. A wife will not question her husband’s right to beat her, she will only count herself lucky if he is not.  
  The concept of dignity follows this dichotomy insofar as a benevolent authority will respect every community member as being equal in dignity and worthiness. A nurturant teacher, for instance, will foster the personal growth of all students. A malevolent authority, on the other hand, an oppressive dictator or tyrannical teacher, will rank people’s worthiness in ‘lesser’ and ‘higher’, will look down on supposedly lesser beings, and will allow ‘dignitaries’ to entertain a sense of entitlement to ‘honourable decorum’. The ‘social command frame of dignity’ has its place here.
* Equality Matching (EM) points at additive differences and equivalent exchanges. Wherever equality matching is given priority in a society, wherever it defines the overall societal system, people will offer products or services only under the condition that they can expect an equivalent return. A person in need cannot count on help unless she can give something back — ‘if there is no contract, there is no responsibility’ (see the discussion of Roman law in chapter 12). The generosity of unconditional communal sharing is discredited as foolish or even traitorous. This intensifies the commons dilemma, as people willing to offer unconditional support are despised as spoilers of fairness rules. People are expected to pledge support only after all others have offered theirs. Notions such as hope or optimism are made dependent on the probability of reasonable returns in the future.  
  In such a context, also dignity and humiliation are linked to strict cost-benefit calculations. Dignity is regarded as something that can be earned through offering products and services or through consuming them. ‘The self’ is seen as a territory that is separated from its surroundings through contractual borders that are to be continuously guarded against possible infringements from unfair contracts. Infringements are typically felt to be humiliating and can set off cycles of humiliation and violence. The ‘social contest frame of dignity’ reigns, and, if it is allowed to define the priorities in a society, ultimately, the dignity of all will be in danger.
* Market Pricing (MP) is a model of ratio and proportion. It is the narrowest, the most quantitative and potentially most destructive and humiliating frame. Every person becomes a commodity — ‘no money means no existence’.   
  Dignity in such a context is tied to arithmetical calculations in terms of money and one’s ability to acquire or spend it. The ‘social contest frame of dignity’ reigns also here, only in this case not just linked to an interval scale as in the case of equality matching, but to a ratio scale. Dignity is conceptualised as individual autonomy in local and global markets that are structured along the lines of competition for domination. If driven to extremes and not contained, the outcome is the stripping of everyone’s basic dignity. In economist Ernst Friedrich Schumacher’s words, ‘In a sense, the market is the institutionalisation of individualism and non-responsibility’.[[3140]](#endnote-3141) Bill Mollison, founder of permaculture, formulated the tenet ‘Love the land, love the people, share the surplus’,[[3141]](#endnote-3142) as the only rescue from the doctrines of ‘the market’.

Alan Page Fiske explains that people use these four modes of coordination to organise nearly every aspect of all social domains, even the most mundane ones. When we invite to dinner, for example, we follow these four models — we may share the food and drink without calculating who gets how much (CS), a host may ask his guests for assistance (AR), the guests might feel obligated to reciprocate the invitation (EM), and the host will have bought the food to be prepared (MP).[[3142]](#endnote-3143) Another example are soldiers in a platoon — they may be ready to sacrifice their lives for each other (CS), they have a commander (AR), they take turns standing guard (EM), and scarce ammunition may be used efficiently (MP).[[3143]](#endnote-3144) Whenever a group or a dyad interacts, ‘they can seek a consensus of the group as a whole, the chief can decide (and delegate minor aspects of the decision), people can vote, or they can use a market mechanism based on utilities or prices’.[[3144]](#endnote-3145) In general, in the face of any task, people ‘can all simply pitch in without assigning individual responsibilities, an authority can give orders down a chain of command, everyone can do an equal share (or take turns), or participants can be compensated in proportion to the amount they each complete’.[[3145]](#endnote-3146)

Moral judgement follows similar paths. ‘Treat each person’s needs and suffering as your own, do what the gods or your elders command, treat each person equally, or give every person their due in proportion to what they deserve’.[[3146]](#endnote-3147) When people transfer goods or services, ‘they can give a gift without expecting any specific return; they can pay tribute in fealty to a superior (or, inversely, bestow a benefit to a subordinate as a gesture of largesse); they can make a balanced, quid-pro-quo exchange; or they can sell and purchase at market rates’.[[3147]](#endnote-3148) The social meanings of land are inscribed in this logic as well, as land can be regarded as a shared commons, or as the domain or fief of a lord, or as a marker of equal status (such as eligibility to vote), or as a commercial investment.[[3148]](#endnote-3149)

At this point, allow me to share how I personally benefitted from Alan Page Fiske’s work. Since I was a child, my personal intuition led me to want to embrace unconditional ‘giving forward’, and my initial experimentations with this practice showed me that this is the most fulfilling and meaningful way of living. However, for years, I lacked justifications and was accused of naïveté. I was therefore delighted when I understood how much my personal path resonated with Fiske’s concept of communal sharing, which, in turn, relates to Indigenous economic theory.[[3149]](#endnote-3150) Fiske’s insights helped me stand by my own intuitions and be proud of offering my talents and resources as an unconditional gift of love to humanity without expecting any reward, to be proud of simply and straightforwardly giving everything I have for a dignified future of humankind. I am an ild sjel, as my Norwegian friends would say, a ‘fire soul’, filled with passion for the sake of nothing but loving dignity.

Fiske’s model also helped me understand where people come from who misunderstand my path, why some even feel provoked by it and feel motivated to punish me for it. Some people regard my choices as counterintuitive and paradox — how can rewardless life be rewarding — while others see it as simple foolishness or, worse, they suspect me of being mentally deranged. A ‘sober’ person, they say, invests into the future of humanity only if there are justified expectations of reasonable returns, at least for me personally, and in case there is no such prospect, why should one care? Many find it dubious that I nurture dignity even though I do not even ‘profit’ personally, and some add that this is doubly foolish in a world where humanity is ‘in hospice’ and no longer ‘in hospital’.

Fiske’s model made me understand why so many people ask, ‘Who pays for what Evelin does?’ ‘How come that Evelin with her two doctorates is unable to monetise her efforts?’ Some suspect that I at least must hope to receive ‘points’ for dutiful behaviour as a footnote in future history books or in heaven. I always explain that I am uninterested in any such points, and that the reason for why I refrain from ‘monetisation’ is to resist the erosion of moral values through market interactions. In other words, some misattribute my value choices as some form of concealed selfishness, or they write them off as psychological weakness. The kinder among my critics have pity with me when they see how difficult it is to maintain my life choices, they advise me to take up a mainstream ‘job’. I explain that I exhaust myself — living beyond the notion of ‘job’ is indeed exhausting — precisely to save their future and the future of their children. I am not a drop-out, I am a drop-in, a drop-into a gift economy, an economy of small gifts from the heart that are given with ethical intentions.[[3150]](#endnote-3151)

People who react to my path condescendingly usually come from mindsets of arithmetic operations, from models of sociality that Fiske would call equality matching or market pricing, they deem the Homo oeconomicus model of human nature to be the only model of sanity and dignity. Some accuse me of moral extortion, of wanting to use my life choices to make them feel ashamed of their own selfishness and thus buy myself a sense of moral superiority. Others are so steeped in the authoritarian version of authority ranking that they suspect me of hatching secret plots to control them. They cannot fathom that I look at the world like a gardener does, as a loving nurturer and inspirer, they cannot grasp that gardening may be the best metaphor for understanding dignity and meaning in life.[[3151]](#endnote-3152)

I thoroughly understand why so many people’s narratives oppose mine, why so many people believe that embracing market pricing is a sign of mental health and moral stature. I see how proud they are of being part of ‘modernity’, of ‘us moderns’ who have surpassed the ‘barbaric’ past, who have left behind ‘primitive’ egalitarian communal sharing and authoritarian domination by making the exchange of goods and services ‘effective and fair’ through market pricing. I understand where people come from when they feel personally hurt or even humiliated by me questioning this proud narrative of progress when I point out that communal sharing in the spirit of loving mutuality may not be as ‘primitive’ but rather a form of being-in-this-world in need of being re-considered and reinvigorated.[[3152]](#endnote-3153) Market pricing may not deserve the label of progress, after all, why would the world otherwise be in crisis.

When I meet people who live in bubbles of monetary wealth, those who still are relatively shielded from global crises — and this includes academics with tenure at established institutions or at least with a stable income — many of them are irritated by the fact that I voluntarily forego their privileges and put my personal life on line by side-stepping money-based contracts. They feel that they have earned their privileges through hard work and that they are entitled to enjoy them. This entitlement is undermined by me working twice as hard for something they see as bygone, such as communal sharing, direct solidarity, conviviality, gift economy, and Palaeolithic lifestyles.[[3153]](#endnote-3154) Writer Upton Sinclair observed already in the 1930s that ‘it is difficult to get a man to understand something, when his salary depends upon his not understanding it!’[[3154]](#endnote-3155)

I resonate with sociologists Pierre Bourdieu and Jean-Claude Passeron who faulted ‘dysfunctional educations’ for reproducing dysfunctional systems,[[3155]](#endnote-3156) systems that resist change for the better at all levels, ‘at the levels of psychology, therapy, spirituality, religion, science, philosophy and education’.[[3156]](#endnote-3157)

Luckily, there are also people who resonate with my path of unconditional generosity, people who give me the strength to continue in a mainstream context that is more or less inimical to my life choices. I am always open to new learning, eager and curious, always aware that I might overlook important facts or insights, aware that we all are per definition blind to our own blindness. I am therefore deeply thankful for all support that opens my eyes to new insights, I am doubly thankful when such insights are brought to me in caring and nurturing ways. Combative styles may be acceptable for people with surplus energy, people who are anchored and protected in secure institutional and financial situations. In my case, combative styles drain the energy that I need to continue on my path of love. I would not know what to do without the support of the dignity family around me, Linda Hartling, Michael Britton, and many others.

Howard Richards, philosopher of social science and scholar of peace and global studies, author of the Foreword for this book, has lovingly supported its coming into being both in practice and with his theory building. Through my life choices, I manifest what he calls ‘necessary and sufficient principles’, by which he means two things, first, the principle of always maintaining a ‘pro-social attitude’, and, second, the principle of aiming for a structural understanding of ‘what works’.[[3157]](#endnote-3158) My life path fulfils both of his requirements, it is pro-social and ‘it works’.

Structural understanding — understanding whether a system is functional or dysfunctional — starts with what Howard Richards calls ‘growth points’, ‘levers’, or ‘fulcrums’, that serve as wedges or hinges that demonstrate ‘what works’ to people who initially disagree. Paulo Freire captured the same idea in his phrase of temas bisagra or ‘hinge themes’, philosopher Roy Bhaskar spoke of ‘transcendental arguments’, and political scientist Steven Cohen of ‘reasons for hope’ (see more in chapter 4).[[3158]](#endnote-3159)

I have used the term ‘Trojan Horse’ in my work to highlight that such wedges often are hidden and unobtrusive.[[3159]](#endnote-3160) I manifest this unobtrusiveness in my life path by ‘flying under the radar’ as much as possible. I work twice as hard as many of my peers and it undermines existing systems and their justifications that I do so with the aim to foreground solidarity and forego monetisation. I am always glad when I meet those who appreciate solidarity that is not mediated by contracts or ideologies, who understand the value of solidarity in unmediated shared humanness, who feel inspired and encouraged by my experience that direct and unconditional solidarity really works, that it offers a level of meaningfulness otherwise unattainable.

### Some definitions of human nature threaten human survival

Can we allow ourselves to be optimistic about human nature? Or do we have to call it optimism when we make the best of a bad situation?[[3160]](#endnote-3161) Perhaps only an Orwellian world is possible? Perhaps the only future within our reach is one where dominators fight until one of them has gained world domination and is free to loot all the social and ecological resources of the planet?

Do we humans have an innate yearning for enemies? Do we have a psychological need to fight no matter what? Does human nature compel us to compete for domination under all circumstances? Or can we allow ourselves to be more optimistic and trust that we will be capable of including all of humanity into our circle of cooperation in case the world were free of any systemic pressures towards violence and war? Or would we under all circumstances limit cooperation only to our in-group in service of competing with out-groups? How should we define optimism and pessimism?

Is the human species a superior or inferior species? Are we blessed or doomed? Perhaps our inner demons make it inherently impossible to create a decent world, a world where we unite in respect for cultural and ecological diversity? It may be dangerously foolish to dream of a dignified world for future generations, a world of dialogue, partnership, and mutual trust? Perhaps our best hope for peace is to keep the world’s people in an iron grip? Perhaps philosopher Thomas Hobbes was right in his Leviathan that citizens should voluntarily bow to a strong hand?[[3161]](#endnote-3162) Hobbes would be right if there were no chance for global partnership, then it would be catastrophic not to follow his advice and loosen the grip of domination. However, maybe John Locke is right and there is a chance for positive peace, at least if we give it our all?[[3162]](#endnote-3163) Do we dare? Or do we lack the courage? Perhaps we are proud of negative peace only because we lack the courage to try out positive peace?

These questions are more interesting than statistics about violence, as useful as such statistics are.[[3163]](#endnote-3164) Statistics of violence fail to differentiate between Hobbes and Locke, as violence can be seen to occur both because of human nature and in spite of it — the same statistics can underpin both assumptions.

My position is that we are doomed if we continue to believe in the evilness of human nature. The problem is the correspondence bias.[[3164]](#endnote-3165) The correspondent inference theory indicates that our mind is biased when we observe others’ deeds. We tend to underrate external circumstances that force people to act despite their inner wishes and not because of them, we tend to overlook that others’ behaviour might not reflect their inner most genuine inclinations. This bias intensifies confrontation as it makes us jump to conclusions prematurely, it makes us imagine ‘evil’ were there is none — we infer combative human nature where there are only circumstances that cause certain behaviour to appear ‘evil’.

By rejecting the assumption that human nature is primarily ‘evil’, I do not wish to insinuate that human nature is ‘rational’. The assumption that human nature is primarily rational is also erroneous. Humans are relational beings more than rational beings. Emotionalised polarisation intensifies when both misconceptions merge, namely, when we get indignated at each other’s ‘evil refusal’ to be rational. Even the loftiest goals, if communicated on the basis of these misconceptions and without regard to the emotional-relational human nature, will exacerbate problems rather than solve them. This is why conspiracy entrepreneurs are successful, this is why simply shouting at them that they are irrational will not improve the situation.

How did our misconceptions of human nature occur? This is my simplified description (see more in chapter 5): Around the time of the Neolithic Revolution an era of emergencies unfolded that brought human nature under pressure to the point that a vicious cycle was set in motion. It began with what anthropologists call circumscription, namely, sudden limitations that forced people into confrontation. This brought the correspondence bias to the fore, which, in turn, increased confrontations further, with the result that appreciation for partnership and dialogue was crowded out and replaced by the dominators’ pride in their ability to compete for supremacy. This pride usually stands in the way of acknowledging that much of human behaviour happens in spite of human nature and not because of it. Over time, dominator pride even began to taint our view of our significance in the world, many began to think that destiny had brought them to this world to be warriors for good against evil. Standing tall against adversity became their mission, including adversity they perceived originating from the evilness of human nature — not least colonialism was inspired by this mindset. Fast forward to present times, wherever this hubris reigns, it craves imagining evil so we have an enemy worth fighting. I call this our ‘millennia-long systemic war injury’.

If we accept that the past millennia of Homo sapiens’ history since the Neolithic Revolution unravelled as they did in spite of human nature and not because of it, then we can say that we became dominators not because it is ‘in our blood’, but as a result of tragically unwise adaptations to the shift of our historical context from win-win abundance to win-lose circumscription, just like the Great Divide separated our hominid relatives, the bonobos and the chimpanzees.[[3165]](#endnote-3166) These adaptations then taught us this very bias, which would perhaps have been absent or at least weaker without our dominator conditioning. We learned to believe in the evilness of human nature and we acquired hubris based on this belief.

Now the time has come to unlearn both hubris and belief in evilness, even though this is difficult, not least because it is unfamiliar. Particularly male identity became predicated on the warrior ethos, with the result that ‘real men’ need enemies. Men learned to glorify arms and many resist disarmament until today, they fear that without weapons they would become ‘humiliatingly female’. Particularly in the United States of America, the imagery of threat maintained the pioneer ethos of the lone hero ‘going West’.

Perhaps it is too late? The message that domineering is not adaptive in an interconnected world can perhaps not reach us anymore? Perhaps the concept of evil human nature is simply too valuable to let go? Particularly in Western contexts, where human rights ideals represent the official norm, the argument of the evilness of human nature is what is left to justify continued domination. Phrases such as ‘humans are naturally greedy’ or ‘humans are naturally violent’, can serve ‘to justify some static, reductionist view of “human nature” that, luckily for them, seems to pre-empt the need for activity — for why would one invest social and political energy or organisation in curing economic and social problems if they are the result of a convenient “human nature”?’[[3166]](#endnote-3167)

Present-day politics in the United States of America represent a real life laboratory for the imagery and reality of ‘real men’ — when men need ‘real enemies’ to be ‘real men’, when men need enemies with evil intentions to be men, then taking this imagery away amounts to emasculation. American gun rights activists associate the Gun Control Act of 1968 with the Nazi gun control law — fearing emasculation, they deem it impossible that evil could be contained through a social contract as in other parts of the world — or that evil could even be ‘banal’ for that matter, not least political theorist Hannah Arendt was heavily attacked for this observation.[[3167]](#endnote-3168) Conservative Bill O’Reilly observed that ‘no matter what society does, there will always be mass murder’,[[3168]](#endnote-3169) and the conservative solution is clear, ‘There are no “good guns”. There are no “bad guns”. Any gun in the hands of a bad man is a bad thing. Any gun in the hands of a decent person is no threat to anybody — except bad people’.[[3169]](#endnote-3170) Unsurprisingly, firearm-related mortality rates are double as high in the U.S.A. as in the next country on the list of high-income World Health Organization member states — ‘we have the legal option to murder each other. Neighbour slaughtering neighbour. Blood in the streets’.[[3170]](#endnote-3171)

Here is our opportunity: The Cold War is over, the world is globally interconnected more than ever, and we have access to knowledge and tools as never before. We can do better than only deter war and out-dominate each other. There is no need any more to limit our choices to the mottos of If you want peace, prepare for war and If you want prosperity, invest in exploitation. We can overcome the correspondence bias and heed what peace organisations around the world point out, namely, that it is feasible to follow Mahatma Gandhi’s words of There is no path to peace. Peace is the path.

Here is the conundrum: Two camps confront each other, on one side those who advocate for peace through global partnership, dialogue, and cooperation, and on the other side those who still strive for peace through mutual domination, control, and if necessary war. The dominator camp accuses the partnership camp of a naïve lack of preparedness, while the partnership camp warns that too enthusiastic preparedness will create what it wants to deter. Both sides are exasperated with the other. True to its belief in evil human nature, the dominator side ridicules and humiliates the partnership side, yet, also the defenders of the goodness of human nature undermine their own message when they disseminate it in combative and humiliating ways, thus alienating their opponents rather than winning them over. Both sides feel that the other side increases the odds for the very things to happen they want to prevent — from terrorism and genocide to war, from climate collapse to biodiversity loss.

Human nature — or, more precisely, its conceptualisation — seems to be at the core of this confrontation. If the hypothesis were correct that human nature intrinsically drives domination no matter what, then the dominator camp would be right, they would have a point if humans had an inner urge to fight no matter which external circumstances and pressures they are exposed to.

After studying humankind on all continents for almost five decades, I stand by the partnership camp. I suggest that at this crossroad, the belief in the evilness of human nature may represent the most significant barrier to a dignified future. We are doomed if we allow those who cling to outdated concepts of masculinity to maintain fear and permit those who profit from business as usual to amplify and exploit this fear. Our conviction that distrust is obligatory and trust impossible may be our main problem. We prefer a familiar belief even though it is suicidal. We choose to die from our historical war injury rather than heal from it.

I stand by the extrinsic hypothesis that says that human nature harbours no intrinsic need for competition for domination, on the contrary, that most humans are capable of refraining from it if they find suitable circumstances. My main message is that it is within our reach, as humankind, to create precisely such circumstances now — for the first time in our history we can manifest Homo solidaricus globalis in our global village.

We live in times where it is feasible for us, as humanity, to come together as a world community and hinder would-be dominators to take power and then sacrifice human survival. We can sit together and reframe everything. We have all the knowledge and all the tools. Perhaps we duck the task because we are afraid of the opportunity to be successful?

### The human need for belonging has dark sides

Humans are social creatures who need to belong and feel connected. Our early ancestors survived in their natural environments due to their ability to cooperate. The human ability for cooperation is part of the success of Homo sapiens.

Yet, there are also dark sides to this success, both with regard to our relationship with our ecosystems and our relationship with our social environments. As to our ecological environment, during the Pleistocene, already the megafauna, large-bodied mammal species, paid with their lives for the human ability to cooperate, their extinction can be traced back to hominin migrations.[[3171]](#endnote-3172) Today, most species on planet Earth, including our own, risk following suite.

When we look at our sociosphere, we see that many millennia ago, our planet began to fill with human populations to the point that circumscription kicked in. This was when people began to employ cooperation not only against animals for hunt but also against other people for war. More even, threat from outer enemies became a resource for men to feel significant as warriors, and it became important for in-groups to bolster inner cohesion through negative out-group bias. Today, it is dangerous to use out-group enmity as ‘gender and in-group enhancer’[[3172]](#endnote-3173) because this hampers higher-level unifying processes. Our global climate and biodiversity crises call on us, the global community, to come together and build one ‘global village’ from the many diverse local ‘villages’. Our crises call on us to abandon concepts of masculinity based on the availability of enemies and to leave behind in-group loyalty based on out-group enmity.

While out-group enmity creates problems with outsiders, danger looms also from within groups. When a group becomes convinced, perhaps by its leaders, to deny reality, and all members go along with this denial, the consequences can be dire. History offers many examples of dangerous groupthink. Many Germans, for instance, still believed in the Endsieg, or final victory, when its impossibility was already utterly obvious. Today, Homo oeconomicus still believes in the possibility of ‘final victory’ over nature.[[3173]](#endnote-3174) Many people deny the reality of ecocide still today, or at least they deflect blame by placing the responsibility for fixing climate collapse on the shoulders of the individual.[[3174]](#endnote-3175)

In my terminology, succumbing to destructive groupthink for the sake of maintaining a sense of belonging amounts to voluntary self-humiliation.[[3175]](#endnote-3176) Linda Hartling calls it magical thinking, a sort of delusional self-humiliation.[[3176]](#endnote-3177) In such a situation, all are called to become the proverbial child that speaks out loud when she sees the emperor naked.

The solution is to create a global village without groupthink, a global village imbued with a Zeitgeist that respects sound reality testing with regard to our global challenges, a global village whose citizens cooperate in turning socio-cide and eco-cide into what I call socio-sanity and eco-sanity, into socio-salvation and eco-salvation.

### Cognitive bias is a double-edged sword

Loss aversion is one of many systematic errors in human thought processes.[[3177]](#endnote-3178) It is the human tendency to hold on to familiar entitlements, even if letting go and embracing new realities would open the door for superior opportunities.[[3178]](#endnote-3179) Loss aversion contributes to dangerous cultural inertia in situations where change is necessary.

Another potentially harmful cognitive bias is reactive devaluation. We humans tend to devalue and reject even the best proposals when they originate from someone we perceive as antagonist.[[3179]](#endnote-3180) Then there is the correspondence bias mentioned earlier, with its potential to create unnecessary confrontations.[[3180]](#endnote-3181) The tendency to ‘solve’ cognitive dissonance through denial can have grave consequences as well. In the case of climate degradation, such denial can lead to the collective demise of the human species when it lets unreversable tipping points pass unhindered. Another problem is that of shifting baselines — the fable of the frog being slowly boiled alive — the planet’s ecosphere degrades too slowly for people to understand that action is urgent and too rapidly for action to be finally implemented.[[3181]](#endnote-3182)

The Dunning-Kruger effect describes the difference between people of high competence and low competence. People of high competence tend to be aware that there is much they do not know and they assume that others are as self-critical as they are, while people who lack competence suffer from a dual burden — ‘not only do these people reach erroneous conclusions and make unfortunate choices, but their incompetence robs them of the metacognitive ability to realise it’.[[3182]](#endnote-3183) To say it differently, those who are incompetent, fall victim to miscalibration due to an error about the self, ‘whereas the miscalibration of the highly competent stems from an error about others’.[[3183]](#endnote-3184) At the present moment in history, humanity is in a life-threatening situation due to the Dunning-Kruger effect — the incompetent advocate omnicidal strategies so loudly that those who know better are crowded out.

The solution, as psychologist Kenneth Pope formulates it, is ‘to search actively for opposing views and disconfirming information to help us overcome confirmation bias, Groupthink, the bias of WYSIATI (What You See Is All There Is), and false consensus’.[[3184]](#endnote-3185)

Biases are not always negative, though, they have also advantages. Psychologists Daniel Kahneman and Amos Tversky have defended heuristics and cognitive biases, explaining that biases can be very effective and that it is unfair to portray them merely as flaws in our thought processes.[[3185]](#endnote-3186) The reason for why biases have acquired such a bad reputation, may have to do with the fact that they were tested in laboratory experiments, as laboratories offer very narrow settings and contrast human decisions only with probability theory, an approach that may not be an appropriate yardstick for real-world life.[[3186]](#endnote-3187)

Emotions, as well, have acquired a bad reputation undeservedly (see more in chapter 2). To highlight the role of emotions, I wrote a book on emotions in their relation to conflict and human rights ideals in 2009.[[3187]](#endnote-3188) The important insight is that emotions are essential to decision-making and merit to be liberated from being demonised as hindrance to cognitive rationality. ‘Individuals who suffer certain kinds of brain damage to the prefrontal cortex that impairs affective reactions but leaves cognitive capacities intact, tend to make disastrous social decisions, and their social relationships suffer accordingly, even though their intellectual problem-solving ability may be completely normal’.[[3188]](#endnote-3189)

Altogether, the conclusion is that sometimes quick intuitive decisions are preferable to slow and calculated ones, indeed, quick intuitive reactions may foster ‘more charity and cooperation’.[[3189]](#endnote-3190)

### Humans fall for manipulation

Alexis de Tocqueville wrote the following in 1835 about ‘democratic republics’ and their covert ways of implementing tyranny by replacing open approaches by covert manipulation, by ignoring ‘the body’ and going straight for ‘the soul’:

The master no longer says: You will think as I do or die. He says: You are free not to think as I do. You may keep your life, your property, and everything else. But from this day forth you shall be as a stranger among us. You will retain your civic privileges, but they will be of no use to you. For if you seek the votes of your fellow citizens, they will withhold them, and if you seek only their esteem, they will feign to refuse even that. You will remain among men, but you will forfeit your rights to humanity. When you approach your fellow creatures, they will shun you as one who is impure. And even those who believe in your innocence will abandon you, lest they, too, be shunned in turn. Go in peace, I will not take your life, but the life I leave you with is worse than death.[[3190]](#endnote-3191)

Philosopher Erich Fromm followed up one hundred fifty years after Tocqueville by saying: While outer chains are visible, it is much worse to be ‘unaware of inner chains, carrying them with the illusion’ that one is free.[[3191]](#endnote-3192)

Strategies of covert manipulation are manifold. ‘Mystification’ is one example, it is being used to make exploitation look like benevolence.[[3192]](#endnote-3193) Divide-and-rule strategies are well-known, as is the creation of enemy images and scapegoats.[[3193]](#endnote-3194) We see many manipulation strategies at work in present times — tendencies to reactivate the security dilemma just when it can be attenuated, or to instigate new Cold War-like circumstances,[[3194]](#endnote-3195) or to wage ‘soft cold cyberwar’.[[3195]](#endnote-3196)

Among the most sophisticated methods of covert manipulation is that of overloading people with false choices and unnecessary conflicts to crowd out important choices and necessary conflicts.[[3196]](#endnote-3197) Big data is part of this strategy when it lets humanity drown in data, when it means delivering the world to a sightless infosphere.[[3197]](#endnote-3198) As already mentioned in chapter 7, artificial intelligence may be a misnomer — in many cases, it may rather be artificial sightlessness. Indeed, cogitocide, from Latin caedere, may be the outcome, the killing of the cogitosphere,[[3198]](#endnote-3199) the killing of the realm of thinking and reflection.

Another strategy of manipulation is for authorities to invite critics to exhaust themselves for promises that ultimately turn out to be empty. Sociologist Pierre Bourdieu called this strategy deferred elimination.[[3199]](#endnote-3200) During the past decades, deferred elimination has been widely applied, so much so that ‘the world became rich in plans for sustainability action ... but poor in meaningful action’ (see chapter 7 for Paul Raskin’s experience with deferred elimination).[[3200]](#endnote-3201) On my global path, I have met countless formerly idealistic activists who once thought they could make a difference only to end up demoralised or cynical. Many were inspired by the first Limits to growth report in 1972, many went out into the world to become humanitarian helpers, only to end up resonating with the book titled The road to hell: The ravaging effects of foreign aid and international charity.[[3201]](#endnote-3202) I learned from their experiences to do otherwise in my personal life. I direct my efforts towards global work rather than focussing on local projects, however valuable they may be. My aim is to help create a world where all the valuable local projects I have seen no longer face deferred elimination, where they no longer get crushed as soon as they get too close to the red lines of the global context.

What makes humans so vulnerable to covert manipulation strategies? The human body and the human psyche offer several entry points. One is addiction.[[3202]](#endnote-3203) When humans indulge in addictive behaviour, this creates pleasant feelings at first, while the negative consequences follow later. The more one seeks quick pleasure here and now, the less happy one becomes in the long term. In the human body, short-term pleasure is related to dopamine, while long-term contentment is related to the serotonin system. It is precisely the dopamine system that is targeted by the corporate world when it hooks a society on consumerism[[3203]](#endnote-3204) or when the food industry develops habit-forming products.[[3204]](#endnote-3205)

Manipulation and its detrimental outfalls can even be passed on through generations. The human infant’s dependency on a nurturing environment offers crucial entry points. Already in 1936, humanistic philosopher Erich Fromm theorised that the close emotional exchange of children with their parents has two consequences. On the one hand, the family becomes the most important institution for the survival of society, as society’s requirements are reflected in the parents and conveyed to the child.[[3205]](#endnote-3206) On the other hand, however, if caregivers feel insecure about existing social conditions or suffer from trauma or mental disorder, they may pass on their suffering and their methods of dealing with it through ‘cultural opiates’, so that their offspring may perceive pathological lifestyles as normal from childhood onwards.[[3206]](#endnote-3207)

Toxic parenting styles suppress the very critical thinking that would be needed to reject ‘cultural opiates’. The strict father model of parenting has been described by cognitive linguists Lakoff and Johnson, and poisonous pedagogy is known in German as ‘black pedagogy’.[[3207]](#endnote-3208) All produce childhood trauma by design and open people’s minds to manipulation by toxic leaders.[[3208]](#endnote-3209) Psychologist Alice Miller suggested that this pedagogy was partly responsible for paving the way for Adolf Hitler and his followers to gain power in Germany.[[3209]](#endnote-3210) Fast forward to present times, we may say that a similarly deleterious influence, only more covert, flows from the ‘commercialisation of childhood’.[[3210]](#endnote-3211)

It has often be observed that people tend to repeat scenarios of humiliation that they were unable to process in early childhood. Wiederholungszwang, or repetition compulsion, is a phenomenon that was first described by Sigmund Freud and has been developed further and revised by many thinkers and practitioners since.[[3211]](#endnote-3212) I have used the term humiliation addiction for this predicament in the past. Linda Hartling reminded me that humiliation trap might be a better term, as it avoids putting all blame on the addicted person for lacking will power, strength, or fortitude.[[3212]](#endnote-3213) Conspiracy narrators use this trap actively when they promise traumatised people fake salvation.

We can conclude that humiliation traps can produce transgenerational trauma, and that entire populations can be trapped.[[3213]](#endnote-3214) We can also say that this is precisely what happened to most of humanity during the past millennia — they had to endure the master manipulation of the dominator model of society with the result that the mindset and practice of competition for domination became their cultural opiate. This is what I call our ‘millennia-long systemic war injury’.

### Indignation entrepreneurship hinders sober and constructive action

I am writing these lines in Germany, and I observe with concern how the polarisation that rips American society apart also comes to continental Europe.[[3214]](#endnote-3215) I watch an escalation of ‘hyper-emotionalised indignation rituals’ on all sides of the political spectrum, from what is called identitarian movement on the right side[[3215]](#endnote-3216) to identity politics on the left side.[[3216]](#endnote-3217) As a result, legitimate grievances are being neglected that would require sober and constructive systemic change because indignation entrepreneurship uses up too much energy.

Who is guilty? Who is to be blamed for this situation? Are irrational masses to be blamed who fail to understand the blessings of progress? Many on the left side of the political spectrum admit that they have largely failed their own mission — after all, attention to social grievances concerning economic inequalities and social discrimination is written into their very mission statement. From England we hear that ‘a sense of rage and humiliation’ has grown in the ‘traditional working class’ along with ‘the rise of right-wing nationalism and authoritarian populism’,[[3217]](#endnote-3218) as social democratic parties ‘lost their way’ by bowing to ‘Thatcherism and liberal individualism’, and in doing so, damaged ‘the dignity of labour’.[[3218]](#endnote-3219) In Germany, an author on the left side calls on her friends to return to solidarity with society’s weakest in more inclusive ways than through ‘indignation rituals’ of ‘self-righteous identity politics’ and ‘cancel culture’.[[3219]](#endnote-3220)

Already twenty years ago, in my first publications, I warned that ‘the way was lost’ and that the result could very well be new Hitlers. Later, in my 2012 book A dignity economy, I walked through some of the detrimental effects that flow from present-day economic arrangements. They create artificial scarcity and environmental degradation, they breed ubiquitous mistrust, they promote abuse as a legitimate strategy, they foster fear that debilitates rather than alerting, they produce false choices, and they cause psychological damage.[[3220]](#endnote-3221)

Since 2012, trust has eroded even more, and this all around the world. As it seems, years of systemic ‘defactualisation’, years of ‘image-making’ as political theorist Hannah Arendt would say,[[3221]](#endnote-3222) have prepared the ground for ‘political radicalisation’ and ‘angrynomics’.[[3222]](#endnote-3223) As ‘corporate and government malfeasance, coupled with lies, deceit, and self-serving blame shifting’ seem rampant,[[3223]](#endnote-3224) ‘a mass perception of astonishing elite incompetence is now connecting to the already deep-seated feelings of resentment and anger boiling over from the post-financial crisis period... Unfortunately, it is the extreme right that is best positioned to take advantage of the global discontent’.[[3224]](#endnote-3225) In my 2017 book on terror, I warned that what we allow ourselves to call ‘progress’ may in many ways represent ‘terror’.

The coronavirus pandemic that unfolds while I work on this book, throws the fatality of all these trends into even starker light. In the field of medicine, the pandemic comes on top of pre-existing downward trends,[[3225]](#endnote-3226) so that seemingly banal market transactions become questions of life and death — for instance, when affordable ventilators are made unavailable so that costlier ones can be sold,[[3226]](#endnote-3227) or when lifesaving vaccines are reserved for those who can pay.[[3227]](#endnote-3228) The pandemic also spotlights how the erosion of social trust in societies erodes societal resilience as well. Small countries with a high level of society-wide trust like Norway demonstrate the importance of trust for the success of policies aimed at containing a pandemic.[[3228]](#endnote-3229) Just as a weakened body is more susceptible to being infected and made ill by a virus, a weakened society is more vulnerable to being affected by indignation entrepreneurship that functions like a social-psychological virus that feeds on a microbiological virus. Where trust is lacking, the most farfetched ideas find open ears.[[3229]](#endnote-3230) The coronavirus pandemic now adds germ theory denial to climate denial, and this followed the denial of the dangers of tobacco smoke, all driven by ‘merchants of doubt’.[[3230]](#endnote-3231)

The pandemic also spotlights the difficult relationship between humility and freedom. ‘We are free people, and we can do what we want!’ is a sentence that encapsulates the arrogant misunderstanding of freedom vis-à-vis forces that are so much greater than human wishfulness. Since years, environmentalists are rebuked with precisely such utterances when they call for more regenerative approaches to human activities.

The case of agroecology has occupied me since childhood. I was born into the countryside at a time when it still was ecologically intact, still far from the agrodestruction in the years thereafter. As already reported before, between 1950 and 1990, one third of all fertile soils has been severely degraded or destroyed — the most severe soil erosion in human history — and the depletion of aquifers combines with rising temperatures which leads to serious desertification. Despite these daunting facts, some people still use the argument of freedom to defend conventional farming. One of my environmentalist friends once sighed to me, ‘Evelin, this is the freedom of the fool who cuts off the branch on which he sits. How can foolishness be freedom? How can anybody be so haughty to believe that “freedom” means power over the limitations of nature? These people are so blinded by their arrogance that they do not recognise that a little humility would serve their interests much better! These people humiliate nature and in my eyes also themselves’.[[3231]](#endnote-3232)

As a medical doctor, I have learned to expect pandemics for a long time, even more so since I also watched the encroachment of human life on the habitat of wild animals’.[[3232]](#endnote-3233) When I lived in Japan prior to the pandemic, I was impressed by how diligently people wore masks in public when they had a cough, out of consideration for others. When I see people in Western countries now rejecting the wearing of masks under the banner of freedom,[[3233]](#endnote-3234) I can but resonate with a young author hailing from Pakistan who is flabbergasted by ‘toxic Western individualism’.[[3234]](#endnote-3235) I am grateful to psychologist Jean Twenge for studying the self-esteem movement in the United States for so many years, and for warning that it has led to a kind of ‘dukes up’ narcissism of entitlement.[[3235]](#endnote-3236)

Entrepreneurs of all kinds now use the pandemic as a resource to be exploited and monetised — ‘smaller profiteers’ profit from the suffering that is caused by ‘larger profiteers’.[[3236]](#endnote-3237) To my greatest dismay, I see also vicious humiliation entrepreneurs gathering followers. As a psychologist, I recognise the many reasons that motivate those followers — some simply need to escape isolation,[[3237]](#endnote-3238) others welcome an arena to act out unresolved personal trauma, and yet others are happy about justifications for ‘crybully’ behaviour.[[3238]](#endnote-3239) Conspiracy theorists typically start by ‘exposing’ the ‘official story’ of events such as the pandemic as an alleged cover-up[[3239]](#endnote-3240) and then they portray the virus, or any other suitable token, as a tool in the hands of dominators intent to humiliate the rest of humanity into submission. I turn the argument around and posit that whoever may indeed intend to use a pandemic for goals other than health — for profit, for instance[[3240]](#endnote-3241) — is surely delighted to see profit-driven agitation machines, helped by profit-driven algorithms that fuel ‘lust for combat’,[[3241]](#endnote-3242) exploiting people’s psychological vulnerabilities and thus distracting them from real problems. Indeed, the emotional and economic advantages of heated polarisations can be substantial.[[3242]](#endnote-3243) Again, I see humiliation addiction [[3243]](#endnote-3244) at work when people dwell on scenarios of humiliation, and Linda Hartling speaks of humiliation traps.

Theologian Reinhold Niebuhr once offered this prayer, ‘Father, give us courage to change what must be altered, serenity to accept what cannot be helped, and the insight to know the one from the other’.[[3244]](#endnote-3245) My plea is for us to strive for serenity by taking a step back and cooling down so that forward-looking dialogue can become possible and real problems can receive the attention they deserve. My plea is for us to listen to philosopher Arne Næss, to heed his call for deeper questioning and ask questions where others stop asking.[[3245]](#endnote-3246) Conspiracy entrepreneurs promise ‘the truth behind the cover up’, yet, their followers need to go one step further and ask about the truth behind the conspiracy entrepreneur.

I call for humility in the face of nature — and nature includes viruses. This is not an unreasonable or humiliating imposition.[[3246]](#endnote-3247) I plead not to mistake due humility for undue humiliation. The global community carries the responsibility to come together in dignified humility and serenity and ask deep enough questions so we can ‘know the one from the other’ and avoid losing focus in conspirational cycles of humiliation.[[3247]](#endnote-3248) Moderation, cooling down, unexcited solidarity, this is what is needed to contain humiliation entrepreneurship.[[3248]](#endnote-3249)

### The commons dilemma — The problem of self-destructive short-sightedness

Planet Earth is humankind’s shared commons. Throughout history, Indigenous groups have succeeded in protecting their commons from short-term free riding, and they did so by maintaining cultures of sharing,[[3249]](#endnote-3250) helped by the time-honoured seven-generation rule.[[3250]](#endnote-3251) Archaeologist Ingrid Fuglestvedt has studied Palaeolithic lifestyles for many years and she describes the culture of sharing as ‘a vitality that is maintained through cooperation between humans and animals, this being a joint venture which, as it were, makes the world go round’.[[3251]](#endnote-3252)

When we look at present-day entrepreneurs who cut down the Amazonian Rainforest and threaten the last Indigenous populations that live there, then we realise that they enact the opposite of a long-term time horizon.[[3252]](#endnote-3253) These entrepreneurs focus on the short-term advantages of filling their coffers or securing shareholder value, while overlooking the long-term interest of their grandchildren to inherit a world worth living in.[[3253]](#endnote-3254) They exploit whoever is too weak to speak up, whoever cannot pay for themselves — the trees, the Indigenous peoples, and future generations — and they convince the rest that this strategy is to be hailed as ‘economic progress’.[[3254]](#endnote-3255)

How is this possible? We must humbly admit that the human species is highly vulnerable to fall for short-termism. Since the era of early animists, every time history put a new temptation for short-termism on humanity’s table, it seems our forebears fell for it, and communities who did not learn to abandon it before it was too late disappeared. At the present point in history, this predicament is so severe and so global that there is little time left for learning — the entire human experiment may end.

Short-term free riders who intend to weaken a community’s resilience and undermine their ability to protect their long-term commons have two pathways: the individual level and the community level. We live in times where both are being combined.

When we look at the individual human bodymind, we see many vulnerabilities that operate as invitations to short-termism.

Addiction has been touched upon before, the craving for short-term gratification in place of long-term prudence when the body’s dopamine system is in charge. Addiction plays out in many ways. In the twenty-first century, ‘limbic capitalism’ has turned consumerism into an addictive activity with the result that people are captured in ever more sophisticated ‘luxury traps’.[[3255]](#endnote-3256) The immediate gratification of easy credit card use feeds self-destructive short-termism, as does the dependency on products-pushing social media influencers.[[3256]](#endnote-3257) Psychologists abet this trend when they link the notion of dignity and ‘self-esteem’ with supposedly ‘autonomous’ short-term gratification.[[3257]](#endnote-3258) At the current point in time, as ever more people are hooked on the consumption of fast-disposable goods, they contribute to turning their very own species into a disposable species.

The presently unfolding coronavirus pandemic exposes the destructiveness of this consumerism. It exposes how misguided it is to define a hectic life as a ‘full’ and ‘good life’ and how ill-advised it is to want to ‘go back to normal after the pandemic’, when ‘normal’ means proceeding with destruction.[[3258]](#endnote-3259)

In this dire situation, more deliberate thought processes may be of help, yet, as reported above, there is no guarantee for that to be of help. Not least cognitive biases can lead to irrational rather than rational outcomes.[[3259]](#endnote-3260) Psychologist Daniel Kahneman has conceptualised a dichotomy between two modes of thought, each of which processes the same input, only very differently. System 1 is fast, instinctive, and emotional, while System 2 is slower, deliberative, and more logical.[[3260]](#endnote-3261) Counter to the widespread belief that the conscious and deliberate System 2 is superior, it can produce irrational results when its inbuilt cognitive biases are activated. The intuitive information processing of System 1 — typically considered irrational — can be more logical and more useful. To use the metaphor of the naked emperor, System 1 stands for the child who cries out that the emperor is naked, while the adults use System 2 to deny it. The child Greta Thunberg cries out that a ‘new normal’ is needed, while the rest is proud of their sophisticated denial.

As the human psyche may be weakened from within, community resilience can also come under attack from outside.[[3261]](#endnote-3262) The Indigenous seven-generation horizon is best maintained when a community is stable over time, so that relevant knowledge can be passed on to future generations. Throughout history, Indigenous groups who succeeded in protecting their commons from short-term free riding did so by instilling a sense of long-term responsibility early on in their offspring. This enabled their community to stand together when it was necessary to restrain individuals who were tempted by short-termism.[[3262]](#endnote-3263) Such long-established arrangements, however, become vulnerable when the large-scale context changes too fast and the crisis mode’s short-termism undercuts necessary long-term adaptations. Not least the coronavirus pandemic illustrates this predicament when it forecloses the long-term solutions that are needed to address the much larger crises that loom as the planet’s resources continue to be overstretched.

While a virus can create a crisis mode, people can do so, too. The first peoples of the Americas were affected by both.[[3263]](#endnote-3264) Diseases imported by European ‘settlers’ decimated them, and then they were subjected to abuse that dissolved also the rest of community cohesion:

In the Boarding School Era from the late 1800s to the mid-1900s, the U.S. government enacted legislation that forcibly removed Native children from their homes and placed them in Christian boarding schools. These children were taken to hundreds of miles away from their families for years and faced severe discipline if they tried to speak their languages or practice their traditions. Many children died from malnutrition or disease. Those who survived returned years later to find themselves completely disconnected from their family and traditional ways... The trauma and persecution endured by elder Native generations led to a breakdown of the Native family and tribal structure and a weakening of spiritual ties.[[3264]](#endnote-3265)

When I carried out my doctoral research in Africa in 1998 and 1999 with the aim to understand genocide and war in Rwanda and Somalia, my African friends faulted precisely the overwhelming pace of change when they confronted me:

First you white people colonise us. Then you leave us with a so-called democratic state that is alien to us. After that, you watch us getting dictatorial leaders. Then you give them weapons to kill half of us. Finally, you come along to ‘measure’ our suffering and claim that this will help us!? Are you crazy?[[3265]](#endnote-3266)

When we take a step back and look at big history, then the onset of circumscription about twelve millennia ago comes to mind as an early case of emergency. Our species Homo sapiens had to adapt to an unfamiliar win-lose situation rather fast — fast in historical terms — and they adapted by systematising domination over nature and each other. The Agricultural Revolution may be described as an early form of ‘luxury trap’:

The story of the luxury trap carries with it an important lesson. Humanity’s search for an easier life released immense forces of change that transformed the world in ways nobody envisioned or wanted. Nobody plotted the Agricultural Revolution or sought human dependence on cereal cultivation. A series of trivial decisions aimed mostly at filling a few stomachs and gaining a little security had the cumulative effect of forcing ancient foragers to spend their days carrying water buckets under a scorching sun.[[3266]](#endnote-3267)

‘Carrying water buckets under a scorching sun’ is an image that aptly describes the dominator model of society and how it enabled the free riding of strongmen on underlings and nature. Indeed, for the past millennia, the dominator model, driven by the security dilemma’s motto of If you want peace, prepare for war, operated with short-term competition for domination that trumped long-term cooperation, with the result that the seven-generation rule was impossible to uphold.

‘The so-called tragedy of the commons is one of the most condensed embodiments of patriarchal thinking’, these are sociologist Miki Kashtan’s words, and this even though ‘we are designed by evolution to be part of life and to engage with each other and nature collaboratively to care for life’.[[3267]](#endnote-3268) Indeed, when we look at human history, we understand how erroneous it is to speak of hunter-gatherers and associate hunting with men as a preform of the domination over nature, while associating gathering and gardening with women and regarding it as less important. What really happened was that women and men together were mobile and followed the wild food that nature had on offer. Following the Neolithic Revolution, however, patriarchal thinking took over and tainted even our conceptualisation of the past.[[3268]](#endnote-3269) In my work, I therefore speak of mobile foragers.

The most recent manifestation of ‘hunting’ is the hunting for money in a world that idolises free-riding dominators. ‘The hunt’ in Nairobi slums that was introduced earlier in this chapter captures the reality of this experience that is shared by ever more people all around the world — ‘People chase money. They don’t know where it is coming from or where they need to go or what they have to do to get it. ... This is the essence of experiential existence; seeking, negotiating, searching’.[[3269]](#endnote-3270)

As this predicament is global now, local commons dilemmas[[3270]](#endnote-3271) transmute into a global tragedy of the commons. Ecologist Garrett James Hardin chose the epithet ‘tragedy’ in 1968, because, as he explains, ‘an unmanaged commons in a world of limited material wealth and unlimited desires inevitably ends in ruin’.[[3271]](#endnote-3272) Indeed, it is a tragedy when Homo sapiens proudly speaks of ‘human exceptionality’ when ruin is ubiquitous after twelve millennia of humanity’s campaign of depleting our planet’s resources with ever increasing efficiency.

Throughout history, many thinkers and innovators have attempted to avert ruin and rescue both the individual and the community from having their resilience undermined by free-riding dominators. So far, however, these attempts were always subverted in the end. By now, it is humanity’s last chance.

As one of many examples for such an attempt we might list seventeenth century Enlightenment philosopher John Locke. He taught that all humans are endowed with ‘natural rights’ that know no race, class, or religion, that these rights are more than simply an expression of English political culture, and that it is government’s task to protect these rights. This was a universalist understanding of human nature and of the primacy of the individual independent from traditional ties of race and tribe. Enlightenment liberalism ‘looks at the bright side of individualism and promises in principle to supplement it and correct it with fraternité and with what De Tocqueville called associations’, explains political scientist Harry Targ.[[3272]](#endnote-3273)

Enlightenment liberalism’s promise of global fraternité and solidarity associations stands out, we can acknowledge it for that, as a significant step towards uniting humankind into one family, towards liberating it from short-term victories that translate into long-term defeat. Enlightenment liberalism informed America’s eighteenth century founding principles. In 1775, American statesman Alexander Hamilton spoke of the ‘sacred rights of mankind’ written ‘by the hand of the divinity itself’ never to be ‘erased or obscured by mortal power’.[[3273]](#endnote-3274)

As history shows, ‘mortal power’ disagreed. Historian Robert Kagan has chronicled how traditional autocratic society rejected this new revolutionary liberalism. The governments of Europe and the Church were hostile to the United States of America and ‘earnestly hoped that this new “dangerous nation” would soon collapse into civil war and destroy itself, which it almost did’.[[3274]](#endnote-3275) To the doubters’ astonishment, however, the United States prevailed, it even became a beacon of hope for many — the Statue of Liberty was given to New York by a Frenchman to hail America’s future-oriented vision and shame his own country, France, for failing it. European rulers and societies continued to fight back with anti-liberal worldviews against the Enlightenment liberalism’s radical idea ‘that the individual conscience, as well as the individual’s body, should be inviolate and protected from the intrusions of state and church’.[[3275]](#endnote-3276)

Unfortunately, though, the authors of the United States Declaration of Independence gambled away success through overlooking the difference between superficial pleasure and lasting happiness. They failed to understand that enshrining the entitlement to short-term pleasure opens the door for addiction, which, in turn, undermines long-term ‘fraternité and De Tocqueville’s associations’. In this way, all three promises of the Declaration ultimately became undermined — life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Many journalists still remember Walter Lippmann and his debate with John Dewey in the 1920s, where Dewey stood up against Lippmanian elitism and recommended the long-term inclusion of all people.[[3276]](#endnote-3277) Lippman’s position won out, at the latest when Keynesian economics in the planning of economic and social development were left behind in favour for the ‘neo-liberalist Hayek-inspired flexibility paradigm required by free markets that are to a large extent beyond regulation’, a trend that subsequently found ‘strong political bases in the Reagan and Thatcher governments in the 80s’.[[3277]](#endnote-3278)

After market-priced pleasure had opened the door for short-term free riding in the Anglo-Saxon world, it spread out from there until it became global. The lure of American-style short-term gratification attracts followers all around the world willing to cut into their own flesh for the promise — even literally, if we look at the current rise in cosmetic surgery in Asia that aims to look like ‘pretty Western celebrities’.[[3278]](#endnote-3279) German banks have self-destructed in the attempt to be part of Wall Street adventurism.[[3279]](#endnote-3280) Everywhere, people hold on to the hope that a money-based ‘free market’ will be a source of well-being for all in the long term, even though it is visibly disintegrating into just another version of the drug pusher’s promise of a high, a promise that traps victims into dependency only to squeeze them empty later. More and more people all around the world experience their lives as the drug addict’s hunt for the next shot, a hunt in an increasingly scarce environment. The coronavirus pandemic exposes this tragedy, as predatory growth pays, while the care work that keeps societies afloat in the long term is badly remunerated.[[3280]](#endnote-3281)

When we look for scholars who have studied long-term versus short-term horizons, we find, for instance, social psychologist Geert Hofstede (1928–2020).[[3281]](#endnote-3282) Unfortunately, he was overly optimistic when he saw ‘modern education’ as a way to inculcate a long-term orientation. A long-term horizon presupposes a sophisticated understanding of what ‘modern’ means, it requires holding on to pre-modern knowledge that is beneficial and rejecting ‘modern’ knowledge that is harmful, it requires harvesting and cultivating the best from all worlds.[[3282]](#endnote-3283) Modern education of today is guilty of many pre-modern failings, after all it replicates social inequalities on a scale that reaches back to feudal times.[[3283]](#endnote-3284) Not to speak of the term ‘modern education’ having been abused as a cover for the most abominable atrocities, including the abuse of long-term thinking itself — not least Adolf Hitler weaponised such thinking by inculcating in the Hitlerjugend, the Hitler-youth, the hope for a Thousand-year Reich, an empire that was to last for thousand years.

Educator Magnus Haavelsrud observes that market-driven systems build on ‘a fragmentation of consciousness’ that fits elitist decision-making[[3284]](#endnote-3285) and requires ‘obedience by citizens in accepting the individualism and competition required at the interactional level’.[[3285]](#endnote-3286) By now, the entire world’s population is targeted by the ‘fragmentation of consciousness’ at the hands of elites who free ride globally and avert collective action against them. In the West, the lever is gamification of consumerism, in countries like China it includes the gamification of total surveillance,[[3286]](#endnote-3287) while in Africa it is the application of the five-fold strategy of ‘creating a secure repressive base; divide and rule strategies; controlling the media; creating a confusing and closed system and, last, not pushing people too far’.[[3287]](#endnote-3288)

The Indigenous seven-generation rule had few institutional anchorings in the past millennia’s dominator contexts, and it has even fewer now.[[3288]](#endnote-3289) The time-horizon of leaders in dictatorial contexts is their lifetime, in Western democratic contexts most politician’s time-horizon typically lasts only until the next election, while in the corporate world and that of finance, short-term profit defines the very system. While ‘the total cost of goods and services in a day (all that humankind produces) is around $1 trillion’, on the same day [in 2019], ‘financial transactions are close to $40 trillion’, and this is ‘the only sector of international relations which has no ruler, comptroller, or regulator’, as ‘finance is totally free to do what it likes’.[[3289]](#endnote-3290) What Garrett Hardin describes as tragedy of the commons should rather be called the tragedy of the market, argues the Schumacher Center.[[3290]](#endnote-3291)

Commons typically face two threats — free riders from inside and invaders from outside — and a market economy turns both threats into short-term business opportunities so that the commons dilemma combines with the anti-commons dilemma.[[3291]](#endnote-3292) While in former times, kings convinced their subjects that royals deserved more space on the commons than non-royals did, present-day’s institution of money offers an even more ‘elegant’ pathway to get a bigger share of the commons. The fact that money is a commodity that can be accumulated in an instant, independent of the real world, makes short-termism systemic.[[3292]](#endnote-3293) Long-term mutual solidarity and care that could create dignifying living conditions for all is antagonised by the very systemic frames that should protect them. As this predicament is global now, no citizen can escape its pressure, all lives are trapped within the same systemic confines, whether they agree with it or not. People find themselves in exhausting hamster wheels and rat races, stuck in scarcity traps that put everyone under such stress that ‘mental overstretch’ is now endemic, removing the calm and quiet that would be needed to think long term and devise new systemic frames.[[3293]](#endnote-3294)

Even rebellions turn to short-termism now, as we see right wing populists promise to remedy the economic short-termism that has undermined equal dignity during the past decades with future short-termism of strongman honour.[[3294]](#endnote-3295) ‘The spread of Enlightenment ideas leads to counter-reactions in the form of fundamentalism’,[[3295]](#endnote-3296) and everywhere we see calls for ‘strong leaders with little interest in participatory democracy’.[[3296]](#endnote-3297) We see a Disunited Kingdom, Disunited States, and Disunited Nations.

Related to the time horizon is the space horizon. Those people who profit from social and ecological exploitation — be it the colonisers of the past or present-day’s Global North — have the means to shield themselves through fences, walls, or geographical distance from the destruction they cause. As a result, they do not see any destruction, they do not see the necessity to invest in change, even though they are the ones who caused this destruction and who possess the necessary resources to effect change. On the other side of the fence are the victims, those who see the need for change but lack the resources to effect it.

Hope lies in the fact that this separation of spaces between winners and losers is being perforated just now, as global phenomena such as climate degradation and global pandemics leave no corner of the planet unaffected. We can hope that ‘those who previously had sheltered themselves against degraded commons by money or power will be forced to confront — and thus motivated to ameliorate — shared social and environmental problems’.[[3297]](#endnote-3298)

The situation is like on Titanic at a moment when there still was a small time window to change the course. The ship will sink if those who have the resources to change the course stay uninterested, or if internal conflicts draw all attention away from the looming danger of the iceberg. Whoever holds the view that ‘countries’ should ‘regain’ full ‘sovereignty’ and embark on competition to win, will hasten the collision with the iceberg.[[3298]](#endnote-3299) In a globally interconnected world, protecting planet Earth as humankind’s shared commons is a question of survival for humanity. All players need to cooperate in a joint effort to protect these commons. Whoever endangers the commons as a free rider needs to be reined in by the majority, just as Indigenous groups have done in the past.[[3299]](#endnote-3300) If early foragers knew how to contain greedy free riders without resorting to violence, then such knowledge can be reactivated today.[[3300]](#endnote-3301) Economist Elinor Ostrom showed through her research that it is possible to achieve this even for larger groups — she receive the Nobel Prize for Economics 2009 for this work.[[3301]](#endnote-3302)

We, as humanity, could have healed the security dilemma long ago, but we made the mistake of compounding it with the growth dilemma and its slogan of If you want prosperity, invest in exploitation. Unfortunately, in this way, we aggravated our global commons dilemma. Our primary task now is to unite as human family so we can leave behind all our dilemmas. It is time for global human security in the place of military security, it is time for the blessings of the commons rather than the tragedy of the commons.[[3302]](#endnote-3303)

So far, people like me, those who wish to manifest the dignity of long-term solidarity with all of this Earth’s inhabitants, find little systemic support. What we do, is filling the dignity gaps of the system with offering our own resources. In my case, I sacrifice my entire lifetime to fill the dignity gaps of our contemporary systemic frames.[[3303]](#endnote-3304)

### Economic systems are human-made and not laws of nature

‘Geld regiert die Welt’ is a saying in German. It rhymes better than the English version that says, ‘money rules the world’, or ‘accumulation rules the world’, as philosopher Howard Richards would say.[[3304]](#endnote-3305)

This is my prediction after almost five decades of global experience: If we continue to accept the sentence ‘Geld regiert die Welt’ as if it were a law of nature, it will translate into the demise of humanity. I wrote the book titled A dignity economy in 2012[[3305]](#endnote-3306) to inquire how we can avoid that ‘money destroys the world’, that ‘capitalism is killing democracy’.[[3306]](#endnote-3307) More, how we can avoid that it kills all life on Earth.

Now that ‘Adam Smith’s invisible hand is at our throats’, can we avoid global ruin and instead build economic systems that advance dignity for all?[[3307]](#endnote-3308)

When we look back at the time when Adam Smith lived, we understand that he would be shocked by the ways his teachings are used today. He would resonate with the question recently asked by the International Monetary Fund, ‘Has neo-liberalism been oversold?’[[3308]](#endnote-3309) Adam Smith was an egalitarian who had the welfare of all of society at heart when he recommended self-interested profit maximising for everyone. He did not foresee that the reverse may happen, namely, that society would become the supplier of profit to a few, that a few investors would benefit for a short while at the price of burdening the rest in the long term. Adam Smith would be shocked by the cogitocidal erosion of moral values and the omnicidal degradation of eco- and sociospheres.[[3309]](#endnote-3310) ‘Privatisation’ is not ‘progress’, he would say, it turns into regress when it causes ecocide and sociocide.

Philosopher Howard Richards observes something that also I encounter all around the world: The proposition that ‘more investor-friendly reforms will serve the common good’ is being treated as if it were a truism without need for proof, only Africans remember that ‘the historical conditions of the possibility of unemployment did not even exist until Africa was conquered by Europeans’.[[3310]](#endnote-3311)

Lately, however, change has set in. As progressive politicians of ‘the left’ lose elections all around the world, they begin to ask themselves whether they did not succumb too naïvely to the belief that ‘the market’ has the status of a law of nature to which humans have to adapt.[[3311]](#endnote-3312)

When I began writing my book on a dignity economy and how such an economy might be shaped, I knew that it was misguided to individualise and psychologise the problem, it was wrong to blame the greed of a few individuals. Rather, we face a systemic problem. My primary aim was to identify the core lever in this system that turns the promise of progress into regress. I learned that the culprit is not money, but the institution of money — how money is defined, created, and disseminated.[[3312]](#endnote-3313) Simply digitalising money will not help as long as it builds on the idea of money as an accumulatable commodity, not to speak of the problem with information technology protocols like blockchain creating extra burdens on already scarce energy sources.[[3313]](#endnote-3314) I learned that local communities may be better advised to create their own currencies to ride out future global financial and energy collapses.[[3314]](#endnote-3315)

What are dignifying solutions for the future that surpass existing systems? On my global path, I am always saddened when I see how little energy is invested in sober thinking about this question. Rather, I see people being caught in backward looking cycles of humiliation where those who say ‘I believe in capitalism’ ridicule those who say ‘I believe in socialism’ and vice versa. Both accuse the other of being ‘ideologues’, all claim to be the only ones on the right side of scientific truth. I must admit that I often shake my head in disbelief upon the futility of such discussions. Everyone is outraged, feelings of mutual contempt heat up on all sides, impassioned disgust, anger, and a sense of humiliation fill the space that should brim with sober thinking. Sober thinking becomes clouded with the proverbial fog of war.[[3315]](#endnote-3316) Sometimes, I feel so alienated that I think I am back in the ninth century when people spent time and energy on discussing whether dogheads existed, creatures with a human body and the head of a dog, and if yes, whether these creatures had human souls that needed salvation or not.[[3316]](#endnote-3317)

My position is that whatever solutions we seek for the future, what has to be appreciated, above all, is the reality of planet Earth as the basis of all human life. Planet Earth represents our commons and we need to replenish it with future-oriented solutions that re-combine whatever strategies proved useful in the past, and this independent of any -isms.[[3317]](#endnote-3318) If we listen to Howard Richards’ analysis, there is no need for mutual humiliation anyway, as both ‘capitalism’ and ‘socialism’ suffer from the very same underlying problem, namely, the fact that all are successors of Roman law that dates back two thousand years (read more in chapter 12).

I would add that all are caught in the millennia-old dominator model of society, all are afflicted with what I call the war injury of our dominator past. To be overcome, it requires a second order transition. In the place of past and present-day hyper-isms, I propose to abandon any -ism, or, if we can’t, then at least go for dignity-ism (see more in chapter 11).

We will be well advised, all of us, to remember that economic rules are structured by humans and thus can also be re-structured by humans, and to heed research that subverts the reigning economic order as much as Martin Luther’s teachings did with the Catholic Church, namely, research that shows that people do not act according to the rational choice of Homo oeconomicus.[[3318]](#endnote-3319)

### Solidarity is not the same as free riding

Many people hold what is known as just-world hypothesis to be true [[3319]](#endnote-3320) When they see that people suffer, they rationalise this by saying, ‘they deserve it’. I meet people all over the world, particularly men from the Global North, who say, ‘I despise all these lazy people in the world who have no other goal than to free ride on the hard work people like me do!’ Some of the men I meet are indeed working hard in their professional lives, others are simply born into privilege. Few like to be reminded of concepts such as structural privilege and structural violence, even less so of the fact that many of the supposedly ‘lazy’ people in the world work much harder than they do. Few in the Global North would survive the up to eighteen hours that garment workers in Bangladesh have to work a day.[[3320]](#endnote-3321) Few in the Global North feel called to use their privileges for serious systemic analysis, or, at least for genuine charity. If at all, charity is offered that is not charitable (see more in chapter 12).

To use the image of the Titanic, the men I refer to think that if the poor who live in the lower decks were to work truly hard, the ship would avoid the iceberg and everyone would spend their lives on the very deck they deserve to be on in relation to their efforts. These men are appalled by what they call ‘enabling liberals’ on the luxury first deck, who, as they see it, intend to open all doors to the lazy to live off the brave and industrious who created the good life on the upper deck in the first place.

Free riding is a phenomenon that is being widely discussed in economics and game theory literature. Usually, cost-benefit analysis, rational choice, and (the paradox of) cooperation are in focus, while the impact of social norms on actions are underestimated in game theory and motivations related to altruism are underrated. Social loafing is a similar phenomenon, and it is the topic of study in social psychology. It points at people’s tendency to invest less effort in achieving a goal when they work in a group than when working alone, because in a group, responsibility is diffused and people feel their input is dispensable.[[3321]](#endnote-3322) As social loafing hurts both the individual and the group, it is not regarded as free riding from the economists’ point of rationality, as economists apply the term free riding only to cases where the choice to loaf originates from a rational cost/benefit analysis.

As I see it, the lack of social-psychological insight in economics and game theory literature has significantly contributed to turning the theory and practice of money into a core problem. The idea that money may be useful to manage scarce resources was mistakenly extended to the assumption that money is also useful to ‘manage’ human beings. What surprises economists most is that money as an extrinsic motivator does not increase intrinsic motivation, on the contrary, it decreases intrinsic motivation — ‘tangible rewards tend to have a substantially negative effect on intrinsic motivation’.[[3322]](#endnote-3323) This is why I refuse ‘to be paid’ — receiving money for ‘good performance’ would decrease my intrinsic motivation to serve the world with my work.[[3323]](#endnote-3324)

We could say that in a world that mistakenly assumes that human beings can be reduced to the Homo oeconomicus concept of human nature, free riding represents neither laziness nor corruption, on the contrary, it simply represents smartness. In a world defined by market pricing, in a world where the most admired achievement is the accumulation of monetary resources, there is nothing more profitable than free riding on the solidarity of other people.[[3324]](#endnote-3325) Free riding and corruption are strategies that are perfectly aligned with the concept of Homo oeconomicus — what could be ‘smarter’ than treating other people’s ethical self-restraint as another resource waiting to be exploited?

If we want to place blame, then society as a whole is guilty of systemic free riding on its own social and ecological resources through giving priority to monetary accumulation as a foundation of society. Society as a whole is guilty of the systemic dismantling of Homo amans, the ‘loving being’, guilty of giving systemic support to whoever feels inclined to embody Homo dominans. This society-wide choice could be called systemic political corrumpalism.[[3325]](#endnote-3326)

As I see it, only communal sharing — Alan Page Fiske’s concept of solidarity presented earlier — is suitable to guide the design of constitutive rules at all levels, from micro to macro levels.[[3326]](#endnote-3327) Research on multi-level selection has shown that, while altruists often lose out within groups, groups with more altruists are more resilient.[[3327]](#endnote-3328) So far, no system, be it called ‘communist’ or ‘capitalist’, has manifested communal sharing, all became hijacked by the dominator spirit, by the script of powerful men free riding on the care work shouldered by others, usually in the majority women.

To return to the image of the Titanic, it is true that there will always be loafers and free riders around. As the situation stands now, those on the luxury deck are the most significant free riders. They enforce a ship design that inhibits most of those who live at the bottom to rise up no matter how hard they work. This happens while the human condition on planet Earth does not allow for a cruise ship design with a luxury deck altogether. Rather, the human condition is closer to a lifeboat than a cruise ship, closer to a seagoing Viking ship where all hands are needed on deck.[[3328]](#endnote-3329) To avoid the iceberg, everyone on the ship needs to work equally hard now — to alter both the course of the ship and its design.

We must leave behind the dominator model of society and invite Homo dominans together with Homo oeconomicus into humility. The partnership model of society waits to be nurtured[[3329]](#endnote-3330) — the mutuality model as psychologist Linda Hartling calls it.[[3330]](#endnote-3331) Homo amans relationalis, the ‘loving relational being’,[[3331]](#endnote-3332) awaits reinvigoration. Homo solidaricus awaits to become Homo solidaricus globalis (see chapter 2).[[3332]](#endnote-3333)

### Double standards and mixed messages undermine human rights ideals

Human rights ideals are not Western ideas. They have anchorings in many cultural realms. When I lived in Egypt, I learned to admire ma’at, the ancient Egyptian concept of truth, balance, order, harmony, law, morality, and justice, embodied in the goddess Ma’at. This is just one example. The list of non-Western anchorings of human rights ideals is long.

However, since the West has acted as the main champion of human rights ideals for quite a while,[[3333]](#endnote-3334) the West is guilty of discrediting these ideas more than others.[[3334]](#endnote-3335) Mixed messages and double standards originating from the West have tainted these ideals as ‘imperialistic Western ideas’ and have created deeply humiliating dignity gaps. As a result, those who have access to elections, vote for extremist political parties, while many of the less fortunate vote with their feet and migrate[[3335]](#endnote-3336) or even turn to extremist violence in the form of terrorism.

Strongmen ‘from Abe to Erdogan, Modi, Putin, and Xi’ take over in countries once humiliated by the West, warns peace researcher Johan Galtung.[[3336]](#endnote-3337) Galtung defines four ‘class dimensions’ — economic, military, cultural, political.[[3337]](#endnote-3338) The first class achieves power via carrots, the second via sticks, the third via values, and the fourth via decisions. When these dimensions are correlated — high-high-high-high versus low-low-low-low — they are in equilibrium. Disequilibrium reigns — in my language I would call it dignity gaps — when values fail to correlate with decisions about carrots and sticks. This is precisely what happens now, chronicles political analyst Roberto Savio. Because of double standards, the past three decades have played out as ‘years of greed’, until the financial crisis of 2008 rang in an ‘era of fear’, which now transmutes into an ‘age of anger’,[[3338]](#endnote-3339) worse, into an ‘age of evil think’.[[3339]](#endnote-3340)

Saskia Sassen is a sociologist and scholar of urban and globalisation studies, migration, and mobility, and she warns that the situation is so grave that even terms such as ‘poverty’ and ‘inequality’ no longer adequately describe the expulsion of entire populations from living space:

The last two decades have seen a sharp growth in the number of people who have been driven out of human livelihoods and frameworks that protect their basic needs and rights. Among the expelled are the growing numbers of displaced people in poor countries who live in formal and informal refugee camps, minorities in rich countries who are kept in prisons, workers whose bodies are destroyed on the job, and populations warehoused in ghettoes and slums. The current ‘migrant crisis’ in Europe is perhaps the most acute version of a larger process of expulsion from life-spaces. War is the main reason, but land grabs and both desertification and rising water levels, which will further add to a massive loss of habitat, play a role too. While the visible narrative is one of progress and growing wealth, much of the tragedies mentioned above are invisible, existing in the shadows of the rapidly expanding high-quality built environments that are taking over more and more urban and suburban space.[[3340]](#endnote-3341)

It might seem counterintuitive, yet, terminologies such as ‘poverty’ and ‘inequality’, even though they connote shortcomings, still signal faith in existing constitutional rules and their functionality. After all, ‘it is rather weird to allow poverty to be created and then to try to solve it’.[[3341]](#endnote-3342) The use of the vocabulary of poverty and inequality signals faith in the existing rules and that they have the inherent capacity to create dignity for all if only left to their own devices, perhaps tweaked by mild regulatory reforms, and complemented with some coaching, counselling, and psychotherapy for the unavoidable imperfections of human nature itself. Any serious malfunction would be the individual’s fault, and only uninformed or ill-intentioned people could doubt such a superior system.

The truth may, however, be the other way round. The constitutional rules of our world-system may represent the very culprit. They may be the ones that undermine dignity systemically, and no regulatory reforms and no psychotherapy can undo the damage. The presently existing constitutional rules may be the ones that first lead to the degradation of the realm of thinking and reflection — to cogitocide — and from there proceed to sociocide and ecocide, ultimately risking omnicide.[[3342]](#endnote-3343)

In other words, we may need to be more innovative and think of dignified and dignifying systemic adaptations that make phrases such as poverty and inequality redundant altogether.

### Domination has no inherent endpoint except for total destruction

Domination is a strategy with no inherent endpoint except for the total destruction of its substrate. I have discussed this at length in my book on terror.[[3343]](#endnote-3344) Locusts illustrate this predicament. Locusts survive only as long as there are enough fresh crops available to which they can fly. Humankind, however, has no other planet to go to after it commits global ecocide on planet Earth. Even if we were to succeed in moving to another planet, we would soon turn it into a ravaged place if we were to continue with the same ‘parasitoid relationship’ that we visit on our home planet. The assumption may be true that a species that takes total control over its planet is already on the path to self-destruction.[[3344]](#endnote-3345)

Sociologist Hartmut Rosa and his colleagues describe three ‘motors’ of ‘dynamisation’ of domination, namely, (socio-economic) appropriation, (socio-cultural) acceleration, and (socio-political) activation.[[3345]](#endnote-3346) This ‘triple-A-mode’, they explain, entails ‘a logic of incessant escalation which eventually threatens to undermine itself, leading to a multifaceted process of destabilisation’.[[3346]](#endnote-3347)

Examples for multifaceted processes of destabilisation abound. The proud company Boeing offers an illustration of destabilisation in the literal sense of the word. The 737 Max aircraft is inherently instable in the air, ‘This airplane is designed by clowns, who in turn are supervised by monkeys’, was the verdict from one company pilot in 2016.[[3347]](#endnote-3348)

The design of human life on Earth seems to follow a similar self-destabilising trajectory. In 1948, the international community enshrined principles that outlined superior guidelines, namely, human rights ideals. Yet, inherently destabilising competitions for domination have largely captured these ideals. Despite the fact that human rights ideals de-legitimise deadly competition and call for the implementation of life-giving strategies of dialogue and partnership, as it seems, powerful resistance prevails, both covertly and overtly, while the majority is confused, co-opted, and divided. ‘We live in an age of impotence. Stuck between global war and global finance, between identity and capital, we seem to be incapable of producing the radical change that is so desperately needed’.[[3348]](#endnote-3349)

Competition for domination strategies often proceed behind a veil of rhetoric of human rights and democracy. The influence of people like Ayn Rand (1905–1982) and Leo Strauss (1899–1973), ‘the guru of American conservatism’, has played an important role (read more in chapters 6 and 7). Strauss was a German Jewish émigré to the United States and a historian of philosophy.[[3349]](#endnote-3350) His students, known as the Straussians, have penetrated American government and higher education, for instance, the Bush administration. ‘At the heart of Strauss’s political philosophy is the theme of domination and subordination, or put another way, the conflict between philosophy and the political domain’.[[3350]](#endnote-3351) Strauss’ perception of Plato inspired his view that ‘the masses of people are irresponsible and vulgar and prevent the wise from ruling’, and that therefore the wise can only rule indirectly, namely, through ‘lies, guile, and deception’ and by associating with the powerful via a ‘secret kingship’.[[3351]](#endnote-3352) ‘The authoritarian state, or even the semi-authoritarian state — the one-party state, the illiberal state — offers precisely a Straussian promise, explains scholar Anne Applebaum: that the nation will be ruled by the best people, the deserving people, the members of the party, the believers in the Medium-Size Lie’.[[3352]](#endnote-3353)

The Straussian hope, however, failed that the world would be a better place with a secretly dominated democracy in which the masses busy themselves with competing against each other. Applebaum explains that the principles of competition, ‘even when they encourage talent and create upward mobility, don’t necessarily answer deeper questions about national identity, or satisfy the human desire to belong to a moral community’, and as a result, polarisation eats democracy wherever it still holds out.[[3353]](#endnote-3354) What emerges is polarisation into ‘tribes’ that are hostile to each other.

Philosopher Howard Richards reminds us that if we want to make human rights ideals real, we need to be aware that we confront two sorts of problems that amplify each other: one is ‘tribalism’, or the inability to move from a self-centred scope of ethics to the inclusion of the common good of all, and the other is ‘neo-liberalism’, ‘partly because it makes it impossible to comply with social rights and leaves them as forever broken promises written on official paper but not practiced’:

Also, in practice, free market liberalism has always gone together with the physical repression of the poor. In theory, the free market provides full employment and meets everyone’s needs. In practice it creates a desperate underclass which is kept down by force. Tribalism and neo-liberalism egg each other on: Neo-liberalism makes modernity so awful that people long for the traditional security of tribal life. Tribalism makes traditional life so irrational and so patriarchal that liberals can deem themselves so morally superior that they feel authorised to use force to put it down.[[3354]](#endnote-3355)

I resonate with all voices which warn that the rules according to which we arrange our human affairs on planet Earth at the present point in history are dysfunctional. Our current global institutional system is ‘incompatible with social justice and living in harmony with our Earth system, so it has to be changed, and changed quickly. The clock is ticking’.[[3355]](#endnote-3356)

I therefore propose dignism as a future-oriented set of rules for us to live in harmony with each other as integral part of our Earth system (more in chapter 11).

### Well-intended solutions have often unintended consequences

The world is full of well-intended solutions that ultimately have unintended consequences, some of which are positive, others negative. There are natural disasters and there are human-made disasters, and some disasters happen as unintended consequences of well-intended solutions.[[3356]](#endnote-3357) ‘The road to hell is paved with good intentions’ is a well-known saying, or ‘yesterday’s solutions represent today’s problems’. In German, there is the word verschlimmbessern or dis-improving, literally worse-improving.

Sometimes, negative consequences could have been foreseen, at other times they come as a surprise. Examples for surprises abound. For instance, in 1869, a New York firm offered a handsome amount of money to whoever could find a substitute for ivory.[[3357]](#endnote-3358) The result is that plastic pollutes all continents and oceans today. Or, Freon was welcomed as a miraculous solution in the 1930s. Nobody could foresee that fitting refrigerators with such halocarbon products would deplete the ozone layer of the entire planet.[[3358]](#endnote-3359) The insecticide DDT was meant to save crops and improve agricultural output, yet, it killed insects and starved birds.[[3359]](#endnote-3360) In 1955, retail analyst Victor Lebow suggested that Americans should find ‘spiritual satisfaction and ego gratification in consumption’,[[3360]](#endnote-3361) and by now the result is ecocide and sociocide. A ‘farms race’ filled American supermarkets with affordable food and helped it ‘win’ the Cold War, only to end in the degradation of human and ecological health.[[3361]](#endnote-3362) The car was meant to bring freedom, yet, it brought traffic jams and pollution.

Then there are those cases where negative consequences could have been detected earlier. For instance, never should the world’s population have been made addicted to sugar.[[3362]](#endnote-3363) Never should we have made ourselves dependent on fossil fuels.[[3363]](#endnote-3364) What about the electric car? Even if e-cars do not cause exhaust emissions on the road, the overall eco-balance is negative, as their production pollutes the environment more than conventional cars — again, in old colonial manner, dominators improve their own lives by outsourcing negative consequences.[[3364]](#endnote-3365)

In general, in complex systems, ‘the unintended consequences are often more conspicuous than the planned outcomes of the course of action’,[[3365]](#endnote-3366) in addition, ‘second-order consequences of any major socio-technical system change are often in the opposite direction of the first-order consequences — and bigger’.[[3366]](#endnote-3367) Information technology, for instance, was once expected to lead to the paperless office, or the construction of highways aimed at lessening congestion, in both cases, ‘the first-order effect indeed happened, for a given level of activity’, however, only to be ‘overwhelmed by second-order effects in the other direction’.[[3367]](#endnote-3368) The information revolution will produce ‘the pollution of brains’ if it follows the same line.[[3368]](#endnote-3369)

The system of rules that we call capitalism seems to have travelled a similar road. When Adam Smith published his treatise Inquiry into the nature and causes of the wealth of nations in 1776, English labour was riddled with uncompensated apprenticeships, domestic servitude, and clerical dominion. A secretive system of debts, favours, and gifts kept rigid hierarchies in place, from king to pauper. Smith thought of the market as the solution for this sorry state of affairs, the market should bring ‘liberty and security’ to the disadvantaged, it should solve structural inequality.

When thinkers such as Montesquieu, Sir James Steuart, and Adam Smith promoted capitalism’s constitutive rules, their high moral aim was to attenuate sinful passions by way of more ‘harmless’ commercial activities.[[3369]](#endnote-3370) At their time, wicked behaviour was attributed to three primary passions, namely, misguided love of power, lust, and avarice.[[3370]](#endnote-3371) One possible solution could have been to directly repress these passions by pure reason, however, turning avarice (or greed) from vice into virtue was a more innovative solution. This is at least how economist Albert Hirschman reconstructs the intellectual climate of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, when the pursuit of material interests was no longer condemned as deadly sin of avarice but elevated to ‘advantage’ and ‘interest’ so it could become the saviour from the other two destructive ‘passions of man’.[[3371]](#endnote-3372) What a genial idea, we might say, to counter two vices by turning the third one into a virtue!

Adam Smith lived from 1723 to 1790, and he was as much of an egalitarian as Karl Marx who lived from 1818 to 1883. In essence, both shared a very similar socio-economic project, both wanted to bring more dignity into the world. Marx acknowledged Smith’s intentions, yet, he pointed out that the market had failed to fulfil them and had instead created a structure of dominion over workers. Prior to the Industrial Revolution, in Smith’s lifetime, the free market idea made sense, yet, when Marx lived, ‘the world around Smith’s model had changed, and it was no longer a useful tool’.[[3372]](#endnote-3373) Today, we are at a point where the world has changed again and power and politics have split apart, so that now power ‘rests in global and extraterritorial space’ as sociologist Zygmunt Bauman observed.[[3373]](#endnote-3374) Most adults live their working lives neither under state control nor in a free market, but under a third condition, namely, private government, as philosopher Elizabeth Anderson points out.[[3374]](#endnote-3375)

As we see, solutions that were intended to stem vice, solutions that were meant to create fairer and more egalitarian conditions, ultimately produced the opposite result, namely, hitherto unseen inequalities. Young author Umair Haque, son of a renowned economist from Pakistan, laments:

Capitalism has become our young people’s pimp and pusher, their madam and their jailer, their sweatshop slave driver — it is the algorithm that auctions their bodies, sweat, and muscles to the lowest bidder, at the highest cost, and little more. It is not the gentle hand which nourishes them into adulthood.[[3375]](#endnote-3376)

Adam Smith and Karl Marx have successors also today, people who wish to bring more dignity into the world and whose projects turn into the opposite. Microfinancing has been mentioned before.[[3376]](#endnote-3377) The sub-prime crisis in the United States of America started with the laudable intention to dignify poor people through enabling them to own their own home, and it ended with their expropriation from home and dignity. The sharing economy goes down a similarly path now — instead of enabling cleaner and lighter living, it becomes ‘a Trojan horse for a precarious economic future’.[[3377]](#endnote-3378)

### Pro-social creativity should not be wasted

Human creativity is the most remarkable renewable resource available to humanity. Anthropologists consider human sociality and intelligence to be the two most important selective factors in all periods of human development.[[3378]](#endnote-3379)

In times of crisis, pro-social creativity is needed more than ever, at least if humankind wishes to transition towards a more dignified future. It is in humanity’s self-interest to nurture pro-social creativity at every step in the human development and educational process. The slow and deliberative creativity of the Indigenous seven-generation perspective suggests itself as one element, supported by the fast, instinctive, and emotional creativity that often comes with spontaneous reactions.[[3379]](#endnote-3380)

Empathy is one element that is needed to strengthen the intrinsic motivation to employ creativity ethically and pro-socially. Research shows that children are born with a given number of neurons that participate in empathetic response, and that these brain segments wither if favourable life experiences are lacking.[[3380]](#endnote-3381) Early on in their lives, very young children are intrinsically motivated to help others, and it is important for parents to know that they can nurture this behaviour with social praise, while they must refrain from offering extrinsic material rewards.[[3381]](#endnote-3382)

The latter insight is not just important for parents, it is of crucial significance for society at large, particularly in times of crises that can only be addressed with creative solutions. In contradistinction to what most people think, market strategies of carrots and sticks damage pro-social creativity. Offering extrinsic motivation undermines the development of intrinsic motivation to do the very same thing. ‘Tangible rewards tend to have a substantially negative effect on intrinsic motivation’, and ‘even when tangible rewards are offered as indicators of good performance, they typically decrease intrinsic motivation for interesting activities’.[[3382]](#endnote-3383)

Creativity is embedded in two foundational mechanisms that are at the core of each society’s functioning, namely, coordination and motivation.[[3383]](#endnote-3384) During the past millennia, in contexts of domination and submission, intrinsic motivation was being sacrificed for coordination — superiors secured coordination among their subordinates by forcing their own goals upon them either by way of open domination, or they used indirect carrot and stick strategies. Open domination suppresses self-determined creativity with overt force, while carrots and sticks do the same, only more covertly.[[3384]](#endnote-3385)

In the Global North, in corporate contexts, creativity is now written into many job descriptions as a business imperative. As employers usually are aware that creativity cannot be pushed with open force, they try to use carrots and sticks as a pull factor. This is usually hailed as ‘progress’ over brute force. Yet, due to the psychological dynamics described above, the result may be the opposite. Creativity may be inhibited, or, worse, invested in ways that fail to benefit the employer, not to speak of failing to serve the social cohesion of society as a whole — after all, corruption requires high degrees of creativity.

In my 2012 book A dignity economy, I explored how it is possible that everyone nods dutifully when exorbitant monetary remunerations for corporate leaders are justified with arguments such as, ‘The best and brightest will leave if they cannot accumulate money!’ My answer has always been, ‘Let them leave! They are not the best and brightest. We need to define excellence and meaningfulness in entirely new ways!’.[[3385]](#endnote-3386) Particularly in contemporary American society, some of the brightest exhaust their creativity in tedious jobs in finance,[[3386]](#endnote-3387) or in a new precariat of voluntary self-exploitation, if they do not slide down into the classical version of the precariat altogether.[[3387]](#endnote-3388) Silicon Valley’s extreme income inequalities expose how only very few can unfold their full creative potential in such contexts.[[3388]](#endnote-3389) Economist Daniel Cohen warns that the new digital economy is putting in place a disruptive ‘zero-cost’ production model that introduces new forms of insecurity.[[3389]](#endnote-3390) Unsurprisingly, ‘mental stress in the workplace has increased over the years’,[[3390]](#endnote-3391) as modern humans live above their ‘psychological means’.[[3391]](#endnote-3392)

In sum, creativity loses much of its pro-social benefits when it becomes a business imperative for Homo oeconomicus in a market place.[[3392]](#endnote-3393) Worse still, in the absence of strong intrinsic ethical motivations, any gap in the system becomes a carrot that attracts anti-social creativity, which, in turn, leads to corruption and unethical wielding of power. When pro-social solidarity is considered to be naïve by society at large, when the solidarity offered by the ‘stupid’ is regarded as yet another resource waiting to be exploited by the ‘smarter’ ones, it should come as no surprise that the outcome is a brutal solidarity-free society of ‘smart loners’.

Given such a context, parents are understandably afraid of teaching their children empathy. Parents fear that reality out in the world is too brutal for such nurturing and that their children will turn into defenceless adults if they develop too much empathy.[[3393]](#endnote-3394) Many parents therefore forego the nurturant parent model that fosters responsible and critical citizens, parents turn back to the strict father model of parenting that, however, only produces compliant conformists.[[3394]](#endnote-3395) I observe with dismay that some parents even expose their smallest babies to strategies such as ‘controlled crying’ now.[[3395]](#endnote-3396)

I am personally very thankful that I had the privilege of growing up with a father who fostered a deep awareness in his children that the creativity of loving empathic solidarity is more enriching for the human soul in the long term than any short-term ‘carrot’. This book is therefore also my gift of appreciation to my father. Today’s world needs people like my father, people who nurture empathic creativity embedded in pro-social solidarity. Psychologists Anthony Marsella and Maureen O’Hara are such teachers. Anthony Marsella explains that ‘it takes wisdom, character, and integrity to attach modesty, justice, doubt, humility, and relativity to conclusions’, and Maureen O’Hara adds three more dimensions — creativity, courage, and community.[[3396]](#endnote-3397)

Let us find out what is needed so parents can be assured that their children, when taught to develop empathic creativity, will not be exploited later in life.[[3397]](#endnote-3398) Let us find out how we, as humankind, can organise our affairs in our global village so that empathic pro-social creativity can be nurtured. We need ‘creativity to see the world afresh with its never-before seen possibilities, courage to act on our best sense of things even knowing we might be wrong, and a community to tell us when we are and offer us another view’.[[3398]](#endnote-3399)

### Rationality has limits and world healers are needed

Wherever I go on our planet, I observe the following pattern, usually playing out in three acts. Let me begin with the micro level and the example of a beating husband. In the first act, a social worker approaches him and invites him to engage in respectful self-reflective humility and to acknowledge that there is no excuse for the abuse of his wife. In the second act, the husband may angrily reject such a request, saying that he feels humiliated by the social worker’s intervention, and that he, the husband, may consider retaliating with counter-humiliation.[[3399]](#endnote-3400) The result is, and this is the third act, that the husband loses the respect he could otherwise have gained from all those who invited him to embrace humility. In their eyes, he fails his dignity by trying to uphold his honour.

At the meso level, these three acts play out, for instance, when the police is asked to engage in mindful self-reflective humility and acknowledge that there is no excuse for the abuse of certain people, for instance, of black people. Second act: Some police officers and their supporters with white supremacist leanings may feel humiliated by such requests and angrily reject them, some may even retaliate with counter-humiliation. Third act: They lose the respect they could have gained. Here too, future-oriented dignity is sold out to uphold rankings of honour that belong to a bygone past.[[3400]](#endnote-3401)

This pattern replicates itself in many contexts. Many aspects of the caste system in India that come to mind (see chapter 5). The Catholic Church is burdened with many legacies, from the cruelties of the Inquisition to the arrogance entailed in the rejection of the heliocentric worldview, to the hubris that legitimises humans as masters of the Earth, and, last but not least, widespread sexual abuse (see more in chapter 9). Whenever the clergy turns to cover-ups and fails to apologise, the Church risks losing its dignity by trying to protect its honour.

At macro levels, we find countries such as America, Australia, Germany, or Turkey, who would gain enormous respect if they were to humbly acknowledge the full extent of the genocidal killings they once perpetrated — be it the killing of Indigenous peoples, of the Herero people, or the Armenian people.

Finally, we, as humanity as a whole, would rise in respect if we were to embrace enlightened humility and acknowledge our untenable exploitation of nature and people. The pain suffered by subjugated and exploited people and nature can no longer be discredited as lack of ‘resilience’, time is over for calls that everyone should ‘toughen up’ and ‘become a man’ when becoming a man means delegitimising such suffering as a stain on the honour of Homo ignorans et arrogans. Unfortunately, many feel humiliated by such suggestions and angrily reject them, some even retaliate with counter-humiliation against the authors of such suggestions. We as humanity lose our dignity by trying to rescue our honour.

These three acts typically start with human rights defenders expressing disagreement with what once was regarded as honourable, namely, the ranking of worthiness into hierarchies. As such hierarchies were the result of victories in past competitions for domination, they still have many supporters who are proud of them, who hail and defend them. Human rights defenders disturb this arrangement when they call for self-reflective humility and seek to replace honour with dignity, they therefore face anger in the second act from those who perceive such interventions as humiliating and who pay back with counter-humiliation. In the eyes of human rights defenders, those who defend their honour in this way lose the dignity they could earn.

It is easy to look at such dynamics from afar — to feel superior to people who lived long ago or far away — yet, the closer to home it gets, passions heat up and humility becomes harder. Making peace with one’s own estranged family is often the hardest task of all, because in that situation it becomes clear that no one can simply toggle a rational switch and turn on the humility that is required. Rational choice theory, the engineer’s logic, the lawyer’s arguments, the diplomat’s negotiation skills, all of them reach their limits in the face of hot passions.

This is when psychotherapeutical wisdom is needed to calm down hot cycles of humiliation and build the trust needed to heal them. The need for ‘therapy’ increases when passions heat up in a shrinking world where no one is far away anymore and everyone suddenly becomes a neighbour. As American foreign policy expert Brent Scowcroft said it in 2011, ‘Now, the world is politicised. For most of our history, the average man didn’t know what was going on in anything other than his own village. And he didn’t care much. Now, everybody is within eyesight of the TV, in earshot of a radio, they hear what’s going on... and they are activated by it’.[[3401]](#endnote-3402) World society as a whole needs to become humbly aware that more is needed than mere ‘positive functioning’.[[3402]](#endnote-3403)

I have gathered lifelong experiences with these three acts, starting with the micro level of my own family. I have learned that mindful loving patience is the only way towards connectedness in compassion.[[3403]](#endnote-3404) I have learned that healers need to begin by humbly facing their own personal vulnerabilities and failures first, so they can refrain from self-righteous preaching.

In sum, the world needs healers now. The best expertise of engineers and diplomats is futile and ineffective when their advice is felt to be humiliating. A global person-centred psychology waits to be enacted that is based on trust building. ‘Trust informs almost everything that is predictable or can be made predictable in peoples’ lives’.[[3404]](#endnote-3405) It is time for psychology to be ‘pressed into service’.[[3405]](#endnote-3406) Worldwide healing-centred care is called for.[[3406]](#endnote-3407)

### Long unfinished revolutions wait to be carried out, and this in completely new ways

History offers many examples of revolutions that began with deep-felt yearnings for solidarity in freedom and equal dignity. These yearnings are deeply anchored in human nature.[[3407]](#endnote-3408) During the past millennia, however, these yearnings found little space to flourish. Uprisings were quickly suppressed or co-opted by the dominator contexts that surrounded them. Another deeply anchored human tendency abetted this outcome, namely, our need for safety which leads us to respond to social threat with calls for ‘law and order’.[[3408]](#endnote-3409) As a result, we are left with many ‘unfinished revolutions’.

‘Unfinished revolution’ is a term that was first used in England during the time of the Levellers and their 1647 and 1649 manifesto titled ‘Agreement of the People’.[[3409]](#endnote-3410) When we look further back in history, we find unfinished revolutions that are much older. For instance, we may want to consider Cyrus the Great who lived from 580 to 529 BCE and whose charter is often described as the first statement of human rights.[[3410]](#endnote-3411) The leaders of what is known as axial age around eight to two hundred years BCE would perhaps also agree to be included into the list of historical examples, presumably, they would shake their heads at humanity’s current crises.[[3411]](#endnote-3412)

We can add many more recent examples to this listing. Europe’s intellectual and philosophical movement called Enlightenment aimed at autonomy and freedom, away from the hierarchy of the Ancien Regime[[3412]](#endnote-3413) — only for Europe’s Industrial Revolution of the nineteenth century to bring back the hierarchy of feudal times through making engineers ‘the new priests’. ‘In the family and in the factory, the vertical structure of society continued to dominate. In the twentieth century, Fordism and the assembly line, the standard for the industrial world, retained the age-old pyramidal organisational structure’.[[3413]](#endnote-3414)

Napoléon Bonaparte turned the French Revolution’s promise of égalité into its opposite when he crowned himself emperor. The 1917 February Revolution in Russia was infused with the enthusiastic spirit of liberation from oppression, only to be turned into an authoritarian October Revolution by Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, soon to be taken over by Joseph Stalin, an even more ruthless dictator. The funeral of revolutionary Peter Kropotkin marked the very moment when dominators took over — hundreds of Kropotkin’s admirers were allowed to attend his funeral only to be returned to prison the next day.[[3414]](#endnote-3415) Even the West was affected by the derailment of the original promise of the Russian revolution. As has been discussed before in this book, author Ayn Rand appears to have learned dangerous lessons from this failure, lessons she imported to America and that later brought even the Western economic system almost to its knees.

Already as a small child, my father taught me the lessons that should be learned from Adolf Hitler’s path, so I would be prepared to resist similar manifestations in the future. My father gave me many books to read, among them The nights of the long knives, a book that explains in minute detail how high hopes first were created and then hijacked.[[3415]](#endnote-3416) Germany was a country in need of a new sense of purpose and direction, its citizens were desperately looking for a saviour, and they welcomed Hitler almost like a messiah. Little did they know, or wanted to know, that his was not just a homicidal but also a suicidal mission. Nine months after the defeat of Stalingrad, on 8th November 1943, in the Munich Löwenbräukeller, Hitler still propagated his belief that providence had made him the leader of the Aryan race for world domination. He believed in ‘das Recht des Stärkeren’, in ‘might is right’. He thought that it was not just the right of the strongest to dominate, it was their duty, and that the weak deserved to perish. He measured even his own followers with the same yardstick, these were his words, ‘If my own people were to break under such a test, then I could cry no tears over them, they would not have deserved anything else. That [destruction] would be their own destiny, which they have to attribute to themselves’.[[3416]](#endnote-3417) In other words, Hitler first sparked people’s hopes for a better future so as to win their hearts, then he used their support to ‘democratically’ capture the state system, and finally, he condoned everyone’s demise by blaming his followers for not fulfilling his nightmarish visions.

The list goes on, in many variations and different degrees of gravity. High hopes stood also at the beginning of Iran’s 1979 revolution against an authoritarian rulership. This revolution was originally set off by idealistic students, by secular Iranians who thought that Ruhollah Khomeini was a figurehead only and that secular groups would prevent any new authoritarian rulership from rising.[[3417]](#endnote-3418) Another example is the Friedliche Revolution (Peaceful Revolution) in October 1990 that brought an end to the German Democratic Republic (East Germany) and enabled the reunification of Germany, only to be followed by a campaign of plunder of East German resources that engendered feelings of humiliation in the East German population that are virulent until the day today.[[3418]](#endnote-3419) In Egypt, its hopeful 2011 Dignity Revolution ended in tight military rule. In America, the Occupy Movement exposed people’s frustration with the democrats’ precarious embrace of neo-liberalism,[[3419]](#endnote-3420) yet, it was the Tea Party and Donald Trump who ultimately profited from this frustration.[[3420]](#endnote-3421)

The list does not end here. Military strategists are racing to develop ever-newer military doctrines, strategies, tactics, and technologies, yet, while the aim is to bring peace and security to their countries’ citizens,[[3421]](#endnote-3422) spy drones might soon fly in front of everyone’s windows.[[3422]](#endnote-3423) The most peaceful oil platform or peaceful nuclear installation can easily transmute into a bomb when harmless looking play-drones are dropped on them.[[3423]](#endnote-3424) Where will the Internet lead us?[[3424]](#endnote-3425) It may lead to a ‘techlash’ and an ‘age of surveillance’.[[3425]](#endnote-3426) What about algorithms? Will 3D printing or smart cities save us? When we speak of artificial intelligence, is it indeed intelligent or rather foolishly disoriented, or even dangerous?[[3426]](#endnote-3427)

Decency and dignity are not exempt from this list. In 1971, political scientist Ronald Inglehart was hopeful that dignity would become part of self-expression values.[[3427]](#endnote-3428) Fast forward to 2018, he admitted that he could barely hold on to that hope — just like the hope wanes that Enlightenment ideas will finally enlighten and creativity replace authority as core value.

In the 1970s, humanistic philosopher Erich Fromm called for a ‘total liberation’ through radical and revolutionary humanism, and he saw two pernicious chains keeping people back, namely, property-driven materialism and the individual tendency towards what he called narcissism.[[3428]](#endnote-3429) Fromm taught that, if we want well-being, and if we define well-being as functioning well as a person, then there are two main ways to attain this goal, namely, ‘breaking through one’s narcissism and breaking through the property structure of one’s existence’.[[3429]](#endnote-3430) Fromm saw narcissism as an orientation in which only one’s own body, mind, feelings, and interests count, a state of mind where all of one’s interests and passions are directed to one’s own person:

For the narcissistic person, only he and what concerns him are fully real; what is outside, what concerns others, is real only in a superficial sense of perception; that is to say, it is real for one’s senses and for one’s intellect. But it is not real in a deeper sense, for our feeling or understanding. He is, in fact, aware only of what is outside, inasmuch as it affects him. Hence, he has no love, no compassion, no rational, objective judgement. The narcissistic person has built an invisible wall around himself. He is everything, the world is nothing. Or rather: He is the world...[[3430]](#endnote-3431)

In 2015, economist Daniel Cohen offered a similar message when he explained that we need to re-invent the idea of progress and go beyond material gains. ‘We must try to imagine a world in which happiness and satisfaction with one’s life are less dependent on the expectation of constantly earning more’.[[3431]](#endnote-3432) Materialist and post-materialist orientations can only merge, Cohen advises, when a decent livelihood is perceived as a human right and the ‘infinite desire for growth’ has been overcome.

Time is ripe to finish all endeavours that ever aimed at equality in dignity and solidarity with our socio- and ecosphere and remained unfinished. What are the best methods? Let us learn from critical theorist Homi Bhabha who offers important inspiration from the methods once used by colonised people to resist the power of the coloniser: hybridity, mimicry, difference, and ambivalence.[[3432]](#endnote-3433)

### Competition for domination is the core problem and only a second order transition can solve it

There seems to be a core mechanism that degrades even the most laudable initiatives, almost as if by law of nature. As I see it, this mechanism is competition for domination and control. The most well intended promise of freedom, well-being, and peace tends to become empty when it is captured by dominators.[[3433]](#endnote-3434)

The strategy of competing for domination moved to the forefront of human survival adaptations at the time of the Neolithic Revolution, when living conditions changed so quickly that emergency solutions were needed (see more in chapter 9). Our forebears should have abandoned this strategy as soon as possible and replaced it with more sustainable solutions, yet, they could not do so, because the only true solution, namely, global cooperation, was not yet within their reach. Competition for domination and control thus remained definitorial for human faring on Earth for the past millennia, the last three per cent of our time on planet Earth as Homo sapiens, and, unfortunately, it continues until today. In the past millennia, this strategy brought ‘victories’ and certain measures of peace and well-being to a lucky few in the short term. In the twenty-first century, however, this path reveals itself as suboptimal, at best, and as collectively suicidal in the end.

Walter Benjamin once wrote that ‘not even the dead will be safe from the enemy, if he is victorious’,[[3434]](#endnote-3435) and indeed, throughout the past millennia, dominators removed their defeats from the history books so we should only see their victories. Our biosphere is like a teacher now who enlightens us that it is a fallacy to believe that what is successful for a few in the short term is also viable for all in the long term. It is a misunderstanding to think that competing for domination is a useful strategy in our present situation just because it yielded short-term successes, triumphs, and ‘victories’ to some in the past. After having been treated by us humans as if it were an enemy waiting to be conquered, our biosphere now finally sends out SOS distress signals.

If we fail to radically revise our ways of life on this planet, the noblest of our efforts will turn into their opposite. We cannot allow the strategy of competition for domination to continue unquestioned. A second order transition is needed, both intellectually and emotionally. The dominator script only gives us the choice between anger that is aggressive and kindness that is passive, now the time has come to grow kindly angry, lovingly angry, and caringly angry. As Audre Lorde said about anger, ‘focused with precision, it can become a powerful source of energy serving progress and change’.[[3435]](#endnote-3436)

The dominator script is ill advised, and this is independent of who applies it and where it is applied. Oppressors are ill advised to use this script to subdue inferiors, and it is as ill-advised for oppressed victims to use for their liberation. It would be perilous for the world if the Global North and the Global South were to lock themselves into a ‘dance’ of liberation and suppression now. There are necessary and unnecessary conflicts, and it is time to leave behind all unnecessary conflicts.[[3436]](#endnote-3437) All involved are called on to become ‘kindly angry’ with systemic humiliation, ‘kindly angry’ with the dominators in all camps, so as to direct everyone’s energies towards building a more dignified and dignifying world — this is the tough big love I advocate in my work.[[3437]](#endnote-3438)

To use the image of the sinking Titanic, it is unacceptable for the people on the luxury deck to hold down those on the lower decks, and it as misguided for those in the lower decks to want nothing better than entering the luxury deck. A total reconstruction of the ship is required aside from changing its course. The foundation of our human condition waits to be radically transformed, and this in dignified and dignifying ways.

The core problem is the mindset and practice of competition for domination and control. This practice leads to all-out sociocide and ecocide in a globally interconnected world of finite resources.

Now is the time to take the inspiration of human rights ideals seriously and engage in a dignity refolution. Refolution is a term coined by Timothy Garton Ash to connote a mix of reform and revolution. This dignity refolution will be history’s first continuous revolution, a refolution that will never ‘finish’, that will always need to be kept alive by large enough numbers of people from one generation to another. This refolution will continuously need to be protected from being hijacked by the dominator spirit.

### What when the lifeboat is full?

Bonnie Selterman was introduced before.[[3438]](#endnote-3439) Let me quote and paraphrase more of her questions. What are the various interpretations of the term dignity? In what way do interpretations differ in their goals sought and in the problems encountered with each of these? What about the tension between local interpretations of dignity and a prospective universal interpretation? Who should decide?

There is a tension between the dignity of an individual and the dignity of the group, Selterman points out, after all, Homo sapiens is a species that evolved in groups. Maybe the dignity of the group, for some, is properly deemed to have equal dignity with the individual? If the long-range ideal is having all of humankind be one united in-group, are we not too far away from that ideal? Even if we do not hate the Other, ‘if it is the case that we have evolved into groups to “see” Otherness, to be on alert before trusting the Other, and if it is also the case that changing the socio-political-economic conditions that allow for flourishing without precipitating hate will take time at best’ — how then, Selterman asks, can outsiders like us convince other people, for whom their ‘groupness’ is deeply ingrained, that they would be better off expanding their group identity so that all humanity is included? Then Selterman asks the ultimate question:

Who shall go on the ‘lifeboat’ if the lifeboat can only accommodate a limited number of people and the survival of the community / society / species is at stake? Does this not indicate that, in fact, we may have to value the lives of different human beings differently, thus acknowledging that dignity cannot always be conferred equally? Who decides, when all cannot be saved? Who decides who the deciders shall be?

Perhaps we can rely on people sacrificing their lives voluntarily when the lifeboat is full? After all, soldiers offer their lives to protect their loved ones, and aged people in Indigenous societies have been reported of staying behind to die when they realise that they would become too much of a burden and put the survival of their family members into jeopardy.[[3439]](#endnote-3440) Selterman:

Perhaps, under ideal circumstances, a community / society / whole species of people would voluntarily agree among themselves whose lives should be saved on the lifeboat and whose lives should be sacrificed for the survival of the group. But, we need to consider that the instinct for survival is so strong that too many want to survive, more than the metaphorical lifeboat can accommodate, and end up fighting for ‘lifeboat status’ or being relegated to ‘perish status’, thereby, finding their dignity deemed to be less than the others deemed worth saving.[[3440]](#endnote-3441)

As mentioned earlier in this book, we live in times where the moneyed few of this planet may indeed be preparing to survive what they call the event and let the rest perish.[[3441]](#endnote-3442) ‘The event’ is a euphemism for ‘the environmental collapse, social unrest, nuclear explosion, unstoppable virus, or Mr. Robot hack that takes everything down’.[[3442]](#endnote-3443) Perhaps we should accept that only a few survive? Or should we try to survive all together? If so, how?

Let us consider the following case. In 1816, the 40-gun frigate Medusa was part of a flotilla of four ships tasked to take French colonial officials to Saint-Louis, a rich trading post on the coast of Senegal. This is the story:

On board were around 400 people including soldiers, settlers, and the governor designate of Senegal. The ship was captained by the 53-year-old Vicomte Hugues Duroy de Chaumareys, an aristocrat and old royalist émigré who had not been at sea for twenty years. Despite his lack of experience, de Chaumareys was given the captaincy of this important mission by the King simply for being a loyal royalist. A couple of hundred miles off the coast of Africa the ship ran aground and became stuck in a sandbank. A huge makeshift raft was constructed for the ship to jettison cargo in order to free itself. But when a storm came and the crew feared the ship would break up, the captain ordered an immediate evacuation. However, there was a problem: the ship didn’t have enough lifeboats. A plan was made for the travellers with higher social status — including the captain, of course — to be transported on the few lifeboats while 146 men and one woman were towed on the huge raft that was intended for cargo. For sustenance, those 147 people were given a bag of biscuits, two casks of water and six casks of wine. The sheer weight of all those people caused the raft to partly submerge and food was thrown into the sea to lighten the load. What happened next is still considered shocking in French history, a horror among the horrors of colonialism. Nobody knows for sure, but it is thought that the VIPs on the lifeboats panicked when they thought that the raft would slow them down too much. The ropes were cut, leaving the raft, laden with its 147 people, adrift at sea. When the raft was picked up thirteen days later, only fifteen men had survived and five died soon after. At the moment the ropes were cut, the people on the raft were already hungry and thirsty. As this worsened, they chewed their belts to stave off hunger and fought over the meagre supplies controlled by the officers. When the casks of wine had been finished, there was a drunken mutiny and dozens of men were shot and stabbed, halving the number of those alive in just one night. During the skirmishes, what was left of the water was lost. The weak and dying were thrown overboard. Eventually, when despair culminated, the taboo of cannibalism was broken and the men began to eat the bodies of the dead.

After this story was told by two of the survivors, it became an international scandal and Captain de Chamereys was found to blame and court-martialled. All this happened at a time when the post-Napoleonic French nation was so uncomfortable with its restored regime,[[3443]](#endnote-3444) that the Medusa incident became a metaphor for its sorry state — ‘a nation ruined by incompetence and greed, a defeated nation with little hope’.[[3444]](#endnote-3445)

If we look further at history, we find Captain Ernest Shackleton, who, we could say, represented the opposite of Captain de Chamereys. Shackleton was able to keep his people alive under the most extreme circumstances and he is remembered as a role model of leadership until the day today.[[3445]](#endnote-3446)

The task for humankind now, as it seems, is to learn the appropriate lessons from history and avoid turning planet Earth into a place ‘ruined by incompetence and greed’, the task is to avoid that ‘the sensible among us who are less prone to panic’ have to live ‘at the mercy of the least informed among us’.[[3446]](#endnote-3447)

Perhaps we could imagine a team of dignity pilots standing by the steering wheel of the world ship, competent enough to give lifesaving orders to everyone on board, just as Shackleton did? Would a Shackleton figure be able to contain and hinder free riding? Could dignity nurturers inspire a mindset of loving solidarity on board, so that everyone could become a Shackleton? Could we manifest a dignity ethos of ‘giving forward’ in the spirit of generous solidarity? Could we avoid losing our lives in competitions for domination or in calculations of exchange and market pricing? If we succeed, perhaps it would be possible to save a maximum number of people so that we would not need volunteers to sacrifice their lives?

As it seems, it all depends on the strength and the will of the passengers to elect and respect the kinds of pilots who refrain from throwing the majority over board to let a minority can survive. The presently unfolding coronavirus pandemic presents us with many of these scenarios: Let a few survive and the rest die, or let all survive?[[3447]](#endnote-3448)

The outcome is in our hands. If we wait for others to save us, if we lose ourselves in depressed apathy or selfish carelessness, the best outcome will be undignified survival for a few combined with an undignified demise for the rest. If we give it our all, if we embrace the level of alertness that matches the size of the crises we face, and if we do this together, if we invest this alertness in hope against hope, then we will succeed with the dignified survival of all, or, if there is no other way, at least we will demise in dignity together — either all of us or none of us, but always in dignity.[[3448]](#endnote-3449)

Following Alan Page Fiske’s example of soldiers in a platoon (see above), we may want to nurture a mindset among the human family where all are ready to sacrifice their lives for each other (CS), were dignity leaders like Shackleton are in charge (AR), where all take turns standing guard (EM), and where scarce resources are being shared dignifyingly (MP).[[3449]](#endnote-3450)

I follow this script in my professional and personal life. I regard our planet as the shared commons of all living beings and offer my life as a gift to humanity by taking on the role of a guardian of these commons (CS). I nurture a global dignity community together with my fellow dignity nurturers (AR), I stand guard day and night and encourage all others to do the same (EM), and I limit my use of the finite resources of our planet to a minimum, and I encourage also others to do the same (MP).[[3450]](#endnote-3451)

### The problem with the sceptics and the naysayers

Bonnie Selterman has more questions.[[3451]](#endnote-3452) What about the resistance we encounter when we promote the idea that everyone has dignity but people roll their eyes, or worse? Selterman wonders, ‘If the natural world has evolved in a chaotic, volatile, violent cosmos, maybe we are evolved in circumstances that endow us with unequal dignity even if we now see equal dignity as an ideal to strive for?’

Selterman continues, let me paraphrase her thoughts: If our time in this life is limited and fragile, doomed in any event (short, solitary, nasty, brutish, always at risk of violent death, to quote Thomas Hobbes), it may be in our own self-interest to selfishly make the best of our own circumstances as long as we can? How can we explain that all of us will benefit from promoting ideas of inherent dignity? If such ideas are naïve, is it not more naïve to think we can continue on our current destructive path? However, perhaps the naysayers and sceptics are right after all? What if both ideas are naïve — continuing as we do, and imagining equal dignity for all? Why should not people seek dignity by simply maximising their own most comfortable existence in our short precarious lifetime while they still have time? In that situation, is it at all possible that we can plant enough of the seeds of dignity here, there, and everywhere, so some critical mass may take root? And to do so in time?

In 2016, Bonnie Selterman and I went to hear Bill McKibben speak in New York, and after this event, we discussed her questions.[[3452]](#endnote-3453) In 2018, she wrote to me, ‘I often think of your words that if there is any hope to save the dying species, we should keep trying, and if not, at least we can try to bring dignity to as many people as possible. If it comes down to hospice care, metaphorically, is that all we can do? To those who roll their eyes at the ideal of equal dignity for all, is that our response?’[[3453]](#endnote-3454)

What should our response be in 2022? We live in times where those with material resources hide behind thick walls[[3454]](#endnote-3455) if they do not put their hopes on leaving for others planets.[[3455]](#endnote-3456) Others choose the opposite direction and decide not to have children altogether,[[3456]](#endnote-3457) because they think that the species of Homo sapiens has ‘caused so much damage to the planet already that the only thing that can restore the balance is for humanity to go extinct, and the only humane way to do that is by refusing to procreate’.[[3457]](#endnote-3458)

My answer to Bonnie Selterman in 2022: Let us hold hands and give everything we have to nurture life in dignity. If it is too late, if too many tipping points have already been crossed on our planet, let us face also our species’ time ‘in hospice’ together in dignity. In a lifeboat afloat at sea, pessimism is a death sentence, and even though hope against hope might not secure survival, it is the only way it can.

In the face of challenges that are global, the only feasible way forward for humans on Earth is to never give up global trust-inducing dialogue and partnership — ‘pessimism of the intellect, optimism of the will’, these were the words of philosopher Antonio Gramsci he spoke out of prison.[[3458]](#endnote-3459)

### Without global cooperation, there will be no decent future

Will our billionaires be able to technologise us out of extinction? Or will they simply escape to Mars, while the rest of us is going extinct? Should each nation try to retreat behind their borders and only take care of their own? Or should we retreat even more and turn inwards as individuals and only concentrate on cultivating inner peace? Can world peace grow out of the inner peace of individuals?

I meet these kinds of questions at every corner of our globe since many years. All these suggestions overlook the significance of the security dilemma and the commons dilemma and their power of framing. Even inner peace depends on global frames. Born in Germany, I will never forget that many followers of Adolf Hitler felt inner peace while perpetrating atrocities. Many were convinced that their actions represented the kind of ‘medicine’ that was prescribed by the larger frame as a ‘solution’, a medicine that was ‘bitter but necessary’. Similarly, many among the now living generations have felt inner peace during the past decades while pushing our planet to its limits, convinced this represented ‘development’.

I resonate with social scientist Heikki Patomäki, who speaks from the perspective of critical realist ontology, epistemology, and methodology when he sees the emergence of a ‘global civil society, along with the possible coalescence of a world political party, as part of a broader process of global transformation’.[[3459]](#endnote-3460) We humans and our consciousness, he writes, ‘constitute a causally efficacious layer of the world and cosmos, and this layer can co-determine future history within the confines of real compossibilities and incompossibilities’.[[3460]](#endnote-3461)

Here is my simplified long-history narrative that I suggest opens a viable path. It makes us aware of the resources we have as we face ultimate crises, it allows us to evaluate our strengths, identify where and why we invested them in suboptimal ways, and how we can use this knowledge in better ways. Most importantly, this narrative allows us to be proud of our abilities, while looking back on our failures with mercy rather than losing ourselves in mutual blame games.

We, the species Homo sapiens, have until now settled for short-term success aka long-term failure because we could not know better. Now we know better. One of our most important resources is our ability to cooperate with each other. We can be proud of this ability, as it allows us to scale up to the group level whatever aim we want to pursue. For our Palaeolithic ancestors, cooperation was relatively easy to enact and had little negative side effects given that they were few and could follow wild food wherever it was plenty.[[3461]](#endnote-3462) This was the longest period in Homo sapiens’ history, 97 per cent, which means that cooperation had ample time to become embedded in our bodyminds. It was cooperation for its own sake rather than for the sake of overcoming ‘enemies’. Nature was not yet an ‘enemy’, it was more of a partner, also certain contemporary Indigenous populations teach us this. Then, around twelve millennia ago, circumscription began to make itself palpable, the fact that planet Earth’s surface is finite.[[3462]](#endnote-3463) At that point, the situation changed from what game theorists call a win-win situation — a context of mutually beneficial arrangements of relationships — into a win-lose situation.[[3463]](#endnote-3464) Soon, the world was captured by the security dilemma and ‘we’ began to cooperate to outcompete ‘them’ — cooperation became the servant of competition for domination.[[3464]](#endnote-3465) We invested our ability to cooperate into competition for domination over each other and over nature, and by doing so, we ended with what we call colonisation and globalisation. By now, our competition campaigns meet ultimate finiteness and seeming success turns into obvious failure. With the best intentions, we, Homo sapiens, through being super-cooperators, became super-predators who self-devour.[[3465]](#endnote-3466) In this way, we arrived at the world we have now, still competing for dominance.

Now the time has come to get serious about global in-group cooperation, the time has come to overcome local in-group cooperation that drives global division. If we fail to learn global cooperation, the global power vacuum will be happily filled by a few global dominators intent to control the rest.

In this situation, we humans are extremely fortunate that everything we need for dignified global cooperation is available in our bodyminds. It helps that cooperation became embedded in human nature very firmly during the first 97 per cent of our evolutionary past. Cooperation is thus easier for us to embrace than competition for domination. ‘Killing enemies’ is not in our blood, otherwise soldiers would not commit suicide after coming home from the battlefield. After almost fifty years of global experience, I can attest that our human nature does not need enemies to cooperate. Those who hold on to the belief that out-competing each other as ‘enemies’ lies in human nature, this is my observation and my warning, maintain an anachronistic strategy artificially that is ready to fall.[[3466]](#endnote-3467) We possess the most important resource needed to transcend strategies of competition for domination, namely, our ability to cooperate as neighbours, as stewards of shared commons.

Our planet provides a limited set of conditions and only cooperation in global partnership can create a sustainable path to long-term dignity. The only option in a globally interconnected finite world is global cooperation in dialogue, continuous trust building, and unremitting nurturing of responsible mutual solidarity that includes all living beings. It is wishful thinking to hope we can escape the laws of nature and gamble away nature’s resources without consequences, only ardent gambling addicts can believe so. Human rights ideals of unity in diversity and partnership in freedom and equality in dignity are the only path to human survival and dignified life now and for future generations. Only these ideals can transcend the suicidal mottos of ‘if you want peace, prepare for war’, and ‘if you want prosperity, invest in exploitation’. Only these ideals can open space for Gandhi’s maxim of There is no path to peace. Peace is the path.

If only our Neolithic ancestors had known what we know, namely, that we are but one family on one vulnerable finite planet, we would perhaps not be in the situation we are in now.[[3467]](#endnote-3468) Unlike our Neolithic ancestors, we have both the knowledge and the skills required to live in dignity. Our ancestors only had the skills. They lacked our global knowledge. We are blessed with both. Let’s roll.

### A personal note

I consider my global life as my research methodology and the global village as my university, and I have woven many personal experiences into each chapter of this book. Allow me to also offer three longer personal notes. The first one was at the end of chapter 3, here is the second one, and the third one follows at the end of chapter 11.[[3468]](#endnote-3469)

Allow me to start with my family background. In 1939, Nazi Germany began a horrific war it never should have started, and in 1945, it finally lost this war. As a result, the former eastern territories of Germany — among them Silesia, East Prussia, and Pomerania — became part of Poland. In the years that followed, these regions were largely emptied of their German inhabitants.[[3469]](#endnote-3470) More than ten million people — my parents among them — were transported away to never return, without control over their destiny. Some were transported eastwards, as far as Siberia, others westwards to what later became the socialist state of East Germany, or even more westwards, to what later became the state of West Germany.

My parents were among the latter group. They were unprepared for what awaited them. They hoped to be welcomed with appreciation for having opposed Nazi ideology from the beginning, for their compassion with the victims of Nazi actions, or, at a minimum to be welcomed as fellow German citizens who had paid the highest price for defeat in war, namely, the loss of their homeland. Yet, none of this happened. Even though my parents were lucky and found people who treated them kindly, still, just like other new arrivals, also they were greeted with humiliation. They were called arme Flüchtlingsschweine, ‘pitiable refugee pigs’, or, worse, ‘dirty Polacks’, because many people in the west equated ‘east’ with Slavic people. Being called ‘Polack’ represented a particularly grave insult, especially from those and for those among the German citizens who still adhered to Nazi racial rankings after the fall of the Nazi regime — Nazis had categorised people who spoke Slavic languages as racially the lowest of Europe, as sub-human. My parents encountered what this text reflects:

Anyone who thinks that xenophobia requires people from foreign countries is wrong. After the lost war, millions of refugees and displaced persons from the German eastern regions crowded into the rest of Germany. Today their reception is considered exemplary — but in truth they were met with hatred and contempt and the openly expressed thought that they should not belong to West Germany but to Auschwitz.[[3470]](#endnote-3471)

When Adolf Hitler came to power, my father was a child and he opposed Nazi ideology very early on, something that nearly cost him his life as a young man. The end of the war did not bring him relief however. He found himself at the age of nineteen with only one arm — he had lost one arm in the war — his beloved brothers had perished, his large extended family was either dead or dispersed, his cherished farm was taken away, and his homeland was gone without any ‘right of return’. On top of this, he had accidently witnessed something towards the end of the war that was impossible for him to digest — he had glimpsed from afar what he later understood was the death march from Auschwitz, and, not being able to believe what he saw, he could not reconcile this with him being of German nationality. He almost did not want to continue living. Later years brought more humiliation for him, rather than less, and little healing. In the eyes of many people he encountered, his visibly missing arm placed him into the category of the perpetrators he despised. Not only was the sight of an invalid veteran from a lost war unwelcome, younger generations, ignorant of German history, scorned him by saying, ‘It is your own fault, why did you go to that war?’ Thus, for my father, post-war humiliation came on top of having suffered unspeakable injuries, traumas, and loss during the war.

More than seven decades later — and I am sitting with him as I write these lines — every single day, he mourns the many layers of trauma and humiliation both within himself and out in the world, trying to contribute to their healing. This is why I care for him now that he is 95 years old and why I try to bring as much dignity as possible into the end of his life. I tell him that my dignity work replaces his missing arm, that my life mission mourns his family members who were killed and dispersed by war, that the Nobel Peace Prize nominations represent his lost homeland and give recognition to the many secondary and tertiary war injuries that overshadowed not just his life but also the lives of so many others and all subsequent generations.

When people ask me, ‘Where are you from?’, I explain that even though I carry a German passport, and even though I am extremely thankful for the education I received in Germany, and even though I highly admire Germany’s Humboldtian legacy, I would never say ‘I am German’. My father always said about himself, ‘Germany has destroyed my life! Hitler has raped me! I am Silesian! I am not German!’ When asked, ‘Where are you from?’ I explain that I come from the deep awareness that nothing is certain, an awareness that war can destroy what seems to be sure in the blink of an eye. My explanation is that I was born into a family who was considered less than human when I was young and that this made me feel that I had no right to be part of the human race, let alone of any nation. I simply belonged nowhere, there was no ‘right to return’ to anywhere. At the age of twenty-one, I began to live a global life — not as a tourist but as a fellow human being — learning to be at home on all continents (except Antarctica), so that finally, around the age of forty-five, I began to feel that I belonged everywhere. My most honest reply to the question ‘Where are you from?’ is therefore, ‘I am from humiliation, from many layers of humiliation. I am also from planet Earth, like you, and as a citizen of this planet, I feel responsible for all humiliations that humanity ever perpetrated in its history. I give my entire life to trying to heal past humiliations and prevent future humiliations’.

On my global path, I have met many other people who were displaced and felt as lost as my family did, as unworthy and inferior.[[3471]](#endnote-3472) My family found refuge in religious faith — if dignity is absent on Earth, at least heaven can offer it. In chapters 3 and 5, I explain how I transcended their particular religious orientation later in life, yet, as a child, it formed my horizon. I learned, for instance, that it would be right to ‘give to Caesar what belongs to Caesar, and give to God what belongs to God’.[[3472]](#endnote-3473) I also learned that for unwelcome newcomers like my family, ‘giving to Caesar’ was not a straightforward duty, it was a privilege to be earned first. In hindsight, I conjecture that I studied medicine and law to earn the respect of the majority host society surrounding me, and that I got interested in the field of psychology to understand this choice. In later years, I learned that this search for respect is a general pattern for newly arriving minorities everywhere in the world.

Being a newcomer in a majority context engenders not just a desire to belong and be respected, it also provides a certain inner distance. The result, for me, was a kind of double distance — looking at the world from below and from afar. This distance, combined with the desire to belong, seems to have inspired in me the wish to alert the ‘majority’ to their blind spots, and to do so lovingly rather than aggressively.

I have observed similar trajectories in many other world regions. Even though I have white skin, I failed to be acculturated into mainstream Western self-assured ‘triumphalism’. I see and feel the world from the perspective of the former slave, the former colonised, the dark-skinned person, all of whom have been promised equal dignity without necessarily receiving it — I count myself to be a member of this specific affective community.[[3473]](#endnote-3474) My path resembles in some ways that of William Edward Burghardt Du Bois (1868–1963), the son of an African-American mother, born and educated in the United States of America, who employed the knowledge he had gained in that context to bring more respect to African Americans. He is known for the term and idea of double consciousness, the internal conflict experienced by subordinated or colonised groups in a majority society. He eventually became so disillusioned with prospects for equality for African Americans that he moved to Ghana in Africa and became a citizen of that country.[[3474]](#endnote-3475) My ‘Ghana’ is the global dignity movement that I help nurture.

As this book has laid out at length, promises of equal dignity have a strong potential to elicit feelings of humiliation when betrayed, in particular in people like me who were more than willing to embrace these promises in the first place. My case is made more complex by the fact that coming from a displaced family painfully intersected with the fact that I am also born as a woman. This provided yet another experience of exclusion and I paid a painfully high price for this intersection: The more I healed the wounds from geographical displacement, the more I increased the wounds from gendered displacement. The more I increased my professional standing — including two doctorates — the more I was perceived as a threat in the ‘real world’ (of men), and thus my chances to have the family I yearned for diminished. I was simply unable to find a spouse who would tolerate such a highly educated partner.[[3475]](#endnote-3476)

In some ways, my experience resembles what is known from foreign fighters in Western societies, often young men with a strong belief in the promises of their host society, only to feel humiliated when these promises reveal themselves to be empty.[[3476]](#endnote-3477) While these young men take the path of violence out of humiliation,[[3477]](#endnote-3478) I walk the path of a Gandhi, a Mandela, of a Dietrich Bonhoeffer.[[3478]](#endnote-3479) I also do so rather late in life, I am not an adolescent firebrand, I am willing to sound alarm only after a lifetime of hard work to gain all the respect that was possible for me to attain. I speak up only after many decades of relentless creative doubt and curiosity, after years of observing the human condition without judging, decades of reflecting without concluding, describing without prescribing, ‘zooming in’ and ‘zooming out’ without rigidifying my observations into precise concepts or labels.[[3479]](#endnote-3480) I dare raise my voice only now, and I do so through my personal life choices as much as through my research, authorship, and activism. In my personal life, this means striving to embrace Indigenous worldviews of loving mutuality, it means preventing mindsets of direct or indirect domination from colonising others and me.[[3480]](#endnote-3481)

To use the Titanic metaphor, for me, dignity means keeping Titanic afloat with what I call big love.[[3481]](#endnote-3482) Big love is more than a personal feeling or experience, it is a call for systemic change, it means working for a new future rather than fighting against a bygone past. It means avoiding to let the ship sink, and this entails changing the ship’s course and its design, keeping the ship’s course off the iceberg and aligning its design with its intended function, namely, to serve humanity as a lifeboat.[[3482]](#endnote-3483) As to a new course, it is about speaking to all those who choose not to see the iceberg, convincing them to open their eyes. Changing the design to make the ship seaworthy means flattening it, no longer can upper floors for the rich tower over lower decks for the poor, no longer can there be oppressive hierarchies. White over black, black over white, Aryan over non-Aryan, African over non-African, Homo sapiens over nature — no hierarchisation is justified.[[3483]](#endnote-3484)

Changing the design, for me, means speaking to my friends in the Global North about their lifestyles, reminding them how much they still benefit from colonialism, and that this is an omnicidal path, a path that will sink the ship. When I speak to my friends in the Global South, I first apologise to them, and then I explain that the world needs entirely new definitions of development, progress, and well-being, definitions that need urgent input from the Global South’s knowledge systems.[[3484]](#endnote-3485) Changing the design means inviting people from all corners of the world to search our globe and ‘harvest’ the most dignifying knowledges and skills that ever existed, and to consider this as a common good that belongs to this Earth — not as a resource for profit for a few raiders.[[3485]](#endnote-3486)

Some have discounted me as an alarmist, others as an appeaser. I want to make clear that I am given neither to moral panic nor to moral indifference.[[3486]](#endnote-3487) I am about moral courage, about withstanding indignation entrepreneurship of all kinds.[[3487]](#endnote-3488) I am a gardener, a nurturer, a healer. I am an alarmist in the positive sense of the word, in the sense of being a realist who recognises real problems. After all, real problems abound, from the sociocidal shredding of our social fabric to the ecocidal climate collapse and species extinction. Through my medical and psychological practice, I have learned that it is better to be truthful to a patient who is ill than to placate the patient’s fears through lies. Only the truth, shared with loving care, can serve as a foundation for viable improvement, only the truth can give the patient the strength and courage to seek appropriate treatment. ‘Not nearly enough alarm has yet been raised about the need for limits to growth. Not enough, not smartly enough, and not persistently enough’.[[3488]](#endnote-3489)

Humanity is my patient now, and I highlight all the ‘islands of hope’ there are on this planet, rather than dwelling on the ‘islands of despair’. ‘In difficult times, hope is an act of courage’.[[3489]](#endnote-3490) I dedicate my entire life to pro-actively nurturing cohesion in our global social fabric, and part of this endeavour is to convene a global fellowship of people who choose to practice mutual solidarity in equal dignity, people who no longer wish to wait passively for global division to tear us apart. Over the years, the name Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies has emerged for this community.

During my lifetime, I have become familiar with many different cultural realms, and I always try to find and harvest the unifying and dignifying aspects in all cultural practices and social-psychological skills that ever emerged on planet Earth.[[3490]](#endnote-3491) Here are a few examples: I was lucky to grow up in a rural setting that carried important Indigenous elements and manifested many aspects of the substantivist economic model that political economist Karl Polanyi contrasted with the formalist model of ‘production of crops’.[[3491]](#endnote-3492) Later in life, when I learned more about Indigenous knowledge systems, I understood their enormous wisdom, not least the lifesaving knowledge that is held in Indigenous languages and that can help humanity to avert disaster now.[[3492]](#endnote-3493) I learned about the dignifying tradition of the African ubuntu philosophy through being connected with Africa since 1976,[[3493]](#endnote-3494) I learned about Asian non-dualism during long periods in Japan and China since 1983,[[3494]](#endnote-3495) and about the ancient Egyptian philosophy of Ma’at through being at home in Egypt since 1984.

I became aware of the two thousand year old Roman law and its successors, ironically, in Africa and Asia, namely, through the strong influence of the Anglo-Saxon and French colonial past. What is known as common law system is used in every country that has been colonised by England, except for those that had been formerly colonised by other nations. As philosopher Howard Richards has explained, the Anglo-Saxon system is closer to classical Roman law, while continental Europe has evolved further. Common law is a kind of law that is being developed through decisions of courts and tribunals rather than through legislative statutes or executive action. Continental Europe and most of the rest of the world, on the other hand, use the civil law system or code jurisdictions that are designed by scholars rather than judges — the Napoleonic Code even prohibited French judges from pronouncing law.

Whenever I spend time in Anglo-Saxon spheres, I am struck by a propensity towards courageous individual action, contrasting continental Europe’s disposition for systemic design. Even the academic world follows a related divide. In the field of sociology, for instance, in Europe, the study of moral questions emphasises systemic factors, while American sociologists tend to emphasise individual psychological factors.[[3495]](#endnote-3496)

As I see it, this difference is highly relevant even for the future of humanity, not least with regard to how we deal with risk. While Europe embraces what is called the precautionary principle that suggests that an innovation whose risks are unclear or unknown is to be avoided, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce opposes this principle by highlighting its downside, namely, the restrictions it puts on potentially useful innovation.[[3496]](#endnote-3497)

From my perspective, all sides can learn from each other. If we carefully combine the best Indigenous insights with the American-Anglo-Saxon emphasis on individual action and the continental European strength in planning and design, we have a start.[[3497]](#endnote-3498) I promote this synergy wherever I go. When I am in continental Europe, I speak highly of the Anglo-Saxon emphasis on individual responsibility for action and the hesitancy to create overly rigid bureaucracies — the handling of the coronavirus vaccination campaign in Germany is a point in case.[[3498]](#endnote-3499) I describe my appreciation of the friendliness of American decency and the relative freedom from strict manners and decorum, I explain how much I value the pioneering spirit, work ethic, and commitment to the moral equality and freedom of all people — E pluribus unum (Latin for ‘out of many, one’). ‘America’s navigating an uncharted territory required an adventurous, forceful American ethos that did not require tact and courtesy as much as it did raw courage and direct, quick, efficient interpersonal communication’.[[3499]](#endnote-3500)

When I am in America, I do the opposite, I explain my appreciation for the traditional emphasis on the common good in continental Europe. I warn against the dark sides of the American ethos and legacy of rugged individualism. I warn that academia and science become ‘fake’ and lose their very purpose when the American entrepreneurial spirit is hijacked by an insatiable and world-destroying profit motive driven by self-serving individualism.[[3500]](#endnote-3501) I make clear how much I value systemic theorising in Europe and how glad I am that Europe is more on the side of the precautionary principle for risk evaluation. I explain how much I admire the Humboldtian tradition of education in Germany[[3501]](#endnote-3502) and the existential humanism that says ‘we have to take care of each other’. I find Ayn Rand’s existential nihilism utterly dysfunctional, which suggests, ‘Why bother? The only thing that matters is becoming one of the strong, who subjugate the weak, because life itself has no real meaning, apart from satisfying one’s most corrosive desires’.[[3502]](#endnote-3503) I remind my American friends that ‘shoot first and think later’ is not a sustainable maxim and that the Second Amendment to the United States Constitution that protects the individual right to keep and bear arms — initiated during the time of muskets — has become a ‘suicide pact’ in an America with endless access to automatic weapons. The outcome of this pact is dire, ‘If America can’t resolve its problems peacefully and fairly, if the country cannot form a more perfect union through debate and law, if respect and reason fail in the pursuit of equality for all, then we have the legal option to murder each other. Neighbour slaughtering neighbour. Blood in the streets’.[[3503]](#endnote-3504)

Wherever I am in the world, I explain that Europe, despite its history of horrific crimes, also has certain resources, it has learned lessons that can inspire a third way of moving into the future, a way that transcends Silicon Valley’s ‘lone hero’ zeal for money and technology as much as dampening the Chinese keenness on collective surveillance.[[3504]](#endnote-3505) The spirit of Alexander and Wilhelm von Humboldt is still palpable in daily life in Europe even though these two brothers lived two hundred years ago.

Allow me to end this section and this chapter by sharing an example that highlights this spirit. Journalist Gert Scobel conducts a highly educative programme every Thursday on public television in Germany. Selbstsabotage was the title of the programme of 17th May 2018. The programme addressed the following questions:

Why do we humans fail to do what is good for us? We know so well what is good for us — for our health, the environment, and for society — yet, we fail to act accordingly. Why? What is behind our self-sabotage systems? Are there any ways to turn them off, at least occasionally?[[3505]](#endnote-3506)

The programme featured social psychologist Harald Welzer, a scholar who highlights the human ability to learn, and the fact that history always brought to the fore pioneers who showed the way to a new normality. Psychologist Susann Fiedler, another participant in the programme, explained how she trusts the human desire to maintain personal reputation, which means that certain behaviours may become a new normality when large enough groups validate them. She recommends conducting social simulations of possible futures in social science classroom so that already small children can learn future-oriented pro-social and pro-ecological behaviours. Another discussant, biologist Barbara König, called for species selection to receive more attention, away from primarily focussing on individual selection.

Psychiatrist Wolfgang Merkle spoke up for more nurturing approaches to parenting, for the ‘currency of love’ in place of the currency of obedience or the currency of performance.[[3506]](#endnote-3507) The ‘political climate of tomorrow’ is shaped by the ‘family climate of today’, and therefore, parenting styles and education systems are no private matter, caring relationships are foundational.[[3507]](#endnote-3508) Indeed, Germany offers valuable insights into the linkage between authoritarian styles of education and susceptibility to populist messages — after all, it saw two dictatorships in a row, first the Nazi regime and then the East German regime, both underpinned by widespread domestic violence.[[3508]](#endnote-3509) Experts who work with families in present-day Germany witness how long it takes for a society to learn how to nurture their children’s potential.[[3509]](#endnote-3510)

One year after this programme was disseminated on German television, the coronavirus pandemic broke out, and in hindsight, we can say that these scholars offered all the insights the world needed. They would agree with me that our world needs better local and global institutional systems, systems that nurture loving mutuality and caring relationships both within our human communities and in relation with our life-giving ecosphere.[[3510]](#endnote-3511) Their insights align with the Indigenous seven-generation horizon as a way to avoid that the long-term collective survival of all species on Earth is sacrificed for the short-term interest of a few individuals.[[3511]](#endnote-3512) Their insights align also with Margaret Mead’s saying, ‘Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can change the world. Indeed, it is the only thing that ever has’. Indeed, it has been shown that it may only take the civil resistance of 3.5 per cent of a population to ‘topple a dictator’, and also the new ‘media space’ of ‘mass self-communication’ can decide power.[[3512]](#endnote-3513)

Having been trained as a medical doctor and as a psychologist, I am a keen observer of the wounds that the past millennia’s experiences have inflicted on the dignity of humans and all living beings on our planet. To use the terminology of psychotherapy, by now, these wounds have brought us not just a virus pandemic, they also brought us a pandemic of ‘paranoid anxiety’.[[3513]](#endnote-3514) Through my work, I try to offer a therapeutic remedy, namely, the age-old tradition of solidarity and stewardship in equal dignity.[[3514]](#endnote-3515)

I am a patriot of planet Earth and I see myself as part of a long lineage of Homo sapiens. I am proud of our egalitarian traditions that lasted throughout the first 97 per cent of our history and I regret that these traditions had to go underground during the past millennia, the past three per cent of our history. It saddens me that the spirit of solidarity in equal dignity was assaulted by mindsets of competition for domination during this time and that this spirit could only persist in a few philosophical and religious movements — the axial age was one of its manifestations. I am glad that this spirit has been reinvigorated lately by courageous pioneers such as Bertha von Suttner, Mohandas K. Gandhi, Dietrich Bonhoeffer, Eleanor Roosevelt, Rachel Carson, Paulo Freire, and Nelson Mandela, to name but a few.

As a patriot of planet Earth, I know that we, humanity, if we want to have any chance of a dignified future, ‘face a monumental challenge now, in an incredibly short time frame’.[[3515]](#endnote-3516) I consider the maxim of unity in diversity, operationalised through the principle of subsidiarity, to be the best and only way to manifest a decent future for humankind. The human family’s most important task now is to avoid that diversity becomes division — we should not give priority to societal structures such as ‘the market’ when it disconnects people and creates a world of divided loners. Neither can we let unity devolve into uniformity — be it uniformity through totalitarian versions of communism, be it uniformity through aggressive nationalism, or uniformity as a result of addictive capitalist consumerism.

We have even to be careful with the notion of empowerment, it should not lead to unity in diversity being degraded into uniformity in division. Adolf Hitler’s word for empowerment was Ermächtigung, and his word for uniformity was Gleichschaltung. His aim was to prepare his country for belligerent ‘national socialism’ and make society ready for war by turning it into an easy-to-control streamlined militaristic apparatus. This is why I recommend that we speak of entrustment and stewardship rather than of empowerment.[[3516]](#endnote-3517)

Planet Earth is the commons of humanity that is entrusted to us as its stewards. We are not empowered to destroy it. I dedicate my entire life to humanising globalisation through equal dignity for all in freedom and solidarity so that dignified life can flourish on this planet in the future. I have coined the term dignism (dignity-ism) to describe such a world.

In our global dignity community — the Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies organisation — we have a very long time horizon. We think of us as a seed for a future global dignity community that hopefully will flourish long past our present members’ lifetimes.

## Chapter 11: What now? Egalisation, dignism, and unity in diversity

Outwitted

He drew a circle that shut me out –

Heretic, rebel, a thing to flout.

But Love and I had the wit to win:

We drew a circle that took him in!

― Edwin Markham (1852–1940), Oregon poet laureate
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### What then must we do?

Leo Tolstoy asked in 1886, ‘What then must we do?’[[3517]](#endnote-3518) A painting by Paul Gauguin is inscribed with the questions ‘Where Are We Going? Where Do We Come From? What Are We? / D’où Venons Nous? / Que Sommes Nous? / Où Allons Nous?’[[3518]](#endnote-3519)

On my global path, I have met many people throughout the past decades, and in all corners of the globe, who feel gloomy and say to me, ‘We respect your work, Evelin, but humanity will not change its path until a major catastrophe has hit us — be it a nuclear disaster or an epidemic that kills almost all of us — anything that is dramatic enough to expose beyond doubt how foolish it is to tax our social and ecological systems beyond their carrying capacities. Until that moment comes, humans will do anything in their power to avoid real change! And then it may be too late’.

I must admit that I tend to agree. I have listened to every word my wise and courageous father has told me about the last days of Adolf Hitler’s reign. When it was already blatantly clear that there was no ‘final victory’ in sight, no Endsieg, still, almost until the last minute, doubters risked to be executed for treason even by their own neighbours. There were simply too many enthusiastic ‘believers’ left. My father, then nineteen years old, was lucky to survive, but deeply traumatised.

Is this our present predicament today? ‘Why we’re blind to the system destroying us’ is the title of a blog written in 2018, reminding us that ‘absolute power depends on absolute control over knowledge, which in turn necessitates absolute corruption’, and that a species that takes total control over its planet is perhaps already on the path to self-destruction.[[3519]](#endnote-3520)

My choice in this situation is to avoid fighting against the ills of this world, because confrontation hinders necessary change more than inspiring it. I dedicate every minute of my life to working for a better future, I do everything in my power to convene a global dignity community whose members join hands in developing dignifying ideas for the future. I want to be ready when people turn to me and say, ‘Evelin, now the collapse is here. You have dedicated all your life to thinking about how we, as humankind, should arrange our affairs on planet Earth so that dignified life is possible. What do you say now? What shall we do now?’

The past decades have seen an increase in polarisation worldwide. The coronavirus pandemic deepens pre-existing cleavages that play out even in the streets when wearing facemasks or not wearing them becomes a political statement. The pandemic triggers deeply embodied gag reflexes that separate people — conservatives are disgusted by liberals, and vice versa, and facemasks are just a minor marker of this fault line. In the United States of America, the fault line otherwise runs between those on one side who say ‘abortion means murder’ and ‘guns mean freedom and care for our loved ones’, and those on the other side who say the inverse, namely, ‘guns mean murder’ and ‘abortion means freedom and loving care’.[[3520]](#endnote-3521) As mutual revulsion intensifies, all sides humiliate and insult the other and feel humiliated and insulted by the other. I must admit that it reminds me of the Nazi regime in its last phase just before it was crumbling, the weeks and days when loyalists and anti-loyalists went into final deadlock.

When I use terms such as ‘conservatives’ and ‘liberals’ here, I define them along the lines of the analysis so far laid out in this book. In my vocabulary, I call a person ‘conservative’ when she is embedded in the worldview that formed in the context of a strong security dilemma in the divided world that reigned throughout the past millennia, while ‘liberals’ or ‘progressives’ are those who identify with a hitherto unrealised future, a future of a united world where all living beings are fellow sentient creatures who share one planet. Clearly, this is a simplified abstraction that neglects the many nuances and overlaps, yet, it captures what I observe in different parts of the world, only under different names.

As far as I can see, none of these camps is sufficiently aware of the concept of unity in diversity, and of the fact that this concept can bring all sides together. This oversight is all the more regrettable as we, humankind, if we wish to survive in dignity on our planet, are in a situation where we must bring all together. The entire planet can end up as a war zone in case sociocide and ecocide continue unabated.

Instead of making unity in diversity work, fences are being erected even though they can never be high enough to keep intruders out. Cyber shields will never protect against all cyber invaders, and investing in a space force will only trigger arms races in outer space on top of arms races on the ground.[[3521]](#endnote-3522) As long as the presently existing economic systems remain in place, human traffickers will continue with their profiteering from human suffering.[[3522]](#endnote-3523) Extreme climate events will serve as major investment opportunities to the stock markets, bond markets, and futures markets[[3523]](#endnote-3524) — ‘Africa could be gone but global GDP may still increase’.[[3524]](#endnote-3525) Economic theory will continue building ‘self-contained thought-worlds of its own, impervious to refutation by facts because of its own way of processing facts’.[[3525]](#endnote-3526)

Physicist Paul Raskin asks the core question that is pertinent in this situation: Which global futures could emerge from the turbulent changes now shaping our world?[[3526]](#endnote-3527) Raskin considers three scenarios — conventional worlds, barbarisation, and great transitions. ‘Conventional worlds’ is what we do now, it means business-as-usual, and Raskin calls this a utopian fantasy that is doomed to fail. He predicts that if this fantasy is blindly maintained, barbarisation will be the result, that civilisation will simply descend into anarchy or tyranny. The only hope for humankind lies in bringing about a great transition, namely, to ‘envision profound historical transformations in the fundamental values and organising principles of society’.[[3527]](#endnote-3528) A great transition means leaving behind domination/subordination, violence and militarism, fear-based politicking, concentrated economic wealth and poverty, and the destruction of the planet, it means building ‘an economy and society based on mutual respect, equality, solidarity, peace, unity amidst diversity, and love’.[[3528]](#endnote-3529)

Critical theory provides a similar model of three possible futures. Philosophers Rudolf Siebert and Michael Ott differentiate future I, the totally administered society, future II, the entirely militarised society enwrapped in chronic warfare, including illegal and immoral drone assassination attacks, and future III, a society in which personal sovereignty and universal solidarity are reconciled. Future III represents a society of true freedom, freedom from all involuntary and voluntary enslavement, ‘a society, in which the religious and the secular, the sacred and the profane, revelation and enlightenment, as well as personal autonomy and universal, i.e. anamnestic, present and proleptic solidarity would be newly reconciled’.[[3529]](#endnote-3530) In Future III, ‘nature and spirit will no longer be commodified, but will be liberated, and will be allowed to be what they are in the process of their mutual mediation, reconciliation and liberation’.[[3530]](#endnote-3531) In short, also critical theory envisions a society where nature is humanised and humans are naturalised.

Another thinker who looks into the future is physicist Michio Kaku. He concluded his book Parallel worlds with the following paragraph:

The generation now alive is perhaps the most important generation of humans ever to walk the Earth. Unlike previous generations, we hold in our hands the future destiny of our species, whether we soar into fulfilling our promise as a type I civilisation [meaning a civilisation that succeeds in building a socially and ecologically sustainable world] or fall into the abyss of chaos, pollution, and war. Decisions made by us will reverberate throughout this century. How we resolve global wars, proliferating nuclear weapons, and sectarian and ethnic strife will either lay or destroy the foundations of a type I civilisation. Perhaps the purpose and meaning of the current generation are to make sure that the transition to a type I civilisation is a smooth one. The choice is ours. This is the legacy of the generation now alive. This is our destiny.[[3531]](#endnote-3532)

As more and more people from all disciplines and from all corners of the world open their eyes to our crises and see that our current course is that of a Titanic aiming for the iceberg, we hear more warnings. The sixteen-year-old Swede Greta Thunberg told members of the European parliament in 2019, ‘I want you to act like the house is on fire. I want you to panic’.[[3532]](#endnote-3533)

Let us hear social anthropologist Thomas Hylland Eriksen from Norway. His verdict is that the world is overheated, too full and too fast, uneven, and unequal. He sees three interrelated crises, that of the environment, economy, and identity.[[3533]](#endnote-3534) All areas of life are impacted, energy use, urbanisation, deprivation, human (im)mobility, and the spread of interconnected, wireless information technology. What overheats the world are the contradictions between the global crises of standardising forces of information-age global capitalism on one side, and on the other side the socially embedded nature of people who perceive and respond to these crises locally. Globalisation highlights a tension that is ‘typical of modernity’, namely, a tension between ‘the system world and the life world’, between ‘the standardised and the unique’, between ‘the universal and the particular’.[[3534]](#endnote-3535) Eriksen recommends ethnography to those who are in search for a better future, ethnography as the richest and most naturalistic of all of the social science methods. The task at hand is the ‘study of global interconnectedness and, ultimately, the global system’.[[3535]](#endnote-3536)

Two authors from Germany offer similar observations. Ways out of collective excitement is the title of a book by the first author. He warns that the idea of truth is lost when disinformation is big business — when terror warnings, rumours, fake-news panics, scandals, and real-time spectacles generate huge profits — the result is an atmosphere of nervousness and irritation envelops our networked world.[[3536]](#endnote-3537) The second author cautions that not authoritarian extremism is the greatest danger for our future, but global cybernetic dictatorship by Silicon Valley Orwellianism and the global total surveillance state that already begins to emerge in countries like China and India.[[3537]](#endnote-3538) ‘Technology’s solutionism’— the idea that any problem can be fixed with the right code or algorithm — threatens already now, he warns, not least in the humanitarian aid sector, where we see the digitisation of aid as ‘surveillance humanitarianism’ and ‘techno-colonialism’.[[3538]](#endnote-3539)

The views of these authors coincide with those of the former head of the Club of Rome, El Hassan bin Talal, important international thinker and member of the Jordanian royal family, who warns of the degradation of our cogitosphere, ‘the realm of thinking and reflection’, of the drowning of humanity in a sightless infosphere (see more in chapter 7).[[3539]](#endnote-3540)

This book is written in support of a great transition (Raskin) into future III (Ott and Siebert) into a type I civilisation (Kaku). It is written to bring light into our cogitosphere and help us with the great paradigm shift that is waiting to be manifested — the shift from inequality to solidarity, from a mindset of rights to an ethos of duty and responsibility for solidarity in dignity.[[3540]](#endnote-3541) This book traces our historical journey towards ideals of equal dignity with all its high promises, and it points at the dangers and pitfalls that lurk on the way and that need to be identified and overcome.

This book is embedded in the dignity work that I do together with Linda Hartling and our global dignity fellowship since almost twenty years. Linda Hartling is the former associate director of the Jean Baker Miller Training Institute at the Wellesley Center for Women at Wellesley College. After Jean Baker Miller passed away in 2006, Linda became the full-time director of Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies.[[3541]](#endnote-3542) Linda and I practice collaborative leadership, we strive to ‘valuate’ rather than to ‘evaluate’, we value and dignify all beings. At our best ability, we engage in humble, mindful, authentic, and selfless servant leadership that is both relational[[3542]](#endnote-3543) and transformational.[[3543]](#endnote-3544) We discourage autocratic ‘big-ego’ vanity styles in our group[[3544]](#endnote-3545) and strive to follow Jean Baker Miller in ‘waging good conflict’.[[3545]](#endnote-3546) We have adapted David Cooperrider’s appreciative inquiry concept for our dignity work[[3546]](#endnote-3547) — we resonate with the idea of organisations as orchestras.[[3547]](#endnote-3548) We have looked at Edward de Bono’s recommendations for decision-making[[3548]](#endnote-3549) and emphasise ‘positive sharing, adding value, and reality building’.[[3549]](#endnote-3550) When we also include Peter Senge’s concept of learning organisations, we can say that our Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies community is a ‘global network of local learning orchestras’.[[3550]](#endnote-3551)

Linda Hartling and I work on the themes of humiliation and dignity since the early 1990s, and by doing so we have in many ways been ahead of our time in unleashing the ‘emotional turn’ that is now unfolding in several fields of inquiry, for instance, in international relations theory, and, not least, also in the field of psychology itself.[[3551]](#endnote-3552) Linda Hartling and I call attention to the fact that no discourse is ‘purely’ based on rationality, it always depends on what the participants feel constitutes rationality.[[3552]](#endnote-3553) We call on scholars to consider dignity and humiliation as foundational forces and to recognise that dignity and humiliation are lived experiences more than theoretical concepts, a situation that requires very broad research approaches and transdisciplinary theoretical conceptualisations.

Linda Hartling and I welcome recent trends in research that move away from rigid categorisations of emotions, we welcome the new view on affect, feeling, and emotion as nonlinear, dynamic, and relational.[[3553]](#endnote-3554) Emotions such as anger, fear, and disgust are far from ‘natural kinds’, they lack many of the ‘basic’ properties that earlier theorists attributed to them,[[3554]](#endnote-3555) even though there appears to be a human tendency to differentiate emotions on the basis of hedonic valence and physiological activation.[[3555]](#endnote-3556) There is an emerging picture of the ‘plasticity and flexibility of affective responses’, there is ‘an immense amount of cultural and developmental learning involved in complex interaction with any possible innate response tendencies’, and there is a growing awareness of ‘the impossibilities of endorsing a kind of Darwinian simplicity about “lower” emotions and “higher” cognition’.[[3556]](#endnote-3557)

Linda Hartling and I have broad academic anchorings, with social psychology as an important platform. Social psychology is a unique field, positioned in the middle of micro and macro levels so that it can project its insights ‘up’ and ‘down’, shedding light on the individual as much as on the group. Social psychology offers a grounding in affective practice that emphasises relationality and negotiation,[[3557]](#endnote-3558) so that even otherwise reluctant psychobiologists can embrace it. Social psychologist Margaret Wetherell recommends her field as explaining the limits on ‘affective contagion’.[[3558]](#endnote-3559) The ‘run of the mill affectivity of everyday social life’, as well as ‘moments of extraordinary emotional drama’, are complex acts of ‘appraisal and construction’, they are ‘high-wire integrations across multiple systems which pull together events, physical registrations, intersubjective coordinations and plural flows of meaning-making in constantly changing patterns as situations unfold’.[[3559]](#endnote-3560) Wetherell conceptualises affect as a dynamic process that is ‘entangled with cultural meaning-making, and integrated with material and natural processes, social situations, and social relationships’.[[3560]](#endnote-3561) For Wetherell, ‘affective activity is a field of open and flexible patterns’,[[3561]](#endnote-3562) a field that emerges from the social, cultural, biological and material parts of the broader field in changing interrelationships and entanglements. Affective activity is an ongoing flow — a ‘polyphony’, to use a term by neuroscientist António Damásio[[3562]](#endnote-3563) — a flow of ‘forming and changing bodyscapes’, of ‘qualia (subjective states), and actions constantly shifting in response to the changing context’.[[3563]](#endnote-3564) This flow, says Wetherell, can be ‘categorised, interpreted and parsed’ in more or less subtle ways, it is ‘an assemblage for now which draws on past assemblages and influences the shape of future activity’, where ‘canonical emotional styles’ and distinctive ‘affective repertoires’ emerge ‘in bodies, in minds, in individual lives, in relationships, in communities, across generations, and in social formations’.[[3564]](#endnote-3565) Wetherell explains that ‘affective practice is a moment of recruitment, articulation or enlistment when many complicated flows across bodies, subjectivities, relations, histories and contexts entangle and intertwine together to form just this affective moment, episode or atmosphere with its particular possible classifications’.[[3565]](#endnote-3566) Wetherell warns that we cannot ‘create a split between a semi-conscious, automaton-like, reactive body, and the reflexive, discursive, interpreting, meaning-making, communicating social actor’, and equally, ‘we cannot isolate and reify affect’.[[3566]](#endnote-3567)

Linda Hartling and I resonate deeply with Wetherell’s observations. Linda’s mentor Jean Baker Miller was a pioneer in emphasising the role of relationships and community by drawing on Lev Vygotsky and cultural-historical activity theory.[[3567]](#endnote-3568) Jean Baker Miller’s relational-cultural theory signalled an emotional-relational turn, a turn that transcends any simple emotional turn that is still trapped in Western ‘lone hero’ individualism.[[3568]](#endnote-3569) Linda and I, we resonate with relational realism and its emphasis on the relational subject approach rather than a plural subject approach — we tend to regard the relation itself as having causal effects.[[3569]](#endnote-3570)

Linda and I, even though we did not yet know each other in 1991, were both keenly aware that the years after the Cold War provided a window of opportunity for humankind to manifest relations of global solidarity in Jean Baker Miller’s spirit, and we were both worried that this opportunity would be missed. In 1991, gone was the two-bloc system that had defined the period after World War II, apartheid was about to be dismantled, the human family had a chance to unite in dignity. Linda and I were both hesitant when we met those who thought that ‘capitalism simply had won the ideological conflict with socialism’. As the Indian economy was deregulating, many thought that it would only be a matter of time before also ‘outliers like Cuba or North Korea’ would join global neo-liberalism, and that the state was to be nothing more than an enabler of free markets, while education and modernity would get rid of ‘reactionary and divisive political identity struggles’ based on notions such as ‘kinship and descent’.[[3570]](#endnote-3571) By now, we all understand that scepticism was warranted, that the bright future that many people expected in 1991 has not materialised, and that the triumphalism of 1991 undermined the reasons for hope more than supporting them.[[3571]](#endnote-3572)

As it appears, ‘the West’ was too casual in its display of power, too blind with respect to its own double standards, and too hasty in trusting what is called capitalism. As to the first point, former rivals such a Russia and the U.S.A. could have become friends after the Cold War. Russia could have proceeded from being an equal rival to an equal friend on the world stage, but this did not happen. ‘In the U.S., the collapse of the Soviet Union was seen as a military victory, which led to a spirit of triumphalism and a feeling of omnipotence as the “sole superpower”.’[[3572]](#endnote-3573) ‘The ideological conflict between capitalism and socialism finally seemed to have been replaced by the triumphant sound of one hand clapping’.[[3573]](#endnote-3574) By now, the West is being taught respect for Russia ‘the hard way’,[[3574]](#endnote-3575) and instead of global peace, new Cold Wars loom.[[3575]](#endnote-3576)

On my global path around in the world, I observe many backlashes against ‘too casual displays of power’, not just between countries, also within countries. Within the United States of America, anger at arrogant urban liberals is on the rise among the ‘forgotten Americans’.[[3576]](#endnote-3577) Citizens in the former communist East Germany feel humiliated by arrogant West Germans who look down on them, for having lived in the ‘wrong system’. It humiliates East Germans to have their entire Lebensleistung devalued, to have all their life achievements declared void, no wonder that feelings of humiliation now drive them into the arms of right wing politicians.[[3577]](#endnote-3578)

I have studied many cases of ‘casual displays of power’ and have observed the ways in which such displays can lead to violent backlashes. My doctoral research took its starting point in the historical setting after World War I that saw Nazi rule abuse the frustration and humiliation felt by many Germans as ‘emotional fuel’ for a new world war. The other two cases in my doctorate were Rwanda and Somalia — had I written it later, also Afghanistan would have been included.[[3578]](#endnote-3579) As it appears, we have not yet learned the lesson that it is dangerous and foolish to overlook dynamics of humiliation and that the practice of humiliating ‘losers’ can have disastrous consequences. This lesson is even more relevant now, as the world interconnects globally and people have better access to information than ever and better access to ‘ammunition’ for revenge. It is easy to learn about incidents of humiliation all around the world and identify with its victims, it is easy to take revenge in a world where guns, trucks, drones, and even airplanes are in everyone’s reach.[[3579]](#endnote-3580)

As to the second point, the arrogance of power often builds on the illusion of success and mastery to the point that even reality itself lashes back. The world-system that was shaped by the West after WWII promised the ‘happy end of history’ prematurely. The war in Yugoslavia and the Rwandan genocide showed that millions of people could still be mobilised into mayhem by ideologies that were thought bygone.[[3580]](#endnote-3581) Identity politics fuelled by politicised religion gained influence from India to Israel, from Belfast to Baluchistan. At the same time, what is called neo-liberalism does not deliver on its promises, as social inequalities grow larger rather than smaller, and ecological destruction becomes ever more apparent.

Even though I do my very best to emphasise that my systemic analysis has as its aim to dignify all people, some misinterpret my work as a humiliating attack. I have been accused of ‘arrogant moralising’ for pointing out that many statistics of ‘progress’ may rather represent a ‘flash in the pan’ than sustainable progress, and that ‘success’ that is achieved by way of overuse of resources is short-term and cannot be mistaken for true progress.[[3581]](#endnote-3582) Some feel that I devalue their entire life achievements when I suggest that we are all caught in systems that exploit people and planet alike, that even the best of our presently existing systems are suboptimal.[[3582]](#endnote-3583) It hurts people when I warn that many of the humiliating interventions of the past decades that were deemed to be necessary for ‘progress’ may in fact have been unnecessary,[[3583]](#endnote-3584) and that the end of history may rather be an unhappy one if we fail to innovate our way into better global constitutive rules. I profoundly understand the sorrow and rage of people who have invested their entire lives in infeasible solutions — just as all East Germans deserve respect even though they spent their lives in ‘the wrong system’, also all now living people deserve all our respect, including those who place their hopes in systemic frames I deem infeasible. The engineers of Titanic deserved respect even though it sank.

Some accuse me of being a past-oriented Marxist who humiliates rich people in their efforts to create jobs, others warn that I am not enough of a Marxist when I speak of the shortcomings of ‘we humankind’ because this puts perpetrators and victims into the same category. Yet others accuse me of humiliating workers in their efforts to fill the jobs that keep the economy afloat, and of humiliating consumers in their efforts to make economic growth possible through consumerism. I join Howard Richards in responding that I see at least four core points where Marx was ‘wrong’: First, humans are relational beings and the egoistic Homo oeconomicus concept of human nature is wrong, independent of which system builds on this premise, ‘capitalism’, ‘socialism’, or any other system. Second, not science is at the core of the rules and norms that guide the social construction of our institutions, at the core are our ethical decisions. Third, power lies not in workers nor does is lie in their masters, power lies in our social constructions. Unfortunately, the institutional frames that are currently in place trap everyone against their interest, workers and rich alike. Fourth, people need dignity, love, and security, and this is independent of any market value of their labour — it humiliates everyone’s humanity when dignity and justice are being defined as payment for the market value of what a person produces.[[3584]](#endnote-3585) Howard Richards lauds Pope Francis for calling on governments ‘to work toward putting “human dignity back at the centre” of financial markets and models’.[[3585]](#endnote-3586)

I resonate with all voices who point out that what is wanting most in this historical moment is decent global governance. The coronavirus pandemic throws previously existing breaking points into ever-starker relief. The national state remains the strongest presently available institution that could bring about change, yet, its reach is limited and its abilities undermined. Corporate interests[[3586]](#endnote-3587) work for indecent global governance[[3587]](#endnote-3588) to the point that national politics degrade into roller coasters of more or less futile attempts where even the most well-intentioned local interventions fail.[[3588]](#endnote-3589)

I write these lines in Germany and have observed at close hold how Italy went through such roller coaster experiences in the past years. First, its electorate voted for politicians who thought that a focus on the economy would be helpful, then politicians were voted in who focussed on citizen welfare, until voters despaired and turned their back on the inter-national context and ended in angry nationalism.[[3589]](#endnote-3590)

If we want to gauge the potential strength of the state to change this predicament, ironically, it was demonstrated by people like the American president Donald Trump who launched trade wars on behalf of the United States of America despite the American corporate sector being ‘spooked’.[[3590]](#endnote-3591) His example shows that the power of the state is greater than many assume and could very well be employed in the opposite direction of the Trump administration, namely, to create decent global governance structures so that people could be spared roller coaster experiences.

Decent global governance structures were precisely what the founders of the first peace societies and peace federations had in mind. The New York Peace Society was founded in 1815, and the International Peace Bureau, one of the world’s first international peace federations that still exists, came into being in 1891.[[3591]](#endnote-3592) The spirit of these founders still waits to be acted on, the world has yet to understand the fact that ‘Si vis pacem para bellum!’ is far from an unrockable motto. Si vis pacem para pacem! is a much better guideline in a globalised finite context — If you want peace prepare for peace and not for war! As Gandhi said, There is no path to peace. Peace is the path. Likewise, it is time to accept that humankind has failed with its neo-liberal competition for domination experiment and that new formulas for action need to be put in place.

Ever more voices call for new beginnings, among them social anthropologist and globalisation expert Thomas Hylland Eriksen. I am an admirer of Thomas Eriksen’s work and have quoted him widely in this book, not least with his warning that the problem with complex systems is that what begins as salvation may end in misery, and that ‘the unintended consequences are often more conspicuous than the planned outcomes of the course of action’.[[3592]](#endnote-3593) Eriksen always reminds us of the insecticide DDT that was meant to save crops and improve agricultural output but killed insects, starved birds, and made spring ‘silent’.[[3593]](#endnote-3594) The car promised freedom and brought pollution, while ‘the information revolution leads to the pollution of brains and, perhaps, the spread of Enlightenment ideas leads to counter-reactions in the form of fundamentalism’.[[3594]](#endnote-3595)

I also appreciate the work of cultural ecologist and geophilosopher David Abram, who, like me, feels the need to coin new vocabularies that make clear that we live in a world where all earthly organisms are connected in an interbreathing vital flux. Abram introduced the term Humilocene or ‘epoch of humility’ to connote that we need to foster more ecoculturally inclusive ways for addressing the environmental and cultural crises of our time. We need more-than-human conversations, opportunities, and actions that are humble and holistic.[[3595]](#endnote-3596) It is precisely a sense of humility that made me coin the phrase egalisation as a short way to sum up equal dignity in freedom.

Thomas Hylland Eriksen shall have the last word in the introduction to this chapter:

The old recipes for societal improvement, whether socialist, liberal or conservative, have lost their lustre. The political left, historically raised demands for social justice and equality, is now confronted with two further challenges the shape of multiculturalism and climate change, and creating a consistent synthesis of the three is not an easy task.[[3596]](#endnote-3597)

### Egalisation — Equal dignity in freedom and solidarity

I have coined the phrase egalisation to match the term globalisation and make it linguistically possible to merge both into one word, namely, globegalisation, and, by adding cooperation, to arrive at co-globegalisation. My aim is to turn the focus away from the destructive aspects of globalisation, namely, the presently unfolding globalisation of exploitation, and to open space for a future globalisation of care in solidarity.

Egalisation is my short form for equal dignity for all in freedom, a short form for the call to dismantle existing systems of humiliation, to end and heal present cycles of humiliation and prevent new ones from occurring. Egalisation inscribes itself in the alter-globalisation or alter-mundialisation movements that build on historical precursors such as the workers’ movement, the peasants’ movement, the decolonisation movement, or the women’s rights movement. Alter-globalisation movements emerged in the late 1970s when a new phase of capitalist globalisation unfolded, the phase of neo-liberalism and financialisation. In resonance with these movements, I support global cooperation and interaction, the protection of Indigenous cultures, peace, and civil liberties, while opposing the negative effects of economic globalisation on the environment, on economic justice, on labour protection.

The term egalisation aims at distinguishing equal dignity from notions such as equality, equity, egalitarianism, or identicalness.[[3597]](#endnote-3598) As in so many other areas, there is a ‘too much’ and a ‘too little’, and usually those who want too little warn against too much, and vice versa.

The Cold War and its cycles of humiliation frightened many people to the point that they now want ‘too little’ egalisation — they associate egalisation with the undoing of diversity and the imposition of uniformity. Some even cry out ‘Gulag!’ In response, I make clear that equal dignity is exactly the opposite of any enforced levelling of differences, that the term egalisation should precisely not be confused with uniformity, it does not mean that everyone should become the same. Egalisation rejects claims that there should be no differences between people, on the contrary, it even affirms differences. It affirms differences that dignify, while rejecting differences that humiliate. When we look at the maxim of unity in diversity, egalisation celebrates the freedom of diversity and is thus the antidote against oppressive uniformity. ‘Equal dignity should not be misconstrued as a strategy to equalise individuals through social conformity’, are the words of Linda Hartling.[[3598]](#endnote-3599)

Admittedly, however, there exists an important connection between equal dignity and the levelling of differences. This connection is ‘hidden’ in the human rights stipulation that human dignity requires equal opportunities and enabling environments for all. Equal dignity means equal chances for all and this presupposes a certain degree of economic equality on the ground. Dignity cannot truly be equal in a context of unequal chances, only equal opportunities make the kind of diversity possible that opposes uniformity in dignified ways. Egalisation contradicts the argument that ‘since also poor people have dignity, attention to economic equality is unnecessary’. Rich people in mansions overlooking poor people sleeping in the street is a humiliating understanding of diversity, just as it is a humiliating understanding of dignity to dismiss systemic factors and fault the poor for their predicament by declaring that poverty is a self-chosen plight because ‘dignity is autonomy’. As I wrote in chapter 4, the Lévinasian-Buberian interpretation of dignity includes the aspect of care and equal chances more than the Kantian interpretation of dignity does.[[3599]](#endnote-3600)

On the other side are those who want ‘too much’ egalisation. They tend to misunderstand equal dignity to mean that there should be no hierarchy at all. They are right insofar as egalisation cannot coexist with a hierarchy that defines some people as worthier than others, it cannot coexist with a ranking system that allows some people to arrogate superiority and preside over allegedly lesser beings. Egality, however, can perfectly coexist with certain forms of hierarchy, namely, where all participants are regarded as endowed with equal dignity.[[3600]](#endnote-3601) The pilots of a plane can serve as an example, as in this situation roles and authority are of highest importance. These pilots have a clear leadership role vis-à-vis their passengers when in the skies, this is a relationship that is characterised by stark hierarchy, yet, this does not mean that the pilots should look down on their passengers as lesser beings.[[3601]](#endnote-3602) A dignified social order needs some forms of hierarchy, it cannot be without any hierarchy — we need apt pilots, caring teachers, and nurturing parents. The only hierarchy we do not need is one that is the result of oppressive power seeking. ‘Organic hierarchy provides the organisation, coordination, and efficiency by which the diverse potentialities of autonomous individuals can be realised and their energies can be applied in productive ways that promote the common good’.[[3602]](#endnote-3603)

Considering the maxim of the French Revolution, liberté, égalité, fraternité — liberty, equality, and solidarity, cooperation, and care — we have those who overemphasise liberty and thus want too little egalisation, and on the other side those who underemphasise liberty and want too much egalisation. Exploitative globalisation draws on the first argument, it overemphasises liberty while overlooking that all three goals are lost if only liberty is aimed at. Liberty depends on equal dignity to truly manifest, liberty needs equal dignity that is informed by solidarity, dignified generosity, humility, and responsible mutuality. This is what the phrase egalisation aims to highlight, namely, equal dignity that is free of humiliatingly imposed hierarchy and at the same time free of humiliatingly imposed equalisation. Thus defined, egalisation can dignify globalisation so it becomes globegalisation. When we add solidarity, we can draw together all three — liberté, égalité, and fraternité — into one phrase, namely, co-operative globegalisation, or, in one single word — co-globegalisation.[[3603]](#endnote-3604)

If we imagine the human sphere on the planet as a container with a height and a width, then globalisation addresses the horizontal dimension, the shrinking width, the ingathering of the human tribes that globalisation brought about, while egalisation speaks to the vertical dimension, the height of power differentials and inequality. So far, the exploitative side of globalisation has increased inequality in the world to the point that the container became an extremely high pyramid. Egalisation aims at moving away from this pyramid with masters at the top and underlings at the bottom, towards a flat container where each person enjoys equal dignity, free to engage in loving solidarity with all others and in mutually dignifying connection with all life on this planet.

The horizontal line in the middle of Figure 1 represents the line of equal dignity in shared humility and solidarity. It illustrates a worldview that refuses to essentialise secondary differences into primary differences, that refuses to define the core of human worthiness as something that is ranked, it resists rankism.[[3604]](#endnote-3605) As explained before, passengers in a plane are equal in dignity with the pilots even though the pilots have absolute power. The pilots’ power does not diminish the passengers’ essence as equal human beings. The middle line in Figure 1 is not intended to insinuate that all human beings should be identical or the same — being forced into uniformity is the opposite of equality in dignity. The middle line unifies in dignity as it introduces a shared commonality into the power difference between the pilots and passengers, as much as into any differences that might exist among the passengers. The middle line signifies that the pilots are part of a functional hierarchy without which the plane would not fly, the plane has no difficulties, however, to fly without a first class, flying does not require that some passengers be offered higher levels of care than others. The passengers’ diversity, as long as it is freely chosen and all have access to the same range of vital services on board, does not undermine equal dignity. Equal dignity is undermined, however, when rankists claim that the first class has the same legitimacy to make decisions as the pilots’ cabin, for instance, or when rankists overlook structural reasons for inequality and pretend that the passengers have freely chosen inequality when they have not. In other words, the line of equal dignity only accepts diversity that is free of enforced inequality, it rejects humiliating inequality that tries to dress up as diversity.[[3605]](#endnote-3606)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **The historical transition to egalisation** | | |
| Masters in a ranked honour order |  | Top of |
| (humiliation unleashes violence) |  | Gradient |
| New human rights order (humiliation should be overcome with dignism) |  | Line of solidarity in equal dignity, towards  interconnected  dignified humility |
| Underlings in a |  | Bottom of |
| ranked honour order (humiliation breeds  submissive humility) |  | Gradient |

Figure 1:   
The historical transition to equal dignity in freedom and solidarity

Egalisation invites masters to step down from arrogating superiority and encourages inferiors to rise up from humiliating subordination, up from being held down, up from having lesser value and worthiness ascribed to them. Overlords are humbled and underlings elevated, and all are entrusted with the co-creation of a new future of equality in dignity for all, as free and responsible individuals in solidarity. Only in this way can true freedom, true liberty, true liberté be achieved.

While in former times only the tyrant was removed and the system of tyranny was kept in place so the formerly oppressed could become the new oppressors, a dignified future requires a level of peace making and bridge building that goes further. Former oppressors and former oppressed need to come together in the middle, just as Nelson Mandela aimed at including all South Africans into one shared home country. First order change is not enough, second order change is needed — ‘the power must be taken out of power’[[3606]](#endnote-3607) — this is why the line in the middle is an arrow that points into a new and shared future.

Superficial conflict resolution and compromise are insufficient when deep transformation is waiting to manifest that has the force to engender new enduring realities.[[3607]](#endnote-3608) When problems call for qualitative and discontinuous leaps, when multidimensional and multi-level transformation of the system itself is needed, then linear, transactional, partial, and quantitative change of behaviour within an existing system is insufficient. We are in another ‘story’ now, ‘from the liberation of the various “I’s” (individuals, groups) we are immersed in the liberation of “we” (the global community of life on Earth). In opposition to life dominated by stakeholders, we have begun to write the history of the common universality of life’.[[3608]](#endnote-3609)

We all understand that millennia of cultural moulding will not be undone in a moment. During the past millennia, the overall geopolitical context of a strong security dilemma favoured the hierarchical dominator model of society, and it is therefore unsurprising that it became deeply ingrained. The considerable psychological damage that it caused, and still causes, is still with us. As the feelings of humiliation that arise when the transition from unequal to equal worthiness is promised but betrayed are particularly strong (see Table 1 in chapter 5), deep fault lines of confrontation divide society if these feelings fuel honour revenge (see chapters 8 and 10 on cross back) instead of inspiring the forward-looking co-creation of a world of dignism (see more further down in this chapters, and in chapter 12). This is what the ‘fourth logic’ in Table 3 in chapter 12 warns against.

Even reformers with the loftiest ideas may not see the need for second order change and will continue operating within the dominator script that keeps all three lines in place, oblivious that they also open a second front, namely, one with their own fellow reformers who want to leave this script behind and collapse all three lines into the one arrow in the middle (see also the section ‘New conflicting fault lines emerge on top of old ones’ in chapter 10).

Bill Baird is a reproductive rights pioneer and his experience can illustrate this predicament. He is known as the father of the birth control and abortion-rights movement, and he was jailed eight times for lecturing on abortion and birth control. His wife kindly explained to us the reasons for why she and her husband call themselves equalists rather than feminists.[[3609]](#endnote-3610) Bill Baird was shunned and even invalidated not just by opponents of birth control but also by feminist leaders. He was banned from speaking at and attending ‘no men allowed’ demonstrations with arguments such as ‘We women are capable of speaking for ourselves, thank you!’, ‘Baird’s struggle is the same as ours but it’s our struggle!’, and ‘What happened to him [Bill being banned from speaking] happens to women all the time!’ Joni Baird explains:

I felt that such discrimination hurts a movement’s ability to reach common goals. As Equalists, we believe that ‘labels disable’ and create ‘us versus them’ dynamics unnecessarily fragmenting movements. Therefore, Equalists focus on the content rather than the form of the world’s many imbalanced, fear-based paradigms. Equalists believe all human beings are citizens of Planet Earth and set multiple goals for their liberation. We believe that in order to be collectively harmonious, abundant and balanced, certain universal tenets apply. Those tenets are inherently feminist with regard to our desire to radically change the current domination paradigm (occupied by all genders) to allow for equal pay, freedom from aggression, child friendly work environments, and gender diversity. Through this shift, matriarchy and patriarchy are changed to ‘humanarchy’.[[3610]](#endnote-3611)

Not only are certain strands of feminism still beholden to millennia of cultural moulding and act from within the very dominator mindset they want to oppose, this kind of behaviour also triggers destructive backlashes against feminism. By now, ‘no men allowed’ meets angry men’s ‘no women allowed’, particularly among young males. The world is full of ‘shitty women’, this is the view of some MGTOWs (Men Going Their Own Way), men who vow to refrain from serious romantic relationships with women, especially rejecting marriage.[[3611]](#endnote-3612) Biological and Darwinian determinists have now a growing following, as they hark back to concepts of maleness associated with ‘activity’, ‘productivity’, and ‘conscious and moral/logical strategising’, while regarding females as passive, unproductive, unconscious, and ‘amoral/alogical’ — views that already philosopher Otto Weininger expressed in 1903 when he attributed general ‘amorality’ to women.[[3612]](#endnote-3613) The pseudo-Darwinian message is that gender, gender roles, and dominance hierarchies — men over women — are ‘all firmly entrenched in our biological heritage and not to be toyed with’.[[3613]](#endnote-3614)

When I meet proponents of such views, I try to model Baird’s humanarchy by explaining that what is known as correspondence error or attribution error may be at work, meaning that intrinsic factors are attributed where extrinsic ones are in effect.[[3614]](#endnote-3615) Humanity was exposed to the brutal grip of the security dilemma during the past millennia and this forced them to embrace competition for domination and control. The result was that neither women nor men were free to act according to their ‘nature’, on the contrary, very often both were forced to act against their nature.[[3615]](#endnote-3616) Seeming female ‘amorality’ was thus a result of circumstances rather than of innate character. The earlier reported case of the Nairobi slums throws this predicament into the starkest relief. We could say that the intellectual school of Social Darwinism is a victim of this error and we can greet with joy its decline during the twentieth century, ‘as an expanded knowledge of biological, social, and cultural phenomena undermined, rather than supported, its basic tenets’.[[3616]](#endnote-3617)

The only way to create a dignified future in our present situation, as it appears, is to create a world where the systemic frames that organise human affairs enable all humans to live in resonance with nature — the nature of their own bodyminds and that of their habitat — rather than allowing both to be mutilated. The wounds of past humiliation wait to be healed and future humiliation waits to be prevented. Those who got accustomed to arrogating superiority are invited to humble themselves and join hands with those who rise up from subordinate inferiority, and all are invited to build a new future together. During the transition, awareness is needed of the danger that looms when those who should step down and those who wish to rise up interlock in mutual cycles of humiliation, as this would derail the entire transition that otherwise could succeed. In short, egalisation also means that those who need to step down and those who want to rise up avoid humiliating each other.

Egalisation, to be operational, depends on the principle of unity in diversity. This is the only way to avoid that differences are eradicated in a new totalitarian world where everyone is forced into sameness. Further down, I will explain that I heed this insight even with respect to my own sense of identity. ‘Sunflower identity’ is the name I have coined for my personal global unity-in-diversity identity of fluid subsidiarity, and I explain how this identity helps me in my attempt to contribute to the ‘humanisation of globalisation’.[[3617]](#endnote-3618) It helps me see what is wrong with present-day globalitarism, what is wrong with an ideology that ‘aims to propose the teleology of the market as the new master narrative of Western modernity’.[[3618]](#endnote-3619)

Globalitarism has led to global polarisation and has cast a veil of silence over the obscene increase of inequalities both within and across boundaries. To lift this veil is my aim, and to ‘bring flowers to the ceremony’ where globalisation marries egalisation to become globegalisation. In this ceremony, I invite all of us to join hands, explaining that a world filled with lonely disconnected individuals cannot be our aim, as equal and as ‘free’ as they may be. We need to connect and collaborate caringly, lovingly, and responsibly, in mutual consideration and solidarity. As mentioned above, when we look at the maxim of liberté, égalité, fraternité, then globegalisation can draw together the first two, liberty and equality, while fraternité/sisterhood/solidarity is still missing.[[3619]](#endnote-3620) The task of our time is to co-create co-operative globegalisation, or in one word, co-globegalisation.[[3620]](#endnote-3621)

As I see it, co-globegalisation is needed more than ever now, and this fast. It is a question of humanity’s survival or demise. Co-globegalisation means the solidarity of everything with everything and everyone with everyone, solidarity of all with all, solidarity that reaches beyond inter-national solidarity towards global solidarity, beyond inter-generational, inter-class, or inter-racial solidarity towards human solidarity, beyond inter-species solidarity towards sentient solidarity.

### Co-globegalisation — Towards a decent global village

We must all learn to live together as brothers or we will all perish together as fools. We are tied together in the single garment of destiny, caught in an inescapable network of mutuality. And whatever affects one directly affects all indirectly.

― Martin Luther King Jr. (1929–1968), leader in the civil rights movement[[3621]](#endnote-3622)

When we look at the maxim of the French revolution, liberté, égalité, fraternité, then we find fraternité listed at the end, as the last of the three terms. Indeed, there is a problem with the solidarity of brotherhood and sisterhood, it is a complex task to bring liberty and equality into synchrony with solidarity. Throughout the past centuries, solidarity was often outshone by liberty and equality — at times liberty became so loud a battle cry that it even turned against solidarity, and also equality remained unfulfilled. The result has been serious: sociocide and ecocide.

Globalisation of exploitation has been the name of the game throughout the past decades and it waits to be replaced. Exploitation-globalisation waits to be replaced with cooperation-glob-egalisation. Only a globalisation of solidarity can repair global exploitation — the coronavirus pandemic that began to unfold in December 2019 highlights this predicament — no one is safe until everyone is safe. Only a globalisation of solidarity can prevent the world from falling back into parochial division and prevent a de-globalisation that goes too far, that even destroys the promising opportunities globalisation opened up through ‘ingathering the human tribes’, through bringing together the human family.[[3622]](#endnote-3623) As the human family is on a path to unite and it would be a tragedy, were it re-divided into authoritarian fascist states. This would mean more than ‘the right eating the left’s lunch’,[[3623]](#endnote-3624) it would foreclose the possibility of a dignified future for humanity.

If we look for conceptual reasons for why solidarity fell by the wayside during the past centuries, and why even equality declined, we find one core factor, namely, a misleading definition of liberty, of liberté, of freedom. There are two main ways in which people can interpret the call for freedom, only one of which is constructive. Only if a society defines liberty as a level playing field that is protected by appropriate constitutive rules, can liberty be a common good for all. It is destructive when people conceptualise freedom as might to become right, as the absence of restraints, as the unrestrained use of economic power.[[3624]](#endnote-3625) In that case, the outcome is the opposite of freedom, followed by the destruction of equality and solidarity. A society that defines liberty as freedom for dominators to turn might into right increases the power of dominators at the systemic level and condemns the broader masses to fill the role of manipulated and exploited victims, so that collective bondage is the ultimate outcome.[[3625]](#endnote-3626) Theorist Isaiah Berlin (1909–1997) used wolves and sheep as metaphor to bring this to the point. ‘Freedom for the wolves has often meant death to the sheep’.[[3626]](#endnote-3627)

I sometimes use another animal metaphor, namely, the mousetrap. It is cynical to surround mice with traps, and then praise the ‘freedom’ that each mouse may possess to avoid those traps. The food industry hides addictive ingredients in food, the insurance industry hides important information in the small print of contracts — the list of contemporary traps is long. It is cynical to declare dead mice as simply too lazy or too irresponsible to embrace their freedom. It is cynical to accuse the few courageous mice who dare criticise this trap-system of suffering from greed, it is also cynical to use the few mice who indeed suffer from greed as strawmen. Finally, the ultimate cynicism is to offer costly protection packages against traps.[[3627]](#endnote-3628)

Unfortunately, this trap-system grew exponentially as the world went into free market acceleration, particularly after ‘Reaganomics’ were rung in,[[3628]](#endnote-3629) and from there it led to global overheating.[[3629]](#endnote-3630) Ronald Reagan, president of the United States 1981–1989, and Margaret Thatcher, Prime Minister of the United Kingdom 1979–1990, were both on a mission that ultimately made the world sell out communal care. Wherever freedom is another word for ‘the free market’, traditions of communal care tend to be sold out, literally, and even new and untried approaches to care are blocked. If we believe that the motto of liberté, égalité, fraternité aims at meeting human needs in harmony with the natural environment, then liberty without equality and fraternity betrays the very raison-d’être of the entire principle.[[3630]](#endnote-3631)

To say it short, for the past decades, the world went into the wrong direction. Instead of transcending the dominator mindset of the past millennia, it was brought into overdrive. Oil companies such as ExxonMobil knew since the 1970s about the potential of their activities to cause a climate crisis, yet, they sowed doubt about it.[[3631]](#endnote-3632) This happened, while pioneers of technological inventiveness had shown the way to harmony with our natural environment as far back as 1948. One name stands out, that of Mária Telkes, a Hungarian-American biophysicist, scientist, and inventor. She worked on solar energy technologies, and the world would be in a much better place today, had her approach become mainstream instead of the fossil fuel boom.[[3632]](#endnote-3633)

Even now, the urgently needed turnaround is being delayed. In September 2015, the World Bank promoted a strategy of ‘maximising finance for development’ as part of embracing the United Nations’ Sustainable Development Goals. It declared that it will be ‘re-orienting governments to effectively guarantee profits for private investors from financing “development” projects, effectively reducing public financial resources available for development projects’.[[3633]](#endnote-3634) The question is pertinent: When will development mean care for the common good rather than care for private investors? Goal 8 of the United Nations’ Sustainable Development Goals calls for economic growth in the hope ‘to decouple economic growth from environmental degradation’.[[3634]](#endnote-3635) Is this feasible? Should not the very idea of growth be questioned? Should not the idea of profit be scrutinised? Is mere ‘greenwashing’ enough?[[3635]](#endnote-3636) Is it not absurd to expect that never-ending growth is possible in a predominantly finite context?[[3636]](#endnote-3637) Did ‘capitalism’ outcompete Soviet-style communism because it is better in protecting us and our Earth system, or because it is ‘better’ in exploiting it? Whatever system is at the steering wheel, never-ending growth represents an exponential curve, while a finite context calls for circles.[[3637]](#endnote-3638)

Égalité and fraternité have no chance to succeed unless liberté is made compatible with responsibility, with the duty to share and care. Wherever fraternité is sold out for misguided definitions of liberty, wherever dominators hijack the definition of freedom, wherever solidarity is seen as nemesis for individual liberty, equality will ultimately be lost as well.[[3638]](#endnote-3639) Only in a society that defines liberty as a level playing field that is nurtured with servant leadership and shaped by appropriate constitutive rules, can liberty be protected as a common good for all.[[3639]](#endnote-3640)

Community is a word that has its roots in cum (with) and mūnus (employment, office, service; burden, duty, obligation).[[3640]](#endnote-3641) This etymology invites the definition of freedom in the spirit of Martin Luther King Jr., namely, as a call to moral responsibility, or as Martha Nussbaum and Amartya Sen define it, as capability to do things.[[3641]](#endnote-3642)

So, be careful when you cry freedom, and be wary when others cry it! So much depends on what the word is taken to mean.

Peter Kropotkin is a name that enjoys a comeback these days. Like Ayn Rand, Kropotkin was an import to America from Russia, and both are an important influence still today, only in opposite ways. Kropotkin hailed from an aristocratic land-owning family in Russia and later in life turned away from his privileged background. He spoke up for a decentralised communist society free from central government, based on voluntary associations of self-governing communities and worker-run enterprises. He suggested that a society that is sufficiently developed socially, culturally, and industrially, that can produce all the goods and services it needs, should be in a position to build economic systems of mutual exchanges and voluntary cooperation.[[3642]](#endnote-3643) Kropotkin supported the eventual abolition of money or tokens of exchange for goods and services.[[3643]](#endnote-3644)

Kropotkin’s insights resonate with those of political economist Karl Polanyi, more specifically with what Polanyi called the substantivist economic model, a model that is in dialogue with nature and contrasts the formalist model that stands for the ‘production of crops’.[[3644]](#endnote-3645) Kropotkin’s insights also resonate with anthropologist Alan Page Fiske’s description of communal sharing, the guiding principle for the social and societal life in many Indigenous communities.[[3645]](#endnote-3646) Indigenous communities are known for disallowing life to be defined by what Fiske calls ‘equality matching’ or ‘market pricing’, all of which are less comprehensive frameworks compared with communal sharing. Many Indigenous people have done for ages what Western scientists re-discover only now, namely, learning from nature, or biomimetics.[[3646]](#endnote-3647)

Anthropologists have shown that the argument is erroneous that market pricing is an improvement over Indigenous ways of dealing with each other. Indigenous communities mainly practice mutual sharing and giving forward rather than exchange.[[3647]](#endnote-3648) Giving forward is the finest form of sociality, it is also superior to reciprocity, as reciprocity still involves calculations, something that hinders the spontaneity of generosity.[[3648]](#endnote-3649)

These insights have played a crucial role not least in my personal life. My experience is that it is much more purposeful, liberating, and fulfilling when I simply ask ‘What can I give?’ rather than ‘What do I get in return?’ Linda Hartling offers her experience when she says, ‘I like “mutuality” and especially “movement toward mutuality”, as this does not set up the bean counting of equal exchange. Mutuality does not have to be equal’.[[3649]](#endnote-3650)

Archaeologist Ingrid Fuglestvedt studies the culture of early animists and she explains why sharing is not a form of exchange. Sharing is ‘a vitality that is maintained through cooperation between humans and animals, this being a joint venture which, as it were, makes the world go round’.[[3650]](#endnote-3651) In her exploration of the lives of animists, Fuglestvedt observes that ‘sharing parts of the animal between human parties — as it is between animal and human parties — is carried out with no demands from the giving party’:

There is no expectation to get something back; neither does the receiving party feel they are obliged to give something back on a later occasion. In these societies the only obligation is to share, or give unconditionally. So, in hunting societies the successful hunters may end up in a position of being continual givers of meat, while others are constant receivers. Sharing takes place with no conditions, and in communities of sharing the expression ‘thank you’ does not exist.[[3651]](#endnote-3652)

Osotua is a Maasai word in East Africa that stands for a practice where one person requests gifts from benefactors who will give those gifts freely if they can, without expecting return gifts to match the original one. Research has shown that this is a practice that pools resources best, it minimises risk and increases survival outcomes — for the Maasai it secures the survival of the foundation of their livelihood, in their case their cattle herds.[[3652]](#endnote-3653)

In conclusion, this means that there is no reason for praising modern-day consumer individualism as being superior to traditional collectivistic arrangements — current crises expose this belief beyond doubt as unwarranted hubris. Equal dignity can only truly emerge in a context of communal sharing, in combination with the benevolent form of what Fiske calls ‘authority ranking’, ranking that is about care rather than domination — the nurturant rather than tyrannical teacher. Equal dignity can only flourish as long as quality is protected from being overly quantified. The promise of consumption — that more of it will provide higher rank — ultimately renders the opposite of equal dignity, it brings back the hierarchy of feudal times. ‘How America is reverting back to the feudal age’ is a lament in 2019.[[3653]](#endnote-3654) Indeed, mansions that contemporary jet-set ‘dignitaries’ build for themselves in America represent an architectural manifestation of ‘feudal pride’, as they are simply imitations of palaces of former French aristocracy.[[3654]](#endnote-3655)

Indigenous psychologist Louise Sundararajan warns that relational values disappear through market pricing:

All emotions are relational; our brain is not evolved to interact emotionally with strangers. Globalisation changes that. Sales clerks are trained to wear a smile for all. This is fine so far as superficial emotions go. But real emotions in the stranger context tend to become aberrant — sex with strangers is either rape or prostitution; weakness or inferiority in front of strangers turns a quotidian experience of humbling into that of traumatic humiliation. Of the four types of relational cognition that Alan Fiske delineated, Market Pricing, the type of relational transactions among strangers, has the least capacity to sustain a meaningful relationship — yet this is the type of relational context we are left with when all the other, richer relational contexts liquidify with globalisation.[[3655]](#endnote-3656)

Relational values are at the core of healing professions and therefore nurses and doctors suffer more than others from dysfunctional concepts of freedom. A study by medical scholars explains how physicians feel when ‘nickelled and dimed’ by insurers:

Researchers have described two types of relationships that involve giving a benefit to someone else. In a market relationship, when you provide goods or services, you expect to receive cash or bartered goods of similar value in return. In a communal relationship, you are expected to help when there is a need, irrespective of payment... Caregivers should be appropriately reimbursed but should not be constantly primed by money. Success in such a model will require collegiality, cooperation, and teamwork — precisely the behaviours that are predictably eroded by a marketplace environment.[[3656]](#endnote-3657)

Allow me to share my personal view. I have studied psychology and medicine, and have worked as a psychotherapist for many years, among others, for seven years in Cairo in Egypt. I was a very ‘successful’ psychotherapist I dare say, people usually benefitted from seeing me, independent of whether their background was Western and non-Western. I never ‘applied’ any ‘methodology’, I always invited my interlocutors to be my teachers regarding their specific personal and cultural contexts, and only when suitable did I share what I had learned as a student of psychology in different cultural settings around the world. I always made my doubts transparent, my doubts about the many ‘social engineering’ traps in Western psychology,[[3657]](#endnote-3658) and sometimes I even had to ‘rescue’ people from those traps (see the section ‘Where is the field of psychology?’ in chapter 2).[[3658]](#endnote-3659)

My approach was to offer myself as a fellow human being, to embark on an existential journey together with my interlocutors as fellow seekers. Never would I regard my interlocutors as ‘clients’ or ‘patients’. My aim was to dignify all of us by trying to ‘dis-cover, un-cover or re-cover that part of humanity that is always hidden, sublimated and remains out of reach’.[[3659]](#endnote-3660) On this journey, we confronted ‘love, hate, life and death’ together.[[3660]](#endnote-3661) I trust I was successful in helping people who sought my help in solving conflicts in their personal lives — in other words, I was able to help make what I call ‘small peace’.

Over time, however, I increasingly suffered from the fact that I could not avoid being complicit in reproducing hierarchies of power and privilege. Both of us — therapist and interlocutor — remained captured in larger systemic contexts that stand in the way of ‘big peace’.[[3661]](#endnote-3662) Increasingly, I resonated with those who lament psychology’s role in reproducing hierarchies of power and privilege rather than undoing them. Psychologist Philip Cushman, for instance, argues that after the historical shift from the Victorian ‘sexually restricted self’ after World War II, a new ‘empty self’ has emerged, ‘filled up’ with lifestyle choices catered to by advertisers who offer consumerism, filled by celebrities who offer fancy mannerisms, and by psychotherapists who offer self-improvement. Cushman warns that this strategy, even though it may solve some old problems, ‘creates new ones, including an opportunity for abuse by exploitive therapists, cult leaders, and politicians’.[[3662]](#endnote-3663) Psychologist Nick Haslam chimes in by decrying how normal sadness, worry, and fear have become labelled as mental disorders and overmedicated by the mental health professions, with the serious consequence that resources are deflected away from where they would really be needed.[[3663]](#endnote-3664) In other words, what I call big peace is wanting everywhere.

Slowly, my attention turned to the ‘big peace’ that Alfred Nobel and his inspirer Bertha von Suttner had in mind. It is at this level, that I see healing most needed today — systemic healing is needed. Systemic problems cannot be offloaded on the individual. With this insight in mind, I help convene a global dignity movement, and it has been deeply encouraging that our work was nominated for the Nobel Peace Prize three times.[[3664]](#endnote-3665)

### Dignism — Towards a decent future

I suggest that we, as human family, to achieve big peace, may need to turn to what Alan Page Fiske calls communal sharing and re-instate it as the leading frame for how we arrange our affairs on this planet both locally and globally. Philosopher Howard Richards supports this view by confirming that we only can overcome current dysfunctional liberal ethics through a ‘naturalist and realist ethics of solidarity’, an ethics where human needs and dignity are met in harmony with the environment.[[3665]](#endnote-3666)

I define myself as Homo amans, as ‘loving being’. The Homo oeconomicus model is profoundly alien to me. Love has existential depth and strength, something that consumerism lacks, it is even higher than the most powerful sensation of comradeship in war. I have learned from war veterans about the existential strength of solidarity among comrades during battle, and they say that no other experience can match it. Indeed, in the context of a strong security dilemma, the experience of existential transcendence in war was often so intense that young men gave their lives willingly. Philosopher Karl Jaspers has explained how men have ‘risked their lives in a common struggle for a common life in the world. Solidarity was then the ultimate condition’.[[3666]](#endnote-3667)

On my life path, I have learned that we do not need war to experience existential transcendence. The practice of giving forward, I dare say, can be as intense an experience as the strongest comradeship between warriors in battle in the face of death. The practice of giving forward creates a social-psychological connection that comes from the heart and is much deeper than the connectivity that is promised by competitive consumerism and also much deeper than the connectivity that flows from military command structures.[[3667]](#endnote-3668) Deep-felt love poems from all around the world describe the depth of fulfilment that can connect lovers — I dare say that the Homo amans path of ‘loving all creation’ offers the highest level of fulfilment.

The Homo oeconomicus model humiliates the core of my humanity and it profoundly hurts me to see how the primacy given to market pricing eats into the humanity of all of us and diminishes our humanity at all levels and in all contexts.[[3668]](#endnote-3669) It saddens me when this humiliation, rather than being healed, is made worse by capitalism-versus-socialism hate-speech. I have therefore coined the term dignism (dignity + ism) to replace the terminology of capitalism, socialism, or communism as catchwords. I wish to circumvent the cycles of humiliation that are driven by enraged people who do not even know what these catchwords mean.[[3669]](#endnote-3670) My aim is to turn away from combative backward-looking mindsets and point at positive future-oriented goals that can unite us all:

Dignism describes a world where every newborn finds space and is nurtured to unfold their highest and best, embedded in a social context of loving appreciation and connection, where the carrying capacity of the planet guides the ways in which everyone’s basic needs are met. It is a world where unity in diversity reigns, where we unite in respecting human dignity and celebrating diversity, where we prevent unity from devolving into oppressive uniformity, and keep diversity from sliding into hostile division. Dignism means ending past cycles of humiliation and preventing new ones from emerging. Dignism means loving care for the common good of all of humanity as co-inhabitants of one single finite habitat. Dignism weaves together all dignifying aspects of all of the world’s cultures into one decent global village.

When the world was not yet as interconnected as it is now, ‘honourable’ might-is-right competition sometimes rendered short-term victories. In the contemporary interconnected world, however, this is no longer the case. The collectivistic ranked honour mindsets of the past now render all-out defeat. It is no improvement to individualise the mindset of might-is-right in a market place, even if defeat is only ‘hybrid’, it is still defeat.[[3670]](#endnote-3671) In an interconnected world, global cooperation in connectedness and compassion is what is called for.[[3671]](#endnote-3672)

Cooperation out-performs competition — eminent social psychologist Morton Deutsch, father of the field of conflict resolution and founder of the Morton Deutsch International Center for Cooperation and Conflict Resolution, has dedicated his entire life work to proving the superiority of cooperation. His work and that of many other researchers allows us to regard this as established fact.[[3672]](#endnote-3673) Competitors are well aware of this fact. Competitors enforce cooperation within their in-groups precisely because it makes them stronger in their competition with out-groups. Indeed, cooperation ‘within’ with the aim to make competition ‘without’ more effective is at the core of the mindset of honour engendered by the security dilemma throughout the past millennia.

Today’s global interconnectedness is a radical game changer. Combined with the fact that this planet is also finite, it represents the ultimate deterrent to traditional power-over competition, be it power over others or over nature. In this situation, ‘splendid isolation’ is no solution — even uncontacted tribes in the Amazon, as much as they might try, cannot escape global climate change. Human rights ideals arose in awareness of the insight that time has come to unleash the advantages of cooperation to all of humanity and our planet. Time has come to use cooperation for global con-struction, no longer let cooperation be the servant of competition for domination and mutual de-struction.

Time has come for cooperation to include the entire global village, to nurture respect for equality in dignity for all in solidarity — in short, time has come for what I call big peace, the peace of co-globegalisation and dignism. Unity in diversity is the principle that can guide the implementation of global cooperation, with subsidiarity as the way to make it work.

### Unity in diversity

Biocultural diversity: A checklist

by peace linguist Francisco Gomes de Matos, Recife, 20th December 2017

Does biocultural diversity help...

beautify/fortify Humanity? How?

dignify/edify Humanity? How?

educate/elevate Humanity? How?

enhance/advance Humanity? How?

humanise/ spiritualise Humanity? How?

nurture humility/simplicity? How?

pacify/gratify Humanity? How?

support/sustain Humanity? How?

tranquilise/ harmonise Humanity? How?

What is humanity’s overarching guiding narrative? At the current point in historical time, it seems that ‘search for happiness through material acquisitions’ is the dominant integrative overarching script in most parts of the world.[[3673]](#endnote-3674) Wherever I go, all around the world, I observe how it eats its way into the souls of people — it is idolised by many, some endure it like bad weather, while a few oppose it angrily. What I see lacking is calm and sober long-term envisioning of more sustainable futures.

Paradoxically, those wo suffer from the dark sides of this script most, are sometimes also those who idolise it most. When I come to the Global South and speak with people in the street, I am usually met with disbelief when I ask them to help save the world, including the Global North, from itself — in a kind of self-colonising way, many see the Global North as their only saviour. On the other side, I also meet angry African intellectuals who wish for ‘the fall of the empire’ of the Global North. I appreciate voices in the middle, such as that of Chirevo Kwenda, expert on African traditional religion in South Africa, who explains that social cohesion in Africa does not flow from state sovereignty, liberal democracy, the advance of modernity, or the global economy. Rather, millions of African people suffer, as they are forced to live alienated lives.[[3674]](#endnote-3675)

Living alienated lives is what I call sociocide, and it does not just afflict Africa, it afflicts all of the world, including the originators of the script of happiness-through-material-acquisitions in the Global North. The Global North looks like paradise only from afar. Searching for happiness through material acquisitions above basic needs ultimately damages everything, from the human soul to human lives to the planet’s ecological balance.

The big question poses itself: In a situation where the scramble for material acquisitions depletes the world’s resources and causes both sociocide and ecocide, what should the next overarching narrative be for humanity? Is there a way to manifest true dignity for all? Can we escape being manipulated into false promises of dignity?

The best candidate for the next overarching narrative,[[3675]](#endnote-3676) one that has the potential to protect humanity from ecocide and sociocide, is ‘divided we stand’. Society is a complex system and it is viable and vigorous only when it succeeds in being both differentiated and integrated. If humankind wishes to succeed with the radical transition that is needed now, then the core challenge is to balance the tension between the Many and the One, and to envision its endless practical implications by ‘harvesting’ and reviving all ancient wisdom ever accrued.[[3676]](#endnote-3677) This tension extends across the entire range of human thinking, and it can be expressed in mathematical form, easily detectable wherever the term versus appears. The list of conventional dichotomies waiting to be bridged is long: religious versus secular, right versus left, capitalist versus communist, Eastern versus Western, industrial versus pre- or post-industrial, realism versus idealism, altruism versus egoism, self-interest versus common interest, collectivism versus individualism, big versus small government, visible hand versus ‘invisible hand’, women versus men, globalisation versus localisation, and so on.

‘Divided we stand’ means transforming ‘unity versus diversity’ into ‘unity in diversity’. Unity must not become uniformity and diversity not division. The two prongs of unity and diversity are both essential and complementary (see also chapter 10).[[3677]](#endnote-3678)

When I lived in Japan, I was introduced to the work of intercultural communication scholar Muneo Yoshikawa who brings together Western and Eastern thought into a non-dualistic double swing model. He visualises it graphically as the infinity symbol or Möbius strip ∞. Unity is created out of the realisation of differences, and in this way individuals, cultures, and intercultural concepts can blend in constructive ways.[[3678]](#endnote-3679) Yoshikawa draws on Martin Buber’s idea of dialogical unity — the act of meeting between two different beings without eliminating the otherness or uniqueness of each — an idea that is in harmony with the ideal of equal dignity as enshrined in many religions around the world and in human rights ideals.[[3679]](#endnote-3680) Yoshikawa connects these insights with the notion of soku, the Buddhist non-dualistic logic of ‘not-one, not-two’, or the twofold movement between the self and the other that allows for both unity and uniqueness.[[3680]](#endnote-3681) Yoshikawa calls the unity that is created out of the realisation of differences identity in unity: dialogical unity does not eliminate the tension between basic potential unity and apparent duality.[[3681]](#endnote-3682) Yoshikawa’s model includes also an important third element, namely, an emphasis on the processual, relational, and contradictory nature of intercultural communication.[[3682]](#endnote-3683)

Philosophy of mind is a wide field, broadly definable as the study of the ontology or ‘nature’ of the mind, of mental events, mental functions, mental properties, consciousness, and their relationships to the physical body. All approaches that transcend the either-or dichotomy use the concept of non-dualism with its strong roots in Asia.[[3683]](#endnote-3684) The dominant Western orientation during its expansion throughout the past centuries has been dualism, a metaphysics that holds that ultimately there are two kinds of substance. René Descartes’ mind-body dichotomy is perhaps its most widely known expression. 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. Finally, there are philosophies that refuse to get involved in answering questions about how many kinds of substance there are.

Not only Asia, also Africa has a tradition of non-dualism. The African ubuntu philosophy of ‘we are two, and we are one, and this at the same time’ fosters living together and solving conflicts in an atmosphere of shared and dignified humility.[[3684]](#endnote-3685)

Competency in non-dualistic thinking is the essential foundation for being able to grasp the value of unity in diversity and make it a synergistic ‘win-win game’, to understand that unity is not the same as oppressive uniformity, and that diversity is not the same as unrestricted freedom for divisiveness. Unity and diversity can grow together if kept in mutual balance, if nurtured and celebrated simultaneously. Linda Hartling formulates it as follows, ‘Unity and diversity in balance provides for the growth and participation of all involved, though people grow and participate in different ways’.[[3685]](#endnote-3686) Non-dualism means separation and connection, agreement and disagreement, one and two.

I appreciate the visualisations that the image of a lying eight ∞ inspires. When we look at the master-slave dyad, for instance — be it constituted by honour-based hierarchies or through consumerism-based exploitation — it is best described as an eight that stands vertically rather than lying horizontally. When the downtrodden rise up to manifest a world of equal dignity for all, they aim to turn the eight from a vertical into a horizontal position. When the downtrodden want to become the new masters, their goal is to flip the eight on its head. To achieve this goal, they usually begin by breaking the bond between the two circles of the eight to bring the two sides into a position of mutual hostility as opponents of equal standing who compete for dominance. Until they have subdued their former master who is now their enemy, they will not let the other side out of sight. In many present-day Western societies, this breaking of the bond has gone further. It has become systemic to the point that even the connectivity of mutual hostility is lost. Disconnected individuals float aimlessly in an atomised world, equal but lonely, desperately trying to brand themselves according to the rules of global uniformity in the vain hope to connect with each other’s authenticity. When we look at the ‘McDonaldisation’ of the world, a world where dignity is defined as autonomy, we see only one circle of the eight left, filled with narcissistic ‘autonomous’ loners lost in cultural uniformity. This situation is prone to becoming so painful that even the connectivity entailed in mutual hostility may seem preferable. I observe with dismay how humiliation entrepreneurs offer precisely this relief by channelling hatred and hostility into cult-like followerships. As a remedy, I propose my relational definition of dignity, a definition where all connections in the eight are intact and the eight is lying flat so that all sides are on an equal level and can join hands in mutual loving solidarity.

Even though non-dualism is strongest in world regions like Asia or Africa, and even though current political events seem to contravene the realisation of these ideals in a globalised world, these ideals still remain present also in the West, not least in the motto on the Great Seal of the United States of America, E pluribus unum, Latin for ‘out of many, one’.[[3686]](#endnote-3687) The Center for Multicultural Education at the University of Washington, Seattle has assembled recommendations for the United States titled Diversity within unity: Essential principles for teaching and learning in a multicultural society, where we read, ‘E pluribus unum, diversity within unity is the delicate goal toward which our nation and its schools should strive’.[[3687]](#endnote-3688) American sociologist Amitai Etzioni sees diversity within unity as the only societal design that can solve the tension between the rights of members of minorities and the particularistic values of a national community — diversity within unity ‘assumes that all citizens will embrace a core of values while being welcomed to follow their own subcultures on other matters’.[[3688]](#endnote-3689)

As a path to nurturing more unity and at the same time allow for more diversity in the world, I recommend studying many (in principle all) human cultural realms and ‘harvesting’ all cultural worldviews, practices, and social-psychological skills that have unifying and dignifying effects.[[3689]](#endnote-3690) All continents offer harvest. Catherine Odora Hoppers is the former Chair of Development Education at the University of South Africa, and she speaks of ‘transformation by enlargement for the academy’, whereby she means by enlargement the inclusion of Indigenous knowledge systems.[[3690]](#endnote-3691) The Quechua phrases sumak kawsay and alli kawsay,[[3691]](#endnote-3692) as well as similar terms in other Indigenous South American languages, cannot truly be translated into English because they describe a concept that is ‘foreign to Western logic’,[[3692]](#endnote-3693) yet, they can be approximately interpreted as living well. In Spanish the translation would be buen-vivir and vivir bien, all denoting an Indigenous social system that focusses on reciprocity between people and Earth.[[3693]](#endnote-3694) There is also Panama’s abya yala, Zapatistas and Zapotecos in Mexico speak of mandar obedeciendo and comunalidad, all similar to India’s swaraj and the African ubuntu philosophy, to mention just a few of the better-known expressions.[[3694]](#endnote-3695) Ecuador’s Constitution of 2008 has been hailed as one of the most progressive constitutions as it is the first to enshrine the rights of nature, ‘the principles of harmony with nature and of reciprocity followed since times immemorial by the Indigenous peoples’.[[3695]](#endnote-3696)

The year 2014 was the last year in the United Nations Decade for Indigenous Peoples, and on this occasion, global dignity advocate Kjell Skyllstad warned, ‘We cannot ignore what amounts to genocide in our continued contribution to the eradication of the peoples who contain the key to our own survival’.[[3696]](#endnote-3697) In 2016, the United Nations General Assembly adopted a resolution on the rights of Indigenous peoples, stressing the urgent need to preserve, promote, and revitalise endangered languages, proclaiming 2019 as the International Year of Indigenous Languages and inviting UNESCO to ‘serve as the lead agency for the Year’.[[3697]](#endnote-3698) Dignity is the title of a book that documents Indigenous people.[[3698]](#endnote-3699)

The field of Indigenous psychology is on a similar path.[[3699]](#endnote-3700) From the point of view of Indigenous psychologists, current dominant Western thinking in psychology is doubly misleading, first, it subscribes to a decontextualised vision, and, second, it has an extreme focus on individualism, mechanism, and objectivity.[[3700]](#endnote-3701) Given my dual qualification as a medical doctor and a psychologist, I have often noticed the internal gaps within Western psychology and psychiatry — at all levels, from the epistemological to the psychotherapeutical — seeing them being thrown into particularly stark contrast when applied outside of Western contexts. When I worked as a counsellor and psychotherapist in Egypt, for instance, I was appalled to see Western colleagues trying to impose Western individualism as the only path to mental health. Another occasion was in 1999, when I participated in the 1st Regional Meeting of the World Psychiatric Association and the Kenya Psychiatric Association in Nairobi.[[3701]](#endnote-3702) I am therefore glad when I see Indigenous psychologists inviting mainstream psychologists to muster the self-reflexivity of competent multiculturalism, to accept that they are adherents of an Indigenous psychology that is rooted in the historical and cultural context of Europe and North America.[[3702]](#endnote-3703) The view from nowhere, a view that natural sciences claim, must change into local views from somewhere.[[3703]](#endnote-3704) Only a synergy of multiculturalism and internationalism can help bring together local constructions of meaning with global consciousness, so that all can draw on multiple somewheres and arrive at shared visions and goals.[[3704]](#endnote-3705)

While I call for harvesting from all world cultural heritages,[[3705]](#endnote-3706) I take great care to avoid romanticising ‘The Indigenous’. I appreciate warnings from a psychologist in India who laments that it is ‘great for the West to just box us in spirituality, Ayurveda and yoga alone’, as this helps in making it esoteric, finding useful cultural ‘samples’ for cross cultural psychology, ‘appropriating when suitable, monetising it, and caricaturing it, when not suitable’.[[3706]](#endnote-3707) When we had our Dignity Conference in the Amazonian rainforest in 2019, we were given the same warning.[[3707]](#endnote-3708) ‘Indigenous’ does not automatically mean ‘dignifying’, ‘no population in its entirety embodies one particular way of knowing’, warns also Indigenous psychologist Louise Sundararajan.[[3708]](#endnote-3709) While the Chinese notion of harmony entails helpful concepts of connection, we see also very sophisticated ways of punishment and torture being developed in China.[[3709]](#endnote-3710) Rather than using the phrase ‘Indigenous knowledge’, it may be more appropriate to say ‘knowledge systems of Indigenous populations’.[[3710]](#endnote-3711)

To conclude, maintaining unity in diversity is a balancing act that requires high degrees of cognitive sophistication, interpersonal sagacity, and dignifying communication skills. The most significant mental hurdle to overcome is the misconception that unity in diversity is a zero-sum game, that, if one wants more unity, one has to sacrifice diversity, and vice versa. This hurdle appears to be particularly high and I observe it mainly in Western contexts, where people have the greatest difficulties in grasping that both unity and diversity can be increased together, that it is far from a zero-sum game. This misconception shrinks the world into narrow dualities unnecessarily, be it ‘cosmopolitanism versus communalism’, ‘statism versus anarchism’, or ‘top-down versus bottom-up’.[[3711]](#endnote-3712)

As for communication skills, waging good conflict is a skill that waits to be embraced, as described by Jean Baker Miller, pioneer in women’s psychology and Linda Hartling’s mentor. If it succeeds, the benefits are considerable, the reward is a sense of zest that follows from engagement in mutually beneficial growth-fostering relationships that are characterised by:

* A sense of zest or well-being that comes from connecting with another person(s)
* An increased ability and motivation to take action in the relationship as well as in others situations
* Increased knowledge of oneself and the other person(s) and the relationship
* An increased sense of worth
* A desire for more connection beyond the particular one.[[3712]](#endnote-3713)

The challenge, however, goes much further than only connecting dualities. The third ingredient in Yoshikawa’s double swing model is processual thinking. It means transcending the clinging to fixities and moving towards flux. Embracing processual thinking means leaving behind the expectation that fixity can or should exist for all arrangements, it means letting go of the hope that the tension between unity and diversity can ever be made permanent, it means accepting that all involved need to balance this tension in a never-ending process. Moreover, this balance depends on being achieved through dialogue rather than through threats of break-up or even violence whenever the equilibrium is felt wanting. A power to approach serves this aim better than a power over approach.

Kim Stafford’s story of the poet cited earlier describes this way, and author H. Jackson Brown reminds us that ‘in the confrontation between the stream and the rock, the stream always wins — not by strength but by perseverance’.[[3713]](#endnote-3714) William Stafford, son of Kim Stafford, both renowned peace poets from Oregon on the West Coast of the United States of America, would say, ‘The river always finds the right way, if there is a way’.[[3714]](#endnote-3715)

Going with the flow can also be overdone, however. There is a ‘too much’ and a ‘too little’. ‘Only dead fish go with the flow’ is a reminder.[[3715]](#endnote-3716) Sometimes, firmly standing up is more important than simply ‘standing by’. The art is to stand up in ways that make maximum use of the flow.[[3716]](#endnote-3717)

Economist Paul Collier may serve as an illustration for this artful balance. He demonstrated dignifying communication skills when he engaged in conversations with critics of his book Exodus.[[3717]](#endnote-3718) In this book, he warned that an overdose of non-Western immigration can diminish trust in Western host communities, that too much diversity may diminish unity, and he defended this position in a respectful and non-adversarial style.[[3718]](#endnote-3719)

If we look for geopolitical illustrations, North Korea seems to be one of the most difficult cases to address, while Scandinavia can serve as an uplifting example. North Korea’s ‘myth of Juche’ makes its citizens believe that they are the ‘cleanest’ ‘race’ on Earth. Some observers hope that North Korea only aims at self-reliant communism, yet, North Korean nuclear programme may betray a more serious goal, namely, ‘final victory’ over rival South Korea.[[3719]](#endnote-3720) The global community is therefore well advised to invite North Koreans to join hands with the rest, to become a respected member in the concert of globally responsible actors and relinquish wishing for either splendid isolation or final victory. On the other extreme pole of the spectrum we find Norway, ranked as one of the ‘happiest’ countries in the world.[[3720]](#endnote-3721) Norwegians apply the processual approach called Fabian strategy,[[3721]](#endnote-3722) or piecemeal social engineering, as philosopher Karl Popper called it.[[3722]](#endnote-3723) This approach refrains from rigid dogmaticism, it listens to all and silences none, it counts on respectful dialogue and allows for insights from science to enlighten political processes.[[3723]](#endnote-3724)

The balance of unity in diversity succeeds if it is maintained in a continuous society-wide discourse, without vilifying those who wish for their preference to ‘win’, be it the preference for unity or for diversity. Those who speak up for more diversity need to make sure they do not create hostile division, and those who wish for more unity are called to avoid creating oppressive uniformity. In an interconnected world, everyone’s hands are needed to hold the connection between unity and diversity and keep it intact. ‘Splendid isolation’ offers no escape, not from hostile division nor from oppressive uniformity. In a world where the protection of our collective commons is at stake and free riding still awaits to be contained by a strong majority, responsibility must be shouldered collectively. New societal institutions wait to be created that cultivate dignifying communication skills systemically, skills that allow for the development of intelligent and creative solutions for our global challenges. World peace is hard work.

#### The difficult balance of unity in diversity

Intercultural psychologist Anthony Marsella reminds us that ‘cultural diversity is as important for human survival, adaptation, and adjustment as biological diversity’.[[3724]](#endnote-3725) The disciplines that need to be involved, he suggests, range from indigenous psychologies to ethno-psychiatry, cross-cultural psychiatry, trans-cultural psychiatry, folk psychiatry, primitive psychiatry, cross-cultural psychology, cultural psychology, minority psychologies, cultural anthropology, psychological anthropology, culture and personality, cross-cultural counselling, and, finally, to medical sociology. Francisco Gomes de Matos chimes in and recommends the inclusion of the field of ecolinguistics, a field that covers language diversity, language minorities, language endangerment, and, most importantly, it covers the link between the loss of languages and the loss of species,[[3725]](#endnote-3726) thus helping solve environmental problems through bringing the role of language and discourse in describing and concealing those problems to a wider attention.[[3726]](#endnote-3727)

‘Biological and cultural diversity: The inextricable, linked by language and politics’, is the title of a chapter by Darrell Posey, scholar of traditional resource rights and the environment, ethics, and society:

The integral (holistic) nature of knowledge systems has been shown to be linked to land and territory. Thus, it is impossible to discuss conservation of cultural and linguistic diversity without discussing the basic rights of local peoples and their self-determination and control over their own lands and resources. This, of course, makes future activities of linguistics, anthropologists, environmentalists, and others working with indigenous and local communities a profoundly political matter. And it implies that continued research into language and cultural diversity requires a more collaborative approach in which equitable partnerships evolve from mutual interest between researchers and local communities. The days of ‘our’ studying ‘them’ (with the added barb of ‘before they become extinct’) must be replaced with collaboration to conserve the biological, linguistic, and cultural diversity of the planet — before we all become extinct.[[3727]](#endnote-3728)

Kjell Skyllstad looks back on ninety years of global dignity and peace work and he has inspired three of our global dignity conferences.[[3728]](#endnote-3729) A conference titled ‘Forum 2019: Vanishing voices: Safeguarding intangible cultural heritage under threat in an urbanising world’, took place in Bangkok in Thailand in March 2019. In preparation for this conference, Kjell Skyllstad sent me his early draft of aims and themes for presentations and panels:

* Encouraging citizens at all levels to engage in preserving their cultural heritage
* Raising awareness and reinforcing a sense of belonging to a common cultural space
* Developing research and action plans for preserving local languages and arts
* Mapping endangered cultural and arts venues and activities in urban communities
* Teaching local traditions and arts at all school levels for cultural continuity
* Promoting museums of cultural heritage
* Giving tribal and underprivileged people a voice
* Supporting vanishing vocal traditions towards upholding historical memory Initiating digitalisation of local historical and cultural archives
* Training marginalised groups in using technology and social media to actively engage with societies in upholding their traditions
* Building an atlas of endangered music traditions[[3729]](#endnote-3730)

When we consider Skyllstad’s list of themes, we become aware of the extent of the challenges that lie ahead if we want to create enough unity in the world so that our diversity can be protected and celebrated.

Many questions arise when we look deeper into the motto of unity in diversity. Who decides where unity ends and diversity begins? What happens when diversity divides unity? Who decides at what point voluntary unity becomes oppressive uniformity? Inversely, who determines when diversity no longer means enriching heterogeneity but destructive division? What are the guiding parameters? Can human rights ideals work as parameters? Howard Richards thinks so — he argues for ‘celebrating diversity while simultaneously unifying all human behaviour under an ethic of respect for universal human rights’.[[3730]](#endnote-3731)

The closer we look, the more difficult the questions become. When we speak of unity in diversity, what do we mean by diversity? What does biological and cultural diversity mean? How can we protect it? Does it mean protecting diversity within an in-group so it becomes less homogenous? Or does it mean to protect a homogenous in-group from being invaded by out-groups? An uncontacted tribe, for instance, will lose its cultural uniqueness the moment it is being contacted. Uncontacted tribes need help from outside to keep invaders off their territory when under siege. Is this like Japan, whose sakoku policy over a period of 214 years gave the world the gift of today’s unique Japanese culture?[[3731]](#endnote-3732) What, however, about a man like Anders Behring Breivik, who went on a shooting spree to ‘protect’ Norwegian culture? Can or should Norway isolate itself like an uncontactable tribe? Who has the ‘right’ to keep others ‘off’ their territory? What about all those ‑isms that separate people from each other and from their natural environment — ranging from racism to anthropocentrism to human [supremacism](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Supremacism)? Where does protection end and hatred start? Is it racist or anti-racist when a White person wishes to have children with a Black person?[[3732]](#endnote-3733) At what point does ethno-pluralism veer into parochialism? How far can global intra-cultural diversity go before it creates a backlash and ends in global inter-cultural division?[[3733]](#endnote-3734)

More questions: How can unity become strong enough to prevent diversity from turning into division when people anchor their ‘we’ identity in an enemy imagery of ‘not we’? On a spectrum ranging from total isolation to total openness, uncontacted tribes would stand for isolation, what would the pole of total openness be? If planet Mars were taken over by humans, at first, every newcomer would perhaps be welcomed without any restrictions, however, even Martians would resist further immigration after a while by saying, ‘Now we have developed a unique Mars culture and we do not wish to have more Earthlings move here!’ How can individuals and groups calibrate this range of a spectrum without violence and hatred?

Where shall we in the future have borders, and how shall these borders look like?[[3734]](#endnote-3735) On one side, in a shrinking world, no individual, no village, and no nation-state can have full autarchy, there is no total independence anymore. Will autonomous agency atrophy, will the nation-state atrophy, should it atrophy, or not?[[3735]](#endnote-3736) On the other side, globalisation lets many big power centres lose their former influence and smaller populations can gain space to call for more independence — the list of candidates is long, from the Kurds to the Catalans to the Sami.[[3736]](#endnote-3737)

How shall borders be devised in a world of rising hatred and anger? The exploited of the world in the Global South make themselves increasingly known, for instance, when they try to partake in the riches of their exploiters by migrating to them. By doing so, however, they become a threat to their ‘forgotten’ brothers and sisters in de-industrialised and rural regions of the Global North who elect authoritarian leaders to erect barriers precisely to keep out the first group.[[3737]](#endnote-3738) The exploiters in the Global North also get angry, they usually overlook their role as exploiters and believe that their riches originate solely from their ingenuity, hard work, and superior character. They deem the exploited to be losers, traitors, and would-be free riders who should stay where they are and ‘work as hard as we did’.[[3738]](#endnote-3739) British scholars of the nineteenth century classified peoples and races as ‘civilised’, ‘barbarians’, and ‘savages’, categorisations that lived on after WWII as ‘developed’, ‘developing’, and ‘underdeveloped’ countries, labels that remain in effect in the ‘world’s deep culture/structure’ until the day today.[[3739]](#endnote-3740)

How could borders look like that respect people’s wish for independence and at the same time avoid angry confrontations? Social psychological experiments show that it is very easy to split groups and turn people against each other.[[3740]](#endnote-3741) Even the most irrelevant group differences can lead to fragmentation.[[3741]](#endnote-3742) Splitting tendencies are particularly strong in groups where responsibility for individual action is diluted,[[3742]](#endnote-3743) as this increases the chances for collective ‘stampedes’ of mutual radicalisation to overwhelm individual resistance.[[3743]](#endnote-3744)

The Balkan region is a sad showcase. Former Yugoslavia was once a highly respected country, appreciated all over the globe. Then it allowed divide-and-rule manipulations to set off horrifying stampedes, ultimately leaving the region fractured, weak, and its people in agony.[[3744]](#endnote-3745) The contrast between former glory and later downfall could not have been starker. We held our 27th Annual Dignity Conference in Dubrovnik in 2016, and I spent several months in Sarajevo and Dubrovnik, attempting to understand how this tragedy could happen. How can the world as a whole avoid falling into such traps in the future?

Unfortunately, new ‘stampedes of mutual radicalisation’ may be in the making at a global scale now. When American president Donald Trump was asked to name his ‘biggest foe globally right now’, his answer was, ‘Now you wouldn’t think of the European Union but they’re a foe’. Next on Donald Trump’s list of foes was Russia, and third, ‘economically speaking’, China.[[3745]](#endnote-3746) In the post-Trump era, the Thucydides trap remains to be with us — a phrase that describes the danger of war when an existing great power is faced with an emerging power.[[3746]](#endnote-3747) Political Europe might be the next Yugoslavia if outside attempts continue to fracture and weaken it.[[3747]](#endnote-3748) The entire world will be fractured if big powers continue with divide-the-world competitions.

Is what we call international community really a community? Is it strong enough to withstand divide-and-rule manoeuvres? Is it strong enough to unite for the well-being of all? Could the world’s defence ministries be replaced with one single ‘ministry for future generations’?[[3748]](#endnote-3749) So far, we have Disunited Nations being weakened from within, could they become truly United Nations and forge dignifying world governance structures that protect unity in diversity at a global scale?[[3749]](#endnote-3750) Alternatively, would United World Regions be a better concept to aim for?[[3750]](#endnote-3751) What about self-governing city-states led by citizens’ assemblies?[[3751]](#endnote-3752)

‘For the first time ever, United Nations Member States have agreed on an all-encompassing Global Compact to better manage international migration, address its challenges, strengthen migrant rights and contribute to sustainable development’.[[3752]](#endnote-3753) Is this truly good news? Will this be a lasting step forward? Notably, the United States pulled out of the agreement in December 2017.[[3753]](#endnote-3754)

In the future it will not suffice simply to ‘manage’ catastrophes. The world community needs to unify so it can attend to root causes rather than just to single issues such as migration, climate collapse, species loss, or pandemics. Each single issue is only one among the many challenges that together manifest sociocide and ecocide and create deep tensions in the global governing systems. Constructive institutional transformation will only be possible if the world community succeeds in engaging in fruitful ways with ‘the politics of global diversity and disagreement’.[[3754]](#endnote-3755)

This leads back to the questions asked at the beginning of this section. How can cultural and biological diversity best be protected, and how can unity in diversity best be balanced? The situation seems relatively straightforward with biological diversity. Habitats need to be guarded. Mountain gorillas, for instance, need borders, similar to uncontacted tribes, because many indigenous species can only survive if invaders are kept out.[[3755]](#endnote-3756) Wild species must be prevented from mating with their domesticated brothers and sisters, as this would weaken their resilience in the wild.[[3756]](#endnote-3757)

What if people were to use the same argument to prohibit freedom of travel and restrict migration? How can societies design boundaries so they protect cultural and biological diversity without violence?[[3757]](#endnote-3758) Would we wish for a world where all borders are cordoned off with walls,[[3758]](#endnote-3759) where people were shot who approached them,[[3759]](#endnote-3760) and where those would be killed who disagree with such closed border strategies?[[3760]](#endnote-3761)

If planet Earth is our global commons, and we are its stewards, what kind of borders are suitable to protect it? Is it possible to have dignifying boundaries, such as for the mountain gorillas? Can people be convinced to respect such dignifying boundaries instead of interpreting them as infringements on their freedom? How can we prevent people from misinterpreting due humbling for the sake of the common good as undue humiliation of ‘free’ individuals? Are there commonly agreeable rules that can keep everyone committed?

So far, the widespread sense of entitlement to dominate the planet’s ecosystems has allowed human ‘freedom’ to become ecocidal. Who can teach us to overcome this sense of entitlement? Can traditional approaches to ecosystem protection help us? Can Indigenous taboo rules, for instance, help us curb the ecocidal pollution of the world? How is it possible that even majestic Mount Everest now looks like a rubbish heap?[[3761]](#endnote-3762) Indigenous scholars think they do have answers, among them is professor, writer, and activist Don ‘Four Arrows’ Jacobs of Cherokee and Muscogee Creek ancestry.[[3762]](#endnote-3763) Can we listen to him?

Who shall contain human hubris and how? Is hubris a disease that needs treatment like alcoholism, or is it a crime that needs prohibition like drug trafficking? Drug prohibition laws often simply benefit drug traffickers, while prohibition against smoking was somewhat more effective, at least in certain parts of the world, and alcohol dependency has long been categorised as a personal health challenge in need of treatment. How can the hubris be contained that carries the label ‘lucrative economies of hyper-consumption’?[[3763]](#endnote-3764) What kind of world do we want to live in, a world where people do the right thing because they are afraid to be caught, or because they feel responsible for the common good, or at least duty-bound? The presently unfolding coronavirus pandemic plays out all these questions before our eyes.[[3764]](#endnote-3765)

More questions. What if biological and cultural diversity collide?[[3765]](#endnote-3766) Given that ‘the indigenous “people of wildlife” know a lot about how to protect nature’,[[3766]](#endnote-3767) how can we protect natural habitats when we expel the people who live in them?[[3767]](#endnote-3768) How can future Earthland unite in protecting cultural and biological diversity in its intertwinement?

How can humiliation be healed and prevented so that cultural diversity can flourish and be a liberating force? What about cultural mindsets that result from humiliation? Earlier, the case of honour killing was discussed. What shall we say to people who wish to protect this cultural practice as part of humanity’s cultural heritage? What about female genital cutting? I once sat in a conference between a Somali man and a Somali woman. Like many of my Somali sisters, this woman shunned the practice, calling it mutilation, and she cried out to me, ‘Evelin, do not respect Somali culture, it humiliates us!’[[3768]](#endnote-3769) The Somali man sitting on my other side urged me to do exactly the opposite, namely, to respect Somali culture, including a tradition he called ‘essential’, namely, to ‘protect our girls by closing them’. If I were to happen to meet this man again today, I would offer him to read this book in the hope he would change his mind.

I have since met many women who grew up in migrant communities in Western countries and who shared with me their bitter experiences. Deeyah Khan, born in Norway into a Pakistani community, is one of those brave and courageous women, bringing this message into the world through her personal story and her documentary films.[[3769]](#endnote-3770) When she was being mistreated by her own migrant community and needed help from the majority population that surrounded her, her cries for help went unheard because her suffering was regarded as ‘part of her culture’.

In conclusion, in the case of conflicts between members of different cultural realms, what should be respected, the other cultural mindset or the other person?[[3770]](#endnote-3771) If we say that the best protection of unity and the best definition of the limits of diversity come from human rights ideals — and this is indeed my conclusion and also my practice — then the conclusion must be that we have to protect the individual person’s human rights, the individual person’s dignity, rather than the rights and dignity of ‘a culture’. Yet, when we say that human rights ideals are best suited to delineate the limits of diversity, how can we then avoid that this will be interpreted as imperialist Western narrative of ‘we are better than you and therefore need to teach you’, of ‘we, the civilised free world, are better than you, the uncivilised unfree world’?[[3771]](#endnote-3772) How can we create a global narrative of ‘let us learn together how we can best dignify each other’? How can we nurture an ethos of mutual entrustment? How can we transcend the mindset of unilateral empowerment that endangers both unity and diversity? Psychologists have concluded long ago that the challenges of life are best approached with a mindset of personal growth rather than with a fixed mindset.[[3772]](#endnote-3773) Is this valid also for humanity? Can humankind as a whole grow in wisdom?

What if humiliation stands in the way of unity? What if cycles of humiliation make unity impossible? American politics are torn apart by ‘culture wars’ that are fired up, among others, by conflicting understandings of political correctness. Who is right? Research on the relationship between political belief and personality has identified two types of political correctness (PC), namely, egalitarian and authoritarian correctness.[[3773]](#endnote-3774) According to this study, PC egalitarians hold the belief that cultural forces are responsible for group differences and that differences among groups arise from societal injustice, they support policies and ideas that prop up historically disadvantaged groups, they show high emotional responses to discriminating language, they have a high openness to new experiences, and they desire a more diverse, democratic governance.[[3774]](#endnote-3775) PC authoritarians, on the other hand, believe that biological forces are responsible for group differences, they are more likely to be religious, they support censorship of offensive material and harsher punitive justice, they desire security for people in distress, they show a higher need for order and feel easier disgusted, they are likely to report a mood disorder or anxiety disorder either for themselves or their families, and, finally, they desire a more uniform society through autocratic governance.[[3775]](#endnote-3776)

On the authoritarian side of the culture war, we have people like Jordan Peterson who warns against ‘social justice warriors’ who ‘weaponise compassion’.[[3776]](#endnote-3777) Sociologists Bradley Campbell and Jason Manning were introduced before, they see the ‘culture of dignity’ as having devolved into a ‘culture of victimhood’.[[3777]](#endnote-3778) Social psychologist Jonathan Haidt criticises that too many young people are taught that ‘feelings are always right’.[[3778]](#endnote-3779) On the other side of the culture war stand those who defend the new culture of political correctness by saying that it emerges from the noble wish for greater empathy for one another, far from wanting to instrumentalise victimhood. In short, what is a despicable culture of victimhood for one side is a laudable culture of empathic revolution for the other side.[[3779]](#endnote-3780) What is an intolerant thin-skinned red fascist for one side is a heroic liberator of tolerance for the other side.[[3780]](#endnote-3781) What is a ‘rainbow plague of bleeding-heart political correctness’ for one side is liberation from oppressive patriarchal mindsets for the other side.[[3781]](#endnote-3782) Who is right? Who is to decide?

When we look more closely, we see that many elements in these narratives are indeed based on valid research. If we follow the research of psychologist Jean Twenge on the self-esteem movement, for instance, this movement appears to have led to a widespread ‘dukes up’ narcissism of entitlement.[[3782]](#endnote-3783) The problem starts with the next step, when research is caught in cycles of humiliation, when it is abused for culture wars.[[3783]](#endnote-3784) When we look at this situation through the lens of unity in diversity and its balance, then we observe that what is ‘too much’ for one side in this culture war is ‘not enough’ for the other. Those who decry a culture of victimhood feel that diversity is overemphasised and unity endangered, while those who praise a culture of empathic revolution call on society to include more diversity into their overall scope of unity.

My recommendation to PC egalitarians who wish for more diversity would be to be aware that they risk undermining their own goals and creating division rather than protecting diversity when they overlook or even ridicule that their proposals might elicit visceral disgust in right wing authoritarians. Humiliation has been described as a combination of shame, disgust, and ‘dissmell’,[[3784]](#endnote-3785) and psychologist Paul Rozin found in his analysis of moral disgust that ‘there is quite a bit of oral in moral experience’, particularly in the face of violations of divinity or betrayal of autonomy (see chapter 10).[[3785]](#endnote-3786) Authoritarians have strong gag reflexes and literally choke when they think, for example, of homosexual orientations.[[3786]](#endnote-3787) All around the world, a sense of humiliation is at work that sits deep in the gut when ‘rightists’ go to the barricades in angry disgust, raging against ‘liberal’ universalism and diversity.

The outcome, by now, is that the balance of unity in diversity is in danger of tipping, and this in many places and on many levels. The balance is threatened when barricades begin burning as angry people attack ‘enemy’ out-groups on behalf of their respective in-groups — when those who fight for African-American, Latino, L.G.B.T., or women’s rights, for instance, clash with right wing authoritarians who smart from being excluded from this list of endangered people and who rage against ‘political correctness’.[[3787]](#endnote-3788)

Steven Roach has thought a lot about decency in world politics, and for him, the culprit is the global dimension of moral propriety, as it has increased the range and intensity of tensions between the uniform application of decency standards on one side and the political and moral proprieties of underrepresented groups on the other side. As a result, he observes, the very openness of liberal decency has become a source of political uncertainty, and this, in turn, fuels retrogression.[[3788]](#endnote-3789)

Through my work, I have met many angry people caught in rage and eager for revenge, and I have seen the destructiveness of this path.[[3789]](#endnote-3790) As philosopher Avishai Margalit has noted, some hold on to memories of humiliation as a license to maintain anger,[[3790]](#endnote-3791) as a license to transgress ethical limits and go for the post-victim ethical exemption syndrome.[[3791]](#endnote-3792) I have seen people who remain addicted to humiliation,[[3792]](#endnote-3793) stuck in pubertal rage against authority figures, stuck in the indignation that often characterises adolescence, incapable to shoulder the responsibility of nurturant parents.[[3793]](#endnote-3794) Revolutions have failed due to such dynamics — enraged revolutionaries are often unable to let go of the adrenalin rush of fighting against authorities, unable to transform themselves into leaders who work for a functioning community.

Many among those who are eager to rise from humiliation condemn unity in diversity as unworkable. I always explain to them that the balance of unity in diversity, though difficult to keep, is worth it. Jonathan Haidt describes how in the beginning of his career, everything was about diversity for him, until he understood how divisive this can be. His solution was to become more of a conservative, beginning to speak up against diversity.[[3794]](#endnote-3795) I always recommend the re-balancing of unity in diversity rather than its rejection. Anger is important as a ‘fuel’ for action to overcome humiliation, yet, anger needs to be protected from undermining its very own goals, it needs to be channelled into constructive action, into what Paulo Freire called conscientisation, into social change in the spirit of unity in diversity, in the spirit of a Gandhi or Mandela.[[3795]](#endnote-3796) As Roach observes, ‘emotions can be thought of as ideological conveyers’ either towards decency or away from it.[[3796]](#endnote-3797)

It requires continuous balancing efforts to make unity in diversity work. It necessitates high levels of humiliation awareness in society and high levels of dignifying communication skills to keep processes and institutions alive that open space for sustained trust building so that constructive consensus can be achieved.[[3797]](#endnote-3798) Peace work is hard work.

#### The difficult practice of unity in diversity

To make unity in diversity work in practice, the principle of constrained pluralism is the path. It comprises three complementary sub-principles: irreducibility, subsidiarity, and heterogeneity:

Irreducibility affirms One World: the adjudication of certain issues necessarily and properly is retained at the global level of governance. Subsidiarity asserts the centrality of Many Places: the scope of irreducible global authority is sharply limited and decision-making is guided to the most local level feasible. Heterogeneity grants regions the right to pursue forms of social evolution consonant with democratically determined values and traditions, constrained only by their obligation to conform to globally mandated responsibilities.[[3798]](#endnote-3799)

Governance systems for large-scale environmental problems require nested layers to be effective.[[3799]](#endnote-3800) The European Union builds on the subsidiarity principle — obviously not always in practice, sometimes only in theory.[[3800]](#endnote-3801) Subsidiarity implies that local decision-making and local identities are retained to the greatest extent possible, while allowing for national, regional, and international decision-making when needed. Turmoil in Europe, with Brexit as its most recent expression, illustrates how subsidiarity can never be made static, it is always ‘in crisis’, necessarily so, since a continuous recalibration of superordinate and subordinate layers is its normality.

Balancing the One and the Many, binding the either-or dichotomy together with an and, differentiating while integrating and thus creating unity in diversity, this is an inextricable part of all life. It is a pillar of natural selction, not least symbiosis depends on diversity, symbiosis in the sense of relationships that are mutually beneficial.[[3801]](#endnote-3802) Brain research describes how the human brain embeds subordinate loops into superordinate loops.[[3802]](#endnote-3803) In legal thought, we find notions such as legal pluralism, complementarity, and qualified deference,[[3803]](#endnote-3804) and in restorative justice, we learn about regulatory pyramids.[[3804]](#endnote-3805) A holarchy is a connection between holons, where a holon is both a part and a whole.[[3805]](#endnote-3806) In sociology, analytical dualism seeks to understand a cultural system by separating ‘cultural system’ from ‘social-cultural interaction’, and ‘morphostasis’ from ‘morphogenesis’, while at the same time acknowledging that they are interdependent.[[3806]](#endnote-3807) Sociologist Max Weber’s notion of ideal types operates with the idea of layers,[[3807]](#endnote-3808) and also in political anthropology, the formalist versus substantivist debate is solvable by applying layers.[[3808]](#endnote-3809) Emergency mental health and psychosocial support work is organised in layers as well, ranging from basic to specialised services.[[3809]](#endnote-3810)

In my work, I use layered approaches in many ways, for example, when I conceptualise the notion of humiliation in layers, and even when I organise my own personal identity (see more in my personal note further down). I value philosopher Isaiah Berlin’s insight that in the face of moral collisions that seem irreconcilable, only maintaining a ‘precarious equilibrium’ can help avoid ‘desperate situations’ and ‘intolerable choices’.[[3810]](#endnote-3811) For Berlin, decency and dignity are ‘two commensurable values with overlapping intrinsic qualities’.[[3811]](#endnote-3812)

The case of post-genocide Rwanda can illustrate the caution with which the calibration of the One and the Many needs to be handled. After the 1994 genocide against the Tutsi, Rwanda began to use what is known as single re-categorisation policy. This policy entails that traditional group boundaries are being replaced by a superordinate identity.[[3812]](#endnote-3813) All citizens are regarded as citizens of Rwanda and no longer identified as Hutu or Tutsi. Scholars often recommend dual re-categorisation, as this makes both superordinate and subordinate identities salient[[3813]](#endnote-3814) and avoids ‘identity threat’ and backlash.[[3814]](#endnote-3815) Yet, the case of Rwanda shows that this may not always be the best solution, particularly not in a post-genocide context.[[3815]](#endnote-3816) Bosnia-Herzegovina offers a demonstration of how divisive it can be when either-or dichotomies are not embedded in dignifying unity.[[3816]](#endnote-3817)

My suggestion is that all people on planet Earth, from whatever background they hail, regard themselves as citizens of the world who share the stewardship of our planetary socio-ecosphere, and at the same time celebrate their identifications with a continent, or a country, or a group in ways that protect the spirit of unity in diversity. Many problems would disappear, other problems would become better solvable, if all citizens of planet Earth were to embrace this planetary responsibility.[[3817]](#endnote-3818)

Whatever the best balance between unity and diversity may be, in all cases, what has to be avoided is that unity degrades into uniformity and diversity into division. This is perhaps the most important task humankind now faces. World society needs to protect unity from being turned into uniformity, be it through oppressive domination or through consumerism in a mass market, while diversity needs to be protected from devolving into division, be it division that separates nations, ideologies, classes and/or religions, or the division of everybody-against-everybody that results from extreme individualism in hyper-capitalist contexts.

A society that succeeds in balancing unity in diversity can avoid what peace researcher Johan Galtung calls structural violence. He coined this notion in 1965 in Africa, when he observed the situation in what was then Rhodesia.[[3818]](#endnote-3819) The country was boasting of ‘domestic peace’ because there had been no direct racial violence since its 1923 independence, yet, at the same time, black life expectancy was only half of the whites. Galtung wondered how this could be called ‘domestic peace’. He concluded that the structure had to be adapted, whereby he defines ‘structure’ as ‘patterned interaction’ and ‘violence’ stands for insults to basic human needs, survival, wellness, freedom, and identity. To achieve structural peace, structural literacy is needed that avoids social structures that are too much, too tight, too little/too loose, or too dominant.[[3819]](#endnote-3820) In vertical hierarchy, Galtung observes, there is too much dominance, in anarchy there is too much loneliness because it disregards the human need for belonging and interaction, and in polyarchy there is too much interaction both vertical and horizontal because it disregards the need for some measure of solitude. Even in equiarchy, purely horizontal and equitable interactions can become violent when interaction is limited to small groups only.[[3820]](#endnote-3821)

The notion of structural violence is not a reserve of political science. Charles A. Kiesler was a psychologist and university administrator who looked at professional psychotherapies and warned of the myths of uniformity when he saw them failing to acknowledge the ubiquitous variations in patients, therapists, methods, and disorders.[[3821]](#endnote-3822) Psychologist Anthony Marsella commends Kiesler’s work and illustrates it with an ancient Chinese story of a monkey and a fish who are caught in a turbulent flood:

The monkey and fish are being tossed in the waters and face a perilous end. The monkey then spies a branch and pulls himself out of the water; then wanting to help the fish, grabs the fish and holds the fish out of the water until the flood waters recede. Moral: Good intentions are not enough! If you wish to help the fish, you must understand its nature.[[3822]](#endnote-3823)

Uniformity risks error, this is Marsella’s warning. Worried by the widespread endorsement of cognitive behaviour therapies in the field of psychotherapy, Marsella asks, ‘How does CBT work? Are there variations in CBT healing principles associated with CBT processes? Besides, there are many types of healers, and one type of healer may not be best for everyone, or best for a situation in which there is a cultural difference’.[[3823]](#endnote-3824) Marsella points out that ‘empirically validated’ therapies based on clinical studies that compare therapies with controls cannot be the arbiter for ‘success’ for therapists and healers of all identities.

Anthony Marsella recommends a number of questions to be asked by both therapists and world society: What are our ontologies, our views of human nature? What are our epistemologies, our views of how we know what we know? What are our praxiologies, our views of our practices? What is the nature of the cultural construction of reality? How do wealth, power, position, and person determine our actions?

Globalisation is a case in point. The term globalisation means different things to different people. For some it means beneficial economic development being globalised, for others it is another word for global exploitation. Defenders of globalisation have long advertised it as a blessing for the world, while an increasing number of inhabitants of this world experience it as a curse. As it seems, globalisation has been promoted with double standards, while overlooking that double standards are often more destructive to ideals than open betrayal. ‘It’s a failed neo-liberalism that sowed the seeds of authoritarianism, by dehumanising and violating and abusing people’.[[3824]](#endnote-3825) As has been widely discussed in this book, double standards have the potential to generate a profound sense of humiliation, so profound that it can lead to polarisations that are so hostile that cooperation is no longer possible (see chapters 5, 8, and 10).

Sociologist George Ritzer, in his McDonaldisation thesis, speaks of grobalisation, drawn together from growth + globalisation, a process by which indigenous customs, familiar gathering places, and personalised interaction are replaced with ‘non-places’, ‘non-things’, ‘non-people’, and ‘non-services’.[[3825]](#endnote-3826) Following this line of thought, the recent rise of authoritarian populism and extremist nationalism in the world can be interpreted as a backlash against uniformity, against the uniformity of global McDonaldisation, a backlash that is so strong that it turns diversity into division.

Grobalisation started shortly after World War II, when exploitation grew behind a ‘veil’ of ‘development rhetoric’,[[3826]](#endnote-3827) and it unfolded throughout the past decades in ways that were much more abusive than the narrative of freedom and rising-boats for all made it seem. The betrayal became particularly obvious after the end of the Cold War, when hoped-for economic miracles failed to manifest and economic crises unfolded instead. Even former supporters of what is known as the neo-liberal paradigm — such as economist Joseph Stiglitz, investor George Soros, or philosopher John Gray — have become critics of a deregulated global economy.[[3827]](#endnote-3828) The theory of ‘the market’ as a thoroughly wise natural force, the belief that global markets will bring happiness to all,[[3828]](#endnote-3829) has created illusions that first turned into disappointment and then into anger.[[3829]](#endnote-3830)

Globalisation critics do not oppose all aspects of globalisation. They do not oppose global civil society that works for dignity, they only reject global systemic humiliation. Globalisation critics welcome global cohesion, after all, global civil society benefits from the ‘shrinking of the world’, from the coming-together of humankind, from the ‘ingathering of the human tribes’.[[3830]](#endnote-3831) It is the lack of what I call egalisation that drives criticism, the disappointment and sense of humiliation arising when equal dignity is promised but betrayed.

By now, as the credibility of free market theories has declined, as crises including a virus pandemic shake the world, let me ask: Is it possible that finally a window of opportunity opens for the globalisation of care, responsibility, solidarity, connectedness, and compassion to take root?[[3831]](#endnote-3832) Perhaps the time is ripe for egalisation and solidarity to manifest, for what I call co-globegalisation? This is my hope.

Unfortunately, globalisation critics have so far not been able to use the windows of opportunity that were available in the past, at least not substantively enough. They could not turn the anger that has accumulated in disillusioned populations around the world into the dignifying change that would be needed. Instead, this anger is abused by populists, they turn the poor against the poorest and create hostile divisions instead of global trust and cohesion.[[3832]](#endnote-3833) The most privileged among the victims of globalised exploitation live in America and Europe, they are privileged because they are in a position to vote. They use this privilege to elect populists who fault those ‘higher up’, such as ‘dictatorial Washington’ or ‘tyrannical Brussels’, and at the same time those ‘further down’, the rest of the victims, those who are even more destitute and have only their feet to vote. A ‘body politic well advanced in decay’ places ‘dangerous parasites’ into high office,[[3833]](#endnote-3834) namely, populists who promise ‘freedom for us from them’, who re-fracture the world into hostile divisions, and who do that in a situation where ‘freedom for all’ through a globalisation of care would be urgently needed and it would also be possible.

Does the election of Joe Biden as successor of Donald Trump in 2021 open a window of opportunity that will be substantial enough? Biden promises to be the new Franklin Delano Roosevelt — after all, Roosevelt’s New Deal programs once helped lift the country out of the Great Depression and ‘transformed the role of government in American life’.[[3834]](#endnote-3835) With the election of Donald Trump as president in the United States, we saw arise what economic policy expert Bruce Fisher described as a ‘turn from a neo-liberal Wilsonian globalised system of trade and alliances to a Hobbesian nation-centred system organised by thug capitalists (oligarchs in Russia, hedge-fund and private-equity in the greater US)’.[[3835]](#endnote-3836) I call it the ‘global economic security dilemma’ — not one state pitted against another, but a global ‘superclass’ against the rest — and, by now, this superclass succeeds in re-spawning even the classical security dilemma of states against states (see more in chapter 7).

We know from research that it is not impossible to unify diversity, yet, only under the condition that there are common superordinate goals that are attainable and determined by consent among equals.[[3836]](#endnote-3837) Incidentally, all these conditions are fulfilled in the current moment in human history. Humanity possesses a common superordinate goal, namely, to avoid further ecocide and sociocide and co-create a decent Earthland where diversity can flourish in unity. In this Earthland, all Earthlanders can join hands to establish globally inclusive political and economic systems that nurture consensus-building processes that balance unity in diversity and foster mutual care in the spirit of the Indigenous seven-generation rule. There would no longer be frequent business travellers from a few privileged countries who strip-mine the rest for short-term gain, all would be respectful of the agreed upon borders and restrictions to their activities that protect biological and cultural diversity.[[3837]](#endnote-3838) There would be no ‘illegal paperless people’, no ‘aliens’, all would join hands in solving common problems and learn from each other. All would be Earthland citizens — all would proudly proclaim ‘We, the peoples!’

Federico Mayor Zaragoza has served as director-general of UNESCO from 1987 to 1999. I follow Mayor in calling on us, ‘Now yes, is the time to implement the “We, the peoples...” that with farsightedness but prematurity was in the first phrase of the UN Charter. Now, yes, the peoples can be women and men, of one belief or another, or one ideology or another, of one ethnic identity or another’.[[3838]](#endnote-3839) As we face extreme global challenges and urgently need to overcome global fragmentation and replace it with global cooperation, Mayor calls for two main transitions: First, ‘from an economy of speculation, productive delocalisation and war to a knowledge-based economy of global sustainable and human development’, and, second, ‘from a culture of domination, violence and war to a culture of encounter, dialogue, conciliation, alliance and peace’.[[3839]](#endnote-3840) Together with Federico Mayor, I see cultural diversity as a great asset, while xenophobia, hate, and rejection are threats to peace — there are ‘cultures that count’ and ‘cultures that should be countered’.[[3840]](#endnote-3841)

I also join anthropologist Arturo Escobar’s plea to heal sociocide, I follow his call to re-weave the wounded ‘mesh of life’ — ‘the damage done to it by the heteropatriarchal capitalist/colonial ontology of separation’ waits to be repaired, so we can work ‘towards ontologies of care’.[[3841]](#endnote-3842) Escobar’s vision is for us to rethink and rebuild communities by re-communalising our social life. He suggests to re-localise all activities that have to do with food, transport, energy, building, educating, and healing, and to strengthen local autonomies and direct forms of democracy. Escobar calls on us to do all this simultaneously — de-patriarchalise and de-colonise our societies, engage in ‘the Liberation of Mother Earth’, and work for ‘the flourishing of the pluriverse’.[[3842]](#endnote-3843)

Re-localisation, and this might seem counter-intuitive, requires global thinking and global action. All around the world, I observe that globalisation critics overlook that removing toxic globalisation is not enough. It is insufficient to replace bad power with no power, as the power vacuum will be filled with worse power. ‘Good’ power is the solution, decent power. Yes, says Meg Holden, expert on urban ethics, there is a path towards ‘local, biophilic self-reliance’, towards ‘rediscovering the focus and peace of localised and lower-technology lifestyles’,[[3843]](#endnote-3844) yet, ‘when this work is seen as an alternative to global thinking, not its necessary synergistic complement, it is pragmatically indistinguishable from the work of grave diggers’.[[3844]](#endnote-3845) I follow Holden in wanting to ‘hold a candle to the possibilities of shooting for the stars’, the possibility of keeping ‘all of our fellow humans’ hopes in mind’.[[3845]](#endnote-3846) For me, holding this candle means taking action, it means doing more than simply busying myself with going to work in a context that is undignified and in urgent need of dignification — vita activa, as political theorist Hannah Arendt would say.

Allow me to end this section with economist and veteran commentator Roberto Savio looking back on his long life. He recapitulates what happened, how we went from greed to fear: Initially, ‘since 1989, we have been educated to greed’ to the point that it even became ‘a virtue’, ending in the crisis of 2008, so that now ‘fear has become a strong reality’.[[3846]](#endnote-3847)

Savio hopes for the coming-into-being of a ‘world political party’ founded by all of us collectively:

What bonded people together, until 1989, were values. It is enough to read any constitutions to find those values: justice, solidarity, ethics, equality, law as the basis of society, and so on. Today we live in a world where nobody speaks of values (unless you take market as a value), and least of all the political world. It would be a long walk, but a world party should be based on values, the defence of international cooperation as a warrant for peace and on the fact that competition and greed make few winners, and many losers.[[3847]](#endnote-3848)

On biocultural diversity: A rhymed reflection

by peace linguist Francisco Gomes de Matos, Recife, 11th August 2017

Biocultural Diversity is more than a bioecoquality

It is a LIFE-supporting commitment by all Humanity

Biocultural Diversity is also expressed through linguistic variability

It is a globally shared way of peacefully exercising one’s dignity

A world bioculturally diverse

is also sustainable though prose and verse

Biocultural diversity is a fascinatingly evolving global scenery

To thrive everywhere as a multilingual LANGSCAPE greenery

### A personal note

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.

― Indigenous prophecy[[3848]](#endnote-3849)

Allow me to continue with reflections on my personal experiences and choices. Many personal accounts are woven into the chapters of this book, with three longer notes beginning in chapter 3, continued in chapter 10. I wish to make palpable how I came to see the promise of equal dignity in solidarity as higher than that of ‘honourable status’.

As I have reported earlier, I was born into a displaced family, a family who lost its homeland, Silesia, after the Second World War. It is a family that is deeply traumatised by war and displacement. My parents had no control over their displacement, and it is by sheer accident that I was born in West Germany. During the first decades of my life, I tried to turn my back on my family’s traumas, they were simply too enormous. Only later was I able to realise that my family’s legacy can also be a gift. Slowly I began to act on this gift deliberately, rather than letting trauma influence me beyond my conscious awareness.

The way I act on this gift is to dedicate my entire life to the seemingly impossible goal of ‘never again’, never again war and genocide, no more cogitocide, sociocide, and ecocide. The depth of humiliation that I feel when I look back on the past millennia’s human project of competition for domination and its horrific culmination in the twentieth century, has led me to dedicate all privileges I was lucky enough to receive in my life to this ‘never again’ mission, to planting seeds for a future global dignity society. My unearned privileges are many. My white skin serves as a door opener for systemic benefits, my high education includes two doctorates earned in Europe without debilitating debt, and my European passport enables me to not just feel responsible for all of humankind, I can actually manifest this sense of duty in my lived life by designing it as a project of citizenship in the entire global village. Even being (involuntarily) childless has turned out to be an advantage, as it enables me to take risks I otherwise could not take. The only way for my dignity mission to be credible around the world is by demonstrating and proving independence from national and corporate interest, and this is only possible by living on small gifts with a minimum of possessions. If I had children to care for, I would not dare living in this way. Not being employed anywhere, not having large financial ‘sponsors’, frees me from having to fear ‘biting the hand that feeds me’, it gives me the freedom to step outside of existing systems, and all this bestows integrity on my work and makes it trustworthy. My radically minimalistic approach to living life has proven to be the best way to walk the talk of dignity, not just locally but globally.

If the world were in a better shape, I would follow my personal preferences and be an artist, yet, I feel it is my duty to offer my help when the ship is sinking, when the house is burning — sometimes, I describe my life design as a ‘social sculpture’.[[3849]](#endnote-3850) Mine is a very difficult path and sometimes the price I have to pay seems too high. For instance, I do miss the children I do not have. It saddens me that I could not find a spouse who would support my mission. It hurts me when I am ridiculed or even attacked for my life choices, it makes me sad that these choices even present a provocation to some, a living reproach, a living reminder of dangers that they may prefer to deny or overlook. I would make me much happier if we all were to shoulder the responsibility together to protect our world from ‘pandemics of irresponsibility’.

In my eyes, it is among the consumer mindset’s most insidious ‘successes’ when people strive for nothing more than private happiness while the world around them is burning and drowning. I was born in Germany, and when Jews were transported away to concentration camps to be killed in Nazi Germany, it would have been the duty of their neighbours to save them, even if it meant unhappiness or worse. This is the very level of commitment that I strive to manifest in my life. I follow Dietrich Bonhoeffer’s example[[3850]](#endnote-3851) — he was willing to give his life for a better world, for a world of dignity, partnership, and love, rather than a world of honour, domination, and hatred.[[3851]](#endnote-3852) The words of the President of Germany in August 2020 that he spoke after demonstrations against restrictions in the context of the coronavirus pandemic, are valid both then and now, ‘The irresponsibility of a few is a risk for all of us’.[[3852]](#endnote-3853) I would add that also the irresponsibility of our systemic frames is a risk for all of us. As I see it, no reparations can repair the wounds of ecocide and sociocide that were inflicted during the past decades under the pretext of ‘progress’, ‘development’, ‘economic growth’, and ‘job creation’, even under the cover of certain dignity definitions that justified it.[[3853]](#endnote-3854) I see Western market-driven hyper-individualistic consumerism as a deeply wounding human experiment — I follow philosopher Thomas Pogge in his conclusion that ‘our generation is doing worse than any in human history’ given the opportunities we had and left unused.[[3854]](#endnote-3855) I am saddened when I see people having only two alternatives, either ‘stone age’ or status quo. While I am glad that I can write these lines on a computer, I hope we can achieve future innovations without the level of destruction of the past.

During the first six years of my life, I had the privilege of growing up in a context of rural communal solidarity, and this experience still gives me strength today, several decades later. The communal solidarity that I experienced as a child no longer exists in the Western world, it only survives in certain rural and Indigenous communities in other parts of the world, partly also in what is called ‘shanty’ towns, and this is why I always feel at home there.

I began living globally at the age of twenty-one, and after forty-seven years of doing so, all of planet Earth has become my home. The love I receive from the global dignity community that came into being in the past years outweighs the sadness I feel about not have my own biological children. I feel blessed that I could adopt all of humanity as my personal family, that I can embed myself in ‘a lifelong, 24/7, till-death-do-us-part reciprocal care commitment, implying a quasi-marriage bond involving billions of strangers’.[[3855]](#endnote-3856) I have now many beloved ‘adopted’ children, parents, and siblings, and this in all kinds of social contexts, from slum-like to privileged ones. In slums, I enjoy the gift of communal warmth and creativity and share the lack of amenities, while it is often the other way round in settings called privileged where I find a lot of loneliness and a sense of busy-while-bored meaninglessness in the midst of plenty.

A consciousness of the oneness of the human family and all sentient beings guides me, and my love goes to this entire family.[[3856]](#endnote-3857) This love is not an abstract fancy idea or an eccentric identity game, it is deeply embodied. This love is indivisible, it has ‘professional-private’ integrity, as it is neither part of my ‘private sphere’ nor of my ‘professional sphere’. Indeed, in my view, humankind will not survive if we continue to globalise ‘professional versus private’ dichotomies. Sociologist Richard Sennett explains how this dichotomy came to be prescribed in recent decades in so-called developed countries by the New Economy, as a new form of ‘flexible capitalism’ — like Sennett, I see it as a sociocidal path to the ‘corrosion of character’, worse still, as a pathway to what Hannah Arendt called the banality of evil, at the personal as much as at the systemic level.[[3857]](#endnote-3858)

Philosopher Howard Richard informs us, ‘The historical conditions of the possibility of unemployment did not exist until Africa was conquered by Europeans’.[[3858]](#endnote-3859) In the Native American tradition as well, no word existed for ‘work’ until Europeans arrived. ‘We have a word for living and work is part of living. Everything is living. We never divide life into work and play and recreation and rest. We live, which includes them all. We do what we need to do to live’.[[3859]](#endnote-3860) In the words of other thinkers, ‘In the neo-liberal era, the commons — natural, social, civil, cultural, and intellectual — have been plundered via enclosure, commodification, privatisation, and colonisation. This rent-seeking is an injustice and should be reversed’.[[3860]](#endnote-3861) The ‘trade paradigm and its moral-linguistic toolbox’ has sadly ‘saturated our minds with words such as work, worker, employment, salary, wages, income, tax, and finance’.[[3861]](#endnote-3862) My quasi-marriage bond with billions of strangers entails that I stay close to love and as far as possible away from this ‘toolbox’.

Last century’s history with two world wars, and the tragic victimisation my family had to endure, form the background for my wish for globalisation to become humanised and dignified. My family sought refuge from trauma in religiosity, yet, already as a child, I was unable to follow their path to salvation. I had no words to justify or explain this inability, indeed it tortured me, yet, I felt incapable of embracing a dogma that separated ‘us’ from ‘them’, the ‘believer’ from the ‘non-believer’ condemned to go to hell. As an adolescent, I was therefore an outcast in all worlds, in the religious world of my family as much as in the secular majority surrounding us, a majority that many in my family perceived as morally lost. Had witch burning still been practiced, I would have been a prime candidate, as saving my soul by burning my body would have been regarded as a noble act of service to God and even to me.[[3862]](#endnote-3863)

My upbringing thus provided me with insights into the many different social-psychological patterns and fault lines that I would later encounter also in the rest of the world, only under different headings. Seeing how certain norms can be harmful to society, how certain ‘cultural opiates’ can be normalised, as humanist philosopher Erich Fromm would say, how cultural ‘silos’ erected to protect their members can actually harm them, motivated me to envision and create bridges between these silos — this entire book is meant to be such a bridge builder.[[3863]](#endnote-3864) As I have explained before in this book, I wish to integrate fraternité into liberté and égalité,[[3864]](#endnote-3865) I try to ‘bring flowers to the ceremony’ where globalisation marries egalisation. Glob-egalisation is my neologism for drawing together liberty and equality, and if we also include fraternité/sisterhood or solidarity, then the urgent task I see before us is the ‘global hyper-bridge building’ of co-globegalisation.[[3865]](#endnote-3866)

To work for co-globegalisation is why I define as my locality the global village as my home village, this is why I focus on a global life with a minimum of possessions rather than the privileged ‘local’ life that I could lead in the Global North. My global life is thus not the result of some kind of aimless adventurism, it is the result of many years of deep reflection on the issues discussed in this book, and of profoundly principled choices. I wish to walk my talk, to be the change, not just talk about change, to walk my talk by living as a humble servant of my global family. I wish to be able to look in the mirror. How else can I argue for global solidarity to unite us all in our diversity in the face of the global challenges that stand before us? How else can I prove that I am not part of a global elite responsible for toxic globalisation? How else can I show disappointed universalists and angry nationalists alike my refusal to remedy exploitative globalisation with parochial localisation and local fascism?[[3866]](#endnote-3867) As I am unable to close my eyes for the sociocide and ecocide surrounding us, as I cannot overlook the deep pain it causes, I cannot participate in any world-saving project — be it ‘awareness raising campaigns’,[[3867]](#endnote-3868) the collecting of big data, or making everything ‘smarter’ — when it is designed to avoid real change and only contributes to more cogitocide, sociocide, and ecocide.[[3868]](#endnote-3869)

Even though I walk my global path alone, wherever I go, many people include me in their lives and inspire me. I also draw inspiration from those who lived long ago. I feel ‘part of an atemporal alliance’ of ‘the living and the dead’, I listen to a ‘chorus of voices from the past and present’, I imagine these voices as an ‘interior platoon, a secret society, a tribal unit, an initiation group, a company of martyrs, an inner city of ancestors and descendants’, I am in an imaginary dialogue with ‘mentors, pedagogues, heroes, jesters and iconoclasts’, many of whom preceded me and prefigured my path.[[3869]](#endnote-3870)

Of course, I am aware that I am only able to do my work because I benefit from a number of aspects of the very circumstances I wish to transcend. I behave ‘inconsistently ethically’ to avoid behaving ‘consistently unethically’.[[3870]](#endnote-3871) I am also aware that global living per se is no guarantee for global understanding — I meet enough people who simply become more arrogant and condescending towards others through travel, and people who never travel often understand my message better. I also know that very few of the billions of the world’s inhabitants could follow my path even if they wanted to, simply because most are not born into a Western passport that opens all doors. Therefore I see my privileges as my responsibility to use them for the common good of all of humanity rather than to selfishly consume them for myself.

My call goes out to all those who have resources of time, energy, and knowledge, to use them to foster planetary solidarity rather than simply consuming their privileges for their own benefit. I call on us all to stop leaving globalisation to a global nexus of sociocidal and ecocidal terror — global finance, criminality, war, genocide, terrorism — I call on us to stop leaving even our fear of terror open to being instrumentalised by ulterior interests.[[3871]](#endnote-3872) I am aggrieved that there are no better pathways to global connectivity than social media that instrumentalise the potential for planetary solidarity for profit and surveillance.[[3872]](#endnote-3873) I would like to inspire all who have a Western passport to use it wisely for the common good, unlike the ‘hippies’ who crossed my path in the 1970s and who often used their privileges shamelessly in search for cheap drugs, who exploited poor locals in the remotest world regions sometimes even under the veil of leftist rhetoric — today, this is called beg-packing.[[3873]](#endnote-3874) I am sad when I see some of my friends go out into the world only to make globalisation more toxic by enacting the ‘frequent flyer’ version of global citizenship, when they use the world as a leisure park, or, worse, when they target the commons of our globe as market opportunities yet to be exploited. It gives me hope when I meet couch-surfers nowadays, many of whom use their privileged passports in resonance with what I would call respectful global living.[[3874]](#endnote-3875) I applaud also those who are both daring and caring, who wish to ‘do good’, who feel called to work for development, humanitarian aid, conflict transformation, and environmental protection. Yet, sadly, all too often, also they are drawn into the charitable-industrial complex that is part of the dark side of our current manifestation of globalisation.[[3875]](#endnote-3876) While I laud all good intentions, I observe with dismay how well-intentioned global human rights promoters create conflict rather than prevent it when they hold the illusion that going out into the world to ‘raise human rights awareness’ may suffice to bring about peaceful global cooperation. Not only might they face fierce rejection from power holders and bring local activists into danger, human rights advocacy also throws experiences of inequality and disrespect into starker relief than before. When this experience creates expectation gaps, feelings of humiliation may arise that were not felt before, feelings that may heat up and boil over, and, if combined with access to means for aggressive retaliation, may spawn violence that completely overwhelms and counteracts the human rights defender’s original aim of constructive social change.[[3876]](#endnote-3877) I invite everyone with resources and good intentions to refrain from offering help that humiliates and to aim for the appropriate systems level instead — to use the famous fish metaphor, giving fish to the hungry falls short, teaching them how to fish falls short, and even providing them with a fishing boat falls short in a world of overfished and polluted waters full of legal corporate piracy.

Some think that my global life must have uprooted me, must have ‘deterritorialised’ my values and fragmented my identity — they describe me as a ‘nomad’, as a ‘homeless person’ who ‘travels too much’ and ‘ought to settle down’.[[3877]](#endnote-3878) Others think I must be one of those successors of early colonisers or missionaries who peddle a European middle-class habitus, the ‘class consciousness of frequent flyers’.[[3878]](#endnote-3879) I usually reply that my life path is neither Western nor non-Western, and that more than ‘travelling the world’, I live globally and locally at the same time, that I am sedentary in the global village where I have ‘settled down’. I am not a frequent flyer, I do not ‘travel’, I simply live in this village, and I do so almost without money precisely to avoid that my privileges undermine my message. As mentioned before, if I were employed at a national university or were to receive major funding from one particular source, my dignity mission would be considered suspect, as influenced or informed by national, political, or corporate interests.

I am deeply rooted in many local places, binding them together with love and tenderness into a lived cosmopolitanism.[[3879]](#endnote-3880) This love includes also all animals, plants, and rocks of our planet, because ‘the intelligence in all kinds of life is like poetry’, as environmentalist Robin Wall Kimmerer said so beautifully, ‘the rocks are beyond slow, beyond strong, and yet yielding to a soft green breath as powerful as a glacier, the mosses wearing away their surfaces, grain by grain bringing them slowly back to sand. There is an ancient conversation going on between mosses and rocks, poetry to be sure. About light and shadow and the drift of continents’.[[3880]](#endnote-3881)

It is lived experience and not pale pie-in-the-sky theory when I suggest that dignity can manifest through unity in diversity. It is not wishful dreaming when I propose that the concept of subsidiarity can operationalise unity in diversity, bring together theory and practice, and make it possible to replace the globalisation of exploitation with the globalisation of care, responsibility, duty, and solidarity. Double standards can only be brought into the one single standard of dignity by aligning deeds with ideals, and this is possible through the dignified enactment of subsidiarity.[[3881]](#endnote-3882)

Subsidiarity is also my personal path to meaning. Sunflower identity is the name I use for my global unity-in-diversity identity built with fluid subsidiarity.[[3882]](#endnote-3883) The unifying core of my identity (the core of the sunflower, so to speak) is anchored in our shared humanity, after many decades of global practice, this is deeply embedded in me.[[3883]](#endnote-3884) Per definition, this identity is more securely anchored than any other, because all identifications are fickle except for one, and sociologist Norbert Elias said it already in 1939, ‘Only the highest level of integration, belonging to humanity, is permanent and inescapable’.[[3884]](#endnote-3885) An ethos of globalism, a patriotism for Earthland, including all of its living beings, offers a much stronger mooring for personal identity than any we-against-them nationalism, simply because its anchor is the entire planet rather than local boundaries.

The technological means to reach all corners of our globe are more advanced now than ever — be it by train, plane, or internet platforms. My experience has shown me that it is psychologically feasible to relate to all human beings as fellow family members and that most people are capable of responding in kind. On my global path I am often asked, ‘Where are you from?’ and I reply, ‘I am a human being’, ‘a citizen of this planet, like you’. I avoid saying, ‘I am of this or that nationality’, or ‘I am of this or that profession’, in other words, I resist attempts to link my identity to my passport or genetic make-up.[[3885]](#endnote-3886) I would rather say, ‘I am born with a certain passport’, or, ‘I have studied medicine and psychology’, or ‘my identity is a journey’. I even avoid saying, ‘I am a woman’. In other words, I am extremely careful with the little word am, as it connotes essence, the core of my identity. The only sentence that truly fits my reality is ‘I am’ — only if I stretch myself then I would say, ‘I am a sentient being’ — ‘it is not identity, not autonomy, it is authenticity’, is psychologist Linda Hartling’s comment.[[3886]](#endnote-3887)

At the periphery of my identity (the nested petals of the sunflower, so to speak), I am at home in the most diverse contexts on all continents (except Antarctica). I feel proud of all cultural achievements humankind has ever attained. I have learned to love many of them on my global path — the ‘selection’ ranges from the Indigenous seven-generation rule that is the home of my spirit and soul, to the pyramids of Giza that were my neighbours during my seven years in Cairo, to the Japanese aesthetics that inspired me when I lived in Japan, or fresh Belgium chocolate that seduced me in Europe. On the other side, I feel ashamed of all the atrocities humans ever perpetrated in the world, they all weigh heavily on my shoulders, be it atrocities committed by Joseph Stalin, Adolf Hitler, or any other oppressor. I feel what philosopher Karl Jaspers called the metaphysical responsibility to work for ‘never again’ not just in one particular locality, I feel this responsibility everywhere on our planet, and on behalf of all of humanity.

It is profoundly enriching for me to find safety in trying to ‘swim’ in the flux of diversity rather than ‘clinging’ to fixed positions. The experience of this movement provides me with a greater sense of security than any fortress wall. Rather than seeking safety in one particular local cultural realm, I find fulfilment through the nurturing of loving relationships in many realms. It is a pleasure for me to manifest a protean self[[3887]](#endnote-3888) and continuously pendulate in the spirit of the non-dualist ‘double swing’,[[3888]](#endnote-3889) it is a pleasure to be a voyager rather than a vindicator.[[3889]](#endnote-3890) A voyager uses the challenges of cultural diversity and intercultural conflicts for forging new relationships and new ideas, while vindicators rather justify pre-existing ethnocentrism and stereotypes. Being a voyager is not the same as being a traveller. As emphasised before, I do not ‘travel’, I live in the global village by slowly moving from one home in my global family to another, as a humble cosmopolitan.[[3890]](#endnote-3891) I see myself as a gardener, a nurturer of our cogitospheres, sociospheres, and ecospheres.[[3891]](#endnote-3892) While walking our planet, I try to harvest the best from all cultures,[[3892]](#endnote-3893) I enact ‘the role of the bumblebee’ that flies from flower to flower to nurture unity in diversity by connecting and cross-pollinating the diversity of cultural flourishings around the world, thus following the format of dignilogues that we have developed for our dignity conferences as an adaptation of what is known as ‘open space’ format.[[3893]](#endnote-3894)

What I saw during my training as a clinical psychologist and medical doctor made me sceptical, and this to the degree that I felt incapable after graduation of entering either profession in a mainstream Western context.[[3894]](#endnote-3895) I felt compelled to learn how to attend to the health of all of humankind in its symbiosis with planet Earth, in other words, to promote global mental health,[[3895]](#endnote-3896) to nurture ‘equity in mental health for all people worldwide’.[[3896]](#endnote-3897) I refrain from the Western tendency to individualise trauma, and I certainly refrain from abusing it as commercial or political opportunity, rather, I dedicate my life to creating psycho-social space that can hold and heal trauma, I try to inspire large-scale systemic change that has the potential to dignify all of humanity.[[3897]](#endnote-3898) I engage in world family systemic therapy so to speak.[[3898]](#endnote-3899)

I do my work with humble thoughtfulness, I refrain from underpinning it with religious or ideological doctrine. Even though I value many spiritual and consciousness-raising movements, I see no need to join any of them to understand the current state of the world and work for dignity as a path forward. I avoid the pathos of exalted effusion, be it religious, New Age, or atheistic. Whenever I see people preaching with pathos, even if I resonate with their message, I cringe, particularly, when this pathos is directed against perceived ‘enemies’. I will quietly get up and leave the room when a preacher orates with passion and fervour, or a New Age trainer suggestively whispers ‘now we all close our eyes and relax’. I am not given to rallying believers or followers around me, and I am particularly wary of indignation entrepreneurship that rages against something or somebody. I remember very well how people like Adolf Hitler and Joseph Goebbels were able to bring millions of people into frenzy simply by psychological manipulation — enthusiasm does not mean that its source or its aims are constructive. Instead, I try to inspire everyone to calm down, reflect for themselves, and then work lovingly for the constructive opportunities this world has to offer.

Asked about my religion, I answer that it is love, humility, and a deep sense of awe in a universe that is so much larger than what we as humans can fathom.[[3899]](#endnote-3900) Community, love without reason, beauty and resonance, these are words that best describe my core life orientation and experience.[[3900]](#endnote-3901) I resonate with voices such as this, ‘We ought to take delight in the fact that even if we disagree about the ultimate nature of reality, we share this profound sense of mystery and awe of the cosmos in which we find ourselves’.[[3901]](#endnote-3902) I value Socrates’ words of ‘what I do not know I do not think I know’.[[3902]](#endnote-3903)

Conspiracy theories and narratives — even those that will turn out to be true in the future — divert energy from what needs to be done here and now. In my work, I avoid not just conspiracy theories, I remain in distance from all theories, I remain in loving, cautious, and humble distance from all dogma, even from the dogma of scepticism. I am proud of my humility, proud of refraining from preachy pathos, proud of staying in the mode of calmly wondering and asking questions rather than clinging to ‘belief’. I am doubtful of the very notion of ‘belief’, I wish to avoid the arrogance of thinking that what I see is all there is, so that I ‘disbelieve’ even my own experience.[[3903]](#endnote-3904) In this book you rarely find me say ‘I believe’, rather, I prefer phrases such as ‘as far as I can see’. I am proud of my courage to endure the uncertainty that the limits of our human nature impose on us, I am proud of my refusal to escape into the false security that letters of dogma promise, or spiritual journeys, or technological innovations, even while I acknowledge their value. ‘Loss of faith’ can be a blessing, as legal philosopher Duncan Kennedy has explained (see chapter 5). Staying away from dogma and instead being anchored in love is the very foundation of my ability to nurture a global dignity community whose members hail from all around the world with the most divergent belief systems.

As laid out before (in chapter 2), I have learned that there is no guarantee for ‘truth’,[[3904]](#endnote-3905) there is only the experience of ‘I understand’.[[3905]](#endnote-3906) Through living a life of inter-being,[[3906]](#endnote-3907) I allow myself to be drawn into ‘truth events’ and nurture what physicists call ‘coherence domains’ — places where hearts and minds seem to align.[[3907]](#endnote-3908) I am aware that there is no text without context, I am conscious of the fragile relationship between forme and fond and how ‘the imaginary world holds the real world captive’.[[3908]](#endnote-3909) To me, doing science is precisely to honour this fragility, and in that sense I resonate with the suggestion that ‘science is not only compatible with spirituality; it is a profound source of spirituality’.[[3909]](#endnote-3910)

Fourteenth century Persian Sufi poet Hāfez has impressed me. His full name was Khwāja Shams-ud-Dīn Muhammad Hāfez-e Shīrāzī, which indicates that he was connected with one of the oldest cities of ancient Persia, namely, Shiraz, also known as the city of poets, literature, wine, and flowers. Other Sufi thinkers composed the following lines, ‘I have learned so much from God that I can no longer call myself a Christian, a Hindu, a Muslim, a Buddhist, a Jew. The truth has shed so much of itself in me that I can no longer call myself a man, a woman...’ (see also the end of chapter 4). My personal version would go as follows, ‘I have learned so much from the larger universe of meaning around us that I can no longer call myself a Christian, a Hindu, a Muslim, a Buddhist, a Jew. The truth has shed so much of itself in me that I can no longer call myself a man, a woman...’

Over time, my global living practice has helped me widen the distance between observation and conclusion more than I see most other people do. This is why I can go from home to home also in cultural contexts that are unfamiliar to me. Wherever I am, I begin by radically suspending judgement, just as any anthropologist would do who is proud of being a cultural relativist. I always ask my hosts, ‘Please consider me your younger sister, your very ignorant younger sister! Please hold my hand and guide me, teach me! I want to learn to feel as if I were born here’. During this time, I remain in observation and bracket evaluation, while I nurture the deepest of Buberian I-Thou relationships,[[3910]](#endnote-3911) I simply stay in ‘let-it-flow thinking’ and avoid ‘verdict thinking’.[[3911]](#endnote-3912) Only after a very long journey of reflection, sometimes after many years, do I come to conclusions, some of which are not at all relativistic.

Here is one example. I have at times been part of cultural contexts where what is called honour killing was regarded as legitimate. I have always asked myself what gives me the right to reject this practice, after all, its adherents regard it as a kind of medicine to heal humiliated honour, ‘medicine that is bitter but necessary’. After years of reflection, my conclusion is that the entire dominator context in which this ‘medicine’ emerged, is more than bitter, it is also ultimately suicidal for its own adherents if it is maintained, and this includes humankind as a whole. Due to having suspended evaluation for so long, and due to having fallen in love with the people I lived with, including people who condoned such practices, I am able to explain my conclusions to them with love rather than with moral indignation. This is why I can build true bridges — I begin with suspending judgement longer than others do, while at the end concluding with evaluations that are harsher than relativistic positions would indicate. Due to the length of this journey and my devotion to inter-being with all sides, I have the inner strength to communicate my conclusions more caringly than those who come to the same conclusions after a shorter journey. I have learned that righteous verdict thinking only aggravates the very problems it aims to solve — condemning a situation without understanding is as detrimental as condoning it without understanding. ‘Waging good conflict takes lots of loving time...’ is Linda Hartling’s comment.[[3912]](#endnote-3913)

To me, this is subsidiarity at its best — deep understanding on the ground while building superordinate levels of shared goals, and at the same time forming bridges between all layers. We live in times where globalisation affects most people, global influences make the balance of unity in diversity ever more precarious, and in this situation, my path has enabled me to be a translator of globalisation to people who are deeply bewildered by its effects. Globalisation literature is too abstract, while traditional ethnography is not abstract enough, to use the words of Thomas Hylland Eriksen.[[3913]](#endnote-3914)

On my global path, I also try to combine the best from traditional female role descriptions — such as loving care — with the best from traditional role descriptions for males — such as daring courage.[[3914]](#endnote-3915) I manifest daring care when I work for something new rather than fighting against something old, and loving courage when I dedicate every minute of my life to convening a global dignity family that can seed a dignified future for humankind.

It would insult my life philosophy and I would severely damage myself psychologically, were I to define my purpose in life in terms of dominance over others, be it dominance through power, money, or a combination of both. Filling my life with momentous excitements of ‘owning’ stuff — excitements to which, as is well known, one quickly adapts — is absurdly void of meaning to me.[[3915]](#endnote-3916) It would leave me equally empty were I to live for diversion and distraction. Being reduced to a supplier or a target of sales of products and services would leave me deeply depressed — allowing myself to feel deficient unless I buy or sell something would humiliate my humanity at its core.[[3916]](#endnote-3917) My dignity is independent of my ability to produce sellable products or services, I react with disgust when I am called upon to buy something because it is discounted, or to pay a high price because ‘you are worth it’. I am appalled by advertisement,[[3917]](#endnote-3918) I despise being abused as a wallet on two legs, I profoundly resent being taken for a person of substandard intelligence by advertisers’ sweet voices.[[3918]](#endnote-3919) All around the world, I observe with chagrin how advertisement ‘manufactures a product of its own’, it manufactures ‘the consumer, perpetually unsatisfied, restless, anxious, and bored. Advertising serves not so much to advertise products as to promote consumption as a way of life’,[[3919]](#endnote-3920) and one of its results is ‘materialistic depression’.[[3920]](#endnote-3921) I wonder: How can anybody fall for such fake promises of happiness?[[3921]](#endnote-3922) Who is so ignorant as to overlook that only growth-fostering relationships can create happiness?[[3922]](#endnote-3923)

My more than four decades of global living made me resonate with the ‘radical humanism’ of Erich Fromm, who wrote already in the 1970s that the full humanisation of the human being ‘requires the breakthrough from the possession-centred to the activity-centred orientation, from selfishness and egotism to solidarity and altruism’.[[3923]](#endnote-3924) I follow philosophers Richard Rorty and Axel Honneth when they say that the word solidarity ‘carries positive connotations of sympathy, cooperation and altruism’, yet, unfortunately, ‘is most frequently invoked and experienced in situations of bitter conflict’.[[3924]](#endnote-3925) Rorty and Honneth reject the normative idea of a common human nature and at that point I do not follow them. My observations indicate that solidarity, even though it is often inspired by shared enemies, can also flourish without enemy effigies.

I am very aware that modern forms of ‘scientific’ management in organisations are ‘possession-centred’, and informed by the legacy of slavery.[[3925]](#endnote-3926) I am also aware of the continuity between the organisational methods of Nazi Germany and the world of contemporary business and economic liberalism.[[3926]](#endnote-3927) Therefore, I abstain from the language of ‘human resources’, I am appalled when I see that ‘free choices for free people’ in a ‘free’ market means that public services are ‘dismembered, outsourced, closed down, the source of profit for a few and an impoverished society for the many’.[[3927]](#endnote-3928) I am repulsed by business seminars that teach people to better align their various inner parts,[[3928]](#endnote-3929) so they can function more smoothly in a machinery that ultimately is not designed to serve their interests.[[3929]](#endnote-3930) Even before the coronavirus pandemic broke out, vulnerable individuals navigated ‘war zones’ of insecurity, systematically prevented from forming collectives of cooperation that could give them strength to set alternative agendas and nurture resilience for individuals and society.[[3930]](#endnote-3931) I am saddened when I see people fall from this machinery through depression and psychosomatic symptoms only to have to endure that also these symptoms are being monetised. I wish to abstain from taking part in whatever strategies that monetise systemic failures through offloading them on individual victims, be it through the marketing of psychotropic drugs or through fancy ‘McMindfulness’ psychotherapies.[[3931]](#endnote-3932) It is ironic to see how Western economies depend on consumers engaging psychologically and emotionally with brands that allegedly improve health and well-being, yet, at the same time, at least since the 1960s, ‘we have an economic model which mitigates against precisely the psychological attributes it depends upon’.[[3932]](#endnote-3933) By now, we even destroy our wildlife habitats to the point of unleashing global pandemics.[[3933]](#endnote-3934)

I always ask myself how it is possible that livelihood is confused with monetary income.[[3934]](#endnote-3935) How is it possible that ‘living for money’ is regarded as the only way of life, as if it were a law of nature and not a human-made arrangement? People in the West are proud that they are ‘free to marry for love’, they look down on the concept of arranged marriage. How come that people who eschew ‘marrying for money’ accept ‘living for money’?[[3935]](#endnote-3936) Once upon a time, slavery had the status of a law of nature and it was believed that it was an indispensable pillar of the economic system. How can people who eschew slavery be complicit with a ‘neo-liberal globalisation’ that is reconfiguring and disfiguring all discourses of self and identity in a manner that reminds of slavery?[[3936]](#endnote-3937) I am appalled by the imposition of an ‘economic’ model of relationships and selfhood that draws its validity from ‘a corporate governance structure’.[[3937]](#endnote-3938) Where are those famous ‘factory girls’ now, those girls of the 1850s in the United States for whom ‘the idea of renting yourself, meaning working for wages, was degrading’, for whom it was ‘an attack on your personal integrity’, ‘an attack on human dignity’?[[3938]](#endnote-3939)

I am dismayed when the profit motive is given legitimacy over moral imperatives, I am sickened when profit seeking is rewarded while ‘morally-motivated actions are ridiculed and opposed’ by people who have their own moral inclinations suffocated by ‘[neo-liberal psychology’](https://www.opendemocracy.net/transformation/joel-millward-hopkins/neoliberal-psychology).[[3939]](#endnote-3940) I wish to protect my moral intrinsic motivations[[3940]](#endnote-3941) from being influenced by misinterpretations of Adam Smith’s ‘invisible hands’.[[3941]](#endnote-3942) I would welcome the concept of invisible hands wholeheartedly if it held its promises, yet, my decades of global experience have shown me that the opposite is the case. I assume that Adam Smith would turn in his grave, were he to see the outcome of his teachings and how his original intentions are being violated now. In my book titled A dignity economy,[[3942]](#endnote-3943) I walk through some of the systemic humiliations that I see flowing from contemporary economic arrangements — these arrangements create ubiquitous mistrust, they turn abuse into profit, they increase fear to levels where it can no longer facilitate learning but causes debilitation, they produce false choices and decision fatigue that crowds out important choices and creates the infamous fog of war.[[3943]](#endnote-3944) All together, these arrangements create deep and structural psychological damage — a society that defines itself as a market of self-interested competitors, rather than nourishing it, damages human well-being.

I wish to have a life, not a job.[[3944]](#endnote-3945) I thank Immanuel Kant for saying that ‘everything has either a price or a dignity’, and that ‘whatever has a price can be replaced by something else as its equivalent; on the other hand, whatever is above all price, and therefore admits of no equivalent, has dignity’.[[3945]](#endnote-3946) I have studied economics sufficiently to know that society would be better off if it organised itself in ways that would not make the concept of ‘job’ necessary.[[3946]](#endnote-3947) In this ‘lonely century’ in which we live,[[3947]](#endnote-3948) ‘it’s not jobs, jobs, jobs anymore. It’s relationships, relationships, relationships’.[[3948]](#endnote-3949) Relationships are the main focus in my striving to overcome a Zeitgeist that increasingly merges the notion of work with ‘wage slavery’. In historical slavery, while some enslaved people succumbed to the system, others resisted, and I follow their example. I am sad when I see the world being filled with ‘slaves’ who are so co-opted that they voluntarily participate in competitions of ‘who is the best slave’,[[3949]](#endnote-3950) and this in a situation where the entire slave system risks causing the collective demise of slaves and slaveholders alike. I consider ‘overcoming one’s laziness’ as heroic and virtuous only when it is invested in liberating people from wage slavery, not when it means manipulating them into it.[[3950]](#endnote-3951) My entire life practice aims at protecting my moral and psychological sensibilities from the primacy of what is called the market, as I cannot obtain my sense of worth from a state of affairs that is blind to its own self-destruction. I am appalled when people tell me, ‘Since we depend on monetary income and have to earn money, and nature and future generations fail to pay for their protection and are only profitable when we exploit them, we have to destroy our habitat and that of future generations, and people like you, who declare themselves to be advocates of nature and future generations, are delusional’.

I am delighted to read that already ancient philosopher 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’.[[3951]](#endnote-3952) Many centuries later, philosopher Walter Benjamin (1892–1940) regarded the trope of prostitution as the epitome of a money-based society and its I-It relationships, a society where everyone is a seller and a commodity at once and continually encouraged to buy or sell, where the best thing is to sell oneself, to prostitute oneself.[[3952]](#endnote-3953) If I were to reduce my creativity to serve ‘personal branding’, to become a product of and for myself, I would feel like stranded in the dead-end world of the movie Pleasantville.[[3953]](#endnote-3954) My alternative is to work for transforming systemic madness into what I call systemic sanity.[[3954]](#endnote-3955)

Allow me to share a moment when I felt I was in Pleasantville. It was in the beginning of 2018, when I waited for the subway in the main train station of Oslo in Norway and saw the advertisement for a local hotel chain flashing in front of my eyes. It said that the personnel of the hotel was ‘passionately committed’ to be ‘genuinely attentive’ to their guests.[[3955]](#endnote-3956) It was obvious that the intention was laudable, yet, I asked myself how anyone could actually believe that it is humanly possible to develop genuine passion in return for a salary. While sitting and waiting, I thought back to the first time when I realised that there are indeed people who believe this. In 1976, as part of my psychology studies, I spent several months on a school ship going from Europe to Africa, and I interviewed the seamen who worked on board of the ship. They shared with me many stories, among them that the prostitutes in Brazil were ‘the best’ in their view, because they gave them the feeling of genuine passion. Later in life, I continued to be shocked when I found that even highly educated men did not seem to care whether a woman genuinely loved them — it was enough if she simply displayed love, even if she faked it for money. Through my work in the health sector, I met many women all over the world whose life circumstances had forced them to work as prostitutes or ‘comfort girlfriends’, and they all deemed that men who believe that ‘juicy girls’ are authentically ‘juicy’, and that ‘playing hard with them’ is ‘cool and manly’, are among the most pitiable creatures on Earth, blind even to their own humiliation.[[3956]](#endnote-3957) This is how I see also our entire modern market-driven society — as pitiably.

While waiting in the subway station, I thought of Immanuel Kant’s words and felt validated in refusing to ‘have a price’.[[3957]](#endnote-3958) I was reminded of the ‘big business’ that reigned in the Catholic Church before the Reformation, the business of ‘indulgence trading’, of buying oneself a shorter time in purgatory — how good that this practice was opposed at some point.[[3958]](#endnote-3959) Finally, I thought of my dear co-traveller Linda Hartling who always reminds us that ‘the problem is the commodification of our contributions in monetary terms, whereas the most important work that is done in the world has not been commodified and cannot be commodified, namely, all relational-social work’.[[3959]](#endnote-3960)

Some think that I work for inter-cultural tolerance. My mission goes far beyond both the notion of inter-cultural and the notion of tolerance. I wish to nurture I-Thou inter-human solidarity and protect our human relationships from being hollowed out by economical ‘imperatives’.[[3960]](#endnote-3961) More even, I wish to nurture inter-planetary solidarity that includes all sentient beings and our ecosphere as a whole. I connect my own good with everyone’s good and our planet’s good. This includes being mindful that owning or using ‘stuff’ beyond what furthers the common good undermines dignity at a grand scale, it undermines the human connection with a world of which we humans are only a small part. You might have noticed that I avoid using the word ‘good’ in the sense of ‘worthy’ except when I refer to composite phrases such as ‘the common good’, I usually try to replace ‘good’ with a more detailed description. Since Plato, the Greek word agathón means both ‘the good’ and ‘goods’, and I do not wish to mix goodness with owning goods.[[3961]](#endnote-3962) I deeply resonate with words of wisdom such as ‘the purpose of life is not to be happy. It is to be useful, to be honourable, to be compassionate, to have it make some difference that you have lived and lived well’.[[3962]](#endnote-3963) To me, it is not a ‘good thing’ when free-riding dominators call for ‘freedom for the wolves’[[3963]](#endnote-3964) so they can accumulate ‘goods’ and blame the sheep for their own death. I resonate with all those who call for transformative politics to ‘encourage leisure in the ancient Greek sense of schole, the pursuit of knowledge and meaning, rather than endless consumption’, and to promote work that is resource-replenishing rather than ‘resource-depleting’.[[3964]](#endnote-3965) As I see it, it is not resource-replenishing when the institution of money allows it to be a commodity, to be a ‘good’ that can be accumulated and used as a weapon in competitions for domination and control.[[3965]](#endnote-3966)

I am convinced that the idea of work needs radical re-conceptualisation, it needs to be liberated from being captured by ulterior interests. Human rights ideals indicate that no one should need to ‘earn’ their living, everyone has the right to life through having been born. Care work offered to one’s community out of love should be safe from being hollowed out by commodification. The most virtuous work is robbed of its virtue when it keeps up an exploitative machinery. When ‘work’ means contributing to sociocide and ecocide, when work means ‘cutting off the tree of life’, it is equivalent to making a living from killing.[[3966]](#endnote-3967) This is why I give my life as a gift, this is why I work day and night to contribute to the common good and the sustenance of all people and the planet.

Many suggest that ‘a new income distribution system’ may be a first step towards redefining the notion of work and income, and they may be right.[[3967]](#endnote-3968) I resonate with everyone who thinks that more steps are needed than re-distribution. Many fear that basic income would work as a ‘free lunch’ that would dis-incentivise work and encourage ‘laziness’,[[3968]](#endnote-3969) yet, research shows that it is more likely to be the other way round — only intrinsic motivation supports its own goals fully, whereby it is money as an extrinsic motivator that incentivises free riding.[[3969]](#endnote-3970) A Norwegian economist ascertains that society could easily afford a basic income for all and combine this with a welfare society, the only thing we cannot afford, he says, are ‘so many hyper-rich people who plunder us’.[[3970]](#endnote-3971)

Not only work, also education waits to be de-commodified ‘so that it revives its original purpose of preparing young adults for citizenship’.[[3971]](#endnote-3972) I wish for a world where already small children can learn to be proud of unconditionally ‘giving forward’, of offering whatever little they can give as a free gift in support of the common good, without having to fear being ridiculed as naïve later in life.[[3972]](#endnote-3973) I work for a world where all learn how fulfilling it is to embrace responsibility for the common good,[[3973]](#endnote-3974) a world where faith, industriousness, freedom, and money serve the common good rather than becoming ends in themselves at the price of selling out the common good. Reflections like these motivated us to launch the World Dignity University initiative.[[3974]](#endnote-3975)

When I was younger, I still connected love with reciprocity, until I understood that the only way to live love is to give forward without any expectations of return. Only in that way can one become part of a larger universe of love. I have since separated my personal sense of dignity from compensation, including from monetary remuneration — money cannot define my dignity. I have switched off the ‘calculator’ in my head so I can give my life as a gift, and give it forward. I do not quantify what I give, I do not define justice by using a calculation of reciprocity, I do not ask that my contributions be rewarded with a ‘just wage’. Living for love means refraining from living for money — love must lead, is my motto, the concept of money cannot be more than a humble servant.[[3975]](#endnote-3976) The idea of motivation-through-money is humiliating, it devalues what truly counts, namely, motivation through love.[[3976]](#endnote-3977) Evidently, I need food to eat and a roof over my head, so I live on small gifts of hospitality that are given to me on my path, yet, I refrain from any kind of consumerism. I bear the economic insecurity that is the consequence, I bear the sceptical looks from people who cannot grasp the meaning of what I do. In this way, I combine a very personal life experiment with a global life experiment, all of which is part of me offering my life as a gift to the world.[[3977]](#endnote-3978)

In Peer Gynt, Henrik Ibsen’s famous drama, Peer laments how selfish, arrogant, and self-centred he had been all his life and he asks Solveig, the woman who waited for him faithfully all these years, ‘Where has Peer Gynt been since we last met? Where was I as the one I should have been, whole and true, with the mark of God on my brow?’ She answers, ‘In my faith, in my hope, in my love’. This is how I feel about humankind, particularly during the past decades, as humanity followed Peer Gynt in becoming ever more selfish, arrogant, and self-centred — now we are left with only hope and love.[[3978]](#endnote-3979) This is a kind of love that is much larger and deeper than ‘being in love’ with material possessions or exiting activities, or even loving oneself or other people. Philosopher Martin Buber called it I-Thou encounter, the highest realisation of love, a realisation that entails a dimension that is larger than life, so large that Buber called it divine. ‘The world can’t be comprehended, but it can be embraced one person at a time’, is a sentence credited to Martin Buber, and this is what I try to do in my life as much as I can: to embrace. I embrace even when I cannot comprehend, and above all, I refrain from portioning my embrace like a bureaucrat.

Archbishop Desmond Tutu kindly wrote the Foreword to my book on big love,[[3979]](#endnote-3980) and there he refers to a book by Martin Luther King Jr. to which Tutu wrote the Introduction, a book where King asks all those who are ‘creatively maladjusted’ to use the force of love to affect change rather than hatred. For his funeral, King wished that it should be mentioned that what he tried to do in his life was to ‘love and serve humanity’.[[3980]](#endnote-3981) After many years of loving practice, I feel I can follow King in his footsteps and be connected to a universe of love. This, in turn, enables me to project this kind of love out into the world. Unconditional giving surprises and touches people, seeing a face suddenly light up is the most fulfilling reward for me. Love, tenderness, warmth, kindness, loyalty, solidarity, connectedness, these are not just ‘nice things to wish for’, they are the very oxygen that keeps me alive. Not just me, all of humankind is in need of this oxygen, as I see it, if we want to survive on planet Earth in dignity.

To summarise, I had the privilege of growing up in a context where I could obtain a very high level of education without being overwhelmed by debt, and I was given a passport that makes global living possible. For me, these privileges represent a responsibility, the responsibility to make them useful for the common good. As much as I can, I refrain from seeking relief in the mainstream paradigm of ‘market pricing’, I rather live in ways our ancient forebears did, namely, through embracing the giving-forward gift economy of face-to-face relationships.[[3981]](#endnote-3982) I make it my mission to nurture direct solidarity between people as much as I can, I speak up for what anthropologist Alan Page Fiske calls communal sharing, I refrain from complicity in the arm-length distance that keeps people apart when money mediates relationships. In this way, I try to heal the wounds in the social fabric that occur when relationships are being mediated by impersonal money-based contracts. This is why I say that I want to ‘live life’ rather than ‘have work’, this is why I try to shoulder the full extent of our human metaphysical responsibility, rather than selling it out for ‘a job’.[[3982]](#endnote-3983) The term Homo oeconomicus is another word for the mutilation of human nature and I wish to re-normalise what is normal, I wish to nurture us back to Homo amans, the loving being.

I feel deeply humiliated by the self-righteousness with which we, as ‘mankind’, maintain a dominator spirit that destroys our socio-sphere and eco-sphere. I am deeply saddened by the blindness with which we overlook the self-humiliation we commit. It pains me to see that we let this happen in a situation where dignity is in our reach, where we have everything needed to turn our world into a digni-sphere. The dominator system is like slavery where the slaveholders fault disobedient slaves for the defects of the system, overlooking that the entire system ought to be transformed, that it does not even benefit the slaveholders themselves in the long term. I cannot bring myself to be an arrogant slaveholder, nor a willing facilitator of that system, nor can I be a submissive slave. I am sad when I see how enslaved people compound humiliation by competing for ‘who is the best slave’, or, even worse, seek liberation by following ‘false liberators’.[[3983]](#endnote-3984) I feel ashamed of us humans, our collective blindness humiliates my humanity, yet, at the same time, I also feel loving compassion with us for our unfortunate lack of wisdom. After all, our species is new to this planet compared with other species, we still need to evolve.[[3984]](#endnote-3985)

I resonate with Anthony Marsella when he calls for ‘a new individual and collective identity embedded in nature’ to replace current identities sanctioned by religions claiming that ‘mankind is the master of nature’.[[3985]](#endnote-3986) He calls on us to embrace lifeism, ‘a view advancing a new ontology, epistemology, and praxiology based upon a cosmological view of all life emerging from the earliest days or creation, and the subsequent fission and fusion of matter and energy’.[[3986]](#endnote-3987) Over most of the past millennia, competition for domination and control was fought out with open force, then, more recently, by way of monetary accumulation. Now, time has come to nurture a transition towards something new, towards the well-being of all living beings. Let us leave behind life-through-violence-and-profit and embrace life-through-life!

I am deeply thankful to Linda Hartling for joining me in forging a global cooperative community ‘inside the dignity frame’ and ‘outside the contract frame’. We do not bind people to contracts by money and then lean back until the contract may be broken, only to ‘fire’ the person and ‘hire’ another. What we do instead is nurturing relationships through encouragement and appreciation. These are Linda’s words:

We are not working within the frame of economism, within the frame of contract, money, production, timelines, industry, marketing, deadlines, business, branding, and so forth. We are working within the frame of loving relationships, within the frame of fluid expertise, ‘building a ship at sea’, ebb and flow, movement in mutuality, prolific patience, mutual growth, mutual support, growth-fostering engagement, listening into voice, awe and wonderment, dignilogue.[[3987]](#endnote-3988)

I have dedicated my life to finding out whether and how we can forge better arrangements for our human affairs on planet Earth. Can Homo ignorans turn into a truly sapiens Homo sapiens? Can ‘mankind’ become a humane and kind humanity, a humankind? Can our eco-spheres and socio-spheres become digni-spheres?

A CosmoDigniRevolution

Beyond our pride in a scientific-technological advance,

deep humility and broad spirituality we should enhance.

― Francisco Gomes de Matos, peace linguist, 2018[[3988]](#endnote-3989)

I do not believe, I experience!

― Joan Jonas, artist, Venice Biennale, 2015

Live the questions now. Perhaps then, someday far in the future, you will gradually, without even noticing it, live your way into the answer.

― Rainer Maria Rilke (1875–1926), poet[[3989]](#endnote-3990)

## Chapter 12: A call to action

Nothing appears more surprizing to those, who consider human affairs with a philosophical eye, than the easiness with which the many are governed by the few; and the implicit submission, with which men resign their own sentiments and passions to those of their rulers. When we enquire by what means this wonder is effected, we shall find, that, as Force is always on the side of the governed, the governors have nothing to support them but opinion. It is therefore, on opinion only that government is founded; and this maxim extends to the most despotic and most military governments, as well as to the most free and most popular.  
― David Hume (1711–1776), philosopher[[3990]](#endnote-3991)

Not everything that is faced can be changed. But nothing can be changed until it is faced.

― James Baldwin (1924–1987), novelist, poet, and activist

For decades, evidence has mounted of anthropogenic disturbance of planetary conditions and processes, notably, the global climate, ocean chemistry, the cryosphere, the nitrogen cycle, and the abundance, diversity, and distribution of fauna and flora. Rippling synergistically across space and time, this multipronged disturbance compromises Earth’s stability and heightens risks of a disruptive state-shift of the system as a totality.  
― Paul Raskin, physicist, founder of the Great Transition Initiative, 2021[[3991]](#endnote-3992)
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### Can our eco-spheres and socio-spheres become digni-spheres?

Making peace with nature is the title of a report by the United Nations Environment Programme in 2021.[[3992]](#endnote-3993)

Is this a viable goal? Can we, humanity, make peace with nature? Our planet is our commons, can we collectively protect and replenish it? Can we create a world of shared global commons, of global unity in diversity? Can we create rule-of-law institutions that keep exploiters from undermining the global commons? Can we create cooperation that is globally inclusive? Can we overcome the abuse of cooperation for the sake of domination over other people and nature? Can we make peace among ourselves? Can we create a world without divisive borders and without military forces, only with borders that are dignifying and protective for our cultural and biological diversity?

Can we turn systemic madness into systemic sanity? Can we turn socio-cide and eco-cide into what I call socio-sanity and eco-sanity, into socio-salvation and eco-salvation? Can our eco-spheres and socio-spheres become digni-spheres? Can we imagine a world of dignity, of dignism, nurtured by a dignity economy?[[3993]](#endnote-3994) Can we make such a world work?

The answer is a resounding ‘Yes!’. Very few people understand, and I notice this all around the world, that our species, Homo sapiens, lives in a historical moment that, while unparalleled in terms of crises, is also unparalleled in terms of opportunity. History is not a predetermined process with humans as helpless victims. History is not a prison, particularly not now.[[3994]](#endnote-3995) For the first time, we, humanity, are in a position to succeed in bringing about the kinds of adaptation that can lead us out of our cascading crises. These adaptations are long overdue, overdue since millennia. Our forebears did not yet have the tools we have. We have everything, the knowledge and the skills, and we have a time window of about ten years.

For the first time in our history, we can fully appreciate our place in the cosmos. Our ancestors could not see pictures of our Blue Marble from the perspective of an astronaut.[[3995]](#endnote-3996) Unlike our forebears, we have the privilege of seeing our planet from outside and thus experiencing the overview effect,[[3996]](#endnote-3997) an effect that helps us understand that we humans are one species living on one tiny planet. We can embrace biophilia,[[3997]](#endnote-3998) we can feel ‘the ecology of the living’ taking place within one circumscribed biopoetic space that is shared between all beings.[[3998]](#endnote-3999) We have access to a much more comprehensive knowledge base about the universe and our place in it than even our grandparents had. We have all the knowledge and skills required to build mutual trust and solidarity at a global scale. We have everything needed to humanise globalisation by reaping the benefits that the global ingathering of humanity offers. We can co-create a world of dignism.

Human nature is neither ‘good’ nor ‘evil’, there is no need to idealise human nature nor to demonise it. Much of human action simply depends on the ways constitutive rules frame relational contexts — cooperation and solidarity in the world can be nurtured systemically, through building appropriate societal frames.[[3999]](#endnote-4000) Given the context, humans are capable of the most loving goodness or of the most horrifying evilness, whereby violence, hatred, and terror are deeply entangled with notions of honour, heroism, glory, and loyalty.[[4000]](#endnote-4001) ‘We may not be able to engineer a good Anthropocene or good Homo sapiens, but we can create a society that elicits and nurtures the better angels of our collective nature’.[[4001]](#endnote-4002)

Where do we stand with the task of creating a better society? All around the world, local experiments are on their way that try to act on the Indigenous prophecy that ‘you cannot eat money’, that try to make economic systems compatible with life on Earth. There is a ‘market of promises’ out there,[[4002]](#endnote-4003) created by people who no longer wish to gain ‘prosperity’ at the cost of ecocide and sociocide, who no longer wish to make their livelihood dependent on destruction, who no longer wish to make a living from killing.

More and more people understand that only small problems can be solved from within the system. When a system has big problems, it is time to ask big questions from outside of the system. Philosopher Arne Næss, father of deep ecology, called on us to engage in deeper questioning, to continue asking questions where we previously stopped asking.[[4003]](#endnote-4004) Næss would agree with my conclusion that ecocide and sociocide cannot be addressed by the same economic frames that caused it, that it is not enough to want to solve ecocide with more sociocide, nor the other way round. We need new constitutive frames globally and locally, and we have all the knowledge and skills to create them.

Are new constitutive frames in sight? The short answer is ‘No’.

As it stands now, systemic frames are built on the belief that Adam Smith’s ‘invisible hand’ will come to rescue. As a result, and I observe this all around the world, ‘Adam Smith’s invisible hand is at our throats’.[[4004]](#endnote-4005) Instead of inspiring the creation of new systemic solutions, the growing sense of frustration is being captured by un-social media that gain profit from amplifying ill feelings, fuelling hatred, and merging New Age and far-right ‘Nazi hippies’[[4005]](#endnote-4006) into ever extremer forms of ‘conspirituality’.[[4006]](#endnote-4007) Selfishness is hailed as a virtue, selflessness is suspect, and solidarity is accused of doing harm through enabling the lazy to free ride on the efforts of the hard working.[[4007]](#endnote-4008) People are becoming morally and psychologically so crippled that they lack the courage to envision new ways of living together, let alone creating new systemic frames that invite pro-social behaviour with ‘visible hands’.

The situation is so severe that many aspects of what has been called the event are already with us, no longer something to be expected in the far future.[[4008]](#endnote-4009) In 2018, Douglas Rushkoff, professor of media theory and digital economics in New York, introduced a broader audience to the expression ‘the event’ as a euphemism for any kind of collapse, be it ‘the environmental collapse, social unrest, nuclear explosion, unstoppable virus, or Mr. Robot hack that takes everything down’.[[4009]](#endnote-4010) Highly responsible environmental scientists have gone as far as forecast the extinction of the human species already in a few years’ time — a warning that is serious even if it takes longer.[[4010]](#endnote-4011) As Rushkoff reported in 2018, the privileged few of this world plan to seek refuge behind thick walls with barbed wire, or on islands, or even on other planets.[[4011]](#endnote-4012)

One path towards extinction is nuclear war, and, indeed, the probability for it to happen is on the increase, as nuclear armament races are booming. After the Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces Treaty of 1987, also the New Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty of 2010 was almost abandoned in 2021.[[4012]](#endnote-4013) The age-old motto ‘if you want peace, prepare for war’, is being expanded into ‘if you want peace, prepare for nuclear war’.[[4013]](#endnote-4014) From history, we know that only directly after a devastating war are people tired of mayhem, whereas new generations often begin new wars out of eagerness for ‘glory’.[[4014]](#endnote-4015) Next time, we may predict, there will likely be no post-war. In laboratory simulations of such scenarios, the outcome is a highly militarised world that ends in nuclear war until the entire population of the Earth is dead.[[4015]](#endnote-4016) We will all become refugees without refuge.

We humans are proud of our adaptability, therefore we call ourselves Homo sapiens (Latin ‘wise, judicious’). Our task now is to live up to the name we have given ourselves, to prove that we can be truly wise and judicious.[[4016]](#endnote-4017) The task is to avoid cogitocide, and to do this fast. The task is to halt the destruction of our cogitosphere, our realm of thinking and reflection.[[4017]](#endnote-4018) Otherwise, we will face sociocide, ecocide, and suicide, altogether omnicide.

In this situation, we have to do better than simply unleashing an ‘artificial intelligence’ revolution as a follow-up to our steam engine revolution and computer revolution, we need to manifest a global ethics revolution. If not, ‘artificial intelligence’ will likely turn out to be ‘artificial foolishness’.[[4018]](#endnote-4019) Rescuing our cogitosphere means refraining from blindly hailing big data and artificial intelligence — artificial sightlessness may be a better word for new manifestations of the well-known fog of war.[[4019]](#endnote-4020) It is no sign of intelligence simply to increase the proverbial haystack when the task is to find the needle in this stack.[[4020]](#endnote-4021)

If we use our capacity to be sapiens, we, Homo sapiens, can do better than in the past. We can manifest a world of unity in diversity through creating a dignifying mosaic of diversity. We have enough cultural resources on our planet that can be harvested — ranging from the African ubuntu philosophy to the Norwegian likeverd heritage.[[4021]](#endnote-4022) We can meet the emotional and physical needs of all of our human sisters and brothers in harmony with the Earth that nurtures us. Vasudhaiva kutumbakam means the world is one family, in Sanskrit वसुधैव कुटुम्बकम्, consisting of vasudhā, the earth, ēva, indeed, and kutumbakam, family.[[4022]](#endnote-4023) We can turn the world into a true family home.

This book focusses on big history.[[4023]](#endnote-4024) The reason is that only a wide view over long stretches of history makes primary problems visible, which then spawn secondary, tertiary, and quaternary problems.[[4024]](#endnote-4025) Only a wide view can make us see far enough to manifest true sapiens.

Many have heard of the Neolithic Revolution that began to unfold roughly twelve millennia ago, yet, few are aware how relevant this period is for the solution of today’s problems. Understanding it opens a path to dignity not least because it removes the attribution error with regard to human nature that is one of the main obstacles on the way to a dignified future. It is the false assumption that violent competition for domination is so deeply ingrained in human nature that it is an unavoidable compulsion that is impossible to contain peacefully. I notice that women resonate with my analysis more than men, who are socialised to be proud of their ability to compete and for whom it may therefore be more difficult to see the destructiveness of competition. I speak more about the attribution error in chapters 9 and 10.

At the time of the Neolithic Revolution, our forebears had to adapt to a set of circumstances that was new to them — they began to face circumscription, followed by the threat of the security dilemma and its motto ‘If you want peace, prepare for war’. Our ancestors adapted by competing for domination and control, and this was the best they could do. What is known as the dominator model of society evolved in this context,[[4025]](#endnote-4026) and our presently existing global economic systems represent the latest manifestation of this adaptation. Throughout the past millennia, competition for domination was a successful strategy, at least partly and sometimes. Our forebears could not know that this strategy would one day outlive its already limited usefulness, that it would become a collectively suicidal strategy. They could not foresee the extent to which the world would interconnect socially and the Earth’s carrying capacity would get overstretched ecologically.[[4026]](#endnote-4027) Our forebears could not know what we know, namely, that in an interconnected finite context only dialogical partnership is feasible in the end, that only partnership among ourselves and with our planet is sustainable in the long run.[[4027]](#endnote-4028)

It took several millennia for the long run to arrive. Now this moment has come. Time has run out for short-lived ‘victories’ over other people and nature. Such victories mean collective defeat in an overstretched and globally interconnected ecosphere and sociosphere. We, as humanity, have reached the end of our ‘feasting’ on the resources of our planet. During the past millennia, we have continuously refined our exploitation, and during the past decades we even feasted with fireworks, literally, we burnt our fossil fuels. The only lifesaving plan now is to unite globally and protect our cultural and biological diversity by enacting equal dignity for all in solidarity. This is the opposite of irrational utopia,[[4028]](#endnote-4029) it is the ultimate rationality. For a few years to come, not for long, a small window of opportunity stands open for us to act sensibly.[[4029]](#endnote-4030)

We humans are relational beings more than rational beings, and therefore it is not enough for solutions to be rational. The time has come for us to rescue love, more precisely, big love, as I call it.[[4030]](#endnote-4031) Our Palaeolithic forebears can provide us with valuable inspirations. Archaeological research suggests that they lived in small groups in which solidarity and dialogue with nature were the leading practice — they expressed love through universal embeddedness.[[4031]](#endnote-4032) Luckily, these characteristics ‘are still there in the blood and in the cells, even though they have been to a large extent warped and overridden by recently dominant social structures driven by competition for scarce resources’, explains Howard Richards, philosopher of social science and scholar of peace and global studies, and author of the Foreword for this book.[[4032]](#endnote-4033) In other words, during the first 97 per cent of our history as modern humans, we acquired cooperative social-psychological abilities that we can reinvigorate now.

Palaeolithic life ended when the dominator mindset took over. In a dominator context, love is much more complicated than before. Throughout the past millennia, most larger groups were organised in hierarchies with rulers at the top who imprinted their names not just on all available monuments but also into their inferiors’ minds. It became the duty for inferiors to ‘love’ their superiors, to ‘love’ the belief systems their rulers imposed, and to ‘hate’ whomever their superiors pointed out as ‘enemy’. Freely chosen authentic love was restricted to a few relationships — for instance, to cases where a ruler happened to be a benevolent protector rather than a malevolent oppressor, or across generations and in marriages wherever parents or partners happened to be caring nurturers rather than abusive dominators. Authentic love could also occur in peer groups who solidarised in protest against oppressive superiors — the strongest love was often manifest in ‘slave cultures’, in places where enslaved people carved out ‘niches of liveability’ in resistance to their slaveholders.[[4033]](#endnote-4034)

Where is love today? Where are niches of liveability now? The dominator model of society is still prevalent in many parts of the world and niches of liveability can still be found in their protest movements. While I write these sentences, ‘lines of solidarity’ and ‘solidarity chains’ are formed in Belarus in protest against ‘Europe’s last dictator’.[[4034]](#endnote-4035)

The situation is much more complicated in Western European countries and in the United States of America. ‘In a fully developed bureaucracy there is nobody left with whom one can argue, to whom one can present grievances, on whom the pressures of power can be exerted’, these were the words of political thinker Hannah Arendt already many years ago, it is ‘the rule by Nobody’, which, however, is not to be mistaken for ‘no-rule’, rather, ‘where all are equally powerless, we have a tyranny without a tyrant’.[[4035]](#endnote-4036) Historical sociologist Karl Polanyi expressed similar views when he said that we live in times that are characterised by systems of hierarchy that give power to ‘rulers without a name’, systems in which everyone is isolated and thus much more vulnerable than before to being manipulated by unscrupulous preachers of ideology and religion.

The coronavirus pandemic amplifies the predicament that Arendt and Polanyi describe. By using existing economic rules, global profit-oriented high-tech entrepreneurs are followed by profit-oriented unscrupulous conspiracy entrepreneurs to fill the land of Nobody’s tyranny with tyrannical conspiracy narratives.[[4036]](#endnote-4037) A pandemic of loveless and confused disconnection and loneliness unfolds that will outlast the coronavirus pandemic — this pandemic ‘distorts reality so it becomes recognisable’, in the words of late philosopher Ernst Bloch.[[4037]](#endnote-4038) Even romantic love gets lost in this quandary, when the cracks of loneliness are filled with surrogate consumer experiences, including the online consumption of sexual abuse of women and children. Increasingly, love is also sought by enlisting the devotion of pet animals — anthropomorphisation is a term that describes the attribution of human form or human personality to things not human. In the case of pet animals, their owners infer ‘love’ when these imprisoned creatures beg for food, while the same owners may remain impervious to the suffering inflicted on animals through human ‘love’ for industrialised mass-produced ‘meat’.

Given this state of affairs, I invite everyone to join me in filling the void of isolation with relationships of loving solidarity that are strong enough to carry us into a future of dignity both locally and globally. I am an entrepreneur of loving solidarity,[[4038]](#endnote-4039) a servant leader of collective action,[[4039]](#endnote-4040) of the kind of caring and respectful action that fits the partnership model of society.[[4040]](#endnote-4041) I call on us to withstand what I refer to as the ‘art of domination’ that is used by the dominator model to force or manipulate people into followership.[[4041]](#endnote-4042)

I know it is difficult, and I risk being ridiculed as blue-eyed dreamer. My way to respond is to share my personal experience of living on all continents for many decades (except Antarctica). I remind of the fact that a loveless world is not a God-given law of nature, it is a human-made calamity that can be undone by humans. Nothing keeps us from trying out ‘co-evolutionary love’.[[4042]](#endnote-4043) We can experiment with the intentional and deliberate love that emerges out of ‘waging good conflict’ as path-breaking scholar Jean Baker Miller formulated it.[[4043]](#endnote-4044) It is the sort of love that is embedded in larger contexts of possibility, love that nurtures interconnected individuality in a world of global inter-human relations, relations that reach far beyond inter-cultural or inter-national relations. Many concepts are waiting to manifest in loving ways — ‘differential affective attunement’, ‘collective individuation’, ‘micropolitics’, ‘thinking-feeling’, ‘ontopower’, ‘immanent critique’.[[4044]](#endnote-4045) Many cultural realms on our planet offer treasure troves of dignifying heritages that can support loving unity in diversity — the African spirit of ubuntu alone can carry us a long way, ‘I am because we are’.[[4045]](#endnote-4046)

At the present point in historical time, big love is needed everywhere, at least if we wish to overcome the presently unfolding degradation of unity in diversity — it degrades into a mixture of uniformity without diversity and division without unity. A tragic loss of diversity is caused by the worldwide homogenisation of cultures — also called McDonaldisation[[4046]](#endnote-4047) or global ‘Empire’[[4047]](#endnote-4048) — while the rest of diversity, instead of being protected, is turned into hostile division through violent backlashes against this global uniformity. The institutional mechanisms generating this uniformity are cemented into place by the homogenising effects of legal and ethical frameworks that form the constitutive rules of the modern world-system.[[4048]](#endnote-4049) These constitutive rules create global frames that allow economic power to be used and abused by global players.[[4049]](#endnote-4050) None less than German chancellor Angela Merkel summarised this predicament in 2010, ‘First, the banks failed, then they drove the states to bailouts — they pulled the global economy into a deep abyss, so to speak — then we [the state] had to launch economic stimulus packages, and due to these packages we had to go into debt, now we have the debt and speculators speculate against the debt of states. That is something that is perfidious’.[[4050]](#endnote-4051)

In response to this seemingly intractable quandary, many pour their love into patriotism. I do that, too. I see myself as a loving patriot of global village Earth, of Earthland — or, better, as a loving matriot of Mother Earth[[4051]](#endnote-4052) — and this includes all its living beings.[[4052]](#endnote-4053) I am a patriotic Earthlander who is aware that it is not unity or diversity, it is not globalism or local patriotism, rather, everything is layered — global unity is needed to hold space for local diversity so that local patriotism can flourish. American president Donald Trump’s words in 2019 in front of the United Nations were, ‘The future does not belong to globalists. The future belongs to patriots’.[[4053]](#endnote-4054) I transpose his formulation onto the global level by saying that ‘the future belongs to patriots of Earthland’, and patriotic action is urgently needed.

I would like to encourage all of this world’s citizens, not least the world’s heads of states, to act on this insight. I am aware that in a global arena that is dominated by corporate power, the classical nation state seems powerless, stripped of its sovereignty, yet, we have seen that this does not have to be so. Leaders like Donald Trump have demonstrated that states can use their sovereignty quite forcefully. In his case, he used national sovereignty to create global division, yet, no world leader is bound to do the same. Other leaders can use their national power to create unity in diversity in the world, for example, by rescuing the United Nations from further descending into Disunited Nations. Already prior to the coronavirus pandemic, the United Nations had been reduced to a kind of ‘Super Red Cross’, mainly focussing on ‘sectors that do not affect governance of the economy or finance but politics on refugees, education, health, agriculture and fishing, and so on’.[[4054]](#endnote-4055) Trade and finance, the two great engines of globalisation, have long been ‘outside of the United Nations which is no longer a place for debate and consensus for humanity. It is no secret that the Davos Economic Forum attracts more leaders than the UN General Assembly’.[[4055]](#endnote-4056) In 2018, New Zealand’s Prime Minister Jacinda Ardern called on the United Nations to ‘recommit to its core values of preserving human rights and dignity for everyone’.[[4056]](#endnote-4057)

At this point in history, problems are so massive and so global that it will not be enough for nations to re-unite into United Earth Nations, a higher level of unity waits to manifest, namely, United Earth Citizens. The sheer size of our global challenges calls on ‘us, the United Citizens’ to join hands and protect our global diversity. Together, we can put unity in diversity into practice by finding solutions for all questions waiting to be answered: What is global unity in diversity? How do group identities look like that cultivate global unity in diversity? How can cultural diversity be protected? What does cultural diversity mean in practice? Is it similar to biological diversity? Or not? One day, we might want to celebrate the solstice together, ‘as the embodiment of the unity of cultural heritage and centuries-long traditions’.[[4057]](#endnote-4058)

Many answers are already known to us. For instance, we know that ‘a culture’, to survive, depends on the next generation being initiated into it — this is at the core of the seven-generation tradition of Indigenous peoples.[[4058]](#endnote-4059) In many world regions, this is precisely what has been continuously undermined, Indigenous peoples have suffered discrimination for centuries. Is it possible to stop and heal that damage? If so, who should be the healer and who the healed? Should Indigenous peoples and their knowledge systems be romanticised museums or repositories of resources yet to be exploited by the majority? Perhaps it needs to be the other way round and Indigenous peoples need to heal the rest?

This brings us to a core problem of unity in diversity, namely, the problematic relationship between group identity and humiliation. History offers many illustrations of how identities can be rejected for being a humiliating imposition or be embraced in response to humiliating treatment. As to the first case, when Adolf Hitler came to power, many people with a Jewish background felt more German than Jewish and were beyond disbelief when Nazi Germany identified them as ‘Jews’ who allegedly planned for world domination.[[4059]](#endnote-4060) These Jews felt deeply humiliated when their chosen group identity was denied and another imposed on them. As to the second case, there are those young men with migrant backgrounds in Western countries who have witnessed their parents buckling under humiliation from the majority, and who then took revenge by embracing extremist religious identities, turning into what became known as foreign fighters.[[4060]](#endnote-4061)

What is the way out? What would be a purposeful compass? It seems that love is a good motto for the overarching solution — not the fickle romantic kind of love, and not because love is nice to have, but because there is no rationality without emotions.[[4061]](#endnote-4062) Gandhi’s satyāgraha can serve as an inspiration. The more the world interconnects, the less it is possible for a few diplomats to entertain inter-national relations through negotiations and contracts, as rational as they may be. Average citizens will need to engage in nurturing direct inter-human relations at a global scale. Average citizens will have to acquire the psychological sagacity to attend with love rather than indignation to all the cycles of humiliation around the world that stand in the way of clear thinking and sound planning for a dignified future.

Wherever I go, all over the world, I come across cycles of humiliation driven by hot button words. The strongest usually end on -ism, such as ‘capitalism’ or ‘socialism’.[[4062]](#endnote-4063) ‘The collapse of trust, the rise of animosity — these are emotional, not intellectual problems’, rather ‘the real problem is in our system of producing shared stories. If a country can’t tell narratives in which everybody finds an honourable place, then righteous rage will drive people toward tribal narratives that tear it apart’.[[4063]](#endnote-4064)

I suggest that future-oriented movements that aim at significant change better avoid creating ever more ‘fog of war’. Humanity’s task for now, as I see it, is to muster enough love so that we can prevent our cogitosphere[[4064]](#endnote-4065) from dangerously heating up.[[4065]](#endnote-4066) Only then, I propose, can we collect the clear and sober mind that we need to construct new and better ways of arranging our human affairs on this planet.

How can we sideline hot-button ‑isms? Perhaps we do not need another -ism, perhaps it would be better to live without -isms. But if we need a new -ism, why not dignity-ism, or dignism! I have coined the phrase dignism as a compass for the de-construction of competition for domination and the co-construction of new global governance arrangements of partnership.

I ask us, humanity as a whole, all citizens of Earthland, to forge a global citizens movement under the banner of a new connective narrative, so we can make a decent world come true:

Dignism describes a world where every newborn finds space and is nurtured to unfold their highest and best, embedded in a social context of loving appreciation and connection, where the carrying capacity of the planet guides the ways in which basic needs are met. It is a world where unity in diversity reigns, where we unite in respecting human dignity and celebrating diversity, where we prevent unity from devolving into oppressive uniformity, and where we keep diversity from sliding into hostile division. It is a world where we protect diversity from being levelled out through uniformity and prevent unity from being broken down through division. Dignism means avoiding ‘uniformity without diversity’ as much as ‘division without unity’. It means transforming everything into loving global unity in diversity.

Dignism means ending the cycles of humiliation that emerge when human rights are promised but not delivered, dignism appeals to the enormous power of hope for equal dignity that was created by what we call modernity, only to be left unfulfilled. Dignism means loving care for the common good of all of humanity as co-inhabitants of a single finite habitat. Dignism means establishing governance structures that dignify globalisation and manifest co-globegalisation (chapter 11). Dignism realises unity in diversity through subsidiarity, through weaving together all dignifying aspects of all of the world’s cultures into one decent global village.[[4066]](#endnote-4067)

Human culture itself is sacred, this was the observation of anthropologist and philosopher Ernest Becker, including cultures that are secular and proud of being science-based.[[4067]](#endnote-4068) Becker was inspired by psychoanalyst Otto Rank who saw fear of death as a fundamental human motivation. For Becker, ‘culture’ is a defence mechanism against this universal existential fear.[[4068]](#endnote-4069)

My question: Perhaps dignism can provide the affective and emotional support for a future sacred culture of global unity in diversity? Perhaps dignism can offer the nourishment that the United Citizens of the world need? We know from research that throughout human history communities of a smaller size — 50, 150, or 500 people — had the greatest long-term stability because its members knew each other and could offer each other emotional support, and we also know that larger groups can hold together as well when they provide deeper emotional nourishment through shared values.[[4069]](#endnote-4070) Can dignism provide these shared values and serve as a vision for the future that is emotionally nourishing?

Research tells us also that friendship needs four conditions, namely, cooperation among equals, cooperation on common superordinate goals that are attainable and that have institutional support. Can dignism provide these common superordinate goals?[[4070]](#endnote-4071) Furthermore, research tells us that entrenched disputes need two things to end, ‘sufficient levels of mutual misery, and a vision of a way out’.[[4071]](#endnote-4072) Could the coronavirus crisis be the last drop of misery that ends all disputes?[[4072]](#endnote-4073) Could the climate crisis provide the necessary impetus? Could the threat of mass extinction do it? Could dignism become our new normality in a situation where going back to old ab-normality would be foolish?[[4073]](#endnote-4074)

All this might sound like pie in the sky. It is not. We humans — or, more precisely, the dominators among us and their complicitous followers — have harmed the world to the point that this is the only way towards survival. In a lifeboat, all hands are needed on deck.

Dignism is big love in action. Dignism is the manifestation of Homo amans relationalis, the ‘loving relational being’, the manifestation of Homo solidaricus globalis. This is the only conceptualisation of human nature that can help us build a world worth living in for all its sentient beings both now and in the future.

### Trusting the new universalism of many voices

What can one do except be one

Talking to two, touching three, growing to four million

Each of us is one

All of us are one.

― Carole King, singer-songwriter, 1977[[4074]](#endnote-4075)

It takes courage not to be discouraged... I am a realist, not an idealist... Nothing new ever happened before... make law not war...

― Ben Ferencz, last Nuremberg prosecutor alive,   
what he wants the world to know at age 97[[4075]](#endnote-4076)

On our small but beautiful earth — made small by technology, made beautiful by nature — there is room for one group [of humans] only: the family of humankind!  
― John Scales Avery, Nobel Peace Prize recipient, at the age of 81[[4076]](#endnote-4077)

Since antiquity, scholars have thought about questions of world peace.[[4077]](#endnote-4078) Now we live in times where world peace is more than ‘nice to have’, it is a question of survival. Is there a chance to create world peace from a ‘universal point of view’ that recognises human rights ideals and cultural diversity? Or is the maximum we can hope for the fake peace of ‘calm and quiet’ that is achieved when an iron hand suppresses dissent?

I join the call for a new ‘pluriversalism’, for a new ‘universalism of many voices’, the voices of all local communities with all their multiple social actors and their multiple views on sharing, interdependence, and participation.[[4078]](#endnote-4079)

Philosopher Glen Martin is one of these voices. He reminds us that our dignity lies ‘in the ever-greater actualisation of the true, the good, and the beautiful that results from the temporalised human journey’.[[4079]](#endnote-4080) Martin read my book on big love and commended me on highlighting that ‘love is not an emotion and not a good that descends on us from nowhere, but must become an institutionalised, culturalised, and personalised way of living on the Earth’.[[4080]](#endnote-4081)

Glen Martin advises to replace the United Nations Charter with the Earth Charter as a template for global analysis and action.[[4081]](#endnote-4082) He deems the United Nations Charter to be an obstruction to world peace, as it allows leaders of powerful nations to commit crimes with impunity. The Earth Charter, in contrast, promotes a transition towards sustainable ways of living, towards a global society founded on a shared ethical framework that includes respect and care for the community of life, for ecological integrity and universal human rights, for respect for diversity, economic justice, democracy, and a culture of peace.[[4082]](#endnote-4083)

Philosopher Ivan Illich is another voice. His 1973 book Tools for conviviality was a classic of social criticism, and it still inspires the contemporary British discussion on a new multiculturalism as well as the French approach to convivialism.[[4083]](#endnote-4084) In 2013, forty French-speaking scholars of philosophy and social sciences working with sociologist Alain Caillé signed the Convivial Manifesto, a ‘declaration of interdependence’ that proposes a new humanism that enables humans to take care of each other and of nature.[[4084]](#endnote-4085) It conceptualises conviviality as an ‘ism’, as a normative conviction, as a transformative ‘art of living together’, and as a political programme that transcends the political ideologies of the twentieth century. The goal of convivialists is a democratic-egalitarian society that transcends the growth logic, a society where the relationships between individuals, groups, and communities are made visible in new ways, where people attend constructively to conflict, where they cooperate for the benefit of all and respect each other in their diversity.

The term conviviality comes from Latin con + vivere (together + live) and is used in many European languages — from convivialité to convivialiad, to convivialidade and Konvivialität. In 1999, I was invited to the African Great Lakes region to speak at the Conférence Internationale sur le Rôle de l’Éducation dans la Promotion d’une Culture de Convivialité et d’Édification des Communautés, a conference that was convened by the Ministry of National Education in Burundi.[[4085]](#endnote-4086)

Then there is economist John Maynard Keynes. In 1932, he predicted that in 2030, people’s material needs would be satisfied to the point that work time could be shortened to as little as fifteen hours per week and three hours a day, so that people would have much more leisure time and could turn their attention to art, culture, and metaphysics.[[4086]](#endnote-4087) In their search for new horizons, present-day economists are exploring whether Keynes’ hoped-for shift away from quantity towards quality could perhaps be realised now.[[4087]](#endnote-4088) It was a privilege for me to meet one of them, Paris-based economist Daniel Cohen, when he presented his book The infinite desire for growth at Columbia University in New York City in 2018.[[4088]](#endnote-4089)

There is also the notion of co-responsibility towards future generations that was inspired by philosophers Karl Otto Apel[[4089]](#endnote-4090) and Hans Jonas.[[4090]](#endnote-4091) Their aim is to transcend the ‘naïve’ vision of subjective responsibility, and to open space for broader concepts of collective responsibility through relationships, dialogue, and communication. They call on future international law to entail a Universal Declaration of Human Responsibilities,[[4091]](#endnote-4092) similar to what climate scientist James Gustave ‘Gus’ Speth calls for, namely, a Universal Declaration of Duty.[[4092]](#endnote-4093)

Critical sociologists now affirm the idea of participatory science that is informed by emancipatory purposes — no longer should science simply serve purely cognitive purposes and be neutral. Sociologist Michael Burawoy is one of these sociologists, he calls for a critical turn of public sociology. He looks back on critical sociologist Alvin Gouldner who wrote in 1970 that a sociology is bound to end in deep crisis when its domain assumptions and guiding theories are out of touch with the society they seek to comprehend.[[4093]](#endnote-4094) Gouldner predicted that the days of post-WW II structural functionalism would be numbered,[[4094]](#endnote-4095) given that sociology had lost sight of critique and had subjugated ‘what could be to what is’.[[4095]](#endnote-4096) In 2005, Burawoy called on his colleagues to wake up — if contemporary sociologists want the ‘radical sociology’ of the 1970s to catch up with the revolutionary changes of today’s turbulent world, sociology’s mission must be to transform the world.[[4096]](#endnote-4097) ‘To put it crudely’, Burawoy explains, ‘market tyrannies and state despotisms have deepened inequalities and abrogated freedoms both within and among nations — both tendencies unleashed by the Fall of Communism and consolidated in the aftermath of September 11th’.[[4097]](#endnote-4098) In this situation, the solution must come from civil society, ‘the breeding ground of movements for the defence of human rights, environmental justice, labour conditions’.[[4098]](#endnote-4099) Such movements are ‘sociology’s home ground’, and sociology ‘has an important role to play in these struggles, both in sustaining civil society itself and in nurturing organisations and movements on its terrain’.[[4099]](#endnote-4100)

In 2008, Michael Burawoy wrote an ‘open letter’ to late Charles Wright Mills, a professor of sociology at Columbia University from 1946 until his death in 1962, an influential theoriser of the relationships and class alliances among the U.S. political, military and economic elites. Each fall, when I am at Columbia University, I pass in front of Mills’ former office, and think of Burawoy’s letter that he sent across generations. This was what Burawoy wrote to Mills, ‘Excuse the familiarity, but I’ve known you for a very long time. I first read The power elite (1956) in 1970... You should know that this unmasking of the concentration of power has become a classic text, a mainstay in any political sociology class. It has enduring truth — the interlocking of corporate, military and political elites making life and death decisions that affect us all’.[[4100]](#endnote-4101)

Another important voice is that of Johan Galtung, known as the father of peace research, now ninety years old. It was a great privilege and gift for me that he participated in our 2019 Dignity Conference in the Amazon in Brazil via online connection, after I had met him for the first time in 1998 in Norway and had valued our connection ever since. He proposes a Six Elements Formula for envisioning a better future, shaped by deep culture and deep structure:

* Equity: cooperation for mutual and equal benefit
* Empathy: ability to see and feel reality as the Other does
* Conflict: mutually exclusive goals in present empirical reality
* Trauma: wounds from past violence due to conflict and-or trauma
* Deep culture: reality as in individual and collective subconscious
* Deep structure: patterned interaction, empirical, or potential[[4101]](#endnote-4102)

For Galtung, dialogue is a key starting point to help people speak with each other creatively, including speaking with those whose views one considers hateful or dangerous. The point of conflict-resolving dialogue ‘is not to engage in bargaining or to reach compromises, but to reach a better understanding of the parties’ shared problems and alternative methods of solving them’.[[4102]](#endnote-4103) Dialogue is not enough, however, says Galtung, because dialogue is only good ‘for getting to know each other across gaps of differences’, whereas dialogue is ‘not good enough for symbiosis, for “living together”-ness’. We must go beyond ‘getting to know each other’ and aim for ‘mutual learning’, Galtung advises, and from there, we need to reach for ‘mutual visions’, because only from there can we reach ‘mutual practice’.[[4103]](#endnote-4104)

The former head of the Club of Rome, El Hassan bin Talal, important international thinker and member of the Jordanian royal family, offers a succinct summary of Galtung’s approach when he says, ‘Not conversion, but conversation!’[[4104]](#endnote-4105)

Let me share my experience and my conclusions. For many years, until 1991, I worked as a psychotherapist and counsellor, first in Germany alongside studying medicine, and then for seven years in Egypt. After 1991, I expanded my work from clinical to social psychology and altogether towards a more transdisciplinary approach at a global level. The conversations that I conducted in all contexts I encountered typically uncovered layer upon layer of ‘causes’ of conflicts, just as psychologist Fathali Moghaddam formulated it when he said, ‘A conflict that began as a fight over water can become a fight about identity and collective humiliation, then about land and other resources, then more about religious values’.[[4105]](#endnote-4106) My aim as a psychotherapist has always been to work through all those layers so as to dignify family conversations, and my aim as a transdisciplinary researcher is to do the same also at meso and macro levels — this book is one example. This is also why I design my life as a hands-on facilitation of global family conversations.[[4106]](#endnote-4107)

The global level has become increasingly important for me. Ingathering denotes the shrinking of the world, it is the opportunity for people to communicate with each other more easily than before — communication technology brings people together even in times of pandemics.[[4107]](#endnote-4108) Global conversations can unite the human family across all diversities and infuse ingathering with the promise that human rights ideals offer, namely, that the wounds of humiliation in individuals, groups, and nations can be attended to with love.

Whenever I am part of such conversations, I always strive to uncover the deep emotional roots of human nature that we all have in common, as they evolved during earlier periods of our species’ existence long before the Neolithic Revolution — we can even go back to our hominid ancestor and ask what made bonobos friendly and chimpanzees aggressive.[[4108]](#endnote-4109) Caminos de regreso (return paths) is a maxim that connotes this endeavour — ‘return paths’ aim to lead into the future by turning attention back in time.[[4109]](#endnote-4110) As I see it, only if we succeed with the right kinds of caminos de regreso can we arrive at Martin Luther King Jr.’s vision for a future where the human family shares its world house in dignity.[[4110]](#endnote-4111) As King said in 1967, ‘we still have a choice today: non-violent coexistence or violent co-annihilation’.[[4111]](#endnote-4112)

Morton Deutsch, renowned father of the field of cooperation and conflict resolution, has worked all his life on exploring all aspects of world peace.[[4112]](#endnote-4113) He convened our first Workshop on Transforming Humiliation and Violent Conflict at Columbia University in 2003 and remained our annual honorary convener until he passed away in 2017. Together with his colleague Peter Coleman, the author of the dynamical systems theory, he felt inspired by my global research, and in 2013, Morton Deutsch brought a pledge to our workshop titled ‘Imagine a global human community’:

Imagine a global human community in which you, your children, and grandchildren as well as all the others in our shared planet and their children and grandchildren: ...Are able to live in dignity and are treated fairly. ...Have freedom from the fear of violence and war and can live in peace. ...Have freedom from want so that you do not ever have to live in such impoverished circumstances you and your loved ones cannot have adequate care, food, water, shelter, health services, education, and other necessities for physical and emotional well-being as well as a dignified life. ...Have freedom of information, publication, speech, beliefs, and assembly so that you can be free to be different and free to express open criticism of those in authority individually or collectively. ...Have the responsibility to promote, protect, and defend such freedoms as those described above for yourself as well as for others when they are denied or under threat. ...Will work together cooperatively to make the world that their grandchildren will inherit free of such problems as war, injustice, climate change, and economic disruption.

After reading his pledge, Morton Deutsch sent the following question out to our workshop participants and to the world:

Are you willing to be a member of such a global human community? If ‘yes’, please make the following pledge, ‘I pledge to promote these rights and responsibilities in my own life, in my community, and in the global community as best I can through nonviolent personal actions and working together with others. I also pledge to seek a constructive resolution of conflict about implementation of the foregoing values, when it arises, by working cooperatively to resolve the conflict with those who I am in conflict’.[[4113]](#endnote-4114)

### Leaving behind the tragedy of the commons — Time for the blessings of the commons

At the present juncture in human history, space opens to leave behind the tragedy of the commons — the tragedy that materialises when the short-term selfish interest of a few damages the long-term common interest of the many.[[4114]](#endnote-4115) Space opens for the global human community to succeed in embracing what I call the blessings of the commons. As the world shrinks, as we understand our humble place in the universe, unique opportunities open up to leave tragedy behind. Through global cooperation we can halt free-riding dominators and undo society’s dominator model that lasted for the past millennia and manifested in a neo-liberal extension during the past decades. Every single citizen of this world is called to join in embracing humanity’s responsibility for our planet in humility and wisdom, no longer should we offload this task onto the heavens or strongman leaders. We can shape governance structures of shared responsibility that allow us to celebrate diversity through unity in equality in dignity on the one small planet that is our common home.

Everyone is called to abandon detrimental beliefs. There is, for instance, the belief that only Homo dominans and Homo oeconomicus are able to create a safe future. We need to face, in honest humility, that we are fallible, that we have not always been Homo sapiens et cogitans, rather, more often than not we have been Homo arrogans et ignorans. Now is the time to leave behind arrogance and ignorance, to foster our potential for wisdom, to nurture our ability to think wisely — sapiens — and avoid cogitocide.

The coming ten years will be crucial. History offers us a prime window of opportunity to leave behind our hubris and regain some of the pristine humble pride that many of our ancestors appear to have possessed during the first 97 per cent of our human history. Even though pride can no longer be pristine now — it has been violated by humiliation for too long — still, we can try to heal the traumas that accumulated during the past millennia and build a more dignified future.

In this situation, it would be selfish to retreat into ‘splendid isolation’, what is needed instead is a new global consciousness. Liberation theologian Leonardo Boff laments ‘the foolishness of anti-globalism’:

The moment has come, as palaeontologist and scientist Pierre Teilhard de Chardin prophesied in 1933, when ‘the age of nations has passed. If we do not want to die, it is time to shake off old prejudices and build the Earth’. She is our unique Common Home, the only one we have, as Pope Francis emphasised in his encyclical letter On the caring for the common home (2015). We do not have any other. We are hearing strange prejudices from future power holders and secretaries claiming that globalisation is a communist plot to dominate the world. They are those who, according to Chardin, do not take the time to build the Common Home, but who become prisoners of their petty minded small world, their tiny brains lacking of light. If they cannot see the new shining star, the problem is not with the star, but with their blind eyes.[[4115]](#endnote-4116)

‘It takes a village to raise a child’ is an age-old African adage that applies to the global village now. This global village carries the responsibility of offering to all its newborn a stable environment, to protect them from danger. A human child’s brain develops fastest in the first two to three years and needs a context of affectionate relationships, sufficient nutrition, and opportunities for learning.[[4116]](#endnote-4117) The human brain does not reach full capacity until the age twenty-five, and adolescents’ brains undergo such major modifications[[4117]](#endnote-4118) that particularly young boys need to be caringly held and guided by their communities.[[4118]](#endnote-4119) Experience has shown that male youths of thirteen to fifteen years of age are the most difficult to reach by peace talk,[[4119]](#endnote-4120) even though they are in great need of it, as they are also the ones most vulnerable to being recruited by entrepreneurs of violence.[[4120]](#endnote-4121) One sub-group needs specific attention, namely, those who take risks ‘without thinking’, who engage in ‘impulsive action characterised by insensitivity to risk’, and, even more importantly, those who maintain this behaviour even after adolescence.[[4121]](#endnote-4122) This is where the entire ‘village’ must step in with preventive care and help risk takers grow up to be responsible adults, and, if this is unsuccessful, at least prevent them from ever capturing positions of influence and power in society.[[4122]](#endnote-4123)

I have witnessed the benefits of community-centred care when I worked as a psychologist in Egypt. In the Nile Delta, people have learned to live together for millennia within a circumscribed area of fertile land surrounded by desert. I have often witnessed what I call the ‘twenty-to-two respectful holding’ approach. Imagine a car collision after which the drivers get out of their cars and ‘out of their minds’ and fight with each other in the street. Imagine about ten to twenty able-bodied men appearing from the surrounding offices and shops to constrain the combatants physically while speaking reassuringly with them, allowing them to shout but not to hurt each other. Whenever I saw this happen, it took about ten minutes and the two opponents went their way in peace.[[4123]](#endnote-4124) I am always delighted when I come across variations of such ‘respectful holding’ approaches in other parts of the world.[[4124]](#endnote-4125)

In my view, this approach is what all citizens in the global village would benefit from learning now. There is a particular role for older and wiser men in containing their younger peers who engage in ‘impulsive action characterised by insensitivity to risk’. Particularly fatherless youths are vulnerable, and even more so youths whose fathers humiliated them.[[4125]](#endnote-4126) If such youths grow up without learning ‘sensitivity to risk’, and, worse, if they are allowed to take power in society when they grow up, danger is pre-programmed. It is unsafe for a society to allow people to become leaders who have not grown out of the habit of wanting to compete for ‘who has the longest penis’, to use the blunt and figurative language that nowadays fills un-social media. Society’s survival depends on older males who have learned to ‘connect penis with heart and mind’, who can keep young men from idolising ‘James Bond’,[[4126]](#endnote-4127) who can prevent young men from mindlessly worshipping the ‘four stereotypically masculine skills’ of ‘punching, drinking, fucking, and money’.[[4127]](#endnote-4128) Society needs older males who have learned to think long term, who are not blind to risk, who can acknowledge that female carers sometimes are better leaders than male fighters. We need the wisest of our veterans to introduce mindfulness-based programs already into elementary schools.[[4128]](#endnote-4129)

Dictators such as Adolf Hitler may have suffered from blindness to risk, and also among contemporary narcissistic leaders there is no lack of what has been called ‘idiotic risk taking’.[[4129]](#endnote-4130) The infamous ‘City boys’, the stock traders of the London City and Wall Street financial districts seem immune to fear of risk. Silicon Valley triumphalists even build their business models on the propagation of insensitivity to risk as a cultural icon.[[4130]](#endnote-4131) When caution is deemed old-fashioned and insensitivity accepted as future-oriented ‘coolness’, then society as a whole is guilty of failing its task to prevent the social-psychological handicap suffered by a small segment of society — ‘males on speed’ — from destroying all of humanity’s future.

Naomi Klein, author of The shock doctrine: The rise of disaster capitalism, spotlights the misguided attitudes about care as they are exposed by the coronavirus pandemic:

...one of the things I really feel is being unveiled here has to do with care, has to do with the labour of care which is so systematically ... denigrated and devalued... We do not value the work of care because under capitalism we don’t want to admit that we are interdependent. We don’t want to admit that our success is never just our own... Overwhelmingly the people who do the work of care of propping up the whole structure are women, women of colour, people of colour.[[4131]](#endnote-4132)

Modern humans began to walk planet Earth only very recently, somewhere between two or three hundred thousand years ago.[[4132]](#endnote-4133) Since then, our species had to face many challenges, they had to adapt to conditions of life that often changed dramatically. We have survived because we are so adaptable. So far, our adaptation efforts were more or less haphazard. We were ‘puppets’ of history insofar as we were always late, adapting to problems post-hoc, including problems we had created ourselves.

Now we find ourselves in a situation that is both similar and new. We are in a transitional phase similar to the one that began about twelve thousand years ago when what is known as Neolithic Revolution unfolded. Our ancestors moved from one set of conditions to a fundamentally different one — from abundant unbounded resources to finite boundedness. They did so without sufficient knowledge about the larger context of planet Earth, with the result that their adaptation — competition for domination — leaves us now with depleted resources — from win-win to win-lose, and now to lose-lose. This is new. Now we must do better, now we have all the knowledge needed to repair our ancestors’ maladaptations and bring their transition to a more sustainable and foresightful completion. We have no excuse for failure, our starting position is so much better than that of our ancestors. This is also new.

We have to be fast, though. We have ten years to outgrow twelve thousand years of behaviour. We have entered what physicist Paul Raskin calls the planetary phase of civilisation, where strands of interdependence weave humanity and Earth into a single community of fate on its way to sharing one single Earthland.[[4133]](#endnote-4134) Raskin reflects on the pace of social evolution, how it has quickened throughout human history, and he wonders whether this acceleration is a mere coincidence or the manifestation of an underlying historical principle:

The complexification and enlargement of society also quickens the pace of social evolution. Just as historical change moves more rapidly than biological change (and far more rapidly than geological change), so, too, is history itself accelerating. As the figure suggests, the Stone Age endured about 100,000 years; Early Civilisation, roughly 10,000 years; and the Modern Era, now drawing to a close, began to stir nearly 1000 years ago. If the Planetary Phase were to play out over 100 years, this sequence of exponentially decreasing timespans would persist.[[4134]](#endnote-4135)

In this situation, we need a shift from a machine principle to a life principle, as architect Kisho Kurokawa formulated it — and this shift waits to be brought about locally and globally and not just in architectural designs.[[4135]](#endnote-4136) Nobody should be ‘degraded into a cog in the power-accumulating machine’, as political theorist Hannah Arendt formulated it, we need to resist ‘the capitalist transformation of the body into a work-machine’, as scholar Silvia Federici said it.[[4136]](#endnote-4137) Physicist Fritjof Capra uses similar words when he asks us to shift from ‘seeing the world as a machine to understanding it as a network’.[[4137]](#endnote-4138)

Yet, there is a problem. Even if all wise old men stood up to help young firebrands to grow into responsible adults and lovingly embrace the life principle and reclaim our commons, not all will listen. There will always be some ruthless would-be dominators who will see commons as a resource waiting to be exploited — researchers inform us that we can expect about half of the population to be made up of ‘saints’ and ‘loyalists’, and about a third by ‘ruthless competitors’.[[4138]](#endnote-4139) This challenge cannot be addressed at the level of the individual — salvation cannot come from the ‘lone hero’ with a gun — it requires systemic solutions. Research shows that different frames can change this ratio — a ‘Wall Street’ framing increases the share of dominators, a communal framing encourages the loyalists.[[4139]](#endnote-4140) In other words, we need institutional frames that decrease the number of ruthless competitors systemically so that the majority can prevent the remaining ones from hijacking the system. For an interconnected finite world this means that systemic frames are required that shape communal rules for the global village. To use the language of game theory and negotiation, the interest of all of humankind waits to be honoured rather than the position of a few dominators — the interest of humankind is to have a life worth living in our interconnected and finite Earthland.[[4140]](#endnote-4141) This is why ‘anti-globalism’ is selfish — as long as appropriate global frames are lacking, ‘splendid isolation’ is irresponsible.

In the past, many humanitarian helpers strove to offer ‘help to self-help’, they wanted to enable people to ‘learn to fish’ rather than simply ‘receiving fish’. In our current situation, much more is needed than simply ‘teaching the poor to fish’. Even reforming the fishing industry is insufficient. What waits to happen is the remodelling of the world-system beyond the concept of ‘competitive industry’ altogether, towards one of ‘joint care’.

Our task as humanity is to build systemic global frames that allow us to leave the tragedy of the commons behind and embrace the blessings of the commons. The time has come for the blessings of planet Earth as a commons to be shared by all living beings walking this planet. I call on all the healers of this world, all the medical doctors, all the nurses, all the psychotherapists, all the parents, whoever can shoulder responsibility, to come to the fore and help heal and protect our commons.

Physicians are in the unique position, as they know that medicine can taste bitter and patients may dislike it. Patients would have no chance to get better if physicians were to act like politicians. Politicians, hoping to be re-elected, are usually tempted to decrease the dose of the medicine to accommodate their voters’ resistance. Let us therefore all become physicians. Let us also call on all the traffic police of the world. It is their profession to deal with people who hate red lights and ask for green lights all the way. Traffic would collapse if all red lights were abolished. Before elections, many politicians promise sweet medicine and green lights for everyone, while in the face of sociocide and ecocide, we need to accept that some medicine tastes bitter and some lights need to be red.

We need heroic sacrifice now to make the world rich in dignity. Adolf Hitler made the world rich in suffering when he abused his followers’ willingness to sacrifice, and this is also what our contemporary populists and conspiracy entrepreneurs do.[[4141]](#endnote-4142) Now we depend on a new kind of sacrifice.

The coronavirus crisis highlights the need for heroic collective nurturing of sustainable communal solidarity, no longer profit maximisation for a few, no longer the invalidation of the suffering of the rest.[[4142]](#endnote-4143) The crisis calls for the strengthening of dignifying institutions of loving care in the place of institutions that allow for systemic exploitation. As I see it, we need to rethink our entire economic architecture, there cannot be a ‘private sector’ versus a ‘public sector’ when ‘privatisation’ means selling out our public commons under the guise of freedom of choice. It is not enough to hope for a few benevolent investors and philanthropist to save us. ‘The verdict of history will be harsh’, warns Jan Egeland, Secretary General of the Norwegian Refugee Council, as ‘wealthy nations leave millions behind with alarming funding disparities’.[[4143]](#endnote-4144)

Crises will arrive soon that will be much larger than virus pandemics — we are only at the beginning of the consequences of our degradation of our ecosphere. We can and must do better in the future. A global system of care is needed.

### Leaving behind the security dilemma — Time for the blessings of human security

If a planful transition into a decent future shall succeed, innovative future-oriented ideas need space to unfold. We have to do better than in the past when ideas that irritated power had to ‘go into exile’. When Ottoman Sultan Mehmed II conquered Constantinople in 1453, many Byzantine scholars fled to Europe where they ‘seeded’ the Enlightenment. Spain lost its creative scholars through the Inquisition. Anti-Semitism did the same to Germany, and it was the rest of the world that benefitted — universities around the world are indebted to their immigrants’ legacy for the inspiration they brought.

My global experience indicates that we are utterly unprepared for the historically unprecedented moment we are in, for the opportunity we are being given, for the need to make it flourish rather than squandering it. No history lesson can provide a road map or a blueprint. History does not mindlessly repeat itself, it does not go in circles, and it does not automatically produce ever-greater progress, nor does it predetermine demise. All around the world, I observe that the novelty of the current opportunity still waits to be fully grasped.

Anthropologist William Ury captures our opportunity in one sentence, ‘For the first time since the origin of our species, humanity is in touch with itself’.[[4144]](#endnote-4145) No longer are we condemned to be hapless victims of history, no longer do we have to accept as if it were a law of nature that ‘civilisations flourish’ only to ‘fall again’.[[4145]](#endnote-4146) For the first time in our history, we can build a global civilisation intentionally that merits the label civilisation. We can heed the African adage that ‘it takes a village to raise a child’ and shape a global village that takes its responsibility seriously.[[4146]](#endnote-4147) No longer do we need to transfer trauma from one generation to the next and thus injure entire populations,[[4147]](#endnote-4148) we can become nurturant parents who transfer health to subsequent generations.

Today we, as humankind, are in the privileged position that we have all the resources needed to co-create our global village as a safe space for innovative forward-looking ideas.[[4148]](#endnote-4149) Unlike our forebears, we have everything required to build mutual trust and responsible solidarity, to nurture a global community that heeds the fact that we are one single species of Homo sapiens on one single vulnerable planet — that we are one humanity on one planet. We have all the tools needed to shape our future path in purposeful ways by sitting together, reflect, and then act more deliberately and effectively than ever before in our history. We can attenuate all of the tragic dilemmas of the past millennia — from the commons dilemma to the security dilemma — through the globalisation of care in connectedness and compassion.[[4149]](#endnote-4150) By building global trust, we can prevent cycles of humiliation from re-stoking the military security dilemma that kept the world divided for the past millennia.[[4150]](#endnote-4151) We can finally enjoy the blessings of human security.[[4151]](#endnote-4152)

As it stands now, progress by way of business as usual is an impossible utopian fantasy, for several reasons. Among those reasons is the fact that the phenomenon of humiliation becomes more salient — the very raison-d’être for this book. It becomes more salient because the combination of globalisation and human rights ideals intensifies feelings of humiliation, which, in turn, have the potential to incite rounds of competition for domination that are more deadly than before, with omnicidal consequences.

It all starts with ingathering — both opportunities and problems are related to the coming-together of all of humankind, whereby global cooperation is the opportunity, while global cycles of humiliation are the problem. First to the problem. Ingathering brings people out of isolation and provides them with the opportunity to compare, thus turning absolute deprivation into relative deprivation. As long as human rights ideals are absent, inequality can be explained as divinely ordained or nature’s order, and relative deprivation is not a problem. As soon as human rights ideals become salient, however, they remove such justifications and turn relative deprivation into an illegitimate violation. As a result, wherever and whenever human rights ideals are salient and then betrayed, anger is on the rise.[[4152]](#endnote-4153) In the language of dignity humiliation, it is humiliating to be shown the amenities of modern life in Western soap operas, and to be invited into the family of equals by human rights rhetoric, while simultaneously being deprived of those amenities, deprived not through natural disasters nor divine intervention, but through exploiters who hide behind double standards. Feelings of angry humiliation rise upon such betrayals. Whenever this happens, whenever deprivation transmutes into humiliation, the humiliators can deem themselves lucky if they are not sought out as targets for revenge. When humiliated masses rage against perceived humiliators, only Mandelas can lead them into peace. In the worst case, what I call cross back happens and feelings of dignity humiliation, instead of inspiring peaceful resistance, fuel violent acts of revenge derived from the toolkit of honour humiliation. These are the ominous pitchforks of the French revolution.[[4153]](#endnote-4154)

In this situation, even a world of equal material wealth for all, as important as it is, would not necessarily remove humiliation. Material wealth that is offered without respect for equal dignity may humiliate even more. Being given material possessions without dignity can be felt like selling out for money, like losing face, the face of honour and of dignity.[[4154]](#endnote-4155) In addition, as has been pointed out several times in this book (see more in chapter 8, for instance), material resources provide the very means to turn disaffection into destructive action. This is what early sociologist Alexis de Tocqueville observed in 1856 when he said that the danger of revolution is greatest not when poverty is so severe that it causes apathy and despair but when conditions had been improving, yet only for a few and not for the rest.[[4155]](#endnote-4156)

We live in times where true Realpolitik means embarking on the kind of visionary ‘idealism’ that hitherto has been denigrated as ‘unrealistic’. For the first time in human history, self-interest converges with global common interest — nobody can survive alone on this planet, even less so in opposition to others. It is in the interest of everyone to join hands in cooperation with everyone else in equal dignity and address our global social and ecological emergencies together. Ideals of equality in dignity for all in solidarity represent the only normative framework that is suitable for a globally interconnected and decent knowledge society, a society where knowledge is a common good rather than artificially made scarce and used as ammunition in ever more destructive rounds of competition for domination. For humanity’s survival in dignity, these ideals are the only realistic framework there is, much more realistic than what self-declared realists pass on as realism. In today’s world of opportunity, the concept of a ‘Machiavellian cosmos’ is nothing more than an anachronistic and tragic self-fulfilling prophecy.[[4156]](#endnote-4157)

The desire for equal dignity is deeply embedded in the bodyminds of human beings — after almost fifty years of living globally, I can attest to having observed this everywhere. Human rights ideals are far from mere Western impositions. A ‘dignity cosmos for all’ entails a promise of well-being and meaningfulness that is much higher than that of a ‘Machiavellian cosmos’ — ethically, psychologically, and practically, for individuals as much as for societies. The promise of global unity in diversity is a much higher promise than that of a divided world where local unity feeds the global cruelty of ‘we united against you’.

I am always astonished when people call me an ‘idealist’ when I explain that my work is inspired by the insight that the survival of humankind is at stake and that global cooperation in dignity is the only way out. I ask back what could be more ‘real’ than wanting to avoid extinction? Standing in front of a drowning person, a sinking ship, a burning house, what could be more real than wanting to attempt to rescue, as futile as it may be? The argument that cogitocide, sociocide, and ecocide put human survival at risk is more than an abstract ethical discussion, it is a question of life and death. In the spirit of Occam’s razor, in the face of melting ice caps, no high-flying moral argument is needed to heed this message.[[4157]](#endnote-4158)

This does not mean that deeper moral deliberations are unimportant. Each year I meet more people all around the world who feel that planet Earth would be better off without humans and that humanity’s survival is not a worthy aim altogether, given the hubris with which Homo arrogans et ignorans has treated its habitat. Perhaps a dignified future for humankind is an unattainable goal, many wonder. Indeed, they may be right.

I join all those who do not wish to lose time on probability calculations as to whether a dignified survival of humanity is worth working for or not. I avoid simplistic notions of ‘positive messaging’. I resonate with those who say, ‘We’re not optimists, pessimists, or notionists at all. We are, first and foremost, realists. We understand limits to growth, and we know we must do the yeoman work of rowing upstream in the river of political economy’.[[4158]](#endnote-4159) In times of crisis, sometimes negative messaging is the only truly positive approach.

I have often asked myself why I do the dignity work I do. Is it ‘good’ work? I do not wish to join all those who live blissfully in the self-congratulatory illusion of their own ‘goodness’. How can I tell what is good from what is bad? These are meta-ethical questions about the nature of ethical properties and evaluations. Earlier, I referred to ancient Greek philosopher Plato and why I avoid using the word ‘good’ in European languages. I am wary of the materialistic spin in the notion of agathón with its meaning of both ‘the good’ and ‘goods’.[[4159]](#endnote-4160) ‘Goodness’ is ‘indefinable’, it is impossible to define ‘good’ in terms of natural properties such as ‘pleasant’ or ‘desirable’, and one can also not appeal to nature and say that a thing is good simply because it is ‘natural’ or bad because it is ‘unnatural’.[[4160]](#endnote-4161) At the same time, we often have an intuitive a priori awareness of moral properties or moral truths, as philosopher George Edward Moore has pointed out long ago.[[4161]](#endnote-4162)

I have often reflected on Moore’s ‘intuition’ and asked myself which intuition motivates me to give priority to unconditional love, love without expecting anything in return, love without justification.[[4162]](#endnote-4163) Glen Martin was introduced before, professor of philosophy and religious studies, who acknowledged my words about love and ‘how love is not an emotion and not a good that descends on us from nowhere, but must become an institutionalised, culturalised, and personalised way of living on the Earth’.[[4163]](#endnote-4164)

For the world as a whole — for the ‘global street’ so to speak, beyond the ‘Arab street’ on its way to a dignity revolution — I see no alternative to creating loving and caring trans-national and trans-local capacities, no alternative to global inter-human relations to supplement inter-national relations, no alternative to a global interlinkage of all local ‘civic and ethical entrepreneurial networks that are currently in development’.[[4164]](#endnote-4165) This is why I dedicate my life to creating a dignity movement not just locally but globally. This is why I call on the entire global village rather than only on one local village to shoulder the responsibility of co-creating future-oriented dignifying relationships and institutions globally and locally. This is why I refuse offloading blame on personal vices such as greed or sloth, or on the crimes of those who came before us. This is why I choose to work for forward-looking global institutions that heed the insight that, to use psychologist Kenneth Gergen’s words, ‘all-encompassing compassion is possible; if I am in you, and you within me, then mutual caring should replace antagonism’.[[4165]](#endnote-4166) With Kenneth Gergen, I call on us to replace the Hobbesian dystopia of ‘all against all’ with the global vision of ‘all with all’.[[4166]](#endnote-4167)

If we want to facilitate cooperation and sharing, there are many traditions from which we can learn and reap a rich harvest. For instance, we can look at the pantheist worldview — from the early work of Heraclitus and Plotinus to Spinoza and Ralph Waldo Emerson for whom God is all, for whom no separate entity or bounded entity called God exists as in theist traditions — and we can appreciate eco-theology that sees the sacred in the wholeness of nature.[[4167]](#endnote-4168) Alfred North Whitehead was a mathematician and philosopher, father of process religion and process philosophy, who inspired a wide variety of disciplines, including ecology, theology, education, physics, biology, economics, and psychology.[[4168]](#endnote-4169) Process philosophy sees the fundamental reality as one of continuous change, of continuous becoming, where what we take as enduring reality is only a momentary concrescence, a momentary coming together of ‘occasions of experience’.[[4169]](#endnote-4170) Thinkers in Sufism see every phenomenon as imbued with sacredness, and in Buddhism, scholars speak of co-dependent origination, of pure relatedness of all, of the inter-being of everything in everything else.[[4170]](#endnote-4171) Actor-network theory regards causality as not linear, it sees humans and non-humans in relation with one another, where any element in a system has ‘the capacity to enrol the actions of any other element in its functioning’.[[4171]](#endnote-4172) Theorist Karen Barad, in drawing on the insights of physicist Niels Bohr, goes even further than actor-network theory, for her, phenomena are not ideational concepts, nor are they assemblages of humans and non-humans (as in actor-network theory), they are the condition of possibility of humans and non-humans in their very materiality. Onto-epistem-ology is the study of practices of knowing-in-being, of intra-actions.[[4172]](#endnote-4173) Barad speaks of agential realism and that we are ‘emergent from a dynamic field of possibilities’.[[4173]](#endnote-4174) (See more in chapter 7.)

Ecotheologian Thomas Berry envisions a transition towards an Ecozoic Era, a transition from a period where humans are ‘a disruptive force on the planet Earth’ towards a period where humans become ‘present to the planet in a manner that is mutually enhancing’.[[4174]](#endnote-4175) For Berry, ‘becoming present to the Earth implies becoming present to each other as humans in mutually respectful and dignified ways’.[[4175]](#endnote-4176) Berry’s message speaks to cultural ecologist and geophilosopher David Abram, who has fertilised fields such as ecophenomenology and ecological linguistics, together with ecopsychology as a theoretical discipline and therapeutic practice. Abram coined the phrase ‘more-than-human world’ with the aim to urge humanity to embrace with humility the fact that we are only one part of a broader commonwealth of earthly life.[[4176]](#endnote-4177)

Some of my rich American friends dream of a world without any government, kept afloat by ‘free’ competition — some would add charitable philanthropy, others not. I urge them to read the above listed thinkers’ ideas and try to understand that the concept of ‘freedom for might to become right’[[4177]](#endnote-4178) does not create well-being for all in equality in dignity, on the contrary, it creates a world of vast inequalities and suffering for the majority, a suffering that cannot be adequately remedied with even the best-intended philanthropy.[[4178]](#endnote-4179) Whoever wishes to build a ship will understand that for a ship to function, a masterplan is needed. If one of my rich friends were to plan on building a ship and were to approach a few moneyed friends for donations, then one friend may love sails, another motors, a third furniture, so the result would never be a functioning ship — or a functioning global and local economic system for that matter. As long as the masterplan is left to be drawn up by a few powerful privileged individuals — even the most well-intentioned ones — who place their investments according to their personal preferences, decent global systemic design will remain wanting.[[4179]](#endnote-4180) Charitable donations cannot be the path to global planning, not to speak of the fact that the very notion of charity, even if offered with the best intent, often has disempowering and humiliating effects.[[4180]](#endnote-4181) Charity is unable to replace ethics — we only need to look back in history to George Hibbert, a slave-owner and outspoken pro-slavery activist, who at the same time donated significant amounts of money to charitable causes.[[4181]](#endnote-4182)

Think of Titanic: Inhabitants of the Global North, citizens of so-called developed countries, are the ones who live on the luxury first floor of the cruise ship, where they enjoy fireworks by ripping out planks from the hull of the ship where the poor people live. When they see cracks in their luxury cabins, they repair them with ‘golden Band Aids’, while they overlook the huge holes they create further down in the ship. Offering alms to the poor does not achieve what is needed, namely, a new design of the ship and a new course. Might-is-right competition, even if combined with the world’s best philanthropy, cannot be allowed to define the design of global strategies.

‘When restless billionaires trip on their toys’ is the title of an article that says, ‘Welcome to the age — and whimsy — of the new billionaire class and the precariousness of vanity projects. With so much money sloshing around, and more and more of the super wealthy pushing into areas beyond their expertise, it is likely we will see more headlines about the failure of some of these fanciful investments and philanthropic experiments’.[[4182]](#endnote-4183) Those are the same headlines that subsequently serve as a resource for conspiracy entrepreneurs to exploit and monetise — we see many ‘small profiteers’ profiting from the suffering caused by a few ‘large profiteers’.[[4183]](#endnote-4184)

In this situation, let us ask, together with social anthropologist Thomas Hylland Eriksen, ‘What could be a feasible alternative in a world society which seems to have locked itself to a path which is bound to end with collapse?’[[4184]](#endnote-4185) ‘There is no simple, or single, answer to this, the most important question of our time’, replies Eriksen. ‘Indeed, there is not even general agreement about how to phrase the question ... one size does not fit all ... there is no reason to assume that what works in Costa Rica will work Nepal.[[4185]](#endnote-4186) Each place is interwoven with every other place, but they also remain distinctive and unique’.[[4186]](#endnote-4187)

The ‘most important question of our time’ as Eriksen formulates it, is currently being asked by more and more people all around the world. John Fullerton, member of the Club of Rome, sees no other solution than deep global systemic change.[[4187]](#endnote-4188) Physicist Paul Raskin works for of a great transition[[4188]](#endnote-4189) to be brought about by a global citizens movement,[[4189]](#endnote-4190) a transition that needs ‘a systemic transformation from a market-centric to a commons-centric form’ to succeed.[[4190]](#endnote-4191) ‘A new phase of the alter-globalisation movement needs to be invented’.[[4191]](#endnote-4192)

Many multilateral initiatives have already been brought on its way, for instance, the Arms Trade Treaty in 2014,[[4192]](#endnote-4193) the Nuclear Weapon Ban Treaty in 2017,[[4193]](#endnote-4194) or the Alliance for Multilateralism in 2019.[[4194]](#endnote-4195) There is the World Order Models Project,[[4195]](#endnote-4196) the Earth Constitution,[[4196]](#endnote-4197) the World Federation,[[4197]](#endnote-4198) the World Federalist Movement,[[4198]](#endnote-4199) and the Association of World Citizens.[[4199]](#endnote-4200) There is the Eco-Civilisation Project, the Sustainability Transition Research Network, The Great Turning, the Metanarrative Project, The Next System, the New Economics Foundation, the Transition Towns, the World Academy of Art and Science Project, Progressive International, Big History, the Wellbeing Economy Alliance, and the Cultural Evolution Society.[[4200]](#endnote-4201)

My work, including this book, is part of this list of initiatives and efforts. This book draws together many voices that contribute to a larger orchestra, and I had the privilege of meeting some of humanity’s contemporary pioneers and visionaries in person.[[4201]](#endnote-4202) Together with my dear colleague Linda Hartling and our dignity fellowship, we gather a global community of people who wish to work for dignity, we convene a ‘global family of dignity’.[[4202]](#endnote-4203) We call for the globalisation of mutual care and trust in connectedness and compassion, for global solidarity in lovingly shared responsibility, for an ‘ever-evolving movement toward mutually beneficial growth in all relationships’.[[4203]](#endnote-4204) The aim is that we, as humanity, overcome the presently prevailing globalisation of extraction, exploitation, domination, mistrust, and cruel irresponsibility.[[4204]](#endnote-4205) In our global dignity community, we resonate with those who say that ‘apart from some technological miracle’ the only thing that will solve the challenges to be expected is ‘a level of international cooperation and coming together we’ve never seen before’ — and we worry when we hear people call for ‘every country for itself’, as this would mean that we ‘run lemminglike over the cliff together’.[[4205]](#endnote-4206) Indeed, ‘without a revolution in how billions of humans conduct their lives’, some parts of the Earth could become ‘close to uninhabitable’ ‘as soon as the end of this century’, and ‘other parts horrifically inhospitable’.[[4206]](#endnote-4207)

Every day, I ask myself how we may manifest unity in diversity of ‘all with all’ and globalise solidarity within our planetary boundaries. How may we overcome age-old competition for domination, how can we leave behind the tragic security dilemma with its notoriously evasive military security, how can we instead realise the blessings of certainty through global human security? How can we change our ‘earth emotions’,[[4207]](#endnote-4208) and this at a massive enough scale and speed, so that a ‘global collective conscience’ can arise and be enshrined in governing systems that serve all of the planet with all of its living beings?[[4208]](#endnote-4209) How can we change the generative mechanisms,[[4209]](#endnote-4210) the constitutive rules[[4210]](#endnote-4211) that frame our human affairs at the highest global macro level, in ways that they can fill all layers and all spaces of our activities, down to the last village, with systemic support for dignity rather than indignity? What are the core fulcrums to make a dignified future real? Can we materialise what I call dignism?

Over the years, I have come across many valuable bottom-up initiatives, yet, usually I saw them crash against the ‘walls’ of global constitutive rules and falter at some point — in chapter 10, I explain sociologist Pierre Bourdieu’s notion of referred elimination. As I see it, communal sharing — Alan Page Fiske’s concept of solidarity — is the only concept that is suitable to guide the design of our constitutive rules at macro levels, while market pricing awaits to be demoted from ruler to servant.[[4211]](#endnote-4212) Only then can unity in diversity flourish in dignity at local levels as well, only then can bottom-up initiatives succeed, only then can charity be truly dignifying. The main point, from my perspective, is to find ways to ensure, qua system, that face-to-face inter-human solidarity can unfold at all levels, micro, meso, and micro levels.[[4212]](#endnote-4213) If market pricing is allowed to continue as an all-encompassing global guiding frame, if the social and ecological damages it inflicts are simply abetted through random charity or through a few new regulatory rules and proximate drivers of change,[[4213]](#endnote-4214) the result will be more social and ecological degradation. As long as ‘the market’ is expected to be ‘wise’, trusted to align ‘what is done’ with ‘what is needed to be done’, mutual trust and care will continue to be eroded systemically and most of what is needed to be done will remain undone, because only what is being paid for will be done, only what is ‘profitable’.

All over the world, I observe how Buberian I-Thou relationships are crowded out when inter-human relationships are structured by abstract contracts based on monetary exchanges. The solution is not small government nor big government. When I look around in this world, I see the falsity of the argument of small versus big government everywhere — Somalia’s government is too small, for instance, while North Korea’s is too big. As long as our global constitutive rules are defined by market pricing, the capacities of local initiatives to effect change will remain restricted and the power vacuum caused by the absence of governance at the global level will be filled with corporate activities that are likely to create the very global tyranny that is feared by those who aim for ‘small government’.[[4214]](#endnote-4215) The solution is neither too big nor too small government for our global village, it is decent governance.[[4215]](#endnote-4216) Decent governance means shaping constitutive rules with the help of the subsidiarity principle for the realisation of global and local unity in diversity.

Already in 2012, in my book on a dignity economy, I gathered many arguments and many voices.[[4216]](#endnote-4217) Much of the mathematical modelling that present-day mainstream economists still engage in is too limited.[[4217]](#endnote-4218) It is evident that ‘endless growth on a finite planet is a logical impossibility’.[[4218]](#endnote-4219) All regimes of accumulation are infeasible in the long term, be they accumulation by Fordist/Keynesian or by neo-liberal strategies.[[4219]](#endnote-4220) Systemic change is urgently needed when life depends on investments and sales, both of which are fragile and tend to fail. Systemic change is mandatory when ‘the physical welfare and the sense of self-worth of the people depend on an unreliable economic motor with built-in tendencies toward social chaos and ecological disaster’.[[4220]](#endnote-4221)

Like me, Paul Raskin uses the trope of a ship when he speaks of Earthland, which is his name for the multitiered world we live in today, a world that ‘overlays globalised dynamics across a mosaic of modern, pre-modern, and even remnants of Stone Age cultures’:

On board, white-knuckled passengers are awakening to their existential quandary. They tremulously inquire about location and direction, but bewildered cabin attendants can provide only disjointed information and unpersuasive reassurances. In the cockpit, the insouciant captains cast desultory glances at the flight screens or doze, awaiting instructions from perplexed navigators.[[4221]](#endnote-4222)

Paul Raskin crafts artful formulations to describe the passengers’ psychological responses to sailing on a ship in distress: Some discount all dangers with ‘sweet denial, finding distraction in passing amusements and baubles, and seeking succour in the false panaceas of free markets, religious rapture, or individual beatitude’.[[4222]](#endnote-4223) Others confront their plight open-eyed, but, ‘seeing no way out’, they ‘turn away in fatalistic despair’, while most ‘are just trying to muddle through, keeping their heads down and hoping for the best’.[[4223]](#endnote-4224)

Most people do not dare to face the insight that global interconnectedness makes isolationist and/or power-over strategies obsolete. When ‘global-scale processes increasingly influence the operation and stability of subsystems’, then reductive partitioning into ‘semi-autonomous entities — states, ecosystems, cultures, territories — becomes inaccurate and misleading’.[[4224]](#endnote-4225) ‘Zombie ideologies’ such as ‘territorial chauvinism, unbridled consumerism, and the illusion of endless growth’, held dear by a ‘myopic and disputatious political order’, need to transform into ‘coherent responses to systemic risks of climate change, economic instability, population displacement, and global terrorism’, to name just a few of those risks.[[4225]](#endnote-4226)

Cogitocide, the killing of our cogitosphere, the destruction of our realm of reflection, is the sad outcome if we allow our infosphere to become sightless, this is the verdict of the former head of the Club of Rome, Prince El Hassan bin Talal (see more in chapter 7).[[4226]](#endnote-4227)

Do all these thinkers aim for utopia? Do I aim for utopia? Yes and no. Continuing with business as usual is an impossible utopia. But there is also necessary utopia — eutopia.[[4227]](#endnote-4228) ‘In immoderate times, moderation becomes imprudent — madness in reason’s mask. The business-as-usual utopianism of Market Forces ideology is an egregious case of crackpot realism’, this is also Raskin’s verdict, borrowing a phrase from C. Wright Mills.[[4228]](#endnote-4229)

If we continue on our current path, also psychologist Kirk Schneider warns, we risk becoming mechanically driven puppets, numb to our possibilities and blind to our servitude.[[4229]](#endnote-4230) The most critical problem of our age, he points out, is the loss of the spirituality of awe that is at the very heart of humanity. In the delirium of a robotic revolution and quick fix-instant result society, what is lost is the miracle of the unknown, the humility and wonder, the sense of adventure towards life.

The first step, and I proposed this already in my book on humiliation and international conflict in 2006, is for all of us to cool down, to take a step back, to tune down our profit-driven agitation machine that exploits our anxieties, a machine that rewards all those who feel ‘lust for combat’ and sets in motion ever new cycles of humiliation. The aim must rather be to engage in forward-looking dialogue with a calm and loving heart and mind.[[4230]](#endnote-4231)

We need an empathic civilisation, as called for by social theorist and activist Jeremy Rifkin,[[4231]](#endnote-4232) we need the decent society of philosopher Avishai Margalit,[[4232]](#endnote-4233) and we need this fast and globally. We need a humanism that is inclusive, that acknowledges animals as co-citizens.[[4233]](#endnote-4234) Intercultural psychologist Anthony Marsella calls on us to move beyond our identification and pre-occupation with humanity (such as in humanism, humanitarian, or humanistic) and instead ‘move to an identity with life’, he calls it lifeism.[[4234]](#endnote-4235) This is our responsibility to Earthothers.[[4235]](#endnote-4236)

By drawing all voices together, we can formulate a sacred life principle, we can manifest big love, we can recognise, protect, and enjoy the blessings of our commons and the blessings of human security locally and globally. This is what I call dignism.

### The many options for action

We humans need narratives that anchor us in the world, that tell us where we come from and where we go, that provide us with long-term explanations about life’s meaning and what our true significance is.[[4236]](#endnote-4237) Religions, family legends, clan and national myths, they all provide meta-narratives that explain ‘everything’. These narratives often have such force that people are willing to die for them.

Peace philosopher Howard Richards faults post-modernist critics for leaving us with a cruel choice: either no meta-narrative or toxic meta-narratives. Richards fears that the discrediting of modernity has favoured the rise of fundamentalisms that are fatally hostile to the Enlightenment.[[4237]](#endnote-4238)

Can we do better? Can we create new meta-narratives that truly enlighten our Earth community and bring us together? Or will each group continue to create its own narrative of ‘we against them’ and thus divide the world? Can we shape meta-narratives that are credible, convincing, and globally inclusive, narratives that explain why humankind stands at the abyss facing extinction, narratives that at the same time help us with what we can do?

I have devised a model of four logics to attend to that question. I begin by stepping into a bird’s eye perspective, looking at all of human history. When I did so for the first time, I realised how much strength this move can give us, the very strength we need to shape our future with a sober mind. It can give us the courage to find dignifying ways into the future while accepting with loving compassion the dark shadows of our species and our past. It allows us to avoid having to invest all our energies into desperate or enraged finger-pointing.

If we say that modern humans began to walk planet Earth between two or three hundred thousand years ago, and that we have survived as a species because we are sapiens or wise,[[4238]](#endnote-4239) then our ancestors’ adaptations throughout the last three per cent of our history, the period following the Neolithic Revolution, were less than optimal. We were always late, adapting to problems post-hoc, and necessarily so, because we could not know better. Our forebears could not know that we live on a small spherical globe ‘lost in space’. As they could not see their limitations, we became Homo ignorans et arrogans. Now, for the first time, we can do better. We are in the unique position to become truly sapiens, truly wise. We possess all the knowledge our ancestors did not possess. Our forebears had the skills but not the knowledge, we have both, if we revive their skills.

I call the first 97 per cent of human history the era of pristine pride, pride that had not yet been touched by humiliation (see more in chapter 9). Our ancestors lived in small mobile groups and followed the wild food around them wherever it was abundant, not yet aware that planet Earth is limited in size. Then, around twelve thousand years ago, a new era began, the past three per cent of our history. I call it the era of honour, or, more precisely, the era of collectivistic ranked honour. We became sedentary and preparations for war became our continuous preoccupation, after all, we had many neighbours who could quickly become our enemies. Our Palaeolithic sense of unbounded embeddedness in nature and in relationships of mutuality lost its grounding and we began to compete for dominance over each other and nature. Dominance over each other and nature, however, is a dead-end strategy in the long run, and this is what we have reached now, the end of the long run. Luckily, our Palaeolithic skills and sensibilities are still present in our bodies and souls, in our bodyminds, waiting to be rediscovered, revived, and reinvigorated.

As to the future, I have chosen to dedicate my life to working for an era of dignity, or, more precisely, an era of equality in dignity for all as responsible individuals, free to engage in loving solidarity with each other and in mutually dignifying connection with all life on Earth. My life mission is to raise awareness for the historically unprecedented urgency for us to nurture dignity and avoid humiliation. The negative emotion that defined the age of honour was fear, fear of being conquered, enslaved, or killed, while in the age of dignity, the definitorial negative emotion is humiliation, the simmering rage that arises when equality in dignity is promised but betrayed.[[4239]](#endnote-4240)

At the current point in history, we find ourselves in a transitional phase, similar to the one about twelve thousand years ago, a transition from one set of conditions to a radically new set of conditions. This time, we can embark on a more purposeful and systematic transformation than our forebears. We can look back on our ancestors’ experiences and retain ‘what works’ and avoid what does not work. We know, for instance, that ruthless competition does not work in a finite interconnected context, at least not in the long term, then it brings defeat to all and victory to none. We also know that feelings of humiliation can turn the most benign opportunities malign — humiliated people may prefer death to cooperation even if cooperation would serve them much better.

Our task now is to let dignism be the inspiration and embrace as our shared superordinate goal the co-creation of decent global institutions, institutions that bring humanity together. We have all the resources required to succeed in nurturing solidarity in equal dignity and create a decent world, a global knowledge society of non-material abundance shaped by systemic frames that do not humiliate.[[4240]](#endnote-4241)

We made a worthy start with the French Revolution’s liberté, égalité, and fraternité/solidarité. Unfortunately, however, we never had the courage and wisdom to realise all three of these goals together. Now the time has come for doing so. The way to go about is by turning globalisation of exploitation into globalisation of care and solidarity, to make the ‘trickling down’ of solidarity possible and halting the ‘trickling down’ of exploitation. The way to do so is by merging globalisation with egalisation (my word for equal dignity for all in freedom) so we can form globegalisation. By adding care, solidarity, and co-operation, we arrive at co-globegalisation as the shortest way to describe humanity’s shared superordinate goal.[[4241]](#endnote-4242)

We, humankind, need to embark on this journey together, if we wish to offer our children a future worth living in, and we need to do so lovingly and fast, and keep going despite all backlashes.

In my first book in 2006, I suggested a meta-narrative of four basic logics at the core of the human condition to help us understand all of Homo sapiens’ history over the past three hundred thousand years, and to find a compass into the future. Table 3 displays these four logics (see also the Appendix), namely, the pie of resources, the security dilemma, the future time horizon, and social identity.[[4242]](#endnote-4243) The table also suggests how these logics manifest through the three major eras of human existence that I defined as, a) the era of pristine pride, b) the era of honour, and c) the era of equal dignity. These logics draw on several academic disciplines and traditions and treat concepts such as democracy, communism, capitalism, modernity, or post-modernity as epiphenomena.

* The first logic addresses the question as to whether and to what extent the pie of resources is expandable (game theory is relevant here, as developed within the discipline of philosophy)
* The second logic concerns the security dilemma and whether it is weaker or stronger (using international relations theory, as developed in the field of political science)
* The third logic asks whether a long-term or a short-term future time horizon dominates (as described in many academic disciplines, among them cross-cultural psychology, with the Indigenous seven-generation sustainability rule as most important example)
* The fourth logic concerns the human capacity to tighten or loosen fault lines of identification (social identity theory, as developed in social psychology, most importantly, as laid out in this book, entailing the warning that dignity humiliation can create historically unprecedented fault lines of confrontation)[[4243]](#endnote-4244)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **The human condition** | | | | | |
|  | | **The future time horizon** | | **Social identity** | |
| **short** | **long** | **respect** | **humiliation** |
| **The pie of resources** | **fixed** | (b) |  |  | (b, honour humiliation) |
| **expandable** |  | (a, c) | (a, c) | (c, dignity humiliation) |
| **The security dilemma** | **strong** | (b) |  |  | (b, honour humiliation) |
| **weak** |  | (a, c) | (a, c) | (c, dignity humiliation) |

Table 3: The human condition

If we inscribe these four logics into the chronology of human history on planet Earth — the era of pristine pride, the era of honour, and the era of equal dignity — then our forebears enjoyed pristine pride in small egalitarian groups that followed the abundant wild food that represented an expandable pie of resources (a) for the longest period of our history. Then came the time when our species had completed what I call our first round of globalisation, and this was around the time of the Neolithic Revolution. A dramatic shift occurred in a rather brief historical time span, abundant resources turned into limited ones, a win-win situation turned into a win-lose situation, and circumscription spawned the security dilemma and the commons dilemma. Our forebears responded with a new ethos and emotional coinage, the era of honour began, which legitimised the vertical ranking of human worth into ‘higher’ and ‘lesser’ beings (b). Presently, we are participating in yet another radical shift (c), as significant as twelve thousand years ago, with the year 1948 with the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights as one of its most prominent markers, aspiring to an ethos and emotional coinage of equal dignity in freedom and solidarity.

The most important problem we, as humanity, face at this point in time is that we risk going back to (b) if we overlook that our planet is finite and globally interconnected, if we fail to integrate solidarity with equal dignity and freedom, if we fail to include fraternité into égalité and liberté.

The most destructive scenario, one that we should avoid, combines a short future time horizon in a context where the pie of resources is fixed or even decreasing, where a strong security dilemma reigns, where fraternité is missing from égalité and liberté, where individuals and groups are exposed to humiliating systems and treatments, and where they retaliate with counter-humiliation so that polarising rifts are created instead of healed and prevented. When the transition from unequal to equal worthiness is promised but betrayed, particularly strong feelings of humiliation arise (see also Table 1 in chapter 5), and deep fault lines of confrontation will divide society if these feelings fuel honour revenge (see chapters 8 and 10 on cross back) instead of inspiring the forward-looking co-creation of a world of dignism. This is what the fourth logic warns against. Unfortunately, the world we live in now seems to veer into precisely this malign direction.[[4244]](#endnote-4245)

The most constructive and benign scenario, the one I work for, is a global knowledge society that treats knowledge as an expandable pie everyone has access to, while remaining mindful of the finitude of the pie of all ecological resources except solar energy. I work for a world where all people conceive of themselves as part of one single global in-group, as one-planet-one-humanity, where systems and practices of humiliation no longer have legitimacy, where we transcend the security dilemma by building global trust so that we can unite in solidarity in an atmosphere of respect for diversity in equal dignity. I work for a world where we draw appropriate lessons from long past time horizons for the sake of future time horizons that reach far beyond seven generations, so we can protect and replenish the planet as humanity’s commons.

Clearly, these narratives are highly simplified, they follow sociologist Max Weber’s ideal-type approach. The chronology of human history is not as clear-cut as described here, and we see expressions of all three eras concurrently in present day’s world. For instance, uncontacted tribes (a) in the Amazonian Rainforest live in a national context where the dominator model of society is presently resuscitated (b). It is entirely possible that all of humankind will travel backwards again, we may fail to continue our journey towards more dialogical partnership in the world, the human rights revolution may join all the other unfinished revolutions in our history. Indeed, this seems to be happening now in a world of worn-down commons full of humiliation, where authoritarian narratives provide relief that deepens the downward spiral, that divides the world more than bringing it together. Co-globegalisation is needed more than ever, yet, it is also more difficult to achieve than ever.

Even though this is such a simplified model of the human condition, I think it can help us analyse social change over long time stretches and in different world regions, as well as help us with future strategy planning. It offers an overarching meta-narrative for a dignified course into the future in times of crisis, and it does so, first, by highlighting the promise entailed in our historical transition towards ideals of equal dignity in solidarity, and, second, by informing us of the dangers and pitfalls to be avoided. It offers the important warning that dynamics of humiliation become more destructive the more the other parameters veer to the benign side,[[4245]](#endnote-4246) it warns that even the most benign scenario is vulnerable to turning malign when feelings of humiliation are allowed to grow. Cycles of humiliation have the potency to override and undermine all otherwise benign trends.[[4246]](#endnote-4247)

The four logics model offers even more advantages. It opens space for compassion with our challenged species Homo sapiens and it can therefore relieve us from having to despair at ourselves or turn on each other in rage. Throughout the past millennia, many were proud of the human ability to dominate and control, unaware that this strategy was suboptimal at best and that it will bring us down in the end if we keep at it. Reality visits a sobering lesson on proud humans now, for some, it is a humiliation lesson. Invalidated pride, however, can easily turn into disappointed rage, and here the four logics model can serve as an antidote insofar as it opens space for the human capability for love and courage to come to the fore. With humanity being in ‘hospital’, if we give it our all, if we hold hands in loving mutual support, we can co-create a future where the best of human nature can flourish. Even if it is too late and we are already in hospice, we can at least go down in dignity together.

The concept of dignity has unifying power as long as dignity is defined as equal dignity in mutual solidarity rather than as the autonomy of lone heroes competing for domination and control. The concept of equal dignity for all can unify all religions of this world, all faiths, all life-giving ideologies, it can bring the sustainability community together with the consciousness community,[[4247]](#endnote-4248) it can merge all of them into one overarching meta-narrative.[[4248]](#endnote-4249) Many faiths have a definition of religion at their core that coincides with how I define my personal religion. My religion is love, humility, and awe for a universe too large for us to fathom.[[4249]](#endnote-4250)

A culture of peace in dignity can also merge the best of traditional male and female role descriptions, it can combine the courageous heroism that formerly was reserved for males with the care work that was formerly delegated to women. It can invite all — men, women, including also all those who do not resonate with the masculine versus feminine binary — to leave behind our androcentric world that has grown anachronistic and embrace the conceptually female approach of maintaining social cohesion through complex, relational, multilateral, foresighted, integrative, and holistic strategies. It can help demonstrate why the glorification of war and domination is outdated and how we can transcend it, it can help us move from the heroism of honour to the heroism of dignity as the highest form of ‘personal meaning making’.[[4250]](#endnote-4251)

How can we realise the benign scenario and avoid the malign one? At the present juncture in human history, it is not enough to meditate, pray, or otherwise aspire to higher consciousness, as important as it is. We cannot afford waiting for a few enlightened Gandhis or Mandelas to rescue us.[[4251]](#endnote-4252) Moreover, Gandhis and Mandelas tend to be crushed by the larger context, as has happened with many earlier dignity movements. Bertha von Suttner’s book Lay down your arms in 1892 and Rachel Carson’s book Silent spring in 1962 ought to have been ultimate wake-up calls to stop war on people and nature. Yet, the result was more war rather than less.

We know from social psychology that human behaviour depends on frames more than on personal inclinations. ‘The important levers for policy purposes lie outside the psychology of individuals, in the social structures that sustain and guide people’s decisions’.[[4252]](#endnote-4253) Humans are psychologically unselfish while being biologically selfish,[[4253]](#endnote-4254) and therefore we cannot depend on individual pro-social tendencies, we must create overarching structural frames that nurture and enable them. We know that people have deep moral feelings for their in-group members and that empathy ends at the boundaries of one’s in-group. As long as the world is divided, the result will be hatred for out-groups and violence and war, all inspired by love for one’s in-group.[[4254]](#endnote-4255) In a divided world, it does not help with more empathy, more empathy does not necessarily mean more peace, on the contrary, more empathy may strengthen loyalty with ‘we in cooperation against you’, it may sharpen polarisation, it may trigger more cycles of humiliation and increase violence rather than decrease it.[[4255]](#endnote-4256) ‘Violence, hatred, and terror are deeply intertwined with honour, heroism, glory, and love’, this is the message of my 2017 book on terror.[[4256]](#endnote-4257) Im-munity can stand in the way of com-munity.[[4257]](#endnote-4258) The only solution is to un-divide the world, to bring the world together into one single in-group — one humanity on one planet. After more than four decades of being at home on all continents, I can attest that we humans are psychologically capable of doing so, we do not need an outer enemy to feel that we belong together.[[4258]](#endnote-4259)

There is no alternative if humankind wishes to survive in dignity, we have to embrace the fact that we are one single in-group on one tiny planet without out-groups. Only then can we overcome out-group biases, only then can cooperation and empathy unfold their true unifying potential. Only if we frame our world society in ways that pro-social tendencies receive systemic support, only if we become a commons-centric global village of dignity rather than a market-centric and honour-driven Wall Street village, can cycles of humiliation and counter-humiliation be healed and prevented, can global and local meta-humiliation and mutual meta-dehumanisation end.[[4259]](#endnote-4260) We are lucky that courageous pioneers began to enshrine human rights ideals in 1948. These ideals are precisely what we need to define our global in-group ethics.

Anthropologist Margaret Mead is often quoted as saying, ‘Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can change the world. Indeed, it is the only thing that ever has’. During recent years, every year once I happened to pass in front of her former office in the American Museum of Natural History,[[4260]](#endnote-4261) and each time I asked her in my mind: What did you mean by thoughtful? My intuition tells me that she meant stepping out of here-and-now details and imagining new worlds from a bird’s eye perspective, and from there to proceed towards caringly and cautiously nudging dignifying systemic paradigm shifts. As soon as we step into a bird’s eye perspective, we realise that systems are not static but dynamic[[4261]](#endnote-4262) and that complex problems cannot be addressed by breaking them down into their simplest components. Systems thinkers of complexity science use a system-of-systems approach that is informed by Indigenous modes of thinking and visioning,[[4262]](#endnote-4263) they speak of co-evolution to the edge of chaos that follows the principle of the adjacent possible.[[4263]](#endnote-4264) Systems thinkers use phrases such as glocal eco-civilisation thrivability, hyperconnectivity and deep conviviality — conviviality intra-personal, trans-species, and trans-generational — they see humanity as ‘curator of planetary thrivability’.[[4264]](#endnote-4265)

Systems thinkers have developed a two loops model of responding to the existential risks humanity faces, they suggest to ‘hospice’ a system when it is dying and an alternative system is ushered in, while highlighting the choice between the two.[[4265]](#endnote-4266) Other thinkers speak of a two-pronged approach, first bending environmental and social justice curves within a current framework, then fostering a longer-term shift in consciousness to integrate people and planet.[[4266]](#endnote-4267) Yet others see three pathways, Christiana Figueres, for instance, the former executive secretary of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change, remains ‘stubbornly optimistic’ about addressing three pathways together — global emergency management, enhanced policy reform, and transformative redesign.[[4267]](#endnote-4268)

I suggest a multi-tiered refolution, using historian Timothy Garton Ash’s term of refolution that mixes reform and revolution. At its core — and also here I follow Max Weber’s ideal-type approach — I see a two-tiered or two-pronged strategy of first gathering enough support for creating new systemic frames, and then letting those frames do their work in amplifying a new Zeitgeist. Following physicist Paul Raskin, I call on a global citizens movement at all levels, from civil society to the gatekeepers of political and economic institutions, to envision how a decent world may be organised and then mandate a small group of thoughtful citizens — just as happened in 1948 under the leadership of Eleanor Roosevelt — to begin a dignity transition by creating new cultural and institutional frames in the spirit of dignism.[[4268]](#endnote-4269)

This small group will have to muster the courage to hold space for ‘fuzziness’, so that the vision of a future of dignism can be filled with creative ideas for action that may be so innovative and novel that no one has thought of them so far.[[4269]](#endnote-4270) It falls short to discuss the details of possible solutions for systemic crises only within the confines of the system that created them. Therefore, holding large enough ‘legroom’ for deeper questioning — just as philosopher Arne Næss has called for — means refraining from spelling out the details of how to reach this future prematurely.

This small group will have to muster the courage to envision out-of-the-box ideas for how new dignifying global constitutive rules[[4270]](#endnote-4271) for our world-system may look like,[[4271]](#endnote-4272) how new generative mechanisms may be shaped.[[4272]](#endnote-4273) These new mechanisms and rules must have the capacity to manifest unity-in-diversity convivialism, inclusionism, and lifeism beyond humanism.[[4273]](#endnote-4274) We the planet, the instinctive bond between human beings and other living systems, waits to be embraced.[[4274]](#endnote-4275) Livelihood for all species on our planet waits to be ensured.[[4275]](#endnote-4276) When a new Eleanor Roosevelt moment finally emerges, we hope that the world will be ready for a Universal Declaration of Human Vulnerability,[[4276]](#endnote-4277) for Universal Declarations of Human Responsibilities and Duty.[[4277]](#endnote-4278)

Where do we stand on this? Glenn Albrecht was born in 1953, one year before me. He was a professor of sustainability in Australia, and his words could be mine:

During a relatively short period of human history we have seen the emergence of a growth-addicted industrial-technological society that has achieved its success at the expense of the vitality of the Earth. The productive capacity of the system called Capitalism has produced great human wealth for some, yet it has also produced global scale pollution, negative climate change, and mass species extinction. It has, at the same time, impoverished and corrupted many of the efforts that have been made to harmonise human enterprise with the life systems of the Earth. The usurpation by a powerful elite (with instruments such as mass media) of concepts like democracy, sustainability, sustainable development, and resilience have all taken place within my lifetime (sixty-three years).[[4278]](#endnote-4279)

Allen White is an expert in sustainability strategies and governance, and he chimes in. ‘The persistent social-ecological costs of runaway shareholderism exposed CSR [corporate social responsibility] as incapable of reining in the capitalist juggernaut, let alone driving transformative change...’[[4279]](#endnote-4280)

Ruben Nelson is a ‘pioneer of serious futures thinking’, and he is one of the few I know who can give us a global overview over the world’s foremost future-oriented initiatives and where they stand with respect to radically innovative and new thinking.[[4280]](#endnote-4281) I resonate deeply with his observation that most fall short, that none comes close enough to taking the big step of imagining truly new forms of civilisation, none comes with a theory that would ‘change everything’.[[4281]](#endnote-4282) Nelson warns that ‘no such theory exists. We are flying almost blind’.[[4282]](#endnote-4283) We need more than a Great Transition, Great Transformation, or a Great Turning, he says, we need transcendence, a new theory, one of personal-to-civilisational transcendence.

Like Albrecht, White, and Nelson, I see that radically new concepts are urgently needed, concepts that give priority to the nurturing of all life-like forms. During my forty-seven years of global living, I have witnessed with dismay how we, humanity, have burned ‘fireworks’ as if there is no tomorrow — burning fossil fuels was the most recent and most shortsighted manifestation of our millennia-old habit of exploiting nature. Like Albrecht, I once had great hopes for Erich Fromm’s concept of bio-philia, yet, instead of being hailed and nurtured, it has fallen prey to reductionist science that pulls things apart and isolates particularities, so it has been turned into ecocidal necro-philia. I appreciate Albrecht’s neologisms — the Symbiocene as successor of the Anthropocene, and symbiomimicry and sumbiophilia for the love of living together. ‘Since we evolved within a pre-existing ecological matrix as an intensely social species and lived in relative harmony with all other life forms, sumbiophilia must also be deeply ingrained within us... As the politics of sumbiocracy play out and we live by symbiomimicry in all our technologies and habitats, the Earth will breathe a huge sigh of relief’.[[4283]](#endnote-4284)

What are our chances of achieving a dignified and dignifying future? It has been calculated that for a new perspective to be successful, it may take only about 3.5 per cent of a population to adopt it and coordinate their actions into a social movement.[[4284]](#endnote-4285) For the United States of America this means that it would only require twelve million people ‘for transformative change’.[[4285]](#endnote-4286) In November 2019, more than 11,000 scientists from 153 countries released a statement alerting humanity to the ‘catastrophic threat’ that we face as the climate emergency continues apace, calling for global system change.[[4286]](#endnote-4287)

Pragmatic hope is needed now — the opposite of naïve optimism or dystopian despair — and these are the words of physicist Paul Raskin, founder of the Great Transition Initiative:

The signature feature of the Planetary Phase — the enmeshment of all in the overarching proto-country, Earth — suggests an answer. The natural change agent for a Great Transition would be a vast and inclusive movement of global citizens. The world now needs citizens without borders to come together for a planetary community ... The challenge is extraordinary, but so are the times. In transformative moments, small actions can have large consequences. The efforts of an active minority can ripple through the cultural field and release latent potential for social change.[[4287]](#endnote-4288)

Loss of hope, passive hope, magical hope — such kinds to hope undermine what is needed, namely, radical hope that embraces ‘a sense of despair about the human future’.[[4288]](#endnote-4289) I resonate with the words of Extinction Rebellion leader Skeena Rathor, ‘...this isn’t about saving humanity, this is about our courage to love as we have never loved before... Let us live now at the edge of our courage to love’.[[4289]](#endnote-4290)

At the present moment in history, perhaps the coronavirus pandemic may open a new window of opportunity for hitherto unthinkable solutions? Worldwide lockdowns finally brought us an anthro-pause — will it bring us what I am waiting for since many decades, namely, a new ‘Eleanor Roosevelt moment’ like 1948?[[4290]](#endnote-4291) The Earth Day of 1970 could have been such a momentous opportunity, or the end of the Cold War — yet, both went largely unused.[[4291]](#endnote-4292)

Due to the run-away self-reinforcing climate-degrading feedback loops that presently unfold, we must expect global emergencies of magnitudes that vastly surpass the present coronavirus crisis.[[4292]](#endnote-4293) In times of emergency, Margaret Mead’s adage has immediate significance because small groups of thoughtful people can act swiftly — if too many people are involved in emergencies, they fall over each other’s feet.[[4293]](#endnote-4294) Our Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies community gets ready for being part of such a group. The Eleanor Roosevelts of today need to double their efforts in envisioning dignified futures for all, and finding ways of how they may be put into practice. Most importantly, they have to anticipate the counter-forces that are to be expected and make plans for how to integrate them lovingly and dignifyingly, so that polarisations can be avoided that undermine all constructive efforts. Allen White formulates it as follows:

Gender equality, Indigenous peoples, new economy, climate justice, guaranteed minimum income, universal health care, nuclear disarmament — these and other social movements intersect with human rights in both spirit and substance. All are rooted in justice, security, freedom, inclusiveness, and resilience. The shared values constitute the foundation for a unified yet plural meta-movement that awaits crystallisation. Human rights is a beacon of the possible, a story of moving a bold vision from the implausible to the inevitable. It is a historic moment for a multi-domain, multi-scalar meta-movement to follow the same trajectory towards the systemic change that Earth so desperately needs.[[4294]](#endnote-4295)

Even if a small group of thoughtful people succeeds to put new systemic frames in place, this is not enough. These frames need to be carefully tested out and flexibly revised.[[4295]](#endnote-4296) It is important to avoid what happened in the past, namely, that systems rigidified to the point that only bloody revolutions could undo them when they failed to bring about the promised dignity.

Peace philosopher Howard Richards wrote the Foreword to this book. For decades, he has analysed the world’s dire predicament, and these are his words of wisdom:

If humanity has painted itself into a corner where neither the private sector nor the public sector can reliably move resources from where they are not needed to where they are needed — not even if they want to — then how can the system be changed so that it will stop producing results nobody wants, like global warming and the eventual death of the biosphere, and that it will start producing results everybody wants, like more equal and less violent societies?[[4296]](#endnote-4297)

Richards thinks that a proposal submitted to the American Congress in 2019 is a worthy beginning, a proposal known as the ‘Green New Deal Resolution’ that calls for ‘decarbonisation, jobs, and justice’,[[4297]](#endnote-4298) however, Richards warns, there is one crucially important condition: the notion of ‘jobs’ needs to be radically redefined. All initiatives that accept that only money-making work is ‘work’ will cause workers and ‘non-workers’ alike to contribute to rising inequality and the depletion of the planet.[[4298]](#endnote-4299)

Howard Richards offers very practical steps to achieving global systemic change. He starts with going to the core of the problem, namely, the fact that the institutions that structure today’s world-system are built on successors of Roman law,[[4299]](#endnote-4300) with the consequence that many Roman law rules are systemic imperatives by now.[[4300]](#endnote-4301) Just over the past few decades, over 3000 trade and investment agreements have entrenched Roman law’s property rights ever more deeply.[[4301]](#endnote-4302) This is problematic because these imperatives ultimately lead to the shredding of the social and ecological foundations of life on Earth. While Roman law imposes a duty not to harm, the problem is that it fails to stipulate a duty to help,[[4302]](#endnote-4303) and in this way, it legitimises de-solidarisation and promotes an impersonal way of relating to other people as mere abstract role-bearers in contracts.[[4303]](#endnote-4304) The Roman distinction between private law and public law (now global) allows people to maintain the dysfunctional belief that there is no responsibility when there is no contract. In short, in my words, narrow neo-Roman concepts of property rights stand in the way of dignity because they diminish and degrade the commons, they block and discredit communal sharing, they undermine direct and unconditional solidarity of people with each other and with the rest of life on Earth.

Howard Richards suggests that if disconnection is our contemporary condition and present-day neo-Roman law principles the root problem, then integration is the solution. He reckons that local governments cannot be counted on for help in this situation, as their primary duty is to serve post-Roman law, enforce contracts, and protect the security of investments, while being forbidden to interfere with the free mobility of factors across borders. Richards studied the example of Scandinavian countries and found that even though they have a tradition of equality and have done better for a while, ultimately, also their model is inherently unviable.[[4304]](#endnote-4305) He is convinced that even the most ambitious improvement of global regulatory rules will be insufficient to create truly level playing fields for all. What is needed is more foundational change, namely, new global constitutive rules.[[4305]](#endnote-4306) This is Richards’ advice to us in 2019:

Spend enough time, but not too much, denouncing scandals that violate existing basic norms. But remember that the survival of Homo sapiens depends on changing existing basic norms. Use complaints about a billionaire president who refuses to disclose his tax returns as a hinge theme (in Paulo Freire’s terminology) to turn the conversation into a critique of the cultural rules that constitute (John Searle’s and Tony Lawson’s terminology) property. And/or critique some other main feature of today’s hegemonic Basic Cultural Structure (BCS).[[4306]](#endnote-4307)

Richards suggests a number of methodologies to fit our social structures to our ecological contexts and to guarantee a right to livelihood for all.[[4307]](#endnote-4308) In chapter 5, Duncan Kennedy explains the distinction between ‘inside’ and ‘outside’ rights, meaning that a person has rights even if the legal order does not recognise them or makes it even illegal to exercise them. What Richards calls for is nothing less than that we, the global human community, bring inside and outside rights into alignment by doing something about our global legal frameworks. Brief, we must revise the principles that arise from Roman law and form the basic pillars of the constitutive rules of our modern world-system, and Richards recommends correcting the following basic cultural structures:

* Suum cuique is a tenet that means ‘to each his own’.[[4308]](#endnote-4309) This tenet needs to be corrected, Howard Richards suggests, by socially functional forms of land tenancy and socially functional forms of property in general. Otherwise, this principle will continue to give legitimacy to those who have monopolised economic capital in their own hands[[4309]](#endnote-4310) allowing them to maintain or even increase this inequality.[[4310]](#endnote-4311) We should not permit a narrow neo-Roman concept of property rights to stand in the way of life on Earth.
* Pacta sunt servanda (agreements must be kept) [[4311]](#endnote-4312) induces people to think that there is no responsibility where there is no contract. This rule needs to be corrected by mutual beneficial responsibility for one another’s welfare regardless of whether there is a contract or not. As it stands, there is no written contract with the next generation and with nature. Human action should seek to promote positive externalities and avoid giving legitimacy to negative externalities, as Linda Hartling formulates it, healthy relationships are a ‘centrality’ to survival of humankind, not an externality.[[4312]](#endnote-4313)
* Honeste vivare (to live honestly) needs to be corrected by recognising that our very identity is relational, and alterum non laedere (not hurting others by word or deed) needs to be corrected so it promotes service to others beyond the obligation not to harm them.[[4313]](#endnote-4314) If not amended, people may think that honesty means ‘not hurting a contract’, making sociocide and ecocide legitimate when ‘it is part of my contract’.

Howard Richards suggests that these corrections will clear the most important obstacles that stand in the way of rebuilding the present one-size-fits-all global regime of capital accumulation. These corrections will loosen what Ellen Meiksins Wood calls systemic imperatives.[[4314]](#endnote-4315) Once these obstacles are out of the way, it will be possible to support human life and all life on Earth and make a moral economy possible.[[4315]](#endnote-4316)

Howard Richards lives in Chile and often works in South Africa. I had the privilege of joining him in both places.[[4316]](#endnote-4317) In collaboration with his colleagues, he has put in place an approach called unbounded organisation, providing goods and services in multiple down-to-earth ways and in ‘a limitless variety of material practices’ that are much more transformative and dignifying than presently existing practices, and suitable not just for South Africa but everywhere.[[4317]](#endnote-4318) Richards explains that unbounded organisation is about ‘bringing people whose bodies are comfortable with their cultures together in discourse coalitions that solve physical problems, for instance, water supply, and at the same time nurture local culture in the life-worlds that are, as Habermas says, the worlds where personalities and moral consciousness are formed’.[[4318]](#endnote-4319)

If we want to follow Howard Richards and shape a dignity transition, we would need what I call unbounded creativity — creativity that is global in scope, that is intentionally nurtured, and that does not shy away from thinking outside of existing systemic boundaries. For this creativity to unfold, we can benefit from thousands of years of diverse human cultures and human talent. Howard Richards published a book on Gandhi and the future of economics in Dignity Press,[[4319]](#endnote-4320) and indeed, Gandhi, together with Bertha von Suttner, Dietrich Bonhoeffer, Eleanor Roosevelt, Rachel Carson, Paulo Freire, Nelson Mandela, Martin Luther King, and many other historical figures, can inspire us to shoulder our responsibility and create global movements of dignifying change agents.[[4320]](#endnote-4321) An unbounded world citizens movement can make the promise come true that ‘all human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights’.[[4321]](#endnote-4322)

To the best of my ability, and in collaboration with many others, I try to contribute to these endeavours, and I do so with love, humility, and filled with awe and wonderment in the face of a universe that is so vast that we cannot understand it. What I do, together with my colleagues, is prepare for the next tipping points, for the next moments when space opens for new solutions, when new answers will be sought and become more acceptable. I resonate with social theorist Mary Mellor who points out that ‘re-thinking alone cannot achieve change’, change ‘will come from the exposed failures of current thinking and practice, if we are ready with an alternative analysis and framework for action’.[[4322]](#endnote-4323) I work day and night to develop such alternative analyses and practices, so we are ready when the next tipping points force us to find new ways to arrange our human affairs on this planet. This book is one of the expression of these efforts.

On my path, I avoid open confrontation as much as possible — heated polarisations tend to create deadlocks that slow down constructive change rather than hastening it — I work for ‘underground doubt’ to grow, with the aim that a large enough global dignity community may be ready when the next turning points come. I call on all cultural traditions to come forward from all around the world that have dignifying concepts to contribute, be it the ubuntu philosophy from South Africa[[4323]](#endnote-4324) or the Norwegian cultural heritage of likeverd and dugnad.[[4324]](#endnote-4325) To my dismay, I observe that all these cultural heritages are currently being ‘sold out’ even in South Africa and in Norway, not to speak of the onslaught on Indigenous knowledge systems and skills all around the world, and I hope we can recover them before the race for profit has made them extinct.

I invite bridge builders and unifiers like me to be brave and show courage. In times of increasing polarisations, all opponents want everyone to take their side and attack the other as ‘the enemy’. Bridge builders must be prepared to be accused of running ‘the errand of the enemy’ despite the fact that their aim is the stark opposite. I usually defend myself by pointing at my experience as a psychotherapist, namely, that many conflicts do not need to be solved, they simply become irrelevant. It is often preferable to take a step back and focus away from visible symptoms, as this opens space for change to come from a deeper place, change that makes surface symptoms so irrelevant that after a while ‘conflict resolution’ is no longer needed. To me, the concept of dignity is this deeper place.

To summarise, we live in times of crises so big that we do not have time to wait for the majority of people to transmute into Gandhi-like wisdom leaders. If we think back to Margaret Mead’s reflection that a small group of thoughtful and committed citizens can change the world, then most small groups at the local level are too weak, at least in the longer term, they cannot withstand global frames that antagonise them. I have met many discouraged idealists all around the world who once thought they could make a difference. What is needed is attention to global frames. My experience has led me to embrace the big history approach laid out in this book, and to resonate with Howard Richards’ emphasis on global institutional building to foster global cooperation and guide subordinate feedback loops qua system rather than leaving them to the hazard of ‘the winner takes all’.

The transitions we need now will have to proceed in several intertwined loops, and, clearly, these loops need the inspiration from small local groups of people who try out local solutions. Yet, of primary importance is to put in place new nested layers of self-reforming dignifying global institutions that can aid the transformation of local mindsets in a top-down-bottom-up fashion. Any dignifying local move will then have the advantage of enjoying support from the larger systemic frame rather than being crushed by it.

Global frames need to have robust infraethics and ethics,[[4325]](#endnote-4326) they need to follow the principle of unity in diversity so they can nudge people to widen the boundaries of empathy and compassion to match ‘we the planet’, so we can leave behind ‘we against them’. Unity in diversity means that two processes complement each other, unifying and diversifying processes, it means that larger political units offer smaller communities more autonomy.[[4326]](#endnote-4327) ‘We against them’ can move into ‘we with them on this planet’.

There are many local civil society initiatives and only relatively few take the global level as their main focus. This is why I refrain from adding one more local initiative — others are better equipped for that task than I am. I have chosen to refrain from consuming the privileges of a high education and a Western passport for my own advantages in the ghettos of the Global North and instead offer them as a gift to serve the common good through dedicating my life to being an ambassador for dignity at the global level, in our entire global village.

### Together we can chart a global roadmap

It is imperative that we, the peoples of Earth, declare our responsibility to one another, to the greater community of life, and to future generations.   
What would compliance with such responsibility entail?  
Would you be willing to make such declaration to each other?  
What do you think is the foremost exercise of global responsibility, the first priority learning task?  
― Richard Mochelle, global ethics and whole systems designer, 2020[[4327]](#endnote-4328)

In times of crisis, communities tend to become ever more polarised, as two possible pathways into the future grow ever more irreconcilable — ‘more of the same’ or ‘less of the same’.[[4328]](#endnote-4329) A painful gap opens up between ‘let us optimise and maximise business as usual’ and ‘let us do a complete turnaround, exit from business as usual, and embark on something entirely new’. Incumbents antagonise innovators and vice versa, and if this fault line is not bridged, it makes the crisis worse. Already philosopher Thomas Kuhn taught us that paradigm shifting is difficult.[[4329]](#endnote-4330) Both groups, incumbents and innovators, get ever more aggravated, both think that the other side is responsible for the deepening of the crisis. Both sides mobilise passionate emotions among their followers, both sides feel ever more humiliated by the other side’s reluctance to ‘see the truth’.[[4330]](#endnote-4331) Both sides ratchet up their willingness to make sacrifices for their respective position, and if no overall decision is taken, energies that should go into collaborative con-struction will drive all-out de-struction.

While I write these lines, my 95-year-old father tells me every day how deadly such standoffs can be. He could easily have been killed for his opposition to Nazi ideology and Nazi practice during the Second World War. While Adolf Hitler and his followers should never have started this war, it could have ended years earlier had not too many German citizens believed that ‘more of the same’ would render ‘final victory’. Until the war’s last day, overzealous Germans were willing to sacrifice thousands of lives for the Führer,[[4331]](#endnote-4332) while they should have invested their energies into building their country without him.[[4332]](#endnote-4333) Unerschütterliche Opferbereitschaft, or ‘unwavering willingness to sacrifice’,[[4333]](#endnote-4334) was a great force on all sides — it could have energised a live-giving dawn had it not been consumed by a lethal deadlock.

The United States has experienced serious polarisations in the past years as well. The ‘lovers of capitalist freedom’ trust that the famous American dream would come true again if only those free-riding ‘socialists’ who don’t know what hard work is would come to their senses. Their opponents suspect that it may be precisely the other way round, namely, that the American Dream is destroyed by its very ‘capitalist’ foundations, despite all hard work.

At the present point in history, all of humanity faces potentially deadly impasses. Not just the American dream does not work when it simply means ‘winning’. An overwhelming number of scientists from all around the world agree that the time has come to invest our willingness to sacrifice in saving the planet from human destruction — ‘final victory’ over nature and over other people is a doomed project. A short time window stands open for us to be used, and in this situation, it is paramount to avoid lethal deadlocks.

Some of my friends in the business world, mostly men, implore me to trust that they will make ‘capitalism’ work for the benefit of the well-being of all, that competition is not just ‘fun’ but is required for the best ideas to win. They feel humiliated when I warn that ‘success’ that is achieved by way of overuse of resources is short-lived, that it cannot be mistaken for true progress.[[4334]](#endnote-4335) They rage at me when I urge them to listen to philosopher Arne Næss and his call for deeper questioning, to continue asking questions where others stop asking[[4335]](#endnote-4336) — what if the worst ideas win and the best lose? They feel insulted when I implore them to read Thomas Pogge, philosopher of global justice, who warns that it is morally unconscientious to use historical benchmarks to prove present improvements, rather, one should compare the status quo with what would be possible — they are furious when I join Pogge in his conclusion that ‘by this standard, our generation is doing worse than any in human history’.[[4336]](#endnote-4337) There are de-generative economic systems and there are re-generative economic systems, says Linda Hartling, and for now, sadly, we are addicted to the de-generative spoils of ‘war against nature’.[[4337]](#endnote-4338)

This is my narrative and my plea:

We, Homo sapiens, are newcomers on planet Earth compared with other species. We can look back on two major turning points in our short history, and at each of them, we had to forge radically new adaptations. One of those turning points is now. We find ourselves in a situation where we understand that what we did at our first turning was suboptimal and that we need to do better now. Many millennia ago, at the time of what we refer to as Neolithic Revolution, our forebears completed what we could call the ‘first round of globalisation’. They began to face the fact that our planet’s surface is finite, abundance began to be replaced by scarcity, win-win contexts began to be replaced by win-lose impasses. Our forerunners adapted by starting to compete for domination, and the past millennia’s competition for domination brought many ‘victories’, both over people and nature. Yet, it also brought long-term social disintegration and ecological degradation. We are now in our final round of globalisation, and we understand that not just the surface of our planet is finite, also clean water, clean air, fertile soils, and minerals. The future will likely bring many ‘lose-lose no-win’ impasses if we fail to un-learn fighting for dominance, as this will otherwise cause our demise. If we continue uncritically with what we call ‘modern progress’, then also the rest of our ecological and social resources will soon be depleted. Time is over for shortsighted ‘victories’ that cause long-term destruction. Millennia of systemic humiliation are enough. Our task now is to look back and re-kindle pre-Neolithic indigenous strategies for sustainable living, now we have proof that they merit our respect and our attention, that we were wrong in looking down on them. Our task now is to learn loving partnership and dialogue so we can survive together. Bold new action is needed, or, more precisely, merging the best of new science with the best of pre-Neolithic and Indigenous wisdom. No longer can we seek honour through victory, domination, and control. The order of the day is to seek dignity through care. So, let us embrace equality in dignity for all individuals in freedom and mutually dignifying solidarity with each other and in loving connection with all life on Earth. We have all the knowledges and skills needed, we have no excuse anymore for failing to take the right action.

The inspiration for this book came from the year 1757, the year when humiliation was for the first time listed as a violation of dignity in the English encyclopaedia. This listing represents a linguistic marker for a revolutionary transition of the Zeitgeist that was relevant not just for the English realm but for all of humanity, a transition towards ideals of equal dignity, a transition that matches the Neolithic transition in its significance, only that a sounder completion is needed now. Our Neolithic ancestors are not to blame, developing competition for domination was the best they could do. Still today we are proud of the dominator societies that emerged on all continents, otherwise we would not refer to them as ‘great civilisations’. Yet, we live in new times now, the globe interconnects and overstretches, and we have more knowledge. We can no longer overlook that our Neolithic ancestors’ adaptations are infeasible in the long term and that the long term has arrived. We have all the resources needed to liberate ourselves from uncritical pride and lift our forebears’ adaptations on a more sustainable level.

Not everyone has grasped the extraordinary significance of our time. Unsurprisingly so, as it is always a shock when limits are reached that hitherto were imperceptible. I use the term circumscription to capture the astonishment that arises when something that was believed to be unlimited reveals itself to be limited and finite — be it clean water, clean air, fertile soils, or minerals.

It lies in the nature of sudden tipping points that they change conditions so fast and drastically that it is difficult to bring about matching adaptations. It is hard for presently living generations to accept that after millennia of hierarchical domination, suddenly, the practice of subjugating people and nature no longer means ‘victory’ and ‘progress’ but collective suicide. The choice in front of which we stand is unprecedented — either we proceed unimpeded with ‘business as usual’ towards the global depletion of planet Earth’s last resources, or we rethink and shape our future path by inventing radically more sustainable ways of arranging our affairs on this planet. Never in our species’ history have we encountered challenges that are more profound. The generations now alive carry more responsibility on their shoulders than any generation before. The presently unfolding coronavirus crisis is likely to be nothing but a small prelude. We stand at historically unparalleled crossroads.

My hope is that enough people wake up to understand that in an interconnected world, it is not only essential for our continued existence on our planet, it is also practically possible to move towards worldwide systems that enable trust and mutual solidarity to emerge both locally and globally. The hope is that enough people understand that it is in our reach to overcome our most tragic dilemmas, the security dilemma and the commons dilemma.

As to the security dilemma, we have everything required to create global human security in place of military security. We have everything needed to achieve global disarmament — after all, global armament is human-made, it is not a law of nature.[[4338]](#endnote-4339) As the coronavirus exploded around the world, United Nations secretary-general António Guterres rightly sent this plea to all power holders and all those who still believe in military security, a plea for an ‘immediate global ceasefire’ to ‘end the sickness of war and fight the disease that is ravaging our world... That is what our human family needs, now more than ever’.[[4339]](#endnote-4340)

As to the commons dilemma, we have everything needed to overcome also this dilemma. We can turn the tragedy of the commons into what I call the blessings of the commons.[[4340]](#endnote-4341) Our planet is our ecological commons, while the ‘glue’ that keeps our communities together is our social commons. As for now, we are surrounded by tragic degradations of both, our ecological and social commons. Humanity’s long-term interest in its own survival is undermined by short-term profit interests of a few ‘dignitaries’ and their cohorts, by ‘dignitaries’ — be they men or women — who feel entitled to the privilege of free riding on others’ hard work and the planet’s resources. Time has come to unlearn the arrogance of ‘dignitaries’ and to learn dignified humility, to refrain from exploiting, oppressing, and humiliating allegedly ‘lesser’ humans and non-human species. In an interconnected world, long-term demise for all is the result when a few dominators engage in the exploitation of humanity’s commons.

New technology may help us, yet, even the best technology will fail us if we fail to harness it, if we fail to ask deep enough questions. Who drives the development of technology, and why? Where is the power and the money? We have to ask these questions together, and we have to ask them calmly so we avoid incendiary cycles of humiliation driven by entrepreneurs of indignation narratives and conspiracy theories.[[4341]](#endnote-4342) The epoch of wise and sober moderation, the ‘epoch of humility’, the Humilocene, waits to manifest.[[4342]](#endnote-4343)

The epoch of humility will teach us that clashes of civilisations are potentially enriching, whereas clashes of humiliation are dangerous. In 1996, political scientist Samuel Huntington predicted a clash of civilisations for the post-Cold War era.[[4343]](#endnote-4344) As I see it, Samuel Huntington might have mistaken clashes of humiliation for clashes of civilisations, because cultural and religious identities are often used as ‘ammunition’ in cycles of humiliation, so that on the surface they look like clashes of civilisations.

Clashes of civilisations are potentially enriching because they can inspire transformative learning.[[4344]](#endnote-4345) They can become ‘dialogues among civilisations’ that encourage the harvesting of all dignifying aspects from all cultures that ever existed — be it the ubuntu philosophy from South Africa or the Norwegian cultural heritage of likeverd and dugnad. A culture of mutual learning and understanding is cognitively enriching and it is emotionally more gratifying than a global culture of war.[[4345]](#endnote-4346) The United Nations declared the year 2001 to be the United Nations Year of Dialogue among Civilisations.[[4346]](#endnote-4347)

Clashes of humiliation, on the other side, are dangerous, because they lead to hostile standoffs that disrupt global interconnectedness and undermine the promise of global solidarity it entails. Clashes of humiliation have the force of re-dividing the world and bringing back the tragic dilemmas that held our ancestors in their gruesome grip, they can transform a potentially united ‘global village’ into a divided and ravaged war zone.

To reach the epoch of humility, we need to heal and prevent humiliation. This, however, is easier said than done because we live in times where the likelihood for clashes of humiliation is on the increase rather than on the decrease. Two phenomena — global interconnectedness and the rise of human rights ideals — play a particular role. They create expectation gaps — dignity gaps, or indignity traps[[4347]](#endnote-4348) — that heat up feelings of humiliation as never before. This is why I speak of feelings of dignity humiliation as the nuclear bomb of the emotions. This is why dynamics of humiliation will become the strongest obstacle to a dignified future.

The ‘nuclear bomb of the emotions’ drives the downtrodden to use the proverbial pitchforks against those ‘higher up’ who arrogate superiority and exploit everything they deem to be of ‘lesser’ significance, who exploit humanity’s social and ecological resources. In former times, the pitchforks would either be suppressed or, if victorious, their holders would replace the old power elite. In an interconnected world at the brink of ecological collapse, such cycles of domination are a luxury we cannot afford anymore, they risk collective demise. A second order transformation is needed, a new level of social change that foregrounds loving care in shared humility. Not only is the suppression of pitchforks obsolete now, however, their use is as well, as this use is informed by the same sense of self-righteous entitlement for ‘victory’ that drives the power holders it opposes.

Protests such as the Me Too movement that began in 2017, the Black Lives Matter protests of 2020, or the Everyone’s Invited movement of 2021, all represent promising beginnings, under one condition, however, namely, that they avoid entering into competitions over who can project the most authoritarian moralism into the world, that they stay the course and manifest new levels of loving care in shared humility.[[4348]](#endnote-4349)

‘Dialogues among civilisations’ are important, yet, they will not be enough. Global inter-human relations wait to be nurtured by global citizen ‘healers’ who join diplomats as they negotiate inter-national relations. Diplomats are rational negotiators and therefore no match for populist humiliation entrepreneurs who manipulate the psychology of the masses, diplomats cannot create the global trust that is the most sought after resource at this point in history.[[4349]](#endnote-4350) Likewise, the climate and biodiversity crises cannot be tackled by climate scientists alone. Veteran climate scientist James Gustave ‘Gus’ Speth once thought that the top environmental problems were biodiversity loss, ecosystem collapse, and climate change, and that within 30 years, good science could address those problems. But, so he admits, ‘I was wrong. The top environmental problems are selfishness, greed and apathy, and to deal with those we need a spiritual and cultural transformation. And we scientists don’t know how to do that’.[[4350]](#endnote-4351)

Humans are relational beings, and while rational thinking is a human capability, it is not dominant. The belief that humans are primarily rational beings is yet another top environmental problem. Even the best solution will be undermined if it is communicated on the basis of this belief, as the problem will be exacerbated rather than solved. Indignation at each other’s ‘stupidity’ or ‘evil refusal to be reasonable’ will be the result, and this will intensify emotionalised polarisation.

Political scientists and climate scientists will need the support from all fields of psychology that can help cultivate global connectedness and compassion[[4351]](#endnote-4352) and can offer healing-centred care.[[4352]](#endnote-4353) Every human being is an Earth citizen and whoever has the resources is called to become a global caregiver and engage in global human-to-human trust building, as humiliation can only be remedied through humble and respectful attention offered by all involved. No longer can charity function as purchase of indulgence or care-less ‘missionary’ of economism,[[4353]](#endnote-4354) when what is needed is care-ful care. No longer can we abandon the world to be used and abused as ‘business opportunity’, ‘leisure park’, or ‘arena for self-congratulatory philanthropy’ by the Global North.

Given the vast amount of knowledge that we, as humanity, have access to, we no longer have to accept that all aspects of our lives be captured by ulterior interests. We do not have to make do with a world that allows people to mistake equal dignity for equal entitlement to profiteering, a world where profiteering even informs the very institutions of the world-system and legitimises free riding on the common good at a global scale. No longer do we have to accept rules that incentivise mistrust, where conspiracy entrepreneurs poison relationships between nations as much as between individuals.[[4354]](#endnote-4355) Allowing for such a state of affairs to continue means nothing but condoning the prolongation of worldwide systemic humiliation. More options are on the table now than big or small government, there is also decent governance. Decent governance means putting in place systemic constitutive rules that dignify both local and global governance on the basis of unity in diversity and with the help of the subsidiarity principle. Helping to bring such a future about for our global village is everyone’s responsibility now.

Together, all of the citizens of this world need to co-create the next form of civilisation, a form that can dignify us all.[[4355]](#endnote-4356) Migrating to another planet will not help, our presently reigning hegemonic mindset would quickly destroy it as well.[[4356]](#endnote-4357) It is time to learn to cooperate with our own evolution on the planet that we have. It is time to prepare for the crises that loom, to summon post-despair and post-denial hope. For philosopher William James (1842–1910) meliorism stands in the middle between optimism and pessimism, meliorism is the probability that humans can improve the world.[[4357]](#endnote-4358) I call it steadfast love.

Ruben Nelson of Foresight Canada was introduced earlier. He sees us trapped in STEMxM (Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics x Money).[[4358]](#endnote-4359) Our ‘most fundamental limitations’ are ‘in our unconscious acceptance of the host of subtle ways Modernity has bound us to itself as if it owns us’.[[4359]](#endnote-4360) As we begin to understand our ecological limits, as we sense that we run out of cheap energy and disrupt the climate, here is the problem, says Nelson — we do not yet understand ‘humans as persons’.[[4360]](#endnote-4361) Nelson reminds us of Scottish philosopher John MacMurray who offered this historical analysis: From the twelfth to the eighteenth centuries, the West learned ‘to think systematically and to manage the material world’, then, in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the West learned ‘to think systematically about and to manage organic things’, however, we still have to perceive and understand ‘persons as persons’ and ‘act accordingly’.[[4361]](#endnote-4362) We are ‘still treating persons as things’, MacMurray concluded.[[4362]](#endnote-4363) Martin Buber would say that we still treat persons as I-It objects.[[4363]](#endnote-4364)

I resonate deeply with these observations. I see us travelling full speed into a dead end without even imaging alternative future-oriented roads, let alone trying them out, at least not at large enough scales. After the end of the Cold War, I saw humanity in hospital and thought that working for dignity could bring about long-term healing. I thought we had the choice between dignified survival and undignified survival. Now humanity is perhaps already in hospice and, who knows, our foremost task may be to accept the unavoidable and at least go down together in dignity. By now, I am in mourning, I mourn the long list of species that are dying out, a list that may very well include Homo sapiens prematurely, and this not due to a volcanic eruption or a meteor impact but at our own hands.[[4364]](#endnote-4365) I mourn that we, Homo sapiens, even though we have everything required to turn the situation around, sleepwalk behind triumphalist dominators and manipulators who head for the cliff. If we continue like this, the majority of humanity will soon suffer the kinds of humiliation that mostly Indigenous populations had to endure so far: trauma, addiction, suicide.[[4365]](#endnote-4366) It is sad to see the presently unfolding coronavirus pandemic accelerate the funnelling of valid worries into dangerous conspiracy narratives and violence instead of sober future planning.[[4366]](#endnote-4367)

Ruben Nelson delivers a passionate appeal to humanity, namely, ‘to grow up’ in the sense of growing in wisdom and humility. ‘The great work of the 21st Century is not to make Modernity sustainable’, he says, ‘rather, it is to learn to let go of Modernity; to outgrow it, and this at every scale at which we exist from individual persons to families, to friendships, to communities, altogether to new cultures that embody the next form of civilisation’:

Our new work is to embrace the adventure of being the first people in human history who learn to nurture the next form of civilisation into being. In the past, all new forms of civilisation have emerged unconsciously, slowly over centuries, if not millennia, locally/regionally and as an option. No culture was required to embrace the new form of civilisation. Now we face the challenge that we grow into a new form of civilisation, do so openly and consciously, rapidly by any historical standard, and all this in a way that in time is scalable globally because our existence and that of much that we love requires it. In short, the most fundamental limitations of local action are found in our unconscious acceptance of the host of subtle ways Modernity has bound us to itself as if it owns us.[[4367]](#endnote-4368)

Ruben Nelson’s analysis of humanity’s current state of affairs aligns very much with my global observations. Our state of affairs is particularly saddening because for the first time in human history, it is no longer an unrealistic dream to transcend competition for dominance and embrace dialogical partnership globally and locally. Now we can. We can leave behind the idea that freedom is only securable through maintaining a Hobbesian ‘Wall Street world’, a world where ‘competitiveness’ means having the most fear-inducing weapons and the strongest bullies as leaders, where selfishness is a virtue and selfless service is regarded as a psychological deficiency. We have everything needed to make the ideal of multi-lateralism work by building a global village that deserves its name.[[4368]](#endnote-4369)

Human rights ideals represent global in-group ethics, the very ethics that the global village needs if it wants to heal its divisions[[4369]](#endnote-4370) and create a decent future for itself.[[4370]](#endnote-4371) The scope of ethics, the scope of empathic identifications that a village usually offers to its inhabitants within its borders can now include the entire global village.[[4371]](#endnote-4372) The care and loyalty that we usually offer to fellow members in an extended family or in a traditional tribe can now encompass all human beings in global connectedness and compassion.[[4372]](#endnote-4373) We can rescue basic decency worldwide, the decency of ‘protecting the essential needs and conditions of upholding the dignity of all persons’.[[4373]](#endnote-4374) We can turn our planet into a planetary ‘territory of life’.

To do so, we may need to learn from all Indigenous peoples who still practice skills and traditions of dialogue with nature instead of control over nature. Small Indigenous groups show how commons can be protected, and recent research demonstrates that also larger groups can do so.[[4374]](#endnote-4375) Survival International[[4375]](#endnote-4376) and the International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs[[4376]](#endnote-4377) are among relevant initiatives. The work of Catherine Odora Hoppers on Indigenous knowledge systems in Africa has been mentioned before,[[4377]](#endnote-4378) as has the work of Don ‘Four Arrows’ Jacobs of Cherokee and Muscogee Creek ancestry.[[4378]](#endnote-4379)

Territories of life are territories and areas that are governed, managed, and conserved by custodian Indigenous peoples and local communities. In 2010, they formed a consortium that engages in:

* work at the local level (self-strengthening of specific ‘territories of life’)
* work at national level (networking and coalition building to — hopefully — reach a critical mass for policy change)
* work at regional level (sharing experiences and mutual learning)
* work at international level (promoting international policy recognition of territories of life for conservation of nature but also for sustainable self-determination, livelihoods and well-being of custodian communities).[[4379]](#endnote-4380)

So far, the consortium’s experience indicates that all levels of work are mutually enriching, yet, that the national level is the hardest obstacle and therefore in need of most attention. ‘The local level is essential and gives meaning to all the others. The international level has been important to awaken many to what was possible. The national level is the hardest and can be the most fruitful’.[[4380]](#endnote-4381)

We, as humankind, are in a position now where we can form a global citizens movement and rescue our world from becoming territories of death. We can turn it into territories of life. Convivialism and inclusionism can make us embrace our planet as we the planet with sustenance for all species. We can jointly envision a dignity transition towards new global generative mechanisms and new constitutive rules. We can heed the African adage that ‘it takes a village to raise a child’ and co-create a global community of nurturant parents who raise their children to be stewards of our shared social and ecological commons.[[4381]](#endnote-4382) The transgenerational transmission of loving empathy is possible, we can leave behind the transgenerational transmission of trauma.[[4382]](#endnote-4383) Nurturant parenting strengthens the intrinsic motivation in children to act pro-socially, and when these children grow up, they will need no carrots nor sticks to be responsible citizens, they will fill their communities with dignity out of their own volition.[[4383]](#endnote-4384) We can apply the Indigenous seven-generation rule and protect our global commons — small Indigenous groups know how to do that and also larger groups can do it.

Dignity is much more than individual autonomy, dignity speaks to philosopher Martin Buber’s notion of I-Thou relationships, dialogical encounters that entail a dimension that is larger than life, encounters that are so awe-inspiring that they deserve the word divine.[[4384]](#endnote-4385) In my work, I speak of the literacy of love, of love as the very foundation for human dignity.[[4385]](#endnote-4386) Only with this love can feelings of humiliation be healed and prevented from becoming the nuclear bomb of the emotions. I value a Norwegian philosopher saying that ‘our emotional life, in the tension between passion and suffering, confronts us with love as the basic premise of human life in all its complexity’.[[4386]](#endnote-4387)

A future of dignity, a future beyond systemic humiliation, is within our reach. Equal dignity in loving solidarity — what I call dignism — can become reality. It may sound like utopia and it is utopia. Global dignism, however, is a necessary utopia, a eutopia, and it remains necessary even if the probability of its realisation is small. Humankind’s survival depends on this eutopia. The alternative is environmental collapse and a militarised world that ends in mutual destruction.[[4387]](#endnote-4388)

Both pessimism and optimism are luxuries that are only affordable in good times, they can become life threatening in times of crisis.[[4388]](#endnote-4389) Antarctic explorer Ernest Shackleton kept his people alive under the most extreme circumstances, and he did so by creating a balance between the courage of optimism and the reality testing of pessimism. Had he placed all pessimistic members of his crew into one lifeboat together, they would have lacked courage and sunk. Had he placed all optimistic people in one boat together, they might have also sunk due to neglecting reality testing. The art is to complement each other — ‘pessimism of the intellect, optimism of the will’, to use the words that philosopher Antonio Gramsci spoke out of prison.[[4389]](#endnote-4390)

Three reasons for optimistic hope and hopeful optimism are certain. First, humans are capable of enormous courage and loving cooperation. Second, we, the presently living generations, unlike our Neolithic forebears and even unlike our immediate grandparents, have all the scientific knowledge and technological means needed to co-create a decent global village. Third, the coronavirus pandemic has shown that we are capable of far-reaching societal changes and this fast.

Now the moment has come where we have to make the effort to translate our theoretical insights into action.[[4390]](#endnote-4391) We cannot lose time on calculating whether making the effort is worth it or not, the future is not like a business partner with whom one can make deals. People in a lifeboat drown if they lose time on waiting for hope. As long as we wait to act until hope has ‘befallen’ us, there will be no hope. Likewise, as long as we hope for miracles to happen so we can stay lazy now, there will be no hope. Hope depends on our action, on us creating hope against hope, on the optimistic fatalism of ‘determination in the face of uncertainty’.[[4391]](#endnote-4392) We are the authors of hope, not its recipients, hope is the outcome of our action, not its precondition. Only if we give it our all, without hesitation, will there be hope, and it will be slow hope rather than fast hope.[[4392]](#endnote-4393) ‘Wringing our hands just slows us down from pushing up our sleeves’ is a well-known proverb, or, as it rhymes in German, ‘Es gibt nichts Gutes, außer man tut es’, meaning ‘nothing good happens unless we do it’.

Besides, whose hope are we speaking of? Those on the luxury top floor might hope that their cabins will stay afloat when the rest of the ship goes down. Or they may hope to survive by monopolising the lifeboats and letting the rest perish. Is that what we mean by hope? What about the presently unfolding conspiracy entrepreneurship that ‘surfs’ on our fears and monetises them, does this make us more hopeful?[[4393]](#endnote-4394)

This is my message: Let us aim at surviving all together in dignity, or, if unavoidable, let us at least go down in dignity together. Rather than losing time and energy on asking whether there is reason for hope, on calculating odds or waiting for miracles, let us face the fact that reasons for hope depend on our action.[[4394]](#endnote-4395) We cannot know the future, we are surrounded by symptoms and predictions, and we will only know which symptoms are significant and which prophecies are true after what has been predicted has happened: post res perditas. What we know for certain already now is that love and dignity are within our reach, that human nature allows for it, that, if we hold on to love and dignity, we will always gain, no matter if we survive or go down together.[[4395]](#endnote-4396)

This is our road map: Let us preserve a dignified sense of our strength, let us stay calm even in the face of adversity, let us avoid depression just as much as indignated rage or triumphalist optimism. Let us connect passion, love, and companionship with patience, so we can make thoughtful plans rather than ‘running into the bullets’ in panic and rage. It is no option anymore to build in-group solidarity on out-group hatred, because this will hinder us to turn ‘enemies’ into friends. Let us nurture the strongest force there is, namely, loving and passionate solidarity just for its own sake, and let us do so globally.[[4396]](#endnote-4397) Let us pool our energies into a ‘declaration of independence’ for Earthland and sit together in global constitution-building assemblies to co-create the next form of civilisation. We have everything needed ‘to orchestrate simultaneous, worldwide cosmopolitan declaration ceremonies’.[[4397]](#endnote-4398)

The list of dignifying peacebuilders such as Bertha von Suttner, Mohandas K. Gandhi, Dietrich Bonhoeffer, Eleanor Roosevelt, Rachel Carson, Paulo Freire, or Nelson Mandela waits to become much longer. Your name should be added to it. Let’s roll!

### Together we can achieve global dignity in solidarity

If we, as humanity, were magicians, we could implement new global constitutive governance rules overnight, try them out for a few months, and replace them until we found the most dignifying ways for us to arrange our affairs on this planet. As we are not magicians, the maximum we can do is envision eutopian futures, and then try them out as best as we can. This is what humanity did so far, very slowly, always waiting for bloody revolutions to halt outdated experiments, or, as happens now, even risking human extinction in the vain hope for victory through competition for dominance.

I dedicate my entire life to calling on all of us to envision and try out dignifying eutopian futures as much as is feasible in our presently existing world, and at the same time always remain prepared to adjust and try again. I have embedded myself in as many cultural contexts as was possible for me to realise during my lifetime, with the aim to collect as much experience and knowledge as possible about what we humans are capable of in terms of dignity and what the best ways may be for us to arrange our journey on our planet Earth. I made the human family my family and took the planet as my university. To avoid having my dignity mission suspected of being influenced by ulterior national, political, or corporate interests, I live on small gifts and almost without possessions and money, and this gives me the freedom to develop out-of-the-box perspectives on our human condition. I am not an idealist driven by any religion or ideology, I am a realist in a loving and caring I-Thou relationship with all of humanity. I give unconditional love without expecting rewards. This is my personal gift to humanity, motivated by my family history of trauma inflicted by the Nazi regime and the war it unleashed in the twentieth century.

Together with relational psychologist Linda Hartling and a dedicated core group of scholars and educators, I have the honour of nurturing a global collaborative movement of people who wish to walk the talk of dignity. I do so ever since the idea for this work was born in 2001. We call it Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies (HumanDHS). Linda Hartling describes it as ‘more than a fellowship, more than a community, more than a network, more than a family, more than a movement, more than any currently available definitions ... perhaps it could be described as an ecosphere, a relational ecosphere of loving beings connected in efforts to cultivate a better future for all people’.[[4398]](#endnote-4399) Linda Hartling is our director, I am the founding president, and we have both written a doctoral dissertation on the topic of humiliation (Hartling in 1995, Lindner in 2001). We look back on nearly twenty years of ‘holding hands in dignity leadership’, twenty years of organisational experience and lessons learned, and we plan to continue with this work throughout our entire lifetimes, as this is not a ‘job’ for us but a life mission.[[4399]](#endnote-4400)

In the information we send to interested people, we offer the following text as a description of our dignicommunity, which also serves as an encouragement and inspiration for others:

We are a global transdisciplinary network of concerned scholars, researchers, and educators of all academic fields, in collaboration with practitioners, creative artists, and many others, all of whom share a wish to stimulate systemic change, globally and locally, to open space for dignity, mutual respect, and esteem to take root and grow. Our goal is to foster healing from cycles of humiliation throughout the world, ending systemic humiliation and humiliating practices, and preventing new ones from arising. We wish to open space for feelings of humiliation to be transformed into action that dignifies the lives of all people and that replenishes our planet. We suggest that a frame of cooperation and shared humility is needed — rather than a mindset of humiliation — if we wish to build a better world, a world of equal dignity for all in solidarity.

We work primarily with individuals rather than with organisations, and these individuals then bring their organisational affiliations into our network. In this way, we answer the call we hear from all around the world, namely, that what is most lacking today is ‘global transformative collaboration among multi-local human actors’.[[4400]](#endnote-4401) We invite people who focus on the ‘ultimate drivers’ of deep systemic change, namely, the ‘values, knowledge, power, culture, all of which shapes society and the human experience’ at their core.[[4401]](#endnote-4402)

The HumanDHS network has convened more than 35 conferences all around the world since 2003 — usually two conferences per year — and we also wish to invite the reader of this book to participate in the future. Thus far, we have had one global conference taking place at a different location each year, including conferences in Europe (Paris, Berlin, Oslo, and Dubrovnik), Costa Rica, China, Hawai’i, Turkey, Egypt, New Zealand, South Africa, Rwanda, Chiang Mai in Northern Thailand, Indore in Central India, and the Amazon in Brazil. Furthermore, we come together for a second time each December, namely, for our Workshop on Transforming Humiliation and Violent Conflict at Columbia University in New York City, with the late Morton Deutsch as our honorary convener. During the coronavirus pandemic, this workshop took place online.

A new educational effort emerged out of our dignity network in 2011, namely, the World Dignity University initiative, into which we invite all learners and educators for whom dignity is central. In 2012, Dignity Press was established with its imprint World Dignity University Press. It has published a wide range of books in several languages on topics related to dignity and humiliation.

All efforts are a pro bono labour of love and entirely maintained by wealth that is measured in gifts of time, energy, and talent, all creatively shared by the network’s members and supporters.[[4402]](#endnote-4403) Our experience has shown that dignity quickly falls by the wayside when monetary exchanges become involved. Therefore, we intentionally strive to avoid becoming yet another ‘profiteering’ non-profit organisation, instead, we live by the maxim that ‘money should serve rather than lead’. We forego competing for donations, grants, or corporate sponsorship, and maintain a close to zero budget. Thus, we keep our dignity mission ‘unsullied’, by stepping outside of the monetised world. We practice various approaches to a gift economy,[[4403]](#endnote-4404) as we have learned that this is the only way for us to prove the integrity of our mission. No one can suspect us of running errands for national or corporate interests. In this way, our HumanDHS network takes seriously the insight that ‘mission-driven organisations are less corrupt’.[[4404]](#endnote-4405) Philosopher Howard Richards who contributed with the Foreword to this book said it well, ‘Gandhians can associate being mission-driven with dharmic living, Christians with vocation, Marxists with solidarity ... the list could go on’.[[4405]](#endnote-4406) We are driven by dignity.

In line with our ‘lean’ approach, we forego investing energy in building brick-and-mortar structures. We have no ‘headquarters’ that would give our work a national anchoring that might suggest all other places are not our headquarters, thus tempting people to associate us with specific national interests. We are a fellowship of individual citizens, we are United Global Citizens for Dignity, and in this respect, we are even more global than the United Nations, as this is a fellowship of nations. In practice, taken together, all the places are our headquarters where members of our organisation are based, thus manifesting us as a glocal movement, headquartered on planet Earth, with the postal address of ‘planet Earth’. I serve as our global ambassador, my laptop could be called our globally mobile headquarters, with Linda Hartling living in Portland, Oregon, and our members coming from all continents. We invite all like-minded people to join us in creating a strong sense of lifelong belonging to this global dignity family.[[4406]](#endnote-4407)

These highly deliberate ways of organising our efforts grow out of our community’s ongoing ‘dignicreativity’. Linda Hartling’s mentor was ground-breaking thinker Jean Baker Miller, who observed that creativity is a ‘continuous process of bringing forth a changing vision of oneself, and of oneself in relation to the world’.[[4407]](#endnote-4408) As a community, we cherish Oregonian poet William Stafford’s insight that ‘the creative life of unknown people might be a tremendous hidden river’.[[4408]](#endnote-4409) We work to un-hide such rivers of dignicreativity and chart new dignifying paths for people and our planet.

In my case, when people ask me, ‘Where are you from?’ I reply, ‘I live in the global village as part of a global dignity family’.[[4409]](#endnote-4410) When people ask, ‘What is your religion?’ I reply, ‘My religion is love, humility, and awe and wonderment’. When people ask what drives my creativity, I ask back, ‘Perhaps the aim of life is to understand the universe?’[[4410]](#endnote-4411)

Through our work, we meet many people around the world who are intelligent and diligent, hardworking, and prolific. Few, however, are sensitive to humility, few understand the growing significance of dignity and the increasing danger from its violation, humiliation. This sensitivity is like a foreign language that some people speak and others do not. It is a language that is difficult to learn — some people seem to know it intuitively, perhaps through particularly harsh life experiences that they succeeded in overcoming without becoming other- or self-destructive. This sensitivity is what is most valuable for us, more important than any ‘tangible product’ or achievement. We look for people who embody and cultivate the language of dignity through their efforts. Through our work, we wish to spell out in ever-greater depths what this new language of equal dignity in solidarity means, the language of which so few people have an inkling. We ourselves are only learners as well, of course — we are all perpetual apprentices.

We think very long-term and plan the collaboration in our community to last throughout our lifetimes. Everyone who embodies and cultivates the language of dignity is welcome in our dignity family. Since our work is not about money, power, or other quantifiable markers of success, our dedication to dignity is our ‘dignity credential’. We are aware that many of those who live by material markers look down on our work and discard it as a ‘humiliation credential’. The nomination for the Nobel Peace Prize in 2015, 2016, and 2017 gave us great courage and has been lifesaving for many of our members around the world who often stand up for dignity under the most adverse conditions, some even putting their lives on line. We hope this recognition can be an inspiration also for you and the many others who work for dignity throughout the world.

Our dignity fellowship is a fluidly evolving cooperative community rather than a monolithic organisation that speaks with one voice, neither do we wish to be a monolithic organisation.[[4411]](#endnote-4412) Rather, we aim to manifest dignity by holding space for unity in diversity. In this context, Linda Hartling and I wear two ‘hats’ — one for unity and the other for diversity. We wear the first hat when we convene our global dignity community and organise our conferences, in this role we are unifiers who strive to protect the diversity of the entire fellowship so that everyone can forge their own path to dignity in their work and lives. We wear the other hat when we write books, articles, or give lectures, then we are simply one part among others of the diverse membership of our community. It is therefore important for me to make clear that I speak only for myself in this book, as an individual researcher, and that my views do not define any ‘official’ position of our dignity movement. My judgements and misjudgements are entirely my own, and I am humbly aware that I am per definition as blind to my own blindness as we all are.

As I hail from a displaced family who has been deeply affected by the two world wars of the last century, I am particularly aware of the vulnerabilities of our human faring on this planet. All my life, I have been preparing for the next ‘Eleanor Roosevelt moment’ like in 1948. I wait for a new window of opportunity to open for dignity to regain the attention it deserves. Together with Linda Hartling and all other close collaborators, I am helping to nurture a moment like this to manifest, ready to be among its co-authors if needed, ready to contribute with our approach to loving dignity.

In 1962, when Rachel Carson alerted the world to the dangers of the indiscriminate use of pesticides for the whole natural world, many were full of hope for a substantial turnaround.[[4412]](#endnote-4413) Many ‘yes we can’ moments followed, the Brundtland Commission in 1987, the Earth Summit in 1992,[[4413]](#endnote-4414) the Nobel Peace Prize for the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change in 2007,[[4414]](#endnote-4415) and the Paris Agreement on global warming in 2015.[[4415]](#endnote-4416) Yet, in the end, at least so far, short-term corporate interests always prevailed. ‘It is a sad fact that humanity has largely squandered the past 30 years in futile debates and well intentioned, but half-hearted responses to the global ecological challenge. We do not have another 30 years to dither. Much will have to change if the ongoing overshoot is not to be followed by collapse during the twenty-first century’, these were the words of environmental pioneer Donella Meadows in 2004.[[4416]](#endnote-4417) By now, we still dither, and corporate interests are still winning out. We only have to look at the Sustainable Development Goals set by the United Nations General Assembly for 2030 and we see that Goal 8 presents with an exponential economic growth curve, a curve that represents an impossibility in a finite context.[[4417]](#endnote-4418)

The world went from ‘Earthrise’ in the 1960s, to ‘profit versus planet’ around 1970–1987, environmentalism turned into ‘sustainability’ around 1987–1997, and finally into ‘market environmentalism’ from 1998 to 2018.[[4418]](#endnote-4419) In 2019 came Greta Thunberg. Since 2020, we have the Covid-19 virus. What comes next?

In 2021, veteran political analyst Roberto Savio invites us to look back. He was born in the early 1930s and was personally present during many important turning points since World War II.[[4419]](#endnote-4420) After the horrors of this war, in 1948, a window of opportunity opened for human rights ideals to be adopted. Savio saw the non-aligned nations movement arise in 1955 from the denouncement of the colonial system, then, in 1974, he witnessed enthusiasm culminate in the hope ‘that this was only the beginning of a process of dignity and freedom’. Unfortunately, so Savio concludes, this enthusiasm was premature, as history began to go ‘backwards again’ in 1981.[[4420]](#endnote-4421)

The great question for now is this: Can we make history go forward again?

Why have we, the human family, missed so many historical invitations to unite in dignity, even in today’s situation where we face global crises that urgently need collective action? Why do we let grim as well as fortuitous historical invitations for unified action pass by? We turned down the fortuitous invitation entailed in the ending of the Cold War, we let the grim invitation of the September 11 attacks in 2011 pass, and in 2008, we failed to recognise the call for unity in dignity in response to an enormous financial crisis as well. The 4,000-page report by the International Panel on Climate Change scheduled to be published in February 2022 states that ‘we need transformational change operating on processes and behaviour at all levels: individual, communities, business, institutions and governments. We must redefine our way of life and consumption’.[[4421]](#endnote-4422)

As we watch cascading crises unfold around the world, our shared hope is for an exponential change of heart so that global unity rooted in respect for local diversity becomes possible. We have a time window of roughly ten years before us where we still can mitigate catastrophe. The central question we face, as humanity, and that we must ask and answer together in all languages, remains:

How must we, humankind, arrange our affairs on this planet so that dignified life will be possible in the long term?

Small wins  
Howard Richards’ reply to Evelin Lindner’s question  
‘How must we, humankind, arrange our affairs on this planet so that dignified life will be possible in the long term?’  
― Howard Richards, September 2021[[4422]](#endnote-4423)

No problem can be solved from the same consciousness that created it. We have to learn to see the world anew.

― Albert Einstein (1879–1955)

The person who says ‘it cannot be done’ should not interrupt the person doing it.

― Chinese Proverb[[4423]](#endnote-4424)
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Toward a dignihistory: A global plea

Recife, 9th May 2019

Evelin Lindner has eloquently shown us

how Humility has been probed and how

Human Character has been elevated.

A much needed inspiration her research has provided.

By her findings and insights many-a-generation will be guided.

This comprehensive Dignity of Dignity

will help build new ways of peaceful living for Humanity.

Toward a dignihistory: A global plea

Recife, 1st November 2018

Historians say that Humanity has gone through revolutions,

but also that such periods may have brought about evolutions.

In what has the History of Humankind excelled?

What human-enhancing values have been propelled?

What phases of History have been exemplarily edifying?

Alas, what historical events have been utterly terrifying?

How?

By today´s historians what great deeds have been pronounced?

Alas, what shameful historical facts have been globally denounced?

How?

As History eloquently reminds us of our variegated past,

can it help us anticipate a future which will peacefully last?

How?

Multi-lingually global accounts of dignifiers’ acts will be retold

to be probed and cherished as if they were historical gold.

When will world history as DIGNI-History be composed?

When the education of global citizens as COSMODIGNIFIERS shall be proposed.

May this reflection also be taken as a global plea

for a DIGNI-History there to be.

An emerging (r)evolution: A DIGNIrevolution

Recife, 8th July 2018

In his acclaimed SAPIENS. A brief history of humankind (HarperCollins, 2015), Yuval Noah Harari has three chapters on revolutions: Cognitive, Agricultural, and Scientific. In the book’s Timeline of History, the author adds Industrial Revolution. In his HOMO DEUS. A brief history of tomorrow (Vintage, 2015), we find a chapter on the Humanist Revolution.

Surprisingly, DIGNITY does not appear in the Index of his two books.

If I were asked to start a list of emerging revolutions, I would humbly suggest a DIGNIrevolution, a change which is being advocated and implemented by a global community of DIGNIFIERS, committed ‘to help build a world of equal dignity to all’ and who share the conviction that Humankind’s Life-on-Earth-enhancement rests on the sustained elevation of human character, conduct, and communication.

In such spirit, my open-ended list is presented for readers to reflect on, discuss/probe/question. To know more about the community of Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies, see [www.humiliationstudies.org](http://www.humiliationstudies.org).

DIGNIrevolution: An alphabetically arranged list

The DIGNIrevolution is being realised transdisciplinarily through such knowledge areas / domains / fields as:

DIGNanthropology

DIGNagriculture

DIGNIarts

DIGNIbiology

DIGNIcommunication

DIGNIcreativity

DIGNIculture

DIGNIdiplomacy

DIGNeducation

DIGNecology

DIGNeconomics

DIGNIentertainment

DIGNethics

DIGNIfuturism

DIGNIglobalisation

DIGNihealth professions

DIGNIhistory

DIGNIjournalism

DIGNijustice

DIGNIlaw

DIGNIlinguistics

DIGNIliteracy

DIGNIliterature

DIGNImusic

DIGNIpeace

DIGNphilosophy

DIGNIpsychology

DIGNIrights

DIGNIsciences

DIGNIsecurity

DIGNIspirituality

DIGNItechnology

DIGNItrade

What other emerging (r)evolutions would readers add to my list?   
Why?   
May this poster be worthy of your CREATIVattention.

Linda Hartling’s response on 9th July 2018

Wonderful, dearest Francisco!

I’m building on your ideas with a few more that you may have already thought of...

DIGNIrelationship

DIGNIcare

DIGNIconnection

DIGNIcompassion

DIGNIpolitics

DIGNIleadership

With all of my DIGNIadmiration!

Linda

# Appendix

In this Appendix a condensed schematic overview over the flow of the argument in this book is offered in Table 4 and a summary of the human condition as it presents itself at the present moment in history in Table 5 (a repetition of Table 3 in chapter 12).

|  |
| --- |
| **Guiding questions** |
| We as humankind, where do we come from, where are we now, and where must we go, if we wish for a dignified future? |
| **Short answer**  We have dug ourselves into a multitude of perilous crises, both despite and because of what we call progress. We engage in systemic humiliation — ecocide and sociocide — we shred our relations with our habitat and with each other. We catalyse the degradation of our ecosphere and sociosphere by damaging our cogitosphere, the realm of thinking and reflection. We do so to the point of cogitocide, so that we embark sightlessly into collective suicide as a species, and on omnicide, the annihilation of all life on Earth.  At the same time, there is also an immense window of opportunity waiting for us to use. Never before in human history did we possess all the knowledge and skills to turn the entire world into a dignity sphere. Unfortunately, so far, instead of recognising the depth of the crises we face and grasping the historic opportunity to exit, it seems that most of us choose to stay shortsighted and myopic. |
| **The hope**  Perhaps we need a crisis that is big enough to urge us to use existing windows of opportunity in earnest? What about the coronavirus pandemic, despite the suffering it causes? |

|  |
| --- |
| **Choice of tools for analysis and modelling** |
| Social psychology is positioned in between micro and macro levels of analysis and modelling and thus offers access to full transdisciplinarity ‘up and down’. |
| Big history shapes emotions and meta-emotions (how we manifest emotions). |
| The philosophy of mind of non-dualism and unity in diversity can be connected with process philosophy. |
| Unity in diversity can be manifested through layered approaches, such as the notion of subsidiarity, or Max Weber’s ideal-type approach. |
| Critical realism is a fruitful philosophical approach to understanding science. |
| As for methodologies, transdisciplinary approaches are helpful, as is self-reflective autoethnography. The author of this book has developed a unique holistic methodology, what she calls a global life design, grounded in walking the talk of dignity in all spheres of her personal life, including the use of a gift economy as a path to independence from national and corporate interests and funding. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Conceptualisation of past history** |
| Punctuation of history in the past: The Neolithic Revolution unfolded after the first 97 per cent of Homo sapiens’ history (archaeology, anthropology), at the end of what Lindner calls the first round of globalisation. |
| New factor: A win-win context transmuted into a win-lose context (William Ury, anthropology, game theory, and conflict studies), circumscription became salient (Robert Carneiro, anthropology). |
| Homo sapiens’ adaptation: Partnership transmuted into competition for domination and control in all spheres, social and ecological (Lindner). |
| Reality of the past millennia (the past 3 per cent of Homo sapiens’ history): The security dilemma represented the strongest obstacle to peace (political science). |
| Homo sapiens’ adaptation: The androcentric dominator model of society (Riane Eisler) arose, equal dignity transmuted into ranked honour, including rigid gender roles (Lindner). |
| Result: Worthiness became ranked, humiliation became a legitimate tool for superiors to keep the hierarchy of ranked honour in place. Aristocrats could go to duel in response to the humiliation of their honour, while subordinates could not. Honour was for men, shame for women (Lindner). |

|  |
| --- |
| **Conceptualisation of present times** |
| Historic opportunity: The ingathering of humanity and the awareness of humanity as one family on a vulnerable interconnected and finite planet makes it possible to attenuate the security dilemma and turn the tragedy of the commons into the blessings of the commons (Lindner). |
| Present punctuation of history: The idea of equal dignity is regained, with the year 1757 as a linguistic marker in the English language. The maxim of liberté, égalité, fraternité (solidarity) emerged in 1789, and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights was adopted in 1948. Human rights ideals are the only feasible ‘in-group ethics’ for a global village, the only way to unite its diversity and survive (Lindner). |
| New reality: The Zeitgeist is divided into two camps: those who resonate with this shift and want to continue with it, and those who do not (Lindner). |
| New reality, wherever human rights ideals become salient: Humiliation turns from a legitimate pro-social tool into an anti-social illegitimate violation (Lindner). |
| New reality: Dignity humiliation separates from honour humiliation (Lindner). |
| New reality: The promise of equal dignity is higher than the promise of ranked honour, and dignity humiliation (the betrayal of the promise of equal dignity for all) is therefore more hurtful than honour humiliation (Lindner). |
| New reality: Most people are still socialised into the honour mindset, and the challenge is to learn how to respond to dignity humiliation in dignifying ways rather than with honour revenge (cross back, Lindner). |
| New reality: Cross backs (feelings of dignity humiliation responded to with tools of honour revenge) turn humiliation into the nuclear bomb of the emotions (Lindner). |
| New reality: Meta-cycles of humiliation occur when honour and dignity mindsets clash. ‘Clashes of civilisations’ can be enriching, while clashes of humiliation are dangerous (Lindner). |
| New reality: Instead of open oppression, the stealth ‘art’ of humiliation (Lindner) is used to thwart backlashes from humiliation — see also governmentality (Michel Foucault), naturalisation, and méconnaissance (Roland Barthes, Pierre Bourdieu, Foucault, and others). |
| New reality: Competition for domination is brought back and maximised through a new kind of dilemma, a growth dilemma, in the name of ‘efficiency’ and profit maximisation (Lindner). |
| The classical security dilemma is reactivated when for-profit military security replaces human security (Lindner). |
| New reality: As the vulnerabilities of commons are exploited as ‘business opportunities’, the commons dilemma transmutes into the tragedy of the commons, foreclosing the opportunity to create the blessings of the commons (Lindner). |
| Result: global and local ecocide and sociocide, catalysed by cogitocide. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Opportunities, responsibilities, and obstacles for the future** |
| Opportunities for the future: Starting from the era of pristine pride, humanity proceeded to the era of ranked honour, then to the era of equal dignity, and there is an opportunity now to create a future of equal dignity in solidarity (Lindner). |
| Opportunity: The ingathering of humanity through globalisation makes the transition from inter-national and inter-cultural relations to global inter-human relations possible (Lindner). |
| Opportunity and responsibility: The more the classical security dilemma attenuates through global interconnectedness and through the awareness that humanity is one family on a vulnerable interconnected and finite planet, the more it is the responsibility of every single citizen to engage in citizen-to-citizen global trust building so as to manifest equal dignity in solidarity in practice and forge dignified and dignifying global inter-human relations (Lindner). |
| Responsibility: As global inter-human relations overtake inter-national relations, as citizens take over from diplomats, the various fields of psychology have the responsibility to join political science in its role to advise the public. |
| Obstacle: Humiliation turns into the strongest obstacle to a dignified future, particularly dignity humiliation, or the ‘nuclear bomb of the emotions’. In the age of honour, the definitorial negative emotion was fear, in the age of dignity it is humiliation. Cycles of humiliation can re-fragment the world and bring back the classical security dilemma, they can turn a potentially united ‘global village’ into a divided war zone. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Hope for the future** |
| The long-term survival of Homo sapiens is possible through dignism (dignity-ism) and the humanisation of globalisation through egalisation (equal dignity for all in freedom), so that we can arrive at globegalisation, and combine it with solidarity, so that we will have co-globegalisation (Lindner). |

Table 4: A schematic overview over the flow of the argument in this book

In my first book in 2006, I suggested that there are four basic logics at the core of the human condition. Table 3 in chapter 12 displays these four logics, namely, the pie, the security dilemma, the future time horizon, and social identity.[[4424]](#endnote-4425) The table also suggests how these logics manifest through the three major eras of human existence that I defined as, a) the era of pristine pride, b) the era of honour, and c) the era of equal dignity.

* The first logic addresses the question as to whether and to what extent the pie of resources is expandable (game theory is relevant here, as developed within the discipline of philosophy)
* The second logic concerns the security dilemma and whether it is weaker or stronger (using international relations theory, as developed in the field of political science)
* The third logic asks whether a long-term or a short-term future time horizon dominates (as described in many academic disciplines, among them cross-cultural psychology, with the Indigenous seven-generation sustainability rule as most important example)
* The fourth logic concerns the human capacity to tighten or loosen fault lines of identification (social identity theory, as developed in social psychology, most importantly, as laid out in this book, entailing the warning that dignity humiliation can create historically unprecedented fault lines of confrontation)[[4425]](#endnote-4426)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | **The future time horizon** | | **Social identity** | |
| **short** | **long** | **respect** | **humiliation** |
| **The pie of resources** | **fixed** | (b) |  |  | (b, honour humiliation) |
| **expandable** |  | (a, c) | (a, c) | (c, dignity humiliation) |
| **The security dilemma** | **strong** | (b) |  |  | (b, honour humiliation) |
| **weak** |  | (a, c) | (a, c) | (c, dignity humiliation) |

See Table 3 in chapter 12: The human condition

The fourth logic speaks to the transition from unequal to equal worthiness, see Figure 1 in chapter 11. Egalisation invites masters to step down from arrogating superiority and encourages inferiors to rise up from humiliating subordination, up from being held down, up from having lesser value and worthiness ascribed to them. Overlords are humbled and underlings elevated, and all are entrusted with the co-creation of a new future of equality in dignity for all, as free and responsible individuals in solidarity. When this transition is promised but betrayed, feelings of dignity humiliation arise that are of unprecedented strength (see Table 1 in chapter 5), and deep fault lines of confrontation will divide society if these feelings fuel honour revenge (chapters 8 and 10 on cross back) instead of inspiring the forward-looking co-creation of a world of dignism (chapters 11 and 12). This is what the fourth logic warns against.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **The historical transition to egalisation** | | |
| Masters in a ranked honour order |  | Top of |
| (humiliation unleashes violence) |  | Gradient |
| New human rights order (humiliation should be overcome with dignism) |  | Line of solidarity in equal dignity, towards  interconnected  dignified humility |
| Underlings in a |  | Bottom of |
| ranked honour order (humiliation breeds  submissive humility) |  | Gradient |

Figure 1 in chapter 11:   
The historical transition to equal dignity in freedom and solidarity
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     This definition, while representing a substantial progress with respect to moving away from the conceptualisation of mental health as a state of absence of mental illness, raises several concerns and lends itself to potential misunderstandings when it identifies positive feelings and positive functioning as key factors for mental health. In fact, regarding well-being as a key aspect of mental health is difficult to reconcile with the many challenging life situations in which well-being may even be unhealthy: most people would consider as mentally unhealthy an individual experiencing a state of well-being while killing several persons during a war action, and would regard as healthy a person feeling desperate after being fired from his/her job in a situation in which occupational opportunities are scarce. People in good mental health are often sad, unwell, angry or unhappy, and this is part of a fully lived life for a human being. In spite of this, mental health has been often conceptualised as a purely positive affect, marked by feelings of happiness and sense of mastery over the environment.

     It is a privilege to have Norman Sartorius as an esteemed member in the global advisory board of the Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies community.  
     See also Jenkins, 2021, for a historical overview over the concept of mental illness, starting from humanity’s evolutionary past, through the major historical epochs from the mythological, the Classical, the Middle Ages, the Renaissance, the Enlightenment, and modern, and, last, the postmodern. I thank Louise Sundararajan for introducing us to Paul Jenkins’ work and this book. [↑](#endnote-ref-557)
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559. Gilligan, 1997, p. 110. [↑](#endnote-ref-560)
560. ‘With Iran, humiliation is a dangerous card to play’, by Amanda Ripley, *Washington Post*, 19th January 2020, www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/2020/01/19/with-iran-humiliation-is-dangerous-card-play/. [↑](#endnote-ref-561)
561. Tomkins, 1962–1992. [↑](#endnote-ref-562)
562. Nathanson, 1992. [↑](#endnote-ref-563)
563. Donald L. Nathanson in a personal communication when he visited the University of Oslo, 1st October 1999. See also Nathanson, 1992, p. 59. [↑](#endnote-ref-564)
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     Smedslund refers to psychologist James Lamiell, 2019, and his book *Psychology’s misuse of statistics and persistent dismissal of its critics.* [↑](#endnote-ref-594)
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     The relatively tame Danish political cartoons that ran in 2005 unleashed a torrent of protests among Political Islamists on three continents, threats of mass murder, and actual violence and killings. What does this reaction have to do with any reasonable sense of humiliation?

     See for a reaction, ‘Humiliation and terrorism: Goldhagen’s analysis’, by Richard Landes, *The Augean Stables*, 27th March 2007, [www.theaugeanstables.com/2007/03/27/humiliation-and-terrorism-goldhagens-analysis/](http://www.theaugeanstables.com/2007/03/27/humiliation-and-terrorism-goldhagens-analysis/):

     Now that’s a great expression — ‘reasonable sense of humiliation’. Any discussion of ‘humiliation’ should include what’s ‘reasonable’. For example, any discussion of ‘humiliation’ at checkpoints needs to address the reason for the checkpoints, the incredible shame to Islam that these checkpoints exist because of a death-cult that sends over women and children as suicide terrorists, and the fact that — viewed reasonably — Israeli checkpoints are a mild response to an outrageous provocation. Only the ability of demopaths to argue against the ‘Apartheid Wall’ renders the ‘humiliation’ of checkpoints the cause, not the consequence of the problem.

     See also Lindner, 2006b, p. 85, on Somali warlord Osman Ato, italics in the original:

     A warlord may indeed cover up power lust by using humiliation rhetoric. Ato may or may not be using humiliation to shield ulterior motives. The situation could be mixed — perhaps he sometimes feels genuinely humiliated and sometimes merely uses the humiliation argument to his political advantage. We do not know. What we know, and what a researcher has to report, is that he uses the humiliation argument, genuinely or not. An impartial researcher must recount this, nothing more and nothing less. A researcher cannot discount a person’s claims to feeling humiliated. [↑](#endnote-ref-606)
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607. See Lindner, 2000e, and Lindner, 2015b. My intention with my doctoral research was to help prevent future mass violence through understanding the dynamics of humiliation, my intention was *not* to blame the victims. My intention was *not* to suggest that Hutu were justified in perpetrating genocide in response to feeling humiliated by Tutsi. Similarly, Nazi Germany was *not* justified in unleashing war in response to feeling humiliated by the Versailles Treaties. I am profoundly worried by the fact that the latter narrative gains ground in Germany these days, not just driven by right wing extremists but also by a desire in the political centre to stabilise the country. Historian Andreas Wirsching reports from his experience that hardly any event in Germany about the wars of the past century goes by ‘without someone saying that the Versailles unjust peace is to blame’. See ‘Historiker über Militarismus und Sozialdarwinismus: Stammt die Ideologie Hitlers aus dem Kaiserreich?’ ein Interview von Klaus Wiegrefe, *Der Spiegel* 23/21, 7th June 2021, www.spiegel.de/geschichte/nationalsozialismus-die-buehne-die-hitler-1919-betrat-gab-es-vor-ihm-und-auch-das-publikum-a-d592716a-0002-0001-0000-000177779154, pp. 54–56, p. 55:

     Wirsching: ...Dann sind wir schnell im Narrativ der Fünfzigerjahre. Da waren quasi die Alliierten am Aufstieg der Nationalsozialisten schuld. Spiegel: So etwas behauptet heute niemand. Wirsching: Das unterschätzen Sie. Es vergeht kaum eine Veranstaltung über den Ersten Weltkrieg, nach der nicht jemand sagt, aber der Versailler Unrechtsfrieden sei doch schuld daran.

     See more about the work of Andreas Wirsching in note 2275 in chapter 7.  
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     Those born in Europe, or who came here as a child, do not belong to the economically deprived. Sociological models are therefore not well suited. They have many choices other than terrorism Islamists are concerned with pure doctrine. In Palestine the situation is different to Europe. In Gaza there are fewer choices. The humiliation experienced is much greater. They can ‘go black’, and then usual rational assessment values dissolve: lost honour must be avenged at whatever cost. Taliban, or those who live in Pakistan or the Middle East, experience different dynamics, much more acute frustration. Palestinians were apparently the first Muslims in modern times, in the 1990s, who used suicide bombers (*Assassins* were using similar methods 1000 years ago), and then time passed and the Taliban entered the stage much later, in 2006. The Tamil Tigers in Sri Lanka were the first in modern times who used this as *modus operandi.* [↑](#endnote-ref-732)
732. Lewis, 1971. [↑](#endnote-ref-733)
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735. See Lindner, 2009d. During my interviews in 1999 in Rwanda I learned that prior to 1994, many Hutu men would see a Tutsi woman as a desirable status symbol even though the *Hutu ten commandments* of 1990 (fashioned on *The twelve theses against the un-German spirit* of 1933) indicated that ‘we shall consider a traitor any Hutu who marries a Tutsi woman, befriends a Tutsi woman, employs a Tutsi woman as a secretary or a concubine’. See also the *Bahutu manifest*, composed by nine Rwandan Hutu intellectuals in 1957, identifying the ‘indigenous racial problem’ of Rwanda as the social, political, and economic ‘monopoly which is held by one race, the Tutsi’, calling for a double liberation of the Hutu people, both from the race of white colonials and the race of ‘Hamitic oppressors’, the Tutsi. Ugandan academic Mahmoud Mamdani, 2001, describes the outcome in his book *When victims become killers: Colonialism, nativism, and the genocide in Rwanda*.  
     See also chapter 11 in this book for a discussion of diversity, see, for instance note 3733, where I refer to the work of Daudi Azibo, a theorist in African-centred psychology in the United States of America, and his *Azibo Nosology* that lists 55 culture-focused personality-based mental disorders particular to African descended people, drawing on the works of 22 mental health scholars spanning over 60 years. Azibo speaks of ‘a sense of personal humiliation’ and ‘deep feelings of inferiority’ among African Descent People (ADP) from White saviour mentality on the basis of the ‘negativists-pejorativists profile’ that results ‘from Eurasian psycho-cultural hegemony’, Azibo, 2014, p. 55. On page 116, Azibo quotes Senegalese historian Cheikh Anta Diop as saying that ‘mankind originated in Africa, it was necessarily negroid before becoming white through mutation ... at the end of the last glaciation in Europe’, Diop, 1982, p. 28. Azibo encourages ADP mental health workers to take Diop’s insight to heart and query ADP patients who contemplate out-marriage with a white person, ‘Why would you (or Who would) want to become or follow a mutation especially since you/ADP embody the original human being?’  
     History offers many examples of lingering admiration for a patron even after having redefined him as an oppressor, followed by violence. For a historic scenario, see, for instance, *Traumatic politics*, a book by Barry Shapiro, 2009, where the author analyses why the French Revolution’s first representative assembly was unable to reach a workable accommodation with Louis XVI. He describes that monarchical loyalties remained intact even on the eve of the Revolution, showing how the pre-revolutionary cultural and discursive innovations had not succeeded in ‘desacralising’ the king before 1789. [↑](#endnote-ref-736)
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743. Deutsch, 2006, p. 38. [↑](#endnote-ref-744)
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     ...believers who seek to communicate the significance of the cross of Christ across cultural barriers will need to be aware of the cultural values and perspectives of the people they are addressing in order to discover appropriate metaphors that reveal the gospel message in a way that speaks to their felt needs. In this article, I use Roland Muller’s three cultural dichotomies as a model towards analysing cultures for the purpose of discovering an explanation of the atonement that will connect with the hearers. [↑](#endnote-ref-758)
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     Crucially, this logic is not limited to the sphere of market exchange, but is treated as a moral and political rationality that can be extended into all spheres of life, such as urban governance, education reform and personal responsibility. The prevalence of league tables, coaching, branding and auditing in various non-market domains is testimony to this.  
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770. Psychologists Jim Sidanius and Felicia Pratto list three mechanisms with which legitimising myths maintain inequality among different groups in society. Slavery exemplifies the first mechanism, the ‘official terror’ of institutional discrimination. Second, there is the aggregated individual discrimination of one individual against another, an effect that only becomes palpable at a larger scale when many people commit it rather than just a few. Third, there is the behavioural asymmetry of keeping people in ‘their place’, an asymmetry that is accepted and upheld by superiors and inferiors alike. The passive and active cooperation of subordinates with their own oppression is what ‘provides systems of group-based social hierarchy with their remarkable degrees of resiliency, robustness, and stability’, Sidanius and Pratto, 1999, p. 44. See also chapter 10, look for note 2466.  
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     Let me offer a summary of this documentary film. Economist Joseph Stiglitz, 2012, calls for a new social contract, and Thomas Piketty, 2013/2014, explains how the post-WWII period did not represent a long-term upward trend towards more equality, but rather an exception from a larger trend towards rising inequality. Sociologist Brooke Harrington, 2016, has studied how the ‘one per cent’ continue getting richer despite financial crises and taxes, and she laments that the legitimate anger about this situation among the electorate is now being channelled towards scapegoats who have nothing to do with it — for instance, towards migrants, refugees, or minorities. Economist Branko Milanović, 2016, studies global inequality, and Markus Goebel and Grabka, 2011, have looked at rising inequality in Germany. Economist Raj Chetty laments the ‘fading American Dream’, and that American children no longer can expect to earn more than their parents (www.equality-of-opportunity.org). Political theorist Yascha Mounk, 2017, has looked into ‘luck, choice, and the welfare state’, while Marcel Helbig, a researcher on education and social inequality in Germany, reports that private schools have increased by 30 per cent. Sociologist Jutta Allmendinger, et al., 2010, also education experts, recommend the European social model of unity in diversity as an alternative to the American form of market capitalism and its promotion of economic growth without regard for solidarity and social progress. Sociologist Michael Hartmann, 2007, has researched the sociology of elites, and psychologist Paul Piff, et al., 2012, found that higher social class predicts increased unethical behaviour. [↑](#endnote-ref-772)
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774. Smith, et al., 2017, based their research on, among others, Nisbett, et al., 2001, who suggested that members of individualistic cultures more frequently think analytically and therefore can be expected to be able to differentiate between all three — dignity, face, and honour values. This is why Smith et al. formulated as their first hypothesis that ‘those who perceive their nation to be based on dignity values will perceive it not to be characterised by reliance on either face values or honour values’, see Smith, et al., 2017, p. 2570. In contrast, ‘members of the face cultures of East Asia more frequently think holistically’ (ibid.), giving preference to the preservation of harmony and face, and they will therefore welcome dignity values of equality as basis for interpersonal harmony, while rejecting honour values of assertion and defence against threat. Smith’s second hypothesis suggested that respondents from face cultures will see dignity and face values as opposed to honour values and those who perceive their nation to be based on face values will also perceive reliance on dignity values as contributing to face. Their third hypothesis dealt with honour culture, where reliance on face and dignity values would be rejected as ineffective to uphold honour. Smith et al. found their first hypothesis confirmed by respondents in UK and Finland, the second hypothesis appeared to be confirmed in China and Malaysia, while the third hypothesis was confirmed by respondents from Lebanon, Turkey, Brazil, and Mexico, who perceived honour values as contrary to dignity and face values. [↑](#endnote-ref-775)
775. Nisbett and Cohen, 1996. It is a privilege to have Dov Cohen as an esteemed member in the global advisory board of our Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies community. [↑](#endnote-ref-776)
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778. Campbell and Manning, 2014. [↑](#endnote-ref-779)
779. Minkov, 2011, and Smith, et al., 2017. [↑](#endnote-ref-780)
780. Matsumoto, et al., 2007, p. 92: with Emotion Regulation (ER), ‘people voyage through life; without it, they vindicate their lives’. It is a privilege to have David Matsumoto as an esteemed member in the global advisory board of our Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies community. [↑](#endnote-ref-781)
781. Riesman, et al., 1950/2001. I thank David Bargal and Ya’ir Ronen for reminding us of Riesman’s work in our 2014 Workshop on Transforming Humiliation and Violent Conflict at Columbia University, New York City, 4th–5th December 2014. See www.humiliationstudies.org/documents/BargalRonenNY14meetingHopeAmidstDestructivenessDialogue.pdf. It is a privilege to have both David Bargal and Ya’ir Ronen as esteemed members in our Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies community. [↑](#endnote-ref-782)
782. Ray and Anderson, 2000. I thank Steve Halls for giving me Ray and Anderson’s book in Osaka, Japan, in 2004, when he was leaving his post as director of International Environmental Technology Centre (IETC) in Osaka and cleared his desk. [↑](#endnote-ref-783)
783. See Standing, 2011, Standing, 2018, and Styhre, 2017, on precarious work. See Standing, 2017, and Standing, 2019, for the plunder of the commons. When I spent time in São Paulo on 2012, I learned of the significant impact of Standing’s work in Brazil and thank David Calderoni for making me more thoroughly aware of it than I had been before.   
     Living under precarious circumstances in financial insecurity represents a considerable cognitive load. Living in poverty means losing 13 IQ points. See, for instance, Mani, et al., 2013. See also Harris, 2017, and ‘Laziness does not exist: But unseen barriers do’, by Devon Price, *Medium*, 23rd March 2018, https://medium.com/@devonprice/laziness-does-not-exist-3af27e312d01.  
     Ronaldo Munck is the head of Civic Engagement at Dublin City University, and he comments on the notion of the precariat in his contribution to the Great Transition Initiative (GTI) Forum on the topic of ‘The precariat: Today’s transformative class?’ based on the essay of the same title by Standing, 2018, on 4th September 2018:

     What is most noticeable in the literature around the precariat is that it is almost totally Northern-centric in its theoretical frames and its empirical reference points. There is a Northern sensibility at play here, it seems, harking back to Britain in the 1950s as the model of economic and political development the precariat aspires to regain. From a Southern perspective, work has always *already* been precarious, a basic fact which unsettles the notion that something new has been discovered. While the precariat discourse exudes nostalgia for something which has passed (the Keynesian/ Fordist/welfare state), it does not speak to a South which never experienced welfare state capitalism.

     See also ‘Invisible exploitation: How capital extracts value beyond wage labor’, by Eva Swidler, *Monthly Review*, 1st March 2018, <https://monthlyreview.org/2018/03/01/invisible-exploitation/>, where she makes the point that the experiences of workers who are newly precarious in core countries are in line with the ongoing experience of most workers in the world, be it in what is called the informal sector, peasants, women doing unpaid labour, pieceworkers, and so on.  
     Bill Fletcher, Jr. is the former president of the TransAfrica Forum and the executive director of the Global African Worker Institute. He notes that Standing is not reviewing the overall history of capitalism and instead focusses on the condition of the North American and West European working classes largely from 1945–1975/1980. Fletcher writes in his contribution to the Great Transition Initiative (GTI) Forum on the topic of ‘The precariat: Today’s transformative class?’ 6th September 2018, in response to the essay of the same title by Standing, 2018:

     The longer history of capitalism, time and again, demonstrates an incredibly precarious existence that has included the splitting of one’s life between agriculture and industry; mass internal migrations in search of work; a shorter lifespan, not to mention the true precariousness of the life of a slave or indentured servant. For most of the existence of capitalism, the working class has been in a precarious state. The so-called ‘golden age of capitalism’, i.e., the period of 1945–1975/1980, was an exception rather than the rule.

     Sociologist William I. Robinson adds in his contribution to the Great Transition Initiative (GTI) Forum on the topic of ‘The precariat: Today’s transformative class?’ on 6th September 2018, that the precariat is not a class but a condition — with precariousness being imposed ‘on increasing numbers of the global working class in the face of capitalist globalisation and the transition underway for several decades now from Fordist to flexible accumulation’. [↑](#endnote-ref-784)
784. Standing, 2018, p. 7, italics in original:

     The precariat is split into three factions, which has hindered its becoming a class-for-itself and is challenging for those wishing to develop and organise a progressive response.  
     The first faction is the *Atavists*. They have fallen out of the proletariat, or come from old working-class families or communities whose members once depended on full-time jobs. Some are young; many are older, looking back wistfully. Their deprivation is about a lost Past, whether real or imagined. Having relatively little schooling or education in civics, history, or culture, they tend to listen to the sirens of neo-fascist populism.  
     They have been voting for the likes of Trump, Putin, Orban, Marine Le Pen, Farage and other Brexiteers, and the Lega in Italy. It is not correct to call them the ‘left behind’, since they are expected to function inside a new labour market. But they are bitter, eager to blame others for their plight. Those they demonise comprise the second faction of the precariat, the *Nostalgics*. This group is composed of migrants and minorities, who feel deprived of a Present, with nowhere to call home. For the most part, they ‘keep their heads down’, doing whatever they can to survive and move forward.  
     The third faction is best described as the *Progressives*, more educated and mainly young, although not exclusively so. Their defining sense of deprivation is loss of a Future. They went to university or college, promised by their parents and teachers that this would lead to a defining career. They emerge without that, often with debt stretching into that future. Beyond their own future, more and more despair about the planet’s ecological future.

     See also note 2522 in chapter 8. [↑](#endnote-ref-785)
785. Fromm, 1932. Since the break-up between Adorno and Fromm, there has been a tendency to ignore Fromm’s significance in the development of the concept of authoritarianism, informs Rainer Funk, trustee of Fromm’s literary material. [↑](#endnote-ref-786)
786. Sociologist and philosopher Theodor Adorno is known for having shed light on authoritarianism. Three core components were originally listed by Adorno, et al., 1950, p. 148:

     • authoritarian submission (submissive, uncritical attitude towards idealised moral authorities of the in-group)

     • authoritarian aggression (a general aggressiveness, directed against various persons, which is perceived to be sanctioned by the established authorities)

     • conventionalism (adherence to conventional, middle-class values).

     See also Altemeyer, 1981, 1996, 2003, 2009, and the archive of Altemeyer’s original Global Change Game Website, <http://web.archive.org/web/20020805124207/www.mts.net/~gcg/index.html>. See Stenner, 2005, for more recent work on authoritarianism, and how it can be latent until it is activated by a perception of threat (social threat theory), and see also Hetherington and Weiler, 2009, on authoritarian views being expressed under threat.   
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      See also the work of psychologists Tarsha and Narváez, 2019, on the *evolved nest*: ‘Although most people want children to thrive, many adults in industrialised nations have forgotten what that means and how to foster thriving’. See more in note 701 in chapter 3.  
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1743. See Scharmer, 2009. [↑](#endnote-ref-1744)
1744. See Swidler and Mojzes, 2000. [↑](#endnote-ref-1745)
1745. The formulation ‘waging good conflict’ was coined by Jean Baker Miller, 1976/1986. Note also Jean Baker Miller’s husband Seymour ‘Mike’ Miller, 2008b, who reflected on sociologist Joseph Michels, 1911/1915, and his classic *iron law of oligarchy* with respect to left-wing organisations:

      Many of these organisations flourished mainly because they had a charismatic leader who dominated their thinking and activities. While I am all for democracy, I have realised from my many activities and involvements that the quality of organisational leadership is crucial. Unfortunately, too few studies of social movements adequately explore the ongoing life of organisations that seek to change a neighbourhood, company, the nation or the world. Nor has that literature explored how some social movements achieved important transformations.

      It was a privilege to have Jean Baker Miller as an esteemed member in the global advisory board of our Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies community until her passing in 2007, and we will always honour her spirit. It is equally gratifying to have also her husband Seymour M. (Mike) Miller in our global advisory board. [↑](#endnote-ref-1746)
1746. Linda Hartling in a personal communication, 4th June 2009. A very hands-on illustration is to be found in *How to talk with your relatives over the holiday*, by Sharon Salzberg, ‘On Being’, with Krista Tippett, WNYC (non-profit, non-commercial, public radio stations located in New York City), 17th November 2017, https://onbeing.org/blog/sharon-salzberg-how-to-talk-with-your-relatives-over-the-holidays/.  
      Read more about *Zhi Yin*, the deep listener, in note 71 in the Preface. [↑](#endnote-ref-1747)
1747. See Haslam, 2016. [↑](#endnote-ref-1748)
1748. ‘When healing looks like justice: an interview with Harvard psychologist Joseph Gone’, by Ayurdhi Dhar, *Mad in America*, 18th October 2019, www.madinamerica.com/2019/10/healing-looks-like-justice-interview-harvard-psychologist-joseph-gone/. [↑](#endnote-ref-1749)
1749. ‘When healing looks like justice: An interview with Harvard psychologist Joseph Gone’, by Ayurdhi Dhar, *Mad in America*, 18th October 2019, www.madinamerica.com/2019/10/healing-looks-like-justice-interview-harvard-psychologist-joseph-gone/. Read the full quote in the electronic version of this book. [↑](#endnote-ref-1750)
1750. See Johnstone, et al., 2018. The approach of the Power Threat Meaning Framework can be used by individuals, families, and social groups, and it is summarised in four questions:

      • What has happened to you? (How is power operating in your life?)

      • How did it affect you? (What kind of threats does this pose?)

      • What sense did you make of it? (What is the meaning of these situations and experiences to you?)

      • What did you have to do to survive? (What kinds of threat response are you using?)

      Two further questions help think about what skills and resources might be available:

      • What are your strengths? (What access to Power resources do you have?)

      • What is your story? (How does all this fit together?)

      I thank professor of psychology Thomas Teo from York University in Toronto, Canada, for making Louise Sundararajan and her Indigenous Psychology Task Force aware of this work. [↑](#endnote-ref-1751)
1751. See ‘Introducing the Power Threat Meaning Framework’, *The British Psychological Society (BPS) News*, 1st February 2018, [www.bps.org.uk/news-and-policy/introducing-power-threat-meaning-framework](http://www.bps.org.uk/news-and-policy/introducing-power-threat-meaning-framework). The lead author is Consultant Clinical Psychologist Lucy Johnstone, along with professor Mary Boyle.  
      I spent part of my medical education on a psychiatric ward, and this experience, combined with my insights from my training as a clinical psychologist and my family’s evangelical background, made me keenly aware of the connection between healing and preaching — *fra frelse til helse*, ‘from salvation to medication’, is a saying in Norway. Furthermore, I observed the strong influence of patriarchal mindsets in these fields, mindsets that disadvantage women through authoritative definitions of health and certified guidelines for medical diagnoses and approaches to treatment. I witnessed a recurrent pattern of male psychiatrists, male psychotherapists, and male spiritual leaders being surrounded by chronically depressed female admirers who often simply moved back and forth between abusive husbands and patronising ‘healing’ systems, never finding a healthier exit. Incidentally, the wives of therapists seemed to be particularly afflicted, an observation I made in Germany during my medical training in the 1980s, unaware that Jean Baker Miller made the same observation concurrently in the United States, as I learned from Linda Hartling in 2021.   
      See also Kristin Kobes Du Mez, 2020, *Jesus and John Wayne: How white evangelicals corrupted a faith and fractured a nation*. In her book, Du Mez analyses how Donald Trump could become a venerated hero for evangelicals in the United States. If we interpret economism as a belief system — see Norgaard, 2015 — we could add a certain group of business icons and business consultants to the list of ‘healers’, all forming part of a kind of patriarchal ‘guruism’, as Linda Hartling would suggest.  
      See more in note 3221 in chapter 10, and note 3895 in chapter 11. [↑](#endnote-ref-1752)
1752. Among those who were kidnapped was Ola Skuterud from the Norwegian Red Cross, head of a larger group. I had the privilege of being welcomed into his home in Nairobi during my doctoral research in 1999, and I had the opportunity to learn deeply from his experiences. It is a privilege to have his support for our Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies community. In his house, I met also the chief negotiator of the Red Cross who finally secured the hostages’ release, and also he shared with me vitally important insights. [↑](#endnote-ref-1753)
1753. Lindner, 2001e. See also Lamiell, 2019, and Smedslund, 2021, who advocates a trust-based person-centred psychology rather than the presently reigning psycho-demography paradigm that overlooks the role of trust, ‘The invisibility of trust in the literature may reflect the context of most academic research. Participants are often psychology students motivated by the curriculum, formal or unstated obligations, or by payment or other rewards’.  
      I am glad that younger colleagues, such as Daniel Sullivan, 2020, now call for a stronger sensitivity to the social and historical context in social psychology research. See also ‘Is peaceful research possible? On the methodology of peace research’, by Johan Galtung, *TRANSCEND Media Service*, 1st Jul 2019, www.transcend.org/tms/2019/07/is-peaceful-research-possible-on-the-methodology-of-peace-research/. [↑](#endnote-ref-1754)
1754. Lindner, 2006b, p. 85, in my book *Making enemies: Humiliation and international conflict*, chapter 4: ‘Humiliation and misunderstanding’. [↑](#endnote-ref-1755)
1755. See, for instance, Hammond, 1998. In research, the ecological validity of a study means that the methods, materials and setting of the study must approximate the real-world that is being examined. Ecological validity is not the same as external validity. A study may possess external validity but not ecological validity, and vice versa, even though improved ecological validity of an experiment usually improves also the external validity. [↑](#endnote-ref-1756)
1756. I highly appreciate the approach of sociologist Maggie O’Neill, 2007, who bases her work on the theoretical concept of ethno-mimesis, an inter-connection of sensitive ethnographic work and visual re-presentations. It is both a methodological tool and a process for exploring lived experience, for instance, that of displacement, exile, belonging, and humiliation. It is a privilege to have her as esteemed member in the global advisory board of our Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies community.  
      See also the field of transpersonal psychology. In the rnid-1990s, Rosemarie Anderson and William Braud developed *intuitive inquiry* and *integral inquiry*, which, together with *organic inquiry* seeks ‘to invite everyone involved in research to engage the possibility of being transformed in some way by their participation’, see Anderson and Braud, 2011, p. 1.  
      Note in this context also the work of Hussein Abdilahi Bulhan, 1985, 2015. Watch *The art of survival* by Dr. Hussein A. Bulhan, TEDxHargeisa, 26th April 2018, https://youtu.be/sHkpEDD41Z0, and see his book *Losing the art of survival and dignity*, Bulhan, 2013. I learned tremendously from meeting with Dr. Bulhan in his office near his house in Hargeisa in Somaliland as part of my doctoral research on 10th December 1998. His verdict was, I paraphrase, ‘Charity is humiliating, it is disempowering. The Western view of Africans is deeply humiliating. The image which the West has of the African person is that it is a superficial person who needs food and shelter and will play music and be happy upon receiving it. The West sees Africans as easy-going creatures, as a kind of lobotomised Westerners. After de-colonisation, it was said that the Africans are now depressed because their “father” is gone and they are now lost like children’. Bulhan pointed at a dynamic that I observe all around the world, and the avoidance of which is foundational to my entire work: He reported that there are indeed individuals from the West who really want to help, yet, there are also institutional structures that were established long time ago and that are humiliating. Upon entering such an organisation, after some time — often after something like two years — the well-willing Western helper will be ‘programmed’.   
      See also the book *Road to hell: The ravaging effects of foreign aid and international charity*, a book written by Michael Maren, 1997, and read by every aid worker I met when I conducted my doctoral research in Africa in 1998 and 1999. [↑](#endnote-ref-1757)
1757. See Taylor, 1992. [↑](#endnote-ref-1758)
1758. As to the topic of human nature, see more in note 440 in chapter 2, and the section titled ‘Some definitions of human nature threaten human survival’ in chapter 10. [↑](#endnote-ref-1759)
1759. Meg Holden, professor of Urban Studies and Geography, in her contribution to the Great Transition Initiative (GTI) Forum on the topic of ‘Thinking globally, acting locally?’ 24th July 2019. [↑](#endnote-ref-1760)
1760. See, for instance, Michael Maren, 1997, and his book on a humanitarian worker’s ‘road to hell’. See more in note 1452 in chapter 5. [↑](#endnote-ref-1761)
1761. The following article chronicles what also I have observed throughout the past decades, and what made me desist from involving myself in humanitarian aid. ‘COVID-19 changed the world. Can it change aid, too? “If we don’t do it now, no other reform agenda will matter”,’ by Jessica Alexander, *The New Humanitarian*, 16th July 2020, www.thenewhumanitarian.org/africa/east-africa/drc. See more in note 999 in chapter 4. [↑](#endnote-ref-1762)
1762. Plato, 399 BCE/1966, p. 21. Socrates went to a politician who had the reputation of wisdom, but after speaking with him, Socrates found out that this man was not as wise as he had supposed himself to be. Socrates thought to himself that he was wiser than this man, because ‘what I do not know I do not think I know’. As a youth, I read the German translation, ‘Ich weiß, daß ich nicht weiß’. See ‘Platon: Des Sokrates Verteidigung’. In: *Sämtliche Werke. Band 1*, Übersetzung: Friedrich Daniel Ernst Schleiermacher, 1805. Berlin [1940], S. 9. Originaltext:

      Denn es mag wohl eben keiner von uns beiden etwas Tüchtiges oder Sonderliches wissen; allein dieser doch meint zu wissen, da er nicht weiß, ich aber, wie ich eben nicht weiß, so meine ich es auch nicht. Ich scheine also um dieses wenige doch weiser zu sein als er, daß ich, was ich nicht weiß, auch nicht glaube zu wissen.

      See also philosopher Bertrand Russell, 1933/1998, on 10th May 1933, p. 28: ‘The fundamental cause of the trouble is that in the modern world the stupid are cocksure while the intelligent are full of doubt’.  
      Read, furthermore, on the Dunning-Kruger effect in note 2006 in chapter 7. [↑](#endnote-ref-1763)
1763. Lindner, 2001e. See also Lamiell, 2019, and Smedslund, 2020, 2021. [↑](#endnote-ref-1764)
1764. Karlberg responds to an essay written by Cristina Escrigas on the dire situation of higher education. Cristina Escrigas, 2016, is the former executive director of, and current adviser to, the Global University Network for Innovation (GUNi), an organisation created by UNESCO, the United Nations University, and the Technical University of Catalonia (UPC). [↑](#endnote-ref-1765)
1765. Karlberg, 2013, p. 14. [↑](#endnote-ref-1766)
1766. Michael Karlberg in his contribution to the Great Transition Initiative (GTI) Forum on the topic of ‘A higher calling for higher education’, 13th May 2016, in response to Escrigas, 2016. [↑](#endnote-ref-1767)
1767. Kim Stafford’s personal communication, 4th August 2017:

      Please feel free to use my humble poem, which was based on a conversation with two mediator friends in Alaska, where we started with the recognition we must banish two words from our conversations with those who disagree: ‘No’ and ‘But’. Instead, we proceed in the musical key of ‘Yes’ and ‘And’...

      We thank Dr. Rajesh Dixit, for translating this poem into Hindi, see wwww.humiliationstudies.org/education/teamlong.php#dixit. [↑](#endnote-ref-1768)
1768. **Chapter 7: Beware of systemic humiliation — Cogitocide, sociocide, and ecocide**

      See ‘Freedom for the wolves’, Berlin, 1969, p. xlv. See also Berlin, 1958b, a, Lakoff, 2006b, or Orr, et al., 2020. See more in note 89 in the Introduction. [↑](#endnote-ref-1769)
1769. Festinger, et al., 1956, p. 3. [↑](#endnote-ref-1770)
1770. ‘Reflections on peace linguistics and on ecolinguistics’, by Francisco Gomes de Matos in a personal communication, 12th May 2019. [↑](#endnote-ref-1771)
1771. See the transcript of the speech by Sir David Attenborough on 3rd December 2018, at https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/The%20People%27s%20Address%202.11.18\_FINAL.pdf.   
      The 2018 United Nations Climate Change Conference was the 24th Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (COP24), also known as the Katowice Climate Change Conference. It was held between 2nd and 15th December 2018 in Katowice, Poland.   
      See also Attenborough, 2020, and his 2020 documentary film *A life on our planet* at https://attenboroughfilm.com. See, furthermore, his interview on PBS News Hour, 6th October 2020, www.pbs.org/video/october-6-2020-pbs-newshour-full-episode-1601956801/. [↑](#endnote-ref-1772)
1772. As a term, *ecocide* dates to 1970, when Arthur Galston, an American botanist, used it to describe the appalling effects of Agent Orange on the vast forests of Vietnam and Cambodia. See also Higgins, 2016. [↑](#endnote-ref-1773)
1773. Green New Deals (GNDs), in their attempt to remedy ecocide, fail when they simply replace one mastery strategy with another one, when they implement public policies built on the same economic principles that led to ecocide and sociocide in the first place. Current GND proposals usually aim to address not only ecocide but also sociocide insofar as they aspire to achieve social aims like job creation and reducing economic inequality. I resonate with the conclusion of the member of the Club of Rome Stefan Brunnhuber that the monetary system is the missing link in the debate of sustainability. See Brunnhuber, 2021, and Lietaer, et al., 2012.  
      See also *The youth have seen enough,* by Rex Weyler, Greenpeace, 4th January 2019, www.greenpeace.org/international/story/20260/the-youth-have-seen-enough/.  
      The name Green New Deal (GND) refers back to the New Deal by the American President Franklin D. Roosevelt in response to the Great Depression in the 1930s. For European efforts, see, for instance, ‘Statement by President von der Leyen on delivering the European Green Deal’, European Commission, Brussels, 14th July 2021, https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/STATEMENT\_21\_3701. [↑](#endnote-ref-1774)
1774. ‘Sociocide is the intended wounding-killing of a society by eliminating the prerequisites for a live, vibrant, dynamic society’, writes peace researcher Johan Galtung, in ‘Sociocide, Palestine and Israel’, *TRANSCEND Media Service*, 8th October 2012, [www.transcend.org/tms/2012/10/sociocide-palestine-and-israel/](http://www.transcend.org/tms/2012/10/sociocide-palestine-and-israel/), italics in original:

      *Sociocide*, the killing of a society’s capacity to survive and to reproduce itself, should become equally and prominently a crime against humanity. A society is a self-reproducing social system. So are human beings, with our basic needs for survival, wellness, identity, freedom. Society is also an organism, with a lifespan far beyond that of individuals. For humans to survive as humans, their basic needs have to be met. For that to happen the society has to survive. For the society to survive the basic social *prerequisites* must be met:

      • for *security*, against violence, killing, wounding the members

      • for economic *sustainability*, against their starvation, illness

      • for *identity* culturally, a meaning with life, against alienation

      • for *autonomy* politically, to be a master of their own house.

      As society unfolds, so do humans, and vice versa. Life breeds life.  
      This also holds for nomadic societies based on hunter-gatherers. Monasteries are incapable of self-reproduction biologically when based on one gender, but are highly viable societies based on recruitment.  
      Under modernity, identity is carried by the *nation*, with four characteristics: an *idiom*, a *religion-worldview*, a *history* — of the past, present and future — and *geographical attachment*. *Time, space*, with the means to communicate and something to believe is crucial.  
      Under modernity the state is the key executor of all the above.  
      *Sociocide is the intended wounding-killing of a society by eliminating the prerequisites for a live, vibrant, dynamic society.*  
      *Sociocide* molests the human members. In the longer run, lethally. *Sociocide* is what Western, and not only Western, colonialism has done for centuries, denying others their autonomy, imposing their own identity — language and worldview — moving others out of their own historical dialectic and into history as Western periphery, denying them the land they are attached to with their hearts and minds. And their bodies for security and sustenance, for food, water, health.

      See also Cormann, 2015. [↑](#endnote-ref-1775)
1775. See ‘The vengeance of history: Thirty years of foreseeable retrogression’, by Hall Gardner, *Wall Street International Magazine*, 18th December 2018, <https://wsimag.com/economy-and-politics/46316-the-vengeance-of-history>. Hall Gardner is professor and chair of the ICP Department at the American University of Paris, and author of *World war Trump: The risks of America’s new nationalism*, Gardner, 2018a. It is a privilege to have Hall Gardner on the global advisory board of our Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies community.   
      See also ‘UN General Assembly: Guterres warns against “new Cold War”,’ *Deutsche Welle*, 22nd September 2020, https://p.dw.com/p/3iqdT. See, furthermore, ‘Former Australian Prime Minister Kevin Rudd: “A Cold War with China is probable and not just possible”,’ interview conducted by Bernhard Zand, *Der Spiegel Online International*, 24th September 2021, www.spiegel.de/international/world/former-australian-pm-kevin-rudd-a-cold-war-with-china-is-probable-and-not-just-possible-a-959ebfec-826e-4961-821c-29b7d1e8736c. See also the work of Ankit Panda, expert on the Asia-Pacific region, and his warning of ‘chaotic armament’ in the Indo-Pacific region, frequently quoted in the magazine *Der Spiegel*, see www.spiegel.de/thema/kim\_jong\_un/.   
      See, furthermore, *Global arms industry: US companies dominate the Top 100; Russian arms industry moves to second place*, Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), 10th December 2018, www.sipri.org/media/press-release/2018/global-arms-industry-us-companies-dominate-top-100-russian-arms-industry-moves-second-place. [↑](#endnote-ref-1776)
1776. I very much thank the President of the Club of Rome from 1999 to 2007, Prince El Hassan bin Talal, for his personal message from 19th May 2020, where he suggests the term *cogitocide*. He proposed the term *cogitosphere* in his Opening Address to the 2004 Annual Conference of the Club of Rome ‘On limits to ignorance: The challenge of informed humanity’, 11th–12th October 2004 in Helsinki, Finland. His address was titled *The challenge of informed humanity: From ‘infosphere’ to ‘cogitosphere*’. In this address, he calls on the Club of Rome to elevate the ‘Cogitosphere’, or the realm of thinking and reflection, ‘above that of the Infosphere in order to avoid sightless vision and to focus our deliberative process on the real challenges facing informed humanity’. See also notes 1779, 1780, and 1781 in this chapter, and note 4105 in chapter 12.  
      Prince El Hassan bin Talal is an important international thinker and member of the Jordanian royal family, the uncle of the sitting King Abdullah II, and he is deeply engaged in conversations regarding issues of human rights and development and how they are increasingly integrated with security matters on the international agenda and in the Arab World. See, among others, bin Talal and Schwarz, 2013, ‘The responsibility to protect and the Arab World: An emerging international norm?’ in *Contemporary Security Policy*.  
      As one of the many expressions of cogitocide, we may identify the rise of conspiracy narratives. I could refer to many examples here, yet, I limit myself to the ‘great reset’ conspiracy narrative, as this functions as a kind of container for many smaller conspiracy theories that gather under its umbrella. All appear to follow a similar pattern of what could be called meta-humiliation entrepreneurship, which means surfing on the humiliation entrepreneurship that others perpetrate on the ground — ‘smaller profiteers’ profit from the suffering caused by ‘larger profiteers’. See, among others, ‘How the “great reset” of capitalism became an anti-lockdown conspiracy’, by Quinn Slobodian, *The Guardian*, 4th December 2020, www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2020/dec/04/great-reset-capitalism-became-anti-lockdown-conspiracy. See more in note 27 in the Preface, and see the section titled ‘Indignation entrepreneurship hinders sober and constructive action’ in chapter 10.  
      Note also the concept of mentacide in African-centred psychology, described as a perpetration that ‘employs societal institutions which project images, values, beliefs, and opinions which render correct orientation in ADP [African Descent People] void of its pro-African orientations to living by instilling in the psyche pro-Eurasian orientations to living with their corollary anti-African sentiments’, Daudi Azibo, 2014, p. 57.   
      I would contend that mentacidal dynamics are not only relevant to African-centred psychology. See also note 529 in chapter 2 for African scholar Michael Chege’s warning against casting Africa as either ‘idyllic’ or ‘barbaric’. [↑](#endnote-ref-1777)
1777. *Cogito, ergo sum* is a well-known philosophical proposition by philosopher René Descartes, meaning ‘I think, therefore I am’. *Cogito, ergo sum* originally appeared in French as *je pense, donc je suis* in 1637, in Descartes’ oeuvre *Discours de la méthode*. Descartes intended to say *dubito, ergo cogito, ergo sum*, or ‘I doubt, therefore I think, therefore I am’. [↑](#endnote-ref-1778)
1778. *The challenge of informed humanity: From ‘infosphere’ to ‘cogitosphere*’, Prince El Hassan bin Talal’s Opening Address to the 2004 Annual Conference of the Club of Rome ‘On limits to ignorance: The challenge of informed humanity’, 11th–12th October 2004 in Helsinki, Finland. [↑](#endnote-ref-1779)
1779. Bin Talal refers to cultural theorist Paul Virilio, 1977/2006, originator of the concept of *dromology*, ‘the science of speed’, where he points at the media-driven acceleration that results in an infosphere that diminishes and engulfs the political subject — the accountable leader as much as the participatory citizen and the deliberative process itself. The outcome is what bin Talal calls *infoterror* and *infowar*, and what Virilio describes as the ‘aesthetics of disappearance’. [↑](#endnote-ref-1780)
1780. See the *Alain Elkann Interview: HRH Prince El Hassan bin Talal*, 1st November 2020, www.alainelkanninterviews.com/hassan-bin-talal/: ‘Cogens — the use of one’s ability to think — is the most democratic expression I can think of, of commenting on public and private life’. Latin *cōgēns*‎, is the present active participle of *cōgō*‎ or ‘drive together’, ‘compel’, from *cō*‎ + *agō*‎, ‘drive’. See www.wordsense.eu/cogens/.  
      As one of the many expressions of cogitocide, we may identify the rise of conspiracy narratives these days. See more in note 27 in the Preface, and see the section titled ‘Indignation entrepreneurship hinders sober and constructive action’ in chapter 10. [↑](#endnote-ref-1781)
1781. Rounsevell, et al., 2020, call for a prominent target to lower species extinction rates, comparable to the 2-degree climate target. Robin Wall Kimmerer, 2013, founding director of the Center for Native Peoples and the Environment, cautions that our species is so new to this planet compared with other species, we still need to ‘grow up’. See more in note 3881 in chapter 11. [↑](#endnote-ref-1782)
1782. While the causes of the degradation of the world’s ecosystems — from oceans to forests to farmlands — ‘are various and complex, one thing is clear: the massive economic growth of recent decades has come at the cost of ecological health’, see *Becoming #GenerationRestoration — Key messages: Ecosystem restoration for people, nature and climate*, by United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), and Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), 3rd June 2021, https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/36252/ERPNC\_KMEN.pdf.   
      See for the UN Decade on Ecosystem Restoration 2021–2030, www.decadeonrestorationorg.  
      On 9th August 2021, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) launched *AR6 climate change 2021: The physical science basis*, representing the first part of its Sixth Assessment Report, see www.ipcc.ch/report/ar6/wg1/. The first line of the report summary reads, ‘It is unequivocal that human influence has warmed the atmosphere, ocean and land’. The IPCC is a body of the United Nations that is mandated to provide objective scientific information relevant to understanding human-induced climate change. See also ‘IPCC report: ‘Code red’ for human driven global heating, warns UN chief’, *United Nations News*, 9th August 2021, https://news.un.org/en/story/2021/08/1097362.  
      See also ‘Rethinking our vision of success: A conversation with Robert Pollack’, *Edge*, 10th October 2019, https://stage.edge.org/conversation/robert\_pollack-rethinking-our-vision-of-success:

      I’ve lived as a biologist in the world of Darwin, trying to understand Darwinian pre-adaptive mutation in terms of cancer as distinct from normal cells. ... We are 100,000-fold in excess of our natural numbers, and we threaten the planet by our success.

      Robert Pollack is a professor of biological sciences, and it was a privilege for me to be introduced to him by Clifford Hill and meeting up with him at Columbia University on 13th December 2004, and reconnecting again in 2021. *Edge* aims ‘to arrive at the edge of the world’s knowledge, seek out the most complex and sophisticated minds, put them in a room together, and have them ask each other the questions they are asking themselves’.  
      See, furthermore, Randers and Golüke, 2020, saying that just stopping CO2 emissions may no longer be enough to stop global warming, that the world must undertake a massive effort to capture carbon out of the atmosphere and store it back underground, a technology known as carbon sequestration. This will be a task that is ‘equivalent to the work involved in putting all the man-made CO2 into the atmosphere, which has taken us 100–200 years of industrial activity. Getting it out again will be the same type of effort’.  
      See also Roy Eidelson, 2018, *How the 1% manipulate our understanding of what’s happening, what’s right, and what’s possible*. It was a pleasure to meet met Roy Eidelson at the Solomon Asch Center when I visited on 28th November 2005, invited by Paul Rozin, hosted by Clark McCauley.  
      See also ‘Stephen Pinker & NY Times Nicholas Kristof: Wrong about Western “progress”,’ by Charles Eisenstein and Jeremy Lent, *Tikkun*, 23rd May 2018, [www.tikkun.org/nextgen/new-yorkers-pinker-ny-times-nicholas-kristof-wrong-about-things-getting-better-and-safer-1-charles-eisenstein-2-jeremy-lent](http://www.tikkun.org/nextgen/new-yorkers-pinker-ny-times-nicholas-kristof-wrong-about-things-getting-better-and-safer-1-charles-eisenstein-2-jeremy-lent). See also Eisenstein, 2011, 2014. It was a privilege to have Charles Eisenstein with us in our 2012 Workshop on Transforming Humiliation and Violent Conflict at Columbia University in New York City.  
      Hans Rosling and Steven Pinker have been criticised of having a *positivity bias*, also called *Pollyannaism*, which means remembering pleasant items more accurately than unpleasant ones. The 1913 novel *Pollyanna* by Eleanor Porter describes a girl who tries to find something to be glad about in every situation.   
      See also *A confused statistician*, by Anne H. Ehrlich and Paul R. Ehrlich, Millennium Alliance for Humanity and Biosphere, 12th November 2013, http://mahb.stanford.edu/blog/a-confused-statistician.  
      See, furthermore, David Pilling, 2018, and his related analysis. I thank Michelle Brenner for making me aware of Pilling’s work.  
      Hans Rosling, whose life mission was to highlight optimism, listed five risks that even he would ‘worry about’, all of which have either arrived or are looming: global pandemic, financial collapse, a new world war, climate change, and extreme poverty. Rosling’s term *factfulness* is commented on in ‘Swansong of Hans Rosling, data visionary’, by Jim O’Neill, *Nature*, 3rd April 2018, www.nature.com/articles/d41586-018-03921-y.  
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      See also ‘From hubris to humiliation: America’s warrior class contends with the abject failure of its Afghanistan project’, by Greg Jaffe, *Washington Post*, 14th August 2021, www.washingtonpost.com/national-security/us-hubris-afghanistan-humiliation/2021/08/14/47fb025a-fc67-11eb-9c0e-97e29906a970\_story.html. See also ‘The entirely predictable failure of the West’s mission in Afghanistan’, by Christoph Reuter, *Der Spiegel*, 20th August 2021, www.spiegel.de/international/world/the-trillion-dollar-illusion-the-entirely-predictable-failure-of-the-west-s-mission-in-afghanistan-a-0193fa9c-aa6f-4719-84de-01ead3aefcf6.  
      In my doctoral research, I described how hubris caused the failure of ‘help’ in Somalia in 1993 and 1994 (see note 1464 in chapter 5 and note 3579 in chapter 11), my closeness to Egypt allowed me to observe how the world’s neo-liberal context damaged Egypt, and now hubris and toxic economics together bring down Afghanistan. [↑](#endnote-ref-2665)
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2667. ‘It’s the Egyptian economy, stupid’, by Amitai Etzioni, *National Interest*, 24th January 2013, http://nationalinterest.org/commentary/its-the-egyptian-economy-stupid-7984. [↑](#endnote-ref-2668)
2668. See, among others, *International donors are complicit in Middle Eastern elites’ game*, by David Linfield, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 11th January 2021, https://carnegieendowment.org/2021/01/11/international-donors-are-complicit-in-middle-eastern-elites-game-pub-83595. I thank Prince El Hassan bin Talal for making me aware of this article. See also Alvaredo, et al., 2018, a study that measured inequality in the Middle East 1990–2016 and found that it is the world’s most unequal region. See also *Inequality and its discontents in the Middle East*, by Lydia Assouad, Carnegie Middle East Center, 12th March 2020, https://carnegie-mec.org/2020/03/12/inequality-and-its-discontents-in-middle-east-pub-81266. [↑](#endnote-ref-2669)
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2672. **Chapter 9: How we got here**
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      See also chapter 12 for the unbounded organisation concept by Howard Richards and his colleagues. [↑](#endnote-ref-2674)
2674. See Lucius Anneus Seneca, Letters to Lucilius, pp. 91–63. Watch Ruben Nelson’s Don Michael Day Presentation *Civilization next: How human nature is about to change trajectory*, San Francisco, February 2019, https://vimeo.com/320297382. See more in note 1805 in chapter 7, note 2754 in this chapter, and notes 4149, 4201, 4282, and 4368 in chapter 12. [↑](#endnote-ref-2675)
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2677. See ‘Will humans be extinct by 2026?’ *Arctic News*, http://arctic-news.blogspot.com/p/extinction.html. See, furthermore, ‘Climate collapse and near term human extinction: A speech by Guy Mcpherson, the global research news hour episode 70’, by Michael Welch, *Global Research*, 14th June 2014, www.globalresearch.ca/guy-mcpherson-on-climate-collapse-and-near-term-human-extinction/5386102. See more in the context of the *Seneca cliff* in note 1805 in chapter 7. [↑](#endnote-ref-2678)
2678. Read well-written summaries of the *Fermi paradox*, first theorised in 1996, and the *great filter* on https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fermi\_paradox, and https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Great\_Filter. See for background reading Webb, 2015, or Seitz and Hite, 2020. [↑](#endnote-ref-2679)
2679. Aaron Karp, lecturer in political science and geography, in his contribution to the Great Transition Initiative (GTI) Forum on the topic of ‘After the pandemic: Which future?’ 29th May 2020. [↑](#endnote-ref-2680)
2680. *Carbon emissions of the richest 1 percent more than double the emissions of the poorest half of humanity*, Oxfam, 20th September 2020, www.oxfamamerica.org/press/carbon-emissions-richest-1-percent-more-double-emissions-poorest-half-humanity/. [↑](#endnote-ref-2681)
2681. See, among others, *This year, it has been clearer than ever that we are not each other’s enemies. Rather, our common enemy is a tireless virus that threatens our health, security and very way of life*, United Nations, International Day of Peace, 21st September 2020, www.un.org/en/observances/international-day-peace. [↑](#endnote-ref-2682)
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2684. See, also Reyes, 2006. [↑](#endnote-ref-2685)
2685. See classic publications on *big history* by McNeill and McNeill, 2003, or Chaisson, 2001. See also Spier, 2010, Harari, 2014, 2015/2016. See more in note 35 in the Preface. See also the work of German history theorist Jörn Rüsen, 2013/2017. Rüsen’s work speaks to several points made in this book, see also note 125 in the Introduction, note 477 in chapter 2, note 2337 in chapter 7, note 2805 in this chapter, notes 3429 and 3503 in chapter 10, note 3924 in chapter 11, and notes 4085 and 4234 in chapter 12. [↑](#endnote-ref-2686)
2686. See also Ram Vaidya and Koenraad Elst, in ‘How do ancient traditions inform our role in modern society?’ in the conference ‘Ancient Cultures: Championing Humanity’ that was convened by the International Center for Cultural Studies on 20th–21st February 2021. See https://youtu.be/1yF-8K\_6VxE. Ram Vaidya recommends drawing a *long line* forward from the ancient past, using the long view as a compass so that contemporary hurdles are easier to overcome. [↑](#endnote-ref-2687)
2687. I appreciate the doctoral dissertation of historian Steffen Klävers, 2019, who is critical of recent research approaches from the field of comparative genocide research and post-colonial studies that postulate that the idea of a ‘singularity’ of the Holocaust needs to be rejected because National Socialism and the Holocaust had a colonial quality. Klävers notes that the Holocaust cannot be viewed in this way. In Nazi anti-Semitism, every single Jewish person was supposed to be exterminated because she was viewed as part of a pernicious, hidden, abstract and overpowering counter-race, a quality that did not characterise colonial racism.   
      I see, however, parallels in the genocide against the Tutsi in Rwanda in 1994. Both were the theme of my doctoral research titled *The psychology of humiliation: Somalia, Rwanda / Burundi, and Hitler’s Germany*, Lindner, 2000e. [↑](#endnote-ref-2688)
2688. In my work, I apply the *ideal-type* approach as described by sociologist Max Weber, 1904/1949. See more in note 65 in the Preface. [↑](#endnote-ref-2689)
2689. See Ury, 1999. I had the privilege of meeting William Ury for the first time at the launch of the Coexistence Initiative at the State of the World Forum in Belfast, 2nd–9th May 1999. He gave his keynote address titled ‘The challenge of community building’ on 8th May. It is a privilege to have William Ury as esteemed member in the global advisory board of the Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies community since its inception.  
      See also *William Ury: The walk from ‘no’ to ‘yes’*, TEDxMidwest, 2010, [www.ted.com/talks/william\_ury.html](http://www.ted.com/talks/william_ury.html). William Ury helped found the Abraham Path project, a long-distance walking trail across the Middle East which connects the sites visited by the patriarch Abraham as recorded in ancient religious texts and traditions.   
      In my work, I compare the inflection point of the Neolithic Revolution with the Great Divide that separated Homo sapiens’ close relatives, the panins, into two groups. See note 2718 in this chapter. [↑](#endnote-ref-2690)
2690. Lisi Krall in her contribution to the Great Transition Initiative Forum titled ‘Interrogating the Anthropocene: Truth and fallacy’, 16th December 2020, in her response to Raskin, 2021.   
      Paul Raskin criticises Krall’s long view on the Anthropocene in his response in February 2021 to the comments he received on his essay. See https://greattransition.org/gti-forum/antropocene-raskin-response:

      Lisi Krall ... roots the Anthropocene in the ascent of social hierarchy some 10,000 years ago, thus letting modernity, capitalism, and the Industrial Revolution off the hook. Indeed, there is much to learn from this long view (and from what is called the ‘early Anthropocene’). But drawing an unbroken historical line from the first great transformation (agriculture and early civilisation) through the great transformation of modernity to the Planetary Phase is questionable. The revolutionary shifts along the way transformed everything — even the character of social hierarchy.

      I highly appreciate Paul Raskin’s critique. In this book, I attempt to explain how my global experience of more than four decades engendered an intuition that resonates with Krall’s position. My view is that only a wide view over long stretches of history makes primary problems visible, which then spawn secondary, tertiary, and quaternary problems. requires a new weighting in the light of Max Weber’s ideal-type approach and the argument of usefulness for the future, [↑](#endnote-ref-2691)
2691. *The illumination of wings — finding our way to a sacred economics*, talk given by Lisi Krall at the Loretto Women’s Network & Loretto Earth Network’s 2015 winter meeting on February 13, 2015 at the Loretto Center in Denver, Colorado, U.S.A., 28th February 2015, https://youtu.be/JwRRPZSQ3k8. Lisi Krall is a Professor of Economics at the State University of New York, Cortland, with expertise in political, cultural and ecological economics, who has written and spoken on feminist economics. See her contribution to the Great Transition Initiative Forum titled ‘Interrogating the Anthropocene: Truth and fallacy’, 16th December 2020. [↑](#endnote-ref-2692)
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2693. See Gaertner and Dovidio, 2000, Gaertner, et al., 1999, and Gaertner and Dovidio, 2012. In my work, I compare the inflection point of the Neolithic Revolution with the Great Divide that separated Homo sapiens’ close relatives, the panins, into two groups. See note 2718 in this chapter. [↑](#endnote-ref-2694)
2694. Archaeologist Ingrid Fuglestvedt in a personal communication, 17th October 2011: ‘Egalitarian hunter-gatherers, especially the animists, are the best societies this world has ever witnessed. This is not a reference to the Garden of Eden; it is to acknowledge that some systems are better than others in taking care of everybody’s integrity, both human and animal’. See more in note 3252 in chapter 10.  
      See also David Suzuki, 1992, who explored the ecological wisdom of Native Peoples from around the world. I thank Linda Hartling for making me aware of David Suzuki’s work. See more in note 2717 further down in this chapter. [↑](#endnote-ref-2695)
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      As to the loss of the world’s largest animals, also called megafauna, they began to disappear starting about 60,000 years ago, first in Sahul, the supercontinent formed by Australia and New Guinea during periods of low sea level. See ‘Did people or climate kill off the megafauna? Actually, it was both’, by Frédérik Saltré, Corey J. A. Bradshaw, and Katharina J. Peters, *The Conversation*, 3rd December 2019, https://theconversation.com/did-people-or-climate-kill-off-the-megafauna-actually-it-was-both-127803: ‘We found that megafauna extinctions in areas where they coexisted with humans were most likely caused by a combination of human pressure and access to water’. See also Ripple, et al., 2020, ‘Scientists have a moral obligation to clearly warn humanity of any catastrophic threat and to “tell it like it is”. On the basis of this obligation and the graphical indicators presented below, we declare, with more than 11,000 scientist signatories from around the world, clearly and unequivocally that planet Earth is facing a climate emergency’. [↑](#endnote-ref-2696)
2696. See Ury, 1999. [↑](#endnote-ref-2697)
2697. See the work of primatologist and anthropologist Carel van Schaik. See, for instance, ‘Das Patriarchat ist eine Anomalie in der Menschheitsgeschichte: Eva und Adam waren gleich, erst Sesshaftigkeit und Besitz versklavten im Laufe der Jahrtausende die Frau’, an interview with van Schaik by Rafaela von Bredow, *Der Spiegel* 48/20, 21st November 2020, pp. 106–110, www.spiegel.de/wissenschaft/mensch/das-patriarchat-ist-eine-anomalie-in-der-menschheitsgeschichte-a-00000000-0002-0001-0000-000174103658. [↑](#endnote-ref-2698)
2698. See Ury, 1999. [↑](#endnote-ref-2699)
2699. I very much thank the President of the Club of Rome from 1999 to 2007, Prince El Hassan bin Talal, for his personal message from 19th May 2020, where he suggests the term *cogitocide*. See more in note 1777 in chapter 7. *Sociocide* is the killing of our sociosphere, of the cohesion in our human communities. *Ecocide* is the killing of our ecosphere, of our ecological world, of which we are only a small part, despite our belief to be its masters. [↑](#endnote-ref-2700)
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2701. Circumscription theory has been developed by anthropologist and curator of the American Museum of Natural History in New York City, Robert Leonard Carneiro. See, among others, Carneiro, 1970, 1988, 2000, 2010, 2012, and Carneiro, 2018. See, furthermore, Sanderson, 2007, and Schacht, 1988. Carneiro acknowledges that his circumscription theory has famous forerunners, see Carneiro, 2018, p. 53: ‘The line of succession in recognising the importance of a restricted environment in engendering political integration thus runs from Cieza de León through Ephraim Squier to Herbert Spencer’. I have taken my inspiration from Carneiro’s work. While he describes circumscription as the mechanism that led to state formation, I use his reflections in a broader sense. It is a privilege to have Robert Carneiro as an esteemed member in the global advisory board of our Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies community. I mourn his passing in 24th June 2020. [↑](#endnote-ref-2702)
2702. Every year in November or December, from 2009 until 2019, when he grew too old, I paid anthropologist Robert Carneiro a visit in his office in the American Museum of Natural History in New York City, near the former office of Margaret Mead. I mourn his passing in 24th June 2020 and treasure his 2018 book that he gave to me in his office on 8th November 2018, with his warm dedication, ‘To the incomparable Evelin, who, with one cast of her net encompasses the world. With esteem and affection, Bob’. [↑](#endnote-ref-2703)
2703. Carneiro, 2018, p. 5. I thank Robert Carneiro for gifting this book to me in his office in the American Museum of Natural History, New York City, on 8th November 2018. I thank him for his warm dedication: ‘To the incomparable Evelin, who, with one cast of her net encompasses the world. With esteem and affection, Bob’. [↑](#endnote-ref-2704)
2704. Carneiro, 2018, pp. 4–5. See also James C. Scott, 2017. The ‘automatic’ theory was offered by archaeologists such as Robert Braidwood and Gordon Childe. [↑](#endnote-ref-2705)
2705. Carneiro, 2018, p. 14. [↑](#endnote-ref-2706)
2706. Carneiro, 2018, p. 14. [↑](#endnote-ref-2707)
2707. See Ury, 1999, and *William Ury: The walk from ‘no’ to ‘yes’*, TEDxMidwest, 2010, [www.ted.com/talks/william\_ury.html](http://www.ted.com/talks/william_ury.html). See more in note 2690 in this chapter. See also anthropologist James Suzman, 2017, and his book *Affluence without abundance: The disappearing world of the Bushmen*. See also note 2718 in chapter 9 on the Great Divide. [↑](#endnote-ref-2708)
2708. See Chase-Dunn and Hall, 2002, and Chase-Dunn and Hall, 1997. [↑](#endnote-ref-2709)
2709. Carneiro, 2018, p. 15. See also Carneiro, 1970, 1988, 2000, 2010, 2012. See, furthermore, Sanderson, 2007, or Schacht, 1988. Carneiro first conceptualised *environmental circumscription* and later added *social circumscription* and *resource concentration*.   
      For the Swahili proverb see note 2723 further down in this chapter. I thank Catherine Odora Hoppers for describing to me the exact ways in which this proverb was being enacted in Uganda until colonisation brought circumscription. [↑](#endnote-ref-2710)
2710. In the Levant, the Natufian culture became sedentary at around 12,000 BCE, more than 2000 years before they started to cultivate plants. See, among others, Moore, et al., 2000. [↑](#endnote-ref-2711)
2711. The *Holocene* is the current geological epoch which started approximately 11,700 years ago, when the glaciers began to retreat, and the Neolithic Revolution unfolded. Some also call it the *Anthropocene*, because it is the epoch, when human activities began to have a significant global impact on Earth’s ecosystems, see, for instance, Zalasiewicz, et al., 2010. Consider also sociologist Jason Moore, 2014, locates the beginning of the *Capitalocene* 2000 years ago, ending in ‘a rat race’ now. See www.capitalocene.com, ‘virtual capital is significantly more destructive than real capital, and it is pushing the international financial markets without mercy’. [↑](#endnote-ref-2712)
2712. The reasons for and the circumstances of the rise of agriculture are hotly debated, see, among many others, Richerson, et al., 1999, Richerson, et al., 2001, Richerson and Boyd, 2001, Boyd and Richerson, 2009. See also recent findings that farming in the Fertile Crescent did not begin in a single population, but rather was tried out all over the Fertile Crescent, a region in the Middle East that includes modern-day Iraq, Jordan, Syria, Israel, Palestine, south-eastern Turkey and western Iran. The descendants of the early farmers from the Zagros Mountains on the border between Iraq and Iran probably migrated east, taking their farming techniques to Asia, while those from the Turkey region migrated north into Europe and introduced farming there. See the work of the palaeogenetics team around Joachim Burger and Broushaki, et al., 2016. I thank Linda Hartling for making me aware of these new findings. [↑](#endnote-ref-2713)
2713. The Jōmon period in Japan, for instance, that began circa fourteen thousand years ago, or pre-Columbian cultures of the North American Pacific Northwest, especially the Valdivia culture of Ecuador, saw a high level cultural complexity within a context of mainly hunting-gathering and some horticulture. [↑](#endnote-ref-2714)
2714. ‘The worst mistake in the history of the human race’, by Jared Diamond, *Discover Magazine*, May 1987, pp. 64–66, www.ditext.com/diamond/mistake.html: ‘Archaeologists studying the rise of farming have reconstructed a crucial stage at which we made the worst mistake in human history. Forced to choose between limiting population or trying to increase food production, we chose the latter and ended up with starvation, warfare, and tyranny’.  
      See also the work of zooarchaeologist Sarah Pleuger, see more in note 3252 in chapter 10.  
      See, furthermore, Manning, 2004, Hemenway, 2009, or Harari, 2014, who share the view that the agricultural revolution was history’s ‘biggest fraud’. See, furthermore, ‘Is sustainable agriculture an oxymoron?’ Toby Hemenway, *Permaculture Activist*, Number 60, May 2006, www.patternliteracy.com/203-is-sustainable-agriculture-an-oxymoron. [↑](#endnote-ref-2715)
2715. See, among others, Gepts, et al., 2012. [↑](#endnote-ref-2716)
2716. The ‘automatic’ theory indicates that the advent of agriculture made it possible for larger groups to become sedentary, and this view entails three positive appraisals that I do not resonate with, namely, that sedentary lifestyle represents progress, together with agriculture, and that this has arisen from human inventiveness. It could also be the other way round, three times negative, namely, that foragers faced the shrinking of their territory, i.e. *circumscription*, and that many only very reluctantly turned to a sedentary lifestyle and to *intensification*, to domesticating plants and animals, in sum, to agricultural systems.   
      Indeed, many of our pre-Neolithic ancestors resisted sedentism and plough agriculture, they tried to hold on to their mobile subsistence, and together with anthropologist and political scientist James C. Scott I applaud them for that. See Scott, 1990, 1998, 2008, 2009, 2012, 2013, 2017. Anthropologist James Suzman, 2020, p. 101, confirms, ‘For 95 per cent of our species’ history, work did not occupy anything like the hallowed place in people’s lives that it does now’. See also Suzman, 2019, *Affluence without abundance: What we can learn from the world’s most successful civilisation*, namely, the Bushmen.   
      See also the evaluation of archaeologist Ingrid Fuglestvedt, shared in a personal communication, 17th October 2011: ‘Egalitarian hunter-gatherers, especially the animists, are the best societies this world has ever witnessed. This is not a reference to the Garden of Eden; it is to acknowledge that some systems are better than others in taking care of everybody’s integrity, both human and animal’.   
      See, furthermore, David Suzuki, 1992, who explored the ecological wisdom of Native Peoples from around the world. I thank Linda Hartling for making me aware of David Suzuki’s work.  
      My views are also shared by people like Werner Pfeifer, born in 1964 and raised in Namibia, where he lived with San (Bushmen), and is now offering bush craft courses in cooperation with traditional San. See www.lcfn.info. [↑](#endnote-ref-2717)
2717. See Takemoto, et al., 2015, or ‘The Great Divide: A fateful crossing of the Congo River by ancestral apes led to the rise of the modern bonobo’, by Katie Jewett, *bioGraphic*, 25th April 2017, www.biographic.com/the-great-divide/. Read also the ‘survival of the friendliest’, Brian Hare, 2017.   
      According to some anthropologists, some early human ancestors went through a bonobo-like phase of reduced aggression as well, see Clark and Henneberg, 2015.   
      You may enjoy watching *Why we hate*, a 2019 six-part documentary series produced by Steven Spielberg. See www.discoveryuk.com/series/why-we-hate/. While the film ends in offering solutions at the level of the individual, such as, for instance, meditation, I resonate with those voices that call for more systemic solutions. See for such voices, among others, ‘Discovery docuseries Why we hate is essential viewing. It’s also deeply flawed’, by Judy Berman, *Time*, 10th October 2019, https://time.com/5696541/why-we-hate-discovery-review/.  
      In conclusion, we could say that the Neolithic Revolution acted like the Great Divide insofar as it marked Homo sapiens’ journey from a ‘bonobo context’ of material abundance to a ‘chimpanzee context’ of circumscription. The task at hand now, for the species of Homo sapiens, is to return to a ‘bonobo context’, only that this time, it cannot be material abundance, after all, the planet cannot be enlarged, it must be non-material abundance in a global knowledge society.

      Community frame = partnership model of society (Riane Eisler) = bonobo frame  
      Wall street frame = dominator model (Riane Eisler) & capitalism = chimpanzee frame [↑](#endnote-ref-2718)
2718. Martinez, et al., 2019, offer a ‘connectionist logic of syncretism’ as a path to rise above a mere ‘win-win’ appeal to logic, because what is as stake is a ‘clash of beliefs and faiths as well as of ways of thinking’, p. 907:

      The technocentrists worship at the temple of the free market, embrace the doctrines of consumer sovereignty and shareholder value, and their faith is kept strong and pure by the expectations and exhortations from the high priests to be found among the city analysts, management consultancies, and business schools. The ecocentrists have an equally strong faith. Convinced of the moral justice and logical wisdom of protecting the planet, they have their own liturgy of criticisms of ‘big business’, want to take a stand against the evils of globalisation, and are inspired by their own shamanic visionaries who have founded successful business that put socio-environmental principles before profit. One reason why sustainability integration has been so difficult to achieve in practice is that it is not just a battle of competing business logics but a battle of faiths. As such, the notion of syncretism with its roots in religious synthesis may be far more relevant and useful than conventional approaches to combining the two, which rarely seem to rise above a ‘win-win’ appeal to logic. [↑](#endnote-ref-2719)
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4369. See the classical works on *cleavages* in society by Norwegian political scientist and sociologist Stein Rokkan and Lipset, 1967. Compromise across groups is more difficult to achieve when disagreements produced by one division *reinforce* those produced by another, for instance, when class and race divisions combine. Compromise is more easily achieved in case of *cross-cutting* cleavages, when disagreements produced by one cleavage lessen those originating from another. See, for instance, the chapter ‘Geography, religion, and social class: Crosscutting cleavages in Norwegian politics’, in Rokkan, 1967.   
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