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Dear Paul, Jonathan, and all across the Great Transition Network, please accept my deep appreciation for this extremely rich and enlightening discussion. As always, the depth and breadth of your knowledge and wisdom humbles me. Paul and the Global Scenario Group’s essay from 2002 and its follow-ups have been foundational for my work.¹

A positive note: What we can do

In this group, we all seem to agree that we, as humankind, have dug ourselves into a multitude of perilous crises, both despite and because of what we call progress. Notwithstanding, allow me to begin my comments with a positive note. Few people seem to take in that Homo sapiens lives in a historically unparalleled promising moment. History does not go in circles. For the first time in its history, humankind is in a position to succeed in bringing about the kinds of adaptation that are needed. For the first time, humanity can fully appreciate its place in the cosmos. Unlike our ancestors, we can see pictures of our Blue Marble from the perspective of an astronaut.² Unlike our forebears, we have the privilege of experiencing the overview effect with respect to our planet,³ which helps us understand that we humans are one species living on one tiny planet, so that we can embrace biophilia.⁴ We can feel ‘the ecology of the living’ taking place within one circumscribed biopoetic space that is shared between all beings.⁵ We have access to a much more comprehensive knowledge base about the universe, our place in it than our grandparents ever had. We have everything needed to build global mutual trust and solidarity, we can humanise globalisation and reap the benefits that flow from the global ingathering of humanity. As Arthur Dahl notes, ‘the forces of integration have also been building momentum, with information systems uniting the
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world as never before and empowering a sense of belonging to one human family.’

What we do

Where do we stand? We engage in systemic humiliation — *ecocide* and *sociocide* — we shred our relations with our habitat and with each other. We degrade our *sociosphere* and our *cogitosphere*, our sphere of thinking and reflection, to the point that we sacrifice our *ecosphere* and thus embark on our collective suicide as a species. As long as we uphold competition for domination as a mindset and social and societal order, even moving to a new planet will not help, as we would soon devastate it as well.

We know from research that human nature is neither ‘good’ nor ‘evil’ but social, and that much of human action depends on the ways constitutive rules frame relational contexts. At the current historic juncture, two historically new forces — globalisation and the rise of human rights ideals — create expectation gaps, or *dignity gaps*, or *indignity traps*, which make feelings of humiliation arise more forcefully than ever before, feelings of humiliation in the face of acts and systems of humiliation. Dynamics of humiliation will become the strongest obstacle to a Great Transition — particularly dignity humiliation, or what I call the ‘nuclear bomb of the emotions’. Cycles of humiliation can turn a potentially united ‘global village’ into a divided war zone.

Present-day’s most definitorial systemic humiliation is a world-system (Wallerstein’s notion) that gives priority to profit maximisation rather than common good maximisation, a state of affairs that sends humiliation into every corner of the world. The coronavirus pandemic was a ‘predicted crisis’ due to this predicament. The rush for profit at any price is bringing humans in close contact with novel pathogens that can spread around the world, killing hundreds of thousands in a few months, while at the same time pushing aside decades of warnings. The pandemic throws into stark contrast the fact that global care for the common good is paramount, while the profit motive is destructive when it takes the lead rather than being of service.

When I look at the pandemic’, I say with Andrea Surbone that ‘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.’

I am writing from Germany, where I take care of my 94-years-old father, finding myself in a privileged bubble compared with other parts of the world. However, as I am nurturing a global movement of academics and practitioners who wish to bring more dignity into the world (and reduce humiliation), I am approached by members from all around the world and Shalmali Guttal’s bleak description of the situation in the Global South illustrates what I see. For instance, I am in touch with members of our network from the Global South who wish to protect their families from financial ruin and ask me, as a medical doctor, at which point they need to end their own lives to avoid costly yet vain medical treatment.

I hail from a displaced family who was deeply affected by the two world wars of the last century, a family who lost everything in 1946 after WWII. This has made me much more aware of the vulnerability of our human-made arrangements than my peers in the Global North. I thank Maurie Cohen for reminding me of the work of Kai Erikson on the social consequences of catastrophic events. The Overton window of discourse in my displaced community has always been wider than that in the mainstream population, always filled with the expectation of new meltdowns. I am therefore not surprised. For decades, I have expected what happens now and have been living in the state of alarm that engulfs the world now.

In short, this is what we do: Despite the immense window of opportunity waiting for us to use, unfortunately, so far, instead of recognising the depth of the crises we are in and instead of grasping our historic opportunity to exit, it seems that most of us choose to stay shortsighted and myopic. Like Vishwas Satgar from South Africa, I see that Paul Raskin’s Barbarism and Fortress World scenarios have arrived.

What stands in the way of what we can do

Can the coronavirus disruption turn into systemic shift? I share Allen White’s hope, namely, that
'COVID-19 may represent a historic branch point for mobilising across geographic boundaries, classes, and issues', and Frank Fischer’s observation that ‘decentralised ecocommunal movements offer promising alternatives, including ecovillages, urban as well as rural.’ Yet, I also share Fischer’s fear, namely, that ‘large numbers of people will unwittingly embrace the paternalist system of a political strong man, first and foremost in the desperate effort to feed their families.’

Sahan Savas Karatasi points at something very important, namely, that ‘being right on a political issue is not sufficient to win a struggle.’ The problem he points at is that being right does not take account of the need to express emotions, in this case emotions of disgust and anger in the face of (real or perceived) acts and systems of humiliation.

French Aristocrat Alexis de Tocqueville (1805–1859) authored the classic text The Ancien Regime and the revolution in 1856. 1 He observed that the chance for uprisings is greatest not when dearth is so severe that it causes apathy and despair, but when conditions had been improving, and even more so when this improvement benefitted a privileged few more than the rest. What Tocqueville alluded to was the expectation gap that opens when improved conditions raise hopes without fulfilling them. When raised hopes get disappointed, retaliation may ensue, retaliation that is more impactful precisely through the improved conditions that give better access to resources. 2

I see current systemic frames creating dearth to the point that people become paralysed. As I observe, people are not able to act on their feelings of rage over acts and systems of humiliation in the spirit of Paulo Freire’s conscientisation 3 and Nelson Mandela’s strategy of inclusiveness because sociocide and cogitocide stand in the way.

Cogitocide comes from Latin caedere, or the killing of the cogitosphere, the realm of thinking and reflection. 4 Humanity is drowning in data, yet it is a sightless infosphere — artificial intelligence is a misnomer — it is artificial sightlessness. Sociocide is brought to people not least through systemic frames that incentivise selfishness and caste suspicion on selflessness, in the belief that Adam Smith’s invisible hand will come to rescue. As a result – and I observe this all around the globe – people are being morally and psychologically crippled to the point that they lack the courage to envision and create systemic frames that would invite pro-social behaviour with ‘visible hands’. Feminist economists have long reminded us, in vain, that our economies depend entirely on ‘invisible’ work, particularly that of women, and they warn that personal autonomy is a myth while dependency is the reality. One economist asked a fitting question: ‘Who cooked Adam Smith’s dinner?’ 5

As Sujata Dutta notes, ‘the onus is on the adults for having mislead them to an erroneous understanding of this world till now.’ So-called neoliberalism trained people systematically to develop mistrust, which now helps conspiracy theorists. Maurie Cohen cogently formulates how ‘the trauma of corporate and government malfeasance, when coupled with lies, deceit, and self-serving blame-shifting, leads to a process of political radicalisation.’ Walden Bello’s global view resonaotes with my observations, ‘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.’ Frank Fischer adds that ‘the new social media will continue to be rife with fake news and conspiracy theories, all of which will make it difficult to successfully communicate the need for a major transition.’

The spirit of love

All my life, I have been preparing for the next ‘Eleanor Roosevelt moment’, like in 1948, when a window of opportunity stood open for dignity to get the attention it deserves. In our dignity movement, we are helping to nurture another moment like this since years, and we hope to be among the co-authors of this moment, contributing with our approach of what we call big love. I am therefore particularly delighted to see the word ‘love’ being mentioned in this discussion by two women, Kavita Byrd and Mamphela Ramphele, who call for love and mutual solidarity rather than competition for domination. Kavita Byrd points out that the Covid pandemic has illuminated the regenerative potential of love, care, and solidarity, and that a ‘just, loving, caring world, a reverence
for the sacred on this Earth and beyond’ is possible, but, of course — only if we act. Her diagnosis is also mine, namely, that ‘the global capitalist system’ has caused the crisis, and ‘will cause many more to come’, and that the ‘spirit of love’ needs to be ‘expressed in our consciousness, actions and world’. Mamphela Ramphele mirrors my observations after forty-five years of what I call ‘global living’ — of being at home on all continents — namely, that huge benefits flow from the leadership of ‘progressive women who are demonstrating the power of the feminine to operate within a values framework that emphasises interconnectedness, interdependence, reciprocity, and intergenerational responsibilities and complementarities.’

The hope

The only realistic hope I see — as faint as it may be — is that enough people will wake up to understand that in an interconnected world it is not only practical, but essential for our continued existence on our planet to move towards a world-system that enables trust and mutual solidarity to emerge both locally and globally. The hope is that enough people understand that it is feasible to attenuate the security dilemma and that we can overcome the commons dilemma. It is feasible to create global human security rather than military security and to turn the tragedy of the commons — when people’s short-term selfish interests to exploit resources destroy long-term group interests — into the blessing of the commons. In an interconnected world, long-term demise for all is the result when a few strongmen elites strive for domination over the rest and engage in the exploitation of humanity’s common planetary resources.

Cycles of humiliation can re-fragment the world and bring back the classical security dilemma. Global human-to-human trust building is everyone’s responsibility now, rather than leaving the navigation of ‘foreign relations’ to diplomats, while allowing the Global North to abuse the world as business opportunity and leisure park. Therefore, the field of psychology will and should increase in importance while political science becomes less salient. The more the classical security dilemma attenuates through the ingathering of humanity and a rising awareness of humanity being one family on a finite interconnected vulnerable planet, and the more ideals of equal dignity become salient, the more the various fields of psychology gain significance, and political science loses it. Global inter-human relations are increasingly in demand, overtaking inter-national relations.

We do not have to make do with a world where ulterior interests capture all aspects of our lives, and even charitable NGOs turn into ‘missionaries of the new era’ of economism. We do not have to make do with world where equal dignity is mistaken as equal entitlement to profiteering, a world where profit-at-any-cost poisons all of our institutions, locally and globally, and legitimises free-riding on the common good at all levels. This is nothing but worldwide systemic humiliation. There are more options on the table than big or small government, namely, good governance. Good governance means shaping constitutive rules with the help of the principle of constrained pluralism — comprising the complementary sub-principles of irreducibility, subsidiarity, and heterogeneity — thus dignifying both local and global governance.

In this situation, I deeply resonate with Shalmali Guttal’s call that ‘a humane and just post-COVID-19 scenario will require fundamental changes in our economic, institutional, and governance structures.’ Ruben Nelson always summarises the present challenge most succinctly, namely, that it lies ‘at the level of the very understandings we have of the nature of knowledge, truth, and being’, and that we are already past ‘Peak Modernity’ and that it can no longer simply be saved ‘by making it to be sustainable, equitable, and humane’. With Sahan Savas Karatasli, I see us requiring a ‘global revolution that replaces the current world order with an alternative form’ through a ‘mass mobilisation from below’, through a horizontally linked ‘movement of movements’.

Clearly, Peter Sterling is right in saying that we must restructure ‘work’ and that sociality and opportunities to prove oneself in creative and pro-social ways must trump ‘efficiency’. Among others, education waits to be restructured. ‘Cease cramming kids into classrooms to administer one curriculum’. Schools should never be used as social-intellectual sorting systems, rather they should be supporting systems that ‘explore each child’s natural talents and provide programs to optimise their growth.’ Peter Sterling reminds us of the lessons from neuroscience, namely, that ‘what we
practice, we become’.

In 2011, our dignity movement launched the World Dignity University initiative (WDUi). This initiative is designed to put dignity at the centre of learning and knowledge. We wish for the WDUi to become a pathway for building global connections that transcend national boundaries and individual identities, moving beyond the fragmentation and degradation of knowledge, relationships, and the planet that we see rising in the world today — beyond sociocide, cogitocide, and ecocide.

I have coined the term dignism (dignity + ism) to describe a world where every new-born 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 everybody’s basic needs are met. It is a world, 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.18

When Rachel Carson published her book Silent spring in 1962, many were full of hope for a substantial turn-around.19 The Brundtland Commission of 1987, the Earth Summit of 1992,20 the Nobel Peace Prize for 2007 to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and former US Vice President Al Gore,21 and the 2016 Paris Agreement concerning global warming,22 all these were moments of ‘yes we can turn around’ enthusiasm. Yet, in the end, corporate interests won out. In 2015, the United Nations General Assembly set Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) for 2030, and goal number eight shows an exponential economic growth curve, a curve that is absurd in a finite context.23 We went from ‘Earthrise’ in the 1960s, to ‘profit versus planet’ around 1970–1987, we turned environmentalism into ‘sustainability’ around 1987–1997, and finally into ‘market environmentalism’ from 1998 to 2018. In 2019 came Greta Thunberg, and in 2020 the Covid-19 virus. They question us why we, the human family, have missed so many invitations to unite in response to our global challenges. They ask us why we let grim and kind invitations pass alike: We let the invitation of the September 11 attacks pass in 2001 and the enormous financial crisis in 2008, and we even turned down the kind invitation of the end of the Cold War.

As John Ehrenfeld suggests, ‘we should be explicitly cheering on those who are discovering their caring, connected side’, and he refers to Erik Olin Wright’s observation that ‘changes in the interstices, that is, places in the institutional structures that are largely overlooked, have better chances to persist than those aimed at higher-level.’ In Wright’s spirit, my suggestion is that every one of us talk about this crisis as a tipping point towards a Great Transition. Talking is useful, as it can become a self-fulfilling prophecy. My other suggestion is that every one of us aims for personal consistency through walking the talk of dignity in all spheres of their lives. In my case, I do that by manifesting a gift economy also in my personal life.

In the small city of Hameln, where my father lives, a DignityNow group has formed, following our DignityNowNY group, and they ask for three changes in the spirit of love: no longer the production of ‘stuff’, no longer the exploitation of the Global South for the sake of producing this ‘stuff’, thus helping to mitigate the exploitation of the planet’s resources.24

Paul’s Great Transition process is the only way I can see for humanity to survive in dignity, brought about by a broad and diverse global citizens movement that envisions ‘profound historical transformations in the fundamental values and organising principles of society.’25 I thank Ronaldo Munck for his crisp summaries of Paul’s scenarios.

As the world watches the heart-breaking coronavirus pandemic unfold, our hope is for an exponential change of heart so that global unity rooted in respect for our local diversities becomes possible. When a new Eleanor Roosevelt moment comes, we hope to be ready for a Universal Declaration of Human Vulnerability26 and a Great Transition. We hope to be ready to answer the following question together with everyone: How must we, humankind, arrange our affairs on this planet so that dignified life will be possible in the long term?
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3 White, 2014.


5 Author Andreas Weber, 2016, develops a creative ecology of the living – a biopoetics. This is the book description:

Meaning, feeling and expression – the experience of inwardness – matter most in human existence. The perspective of biopoetics shows that this experience is shared by all organisms. Being alive means to exist through relations that have existential concern, and to express these dimensions through the body and its gestures. All life takes place within one poetic space which is shared between all beings and which is accessible through subjective sensual
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experience. We take part in this through our empirical subjectivity, which arises from the experiences and needs of living beings, and which makes them open to access and sharing in a poetic objectivity. Biopoetics breaks free from the causal-mechanic paradigm which made biology unable to account for mind and meaning. Biology becomes a science of expression, connection and subjectivity which can understand all organisms including feeling agents in a shared ecology of meaningful relations, embedded in a symbolical and material metabolism of the biosphere.

6 I very much thank the President of the Club of Rome from 1999 to 2007, Prince El Hassan bin Talal, for his personal message on 19th May 2020, where he shared with me 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, Helsinki, where he suggests cognitosphere. His address to the gathering was entitled ‘The challenge of informed humanity: From “infosphere” to “cogitosphere”’, where he calls on the Chiebe of Rome to elevate the ‘cogitosphere’, or the realm of thinking and reflection, above that of the Infosphere ‘in order to avoid that sightless vision and to focus our deliberative process on the real challenges facing informed humanity’.


8 Dr. Gro Harlem Brundtland is the former Prime Minister of Norway. On 27th March 2020, she is in the Norwegian media explaining that the Corona crisis is ‘a notified crisis’. Since 2018, she is co-chair of the Global Preparedness Monitoring Board (GPMB, https://apps.who.int/gpmb). In 2018, she was asked by the World Bank and WHO to lead a report on a work on how the world would deal with a global infectious and deadly epidemic. Together with the head of the International Red Cross, she brought together international experts and health politicians. The report came in September 2019, and she said: ‘For too long, world leaders’ approaches to health emergencies have been characterized by a cycle of panic and neglect... It is high time for urgent and sustained action. This must include increased funding at the community, national and international levels to prevent the spread of outbreaks. It also requires leaders to take proactive steps to strengthen coordination mechanisms across governments and society to respond quickly to an emergency’. See World at risk from deadly pandemics: Expert group outlines steps to prepare for – and mitigate – the effects of a widespread global health emergency that could kill millions, damage global economy, World Health Organisation, 18th September 2019, https://apps.who.int/gpmb/assets/annual_report/GPMB%20Press%20Release_Final.pdf.


12 Lindner, 2020. Consider also Larry Brendtro, et al., 2009, who point out that saying ‘you no longer belong to our group’ amounts to the ultimate form of punishment, namely, social death. I thank Mechthild Nagel, for making me aware of Brendtro’s work. See also the work of sociologist Michèle Lamont, who speaks of a recognition gap, highlighting ‘the centrality of stigmatisation (feeling underestimated, ignored, and misunderstood) over discrimination (being deprived of resources)’. See ‘Addressing the recognition gap: Destigmatisation and the reduction of inequality’, by Michèle Lamont in a seminar in the President’s Seminar series, part of the Rethinking Open Society project, 4th December 2017, https://youtu.be/VrHb6mUNAo. In the context of post-materialism theory, in 1971, political scientist Ronald Inglehart hoped that dignity will become part of self-expression values: ‘Throughout history, survival has been insecure for most people, forcing them to give top priority to survival needs. But in advanced industrial societies, the economic miracles of the post-war era and the emergence of the welfare state gave rise to conditions under which much of the post-war generation grew up taking survival for granted; they give increasingly high priority to post-materialist values such as belonging, self-expression, and free choice’, Inglehart, 1971, Abstract. Both materialist and post-materialist orientations may merge whenever a decent livelihood is perceived as a human right and the ‘infinite desire for growth’ has been overcome, as Daniel Cohen, 2015/2018, has formulated it.


De Morais, in contradistinction to Freire, sets forward not two but three levels of awareness. He adds to Freire’s two, which are: the naïve level and the critical level. The third is the organisational level of awareness. At the naïve level a person is aware of problems but is unable to understand their cause (and so may blame God or the Fates). The critically conscious person is able to identify the factors responsible for problems, and their inter-relationship.
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Organisational awareness is reached when the person has the ability to act together with others to address a problem or attain particular results. Organisational awareness manifests what de Morais calls a ‘methodological rationality’.

14 I very much thank the President of the Club of Rome from 1999 to 2007, Prince El Hassan bin Talal, for his personal message on 19th May 2020, where he suggested to me the term cogitocide. I thank him for sharing with me 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, Helsinki.


16 Merz, 2012.


EBA best practices point to a very different agenda based on promoting large-scale industrial agriculture at the expense of family farmers, pastoralists and indigenous peoples. It is biased towards industrial agriculture and agribusiness, and the intent of the new indicator makes it even more urgent to challenge the EBA initiative.


20 Greta Thunberg had a forerunner, her name was Severn Suzuki. As a twelve-year-old, she spoke at the Earth Summit Rio92 to the leaders of the world. Her speech was hailed by everyone as deeply touching. Twenty years later, she came back to the Rio+20 Summit and her message was the following: nothing has happened! See Severn Suzuki’s speech at Rio92, 1992, published on 28th February 2007 by Evandro Barboza, https://youtu.be/5g8cmWZOX8Q. See also Severn Suzuki’s speech at Rio+20, 2012, published on 20th June 2012 by ONU Brasil, https://youtu.be/1FmSxmpitBA: ‘After 20 years, the 12 year-old-girl, who made a speech in front of the Chief of States at RIO92, came back to Rio de Janeiro to tell what she wants for the future of the planet’. See what she said twenty years later here: At Rio+20, Severn Cullis-Suzuki revisits historic ’92 speech: Fights for next generation, published on 21st June 2012 by Democracy Now! https://youtu.be/z5qFpPlsY1.

21 The Nobel Peace Prize for 2007 was awarded to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and former US Vice President Al Gore. See www.nobelprize.org/prizes/peace/2007/gore/facts/.

22 For the Paris Agreement, see https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/the-paris-agreement/the-paris-agreement.

23 For the Sustainable Development Goals, see https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/sdgs. If goal number eight were to be taken seriously, it would undermine the success of more or less all other goals.

24 I thank Georg-Wilhelm Geckler, May 2020.


26 Michael Britton, DignityNowNYC, in a personal communication, 1st April 2020:

If Eleanor Roosevelt were here today, instead of the universal declaration of human rights, we might be ready, in one of Evelin and Linda’s Eleanor Roosevelt Moments, we might be ready for a Universal Declaration of Human Vulnerability, or a Declaration of Universal Human Vulnerability – premising a need for pulling together, universal cooperation as the foundation of planetary life.