

The Moment Is Now!

Evelin Lindner
2011

Chapter for a book to be co-authored with Linda Hartling

Envisioned Contents List

Foreword

Preface

Acknowledgments

Introduction

Part I: Setting a Big Stage

- Chapter 1: The Moment Is Now! Evelin Lindner
- Chapter 2: Toward a Relational Ecology Linda Hartling
- Chapter 3: Obstacles to Understanding Evelin Lindner

Part II: Dignity and Humiliation

- Chapter 4: The Dignity Dilemma Evelin Lindner
- Chapter 5: Humiliation Is Real Pain Linda Hartling
- Chapter 6: Healing, Resilience, and Creativity Linda Hartling

Part III: Hope for the Future — Turning Ideas into Action

- Chapter 7: Models of Actions — Promising Paths Linda Hartling and Evelin Lindner
- Chapter 8: We Are a Learning Community Linda Hartling
- Chapter 9: Walking the Talk Linda Hartling and Evelin Lindner

Glossary

Index

Bibliography

CHAPTER 1: THE MOMENT IS NOW!

By Evelin Lindner

There are no passengers on spaceship earth. We are all crew.

— Marshall McLuhan

—Chapter 1: The Moment Is Now!	2
We live at the onset of new history	2
Today’s ingathering of the human family is our biggest chance.....	4
We live in times of great opportunities. Yet, we squander them.....	6
How can a future be built where everybody has the chance to live a dignified life?	9
Provocative WHY question for in-depth reflection and research.....	9
Bibliography	10

We live in extraordinary times. Never before in history have we, as human species, been presented with a window of opportunity as wide as now. None of our ancestors was able to see pictures of our Blue Planet from the perspective of an astronaut and *see* how we humans are *one* species living on *one* little planet. None of our ancestors lived in a world with such a comprehensive knowledge base, knowledge that—if we decide to use it—is substantial enough to tackle all our challenges.

Francis Fukuyama spoke of the end of history.¹ Yet, History does not end; it does not proceed in cycles; and it does not repeat itself, at least not in the long term. It repeats itself only in limited periods. For the first 95 percent of human history, for example, when we were populating our planet as migrating hunter-gatherers, history repeated itself: we could always wander off and find new and untouched abundance.² Around 10,000 years ago (very simplified), the “party” of unlimited abundance came to an end, and what anthropologists call *circumscription* set in.³ For the past ten millennia, or the last five percent of our history as *homo sapiens*, another kind of history repeated itself, this time empires conquered their neighbors, became ever more powerful, only to fall apart again.

We live in a time now when a new set of conditions launches us into a crucial opportunity to build a different history for the future.

We live at the onset of new history

A new set of conditions? Yes. What is new is that our world has become *one world*. It has “shrunk” to the point that we, as a human family, can fathom and act upon the fact that we live in *one single interconnected* world, and we can grasp this set of conditions better and more comprehensively than ever before.

During the past millennia, we saw the world as compartmentalized. Humans lived in socially, culturally, and nationally defined spheres of behaviors, traditions, and values. When these spheres began to grow and collide, fear of being attacked and subjugated or annihilated became ubiquitous. The need to fight for *independence* to avoid *dependence* became ever more pressing. Overpowering others or being overpowered became the main choice. Political scientists have thought a lot about what they call the *security dilemma*. The security dilemma is a tragedy—arms

racess that are motivated by mutual fear, often hasten what they are intended to prevent.⁴

In a shrunk world, in contrast, we are now faced with the undeniable reality of *global interdependence*, a reality that is making itself felt in ways that would astonish our ancestors. Living on *one* planet has never been about anything else but interdependence—a planetary ecosphere is interconnected by default—however, this fact was obscured by lack of knowledge and by the dynamics of the security dilemma. Today, human interdependence must be taken seriously, it must be addressed with urgency. We now have the means to understand and to act upon the new reality that the world has grown too small for walls and too small for wars. Security is no longer to be had in the same ways as in the past. In the past, contention and enforced separation sometimes did bring a certain measure of security, at least temporarily. Powerful empires did succeed in giving their citizens a sense of security, at least as long as they had rulers who guarded and expanded the empire’s borders with due ruthlessness and cunning. In contrast, security in an interconnected world can only be had by nurturing relationships of global cohesion. Cohesion that is informed by *equal dignity for all*, a dignity that is manifested through the principle of *unity in diversity*.

Stratified societies have strategic advantages.⁵ During the past millennia, they crowded out egalitarian societies almost everywhere on the planet. Rulers who kept their own people “in line” stood a better chance to keep their enemies out: this is the *dominator model* of society described by social scientist Riane Eisler.⁶ This model was ubiquitous on our planet throughout the past five percent of human history. Institutionalized and socially accepted violence kept hierarchies of domination in place in most parts of the world. Even though this system expressed itself in myriad ways, at its core it was always about a rigid male-dominant “strong-man” rule, at all levels, from the family to the state. “Domestic chastisement,” for instance, was the duty of the male head of the family (the term “domestic violence” was not yet known). Warfare gave a man his most prized badge of honor: the knight in shining armor was a hero, a symbol of valor, of courage and honor.

“Si vis pacem para bellum” (“If you want peace, prepare for war”) was the motto that ruled the world as long as the security dilemma was strong. There was little space for Mahatma Gandhi’s “There is no path to peace. Peace is the path.” Pacifism was regarded as unpatriotic; pacifism and patriotism did not go together. Peacemakers had little chance to be heard and understood. Still at the outset of WWI, Margaret Thorp, a Quaker pacifist, for instance, caused an uproar when she expressed dismay at her women friends knitting socks for “their” soldiers; in the face of an enemy, these otherwise staunchly pacifist women believed war was the path to peace.⁷

Under conditions of a strong security dilemma, the principles of unity in diversity had little chance to thrive. Rulers risked losing the next war if they failed to keep their underlings in uniformity, the uniformity of “one’s due place.” The uniform of a soldier is uniform in style for the same rank not without a reason. Free and creative diversity was not permitted, at least not for underlings. Moreover, with one’s enemies, one had to have nothing in common: it was to be total division and rigidly bounded difference. An enemy, an opponent set on killing “us,” had to be captured or killed. Some enemies were respected as equals and honorable opponents, still they had to be killed or captured if they could not be turned into friends. Others were dehumanized and killed as “subhumans” or “vermin.”

Transgressions against the honor-based hierarchy were redressed by deadly duels or duel-like wars between equals, while underlings were expected to keep their heads down and endure humiliation as it was dished out to them. Myriad rituals enforced this system, for equals it ranged from marriages instrumentalized for power alliances to honorable duels, for subalterns from being made to kowtow to being tortured or killed at a whim.

Today's ingathering of the human family is our biggest chance

“For the first time since the origin of our species, humanity is in touch with itself,” said anthropologist William Ury.⁸ Anthropologists call it the *ingathering* of the human tribes. Today's ingathering of the human family entails dangers, however, it is also our biggest chance. Interdependence is our opportunity if we want to build a worthwhile future for our human family on our planet. Never have we gathered as an entire family. Never have we faced a situation where speaking of *one single* global “we” is feasible; we are used to having enemies, we were always compelled to be afraid of “them.”

In an interdependent world not only is it necessary to transcend the simplistic and totalizing images of “enemy empires,” it is the new “realism,”⁹ for the first time it is also feasible to do so. When there is only *one single* “we” and no “them” left, the situation is radically new and opens space for hitherto unseen cultural mindsets and behavioral scripts to emerge, and to stay. The first thing we have to learn is to avoid using the language of enemy empires to artificially reignite the security dilemma by way of political hyperbole or media spin—the 2003 Iraq war was a prime example.

Today, no longer can we apply the recipes of the past, at least not blindly. We cannot simply copy history lessons when the conditions are profoundly new. Under conditions of global interdependence, it is utopian and dangerous to continue with a “business as usual” that evolved when the main alternatives were independence or dependence.

Resisting business as usual does not mean demonizing it. The practices of the past had their functions. A strong security dilemma is an inescapable tragedy and we should not blame its victims. We should not blame the individual when the context is at fault. Men, for example, had to learn to be fearless in battle and risked becoming emotionally crippled as a result, while women had to make do with what was left to them in a world in the grip of chronic threat—both, men and women were crippled by the psychological and social costs of the constant threat of war. Using a large-scale geopolitical lens to view the historical changes in our human condition protects us from unnecessarily pathologizing or degrading our predecessors. It protects us, furthermore, from demonizing what happens when people cling to outdated templates of perception and action still today. We know that they are not necessarily “evil,” but have simply not yet understood that we live under new circumstances to which we have to adapt if we are to survive as a species. Furthermore, large-scale lenses help us to avoid romanticizing the past and wishing ourselves back into an imaginary, yet tragically mutilating, golden age. The real golden age is now, for us to have, if we are willing and able to manifest it!

To the degree that we can accept that we live in *one* world, to the degree that we can weaken the historical power of the security dilemma—thus liberating ourselves from fear of war and the necessity to prepare for war—global cooperation and *partnership* has a chance to replace *domination*, at all levels, from micro to macro levels. To the degree that the old “all-or-nothing world” of “only one's own group and the enemy” wanes, what can emerge instead is “a fission-fusion social structure, in which the boundaries between groups are not absolute and impermeable,”¹⁰ and creative networks can replace hierarchies of coercion.¹¹ Rather than a world of unequal worthiness, of “higher beings” presiding over “lower orders,” we can aspire to a new world of equal dignity for all: Article 1 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) begins with this sentence: “All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights.

The transition from *unequal* to *equal* worthiness is the most significant cultural transition of our time. In all walks of life, we observe this transition. It is a transition from domination to partnership, from the *vertical ranking of human worth and value* to everybody being on an *equal*

footing with regard to essential worth and value. Expressions of domination presently lose their legitimacy in all walks of life: “domestic chastisement” is recognized as “domestic violence;” “pedagogy” that teaches to “break the will of the child” can be recognized as “child abuse;” “cultural practices” such as female genital cutting can be recognized as “harmful cultural practices;” “teaching enemies lessons through demonstrations of military ‘shock and awe’ can be recognized as “deadly action that devastates human dignity, human rights, and human lives”—the list is endless and permeates all levels, from micro to meso to macro levels.

The new paradigm cannot be characterized by decontextualized and ahistorical definitions of dignity. A rich, deep, and expansive conceptualization of what has come to be known as the *inherent dignity* of every human being is called for, or, more precisely, the inherent *equality in dignity* of every human being, including dignity for all living creatures on our planet.¹² The first sentence of the UDHR Preamble speaks of inherent dignity: “Whereas recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world...” Emphasizing *equality in dignity* is nothing less than a historic revolution, a historical turning point as significant as what happened when the dominator model first came into being about 10,000 years ago. It is a normative U-turn against millennia of domination, because it means *nondomination*, or the delegitimization of the last millennia’s practice of treating some people as higher beings and others as lesser beings.

This transition also reaches beyond the concept of respect. There was a time when apartheid was called segregation. This was the time when white people’s supposedly inborn superiority and black people’s allegedly “natural” inferiority were being respected: in other words, people used to *respect unequal* worthiness and rights. Today, people, if so socialized, will *respect equal* worthiness and rights. This is what is expressed in Article 1 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR): “All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights.”

This transition is, furthermore, not simply tied to the absence or presence of hierarchy, inequality, or stratification, but to the ranking or unranking of human worth. Functional hierarchies (the captain of a ship), temporary inequalities (the teacher and the student), and pragmatic stratification (the training of Olympic athletes) can coexist with equality in dignity. The pilot team in a plane or the captains of a ship are masters over their passengers when in the sky or at high sea. While hierarchy and inequality characterize these situations, the pilots and the captains need *not* look down on their passengers as lesser beings. Diversity and difference can go together with sameness of value and worth; there is no automatic mechanism that ties diversity and difference to the ranking of human worthiness. This is why unity in diversity is such an important principle. Equality in dignity must not be confounded with uniformity or with “everybody being the same.” On the contrary; dignity is manifested when diversity is nurtured, respected, and celebrated within the unifying value of equality in dignity. In the new world of interdependence, the unity in diversity paradigm cherishes diversity and embeds it into a unity of human relationships that are nurtured by mutual respect for equality in dignity. “Peace is not unity in similarity but unity in diversity, in the comparison and conciliation of differences,” said Mikhail Gorbachev, the very man who brought oppressive communism to an end.

How can we identify which hierarchies, inequalities, or stratifications do not serve the new paradigm of equality in dignity? The *Lévinasian* interpretations of human rights versus the *Kantian* interpretation illuminates this point. Philosopher Alain Badiou explains the difference.¹³ The Kantian interpretation sees human rights as an abstract principle, while the *Lévinasian* interpretation emphasizes that human rights also mean care and respect for the other. It is the discussion of so-called negative and positive (“welfare”) rights. When we read the first sentence of Article 1 of the Human Rights Convention carefully, we must admit that philosopher Emmanuel Lévinas might have a point: the notion of equal dignity represents a Lévinasian

“Trojan horse” that “sneaks” into the Kantian view. The “Trojan” connection is implicated in the human rights stipulation that equal chances and enabling environments for all are necessary to protect human dignity.

The Kantian version could be paraphrased starkly as follows: “Equal dignity means that also the poorest can enjoy full dignity. For dignity to be realized, what is needed is a societal framework that gives everybody political rights, for example, the right of free speech.” The Lévinasian interpretation, again starkly paraphrased, may sound as follows: “Free speech is not enough. What about those who have no access to have their voice be heard, who have not even enough food to survive, let alone the resources to form informed judgments. For equal dignity to manifest for all, social contexts must be created that give everybody the chance to live dignified lives.”

One of the most fascinating aspects of the transition from unequal to equal worthiness is the turnabout of the notion of humiliation. Around 1757, humiliation dramatically changed course in the English language, from positive to negative. While humiliating and humbling underlings was legitimate before, it became illegitimate. Humiliating underlings, showing them their “due lowly place,” “teaching them due humility” was seen as prosocial until 1757. William Ian Miller notes 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.”¹⁴ While humiliation turned sour, humility remained positive, it became even more positive, no longer just the traditional meekness of subservient humility, but also humble pride.

In other words, with the advent of the notion of equality in dignity, feelings of humiliation, and fear of humiliation, became more hurtful and heated than before, and this is why they can so easily transmute into what I call in my work “the nuclear bomb of the emotions.” Humiliating equal worthiness is so much more hurtful than humiliating worthiness that is already unequal.¹⁵ Dignity is about our inner essence, not just about our rank in society. Ideals of equality in dignity indicate that all human beings are part of the human family qua birth, not just American nationals or European nationals, or global elites who can buy their way. Human ideals invite *everybody* into one single human family. Moreover, families should share, in solidarity, according to need and ability, don’t they?

Feelings of humiliation can inspire Mandela-like social change, however, they can also lead to war and genocide (imagined “fear of future humiliation” were the backdrop of the Holocaust and the Rwandan genocide). It is therefore crucial that we refrain from humiliating each other, that we particularly refrain from creating apartheid-like contexts that humiliate by virtue of their structure.

Feelings of humiliation can create unbridgeable divides, particularly unbridgeable in a world that otherwise accepts the invitation into equality in dignity for all, and highly damaging in a world that otherwise grows ever more interdependent.

Rifts of humiliation can undercut all our efforts to build global cohesion and collaboration and have therefore to be healed and prevented.

We live in times of great opportunities. Yet, we squander them

We live in times of great opportunity. Yet, today, we, as a human family, are squandering our chances. Instead of working together and striving to be good guardians of our planet for our children, we cling to outdated models of the past. We serve as “useful idiots” when we blindly or unwittingly uphold antiquated systems of domination.

When the security dilemma was strong, leaders often were formidable dominators, however,

their domination was accepted when it protected against enemies and when loot from raids brought riches. If leaders acted as benevolent patrons and treated their underlings well, they were loved, even venerated, and they did not need much violence to obtain obedience. If they, however, exploited their leadership position for their sole advantage, if they simply acted out of a sense of entitlement to reap privileges, they risked to be despised, and they depended on raw force to get their will.

Always, leaders of the second sort tried to cloak themselves as the first kind so as to reach their goals more easily. Some indigenous populations, for instance, were successfully convinced that it was a good deal to receive worthless glass beads from benevolent white patrons in exchange for valuable land. They were duped into agreeing to be raided.

This is what we do today, as a human family, we agree to being raided, and we do that at our future's peril. Leaving the world to speculators to make ever more money from money, for instance, is like opening the door to being skinned. We sell out our humanity and our planet voluntarily. Due to interdependence, nobody is exempted from the ensuing peril, nobody will reap any victory, all will lose. This will include also the children of the very raiders, since also they will not find a planet worth living on.

Why do we squander our chances? Because we still are caught in the past. We fail to see that the situation is historically radically new. We overlook our very window of opportunity because we fail to see the big picture. We overlook it because so many of us are too busy trying to survive living in a dysfunctional system. Too many people continue to be loyal to a bygone dominator model just because this is what they have learned and this is what they are used to. They see the old paradigm as normal and necessary. Some do so overtly; they are perhaps the least problematic since they are easier identifiable. Those who do it covertly, and those who are unaware of their loyalty, represent the more serious problem.

In the case of Nazi Germany, Adolf Hitler came to power under the cover of peace, honor, pride, and patriotism. His followers loved him, many of them blissfully unaware that they swore loyalty to a mass murderer who would not shy away of even destroying his own people. Their loyalty turned out to be not only homicidal but also suicidal. Hitler first hijacked the hearts of the people, then the institutions of the state, so as to make both perpetrate for him the mass murder and mass raiding he set out to bring about.

“Every human being is born free...,” this phrase is ambiguous, and this is the banner under which present-day raiding takes place. When people bow to the definition of freedom as “freedom from all incumbrances, including decency and civility,” then the old world of domination and submission is reinstated, only more brutally than ever. “Every human being is born free...” does not mean that everybody should be free to do as they please. These words do not mean that *might* should be free to be *right*. On the contrary. These words mean that we should recognize the equal worth of all people, in the long term, not just for a short moment. We must move beyond conceptualizing human worth as a running competition, where all start at the same line, but a few moments later, the winners take all. This is not a path we want to follow as humankind. Research is mounting which shows the damage that flows from the currently sharply increasing inequalities in socioeconomic status around the world. Researchers Richard Wilkinson and Kate Pickett were among the first to send a loud wake-up call: Reducing all forms of unjust inequalities is one of the central challenges of our present time.¹⁶

The paradigm shift of our days goes from unequal worthiness to equal worthiness, or, to be precise, from unequal worthiness in collectivist groups of “we” versus “them,” to equal worthiness for individuals in one single group, the human family. Our task is to shape this transition with clear intent, instead of letting it be hijacked by those who have ulterior motives. We need to humanize *globalization* with *egalization*, a word I coined to connote the true

realization of equality in dignity. We have to strive for *global egalization* or, if drawn together, *globegalization*.

Yet, even *global egalization* is not enough. We have to do more. The motto of the French Revolution was *liberté, égalité, fraternité*. What we have to add to *liberté* and *égalité* is *fraternité*, or brotherhood and sisterhood, love for humanity, solidarity within our human family.

Unfortunately, we have thrown out solidarity together with collectivism. Under conditions of a strong security dilemma, when fear of enemy attack is an overwhelming defining force, human worth tends to be ranked and tied to an in-group that fears an out-group: leaders have the command over followers, and the interests of the group override the interests of the individual. Instead of unity in diversity, uniformity reign within one's in-group, while division reigns with regard to one's enemy out-group. Yet, even though collectivism can slip into distortions of unity that lead to oppressive uniformity, collectivism can also offer a sense of authentic belonging and cohesion, or solidarity. This is the solidarity that is worth preserving.

The United States of America can serve as an example. It is the land of the free, the land of immigrants who yearned for freedom when they arrived, for individual freedom. However, is it freedom that has been achieved? World War II, then the Cold War, then the War on Terror, they all affected civil liberties. Is it freedom when a collective culture presses everybody to compete against everybody else in a free market that is so oversight-free that the gap between the top and the bottom widens ever more? Is ruthless individualism freedom? Particularly when it is prescribed by awesome collective pressure? Where is solidarity? Perhaps the myth of the lone hero is a disconnecting myth if it becomes too powerful?

Ruthless individualism lends itself to degrading diversity into division, and unity into disconnection. No unity, no solidarity, only division, everybody against everybody, as if the security dilemma now sets individuals up against each other, no longer only states. Is it possible that this definition of freedom is a divide-and-rule device?

A heavily spinned definition of freedom seems to have given power to what David Rothkopf calls a *superclass*, a global elite of circa 6,000 unelected powerful individuals whose wealth makes their decisions more influential than those of many governments.¹⁷ They can hijack entire systems and have them do the raiding for them. WWI, the Cold War, the War on Terror have their targets of battle, when the market is too "free," we all become the target of battle. Our bodies, our souls, our relationships with each other and with nature, in the past decades, everything has increasingly been turned into a commodity; we serve as devices for the maximization of profit.

The present economic system has been characterized as a descendent of European raiding culture.¹⁸ Europeans went from trade to raid. This was apparent, for instance, in the ways colonization started out from trading posts. Modernity, or the dominator role of the West, was seemingly successful for a long stretch of time, relegating the rest of the world, from indigenous populations to the entire Muslim World to a humiliating sense of "being too weak," of being "not smart enough." Raiding undoubtedly produces quick results. This is because raiding freerides on the sustaining work that nature and humans have put in prior to being raided. Raiders measure success by making invisible the nurturing that went into creating the spoils of their raids. Raiding is a fake success. More so, in the long term, raiding is a Pyrrhic victory, a victory not worth having, since it is a success only as long as there is something left to be raided. When there is nothing left to be taken, the very foundation for future sustenance is also gone.

We are now reaching the limits of what can still be raided without bringing the entire system down. We are seeing that the truly superior approach to life on Earth, in the long term, is not raiding, but sustaining. All indigenous cultural insights from all around the world that protect commons, insights that appeared to be "weak" in the face of raiders, need to arise from their

undue humiliation now in due haste. Come out of undue humiliation! This is the message to the world's thought communities that have knowledge of how to sustain rather than raid!

Let us stop being complicit with creating fear, or capitalizing on fear, to get the dominator-raiding model going beyond its due date for the sake of privileges for a few in the short term, at the peril of all of us in the long term.

How can a future be built where everybody has the chance to live a dignified life?

In 1976, Jean Baker Miller asked, “How do we conceive of a society organized so that it permits both the development and the mutuality of all people?”¹⁹ Yes, how can a future be built where everybody has the chance to live a dignified life? How can unity in diversity be nurtured, locally and globally?

One way to do this is by scrutinizing all human cultures, and by “harvesting” those cultural worldviews, practices, and social-psychological skills that have unifying and equalizing effects.²⁰ The African *ubuntu* is only one example, it means, “I am because of you.” It is a traditional philosophy for living together and solving conflict in an atmosphere of shared humility.

When we treat people as equal in dignity, we detect to what extent the ranked honor code has mutilating effects.²¹ Turning people into players of domination and submission means wasting their potential. Human rights ideals are therefore not just another normative frame on a par with honor rankings; human rights liberate humankind from millennia of bondage. Moreover, human rights are not just a Western idea. The deep awareness that everybody deserves to be treated as equal in dignity is embedded into many world philosophies. Many world religions had at their outset, and have at their core, an ideal of equality in dignity. During the past millennia, however, this was an awareness that was usually crushed by hierarchical social and societal structures.

Today, an increasingly interconnected world opens space for this awareness, and it is called human dignity and human rights, carried to the fore by strong and humble love for all humans, for all living creatures, for our entire planet by us, the global human community. It means nurturing mutuality, creating relationships of mutual care, love, and respect, and mobilizing our entire world community to care jointly for our planet and ourselves.

“A vast and coherent movement of global citizens is the critical historical agent now missing from the global stage. A global citizens movement (GCM) engaging masses of people, ‘nurturing values of human solidarity, ecological resilience and quality of life’ would ‘embrace diverse perspectives and existing movements as separate expressions of a common project,’” this is what we read in “Civil Society Organizations: Time for Systemic Strategies” in the October 2011 issue of *GTI Perspectives on Critical Issues*.

Provocative WHY question for in-depth reflection and research

Why do we live in historically new times?

Why do we, as human species, have opportunities that we did not have before?

Why is it too simplistic to merely be “against” globalization, or “for” it?

Why do we, as humankind, currently fail to use the window of opportunity that we have?

It's dignity, stupid!
— Rana Jarbou, Egypt²²

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Badiou, Alain (2001). *Ethics: An essay on the understanding of evil*. London: Verso.
- Berman, Morris (2000). *Wandering god*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Betts, Richard K. *Conflict after the cold war: Arguments on causes of war and peace*. New York: Pearson, 2005.
- Boucher, David (2009). *The limits of ethics in international relations: Natural law, natural rights, and human rights in transition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Carneiro, Robert Leonard (1988). «The circumscription theory: Challenge and response.» In *American Behavioral Scientist*, 31 (4), pp. 497–511. doi: 10.1177/000276488031004010
- Collins, Alan (2004). «State-induced security dilemma maintaining the tragedy.» In *Cooperation and Conflict*, 39 (1), pp. 27–44. doi: 10.1177/0010836704040833.
- Eisler, Riane Tennenhaus (1987). *The chalice and the blade: Our history, our future*. London: Unwin Hyman.
- Eisler, Riane Tennenhaus (2007). *The real wealth of nations: Creating a caring economics*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Ekern, Stener (2008). «Are human rights destroying the natural balance of all things? The difficult encounter between international law and community law in Mayan Guatemala.» In *Human rights in the Maya region: global politics, cultural contentions, and moral engagements*, pp. S. 123–43. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Finnis, John (2011). *Natural law and natural rights*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Flinders, Carol Lee (2002). *Rebalancing the world: Why women belong and men compete and how to restore the ancient equilibrium*. San Francisco: Harper.
- Fukuyama, Francis (1992). *The end of history and the last man*. New York: Avon Books.
- Giorgi, Piero (2001). *The origins of violence by cultural evolution*. 2nd edition. Brisbane, Australia: www.pierogiorgi.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/12/The-origins-of-violence-by-cultural-evolution.pdf.
- Held, David (2010). *Cosmopolitanism: Ideals and realities*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Herz, John H. (1950). «Idealist internationalism and the security dilemma.» In *World Politics*, 2 (2), pp. 157–80. doi: 10.2307/2009187.
- Jervis, Robert, Richard Ned Lebow, and Janice Gross Stein (1985). *Psychology and deterrence*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Lindner, Evelin Gerda (2006). *Making enemies: Humiliation and international conflict*. Westport, CT, London: Praeger Security International, Greenwood.
- Lindner, Evelin Gerda (2007). «Avoiding humiliation — From intercultural communication to global interhuman communication.» In *Journal of Intercultural Communication, SIETAR Japan*, 10, pp. 21–38. www.humiliationstudies.org/whoweare/evelin02.php.
- Lindner, Evelin Gerda (2009). *Emotion and conflict: How human rights can dignify emotion and help us wage good conflict*. Westport, CT, London: Praeger, Greenwood.
- Mann, Barbara Alice (2000). *Iroquoian women, the Gantowisas*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Miller, Jean Baker (1976/1986). *Toward a new psychology of women*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Miller, William Ian (1993). *Humiliation: And other essays on honor, social discomfort, and violence*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Oakley, Francis (2005). *Natural law, laws of nature, natural rights: Continuity and discontinuity in the history of ideas*. New York: Continuum.
- Rogers, Deborah S., Omkar Deshpande, and Marcus W. Feldman (2011). «The spread of inequality.» In *Public Library of Science (PLoS) ONE*, 6 (9), p. e24683. doi:

- 10.1371%2Fjournal.pone.0024683.
- Rothkopf, David J. (2008). *Superclass: The global power elite and the world they are making*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Sapolsky, Robert M. (2006). «A natural history of peace.» In *Foreign Affairs* (January/February), pp. 1–7. www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/61382/robert-m-sapolsky/a-natural-history-of-peace, opim.wharton.upenn.edu/~sok/papers/s/sapolsky-foreignaffairs-2006.pdf.
- Schultz, Ellen E. (2011). *Retirement heist: How companies plunder and profit from the nest eggs of American workers*. New York: Portfolio.
- Snyder, Jack (1985). «Perceptions of the security dilemma in 1914.» In *Psychology and deterrence*, edited by Robert Jervis, Richard Ned Lebow, and Janice Gross Stein, pp. 153–79. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Snyder, Jack, and Barbara Walters (Eds.) (1999). *The security dilemma and intervention in civil wars*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Summy, Hilary N. (2006). *'Peace angel' of World War I: Dissent of Margaret Thorp*. Brisbane, Australia: Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies, University of Queensland.
- Syse, Henrik (2002). «Which nature, whose law - and what about rights? Reflections on natural law as a tradition of universal ethics.» In *Universal ethics: Perspectives and proposals from Scandinavian scholars*, pp. S.33–43. The Hague, The Netherlands: Nijhoff.
- Syse, Henrik Preben (2007). *Natural law, religion, and rights: An exploration of the relationship between natural law and natural rights, with special emphasis on the teachings of Thomas Hobbes and John Locke*. South Bend, IN: St. Augustine's Press, University of Oslo, Norway, doctoral dissertation (dr. art).
- Ury, William (1999). *Getting to peace: Transforming conflict at home, at work, and in the world*. New York: Viking.
- Wilkinson, Richard G., and Kate Pickett (2009). *The spirit level: Why more equal societies almost always do better*. London: Penguin.

Chapter 1

¹ Fukuyama, 1992.

² Ury, 1999, p. 108. See also Flinders, 2002, who conceptualizes human history in similar ways. See furthermore Giorgi, 2001 or Berman, 2000. A very accessible presentation of homo sapiens' history can be found at www.bradshawfoundation.com/journey/adam.html.

³ See, among others, Carneiro, 1988.

⁴ Herz, 1950. The topic of the security dilemma has been expanded upon by many other authors. See Jervis, et al., 1985, or Betts, 2005. In Snyder, 1985, the security dilemma is defined as one state requiring the insecurity of another (see also Snyder and Walters, 1999, while in Collins, 2004 the security dilemma is defined as a state-induced security dilemma).

⁵ Rogers, et al., 2011.

⁶ See Eisler, 1987 and her most recent book Eisler, 2007.

⁷ Summy, 2006.

⁸ Ury, 1999, p. XVII.

⁹ See, among others, Held, 2010.

¹⁰ Sapolsky, 2006, pp. 6-7.

¹¹ Lindner, 2006, p. 52.

¹² The idea of natural rights is intensely discussed topic in philosophy. Is this idea perhaps only a political tool? See, among others, Boucher, 2009, Ekern, 2008, Finnis, 2011, Oakley, 2005, Syse, 2002, Syse, 2007.

¹³ Badiou, 2001.

¹⁴ Miller, 1993, p. 175, italics in original.

¹⁵ Lindner, 2006, p. 28.

¹⁶ Wilkinson and Pickett, 2009.

¹⁷ Rothkopf, 2008.

¹⁸ Mann, 2000. One of the most recent examples of raiding is described in Schultz, 2011.

¹⁹ Miller, 1976/1986, p. 96.

²⁰ See also Lindner, 2007.

²¹ See also Lindner, 2009, chapter 8.

²² March 15, 2011, www.thedailynewsegypt.com/global-views/qits-dignity-stupidq.html.