CULTURES OF TRANSITION AND SUSTAINABILITY

Culture after Capitalism

JOHN CLAMMER

Cultures of Transition and Sustainability

John Clammer

Cultures of Transition and Sustainability

Culture after Capitalism

palgrave
macmillan

John Clammer
United Nations University
Shibuya-ku, Tokyo, Japan

Preface

The genesis of this book lies primarily in three sources. One has been my personal concern, like many other concerned citizens, with the rapidly deteriorating state of the world, even compared with what we remember from our own childhoods; and the parallel concern that so many of our political leaders and public intellectuals are failing to face up to—the fact that we really do face a planetary crisis of unprecedented proportions. The second source has been the trajectory of my own work, which has long been engaged with issues of culture and development and which has more specifically turned to that flower of cultures—the arts, a neglected topic in development circles. The third has been my work as a teacher and researcher at the Institute for Advanced Studies in Sustainability at the United Nations University (UNU) in Tokyo where, unlike in many more conventional universities, issues of sustainability are our daily concern. The book is not expecting to provide *the* answers, but to stimulate discourse by reconfiguring debates about sustainability when looked at from a specifically cultural angle. It seeks to encourage the addressing of sustainability as our major collective experiment, and indeed, as an adventure of creativity and the spirit, and to suggest new syntheses and patterns of holistic thinking that have not yet received enough attention.

A small part of Chap. 3 (on art) has seen the light of day in a different form in the Australian magazine *Social Alternatives.*

Tokyo, Japan   John Clammer

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

CONTENTS

The Cultural and Civilizational Roots of Our Planetary Crisis

Few would deny that our planet is in crisis. While problems have occurred in the past and no doubt have done so throughout both planetary history and the shorter history of human civilization, the present conjunction of issues is unique, both in the sense of their potentially terminal nature (the real possibility of destroying much of the life on Earth and with it human society as we now understand it) and in the convergence of problems that were formerly separate or occurred in spatially or temporally distinct spheres, but now occur together. The list is familiar and depressing: climate change and global warming with its huge potential to fundamentally disrupt agriculture, weather patterns, the habitability of large areas of the globe and to be the source of an increasing number of "natural" disasters (although the causes are human induced) and environmental refugees. Conflict and war rage across much of the planet and with terrorism reaching its tentacles even into the previously most "secure" countries, territories and social groups. Huge biodiversity loss and ecological destruction, with its unknown consequences for eco-systems and through them to health, food, and other vital indicators for sustainable human life, is rampant and we seem to be in one of the tragic periods of mass extinctions, but this time induced by humans and our activities. Resource depletion—not only of oil, but even more significantly for life, if not for industrial civilization, of water is now a basic determinant of international politics. The militarization of the globe and the consequent obscene expenditure on weapons and the technology of destruction and the very real possibility of a new arms race leading ultimately to international conflict continue despite the need for resources

for genuine and human centered development. Unfair and unequal trade continues and expands on what is anything but a level playing field. The persistence and in some cases even expansion of hugely unacceptable levels of poverty is a planetary scandal given our levels of technology and know-how. So the sad list goes on, and most of us could add other candidates: continuing gender discrimination, racism, corruption, biased and unjust legal systems, failed states, homelessness, unemployment, caste-ism and other forms of socially approved methods of social exclusion, domestic violence, rape and sexual crime, and indeed crime in general and its ever newer forms including cyber-crime, trans-border human trafficking, drug trafficking, illegal (or legal) trade in small arms, the rise of intolerant forms of religious fundamentalism and no doubt yet other "social problems" both local and global.

Taken together, these all point to the irrefutable fact that we have deeply and possibly irredeemably fouled our own nest. Our beautiful, fertile and probably the only inhabited planet in our solar system or beyond (and the only one, except in science fiction fantasies, that we have to live on) we have systematically trashed and turned into what is rapidly becoming an ecological desert, a universal war zone, a place of vast and unnecessary social inequalities, injustices and patterns of exclusion from the common goods that the Earth makes available to all of us and a place of deep insecurity. This insecurity is fueled by induced patterns of "social change"—urbanization and its often consequent loss of social ties, the loneliness and social isolation of the increasing number of elderly in many societies, changes in family structures, rising individualism with the freedom that it brings, but with costs, and our often narcissistic absorption in new technologies that while they may create "virtual" relationships, rarely create real ones.

These facts are not entirely lost of course on the world, and an increasing chorus of voices from the scientific community, civil society, victims, concerned social scientists, practitioners of "alternative" agriculture, medicine, education and lifestyles, a huge range of social movements, artists, "development" agencies within the UN system and in some governments, universities, anti-globalization activists, individual authors and in a few cases even businesses have begun to name and discuss possible solutions to this devastating situation. Paul Hawken, in his book on what he describes as "the largest social movement in history" identifies and provides links to some of the hundreds of thousands of organizations working towards ecological sustainability and social justice (Hawken 2008). This expanding

response to the planetary crisis falls into several categories. There is of course the rapidly growing scientific literature emerging from ecology, Earth sciences, meteorology, and such inter-disciplinary committees such as the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, and parallel to it an equally fast-growing literature on "sustainability", much of it building on the earlier work of documents such as the document of the 1987 World Commission on Environment and Development—the so-called "Brundtland Report" after its chairwoman (WCED 1987)—that first introduced the concept into the wider discourse, especially as it applied to the notion of 'development' and where current patterns of such development were taking us. The thrust of the first category is generally ecological, and of the second largely the relationship between ecology and economy (especially economic growth). Another category consists of the "end of civilization" theorists, ranging from those predicting complete social and ecological breakdown (for example Vacca 1974) to voices arguing that unless we radically change direction, we will indeed face the end of human life on the Earth as we have hitherto experienced it (Rees 2004, Oreskes and Conway 2014), and those who suggest that on the basis of the historical study of past civilizations that have collapsed, the reasons were mainly ecological, combined with the frightening fact that those societies knew that they were heading for disaster, but had no political will to change direction, maintaining a "business as usual" path until their eventual and all-too predictable collapse (Diamond 2005). Yet another, and one significant for the theme of this book, is the "Transition Movement"—the movement that began in a small town in Southwest England and has since spread into an international one concerned with the numerous issues that will arise from the transition from an oil-based society to one based on alternative forms of energy, as we pass the point of "peak oil" and the essential source of energy and manufacturing in our carbon-based industrial economy begins to decline in availability or economic viability of extraction (Hopkins 2008).

What all of these approaches lack however is a systematic discussion of *culture*: the very real possibility (or certainty) that it is our civilization so-called that has got us into this mess is the first place. Our addiction to consumption, treating of the natural world simply as a "resource" for exploitation, our highly inefficient, polluting and congesting transport systems (mainly the car, but increasingly air travel and sea-transport of goods too), our almost instinctive tendency to turn to violence as the "solution" to political problems and then our unwillingness to accept responsibility

for the refugees and victims generated by our war-making, the huge distortions in our economies devoted to weapons and the endless production of yet more unnecessary products, while never having "enough" to pay for welfare, education, universal health coverage for citizens, or the special needs of special needs people, and our eagerness to impose the same dysfunctional model on the rest of the world in the name of "development" or "aid". It is to the discussion of this neglected dimension of culture that this book is dedicated, not so much as critique (although of necessity there is an element of that), but as an exploration of how culture may be seen as an essential component of sustainability and any successful transition to a peaceful post-oil and possibly post-capitalist society, and how a sustainable culture might be envisioned, since a cogent argument can be made that our current one (that of the 'developed' West, Japan and the rapidly expanding middle-classes of the rest of the world) is not sustainable and cannot create an equitable world for future generations.

The Meaning of Sustainability

The notion of "sustainability" has become one of the buzz-words of our generation. And rightly so in many ways—without sustainability in its most obvious senses, we do not have a future: an "unsustainable future" is a contradiction in terms. But in order to understand better how the concept might apply to *cultural futures* we need to unpack a little its history and semantics. A large and proliferating literature now exists (for a good survey and extensive bibliography see Robertson 2014). But the sources of the idea and its almost total neglect of the cultural dimension can quickly be traced. It is significant that in the well over 600 sources cited in the Robertson book, only two, if one excludes works on product design, architecture and urban planning, relate to culture (for a relatively rare exception see Kagan and Kirchberg 2008).

There are (as of course with many concepts in the social sciences) some immediate problems, and perhaps two major ones with the idea of 'sustainability'. The first is definitional. The well known definition of the Brundtland commission is the much quoted one that "Sustainable development is development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs". But this begs certain questions such as whether the notions of sustainability and development are compatible or whether indeed the idea of "sustainable development" is a self-contradictory idea, and whether we

can know the needs of future generations, especially those distant in time from us. The second is measurement. How can we know that any given practice is "sustainable"? How long is our time frame here, and by what criteria are we measuring now the success of any practice claiming to be sustainable? What in other words are the indicators of sustainability? (Bell and Morse 2008, Bennett et al. 1999, Hart 2006). The sources of the idea of sustainability are not hard to see: growing realization of the environmentally destructive outcomes of the industrial based growth model which had prevailed for so long, declining essential natural resources such as oil, water and rare earths, declining agricultural productivity with overuse of chemical fertilizers and pesticides and top-soil loss, deforestation, declining fisheries, and rising populations and accompanying consumption. At the same time there appeared to be an impasse in development theory, with Marxist derived ideas in decline, the perceived bankruptcy of the modernization model (itself seen as one of the causes of the problems now confronting the world community), and anti-development voices on the rise, promoting the not unreasonable position that it was "development" itself that was at the root of our contemporary crisis (Sachs 1995). Notions of going beyond growth to a steady-state economy were already in circulation, for example in the work of Ernst Schumacher in his now classic book *Small is Beautiful* (Schumacher 1979), and in the ideas of such unconventional economists as Hazel Henderson (1978, 1988) and Herman Daly (1973) together with ideas of alternative development of many kinds inspired by these ideas and in particular ones arising from an environmental critique of conventional development and industrialization and the social consequences of globalization. In fact the 1970s and 1980s were an exceptionally fertile period for such ideas, corresponding to the general cultural ferment of those decades and the preceding one, impacting areas as diverse as music, fashion, anti-war movements, New Age thinking, the growing attraction of Asian religions (especially Buddhism) in the West, and profound shifts in social values signaled and fueled by the writings of authors such as Theodore Roszak (e.g. Roszak 1973) with their message of the creation of a counter culture to the prevailing militarist, industrialist and culturally oppressive mainstream.

Significantly too, when the World Commission on Environment and Development issued its report, it identified six core issues—population, food security, ecosystems and biodiversity, energy, industry and urbanization, but nothing at all about social or cultural aspects of sustainability. This is true of the solutions proposed—democratic political systems, an

economic system that can deal with the tensions arising from development itself, a production system that is ecologically responsible, a technological system that fosters sustainable patterns of trade and finance, and an international system that does the same, together with administrative systems that are flexible and can learn from experience. While these all imply a social and cultural dimension, none are specifically identified in the report. But in fact any comprehensive approach to development must recognize that it is a multi-disciplinary field that requires holistic thinking, since all its elements—poverty, environment, resources, migration, urbanization, gender and patterns of inequality, health issues and so forth—are all interrelated. Such holistic thinking has begun to slowly emerge (for example in the World Summit on Sustainable Development held in Johannesburg in 2002), but again with little or no reference to culture, either as a means of promoting sustainability, or as a key element *of* sustainability. The argument being advanced here is that all the specific dimensions of sustainable practice so far identified—such as use of renewable energy sources, re-cycling, low-carbon and zero-waste societies, localization strategies, alternative forms of transportation and so on—all have deeply cultural characteristics since all require behavioral changes and involve re-orientations of notions of self, relationships, daily life style decisions, travel patterns, and such obviously cultural processes such as clothing choices, food habits, entertainment patterns and even religious thinking, as with the rise of various forms of eco-spirituality as alternatives or supplements to more traditional religious observances and practices.

So too do many of the suggested solutions—participation, democratization, empowerment, localism, grass-roots development, the activation of social movements, drawing on indigenous knowledge for example. In fact these are all profoundly socio-cultural in nature and require quite significant shifts in cultural attitudes and values to make them work. In short: there can be no sustainability without cultural transformation. In many ways the notion of sustainability is more of a moral principle, a question of values, than it is a precise program or definition, it is one that requires the re-ordering of commitments and priorities. This was recognized a decade before the Brundtland report, in a document published by the Dag Hammerskjöld Institute (1975) in which it was argued that development means the development of people, not just the increase in the number of things, and that, while it should certainly aim first to meet the basic needs of the poor, should lead ultimately to the "humanization" of people by fulfilling their essential needs for expression, creativity, conviviality and

control over their own affairs, and as such must be endogenous and self-reliant, be in harmony with the environment, and requires deep social as well as economic transformations. These are all good ideas, but their realization also requires major changes in current attitudes, not only structural changes in the global economy, but challenging such dominant paradigms as the growth model, techo-centrism and its assumption that more or better technology is the solution to our problems, the ways in which we measure progress through such indicators as GNP, consumerism, and implies fundamental shifts in our relationship to nature, our concepts of true wealth, our political priorities, our educational systems, and our measurement of "status" and the bizarre lengths that many of us are prepared to go to in achieving what society currently defines as "success".

All this requires a number of things: the expansion of our social imaginations, positive visions, understanding of the psychology of change, a willingness to reorder our political short-term thinking, and a willingness to confront the difficulties of making the transition from where we are now to a truly sustainable future. Sustainability is not an end point or even a steady-state: it is a process, a goal that we seek but which is always receding, and is as much a matter of values and cultural reorientation. It is essentially a "utopian" concept, and no worse for being that, for in our current situation the very desire to create a humane and ecologically just society where the quality of life rather than its quantity is the goal, is the force that attracts us to a future that would both be inhabitable and one which we would most like to inhabit.

The Cultural Dimensions of Sustainability

Dominant approaches to sustainability then have largely focused on its ecological dimensions and the relation of these to continuing 'development' or growth and their possible incompatibility (and how of course to overcome that disjuncture.) In none of the foundational literature is the role of culture considered, either in the sense of examining the ways in which cultural patterns of the kind identified above have contributed to the creation of unsustainable lifestyles, economic practices, agriculture and food systems and urbanization, or in the sense of imagining future sustainable cultures—one that would be compatible with post-oil and "post-development" situations. There are indeed many models of such cultures, and we will return to an exploration of them in later chapters. But the essential point is that cultural values and sustainable development

are intimately linked: the latter cannot happen without the former. Our job then is to examine the ways in which cultural practices have contributed to unsustainable lifestyles, how these practices might be transformed into ones compatible with not just sustainable but also socially just and creative and desirable futures, and to speculate about the forms that such sustainable cultures might actually take, accepting of course that there might be a plurality of such forms arising from different ecologies, historical experiences and visions of the future, while all converging on the point of creating, if not utopia, at the very least a shared commitment to social and ecological justice and to maximizing the conditions for human fulfillment in the context of the one Earth that we share with many other bio-forms.

At the basis of this of course lies the fundamental question: what is development or "progress" *for*? Is it simply about the expansion, maximization and acquisition of material resources? More technology? More "growth"? Such a view, with its emphasis almost entirely on the economic aspects of development is a highly impoverished one. It excludes not only the rights of nature and other species which share the planet, but also the aesthetic, spiritual and expressive needs of human beings. It is significant that while we have an economics of development, and to some extent both a politics and a sociology of development, we do not have a psychology of development: a concern with what induces change and how people often resist it, with what they want from development and with how they visualize their ideal future life to be, with their struggles with universal existential issues. All of these involve culture; in fact they often constitute culture and its many expressive forms in the arts, in religion, in philosophies and in imagination. The critic of the forms of globalization fed by corporate capitalism, David Korten, has recently written that "To create a just, sustainable, and compassionate post-corporate world we must face up to the need to create a new core culture, a new political center, and a new economic mainstream" in seeking to bring into existence what he calls "a new integral culture that affirms life in all its dimensions" (Korten 1999: 261). He is right, but whereas most of the literature on sustainability has concentrated on the economic and the political, our concern here will be with the cultural, and what that new "core culture" might look like and how it might be achieved.

Several initial points can be made here. The first—the unsustainability of many contemporary cultural practices—probably does not need to be argued much further, except to point out its many levels. The word

"consumption" for example actually points to many inter-related practices: excessive consumption ("conspicuous consumption") especially of luxury goods, "binge-flying" (the practice of taking off, literally, at short notice for unnecessary short trips on the proliferating "no frills" cheap airlines, for short vacations), the practice of driving alone in a privately owned car rather than walking, cycling, taking public transport or car-pooling, again often on short and unnecessary trips, over-wrapping and use of excessive packaging, daily foods only available in plastic packages in supermarkets, "fast foods", ecologically damaging forms of entertainment, and many others, including those necessary and innocent ones necessary for maintaining daily life.

All human beings need to consume to survive—basic foods, clothing, shelter and entertainment, but our current civilization appears to be one committed to excess, fueled by relentless advertising, and promoting the idea that "success" and status are to be measured largely by the volume and form of one's personal consumption. Critique of such practices is not new—the so-called "Frankfurt School" of critical social theorists in pre-war Germany for example devoted considerable energy to delineating and examining what they termed the "cultural industries"—the mass produced, homogenizing, dumbing-down and passively consumed forms of popular culture produced not any longer by individuals or spontaneously from within their communities, but by large and often monopolistic industries—Hollywood, "Bollywood", large chain-stores of the Walmart variety, and a small number of media companies often controlling television, music industries, the press and now Internet content. This is the set of practices that together with "rationalization" understood as standardization and homogenization along the lines of efficiency, calculability, predictability and control the contemporary sociologist George Ritzer has called the "McDonaldization of Society" (Ritzer 1996).

Other commentators have focused on the narcissism of much contemporary cultural production (Lasch 1979) and especially of areas like contemporary art (Spalding 2003). But while it is necessary to take a critical view of culture as a first step, it is also equally necessary to go beyond critique to *reconstruction*. As the art scholar Shannon Jackson has rightly pointed out, "artistic radicality" is often taken to mean the disruption of the social, whereas it should be to do with the imagining of sustainable social institutions (Jackson 2011: 14). There are many ways in which this can be understood: as promoting public art rather

than the rarified and commoditized productions of the "art world", recovering and reviving the "crafts"—indigenous forms of functional art that often play a major role in the economy of local cultures and which have great aesthetic qualities, the use of the arts in therapy and in conflict resolution and transformation (Urbain 2015), promoting theatre for social change, and in many other contexts (Clammer 2015a). Culture obviously has to do with identity, with dignity, with expression and hence with conceptions of selfhood, with notions of health and illness, with the human need to symbolize and to create and tell stories, and with the existential struggles embodied in religions. It is not consequently just a "residue"—the explanation of last resort when all other modes have been exhausted—but is the central pivot of human life. Culture will be as important in a "post-development" world as it is now, although its forms will have to change in many respects. A great deal of contemporary politics is in fact cultural politics—struggles over identity, ethnicity, sexualities, languages—and as such culture itself is a primary site of struggle and the source of ideas of "alternative" views and visions of social transformation (Nederveen Pieterse 2001, Rahnema and Bawtree 2003).

A sustainable future must by definition be an "alternative" to the present one: it is more than evident that "business as usual" not only cannot be sustained, but is the source of our problems. The source of change must be cultural—shifts in values, full incorporation into the models of the social sciences of the existential dimensions of life including its emotional and psychological ones, the promotion of social imagination, and the nurturing of the spaces in which such creativity and the exploration of positive alternatives can be carried out—are all at the basis of the search for sustainable cultures—cultures that enhance human well-being, provide democratic access to cultural, social, legal, political and educational resources (are predicated in other words on social justice), are ecologically sound, and which, without being frivolous, are fun to live in—fulfilling, joyful, creative, convivial and fair. Without consideration of culture there can be no "development" in any serious or holistic sense of the word: transformation towards a more humane and livable future for all the species that inhabit our planet, but also one in which we take seriously the existential challenges facing us all, including suffering, our emotions, the need for aesthetic expression and appreciation, and the other inescapable elements that make human life what it is (Clammer 2012).

Culture and Development Revisited

One of the main points at which issues of culture in relation to sustainability have been stimulated is in the area commonly called "culture and development". Recognizing that many well intentioned development projects do not work or generate fresh and unexpected new problems, more attention is now being paid to the role of culture and of the sociological aspects of both policy and practice. In designing or implementing a development project—say a health centre or clinic—issues of technology are not the only factors. Questions of local conceptions of illness and health, traditional healing methods, local power structures and social structures (caste, gender, and other forms of social stratification and inequality), language, religion, diet, indigenous regimes of fitness and conceptions of the body, attitudes to drugs, surgery or other forms of medical intervention, and even of architecture—the design, layout, sanitary facilities, and spaces of privacy (for example in the case of the Sudanese Salam Centre for Cardiac Surgery) (Pantaleo 2011) are all equally important and may be critical in determining the effectiveness of the clinic or even its use by local people. Western forms of medicine, although technically "effective", may be seen as intrusive and materialistic. As Colin Samson puts it in his study of health and colonial domination amongst Innu peoples of northern Labrador (Canada) "The Innu view of health is at once spiritual in its insistence on the connections between respect for the Animal Gods and personal well-being, and political in its essential linkage of the imposed community with illness. By contrast Western medicine is intensely secular and, in a mystifying way, apolitical. Illness is thought to result principally from specific physical pathology, and an indifference is sustained towards the dramatic environmental changes that have been forced upon the Innu and many other similarly situated peoples" (Samson 2004: 175). The Innu people are well aware of the impact of environmental change promoted by such activities as mining and the resulting pollution on health, and are convinced that the traditional diet is superior from a health point of view to the vitamins and foods available from the local trade stores (to say nothing of the constant exercise involved in a hunting lifestyle) and that an indigenous nurse is likely to be a much more effective medical practitioner than a (Western) trained doctor who does not understand the connections between health and belief in Innu culture.

Much the same points can be made about agriculture, irrigation, pest control, livestock management and their connections to indigenous knowledge, belief, culture and local social structures (Haverkort et al.

2003), architecture and building techniques that have long used recyclable local materials and which is adapted to local climatic conditions and culture (Aquilino 2011), appropriate technologies and energy systems, crafts, and dress, itself normally or at least originally adapted to climatic conditions and the local availability of materials, as well as congruent with cultural/religious concepts of modesty, gender, status and age. The rising awareness of the necessity of a cultural approach to development has given rise to an expanding literature (for example Schech and Haggis 2000, Olivier de Sardin 2005), but which suffers from two major limitations. The first is that it does not generally deal with concrete manifestations of culture at all (especially as reflected in such areas as artistic practices, dance, popular culture, dress, housing, foods and religion), but rather with social structure (gender, caste, class and so forth). The second is that it is instrumental in its understanding of the role of culture: culture that is as a means of promoting "development", but not as a desirable end in itself, and as an essential condition of sustainability and a livable and hopefully vibrant future. But it is these latter dimensions of culture that must be not only taken into consideration, but actively promoted if true sustainability is to be achieved.

Without entering into the endless academic debates about the precise meaning(s) of "culture", we can assuredly say some things: that culture is the medium in which humans live their lives (and indeed often frames the ways in which they leave those lives). It is not a residue, whatever is left over (especially in development discourses) when the primarily economic explanations have been exhausted. The various elements that anthropologists have listed in trying to define culture—values, learnt behavior, material expressions, beliefs, 'ways of life' and so forth are all valid. But these need to be seen in the context of the fact that the possession of culture is what makes humans what they are and what distinguishes them from the 'cultures' of other intelligent species—dolphins, elephants, dogs, the 'higher' apes for example—which, while they have complex systems of communication, often exist in social groups, exhibit ritualistic behavior and clearly have feelings, do not normally "extend" themselves through such practices as art, religion and advanced technology, and even when they do, have limited repertoires, as with the bower bird which creates elaborate and highly decorated nests with which to attract mates, suggesting that they have a sense of beauty, but about which it would be difficult to write an art history (Rothenberg 2011). The 'history' of such phenomena is evolutionary, not conscious.

Human cultures however are always historical (they have pasts, were invented somewhere and sometime) and are to a great extent driven by constant innovation, even manic innovation some might feel. As such they are not only historical, but also adaptable, not only in the sense of adaptation to such external factors as climate and habitat, but are reflexive. A technological invention for example might inspire artistic or fashion innovation, and the stylistic explorations of one artist may trigger further extended explorations by others. It this was not so, there would be no 'art history'. The deep reflexivity of human cultures means that not only are they adaptable, but also can innovate internally through a constant process of novelty-seeking, influence, borrowing, fantasy, and all the elements that go into the mysterious faculties of imagination and creativity. Dogs dream, but whether they dream of utopias is another question, and if they do, it is not very evident that they act to bring them into existence. The fundamental consequence of all this is that human cultures are not fixed. They are, as many people like to say, "dynamic"—they have pasts, were invented somewhere, are future oriented, and in most cases are very unstable in the sense of being in constant flux despite the best efforts of cultural and political conservatives to 'fix' them at some point of time or practice. As one level of culture 'evolves', say attitudes to same-sex marriage, so do others in response—in that case laws, housing regulations, rules about adoption of children, inheritance, and ultimately perhaps religious attitudes. And as we also know, cultures are future oriented, not surprisingly as human psychology is future oriented and expectations, plans, hopes, visions, prophecies and even science fiction, greatly determine the lives of both individuals and their larger communities. So if culture is not fixed—it has a history and was invented by humans—so it can be changed. This is not to say that such change is easy—the past, those very histories of invention and their embodiment in institutions, customs, religions and other social forms, to say nothing of networks of power and privilege which will resist their own erosion—resist modification as well as seek it. The *psychology* of change then is a very important and neglected aspect of the pursuit of sustainable cultures. Envisioning a sustainable future may not be all that difficult: getting there may be the big problem given the inertia, structural constraints and special interests of the "system" as it currently exists.

Since cultures clearly centrally involve values, there is unlikely to be a single "sustainable culture" except in a general and universalized sense, akin perhaps to the 'universal' values set out in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. That is to say while some values may indeed be

universal—for example that sustainability itself is an absolutely agreed value—its manifestations might take many forms. These forms might again, as with all forms of culture, be environmentally influenced—the "sustainability" of a pastoralist or hunter-gatherer community being somewhat different from that of the dweller in a large city, and the care of a mountain environment requiring different techniques of sustainable management than lowland grasslands. Yet all these varieties might share certain principles—the necessity of sustainable practices regardless of context, the inalienable rights of nature as the basis on which all human life and culture ultimately rests, the promotion and enhancement of social justice, gender equality and the absolute resistance to any forms of racism, sexism or ageism, non-violence in the resolution of disputes, and cultivation of spaces of freedom for expressive creativity and the exercise of the imagination. Such principles are entirely compatible with many forms of ecology—there is no reason why the Innu cannot practice them as well as the Amazonian Indian, the New York urbanite as well as the nomad in the desert. Unless that is, they are prevented from doing so by other cultural norms. In which case of course this is the place at which cultural criticism enters the picture, not necessarily driven from the out-side, but ideally from critique and negotiation from within. The Taliban oppose education for women, but many voices in Afghanistan, Pakistan and elsewhere argue strongly for the contrary case, and have put it into practice: a creative process opposing a destructive one, with potential knock-on effects throughout the society in question. Similarly they are compatible with many forms of social organization—such matters as marriage, descent rules, political organization and economic produc-tion and consumption, but where they are not, that may again be the point at which those customary forms need to be re-negotiated in terms of the over-arching requirements of the common good. Sustainable practices have two important characteristics: they trump other practices incompatible with sustainability, even in the broad and abstract sense defined by the Brundtland commission report—not to compromise the needs of future generations by selfish exploitation of resources by the present generation; and they involve ethical decisions. Debates about values always do, and in this context it implies a substantial expansion of the field called by some "development ethics" (Gasper 2004, Goulet 1995) into a wide ranging enquiry into not only the morality of the present world system, but even more so into the infusion of political and economic debate with ethical considerations, since the notion of

sustainability includes not only technical and climate science considerations, but equally or even more importantly, issues of access, psychological attitudes to nature, and to the development of what Amartya Sen and others have called "capabilities" (Sen 1999, Nussbaum and Glover 1995) compatible with there being a livable future for humankind and the rest of the planet on which we totally depend.

Simply contemplating the problems of the contemporary world is depressing, sometimes almost terminally so, unless balanced with an awareness that not only is change possible, but that there are tens of thousands of initiatives working towards positive transformation—social justice issues, new economic thinking, a world-wide environmental movement, the Transition movement, in the arts, appropriate technology, in new forms of religious thinking, new social movements, feminism and anti-sexist movements in general, in the rise of the concept of 'social entrepreneurship', in biodynamic and other forms of organic and sustainable agriculture, in experiments in communal living and cooperative housing, amongst progressive intellectuals, in "green architecture" initiatives, alternative energy systems, in educational experiments, in peace movements, in collective discussions of the kind that eventuated in the Earth Charter, in utopian and imaginative literature, and in many other areas. Taken together these may indeed collectively constitute what Paul Hawken calls "the greatest social movement in history". Certainly there are problems: about whether they can seriously challenge the major structural forces of business and militarization that dominate the globe; as to whether they can or should be "scaled up" or coordinated into a single 'alternative' movement of opposition to those structural forces (even if such coordination was possible given the diversity of these movements), and the dangers of competition, rivalry and non-democratic nature that characterize much of the NGO world.

Resources then certainly exist and are distributed globally. Many are understandably oppositional: they challenge the hegemony of the dominant institutional orders and are critical of the forms of globalization that have generated many of the social and environmental problems that we now face (and indeed the so-called "anti-globalization" movement has been a major source of creative thinking and analysis about possible alternatives). But opposition is only half of the story: they also suggest forms of cultural, social, economic and political change that point to a more just, humane and ecologically sustainable future. They propose new norms and new stories and narratives of possibilities, and imagine new cultural conditions essential

for peace and holistic development. In this book we will undertake two main tasks: to illustrate and evaluate some of these many alternative modes of thinking and action, and then to derive from them certain principles that will help us promote the notion and necessity of sustainable cultures and of cultural practices that promote sustainability. From the diversity of examples it is possible to develop a more general theory of cultures of sustainability.

To do this it is necessary to stress the relationships between culture and economy and other areas of life and analysis. For example food habits are closely related to culture (including religion), but also to forces of globalization. The "modernization" of diet frequently leads to the paradoxical malnutrition of many in the rich countries, where many subsist on diets of fast foods, sugar-laced products, chemically preserved or enhanced packaged or canned products and large quantities of meat, while eating little in the ways of fruits and fresh vegetables. The "modernization" of urban diets in Nigeria has both led to similar health outcomes (obesity, rise in heart diseases and diabetes), and to new forms of dependency as the traditional cereals of sorghum and millets are replaced by wheat and rice, which have to be imported (Barkin 1997: 78). Sustainability is a holistic concept and the methodologies used to approach it must likewise be holistic. It involves concepts of justice, structural as well as local issues, ideas of "development", as well as ecological and economic dimensions. All of these are pervaded with cultural considerations, all involve values and ethical decisions and all require imagination as much as techniques, "management" and technology to provide livable solutions.

Approaching Sustainable Cultures

Despite the proliferation of literature on sustainability, little of it devotes any attention, or only cursory attention, to issues of culture. Yet culture is the medium in which we swim as humans—our complex sets of beliefs, practices, material manifestations, arts, architectures, fashions, food habits, ideas about gender and hierarchy, the way in which we socially construct memories and memorials, our ethical and aesthetic systems, even our views about what constitutes "nature" (see for example Soper 1995; Dickens 2004) which in turn influence or determine our views of ecology, how we treat non-human animals, our dietary practices and our landscape painting. And if, as some have argued, our culture (in particular its consumerism and its disregard for our highly negative impact on the environment, our profligate means and patterns of travel in the rich world, our narcissistic contemporary

art and banal popular culture, and our unconcern with the multiple problems of poverty and inequality of access and life-chances that bedevil much of both the developing and developed worlds) is at the root of our current (and unless we react quickly and positively, potentially terminal) planetary crisis, then it is to culture that we must turn our attention.

This is of course the subject matter of this book, and the objective is to elaborate and discuss the role of culture in relation to sustainable futures through a number of themes. The following chapter consequently begins with critique: to examine in more detail the nature of our unsustainable cultural practices, not only those associated with consumerism, but a much wider range of issues including the emergence of a new culture of violence, new modes of alienation and anomie resulting from the homogenizing effects of what, as noted above, George Ritzer has termed "McDonaldization" (Ritzer 1996), the ways in which subjectivities are formed and manipulated through mass media and advertising, the nature and quality of many contemporary cultural practices (in film, journalism, literature and art for example), and the ways in which technological advances such as the Internet prove to be double edged: making personal connectivity so much easier across distances, while saturating us with information, complicating things formerly as simple as checking in at an airport, keeping us hugely busy with our "tweeting" and Facebook, and actually reducing real human interaction while generating new forms of cyber-crime and even illnesses. Of course these trends in society have not gone un-noticed, and a substantial literature of critique and alternatives has arisen, some of which, that most closely related to issues of culture, we will discuss.

Critique should lead to constructive ideas, and in Chap. 3 we will examine a range of the cultural resources for sustainability that have begun to emerge across a whole range of fields—in religion, the arts, design and architecture, in innovative social movements, in theatre, in photography and documentary film making, and in education. Amongst these important initiatives are fresh ideas about the economy. If a common problem amongst economists is to ignore culture, a common error in cultural studies is to ignore the economy. In fact, culture and economy are intimately linked, and no holistic discussion of the idea of sustainable cultures can ignore this. Chap. 4 will be devoted to exploring these links and the innovative ideas emerging from work in such areas as the "sharing economy", solidarity economy, the Transition movement, steady-state economics, the anthropology of work, so-called anti-globalization movements, economic anthropology, the study

of contemporary trends in food supplies and other critical resources such as water, work on gift economies, the links between ecology, economics and culture, and the important notion of "Deep Economy" pioneered by Bill McKibben (McKibben 2007) and its associated ideas of regionalism and local economies with small carbon-footprints.

Chapter 5 in turn broadens these concerns to introduce the idea of what I am here calling the "social imagination"—imagination that is not only directed at artistic production, but to the even greater artistry of re-imagining our social and political arrangements. There has long been a history, both literary and practical, of visualizing and creating utopian communities. While to some extent this project has fallen into disrepute because of the tendency of many such experiments to veer in the direction of totalitarianism, its continuing importance is signaled in the many contemporary manifestations of a utopian impulse in such ideas as "earth democracy", ecological democracy, a "new bottom line", radical democracy, re-building communities, the "eco-just society", the nature of societies after oil, "Wild Law" and others that can collectively be described under the rubric of 'political cultures'. This chapter will discuss these ideas and their contribution to outlining what a sustainable culture and a sustainable future might look like. Chapter 6 will take up an associated idea and one that emerges organically from a discussion of political cultures—notably the idea of citizenship and how it might be understood in a planetary rather than national sense and how it might be related to the idea of sustainability: the building of notions of self and of citizenship that promote and secure that desirable future. Chapter 7 extends these ideas by considering the idea of sustainable cultures itself in relation to two apparently contradictory ideas—on the one hand globalization and its tendencies to homogenize cultures, and on the other the rediscovery of local knowledge and the fact that these point to many potentially different and indigenous images of sustainability and of how to achieve it, an issue especially pressing as the world experiences both the effects of economic globalization, and of climate change, both macro-forces that are pushing individual cultures in directions that are not necessarily desirable for maintaining either cultural diversity or creating truly sustainable ones. The final chapter builds on all these themes by examining a number of specific proposals for the building of that sustainable future: actual models and proposals, practical, literary, social science based, and emerging from the "Blessed Unrest" of massive civil society mobilization that Paul Hawken (2008) has identified, and the means of transition to a sustainable culture.

Wonderful ideas however, regardless of how beautiful they may look on paper or in the mind of the social visionary, have to be actualized if they are to positively influence the present and the future, and this is of course where so many utopian schemes fail. Not only do we face the problems of converting such transformative ideas into practice in democratic ways, but knowing the nature of the contemporary world we can well imagine that the transition to the future, which must obviously come in some form unless history ends tomorrow, might well be a bloody and conflict ridden period as societies struggle and war over resources, territory, military and even cultural hegemony, the whole fraught situation made infinitely worse by the irreversible effects of climate change, disrupting agriculture and pushing onto the world stage potentially millions of environmental refugees. It is not surprising that some pessimistic (or realistic?) authors see the immediate future as one of a new barbarism (Vacca 1974). To avoid such a terrifying and civilization ending scenario, clearly some good ideas are needed about how we might make the transition from where we are now to a sustainable future, in such a way that the transition (from oil to a post-oil society, from one based on growth to one committed to a steady-state economy, from a militarized one to one committed to peaceful coexistence, from one marked by huge inequalities and social injustices to one of fairness and the possibility of self-realization for the greatest possible number, from a consumerist one to a sharing one, and from one that is predatory in its relations to nature to one that not only coexists with that nature, but rather enhances and nurtures it) is itself peaceful and well managed. That may well seem a tall order, but history is full of unexpected things happening, and the possibility of a successful transition is very much enhanced if we have a vocabulary of possibilities and creative ideas that might provide politicians, economists and social change activists with models, in this case of how to satisfactorily realize cultural transition—from a destructive and non-sustainable one that underpins other unsustainable practices, to one that promotes the full realization of true humanness in harmonious coexistence with nature.

This is why the final chapter is a synthesis of the ideas forming the body of the book, leading to a discussion of what a sustainable culture, or rather cultures, might look like in the light of the foregoing discussions, and how its achievement is related to a number of critical areas, including the nature of education, the key question of the transformation of values, and the formulation of ethical principles that promote not only a social and culturally just lifestyle, but also one that creates a pro-active relationship to

environmental sustainability, the ultimate basis on which all other forms of sustainability must rest. We truly do face an unprecedented macro-crisis in our planet's history, one induced almost entirely by human activities, not only in relation to the environment, but through our blind commitment to war, to ever increasing consumption and greed, urbanization, pollution, and social polarization, racism and exclusion, while paying lip-service to the idea of human rights, unbalanced tragically by an unequal commitment to human responsibilities. We live too in an era where the great mobilizing political and religious ideologies and movements of the past—Marxism, organized religion, revolution in its many forms—have largely faded away in our post-modern age in which these great "meta-narratives" have weakened and either largely disappeared or been usurped by perverted caricatures and in which little has appeared to replace them. It may well be that the narrative of sustainability is just this new meta-narrative—a commitment to the preservation of the Earth and its inhabitants, human and non-human, its restoration to a state of justice, beauty and ecological and cultural diversity, as what the eco-theologian Thomas Berry has called the "Great Work" (Berry 1999) of our generation. If it is not already, we should strive to make it so, and beginning with the roots of our crisis in culture, we may be able to create a model of what true sustainability looks like, and how we might reach it.

Bibliography

Aquilino, Marie J., ed. 2011. *Beyond Shelter: Architecture for Crisis*. London: Thames and Hudson.

Barkin, David. 1997. Local Autonomy, National Development and International Integration: Challenges for Today, Models for Tomorrow. In *A World That Works: Building Blocks for a Just and Sustainable Society*, ed. Trent Schroyer, 76–85. New York: The Bootstrap Press.

Bell, Simon, and Stephen Morse. 2008. *Sustainability Indicators: Measuring the Immeasurable?* Sterling, VA: Earthscan.

Bennett, M., P. Jones, and L. Klinkers. 1999. *Sustainable Measures: Evaluating and Reporting for Environmental and Social Performance*. Sheffield: Greenleaf.

Berry, Thomas. 1999. *The Great Work: Our Way into the Future*. New York: Bell Tower.

Clammer, John. 2012. *Culture, Development and Social Theory: Towards an Integrated Social Development*. London and New York: Zed Books.

, ———. 2015a. *Art, Culture and International Development: Humanizing Social Transformation*. Abingdon and New York: Routledge.

Dag Hammerskjold Institute. 1975. *What Now? Another Development*. Uppsala: Dag Hammerskjold Institute.

Daly, Herman E. 1973. *Toward a Steady-State Economy*. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman and Company.

Diamond, Jared. 2005. *Collapse: How Societies Choose to Fail or Succeed*. New York: Penguin.

Dickens, Peter. 2004. *Society and Nature: Changing Our Environment, Changing Ourselves*. Cambridge and Malden, MA: Polity Press.

Gasper, Des. 2004. *The Ethics of Development*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Goulet, Denis. 1995. *Development Ethics: A Guide to Theory and Practice*. New York: Apex Press.

Hart, Maureen. 2006. *Guide to Sustainable Community Indicators*. West Hartford, CT: Sustainable Measures.

Haverkort, Bertus Katrien van 't Hooft, and Wim Hiemstra, eds. 2003. *Ancient Roots, New Shoots: Endogenous Development in Practice*. Leusden (The Netherlands) ETC/Compas and London and New York: Zed Books.

Hawken, Paul. 2008. *Blessed Unrest: How the Largest Social Movement in History is Restoring Grace, Justice and Beauty to the World*. New York: Penguin Books.

Henderson, Hazel. 1978. *Creating Alternative Futures: The End of Economics*. New York: Berkley Publishing Corporation.

, ———. 1988. *The Politics of the Solar Age: Alternatives to Economics*. Indianopolis: Knowledge Systems Inc.

Hopkins, Bob. 2008. *The Transition Handbook: From Oil Dependency to Local Resilience*. White River Junction, VT: Chelsea Green Publishing.

Jackson, Shannon. 2011. *Social Works: Performing Art, Supporting Publics*. New York and Abingdon: Routledge.

Kagan, Sacha, and V. Kirchberg. 2008. *Sustainability: A New Frontier for the Arts and Culture*. Frankfurt am Main: Verlag fur Akademische Schriften.

Korten, David C. 1999. *The Post-Corporate World: Life After Capitalism*. West Hartford, CT and New York: Kumarian.

Lasch, Christopher. 1979. *The Culture of Narcissism*. New York: Warner Books.

Mckibben, Bill. 2007. *Deep Economy: The Wealth of Communities and the Durable Future*. New York: Holt.

Nederveen Pieterse, Jan. 2001. *Development Theory: Deconstructions/Reconstructions*. London and Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Nussbaum, Martha, and J. Glover. 1995. *Women, Culture, and Development: A Study of Human Capabilities*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Olivier de Sardin, Jean-Pierre. 2005. *Anthropology and Development: Understanding Contemporary Social Change*. London and New York: Zed Books.

Oreskes, Naomi, and Erik M. Conway. 2014. *The Collapse of Western Civilization: A View From the Future*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Pantaleo, Raul. 2011. On Beauty, Architecture and Crisis: The Salem Centre for Cardiac Surgery in Sudan. In *Beyond Shelter: Architecture for Crisis*, ed. Marie J. Aquilino, 210–219. London: Thames and Hudson.

Rahnema, Majid, and Victoria Bawtree. 2003. *The Post-Development Reader*. London and New York: Zed Books.

Rees, Martin. 2004. *Our Final Century: Will Civilization Survive the Twenty-First Century?* London: Arrow Books.

Ritzer, George. 1996. *The McDonaldization of Society: An Investigation into the Changing Character of Contemporary Social Life*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.

Robertson, Margaret. 2014. *Sustainability: Principles and Practice*. Abingdon and New York: Routledge.

Roszak, Theodore. 1973. *Where the Wasteland Ends: Politics and Transcendence in Postindustrial Society*. New York: Anchor Books.

Rothenberg, David. 2011. *Survival of the Beautiful: Art, Science and Evolution*. London and New York: Bloomsbury.

Sachs, Wolfgang, ed. 1995. *The Development Dictionary: A Guide to Knowledge and Power*. London and New York: Zed Books.

Samson, Colin. 2004. 'We Live This Experience': Ontological Insecurity and the Colonial Domination of the Innu People of Northern Labrador. In *Figured Worlds: Ontological Obstacles in Intercultural Relations*, eds. John Clammer, Sylvie Poirier, and Erik Schwimmer, 151–188. Toronto and London: Toronto University Press.

Schech, Susanne, and Jane Haggis. 2000. *Culture and Development: A Critical Introduction*. Oxford and Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Schumacher, E.F. 1979. *Small is Beautiful: A Study of Economics as if People Mattered*. London: Abacus.

Sen, Amartya. 1999. *Development as Freedom*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Soper, Kate. 1995. *What is Nature? Culture, Politics and the Non-Human*. Oxford and Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Spalding, Julian. 2003. *The Eclipse of Art: Tackling the Crisis in Art Today*. Munich and London: Prestel.

Urbain, Olivier. 2015. *Music and Conflict Transformation: Harmonies and Dissonances in Geopolitics*. London and New York: I.B. Taurus.

Vacca, Roberto. 1974. *The Coming Dark Age*. London: Panther Books.

WCED (World Commission on Environment and Development). 1987. *Our Common Future*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Culture in Crisis

The idea that our culture is in crisis is not exactly a new one. But like the critical issue of climate change, while we have long known about it, we haven't done much to address the problem. There is a long pedigree of cultural criticism going back, even in the relatively recent past to such important thinkers as Erich Fromm (for example in his *To Have or to Be?* 1982), Herbert Marcuse (1964), Theodore Roszak (1973), the earlier incarnations of the environmental movement, various shades of Marxism, "alternative" development thinkers, Gandhians and radical economic thinkers often influenced by Gandhi such as Ernst Schumacher in his seminal *Small is Beautiful: Economics as if People Mattered* (1979) and the very neglected Indian economist J. C Kumarappa in his work on the 'economy of permanence' (1958) and a host of others. Fast-forwarding to the present and we find writers such as David Korten, Martha Nussbaum, the sociologist Zygmunt Bauman, the philosopher and social theorist Slavoj Zizek (2011) and numerous thinkers coming from ecological, religious, political, academic and activist backgrounds, many of whose voices will be heard in the subsequent pages. The whole Utopian tradition, especially in the West, is a long standing theme in literary and social thought, and one by no means dead, as attested for example by Ernest Callenbach's influential novel *Ecotopia* (2004).

Of course, along with climate change deniers, there are no doubt plenty of people who will argue that there is nothing wrong with our culture (here "our" referring to the affluent societies of the West, Australasia, Japan, and the new middle classes of both the newly developed societies

such as Singapore and those striving to join that rank, including the affluent sectors of such diverse societies as China, South Africa, Brazil and the Gulf states). But much of the evidence I would suggest points in a less optimistic direction. There are several levels of this argument. The first, as a result of globalization, has been the increasing homogenization of cultures world-wide. This has many consequences: a loss of cultural diversity parallel to the global loss of bio-diversity, loss of languages and with them both their complex world views and the indigenous knowledge embodied in those languages; the phenomenon that many would describe as "cultural imperialism" (for example Hamm and Smandych 2005)—the driving out of local forms of cultural production and enjoyment by foreign forms embodying very different values and images of the good life to say nothing of being culturally inappropriate from the point of view of the recipient cultures; the displacement of local musics or their appropriation by the global music industry; the de-valuation of local cultures and the replacement of many of the previously artisan produced products by mass produced objects, often of non-biodegradable materials such as plastics, loss of local cuisines, fashions and forms of body decoration, and so forth. A second level is that our "advanced" cultures seem to produce as much alienation and anomie as they do satisfaction. Depression, crime, drug taking, divorce, levels of violence have hardly disappeared, but in many cases have increased in numbers, degree or intensity, and are aided and abetted by the mass media and popular culture. Indeed a third level is the nature of that popular culture, and much of the less-popular culture, in terms of its quality, values and contribution (or lack of) to sustainable lifestyles. In which context, the very living of daily life is often rendered unsustainable as a visit to any supermarket proves: the volume of plastic packaging, the enormous carbon-footprints or "food miles" of many of the (absolutely non-local) products on sale, the low or even negative nutritional value of many of those same products and the non-biodegradable chemical content of most of the non-edible ones (domestic cleaning materials, washing-up liquids, bug-sprays) and their high oil content, and quite possibly the lack of any accessible public transport by which to get home with one's purchases. The greater context of all of this is of course addiction to consumption way beyond daily necessities, and the fact that virtually all those products are delivered to us by marketing chains which are the retail end of a large system of agri-businesses, shippers, wholesalers and middle-men of which we have little knowledge and which might or probably might not be engaged in "fair trade" practices. The very fact that those businesses that

are advertize themselves as such, certainly suggests that most others are not, but are driven by profit rather than by any concern for the producer at one end of the chain and the consumer and her health at the other.

Added to this is the phenomenon identified by the German sociologist Ulrich Beck as the elements constituting the "Risk Society" in which we now all live (Beck 1992). Risk has always been a characteristic of human life—disease, crop failures, natural disasters, sabre-tooth tigers—but modernity has ushered in a whole new dimension. Many of the new risks are unknown, or if known about, either undetectable by usual human means (atomic radiation, toxic chemicals in the environment), or impossible to deal with or flee from. We are furthermore surrounded by complex systems—mass transit systems, air travel, technological medicine, computerized communication and control systems—and unforeseen elements such as hitherto unknown diseases (SARS, MERS, AIDs, avian flu, Mad Cow Disease) that seem to emerge suddenly out of nowhere, but often with devastating consequences. Even large threats—global warming, climate change, resource depletion, proliferating wars and terrorism—now surround us, but all we can do is to rely on "experts" to advise us, warn us and protect us, even though the evidence often is that the "experts" do not understand the situation either (or have created it in the first place). Our culture is often of little help here: either it fails us in the face of barbarism (the old 'how could the Nazis arise in the land of Beethoven' trope) or indeed feeds our anxieties: "horror" movies, films depicting war and crime (not always with happy endings), the taking of 'natural' disasters—sudden ice-ages, super-storms, gigantic tsunamis—as the themes for Hollywood movies aimed at "family audiences" and of novels. While there are certainly exceptions—the blockbuster film *Avatar* for example depicting the depredations of humans on the resources and peaceful and ecologically oriented people of another planet, we having wrecked this one—but losing in the end and being forced to return to our damaged Earth—a critical view of much popular culture globally would not find much that encourages either harmonious living or sustainable lifestyles. Let us now try to unpack this in more detail.

Consumption and Its Vicissitudes

The first order of blame is often directed at consumption habits, and rightly so in many respects. Excessive consumption of any kind is resource consuming (and almost certainly unhealthy), leads to the over-production

of more and more "stuff", much of it entirely unnecessary: the vast array of plastic-packaged soft drinks that can be purchased from any vending machine or convenience store for example, or the practice of manufacturers of flooding the market with any number of "new" variations of what is basically the same product, say canned coffee or beer, re-packaged in ways to make it appear to be something novel, endless changes of fashion in clothing, "binge flying, and more. Seen from the perspective of developing countries or from the poor in so-called developed ones, much of this borders on the obscene: high prices paid for what are often merely symbolic products (signaling wealth or status)—my former $10 watch bought at a street market stall actually keeps time as well as any Rolex—which are rapidly discarded and become waste. Indeed one of the emerging global problems is e-waste: the problem of the disposal of objects such as computers and mobile phones which contain toxic materials which should not re-enter the environment and which are hazardous to those (usually in the poorer countries) tasked with dismantling these toys and conveniences of the rich. The examples can be almost endlessly multiplied: excessive air travel, unnecessary use of the car for short or avoidable journeys, failure to re-cycle re-usable "trash", high volumes of advertising including material aimed at children encouraging them to consume, high energy bills for unnecessary levels of heating and cooling in buildings themselves representing forms of excessive consumption or designed as temples of that very consumption—think corporate headquarters, mega-malls, hypermarkets, airport terminals. The influential Washington DC based Worldwatch Institute in its 2010 annual volume on *The State of the World* devoted the whole book to, as its sub-title expresses it, "Transforming Cultures from Consumerism to Sustainability" (Worldwatch Institute 2010). The many innovative solutions that are proposed in that report we will return to in the next chapter. Suffice it to say at this point that while we must all consume to sustain life, excessive consumption that uses up irreplaceable resources, creates large carbon-footprints, generates or signals large and growing inequalities, and which is unhealthy for the planet (by generating waste, pollution and large quantities of energy for its production and sustenance) and for individuals (by promoting unhealthy lifestyles, over-dependence on mechanized transport, consumption of junk food and canned entertainment), works directly against sustainability for society as a whole.

But having said this we must go a little deeper if any model of sustainable consumption is to emerge. There is, quite naturally from a critical perspective, a tendency to be rather puritanical about consumption: that,

certainly in its more conspicuous forms, it is an evil, and, especially when based on a diminishing resource base of oil and minerals, and is pollution and waste generating, is simply selfish and in the long term self-destructive. This view is reinforced by the recognition that the negative impacts of over-consumption by the few tend to impact first and foremost those less able to participate in the consumption economy—in other words the poor and marginalized. The rich can retreat into their air-conditioned gated communities; it is the poor who have to live next to or on top of the municipal garbage heap where the discarded remnants of the lifestyles of the wealthy end up and where the (often toxic) recycling of which becomes the economy and lifestyle of the poor.

This is all true, but generally fails to take into account the sociological and psychological dimensions of consumption. These dimensions include the role of consumption in a range of significant cultural contexts, some of which, identified by the social psychologist Helga Dittmar (1992) include material possessions as part of what she calls the "extended self", material possessions as both material and symbolic expressions of identity, and the role of possessions in signaling gender, ethnic, class and other categories. She does not give much attention to another significant role of material things: the embodiment of memory (as with personal mementoes) and in its extended sense as "antiques"—objects that condense value in both a material (financial) sense and as personal and collective history. It is significant that when displaced survivors of the March 2011 earthquake, tsunami and nuclear meltdown at the Fukushima nuclear plant in Japan were allowed to briefly visit their damaged and irradiated homes to collect personal items, the first thing that many of them took away were photo albums of family pictures. As the anthropologist Mary Douglas and her economist collaborator Baron Isherwood clearly state it "Instead of supposing that goods are primarily needed for subsistence plus competitive display, let us assume that they are needed for making visible and stable the categories of culture. It is standard ethnographic practice to assume that all material possessions carry social meanings and to concentrate a main part of cultural analysis upon their use as communicators" (Douglas and Isherwood 1980: 59). If this is true, as I think it is, then simple critique of consumption is not enough. If people are to be weaned off excessive consumption, mere propaganda is unlikely to be effective. Rather new ways must be established to "make visible and stable" the categories of sustainable consumption, a very important subject to which we will return. The argument here in short is that neither persuasion in the face of facts

(that current lifestyle practices are bad for the Earth, something we already know although such evidence will be rejected by groups such as climate change deniers) nor even economic arguments—that driving a hybrid is better than a fully petrol driven one, or better still that having a car at all is uneconomical when good public transport is available, or that eating organic is cheaper in the long run because of greatly reduced medical expenses in the future—unless the cultural "story" changes. Only that can usher in revolutionary changes.

An influential, if controversial, variation on the theme of consumption has been the celebrated thesis of George Ritzer on the "McDonaldization of Society" (Ritzer 1996). Building on the argument of the earlier German sociologist Max Weber that the rationalization, standardization and normalization of society have become the primary characteristics of contemporary society (at least in the West). "McDonaldization", exemplified by the character of the fast-food chain of that name, is according to Ritzer, identified as efficiency, calculability, predictability, and control, made possible by the application of technology with little real human interaction taking place whether at the level of production (machine produced totally standardized hamburgers and buns), service (standardized menus, mechanized ordering and payment), or consumption (encouraged to be fast, in sterile standardized environments, with little or no interaction with the staff—as in a 'slow food' restaurant—or other customers). In drive-in or drive-through varieties, any kind of human interaction is even less. Ritzer is at pains to argue that his book is not an attack on McDonalds the fast-food chain as such, but on the pervasive processes of "McDonaldization" that characterize contemporary nomadic, anomic, mass and production-line society. Yet this is a bit disingenuous since as his critics have pointed out, it is precisely many of the characteristics of the chain that represent many of the least desirable characteristics of the mass consumption society—not only rationalization (something that takes place in many other spheres from industrial production to bureaucracies), but also seduction (being encouraged by advertising, "give-aways" such as toys, and the image that somehow such fast-food places are "cool", risk free and convenient compared with doing things like actually preparing food oneself).

The hidden costs of such convenience are furthermore concealed—the poor nutritional quality of the food and its high fat, sugar and salt content, the pressure on suppliers and farmers to also totally standardize their products (for example the size and shape of the potatoes to be turned into

fries), and the ecological costs (tropical de-forestation to grow soya beans to feed cattle that will end up as hamburgers)—to say nothing of animal rights when the lives and deaths of the cows and factory bred chickens that provide the basic raw materials are taken into account. The outcome of consumption systems that can be characterized as "McDonaldized" are standardized, poor quality products, supported by low wage labor working in monotonous conditions with little or no opportunity for autonomy of decisions within the workplace, with a "back story" of environmental destruction, immense pressure on suppliers, whether these be farmers, Bangladeshi garment workers, toy assemblers in a Chinese sweat shop, or at the ultimate output end, someone disposing of the toxic junk created by these "rationalized" systems, with the consumer most likely to have no knowledge (or worse still, concern) with the social and ecological processes and the political conditions which have brought the apparently cheap meal to the table or the dress, shirt or sneakers to the adornment of the affluent body. Such considerations now extend into the "hospitality" industries (the working conditions of hotel room maids, or even the "emotion work" of air hostesses and those who work in face-to-face situations in areas of the 'hospitality industry'), a clearly gendered dimension as the previous examples demonstrate, reduction of real choices (I can choose which supermarket or inter-changeable convenience store to go to, but they all have basically identical products), into food cultures, and into many other spheres of everyday life.

Ritzer's thesis has been criticized along many lines—too broad, not taking into account countervailing tendencies from farmer's markets to the slow food movement and other resistances to the homogenizing tendencies of modern society and globalization processes, too Weberian and not Marxist enough and from yet other points of view (Smart 1999). Yet without fully endorsing his position (many of those critiques are valid) it is true that Ritzer has identified some important characteristics of contemporary consumer society. These include not only the more obvious ones of homogenization, control and predictability, but more subtle ones too. Any culture 'reveals' the world and ourselves to ourselves if we look critically at it. Is the "McDonaldized" world actually the one we want, or can it be sustained even if we did? Citing the philosopher Agnes Heller, Joanne Finkelstein notes that "Agnes Heller (1982: 20) has pointed out that the individual's consciousness of the general, of how s/he thinks society works, can be seen in the particular, in how s/he conducts the affairs of the everyday… Heller shows that the individual's sense of the totality of

reality, of understanding how society works, is implicitly expressed through the ordinary routines of the everyday. On this basis, eating at McDonald's can be taken as an illustration of how characteristics of historical and economic structures enter human imagination and play a significant role in the manufacture of those nuances of behavior which are conventionally described as private, personal and idiosyncratic" (Finkelstein 1999: 78). Forms of economic practice enter into the cultural sphere: eating a hamburger can signal a great deal, including about whether that food habit is a part of an unsustainable lifestyle and one that may have to be abandoned or modified if a sustainable form of culture is to be achieved.

But that is not all, since forms of consumption, and the (capitalist) economies that create and promote them, also profoundly influence subjectivities. Not only are varieties of knowledge filtered through our cultural and civilizational narratives, but so are emotions, and what, in writing about consumption in contemporary Japan, I called "received dreams"—our very models of longing and desire and images of the past and especially of the future (Clammer 2000). But here immediately something needs to be said—that while the general logic of capitalism is essentially the same everywhere, its local manifestations vary. If the USA has seen one of the "purest" forms of free market capitalism, in Germany a different variety exists where both state intervention and a powerful Green lobby have radically influenced energy policy (away from nuclear towards renewable) and social policy (a much higher degree of welfare, health care and pension and unemployment support, and free education up to and including the university level). Japan provides yet another possibility, with a strong nexus between government and business (with all the possibilities of corruption that such an arrangement involves) and with traditional ideas of culture and behavior providing a powerful modifying force on the possibility of pure market principles applying. Indeed one commentator has even suggested with some seriousness that Japan is really a socialist society pretending to be a capitalist one (Kenrick 1990). Nevertheless, inherent in capitalist led consumption is the process of moulding subjectivities, especially the master one—that to consume is to be, that identity and status are the products of what and how much one consumes, and that happiness is to be pursued through expanding the range of consumption. The depth and pervasiveness of this model is so great that to a great extent we are not even aware of it: the life of shopping for things made by others, filling our leisure time with entertainment produced by multi-national media corporations, watching "spectator" sports rather than actually

playing them, going to art galleries rather than painting, buying packaged holidays that are planned (by others) down to the smallest details of what we will see and where we will eat and how we will travel, these are all the stuff of the culture modern life.

The deepest cultural changes are by definition not the surface ones—the content of TV shows, or the popularity of comics—but are those inscribed at the level of the body and emotions. Our ideas about diet (for example the recent craze, mostly in North America, for "gluten free" diets or "Paleo" ones), tells us a great deal more about our ontologies—our theories of being—than do any number of musings by philosophers. Ideas about diet connect seamlessly with religious beliefs, with contemporary (and ever shifting) concepts of the "ideal" body shape and its "performance", with images of youthfulness and of ageing, and hence with our emotions. The links between all of these, uncovered by the cultural historian Norbert Elias in his seminal work on what he called the "civilizing process" (Elias 1995). It is pertinent then to ask to what extent these emotions and body images are "natural" and to what extent socially constructed. The anthropological evidence is that while there is a basic sense of what Marx called "species being" or common humanity, such emotions and images are indeed culturally produced and sustained. Ideas of beauty in the salons of twenty-first Century Paris and in a village in New Guinea are rather different, as are ideas of early twenty-first Century beauty in general in Europe different from what they were in the seventeenth or eighteenth Centuries.

Similarly the expression of emotion—which takes largely somatic forms such as blushing, facial expressions, giggling, laughter and body posture—are culturally relative, and, as scholars of cross-cultural theatre practice have long known, have to be learnt (Schechner 2013). The question arises, rather parallel to the question about the sources of climate change, to what extent these emotions and body images are now generated primarily by capitalism, and constantly manipulated to tell us what to wear so as to look "good", to smoke so that we appear "cool" or masculine, that wearing sun glasses on gloomy days makes us look fashionable, and if it is really too dark to see, never mind, just wear them on top of the head, where to be seen, what to drive, what "apps" we absolutely must have on our "smart" phones, what objects we must surround ourselves with to be culturally cutting edge and how to shop for them, what high carbon footprint and socially useless contemporary art we should swoon over to be thought culturally progressive… the list goes on.

While in some ways these processes are not new—they are as old as the market economy—the difference lies in their intensity (the volume of advertising that we are subject to), the energy and resource guzzling nature of many of these activities, their solipsistic character (many studies having shown that excessive cell phone and Internet use actually reduces real human contact replacing it with a kind of virtual facsimile), and their totalitarian nature. The result is that all of us, even if critics of capitalist economy and culture, are inevitably complicit in it: to a great extent we have no choice. How else can we eat, travel, entertain ourselves, communicate, other than through the illusory "choices" that are now, to use Weber's celebrated phrase, the "iron cage" (quite often, at least for the affluent who have presumably made their wealth through advantageous use of the same system) that we are entrapped in? To resist these imposed lifestyle choices is difficult, but not impossible—"dropping out", eating slow food, refusing private means of transport other than a bicycle, not having a television, buying from farmer's markets are all real possibilities pursued by many, but inevitably in the "developed" world, and increasingly in large sectors of the developing one, in the context of this larger globalized and capitalist world in which even our dreams and certainly our ambitions are manipulated by the larger economic system.

We live then in a rather strange world—one in which we have become servants of the economy rather than it serving us. It is partly for this reason that scholars such as Martha Nussbaum have argued for the importance of the humanities in cultivating imagination, educating for democracy, promoting good citizenship and creating empathy (Nussbaum 2010) and, I would add, offsetting the fact that the majority of students worldwide are now choosing subjects at university level related to business and (neoliberal) economics and in the context of the increasing "McDonaldization" and bureaucratization of higher education and its mass character of ever larger classes and PowerPoint dominated ways of communication. This has profound implications for social theory in at least three ways. One is that social theory becomes the theory of *capitalist societies*, rather than a free floating and autonomous activity. The second is that all social theory must be alert to the intimate connections between the social, the cultural, the economic and the political and the many ways in which they interpenetrate. The third, to which we will come in subsequent chapters, is that any emancipatory theory, and practices deriving from it, must start from this context. There can be no struggling free of unsustainable practices without first understanding the nature of the system of thinking that has

generated them in the first place. Sustainable practices must be rooted in genuine alternatives, or they will simply be re-colonized by this currently largely hegemonic system that is driving civilization rapidly towards self-destruction.

Amongst these consequences for social theory are certainly two that are important. One is the theory of the sociologist Stjepan Meštrović that in a McDonaldized world, emotions themselves become mechanized and result in what he calls "quasi-emotions" such as "niceness", "curdled indignation", artificial nostalgia, and the manipulation of the emotions in relation to famines, conflicts and refugees, either on the part of those who want to attract our attention to such events (such as humanitarian NGOs), or by those who want us not to think about them or to quickly reach the point of "compassion fatigue". The resulting (to use Meštrović's term) "happy consciousness" is scripted and manipulated and is in fact a major form of, in Marxist language, false-consciousness. All this might not be so bad if it were not for its effects—lack of empathy, ethnic, gender, religious divides, the rise of hate speech, unwillingness to become involved in the problems of others—that result from this manipulation (Meštrović 1997). While this hardly constitutes a "post-emotional" society as Meštrović characterizes the society centered on consumption, the predominance of personal "lifestyle politics" rather than what Anthony Giddens has called "emancipatory politics" (Giddens 1991), does illustrate the extent to which the emotions have become the site of control, suggestion and direction away from larger social goals for many.

The second implication is for the nature of ethics. In particular the work of the sociologist Zygmunt Bauman (1994, 1995) has raised profound questions about the morality of, and the place of morality within, our "postmodern" culture. Here a set of leading questions arise: the rise of moral uncertainty in the complex "risk society", the possibility of their being indeed ethical universals in a postmodern world in which the very idea of "meta-narratives", of collective binding stories is under attack and in which concepts such as "human nature" are seen as dangerously "essentialist", and in which distrust, indifference and cruelty now seem to be the new norms in or for much of the world. At the same time, in a world in which we constantly talk about rights and entitlements, the issue of responsibilities has become occluded. This is especially important in a globalized world in which we constantly have to confront the "stranger", yet in which borders are increasingly controlled and patrolled and in which our own violence has triggered the flow of refugees and the dispossessed

that are the result of our politics, our economies and our un-ecological practices. The possibility of re-establishing community or of genuinely "meeting" the "Other" then should become an essential element in any new politics, particularly any variety that represents itself as democratic. The violence of contemporary society, systemic as well as individual, itself requires cultural analysis.

THE CULTURE OF VIOLENCE

We find ourselves living not only in a risk society, but in a very violent one too, and indeed, that level of violence constitutes one of the biggest areas of risk. International wars may well have declined in number and intensity since 1945 (although they certainly have not disappeared), but regional and local ones have not. At the time of writing violent conflicts rage in Syria, Libya, Iraq, Yemen, and South Sudan, brutal warlordism persists in the Congo, much of Mexico is traumatized by gang violence, the favelas of Brazil are virtually no-go zones, and the recent past has seen vicious ethnic cleansing in Rwanda, the Balkans, Myanmar. The streets of the sophisticated South African city of Johannesburg are unsafe at any time, and similar levels of violent crime are "normal" in many other cities of the world. Murder rates remain high in some of the major cities of the "developed" world; domestic violence and campus rape are commonplace; mass killings because of the easy and legal access to firearms in the United States are tragically regular occurrences as is police violence towards mainly minority peoples; and state violence towards Indigenous people and other protesters against ecologically damaging developments such as dams, oil drilling in pristine areas and pipe lines is common even in such "enlightened" countries as Canada.

At the same time we see the militarization of society with huge budgets devoted to "defense", war games and shooting ranges as popular leisure activities, and the violent nature of a high percentage of video games, television shows and Hollywood movies. Terrorism of many forms pervades the news channels and has spread to become a sinister menace almost everywhere and a cartoonist in Paris or Copenhagen is no longer safer than a resident of Algeria or Afghanistan, and even the suburban trains and subways of socially tranquil Japan now claim to be on "high alert" against the possibilities of incidents. Embassies are now built like fortresses rather than as the welcoming portals to desirable foreign countries. We live in fact in a "civilization" not only pervaded by ecological

self-destructiveness and large areas of social injustice, but a very violent one in which fear rather than security of person, property and legitimate activity are now the norm. This fact, as much as environmental degradation and climate change, critical although those are, makes our culture and way of life unsustainable.

The leading peace studies scholar Johan Galtung has proposed a triangular relationship between structural, cultural and direct violence (Galtung 1975, 1990), structural violence being the kind that results from, for instance, unfair trade patterns, direct from such events as acts of war or assault, but cultural from the codes, hierarchies or what the French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu has called the "habitus" or taken-for-granted relationships and practices within a culture that may in fact conceal forms of oppression and denigration although not announced as such. Cultures in other words can be simultaneously our life spaces, and a major source of false consciousness. While all forms of violence need to be combated, recognizing and opposing cultural violence is not easy since it is often embedded in life practices and in "tradition". Scarification, female circumcision, cannibalism, extreme rites of initiation, or even the "discipline" imposed on military recruits as part of their socialization into a regime of control, killing and legitimatized destructiveness, are all "cultural", but evidently need critique. When looking at specific examples of social violence, culture always needs to be taken into account, whether in Columbia, Sri Lanka, the USA, Uganda, or in any other context (Rupesinghe and Marcial Rubio 1994).

As with our discussion of consumption, so too violence needs to be placed in a wider context of interpretation. While almost invariably to be condemned as an evil in itself, violence in its various manifestations is linked to struggles over identity, the inroads of modernity on hitherto relatively isolated societies, threats to religious beliefs or the ability to embody them in practice, conceptions of nationalism, networks of crime and corruption, and the cynical capitalism of arms trading. While no one has thankfully been killed in a nuclear attack since 1945, a very large number have been by "small arms", and while strenuous efforts have been made to ban or at least limit the possession and use of nuclear weapons and other "weapons of mass destruction" such as poison gas, major nations, including the five permanent members of the UN Security Council, and some minor ones such as Singapore, continue to manufacture and sell on a large scale the weapons that cause death on a huge scale, and which make the equipping of terrorist and extreme fundamentalist groups such as the Taliban or ISIS

quite easy, while also providing the tools of repression in every situation where "police action" is used to suppress legitimate dissent. The attempt to create non-violent societies is as much a challenge as fighting climate change, and an ecologically balanced planet still plagued by violence would hardly be a goal worth reaching. And as Galtung suggests, the roots of such a transition are in culture. One that constantly extols, glorifies or legitimates (often in indirect means such as its films and popular culture) violence is hardly moving towards a sustainable culture. Demonization of the Other, racism, sexism, ageism, religious intolerance, disregard for the rights of animals and the rest of the complex bio-systems on which we all depend, cannot be elements in any society that plans to persist into the future, and that future would not be a pleasant one even if we should reach it. Consumerism can itself be a form of violence—taking endlessly from finite nature to gratify immediate wants. Furthermore, violence is often linked with corruption, one of the great breaks on development, a source of crime, especially of the "white collar" kind, and a pervasive process that often distorts any progress towards sustainability, whether by diverting resources to illegitimate ends, or by signaling to people that honesty is a worse policy than dishonesty, and far less lucrative (Barcham et al. 2012). We must evidently move towards a holistic picture of what a sustainable culture might look like.

Life Enhancing/Life Denying

Any serious cultural analysis of our current social trends points to some alarming conclusions, and sadly the examples can be multiplied. We see for example the rise of many forms of religious fundamentalism, forms which are almost always perversions of the life enhancing qualities of the original revelation: Orthodox rabbis in Israel forbidding the non-Orthodox even the right to be married, violent extremists beheading and murdering their way across huge swathes of the Middle East in the name of some degraded concept of Islam, Buddhist monks in Myanmar leading the persecution of the Muslim Rohingya people, attacks on Christian churches in Pakistan, and until very recently Catholics and Protestants killing each other in Northern Ireland while both claiming the label of Christian. We see the increasing detachment of our culture from ecology resulting in the climate crisis that we all (but especially the poor, the small farmers, the island dwellers) now face, and our increasing reliance on industrialized chemical driven food systems even as top soils are

destroyed, animals are brutally treated in factory farms and vast feeding lots where they stand in their own waste and have to be fed antibiotics to help them withstand the infections that result (and which enter human bodies through the ingestion of the meat products produced), and essential resources such as water are over-utilized (Roberts 2009). The result is not only a globally emerging food crisis, and associated resource crisis, loss of biodiversity and health problems resulting from any number of toxic chemicals entering the food chain, fantastic science-fiction like attempts to come up with "geo-engineering" solutions to humanly induced climate change and attempts to "manage" the environment when we do not even understand the complexities of its ecology, all leading to what Bill McKibben has called the "Death of Nature"—a situation in which there is no real wilderness left untouched in some form or another by human intervention, a sterile world in which our attempts to control the environment have just led to its (quite possibly terminal) impoverishment (McKibben 1989).

We may then be living in what in the Hindu world is called "The Age of Kali"—the terminal cycle of civilization. Certainly there is plenty of evidence for this—including the scandal of massive poverty in a rich and technologically sophisticated world and despite decades of "development". The very fact of underdevelopment and all its attendant ills—poor quality food, lack of access to health care or education, low quality housing, chronic economic uncertainty, exposure to both direct and structural violence—shows clearly that on a global level our civilizational project has not worked out. The poor quality, distorted values and violence of so much popular culture, and the hermetic and socially inconsequential character of much "elite" culture including such forms as the contemporary visual arts (Spalding 2003) both suggest a deep cultural rot, and certainly a loss of vision or of nerve in the face of planetary crisis.

If this situation sounds deeply depressing (and it is) the possible solutions do not of course lie in ignoring it or in simply searching for technological "fixes" that will somehow get us out of the hole which we have dug for ourselves, or which certainly certain political and economic groups have dug for the rest of us. The very extent of the crisis has not surprisingly triggered a huge outpouring of creative ideas, economic, political, social and cultural to address it and its causes. It is to these often innovative ideas and cultural practices, or at least a representative range of them that we will now turn in the next chapter.

Bibliography

Barcham, Manuhuia, Barry Hindess, and Peter Larmour, eds. 2012. *Corruption: Expanding the Focus*. Canberra: ANU E Press.

Bauman, Zygmunt. 1994. *Postmodern Ethics*. Oxford and Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

, ———. 1995. *Life in Fragments: Essays in Postmodern Morality*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Beck, Ulrich. 1992. *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity*. London: Sage.

Callenbach, Ernest. 2004. *Ecotopia*. Berkeley: Banyan Tree Books.

Clammer, John. 2000. Received Dreams: Consumer Capitalism, Social Process, and the Management of the Emotions in Contemporary Japan. In *Globalization and Social Change in Contemporary Japan*, eds. J.S. Eades, Tom Gill, and Harumi Befu, 203–223. Melbourne: Trans Pacific Press.

Dittmar, Helga. 1992. *The Social Psychology of Material Possessions: To Have Is to Be*. Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Douglas, Mary, and Baron Isherwood. 1980. *The World of Goods: Towards An Anthropology of Consumption*. Harmondsworth and New York: Penguin Books.

Elias, Norbert. 1995. On Human Beings and their Emotions: A Process-sociological Essay. In *The Body: Social Process and Cultural Theory*, eds. M. Featherstone, M. Hepworth, and B.S. Turner, 339–361. London: Sage.

Finkelstein, Joanne. 1999. Rich Food: McDonald's and Modern Life. In *Resisting McDonaldization*, ed. Barry Smart, 70–82. London and Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Fromm, Erich. 1982. *To Have or To Be?* New York: Bantam Books.

Galtung, Johan. 1975. *Essays in Peace Research*, vol 1. Copenhagen: Christian Ejlers.

, ———. 1990. Cultural Violence. *Journal of Peace Research* 27(3): 291–305.

Giddens, Anthony. 1991. *Modernity and Self-Identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Hamm, Bernd, and Russell Smandych. 2005. *Cultural Imperialism: Essays on the Political Economy of Cultural Domination*. Peterborough: Broadview Press.

Heller, Agnes. 1982. *A Theory of History*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Kenrick, D.M. 1990. *Where Communism Works: The Success of Competitive Communism in Japan*. Tokyo: Charles E. Tuttle.

Kumarappa, J.C. 1958. *The Economy of Permanence*. Kashi: Sarvasevasangh Publications.

Marcuse, Herbert. 1964. *One Dimensional Man*. Boston: Beacon Press.

McKibben, Bill. 1989. *The End of Nature*. New York: Anchor.

Meštrović, Stjepan. 1997. *Postemotional Society*. London: Sage.

Nussbaum, Martha C. 2010. *Not for Profit: Why Democracy Needs the Humanities*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press.

Ritzer, George. 1996. *The McDonaldization of Society: An Investigation into the Changing Character of Contemporary Social Life*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.

Roberts, Paul. 2009. *The End of Food*. Boston and New York: Mariner Books.

Roszak, Theodore. 1973. *Where the Wasteland Ends: Politics and Transcendence in Postindustrial Society*. New York: Anchor Books.

Rupesinghe, Kumar and Rubio C. Marcial, eds. 1994. *The Culture of Violence*. Tokyo, New York and Paris: United Nations University Press.

Schechner, Richard. 2013. *Performance Studies: An Introduction*. 3rd ed. London and New York: Routledge.

Schumacher, E.F. 1979. *Small is Beautiful: A Study of Economics as if People Mattered*. London: Abacus.

Smart, Barry. 1999. *Resisting McDonaldization*. London and Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Spalding, Julian. 2003. *The Eclipse of Art: Tackling the Crisis in Art Today*. Munich and London: Prestel.

Worldwatch Institute. 2010. *State of the World 2010: Transforming Cultures from Consumerism to Sustainability*. London: Earthscan.

Zizek, Slavoj. 2011. *Living in the End Times*. London and New York: Verso.

Cultural Resources for Sustainability

The previous chapter may well have left us all feeling rather depressed, and with good reason. But problems are also opportunities, and it would be a big mistake to assume that resources for addressing, or certainly beginning to address, these problems, do not exist. As we have noted, Paul Hawken has identified thousands of NGOs, social movements and citizens' initiatives that are, as the cover blurb of his book suggests, "restoring grace, justice, and beauty to the world" (Hawken 2008). In this chapter we will turn to examining some of these initiatives that take a cultural form and explore how they might (and do) contribute to the creation of a wider culture of sustainability.

Reclaiming Consumption

Many commentators as we have seen trace many of the problems that we currently collectively face—pollution, resource depletion, waste generation, deforestation—to excessive consumption. But culture of course is wider than consumption, and much consumption behavior is driven by cultural considerations—status seeking for example. To encourage diminution of consumption through propaganda, while not necessarily a bad thing in itself, is unlikely to succeed unless the underlying *culture of consumption* is addressed and modified. In introducing the 2010 Worldwatch Institute annual report, entitled "Transforming Cultures from Consumerism to Sustainability", the lead editor notes rightly that

> Human beings are embedded in cultural systems, are shaped and constrained by their cultures, and for the most part act only within the cultural realities of their lives. The cultural norms, symbols, values and traditions a person grows up with become "natural". Thus asking people who live in consumer cultures to curb consumption is akin to asking them to stop breathing—they can do it for a moment, but then, gasping, they will inhale again. Driving cars, flying in planes, having large homes, using air conditioning…these are not decadent choices but simply natural parts of life—at least according to the cultural norms present in a growing number of consumer cultures in the world. Yet while they seem natural to people who are part of those cultural realities, these patterns are neither sustainable nor innate manifestations of human nature. They have developed over several centuries and today are actively being reinforced and spread to millions of people in developing countries. Preventing the collapse of human civilization requires nothing less than a wholesale transformation of dominant cultural patterns. This transformation would reject consumerism—the cultural orientation that leads people to find meaning, contentment, and acceptance through what they consume—as taboo and establish in its place a new cultural framework centered on sustainability. (Assadourian 2010: 3)

Such a transformation would be a far reaching one involving the evolution of a culture committed to not just minimizing environmental damage, but proactively restoring ecological systems to full health, shifting notions of achievement and status from consumer based ones to notions of human integrity based on "being not having", to paraphrase Erich Fromm, and would require substantial changes, even revolutions, in business, education, media, government, transportation, housing, agriculture, fashion and just about every other area of human life. Far fetched as such a suggestion might seem, there is now plenty of evidence that this cultural revolution is exactly the one required if humanity is to have a sustainable and desirable future at all.

And the evidence for the un-sustainability of current consumption patterns is overwhelming—the excessive and increasing use of resources by individuals in both developed and developing societies (meat, fish, oil, water, natural gas and junk foods in particular) such that ecological footprints are now exceeding the carrying capacity of the Earth and with vast and probably irreversible ecological damage being done as a result—deforestation for livestock feed, depletion and pollution of diminishing ground water, huge emissions of green house gasses and toxic chemicals into the atmosphere and oceans with the resulting acidification of

the latter (for a good survey see Assadourian 2010). Although driven by business interests and its essential associate, the huge world-wide advertising business, the oddity of the consumer based society is that it does not in fact lead to higher levels of satisfaction or happiness, but leads to stress, competition, sensory overload, poor diets often leading to obesity and any number of "lifestyle illnesses" including ones such as diabetes. Obsession with "growth" on the part of politicians and many economists has the paradoxical effect of expanding damage while not increasing satisfactions beyond a certain basic level.

The obvious conclusion to be drawn from this is to work towards creating a culture of sustainability, to encourage a paradigm shift in attitudes, values and the "stories" or narratives of "success" on which social expectations (and hence the workings of education and other institutions) are based. To do this involves identifying what Donella Meadows has called the "Leverage Points" from which a system can be creatively transformed (Meadows 1999)—the key ideas or assumptions around which the system is organized, and of course to suggest alternatives. Amongst these Assadourian suggests might be ecological restoration, equity (social justice), discouragement of consumption patterns that actively undermine long term well being such as junk foods, meat eating, tobacco use, car dependency, addiction to disposable goods, social policies to avoid social isolation, long commutes, and active encouragement of healthy eating, use of affordable public transport, increasing support for public services and amenities such as parks, libraries and community gardens, "cradle to cradle" design (of which more below), environmentally designed housing and other buildings that minimize both the use of un-recyclable materials in their construction, and use of energy for heating and cooling and which collect and recycle both rainwater and their own internal water from activities such as bathing and clothes washing and finally use it for recharging groundwater.

In fact, with a little imagination (and drawing on actual examples) the potential list is huge and can include both micro-level activities (reading newspapers on line or re-cycling of paper ones) and macro-ones such as urban design to discourage car use, make inner city areas convivial and attractive, and locate housing near jobs. Social entrepreneurship can be encouraged (supporting businesses that are socially useful and ecologically responsible), businesses and business law restructured around responsible and ecologically sound production and distribution practices, including encouraging localism and farmers' markets, and very strongly encouraging

the media—perhaps the most powerful single force in contemporary society—to devote its attention to public education along these lines, to develop stories that change people's conceptions of status, fashion, fun and leisure and which like other businesses work towards minimizing the ecological footprint of their productions, as is already happening in the theatre world (Arons and May 2012, Besel and Blau 2014). There are in other words, almost endless areas where creative social imagination can think of ways and means to reshape and re-conceptualize a vast range of social practices and institutions in ways that make them not only sustainable in a physical sense, but also convivial and life-enhancing, unlike so many of the historically strange rituals that we currently engage in to demonstrate our status, power and identity.

But to return to consumption for a moment, rather than simply condemning it (all of us after all have to consume to some degree to live) a better approach might be to see how it can be transformed in more sustainable directions. This indeed is the thrust of the Worldwatch Institute's 2010 annual report (Worldwatch Institute 2010), a book which contains numerous examples of innovative ways of building sustainable consumption patterns. These include stimulating existing religious world views, many of which extol simplicity, to play a greater role in value transformation; encouraging shifts from conventional and industrial agriculture towards permaculture; orienting early childhood education (when small children are very susceptible to attitude and value formation) towards sustainable lifestyles, and, conversely, working to ban or reduce the impact of commercially oriented advertising directed at small children on television and in the print media and through fast-food chains (themselves not a positive feature of sustainability!); and encouraging schools to utilize fresh local produce in their school meals and to create their own school gardens where children can have the experience of hands-on horticulture and have the thrill of eating food that they have grown themselves. Other recommendations include making universities, where much of the talk about sustainability goes on, themselves sustainable, encouraging social entrepreneurship in the business world, re-localizing businesses (i.e. drawing on locally available resources, supporting local industries and agriculture and reducing the huge carbon-footprint of long distance transportation), re-orienting health care towards prevention, re-designing cities to make them convivial spaces and to reduce travel, reducing working hours and encouraging sustainable leisure activities (a great number of leisure activities such as motor

racing, cruising, binge-flying, and over-consumption being anything but sustainable practices), encouraging a "less is more" attitude including in surprising activities such as weddings and childbearing. And, importantly and long overdue, the stimulation of changes in the legal system from one based on the protection of private property to one that represents what the pioneering advocate of a more planet friendly form of law and legal cultures has called "Earth Jurisprudence" (Cullinan 2011).

The list indeed can go on in many directions—toy libraries, collective housing or forms of "social housing" in which, while individual dwelling units are private, other facilities such as common rooms, possibly kitchens, games rooms, storage areas for such rarely used items as luggage and access to communal facilities such as gardens, washing machines and vacuum cleaners are shared. In situations that I have seen myself, the principle has been extended to transport (shared car or cars and bicycles), baby-sitting, elderly care, gardening on allotments situated someway from the dwellings, security, books, records and CDs, cleaning of common areas, toys and accompanying the smallest children to kindergarten. Slow food, the idea of "de-growth" (to which we will return in a later chapter), and the important idea in a growth-obsessed world, of the "steady-state economy" (Daly 1973), urban gardens and the many "innovations that nourish the planet" discussed and documented in the World Watch Institute's report of that name—including eco-agriculture, practices for eliminating hunger, rainwater harvesting, preventing post-harvest losses, solar cookers, and many more (Worldwatch Institute 2011). Confidence in the possibility of a new form of civilization begins to emerge when the huge range of initiatives and experiments in progress around the globe becomes apparent. All of these suggestions require a cultural shift—a shift in values and attitudes—and would in turn lead to a new form of culture or civilization, one which in its ideal form would be in harmony with the environment, socially just, convivial, and creative—encouraging and rewarding forms of expression that enhance rather than undermine those core values of the new civilization as is so often the case with our contemporary civilization with its violence, triviality and self and environmentally destructive practices. It is significant that in emerging debates about the question of "culture and development", the emphasis has begun to shift from seeing culture as something purely instrumental in promoting some form (of usually economic) development, to something to be promoted in its own right—not "culture and development" but rather the "development of culture", since the presumed desired outcome of all "development"

processes is the good life, one in which inevitably cultural expression in the form of the arts, religion, sports, leisure activities, non-utilitarian gardening (you cannot eat—most—flowers!), and friendships would be hugely enhanced. Otherwise, why "develop"? (Clammer 2012). If this is the case, then we should turn our attention to those cultural expressions and consider the ways in which they both contribute to sustainability and can themselves be made more sustainable. So let us start with the arts.

ART AND THE ARTS OF SUSTAINABILITY

The British "green" architect James Wines has provocatively argued that "without art, the whole idea of sustainability fails" (Wines 2008: 9). This is an interesting idea worth unpacking, since in most discourses of sustainability little attention is paid to the role of the arts, whether visual, performing or literary. The two major exceptions to this which are attracting much more attention are architecture and design. The first has a clear relationship to sustainability—buildings occupy space, and use large quantities of material in their construction and large amounts of energy in their running and maintenance. The notions of "green" or "ecological" architecture and even the notion of "slow architecture" reflect concerns with this—attempts to design and build in ways that utilize either minimum materials, or re-cycled ones, and which are energy efficient when built and easy to maintain, and possibly even, as with traditional Japanese architecture, themselves recyclable in that virtually all their materials can be re-used in a new building or for other purposes, and of course are pleasant to look at and to live or work in. Parallel to green architecture have been innovations in design, both ideas of "social design"—designing functional and beautiful objects not just for the rich, but for the very poor as well—solar stoves, micro-power units, roll-along water carriers for transporting water from wells or rivers that can be pulled even by a child, and of the important principle of "cradle-to-cradle" design where objects are manufactured to be fully recyclable, and where, as in nature, there is no such thing as "waste" (McDonaugh and Braungart 2002). The fundamental idea is designing *with* nature and in many cases utilizing the idea of bio-mimicry to produce both objects and human habitats that are energy efficient, waste free and integrated with other living systems (Edwards 2005: 97–112).

A good example of these design principles is what Michiel Schwarz and Diana Krabbendam call "Sustainist Design"—design built around

the principles of sharing, localism, connectedness and proportionality (Schwartz and Krabbendam 2013). Sharing implies collaboration, open exchange and the expansion of the idea of the commons; localism refers to enhancement of community, the joy of local experiences and rootedness is a sense of place (and responsibility for that place); connectedness links people to one another and to the environment and fosters a culture of interdependence rather than individualism; and proportionality goes beyond the modernist ideas of speed and 'bigger is better' to a sense of "selective slowness" and appropriate human scale. Taken together they suggest that this implies a whole new agenda of social design and indeed a whole culture and set of everyday practices based on cooperation, sharing, new ways of seeing and doing, that works with nature, and which enriches the quality of life rather than judging its success by the quantity of goods or experiences packed into a lifestyle of ever increasing velocity and crowdedness. These "theoretical" principles they illustrate with a range of actual examples, including The "FairPhone", a simple mobile phone utilizing minimum hazardous materials, that is easy to use and recycle and which is linked through a kind of fair trade arrangement with the miners and their communities that actually extract the raw materials, innovative toilets requiring minimal water use, urban gardening in an underprivileged Paris suburb, furniture from reclaimed materials using workmen from homeless backgrounds, simple solar energy systems in rural India, and many others drawn from urban planning, appropriate technology and other contexts. In every case the design and the cultural, social and ecological connectedness that it is intended to foster form a single unit—hence the notion of "social design".

In architecture and design, principles of sustainability are not so hard to discern. But what about the other arts, including such forms as painting, theatre, dance, music, pottery, sculpture, literature and textiles? The alternative development thinker and critic of corporate capitalism, David Korten, has suggested in a recent major book that the salvation of our society lies in the creation of what he calls "new stories"—narratives of our being-in-the-world that do not exalt what he terms "Empire"— notably a civilization based on domination, exploitation, power, consumption and resource extraction. These new stories should be ones that move us towards a different scale of values in which equality, social justice, ecological responsibility, and creativity are at the core (Korten 2006). He goes on to speak of the need to create new economic, political and cultural stories, but in practice his book dwells almost exclusively

on the first two. The question of cultural stories—the largely unspoken beliefs, assumptions and worldviews that underpin both economic and political frameworks and which constitute the fabric of our everyday lives—is left largely untouched. And what is the content of these stories, our culture in terms of its actual living components? To a perhaps surprising degree (at least to those who never think of their lives in this way) the answer is what we generally call the "arts". We live daily in an environment of buildings, objects of everyday use (the coffee cup from which I am now drinking, decorated as it so happens with an image by Picasso and bought in the Picasso Museum in Barcelona), fashions, foods, décor, hairstyles, and any number of forms of entertainment from films to literature, from theatre to comics. We daily use textiles as both clothing and decoration, we spend hours amongst the artifacts and productions of popular culture, we enjoy and exercise ourselves with dancing and its accompanying music, many of us listen to that music while we work, commute or relax.

In fact then, our lives are saturated with the arts and their products material and immaterial: they are at the core of culture. They not only provide the substance of much of our lives (and provide livelihoods for many millions), but are also the sources of empowerment, identity building, skill development, utopian visions and social and cultural alternatives, but also, and very importantly our fantasy or imaginative lives. Perhaps Max Weber was right, and the "iron cage" of the rationalist, technological, bureaucratic and managerial civilization that we have built for ourselves does little to nurture our imaginative, erotic and fantasy lives. In fact fantasy breaks through constantly like weeds through a pavement: in science fiction and other imaginative forms of literature, in film (*Harry Potter*, *Avatar*, *The Lord of the Rings*), in video games, and of course in the arts themselves, always the source of alternative visions and as such seen as playing a vital role in the "re-enchantment" of a world dangerously denuded of magic (Gablik 2002). The relationship of the arts to sustainability and to humane and holistic development should in any case be clear if we ask ourselves what kind of future we desire to live in and have our children live in. In every case known to me, the answers always have to do with the quality of life rather than primarily an increase in material well being, such an increase in any case being understood not as simple accumulation, but as resources to be invested in that qualitative improvement including centrally access to and participation in the cultural riches of civilization.

It follows that the arts, and their study as part of any rounded and indeed democratic education as Martha Nussbaum and others have so cogently argued, should be understood as constituting the essential fabric of society. They are both the sources of individual and collective identity and of the kinds of empowerment that come through the recognition that one has expressive and performative capabilities, a recognition that inspires art based therapies for psychological and emotional disorders, and potentially for much wider social ones too (Landy and Montgomery 2012). One of the unsustainable pathologies of contemporary civilization is the powerful tendency for the economic and political to make culture their handmaiden, rather than the other way around. It is for this reason that scholars such as Nussbaum have argued that the humanities play a vital role as carriers of values that, as their name implies, have to do with the humanization of life, including the promotion of dialogue, imagination, ethical perspectives, aesthetic appreciation, and notions of citizenship that go far beyond simply voting occasionally in elections (Nussbaum 2010).

This makes good sense if we recognize that the idea of culture includes not only institutions, material culture and lifeways, but also emotions, narratives, ways of generating and transmitting meaning and values, and ways of grappling with the existential issues that confront all human beings. Any viable notion of "sustainability" must include these same factors, and any "new story" must emerge from these same sources. While it may seem difficult to "justify" the arts in any narrow economic sense, as expressing the imaginative resources of a society their long term effects are incalculable. The Harvard based Brazilian social theorist Roberto Mangabeira Unger has argued at length in his (literally) weighty tome *False Necessity*: *Anti-Necessitarian Social Theory in the Service of Radical Democracy* (2001) at least three important things. These are, firstly, that while social structures do indeed having profound shaping effects, they are not set in concrete and can be changed. Secondly, that society is something in a constant process of becoming and is constantly driven by cultural changes. Thirdly, that social alternatives emerge from the imagination. In such an understanding of society the artist has a pivotal role, not as a glorified decorator for the rich and powerful, but as a source of new symbols and visions, an embodier of hope that transcends the limitations and "givens" of the current social, economic and political situation, and as the source of creative fantasies that spill over into the re-organization of everyday life (think simply of fashions, design and architecture), and as such are drivers of cultural change. Cultural change in turn deeply influ-

ences social processes and often leads them, and as I have argued at length elsewhere, art movements are an important form of social movement, seriously neglected by scholars of social movements, but highly significant for their mobilization of people and resources often with the precise intention of promoting social and political change. Examples might include in the West the Surrealists, the Italian Futurists, the Constructivist and Socialist Realist painters of the early Soviet Union, in Latin America the revolutionary artists and poster makers of Cuba, and the "Theatre of the Oppressed" arising from the work of the Brazilian director Augusto Boal, and in Asia the anti-colonial artists of India and in particular Bengal who saw painting in particular as a way of resisting the cultural hegemony of the British (Clammer 2014).

Sustainability then, which is usually (and rightly) thought of in terms of the environment, in a more inclusive sense involves many aspects of culture, including the arts in their constructive dimension (creating imaginative possibilities), as ways of creating social solidarity and opposing racism and other social divisions (Crehan 2011), and in their critical form (deconstructing bad taste, limited ways of seeing, poor architecture and ugly urban planning). This is not only true of the visual arts, but has greatly influenced attitudes and practices in the performing arts as well across a variety of issues—using theatre to address human rights abuses (Rae 2009, Jackson and Toni Shapiro-Phim 2008), utilizing its communicative power to raise environmental consciousness as in the books edited by Arons and May and Besel and Blau cited above, utilizing performance to promote socially useful public projects (Jackson 2011), and in addressing a whole range of social justice issues including gender violence, caste oppression, corruption, environmental degradation and underdevelopment, particularly as inspired by the seminal work of Augusto Boal (2008) and with many applications around the globe, particularly in India (Ganguly 2010).

Theatre however tends to reach a relatively limited audience, while film, now one of the most popular media world wide from Hollywood to Bollywood, reaches far more people, not only in cinemas, but also through television and the rental DVD. While "Third world" cinema has long challenged the tragically traditional themes of underdevelopment—colonialism, corruption, poverty and social inequalities—new issues in keeping with our planetary crisis are now being reflected in both documentary films—for example *The Age of Stupid*, or *The 11th Hour*, the latter hosted by the Hollywood star Leonardo di Caprio and featuring both filmic material and interviews with many of the

contemporary luminaries of ecology, alternative forms of development and critics of current industrial and energy policies and practices, and in feature films. These currently include serious examinations of issues such as the Bolivian Cochabama water protests, dramatized in the 2010 movie *Even the Rain*, and in the growing library of "disaster" movies coming from Hollywood studios dramatizing global warming, or rather freezing as in the case of *Ice Age*, extreme weather (*The Perfect Storm*), gigantic tsunamis, out of control viruses, mutant creatures, and ecological themes (*Avatar*). In literature, while not naming sustainability as such, the Nobel winning poets Pablo Neruda in Chile and Octavio Paz in Mexico both directed their art at the underlying issues of injustice, underdevelopment and inequality, in a part of the world where poetry has long been taken very seriously as an art form and as a source of social critique and protest, as at least until recently it was in Russia and in Eastern Europe, and where the novel continues to be a major form of literary social analysis (see Kundera 1990, 1996).

This in turn relates to the question of arts education for sustainability. Much art education naturally and rightly focuses on the acquisition of high levels of skill in the appropriate art—no one wants to listen to off-key opera singers or violinists or to look at bad paintings—but as the world around us has changed so dramatically and threateningly, and partly as the outcome of human educational processes, the question of education for sustainability must arise (and we will return to it in more detail later). In this case the issue is specifically that of relating arts education to sustainability. The potential effects of this are of great magnitude— producing a generation of architects, designers, film makers, theatre producers, visual artists and musicians who work is devoted not only to high technical standards, but also to, quite literally, saving the Earth. Fortunately initiatives are emerging in this field in both developing and so-called developed societies. Mary Stone Hanley and her collaborators have documented and stimulated a range of examples of arts education aimed at promoting sustainability, social justice, positive ethnic relations, and development utilizing a range of media including story-telling, theatre, audience friendly art museums, music, dance, painting, photography and film making (Hanley, Noblit, Sheppard and Barone 2013). Sustainability remains a rather abstract and distant concept until it is operationalized in personal and institutional practices, and the arts prove to be effective in promoting not only behavioral change, but as a legitimate and powerful way of expressing emotions.

Many people feel anxious, angry, disempowered and disturbed about the deepening environmental crisis, climate change, violence, conflict and persisting injustices, but often have no clear way of expressing those feelings. The arts provide just such as an avenue, and a socially legitimate one as their role is generally respected and recognized (or feared) in just about every society. Art can be very important here in three particular contexts. The first is in providing resources for dealing imaginatively and emotionally with the inevitably coming changes in world society, livelihoods and patterns of consumption. While some will welcome these, others will feel tremendous grief at the loss of old and familiar ways of life, expectations, careers, homes, and the other elements that make up so much of our (at the moment) taken-for-granted daily lives. The second is that while we may rightly talk about the "Transition Society" (Hopkins 2008), and the economic aspects of the move from an oil dependent society to one in which we will have to seriously cut energy usage and/or utilize extensively other and renewable sources of energy and transport, little is said about the *cultural* dimensions of such a transition. What will we do in the evenings? What will our forms of entertainment and cultural expression and consumption be like? How will lifestyles (including consumption) be impacted? These are all areas that require substantial thinking and experiment, for without a sustainable culture, other moves towards sustainability will fail in the long run.

There is no guarantee that a "post-oil society" would be a convivial and just one; far from it, many commentators fear decent into barbarism, war and greed over control of diminishing natural resources. Which is where the third issue comes in: the role of the arts in conflict prevention and resolution and the promotion of cross cultural diversity that is respected and treasured. Interestingly it has been particularly in the field of music—a true cultural universal and one enjoyed by most of us—where an innovative literature and areas of practice are emerging and in which, while comparative evidence is still limited, there are many examples of successful use of music in overcoming deep rooted political and religious barriers, as in Edward Said (of Palestinian Christian origin) and Daniel Barenboim (of Jewish origin) bringing together Arab and Israeli young musicians through the medium of workshops and co-performance, or in post-civil-war healing, as with the music of the internationally celebrated *Refugee All Stars* (for an extensive overview and documentation see Urbain 2015).

A number of visionary contemporary educationalists have pointed to the ways in which learning must become transformative if a sustainable

future is to be achieved (for example O'Sullivan 1999). While the specific ingredients of this transformed and transformative education vary, what all seem to have in common is the need to provide the imaginative resources necessary to create the "new story" that our dying civilization needs urgently to seek. One of the leading educational theorists of/for sustainability, Brian Murphy, has the following to say:

> *This process of education will also respect and promote the visionary and artistic character of human existence.* Nothing marks our uniqueness as individuals as do imagination and vision—the individual as artist re-creating the universe in the mind and in free expression through the 'arts', crafts, media, athletics, horticulture, and the plethora of avenues in the realm of 'recreation' and the realm of 'work'…. Imagination and vision are the cutting edge of knowledge. Knowledge is derived from the process of forming reality in the mind, and then questioning this 'reality' by re-forming it in the world. Knowledge is merely the present answers to the questions of the imagination. While the process of creating knowledge should be scientific, the process of formulating questions and creating a range of possible answers is a function of imagination, of vision—it is an artistic process. (Murphy 1999: 90–91)

This is very close to what the leading peace activist and scholar John Paul Lederach has called "the moral imagination"—the ability to think about and express alternatives that contribute to the well-being of the whole—both the human-sphere and the biosphere on which we ultimately depend—a process that Lederach sees as being essentially an artistic one (Lederach 2005).

Culture and sustainability are intimately linked—culture as both supporting an authentic and holistic form of development that leads to genuine human and planetary well-being, and in so far as culture itself needs to be sustainable. As the very medium of human lives, culture, and the arts that make up so much of it, are the keys to both present satisfaction and a sustainable future. The most important mechanisms for achieving that sustainability exist not only within politics and economics, but profoundly in the cultural realm, the space in which our imaginations and expressivity should flourish and through which the re-enchantment of the world might take place, and will necessarily do so if that re-enchantment is to be envisioned and achieved. But that of course has implications for the arts. Much, if not most, contemporary art, has very little to do with current world problems, and may indeed contribute to them in utilizing large quantities of unsustainable materials—as in the vast "wrapping" activities

of the artists Christo and his partner Jeanne-Claude including large areas of pristine coastline, islands and desert canyons, and other forms of "land-art" some of which involve destructive interventions at natural sites (Lailach 2007), the use of toxic and unrecyclable materials in theatre productions (Garrett 2012), or simply being narcissistic and frankly irrelevant, despite the twitterings of critics attempting to justify its existence (for an extended and remarkable example see Jones 2010). Creativity in itself of course cannot and should not be controlled or politically manipulated, as with the "Socialist Realism" period of Soviet Art, or the Nazi suppression of what they deigned to call *Entartete Kunst or* "degenerate art", art which contained the work of painters and sculptors now recognized as being amongst the masters of modern art. Cleverness and entertainment have their rightful places, but it is questionable whether a great deal of contemporary artistic production contributes in any meaningful way to highlighting and addressing our pressing planetary problems, and may even contribute to them by extolling violence (as in much film), creating large carbon foot prints, and distracting people from the big issues: in fact fiddling while Rome burns.

There are many exceptions to this irrelevance, and it has been particularly in art forms such as photography and writing that huge contributions have been made to critical thinking, consciousness raising and proposing creative alternatives (for a broad survey and analysis see Clammer 2015a). The challenge for the arts becomes, while maintaining quality and expertise, to find ways of stimulating the social imagination as well as a purely "internal" artistic one. There are of course signs of this happening with the appearance for example of what Malcolm Miles calls "eco-aesthetics" (Miles 2014) and the examples of art works which are either themselves environmentally sensitive, or which actively promote an environmental program, and the emergence of other forms of activist art, some of which has a fairly long history and certainly some contemporary manifestations were inspired by the work of the social and cultural critic and counter-culture guru of the 1960s, Herbert Marcuse, particularly in his major work on art *The Aesthetic Dimension* (Marcuse 1978). What is significant about these kinds of works is that they are not concerned simply (as in much art historical discourse) with such internal issues as stylistic change, influences and changing use of colors or motifs, but with the much larger question of the relationship between culture and the wider society. Art is embedded in and influences the social, political and economic environments in which it is embedded. It both reflects and generated new cultural norms, and, as Marcuse argued a generation ago, it both disrupts the major codes

of the dominant society, and, by generating beauty (ideally!) subverts the repressive character of the oppressive character of "reality" by proposing and embodying alternatives, a view shared by his fellow-Marxist Ernst Fischer, who has argued that while art is often distorted and commodified under capitalism, it retains its essential function as the major source of cultural deconstruction and reconstruction (Fischer 2010).

In each case the underlying idea is that to create change, one must first be able to imagine it. This can be embodied in different practices—non-repressive forms of sociality and creativity, "re-enchantment", the rejection of the primacy of commodities, inspiring fresh visions of nature, "re-inflecting" to use Miles' term, or perhaps even better "infecting" with a new sense of values and cultural alternatives.

While we have here taken the arts as the paradigm case of such cultural possibilities, much the same principle—of seeking for sustainable, non-repressive, socially just and convivial alternatives to the unsustainable and often destructive nature of contemporary cultures—can be applied with a little imagination to many other fields. One obvious example, closely related in fact to art and design, is fashion. The fashion industry, while certainly providing us with a lot of entertainment and means of self-expression, is also highly commodified and extremely wasteful. The constant introduction of "new" styles, the vast over production of clothes which are never bought, the urge, fueled by advertising and the fashion industry itself and its relation to the media, for us to constantly discard and replace perfectly wearable and functional clothes for the "latest" styles which will in turn go "out of date" with remarkable speed all suggest a highly unsustainable and self-serving industry, but one that is so much part of our everyday environment that we hardly notice it. But we should and a number of commentators have turned their attention on this strange industry that occupies a central place in everyday and popular culture, but which is rarely examined either for its environmental impact or for its role in signaling and indeed creating social hierarchies and even forms of oppression (military uniforms, the uncomfortable dressing codes imposed on people—especially women—by religious and cultural expectations) (for an extended discussion see Fletcher and Tham 2014).

Any number of other cultural fields might follow the same pattern—food for example. The extensive, but often not-recognized dangers, facing the world food situation need urgent attention. These range across a number of issues—factory farming and its polluting effects and imposition of actual or almost suffering on animals, the carbon footprint of the meat

eating habit, and the destruction of forests and other habitats to simply grow feed-stuff for meat animals, particularly cows, over fishing which has drastically depleted "stocks" (as if other species were simply a resource for our exclusive use) ocean-wide, the diminishing population of bees, essential pollinators, from a variety of reasons probably including global warming and over-use of pesticides, declining water tables in areas of intensive industrial farming, the carbon-footprint of long distance transportation of foods by sea and trucks, and the sheer poor quality of the sugar laden, salty, hormone saturated, chemical filled and low nutritional value of the foods that we often end up with—and this is in the rich world, let alone the poor (Roberts 2009). The "slow food" movement, the move towards permaculture and organic farming, localism, the rise of farmers' markets, and concern over GMO foods are all aspects of positive reactions to these concerns (McKibben 2007). Related, but rarely discussed issues are those of food storage and freshness and even cooking itself, both in terms of energy use (for example the use of solar rather than wood or kerosene fueled stoves), all of which have an impact on health, the environment and the quality of the food finally eaten. Travel is another extremely important area: unnecessary air travel when tele-conferencing is possible, "binge-flying" and the vast amounts of agricultural land increasingly being taken over by new or expanded airports, every little city now seeming to want one, quite apart from the huge carbon footprint and consumption of non-renewable fossil fuels that the industry absolutely depends on. 75 % of the cars that pass my apartment contain just one person—a highly inefficient, noisy and even selfish use of a polluting, fuel burning and very low ratio of fuel to energy technology in a city in which a dense, safe and highly efficient public transportation system exists.

One final related example to that of the arts is of course urbanization and the crucial question, given the size of mega-cities all over the world and the tendency of rural dwellers to migrate to them, swelling their already, in many cases, gigantic size (Tokyo, Mexico City, Delhi, Beijing, Sao Paulo, Kolkata, Accra, Cairo…) and putting ever more pressure on urban services including such essentials as transportation, water, sanitation, waste disposal, education, health care and acceptable housing. Cities are also the centers of cultural production and consumption—publishers, bookshops, theatres, cinemas, art galleries, museums, universities, art schools, television studios and film maker's offices and studios, the home of writers, architects, artists and craftspeople, and the places to which tourists go to enjoy the resulting cultural riches. Multiple issues then arise—the sustainability of cities themselves, the

protection of local and minority cultures that often get lost in the process of rural-urban migration, the cultivation of the cultural riches of cities, including festivals, the architecture and heritage, convivial spaces such as parks and gardens, and the promotion of those convivial qualities by making access to cultural resources affordable and welcoming.

This means of course an active and inclusive policy, but one that not only stimulates cultural production and utilization, but does so in a sustainable way as a basic part of such policies. As suggested above, a weakness in the otherwise admirable Transition Movement is that it has not given much attention to the cultural aspects of such transformations. Cities, as key focal points of economies, political life, communications, and cultural activity, are necessarily equally key in achieving sustainability. To make them so requires cultural changes in such areas as transport (walk or cycle, don't drive, or if driving, share your car), housing (its size, energy efficiency and the ways in which its configurations promote or retard sociality—it being known that high density low-rise living is much more effective in these respects than high-rise), use of public spaces such as parks, safety, location of housing close to work places, encouragement of urban gardening, promoting pride in local urban cultural traditions and creating both social access and physical access (to the physically challenged for example), while celebrating the diversity and multi-culturalism of most contemporary big cities and the global resources that these bring in terms of foods, music, fashion and religion to otherwise local areas. Culture and the sustainability of cities go closely together (Nadarajah and Yamamoto 2007).

THE RELIGIOUS DIMENSIONS OF SUSTAINABILITY

As the first draft of this book was in progress, Pope Francis issued his important "eco-encyclical" *Laudato Si*, not only drawing attention to climate change as a phenomenon that can no longer be denied, but also to its causes—unbridled consumerism, despoliation of the natural environment in the pursuit of profit, the unjust and rapacious economic system that generates huge quantities of waste, including "human waste" in the form of the excluded, the exploited workers and those in many other ways marginalized by the very nature of laissez-faire capitalism, to say nothing of pollution, reckless and environmentally damaging resource extraction processes, and a general culture of selfishness. This is an important document, not only because it may galvanize the world's estimated 1.2 billion Roman

Catholics into a heightened environmental awareness as a central part of their thinking and relationship to the planet, but also because it is not a vaguely "spiritual" tract, but one which contains a stringent economic-political-social analysis highly critical of current economic and lifestyle practices and of the weak leadership of our political elites in addressing these critical global issues, and which suggests the appropriate changes necessary to creatively confront them. Its knock-on effects may be great as, although addressed primarily to Catholics, it obviously touches on the same theological and ethical issues shared by all Christians, Orthodox or Protestant as well as the Pope's primary constituency.

But in many ways the actual content is not new—many of these things have been said for years by environmentalists, critics of consumer capitalism, and those working in the field of development, especially those concerned with the lack of progress in addressing extreme poverty in many parts of the world. And they have also been said by a rapidly increasing chorus of religious leaders and writers from just about every religious persuasion. The same edition of *State of the World* that addresses consumerism, significantly contains a chapter entitled "Engaging Religions to Shape Worldviews" (Gardner 2010) and which discusses, albeit briefly, a large range of responses from contemporary religious teachings that address in particular climate change and environmental issues, including Chinese Taoist responses, Buddhism, Indigenous ecological and economic practices, Islamic finance, Jewish teachings on the Sabbath and which all in one way or another, drawing on their own specific scriptures and theology, address issues of the sacredness of the natural world, consumption and materialism, and raise questions about such issues as the desirability of vegetarianism, not only as a personal health measure, but as a planetary solution to the huge carbon footprint (amongst other issues) of meat eating and breeding animals for that purpose.

In fact the last decade has seen a huge outpouring of literature from within or commenting on the environmental teachings (many rather recently rediscovered) of the major religious traditions. Compendia such as *This Sacred Earth: Religion, Nature, Environment* (Gottlieb 2004), systematic texts such as the same editor's book *A Greener Faith: Religious Environmentalism and Our Planet's Future* (Gottlieb 2006), works coming from within specific religious traditions such as Buddhism, which has produced a large volume of literature (for example Tucker and Williams 1997, Kaza and Kraft 2000), Jainism (Chapple 2006), Indigenous religious traditions (Kinsley 1995), Shinto (Clammer 2010), Paganism (De Angeles et al. 2005), and in many other areas related to religion and

broader understandings of spirituality such as Eco-feminism and critiques of materialist science (van Lippe-Biesterfeld and van Tijn 2005). In may cases these religious responses to primarily ecological crisis, are related on the one hand to the emergence of Deep Ecology, and on the other to, at least in the Christian context, the slightly older critical tradition (also largely Catholic) of Liberation Theology, which has had a much stronger emphasis on the poor, issues of social and economic justice, and political transformations (again the literature is large, but for a representative sampling see Hennelly 1997). In fact it is within the field of liberation theologies that the connection is made between social justice and environmental justice and to link environmental abuses to social and economic ones. This is important, because a purely environmental emphasis can easily miss out those essential issues, although almost inevitably they have to touch on culture and values, again with consumerism as the leading culprit.

Within religious thinking such a positive shift is undoubtedly happening, and in a way the recent encyclical is but a summation of much of this thinking. A survey of relatively recent religious thinking, certainly over the last twenty years, has seen a big shift from simply traditional "theological" issues (although that term cannot be applied strictly in Buddhism or probably in Taoism) towards issues of social justice, peace, inter-religious dialogue around common themes and in particular of ecology. This is seen in the emergence of such significant movements as what is usually termed "Socially Engaged Buddhism" (for example Jones 2003), and parallel to it the discovery of "Engaged Islam" (Engineer 2010), the continuing vitality of Liberation Theology and the spread of its influence into Judaism from Christianity together with vital new thinking amongst Jewish leaders about what might equally well be called "Socially Engaged Judaism" (Ellis 1987, Lerner 1996) and the beginnings of "Socially Engaged Hinduism" and Hindu engagement with ecological issues (Naganathan 2004) in parts of India. In Islam one of the major engagements has been with economics, and the development of an Islamic economics that stresses charity to the poor, the absence of interest on loans and similar transactions, and the principle of social justice in economic arrangements which in turn structure much or even most of what goes on in society.

Despite the supposed in-roads of secularization, itself now a doubtful empirical and theoretical concept, it is evident that religion forms a major and critical part of culture just about everywhere. This is very true of Asia, Africa and Latin America, where the bulk of the world's population now live, but also in the places where secularization is supposed to have taken root

such as Europe and North America. But in fact we see religion alive and well everywhere—the resurgence of the Orthodox Church in Russia and Eastern Europe after the fall of communism, the powerful influence of so-called evangelical Christianity on North American politics and values (the gay marriage issue for example), the international influence of the Dalai Lama and his teachings and indeed quite widespread conversion to Buddhism in many places in the West and the emergence of specifically "Western Buddhism", the attraction of Sufism and of the extraordinary poetry of such Islamic mystics as Jelaluddin Rumi. Empirical studies of religion and culture in Asia have shown clearly the connections between religion and ethical cooperation across religious boundaries, its role in conflict resolution and post-conflict healing in damaged societies such as Sri Lanka, Cambodia, Fiji and Indonesia after the murderous coup of 1965, promoting peaceful social movements in Thailand, resisting nuclear testing and proliferation in the Pacific and promoting inter-civilizational dialogue (Camilleri 2001). Religion has played a not dissimilar role in South Africa, many parts of Central America and in many other contexts, including as it were "translating" the secular language of environmentalism into a language congruent with the spiritual expectations and world view of believers. It is significant too that there has been a shift towards a cultural dimension, and not one, as in an older "missiological" literature concerned with how to understand culture as a way of evangelizing the natives more effectively, but towards the ways in which a concerned *religious culture* can engage with issues of social change, underdevelopment, social injustice, and human liberation, and indeed proposes a model that goes beyond 'development' to a much wider notion of social transformation (Samuel and Sugden 1987).

The "bottom line" here should not be hard to see. While religion historically (and tragically in the contemporary world) has all too often been the source of violence, patriarchy, exclusion, reactionary thinking and numerous other ills, it does not have to be, and can on the contrary, be a profound force for positive change. This is precisely because religion is so often constituitive of culture, and for many people is their primary cultural identity and source of identity. Where religion acts to promote sustainability and values and lifestyles compatible with that sustainability it can have a profoundly transformative role, both at the level of individual behavior and at a much broader political and social level. It can modify and transform economic relations (and certainly in the past profoundly did so), re-orient people to concerns with social justice and ecological responsibility, provide them with a deep sense of meaning and identity outside of or in opposition

to the blandishments of consumer culture, and provide a sense of joy and satisfaction that far outweighs the all too temporary thrills of that culture. As with art of course, the challenge is to encourage those positive dimensions often in the face of resistance from conventional thinking, vested interests and hierarchies of power that benefit from the current arrangements despite the evidence of their widespread long term destructiveness.

In Summary

While the natural feeling amongst many is that our dominant culture is indeed a destructive and perhaps even more tragically a self-destructive one, despite all the signs of impending disaster (and for many actual contemporary disasters) a little investigation shows that there are many sources of renewal and energy within that civilization. In the arts, religion, design, environmental movements, peace movements, feminism, anti-racism, "alternative" medicine, agriculture, cooperative movements in housing, educational experiments, energy sources and many other contexts, thinking and practice are rapidly shifting towards sustainability in the search not only for a better world, but also in the recognition that without sustainability we do not have a future, or certainly not one worth living in—a denuded world empty of cultural and biological diversity, polluted, ugly and probably, for most of the survivors, poor. The challenge is to systematically encourage sustainability thinking in all fields of human activity—the arts, daily living, farming, industry, transportation, housing, waste disposal (and radical reduction), in the design of everything. But simply changing values is not enough: such a value shift has to be incorporated into new political structures, new forms of economic practice and new models of social transformation—of how to get from here to there, from an unsustainable present to a sustainable future—without violence and without unnecessary social dislocations. So it is to these that we must now turn, from the theory of sustainability to its operationalization in the real world.

Bibliography

Arons, Wendy, and Theresa J. May, eds. 2012. *Readings in Performance and Ecology*. New York and London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Assadourian, Erik. 2010. The Rise and Fall of Consumer Cultures. In *Worldwatch Institute, State of the World 2010: Transforming Cultures from Consumerism to Sustainability*, 3–20. London: Earthscan.

Besel, Richard D., and Jnan A. Blau, eds. 2014. *Performance on Behalf of the Environment*. Lanham, MD and Plymouth: Lexington Books.

Boal, Augusto. 2008. *Theatre of the Oppressed*. Trans. Charles A. and Maria-Odilia Leal McBride and Emily Fryer. London: Pluto Press.

Clammer, John 2014. *Vision and Society: Towards a Sociology and Anthropology from Art*. London and New York: Routledge.

Camilleri, Joseph A., ed. 2001. *Religion and Culture in Asia Pacific: Violence or Healing*? Melbourne: Vista Publications.

Chapple, Christopher Key. 2006. *Jainism and Ecology: Nonviolence in the Web of Life*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers.

Clammer, John. 2010. Engaged Shinto? Peace and Spiritualities of Nature in Indigenous and New Japanese Religions. In *Socially Engaged Religions*, ed. John Clammer, 50–61. Bangalore: Books for Change.

, ———. 2012. *Culture, Development and Social Theory: Towards an Integrated Social Development*. London and New York: Zed Books.

, ———. 2015a. *Art, Culture and International Development: Humanizing Social Transformation*. Abingdon and New York: Routledge.

Crehan, Kate. 2011. *Community Art: An Anthropological Perspective*. Oxford and New York: Berg.

Cullinan, Cormac. 2011. *Wild Law*: *A Manifesto for Earth Justice*. 2nd ed. White River Junction, VT: Chelsea Green.

Daly, Herman E. 1973. *Toward a Steady-State Economy*. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman and Company.

De Angeles, Ly, Emma Restall Orr and Thom van Dooren (eds.). (2005). *Pagan Visions for a Sustainable Future*. Woodbury, MN: Llewellyn Publications.

Edwards, Andres R. 2005. *The Sustainability Revolution: Portrait of a Paradigm Shift*. Gabriola Island, BC: New Society Publishers.

Ellis, Marc H. 1987. *Towards a Jewish Theology of Liberation*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.

Engineer, Asghar Ali. 2010. Engaged Islam. In *Socially Engaged Religions*, ed. John Clammer, 130–140. Bangalore: Books for Change.

Fischer, Ernst. 2010. *The Necessity of Art*. Trans. Anna Bostock, with an Introduction by John Berger. London and New York: Verso.

Fletcher, Kate, and Mathilda Tham, eds. 2014. *Routledge Reader of Sustainability and Fashion*. London and New York: Routledge.

Gablik, Suzi. 2002. *The Reenchantment of Art*. New York and London: Thames and Hudson.

Ganguly, Sanjoy. 2010. *Jana Sanskriti: Forum Theatre and Democracy in India*. London and New York: Routledge.

Gardner, Gary. 2010. Engaging Religions to Shape Worldviews. In *Worldwatch Institute, State of the World 2010: Transforming Cultures from Consumerism to Sustainability*, 23–29. London: Earthscan.

Garrett, Ian. 2012. Theatrical Production's Carbon Footprint. In *Readings in Performance and Ecology*, eds. Wendy Arons, and Theresa J. May, 201–209. New York and London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Gottlieb, Roger S. ed. 2004. *This Sacred Earth: Religion, Nature, Environment.* 2nd ed. New York and London: Routledge.

, ——— 2006. *A Greener Faith: Religious Environmentalism and Our Planet's Future.* Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Hanley, Mary Stone, George W. Noblit, Gilda L. Sheppard, and Tom Barone, eds. 2013. *Culturally Relevant Arts Education for Social Justice: A Way Out of No Way.* London and New York: Routledge.

Hawken, Paul. 2008. *Blessed Unrest: How the Largest Social Movement in History is Restoring Grace, Justice and Beauty to the World.* New York: Penguin Books.

Hennelly, Alfred T. 1997. *Liberation Theologies: The Global Pursuit of Justice.* Mystic, CT: Twenty-Third Publications.

Hopkins, Bob. 2008. *The Transition Handbook: From Oil Dependency to Local Resilience.* White River Junction, VT: Chelsea Green Publishing.

Jackson, Naomi, and Toni Shapiro-Phim, eds. 2008. *Dance, Human Rights, and Social Justice: Dignity in Motion.* Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.

Jackson, Shannon. 2011. *Social Works: Performing Art, Supporting Publics.* New York and Abingdon: Routledge.

Jones, Ken. 2003. *The New Social Face of Buddhism.* Boston: Wisdom Publications.

Jones, Laura K., ed. 2010. *A Hedonist's Guide to Art.* London: Filmers Ltd.

Kaza, Stephanie, and Kenneth Kraft. 2000. *Dharma Rain: Sources of Buddhist Environmentalism.* Boston and London: Shambhala.

Kinsley, David. 1995. *Ecology and Religion: Ecological Spirituality in Cross-Cultural Perspective.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Korten, David C. 2006. *The Great Turning: From Empire to Earth Community.* San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers and New York: Kumarian Press.

Kundera, Milan. 1990. *The Art of the Novel.* London: Faber and Faber.

, ———. 1996. *Testaments Betrayed.* London: Faber and Faber.

Lailach, Michael. 2007. *Land Art.* Cologne and London: Taschen.

Landy, R.J., and D.T. Montgomery. 2012. *Theatre for Change: Education, Social Action and Therapy.* New York and London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Lederach, John Paul. 2005. *The Moral Imagination: The Art and Soul of Making Peace.* New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lerner, Michael. 1996. *The Politics of Meaning: Restoring Hope and Possibility in an Age of Cynicism.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Marcuse, Herbert. 1978. *The Aesthetic Dimension.* Boston: Beacon Press.

McDonough, William, and Michael Braungart. 2002. *Cradle to Cradle: Remaking the Way We Make Things.* New York: North Point Press.

Mckibben, Bill. 2007. *Deep Economy: The Wealth of Communities and the Durable Future*. New York: Holt.

Meadows, Donella. 1999. *Leverage Points: Places to Intervene in a System*. Hartland, VT: The Sustainability Institute.

Miles, Malcolm. 2014. *Eco-Aesthetics: Art, Literature and Architecture in a Period of Climate Change*. London and New York: Bloomsbury.

Murphy, Brian. 1999. *Transforming Ourselves, Transforming the World: An Open Conspiracy for Social Change*. London and New York: Zed Books.

Nadarajah, N., and Ann Tomoko Yamamoto, eds. 2007. *Urban Crisis: Culture and the Sustainability of Cities*. Tokyo and New York: United Nations University Press, and Jaipur and New Delhi: Rawat Publications.

Naganathan, G. 2004. *Ecological Spirituality: Hindu Scriptural Perspectives*. New Delhi: New Age Books.

Nussbaum, Martha C. 2010. *Not for Profit: Why Democracy Needs the Humanities*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press.

O'Sullivan, Edmund. 1999. *Transformative Learning: Educational Vision for the 21st Century*. London and New York: Zed Books.

Rae, Paul. 2009. *Theatre and Human Rights*. Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Roberts, Paul. 2009. *The End of Food*. Boston and New York: Mariner Books.

Samuel, Vinay, and Chris Sugden. 1987. *The Church in Response to Human Need. Grand Rapids: William B.* Eerdmans and Oxford: Regnum Books.

Schwartz, Michiel, and Diana Krabbendam. 2013. *Sustainist Design Guide*. Amsterdam: BIS Publishers.

Tucker, Mary Evelyn, and Duncan Ryuken Williams. 1997. *Buddhism and Ecology: The Interconnections of Dharma and Deeds*. Harvard: Harvard Center for the Study of World Religions.

Unger, Roberto Mangabeira. 2001. *False Necessity: Anti-Necessitarian Social Theory in the Service of Radical Democracy*. London and New York: Verso.

Urbain, Olivier. 2015. *Music and Conflict Transformation: Harmonies and Dissonances in Geopolitics*. London and New York: I.B. Taurus.

Van Lippe-Biesterfeld, Irene, and Jessica van Tijn. 2005. *Science, Soul and the Spirit of Nature: Leading Thinkers on the Restoration of Man and Creation*. Rochester, VT: Bear and Company.

Wines, James. 2008. *Green Architecture*. Cologne and London: Taschen.

Worldwatch Institute. 2010. *State of the World 2010: Transforming Cultures from Consumerism to Sustainability*. London: Earthscan.

———. 2011. *State of the World 2011: Innovations that Nourish the Planet*. New York and London: W.W. Norton and Company.

Culture and Economy: Rethinking the Relationship

It should be immediately evident that culture is profoundly shaped by the economy with which it is associated. In a capitalist economy the greater amount of culture is commodified. Entertainment is delivered to us (manufactured by distant media corporations) through television, CDs, DVDs, and streaming on the Internet. Most of us are more likely to go and watch, rather than participate in, a play, concert or ballet. We go to art galleries to see art, rather than to produce it. Despite the illusion of "choice" most of our cultural production is pre-packaged, pre-determined and non-interactive. Of course we have choices: we can turn off the TV or not own one at all, avoid or ignore the more violent and mindless movies, stay away from art galleries where we think the work displayed is trivial or offensive. But these actions are negations rather than active positive relationships. The overall result is twofold: the content of most of our cultural consumption is determined for us, is hard to avoid, often glorifies if not actually promotes violent and anti-social behavior and is the result of a huge carbon footprint on the one hand, and on the other a lot of our own cultural production is relegated to the realm of "hobbies" or leisure, unless we happen to be professional artists, dancers, potters, film makers or sportspeople. A great deal of what is called "popular culture" is in fact hardly that except in the sense that it is consumed en mass and across a wide social spectrum; it is certainly not folk art and rarely arises from within communities, but is imposed on them.

A much more extended case can be made of the effects of economy on patterns of everyday life—what we wear and eat, how we travel, the nature

of our housing arrangements, even our ways of celebrating or expressing love and affection. And this is quite apart from the huge critical literature examining the effects of capitalist economies on livelihoods (or lack of), work conditions, migration, development (or underdevelopment), patterns of globalization and the forms of exclusion and marginalization that it gives rise to, as well as its effects on the environment. But the basic issue seems to be this: that we have somewhere in the last century or so experienced the great reversal in which our cultural and social life has become the handmaiden of economics, not the other way around. This is not a book on economics, and a sophisticated literature exists on the relationship between the dominant economic systems of today (largely capitalist ones) and the environment and social order, including its role in promoting or indeed creating climate change. The intention here, rather, is to explore the relationships between economy and culture working from one basic assumption: that if the economy deeply determines the nature of culture, we need a new economy in order to achieve a sustainable culture. Cultures and economies are always deeply mutually embedded as the study of anthropology has long shown, and what is true of "simpler" societies is equally true of large scale ones. The study of economic anthropology shows the ways in which, in many actually existing or historical societies, a highly effective symbiosis has been achieved between culture and economy, leading to long term environmental and social sustainability (Clammer 2015b). An unsustainable economy (to say nothing of one which is unjust) cannot possibly support a sustainable culture. The reverse is also of course true—an unsustainable culture can only promote economic practices which are wasteful, polluting, resource consuming and which may well have an undesirable feedback loop—sugary canned drinks for example, widely advertised as "cool", end up promoting diabetes and obesity (and the cans end up in the trash).

Our concern then in this chapter is not to discuss economies as such, but to explore what might be called the "political economy" of culture, not with the primary intention of critically exploring links between economy and culture (that has successfully been done in works such as Smart 2003), but with the more constructive agenda of exploring how a creative dialogue between culture and economy can promote patterns of sustainability in both. They must in fact go together: if culture is embedded in economy, so economy reflects cultural values, often unexamined but very much present nevertheless. The classical economics that underpins neo-liberal economies is certainly not a value free enterprise as its practitioners and fans would like to suggest: the very

language that it uses—"value", "efficiency", "employment", "productivity", its understanding of such concepts as "work", or even "money"—are all deeply cultural and would not be shared either in other cultures or even in the past in what are now capitalist ones (Hirschman 1981). James Carrier and Daniel Miller have even gone so far as to argue that economics is a "virtual science"—one that in fact creates or invents the very categories that it purports to describe, and on the basis of which policies are made that have profound (although obviously distorted) effects on the real world (Carrier and Miller 1998).

Linking Culture and Economy

There have been a number of insightful attempts to examine, if not specifically the relationship between culture and economy, certainly the characteristics of contemporary economies that cause the most concern for the possibility of the flourishing of a sustainable culture. One of the best known of these is the now classic work of E.F. Schumacher *Small is Beautiful: A Study of Economics as if People Mattered* (1974), and its less well known companion book *Good Work* (1980). The essential problem for Schumacher is that economics, rather than becoming a means to serve humankind "tends to absorb the whole of ethics" (1974: 67). The pursuit of the large scale and increased division of labor has, rather than producing the good life for the greatest number, generated inefficiencies, a disastrous impact on the environment, and in very many cases poor working conditions—whether hazardous, unhealthy, monotonous, or, even in the case of "white collar" jobs, meaningless and unfulfilling activities, long hours (and probably long commutes to get to work at all) and insecurity in terms of contracts, pay and conditions.

Even the relatively secure working environment of the 1950s–1970s in much of the 'developed' world has disappeared, to be replaced with "just-in-time" production settings, short contracts rather than tenure, bizarre arrangements like "zero hours contacts" (in which workers are hired on an hourly basis, but given no guarantees of the hours that they can actually expect to work, which might total zero on a given day or week if "demand" is low), and contracts arranged in such a way that it is legally possible for employers not to have to pay social security or pension contributions. Yet as Marx pointed out long before Schumacher, work is not just something we do, but part of our identity formation. Why else when meeting a stranger at a party do we immediately ask, as apparently the

British queen does, "and what do you do?" In speaking of what he in his main book and elsewhere (Schumacher 1973) calls a "Buddhist economics" he suggests that "The Buddhist point of view takes the function of work to be at least threefold: to give a man a chance to utilize and develop his faculties, to enable him to overcome his egocentredness by joining with others in a common task; and to bring forth the goods and services needed for a becoming existence" and that as a result "sees the essence of civilization not in a multiplication of wants but in the purification of human character. Character, at the same time, is formed primarily by a man's work" (Schumacher 1974: 52–53).

This the modern economy does not encourage. On the contrary, it stimulates greed, wants, individualism and the assessment of status in terms of material possessions. It is, in Buddhist terms then, a system of craving, and this is not accidental to its character but is its essential quality. Such a system can only lead to competition and violence. The alternative is, in Schumacher's words (and here he is clearly building on the work of the Gandhian economist J.C. Kumarappa) "a lifestyle designed for permanence". This he illustrates with what he called "three preliminary examples" notably

> …in agriculture and horticulture, we can interest ourselves in the perfection of production methods which are biologically sound, build up soil fertility, and produce health, beauty and permanence. Productivity will then look after itself. In industry, we can interest ourselves in the evolution of small-scale technology, relatively non-violent technology, 'technology with a human face', so that people have a chance to enjoy themselves while they are working, instead of working solely for their pay packet and hoping, usually forlornly, for enjoyment solely during their leisure time. In industry again—and, surely, industry is the pace-setter of modern life—we can interest ourselves in new forms of partnership between management and men, even forms of common ownership. (Schumacher 1974: 19)

Appropriate technology, worker management, permanence and education are the key elements in this model.

It is significant however that while Schumacher does address some of the issues generated by large scale industry, including what he rather dismissively calls "the environmental problem", his approach does not provide a deep structural analysis of capitalism or to fundamental changes in it. His method is to suggest an ethical critique—his "Buddhist economics", and then piecemeal "solutions" in the form of "human scale" technology and

more workers' control. While the ethical critique is undoubtedly sound if rather moralizing, the lack of a structural approach leaves the basic economic system largely intact—just scaled down and partially democratized. This, despite the huge influence of his book when it first came out, does not take us very far in the direction of sustainability, except in the sense that his idea of "permanence" fits within the general paradigm that Herman Daly calls, to the horror no doubt of conventional (and hence growth addicted) economists, a "steady-state economy" (Daly 1973)—that essentially a finite planet needs a finite economics (and economy)—one that lives within its limited (and usually non-renewable) resources and has limited carry capacity for large numbers of predatory humans and has already reached or passed the point at which bio-system services can cope with the strain put upon them by pollution, chemically based farming, profligate use of water and oil resources, deforestation and habitat destruction, over fishing and the other usual culprits. It may be indeed that the steady state economy is no longer adequate—that our critical situation now requires what the French alternative economist Serge Latouche calls "de-growth"—a retreat from our present situation rather than simply stabilizing it, an idea to which we will return (Latouche 2010).

Many of the ideas similar to Schumacher's suggestions have in fact been incorporated into cooperatives, communes of various forms, direct marketing networks, community supported agriculture, and many other initiatives, with some countries such as Italy, Spain, Columbia, Brazil, Ecuador and the former Yugoslavia during its socialist period pioneering such approaches (Bateman 2015). In most cases surveyed of consumers who bought produce from such enterprises, saving money proved to be the least important factor in the decision, far outweighed by health concerns, desire to support local farmers, building new social ties, environmental concerns and the feeling of participation in a positive social activity. Conviviality trumped economics is every case (Grasseni et al. 2015: 189). It is clear that ideally people want their economy to not only avoid its potential downsides (pollution, environmental destruction, promotion of inequality and so forth), but to actively encourage not just "economic" activity, but production and consumption patterns, and the important relationships between them, that build social capital. There is obviously a huge difference between an anonymous transaction at the check-out desk of a large supermarket and a personal relationship with a farmer through community supported agriculture or at a farmers' market, quite apart from the health benefits of eating fresh, local and seasonal produce and the

large reduction of the carbon footprint that results. But implicit in such experiments, of which there are a large number around the globe, if not always fully articulated, is not only a conception of alternative *economies*, but also of an alternative *economics*. In other words a theoretical body of principles that both lays out the principles on which such economies operate, and shows how it is superior to the outcomes of neoliberal economics: that it actively promotes positive environmental relationships, is non-hierarchical and non-exclusionary, conserves resources and enhances relationships between its participants.

While critiques of neoliberalism, its associated globalization, the assumptions of its economics, and its negative effects in the real world abound, there have been fewer attempts to formulate a genuinely alternative economics. One of the most interesting, and emerging from the same period that saw the publication of Schumacher's book, is the pioneering work of Hazel Henderson in her two books *Creating Alternative Futures: The End of Economics* (1978) and *The Politics of the Solar Age: Alternatives to Economics* (1988). These books are both trenchant critiques of the assumptions and methodology of conventional economics (a critique that has now been taken up by many other voices, including the work of 'ecological economists'), and a sketch of proposals for a transformed future that has many implications for a culture of sustainability. Since, to reiterate the basic theme of this chapter, the economy shapes culture in fundamental ways, so it is necessary to explore how that potentially transformed future might arise from deep changes in the nature of the economy.

Henderson begins by arguing that the basis of major economic changes will necessarily emerge from changes in energy sources and use "And since energy is the basis for all industrial activities and material transformations, this augers a major transition in our economy, technology and, more importantly, our values" (1978: 1). In our context in this chapter, it is of course that last point that is the most significant. And as the history of science and technology show, a major paradigm shift in those spheres triggers major cultural shifts. If this is true of the natural sciences, it is perhaps even more so of economics, and Henderson's denunciation of conventional economics, which she sees as having been largely responsible for leading us into our present crisis (fueled by a philosophy of growth, resource extraction, waste generation on a huge scale, the treatment of workers as mere interchangeable things, ecological destruction and inattention to the "externalities" provided "free" by bio-services) is harsh: "a pseudoscience whose inappropriate concepts, language and methods

are now impeding the needed public debate about *what* is valuable under changing conditions" (1978: 27). After many pages of detailed critique of economic theory and policies, Henderson finally comes to a summation which contrasts what she calls "Hard technological societies" with "Soft" ones. The former are ecologically destructive, require very large energy inputs from non-renewable sources and materials, have economies linked to mass production, are growth oriented, destructive of local cultures, often have high unemployment levels, tend to chemically based agriculture of monocultures, are city based and contain high levels of risk—from technological accidents, unforeseen by products of what appear to be sound scientific or social innovations (think nuclear energy, smoking, carbonated canned drinks, the motor car…), and promote high levels of individualism destructive of community.

The "soft" society on the other hand is ecologically sound and deeply appreciates nature, requires small energy inputs (from renewable sources), recycles and practices "cradle to cradle" production methods, emphasizes local cultures, crafts, languages and regional production, encourages community, has no concept of unemployment since everyone is usefully employed in some socially valuable activity, stresses permaculture and bio-dynamic farming, represents a steady—state economy and while not necessarily anti-urban, appreciates the pleasures of living in smaller communities in close relationship to nature. Above all, such a society, much like its predecessors studied by anthropologists, is inherently sustainable. Indeed its whole way of life (which of course has other interesting elements such as use of transport, housing arrangements, education, family structures, care of the aged, artistic production, clothing and participation in what is already being called a "sharing economy") is predicated on sustainability, non-alienation, conviviality. In fact on both an economy and society of permanence, since both are, in this scenario, simply facets of the same reality, not, as in so many contemporary situations, separate and even antagonistic rivals, in which "culture"—almost all the aspects of everyday life in a "soft" society!—are pushed into the realm of "leisure" (itself usually commodified and often technological in nature) as opposed to "work". It is significant that after *Small is Beautiful*, Schumacher wrote a further book on work, understood as a form not of slavery, but of the pleasure in producing useful goods and services, of perfecting gifts and skills, and of service to and in collaboration with, others.

It is interesting that in all the models of possible sustainable societies which we will examine in a later chapter, it is these "soft" characteristics

that predominate (as it does significantly in a lot of science fiction, which while projecting human civilization into the far future or onto other planets, often represents that future as a kind of high-tech medievalism in which we all wear cloaks and gowns even though we are capable of tele-portation and other wonders.) In her second book Henderson, while extending and deepening her critique of economics and the policy disasters that it has led our "leaders" to perpetrate, rightly argues for a holistic approach to society on the basis that all of our problems (and hence solutions) are interconnected. She identifies seven main interdependent processes currently driving the changes in our lives: production and technology; employment, work and migration, finance, debt and information (the latter which she argues has become a form of money); the arms race and militarization; global pollution and resource-depletion; culture and consumption; and "the multiple realignments and restructurings driven by the six globalization processes" with the observation that "These processes are circular and interactive and all are accelerating due to their interactivity, and they are irreversible" (Henderson 1988: 9). She is basically right, although the issue of their reversibility is precisely the theme of this book. And in fact Henderson is herself optimistic in going on to coin the concept of what she calls the "solar age": one in which we go far beyond simply the shift to solar and renewable resource-based societies to a much larger paradigm shift encompassing the replacement of reductionist and mechanistic thinking with holistic forms of knowledge that learn from the Earth itself, and to recognizing that true "development" cannot be simply economic, but requires collective management of the global commons, including the air, the oceans and even space (1988: 21).

In fact vast creative possibilities exist to promote such a paradigm shift—activists, scientists, technologists in fields such as renewable energy, human rights, environmental protection, animal rights, consumer, protection, peace, anti-nuclear movements, performing arts, community housing, permaculture, design, community currencies and innovative forms of what Henderson calls "the countereconomy" in which ever new forms of locally appropriate informal, barter, sharing, gardening and outside-the-cash-economy activities are emerging, and new forms of political movements that are neither "Left" nor "Right" according to the old categories. An issue which Henderson touches on, and to which we will return in detail in a later chapter, is that of "transition"—of how to move from these many and usually small scale experiments to a much wider and structural social transformation. Without these "scaling ups"

such alternatives remain as merely interstices in the wider and on-going capitalist/extractive economy. It maybe, as some science fiction writers have suggested, that these will be the survivors of a post-capitalist apocalypse, and this maybe so, but it behoves us I think to look for other transformative possibilities that will not merely secure the future for a tiny and probably rather primitive remnant.

The key, Henderson suggests, lies in value transformation, for "As a cultural value system changes, new sets of options and potential new patterns for cultural evolution emerge. Human value systems have always changed, often when presented with natural environmental challenges or environmental changes caused by human activity" (Henderson 1988: 155). Again she is correct, but seems to see values as generating the economic and the scientific, whereas I prefer a rather more "Marxist" approach in which, given the hegemony of the economic system and economic concepts over huge areas of contemporary life, it is the economy which to a great extent generates and promotes values. That is not to say that values do not exist outside of the economy—in certain "non-utilitarian" activities such as art, and certainly in religion, an area never touched upon by Henderson. But even there economics enters the equation in such areas as Islamic prohibitions on interest (something also true of medieval Christianity) and the "sabbatical" and rules of fair dealing in ancient Judaism, all of which recognize I think the very point that we are emphasizing here—that values (including very much religious ones) are often best expressed (literally, as honesty, fairness, recognition of genuine need, avoidance of fraud and profiteering) through economic relationships. Simply promoting the desirable values then only goes some of the way: they need to be enshrined in social practices (in this immediate context economic ones) or tend to be ineffective in practical expression, however much they might be part of an individual's personal "value" system. History surely tragically points this up. As Zygmunt Bauman illustrates in his seminal book (Bauman 1999), it was members of the nation of Kant, Wagner, Beethoven, Luther, Bach (and after 1938 with the absorption of Austria) Mozart who ran the death camps of the Holocaust. Indeed the poignant weight of Bauman's book is precisely his argument that the Holocaust was not an aberration of Western history, but the outcome, the logical end point, of modernity and its socio-economic patterns. It would be tragic indeed if a future Bauman should need to write a book explaining how the collapse of our current civilization was the logical outcome of our own socio-economic processes, culminating in an ecological holocaust that would also of course be the source of

immense suffering for what might remain of the human race. The real Bauman has in fact more or less done as much in his incisive books on the "human waste" of contemporary globalization as well as its environmental impact (Bauman 2004).

Looking Back, Looking Forwards

It is evident that the politically and culturally exciting decades of the 1960s–1980s produced some of the most innovating "alternative" thinking and set out clearly issues that are, tragically, still very much with us. This is not because of the quality of that thinking, but for several other reasons: the "short-termism" of our political leaders, the huge vested interests of the fossil fuel and other extractive industries and those, such as the car industry, that are parasitic on it, the juggernaut like qualities of globalization and the seemingly unstoppable forces of more, faster, bigger, that it has set in motion, and the failure of much of the alternative thinking to turn into any sort of coherent political movement. With the more or less complete demise of the Old Left (not necessarily a bad thing as most in that movement, while certainly anti-capitalist, were as committed to industrialization, pollution and militarization as their Right wing opponents) no systematic political alternative has emerged. Certainly collectively the myriad "Third Sector" movements constitute a potentially strong political lobby, but still only potentially so. Many of its members still vote along the old party lines of their home countries—Democrat/ Republican, Conservative/Liberal/Labour—with a small minority voting for a Green party and a frighteningly large number voting for extreme Right wing parties. Yet it is not really clear that any of these historic divisions any longer match the reality of the contemporary world or the scale of its planetary crisis. *Political culture*, as well as culture in its more conventional sense, is of enormous significance, and is also a theme that we will develop in detail later in the book.

What is encouraging however is that the "alternatives" have a great deal in common, and that alone is a source of hope: the basis for a common economic/cultural program does exist and is based on many practical experiments and a substantial theoretical literature. An examination of some of these examples illustrates this well, and the theme of how economies of sustainability and cultures of sustainability cannot be separated. Indeed, the social critic Michael Albert uses the term hope in the very title of one of his recent books in which he argues for what he calls

"participatory economics", a blueprint for beginning the reconstruction of the economy in ways compatible with a socially just post-capitalist world (Albert 2014).

Among these common themes is a cosmopolitan spirit that is quite different from globalization. While the latter implies homogenization, the former celebrates cultural and local differences and their manifestations in art, music, drama, architecture, food, fashion and just about everything else. This is not just a moral position affirming equality, although it most certainly is that too, but a drawing attention to the many local sustainability initiatives in farming, irrigation, water harvesting and a hundred other practical applications, and to the vast body of traditional knowledge on any number of subjects from agriculture to natural medicine that inhabit the globe and are all too easily eroded or repressed by the hegemony of "scientific" or "rational" reasoning that are reflected in many kinds of dominant thought. But as the anthropologist Marshall Sahlins has pointed out, this domination is not necessarily because of actual superiority, but because of the specific historical circumstances that allowed certain forms of Western "local" knowledge to become universalized and the standards for everybody else's (Sahlins 1996). The cultural resources of the "South" are full of sustainable practices, wisdom and spiritual traditions, most of which do not share the colonizing, patronizing and globalizing characteristics of so much Western thought and practice. And as Trent Schroyer points out in his introduction to a book of social and economic alternatives, not only is the South the repository of such knowledge(s), but has also been the site not only of survival (for some) but also of resistance: "How these people have actually survived and how they have resisted the forces of globalization, regimes of accumulation and colonizing forms of regulation is a source for alternative futures and social orders that is mined here" (Schroyer 1997: 2).

Such a position is built on a number of assumptions: that new norms and definitions of "development" are needed; that forms of both political and economic injustice are at the roots of most conflicts and that peace cannot be secured by military means, but only by redressing those real grievances; that globalization in its current form is mostly negative in its impact on the environment, workers (especially migrant ones), local cultures and national and international levels of inequality; and that capitalism is incompatible with ecological preservation (Kovel 2002) and so a radically new form of economy is urgently required. Allied to these assumptions is that any new order must be democratic in its political

structure and must give voice to all parties concerned (which is of course everybody). Autonomous development with full participation is thus the obvious model to which such thinking gravitates. It may well be that as a result, debates about "scaling up" smaller experiments, whether of consumer cooperatives, producer networks or whatever, are actually in many cases beside the point: here small really is beautiful (the issue being not one of scale, but of the leverage that such counter-organizations have collectively to transform the larger and hostile system). The specific elements will vary from place to place, and may include different emphases: food sovereignty perhaps, water rights, new taxation structures (including such proposals as the ones currently being discussed to tax international speculative capital movements-the "Tobin Tax"), to tax polluters, or even to tax soft drinks based on their sugar content in much the same way that tobacco is taxed, soft drinks contributing substantially to obesity, diabetes and dental costs. These are all positive: constant alertness to violations of the norms of a sustainable and convivial society, including constant pressure on politicians to pay major attention to these issues and demanding accountability and transparency in all policy decisions, would also be required, as sustainability is not an end state, but a goal in constant need of defense and protection.

Phrased in this kind of way, rather than foreseeing a future of deprivation and decline in "standards of living", one can envisage a future with a high quality of life, a pleasing simplicity, high levels of sharing and hence of social relationships, enormous celebration of cultural differences and with much lower levels of stress, pollution of all kinds resulting in much higher levels of health, longevity and general satisfaction with life. If we live in a broken civilization then we need to fix it. There are many ways to do this. Some involve learning from the past and from contemporary societies that have achieved a large degree of sustainability, and this is where the vast ethnographic knowledge of anthropology comes into play. Another is to calmly envisage possible futures in the light of our current knowledge and to plan for one or more of them. Again this not need be a scenario of despair at all, but an act of creativity and imagination and indeed excitement. Most of us would agree that we would not like to throw away many of the medical advances that have been made to date, or with certain other conveniences on which we now increasingly rely such as the Internet, and maybe we will not have to—more natural diets and lifestyle would reduce disease, and there is a big difference between utilizing the Internet and being addicted to it. So let us turn to some of these possibilities.

Economies and Societies of Reciprocity

I have argued at length elsewhere very recently (Clammer 2012, 2015b) and long before (Clammer 1985) that anthropology, and in particular economic anthropology, is a valuable tool for examining alternative economies, since it deals with actually existing or historically recent societies, many of which maintained sustainability over long periods of time. In virtually every case the "embeddedness" of the economy in society and culture (rather than the other way around) is taken for granted, and this is across a wide range of socio-economic types—hunting-gathering, pastoralist, agricultural, fishing, trading and proto-industrial, a wide range of habitats (desert, rain forest, savannah, coastal and so forth), social structures ranging from almost completely egalitarian to hierarchical, and a wide variety of religious practices and beliefs. A very large body of ethnographic literature exists, but here I will simply take up two issues as a way into a discussion of societies of reciprocity: Indigenous Knowledge and the sociology of the gift.

Anthropologists have long recognized the value of the indigenous knowledge possessed by other cultures, but this issue has more recently sprung back into prominence (for example Sillitoe 1998, Sillitoe et al. 2002). There seem to be two main reasons for this: one being that such knowledge contains masses of information on herbal drugs, agricultural techniques, pest control and many other issues including such abilities as navigating in deep forest or on the open sea without benefit of any technological aids, and of course this knowledge could be very useful to the rest of us. The other is that many of these societies have achieved long term sustainability often with high degrees of social harmony (although there is always the danger of over romanticizing them) and so provide models, albeit on a relatively small scale, of how this might be done. Their disappearance is alarming, not only because of the loss of cultural and linguistic diversity, but also because they take with them unrecoverable knowledge embodied in their practices and wisdom traditions, and also in their social practices. One of these, that has attracted the attention of anthropologists for a century, are the patterns of reciprocity that create on going social harmony, exchange and sociality, often expressed through the medium of gift giving. And as many of those anthropologists have also noted, gift giving is not just the exchange of objects, but a deeply symbolic process which reflects or creates the very social order that it symbolizes. Giving of course has not disappeared from contemporary societies, and

it is interesting to reflect on how the gift economy and social patterns of what were once patronizingly referred to as "simpler" societies (they are rarely simple) might inform our own search for sociality and conviviality.

In both these cases the lessons of this vast range of societies can be understood as a source of wisdom for us supposed sophisticates. Long before the advent of modern science and technology a vast range of societies have persisted over long periods of historical time, and much of the evidence suggests that their longevity (essentially another word for sustainability) would have been even more extended were it not for external conquests, as with the North American First Peoples, or, as they became larger and more powerful, that they themselves (as we are now doing), began to disregard the rules of environmental sustainability and thus brought about their own collapse (Diamond 2005). The "indigenous knowledge" was there, but it was ignored. One of the advantages of living in a globalized world is that we can draw on the totality of this vast range of wisdom that is the distillation of centuries of actually coping with ecological challenges of many kinds. But it needs to be remembered that not only ecological knowledge is involved here: sustainable cultures have always been ones with an economy and a social structure that promotes lifestyles compatible with that goal.

In many the link between economy and society (in fact simply facets of each other) is the gift economy. A gift economy is essentially one in which exchange (of objects, and sometimes of people, especially in the form of wives) is designed to create or strengthen social relationships, not to amass wealth. In fact in classical gift economies, such as those to be found in Oceania, the objects are never kept, but are constantly re-cycled to keep the network of reciprocity going: to horde is to break the cycle, which is socially totally unacceptable. A chief in such societies (for example Fiji) appears to be rich—he apparently accumulates large quantities of gifts, but in fact he is simply a conduit and his own status depends on his passing on of those goods and favors. This social logic is not only found in smaller scale societies—contemporary Japan for example is a gift society on a very large scale, and the logic is the same: a gift is not to be kept but in some equivalent form is to be returned or passed on, the underlying principles being of reciprocity and generosity. Sustainable cultures, both socially and ecologically, have long existed. They paradoxically break down rather than become enhanced or scaled up under the impact of "modernization": it is often the process of "development" that brings about their destruction and with it the loss of cultural diversity and the bio-diversity

that such cultures often also maintain as an essential element in their own sustainability. (For a classic example see Helena Norberg-Hodge's lovely book *Ancient Futures*, 2009).

One of the "secrets" of such societies has been the prioritizing of the social over the economic in the sense that economics serves society, not the other way around. This has a number of implications including the deliberate limiting of "growth", not just because too much surplus is difficult to store in places that probably don't have electricity, but because surpluses generate inequalities. There is a large difference between poverty and simplicity, and the deliberate (social) limiting of "needs" does not imply the former, but as again the anthropologist Marshall Sahlins has classically pointed out in his rightly famous essay on "The Original Affluent Society" in his *Stone Age Economics* (Sahlins 1972) actually promotes more leisure time, more time for cultural production and performance, less competition and far more conviviality.

While some commentators (such as Herman Daly) have argued for a no-growth or "steady state" economy, others, such as the French alternative economist Serge Latouche, who has promoted the even more radical idea of "De-growth" (in a number of books, but here I will refer the reader mainly to Latouche 2010 which provides a good summary and synthesis of his ideas). In Latouche's model, de-growth does not simply mean contracting the economy, since to do so (particularly in a rapid way) would bring about instant unemployment and numerous other major problems. Rather "de-growth is conceivable only in a de-growth society, or in other words within the framework of a system that is based on a different logic" (Latouche 2010: 8), or as he goes onto suggest, in an "a-growth" society (in the sense that we talk about "a-theism"). De-growth, which in practical terms involves many relatively conventional ideas—re-cycle, re-use, work less but consume less—is not simply those, many of which are practiced by large numbers of people without bringing down the capitalist system. De-growth is rather a kind of total attitude which can "open up a space for inventiveness and creativity of the imagination, which has been blocked by economistic, developmentalist and progressive totalitarianism" (Latouche 2010: 9). We must then "decolonize our imaginaries" (2010: 13) as we are often unaware of the extent to which they have been insidiously taken over by the images, desires and identity-formation mechanisms of consumer capitalism. This requires a new cultural system involving, among other things the "re-enchantment" of life, or what Latouche calls (2010: 86) a new "politics of time", otherwise time liberated by less work becomes

simply re-colonized by the economy. De-growth is based on the reduction of consumption, not economic contraction as it would be understood by conventional economists. The result is a natural and painless evolution to a de-growth economy, one which is by the same logic environmentally friendly and consumes little in the way of non-renewable resources.

In environmental circles there is of course talk of "restoration ecology"—returning environments to (as far as possible) their pristine state, as described for example the delightful and thoughtful book *The Sunflower Forest* (Jordan 2012). But as far as I know, there has not been much parallel discussion of "restoration economics"—actually identifying the characteristics and practices of "natural economies" and setting out to reproduce them. Since all economic systems structure the social relations that they generate (patterns of work, relations with customers, credit arrangements, time management and a myriad other relationships so embedded that we do not for the most part even see them) a restorative economy would transform its member's relationships to nature and to one another in such a way that a seamless whole of economy/ecology/society/technology as a unity or totality. The cultural implications of this would be fascinating since it implies on the one hand, no more Rambo, and on the other the democratization and de-commodification of the arts and crafts, and revolutions in our forms of housing, dressing, eating and travelling. That is a subject for a "utopian" novel (or perhaps practical handbook) and has indeed to a great extent already been embodied in one—Ernest Callenbach's former underground classic (and now republished) *Ecotopia* (Callenbach 2004).

Certainly one of the intellectual and practical spaces in which some of these ideas are being debated and applied is in the field of what has become known as "Solidarity Economy" (or sometimes as "Social Economy"). Solidarity economy has been defined by one of its leading practitioners as "a socio-economic order and new way of life that deliberately chooses serving the needs of people and ecological sustainability rather than maximization of profits under the unfettered rule of the market. It places economic and technological development at the service of social and human development rather than the pursuit of narrow, individual self-interest" (Quinones 2009: 19). As such it has a number of distinctive characteristics: opposition to the extreme individualism of market based economies, the prioritizing of the development of communities, democratic in its decision making structures and procedures, gives priority to people over capital and property, is based on principles of participation, empowerment and individual and collective responsibility and

adopts "conscious altruism and solidarity, not extreme individualism, as the core of the new socio-economic culture. It tends to favor cooperation, not competition, as the main form of relationship among humans and between them and nature" (Quinones 2009: 21). It is clear then that solidarity "economy" is not simply that, but implies a solidarity culture—a total way of life in which the economic is fully embedded in every other aspect of human existence, including religion, the arts, relationships with nature, health, forms of housing and living arrangements, gender and kinship relations, and political institutions and procedures.

The basis of solidarity economies, and the many practical expressions of this in cooperatives, communes, consumer networks, farmers' markets, community supported agriculture and yet other initiatives (for a comprehensive survey, case studies and bibliography see Utting 2015) is both negative and positive. Negative in the sense that growth economies and neoliberal economics have simply not only not produced their promised miracles, but have actually led to deteriorating environmental and social conditions. Positive in the sense that alternative forms of socio-economic arrangements are simply more attractive socially and environmentally, and can at their best be what have sometimes been called "economies of affection", or "moral economies". As John-Justin McMurtry puts it "Specifically…SSE [Social and Solidarity Economy] is a site of *moral* development—a 'school of the social sympathies' and the 'elevation of the dignity of labour'—as well as *economic* development for the good of society" (McMurtry 2015: 61). McMurtry is here drawing on John Stewart Mill and is concerned about what he (McMurtry) sees as being the *liberal* tendencies of SSE (such as aversion to state control and suspicion of the profit motive) and how these might be purified to establish SSE as a genuine alternative to conventional economic theory and practice. When effectively done SSE suggests numerous ways to "take back" the economy (Gibson-Graham et al. 2013) in ways that make care and interdependence central to politics and which encourage the building of "community economies" (Gibson-Graham 2009)—an important aspect of the whole movement towards "localization" not only as a geographic concept, but as one that both builds solidarity economies and does so on the basis of re-generating communities (Shuman 2000).

Quite naturally one of the major debates in the SSE community is how all this might be achieved, and the danger of seeing solidarity economies simply as a sort of self-provisioning which may actually support the dominant economy by taking pressure off it during its recurrent crises. There

are many answers to this problem of "transition" that we will return to in a later chapter, and some of them come from suggestions within the SSE community itself about how to expand, scale-up or colonize or re-colonize spaces currently dominated by the major economy (and these would include Latouche's de-growth strategies). Others emerge in the hope that shifts in cultural values by enough people will trigger major shifts in the "majority" economy. But yet others come from objective qualities of the crisis itself and the fairly obvious fact that the critical resources on which the industrial economy relies, and in particular oil, cannot last much longer. The system is bound to collapse, and when it does that collapse will be very painful indeed (and is perhaps much closer than we realize) unless we prepare for it, economically, technologically and culturally.

The Culture of Economies Beyond Oil

The realization that we face a looming resource crisis is evident from a growing literature (if not always, unfortunately, from changing policies). This underlies both the initiatives of the Transition Movement (Hopkins 2008) and the perception amongst many writers on current affairs that a major shift in economy and society is inevitable, driven not only by ecological disaster, but by the energy intensive and polluting economy that is behind that crisis, and the fact that such an economy cannot outlast what one author has called "The end of oil" (Roberts 2005). Two issues naturally arise for our consideration in the context of this book: what shifts in cultural practices and values we can make to prepare us for such a radical transition, and what a post-oil culture might look like. Here I will discuss the first of these: the second will be discussed in a subsequent chapter.

The economics (and to a lesser extent the technology) of the transition to a post-oil society are fairly well discussed (if not acted upon). The relationship between fossil fuel consumption and climate change and all its attendant problems—ocean acidification, melting of the permafrost, new disease vectors, loss of coral reefs, unstable weather patterns, rising sea levels, damaging effect on many animal species (the iconic polar bear for one), and of course its effect on humans as displacement becomes more frequent as waters rise and crops fail—is now beyond dispute. Despite this, investment in renewable and non-polluting sources of energy lags far behind investment in further oil and gas exploration (including in such highly delicate ecosystems as the arctic), the exploitation of oil sands (which require huge amounts of energy and water to extract, and create

vast and lasting environmental damage) and nuclear energy which, while itself generates little in the way of greenhouse gasses (if one discounts the construction and eventual deconstruction of plants, which produce a large carbon footprint) has proved to be not only unsafe (spoken by one who personally lived through the meltdown of the Fukushima power station), but which generate large quantities of spent fuel, highly radioactive for generations and even centuries, for which no safe disposal method has been (or could be) found.

But what of the lifestyle changes accompanying a post-oil society? Of course we can expect further technological developments which may mitigate some of the effects, but profound changes would come nevertheless. As John Urry points out in his book on the end of oil (Urry 2013), Western society, as well today as most of the rest of the world, is built on oil. This is not only true of its rise to industrial complexity, but equally true of everyday life: we travel on it, require it to make a huge array of everyday items including everything made out of plastic, is used as the energy to transform matter in most industrial processes (including generating electricity), is the power source of most of our lighting, heating and cooling systems, it is required for most of our packaging materials, is necessary for modern farming methods (and the movement of many of its products around the globe), and is the basis for quite a lot of clothing (ones made of nylon for example). It is an instructive exercise when working with students to not only get them to try to calculate the carbon footprint of their individual lifestyles, but also to try to imagine a lifestyle without anything oil based. The most that they can come up with in my experience is a very primitive one. And, since few have the skills to survive a hunting and gathering existence, a very bleak one.

We lead, in other words, a very high-carbon lifestyle that could not possible survive in anything like its present form the end of oil, or to put it in the nicer language of many of its commentators, a steep "energy descent". The consequences, and surely they will come, are exciting to the imagination. They would include a radically restructured economy based on renewable energy, far less production (especially of frivolous items) and far less consumption, less travel by mechanized means, housing designed for natural cooling and heating, more functional clothes, greatly lowered "food miles" or the distance our food travels to reach us from its source or place of processing, an almost total move to organic farming, cradle to cradle design of just about everything, and the revival of older technologies now used mainly for leisure purposes such as sailing. Entertainment

patterns would have to change radically: few lavish operas or blockbuster movies (assuming even that film can be made from non-oil sources) with their large carbon footprints, and very little in the way of energy consuming electronic games. The resulting lifestyles (adjusting for climate and local conditions) would indeed be probably much like that described in Callenbach's *Ecotopia*: eating locally, travelling little, living in communal or quasi-communal housing, spending a lot of time in nature, making home-made clothes and entertainment and utilizing minimal energy. In his vision, technology has not disappeared: rather it is simpler appropriate technology used sparingly for necessary functions, not the technological development for profit and just sheer technologically unstoppability that characterizes our current system. Just how many "apps" can I crowd onto the screen of my phone, and do I really need one to remind me to pick up the kids, of my next appointment, or where to find a hamburger? Personally I did all of those things quite efficiently and by very low tech methods long before the advent of the smart phone and could no doubt do so again. One thing that would most certainly have to change, if be not abolished altogether and that is the military. Collectively the world's armed forces are the source of vast levels of pollution, constantly move large numbers of people around the globe, invest huge amounts of money in killing technologies, engage in arms trading, occupy whole areas with military bases, leave dangerous and hard to dispose of trash (nuclear weapons, chemicals, explosives) all over the environment and do enormous damage to plant, animal and marine life, quite apart from using up huge budgets that could rather better be spent on essentials such as health care and poverty alleviation.

As Urry also points out, new places for consumption are arising in the world—he specifically mentions Dubai—designed to attract visitors to shop, eat, be entertained and to generally consume, often (as indeed in Dubai) in places of very fragile ecology and little water, all of which has to be imported. Tourism is now one of the biggest sectors of the world economy and, again quite apart from its possible negative effects on local cultures and habitats, has a gigantic carbon footprint. The bottom line is of course that contemporary patterns of industrialization cannot be sustained, which means that the lifestyles based on them and their cultural expressions cannot be either. Furthermore, as Urry argues (2013: 136–137) quoting the social critic Ivan Illich's phrase that "only a ceiling on energy use can lead to social relations that are characterized by high levels of equity", points out that oil provides no such ceiling or equity. It is

concentrated only in certain places, its extraction and refining does not build solidarity between oil workers or between them and either employers or consumers. While it appears to be a "democratic" source of energy it essentially is not: it favours the rich—those who can afford to burn it flying and in their cars and homes, and it holds to ransom those countries which do not have any, but have become like everybody else, totally oil dependent. With energy descent a very real danger is that rather than some equitable sharing mechanism we will see and are already seeing the source of new wars, corruption, pollution and a politics that supports the fossil fuel industries (fictions such as "carbon trading" for example, or allowing, as has recently happened in the US, offshore drilling in the Arctic).

While such a depressing, and ultimately planet destroying scenario, is all too possible, John Urry, as he might as a sociologist, presents a possible optimistic one: "an organized powering down to low-carbon lives and systems" (Urry 2013: 202). His menu includes encouraging the acceleration in the decline of globalization which he already identifies as happening, and the plateauing or actual decline in resource use in the UK as people are simply using less "stuff" and which includes such indicators as dropping sales of cars, especially large ones like SUVs, a peaking of car traffic and leisure travel, de-growth, better indicators of well being rather than the obsolete GDP, ageing societies in which people walk more and do not travel about as much, the rise of "post materialism" and such movements as the "slow food" one, urban gardening, and other social mechanisms that promote neighborliness and hence social ties. If Cuba, despite years of US embargo and with no oil of its own, can achieve a very high rating on human development indices (good medical care, low carbon organic farming, universal education, few cars, worker cooperatives) and one society forced to "power down" by political and economic circumstances, then far from being an anomaly, may prove to be a prophetic case. I would not disagree with any of Urry's specific points, except that collectively it is not clear that they provide the levers necessary to overturn the unsustainable system that is the source of the problems in the first place. Possibly more radical solutions are needed and to these we will shortly come.

If the growth economy is now clearly bankrupt, what fresh ideas can we put in its place? One of the most interesting ideas is that of Tim Jackson (2010) who has argued for a redefinition of prosperity, arguing that formulating such a concept is well within our powers and can lead to, as in the title of his book "Prosperity Without Growth". His key question is how can we flourish in the context of ecological limits, in a finite world with

limited resources? Given that "business as usual" is no longer an option, clearly a redefinition of prosperity is needed that makes sense within these limits and cannot be any longer understood in terms of "more". It must rather be seen in terms of the *quality* of our lives, measured by health, happiness, good relationships and participation in the wider life of the community. Empirical studies of what constitutes subjective well-being (happiness) have consistently shown that money is a very small part of the total equation—factors such as good relationships, health, fulfillment at work, and spiritual life far outweigh material concerns (Jackson 2010: 36–37) and that such happiness involves not selfishness but obligations and responsibilities to others. Similar studies have shown that there is no clear relationship between income growth and improved flourishing and sense of overall well-being beyond a certain basic point (poverty obviously not being much fun unless one is a monk). These are all close to what Amartya Sen, in an early paper on 'the living standard' called "capabilities for flourishing" (Sen 1984)—essentially the conditions under which self-fulfillment and the creation of a meaningful life can be achieved—and do not imply sacrifice and poverty since flourishing, achieving greater social cohesion and a sense of well-being are perfectly compatible with reduced material impact on the environment, and indeed may well be enhanced by it.

The odd thing is that none of these discussions involve culture. But it is deeply implicated in at least two levels. One is the general 'culture' of consumption: if I base my identity and status on material possessions then weaning myself off them will be hard. But if I am a monk or have otherwise chosen a life of voluntary simplicity or even of personal poverty, then far from those material things being 'necessary' for my identity, they would rather be distractions. Where wants are few, material impact on the environment is low. Hence the common argument for the need for value change, away from materialistic ones towards ones more compatible with sustainability. The other level is the actual content of the prosperous or fulfilling life: what will we actually be doing all day and in the evenings and how will we express our 'fulfillment' which I take to be a process not an end state? I assume that we would be doing 'cultural' things, and here it is vital to stress that a new economy requires a new culture. Important as they are, simply arguing for such elements as localism, solidarity economies, cooperatives and so forth tells us nothing at all about the cultural life that animates these new economies. Is localism compatible with the same old Hollywood and its frequently violent movies? Is the contemporary

music industry compatible with a solidarity economy? I think not, and while it is very ill advised to attempt to plan or predict cultural developments, it is important to encourage their convergence with the qualities of the desired new economy.

A substantial part of contemporary economies is made up of cultural production and consumption—publishing, bookselling, film, television, music, art and art galleries, fashion, and in the development context it is significant that organizations such as UNESCO as well as many culturally oriented NGOs have been actively encouraging the promotion of the "creative economy", including crafts, textiles and other indigenous arts, as a powerful way of stimulating development (UNESCO 2013). Culture may play not only an important role in development (and in helping to preserve cultural identity and cultural diversity), but also plays a "therapeutic" role in transforming what Jackson calls the "social logic" of consumerism (Jackson 2010: 98–102), since if the social functions of consumerism (distinction, status, emulation, novelty and so forth) are to be creatively modified and shown to be "proxies for our dreams and aspirations" (Jackson 2010: 100), then something much more satisfying needs to be put in their place, and what else but the content and practice of a transformed culture? As Jackson and others have rightly stressed, a different kind of macroeconomics is necessary; but so equally is a new kind of "macro-culture". If prosperity is not to be identified with material wealth it needs to be identified with cultural wealth, including the elements of relationship and community (which we most often establish, outside of work, through cultural means—dancing, listening to music together, going to concerts or movies)—trust, dignity, purpose, creativity, spirituality, and satisfactory relationships to nature, themselves usually mediated through cultural means—hiking, climbing, sailing, or simply sunbathing. If the materialistic and ecologically disastrous image of prosperity is to be dismantled "The idea of an economy whose task is to provide capabilities for flourishing within ecological limits offers the most credible vision to put in its place. But this can only happen through changes that support social behaviours and reduce the structural incentives to unproductive status competition" (Jackson 2010: 156). Culture, along with other social mechanisms such as marriage and savings accounts, is one of the most profound examples of what are termed "commitment devices": "social and institutional mechanisms which moderate the balance of choice away from the present and in favour of the future" (Jackson 2010: 160) which help to overcome our myopic tendency to favor today too much over tomorrow. Culture is not

only the mechanism through which we anticipate the future identity of our group and society, but also the mechanism through which we measure its historical depth and so its present identity.

Changing the "social logic" means to a great extent strengthening social capital, and this can rarely be done either by negative means or through propaganda: more deep-seated cultural changes in norms, values and sense of satisfaction are required. This is a matter to a great extent of social psychology and of identifying not negative penalties for anti-social behavior (although certain disincentives such as higher taxation may play a limited role), but of stressing the positive pleasures, sense of unity and creativity that comes from meaningful participation in cultural activities. We see then the outlines of a "cultural economy", one in which the economy serves the needs of humans and nature, and itself becomes creative in so doing, leading to an unpredictable but highly exciting unfolding of human potentiality which spills over into many other areas—development, conflict resolution, city planning, leisure patterns, eating, health, and who knows what else. The future is open if we make it so, and the basis of such opening is imagination, possibly the most important faculty of human beings.

Bibliography

Albert, Michael. 2014. *Realizing Hope: Life Beyond Capitalism*. London and New York: Zed Books.

Bateman, Milford. 2015. Rebuilding Solidarity-Driven Economies After Neoliberalism: The Role of Cooperatives and Local Development States in Latin America. In *Social and Solidarity Economy: Beyond the Fringe*, ed. Peter Utting, 150–165. London: Zed books.

Bauman, Zygmunt . 1999. *Modernity and the Holocaust*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

, ———. 2004. *Wasted Lives: Modernity and Its Outcasts*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Callenbach, Ernest. 2004. *Ecotopia*. Berkeley: Banyan Tree Books.

Carrier, James G., and Daniel Miller, eds. 1998. *Virtualism: A New Political Economy*. Oxford and New York: Berg.

Clammer, John. 1985. *Anthropology and Political Economy*. London: Macmillan.

Clammer, John. 2015. *Art, Culture and International Development: Humanizing Social Transformation*. London and New York: Routledge.

, ———. 2012. *Culture, Development and Social Theory: Towards an Integrated Social Development*. London and New York: Zed Books.

, ———. 2015b. Social Economics and Economic Anthropology: Challenging Conventional Economic Thinking and Practice. In *Social/Solidarity Economy*

in China and the World, eds. Pun Ngai, Kok Bun Ku, Yan Hairong, and Anita Koo. London: Routledge.

Daly, Herman E. 1973. *Toward a Steady-State Economy*. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman and Company.

Diamond, Jared. 2005. *Collapse: How Societies Choose to Fail or Succeed*. New York: Penguin.

Gibson-Graham, J.K. 2009. *A Postcapitalist Politics*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Gibson-Graham, J.K., J. Cameron, and S. Healy. 2013. *Take Back the Economy: An Ethical Guide to Transforming Our Communities*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Grasseni, Cristina, Francesca Forno, and Silvana Signori. 2015. Beyond Alternative Food Networks: Italy's Solidarity Purchase Groups and the United States' Community Economies. In *Social and Solidarity Economy: Beyond the Fringe*, ed. Peter Utting, 185–201. London: Zed Books.

Henderson, Hazel. 1978. *Creating Alternative Futures: The End of Economics*. New York: Berkley Publishing Corporation.

, ———. 1988. *The Politics of the Solar Age: Alternatives to Economics*. Indianopolis: Knowledge Systems Inc.

Hirschman, Albert O. 1981. *The Passions and the Interests: Political Arguments for Capitalism Before Its Triumph*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Hopkins, Bob. 2008. *The Transition Handbook: From Oil Dependency to Local Resilience*. White River Junction, VT: Chelsea Green Publishing.

Jackson, Tim. 2010. *Prosperity Without Growth: Economics for a Finite Planet*. London and Washington, DC: Earthscan.

Jordan, William R. 2012. *The Sunflower Forest: Ecological Restoration and the New Communion With Nature*. Berkeley and London: University of California Press.

Kovel, Joel. 2002. *The Enemy of Nature*: *The End of Capitalism or the End of the World*? London and New York: Zed Books and Nova Scotia: Fernwood Publishing.

Latouche, Serge. 2010. *Farewell to Growth*. Trans. David Macey. Cambridge and Malden, MA: Polity Press.

McMurtry, John-Justin. 2015. Prometheus, Trojan Horse or Frankenstein: Appraising the Social and Solidarity Economy. In *Social and Solidarity Economy: Beyond the Fringe*, ed. Peter Utting, 57–71. London: Zed Books.

Norberg-Hodge, Helena. 2009. *Ancient Futures: Lessons from Ladakh for a Globalizing World*. San Francisco: Sierra Club Books.

Quinones, Benjamin R. Jr. 2009. Facets of Solidarity Economy. In *A Non-Patriarchal Economy is Possible*: *Looking at Solidarity Economy from Different Cultural Facets*, ed. Marcos Arruda, 17–85. Rio de Janeiro: ALOE and Paris: Fondation Charles Leopold Mayer.

Roberts, Paul. 2005. *The End of Oil: On the Edge of a Perilous New World*. Boston and New York: Mariner Books.

Sahlins, Marshall. 1972. *Stone Age Economics*. London: Tavistock Publications.

, ———. 1996. The Sadness of Sweetness: The Native Anthropology of Western Cosmology. *Current Anthropology* 37(3): 395–415.

Schroyer, Trent. 1997. Introduction: Working Alternatives for a World That Works. In *A World That Works: Building Blocks for a Just and Sustainable World*, ed. Trent Schroyer, 1–8. New York: The Bootstrap Press.

Schumacher, E.F. 1973. Buddhist Economics. In *Toward a Steady-State Economy*, ed. Herman E. Daly, 231–239. San Francisco: W.H. Freeman and Company.

Schumacher, E.F. 1980. *Good Work*. London: Abacus.

Sen, Amartya. 1984. The Living Standard. *Oxford Economic Papers* 36: 74–90.

Shuman, Michael, H. 2000. *Going Local: Creating Self-Reliant Communities in a Global Age*. New York: Routledge.

Sillitoe, Paul. 1998. The Development of Indigenous Knowledge: A New Applied Anthropology. *Current Anthropology* 39(2): 223–252.

Sillitoe, Paul, Alan Bicker, and Johan Pottier, eds. 2002. *Participating in Development: Approaches to Indigenous Knowledge*. London and New York: Routledge.

Smart, Barry. 2003. *Economy, Culture and Society*. Buckingham and Philadelphia: Open University Press.

UNESCO. 2013. *Creative Economy Report 2013: Widening Local Development Pathways*. Paris: UNESCO and New York: United Nations Development Program.

Urry, John. 2013. *Societies Beyond Oil: Oil Dregs and Social Futures*. London and New York: Zed Books.

Utting, Peter. 2015. *Social and Solidarity Economy: Beyond the Fringe*. London: Zed Books in association with the United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD).

Transforming Political Cultures

The roots of many of our contemporary problems can be traced to the nature of our current political cultures and institutions. This situation has many facets beginning with the almost criminal negligence of our political leaders in failing to seriously address the very problems that they were elected to solve, climate change being one of the most pressing. Others relate to this: the no longer functional party system in the "democracies" and the politics of mud-slinging rather than of cooperation that it promotes; the very notion of democracy itself when the only opportunity for direct political action is to vote every four or five years, where in many cases less than half of the electorate actually turn out to vote; where governments and presidents can be elected with little more than a third of the popular vote because of the way in which the electoral system is set up, including the injustices of the "first past the post" system which permits a government to come into office with the bulk of the population having actually rejected it. This is the situation in many of the major democracies today—in the UK, India, and the USA for example. And this leaves out of the picture the large number of authoritarian regimes that dominate much of the world, throughout the Middle East, Central Asia and much of Africa, and highly corrupt ones elsewhere, military regimes and failed states—South Sudan, Libya for instance, and ones tottering on the edge of failure—Syria, Iraq, Afghanistan. In fact standing back and looking for a moment at the political management of the world, we see on the whole anything but a rosy picture.

91

This is worrying, not least because many scholars of both politics and development have come to the collective conclusion that there is a close relationship between sound development and good governance. Where weak, corrupt or virtually non-existent governance exists, mal-development and almost certainly violence, corruption, weak social services and a general lack of human security prevail. The source of some of these problems is certainly structural—in the nature of political institutions, many of which (the UK House of Lords for example) have their origin in the remote past and in social hierarchies which have long since ceased to exist, or, as is the case in much of the developing world, because the institutions were colonial in origin and do not reflect the local cultural realities. But others are more cultural, sociological and personal—the feeling that the problems are just too big and so a perhaps natural but unfortunate response is just to "tune out", as with the well-known phenomenon of "compassion fatigue". Or because the socially organized lack of much contact with political processes other than things such as occasionally voting and paying taxes leads to the perception of a situation of powerlessness: it seems impossible to influence the outcome of policies and plans that one might strongly disagree with. In some cases the basis of the feeling of powerlessness is individualism: where one is no longer the member of a community in any really meaningful sense, there is no one else to act with, and so collective action becomes difficult or impossible. In this situation politics and everyday life drift apart, and as the sociologist Anthony Giddens has argued what he calls "emancipatory politics"—politics concerned with large issues of social justice, equality and opposing unfairness in any of its guises, ethnic, gendered, religious, social—disappears and is replaced by what he terms "lifestyle politics", the situation in which political interests shrink to those issues that only effect oneself in an immediate way (Giddens 1991). I might then oppose a tax increase because it will eat into my own income, even though it is clear that the increase is socially beneficial, for example expanding health care for the poorer sections of the society, or increasing support for the elderly, or fight to have a socially necessary utility situated far away from where I personally live, in someone else's community, the phenomenon known as NIMBY—"Not in My Back Yard".

Underlying this situation of loss of political energy are at least three other factors prevailing in the rich world. One is that politics has become essentially just a branch of economics, and of course the political kowtowing is mostly in the direction of the large economic interests, and as

a result "political" policy is basically about running the economy in ways that benefits certain sectional interests. If one reads this chapter in the light of the preceding one, interesting alternative possibilities begin to emerge. While there are always strong links between politics and economics, it is clear that a radically different economy would require a very different politics. The politics of what Hazel Henderson calls the "solar age" would be at variance with current practices, and it is an interesting imaginative exercise to try to work out what political arrangements would work best in a non-capitalist, post-oil society. A second is the de-politicizing effects of consumer capitalism. When to-shop-is-to-be displaces to-protest-is-to-be, or worse still to-care-is-to-be, there is invariably a shrinking of political consciousness and activism. If I am what I consume, and status and self-identity and the "feel good" factor are all measured by (successful) participation in the culture of commodities, concern with the well-being of others (the ideal definition of politics) diminishes and is not my problem. A culture of entitlements emerges that is antithetical to a culture of responsibilities (Kumar and Sudha 2010).

Furthermore, when, as the social critic Jean Baudrillard has argued, what we "know" about the world is delivered to us by television, the Internet, our iPhones and second-hand images (and for that matter, via Wikipedia), the boundary between the "real" and the simulacra becomes fuzzy. Hence his controversial claim that the Gulf War "didn't really happen"—it was a TV event reported to us through a very limited repertoire of constantly repeated images, and from the point of view of us who were not actually there and did not actually get killed, it might indeed have been a fiction of the media, along with moon landings, pictures of Pluto beamed back from a remote satellite, and any number of other apparent happenings (Baudrillard 1983). Lest this seem a bit far-fetched, I have encountered tribal people in Southeast Asia whose sole television was run intermittently from a car battery, who were firmly convinced that the moon landing was a fiction cooked up in the TV studios in Kuala Lumpur: obviously the moon is small, clearly visible from the earth, and if people were walking about on it as alleged, they would be easily seen, even from their jungle village. The third is the decline of revolutionary and utopian thinking and activity since the 1980s (Buck-Morss 2000, Jacoby 1999). Once the world was full of revolutionary plans and projects (China, Russia, Cuba, Libya under Gaddafi with his ideas of Arab socialism, Iran, even Burma with its attempt at creating "Buddhist Socialism") with strong underlying ideologies and theoretical frameworks, mostly Marxist.

Now we all seem to be rushing to become capitalists and all too willing to trade our political meetings for shopping expeditions. While a wide range of social movements certainly exist, and the rise of civil society organizations has been one of the major features of the sociological landscape for many years, the larger sense of the possibility of changing the world through political action has greatly diminished, although not totally disappeared (Gibson-Graham 2009). In part as we have suggested, this is due to declining confidence in conventional political processes to actually change anything, and in part because of wider cultural and social processes, including the consumerism discussed in Chap. 2, and in part because of the lack of apparent alternatives. But such alternatives do indeed exist and it is to them that we will now turn, for without a new politics to move things towards a *just* sustainability, one of the major areas of human culture—our desire for successful management of our societies—will remain outside of the sustainability debate, and should that happen it will fail.

Rethinking Political Culture

In the final chapter we will discuss actual models of and proposals for, sustainable societies. Here we will explore some of the specifically political dimensions. It was suggested in the previous chapter that one of the potentially rich resources for thinking about alternative economies is the field of economic anthropology. Much the same can be said about the parallel field of political anthropology. Just as many economic systems, generally adapted to their local ecology and resource base, have existed and flourished over generations, so too have many political systems ranging from the radical democracy of many hunter-gatherer societies, to democratic systems, chiefly societies, kingdoms, theocracies and on to the establishment of state systems as we know them today (for a broad survey of the field see the older but still very comprehensive volume Cohen and Middleton 1967). Without going into the ethnographic details, it can be safely said that what political anthropology establishes is the possibility of alternative political systems, appropriate to local ecology, economy (for example subsistence societies as opposed to trading societies), and population size, and each in turn giving rise to different cultural configurations: the wonderful sculptural traditions of the Ashanti kingdoms of West Africa, the court dances of Java, the religious dramas of Bali, the temple sculptures of south India and the Muslim architecture of the north, the

story-telling of the Kalahari Bushmen, and so on through thousands of examples and variations.

It can be furthermore argued that it is through the migration of images—Buddhist sculpture from north India to China, Korea and Japan, Hindu iconography to Bali, the Chinese script to the rest of East Asia and to Vietnam—that civilizations are formed as much as by direct political influences: a history of Southeast Asia for example cannot be simply a political (or even economic one), but equally requires art history to make any sense of its cultural patterns and traditions (Clammer 2011). Culture and politics go together, even as economics and politics do, so the links need not only clarifying, but new forms of relationship equally need to be proposed. One of the common criticisms of the so-called "post-development" paradigm is that it is strong on criticism (of how development, industrialization and neo-liberal globalization have got us into our present mess), but weak on any actual alternative programs (Ziai 2007). As we have argued throughout the preceding chapters, critique or "deconstruction" is the first stage, but does indeed need to be followed by reconstruction. In terms of political culture, what might such alternatives look like?

One of the fullest accounts of such possibilities has been suggested by the activist Rabbi and political thinker Michael Lerner in a number of books, but particularly in his major work *The Politics of Meaning: Restoring Hope and Possibility in an Age of Cynicism* (Lerner 1996). The book begins from the assumption that there is a loss of meaning in contemporary society, a crisis deeper than simply that of de-politicization, and that the crisis is largely spiritual in nature. An important dimension of the book is its perspective on the *psychology* of politics (Lerner was trained in both philosophy and clinical psychology.) This is interesting, because while there is a very developed field of social psychology, relatively little of the work deriving from this field, and from the practical and theoretical work of social workers, psychiatrists and family therapists, has found its way into political analysis. Early and important works such as Bruno Bettelheim's classic study of the psychology of fascism and survival under extreme conditions (Bettelheim 1986) have had little long term impact on political science. The basis of Lerner's work however is that such a perspective is essential if we are to understand two things, the first being the sources of alienation, unhappiness, violence and social dysfunctions from crime to eating-disorders that pervade contemporary society despite, in the rich world, historically unparalleled levels of affluence, and the second

being the feelings of powerlessness that come from the apparent inability to control or even understand the economic system and its dominance in practically every level of our modern lives.

From this psychological foundation a number of arguments are derived, the first being that while indeed our progressive role should be that of "Envisioning a world that is far more responsive to our ethical and spiritual needs" this "does not mean embracing a naïve optimism that is oblivious to the inevitable pain and suffering in human life" (Lerner 1996: 21). This leads Lerner to summarize his position of "progressive politics" in five basic propositions: to create a society that encourages and supports love and intimacy, friendship and community, ethical sensitivity and spiritual awareness among people; to change the "bottom line" away from preoccupation with "efficiency" understood as increasing wealth or power to one in which "An institution or social practice is to be considered efficient or productive to the extent that it fosters ethically, spiritually, ecologically, and psychologically sensitive and caring human beings who can maintain long-term, loving personal and social relationships" (Lerner 1996: 56); to create the social, spiritual, and psychological conditions that will encourage us to recognize the uniqueness, sanctity, and infinite preciousness of every human being, and to treat them with caring, gentleness, and compassion; to create a society that gives us adequate time and encouragement to develop our inner lives; and to create a society that encourages us to relate to the world and to one another in awe and joy (Lerner 1996: 56–57).

Few would disagree in principle. The problem is that without political and cultural mechanisms for their realization, such entirely laudable goals can easily remain at the level of "psycho-babble". Lerner is aware of this and follows up his basic prescription with a series of suggestions for practical implementation. Some of these are cultural—encouraging what he calls "life energy" through the freeing of sexuality from an area of guilt, prohibitions and fears (and paradoxically both social, political and religious controls, and widespread pornography) to one of joy, the encouragement of cultural practices that promote celebration and conviviality, such as music and dance, encouraging participatory sports (rather than being passive fans), taking back the trivial content of much of the media and transforming it into affirmative and progressive themes, and not allowing religion to dominate ethics and social behavior in repressive ways, in large part by switching from viewing the transcendent as organized institutional religion, and seeing instead through the lens of "spirituality". In this latter

goal Lerner is certainly far from alone, and there has grown up a whole literature arguing basically the same thing—for example Keen 1997, O Murchu 1998—and sharing many of the same assumptions. I will return to these in a moment, but to stick with Lerner for a while longer, the rest of his book is directed to an analysis of why traditional political divisions (liberals v. conservatives) are no longer relevant and represent a defunct political culture inappropriate to dealing with the problems that we face, and a wide range of practical policy implications.

These are important because most of them relate to political culture. These fall into several categories, the first having to do directly with political processes: replacing big government with civil society. The second relating to the economy: encouraging localization, establishing democratic control over the economy, transforming the nature of work into something that nurtures people rather than wears them down (including such steps as job rotation and the establishment of the sabbatical year), the cultivation of both an "economy of caring" rather than a profit driven one of exploitation, and an ecologically oriented one, and the establishment of what Lerner calls the "social audit": " a social and environmental impact report to accompany every annual investment plan, every project, and every proposed piece of legislation, regulation, or budget item" and required of every corporation, civil society organization or government body, at all levels (Lerner 1996: 236). The third relates to education—the creation of educational systems that are values based, teach empathy in so far as that is possible, that don't teach religion, but teach *about* religion and spiritual awareness, and that teach a range of important skills neglected in most existing school systems such as family coping skills, responsibility and self-discipline, which incorporate work-study and community service, and which are focused on education for the community and not for the self or for the corporate world. His final category relates to health—towards the creation of a health care system that has as its priority healing people rather than fighting disease and which is genuinely a system of caring and which is accessible and affordable by everyone and which avoids the arrogance and "medicalization of society" so classically identified by Ivan Illich (Illich 1990).

Lerner's work, both in this book and in the influential magazine *Tikkun* (Hebrew for the fixing or repair of the world) which he founded and edits, is important in that it shifts debates about politics from simply institutional concerns and the usual interests of political scientists to another level altogether: one that locates issues of psychology, culture, ethics and

spirituality at its core. But while his book has been influential, it does fit within a broader shift in thinking. Some of this shift is represented in the "spiritual" move, of which the books mentioned above are only a tiny sampling, and some in the revived interest in a psychology that contributes to not just "self-realization" (a potentially totally selfish and individualistic move), but to world changing purpose and the creation of a good society, perhaps best represented in the work of Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi (1994) with its emphasis on conscious evolution towards a sustainable and harmonious future society. The work of the popular writer Sam Keen whose work is largely about the interface of spirituality and society, in some ways combines these shifts in his emphasis of creating a compassionate community and reclaiming sensuality. The positive side of these writers has been twofold: one is to bring psychology into the debate about sustainable futures, something that will prove to be of importance when we discuss the issues of transitions to sustainability (why, for example, do people so often resist change or ignore the evidence of impending catastrophe?), and the other is to bring religion back into the debate.

In few of the studies that I am aware of in mainstream political science is religion given any space, unless of course it is itself the subject of analysis (the new forms of Muslim fundamentalism and their obviously political effects; the role of the evangelical "religious Right" in US politics for example). But clearly religion is a central part of culture, and its role continues to be very important in many societies, and the world has seen a retreat from the secularism that was being predicted by sociologists thirty years ago. In situations where religion is central not only to identity and ethnicity, but also to ethics, diet, dress, marriage and family structures, it is clearly a significant part of political cultures. It is healthy then to see the role of religion being once again more central attention, as the basis of values, as a form of social activism when expressed in socially-engaged forms such as in the varieties of liberation theology, and as a powerful force in forming post-colonial societies and in shaping inter-cultural relationships (Clammer 2009, Clammer et al. 2004). The negative side however has been an almost compete absence of any real economic analysis, despite the *talking* about the economy. Keen, like Lerner, furnishes us with an economic wish-list including such desiderata as "a shift from the myth of progress to a myth of sustainable growth…a shift from the myth of competition to economic cooperation…a shift from a world divided between the poor and the rich to a more just distribution of wealth… a shift from compulsive production of more complex technologies to production of appropriate, sustainable

technologies" (Keen 1997: 237), but with no indication of how to get there, or of the character of the contemporary global economic system that prevents such nice ideas from being realized. One of the few attempts to bring together spirituality and economics has been the work of John Cobb (Cobb 1990), but such syntheses are rare indeed (however for a brief discussion of possibilities see Clammer 2014). This is a major weakness and suggests an equally major challenge. Even as religions and ecology have begun a very fruitful dialogue, so might religions and economics, with potentially revolutionary implications for both.

This is indeed part of the thesis of one of the most remarkable and insightful books on the transformation of contemporary political life: Roberto Mangabeira Unger's hefty tome *False Necessity: Anti-Necessitarian Social Theory in the Service of Radical Democracy* (Unger 2001), in which he concludes the most recent edition with an appendix called "Five Theses on the Relation of Religion to Politics" (597–603). While the whole book is too lengthy and complex to be easily summarized, a number of key points relevant to our present discussion can be drawn out from it. Unger's starting point involves two main arguments: that while we certainly recognize the powerful shaping effects of social structures, they do not represent iron-clad laws (they were invented by humans and so can be changed by them), and that the way forward is to pursue radical democracy: "to understand why contemporary societies are organized as they are, and to imagine how we can reform them to empower humanity—all of humanity" (Unger 2001: xvii). His lengthy book is in fact largely a meditation on the power of the imagination and of the related idea that we must begin to practice an alternative politics in the mind and in our culture as the first step to materializing it in the world, and that this is an incremental process: "Transformative politics changes, part by part and step by step, the context of institutional arrangements and enacted belief that shapes the practical and discursive routines of social life" (Unger 2001: 25). The book that follows is an attempt to show how this might be done: to critically examine the nature of contemporary political life and its tendency towards "routine without reason", an exploration of the political economy of modern life, including the nature of work, warfare, capitalism and its Communist alternative, technology, agency, rights, solidarity, the organization of political, economic and voluntary organizations and institutions, the costs of the current dominant market regime, and the possibility of what Unger calls the "cultural-revolutionary counterpart" to institutionalized political cultures. Apart from the many specific analyses

and proposals that the book makes, its core can be understood as the need for the application of imagination to the conception and execution of alternatives that take us beyond our existing dysfunctional politics, and as a result, the centrality of the need for a new political *culture*. In a holistic approach to society of course many of these distinctions disappear into what has to be a multidisciplinary model in which the elements are all related. As David Korten has suggested, to create what he calls "a new integral culture that affirms life in all its dimensions" we need "To create a just, sustainable, and compassionate post-corporate world we must face up to the need to create a new core culture, a new political center, and a new economic mainstream" (Korten 1999: 261) and to do this we need, amongst other things, what he calls the creation of a new "story", a new set of images and models of what we really want. In a later book (Korten 2006) he refers to this as the move from "Empire" (preoccupation with power, violence, domination and control that characterizes most political practices) to "earth community"—a life-centered, egalitarian, democratic and sustainable way of life, and suggests that this is to be achieved through a cultural politics in which, for once, higher order cultural and spiritual consciousness holds sway over the lower orders of greed, selfishness and hierarchy (Korten 2006: 328) and that only a "living culture" can be the seed-bed of such a transformation.

But here a convergence arises between those like Lerner to a great extent and Korten to a lesser, who see future political arrangements as being basically a refinement of current ones, but more sensitive to the actual needs and aspirations of people. For Korten this takes the form of an "open, fair, and honest electoral system responsive to the full spectrum of popular views and interests" (Korten 2006: 347), including the right to vote, a non-partisan election administration, direct elections based on one person, one vote and so on. In a sense, business as usual, but just cleaned up. This contrasts vividly with the more radical ideas of such thinkers as John Holloway who, in his important book *Change the World Without Taking Power* (Holloway 2002), has argued that all attempts to 'take power', whether through the ballot box of by revolutionary means, simply reproduce the old political culture. Instead Holloway proposes a "horizontal model" much closer to the ideas of some social movements theorists and activists, in which conventional institutions are rejected, codes of identity entirely rethought (and with them established notions of hierarchy) and the nature of work re-imagined in liberating ways. The free association of individuals then provides the basis for a new political order,

one obviously much closer to "autonomist" Marxism or to anarchism than it is to conventional electoral politics.

This again points us back to the central issue of what kind of political system is compatible with a sustainable future. The fact is that our current system—whether the "capitalist democracy" of the West, or state socialism as it until recently existed in the former Soviet Union or China, is not. Neither have proved to be environmentally friendly (Cuba perhaps being the sole exception, but even there largely because of external factors), their leaders have been unresponsive to the big challenges of the Earth community, all have confused politics with economics, corruption is rife, and their institutions a façade for what passes for "democracy" when a statistical minority of the population can elect a government, when one gets to vote only once every four or five years, and when, as in contemporary Japan, a government on the basis of its majority in parliament, can force through highly unpopular legislation opposed by a majority of the public and without calling a referendum, even though the legislation in question amounts to a de facto revision of the Constitution. Radical reform is clearly needed, which one might envisage as taking one of two forms: an overthrow of existing institutions and their replacement by forms of political participation responsive to people's actual needs and the needs of the planet, and/or a significant change in political culture in which responsibility is not just shifted periodically onto remote "representatives", but is understood to be part and parcel of citizenship. This, to be effective, requires political education: people power can be reactionary and non-progressive without *informed* people (not, note, manipulated people) as there are clearly many destructive and self-destructive ways in which people seek meaning. To revert to Lerner's terminology, there might well be people, and history proves this, who find meaning in fascism, an option certainly world transforming, but in the wrong directions.

The Wider Context of Politics

Politics is not an autonomous zone that floats somehow free of other aspects of society. In fact, as we have seen, politics is inextricably, for good or evil, implicated in economics, whether that economics be one of capitalist exploitation or of solidarity. What however is much less explored, especially in the "alternative" literature, is its connection to legal cultures. All political systems are supposed to operate within the law, and in many cases it is a judicial body such as a supreme court that is the ultimate arbiter

of the legality or constitutionality of a decision of the legislature. Similarly, governments which are signatories to international conventions such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights are supposed to apply them within their jurisdictions. But the nature of the law itself is rarely questioned. Cormac Cullinan however has done exactly that and has shown that legal systems are often systems of organized oppression as they were in his native South Africa during the apartheid period, or as are curbs on free speech or access to state "secrets" are in many societies, which allow "legal" spying and invasion of privacy (as with the recent revelations of widespread snooping by US spy agencies, including on their allies), which disallow inter-racial or inter-religious marriage (in contravention of the UDHR), and which permit corporations to plunder the earth and to be protected from legal challenges to their depredations (Cullinan 2011). In most cases laws protecting private property override concern with the rights of nature, and as a result Cullinan argues, our whole system of governance is distorted. People have "rights" to exploit the planet, but there are few legal recourses for those who would rather protect and nurture it. And even when laws nominally exist they are often not enforced, but bribery and corruption allow illegal mining, logging and other forms of extraction to continue unpunished. As the old Indian saying has it "Don't know the law, know the judge". Cullinan's position then is that our legal system is also dysfunctional if protection of the earth community, which includes nature as much as it does humans, is the priority, and only a shift to what he calls "Earth Jurisprudence" will make a sustainable future possible.

Such an idea, and it seems to me to be an excellent and necessary one, is reflected in an emerging vocabulary such as Vandana Shiva's concept of "earth democracy"—a holistic model of human and planetary well-being encompassing "living economies" (ones that nurture the earth, protect the commons, resist privatization of such shared resources as water, resist corporate colonization of agriculture and more and more spaces through globalization and through what are in effect its agencies, such as the World Trade Organization (WTO), intellectual property laws, and "free trade" agreements between governments). "Living democracies" in which truly representative and participatory political activity are the rule represent the model we seek, and "living cultures" in which gender equality is essential and patriarchy in all its forms resisted, and in which creativity can be given full reign, not only in relation to such areas as the arts, but in vital areas such as food sovereignty and organic farming, and in which cultural diversity is encouraged and cherished is the cultural expression (Shiva 2005).

A not dissimilar idea is found in the magnificent book by Aseem Shrivastava and Ashish Kothari *Churning the Earth* (2014) which, while it is formally about India, in fact has much more universal application, as reflected in the title of their final chapter: "Another India, Another World". The book, a sustained analysis of the impact of globalization, conventional economic policies, belief in "trickle down" economics, crony capitalism and "reforms" that have simply opened India to free-market competition with which much of its agriculture and industries are unequipped to manage, has led the country deeper and deeper into social, economic and ecological crisis. Their response is to propose a model that they characterize as "From Developmentality to Ecologicality" (2014: 339), or as "radical ecological democracy" (2014: 341), based on real democracy—having a voice in all decisions, with (in the Indian context) ancient cultural roots in the clan assemblies, village assemblies and Buddhist economic guilds, stressing localism, bio-regionalism and self-reliance, ecological restoration, diversity, governance based on a bottom up, not top down model, and with all of the many possible alternatives (depending on local conditions) having the common bottom lines of ecological sustainability and human equity, with resilience and adaptability being the principles of "management" of both human and ecological systems. This has many practical implications in their model: emphasis on sustainable and equitable farming (including fisheries and forestry), creating sustainable and democratic cities, decentralized renewable energy, economic democracy, the encouragement of low-impact light industries and handicrafts over heavy industry, and a new model of international relations based on people-to-people exchanges and a meaningful flow of ideas and innovations between countries such that globalization becomes a liberating and communicative process, not one of domination and violence (Korten's "Empire"). Although not discussed in their book, such a model would have many other implications—for migration, ideas of citizenship, and open source knowledge systems, to name but a few.

It would also suggest the question that Tim Jackson raises in his book discussed in the previous chapter—of the nature of governance for prosperity (Jackson 2010: 157ff.). The two keys to sustainable prosperity that Jackson identifies—"a new ecologically literate macro-economics", and changing the "social logic of consumerism"—both have large political consequences, both in terms of how to reach them, and then of how to sustain them once some identifiable goal of achievement had been reached. He suggests that a number of big issues: the role of government (and he seems to assume a modern liberal democracy as his unspoken

model), the balancing of individual freedoms against the common good, especially when the 'commitment devices' that used to help us protect our long term future from the gratification of immediate wants are being eroded, the question of whether government should intervene to protect employment and equity and the need for both leadership and popular mobilization. The problem with this model is that again it does not seem to see the need for any kind of radical change and is yet another version of the gradualism that besets, amongst others, Korten's image of political change. So far our existing institutions including Westminster style governance, neo-liberal economics, and "development", have not delivered on their promises and are in many cases the cause of the problems. Will a little modification of their structures and assumptions really move us towards sustainability? The evidence so far is negative.

Embedded in these conventional models are unspoken assumptions (or silences) about what "leadership" in the face of coming major transitions would look like. Again I think that we can fairly assume that the existing versions do not work, and a look at the syllabus or practice of the myriads of "business schools" that infest the earth makes this quickly clear. The values inculcated in such institutions are precisely those that have got us into the mess in the first place: the whole language of growth, productivity, efficiency, expansion, markets, conquering that reveals the core of competitive capitalism, its military language and colonizing tone ("new frontiers"), and its obscene excitement at the least possibility of new markets, the relative opening of Cuba and the signing of a nuclear agreement with Iran leading to the lifting of sanctions not welcomed as signs of increasing human security and greater possibilities of peace in the world, but as new opportunities for the expansion of McDonaldization. In fact to "manage" the emerging world (and the very concept of management is a dubious one in this situation of uncertainty, risks, lack of clear information, and lack of historical precedents) will require quite different skills than those predominating in politics or in business, and those skills would have to include humility, a willingness to admit that we do not actually know what we are doing a lot of the time, a radically democratic spirit in that all voices and many sources of wisdom and not just those anointed by science or management gurus must be listened to and learnt from, a willingness to experiment and make mistakes (and learn from them not disavow them), a strong sense of justice and equality, and a love of diversity over uniformity.

Fortunately this issue of 'sustainability leadership' is now being addressed, including the lack of any sustainability teaching in a majority of

business schools and a highly critical approach to the fig-leaf of "corporate social responsibility" behind which a lot of corporations hide while actually doing business much as usual. But even a decade and more ago, some management "gurus" were beginning to challenge this paradigm from within the business world, arguing that 'transformational leadership' had to be focused not on profit maximization and short term goals, but on values and ethics, oriented to long term goals, concerned with identifying and releasing human potential and with redesigning work to make it meaningful (Covey 1992). This takes us part of the way, but specialists in sustainability leadership would suggest not far enough. To be really equipped (in so far as that is possible in a highly volatile environment) requires also *knowledge* of such areas as resources, population, energy, ecology, economics and sociology (Parkin 2010). There is of course a risk in the idea that social transformation can be *planned*: the old managerial model very easily raises its bureaucratic head again. But avoiding the excesses of such an approach does not mean that one cannot learn from experience. On the contrary a great deal can be learnt from existing experiments in creating environmentally sustainable lifestyles, building disaster resilience, creating neighborliness and reducing racial tensions in inner city areas, and communicating the results of this learning experience, and systematizing it to a certain degree, can provide valuable training and creating methodologies for analyzing new social change situations (Gershon 2009).

A transformative politics must then be one of emancipation, but not simply in the old narrower political sense, but in a much more comprehensive sense. Emancipation certainly from unfreedom and all forms of social and political oppression, but also from the colonization of the mind and of culture by manufactured and alien forces from without that prevent the creation of an autonomous and sustainable lifestyle which is also one of justice and equity. In fact 'emancipation' should be thought of best in positive terms—as 'freedom into' rather than as 'freedom from'. As the proponents of 'post-development' have argued "The new order of 'post-development' constitutes a different power relation. It evokes an order of relatively horizontal power relations in which people in both developing and developed societies become 'autonomous' and 'convivial' at one and the same time…'post-development' affirms a plurality of culture ('autonomy') as well as sociality/universality between different cultures ('conviviality')" (Nakano 2007: 75). There are of course dangers here: Serge Latouche seeing the possibility of emancipation in the 'un-colonized' spaces of the informal sector with its material poverty from

a developmentalist perspective, but its riches when measured in terms of social networks, sharing, a gift economy and other dimensions that fall below the radar of conventional economics (Latouche 1993), and rich precisely because they have not climbed onto the sinking ship of conventional development which creates poverty rather than solves it, a rather romantic view if one has ever actually lived in an "informal settlement", i.e. a slum.

Likewise "radical democracy" can easily degenerate into reactionary populism (Ziai 2004) and there is not much guarantee that without other elements being present that the removal of other institutional controls or strong values that anarchism in the worst sense of the word will not result. But even in a conventional democracy there is no guarantee of progressive politics: the Americans freely elected Ronald Reagan and two Bushes, and the English Mrs. Margaret Thatcher (and kept her in power for years), and in an earlier era the Germans voted for Adolf Hitler. Political education is clearly needed, not in the sense of ideological indoctrination, but in the sense of full awareness of issues and the causes and nature of our planetary crisis. The basis for this might well be the "Sociology of emergences" identified by Boaventura de Sousa Santos, speaking at the World Social Forum, as "the inquiry into the alternatives that are contained in the horizon of concrete possibilities" leading to the possibility of identifying future possibilities through enlarging the field of agents, knowledge and practices(Santos 2003). This process does not only apply to the 'South', but very much equally to the 'North'. The North has had its fun and in doing so has created many if not most of the existing global problems through colonialism, industrialization, resource extraction, over-fishing and any number of other greed-led processes that have now produced world-wide phenomena such as climate change and massive structural inequalities in the international trading system and in many cases have triggered through its political and military irresponsibility, problems that it now does not want to deal with, such as the refugees and asylum seekers from Syria, Afghanistan, and much of Africa that now flood southern Europe or who drown in the Mediterranean or in the Indian Ocean trying to reach a safe haven.

SOCIAL MOVEMENTS AND NEW POLITICS

One of the persuasive answers that have been given to the possibility of a new and responsive politics has been to look at the nature and potential of social movements. Social movements—ecological, feminist, political,

representing alternative lifestyles including marriage, family, housing, communal living, squatting, or the alternative economic arrangements that almost certainly accompany such experiments—have long fascinated sociologists. The literature is vast, but it tends to circulate around two main poles—that of explanation (how, when and why do such movements arise, what resources do they need to mobilize to become effective, and why do they (often) fail either to take off at all, or to achieve their long term objectives?), and that of description—of communal movements (often small in scale) and of larger scale movements that have been historically important or which still exist to confront usually one main issue (for example anti-nuclear movements in a number of countries). But implicit in both approaches (and they obviously overlap) are a number of significant "theoretical" questions: social movements, while they can be studied from a fairly narrow sociological perspective, suggest even more possibilities. Social movements are heterogeneous in nature, but nevertheless share certain characteristics: they are actual social experiments in changing some situation, they usually begin small, but may then successfully 'scale up' to become major sources of social change, they are seedbeds of fresh thinking about possibilities and actual mechanisms of social change, they intersect with culture and with cultural change -cultural movements, including artistic ones reflect or lead other kinds of social change, something neglected in over-sociological social movement theory (Clammer 2014), and, as James Jasper has cogently argued, they are not only cultural, but also *moral* movements that reflect struggles over fundamental values (Jasper 1997). Furthermore they are 'universal'—found in some form or another in just about every society very much including the 'developing world', as captured in such notions as "new social movements in the South" (Wignaraja 1993), they learn from each other and certain examples—for instance the Chipko movement against deforestation in north India or the Mexican Zapatistas— have become almost required reference points, and are trans-border, as are the issues that some, such as the so-called 'anti-globalization' (really anti-corporate) movements confront, which are of course planet wide in nature (Starr 2000).

They are also, and this is important in the context of building a just and sustainable future society, generally non-violent (Zunes et al. 1999). Unlike most conventional political organizations and parties, social movements are often rapid in their reaction to new events, possibilities, problems, and emerging forms of injustice or structural inequalities, and

imaginative in their ways of addressing them, through a wide variety of means—protests certainly, but also satire, carnivals, sponsoring parties and street art (Crehan 2011), operating community radio stations and other fun means quite beyond the usual stodgy methodology of the established political parties. And very importantly, almost all recognize culture as being one of the keys—whether in fighting cultural imperialism (Hamm and Smandych 2005) and the many forms of McDonaldization, in recognizing that culture itself is a tool in struggles against the negative forms of globalization (as Amory Starr does in the volume cited above), in promoting culture and cultural autonomy as being in itself an important form of social movement, and, as little of the mainstream social movements literature does, recognizing religious movements, including the emergence of so-called "new religions" as very significant forms of social movement, both as a social phenomenon in themselves, and as connecting directly with other forms of social, cultural and ethical change, as with the rise of the Pentecostal movement in Latin America and many parts of Africa, the emergence of "Engaged Buddhism", the continuing vitality of Catholic "Liberation Theology" and many other examples. The literature on new religious movements however tends to be confined largely to the sociology of religion, and does not spill over much, as it should, into wider social movement theory (for a survey see Chryssides 1999).

In his major study of contemporary social movement theory, Alberto Melucci places the role of culture at the center, through his notion of codes. Hence "contemporary 'movements' assume the form of solidarity networks entrusted with potent cultural meanings, and it is precisely these meanings that distinguish them so sharply from political actors and formal organizations next to them…social movements too seem to shift their focus from class, race and other more traditional issues towards the cultural ground. In the last thirty years emerging social conflicts in complex societies have not expressed themselves through political action, but rather have raised cultural challenges to the dominant language, to the codes that organize information and shape social practices" (Melucci 1996: 4, 8). These struggles have appeared in the form of debates over multiculturalism, sexuality, gender, censorship, cultural rights and concepts of nature (and of the inter-relationships between these) as much as in the more 'traditional' issues of emancipatory politics (although I would disagree with Melucci that these have gone away: they are still very much there, although the *form* of struggle against them may well have changed, as

signaled by such things as the emergence of the 'post-development' lobby in relation to conventional understandings of development).

Central to social movement research then should be the issue of social imagination, embodied in or seeking to be expressed by, such movements. It is this question of imagination that is central to the work of Max Haiven and which is very much worth exploring for that reason. Central to the "there is no alternative" view is what Haiven calls "conscripting our imaginations" (Haiven 2014: 7) since all systems, economic, social or political as well as cultural, ultimately are products of such imagination. To intervene in the current planetary crisis, which Haiven sees primarily as a by-product of unfettered capitalism, then requires the fresh exercise of the imagination, which is how he discusses his project in his book: "It is best conceived as a set of exercises of the imagination: different, radical ways of reimagining social relations and the crises we now face. It is a book about ideology, conformity, creativity and the institutions and social formations that sustain them" (Haiven 2014: 8). He goes on to suggest that to carry out this project requires a combination of many elements including critical and social theory, cultural analysis and political economy, and involves ranging over history, politics, ecology, economics, society and notions of identity. Central to all of this is culture, and its wellsprings creativity and imagination, those very forces that have been so extensively co-opted by capitalism: "Likewise, I will argue that culture is far from immune from the influence of economics, but that this relationship is not merely oppressive, that 'culture', broadly speaking, is a key field on which to confront capitalism. Indeed, I am seeking here to sketch what might be called a materialist theory of the imagination" (Haiven 2014: 12–13). His recommendations, based on such an analysis, one completely compatible with the thesis that we have been expounding in this book, contains a number of important elements including "the defense of actually existing commons and the establishment of new commons where we can cooperate on other terms, terms which obey other values, not the single pathological value of capitalism" (Haiven 2014: 22), agreement with the argument of John Holloway that a future revolution cannot just follow the old model of seizing power, power itself being the problem, of resisting the commodification of social values and recognizing inter-dependency rather than rugged individualism, reclaiming the idea of creativity from that commodification to the idea that "Real creativity is the ability to change the world together" (Haiven 2014: 211) and as such is a collective process.

In a parallel book, published in the same year, co-authored with Alex Khasnabish, the thesis is advanced that precisely the way to embody what they call the "radical imagination" is through social movements (Haiven and Khasnabish 2014). Social movements themselves, and sympathetic research on them, constitute vital acts of social transformation, since social movements are themselves an important form of research—they are active experiments in social change, and as such much can be learnt from their failures as well as successes. An important innovation in the book is the concept of what Haiven and Khasnabish call "prefigurative research"—not just what is, but "a form of research borrowed from a post-revolutionary future" (Haiven and Khasnabish 2014: 17). Such an approach asks what research would look like in a post-capitalist world, one based on 'solidarity research' and concerned with not only exploring the implications of the social and economic outcomes of radical re-imaginings of the future, but embodying these (unlike most 'post-development' thinkers) in a "politics of prefiguration" (Haiven and Khasnabish 2014: 61). In other words, as far as possible, social movements—pacifist, anti-racist, feminist, queer, environmental, anti-nuclear or whatever—should embody the future that they envisage. To illustrate this they quote the words of the leading social movement scholar Alberto Melucci, who we have invoked above:

> People are offered the possibility of another experience of time, space, interpersonal relations, which opposes operational rationality of apparatuses. A different way of naming the world reverses the dominant codes. The medium, the movement itself as a new medium, is the message. As prophets without enchantment, contemporary movements practice in the present the change they are struggling for: they redefine the meaning of social action for the whole society. (Melucci 1985: 801)

This is exactly the point of "prefigurative politics"—to embody what Gandhi a generation earlier described as 'being the change you want to see' (although I personally would like to see the enchantment, somewhat excluded by Melucci, reinstated). The possibility then emerges of not just the literary utopia, but of the concrete one, at least in its prefigured form (Day et al. 2007).

We see then a number of different but in many respects converging ideas about a new politics for sustainability. What they have in common is their emphasis on the imagination—whether understood in its

materialist applications by thinkers such as Haiven, or as religious ones by the likes of Lerner, or even of a kind of synthesis of these apparently different points of view in the writings of Gregory Wilpert who has proposed the concept of "Integral Politics" encompassing non-dualism, morality, critique of the pathologies of development, and the need for a new cultural logic including many of the elements that we have discussed in this book (Wilpert 2001), or in the idea of Roger Gottlieb proposing what he calls "spiritualities of resistance" that bring together means of self-centering and healing such as meditation with radical opposition to ecological degradation (Gottlieb 1999). Indeed, there is more than a hint in such approaches that ecology *is* the new spirituality. Clearly one of the intellectual tasks here is to create a dialogue between these different positions—one largely coming from the Marxist or neo-Marxist Left, one from environmentalism, and one from religious presuppositions.

Helpful in this respect is the work of Slavoj Žižek, particularly in his magisterial work *Living in the End Times* (Žižek 2011). In that large and complex book, with the Biblical resonances of its title, Žižek covers a great deal of ground. But here I would like to highlight just a few relevant elements. Starting from an analysis of our current crisis—what he calls, again with a Biblical flavor, the "four riders of the apocalypse"— notably "the ecological crisis, the consequences of the biogenetic revolution, imbalances within the system itself (problems with intellectual property, forthcoming struggles over raw materials, food and water), and the explosive growth of social divisions and exclusions" (Žižek 2011: 10), Žižek explores alternatives to what he calls "the shameless cynicism of the existing global order" (2011: 13). These include the need for an engaged position, moving beyond 'tolerance' to emancipation, the generation of new forms of collective action beyond the market, the exposure of the violence behind the public face of 'law and order' and seeking for a renewed 'Left' beyond the rigid formulations of the old version. He draws on the ideas of the social thinker Philippe Van Parijs who has developed an interesting model of a real "Third Way" beyond both capitalism and socialism through a set of social, economic and taxation mechanisms (Van Parijs 1995), and discusses a number of practical options, including revolution, local interventions and doing nothing. As with a number of other thinkers whose work we have considered, Žižek himself comes back to two key ideas: the transformation of power (2011: 409) and the significance of the commons

and the struggle to establish such spaces. It is with that thought that he concludes the whole massive book:

> Communism is today not the name of a solution but the name of a *problem*: the problem of the *commons* in all its dimensions—the commons of nature as the substance of our life, the problem of our biogenetic commons, the problem of our cultural commons ("intellectual property"), and, last but not least, the problem of the commons as that universal space of humanity from which no one should be excluded. Whatever the solution might be, it will have to solve *this* problem. (Žižek 2011: 481)

Indeed, and this problem goes by a number of names, including that of community.

But the notion of 'community' often has very liberal overtones: a somewhat amorphous concept suggesting some kind of feel-good and cosy notion of togetherness. Its tone is somewhat different from the notions of solidarity or of the commons. In fact, as ecologists know but sociologists have often forgotten, communities are places of struggle and of 'creative destruction' as one species wars with another for dominance. The ecologist William Jordan has very thoroughly discussed this issue:

> We need to consider exactly what community is. What distinguishes it from other forms of association? How do we achieve it and at what cost? How does what we know about community among members of our own species relate to the task of expanding community to include other species? And what might the idea of extending community in this way mean for a society that has, by all accounts, been in full flight from both the experience and the institutions of community for at least two hundred years, a society in which the practice of community, at least in its tougher, more demanding forms, has been decisively marginalized, flourishing only on the fringes of society, among the poor, for example, or in organizations such as gangs? (Jordan 2012: 33).

The notions of 'community', 'solidarity' and 'commons' need careful deconstruction. This is not to reject them as the basis for a new politics, far from it, but to explore the full range of issues involved in their propagation to ensure that that new politics is soundly based. As Jordan points out, the entirely positive view of community is not born out by experience: communities are as full of rivalries, special interests, struggles for privileges and all the other petty but all too real characteristics of just about every human

group. Without understanding the psychology of politics no future politics will be much better subjectively (it might well be better in such objective ways as reduction of structured inequality) than the old forms.

Jordan, in acknowledging the problematic qualities of human communities (and the fact that nature should hardly be romanticized, based as it is on struggle and competition, otherwise known as evolution), suggests that it is the loss of enchantment that prevents human communities from functioning and that in ritual and other mechanisms of *solidarity creation* that the solution might reside. Furthermore, change is the norm, and so looking backwards to forms of community that no longer exist or can be reconstituted cannot be the basis of a new politics of solidarity. We have to discover and/or invent new forms appropriate to our current situation. Culture is of course the means through which this is achieved, both for achieving satisfactory relationships among ourselves and between our species and other one with which we share the planet. This all points to the many ways in which politics can learn from ecology and the non-political: that beyond politics lies the sacred, that psychology is important because suffering is intrinsic to human life (Clammer 2012: 165ff), that what we really seek is not *autonomy*, but *relationship*, as reflected in the thinking of philosophers such as Emmanuel Levinas (1987) and Alain Finkielkraut (1997) and the fact that we "weave the world" and so can potentially move beyond vengeance, arrogance, insolence and debt (Jordan 2012: 95) and that this can be achieved in part at least through what Jordan calls (drawing on an extensive anthropological literature) "world renewing rituals" and narratives of recovery.

We see, in conclusion, the need for a radical new political culture to attain sustainability, and beyond sustainability, renewal and fresh future possibilities well ahead of the sad vocabulary of "mitigation" and "adaptation" so frequently found in the basically pessimistic sustainability literature. There are clearly many versions of what such a politics might look like, but we see some fascinating contours. These include the revival of world centered spirituality, the centrality of imagination, the need for subtle psychology, the requirement of dialogue with and learning from nature, the fundamental importance of relationship, the willingness to live with diversity and in fact to embrace and esteem it, and the major role of culture in creating the alternative vocabularies, performances and visions of the new society. It is to some concrete and literary versions of this possible new society to which we will turn in the final chapter.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Baudrillard, Jean. 1983. *In the Shadow of the Silent Minorities… Or The End of the Social*. New York: Semiotext(e).

Bettelheim, Bruno. 1986. *The Informed Heart*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Buck-Morss, Susan. 2000. *Dreamworld and Catastrophe: The Passing of Mass Utopia in East and West*. Cambridge, MA and London: The MIT Press.

Chryssides, George D. 1999. *Exploring New Religions*. London and New York: Cassell.

Clammer, John. 2009. *Diaspora and Belief: Globalization, Religion and Identity in Postcolonial Asia*. New Delhi: Shipra Publications.

, ———. 2011. Art and the Conception and Creation of 'Asia': Towards a New Model of Social Theory. *Asia Pacific World* 2(1): 5–24.

, ———. 2012. *Culture, Development and Social Theory: Towards an Integrated Social Development*. London and New York: Zed Books.

Clammer, John, Sylvie Poirier, and Eric Schwimmer, eds. 2004. *Figured Worlds: Ontological Obstacles in Intercultural Relations*. Toronto and London: Toronto University Press.

Clammer 2014. *Vision and Society: Towards a Sociology and Anthropology from Art*. London and New York: Routledge.

Cobb, John B. Jr. 1990. From Individualism to Persons in Community: A Postmodern Economic Theory. In *Sacred Interconnections: Postmodern Spirituality, Political Economy, and Art*, ed. David Ray Griffin, 123–142. Albany: State University of New York University Press.

Cohen, Ronald, and John Middleton, eds. 1967. *Comparative Political Systems: Studies in the Politics of Pre-industrial Societies*. New York: The Natural History Press.

Covey, S. 1992. *Principal Centered Leadership*. London: Simon and Schuster.

Crehan, Kate. 2011. *Community Art: An Anthropological Perspective*. Oxford and New York: Berg.

Csikszentmihalyi, Mihaly. 1994. *The Evolving Self: Psychology for the Third Millennium*. New York: HarperPerennial.

Cullinan, Cormac. 2011. *Wild Law*: *A Manifesto for Earth Justice*. 2nd ed. White River Junction, VT: Chelsea Green.

Day, Richard, Greig De Peuter, and Mark Cote, eds. 2007. *Utopian Pedagogy: Radical Experiments against Neoliberal Globalization*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Finkielkraut, Alain. 1997. *The Wisdom of Love*. Trans. Kevin O'Neill and David Suchoff. Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press.

Gershon, David. 2009. *Social Change 2.0: A Blueprint for Reinventing the World*. West Hurley, NY: High Point/Chelsea Green.

Giddens, Anthony. 1991. *Modernity and Self-Identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Gottlieb, Roger S. 1999. A Spirituality of Resistance: Finding a Peaceful Heart and Protecting the Earth. *Tikkun*, March/April, 33–37, 68–69.

Haiven, Max. 2014. *Crises of Imagination, Crises of Power: Capitalism, Creativity and the Commons*. London and New York: Zed Books and Halifax and Winnipeg: Fernwood Publishing.

Haiven, Max, and Alex Khasnabish. 2014. *The Radical Imagination: Social Movement Research in the Age of Austerity*. London and New York: Zed Books.

Hamm, Bernd, and Russell Smandych. 2005. *Cultural Imperialism: Essays on the Political Economy of Cultural Domination*. Peterborough: Broadview Press.

Holloway, John. 2002. *Change the World Without Taking Power*. London and Ann Arbor: Pluto Press.

Illich, Ivan. 1990. *Limits to Medicine: Medical Nemesis: The Expropriation of Health*. New York: Penguin.

Jackson, Tim. 2010. *Prosperity Without Growth: Economics for a Finite Planet*. London and Washington, DC: Earthscan.

Jacoby, Russell. 1999. *The End of Utopia: Politics and Culture in an Age of Apathy*. New York: Basic Books.

Jasper, James M. 1997. *The Art of Moral Protest: Culture, Biography and Creativity in Social Movements*. Chicago and London: Chicago University Press.

Jordan, William R. 2012. *The Sunflower Forest: Ecological Restoration and the New Communion With Nature*. Berkeley and London: University of California Press.

Keen, Sam. 1997. *Hymns to an Unknown God: Awakening the Spirit in Everyday Life*. London: Piatkus.

Korten, David C. 1999. *The Post-Corporate World: Life After Capitalism*. West Hartford, CT and New York: Kumarian.

, ———. 2006. *The Great Turning: From Empire to Earth Community*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers and New York: Kumarian Press.

Kumar, D. Jeevan, and Sudha S., eds. 2010. *Uniting in Responsibilities in a Culture of Rights*. Bangalore: Books for Change.

Latouche, Serge. 1993. *In the Wake of the Affluent Society: An Exploration of Post-Development*. Trans. and Introduced by Martin O'Connor and Rosemary Arnoux. London and New York: Zed Books.

Lerner, Michael. 1996. *The Politics of Meaning: Restoring Hope and Possibility in an Age of Cynicism*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Levinas, Emmanuel. 1987. *Time and the Other*. Trans. Richard A. Cohen. Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press.

Melucci, Alberto. 1985. The Symbolic Challenge of Contemporary Movements. *Social Research* 52(4): 789–816.

, ———. 1996. *Challenging Codes: Collective Action in the Information Age*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Nakano, Yoshihiro. 2007. On the Singular Name of Post-development: Serge Latouche's *Destruktion* of Development and the Possibility of Emancipation.

In *Exploring Post-development: Theory and Practice, Problems and Perspectives*, ed. Aram Ziai, 63–79. Abingdon and New York: Routledge.

O' Murchu, Diarmuid. 1998. *Reclaiming Spirituality: A New Spiritual Framework for Today's World*. New York: Crossroad Publishing.

Parkin, Sara. 2010. *The Positive Deviant: Sustainability Leadership in a Perverse World*. London and Washington, DC: Earthscan.

Santos, Boaventura de Sousa. 2003. The WSF: Towards a Counter-Hegemonic Globalization. www.portoalegra2003.org/publique/cgi/public/cgilua.ex/web/portoalegre/templates/htm/IP5RU/view

Shiva, Vandana. 2005. *Earth Democracy: Justice, Sustainability and Peace*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.

Shrivastava, Aseem, and Ashish Kothari. 2014. *Churning The Earth: The Making of Global India*. New Delhi: Penguin Books India.

Starr, Amory. 2000. *Naming the Enemy: Anti-Corporate Movements Confront Globalization*. London: Zed Books.

Unger, Roberto Mangabeira. 2001. *False Necessity: Anti-Necessitarian Social Theory in the Service of Radical Democracy*. London and New York: Verso.

Van Parijs, Philippe. 1995. *Real Freedom for All: What (If Anything) Can Justify Capitalism*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press.

Wignaraja, P. 1993. *New Social Movements in the South: Empowering the People*. London: Zed Books.

Wilpert, Gregory. 2001. Integral Politics: A Spiritual Third Way. *Tikkun*, July/August, 44–49.

Ziai, Aram. 2004. The Ambivalence of Post-development: Between Reactionary Populism and Radical Democracy. *Third World Quarterly* 25(6): 1045–1060.

, ———. 2007. *Exploring Post-development: Theory and Practice, Problems and Perspectives*. Abingdon and New York: Routledge.

Žižek, Slavoj. 2011. *Living in the End Times*. London and New York: Verso.

Zunes, Stephen, Lester R. Kurtz, and Sarah Beth Asher. 1999. *Non-Violent Social Movements*. Oxford and Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Sustainability, Cultural Citizenship and the Ecological Self

Despite the diversity of discourses surrounding the concept and practice of sustainability, few of us would disagree that in a world still deeply scarred by conflicts based on resource competition, religious fundamentalisms, huge and in many cases widening disparities between the rich and the poor, that dialogue seeking for some common language that transcends cultural and political differences is the most urgent of contemporary tasks. This task is not the preserve of professional politicians moreover, but is the responsibility of every concerned citizen, and particularly of the social scientists who are presumably charged with the duty of examining society and culture and ideally of promoting forms of positive and life-enhancing communication between peoples. But while many of us may agree on the importance of trans-civilizational dialogue and the mutual understanding that should arise from such intercultural conversations, it is difficult to agree on a common language in which to do this which avoids the pitfalls of universalism with its homogenizing tendencies and often ill-concealed ethnocentrism on the one hand, and the forms of relativism that have long plagued some schools of anthropology and continue to plague postmodernism on the other. One way of approaching such issues is through analyzing the idea of citizenship and what it might mean in a world that is globalized in the more conventional economic sense, and which now faces truly global challenges—climate change being one of the most conspicuous, but certainly not the only one. What might "citizenship" mean in a world of declining significance of nation-states in the face of globalization, lack of truly democratic or effective international organizations, huge movements

of peoples, tourists, workers and refugees, and massive and planet-wide ecological problems (Hudson and Slaughter 2007)?

Some are now arguing that have now discovered such a common language that might provide an answer to these questions, notably one centered on the realization of the extent of environmental degradation and its long term consequences for all life forms on the planet. This issue is of paramount importance not only because it addresses the question of the continuance of life on earth as we now know it (and certainly of human life), but equally because it poses fundamental ontological questions, of which the most significant is whether to be human is to be separated from (and presumably "above") the other life forms that inhabit the same biosphere as ourselves? Amongst the classical answers to this question, often emerging from the major Western religions, was of course a resounding yes: we alone possess language, a moral and aesthetic sense, culture, and most significantly, a soul. Furthermore, and also arising from the same religious sources, particularly Christianity in the argument of the controversial but intensely debated and much reprinted paper by Lynn White (1973), is the idea that nature exists for the benefit of humans who are free to exploit it for their pleasure and purposes with no reference to any possible intrinsic qualities, freedoms or moral sensibilities that other bioforms may possess or enjoy. This in short is the philosophical and religious attitude encapsulated in the term anthropomorphism: that humans are the centre of reality and that other life forms exist to serve them.

This viewpoint has increasingly come under scrutiny from many viewpoints: sociobiology has indicated the close continuities between human beings and other species; studies of animal language have shown the elaborate communication systems employed by many species; evidence of the mathematical and symbolic skills of chimpanzees and other higher apes; the emerging field of ecopsychology which has demonstrated the embeddedness in nature of human beings, who suffer considerable psychological damage and even physical illnesses when cut off from contact with nature; and of course growing public awareness of global warming, resource depletion, pollution of oceans, rivers, air and soils, loss of biodiversity and the long term dangers of the use of nuclear powerstations for electricity has led to rapidly rising public awareness of the fact that we are actually approaching a serious and life-threatening ecological crisis, and an expanding environmental movement (the fastest growing sector amongst social movements) that has arisen to address these problems and certainly to draw constant attention to them.

Two of the major sources in a shift of attitude towards nature, and which have considerable implications for cross-cultural sustainability dialogue have been the rise of Deep Ecology as a tendency within the broader environmental movement on the one hand, and the recognition from the perspective of comparative religion that many Asian religions have an approach to nature that is not only comprehensive and very different from that of the major Western religions, but are also fundamentally non-anthropocentric. There are furthermore many points of contact between these two historically and culturally separated approaches, interfaces which I will argue suggest a new model for thinking about sustainability, and for a new sense of cosmopolitan identity based on a concept of planetary citizenship transcending traditional political and national boundaries. The basis of this claim will be the idea that it is possible and indeed imperative to formulate a notion of human identity that is based not on "difference" (a notion that has pervaded much of social theory in the recent past), but on the continuity between humans and nature. This continuity is shared by all human beings regardless of culture or nationality, and hence of a sense of planetary identity both in the sense of human existential unity and of communion with the rest of nature, with the other bioforms and other geographical, geological and atmospheric circumstances which are the context and requirements of our lives and are essential not only to our physical survival (that should be fairly obvious), but also to our psychic, aesthetic, and moral survival. This suggests a form of genuine cosmopolitanism (related indeed to the cosmos) that is not political and hence ideological and divisive, but which is truly radical in its implications for patterns of communications between humans, between humans and the earth and in notions of shared responsibility in a fundamentally interdependent and interrelated universe. Such an approach will also have implications for peace building, conflict resolution and notions of citizenship in a world in sustainability is now the critical goal.

Deep Ecology and the Buddhist World View

The notion of "Deep Ecology" as a theory is usually credited to the Norwegian philosopher Arne Naess who, in a series of papers, has set out the basis of what he contrasts with "shallow ecology" or environmentalism. Deep Ecology according to Naess has eight key characteristics, the main three of which are: 1. The well-being and flourishing of human and non-human life on Earth have value in themselves. These values are independent

of the usefulness of the non-human world for human purposes. 2. Richness and diversity of life forms contribute to the realization of these values and are also values in themselves. 3. Humans have no right to reduce this richness and diversity except to satisfy vital needs. The implications of this are various according to Naess—a much smaller human population, much less human interference in the non-human world, new policies and ideological shifts that recognize the superiority of quality of life over rising standards of living (Naess 1986). His numerous commentators have drawn many conclusions from this platform, amongst which are the question of whether we have the *competence* let alone the *right* to dominate the earth (might true sustainability not be more simply 'letting alone' than trying incompetently to 'manage' everything?), the tracing of the roots of the present environmental crisis to Western anthropocentrism embodied in both religious and in Cartesian philosophical/scientific forms, the limits of any notion of "sustainability" which implies continued growth on a finite planet, the close links between environmental ethics and development ethics, the importance of preserving and indeed expanding areas of genuine wilderness and the need to "embrace" the world rather than attempt to conquer it (for a very full reprinting of many relevant articles on all these themes and more see Sessions 1995). As Naess and others have pointed out, this whole philosophy can be summed up essentially by saying that everything hangs together, everything is related, and that the consequence of this is the necessity of an ecocentric rather than an anthropocentric world view, one in which the totality of things, including the intimate embeddedness of human beings in nature is recognized and celebrated. Implicit in this view is the notion of what might be called the "Ecological Self"—the position that, if all is related in a holistic way, then human nature—the self, or self-identity—cannot be radically separated from identity with the rest of nature. This position, long recognized by poets and the seers of almost all Asian religions (Buddhism, Hinduism and Shinto in particular), now becomes both science and ethics, science because we now know that we are a unity with the broader cosmos, and ethics because this insight now determines how we must act, in relation to each other and to the total Earth community.

It is significant that it has been mainly theologians or scholars of Buddhism who have most firmly grasped this point, such as the Buddhist scholar and therapist Joanna Macy who has pertinently written:

> "It becomes clear, for example, that the grief and fear experienced for our world and our common future are categorically different from similar

sentiments relating to one's welfare. This pain cannot be equated with dread of one's own individual demise. Its source lies less in concerns for personal survival than in apprehensions of collective suffering—of what looms for human life and other species and unborn generations to come. Its nature is akin to the original meaning of compassion—"suffering with". It is the distress that we feel on behalf of the larger whole of which we are a part. And, when it is so defined, it serves as trigger or gateway to a more encompassing sense of identity, inseparable from the web of life in which we are as intricately connected as cells in a larger body. This shift is an appropriate, adaptive response. For the crisis that threatens our planet, be it seen in its military, ecological, or social aspects, derives from a dysfunctional and pathogenic notion of the self. It is a mistake about our place in the order of things. It is the delusion that the self is so separate and fragile that we must delineate and defend its boundaries, that it is so small and needy that we must endlessly acquire and endlessly consume, that it is so aloof that we can—as individuals, corporations, nation-states or as a species—be immune to what we do to other beings". (Macy 1990: 38–39)

Macy goes on to point out that this notion of what she herself calls the "ecological self" is supported by the findings of contemporary science (the idea that we are open, self-organizing systems with no clear boundaries between demarcating a separate, continuous self), transcends separateness and fragmentation, and helps us to overcome a narrow ego-centered notion of altruism for a much more boundless sense of identification growing from a sense of the symbiosis between individual and environment.

Macy sees this transformation in the perception of our place in the world as coming from two main sources—Mahayana Buddhism with its emphasis on the interconnectedness of all things and as causality understood as a complex of relationships and interactions rather than as a linear process on the one hand, and deep ecology on the other. As she puts it in respect of the latter "The perspective of deep ecology helps us to recognize our embeddedness in nature, overcoming our alienation from the rest of creation and regaining an attitude of reverence for all life forms. It can change the way that the self is experienced through a spontaneous process of ever-widening identification. It launches one on a process of self-realization, where the self-to-be-realized extends further and further beyond the separate ego and includes more and more of the phenomenal world" (Macy 1990: 45). We find here too a powerful convergence between systems theory, deep ecology and Buddhism that is appearing increasingly in a broader literature on positive social transformation

(the work of Fritjof Capra 2002 for example) and is itself emerging as a major intellectual movement away from Cartesianism and anthropocentrism. While this is a sense "secularizes" Buddhism (one need not be a Buddhist to hold to such an ecocentric perspective), it should not obscure either the deep ecological teaching enshrined in the Buddhist tradition or its potentially transformative effects on many aspects of scientific and social science thinking. In the first respect Mahayana Buddhism contains not only a substantial body of ecological teaching, but also the significant idea of the potential Buddhahood of all beings, seen as extending to plant life as well as sentient animals: a consequence of the interrelated nature of all things and their constant co-evolution (for collections of essays on these themes see Tucker and Williams 1997, Kaza and Kraft 2000 and Badiner 1990; on implications for social science see Loy 2003, Jones 2003, Clammer 2005 and 2015a).

We find here then the confluence of two movements—an increasing awareness of the nature and magnitude of the environmental crisis that is upon us and falls, if not initially equally on everyone, ultimately on all societies and peoples, and a shift in the perception of the self from an atomistic or monadic one to an inclusive and fluid-boundary one. The Australian ecophilosopher Warwick Fox has furthermore developed a subtle argument in which he explores and answers the question "what is wrong with anthropocentrism?" in both philosophical terms (its inadequacy as an explanation of human's place in the world), and empirically (its disastrous consequences for life on the planet) as well as for its sheer hubris. As he points out, anthropocentric assumptions are convenient, comfortable and self-serving, and it is nice to think of oneself as the end point of evolution, except that we are now living with the consequences of just this attitude that has prevailed, at least in the Western world, for centuries (Fox 1990). Even as Zygmunt Bauman has argued that the Holocaust was the outcome of modernity and the mindset that it produced (Bauman 1999), so we might in parallel argue that the outcome of anthropocentrism has been the ecological meltdown that now starkly confronts us, regardless of our "civilization". Indeed it might be cogently argued that it is exactly our "civilizations" that have brought us to this point and that the outcome of science and the vast managerial resources that modern societies claim to possess has demonstrated that we cannot in fact dominate creation, but rather that their gigantism, developmentalism, industrialism and resource hunger are rapidly destroying the very basis of all life.

Fox, who prefers and has coined the term "transpersonal ecology" to refer to the sense of self that extends beyond one's own ego-centered identity rather than the term "ecological self" (although they have the same meaning), suggests that once this state of expansiveness is achieved, there are three bases for identification: what he terms the personal, the ontological and the cosmological. These he describes as follows: Personally based identification refers to experiences of commonality with other entities that are brought about through personal involvement with those entities… Ontologically based identification refers to experiences of commonality with all that is brought about through deep-seated realization of the fact *that* things are…Cosmologically based identification refers to experiences of commonality with all that is that are brought about through deep-seated realization of the fact that we and all other entities are aspects of a single unfolding reality. This realization can be brought about through the empathic incorporation of *any* cosmology (i.e. any fairly comprehensive account of *how* the world is) that sees the world as a single unfolding process—as a 'unity in progress' to employ Theodore Roszak's splendid phrase" (Fox 1990: 249–252).

There are two important things to note here: an idea of identification that transcends national/cultural boundaries and is instead focused on the common ground of nature which (despite social constructivist ideas that nature too is simply a conceptual invention, while agreeing indeed that specific concepts of nature vary across and between cultures) it is in fact the ultimately shared basis of life; and the idea that *any* unifying cosmology can provide the basis for such identification. If this is the case, then the specific differences between religions in particular dissolve in the higher solvent of common rootedness in the Earth, and much the same can be said of cultures, world views, ideologies or of that very unclear term "civilizations".

If much contemporary social theory and its specific applications such as feminism and multiculturalism and certainly the politics of modernity are to do with difference and its corresponding "Othering" (e.g. Irigaray 1989), what this alternative approach points to is a nondualism the sources of which are found in many of the world's religions (and certainly in Judaism, Islam, Hinduism and Buddhism) and also in the evolutionary conceptions of such ecological thinkers as Thomas Berry and Brian Swimme (Swimme and Berry 1994, Swimme 1996). Since nonduality implies the oneness of things, civilizations and cultures, it can be seen as the kind of foundation of a deeper unity. Speaking of the Buddhist usage

of the term Taitetsu Unno writes that "Implicit in this usage of nonduality is the affirmation of the world of duality where mutual responsibility is the binding thread. Everyday distinctions are fully recognized, free of all egocentric perceptions that distort reality. The world is seen in its pristine form; the suchness of people, things, events, nature, and all phenomena are affirmed in endless interconnectedness" (Unno 1998: 135). The philosophical and ethical implication of this is the form of de-centered knowing (*prajna*) in which the other is seen from within its own suchness and not from the standpoint of the ego-self, a practical knowledge which expresses itself as *karuna* or compassion, the affirmation of the other before the self. This it might be argued is a step beyond the preoccupation with dialogue embodied in the world of such Western luminaries as Martin Buber and Emmanuel Levinas which still assumes a distinction between the self and the other, to a compassionate identification in which boundaries are dissolved in the recognition of the common ground of being.

COMMON EARTH/COMMON HUMANITY/ COMMON CITIZENSHIP?

Traditional philosophical anthropology has focused primarily on the issue of whether there is a common human nature shared by all humanity (Clammer 2013). After several centuries this is still very contested terrain, constantly invaded by new contenders such as sociobiology, cybernetics, cyborgs, and cloning, advancing more from biology than from philosophy. The debate is significant as it relates directly to very practical issues such as human rights, gender differences and race. Its apparently irresolvable nature however suggests that perhaps it is proceeding on the wrong ground. If we shift that ground from the anthropocentric and sociocentric view of conventional social science to an ecocentered or even cosmic view, what does this shift do to our ideas of a common humanity and the cosmopolitan relationships that might emerge if ideas of unity are allowed to prevail over those of difference? To begin with it might make us more humble and as a result less prone to try to control and dominate that which we do not even understand. This in itself would not be a bad thing, but it is certainly not enough. We are wrong for example to suppose that the major axis of conflict in the contemporary world is between "civilizations", or between liberal or authoritarian regimes. Under the regime of globalization in fact it is conflict between industrialization and ecology, between the inherent greed and destructiveness of an unbounded consumption

based economy and the fragility and finiteness of the environment that sustains it (Berry 1999, Kovel 2002). This lies behind the resource based conflicts that currently plague the world and sadly these conflicts are likely to intensify unless and until we can find some way to, as Berry puts it, to "reinvent the human *within the community of life systems*. This is the central phrase, the primary condition for reinventing the human. Because the Earth is not adequately understood either by our spiritual or by our scientific traditions, the human has become an addendum or an intrusion. We have found this situation to our liking since it enables us to avoid the problem of integral presence to the Earth. This attitude prevents us from considering the Earth as a single community with ethical relations governed primarily by the well-being of the total Earth community" (Berry 1999: 161–162). It is this idea that provides the basis for a new and inclusive concept of cosmopolitan identity, and also for an expanded conception of human rights that both understands them in non-sociocentric terms and recognizes the rights of other living beings as having a serious if not equal status.

But is it in itself enough? The Latin American liberation theologian Leonardo Boff thinks not:

> "Having a new cosmology is not enough. How are we to spread it and bring people to internalize it so as to inspire new behaviors, nourish new dreams, and bolster a new kindness toward the Earth? That is certainly a pedagogical challenge. As the old paradigm that atomized human beings and set them against the universe and the community of living beings permeated through all our pores in our lives and created a collective subjectivity suited to its intuitions, so now the new paradigm must form new kinds of subjectivity and enter into all realms of life, society, the family, media, and educational institutions in order to shape a new planetary man and woman, in cosmic solidarity with the overall direction of the evolutionary process". (Boff 1997: 119)

This is indeed true and this poses a challenge to the neglected area of development ethics. One of the few who has devoted himself to the task of creating such a vital but neglected field, Denis Goulet, rightly suggests that the tendency has been in the face of all this talk of "the ecological imperative" to forget the issue of social justice, a tragic and unnecessary distinction because

> "The task of eliminating degrading underdevelopment imposes itself with the same urgency as that of safeguarding nature. These twin concerns have

spawned two ethical streams of protest. Yet almost always the two streams flow in opposite directions: one is concerned with protecting nature, the other with promoting economic justice. This dissonance is tragic because it is the identical pseudodevelopment which lies at the root of both problems. The only antidote to pseudodevelopment is a working ethic of what is generally called 'sustainable development', but which is better termed 'integral authentic development'. Such an ethic joins the two normative streams, linking the concerns for environmental responsibility with the drive for universal economic justice. There can be no sound development ethic without environmental wisdom and, conversely, no environmental wisdom without a solid development ethic". (Goulet 1995: 119)

The notion of cosmopolitanism makes little moral sense if it is divorced from the need for social justice that flows parallel to and constantly intersects with the need for ecological justice. What potentially unites them I suggest is the notion of the ecological self. If identification with nature is one half of that selfhood, identification with the suffering of that nature and of the humans and other entities that inhabit it is surely the other.

A number of consequences flow from this position. The first is a much more inclusive notion of cultural and civilizational dialogue than that currently espoused by the United Nations (e.g. Annan and Matsuura 2001) and which assumes the primacy and continuity of existing political entities (and primarily the nation-state). In response to this kind of thinking Dallmayr suggests that "Regarding civilizational dialogue…such encounter cannot remain entirely human-centered or *polis*-centered. Despite the importance of civility and civilized discourse in 'cities' (the etymological root of 'civilization'), a genuine cross-cultural meeting has to take into account the deeper dimensions and resonances of human experience; differently phrased, it has to make room for certain corollaries or supplements of civilized life—corollaries that are thematized here under the rubrics of 'nature' and 'the divine' (Dallmayr 2002: 3). He is right, but while he goes on to stress the theme of interconnectedness, he does not in fact develop or further theorize this idea of the (quite literally) organic interconnection to the common ground of our being-in-nature. This missing term is of course the element that we are attempting to establish here. This in turn has a broad range of implications. While social inequalities exist, existentially all humans exist in nature and require access to nature as a psychic, spiritual and artistic good (as noted a generation ago in the "basic human needs" approach to development). While social scientists and especially political

scientists tend to regard freedom as the absence of external constraints, it can also be understood as self-development, spiritual and psychic expansion and freedom from what in Buddhism are called "internal formations"—compulsions, rigid patterns of behavior and fixations—and nature as we know from poetry, art, imagination and utopian writing as well as from personal experience, is an unparalleled zone of physical and psychological freedom and a space of self-discovery.

A non-subjectivist approach to the self furthermore creates a communal, even cosmic, sense of identity and interconnectedness that transcends the limits of language and its endless discursive formations in favour of experience which while not entirely unmediated, certainly produces a sense of non-duality rarely available through cognitive and linguistic processes. This has philosophical and anthropological consequences among which is the re-establishment of ontology, of ways of being in the world, as a balance to epistemology, the analysis of knowledge and cognitive processes. Even Buddhism leans to the latter with its emphasis on the mind as the vehicle of knowledge and hence of enlightenment, to the detriment of more somatic modes of "knowing" through the body, through art and through nature. It is not surprising that a great deal of the mystical literature of all religious traditions, to say nothing of the experiences reported by those under the influence of psychedelic drugs, both posits modes of knowing beyond the linguistic/cognitive while finding in nature their common ground of imagery.

Many forms of conflict between cultures cannot be fully explained in materialist terms—as competition for resources—but require also recourse to a grasp of ontologies or what can be described as the figured worlds in which practice is shaped. In a volume devoted to exploring this issue a number of us suggested that nature—land, animals, plants, places, paths and sacred spaces—prove to be foundational to many disputes that on the surface appear to be just legal or boundary disputes: "When conflicts between indigenes and states are closely examined from an anthropological perspective, at their root lie not only material factors but also ontological conceptions—cosmocentric as opposed to anthropocentric understandings of peoples' place in the universe, images of nature, ideas of the self, of the body, of gender, and of mind-body relationships, to name some of the most significant. These in turn prove to be linked in profound ways to ideas of health, healing, religion, identity, food, aesthetics, symbolism and architecture. In the final analysis, the explication of culture cannot ignore the question of ontologies" (Clammer et al. 2004: 5).

Such an approach both overcomes the sociologism of many analyses of cultural conflict which typically gives emphasis only on such issues as ethnicity or resource competition without connecting them to their underlying ontologies or to the wider networks of meaning and signification within which they are invariably embedded, and allows a transcending of the opposition between culturalist (truth is relative to culture) and constructivist approaches by grasping the relational logic in which all entities and actions are embedded in systems in which no element can change independent of change in all the others, a view recognized but suppressed in mainstream anthropology through the marginalizing of such voices as that of Gregory Bateson who has long argued for such an embedded notion of all human experience (Bateson 1979) in which knowledge is not only gained from cognitive processes, but from their interaction with both other humans and the total non-human environment. This is not of course to suggest that inter-cultural conflicts do not take place, but to suggest that a grasp of their deep structures points to much more fundamental sources of resolution than restricting analysis and response only to the surface structures of political or resource conflict or of competing ideas of legality, which themselves often simply reflect radically differing ontological conceptions. Part of the problem here lies not only in the shallow nature of much inter-cultural "understanding", but also because of the sad fact that as Lynn White pointed out in his now classic paper, that while the environmental crisis is a global problem, we simply have not evolved the kinds of institutional arrangements, regional cooperation or international bodies that cut across national boundaries (as pollution for example obviously does) necessary to address it: we huddle together on a shared planet while still divided into our tribes and sects.

Encounter on the Ground of Nature

The necessity for true cosmopolitanism—an identity rooted in a real grasp of the fact of unity or non-dualism—cannot be securely founded in the political or even the religious. While the former speaks of democracy, in practice it divides and excludes and never in any case touches the fundamental existential qualities of being-in-the-world; the latter while invoking a language of brotherhood and equality so often separates and condemns and betrays its true nature in terrorism, segregation or persecution. So where can we seek this commonality, as a project if not yet as an achieved goal? The thrust of this chapter has been to elaborate on the notion of the

ecological self—a recognition of common embeddedness in nature that is the ground of being for all humans: the life-support system of all of us, the source of our shared biological characteristics, and the basis of our ultimate unity with all other species, and hence of any form of true sustainability. Such a recognition at the philosophical level is deeply satisfying and liberating. It also creates a sense of planetary citizenship, a notion that I will now elaborate on in more detail, as it represents the political expression of broad cosmopolitan identity, and the deepening of the notion of the political far beyond its common expression as power, resource competition and domination.

Notions of citizenship have come under challenge with the advent of contemporary forms of globalization and with it the simultaneous weakening of the nation state, the rise of new international actors (transnational corporations, international NGOs, multilateral agencies such as the World Bank and the WTO and UN agencies) and new forms of transnational practice (mass tourism, the internet, borrowing and copying of popular culture across national boundaries). Julie Davidson argues that there are in fact two major discourses in the shaping of emerging ideas of planetary citizenship—that of globalization and that of sustainablility (Davidson 2004: 168). The major conceptual link between them has been perhaps best theorized by Ulrich Beck in his thesis that late modernity is the period in which risks become globalized and of such complexity as to defy easy analysis or solutions, even by "experts" (Beck 1992). Discourses of globalization and sustainability are thus not at odds, (although empirically they may be) but two sides of the same coin. The argument encompassing globalization, neo-liberal economics and marketization and the whole nature of capitalism has led many to the conclusion that all these elements are linked characteristics of the current world system, a system that is undemocratic, promotes widening social divisions, is environmentally disruptive and is in the long run completely unsustainable (Kovel 2002).

In response to this, the notion has been slowly emerging of what Bart van Steenbergen (1994) termed "ecological citizenship", beginning a debate in which not only was the notion of citizenship reexamined in its global, economic and environmental contexts, but in which whole new images of citizenship began to emerge as less an abstract formal and situational entitlement than as an active, ethical status implying obligations and responsibilities, including responsibilities towards the environment, and requiring a cosmopolitan identity as the only possible social location of a global citizen. While rights still retain a central importance, a

shift is clearly occurring from conceptions of the primacy of entitlements to one of responsibility, competence and the sensible use of freedoms, the latter encompassing not only political status but also consumption and behavior patterns more generally. The need for new forms of transnational citizenship in keeping with the globalized nature of the world-system (however this might actually be brought into being and with due regard to the forces at large that can easily retard such a movement—resurgent nationalism, ethnicity, religious fundamentalisms and free-market ideologies for instance, and with full awareness of the difficulties of making global economic and political forces accountable) is clear. That such new cosmopolitan identities must contain a large and essential element of ecological awareness and responsibility is equally apparent. As Davidson aptly puts it "At the core of a cosmopolitan ethic is the idea of people taking more *responsibility* for the conditions of other people's lives".

Cosmopolitan citizenship is premised on cooperative relationships that enable the sharing of responsibilities and burdens. Like it or not, this era of global risk and vulnerability makes fellow citizens of people across the globe because of their shared responsibilities to participate in the achievement of collective goods such as environmental protection and equity. "Citizenship for sustainability entails responsibilities not just for those goods necessary for immediate survival but also for those collective goods that enable the flourishing of humans and other species now and into the future" (Davidson 2004: 176). To achieve this requires not only, as Davidson suggests, the development of an institutional framework for global governance, assuring the accountability of transnational corporations, and the abandonment of consumption ideologies in favour of more appropriate values for sustainability, but also of a concept of the ecological self, for without the self-transformation of its members, no institution, however well intentioned, will achieve more than surface changes leaving the deeper problems unresolved and sustainability unattainable.

It is for this reason that as long ago as the 1960s Seyyed Hossein Nasr in his important book *The Encounter of Man and Nature* (Nasr 1968) diagnosed what he then prophetically recognized as an emerging crisis as being essentially spiritual in origin. His examination of the philosophical, religious and scientific origins of modern human relationships to nature suggests not what we cannot do—the abandonment of our history, however much we might now deplore and criticize it—but a recognition of the lessons learnt from that history. Where we recognize that we have erred, we can repair. The consequences of mechanistic and Cartesian philosophy and

science and of an attitude of unlimited domination over nature are now all too apparent. The alternative (unless we accept that the present system is unmendable and headed for inevitable disaster), is a radical reexamination of values—of identity, selfhood, consumption and citizenship and their transformation in a much more ecological direction. In order to achieve this what is required is an agenda that has a number of key elements. These include, firstly, the recognition of a cosmic perspective (even larger than a global one) in contextualizing all analysis. Peace scholar and activist John Paul Lederach reveals how, after giving a lecture in Guatemala in which he had carefully examined the political, economic and cultural dimensions of peacekeeping and conflict resolution, a traditional Mayan priest spoke to him and pointed out that there was one thing missing: "Your framework is missing the earth and skies, the winds and the rocks. It does not say where you are located" (Lederach 2005: 140). This acute comment not only points to a basic element of identity, especially in societies still based on agriculture and close to the earth, but also highlights the essential connection between social justice and ecological justice. Not only are the number of environmental refugees or those displaced or sickened by proximity to pollution rapidly increasing, but at the level of theory it is important to note the connections between economic activity and its environmental impact. "Growth" or "development" may sound like good ideas until they are placed in the wider context of the long term consequences of any particular policy and its sustainability in terms of environmental impact and resource depletion as well as their effects on social structures and culture, as we have argued consistently throughout this book.

Secondly, cosmopolitan citizenship arises from a cosmopolitan education. Edmund O'Sullivan has argued that modernity has led to an eclipse of cosmology and the loss of holism, a loss that can only be remedied through education for integral development which must include a cosmological awareness and a deep connection to the natural world (O'Sullivan 1999, esp.: 179–207). Thirdly, studies of social change themselves often operate at a relatively superficial level. The causes that bring about deep change are often slow, hidden and require a subtle model of how wholes and parts are interrelated (Capra 2002, Senge et al. 2005). At the present moment we face a situation where although globalization appears to be calling the shots, it is actually the deep underlying ecological changes that will actually bring about profound transformation, not only in geography, economy and society, but in philosophy, science and sociology as well, a transformation already signaled not only by global warming and other ecological

processes, but also by major changes in thinking and values reflected in the rapidly growing "alternative" literature responding to these shifts. There is also an ancient wisdom literature on these matters too, in Buddhism, Taoism, Hinduism, Shinto, and in the thinking of North American, Australian, African, Latin American and Southeast Asian First Peoples that is now being recovered and foregrounded in discussions about our identity within nature (for example Callicott and Ames 1989).

Our current world situation and the search for the sources of sustainability requires new, integral and non-dual conceptions of citizenship and political and social identity. On a planet wracked with problems of ecological collapse, continuing war and violence, religious fundamentalisms taking highly exclusionary and anti-social forms and widening economic gaps in a world in which unacceptable levels of poverty still exist, that identity has itself to be planetary. To regard oneself as an integral part of the whole is to begin to overcome the divisions between self and other and between self and nature. To take such a step is not simply a matter of making a political or social decision: it is also to undertake the arduous task of reformulating one's self-identity, being prepared to make one's boundaries softer and weaker, to move towards a sense of unity with other beings, human and non-human, while being aware of the varieties of conceptions of nature that prevail between cultures, the objective characteristics of the world system and the effects of globalization and the integrity of local cultures that, like ecological diversity, have the right to exist as cultural diversity, with equally positive effects on the health of the planet. As Arturo Escobar puts it:

> "This is to say we need new narratives of life and culture. These narratives will likely be hybrids of sorts; they will arise from the mediations that local cultures are able to effect on the discourses and practices of nature, capital and modernity. This is a collective task that perhaps only social movements are in a position to advance. The task entails the construction of collective identities, as well as struggles over the redefinition of the boundaries between nature and culture. These boundaries will be reimagined to the extent that the practice of social movements succeeds in reconnecting life and thought by fostering a plural political ecology of knowledge". (Escobar 1996: 65)

Here I have suggested that the "ecological self" is a key concept to realize this goal of a truly cosmopolitan identity, a project of absolute necessity if civilized life on this planet is to continue, and one required to take us beyond the level of the purely socio-political to deeper realms of being-in-the-world

where a new sense of freedom is found in the recognition of one's interdependency which sparks off, quite rightly, a new sense of non-dominating empowerment and a sense of being a co-creator in world-creation, not simply a victim or a passive subject of forces beyond control. To become a planetary citizen is consequently a decision, a decision that if made by sufficient numbers, provides the basis for a new world society of responsibility, towards nature as much as towards our fellow citizens and travelers on this common Earth.

Bibliography

Annan, Kofi, and Koichiro Matsuura, eds. 2001. *Dialogue Among Civilizations*. Paris: UNESCO.

Badiner, Allan Hunt, ed. 1990. *Dharma Gaia: A Harvest of Essays in Buddhism and Ecology*. Berkeley: Parallax Press.

Bateson, Gregory. 1979. *Man and Nature*. New York: Bantam Books.

Banma, Zygmant. 1999. *Modernity and the Holocaust*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Beck, Ulrich. 1992. *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity*. London: Sage.

Berry, Thomas. 1999. *The Great Work: Our Way into the Future*. New York: Bell Tower.

Boff, Leonardo. 1997. *Cry of the Earth, Cry of the Poor*. Trans. Phillip Berryman. Maryknoll: Orbis Books.

Callicott, J. Baird, and Roger T. Ames, eds. 1989. *Nature in Asian Traditions of Thought: Essays in Environmental Philosophy*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Capra, Fritjof. 2002. *The Hidden Connections: A Science for Sustainable Living*. London: Flamingo.

Clammer, John. 2005. Beyond Power: Alternative Conceptions of Being and the (Asian) Reconstruction of Social Theory. *Asian Journal of Social Science* 33(1): 62–76.

, ———. 2013. The Project of Philosophical Anthropology. In *Philosophy and Anthropology: Border Crossings and Transformations*, eds. A.K. Giri, and John Clammer, 21–38. London: Anthem Press.

, ———. 2015a. *Art, Culture and International Development: Humanizing Social Transformation*. Abingdon and New York: Routledge.

Clammer, John. 2016. Mahayana Buddhism and the Social Sciences. In *The Bloomsbury Research Handbook of Indian Philosophical Theories of Religion*, ed. Pankaj Jain. London: Bloomsbury.

Clammer, John, Sylvie Poirier, and Eric Schwimmer, eds. 2004. *Figured Worlds: Ontological Obstacles in Intercultural Relations*. Toronto and London: Toronto University Press.

Dallmayr, Fred. 2002. *Dialogue Among Civilizations: Some Exemplary Voices*. New York and Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Davidson, Julie. 2004. Citizenship and Sustainability: Rights and Responsibilities in the Global Age. In *Controversies in Environmental Sociology*, ed. Rob White, 168–184. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Escobar, Arturo. 1996. Constructing Nature: Elements for a Poststructural Political Ecology. In *Liberation Ecologies: Environment, Development, Social Movements*, eds. Richard Peet, and Michael Watts, 46–68. London and New York: Routledge.

Fox, Warwick. 1990. *Towards a Transpersonal Ecology: Developing New Foundations for Environmentalism*. Boston and London: Shambhala.

Goulet, Denis. 1995. *Development Ethics: A Guide to Theory and Practice*. New York: Apex Press.

Hudson, Wayne, and Steven Slaughter, eds. 2007. *Globalization and Citizenship: The Transnational Challenge*. London and New York: Routledge.

Irigaray, Luce. 1989. *Les temps de la difference*. Paris: Le Livre de Poche.

Jones, Ken. 2003. *The New Social Face of Buddhism*. Boston: Wisdom Publications.

Kaza, Stephanie, and Kenneth Kraft. 2000. *Dharma Rain: Sources of Buddhist Environmentalism*. Boston and London: Shambhala.

Kovel, Joel. 2002. *The Enemy of Nature*: *The End of Capitalism or the End of the World*? London and New York: Zed Books and Nova Scotia: Fernwood Publishing.

Lederach, John Paul. 2005. *The Moral Imagination: The Art and Soul of Making Peace*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Loy, David R. 2003. *The Great Awakening: A Buddhist Social Theory*. Boston: Wisdom Publications.

Macy, Joanna. 1990. The Ecological Self: Postmodern Ground for Right Action. In *Sacred Interconnections: Postmodern Spirituality, Political Economy and Art*, ed. David Ray Griffin, 35–47. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Naess, Arne. 1986. The Deep Ecological Movement: Some Philosophical Aspects. *Philosophical Enquiry* 8: 1–2. Reprinted in George.

Nasr, Seyyed Hossein. 1968. *The Encounter of Man and Nature: The Spiritual Crisis of Modern Man*. London: George Allen and Unwin.

O'Sullivan, Edmund. 1999. *Transformative Learning: Educational Vision for the 21st Century*. London and New York: Zed Books.

Sessions, ed. 1995. *Deep Ecology for the 21st Century: Readings on the Philosophy and Practice of the New Environmentalism*, 64–84. Boston and London: Shambhala.

Senge, Peter C., Otto Scharmer, Joseph Jaworski, and Betty Sue Flowers. 2005. *Presence: An Exploration of Profound Change in People, Organizations and Society*. New York: Doubleday.

Swimme, Brian. 1996. *The Hidden Heart of the Cosmos: Humanity and the New Story*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.

Swimme, Brian, and Thomas Berry. 1994. *The Universe Story: From the Primordial Flaring Forth to the Ecozoic Age: A Celebration of the Unfolding of the Cosmos*. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco.

Tucker, Mary Evelyn, and Duncan Ryuken Williams. 1997. *Buddhism and Ecology: The Interconnections of Dharma and Deeds.* Harvard: Harvard Center for the Study of World Religions.

Unno, Taitetsu. 1998. *River of Fire, River of Water: An Introduction to the Pure Land Tradition of Shin Buddhism.* New York: Doubleday.

Van Steenbergen, Bart. 1994. Towards a Global, Ecological Citizen. In *The Condition of Citizenship*, ed. Bart Van Steenbergen. London: Sage.

White. Lynn, Jr. 1973. The Historical Roots of Our Ecological Crisis and Continuing the Conversation. In *Western Man and Environmental Ethics: Attitudes Toward Nature and Technology*, ed. Ian G. Barbour, 18–30 and 55–64. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Rethinking Sustainability

The notion of 'sustainability' is, as we have seen, a complex and slippery one. It has a range of meanings from the idea of creating the conditions for there being a future that is worth having (there will certainly be a future, but perhaps without us, or one so degraded that it would not be pleasant to live in), to the idea embodied in the Brundtland Report of "sustainable growth": more but greener. It refers in negative terms to what we are doing (unsustainable things at almost every level of our civilization) and positively to what we ought to be doing (making fundamental changes to ensure a desirable future for us and our children). It also requires clarification in two important ways. One is that it is largely a Western discourse and has arisen historically out of debates emerging from that part of the world—discussions of culture and development, ecology and critiques of current economic and energy practices—that may or may not resonate with all of the rest of the planetary community in quite the same way. That is not to say that planetary sustainability is not of universal concern (the effects of climate change or resource depletion falling, ultimately, on every one), but the ways in which sustainability is conceived, or indeed already practiced, may well vary *with* culture. The second is that it is a multi-layered concept and refers to levels or zones as diverse as city planning, environment, resources, energy, bio-diversity and of course culture and cultural diversity. These levels relate to each other in complex ways, some of which we have uncovered in previous chapters. But while an interactive model of sustainability is necessary, it needs to be remembered that it is a moving target, both in itself and in the relationship of the levels

that constitute it at any particular point in time. So let us move to a more synthesizing exploration of the elements that make up sustainability in theory and in practice, and do so from a comparative perspective.

Many Sustainabilities?

Knowing what to do requires a sound analysis of where we are and what is happening, but also a vision of where we want to go. The first requires research, and there is now a vast body of literature (although how effective it is raises another question) of such analysis—ecological work, studies of sustainable and unsustainable urban planning, energy studies, examinations of the failures of neo-liberal economics, the negative outcomes of globalization, the disasters generated by capitalism, and so on. The second is less developed for a number of reasons—cynicism generated by the failure of the great utopian political and economic experiments of the past to deliver on their promises (the Soviet Union and other Communist regimes being the sorts of cases usually cited), the unwillingness of 'post-development' thinkers to actually specify where their critiques might take us other than into the vast 'informal sector' envisaged by people like Serge Latouche, weakening of religious visions of the future (traditionally one of religions' strong points), the sheer complexity of the situation, and a sort of shyness that, except among 'futurologists' and some science fiction writers, seems to prevent academics and even activists from defining real alternative scenarios. We seem to know what we do not like, but are fuzzy about what we really want. But this is precisely where culture enters the picture again, not in the sense of actually existing cultural patterns (which may well be, as we have seen, unsustainable), but as creating the imaginative and experimental spaces where visions can emerge and their possibilities and limitations tested. This is why, as we have argued, that the arts are a crucial element of sustainability.

In facing the array of seemingly intractable problems that confront us, it is easy to forget that many successful experiments and ways of living have indeed been created and tried out, at all the many levels of sustainability that we have noted. Farmer's markets, community currencies, organic farms, urban gardening, community art projects, alternative schools and colleges, projects to stimulate local crafts, green jobs and industries, renewable energy, movements for food justice and sovereignty, sustainable transport (Cox 2010), new political arrangements, cooperative housing projects, localization, slow foods, re-cycling, cradle-to-cradle

design principles, environmentally suitable low-energy architecture, are all representative of this huge but quiet movement. Large numbers of culturally appropriate experiments in community renewal have been successfully carried out (Rajan 1993) as have numerous initiatives in grassroots activities to promote sustainability at local levels (ACCU 2006, 2009, Khor and Lin 2001) in education, literacy, agriculture and many other areas. This has been true in the arts as well—in socially activist theatre, often building on the seminal work of Augusto Boal (2008) and his creation of the idea of the "theatre of the oppressed", and in theatre that has deliberately set out to promote ideas of ecology and sustainability through drama (Arons and May 2012, Besel and Blau 2014) or to promote human rights and social justice (Jackson and Toni Shapiro-Phim 2008). And, as we have noted, the field of design is now very oriented towards sustainable practices and it is from the design field that many of the best ideas in sustainability are coming, not least because they are highly practical and have immediate and testable uses.

The role and nature of cities has also become a major issue in sustainability concerns, for a number of reasons—their unsustainability in many instances, but also as the sites of valuable experiments in community building, community art projects, urban gardens, housing, and transport on the one hand, and because cities are also the sites of cultural innovation and the culture-industries—the media, publishing, museums, art galleries, bookstores, concert halls, cinemas and film production companies, and the other paraphernalia of cultural production and consumption. The idea of "creative cities" has emerged to encapsulate this idea—cities as planned centres of culture and places welcoming of artists, festivals and galleries, with good universities and art schools, and very happy to preserve their architectural heritage and to improve on it to make the city an attractive place to work and for cultural tourists to visit. This idea has stimulated others, for example the integration of nature into urban planning (Beatley 2010, Farr 2008), not just urban gardens, but as ways to make cities livable, cooler, aesthetically attractive and to promote habitats for urban wildlife. But it needs to be remembered that nice design in itself does not make a city. It is what goes on in it, its culture, that finally determines its livability. Highly planned cities (Brasilia, Canberra, Tsukuba) are often unattractive to their inhabitants who actually prefer the messy but culturally rich and variegated cityscapes of Rio, Sydney or Tokyo to the sterility of the super-planned, and even when opera houses and art galleries are "added on" this does not feel organic to the place or especially stimulating

of further artistic activity. It is precisely the "Cultures of Cities" (Zukin 1995) that makes them attractive, and also makes them the centers of the "cultural economy"—the place that cultural production plays in contributing to the economy as a whole and hence to development (UNESCO and UNDP 2013).

At the same time, there is a danger in the emphasis on cities, crucial as they are to the achievement of sustainability, drawing equally needed attention away from the countryside. For that place is of course the source of food, of healthy forms of recreation, and of the landscapes that both inspire art and provide psychological and spiritual therapy for urban dwellers. In Japan for example, a highly urbanized society with what is still the largest city in the world (Greater Tokyo), but with a declining birthrate, ageing population and experiencing a substantial emptying of the human population of the countryside (the bears however are coming back) has seen moves to revitalize the traditional form of land management known as *satoyama*. In pre-modern and early modern Japan much of the countryside was closely managed in very efficient ways: unauthorized logging was banned, and landscapes were an integrated "system" of forests, paddy land, vegetable farms, grazing areas for livestock and seashore, water sources were carefully shared, and recycling of waste products was more or less 100%. Even the buildings were largely recyclable, either (the wood and stone) to rebuild a subsequent building, or (the thatch, papered doors and "windows", and the *tatami* mats that provided the flooring) as compost or fuel if it could not be re-used. The whole system was (and in some countryside areas, still is) highly efficient agriculturally, no waste, very low carbon footprint, and supported a sense of community amongst farmers (and others who shared many of the rural villages such as potters and other craftspeople) through collective work on common resources such as water courses, harvesting and thatching (Duraiappah et al. 2010). Such a system was naturally "conservative" and simultaneously both a system of production and conservation, and as such basically permanent. The virtues of anthropology have been extolled a number of times in these pages, and this is another opportunity to do so. Indigenous knowledge is not simply cognitive, but is applied wisdom, and the extensive ethnographic record contains innumerable examples of societies that have flourished over long periods of time because of their adaptability to local ecological and climatic conditions and which have maintained harmonious social relations often based on reciprocity or gift economies, and which, despite the pressures and uncertainties that they inevitably face, are highly convivial (for a set

of good case studies from Amazonia see Overing and Passes 2000). In searching for models of sustainability today, particularly ones that fit the criteria of localism or bio-regionalism, anthropology has much to offer.

Not least because in addition to pointing to such (actual) models, anthropology also posed the question of indigenous modes of sustainability that may not be the same as the ones emanating from the Western discourse. There is a danger of sustainability becoming the last term in a series reading colonialism—neo-colonialism—development—globalization—sustainability, and inheriting the fundamental problems of its predecessors—paternalism, top-down imposed solutions, lack of democracy and consultation, a one-size-fits-all mentality, and resulting injustices, including some people or groups "benefitting" from sustainability while others are excluded or cannot access it to the same degree. The actual (rather than simply nominal) incorporation of indigenous perspectives has many positive implications which include modifying global governance through engagement with local peoples in such areas as information collection and dissemination, policy development, implementation and monitoring, providing models of climate change mitigation and adaptation through methods such as traditional forestry, learning from local health systems and bringing local knowledge and "Western" science into dialogue with each other (McLean et al. 2012). But behind all these practical measures is the more philosophical question of the possible multiplicity of ideas of sustainability.

Studies have shown of course that there are many different concepts of development and sustainability between cultures, and, significantly, between the genders within cultures. These differences are based in world views—in ideas of cosmological and social order, of what is "right" in both ecological and sociological terms, in the local indigenous economy (cattle-herding peoples having rather different perceptions of the world than sedentary agriculturalists or fisher people), the ways in which growth and reproduction occur, the role of God or gods and spiritual beings, senses of body and of self, ethical systems (such as what constitutes honesty, truthfulness or honor), the relationship between individualism and the collective good, what is the content of custom and law, what makes up an education or the process of socialization, attitudes to the land (sacred and inalienable or just another commodity) and territory, and largely invisible but deeply held conceptions of time and space. In many cases these deep cultural conceptions (and their expression in practices agricultural, social, in hunting or in house building and the orientation of build-

ings, in economic transactions) persist until overrun by 'development' or modernization, and often only emerge when disputes occur between the members of one culture and others, in which case these ontological dimensions begin to appear as, for example, different conceptions of law or of property (Dahl and Megersaa 2003, Clammer et al. 2004).

The failure to take seriously such alternative accounts of development has many deleterious consequences—the actual undermining and erosion of vernacular cultures, the destruction of invaluable systems of indigenous knowledge, the colonization of the mind and imaginations with alien concepts that maybe only partially assimilated, but which do not lead to the creation of a new integrated world view, new systems of domination and non-sustainable practices displacing the old and perfectly functional ones, and eroding vernacular concepts of wealth while leading to the commodification of things, arts and people themselves. At the same time, no society stands still and is outside of history, so by the same token even "traditional" or vernacular societies change. The secret then becomes to build on, not destroy, the very bases of sustainability on which those societies were built—social ties, reciprocity, popular creativity, and local conceptions of belief and knowledge (N'Dione et al. 2003). Many of the principles of solidarity economy are to be found in such societies, historical and contemporary. One often hears the objection that it would be difficult to "scale up" such examples to address larger scale problems, but this may be a mistake. The real issues are two: on the one hand the 'scaling *down*' of many of the gargantuan organizations that now seem to rule the world—corporations, militaries, governments, multilateral organizations—to a human scale, and on the other precisely that issue of scale. Size as such is not the issue: it is the 'fit' or appropriateness of an organization, institution, technology or process, in relationship to its environment and purposes that is the key. Hence the constant recourse to localism: small *is* beautiful when it is indeed of the right scale. Our cultural obsession with more/bigger/faster/expansion/growth is the essential problem here: as the dinosaurs proved, being big does not ensure survival. Nothing in fact is "too big to fail". The increasing consolidation of human units into ever larger organizations—states, empires, multinational corporations, mega-malls and mega-universities, vast bureaucracies—is a relatively recent phenomenon, and certainly not the only model of social, economic or political organization available to us. It is remarkable that our imagination is so big when it comes to technology and our toys and getting somewhere faster, but so very limited when it comes to social alternatives.

David Korten has suggested that we need "new stories". This is true, and it should be one of the key roles of the arts to suggest them, but there are already many "old stories" in existence that have been submerged under the juggernaut of modernity, but whose retrieval would point to many forms of age-old wisdom that, through one of the beneficial aspects of globalization, have become the heritage of human kind as a whole, as have the music and the other cultural expressions of cultures seemingly remote from us in space and time.

New Cultures/New Issues

The issue of sustainability should perhaps be seen at two levels moving in a complex relationship to one another. One of those levels is made up of the 'universal' or planetary factors—climate change, pollution, resource depletion. The other is the changing social base. This latter level has itself many facets, for example demographic shifts. Most of the rich world is now seeing demographic decline—the 'problem' of the ageing society, while much of the developing world is seeing increase. This portends many other shifts—in consumption patterns, health care, educational needs, employment patterns and housing, to name some of the main ones. Urbanization in most of the 'developed' world, where cities are on the whole functional, efficient and in many cases nice to live in, is no longer seen as a problem. But the same issue may be a point of crisis in 'developing' societies where we see immense problems of crowding, lack of infrastructure, pollution, traffic, communal tensions, sub-standard housing and slums, crime and all the familiar characteristics of "Third World" cities. In many cases behind any of these specific instances are bigger macro issues, large among which is the changing nature of capitalism itself. For not only are there variations within capitalism—in Japan in contrast with the US, in Germany in contrast with Italy, for example, but the system itself evolves. The move from permanent labor to contract, part-time and temporary labor for example, the movement of not only manufacturing, but also "back office" functions "off-shore" (call centers, hotel booking agencies, travel services, banking) to low wage economies, and shifts from Fordist manufacturing to "just-in-time" flexible systems are all examples of these processes. As these are happening, so is the composition of the labor force itself with large scale international migration, expectations of more gender equality, an ageing workforce in the advanced economies, and changes in educational systems that prepare

(or fail to) younger people for employment, if such be available, which it is not in many of the depressed economies of the 'rich' world, Spain and Greece being currently sad examples of just this phenomenon. The nature of work too is changing, which is why the anthropology of work is a valuable window on such transformations (Wallman 1979). Work for many is becoming an uncertain and "flexible" activity as lifetime tenure vanishes in all but a few instances. Many job functions have been or are being replaced by automation, and de-skilling—working in activities below one's level of education or ability—is common. The huge fast food industry and large store chains such as Walmart illustrate this in practice—low wages, uncertain contracts, no guaranteed working hours (or excessive ones), and the "sharing economy", including such activities as renting rooms in one's own apartment as holiday accommodation, or becoming a free-lance driver for cab services such as Uber, is not so much as sign of economic freedom and liberalization, but of desperation. The 'liberation' of work into a space of freedom, self-expression and community service is consequently one of the goals of any truly 'alternative' economy and a prerequisite for sustainability. Indeed when 'work' becomes essentially indistinguishable from creativity, enjoyment and a sense of purpose, this is a clear sign of progress towards a humane society.

It is necessary, then, to keep these two levels in mind, because the effectiveness of solutions to the 'universal' problems relates closely to the ways in which they are contextualized and expressed at the 'local' level—within specific cultures, economic circumstances and historical experiences. It is not at all clear that our governance structures have been able either to adapt to the new conditions or to mediate between these levels in effective ways (for an excellent discussion, relating primarily to environmental governance, but with far wider implications see Speth 2005: 98–111, 172–201). Reform of these governance structures also requires changes in international law including recognition of the right to a good environment as a basic human right, protection of the commons (including the oceans, atmosphere, the Arctic and Antarctic), the duty not to cause environmental harm (and the polluter pays principle if one does), the precautionary principle, public participation by all concerned stakeholders, and the right to development understood as environmentally sound practices that keep very much in mind the needs of future generations.

Speth, utilizing charmingly Buddhist language, goes on to suggest an "Eightfold Way" to address the problems of over consumption, population, poverty and the other 'drivers' of environmental damage, which

he characterizes as "transitions"—a stable or smaller world population, freedom from mass poverty, environmentally benign technologies, environmentally honest prices, sustainable consumption, a transition in knowledge and learning to the new knowledge needed for sustainability, changes in governance structures and culture, understood as radical changes in public attitudes and motivations (Speth 2005: 152ff.) Of these "The most fundamental transition is the transition in culture and consciousness. The change that is needed can be best put as follows: in the twentieth century we were from Mars but in the twenty-first century we must be from Venus—caring, nurturing and sustaining" (Speth 2005: 191) and continues with a list of suggestions for action, in such large scale matters as national energy strategies, and at an individual and community level, what citizens can do, as voters, consumers, investors, family members, and as workers.

If I were to recommend one book as essential reading that encapsulates many of these issues it would be Naomi Klein's powerful text *This Changes Everything* (Klein 2014). Formally about climate change, it is in reality about "everything": consumption, economies, lifestyles and the stories that we tell about our place on earth (stories again!), and the ways in which we might confront the grim challenges that are facing us as a species and as a civilization in ways that need not be as much painful as exciting. This, she suggests, requires a number of important steps—that we cease "outsourcing"—pushing the problems (and solutions) onto others—environmentalists, scientists, professional urbanologists…and begin to see how we can and must all contribute to making the inevitable effects of climate change a catalyst for far reaching revolutions in all areas of lifestyle and economy, and that for any such transformation to be possible "a worldview will need to rise to the fore that sees nature, other nations, and our own neighbors not as adversaries, but rather as partners in a grand project of mutual reinvention" (Klein 2014: 23). This requires coming out of denial, challenging the assumptions of materialism and the extractivist basis of capitalist economies, and changing culture, perhaps the hardest thing to do, since it, being the very sea in which we swim, is very hard to see. The critics of growth, development, globalization and neo-liberal economics have identified the external chains that bind us to a dysfunctional system, but they are rarely so strong on identifying the cultural and psychological chains that keep us in that same place.

One of the keys to understanding those particular chains is to look at our cultural narratives and in particular the roots of our beliefs that we

can safely dominate nature, and the ways in which we write and teach history. The story of kings, queens, empires, wars and conquests is, if one just stops for a moment to think about it, a highly impoverished story. It not only leaves out 'the people' who actually did things and suffered in many cases their consequences (an absence only relatively recently beginning to be filled with the emergence of social history), but entirely ignores the larger planetary context in which all that activity took place. Only recently has 'Big History'—the planetary story begun to emerge as a serious project, and so too 'Environmental History' is a very recent invention, but one extremely important as it studies how we have exploited nature, transformed it, brought about vast economic, social and ecological changes through the environmental consequences of colonialism and settler agriculture (wheat in north America, sheep in New Zealand, the rubber and tin economies of Southeast Asia, or the coffee and cocoa ones of the Caribbean and tropical Latin America) and the nature of our tastes—for sugar, tobacco, bananas, spices and other products that not only transformed ecologies through the plantation economies of the colonies, but also social structures far and wide, slavery being one of its most conspicuous and tragic instances.

If we think of culture in terms of these civilizational narratives (and in the West many of their origins in Cartesian thought patterns or the thinking of such philosophers as Francis Bacon, as well as in mis-readings of Biblical injunctions to subdue the earth, or in Asia in Buddhism or Confucianism) we can uncover many of the roots of our current crisis. Even economics, that seemingly most 'scientific' of all the social disciplines is actually a collection of stories that have historical origins and could well have arisen in different ways (Hirschman 1977) and in many cases invents rather than describes the "reality" that it purports to examine (and predict and direct)—making it what Carrier and Miller call the principle example of "virtualism"—the creation of a facsimile of sufficient persuasiveness to get many people to believe in it and to structure their behavior accordingly, thus "proving" it to be true by a kind of self-fulfilling prophecy (Carrier and Miller 1998). If a new road map is needed (and Klein provides a very good guide to what that map might look like), the place to begin is with these old stories and to begin to generate new ones that penetrate deeply into and arise from deeply within, the imagination. Deep change in other words must come from within and cannot come from technological "fixes" (especially as none actually exist) or other extrinsic sources, important as they are at other levels of seeking sustainability (changes in energy

use or transport patterns for example). The key "fix" is to fix ourselves. "Escape" stories (moving to another planet) or "terraforming" one to make it habitable by humans, "geoengineering" the one we do have, moving underground to escape the mess we have made of the surface, or just assuming that somehow science will save us, no longer work. They really are "science fiction". The deep stories are embedded within us. Why else to relax do we seek nature? Why is "forest bathing" an effective therapy for some forms of cancer? Why is music so important to us? Why is dance such a popular form of social activity in almost all cultures? The very questions that the emergent field of "eco-psychology" is now asking provide us with the key to "deep sustainability", which lies ultimately in rediscovering our relationship to nature, and modifying our behavior in such a way that the relationship flourishes and becomes the basis for new forms of creativity and conviviality. Historically it has been the arts and transformational social movements that have been the vehicles for such rediscoveries, and it is no accident that the source of our organized food production is called agri-*culture*.

To simply assert 'culture and sustainability' or 'culture and development' then is not enough. It is the *content* of those cultures and the values that they embody that is the key. But here we face two challenges: that of linking specific cultural manifestations to sustainability, and the valuation or critique of culture on the other. In her book on resistance to corporate globalization, Amory Starr (Starr 2001) discusses the "cultural turn" in thinking dating from the 1990s or before and its embodiment in the new discipline of Cultural Studies and what she calls the "feverish embrace of the cultural as political" (Starr 2001: 34). Many bands at that time began to describe themselves as 'anti-corporate' with 'anti-corporate fans, looks, atmosphere' and so on. Some did indeed refuse to sign with the major (corporate) labels and incorporated social and political themes into their music, but for others simply defining themselves as anti-corporate seems to have satisfied their need to appear 'radical'. Much the same can of course be said about many writers, intellectuals and university professors. Yet as we well know, even (or especially) 'radical' or protest movements can easily be assimilated into mainstream commercial culture in ways in which protests against the system become paradoxically part of that system itself—proof indeed of how 'democratic' it really is.

Two conclusions flow from this: the need for 'cultural creatives' to produce work—art, music, literature, performance—that is genuinely oppositional in the sense of promoting sustainable and social justice values, a style

of "positive opposition", and for the integrity of vernacular or indigenous cultures to be protected against the negative inroads of the market and 'development'. Starr summarizes this as follows:

> Social movement activists have long recognized the role of culture. A community's shared values and visions provide a cultural *lens for critical analysis*. Third world critics of Western development models, such as Paulo Freire, Pramod Parajuli, and Sulak Sivaraksa explain how traditional indigenous culture is the basis for critiques of oppression and for new visions and techniques. People have secured the survival and development of their communities by creating cultures of resistance, in which culture is the *medium of struggle*. Rex Nettleford and Bernice Johnson Reagon describe cultural 'creolization' as the intentional process through which a community ensures its survival. This means that creole productions of self are survival responses to conditions of oppression, responses that testify to peoples' creativity, vibrancy and tenacity. Indigenous cultures are in no way inauthenticized by this agentic process. (Starr 2001: 35)

As James Scott (1985) has shown in his illuminating studies of Malaysian peasants, such cultures generate techniques of struggle (mostly non-violent, but no less effective for being that), and are spaces of spiritual freedom and shelter from de-humanizing external forces. There clearly can be and are cultures of resistance, but they should be celebrated in the realization of their fragility in the face of the powers of commodification, and in the recognition that while they may indeed transform subjectivities (as happens in religious as well as in artistic movements), that transformation needs to be aligned with collective action, and as Starr rightly argues, with ways of influencing structures, lest the cultural 'gesture' remains simply that—an authentic sound, but without an echo.

CULTURE AND STRUCTURE IN SUSTAINABILITY

The key issue then is not just to argue for the significance of culture—that is hopefully quite clear, as is the recognition that without changing our master 'stories' no great change is going to take place, but that culture needs to be related to wider action for change. That is of course the objective of social movements, some examples of which will be discussed in the next chapter. But to place those movements in context, some additional clarification might be useful. We tend to be a reactive culture: we wait for a problem to arise before dealing with it, rather

than anticipating probable futures on the basis of current trends (global warming and ecological collapse being very good cases in point, and energy transition is soon going to be another.) Sustainability requires the integration of human activities into the wider bio-sphere (it already is of course, but in largely negative ways.) Human actions have created the problems, so presumably can also address them and suggest solutions. We have stressed a number of times the important difference between seeing the future as one of sacrifice and having to "give up" the fruits of our now clearly dysfunctional civilization, and one which sees the future as an exciting vista of new opportunities, discoveries, deep pleasures and new forms of creativity and satisfying community. If business can use such a language in its advertising, so presumably can sustainability studies and thinking. If cultural creativity (stimulated through education) can be directed at such goals the future becomes an adventure not a burden. Come it will, so the key is clearly the spirit in which we approach it. Evolution has not yet ended, and so can be to some extent at least directed, and this is certainly true of cultural evolution. The goal then is not a "steady state" society or economy, but one which evolves increasingly in the direction of sustainability in all its dimensions.

This "co-evolution" of culture and environment certainly involves the integration of the former into the latter, and this as we have seen has many dimensions—religions rediscovering their environmental teachings, our food habits and fashions, travel patterns and overcoming the huge inefficiencies of our agricultural, energy, architectural and transportation systems. To this end encouraging cultural as well as bio-diversity is to be valued, not only as a desirable end in itself (and as a matter of cultural justice—who is to say which cultures should disappear and which continue?), but because bio-diversity and cultural diversity mutually support each other (Maffi 2001). The toleration, let alone encouragement of such diversity is not always easy: it involves accepting religious diversity for example (something that the missionary minded or the fundamentalist may find hard), and accepting that ecological restoration means not just nice plants, but also the fauna that lived amongst them returning, even if these be bears or wolves.

The last two decades of scholarly activity have seen, amongst many other things, the emergence of the idea of "cultural politics": that culture is itself a space of struggle (for representation, identity, seeking cultural access or cultural democracy, for a post-colonial autonomy on the part of the formerly colonized, and so on), and it is through cultural means—

writing as a weapon in class struggle, feminist or gay literature, in the visual arts as colonial painters attempt to struggle free from the styles and themes of the foreign (for example in India—Mitter 2007) and in cinema (Clammer 2015a: 83ff). In their extensive compendium on cultural politics *Cultural Politics: Class, Gender, Race in the Postmodern World*, Glenn Jordan and Chris Weedon provide a systematic coverage of such issues (Jordan and Weedon 1995),but with the important omission of both the politics of the environmental movement and of religious movements, both of which we have stressed in this book. An expanded cultural politics needs to include these, and the reality of the contemporary world shows clearly their extensive impact on debate, policy, voting behavior, identity and many other aspects of life including such apparently mundane things as food habits, dress, daily, weekly and yearly cycles of activity and general orientation to the world and the formulation of causal models thought to underpin visible reality.

Culture and sustainability cannot be separated, whether in the instrumental sense (a culture that contributes to the building of sustainability) or in the sense of a desired culture, one sustainable in itself, integrated with ecology, and convivial and creative in its social forms and its artistic, fashion and technological expressions. Mechanical and planned models of social change rarely work: all social policies have unforeseen consequences. As the authors of the valuable book *Presence: An Exploration of Profound Change in People, Organizations, and Society* (Senge et al. 2005) argue, a thorough-going holism is needed to understand social change: a mechanical model is inadequate when one is dealing with what is really a living system of much greater complexity than any machine. This viewpoint has many implications including the inadequacy of purely economic and political approaches to creating sustainability, the fact that humans are "co-creators" in the process of evolution, and the more so now that we have entered the "Anthropocene"—the era in which human activity has fundamentally altered natural processes—and so the emerging future depends on us. Simply "fixing" things on an ad hoc basis is no longer adequate to the tasks that confront the global community, tinkering with the machine is not enough—it needs replacing, and not with another, bigger machine, but with an organic conception of society and its constituent parts and its relationships to nature.

For these reasons "management" is not the approach that will work. The creative process is a learning process, and in seeking sustainability a certain humbleness is needed—a willingness to learn from mistakes

and to listen constantly to feedback and to make adjustments as we go along. This involves, among other things, a clear view of causality—that changes in one part of the system of course create changes elsewhere, but in ways that may not be immediately apparent. To see culture in a purely instrumental way is to greatly diminish it. It is really the embodiment of accumulated human wisdom, expression and creativity and as such the essential quality of humanity. It is also the means through which we explore the world, crystallize our findings in such concepts as "identity", extend constantly our subjectivities, structure our relations to the natural world (from which much of the symbolism of culture comes), and seek and often achieve the best forms of conviviality. It is both spiritual and material, expressive and solidified into "tradition", and whether we realize it or not, is our primary occupation as it fills our leisure time, is the form in which we embody our visions and desires, and lies at the basis of those things rarely thought of as "culture" such as science, economics, politics and the law. It is our sports as well as our most lofty religions, our music, and our performances, whether these be on the stage or in the kitchen. In a sense then, sustainability *is* culture: the ideal point is that at which the two become one. Here we have suggested some of the paths though which this project might be both thought and practiced. The key is grasping the possibility of re-shaping potentiality, rather than succumbing to a sense of 'inevitability'. Writing *that* new story is the big cultural and artistic task.

Bibliography

ACCU (Asia Pacific Cultural Centre for UNESCO). 2006. *Tales of Hope: Grassroots Activities of Education for Sustainable Development*. Tokyo: Asia Pacific Cultural Centre for UNESCO.

———. 2009. *Tales of Hope II: Innovative Grassroots Approaches to Education for Sustainable Development (ESD) in Asia and the Pacific*. Tokyo: Asia Pacific Cultural Centre for UNESCO.

Arons, Wendy, and Theresa J. May, eds. 2012. *Readings in Performance and Ecology*. New York and London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Beatley, Timothy. 2010. *Biophilic Cities: Integrating Nature into Urban Planning and Design*. Washington, DC: Island Press.

Boal, Augusto. 2008. *Theatre of the Oppressed*. Trans. Charles A. and Maria-Odilia Leal McBride and Emily Fryer. London: Pluto Press.

Carrier, James G., and Daniel Miller, eds. 1998. *Virtualism: A New Political Economy*. Oxford and New York: Berg.

Clammer, John. 2015a. *Art, Culture and International Development: Humanizing Social Transformation*. London and New York: Routledge

Clammer, John, Sylvie Poirier, and Eric Schwimmer, eds. 2004. *Figured Worlds: Ontological Obstacles in Intercultural Relations*. Toronto and London: Toronto University Press.

Cox, Peter. 2010. *Moving People: Sustainable Transport Development*. London and New York: Zed Books.

Dahl, Gudrun, and Gemetchu Megerssa. 2003. The Spiral of the Ram's Horn: Boran Conceptions of Development. In *The Post-Development Reader*, eds. Mahjid Rahnema, and Victoria Bawtree, 51–62. London: Zed Books.

Duraiappah, Anantha Kumar, Koji Nakamura, Kazuhiko Takeuchi, Masataka Watanabe, and Maiko Nishi. 2010. *Satoyama-Satoumi Ecosystems and Human Well-Being: Socio-Ecological Production Landscapes of Japan*. Tokyo, New York and Paris: United Nations University Press.

Farr, Douglas. 2008. *Sustainable Urbanism: Urban Design with Nature*. New York: John Wiley.

Jackson, Naomi, and Toni Shapiro-Phim, eds. 2008. *Dance*, *Human Rights*, *and Social Justice*: *Dignity in Motion*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.

Jordan, Glenn, and Chris Weedon. 1995. *Cultural Politics: Class, Gender, Race in the Postmodern World*. Oxford and Cambridge MA: Blackwell.

Khor, Martin, and Lim Li Lin, eds. 2001. *Good Practices and Innovative Experiences in the South*, Vol. 3. London and New York: Zed Books and Penang: Third World Network.

Klein, Naomi. 2014. *This Changes Everything*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Maffi, Luisa, ed. 2001. *On Biocultural Diversity: Linking Language, Knowledge and the Environment*. Washington, DC and London: Smithsonian Institution Press.

McLean, Kirsty Galloway, Ameyali Ramos Castillo, and Sam Johnson. 2012. The Role of Indigenous Peoples in Global Environmental Governance: Looking Through the Lens of Climate Change. In *Green Economy and Good Governance for Sustainable Development: Opportunities, Promises and Concerns*, ed. Jose Puppin de Oliveira, 245–266. Tokyo, New York and Paris: United Nations University Press.

Mitter, Partha. 2007. *The Triumph of Modernism: India's Artists and the Avant-garde, 1922–1947*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

N'Dione, Emmanuel Seni, Philippe de Leener, Jean-Pierre Perier, Mamadou Ndiayo, and Pierre Jacolin. 2003. Reinventing the Present: The Chodak Experience in Senegal. In *The Post-Development Reader*, eds. Majid Rahnema, and Victoria Bawtree, 51–62. London and New Jersey: Zed Books.

Overing, Joanna, and Alan Passes. 2000. *The Anthropology of Love and Anger: The Aesthetics of Conviviality in Native Amazonia*. London and New York: Routledge.

Rajan, Vithal. 1993. *Rebuilding Communities: Experiences and Experiments in Europe.* Totnes: Green Books in association with the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF).

Scott, James C. 1985. *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance.* New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Senge, Peter C., Otto Scharmer, Joseph Jaworski, and Betty Sue Flowers. 2005. *Presence: An Exploration of Profound Change in People, Organizations and Society.* New York: Doubleday.

Speth, James Gustave. 2005. *Red Sky at Morning: America and the Crisis of the Global Environment.* New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Wallman, Sandra. 1979. *The Social Anthropology of Work.* London and New York: Academic Press.

Zukin, Sharon. 1995. *The Cultures of Cities.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Cultural Futures: Getting There From Here

The desire for a new world is palpable and can be seen clearly at many levels of society and culture, from 'post-development' debates to science fiction, from the burgeoning of organic farming and growing interest in permaculture to the huge number of social movements and organizations, NGOs and civil society groups, and in the endeavors of intellectuals, academics, writers and artists not only to critique contemporary society and economy, but to propose alternatives. Sometimes confronting the massive range of problems that our civilization faces can be depressing and daunting and even paralyzing. One of the best antidotes to this depression is to reflect not on the problems, but on the myriads of responses that already exist. In his survey of the tens of thousands of initiatives directed at addressing one or more of the serious issues confronting us, Paul Hawken (2008) reveals the range of extraordinary creativity that exists, and the very alphabetical organization of his appendix draws attention to this—from agriculture through the arts to biodiversity, civil society, cultural heritage, education, energy, climate change, health, human rights, law, peace, pollution, sustainable cities and design, water and a host of other issues such as wildlife conservation, fair trade, children, mining, coastal ecosystems and many more. But while his invaluable book provides us with a wonderful resource base for such movements, he does not discuss actual experiments in manifesting these diverse principles or of the ways to get there. This final chapter has four themes: to alert us to actual concrete experiments and alternative models for achieving sustainable futures; to discuss mechanisms and methodologies for getting there; to elaborate

on the problems and challenges of transition; and to think through what some of the major outcomes, cultural, social, economic and political, of such a necessary and certainly inevitable transition might be.

MODELS

Utopias have been somewhat out of fashion for some time, and in some circles have always been. Marx for example opposed the "utopian socialisms" of his time on the grounds that they were fantasies that could never be achieved in the real world, and were distractions from understanding the objective basis of "scientific socialism", which, by revealing the actual laws of social and economic dynamics, was alone in a position to change them. Others have taken a rather different view: that the seeking for ideal (humane, just and ecologically responsible) society is a noble project, and at the very least stimulates radically alternative thinking about society in both its deconstructive and reconstructive dimensions. Certainly it is a subject of perennial fascination and its echoes can be seen not only in contemporary literary versions such as Ernest Callenbach's *Ecotopia*—an imaginary report of a journalist from the US who is allowed to visit the breakaway far western parts of the North American continent where a free, creative and ecologically responsible society has been founded and is flourishing—through science fiction movies such as the highly successful blockbuster *Avatar* in which rapacious humans from an environmentally ruined earth attempt to colonize and (quite literally) mine another planet occupied by a race of peaceful, highly intelligent and nature-related people, and are eventually repelled. Not withstanding the somewhat Hollywood character of both, with the inevitable love affair between the US journalist and a liberated Ecotopian woman in the one case and between a human and an Avatarian woman on the other, both signal the deep seeking for such close to ideal states of being. This urge has very ancient roots. While rarely read as such, the Biblical book of Isaiah is a very old piece of utopian literature, long preceding the book by Thomas More that gave the genre its name.

While the historical roots of utopian thinking seem to be mostly European, from More to such major recent thinkers such as Ernst Bloch in his works on the utopian functions of art and literature, on the philosophy of the future, and as embodied in his major work *Das Prinzip Hoffnung*—"The Principle of Hope" (Geoghegan 1996), its practical flourishing seem in many cases to be North American, particularly in its embodiment in

intentional communities—communes, religious, "New Age", political, artistic or agricultural in nature, or several of those elements combined. (Again the literature is vast, both historically and sociologically—for a small and representative sampling see, largely on the US, Veysey 1973, on the theory and practice of communes Kanter 1972 and Hall 1978, on utopian experiments in England from the sixteenth century Armytage 1961 and on New Age communities from a comparative perspective Popenoe and Popenoe 1984). And despite the belief of writers such as Russell Jacoby (1999) that the end of utopia is upon us—partly because the major experiments such as Chinese or Soviet communism have apparently failed, and partly because the contemporary (and non-revolutionary) culture no longer seems to believe in positive futures (partly too in Jacoby's argument because of the decline of religious belief which has historically been the tap-root of utopian thinking), it would seem that the impulse is alive and well, in literary forms, in social experiments, in radical rethinking in the work of many of the authors that we have discussed in previous chapters, and in the revival rather than the disappearance of religion and its expression in visions of the future, whether in the perverse "utopias" of the Islamic State and its affiliates, or increasingly in images of an ecologically responsible future (for example Coward and Maguire 2000).

Space does not allow more than a rather cursory survey of some of the most interesting of this "alternative" thinking, all directed towards the creation of a sustainable future, but it is hoped that at the least it will act as a stimulus to further exploration and a guide to some of the literature that rarely appears in the mainstream sustainability writing (for example Robertson 2014). Broadly such alternatives can be loosely grouped as follows: literary versions, localization and subsistence models, including the related model of "de-growth", the recovery of indigenous knowledge and lifestyles, religious or spiritually inspired alternatives, and alternative economies. What links them all is the primacy of ecology as the one big issue which transcends traditional religious and political boundaries, and is the key to future survival of our species (and many others).

1. Literary Alternatives. Literary alternative communities and alternative futures have a long and distinguished history and range across many cultures, although they do on the whole seem to be a Western preoccupation (Berneri 1971). They do have a habit of popping up in unexpected places—as suggested earlier, much science fiction and fantasy literature can be read as a form of utopianism—and also

attract serious social science writers. For example the distinguished geographer, urbanist and scholar of postmodernism, David Harvey, concludes one of his major books, appropriately titled *Spaces of Hope* (Harvey 2002), with an extensive appendix delineating an ideal future, post-revolutionary society which he calls "Edilia" (257–281) which has many of the characteristics of a classic utopia—after a period of economic collapse and military intervention, a new society emerges with gender equality, disarmed, organized as a free and flexible network of parenting collectives, neighborhoods and loose federations for mutual barter and trade. Work and technology are transformed, energy is drawn entirely from renewable sources, waste is re-cycled, division of labor disappears as does the distinction between work and hobbies, festivals and convivial gatherings are common, universities have been disbanded and replaced by learning networks much like those described by Ivan Illich in his seminal book *Deschooling Society* (1971), and new and non-punitive methods of dispute resolution have been devised within an entirely and genuinely democratic political structure, if the word 'political' can still be used of and in a society where the old distinctions between society/culture/economics/politics have been effectively dissolved. No doubt there is scope for many more such literary utopias, read not just as fantasies, but as ways of exploring potential alternative futures without actually doing damage to actual people, as is true too of creative "Futurology" when it is seen as a way of exploring, imaginatively, real possibilities in energy use, transport, design, city planning (often the focus of such futurology), technology, food production, land use, and waste disposal and re-cycling (for a classic earlier "pre-sustainability" vision see Goodman 1977, most of which is still perfectly valid, since it was part of an emerging discourse of designing with nature, simpler lifestyles and a more "humanistic" architecture).

2. Localism, Subsistence, De-Growth. A very common theme running through much of the literature on alternatives is one variety or another of localism or its virtual synonyms such as 'bio-regionalism'. The logic here is simple: on the one hand growing and eating locally is healthy, greatly reduces the carbon-footprint of the transport of food over long distances, supports local small farmers and creates a new sense of community (McKibben 2007), and on the other it can be an important mechanism for undermining the hegemony of

global economic, agri-business and such entities as multinational seed merchants (often also engaged in genetically modified crop experiments) as opposed to local and environmentally appropriate varieties, and promoting empowerment of women and minorities, reclaiming the commons, promoting ecologically sound agriculture and encouraging urban gardening which generates not only food, but as many studies have shown, also community (and hence reduces crime and vandalism, gang violence, and has such functions as creating networks amongst socially isolated immigrant women). Much of this is expressed not only in the literature on localism/bioregionalism, and with it such new social and economic arrangements as farmer's markets, community supported agriculture, new work arrangements such as urban dwellers going to provide voluntary labor on the farms from which they buy, the stimulation of the organic movement, and formerly urban inhabitants returning to farming and gardening as a preferred lifestyle. While the word 'subsistence' in English rather carries connotations of poverty level living, the thrust of the subsistence movement, while certainly promoting simplicity and low-consumption lifestyles, is really about sustainability and the transformation of the globalized economy into one consistent with ecology, equality, and, to put it quite simply, happiness (Bennholdt-Thomsen and Mies 1999, Bennholdt-Thomsen et al. 2001).

A related movement, or at least idea, is that of the French alternative economist Serge Latouche, with his concept of "de-growth" which was touched upon in an earlier chapter (Latouche 2010). De-growth is not to be confused with economic contraction—a process that would naturally create unemployment, austerity and misery, but an *economic transformation*, one that would, as all these changes do, necessitate major cultural shifts. De-growth, as we noted before, is as Latouche puts it "is only conceivable in a de-growth society, or in other words within the framework of a different logic" (2010: 8). That logic includes consuming less and working less on the principle of "less but better", re-cycling and re-use, the encouragement of the so-called "informal economy" in which this happens anyway and which also promotes social ties, the re-enchantment of leisure, and welcoming spaces for inventiveness and creativity. De-growth in other words is very close to the "steady-state" economy promoted by Herman Daly and others and is based on

the same premise that an economic revolution must be stimulated by a cultural revolution—away from consumption towards a harmonious relationship with nature on the one hand, and a simpler but socially just society on the other.

3. The recovery of indigenous knowledge. As we also noted earlier, anthropologists interested in development have begun to explore the recovery and preservation of indigenous knowledge-forms of wisdom and experience related to agriculture, animal husbandry, medical knowledge, architecture, the arts and crafts and social arrangements that are part of the patrimony of many "simpler" societies, and which have endured for very long periods and have allowed the communities possessing such knowledge to be sustainable over generations and even centuries (usually until the sudden and unsought irruption of modernization and 'development'). This theme has not only been taken up by anthropologists, but also by alternative thinkers looking to find the basis for a sustainable future. One major example of this is the quite influential book by Thom Hartmann: *The Last Hours of Ancient Sunlight: The Fate of the World and What We Can Do Before It's Too Late* (2004). After reviewing the all too familiar problems—climate change, extinctions, deforestation, collapsing aquifers, new diseases and old ones re-emerging—Hartmann draws a contrast between "younger cultures" (ours) and "older cultures" and finds in the latter (essentially tribal cultures) sustainable agriculture, community cooperation, egalitarian social structures, natural means of population control and similar positive and sustainable practices. Given that he only cites a tiny number of actual examples, anthropologists would have some problems with this rosy characterization of pre-industrial life styles, but nevertheless his point is to draw on forms of social and ecological wisdom which have existed and to some extent still do. Amongst Hartmann's prescriptions are not only the familiar ones of women's empowerment, reduction of consumption and creating new standards of "wealth", weaning ourselves off oil and such like, but also inventing "new stories" (an increasingly common trope) that draw on the wisdom of our ancestors, meaning not only our literal ones (since they presumably shared that simpler lifestyle), but the wisdom of the "old cultures" in general, reinventing rituals to connect us back to life and nature and adopting the "synergist worldview" that he

believes to characterize those old cultures. A not dissimilar model is proposed by William Kotke whose book *The Final Empire*: *The Collapse of Civilization and The Seed of the Future* (1993) follows a similar trajectory, although with a more fully developed analysis of such factors as degradation of soils, dying oceans, colonialism and pollution, and contrasts these negative historical and civilizational traits with his own solution based, as with Hartmann's, in recovering a form of ancestral wisdom involving peace with the earth, non-hierarchical and democratic social structures, organic or bio-dynamic agriculture, bio-regionalism and ecological restoration, among other elements. Clearly there are continuities here with both the subsistence perspective (Kotke for example prefers to use the world "sedentariness"), and with anthropology, that little used resource for alternative thinking about economics, family, political arrangements and social possibilities, and other approaches that draw on the great resources of traditional knowledge (Subramaniam and Pisupati 2010).

4. Religious/Spiritual. We noted before the re-emergence of religion in, particularly, ecological debates, and of the rise of the notion of spirituality as the basis for a new form of non-materialistic and values based politics (Lerner 2000). This has taken a number of forms—certainly in writing—with a growing literature stressing the necessity of the 'spiritual' in alternative forms of social life (although the word 'spiritual' is notoriously slippery—perhaps "values based" is a more neutral term), and this alone signals an important trend in contemporary thinking that will be ignored at our peril, especially by progressive thinkers in such areas as the 'post-development' debate. There are in fact very progressive figures active in such areas as the movement of landless people in India who have quite systematically brought together spirituality and social action (for example Agnivesh 2003) as did an earlier generation of Christian activists (prominent amongst whom were such Protestant writers as Ronald Sider and Anthony Campolo in addition to many radical Roman Catholic thinkers such as Leonardo Boff), classical Jewish thinkers such as Martin Buber, and some development studies scholars who have attempted to relate religion and development and even to see 'development' as itself a form of religion (Salemink et al. 2004). But quite apart from writers, there have been many social experiments based on spiritual values, not only amongst historical communes

such as the famous Shaker colonies in North America or the contemporary Amish, but also throughout the modern world—not only the "New Age" communities, but also significant experiments such as the anti-caste, non-hierarchical (all the more significant in a largely Hindu context) Swadhyaya movement in India (Srivastava 1998), and the many other religiously based social movements that exist throughout that very large and still very religious sub-continent. One very important aspect of this, which I have never seen once mentioned in the "alternative" literature emerging from the West, has been Islamic thinking, particularly, which links us directly to the next issue, notably Islamic rethinking of economics (Jomo 1993, Siddiqi 1981). Given the international size and significance of the Muslim communities worldwide this is a significant and myopic absence. Indeed generally in alternative thinking there has been little attempt to grapple significantly with non-Western traditions, a form of intellectual hubris well due for rejection. For whatever the negative (mainly economic) aspects of globalization might be, certainly one of its positive dimensions is the bringing into dialogue of different cultures, religions, forms of art and other aspects of civilizations.

5. Alternative Economics. As we have argued in this book, given the profound influence of economics on culture, no sustainable culture is possible without its embeddedness in a sustainable economy. It is probably true to say that most debate about sustainability that does not deal directly with ecology, deals with economics, or indeed with the overlap between the two, as in discussions of "green economies" and their components such as energy sources, cities, new governance patterns, promotion of biodiversity and so forth (Puppin de Oliveira 2012). The range of alternative economies proposed is considerable, but all share elements in common, such as ecological sustainability, social and economic justice and especially equitable access and rewards, gender equality, and the idea that work should be fulfilling and enjoyable. The range of possibilities also reflects political choices from essentially middle-of-the—road positions that do not necessarily fundamentally challenge the political basis of contemporary advanced democracies and which argue for an "eco-economy" (Brown 2001) to arguments for more radical forms of "eco-socialism" as exemplified by such thinkers as Rudolf Bahro, Andre Gorz and Joel Kovel, arguments for an "open" economy

designed for maximizing human well being without drawing strong ideological boundaries (Bakshi 2009) and on to solidarity economics and, once again, spiritually based systems of ideas such as PROUT—the "Progressive Utilization Theory" developed by the Indian social philosopher P.R. Sarkar which stresses economic democracy, sustainable agriculture, cooperatives as the organizational basis for the economy, restorative justice and a strong resistance to neo-liberal globalization (Maheshvarananda 2003). Clearly economic imagination is alive and well, and this does not include the development of ecological economics as an important strand in mainstream economics and internal critiques of economics itself, not only older ones such as that of Hazel Henderson, but very contemporary ones addressing both the very nature of economics (Keen 2011) and the tenets of development economics in particular (Chang and Grabel 2014).

Mechanisms and Methodology

It is clear then that there are indeed very many alternatives, and that both thought and practice are generating many fresh ways of envisaging sustainable futures. But sadly many writers on the subject are long on ideas, but rather short on methodology, of how to get to that sustainable society. So here we must turn to a discussion of this neglected but vital dimension. Clearly this is a question of levels. Firstly that of creating structural change, including at the global level (the radical reform or abolition of the major multinational financial and trade institutions—the IMF, World Bank, WTO and their regional clones such as the Asian Development Bank (ADB)), the transformation of patterns of trade, resistance to the land-grabbing of countries like China in Africa and resisting the negative features of economic globalization. It is to a great extent that the anti-globalization/anti-corporate movement has devoted itself, and built up a large body of experience and methods, from direct confrontation to creating modes of fair trade and the cultural undermining of the corporate dominated media (Starr 2000). Secondly, of the intellectual critique and the building of alternative economic models pioneered by such 1970s thinkers as Hazel Henderson and Ernst Schumacher and carried forward by the now very substantial literature analyzing neoliberalism, introducing such innovations as ecological economics and solidarity economics, and into the present by such contemporary writers as Serge Latouche and the

loose body of thinkers and activists who comprise the 'post-development' school. There is of course the personal level, whether understood in behavioral terms—reducing consumption, adopting alternative energy sources, re-cycling, living in communal housing, abandoning the car for the bicycle and public transport—or in more psychological or spiritual ways and via the practical application of religious belief. And of course there is the cultural level: again understood as on the one hand the transformation of values and practices across a large range of activities including such quite serious matters as how one spends one's leisure time, and on the other as the renewal of cultural expressions—the visual arts, performance, music, fashion, crafts, architecture, design and its other forms, in ways that are sustainable in themselves and contribute to the wider pursuit of society-wide sustainability and conviviality.

In one of his late works (the series of conversations with the conductor Daniel Barenboim on music), Edward Said, best known of course for his classic work on Orientalism and the representation of the 'Other', urged his readers not to abandon what he called 'cultural work'—the seeking to transform reality not only through political and economic means, but through cultural ones, as means of resolving conflicts, bringing people together in new forms of community, inspiring imagination, and as enriching the quality of everyday life (Barenboim and Said 2004). In this respect he was reflecting the earlier arguments of the enormously influential Brazilian educator Paulo Freire who, in one of his slim but influential books had pioneered the role of culture—and particularly of the spoken and written word including its embodiment in indigenous literature, as a major tool of social transformation and the achievement of both social justice and what he famously termed "conscientization"—consciousness raising, clear perception of one's social, economic and political status and the reasons for it, the overcoming of "false consciousness" (to use Marx's term) and to stimulate the social imagination. This leads Freire to the position of the key role of liberating education and social analysis which both "denounces" the current oppressive forms and is a form of "annunciation" of what he calls the "announced reality" that is being proposed—the new social order itself (Freire 1972: 40), a cultural revolution aimed at overcoming domination, or what he terms "cultural action for freedom" (1972: 76). For "Revolution is always cultural, whether it be in the phase of denouncing an oppressive society and proclaiming the advent of a just society, or in the phase of the new society inaugurated by the revolution. In the new society, the revolutionary process becomes cultural revolution" (Freire 1972: 82).

The context in which Freire was originally writing was one of neo-colonialism, and a theme of his work is consequently, to use the title of Linda Tuhiwai Smith's important book, "Decolonizing Methodologies" (Smith 1999). In that book Smith, in part through a vigorous critique of standard anthropological methodologies and all its assumptions (the disinterested observer in the person of the ethnographer, the objectivity of her or his account, the authoritative voice of the author and so on), shows how the supposedly neutral or objective methods of the social sciences are in fact nothing of the kind, but often embody patterns of power, ethnocentrism (or even racism), gender biases and many other distortions that can only be remedied by allowing the genuine voices of the "subjects" to appear and be heard. Anthropology always involves interpretation: true objectivity must then be to allow the indigenous version to emerge, not just as "material" for the metropolitan anthropologist, but as a genuine one with at the very least epistemological and ontological parity with that of the model of the observer.

In the context of social and cultural transformation then the nature of "research" must change, and this is the theme of Max Haiven and Alex Khasnabich's exploration of the nature of social movement research referred to earlier. They sum up this dimension of their book as follows:

> In these times, no research is neutral. We join many others in insisting that social movement research is not merely the work of distanced data collection and interpretation, but an intimate and vital part of social transformation. But, unlike many, we take seriously the question of the researcher's responsibility not merely to 'observe' and report on the radical imagination but to awaken, enliven and 'convoke' it. This book, then, sees research not as a foreign presence within social movements, but as an important part of the way social movements reproduce themselves. We argue that the processes of 'research' are already underway in social movements, and that researchers can arrive not simply as outside observers, but as critical, reflexive agents who work in solidarity with movements to build their capacity for resilient and transformative struggle. (Haiven and Khasnabish 2014)

This leads them to their concepts of "pre-figurative research"—"a research methodology that is borrowed from the future that we wish to create" (2014: 22), and it is important to note that in many social movements this is already happening, but perhaps not in such a self-conscious way. For example in the Subsistence Movement, the creation of new forms of social life is inseparable from both critique of the existing order and

analysis of why, despite its pretensions, it does not actually deliver the good life for the majority, and with, on the other hand, methodologies of knowledge production and sharing, control over one's own body, gender equality, radical democracy and access to and self-production of safe and nutritious food, among others.

In practice then, and in our current planetary situation, methodologies in both the social and natural sciences cannot claim to be simply neutral. If they are not devoted to solving the problems and creating future sustainability, they are, as the saying goes, part of the problem. The implications of this are total and apply to all fields, including such unexpected ones as law, a major but usually unquestioned part of our daily political and business cultures, but which needs to be radically re-oriented from the protection of private property to stimulating sustainability, or what as we have noted, Cormac Cullinan has called "Earth Justice", the preservation of cultural and linguistic diversity, the latter embodying codes of ecological knowledge and other forms of wisdom and ways of perceiving and relating to the world (Abley 2003), and of course education. This excursion into the need for "applied" methodologies points us towards their major application: creating and managing the transition to sustainability.

Managing Transition

The preceding discussion has suggested that there are many models, and given the extent and critical state of our planetary crisis, in some ways the more the better, particularly when they are related to local ecological conditions, history and social structure. Much can be learnt even from failures—from the sociology of the many communal and utopian movements that have come and gone over many generations and teach significant lessons about the possibilities of building true human community in positive relations with nature. But certain key common factors nevertheless stand out. These can be briefly summarized as follows:

No serious cultures of sustainability can emerge without major structural changes in the global system and particularly in its economic, political, trade and energy generation dimensions.

In a dialectical relationship with the above, psychological, spiritual and deeply cultural shifts are required—in consumption patterns, non-exploitative relations to nature, complete gender equality, promoting and not merely "tolerating" cultural and ethnic diversity, but certainly with intolerance of illegitimate hierarchies, while valuing simplicity in modes of

travel, leisure and sporting practices, and very much in the ways in which 'status' is acquired and maintained.

Promoting and rewarding forms of cultural creativity which contribute to sustainability, conviviality and non-violence, which includes renewal of the arts.

Examining historically and sociologically the ways in which major social transformations have occurred in the past, and deriving from these not only tips for current action, but also noting what to avoid, including the all too common phenomenon of past revolutions degenerating into violence and authoritarianism, and trying to understand why, and in particular that political change does not and never will by itself create profound transformations at other levels, for example in fundamental values.

It is fairly obvious that the old models, particularly of politics, have not succeeded in producing positive transformational change. It is for this reason that many are looking at social movements (including religious and ecological ones) to provide the basis for such necessary (for our very survival, let alone flourishing) radical shifts away from our old "business as usual" version. Social movements too have their weaknesses—internal factionalism, rivalry with other ones, a tendency to dissolve when immediate objectives have been met (or when they have not and fatigue sets in). So, taking a broad definition of social movements, we should examine their potential as the carriers of major social transformations towards a sustainable future.

One of the most practice-based of these is the Transition Movement—the movement that began in the UK and is based on the premise that we have reached the point of "peak oil" and that it is now absolutely necessary for society to begin to plan and to move from oil dependency to a post-oil society based on local resilience (Hopkins 2008). Unlike much of the 'post-development' debate, the transition movement offers an actual blueprint, and one not phrased in political terms (although it clearly has profound political implications). The key is resilience—the "ability of a system, from individual people to whole economies, to hold together and maintain their ability to function in the face of change and shocks from the outside" (Hopkins 2008: 12) and that the immediate task is building such resilience in the expectation of the big shifts to come. Such a transition implies many, but positive, changes: changes in culture from activities based on oil-dependency to more self-reliant ones, re-skilling and learning or re-learning how to create local agricultural and food production systems, alternative energy, use of local materials in building technology, waste

disposal in creative ways, and so on. To nurture such a shift in Transition terms does not require a violent revolution, but compassionate action towards birthing a new (or in some senses very old) way of living, a process that requires not only technical shifts (in energy production or agriculture for example), but an understanding of the psychology of change (including why people so often resist positive or necessary change even when they can see its inevitability), promoting creativity in the direction of producing new visions, stories and "myths" and making the idea of participating in such transition the most exciting and fulfilling thing that anyone could do.

If a vision of abundance rather than of sacrifice and shortages is a realistic one, then huge energies can be concentrated on its achievement. One model that the Transition Movement favors as one of its most practical solutions is that of permaculture, in both agriculture and as a wider design principle based on ecological principles and concerned, as its name suggests, with permanence and sustainability (Holmgren 2002). The process of "energy descent"—moving from an energy intensive, oil based society and economy to a largely self-sustaining one with a very small carbon-footprint—will be painful indeed unless carefully thought through (the intention of the Transition Movement) and accompanied and fueled by cultural shifts (the by now familiar ones), and by the recognition that the proposed future—simpler, largely pollution free, quieter, less stressed, more convivial—is in fact the one that we would prefer to live in. The whole idea of Transition is to anticipate and plan for the changes necessary to reach that future, without incurring not an energy descent, but a descent into chaos and violence.

For all its very many virtues and practical proposals, the weakness of the Transition Movement is its lack of a political dimension and its uncertain analysis of the structural economic factors that are the basis of many of our planetary problems, not just oil, although the oil economy and industry is paradigmatic of those structural characteristics—a sort of evil twin to permaculture. This is why substantial space has been given in this book to the political and economic aspects of culture, and the need for a holistic picture. Changing consciousness will not overnight change the structural problems: the two have to be related in creative ways (hence our prior discussion of methodology). But certainly the Transition Movement does offer very concrete and practical steps and its approach reminds one of the 'slow food' movement: don't rush but begin now to make small but significant changes. It is also of course entirely non-violent and non-confrontational. Beginning perhaps with Gandhi, the idea that dedi-

cated but non-violent social movements (which have huge moral power precisely because of their non-violence) can have huge positive effects on promoting desirable social transformation, is once again gaining momentum. In their world-wide compendium of studies on non-violent social movements, Stephen Zunes and collaborators describe and analyze a wide variety of movements from all geographical regions and under a wide variety of political regimes, that have has high levels of success in promoting people-centered policies and resisting unjust ones in many social and cultural contexts (Zunes et al. 1999). This has been followed more recently by a systematic attempt by the sociologist Stellan Vinthagen to develop a broad theory of non-violent action that considers both the dimensions of resistance and re-construction (Vinthagen 2014).

The former administrator of the Right Livelihood Award has surveyed the nature of the winners of that award over a number of years, all of them being examples of 'how to get there from here', and summarized his findings (Ekins 1992). Ekins begins from the approach of the peace scholar Johan Galtung cited before, and his suggestion that there are four 'spaces' of the relationships which produce peace or violence, and also sustainability—the human space of personal relationships, the social one of culture, politics and economy, the global space of world systems, and the ecological space in which people interact with nature (Ekins 1992: 3). On the basis of this Galtung derived model, Ekins suggests that the images of sustainability contained in the older Brandt and Brundtland reports are severely compromised, and are essentially ways of promoting the oxymoron of 'sustainable growth', and in promoting the idea of 'one world' are actually supporting both globalization and the forms of forced cultural convergence implied by standard conceptions of development, and confuse two notions of 'interdependence'—the negative one of 'integration' into the world system through debt on the one hand, and the true interdependence of people through people's organizations "which are the antithesis of the conventional aid/trade/debt links in the global economy" (Ekins 1992: 38). His alternative emphasis is on reforming consumption, principally in the rich countries which are the source of most carbon emissions, altering energy usage and creating a new concept of health based on a cultural shift away from the consumption of health damaging products (junk food, tobacco, alcohol, narcotics, powdered milk baby formulas, unnecessary, overpriced and even dangerous pharmaceuticals), and acting against armaments and military spending. He provides a number of actual examples of communities which have moved in these

directions including the Finnish Village Action Movement and the Indian Swadhyaya movement noted above. In both cases he sees spiritual renewal as a key to their respective success. Many other very practical resources for social action towards sustainability also exist—both larger scale ones that address social movements and their possible strategies (Albert 2002), and ones that provide concrete advice for individuals concerned, quite literally, with saving the planet (Litvinoff 1990, Harrow 2004) from recycling to buying fair trade goods.

This is an issue that is being addressed in a variety of ways—including as part of very serious analyses of the possible nature of resistance to neo-liberalism and its latest incarnations as 'the era of austerity', in which while resistance to globalization can take reactionary forms (the Tea Party in the US, the emergence of the far-Right in Western Europe), a progressive alternative is possible, and that such resistance includes what Owen Worth calls "the return of God" (Worth 2013). But this "return" can itself signal either progressive or reactionary tendencies—fundamentalist Islam or Christian Evangelicalism as much as liberatory spiritualities and theologies of liberation. There are in fact at least three levels here—the analysis of actually existing religious movements that promote or retard a progressive (humanist, ecological, egalitarian and pro-social justice) agenda, the contributions of religious/spiritual thinking to providing a theoretical and practical basis for sustainability, and emerging thinking about the spiritual costs of transition. An example of the latter is the work of writers such a Carolyn Baker who assumes the coming collapse of industrial civilization and seeks to develop spiritual tools to cope with what she sees as being inevitably a deeply traumatic period as old forms and dreams collapse, as long held expectations for the future erode and vanish and as new and unexpected forms of life emerge in a post-collapse world (Baker 2009). While the Transition people attempt to provide practical tools for the shift to the post-oil society, Baker attempts to provide the spiritual ones, which include facing the fact that the transition will be an experience of great loss as well as (potentially) great gain, developing an almost 'Japanese' aesthetic of accepting that the moment is to be savored as all things pass away, recognizing that beauty is both necessary in our lives but also ephemeral, developing what she terms "deep listening" to the events and their meaning that surround us, promoting "mirth-making" rather than sorrow in the face of change, and both telling the ancient stories and writing new ones. She also considers such quite practical issues as how to bring up children in a world in which the traditional expectations are collapsing, new ways of conceptualizing health and

dealing with sickness in a situation where contemporary high-technology medicine will almost certainly be in decline, and how to think about scarcity and abundance in a radically changed economy. Despite the rather New Age quality of her writing, the issues that Baker raises are serious ones and complement the rather formalized discussion of the psychology of change found in the Transition literature. Change is indeed not easy and fundamental changes require quite radical re-orientations of world view, what constitutes meaning and a meaningful life, and while 'practical' suggestions about sustainability now abound, the psychology and spirituality of a truly sustainable lifestyle and all that it implies, including our relationship with other species which share the planet, is an area that requires some deep thinking, research and experimentation with new models, some of which may derive from traditional religions, but others which may well emerge from the process of struggle for a new world itself.

I have found that, when asking students about their views on how to achieve sustainability, they almost inevitably put education at the top of their list. They are not alone in this, and a substantial literature now exists ranging from radical models of "de-schooling" society (Ivan Illich), through the transformative potential of literacy (Paulo Freire) to a large range of practical experiments in "alternative" schooling, home education, "barefoot universities", innovative art education experiments, and many others. Education is of course an ambiguous beast: on the one hand it is the major mechanism especially in 'advanced societies' for socialization, incorporating people into the industrial and bureaucratic structures of those societies and teaching them skills that they probably will never need while ignoring the ones that they do, while on the other it has enormous potential for promoting exactly the kind of values, attitudes, lifestyles and skills required to create and maintain a sustainable society. To seek for such a society then requires that central attention be paid to the content and methodology of education. Fortunately a number of educational thinkers are doing just this, and here I will mention just two. One is Brian Murphy whose book *Transforming Ourselves, Transforming the World* (Murphy 1999) is sub-titled "An Open Conspiracy for Social Change" and attempts to set out an account of what transformative knowledge might look like and how a democratic and participatory education can contribute both to generating such knowledge and transmitting it in ways consistent with its goals. An even more developed model is to be found in Edmund O'Sullivan's book *Transformative Learning* (1999) in which he sets out proposals for the recovery of an "Ecozoic" vision as the basis

of education, and with it the return of cosmology (what is now being called in some circles "Big History"), critique of the "dream structure of our Western cultural mantras"—"progress", "growth", "development", globalization, competition, consumerism, power, class, violence, racism and patriarchy—and an alternative vision based on education for justice, peace and diversity and rooted in what O'Sullivan calls "the planetary context of creativity"—a cosmological and evolutionary model that leads to the cultivation of an 'ecological self' of the kind of which we have spoken. This requires that education be concerned with human scale development, the promotion of community and a sense of place, and the recognition of both cultural and biological diversity and leads to the appearance of a civic culture that, amongst other things, celebrates diversities of spiritual expression and Eros—that approaches the world with an attitude of awe and mystery, not as a set of technical "problems" to be addressed through managerial interventions, as in the horrible and hubristic phrase "environmental management".

Transition to a sustainable society is evidently a multi-faceted procedure, operating simultaneously at many levels, and the models vary substantially from the gradualist ones of the Transition Movement or the likes of Michael Lerner who proposes a package including such elements as national and regional summits on ethics and meaning, promoting networks of "meaning oriented" professionals, public intellectuals and public journalism, consciousness raising groups and replacing the outmoded concepts of the GNP and GDP with better indicators of real progress such as the "Country Futures Indicators" (CFI) developed by Hazel Henderson (Lerner 1996: 285–307) and encouraging spiritual practices, to much more radical ones. As Roberto Unger notes, any form of transformative practice will throw up problems—finding a balance between reconstructing institutional arrangements and revising personal relations, from the top-down or from the grassroots up?, to seize or seek power or to shun it?, to engage in experiments that pre-figure the post-revolutionary situation? of how to both recognize and devalue the logic of group interests, of how to create a visionary language that will inspire people towards change, and how to identify and exploit transformative opportunities in situations which appear to be stable and with no obvious openings towards radical change? (Unger 2001: 395–430). The question is, as Shrivastava and Kothari put it (2014: 410–11) whether we want business as usual and an inevitable decent into visible insanity, a slow transition to sanity, or a rapid transition to sanity? That change will come is inevitable. What is at stake

is our ability to foresee (we already can) and our willingness as a species to make that change not only as smooth as possible, but leading to a desirable rather than an impoverished social and ecological future, whether we serve the evolution of life or oppose it, with predictably disastrous consequences for us and the planet as a whole.

Outcomes

Sustainability will not come about by fiat—by some sudden miraculous intervention from above. To think so is a false temptation—the idea that things have become so bad that only a strong authoritarian leader can get us out of our self-induced mess. History (and anthropology) have shown that there can be many social and cultural alternatives that work. In many ways the political system in particular that we are stuck with at the moment is an anachronism, something that was an innovation two centuries ago, but at both the national and international levels has proved unable or unwilling to confront the massive problems that now beset us. Ultimately the roots of all such systems are cultural—the expressions of our values, priorities and imaginations. Hence the emphasis in this book on cultural change as the basis for all other forms of change. It is often thought that cultural movements (in the arts for example) follow social ones, but as I have argued elsewhere (Clammer 2014) this is not the case: often cultural movements are the fuel or lubricant that inspires other forms of change. Almost all intentional communities are built on a cultural basis—religious, artistic, a lifestyle—as are in fact all communities. The challenge that now confronts us—what the eco-theologian Thomas Berry calls the "great work" of our generation—is to create a sustainable and just culture and society that can carry us into the future. It is important to stress "just", as there is no guarantee that a post-oil or post-industrial society would necessarily be such, or be democratic or an expression of the other values that we almost universally desire in our ideal society. *True* sustainability I would strongly argue, requires justice, if not it is merely survival, quite a different and much depleted thing (Agyeman 2013).

The "cultural" approach to sustainability also has other implications, methodological and otherwise. These include a notion of holism: that all the elements in a workable model of society must be seen as inter-related, the social with the economic, the religious with the political, and so on, the centrality of values: that the good society is one with a strong ethical core (and not, I stress, simply a legal one, as is largely the case today, in

those cases where even the legal system exists and is honest and above corruption and political influence), and that it tends towards an aesthetic: one of simplicity. For the over consumers, this means reduction but not loss, an increase in time, leisure, creativity with smaller means; for the under-consumers it means simplicity not poverty rather than seeking (now impossibly) to emulate the over-consumers and to join their destructive ranks. This also implies the renewal of many of our cultural forms, not just consumption patterns, but also the arts, and a move from narcissism not simply to social engagement but to an awareness of their potential role in building a just planetary community, and of religion, the very source of ethics, meaning and world views for many millions. This is why we have constantly stressed the role of the imagination, which is at the root of culture and of any form of social transformation. Without tapping into emotional well-springs no lasting change occurs or is sustained: we need to be "engaged" not just in some political or economic sense as the word is often so loosely used in self-defined "radical" circles. Sustainability is actually an emotional project, not a political one. It implies the pursuit of justice (social, economic, ecological and visual), of cultural and bio-logical diversity, of care in our relationship to the world of nature and to each other, and the willingness, energy and creativity to found institutions, for example in education, that embody those ideals of ecological literacy, social justice, peace, and which practice them not just teach them. Gandhi was right in insisting that we must be the change that we wish to see, and Thomas Berry on insisting that this is the Great Work. It is, and it will be by our success in engaging with it (or, tragically our failure to do so) that future generations, if such there be, will judge us.

Bibliography

Abley, Mark. 2003. *Spoken Here: Travels Among Threatened Languages*. London: Arrow Books.

Agnivesh, Swami. 2003. *Religion, Spirituality and Social Action*. Delhi: Hope India Publications.

Agyeman, Julian. 2013. *Introducing Just Sustainabilities: Policy, Planning and Practice*. London and New York: Zed Books.

Albert, Michael. 2002. *The Trajectory of Change: Activist Strategies for Social Transformation*. Cambridge, MA: Southend Press.

Armytage, W.H.G. 1961. *Heavens Below: Utopian Experiments in England 1560–1960*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Baker, Carolyn. 2009. *Sacred Demise: Walking the Spiritual Path of Industrial Civilization's Collapse*. New York: iUniverse Inc.

Bakshi, Rajni. 2009. *Bazaars, Conversations and Freedom: For a Market Culture Beyond Greed and Fear*. New Delhi: Penguin Books India.

Barenboim, Daniel, and Edward W. Said. 2004. *Parallels and Paradoxes: Explorations in Music and Society*. London: Bloomsbury.

Bennholdt-Thomsen, Veronika, and Maria Mies. 1999. *The Subsistence Perspective*: *Beyond the Globalized Economy*. London: Zed Books.

Bennholdt-Thomsen, Veronika, Nicholas Faraclas, and Claudia Von Werlhof. 2001. *There is An Alternative: Subsistence and Worldwide Resistance to Corporate Globalization*. London: Zed Books.

Berneri, Marie Louise. 1971. *Journey Through Utopia*. New York: Schocken Books.

Brown, Lester 2001. *Eco-Economy: Building an Economy for the Earth*. New York: W.W. Norton and Company.

Chang, Ha-Joon, and Ilene Grabel. 2014. *Reclaiming Development: An Alternative Economic Policy Manual*. London and New York: Zed Books.

Coward, Harold, and Daniel C. Maguire, eds. 2000. *Vision of a New Earth: Religious Perspectives on Population, Consumption and Energy*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Ekins, Paul. 1992. *A New World Order: Grassroots Movements for Social Change*. London and New York: Routledge.

Freire, Paulo. 1972. *Cultural Action for Freedom*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Geoghegan, Vincent. 1996. *Ernst Bloch*. London and New York: Routledge.

Goodman, Percival. 1977. *The Double E*. New York: Anchor Books.

Haiven, Max, and Alex Khasnabish. 2014. *The Radical Imagination: Social Movement Research in the Age of Austerity*. London and New York: Zed Books.

Hall, John R. 1978. *The Ways Out: Utopian Communal Groups in an Age of Babylon*. London and Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Harrow, Lisa. 2004. *What Can I Do? An Alphabet for Living*. White River Junction, VT: Chelsea Green.

Hartmann, Thom. 2004. *The Last Hours of Ancient Sunlight: The Fate of the World and What We Can Do Before It's Too Late*. New York: Three Rivers Press.

Harvey, David. 2002. *Spaces of Hope*. Edinburg: Edinburgh University Press.

Hawken, Paul. 2008. *Blessed Unrest: How the Largest Social Movement in History is Restoring Grace, Justice and Beauty to the World*. New York: Penguin Books.

Holmgren, David. 2002. *Permaculture: Principles and Pathways Beyond Sustainability*. London: Holmgren Design Press.

Hopkins, Bob. 2008. *The Transition Handbook: From Oil Dependency to Local Resilience*. White River Junction, VT: Chelsea Green Publishing.

Illich, Ivan. 1971. *Deschooling Society*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Jacoby, Russell. 1999. *The End of Utopia: Politics and Culture in an Age of Apathy*. New York: Basic Books.

Jomo, K.S. 1993. *Islamic Economic Alternatives: Critical Perspectives and New Directions*. Kuala Lumpur: Ikraq.

Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. 1972. *Commitment and Community: Communes and Utopias in Sociological Perspective*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Keen, Steve. 2011. *Debunking Economics: The Naked Emperor Dethroned?* London and New York: Zed Books.

Kotke, Wm.H. 1993. *The Final Empire: The Collapse of Civilization and The Seed of the Future*. Portland, OR: Arrow Point Press.

Latunche, Serge. 2010. *Farewell to Growth*. Trans. David Macey. Cambridge and Malden, MA: Polity Press.

Lerner, Michael. 1996. *The Politics of Meaning: Restoring Hope and Possibility in an Age of Cynicism*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

, ———. 2000. *Spirit Matters*. Charlottesville, VA: Hampton Roads Publishing.

Litvinoff, Miles. 1990. *The Earthscan Action Handbook for People and Planet*. London: Earthscan.

Maheshvarananda, Dada. 2003. *After Capitalism: Prout's Vision for a New World*. Copenhagen and Washington, DC: Proutist Universal Publications.

Mckibben, Bill. 2007. *Deep Economy: The Wealth of Communities and the Durable Future*. New York: Holt.

Murphy, Brian. 1999. *Transforming Ourselves, Transforming the World: An Open Conspiracy for Social Change*. London and New York: Zed Books.

O'Sullivan, Edmund. 1999. *Transformative Learning: Educational Vision for the 21st Century*. London and New York: Zed Books.

Popenoe, Cris, and Oliver Popenoe. 1984. *Seeds of Tomorrow: New Age Communities That Work*. San Francisco: Harper and Row.

Puppin de Oliveira, Jose, ed. 2012. *Green Economy and Good Governance for Sustainable Development: Opportunities, Promises and Concerns*. Tokyo, New York and Paris: United Nations University Press.

Robertson, Margaret. 2014. *Sustainability: Principles and Practice*. Abingdon and New York: Routledge.

Salemink, Oscar, Anton Van Harskamp, and Ananta Kumar Giri. 2004. *The Development of Religion/The Religion of Development*. Delft: Eburon.

Shrivastava, Aseem, and Ashish Kothari. 2014. *Churning The Earth: The Making of Global India*. New Delhi: Penguin Books India.

Siddiqi, Muhammad Nejatullah. 1981. *Muslim Economic Thinking: A Survey of Contemporary Literature*. Leicester: The Islamic Foundation and Jeddah: International Centre for Research in Islamic Economics.

Smith, Linda Tuhiwai. 1999. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. London and New York: Zed Books.

Srivastava, Raj Krishan. 1998. *Vital Connections: Self, Society, God: Perspectives on Swadhyaya*. New York and Tokyo: Weatherhill.

Starr, Amory. 2000. *Naming the Enemy: Anti-Corporate Movements Confront Globalization*. London: Zed Books.

Subramaniam, Suneetha M., and Balakrishna Pisupati. 2010. *Traditional Knowledge in Policy and Practice*. Tokyo, New York and London: United Nations University Press.

Unger, Roberto Mangabeira. 2001. *False Necessity: Anti-Necessitarian Social Theory in the Service of Radical Democracy*. London and New York: Verso.

Veysey, Laurence. 1973. *The Communal Experience: Anarchist and Mystical Counter-Cultures in America*. New York and London: Harper and Row.

Vinthagen, Stellan. 2014. *The Sociology of Nonviolent Action*. London and New York: Zed Books.

Worth, Owen. 2013. *Resistance in the Age of Austerity: Nationalism, the Failure of the Left and the Return of God*. London and New York: Zed Books.

Zunes, Stephen, Lester R. Kurtz, and Sarah Beth Asher. 1999. *Non-Violent Social Movements*. Oxford and Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Bibliography

Ekins, Paul. 1992. *A New World Order: Grassroots Movements for Social Change.* London and New York: Routledge.

Clammer, John. 2014. *Vision and Society: Towards a Sociology and Anthropology from Art.* London and New York: Routledge.

———. 2016. Mahayana Buddhism and the Social Sciences. In *The Bloomsbury Research Handbook of Indian Philosophical Theories of Religion*, ed. Pankaj Jain. London: Bloomsbury.

Gibson-Graham, J.K. 2009. *A Postcapitalist Politics.* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Index