Education and Capabilities for a Global 'Great Transition'

Des Gasper

Pre-publication version of a chapter in:
Human Development and Capabilities: Re-imagining the University of the XXI Century,
eds. A. Boni, M. Walker, 2013; Abingdon, UK: Routledge; pp. 53-66.

Introduction

What are the implications for education of the emergent global challenges of sustainability? Various studies suggest that major changes are required in predominant human values during the next two generations, to ensure politically and environmentally sustainable societies and a sustainable global order. Three required moves, according to *The Earth Charter* and the *Great Transition* study by the Stockholm Environment Institute (Earth Charter Commission; Raskin et al. 2002), are the following: from pursuit of human fulfilment predominantly through consumerism, to a focus on quality of life above quantity of commercial activity; from the predominance of possessive individualism, towards more human solidarity; and from a stance of human domination and exploitation of nature, towards an ecological sensitivity. This essay considers such a neo-Stoic project—covering, broadly speaking, the cultivation of humanity's flourishing as individuals, as collectivity, and in and towards our natural environment, each of them as desirable in themselves and in order to preserve humankind.

The challenge of value transition is also a challenge for the capability approach to human development. The tension between individualist consumerist and solidarist humanist versions of liberalism is found also between some of the possible interpretations of the capability approaches of Amartya Sen and Martha Nussbaum. The capability approach in a form which lacks notions of caring, and lacks an emphasis on the paradoxes of choice whereby in many cases having more options can bring less satisfaction (Schwartz 2005), could become an instrument of consumerism rather than a tool in its critique and reconstruction (Gasper and Truong, 2010). Similarly, doubts arise over how far an individual-centred human rights perspective alone can motivate a solidaristic global ethics. A larger vision of human be-ing may be required.

This paper looks first at the scale of the challenge and at some possible paths of social change, using the work of the *Great Transition* project. Like other recent surveys (e.g., UNDP 2007; Jackson 2009a, 2009b; Stern 2010) this material underlines the extreme challenges that humankind faces, given the nature of current values and behaviour.

Second, we consider the possibilities of change at personal, societal and global levels, with reference to the roles and mutual entanglement of personal change and system change and the question of where education fits in. The Great Transition Initiative's work (www.gtinitiative.org) accords a vital role to national and global citizens' movements driven by the energies of young people, and implies potential major roles for progressive education and, conversely, a negative role for anti-progressive education. We use Brown and Lauder's study of *The Future of Society in a Global Economy* to identify some of the barriers to change, and elements of the required

1

rethinking of personhood, intelligence and education. However, that study's conventional preoccupation with 'success' in the global economy partly counteracts its other insights. So we will move on to Nussbaum's *Cultivating Humanity* for a profounder discussion of the roles for liberal humanist education in our 'one world', with special reference to university education.

The final section reviews the various discussions of required roles and links them to George's work (1997, 2012) on possible lessons from multi-national postgraduate education in the field of international development studies. This illustrates a form of education that can contribute towards two of the value changes required for sustaining humankind: greater global solidarity, and a rethinking of quality of life as rooted in richness of relationships more than in volume of possessions.

The Great Transition that awaits us – but which one?

Long-range trajectories

Work in 'The Great Transition Initiative' (GTI) identified three areas of critical uncertainties for humanity's future (Raskin 2006a): environmental risks; the economic instabilities of (to use Edward Luttwak's term) 'turbo-capitalism'; and socio-political combustibility. The three areas are strongly interconnected, which brings the risk of destructive chain reactions and resultant crises. The likely triggering factors are: financial collapse; pandemics; climate change; mega-terrorism; and key resource shortages. All the elements of high vulnerability are present: high exposure to shocks, due to turbo-capitalism's economic, political, and environmental imbalances and low capacity to anticipate and avert or mitigate their consequences; high sensitivity to shocks when they arrive, thanks partly to the pervasive interconnectedness; and low coping capacity, including for adaptation to the effects and for learning about and acting on the causes.

The GTI sketches six indicative scenarios of global futures (Raskin et al. 2002, Raskin 2006a). First are two Conventional Worlds scenarios. The *Market Forces* scenario is an optimistic story of adaptation through the operation of markets guided by an in-built hidden hand and the occasional light-touch by market-friendly technocrats. The *Policy Reform* scenario too embodies a 'sustainable development' belief that unending economic growth, environmental sustainability and equity can somehow be combined through better technology and (in this case) active policy intervention. The GTI studies consider that these two scenarios contain internal contradictions and extreme risks. 'They must reverse destabilizing global trends—social polarization, environmental degradation, and economic instability—even as they advance the consumerist values, [unending] economic growth, and cultural homogenization that drive such trends.'(Raskin 2006a, p.3).

The Barbarization scenarios present the working out of these contradictions. The *Breakdown* scenario shows a Malthusian future in which human expansion triggers off cataclysmic chain reactions of pestilence, war, famine and eco-system decline. In *Fortress World* some groups, intra- and inter-nationally, manage to barricade themselves off from the zones of breakdown.

The two remaining scenarios concern futures of sustainability through radical change. The *Eco-communalism* scenario is a traditional Green utopia of 'small is beautiful', in which humankind turns away from large-scale industrialism, a globalized economy and attempted environmental engineering. The GTI studies see this variant as implausible.

Their hopes rest instead on the final scenario, the *New Sustainability Paradigm*, marked by an 'alternative globalization' guided by values of human solidarity and a rethinking of the nature of human be-ing and well-being. It:

> sees in globalization, not only a threat, but also an opportunity for forging new categories of consciousness—global citizenship, humanity-as-whole, the wider web of life, and sustainability and the well-being of future generations. … a pluralistic vision that, within a shared commitment to global citizenship, celebrates diverse regional forms of development and multiple pathways to modernity. (Raskin 2006a: 3)[i]

All the scenarios can in fact be called a great transition of one sort or another, in face of the crises that likely await humankind in the 21st century. Which of the scenarios is more likely depends on what combination emerges of intensity of crisis and degree of coping capacity. A low intensity of crises plus high coping capacity would allow a 'Conventional World' path. That pair of scenarios appear implausible on the basis of current evidence. Given high intensity of crises and low coping capacity we will move along a 'Barbarization' pathway. This second pair of scenarios would be intolerable. Given high intensity crises yet high coping capacity we may be both driven towards and able to make a 'Great Transition' of a profound yet favourable kind. Our need is to build coping capacity, including through value change.

The GTI judges that global coping capacity can only increase greatly if a powerful global citizens movement emerges (or, more precisely, a 'movement of the movements'; Hintjens 2006). The project's detailed analyses show contingent pathways, each representing a different possible direction beyond each phase of crisis, depending on the presence in those phases of either a weak or a strong global citizens movement (Raskin 2006a). But the presence and strength of a movement are not sufficient. Required for a favourable transition in face of the likely crises are elements of shared vision, a shared identity of global citizen, and a realistic change strategy. Only with a powerful *and* well-oriented global citizens movement can even the modest Policy Reform scenario become plausible, as opposed to the pattern we have seen during the past generation: recurrent fine-sounding global commitments which then remain largely unimplemented.

History shows that people's and sometimes even societies's choices can be affected through envisioning alternative stories about the future and responding to the perceived threats and opportunities. Human values and the resulting social movements form key sets of variables that have influence and are themselves influenced and influenceable (Raskin 2006a, 2006b).

Value change?

For major societal reform people must perceive that they face real choices and must feel deeply motivated to take the reform choice. Processes of societal reform thus require values as drivers, that help to motivate and reconfigure patterns of action. Humankind, especially its high-impact consumers clustered mostly in high-income countries, must become motivated towards choices which are compatible with global sustainability.

The Great Transition work presents three major types of value change required in response to the emerging and foreseeable crises and for a move to a sustainable global society: (a) from consumerism, and an ideology of life-fulfilment through buying, to a focus instead on quality of living; (b) from individualism to human solidarity, including concern for the 'external effects' one imposes on others; and (c) from domination of nature, to ecological sensitivity. This formulation is inspired by the work that led to the

Earth Charter (Raskin 2006b:3). Even Nicholas Stern, former Chief Economist of the World Bank and an apostle of unending growth, argues that basic value changes will be needed to motivate the types of life-style reorientation, long-term oriented investments and international cooperation that are essential for preventing dangerous global warming (Stern 2010, Chs. 7, 9, 10).

A study by Robert Kates et al. (2006) takes a hard look at the scale of required value change.[ii] It summarises eight multi-national surveys of stated values, such as the World Values Survey which has been run since 1981 by Ronald Inglehart and others. (Kates et al. use the 2002 World Values Survey, conducted in 79 countries.) Here are the surveys' main findings in the three key areas. *(A) On Quality of Life.* Strong orientation to pleasure through purchases predominated around the world (Kates et al., 2006: 5). We seem, in the majority, presently to embrace an ongoing, never-ending quest for fulfilment through purchase of ever-growing volumes of commodities. *(B) On Human Solidarity.* Large majorities were concerned about the weak (children, the elderly, sick or disabled). But views were divided about poverty; e.g., large majorities in Pacific Rim countries, including China and the USA, blamed poverty on laziness and lack of willpower, while majorities elsewhere stressed instead lack of fair opportunities as the main cause. Despite this division, large majorities everywhere were reportedly willing to pay 1% more of their income as taxes to help the world's poor; vastly more than nearly all governments actually give. Tolerance of other groups was supported in the abstract, but a third of the respondents wanted to not live next to specified other groups. Increased global interconnection was seen as having been good overall so far, but at the same time majorities were worried at the prospect of having any more of it. *(C) Ecological Sustainability.* Large majorities rejected an ethic of human domination of nature, when they considered the issue directly.[iii] But strong tensions existed between the different values that people espoused. While most people 'think that less emphasis on material possessions would be a good thing' (Kates et al. 2006: 8), at the same time meaning and fulfilment are pursued to a large extent through acquisition of commodities.

Kates et al. conclude that there is much stated support for values of solidarity and ecological sustainability, but our behaviour does not yet match this well. And: 'Regarding quality of life values…much more fundamental value change is required', away from a preoccupation with unending, ever-growing commodity acquisition (ibid., p.11) and to better balance material consumption in relation to other values.

Major and surprising value changes can occur. Kates et al. contrasted the world of 2006 with the world of the late 1920s, which lay as far back from their time of writing as 2084, the end date in GTI scenarios, lay in the future. Compared to the early 21st century, in value terms the 1920s represent in many respects another mental universe, thanks partly to the unexpected extent of growth from the 1940s onwards of values of universal human rights, including of women's rights and racial equality.

How can fundamental changes in values and practices arise? What roles does or can education play? Is it just a dependent variable within society, with no fundamental system-altering impacts? We will focus here on attitudes towards consumption and ideas about sources of well-being, which Kates et al. identified as the biggest challenge. We will give attention also to value change for global solidarity, which involves a rethinking of personhood and identity and perhaps an awareness that richness lies especially in relationships, and connects to the rejection of consumerism.

Values and change at the level of the person

Individualisation and the lack of subjective security
According to Brown and Lauder (2001), individualist consumerism is one of several forms of individualism and individualisation which grew in mass industrial society as types of 'answer to the threat to personal identity posed by the factory model of Fordist and bureaucratic work' (p.54). With mass fashion, individuals can experiment with 'personal' 'statements' that yet use a given, society-wide or sub-group specific, visual language, so that the índividual remains safely a group-member. We see also increasing negotiation of roles in various life-spaces, including regarding marriage, roles of parent and son/daughter, and so on. Various of these forms of individualism may reinforce the preoccupation with purchasing.

In Brown and Lauder's judgement, the society of self-concern 'is ultimately self-defeating as many are finding to their material and psychological cost' (2001: 281). Well-being research confirms this argument for at least a large proportion of people in high-income countries (see e.g., Barber 2007; Bruni and Porta 2007; Easterlin 2002; Schwartz 2005; Seligman 2002). The argument criticises consumerism, in terms of how to promote self-interest; it is not yet an evolved critique of non-solidarity and it may not move those people who have the luck to achieve fulfilment through self-concern and consumerism, perhaps in part thanks to ability to exploit others. To deepen the critique of consumerism as well as to open out to solidarity, we require some rethinking of 'self'.

Consumerism provides for a form of identity in mass society, and identity in turn provides subjective security. Seeking that security through consumption requires constant reinforcement through new expenditures. Objective security in terms of health, physical and economic security does not guarantee subjective security. Indeed, the more that people have, sometimes the more fearful they become that they will lose it. In the absence of subjective security, wants are insatiable. Modern capitalism consciously fuels subjective insecurities, as a basis of new demand (see also Hamilton 2010).

Historically, religion has figured as a major source of subjective security, though not a very reliable one. It can also become a source of fear and discontent—as when other people are considered to be not following the good road—and a justification for seeking domination. External sources for internal subjective security, whether religious guarantees or consumer expenditures, are in general at risk of failure. A subjective security that does not rest on some profounder reasoned accomodation with life, not simply on authority or constant material reassurance, is liable to recurrent destabilization or decay (Gasper 2007).

Change: personal change or system change?
Consumerism offers an apparent path for assuaging long-term dissatisfactions that it cannot in reality address. But it does provides short-term gratifications, so while it may not profoundly or sustainedly satisfy, how far can it be changed ? Many social scientists are sceptical regarding what to expect from change by individuals--even if financially motivated by new incentives or full-cost accounting--if the required change runs against predominant meaning-systems.

Tim Jackson, director of the ESRC Research Group on Lifestyles, Values and Environment at the University of Surrey, concluded as follows from a multi-year research programme on personal motivation and systems of consumption. First, people's major motivations include a need for meaning and identity. 'Material artefacts embody symbolic meanings' (Jackson 2006: 378). The consumption of the already well-off is mainly a pursuit of symbolic meanings and identity through acquisition and possession of goods. The relative emptiness of the purchase and consumption themselves allows their endless repetition. Meaning-giving comes more through the process than the product: meanings arise within social living. The individual is not simply bound into a social fabric, but created therein: 'Self is a social construct' (ibid: p. 374).

Second, in particular, 'Consumer society is a cultural defence against *anomie*' (p. 384), and one or other such defence is required now that people live long and, in most countries, face fewer direct threats, yet still face the certainty of death. Attempts to change individual consumers' behaviour towards sustainability, through information and financial incentives and disincentives, will typically have little impact, given people's other motivations, their social lock-in to a set of roles, institutions and infrastructures, and the massive resources of capitalist business that pull in the other direction. Instead, to a large extent, change must come through changing the perceptions and norms in their peer groups and communities.

Third, can education contribute? The conundrum that 'we can't change persons unless we change systems' and 'we can't change systems unless we change persons' partly arises out of the crudity of our concepts, as a sort of Zeno's paradox of social movement. Social change does happen and it happens through actions of persons. This is the premise of scenario analyses. Jackson was talking about moves towards sustainable consumption, a field where little progress has been made so far in rich countries, despite forty years of knowledge of the directions required. But in terms of value systems more widely we do see changes, such as the growth of belief in and commitment to human rights and racial equality, and the gradual change of norms about gender relations. Important historic examples of value change that have contributed to eventual social change can inform and inspire us: such as the removal of slavery and the decline of colonialism (Crawford 2002), and the largely peaceful displacement of the British Raj in India, the colour-bar in the USA and apartheid in South Africa (Sinha and Gasper 2009).

Values and change at the level of society

Education can contribute better to rethinking in and of society, suggest Brown and Lauder, if it itself exemplifies an inspiring social alternative. They propose a stress on collective intelligence, as a counterbalance to the language of individualism. Robert Bellah's famous study *Habits of the Heart*, for example, while it did not find a purely 'me'-generation in USA, found 'that the language of individualism, as the primary language of self-understanding, limited the ways in which people think' (Brown and Lauder 2001: 209). So, first, consistent with Jackson's observations, we should understand people as social beings, marked by mutual dependence and sociability, between whom informal learning and trust are vital for much complex cooperation. Second, individual intelligence is thus for nearly everyone not fixed but capable of increase, given intelligence's strong cultural and social determination. Third, intelligence

must be recognised as also a property at the group level. We must correspondingly recognise the central importance of maintaining a social fabric, for allowing good quality of life and good socio-economic performance. So the idea of what is work must expand to cover also care activities and periodic re-training. Fourth, intelligences are plural (Gardner 1983); and in particular, emotional intelligence, which covers knowledge and skills in self-management and in managing one's relations with others, is very important for well-being and in complex cooperative flexible work and living. Flexible cooperation in a complex world calls for skills in communication, understanding others, and negotiating roles and relationships. 'Yet many of the trends [in the past generation] have served to stunt these abilities', argued Brown and Lauder (2001: 174). They outline how isolation in social life brings a lack of feelings of commonality, which contributes to increased self-interested behaviour and to lack of the interactions that can generate both informal learning and a picture of well-being that is different from 'the struggle for money, power and status' (ibid: 223).

This rethinking, of intelligence and of persons as social beings, leads into a rethinking of education around a wider set of capabilities. '[A] Collective Intelligence [perspective]…suggests that all are capable rather than a few; that intelligence is multiple rather than [exclusively] a matter of solving puzzles with only one right answer; and that our human qualities for imagination and emotional engagement are as important as our ability to become technical experts' (Brown and Lauder 2001: 8). In UNESCO's terms, education must cover four types of learning – to know, to do, to be, and to live together.

Brown and Lauder's book thus indicates some steps that are useful for the moves required beyond consumerism and towards greater human solidarity, by acknowledgement of persons as social beings and by corresponding recognition of collective intelligence and of multiple dimensions in individual intelligence. Yet the book retains a mindset that hinders both those essential moves. It remains parochial, and unfortunately representative, in its national-level focus and preoccupation with contributing to national economic product and its growth,. Rich country governments continue to take economic growth rates as their lead performance criterion. This perspective has become archaic in a 21st century of stagnant rich country levels of subjective satisfaction, melting Polar ice-caps, and dangerous pockets of desperation in the South and indeed in the North too. Even in terms of self-interest, there can be no human security for the rich without an empathetic global vision.

Some authors think that to change society we must change individuals, while others think that we cannot change individuals unless we change society, including the driving forces in polity, culture, and economy. But, in either case, who are the 'we' who would take action? Some discussions of social change assume that elite-determined strategies can be implemented by pulling the switches in a societal control-room, including those on the education control-panels. What can we achieve via education, though, if education is merely talk delivered in isolated, socially marginal situations? Asking such questions makes us become more explicit about our hypotheses concerning social change, education's roles in it, and the capabilities required in processes of change.

In one family of hypotheses, education can lead to value-change that can generate pressures on powerholders that can lead to reform. In a more specific subset of the hypotheses, such processes require incubators and carriers within suitable civil society organizations. More specifically still, in the Great Transition Initiative, the most dynamic

group in civil society is posited as young people, who in the optimistic scenarios eventually join and lead successful movements of value-reorientation (Raskin et al. 2002). Young people are no automatic source of reform, and every age group must play a part; but to bank on youth as the key force of energy, impatience and potential, is indeed what many educators and educationists typically do. Let us look at how higher education in particular might contribute to the progress required on rethinking of quality of life and a move to greater global solidarity.

The global level - cultivating humanity

Liberal education, in the view of Seneca (c. 4 BC – 65 AD), is such education as 'makes its pupils free, able to take charge of their own thought and to conduct a critical examination of their society's norms and traditions' (Nussbaum 1997: 30). It promotes what some modern authors call critical autonomy. The Stoic ideal of education went further: it aimed to produce 'people who can function with sensitivity and alertness as citizens of the whole world. This is what Seneca means by the cultivation of humanity' (Nussbaum, p.8). It matches the calls for extension of human solidarity.

Three capacities, says Nussbaum, are required. First is: 'the narrative imagination. This means the ability to think what it might be like to be in the shoes of a person different from oneself' (Nussbaum 1997: 10-11); and, more fully, 'a capacity for sympathetic imagination that will enable us to comprehend the motives and choices of people different from ourselves, seeing them not as forbiddingly alien and other, but as sharing many problems and possibilities with us' (ibid., p.85). We could also call this empathy. We require empathetic imagination concerning both those with whom we are in direct contact and others anywhere else, in our socio-political community and in the world. The Stoics saw this as the basis for a stance of world citizenship. This stance is not the same as an assertion of insignificance of the local and of local ties and commitments, and there remain many good reasons for strong such ties.

Required secondly is 'the capacity for critical examination of oneself and one's traditions' (Nussbaum 1997: 9). The 'capacities to be a good reflective citizen' (ibid., p.26) include these first two capacities: narrative imagination and critical self-examination.

Third, her picture of requirements for global citizens goes further: 'an ability to see [ourselves] not simply as citizens of some local region or group, but above all, as human beings bound to all other human beings by ties of recognition and concern' (1997: 10). The three features are interconnected: empathy or the narrative imagination supports the capacities for solidarity and being self-critical.

Let us similarly then distinguish aspects in Nussbaum's formulation of the Stoic ideal of the formation of 'people who can function with sensitivity and alertness as citizens of the whole world', at three levels: personal and interpersonal or face-to-face; the citizen within a wider society; and the citizen of the world.

Requirements at the first level, of face-to-face interactions and interaction with oneself, include cultivation of self-control. This requires support from appealing narratives of well-being that provide alternatives to the narratives of consumerism, and corresponding alternative channels for improving well-being. Two generations of experiments with 'alternatives' force us though to think hard about how and when such

shifts are feasible on a large scale, given that, as Jackson noted, we are social beings, largely confined and driven within a social system and culture. Encouraging examples of innovation do exist but system-change requires more than only efforts directed at better quality in immediate individual life-worlds.

Beyond the face-to-face level, other citizenship qualities are required, including deliberative capacities and respect for others. Respect, Nussbaum argues, depends on the images that we use to characterise ourselves and others (Nussbaum 1997: 65). Here again, besides change at individual level we need changes in the categories and power-systems which structure our societies.

At the third level, objectives for creating, strengthening and nurturing a global community vary, from high cosmopolitan ambitions to make obligations to all people both considerable and identical, to more modest variants that will ensure that all people are considered and are given weight (ibid., p.9). Cosmopolitanism in the sense of treating people everywhere the same is not itself enough, and includes variants that differ utterly from global solidarity. Market cosmopolitanism in particular is not encumbered by what it considers parochial local solidarities: it treats people worldwide according to a universal principle that their wishes are weighted according to their purchasing power, and those without purchasing power are ignored (Gasper 2005). A cosmopolitanism that incorporates global solidarity is utterly different. To try to counter and re-direct market forces, solidaristic cosmopolitanism needs to be incorporated in an education guided by something like the Stoic ideals that Nussbaum enunciates.

Nussbaum's *Cultivating Humanity* reviewed a range of relevant initiatives in university education in the USA in the 1990s. It recounts eloquently their rationales and islands of success. Similar studies are required in every country, to identify and share possibilities of advance. In another chapter in this book, George (see also 1997, 2002, n.d.) presents an example from the Netherlands, of a type of international education that can contribute positively, which I will refer to below. She noted also some other types of international education that can be a handmaiden of economistic and often egoistic 'Conventional Worlds', and that carry the risk of leading into 'Barbarization Scenarios'.

Conclusion – global challenges and the possible role of international graduate education

We have asked what roles should and can higher education, in particular, play in responding to the global challenges of sustainability and in contributing to required moves in values. We looked in particular at the necessary moves from consumerism to a focus instead on quality of living, and from normative individualism to human solidarity. We suggested that these moves involve promoting and using the following capacities that Nussbaum highlights as required for sensitive global citizenship: the ability to place oneself mentally in the position of other persons; the capacity for critical examination of oneself and one's society; and ability to see oneself as, besides an individual and group-member, also a human being connected to fellow human-beings by heritage, similarity, and intensive mutual dependence.

Let us review a number of warnings and suggestions regarding value change that emerged in the essay, and briefly refer to how some forms of international graduate education might helpfully contribute.

First, we saw that consumerism will not be moderated merely through distributing information and changing financial incentives; change must involve evolution of the perceptions and norms in consumers' peer groups and communities. One insight from consumption studies is that contemporary consumerism is grounded in part in subjective insecurity, and reinforces it, and in needs for meaning and identity in the face of our now much longer but still foreseeably finite lives. Alternative sources of security, meaning and identity must be advanced. How?

Building solidarity can be one important way to reduce subjective insecurity, and to change perceptions of identity and norms of behaviour. Fostering of empathy through modalities such as shared postgraduate education for future senior professionals and leaders can, if well designed, make a valuable contribution. We know that scenarios thinking, such as exemplified in the *Great Transition* work, is an important tool for focusing attention on fundamental issues about sustainable and unsustainable futures, provided that the groups who prepare or consider the scenarios contain sufficient variety of experience. Insight about future possibilities can grow out of, and in turn strengthen, empathy and mutual concern; these qualities are important for making realistic projections as well as for subsequent cooperation. The required types of sustained mutual exposure and serious shared exercises in imagining are feasible within suitably designed postgraduate international education. This form of education can involve substantial mixed groups, each of which lives and works together for a substantial period, and within which junior and mid-career professionals mature who will later assume influential positions within their societies and in many sorts of international organization and social movement.

Next, we noted how understanding of present day consumerism, education, and potential paths of societal change must involve seeing people as social beings, who are marked by mutual dependence and sociability and between whom informal learning and trust are vital for complex cooperation. Such understanding can be promoted particularly well by residential education, which provides time and spaces for people to interact face-to-face over sustained periods, especially in informal fora.

The emphasis on persons as social beings, and a corresponding recognition of the multiple dimensions in individual intelligence and of collective intelligence, are relevant to making progress beyond consumerism and towards greater human solidarity. Amongst the multiple aspects of intelligence, the knowledge and skills involved in self-management and managing one's relations with others are important for well-being and flexible complex cooperative work and living. Further, for a group to show collective intelligence, it must possess sufficient relevant variety and overlaps in backgrounds and information sources, otherwise it is liable to group-think or conflict when it is later forced to attempt to respond to events (Kahane 2010). Co-residential education is again an important potential contributor in strengthening such awareness and skills, including awareness of the multiple valuable types of background, perspective and intelligence, and recognition of how different contributions are brought by different sorts of people.

The form of international development studies education that George documents and analyses (1997, 2012) can be a particularly intensive and effective 'pressure-cooker' for these sorts of knowledge, skills and awareness, especially when it has good geographical balances both amongst students and amongst staff, with inclusion of a good number of students from rich countries but without their predominating numerically; and provided

that it maintains the core emphases that she highlights: a wide-ranging and systematic analysis of poverty, marginalisation and exclusion, and a cosmopolitanism that is interested in all levels from the local through the national and regional to the global.

Many of the important principles that are embodied in such an educational format can be included also to a worthwhile degree in other, more conventional, formats. For responding sufficiently to growing worldwide pressures and likely crises, however, the world would be well served by creation of more such 'pressure-cookers' of international higher education, that can contribute to the future leadership and energy that will be needed in major processes of intentional social change. J.S. Mill's observation 150 years ago -- of 'the value, in the present low state of human improvement, of placing human beings in contact with persons dissimilar to themselves, and with modes of thought and action unlike those with which they are familiar'[iv] – takes on additional relevance in the present era.

References

Barber, Benjamin R., 2007. *Consumed.* New York: W.W. Norton.

Bellah, Robert, Madsen, R., Sullivan, W.M., Swidler, A., Tipton, S.M., 1985. *Habits of the Heart.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Brown, Phillip, and Lauder, Hugh, 2001. *Capitalism and Social Progress – The future of society in a global economy.* Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Bruni, L, and Porta, P.L., eds., 2007. *Handbook on the Economics of Happiness.* Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Earth Charter Commission, 2000. *The Earth Charter.* See: http://www.earthcharterinaction.org/content/

Easterlin, R. (ed.). 2002. *Happiness in Economics.* Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Gardner, Howard, 1983. *Frames of Mind: The Theory of Multiple Intelligences.* New York: Basic Books.

Gasper, Des, 2005, Beyond The Inter-National Relations Framework: An Essay In Descriptive Global Ethics. *J. of Global Ethics*, 1(1), 5-23.

Gasper, Des, 2007: Uncounted or Illusory Blessings? Competing Responses to the Easterlin, Easterbrook and Schwartz Paradoxes of Well-Being. *J. of International Development*, 19(4), 473-492.

Gasper, D. and T-D. Truong, 2010. Development Ethics through the Lenses of Caring, Gender and Human Security. Pp. 58-95 in *Capabilities, Power and Institutions*, eds. Stephen Esquith and Fred Gifford, University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State Univ. Press.

George, Shanti, 1997. *Third World Professionals and Development Education in Europe – Personal narratives, global conversations.* New Delhi, London, and Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

George, Shanti, 2002. *Technocrats and Humanist Intellectuals in the Third World:cases from a school of development studies in Europe.* Working Paper No. 364, The Hague: Institute of Social Studies.

George, Shanti, 2012. CHAPTER in this book.

George, Shanti, n.d. *International Education for Global Citizenship and Cosmopolitanism: Development Studies and Global Friendships.* Book manuscript.

Hamilton, Clive, 2010. *Requiem for a Species – Why we resist the truth about climate change.* London: Earthscan.

Hintjens, Helen, 2006. Appreciating the Movement of the Movements. *Development in Practice*, 16(6): 628-643.

Jackson, Tim, 2006. Consuming Paradise – Towards a social and cultural psychology of sustainable consumption. In *The Earthscan Reader in Sustainable Consumption*, T. Jackson (ed.), London: Earthscan; 367-395.

Jackson, Tim, 2009a. *Prosperity without Growth? – The transition to a sustainable economy.* London: Sustainable Development Commission.

Jackson, Tim, 2009b. *Prosperity without Growth – Economics for a Finite Planet.* London: Earthscan.

Kahane, Adam 2010. *Power and Love – A Theory and Practice of Social Change.* San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Kates, R.W., Leiserowitz, A.A., Parris, T.M., 2006. *Great Transition Values – Present Attitudes, Future Changes*. Great Transition Initiative. http://www.gtinitiative.org/documents/PDFFINALS/9Values.pdf

Leiserowitz, A. A., R. W. Kates, and T. M. Parris. 2005. Do Global Attitudes and Behaviors Support Sustainable Development?. *Environment*, 47 (9): 23-39.

Luttwak, Edward, 1999. *Turbo-Capitalism: Winners and Losers in the Global Economy*. New York: Harper Collins.

Mill, John Stuart, 1848. *Principles of Political Economy.* London: J.W. Parker.

Nussbaum, Martha C., 1997. *Cultivating Humanity – A classical defence of reform in liberal education*. Cambridge MA: Harvard Univ. Press.

Raskin, Paul, 2006a. World Lines: Pathways, Pivots and the Global Future. http://www.gtinitiative.org/, Great Transition Initiative, Paper 16.

---- 2006b. 'The Great Transition Today: A Report from the Future.' Great Transition Initiative, http://www.gtinitiative.org/documents/PDFFINALS/2GTToday.pdf

Raskin, P., T. Banuri, G. Gallopin, P. Gutman, A. Hammond, R. Kates, R. Swart, 2002. *Great Transition,* Boston: MA: Stockholm Environment Institute. http://www.gtinitiative.org/documents/Great_Transitions.pdf

Schwartz, Barry, 2005. *The Paradox of Choice – Why More is Less*, New York: Harper Perennial.

Seligman, M. 2002. *Authentic Happiness*. New York: Free Press.

Sinha, Manisha, and Des Gasper. 2009. How Can Power Discourses Be Changed? *Critical Policy Studies*, 3 (3&4), 290-308.

Stern, Nicholas, 2010. *A Blueprint For A Safer Planet - How We Can Save the World and Create Prosperity*, London: Vintage Books.

UNDP, 2007. *2007/2008 Human Development Report: Fighting climate change: Human solidarity in a divided world*. New York: Human Development Report Office, United Nations Development Program.

---

[i] For more details, see materials at: http://www.gtinitiative.org/.

[ii] See also Leiserowitz, Kates, and Parris, 2005.

[iii] In many cases there was greater environmental concern in developing countries than in rich countries.

[iv] Mill 1848: vol.2, book 3, ch.17, section 5.