

---

# *The Awakening*

*A manifesto for a new civilizational order*

---

*The Artisans du Recul des Frontières de l'Impossible*  
collective (C@ARFI)

A living document – Version 14

Jean-Marc Fontan (anthropologist)  
Juan-Luis Klein (geographer)  
Vincent van Schendel (economist)

Montréal

November – 2022

*We cannot solve our problems with the same thinking we used when we created them.*

Albert Einstein<sup>1</sup>

*I lack imagination you say  
No, I lack language.  
The language to clarify  
my resistance to the literate...*

Cherrie Moraga<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.babelio.com/auteur/Albert-Einstein/2827/citations>.

<sup>2</sup> Moraga, Cherrie (1983), quoted by G. Anzaldúa, in 'Speaking Tongues: A Letter to 3<sup>rd</sup> World Women Writers', in *This Bridge Called MY Back*, p. 166.

## Table of contents

<b>1.0 Background information</b>	4
1.1 An historic moment	4
1.2 <i>Lucid, quick, agile, wise, humble and cautious action!</i>	7
1.3 <i>Expectations</i>	7
1.4 <i>Starting anew with radical and subversive imagination</i>	9
<b>2.0 THE FOUNDATIONS OF THE MANIFESTO</b>	11
2.1 <i>Building a new civilizational order</i>	11
2.2 <i>Breaking down logic, building a narrative</i>	13
2.2.1 <i>Rethinking our relationship with nature</i>	13
2.2.2 <i>A civilization that stands on the subjugation of women</i>	14
2.2.3 <i>Redefining wealth</i>	15
2.3 <i>Possible scenarios: the informed choices we can make</i>	16
2.4 <i>Four conditions for effectively tackling the global and planetary crisis</i>	20
2.5 <i>The three key components of all evolutionary and transition processes</i>	20
<b>3.0 Twelve challenges for transitioning to the Awakening</b>	22
3.1 <i>The Awakening: agreeing on an emancipatory horizon and a great narrative of enchantment</i>	23
3.2 <i>Forming a wider social bloc from an offensive and inclusive coalition</i>	25
3.3 <i>Adopting hybrid pedagogical methods that promote a great convergence</i>	27
3.4 <i>Promoting Subversive Innovation</i>	31
3.5 <i>Ensuring relevant and viable transition management</i>	33
3.6 <i>Generating interest and adherence to free up the radical imagination</i>	35
3.7 <i>Approaching knowledge differently</i>	38
3.8 <i>Ensuring praxeological coherence with the help of subversive innovation</i>	39
3.9 <i>Accounting for resistance</i>	39
3.10 <i>Building institutions and collective action that can support the transition</i>	40
3.11 <i>Accounting for externalities</i>	41
3.12 <i>An ecology of knowledge and epistemic justice</i>	41
<b>CONCLUSION</b>	43

# Manifesto

## 1.0 Background information

### 1.1 An historic moment

We are at an historic moment in time, with a responsibility to find a viable solution to the current global and planetary crisis. An historic moment, where calls to action, demands and experiments<sup>3</sup> are urging, and paving the way for, major, radical systemic and cultural transformations.

More than a collection of crises, more than a quest for a new phase of growth, more than the rising obsolescence of a certain “development model”, what is at play here, in our opinion, is a transition to a new **‘civilizational’** era. Such transitions have occurred before, usually over several centuries, such as the **‘transition’**<sup>4</sup> from feudalism to capitalism. Contrary to previous transitions, however, this one must happen much faster, and so demands that we make ethical and informed choices at the risk of having other, much less desirable ones, imposed on us.

The outcomes of the processes and dynamics described here have not yet been determined. We are in no way at the mercy of determinism; nothing is inevitable, nor is the path pre-ordained. Finding a positive way out of the current global crisis, though, will not happen automatically. Negotiating a transition toward a new order of civilization will require a sustained effort, a renewed consciousness, and concerted actions. The transition will benefit from the many experiments of the past decades and will build on new narratives that allow us to subscribe to a promising future. Our efforts will showcase new institutions and organizational structures, a new legal framework, forging a path for new ways to act and think. The transition must account for the current state of the world, interests, tensions and existing conflicts. However, we cannot proceed without planning to enact concrete actions that will mobilize support for these necessary systemic changes.

We have the choice to implement a social and ecological transition that will make way for a new pluralist civilizational order. It will not come about on its own, and failing this, the human species can add itself to the long list of endangered species, slowly disappearing decade after decade, from the planet’s ecosystems.

This Manifesto is a call to debate. We are adding it to many other writings<sup>5</sup> that expose current disruptions. We believe that recognizing the magnitude of both the challenges we are

---

<sup>3</sup> See “List of proposals, initiatives and demonstrations” that we have identified so far at the end of the Manifesto.

<sup>4</sup> Words in single quotation marks and in italics Apple Chancery font are defined in the Glossary.

<sup>5</sup> See, for example, Dominique Bourg (2022), *Une nouvelle terre*, Paris, PUF; or Bernard Billaudot (2022). *Société, économie et civilisation*, La Plaine-Saint-Denis, Éditions des maisons des sciences de l’homme associées.

facing and the transformations that will be needed to overcome them is essential. We present this Manifesto as a tool. Certain sections are dense, not to mention dry. There have been previous versions<sup>6</sup> and there will be others. We hope it is improved, qualified, and expanded as it becomes nourished by the discussions and experiments it stimulates. The terms in italics are referenced in the glossary of the appendix where certain conceptual discussions have been elaborated.

We are aware that this is not a text for the general public. Though we have not come to that point yet, we will one day; to imagine a world worth building, we must engage in theoretical debate, confront ideas, experiment, support initiatives, build consensus, and encourage the convergence of various ideological positions.

#### **The challenges and changes we face are manifold**

- An unprecedented climate and environmental crisis (global warming, loss of biodiversity, etc.), disclosed and documented for many years by the IPCC
- The health crisis: the COVID pandemic, which was preceded by past epidemics, and which will be followed by future epidemics and pandemics
- Mass migration: political refugees, refugees from territorial conflicts and, increasingly, climate refugees
- An increase in inequality across the globe
- A profoundly changing geopolitical context
- A rapid rise in the use of digital media and artificial intelligence in almost all spheres of production and of social life
- A rise in identity-based, communitarian and anti-colonial demands, which have been growing for several decades
- Unprecedented attacks against women's rights around the world
- A crisis of democracy
- Economic and social politics that are increasingly influenced by neoliberalism and neoconservatism along with the spreading of populist ideologies
- Political and territorial frameworks that are inadequate to support the exercise of democracy
- A crisis of thought, especially in terms of economics: an inability to rethink the world as anything but one big market

---

Thomas Piketty (2019). *Capital et idéologie*, Paris, Seuil, chapter 17, Éléments pour un socialisme participatif au XXI<sup>e</sup> siècle.

<sup>6</sup> One of the first versions of the Manifesto was published in the Magazine ACFAS, dossier Bifurcation, on September 22, 2020: <https://www.acfas.ca/publications/magazine/2020/09/manifeste-changement-global>.

These many challenges and transformations are not isolated cases, but rather they feed into each other.

The Manifesto of the Awakening is an addition to the ‘subversive’ voices of the alternative. It supports the work of rebuilding a civilizational order. The Manifesto is a rousing call to our consciousness with the aim of establishing a new emancipatory order, which will be designated here as that of the ‘*Awakening*.’ An awakening in the sense of rising collectively to act, standing up to free ourselves from the shackles, which until now, though alienating, were considered legitimate and relevant. As such, the Manifesto forges a path to establishing a maieutic *modus operandi*.

The crisis before us is global and planetary; all of society’s strengths will need to be mobilized. As we have indicated, human history has known many transitional phases, which have occurred through long periods of gestation and maturing. Though the current transition is well underway, we must accelerate the thinking and planning stage.

More than just another “great transformation”, what’s in progress is a “great transition,” as evidenced by the significance and the gravity of multiple ongoing changes. In the face of these changes, it is important to fully command the advent of the great transition.

To speak of a change in civilization may seem a rather distant prospect considering the ever multiplying challenges at hand and the urgency with which we must take action. We wish to thoroughly emphasize the mindset to which the coming debates and actions must, in our opinion, subscribe. To put it simply, the transition cannot be reduced to turning down the heat and driving an electric car. We will have to “profoundly transform our societies”<sup>7</sup> and to do so, we must change our collective representations and think differently about the world.

Making superficial adjustments will only waste time if we do not channel our energy in creating a broader, collective vision. Solutions will have to be concrete and quickly implementable. Analysis, though it should be detailed, cannot be a substitute for action<sup>8</sup>, but rather should give meaning to our actions.

As we see it, the ‘*transition*’ process currently underway requires us to act radically, to be oppositional, critical and subversive, to work urgently with wisdom, humility, moderation and caution, all while taking the necessary time – a paradox – to hold debate. As Alain Denault<sup>9</sup> underlines, a worsening climate crisis will require us to accelerate deliberations and transformations.

---

<sup>7</sup> Bernard Lemoult (2022). « Pourquoi les transitions n’avancent pas plus vite? Excentricité et frottement, à la base des progrès sociétaux », Nantes, Collège des transitions.

<sup>8</sup> “Once humans have a need to know, they then have a need to believe—that’s to say, to give meaning to their knowledge—and to dream in order to come to terms with change.” (Éloi Laurent (2021). *Sortir de la croissance, mode d’emploi*, Paris, Les liens qui libèrent).

<sup>9</sup> Alain Denault (2022). *Moeurs*, Montréal, Écosociété.

## 1.2 Lucid, quick, agile, wise, humble and cautious action!

Our collective challenge is to give progressive and emancipatory meaning to the developing transition. The type of transition that we must prioritize requires us to be humble in our wants, to have realistic expectations and clear actions. These qualities are essential in guaranteeing as much the survival of humanity as the sustainability of the planet's natural 'ecosystems'. As such, this Manifesto lists the key elements of the transition process, which, depending on the path it takes, will mobilize past, present, and future emancipatory proposals for a redemptive utopia<sup>10</sup>.

We have created the Manifesto of the Awakening as a collective, evolving, written document about the key points to consider in conceiving of and enacting actions and thoughts for mitigating the global and planetary crisis. The Manifesto recognizes the legitimacy and the relevance of any approaches, processes or social dynamics that aim to transition away from the hegemony of the institutionalized social order, represented as much by the modern era as by 'capitalism'.

## 1.3 Expectations

As mentioned, this Manifesto is meant to be a complementary tool to be used for subversion by 'transition initiatives' that promote a critical course of action or emancipatory ideas. The Manifesto invites those initiators to consider the importance of:

- being inclusive of involved parties, as described by John Dewey<sup>11</sup>, and to avoid scattered, isolated, or siloed actions;
- acting with an emphasis on convergence and synergy of proposals, initiatives, or struggles that define the boundaries of an emancipatory horizon and a new civilizational order;
- considering the deeply complex nature of the problems faced by humanity and the environment, a complexity requiring holistic and ecosystem-based solutions.

There is good reason to take this complexity into account when considering the new civilizational horizon. Edgar Morin<sup>12</sup>, with his reflections on 'complex thought', proposes a method that invites us to use three guiding principles when navigating something with this complexity:

1. the dialogical principle, i.e. the interdependency of opposites [wealth/poverty];

---

<sup>10</sup> Here we are referring to the utopic gardens presented in the blog for the book-movie *Paths Through Utopias* by Isabelle Fremeaux and John Jordan: <https://lessentiersdelutopie.wordpress.com/>.

<sup>11</sup> John Dewey, "The Public and its Problems" (1927), reprinted in John Dewey. *The Later Works*, vol. 2, edited by Jo Ann Boydston and associated, Carbondale, Southern Illinois University Press (1st ed., 1977), paperbound, 1983. Excerpt: [https://www.cairn.info/revue-hermes-la-revue-2001-3-page-77.htm?try\\_download=1](https://www.cairn.info/revue-hermes-la-revue-2001-3-page-77.htm?try_download=1).

<sup>12</sup> Morin, E. (1995). "La stratégie de reliance pour l'intelligence de la complexité," in *Revue internationale de systémique*, vol. 9, n° 2.

2. the hologrammatic principle, which states that the part is present in the whole, and the whole is present in the part [the tree is in its leaves]; and,
3. the principle of recursion, where effects themselves cause what produce them in the first place [our actions caused climate change, which in turn has an effect on our actions]<sup>13</sup>.

In the aim of defining the parameters of a shared future and in order to properly mark and establish the boundaries of new cultural tendencies, we are outlining two paradigms that describe the basis of our proposed approach.

1. The paradigm of the ‘Collective’ proposes an idea for imagining the ‘juridicity’ or legal framework needed for our desired transition. Our current system of judicial hegemony<sup>14</sup> has been founded on anthropocentric laws, which turn the foundation of our modern social order into private property and corporate entities.

We must revisit our relationship with the legal system to emphasize biocentrism (*‘biocentric jurisprudence’*) in order to create institutional and organizational systems that stand on associative democracy, alterity, ecosystemic relationships, debate, social and material technologies with non-alienating temporal structures,<sup>15</sup> respect for ecology and slow growth.<sup>16</sup>

<sup>13</sup> These three principles are presented in *La Lettre d’ADELI*, n. 87, <https://espaces-numeriques.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/l87p37.pdf> :

- The dialogical principle “brings together two antagonistic notions, which, on the face of things should repel one another, but are in fact indissociable and essential for understanding a single reality.” Analysis and synthesis are necessary for understanding.
- The hologrammatic principle shows how “the part is present in the whole and the whole is present in the part,” like how the totality of the genetic heritage is present in each individual cell.
- The principle of organizational recursion explains the “generating loop in which products and effects themselves produce and cause what produces them.” (Martine Otter (2012). “Edgar Morin, penseur de la complexité.”

<sup>14</sup> The notion of hegemony refers to three specific cultural dimensions put forward by the work of Antonio Gramsci :

« 1) the idea that hegemony is partial, or in other words, that it is never total; 2) the idea that many people who do not benefit from a certain ideology or value set can still share this ideology or value system, even when it only benefits those in power; and 3) the idea that change from within is possible ». (Dominiquez, V.R. (2021). “Hégémonie, ANTHROPEN,” <https://revues.ulaval.ca/ojs/index.php/anthropen/article/view/51291/323>.

More specifically, hegemony refers to an “order of signs and practices, relations and distinctions, images and epistemologies—drawn from a historically situated cultural field—that come to be taken for granted as the natural and received shape of the world and everything that inhabits it.” (Comaroff, J. and J. Comaroff (2008), *Of Revelation and Revolution*, Volume 1, Switzerland, University of Chicago Press, p. 23).

<sup>15</sup> On this subject, see the work of Hartmut Rosa, summarized in the book: *Accélération, une critique sociale du temps*, Paris, La Découverte, 2010 [2005].

<sup>16</sup> By slow growth, we mean:

*The slow-growth movement advocates for a cultural change toward slowing down our lifestyle, not by abandoning our responsibilities, but by finding a less agitated, more thought-out way of doing things. It challenges the principles of*

2. The main principles of the ‘*Buen vivir*’ epistemology and its values, where “*To live well, is to live in community, in fellowship and, above all, with complementarity. A communal, harmonious and self-sufficient life. To live well means to complement each other and to share without competition, to live in harmony with people and with nature. It’s the basis for nature conservation, for life itself and for all of humanity*”<sup>17</sup>).

#### 1.4 Starting anew with radical and subversive imagination

This Manifesto is thus intended as a response to Cornelius Castoriadis<sup>18</sup> invitation to start anew with ‘*radical imagination*’, radicalism applied to our approach for living well together where organizational and institutional frameworks are based in local territoriality and close-knit communities. Also, we must work collectively to redefine what it means to live well, as it pertains to decolonized cultural parameters<sup>19</sup>, solidarity, democracy, alterity, inclusion, ‘*Peircean doubts*’, ‘*critical reflexivity*’, ‘*epistemological justice*’ and ecology.

The new organizational and institutional framework that must be established will need to be respectful of an ‘*ethical and aesthetic re-enchantment*’ and promote ‘*social and environmental justice*’.

- This framework will depend on a re-enchantment of the ‘*institution*’ of ‘*labour*’, in the Arendtian<sup>20</sup> sense of the word. We will have a “*job*” to do together with the aim of collectively building human futurity<sup>21</sup> as a logical function of ‘*ethics*’ and ‘*aesthetics*’ inspired by the continuous expansion of nature and of the universe.
- These organizational and institutional frameworks will have the advantage of being inspired by proposals for change from critical studies carried out in both the Northern

---

*globalization, which prioritize quantity, speed, consumerism and the need for immediate results. It’s a question of slowing down, because we are losing ourselves, our own values and meaning. There is now a slow version of anything you can imagine: slow money, slow parenting, slow school (slow education), slow reading, slow architecture, slow medicine, etc. While the ways in which slowness has been adopted by worldwide popular movements varies greatly, without a doubt, commonality is found in the need to take lots of time to meet the basic needs of daily life. These movements are seeking a deeper relationship with the world’s complex nature. (<https://simplifier-la-vie.com/slow-movement-bonheur-dans-lenteur/>)*

<sup>17</sup> Huanacuni Mamani Fernando, *Buen Vivir/Vivir Bien: filosofía, políticas, estrategias y experiencias regionales andinas*, Lima, Coordinadora Andina de Organizaciones Indígenas, 2010, p. 21.

<sup>18</sup> Castoriadis, C. (1975). *L’institution imaginaire de la société*, Paris, Seuil.

<sup>19</sup> Serge Latouche (2003). *Décoloniser l’imaginaire. La pensée créatrice contre l’économie de l’absurde*, Paris, Paragon.

<sup>20</sup> In *The Human Condition* (1961, [1958]), Arendt defines work in terms of three tightly woven notional spaces: labour (private realm), work (social realm) and action (public realm).

<sup>21</sup> The concept of futurity comes from John R. Commons (1934) and can be summed up by the idea that humans anticipate the future with their actions in the present. Anticipating the future signifies an ability to control it through a choice of good deeds, behaviours, ideas and values with the aim of instituting them within an ensemble of rules or with the help of convention. (Gislain Jean-Jacques (2002). « Causalité institutionnelle : la futurité chez J. R. Commons », dans *Économie et institutions*, n°1, 2<sup>e</sup> semestre.)

and Southern Hemispheres, as presented by Boaventura de Sousa Santos<sup>22</sup>. They will aim to build a plurality of worlds, in the way that Arturo Escobar<sup>23</sup> invites us to imagine—a constructivist approach with a scaffolding based on the local territory as a ‘project’, whose diversity of form and rights is recognized and respected.

*What unites these critical studies in the South and in the North is not only their intention to understand and to support the transformations toward social and ecological sustainability that civil society has induced, but also their epistemological foothold. (Koop, 2021, p. 122<sup>24</sup>)*

*There is an interesting convergence between certain philosophical, biological and Indigenous peoples’ narratives in asserting that life entails the creation of form (difference, morphogenesis) out of the dynamics of matter and energy. In these views, the world is a pluriverse, ceaselessly in movement, an ever-changing web of interrelations involving humans and non-humans. It is important to point out, however, that the ‘pluriverse’ gives rise to partial coherence and stability of given practices and structures through processes that have a lot to do with meanings and power; in this way it can be seen in terms of a multiplicity of worlds. (Arturo Escobar, 2012, p. 47<sup>25</sup>)*

---

<sup>22</sup> De Sousa Santos, B. (2016) *Épistémologies du Sud. Mouvements citoyens et polémiques sur la science*. Paris, Desclée de Brouwer.

<sup>23</sup> Escobar, A. (2016). “Thinking-feeling with the Earth: Territorial Struggles and the Ontological Dimension of the Epistemologies of the South”, *Revista de Antropología Iberoamericana*, vol 11, no 1, pp:11-32 DOI: 10.11156/aibr.110102e.

<sup>24</sup> Koop, K. (2021) *Changer le monde, changer de mondes. Pour une géographie des transformations sociétales par le bas*. Mémoire pour l’obtention de l’Habilitation à diriger des recherches. Université Grenoble Alpes.

<sup>25</sup> Escobar, A. (2012). “Beyond Development: Postdevelopment and Transitions Towards the Pluriverse,” *Revista de Antropología Social*, 21, 23-62.

## 2.0 *The Foundations of the Manifesto*

### 2.1 Building a new civilizational order

An important transition between the 18th and 19th centuries culminated in an ‘*overturning of the civilization*’. While it created the working ‘*institutional and organizational arrangements*’ of ‘*modernity*’, it also destroyed the now obsolete great European social orders. The transition from feudalism to the Modern period<sup>26</sup> erected the buttresses of a new era extending from pre-modernity up until the present ‘*globality*’, described by various authors as second modernity, advanced modernity or late modernity. This breaking away from feudalism caused a decline in scholasticism and a rise in an episteme based in technological and scientific rationality. The modernization of this era was based on various outlooks, such as individualism, heteronormativity, patriarchy, anti-feminism, the fabrication of witches and witchcraft,<sup>27</sup> neo-colonialism, imperialism, ‘*developmentalism*’ and ‘*capitalism*’, and the human subjugation of nature.

As early as the late 15th century, scientific data show the acceleration of ‘*colonization*’ to be the source of the integration process of world populations to a civilizational model that had been promoted by modern developmentalism. In the transition between the 19th and 20th centuries, the modern new order had gained the potential for universalization such that it spread worldwide in half a century. For most of humanity, this universalization, as a developmental model, entailed a profound transformation and a convergence of economic, political, and cultural modalities for communal life.

Modernization through colonialism has generated its fair share of negative outcomes. It has occurred by and through social stratification (‘*socio-identitary disparities*’ as seen in social classes) and territorial stratification (‘*socio-territorial disparities*’ as seen in the divide between centre and periphery). Additionally, modernization through colonialism has:

- exacerbated existing extractivism, i.e., increasingly structured and organized mechanical predation of natural resources. Destructive extraction processes have caused major disruptions of the Earth’s ecosystems, spurring on climate change, causing a decline in biodiversity, and producing many different kinds of pollution;
- intensified what David Harvey<sup>28</sup> calls accumulation by ‘*dispossession*’.

Modernization through colonialism, which is individualist, patriarchal, developmentalist and capitalist, depends on an unstable equilibrium between order and chaos. This has given the

---

<sup>26</sup> “Modern times began toward the end of the 15th century and came to an end in the late 18th century during the 1789 French Revolution. The period was defined by two eras: the Renaissance (late 15th to late 16th centuries); the old régime and absolutism (17th century until 1789).” (<https://misterfanjo.com/index.php/2017/06/18/temps-modernes-frise-historique-projet-p02/>).

<sup>27</sup> Sylvia Federici : *Caliban et la sorcière*. <https://entremonde.net/IMG/pdf/18rupture-caliban-et-la-sorciere-web.pdf>.

<sup>28</sup> David Harvey (2007). “Neoliberalism as Creative Destruction.” *The Annals of The American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 610 (1): 22-44.

global and planetary crisis its paradoxical nature; torn between efficiency, as demonstrated by an ultra-rich private sector, and indecency, as characterized by nearly generalized poverty, among other things.

The current global and planetary crisis has numerous features.

- It is *socio-territorial* due to the constant growth in inequality and inequity within, and between, nation-states;
- It pertains to *identity* because populations no longer adhere to the main “quasi-religious” beliefs and ideas of modernity, such as progress and growth (Ulrick Beck);
- It is *institutional* in the way that institutions can barely carry out the duties for which they were created and that populations of different territories, disappointed by the ineffectiveness of these institutions, believe less and less in their ability to solve the main issues at hand;
- It is *political*:
  - as a result of multiplying conflicts and social tensions:
    - local and regional wars are common;
    - there is an ever-present threat of a major war, as demonstrated by Russia’s invasion of Ukraine in February 2022;
    - there was a shift of geopolitical balance after the two world wars of the 20th century; and finally,
    - we have witnessed a multiplication and a diversification of tensions and conflicts between people, ethnicities and populations; on this last point, if social diversity grows, we’ll also observe a recomposition of racist and discriminatory modalities between ethnicities and communities;
  - due to attacks on democratic ideals and scientific rationale: anemic attendance at the polls, loss of confidence in political institutions, a rise in populism, increased occurrences of fake news and anti-science rhetoric...
- It is *economic* as:
  - a continuous unequal reconfiguration of modes of production, distribution, redistribution and accumulation of wealth, to which both artificial intelligence and the fourth industrial revolution have contributed, which aims to generate excessive profits in the hands of fewer and fewer people by falling profit rates with a technological rebound effect<sup>29</sup>.
  - growth in and of itself is called into question through the degrowth movement and through well-being measurement methods. (Joseph Stiglitz, Amartya Sen and Jean-Paul Fitoussi<sup>30</sup>);

---

<sup>29</sup> “The progressive tendency of the general rate of profit to fall is, therefore, just an expression peculiar to the capitalist mode of production of the progressive development of the social productivity of labour.” (Karl Marx (1894), *Capital (Volume III)*, p. 154).

<sup>30</sup> See: <https://www.vie-publique.fr/sites/default/files/rapport/pdf/094000427.pdf>.

- we see a transformation of the labour market where unemployment and a labour shortage coexist; where the value and meaning of work are being challenged and redefined; and where, once digital technologies have been introduced, there is a transformation of the organization of work and the resulting social safety net.
- It is *cultural* due to our collective struggle to imagine a radically new cultural perspective able to fully integrate social and artistic criticisms as described by Eve Chiapello and Luc Boltanski<sup>31</sup>;
- It is *ecological* following a decline in biodiversity, a deterioration of our ecosystems, intensifying types of pollution and a rise in the number and strength of climate disruptions<sup>32</sup>;
- It is *moral and ethical* due to the fractured common values of our communities and the loss of appreciation for diverse values.

In short, the current crisis is a global and a planetary one, defined by dwindling teleological progress and conducive to restructuring the present “civilizational order.” This restructuring seems necessary to counterbalance the fatalism that makes the extractivist development model inescapable and inevitable<sup>33</sup>.

## 2.2 Breaking down logic, building a narrative

Contemporary productivist logic is tightly interwoven with a series of domination-based relationships and representations of the world that must be redrawn and rebuilt: domination of nature, domination of women, colonialism, racism, exploitation of labour. In order to build a new world, we must question all of these domination-based relationships. The social and ecological transition toward a new civilizational order demands that we articulate these inquiries on a global scale.

### 2.2.1 Rethinking our relationship with nature

Civilizational advancements that followed feudalism and the rise of capitalism, whether commercial, industrial or financial, glorified the principle that humans dominate over nature. This predatory view of the world, which itself was born of rationalism, is still widespread and has left its mark on most human activity and behaviour.

*It is thanks to our implementation of a divide between nature and culture that science has become so efficient and so dominating, but it is because of this same divide that nature, which was ultimately treated as though it belonged only to us, was slowly but surely damaged. Shamelessly, we stamped it with an irreversible mark, forgetting that it was porous, reactive, finite, fragile.* (Étienne Klein<sup>34</sup>, p. 54-55)

---

<sup>31</sup> See *Nouvel esprit du capitalisme* and the summary presented in: <https://www.multitudes.net/Vers-un-renouveau-de-la-critique/>.

<sup>32</sup> See Kate Raworth, the doughnut economics: <https://www.kateraworth.com/doughnut/>.

<sup>33</sup> Integrating digital means in everyday production processes could, however, rejuvenate extractivism: henceforth, it is data that will be extracted, transformed, sold and used.

<sup>34</sup> Klein, É. (2020). *Le goût du vrai*, Paris, Gallimard.

Rationalism—which rose in opposition to scholasticism in the 15th century by positing that it was reason, not a relationship with the sacred, that gave access to knowledge—built a “progressive” way of thinking of historic proportions, in that it liberated human activity from religion. Rationalism assumed the existence of dualism: between soul and body, reality and thought, the latter of which was considered to be a reflection of an external reality. It also posited a duality between human beings and Nature. Descartes considered Nature to be a passive substance and animals to be soulless automatons. The exteriority of Nature, legitimate by organized religion, considered to be at humanity’s service, justified our domination of it.

Yet, Descola<sup>35</sup> (p. 30) remarks that it is important

*... to convey the fact that the Modern West's way of representing nature is by no means widely shared. In many regions of the planet, humans and non-humans are not conceived as developing in incommunicable worlds or according to quite separate principles. The environment is not regarded objectively as an autonomous sphere. Plants and animals, rivers and rocks, meteors and the seasons do not exist all together in an ontological niche defined by the absence of human beings.*

Of course, debates over the course of the following centuries allowed this initial rationalism to be put into perspective and to be contested. But the dualist nature still predominates. This inability of human beings to view themselves as stakeholders in their own environment and to integrate their actions with it, has led them to perceive the Earth as a garden to be harvested without restraint, with no regard for the consequences.

There is need for philosophical debate regarding our vision for the world. But also regarding which collective behaviours we must prioritize, and which public policies—social, cultural, and political—should be implemented.

### 2.2.2 A civilization that stands on the subjugation of women

If our civilization, which followed feudalism and saw the expansion of capitalism and the commodification of all spheres of society, has grown through the subjugation of Nature and colonialism in all shapes and forms, then it has also facilitated this expansion, as is historically well-documented, by dominating half of humanity: women. Feminist works of the past fifty years have widely documented the issue of the oppression of women and the patriarchy. Certain works have gone even further. Federici (2004, p. 12)<sup>36</sup> for example, writes:

*My description of primitive accumulation includes a set of historical phenomena that are absent in Marx, and yet have been extremely important for capitalist accumulation. They include (i) the development of a new sexual division of labor subjugating women's labor and women's reproductive function to the reproduction of the workforce; (ii) the construction of a new patriarchal order, based on the exclusion of women from waged-work and their subordination to men; (iii) the mechanization of the proletarian body and its transformation, in the case of women, into a machine for the production of new workers. Most important, I have placed at the center of my analysis of primitive accumulation the witch-hunts of the 16th and 17th centuries, arguing that the persecution of witches, in Europe as in the New World, was as important as colonization and the expropriation of the European peasantry from its land were for the development of capitalism.*

---

<sup>35</sup> Descola, P. (2013). *Beyond Nature and Culture*, London, University of Chicago Press.

<sup>36</sup> Federici, S. (2004), *Caliban and the Witch: Women, the body and primitive accumulation*, New York, Autonomedia.

She continues (2004, p. 63):

*The expropriation of European workers from their means of subsistence and the enslavement of Native Americans and Africans to the mines and plantations of the “New World” were not the only means by which a world proletariat was formed and “accumulated.” This process required the transformation of a body into a work-machine and the subjugation of women to the reproduction of the work-force. Most of all, it required the destruction of the power of women which, in Europe as in America, was achieved through the extermination of the “witches.” Primitive accumulation, then, was not simply an accumulation and concentration of exploitable workers and capital. It was also an accumulation of differences and divisions within the working class, whereby hierarchies built upon gender, as well as “race” and age, became constitutive of class rule and the formation of the modern proletariat.*

This excerpt reminds us of a key point. The same logic leads us to ignore evidence of ecological damage, widening inequalities, oppression of women, colonialism... [These are not different issues, rather different facets of the same desire to dominate and enslave<sup>37</sup>].

### 2.2.3 Redefining wealth

Since the late 19th century, economic growth has been exponential. It has been stimulated by rapid technological advancements and high levels of energy consumption, and has been sustained by a continuous, albeit uneven, rise in profits and in consumption. Since the mid-twentieth century, there has been one central indicator for measuring growth: gross domestic product (GDP). Growth has thus become the target of public policy, gaining its own narrative: it simultaneously finances development while improving living conditions and social services, all while supporting innovation that serves actors of dominance. There is both a virtuous circle and a vicious cycle within this mode of operation; it is justified and legitimized by a “fairy tale” about growth that has become dominant throughout the 20th century. “Growth above all else” has become the slogan of dominance. By this logic, if we’ve agreed on the importance of redistributing a minimum amount of wealth, then we must do all we can to ensure its production and reproduction, at any cost!

There are several problems with this liberal narrative. Though it is becoming less and less attractive, it is no less dominant and still represents the basis upon which our public policies are conceived. Until now, all governments, of all allegiances, have subscribed to its premises and proposals where supporting and stimulating growth is essential for financing public services and securing the common good. But this ignores several key problems.

First, growth generates externalities. The “damage of progress” is never taken into account, unless it incurs other expenses. This is especially true regarding environmental degradation.

Second, growth is spread unevenly between countries, territories, genders, classes and social groups. It is therefore not an indicator of progress for everyone.

Third, GDP measures everything that can be paid but it overlooks many volunteer, citizen-led and family activities that improve the lives of hundreds of millions of people.

---

<sup>37</sup> Racial capitalism scholars (e.g., Melamed, Robinson, Pulido, etc.) make a related argument to Federici and other Marxist Feminists: that capitalism demands hierarchies in value in order to justify labour exploitation, land dispossession, etc. And that « race » functions as the logic behind these hierarchies in value. In other words, the concept of « race » and racial inequality is necessary to the historical development of capitalism (like sexism is essential to the social reproduction of the labourer).

Adam Saifer y-1-5 16:21

**Commentaire [1]:** Racial capitalism scholars (e.g., Melamed, Robinson, Pulido, etc...) make a related argument to Federici and other Marxist Feminists : that capitalism demands hierarchies in value in order to justify labour exploitation, land dispossession, etc... And that « race » functions as the logic behind these hierarchies in value. In other words, the concept of « race » and racial inequality is necessary to the historical development of capitalism (like sexism is essential to the social reproduction of the labourer).

Forth, the facts should be corrected. It is not growth that enables education and health, but rather the inverse. Spending on education, health, and infrastructure enabled and supported various phases of economic expansion, particularly in the last 150 years. It was extending social rights and universal suffrage that allowed the will of the people to be heard, demanding more equitable distribution of profits, notably through social programs and fairer work compensation.

Therefore, recognizing the processes that are the source of socially produced and privately held wealth production is essential, just as it is urgent to develop indicators capable of correctly guiding and evaluating our decisions, and to force various criteria in political and economic choices, both past and future, to be taken into account. Much work done in the past decades has taken this direction<sup>38</sup>. However, there remains lots of work to be done. There are a number of issues to consider. Progress indicators cannot only be technical tools; they must be representative of the operational measures dictated by the collective vision of a society's population. If such a vision considers that society should not be an enormous market to which all societal institutions answer, we must then emphasize the whole of human activity and interactions deemed to be essential to the making of a society where living well together supersedes unhappiness.

If we opt for this alternative vision of social development, must we not choose degrowth, convivialism or other alternatives to neoliberal hegemony to achieve it? This is an ongoing debate. One thing is certain, we must dispel the myth of growth and work collectively to construct a narrative of redemption<sup>39</sup>.

However, we must not underestimate the hold that the “religion of growth” has on large swathes of the population, equally in terms of ideological choices as learned behaviours and the will to maintain or achieve a certain kind of lifestyle that largely depends on extractivism and capturing wealth by those with privilege. Conservative currents throughout the world are tapping into the feeling that prosperity has been lost and must be regained. The difficulty in countering these trends comes in large part from the complexity involved in constructing a new narrative that is at once coherent while offering a promising future.

Such an upheaval with the aim of a redemptive narrative, which cannot settle for just a green economy, cannot be the work solely of enlightened leaders working for the common good. It requires large numbers to adhere to it, which entails multiplying debate forums, diversifying experiments, all while respecting justice. In this instance, democracy is an essential condition.

### **2.3 Possible scenarios: the informed choices we can make**

As we are faced with the current global and planetary crisis, some responses have been and continue to be put forward. One type of response is that of denial: a refusal to accept neither the consequences nor the contradictions of today's civilizational model, or any significant change, for that matter. In this case, the status quo, or maintaining “good old temporal

---

<sup>38</sup> See, for example, Jean Gadrey, and Florence Jany-Catrice : *Les nouveaux indicateurs de richesse, La découverte*, 2016; Stiglitz, Fitoussi and Sen, op. cit.,. See also the UN's Sustainable Development Goals (SDG), or the Human Development Index (HDI).

<sup>39</sup> Gilbert Rist (2007). *Le développement. Histoire d'une croyance occidentale*, Paris, Les Presses de Sciences Po, coll. “Monde et sociétés.”

order,” steers the selection of transformations that are promoted. We would be wrong to underestimate this trend, multifaceted as it is, which manifests as socially and technologically alienating innovations in many social, cultural, economic and political spheres.

However, positive transitional processes oppose negative ones<sup>40</sup> and such processes can be deployed in four scenarios.

- We call the first scenario *superficial reformism* as it is characterized by a refusal to acknowledge the gravity of the crisis at hand and, therefore, a refusal to engage in a radical transition. While this superficial transition aims to depart from the status quo, it is limited to minor adjustments at the margins, and/or possibly a desire to reinforce capitalist stances, thus paving the way for a hypercapitalist model.<sup>41</sup> *Superficial reformism* aims to preserve today’s lifestyle at all costs: a fundamentally extractivist economy that promotes hyperconsumerism and is founded on colonialism. This first scenario often has the same concrete effects as negative transitional processes.

*Superficial reformism* presents as a hyper conservative response and defends all advancements that promote individualism and consumerism. It relies on turning a blind eye to facts, including scientific ones. It denies the deeply social causes of inequality and climate change. It emphasizes the utopia of natural resilience and a good conscience, reassuring us that *everything will work out in the end, as has been the case for all of human history*.

- We have named the second type of transformation *in-depth reformism*. It promises a real metamorphosis, but is limited to major technological changes. Through technology, it aims to stem the negative impacts of production, consumption and economic wealth accumulation within the capitalist political-economic model. With this *in-depth reformism*, we find new forms of work organization (Uberization, algorithmic management...), recommendations for responsible consumer habits (zero-waste models) and the early stages of a collaborative economy.

Grounded in neoliberal ideology, *in-depth reformism*, depends on technological ‘innovation’ to sustain strong economic growth while, as social norms demand, incurring low social costs and exerting a minimal negative environmental impact<sup>42</sup>. This solution is less about slowing the course of development than about reducing the impact of the negative ‘externalities’ that it causes by more radically integrating a circular economy and sustainable development goals into its discourse and proposals.

- A third scenario for a transition comes in the form of *social-democratic revolutionism*, which presents a social and ecological metamorphosis of the modern developmental

---

<sup>40</sup> The methods for presenting different arguments and modes of transition can vary. See: René Audet (2015). “La transition écologique au Québec: Discours et coalitions d’acteurs autour de trois modèles de transition”, [https://cidd2015.sciencesconf.org/52411/Communication\\_CIDD2015\\_ReneAudet.pdf](https://cidd2015.sciencesconf.org/52411/Communication_CIDD2015_ReneAudet.pdf).

<sup>41</sup> For example, see: Alain Cota (2018). *L’hyper-capitalisme mondial*. Paris, Odile Jacob.

<sup>42</sup> One of Bill Gates’ most recent books (2021), *How to Avoid a Climate Disaster: The Solutions We Have and the Breakthroughs We Need*, published by Knopf, clearly illustrates this mode of transition.

framework without necessarily redefining the cultural basis of advanced modernity. The current vision for *social-democratic revolutionism* is expressed in a plethora of ways: everything from degrowth paradigms to convivialism to participatory socialism, all the way to ‘democratized, de commodified and decarbonized work...’

*Social-democratic revolutionism* consolidates a number of proposals, both pragmatic and theoretical, that, though they rarely converge, share the fact that they have worked in silos. These proposals have the goal of bringing together social and technological innovations. This option is being explored by a thousand and one so-called realistic utopian experiments<sup>43</sup>.

At the roots of *social-democratic revolutionism* is what we might call a ‘post’ transition: post-capitalist, post-productivist, post-industrial, post-economistic, post-patriarchal, post-colonial, post-consumerist and sometimes pro-veganism... Its roots are grounded in the momentum of revolution, dating easily as far back as the late 18th century, a period when our relationship with modernizing development was slowed by the emergence of a persistent and recurring counter-hegemony. This counter-hegemony paved the way for ideas about subsidiarity, decentralization, local ‘autonomy’ and the ‘slow’ movement, i.e. *slow development* in the form of *slow food*, *slow cities*, *slow science*...

- A fourth type of transition can be imagined in the form of *radical revolutionism*. This kind of revolutionism promotes a complete transformation, which would entail redefining cultural orientations, as well as organizational and institutional forms, which have been the source of various civilizational and societal models. According to Cléo Collomb, a transition of the like must be based on ‘*relational ontology*’<sup>44</sup>.

*Radical revolutionism*, which is an extension of the third type of transition, goes beyond the post-capitalist model by subscribing to ‘*extensionism*’. This model is in a pre-gestation stage. In terms of ethics and aesthetics, it would be a significant pivot as it proposes a new zeitgeist and a fundamentally emancipatory cultural orientation.

The radical revolutionism movement is a renewal of a pre homo sapiens relationship with Nature. It invites us to think about and act upon profound transformations, entailing difficult choices and calling for a great deal of humility, modesty and respect for the constituent substance of matter and life’s fundamental processes and dynamics. Thus, the path forward relies on keywords, proposed by mostly intellectuals or utopian creators who have invited humanity in all its diversity and complexity to sever ties in an extreme and radical way, or to overturn the status quo, as proposed by Michel Beaud (1997, p. 246<sup>45</sup>).

---

<sup>43</sup> *This movement is increasingly polymorphous and changing. Squatters, self-managed social or cultural centres (okupaciones), punk communities, modern or self-managed schools, Atheneum schools, co-ops and reclaimed factories (more or less self-managed), co-owned land, liberated territories (Neozapatist Chiapas, the recent Oaxaca commune), eco-villages all affect Latin America and add dimension and extraordinary vitality to the alternative dream of community.* (Antony, 2016, section 91 / <https://journals.openedition.org/chrhc/5480>).

<sup>44</sup> Collomb, Cléo (2011). “Ontologie relationnelle et pensée du commun”, *Multitudes*, vol. 45, no. 2, pp. 59-63.

<sup>45</sup> Michel Beaud (1997). *Le basculement du monde*, Paris, Éditions La Découverte.

*More and more people are saying, 'We're beaded for a 'wall'; we're moving faster and faster. Today, that which is irremediable is possible – in existing forms or ones yet to be conceived of – even if it can still be cast aside. It is not optimism to object and say that all will work itself out, but rather ignorance. To speak about problems and risk is not a sign of pessimism, but of a spirit of responsibility. Evaluating perils and their sources and reinstating primacy to values in order to devise strategies and execute them: there lies optimism. The task at hand is certainly more than any one person can handle. But it may be accomplished once we reject the current collective resignation, assume the responsibility that our great power lends us and choose objectives and priorities that restore meaning to our future.*

Such a radical and revolutionary upheaval would allow us to renew our way of thinking and to concretize as much our 'social interests' and our 'relationship with time' as our 'relationship with Nature.' This upheaval would allow us to live together in a way that takes inspiration from the complex thinking highlighted by Edgar Morin<sup>46</sup>. The most developed example of this stance can be seen in the philosophy of 'deep ecology'<sup>47,48</sup>.

Innovation in all forms—social, technological, legal, cultural, economic, political, epistemic—would follow the path of ecosystemic evolutionism in niches where the evolution of the human species would integrate itself harmoniously into evolutionary and developmental processes acting on other species inhabiting their bioregion, thus contributing to a continuous and balanced transformation of natural ecosystems. As far as we understand, radical revolutionism encourages a political imagination that respects 'extensionism'.

Faced with the intentions and goals of these four scenarios, it is clear that, when it comes to decision-making, a key issue lies, on one hand, in the ability of governments to act, and, on the other hand, on the will of populations and private and social organizations – small, medium and large alike – to engage in plans that are more or less reformist, but also more or less revolutionary.

At the very least, these four choices refuse to accept the status quo (*conservative negativism*). Their goal is participation in a re-founding, whether it's minimal (*superficial reformism*) or more advanced (*in-depth reformism*), a partial upheaval (*social-democratic revolutionism*) or a total upheaval (*radical revolutionism*). In practice, from the four listed scenarios, certain proposals will overlap with others, or can be integrated in various ways from different perspectives.

---

<sup>46</sup> Morin Edgar (2005). *Introduction à la pensée complexe*, Paris, Seuil, coll. « Points / Essais » (no 534).

<sup>47</sup> Most developed, in the sense that deep ecology shares the most central aspects of environmental ethics with other theories such as The Land Ethic, biocentrism, ecocentrism and integral ecology. For information on several of these topics, see: Vinh-De, N. (1998). Qu'est-ce que l'éthique de l'environnement? *Horizons philosophiques*, 9(1), 87–107. <https://doi.org/10.7202/801093ar>.

<sup>48</sup> *In considering nature as only a substance to be objectified by science and a resource to be exploited by technology, modern humanity has engaged in self-mutilation. Its conscience has been fragmented, cut off from reality, left as an artifact. According to Alan Drengson, in the Renaissance and the Modern era, technocratic paradigms began progressively overtaking the organic paradigms of the religious societies (Christian or otherwise) enshrined in our cosmos and in the Creation. If, on one hand, there is alienation of man and nature, then deep ecology seeks to save nature by restoring the unit of the Self: Bill Devall's Ecological Self, a self that extends to nature through ethics but also through empathy.* (Falk Van Gaver, <https://observatoiresociopolitique.com/plongee-en-ecologie-profonde-jeudi-12-decembre-2013/>).

## 2.4 Four conditions for effectively tackling the global and planetary crisis

There are four essential conditions for acting with swiftness, agility, efficiency, wisdom and caution in response to the global and planetary crisis.

- The first condition is to identify an '*emancipatory horizon*' and a great '*narrative*' of enchantment, one that will revive an ethic and aesthetic where not everything depends on a rationale of efficiency and effectiveness, but also, and most importantly, will prioritize the relevance of the actions we take, i.e. that they must be coherent with said narrative.
- Concurrent to the collective imagining of a great narrative of enchantment, the second condition is to gather en masse, to facilitate consensus, even to federate on a large scale. This will require us to generate a narrative from a place of inclusive consensus. Inclusivity will then facilitate the forming of a great social pact. In order to attain this level of consensus, however, we will need '*network leadership*' that is respectful, inclusive and has the ability to unite.
- In the aim of demonstrating the feasibility of an solidary, democratic, united and ecologically sound society, the third condition aims to ensure the emancipatory proposal's relevance and viability in the face of the global and planetary crisis.
- The fourth condition accounts for the limitations of existing organizational and institutional structures, and maintains the importance of making them more flexible, mobile, agile, versatile, adaptable, transformative and subversive. It thus ensures that transition initiatives successfully implement the acceptable developments in order to facilitate a just and decent institutionalization process. It will also simplify the transition from subordinate experiences (formal '*subsumption*') to fully recognized experiences (real subsumption), favouring a course of action that is respectful of '*extensionism*', and an evolutionary hominization process consistent and in harmony with the evolutionary processes of Nature's other components.

## 2.5 The three key components of all evolutionary and transition processes

In studying the evolution of species and by identifying natural selection as an indicator that determines first and last forms, Charles Darwin did not intend to demonstrate the progressive or teleological nature of the mechanisms of natural evolution. Just like other thinkers of the 18th and 19th centuries, he simply sought to understand how the various life forms he studied had evolved. His approach had no normative intentions, no mention of a sacred determinism. For Charles Darwin, it was purely an attempt to objectively and scientifically understand phenomena that were considered to be natural and external to any human or divine will.

Since then, our knowledge of evolutionary processes has grown. However, the fundamental intention behind these processes, which is to objectively and scientifically understand them, is still key. This Manifesto intends to respect the need to think about the current transition as it relates to a stance that goes above and beyond a unilinear trajectory in order to subscribe

to a complex view of space and time (Appadurai<sup>49</sup>, 2012). As far as we know, this stance tells us that three components act as “interrelated driving forces” of evolution. They are:

- determinism as it pertains to “natural laws”: associated with the fundamental forces of the universe and with minor forces of phenomena like natural or cultural selection;
- the trinomial “probability, chance, contingency” where probability expresses orders of possibility, chance accounts for the occurrence or non-occurrence of phenomena, and where contingency explains phenomena based on a probability that has been actualized or that will inevitably occur if nothing is done;
- clinamen and freedom to act, which have crept into mechanical determinism, giving it an expression of indeterminacy and giving relativism a glimpse of the flowery expressions of mechanical fatalism. Determinism found in nature is particular; as it relies on clinamen and freedom to act, – in everything from atoms to social movements – the perspective shifts to continuously renewed probabilities. In the big picture, this margin of error evokes an evolutionary environment where many possible positive happenstances manifest out of necessity. We can therefore reconcile chance and necessity with freedom to be, to act and to think.

From this perspective, all evolutionary processes are fundamentally transient which brings to light the intersection of these three components. This reminds us of the importance of accounting for determinism, the “probability-chance-contingency” trinomial, and free will in all action-based processes that are otherwise centered around living well together. It also reminds us that this dynamic will bring about certain arrangements, the effects of which cannot be predicted with certainty. Thus follows the need to be reflexive in real time when it comes to the praxeological approaches put forth in the Awakening’s civilizational environment. We must be able to quickly detect its undesirable and unexpected effects and to grasp their deeper meaning so as to mitigate the impact it has on how we live well collectively.

While these three components constitute the driving force of all evolutionary and transitional processes, we might wonder about the global framework that bears the weight of these forces.

For reference, and for simplicity’s sake, the *real* can be summed up with three sets of concepts or notions.

- On the broadest scale, it can be represented with notions of the universe (in its simplest expression) and of the pluriverse (in its broadest vision).
- At a smaller scale, that of an astronomical object, the smallest homogeneous unit of a celestial object [solar system, nebulae, star cluster, galaxy...], it is represented by the concepts of Nature (in its most objective form) and of Gaïa (in its subjective form).
- Nature and Gaïa, which can themselves be broken down into more easily observable singular empirical entities: so-called natural ecosystems which themselves open up cognitive space to a wide variety of realities.

---

<sup>49</sup> Appadurai, A. (2012). *Thinking beyond trajectoryism. Futures of Modernity*. Bielefeld, Heinlein, M. et al. (Eds).

The ethical and ecological perspective of an ecology must include the “going concern” (identified in the work of the Commons) while considering the situation of “collective being/becoming of the Real” as an ethical and aesthetic reference to human actionalism, to the practice of living together that inhabits us and upon which we build from day to day through cooperation and adversity.

According to the ecological pragmatist perspective of early American philosophers (Peirce, James, Dewey and Adams), this collective being/becoming of the Real asks us to accept that we exist in alterity (opposite that which is external, and therefore different than the self) all while reminding us that the self, our substance in the Spinozian sense of the word, from quantum space to Newtonian space, is itself made up of alterities organized as an ecosystem that generates totalities, themselves participant in other selves and larger totalities...

What follows is an ethical and aesthetic perspective stemming from alterity and relationships that generates the extensiveness of Nature, the Universe and the Pluriverse. Everything depends on a principle of rectitude and inherent rights. This principle creates conditions of equilibrium in the Real world, which are essential to the creative movement of the extensions of Nature, the Universe or the Pluriverse. Re-exploring the ethical and aesthetic dynamics of the Real to then apply those principles to our own evolution and futurity is key to thinking more naturally about living together in civilization. Thus, culture cannot be built as a regulating power disconnected from the “ethism” and aestheticism in the service of the Real.

As Aldo Leopold<sup>50</sup> (1966, p. 262) informs us, “a thing is right when it tends to preserve the integrity, stability, and beauty of the biotic community. It is wrong when it tends otherwise.”

Respecting this relationship with Nature, which is itself a component of our reality and of the Real, means taking note and being aware of the pluralism of our rights and responsibilities that encase us in something bigger than itself, bigger than ourselves. As Catherine Larrère<sup>51</sup> (2006, p. 33) reminds us,

*The choice is not between humans and nature, but rather between a uniform world, modeled only by economic interests, and a diverse world that leaves as much room for the plurality of human aspiration as for the plurality of the living. A uniform, anthropocentric world is not sure to be humanist. By measuring everything in terms of humans, we risk measuring only a small part of humanity.*

### 3.0 *Twelve challenges for transitioning to the Awakening*

In light of the conditions listed in the previous section, we have identified twelve main challenges to breaking down the existing order and building an equitable transition to an emancipatory cultural horizon.

---

<sup>50</sup> Leopold, A. (1970). *A Sand County Almanac*, Random House Publishing Group.

<sup>51</sup> Larrère, C. (2006), “Questions d’éthique environnementale,” *Les grands dossiers des sciences humaines*, 3, n° 2, p. 33.

### 3.1 The Awakening: agreeing on an emancipatory horizon and a great narrative of enchantment

*We are entering into a phase of bifurcation, and therefore of uncertainty, where, in order to preserve itself at all costs, **financial capitalism** will impose increasingly authoritarian and law-and-order political models, and decreasingly democratic ones (the shifting political landscape to the right of right is a type of response to that demand); or, impelled by progressive social actors of civil society, **a new social pact** will see the light of day. It is clear that the transition is under way and that we must urgently give it the direction we want along with its institutional forms and a narrative. **We must therefore have the lucidity to recognize that a battle over the direction of current transitional processes is ongoing**<sup>52</sup>.*

Despite the disastrous effects of the global and planetary crisis, political and economic elites continue, in large part, to have faith in the benefits of modernity. Collectively, we have relegated the task of imagining a better future to the dreamers and utopians. We must awaken our spirit to a new civilizational reality that will promote the subjective material conditions required to guarantee living well collectively in a way that is inclusive, supportive, democratic, united, ecological and, ethically and aesthetically speaking, founded on a new epistemic enchantment.

We have identified the era of the **Awakening** as the historical period that will ensure the concretization of a great enchanting narrative that advocates for the transition's objective modalities. These will allow many of the contradictions at the heart of the current global and planetary crisis to be overcome. To construct this narrative, we will draw on the numerous experiments and initiatives currently underway, but also from the work of reconceptualizing normality. This construction will require breaking down polluted knowledge fed by colonialism, extractivism, sexism and inequality in order to defuse the negative effects of socio-territorial disparities that have been naturalized in social relationships.

Just like decolonized knowledge, emancipatory experiments and initiatives will provide the key elements of a new vocabulary that will need to be aligned with our goals for emancipation. Deconstructing to rebuild will require us to be vigilant against those wanting to rebuild the old order, which means resisting the temptation to re-engage with 'neomodernism' and "neo-colonialism."

Fundamentally, we will have to reimagine our relationships with our livelihoods. To do so, we must clarify the meaning of "working within society," define what "production of collective living" and "working together" represents, as well as specify how "human, plant and animal dignity" relates to inter-species coexistence, indispensable in light of evolutionary interdependence-based relationships.

We will need to specify the rights of the Commons and imagine how to manage the counter-powers or centripetal will that feeds corruption, nourishes deviancy, and drives the development of mafia-like societies. The work is at once theoretical and practical, forward-looking while anchored in daily actions. It builds meaning that will allow us to state the possibilities for the world, and the pathway to achieving them.

---

<sup>52</sup> Delruelle, É. (2015): <http://blogs.ulg.ac.be/edouard-delruelle/la-modernite-comme-fin-et-comme-aporie/>.

The Awakening will rely on a cultural/natural configuration that mobilizes a social and environmental pact and a set of values and principles.

- A new 'social pact' will allow us to reconnect with a

*material existence of communal living no longer based on property and separation, but rather on cohesion and the collective. Essentially, we must resist the privatization of possessions, knowledge and power. Similarly, it is important to preserve the symbolic dimension of existence. This would be possible through a re-enchantment process that would connect our existence with processes and dynamics that promote Nature's expanse: multiplication, densification and complexification of ways of being, acting and thinking. It is important to continue producing uniqueness and differences, in short, to resist the excessive hold that communities have over the individual... Postmodernity is therefore not simply the end of great narratives. It is the moment where we, the modern us, are confronted with a duty to revoke our contradictions, that is, to face our duty and responsibility to exist individually within the communal<sup>53</sup>.*

- An environmental agreement, in the image of Article 2 of the United Nations' Global Pact for the Environment will make it so that:

*every State or international institution, every person, natural or legal, public or private, has the duty to take care of the environment. To this end, everyone contributes at their own levels to the conservation, protection and restoration of the integrity of the Earth's ecosystem<sup>54</sup>.*

- A set of key values and principles will be written in the 'Codex of the Collective':

- Solidarity between humans {sociative values}
- Complete and whole democratization ['governmentality' principle]
- Alterity and altruism {sociative values}
- 'Ecocentrism' ['subsistence' principle and ecological values]
- Critical cognitivism [principle of doubt and respect for target public]
- Legal pluralism of the Collective [ecosystemic governance principle]
- Ethism of beauty, harmony and *Buen vivir* [substantivism principle and values]
- Aestheticism of balance in the Real [artistic principle in and of itself]

### Imagining another world

*If we accept the need for a new ethic, we must incorporate elements that are consubstantial with a true process of radical transformation and that promote equality, diverse forms of equity, liberty, social and environmental justice, as well as moral, aesthetic and spiritual elements. In other words, human rights merge with the rights of nature in an effort to permanently democratize society and to build strong citizenry. Every person has a right to a dignified life that ensures health, food and nutrition, access to clean water, to housing, to a healthy environment, to education, to work and employment, to rest and leisure, to physical activity, to adequate clothing, to social security and to other necessary social services. In order to really exist, access to these rights demands a change in the distribution of wealth and*

<sup>53</sup> Ibid.

<sup>54</sup> Global pact for the environment project: <https://globalpactenvironment.org/uploads/EN.pdf>.

*revenue, all while ensuring environmental balance. This leads us to reestablish and review all that would be public, universal, free and diverse components of new societies systematically seeking liberty, equality, equity and inclusion as the main drivers of Buen Vivir.*

Alberto Acosta (2011.) « Sólo imaginando otros mundos, se cambiará éste. Reflexiones sobre el Buen Vivir », p. 204-205, in Farah H. Ivonne et Luciano Vasapollo (Eds). *Vivir bien: Paradigma no capitalista?*, La Paz, Plural editors, pp. 189-208.

### 3.2 Forming a wider social bloc from an **offensive and inclusive coalition**

Adam Saifer y-1-6 15:57

Commentaire [2]: This is unclear to me.

As we look past our differences, and agree on our commonalities, it will be important to prioritize filial modes of association over contractual ones and a destiny shared by all. On this matter, it will be tempting to propose scattered yet competing ways out of this crisis, but that would be counterproductive. Certainly, the many resulting experiments would serve as an anchor, but this dispersal would demand more than we have to give. New alliances will be both possible and necessary, requiring clear definitions of inclusion and exclusion. They will allow everyone the chance to broaden their actions and perspectives. Alliances will be a prerequisite to the creation of a formal coalition and its formalization within the constitution of inclusive social blocs.

To this day, neither the urgency to act nor calls for change have incited an appropriate response from heads of state and large international organizations or institutions. What's more, agreements such as the Convention on Biological Diversity<sup>55</sup> or COP 21<sup>56</sup> have been reached, and slogans along the lines of the Sustainable Development Goals<sup>57</sup> (SDG) issued. These mitigation measures are wildly insufficient in creating the needed upheaval that would adequately respond to contradictions (development of social inequalities, destruction of ecosystems, political insecurity...) that define the modern civilizational order and the social interests it promotes. These are conventions, agreements and objectives that, among other things, are barely adhered to, if at all, and are often not respected by states.

Additionally, it must be noted that this axial upheaval will not come from the business sector, through its attempts at accountability or humanizing capitalism.

This upheaval will be everybody's problem. In the day-to-day, it is part of a long-standing commitment that has been renewed time and again over the centuries. This commitment has been expressed with calls for systemic change proposed by intellectuals, explored by ideators or different organizations, and most recently, relayed by progressive and critical media.

The unfolding of this emancipatory narrative is a testament to subversive experiments that are constantly being reborn from their ashes. Some have gone the way of institutionalization through a variety of associative forms or new modes of sociality. These ways of "thinking and doing differently" have taken place at the local level, and still to this day, even at the

<sup>55</sup> Conference on biodiversity: <https://www.cbd.int/doc/legal/cbd-en.pdf>.

<sup>56</sup> The Paris Agreement: <https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/the-paris-agreement/the-paris-agreement>.

<sup>57</sup> Sustainable Development Goals: <https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/>.

level of institutional organizations and arrangements, through processes and dynamics that test new relationships with the economy, with politics, the legal system or culture.

*The transition would not be possible solely by destroying the basis of inherited materials... and replacing it with another. A new mode of production will take its place when it has a material basis of its own*<sup>58</sup>.

*We must support a new system of governance whose principle task is to create a system that is mutually beneficial for humans, all living creatures and the constituent elements of the Earth system. The Earth community as a whole must share “commonalities” –earth, water, air and ecosystems– with each other in a healthy and sustainable way in order to respect everybody’s well-being. In addition, the laws must align with planetary limits and reflect biophysical realities*<sup>59</sup>.

In other words, dialectically speaking, history is transitional, both on a daily basis and over the long term.

- History is a testament to the presence of circumstantial or gradual modifications of both small and giant quantitative and qualitative leaps.
- History is full of breakthrough initiatives and ideations, or ones on the fringe, of which some succeed in modifying behaviour, habits and thought processes.

Revolutions, either quiet or violent, as disruptive mechanisms of adjustment or repositioning, certainly play an important role in any transitional process.

- Revolutions are catalysts of processes and accelerators of dynamics.
- Revolutions put pressure on representations of a future that is shared or not, full of moments of overcoming, siloing (counter-revolutions) or travesties.

Granted, all subversive intentions that propose minor or major change are often scattered at the outset. Even if they resonate with certain people, these intentions are rarely unified and convergent. This intention, or this *drive*, is generally confronted with the conservative and protective reactions of aristocratic or elite interests, those in charge of, or in control of, the institutions responsible for the modalities for regulating institutional orders.

Being in this dominant position allows them to filter out advantages and disadvantages in order to have these intentions for change appear either in a positive or a negative light. This implies that transitions cannot afford to engage in conflicts arising from colliding perspectives and interests. The modalities for regulating these conflicts are a major challenge.

Therefore, a renewal of material bases generally corresponds with a recomposition of elites and aristocracies, or, at the very least, with a reconfiguration of social blocs with or without

---

<sup>58</sup> Maurice Godelier (1990). “La théorie de la transition chez Marx.” *Sociologie et sociétés*, 22 (1), 53–81. <https://doi.org/10.7202/001301>, p. 63).

<sup>59</sup> Matthias Petel (2018). “La nature : d’un objet d’appropriation à un sujet de droit. Réflexions pour un nouveau modèle de société,” *Revue interdisciplinaire d’études juridiques*, 1, vol. 80, p. 207 à 239, pp. 221–222. On this matter, see also: Thibault Faraüs (2022). *Les écosystèmes ont-ils des droits ?* Ed Libel, <https://www.les-communs-dabord.org/parution-les-ecosystemes-ont-ils-des-droits-par-thibault-faraus-editions-libel-fevrier-2022/>.

the ability to hold power and thereby influence the future of societies. For over two hundred years, the work of recomposing elites and reconfiguring developmental modalities has given way to alternative proposals for deploying the hegemony of a “modern project” under the banner of liberalism.

Amid these proposals, some have exerted real influence, allowing for an upgrade of such a project. They have contributed to its evolution allowing it to move from a first to second phase of modernity, and then to a third and a fourth. However, they have never yielded a new narrative, a new horizon, a new ‘social bloc’, nor a reordering of society’s major institutional spaces. This strategy was so effective, the transition essentially took the path of resilience, reinforcing the capitalist—and other—foundations of the modern civilizational order.

Analyzing great transitions throughout history that have characterized the life cycles of past civilizations would testify to many challenges overcome and failures admitted. But none of these transitions have been confronted with a situation as complex as the current one, where the entire population of the planet is simultaneously threatened by a tangible, visible and external threat, as seen, on a small scale, by the COVID-19 pandemic, the invasion of the Ukraine and the present rebellion in Iran, and on a broader scale, by the continuous widening of social inequalities, climate instability, and the deterioration of the Earth’s natural ecosystems.

Faced with the immediate urgency, the slow transitional process outlined by Maurice Godelier to characterize the passage from feudalism to capitalism would be inadequate in tackling the global and planetary crisis<sup>60</sup>. Crucially, we must respond to this crisis with speed, efficiency, relevance and caution. As key moments marking revolutionary periods have demonstrated, success will depend on forming a federation or joining forces around network leaders in order to reach the consensus required for identifying new institutional pathways, all in order to induce necessary qualitative leaps and a deconstruction of the modern hegemony’s institutional structures<sup>61</sup>. The challenge will be in managing a fast-tracked transition mechanism to move beyond the spirit of modernity and facilitate the emergence of an age of Awakening.

### 3.3 Adopting hybrid pedagogical methods to promote a great convergence

To establish a new civilizational order, we need a *New Spirit of the Times*, such as the one that came about over the course of several centuries within the cultural framework of the

---

<sup>60</sup> Dominique Bourg *et al.* (2020). *Retour sur Terre, 35 propositions*, Paris, PUF, Hors collection.

<sup>61</sup> Emmanuel Bonnet, Diego Landivar and Alexandre Monnin (2021). *Héritage et fermeture. Une écologie du démantèlement*, Paris, Divergences.

*We depend on an “organized world” for our survival, devised by industry and management. Presently, this world is under threat of collapse. While progressive movements dream of a shared world, we have, against our will, inherited less bucolic commonalities, “negative” ones, in the likes of contaminated rivers and land, polluting industries, supply chains or even digital technologies. What to do with this burdensome inheritance upon which billions of people depend for the short term, all the while it is being condemned in the medium term? We have no other choice but to learn, urgently, to restore, to foreclose and to reallocate this heritage all while maintaining judicial and democratic stakes. Up against the modernization front and the anthropology of the project, openness and innovation, all that’s left is to invent an art of shutting down and dismantling: an (anti)environmentalism where we “get our hands dirty.”* (Book cover)

Modern period and, more specifically, the Age of Enlightenment in Europe, which was a pivotal and catalytic period. A shift from a modern mindset to the “spirit of Awakening” cannot be ordered through an injunction. This will need to be built from within or across existing social orders.

Such a creative and transformative process has come about in the past and over the long term through heterogeneous approaches that are often in competition with each other. For its part, the current global and planetary crisis will require us to quickly come up with a well thought out and lucid solution. It will require accelerating the processes and dynamics needed to define a new dependence on one—and many—pathway(s)<sup>62</sup>. However, this speed will require increased vigilance in order to accelerate the transformations without giving in to deviations founded in or based upon compromise and the re-establishment of previous orders.

In order to act with prudence, forethought, and speed, the proposed approach will depend on established knowledge, achievements, and ongoing exercises.

- The key elements for engaging in the Spirit of Awakening already exist in the form of ideations, propositions and reflections. However, they are dispersed and scattered in a multitude of places and are evolving in parallel with each other.
- Many experiments, initiatives, and achievements have taken place in Quebec and elsewhere in the world, which demonstrates that it is possible to do things differently here and now. Linking up these initiatives and discussing them would be a source of deep and plentiful learning that could galvanize their roll-out.
- History has shown us that a unification of transition efforts is indeed possible. For this to happen, strong, inclusive leadership, ‘distributed and shared’ among networks, is required. The challenge this leadership would face would be in transforming centripetal actions into a single centrifugal movement, one that would promote convergence between existing alternatives. A true reflection of the natural process of evolution by which life emerged and expanded, the challenge will be to achieve convergence without sanitizing identities, both mobilized and mobilizable, as well as those that are emerging.

Coming to terms with the fact that it is necessary to renew the objective material bases of communal living will depend on two interdependent actions (praxeology), the first being cognitive in nature. This action will allow us to define the ethical and aesthetic dimensions of the new spirit of the Awakening. The second, being pragmatic, will promote the development of societies that are inclusive and respectful.

Facilitating the dissemination of the Awakening will require a pedagogical approach that mobilizes various means of democratic expression: from representative to direct, including deliberative democracy. This must be done in order to:

- collectively build the foundations of a new emancipatory order; and,

---

<sup>62</sup> The presence of both the single and the plural testifies to a new relationship with Nature, and thus to a common pathway, which could only occur through a diversity of pathways in the way that multiple affluents feed into a river and many roots nourish a single tree. This is unity through diversity.

- mobilize the affected and active public in terms of a social and ecological transition in order to create “a path of many voices,” a path of convergence where the voices of social movements, of civil society organizations, of independent movements, of formal and informal groups, of representatives working at the heart of small, medium, and large businesses, of organizations and institutions and of populations all intersect, just to name a few examples.

This endeavour will require initiating a mobilization procedure for reflection and development with a nucleus of people from several different organizations in order to generate “starter cells” whose reach will then be extended by federating or affiliating with larger networks and then becoming social movements. This process would promote the development of “conventions” to be established at the appropriate territorial scales (Neighbourhoods/Urban districts/Cities/Quebec/Canada/Continents...)

This kind of strategy, one that rests as much on the interests of small, medium and large networks as on the broad mobilization of the population (John Dewey’s publics) for the purpose of implementing these conventions, would allow us:

- to create broad consensus around a great narrative;
- to reflect on, apply, and document new applied ideas;
- to foresee – to construct the “ecocentric” meta-institutional framework required to house the great narrative and invite practices; and,
- to more widely mobilize for the constitution of a *Community for Humanity at the heart of a Community of Naturality*.

A pedagogy of mobilization and convergence will require foundations upon which to stand. These foundations will be the elements of an initial work proposal in that it will be important to create:

- an initial narrative<sup>63</sup> that can be modified and improved upon;
- an initial map<sup>64</sup> of practices that require validation or innovation;
- prolegomena for an institutional matrix to be enacted:
  - a judicial order of communal values founded on ecocentrism: a new relationship with the environment that is respectful of the extensionism of Nature principle; this at least requires us to move from an individual rights approach to a relational one<sup>65</sup>;

---

<sup>63</sup> For example, see Solon’s approach: <https://solon-collectif.org/>.

<sup>64</sup> An approach of this kind has been adopted by TIESS : <https://www.passerelles.quebec/cartographie#/carte/@48.05,-68.01,6z?cat=all>.

<sup>65</sup> *A relational approach to rights leads us to find a compromise in a social and environmental context. We must account as much for all human needs as those of the ecosystem. Human freedom is not negated. Rather, it is contextualized in its relationship to the natural world.* (Petel, op. cit., p. 231)

- commercial and financial communal logic<sup>66</sup> where ‘*moral incentives*’ will take precedence over ‘*economic incentives*’;
  - an approach that links filial and contractual logic to generate organizations and institutions fundamentally embedded in the diversity of society, in the Polanyian sense of the term, and subject to modalities of socio-ecological regulation;
  - a strong resurgence of use ‘*value*’ (in the Marxian sense) and the prioritization of ecological value (a healthy and balanced ecosystem between the diversity of beings or substances and their inevitable relational dependency);
  - a definition of work as it relates to human activity as a whole and not solely to economic activity;
  - a dissolution of social relations based on discrimination and specific interests into inclusive and respectful relations<sup>67</sup>;
- a ‘*social percolation*’ strategy founded on inclusive and democratic pedagogy that aims to build a new political action scene.

---

<sup>66</sup> *We now have the choice between integrating environmental criticism into the capitalist framework through the lens of market value or redefining our relationship with the natural world in terms other than those relating to the market. By recognizing the rights of nature, in our opinion it would be possible to sketch out a human to nature rapport that does not reduce everything to economic rationality.* (Ibid., p. 219)

<sup>67</sup> The underlying idea here is to attenuate social and territorial disparities of social interests.

### 3.4 Promoting *Subversive Innovation*

Incrementally implemented innovation (that which is added to what exists already) will generate a minor form of change while radical innovation will cause a major disruption allowing us to define new avenues for living together that are social (organizing human activity such as work), biological (commensalism) or material (adding materials or a new organization of materials) in nature.

#### **Extractivism and neoextractivism**

*While classical extractivism has been defended as being a means of economic growth, justifications for neoextractivism are often social in nature. In fact, governments argue that the State must intervene to maintain and intensify extractivism as a means of obtaining the financial resources necessary to implement poverty-reducing plans and programs. The novelty of the large number of these programs lies in the fact that they target the most impoverished sectors. While revenues obtained from exploiting extractive sectors have various targets, the discourse around legitimizing extractive actions frequently relies on the financing of social measures. Neoextractivism does not offer better social or environmental practices than classical extractivism, at least for now. Thus, insofar as the ecological impacts of these practices persist, citizens will denounce them, which in certain cases, has become large-scale protests. Governments deny or minimize these impacts, or they assert the need to accept them as indispensable to maintaining development. They ask local, directly affected communities to sacrifice themselves for what is presented as public interest, without questioning the consequences of this kind of development.*

According to Gudynas, Eduardo (2011). Más allá del nuevo extractivismo: transiciones sostenibles y alternativas al desarrollo. In Fernanda Wanderley, coordinadora, *El desarrollo en cuestión. Reflexiones desde América Latina*, La Paz, Oxfam y CIDES UMSA, p. 388. Translated (French) and synthesized by Juan-Luis Klein.

Let's not forget that all innovations, whether they are incremental or radical, can have a positive or negative impact on the 'social or environmental footprint' that we generate both individually and collectively. In other words, in order to ensure that the guiding principles of a civilizational order can truly innovate with the aim of reducing our social and ecological footprint, at least two conditions must be met.

- On the one hand, having 'filters' that respect the principles and values put forth and promoted by the target horizon and the great narrative.
- On the other hand, taking a holistic approach where proposed innovations and projected changes must be judged or evaluated from the perspective of their integration in the ensemble of the institutions key to the new civilizational order.

#### ***A Regenerative Economy***

*Many environmental economists have integrated the concept of a regenerative economy into their discourse. The principles of this approach date back to the work of Bill Mollison on permaculture in 1978 (Mang, P., & Haggard, B., *Regenesis*, 2016). The Australian ecologist modified the conventional agricultural model, taking inspiration from the relationships and processes of natural ecosystems. This "permanent" agriculture generates the required crops for society all while producing a surplus of resources, thus*

*regenerating the earth. Bill Mollison defined the principle of regeneration as “generating a surplus of energy and resources that can be reinvested in order to develop the natural and human resources in an integrated manner.” (Mang, P., & Haggard, B., Regenesi, 2016). This principle was then taken up by several ecologists in the 90s, who merged the terms regeneration, ecosystems and sustainability. The regenerative economy model is based on a biomimetic vision of natural systems, which prosper only because they have the capacity to self regenerate, just as the cells of our bodies regenerate every seven years (Fullerton, 2015). It is thus this capacity for regeneration that gives the human body longevity. By this logic, sustainability is the result of regeneration as opposed to the goal. Thus, to achieve a sustainable economic system, societies must base themselves on a regenerative model (Fullerton, 2015).*

(Lancot, Jean-Philippe (2019), Identification des outils permettant la régénération de l'environnement dans les stratégies d'affaires des entreprises québécoises, Sherbrooke, Université de Sherbrooke, Master's in Environment, p. 4)

*Regenerative economy, as defined in this essay, is a critique of society's incorrect vision of sustainable development. It demonstrates that achieving net-zero impact in terms of environmental pollution and social externalities, as is the target of sustainable development, will not sufficiently support the survival of humanity. The support capacity of ecosystems has been considerably ravaged by human activity, which has prevented them from naturally regenerating. Sustainable development in future societies must therefore go beyond net-zero goals by regenerating ecosystems. A regenerative economy can be achieved notably by applying ten basic actions spread over five pillars: a natural economy, a vision for wealth, social equality, a local economy and a circular economy. This essay demonstrates the fact that businesses have a fundamental role in this environmental turnaround, as they are greatly responsible for the degradation of ecosystems.*

(Ibid., p. 58)

It is under these conditions that innovation with a positive impact grounded in an institutionally based logic will be able to fully facilitate the transition from one economic model to another.

As the proposal of the *Climate Justice Alliance*<sup>68</sup> can attest, ensuring the emancipation of a dominant civilizational model that we want to leave behind (extractive economy, for example) and allowing for the emergence of a new model founded on a regenerative economy will require subversive cultural filters.

For the Climate Justice Alliance, this proposal for a transition is to be deployed based on a six-point strategy.

- *Fight the Bad*: shut down extractive structures and deconstruct the institutional ecosystem of an extractive economy.
- *Build the New*: develop a new economic ecosystem centered on socially and ecologically responsible regenerative institutions.
- *Change the Rules*: re-invent or generate rules needed to facilitate the transition process.
- *Move the Money*: redirect the extractive economy's capital reserves in order to sustain the regenerative economy's activities and jobs.

---

<sup>68</sup> See: <https://climatejusticealliance.org/about/>.

- *Build the Bigger We*: start a world movement around the transition project.
- *Change the Story*: bring a new narrative to the forefront that contains stories illustrating the validity of the in-depth transformations that must occur.

It will also be important to re-engage with progressive cultural world heritage to revive innovations that have historically been cast aside due to their emancipatory subversiveness<sup>69</sup>. This would free up the collective imagination and creativity to support a great realignment of the foundations of living well together in the form of emancipatory cultural orientations that boast new ethics and aesthetics.

### 3.5 Ensuring relevant and viable transition management

To mark the arrival of the *Awakening's* civilizational order, it will be advantageous for actors promoting a new social order to come together to create social blocs that promote ambidextrous transition strategies.

- On the one hand, they must support the mitigated forms of development promoted by energy transition, green economy, or circular economy proposals, all while paying attention to attempts at recovery generated by the conservative resistance that promotes the status quo of modernity.
- On the other hand, it will be important to simultaneously institute a societal framework that promotes a social and ecological transition proposing a disconnection from the driving principles of the current civilizational order which is strongly reliant on the great modernizing European dream of Enlightenment.

It seems clear that healthy transition management that aims to install a new civilizational landscape will require working from objective conditions belonging to the current period, and thus from the landscape of the current global reality. It will be a question of drawing from heritage and subversive social and ecological experiments in order to set the stage in parallel to the original that, without being completely disconnected from it, still aims to replace it.

To overcome the base contradictions inherent to the current civilizational model and institute a new civilizational order, strategic management of the disruption process should be closely monitored. We must identify and invest in potential action sites, along with their host territory. From the Polanyian perspective of '*double movement*', initiatives that develop a dependency on the emancipatory path could very well be born. The path to emancipation will require that we rethink our relationship to land use in order to get away from isolation and dependency on fossil fuels. We must even rethink mobility, access to food, habitat, health, education and the use of digital technologies, just to name a few kinds of innovations. The transition will also need to consider the respectful retraining of workers and the scope of economic activities by sector. Modes of attaining common property must be supported economically and politically.

---

<sup>69</sup> The Anarcho-indigenism movement has proposed a way of working that aligns with this approach. See Dupuis-Déri, F. et B. Pillet (s.l.d.) (2019). *L'anarcho-indigénisme*. Montréal, Lux Éditeur.

Simply put, we will need to make a qualitative leap, just like a trapeze artist leaping into the void to reach a distant goal by using the momentum of their jumping off point.

But we must be cautious. Though this transition is depicted as an acrobatic leap, it is not simply a question of jumping higher, as in the case of a “social-democratic” transition (dark green capitalism), or of jumping less high, as in the case of superficial reformism (pale green capitalism).

On the contrary, we must create momentum, and spark a metamorphosis to enable a change of trajectory toward emancipatory progressivism. Such an option would be the alternative subversive path incarnated in the Awakening (radical revolution).

We must pay attention not to be caught by the recuperation counter movement (described well by Luc Boltanski and Ève Chiapello in *The New Spirit of Capitalism*), which would strip the transformation of its critical and subversive spirit and simply project humanity toward more authoritarianism and discrimination. Here, there would certainly be a change in level to height the intentionality of “hyper-capitalism”.

Generating an alternative regime will require us to:

- innovate at the level of the real world, its everyday issues, through concrete initiatives, both individual and collective (Pruvost, 2021<sup>70</sup>);
- implement systemic modalities capable of supporting alternative institutionalization processes, which are essential for managing advances and installing guardrails to prevent the backlash of predatory, speculative or alienating aspirations.

as well as to conceptualize:

- a multidimensional ‘juridicity’ based on the collective as a function of the aestheticism of the ‘legal personification of the Real’;
- a non-speculative financial order, that is also, consequently, non-capitalist;
- a relationship with politics that re-establishes filial connections;
- the valorization of economies that recognize value in sharing and prioritization of use value and ecological value.

*There are four possible avenues before us that would awaken us to a new civilizational order and a new societal horizon.*

*The first avenue*

Defining the large-scale cultural orientation and the guiding principles to be embedded in a new social contract: the ‘*Codex of the Collective*’.

*The second avenue*

---

<sup>70</sup> Pruvost, Geneviève (2021), *Quotidien politique. Féminisme, écologie, subsistance*. Paris : La Découverte.

Working toward disconnecting progressive initiatives from the modern liberal judicial order, all while ensuring convertibility that would act as a bridge. This means keeping an organization's deed of incorporation active within the dominant judicial system while giving it a second, more central mission that revolves around an identity and structure under a separate judicial order, that of the Collective.

#### *The third avenue*

Structuring the financial order on new foundations. This path requires developing a social financialization process – based around local exchange systems, melting currencies, socio-environmental responsibilities – guaranteeing a non-speculative environment that prioritizes collectives and natural ecosystems over wealth-creating processes.

#### *The fourth avenue*

Reconnecting with the principle of a basic territorial governance where contract and filiation are used according to their relevance to the new episteme. The local, in the form of the '*Local Project*', is the key to an inversion where globalization could be set back on its feet and conceptualized on different scales: from local to global in an iterative and '*fractal*' process.

### **3.6 Generating interest and support to unleash the radical imagination**

Over the course of a little more than two million years, the first hominids have gone through a variety of lifestyles and territorial occupations. For certain social groups, this temporal horizon has meant greater longevity, a low birth rate and significant technological developments, both in terms of “social technologies” and material ones. Like other mammals, hominids produced and consumed what was essential for their survival.

Over the past two million years, humanity's “elites” have deployed their talents in increasingly sophisticated and comprehensive developmental configurations. We have moved from nomadic bands, coexisting autonomously and independently from one another, to a diversity of nation-states integrated within broad political, economic, social and cultural networks.

The 21st century represents the culmination of this process. Amidst the lack of well-being experienced by the vast majority of humans, it embodies an “ideal of well-being” promoted by a minority in the name of a utopian dream. Just like the myth of Sisyphus by Albert Camus, the 21st century promised eternal perfectibility and its eventual universalization, something that, in fact, can neither be achieved, nor made universal.

This is our Sisyphean reality and our Castoriadian emancipatory *raison d'être*: we must escape the “enclosures” imposed by heteronomous institutions in order to overtake the alienating myth and institute realistic utopian lifestyles founded on the radical imagination principles of *Buen vivir* and the *collective*.

Becoming aware of this overtaking the modern myth: therein lies the upheaval that must be provoked. It is this liberating future to which a concrete proposal for a just *social and ecological transition* refers and with which it is associated. Such a proposal must be capable of deconstructing old complexity all while allowing for the deployment of a new “ideal and life order.”

*Any being-for-itself exists and can only exist in a closure. Thus also society and the social individual. Democracy is the project of breaking the closure at the collective level. Philosophy, creative self-reflective subjectivity, is the project of breaking the closure at the level of thought. But of course, any breaking of the closure, unless it remains a gaping “?” which does not break anything at all, posits something, reaches some results, and, thereby, risks erecting again a closure. The continuation and renewal of reflexive activity—not for the sake of “renewal,” but because this is self-reflective activity—entails therefore the putting into question of previous results (not necessarily their rejection—no more so than the revisability of laws in a democracy entails that they have to be changed wholesale every morning).*

*Thus the birth of philosophy is not just coincident but equi-significant with the birth of democracy. Both are expressions, and central embodiments, of the project of ‘autonomy’. (Castoriadis, 1990<sup>71</sup>)*

The great civilizational transitions of the past have been long and have been effected through a variety of processes and dynamics. With cooperation and struggle, these processes and dynamics have favoured the blossoming of previous configurations of collective living. Our challenge is completely different. We must act, think, test and progress rapidly while we conceive of and test out a new spirit of the times. This time, the horizon and the great narrative cannot be left to emerge slowly. An accelerated form of upheaval is needed and requires an inclusive form of adherence shared and attained by and from the majority.

- Economically, the *Awakening’s* proposal requires a positive socio-ecological response to the need to generate as much a decent level of socially useful and collectively available energy as equitable modalities for distributing, redistributing, accumulating and disposing of this energy. From this perspective, the logic of a circular relationship with nature, as much as a social and solidarity economy with an ecological dimension, has important qualities from which the *Awakening’s* proposals can learn.
- Politically, the *Awakening’s* proposal can count on representative democracy’s long-standing tradition of revocable agency, associating it with a political sphere where other democratic modalities – including deliberative and participatory democracy, or even direct democracy – will be put into relevant, legitimate and authoritative practice. This proposition would also benefit from thinking about a collective form of the Habeas Corpus<sup>72</sup> *modus operandi*.
- Judicially, the proposal requires a re-establishment of the dominant justice system in order to de-privatize logic, “communalize” it and reconnect it with the historical dynamics of research on the extent of Nature, of a reconnection with the elementary forms of the imagination of the living.
- Culturally, the proposal must have an aesthetic dimension consistent with the ethical principles of solidarism, democratism, alterity and environmentalism: a relationship

---

<sup>71</sup> Cornelius Castoriadis (1989), “The ‘end of philosophy?’” in *Salmagundi*, no. 82-83, p. 11.

<sup>72</sup> Reference to the notion of liberty presented by Karl Polanyi “La liberté dans une société complexe,” in Cangiani, M. et J. Maucourant (ed.) (2008), *Essais de Karl Polanyi*, Paris, Seuil, chap. 42 (chapter published in 1957).

with the aesthetic developed and thought out as a function of our humanity and our naturality. Remember what was said by Baruch Spinoza<sup>73</sup> : *in no case do we strive for anything because we deem it to be good, [usefulness according to Rationality] but on the other hand we deem a thing to be good, because we strive for it [in the Aristotelian sense of good or beautiful in naturality]*”.

- Socially, it will be important to mobilize historical organizational forms that have had success in finding equity, solidarity, alterity and environmental practices<sup>74</sup>.
  - Association by contract<sup>75</sup> for plural purposes:
    - for human reproduction;
    - for producing the means of existence;
    - for consuming the means of existence<sup>76</sup>;
    - for cognitive and artistic expression;
    - for public services...
  - Filial alliances on multiple scales:
    - predominance of community and local scales;
    - regionally entwined localism
    - itself entwined in the supra-regional up to the global scale
    - all while respecting the developmental logic of naturally inhabited ecosystems.
- From a cognitive perspective, we must maintain our capacity to produce critical knowledge that is respectful, emancipatory, and that promotes extensionism. Raising our awareness is an essential condition for continuing evolution that is not to the detriment of the natural enrichment that comes from the multiplication of beings.

At the heart of this approach, we must find adequate answers to the great civilizational woes of the time. We must do this so that all categories of populations and identities will find their

---

<sup>73</sup> Ethics, 1677, third part proposition 9.

<sup>74</sup> Various works explore such organizational forms like: Clastre. P. (1974). *La société contre l'État*, Paris, Seuil. Shalins, M. (1977). *Âge de pierre, âge d'abondance, l'économie des sociétés primitives*, Paris, Gallimard. Testart, A. (2005). *Éléments de classification des sociétés*. Paris, Errance.

<sup>75</sup> See the works of Ferdinand Tönnies (2010 [1887] on moving from communal societies to associative societies. *Communauté et société*, Paris, PUF. The theory of Tönnies summed up by Aurélien Berlan: “the tendency of community ties, as sustainable links between people, being constitutive of human life, to dissolve is the central pathology of a society where isolated individuals are no longer connected by these links, ephemeral and impersonal as they are, that are woven between their respective functions, like in a market exchange. And in so far as this evolution leads to a transformation of behaviour, increasingly guided by a calculation of personal interest, it will create a complete upheaval of human nature: the birth of “the abstract man”, cut off from community and reduced to instrumental reason, condemned to maximizing his private interests because there is no collective world left to defend.” (Berlan, A. (2012). Chapter 2. La dissolution des formes de vie communautaires : Ferdinand Tönnies, paragraph 9. In A. Berlan, *La fabrique des derniers hommes: Retour sur le présent avec Tönnies, Simmel et Weber* (pp. 87-157). Paris: La Découverte.)

<sup>76</sup> In “Socialist Accounting”, Karl Polanyi (1922) identifies two associative modes: production cooperative and consumer cooperative (in M. Cangiani and J. Maucourant (Ibid., 2008)). Since his analysis is limited to economic forms, we are presenting an extension of his approach by integrating other social dimensions.

place and be fully recognized. The recourse of a diversified, inclusive and equitable mobilization strategy will base the entirety of the transitional approach on individuals, groups, organizations and institutions heading toward renewed civilizational configurations.

### 3.7 Approaching knowledge differently

The question of producing and integrating knowledge is crucial when considering the socio-economic transition and a changing civilization, and not only as a response to the following questions: “which knowledge should we be producing?”, “what remains to be discovered?”, “what is relevant to be transmitted to whom and how?”, “how should knowledge be produced?” and “which knowledge should be recognized as legitimate or as vectors of living well together?”. Let us elaborate on several key elements in response to these questions.

The truth about climate change is starting to be well known. If the first warnings about climate change from the 1970s seemed insignificant or were met with skepticism, then the interdisciplinary work of the IPCC leaves no room for doubt as they are able to predict what is likely to happen. Subsequent international conferences have been held, and international agreements have been signed. We know the scale of the problem. We have known about it for some time. But still, “we” are not doing much. Knowledge that has been produced, accumulated, and disseminated allows us to access a certain framework for mobilization. But in “high places”, at the level of government and big business, this framework collides head on with the episteme of growth at all costs: a well established belief system, embedded in laws and institutions, that mobilizes resources and investments, and conditions habits according to short-term interests. Knowledge about the climate crisis is being met with closed doors.

The “awakening’s framework” will allow us to set the table and prepare for next steps. It draws on existing knowledge and a growth in awareness that will shake itself from sleep and fully unfurl its reach. The Awakening invites us to transform climate science into action-based knowledge. This knowledge/action, this praxeology, will be developed specifically through action, interaction, deliberation and reflection. Undoubtedly, this knowledge/action will be met with opposition. As history reminds us, it will evoke tension, conflict and rifts. In other words, all gestures and initiatives are important as they will, in one way or another, invite us to build the socio-economic transition peacefully.

This preliminary comment leads us to a second one. It is important to go beyond the Cartesian concept of knowledge as a reflection of reality. Knowledge is built through action, which is what then transforms reality. The result is that knowledge has several components, as ATD Fourth World demonstrated<sup>77</sup>: life knowledge, action knowledge and academic knowledge. These are all complementary. Once these kinds of knowledge have been recognized, integrating them into each other presents a challenge as this also produces an intersection of powers. The integration of tacit lived knowledge and action knowledge into global knowledge is paramount within the context of a socio-economic transition. It is

---

<sup>77</sup> ATD Fourth World Research Group (1999), *Le Croisement des savoirs*. Quand le Quart Monde et l’Université pensent ensemble, Paris, éd. de l’Atelier et éd. Quart Monde. Groupe de recherche action-formation Quart Monde-Partenaire (2002), *Le Croisement des pratiques. Quand le Quart-Monde et les professionnels se forment ensemble*, Paris, éd. Quart Monde. Also: Brun, Patrick. « Croisement des savoirs et pouvoir des acteurs. L’expérience d’ATD-Quart Monde », VST - Vie sociale et traitements, vol. no 76, no. 4, 2002, pp. 55-60.

important to incorporate citizens' knowledge into the identification of new perspectives and future transformations.

This question is epistemological and methodological in nature. It involves concrete mechanisms for recognizing citizen knowledge and modes of diffusion and for merging them.

### **3.8 Ensuring praxeological coherence with the help of subversive innovation**

Existence is essentially a dialectical process, insofar as the material conditions for production and reproduction of matter or life are constantly evolving and being transformed. No matter the framework, there is a kind of wear caused as much by the passage of time as by its evolutionary embeddedness in a material space. It is therefore important to see how, by and through experimentation and institutional adaptation, it is possible to face the constant transformations of context and circumstances without losing the coherence and cohesion of the big picture proposal.

We will need to demonstrate that other lifestyles are feasible and legitimate. We will need to pave the way to a new world that must be much more than the sum of many "small, nice anecdotal experiences." This will require new coordination modalities in order to ensure 'coherence' and 'cohesion' between visions and experiments.

Experiments, initiatives, and proposals pertaining to transport, food supply, energy, habitat and recycling, for example, are more and more present all over the world. Anchored mostly in individual territories and mobilizing local populations, they support learning, reproducibility, and universalization. They allow us to concretely identify regulatory, cultural, political, technological, financial, or governing roadblocks and to propose solutions to remove and scale them. The social and solidarity economy often carries initiatives like these: collective decision-making and property are conducive to innovation, experimentation, deliberation, and learning. These initiatives are often supported by municipalities, the first level of government confronted with climate change and the challenges of a socio-ecological transition.

In short, we are not starting from scratch—far from it. Connecting these experiments is a condition of their universalization and of cross-disciplinary learning.

### **3.9 Accounting for resistance**

Adhering to the subversive and innovative movement of the Awakening's socio-ecological transition entails confrontation with the established order and hegemonies in place. It is clear that forging a new path of dependency before we calibrate existing civilizational behaviours will elicit resistance, rifts, schisms, and opposition. There will be conflict.

In terms of the nature of the emergencies with which we are confronted – we need only think of the intensification and the acceleration of climate change – the scale of conflicts will be more or less attenuated depending on which viable options present themselves. History reminds us that in the face of great adversity we too easily shift to barbarism and different forms of totalitarianism.

The reality of having to respond to resistance with justice and equity and of having to face confrontational actions that mobilize different forms of violence can neither be obscured nor minimized. Let us remember the words of Martin Luther King<sup>78</sup>:

*We adopt the means of nonviolence because our end is a community at peace with itself. We will try to persuade with our words, but if our words fail, we will try to persuade with our acts.*

*With patient and firm determination we will press on until every valley of despair is exalted to new peaks of hope, until every mountain of pride and irrationality is made low by the levelling process of humility and compassion; until the rough places of injustice are transformed into a smooth plane of equality of opportunity; and until the crooked places of prejudice are transformed by the straightening process of bright-eyed wisdom.*

### 3.10 Building institutions and collective action that can support the transition

The Manifesto of the Awakening raises the issue of the healthy management of authority and power. If, according to John Rogers Commons, institutions are collective actions that steer individual action, it is clear that we must envision institutions that will also be able to steer collective action. We must account for this reality of revolutionary spaces in which we are investing as well as the power struggles between domination and emancipation.

The expression ‘collective action’ as employed here goes beyond the usual concept of a common concerted action<sup>79</sup>. Here we mean everything that causes collectives to act together, in the pragmatist sense of the term (Peirce, James and Dewey). Collective action is the whole of gestures, behaviour, usage, rules and habits that govern the action of a collective of human beings, whether or not its members know each other. Understood in this way, the employees of a multinational corporation with establishments around the world possess the same collective action: the same employer, the same products, the same uniform, the same objective, the same values etc. All social movements have a collective action as well: before it becomes a concerted action, it begins as a rollout of a common framework, of congruent gestures, values, language etc. It is collective action that sets gestures in motion that transform what already exists. Collective action includes institutions, or, as Elinor Ostrom highlights: “we mustn’t believe that there can be institutions other than those created by the State<sup>80</sup>”.

Therein lies precisely the issue: establishing rules, human collectives, a vision, a narrative that will allow a movement of the socio-ecological transition to converge and to recognize itself for what it is, on its own foundations, to act in order to carve out a path for the future. In short, building “our” institutions and “our” collective action, even if it means intersecting existing institutions that were not built to promote a transition.

---

<sup>78</sup> Amnesty International, 16 Martin Luther King quotes to remember : <https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/campaigns/2016/01/16-martin-luther-king-quotes-to-remember/>.

<sup>79</sup> Commons, J.R. (1950). *The economics of Collective action*. New York: The Macmillan Company.

<sup>80</sup> Cited by Pierre Dardot and Christan Laval (2014). *Commun. Essai sur la révolution au XXI<sup>e</sup> siècle*, Paris, La Découverte, p. 149, note 22.

It is important to understand here how collective action comes about and how it “controls” and permits future actions.

### 3.11 Accounting for externalities

History has revealed a social division of labor and the weaving of this division into the cognitive and legal fabric of society. Knowledge, as much as laws and rules, has equipped institutions with the material required to legitimize the distinction between social roles and functions given to individuals, groups, communities, organizations and institutions and make them operational. This social division of work is not in and of itself a bad thing, but requires careful consideration and evaluation<sup>81</sup> in order to avoid injecting discriminatory processes and dynamics that create social disparities and a distancing from the issue of environmentalism.

Externalities have led to (and will lead to more) failures to account for certain costs, such as social and environmental ones. Though this failure to take these costs into account could be a positive thing in the end, unintended consequences could cause negative effects by creating socio-territorial disparities, demobilization, and disengagement. This second type of externality, a vector of discriminatory social relationships, must be avoided to ensure transversality and complementarity of roles and functions between institutions and social entities. For example, we will have to:

- avoid having the State define itself as the one and only head of providentialism, as is the current civilizational model, to the detriment of actions by civil society organizations dedicated to the common good and to public interest;
- ensure that commercial organizations assume their responsibilities by really considering the social and environmental costs of their endeavours, all while promoting fair wealth distribution, or redistribution, and a *‘fair disposal of waste material.’*

### 3.12 An ecology of knowledge and epistemic justice

The ecology of knowledge recognizes the diversity of mechanisms of knowledge production all while clearly indicating the performative differences between the different types of knowledge produced. Peirce outlines four methods for belief fixation: the method of tenacity (believing in what we believe); the method of authority (knowledge imposed by an osn’t authority); the *a priori* method (knowledge that is pleasing or comfortable); and the scientific method (which allows for agreement between scientists).

Of these four modes, Peirce prioritizes the scientific method of belief fixation. Why? Science represents the most appropriate method of generating knowledge because it is continuously subject to doubt and is therefore a perpetual quest for truth.

---

<sup>81</sup> A method of evaluation similar to that of ‘Fifth Generation Evaluation’ founded on the learning and empowerment of actors.

The ecology of knowledge accounts for this environment that encompasses more or less simple, and more or less complex, mechanisms that allow for the generation of knowledge; an environment that includes the whole population, organizations and institutions and sees them entering into more or less validating or demeaning relationships.

Peirce does not really discuss power struggles unless it is to relate them to a mode of production and of knowledge management. However, Dewey extends the Peircean epistemology by discussing the place of politics in the knowledge production process, a process associated with investigative work requiring the participation of all stakeholders concerned with the resolution of a problem.

Participative democracy thus becomes a sine qua non condition of the investigative process. For Peirce and Dewey, such a process relies on the use of the scientific method in their investigative method, which demands that we be open to the views of all stakeholders. Stakeholders are called upon to participate in the process of gaining knowledge, that's to say, to the social resolution of problems with a social component. This participation is important because defining the problem is part of its investigation. The more inclusive this definition is and the more respectful it is of different views, opinions, and knowledge... the more it will allow a wider scope of the problem to be covered, and the more it can be open to an inclusive conceptualization that includes actions leading to solutions.

The pragmatism presented by the work of Peirce and Dewey goes beyond the intersection of knowledge; it opens the door to an intersection of practices and a collective governance of the process. Participative democracy falls within the scientific approach and can be added to the toolbox.

## *Concluston*

This Manifesto is an invitation to be subversive for the good of humanity. It supports all current experiments by putting forth a guide containing key points to take into consideration.

We are aware of the complexity of the task of rethinking our civilizational matrix. Such a task has everything to gain if it relies on mobilizing collective intelligence and is aware of the conditions that must be respected, the warnings to consider, and the avenues to explore.

This Manifesto has therefore identified conditions and challenges. It proposes a reflection galvanized by action enriched by learning and development drawn from our history of resistance to injustice and avoidance of alienating solutions; action defined by a new ecology of knowledge; and finally, actions that test proposals for the future in terms of socio-ecological ethics and aesthetics.

To move in this direction, a federative and percolative pedagogy must be put in place, one that relies on dialogue, debate, and working in tension and conflict in order to build consensus, at the very least, and ultimately to alliances. This kind of pedagogy also implies defining a “no” to all forms of progress that are not deeply anchored in renouncing advantages and privileges provided by the modern developmental civilizational model, which has been universalized around the world.

This Manifesto has partially answered a number of questions that remain unresolved and will have to stay that way. Complementary work is required to polish as much the reflection process as the pedagogical one, as well as the mobilization strategy. Some thought is also required to ensure the Manifesto is well distributed and continues to be developed through collective reflection that results from testing its impact on various affected publics.