

SUSTAINABILITY AT A CROSSROADS



CHALLENGES AND DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES OF THE GUIANA SHIELD

Edited by
Jack Menke

INSTITUTE FOR GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH
ANTON DE KOM UNIVERSITEIT VAN SURINAME

Copyright © 2021 by The Institute for Graduate Studies and Research (IGSR),
The Anton de Kom University of Suriname

All rights reserved. Published 2021 by The Institute for Graduate Studies and
Research, The Anton de Kom University of Suriname

No Part of this publication may be reproduced in any form or by any
electronical or mechanical means, without prior written permission of the
copyright owner, except for the use of quotations in a book review.

Printed in Suriname by Suriprint N.V.

ISBN: 978-99914-2-024-0

Editor: Jack Menke

Graphic design by ChadLab

Cover design by Leo Wong Loi Sing

CONTENTS

PREFACE	7
----------------------	----------

INTRODUCTION

The Guiana Shield at a global and regional crossroads for sustainability	11
<i>Jack Menke</i>	

PART 1

SUSTAINABILITY AND CULTURE	29
---	-----------

1. Sustainable humanity	30
--------------------------------------	-----------

Glenn Sankatsing

2. Historic period Archaeology in the Guiana Shield: Sustainable cross collaboration	50
<i>Cheryl White</i>	
3. Saamaka Doon	73
<i>Terry Agerkop with Jerome Egger</i>	

PART 2

SUSTAINABLE PRODUCTION	89
-------------------------------------	-----------

4. Socio-biodiversity products: opportunities to promoting local development in Brazil and Suriname	90
<i>Janaína Deane de Abreu Sá Diniz and Rudi Henri van Els</i>	
5. Energy in Suriname and the Amazon region: Local energy for local development	121
<i>Rudi Henri van Els</i>	
6. The revival of Guiana Shield geological research in Suriname	153
<i>Theo E. Wong</i>	

PART 3

NATURE, BIODIVERSITY AND HEALTH 167

7. Changing and challenging times: Health and
demographic transitions in the Indigenous peoples
in the interior south of Suriname 168

Marthelise G. M. Eersel

8. Plant-based traditional medicinal preparations in Suriname:
Linking traditional and academic knowledge 184

Dennis R.A. Mans

PART 4

REGIONAL INTEGRATION AND POLICY 225

9. Integration and International Security in the
Guiana Shield 226

*Paulo Gustavo Pellegrino Correa, Eliane Superti and
Mateus Meireles Evangelista*

10. Sustainability challenges: Towards academic integration
of the Caribbean Amazon and Brazil 246

Jack Menke

CONTRIBUTORS 273

1. Sustainable humanity⁵

Glenn Sankatsing

Power to define

The future of humanity and the continuity of life on planet Earth have become terrible unknowns. Rather than a short-term problem due to temporary ecological misconduct that time will cure, we are now experiencing the culmination of a long-standing irresponsible attack on nature that has seriously undermined the health of our planet and its ability to sustain life.

Humanity has been tampering dangerously with the exceptional conditions that made life on Earth possible. The extinction of humanity, which once belonged to the sphere of science fiction, has gone from being a hypothesis of doom thinkers to a terrifying concern that science, politics and society can no longer sidestep. Our precarious condition demands urgent transformative action and even a metamorphosis to change the terrifying contemporary trends that can end our stay on Earth. To find a way to rescue our future, we must be willing to go far. Fortunately, there is a law in nature that, seeing death and extinction, organisms and species become creative in finding survival options.

The root of our existential problems is anthropocentrism, the predatory ideology that places the human being at the center of the universe, affirming that the purpose of nature, including all its forms of life, is to serve humanity. We “treat man as the measure of all things,” as Friedrich Nietzsche (1873) pointed out, because “we like

5. This chapter builds on *Quest to Rescue Our Future* (Sankatsing, 2016), which deals with the major contemporary challenges facing humanity.

to imagine that man is nature's goal" according to Albert Schweitzer (Cicovacki, 2009). From a harmonious integration into nature we opted for a "cosmic solitude" (Jonas, 1966, p. 282) in the universe that has degraded science and technology into devices to multiply the ability of one species to dominate all others for its selfish agenda. A species that shuns harmony with other life forms and steps in its previous footprints before nature has time to erase them is not sustainable in evolution.

Sustainability is essential for continuity and makes the difference in evolution between survival and extinction. But what must be sustained? Does sustainable development, which many see as a paradigm shift after a long era of failed developmentalism, provide the answer? How significant is the term, if it is difficult to imagine a case of unsustainable development? Does this have implications for the Sustainable Development Goals that resonate around the world? Can the current profit-based system that takes nature as the object of manipulation and predation be sustainable? If not, is an extrasystemic route the alternative survival option? These challenging issues require deep critical reflection that can lead to iconoclastic responses that break with established wisdom and power structures.

A good starting point for understanding the intertwined challenges of global sustainability is the Amazon rainforest, which remains intact but threatened by the kind of deforestation that has turned other lush places on Earth into arid lands. The critical importance of this region for the ecological health of our planet makes its heart, the Guiana Shield, an emblematic case to address the imminent eco-cataclysm. This invites assertive action to change the current course towards the abyss. As the most virgin tropical forest, the Guiana Shield, home to the most densely forested country on Earth, provides a seventh of the world's freshwater supply. Its estimated 500 million tons of carbon sequestration per year balance much of the pollution generated by the industrialized world. The conservation of this unique natural asset goes to the heart of

sustainability, which requires a rejection of the dominant predatory system that is responsible for our contemporary misfortunes.

But any sustainability proposal that does not break with a fundamentally unsustainable system that targets nature as the object of predation is suspect. This implies that the buzzword *sustainable development* needs critical scrutiny.

The Pakistani cultural critic Ziauddin Sardar has alerted us to the power of system maintenance discourses in colonial and imperial domination. “The real power of the West is not located in its economic muscle and technological might. Rather, it resides in its power to define... The non-Western civilizations have simply to accept these definitions or be defined out of existence. To understand Eurocentrism, we thus have to deconstruct the definitional power of the West” (Sardar, 1999, p. 44).

The power to define has been one of the most important tools for paralyzing people’s critical thinking and deactivating them in a state of mental slavery. A good example of this is the word freedom, a value considered by many as a singularly positive contribution of Western civilization to the rest of the world. The freedom of the Western world was compatible with centuries of slavery. Western moral philosophy and social sciences never bothered to address this anomaly. On the contrary, the freedom struggle of slaves was described as dissent, terrorism and attack on civilization, which justified the harshest repression. How did Haitian slaves dare to free themselves from France, the apex of civilization?

Unless we review and redefine the central terms of the ecological debate that have been systematically hijacked by the perpetrators, no clear diagnosis can be made, and no meaningful alternative for a sustainable human project can be found. To undertake a strategy to rescue the threatened future of humanity, we must first rescue three basic concepts: development, sustainability and evolution.

Development

The failure of all development models in the last seventy years has had a terrible social impact around the world that has discredited dominant social science designs and imperial political models. The twentieth-century project of bringing development to people in distant latitudes was the modern reincarnation of the old mantra of the civilizing mission: What was good for the West is best for the rest. To civilize was to domesticate other peoples by cloning Europe into other places, globalizing its local experience. The result has been exactly the opposite of development. It undermined the inner strength and potential of societies, their insertion into their own context and their search for appropriate responses to the challenges posed by nature and habitat.

You can give a mango seed sunlight, water and fertilizer to grow into a healthy mango tree, but it will never become an apple tree. A child understands this self-evident truth, but the development expert will have sleepless nights to deal with its implications. Development cannot be transferred or implanted from the outside, not even as a generous gift, because development is intrinsically from the inside.

Development can be triggered, stimulated and supported, but it can never be inserted or imposed from outside, as any seed or embryo illustrates. You cannot grow from the genetic code of another, not as an organism, not as a plant, not as a species, not as a community. Strictly speaking, you cannot grow potatoes; potatoes grow themselves. Driven primarily by an internal clock, the challenge of life and evolution is to adapt to context and respond appropriately to environmental conditions.

Development is the mobilization of inherent potentialities in interactive response to challenges posed by nature, habitat and history to realize a sustainable project with an internal locus of command. “In nature as well as in history, there is a cosmic push to survive, to

grow, to flourish, to bear fruit, and to defeat death by reproduction” (Sankatsing, 2016, p. 35). This omnipresent force constitutes the basis for development in all fauna and flora, as a creative, adaptive, life-seeking self-realization that mobilizes open and hidden faculties. It is seasoned with the heat and cold of each day on the playing field of external conditions, to turn an inner blueprint into printed life. This inherent dialogue and life-seeking interaction with the surrounding context is the direct story that nature and history are telling us all the time.

Development is context-bound, context-seasoned and context-responsive, because the replacement of a sovereign connection with the context by an external protocol translates into the transformation into a clone. In nature, if you don’t participate, you die. From this perspective, the main underlying forces that constitute development are: (1) situatedness based on the relationship with the context; (2) sovereignty based on internal command; (3) sustainability as a guarantee of continuity; and (4) participation as a prerequisite for mobilizing potentials.

The colonial and imperial project of the last half millennium was exactly the opposite of each of these requirements. It was not development; it was *envelopment*, a process of annexation and molding from the outside. *Envelopment is the paternalistic and disempowering control of an entity by an external locus of command at the expense of its internal life processes and ongoing evolution.* Around the world, communities were reformatted by external actors in a still ongoing process of global envelopment. Instead of development unfolding the inner potential, envelopment molded the other from the outside through transference and imitation. This reminds us of an envelope, in which the sender encloses the message.

If the shorthand for development is mobilization of potentials in response to context, the key characteristic of envelopment is

alienation through demobilization. It incapacitates the potentialities and removes the locus of command. The master strategy of envelopment was to outsource the destiny of others in a process of inclusion by exclusion, and integration by alienation, at the service of foreign interests.

Now we can understand why all the so-called development models have failed. In one way or another, they were devices of envelopment presented as mimicry models (Christianization, civilizing mission and modernization), deterministic models (evolutionary, economic, ecological and biological determinism), models of economic envelopment (economic growth, center-periphery and world system) and critical models (dependency and post-development).

These models needed a blank slate, suppressing the internal life processes of the original peoples, overwriting their culture, interrupting their history, truncating their evolution, breaking their social texture and undermining the creative force of their internal social dynamism. People ceased to be the architects of their own future. Their communities were reduced to remote-controlled trailer societies without steering wheel or engine in a project to serve the imperial appetite of expansionist powers whose global mission was not to impart but to collect.

Amid the global failure of developmentalism, *sustainable development* was offered in the 1980s as an innovative alternative, which has conquered the global debate on development. Undoubtedly, sustainability is a non-negotiable condition for continuity and survival. But is sustainable development really the panacea that so many people, including suspect actors such as the corporate world and the dominant powers represented by the United Nations, but also transformative agents such as NGOs and social activists, continue to embrace enthusiastically?

Sustainable development: a panacea or a hoax?

Sustainability appears as an essential element in our definition of development. The unsustainable leads to discontinuity, collapse and extinction, which is the denial of development. If development is sustainable by definition, sustainable development is a pleonasm, comparable to participatory democracy (Sankatsing, 1998 and 2016).

Unsustainability is the denial of development, leading to discontinuity, crisis, collapse, death and, ultimately, extinction. Redundancy is not innovation and repetition is not a paradigm shift and does not even add a new explanation. This makes one wonder how *sustainable development* could conquer the development debate so quickly and what forces have been behind the meaningless twist to offer the term as a new approach to overcoming the failed era of developmentalism.

The launch of *sustainable development* in the Brundtland Report (1987) was not driven by sustainable ecology but by sustainable economy. Economically dominant countries and corporate interests were alarmed that the ecological destruction caused by irresponsible acts against the environment could become a boomerang that would undermine the profit-based global economic system and seriously damage its capital accumulation mechanism. For two centuries, the health of planet Earth has never been high on the market agenda. The trigger for the launch of the “sustainable development” discourse was sustainable growth, sustainable benefits and sustainable envelopment. As evidenced by the continuing deterioration of the ecological status of our planet and the shameful inaction at world summits, the driving force for sustainable development was not love of nature, fascination with natural beauty, the well-being of the planet or the genuine needs of humanity to guarantee its inalienable right to survival.

Sustainable development, born as a strategy to ensure the continuous generation of profit, was essentially the criticism that human beings had been too careless with their project to exploit nature. Therefore, *sustainable economy* would be a more honest term than sustainable development.

Maintaining their economy rather than saving our ecology was the main reason why the rulers and corporate elites of an unsustainable predatory system offered the term as a panacea at many “Earth Summits” that only paid lip service to ecological concerns. They systematically blocked structural actions to improve the ecological health of the planet, as this would require a corporate economic toll and demand an end to the predatory economic system that dominates the world today.

Sustainable development offered cosmetic embellishments and temporary relief, but it did not care about the sustainability of humanity on planet Earth. On the contrary, it justified the anthropocentric worldview to absolve the predatory system responsible for our existential problems. We must take seriously Subhabrata Banerjee’s warning that “we should not entertain notions about global sustainability unless we know whose globe and whose sustainability we are talking about” (Banerjee, 2003, pp. 171-172).

Sustainability is not a recent invention; it is at the heart of evolution. Prior to the Brundtland Report, the German philosopher Hans Jonas had formulated the ethical principle behind sustainability in more powerful terms. “We do not have the right to choose, or even risk, nonexistence for future generations on account of a better life for the present one” (Jonas 1979, p. 11).

The idea of sustainability goes back to the cosmovision of communitarian peoples for a balanced and harmonious relationship in the economic, ecological, social and cultural fields. Most religions and thought systems have sustainability embodied in sacred stories and writings about the origin of humanity and its permanence on

Earth, whether in the form of Pachamama, Gaya or Mother Earth.

Reincarnation in Hinduism and Buddhism requires above all durability, otherwise you would have no place to return to. The oldest known statement about sustainability is from the Book of Genesis, chapter 2, verse 15. "And the Lord God took man and put him in the Garden of Eden to till it and to keep it." It is difficult to misunderstand this mandate to work and cultivate the land, while we take care to preserve it. This is imperative if we are to address current needs without aborting the satisfaction of future needs. Breaking the vital link between economy (working the earth) and ecology (preserving the Earth) is a capital sin with enormous consequences, as the Holy Qur'an warns (Surah 30:41): "Destruction has come upon land and sea by what man's hands have caused, and He will let them taste part of what they have done wrong, so that they may repent." Sustainability is a condition for continuity; continuity is a condition for survival, and survival is the main immediate objective of evolution.

In contrast, sustainable development has been co-opted by the system responsible for our ecological crisis, and at the same time has been an instrument in the hands of powerful states to blackmail poor and forest-rich countries into leaving their natural resources intact unless they are strategic for generating global corporate capital gains. They blamed "slash-and-burn farmers to damage forests, while tax incentives welcomed large-scale destructive logging companies for following 'sustainable' practices" (Banerjee, 2003, p. 43). The economy overwhelmed ecology, as seen in the despicable worldview that replanting two seedlings for any harvested tree would ensure sustainability. The thousands of plants taken down by the falling tree in an intertwined forest and the destruction of part of the ecosystem are not worth mentioning because they have no monetary value for the timber industry.

All this leads to the revelation that the *raison d'être* for launching the sustainable development discourse was not greening the planet,

but the greening of greed. The love of money rather than love of nature triggered the alarms of an anthropocentric effort to keep the planet fit for a perpetual assault. The unattainable goal of sustainable growth for sustainable benefits has outweighed that of sustainable living.

Sustainable development was neither development nor sustainable. The sustainable development discourse is about sustainable growth, sustainable profit, sustainable anthropocentrism, sustainable capitalism, in a word sustainable envelopment based on a predatory model of dealing with nature. It cannot stop the danger to our permanence on Earth. Clean energy for a dirty system is not a sustainable alternative.

Evolution and survival

The only beauty of nature is its monetary value. This anthropocentric myopia disconnected our species from its natural synergistic incrustation in the universe. Humanity has gone astray as a species and now finds itself at an existential crossroads in evolution. In order to understand the contemporary pitfalls of humanity on its way through time and to find options for recovery, we need to identify the driving force of evolution.

In his masterpiece on the origin of the species, Charles Darwin (1859) erroneously took “natural selection” as the core of the evolutionary process. A year later he wrote in a letter to Scottish geologist Charles Lyell, “Talking of ‘Natural Selection’, if I had to commence de novo [all anew], I would have used ‘natural preservation.’” (Darwin, 1860). If broader development-based natural preservation had been preferred to “natural selection” confined to probability, subsequent discussions of evolution and current thinking on the subject would have been very different.

In line with the pre-Darwinist perspective of Arthur

Schopenhauer's 1818 "will to live", Albert Schweitzer (1923) linked the idea of preservation more than a century later with "reverence for life". His basic principle was "it is good to maintain and to encourage life; it is bad to destroy life or to obstruct it". Following the same line of thought in the 1980s, Hans Jonas stressed the importance of life itself by placing the core of ethics in the imperative of responsibility and accountability to avoid sacrificing future generations for a better life for the present (Jonas, 1979).

Continuing this line of reasoning, a recent study, *Quest to Rescue Our Future* (Sankatsing, 2016), connects evolution with development as an internal process of survival that ensures the command of destiny by mobilizing one's own potentialities in response to contextual factors. Its identification of the driving force of evolution as "Life looking for more life", an omnipresent force in the universe, opens new perspective for the quest to rescue our future.

Life looking for more life leads us directly to sustainability, which is a precondition for any species to pursue survival, well-being, prosperity and happiness. This evolutionary imperative paves the way for a development strategy that breaks with the prevalence of the anthropocentric project that took nature as the object of predation and threatens humanity with collapse and extinction.

The neurotic search for private wealth at the expense of the life of our species deprives today's powerful economic and political elites of the moral authority to speak. We should no longer listen to those who emphatically told us to our faces at the Paris summit in 2015 that they are unwilling to pay the economic price of our ecological survival.

We are not running out of options; we are running out of time, and we must act quickly. There is little room for dialogue and negotiation with the recalcitrant forces that are actively destroying humanity. The time has come to mobilize humanity to take command of its destiny.

Sustainable humanity

For more than thirty years, sustainable development has been a buzzword among strange bedfellows, such as governments not respecting the Paris Agreement of 2015, social activists fighting for a better world, mega corporations damaging our planet, and people resorting to green consumption. The reluctance of the sustainable development discourse to distance itself from the dominant predatory system makes it part of the failed developmentalism it seeks to overcome. Sustainable development will not be able to abort the imminent eco-cataclysm, because it does not reject the dominant model of civilization, which considers greed, competition and profit as the highest virtues. Sustainable development cannot produce a sustainable humanity.

An in-depth analysis of the spheres of politics, religion, science, civil society and the media has revealed that none of them is capable of offering an escape route from our impending downfall (Sankatsing, 2016). Even “philanthropic” billionaires cannot save the system by redistributing a small portion of the booty produced by an unsustainable model built on the dispossession and marginalization of the majority. Billionaires who feel the impulse to give back to society admit that they have taken too much; the best philanthropy is not charity, but equality, respect, justice and sustainability.

Modern civilization cannot offer a solution, because it is the core of the problem. Rather than a reform, its metamorphosis is necessary for a sustainable humanity. This leads to the shocking conclusion that the only way to rescue our future is an extrasystemic route.

It is imperative to replace the dubious system maintenance term *sustainable development* with that of *sustainable humanity* based on evolution. This reorientation towards evolution, which takes *life looking for more life* as the driving force, is the first step in breaking with the prevailing predatory model. Current trends of marginalization go in the opposite direction of mobilizing the potential of our species.

“Humanity has passed the point where 1% owns more wealth than 99% of our fellow humans, and the continued tendency of more money in fewer hands may soon produce the first trillionaire. Somebody needs to stop this unique madness in the animal world” (Sankatsing, 2016. p. 340). It is difficult to understand how this marginalization of the majority can be compatible with the requirement of participation inherent in development, which is an indispensable condition for mobilizing one’s own potential. A species that cannot feed its members has no right to exist in the universe.

A direct consequence of rejecting the discourse of sustainable development and opting for sustainable humanity is the need to revise the Sustainable Development Goals. None of the stated objectives can be achieved, unless the quintessence of the unsustainable anthropocentric worldview is abandoned in favor of a harmonious cosmocentric worldview. The problem in formulating these goals was not the divergence between stakeholders with conflicting interests, but the convergence of their interests in seeking a solution within the limits of the dominant system. Poverty, zero hunger, good health and well-being cannot be achieved in an unequal and unjust world controlled by capital and power structures that have made war the final arbiter.

Poverty is a symptom of a sick society comparable to pain. The fight against poverty must go beyond the elimination of symptoms, similar to the fight against fever with a cold shower. It must address the disproportionate appropriation of wealth by small elites. The fight against poverty must move to combat inequality and the concentration of wealth in the hands of a few (Sankatsing, 2016, p. 339).

We need to replace the Sustainable Development Goals with Sustainable Humanity Goals, SDG by SHG. It will make a big difference that immediately signals the need to overcome global envelopment and reconnect with the life-giving force of evolution.

Western civilization has failed as a model for humanity, and even civilization itself failed in its anthropocentric mission. When understood as a greater capacity to dominate nature for the benefit of human beings in a civilization-barbarism dichotomy, the root of our ecological crisis comes to light; it is the very idea of civilization, in fact the barbarism of civilization.

Humanity can only be sustainable when economy and ecology are not the opposites that modern man has made of them. We must honor their common root *eco*, which derives from *oikos*, the Greek word for home. In a harmonious and complementary relationship to live wisely on Earth, we must keep our great house intact, while keeping it clean and habitable. Economic activities must meet the needs of humanity without causing irreparable damage to the environment. Before we can work on its maintenance, we must refrain from destroying the planet.

Establishing a sustainable humanity, necessary to pursue the survival of our species, requires a redefinition of several terms that are impregnated by the anthropocentric cosmovision. *Natural resources* and *energy scarcity* are two examples that illustrate this.

The division between civilization and barbarism has separated nature into resources suitable for human exploitation and useless non-resources that lack direct and identifiable value for the generation of benefits. “Natural resources” is an anthropocentric relocation of the surrounding world that privileges a selected part of nature as more relevant than the rest, only because it is more valuable to humans and more likely to serve their project of pointing out objects of predation and exploitation. Management guru Peter Drucker made this very explicit. “There is no such thing as a ‘resource’ until man finds a use for something in nature and then endows it with economic value. Until then, every plant is a weed and every mineral just another rock” (Drucker, 1985). The reduction of nature to natural resources degraded it into an object of manipulation and pillage, which fits perfectly into the scheme of envelopment to dominate nature.

The energy shortage is another alarming system maintenance discourse of anthropocentric signature. There is no lack of energy, but abuse of energy and waste of energy. The main cause of our ecological distress is not the satisfaction of genuine needs, but the maximization of profit. The appetite for capital leads to the appetite for energy.

Our market-based system requires the expansion of demand, but human needs tend to increase to a point of saturation, because the goal of growth in evolution is to stop growing when maturity is reached. The only solution to the perennial growth demanded by modern economics is the creation of an artificial demand beyond real needs, shortening the life of the product, inducing its premature death and promoting new lifestyles that multiply the replacement rate of products before their natural expiration. Symbolic value in an extravagant world overwhelms value based on needs.

The so-called energy crisis is a pathological state of energy obesity caused by inflated production in the service of an abusive system of making money. A fraction of current energy consumption would be sufficient to meet current needs. Instead of finding more sources of energy, the challenge before us is to abandon an unsustainable model that demands ever-increasing levels of energy. Why should humanity support “sustainable growth” that does not sustain life, not even the basic needs and physical survival of the majority of human beings who are not on its agenda?

As a species we need to take resources from nature in order to survive, but we cannot survive if our impact on nature exceeds its restoration capacity. These two extremes mark the limits of sustainability to ensure that the impact on the environment avoids irreparable disruptions. The current environmental crisis is a violation of the upper limit, caused by an overload on our planet that prevents its damage from being repaired in time. The resilience of life and the resilience of the planet go hand in hand. A sustainable humanity lives in harmony and complies with the logic of evolution.

These two examples, natural resources and energy scarcity, illustrate how the power to define can derail us from real problems and block us from finding appropriate answers. A practical step towards sustainability is the translation of development into the following survival sovereignties: food, health and shelter sovereignty; ecological and energy sovereignty; educational and technological sovereignty; communication and information sovereignty; economic sovereignty, and political sovereignty.

Food sovereignty will require a strategy to boost local production, organic agriculture, greenhouses, livestock and fisheries. Today, food is massively distributed from powerful countries to poor countries, while the four largest fast food chains have more than 100.000 stores in the world. Food should come in baskets, not in container ships. Ecological and energy sovereignty must benefit from alternative sources of energy. Why should countries with constant winds or burning under the tropical sun use expensive and harmful fossil fuels that benefit billionaires and pollute our habitat?

Educational and technological sovereignty should break knowledge dependence and review the unilateral appropriation of technology by patent laws, which prevents poor countries from addressing their problems with existing knowledge.

Economic sovereignty immunizes against the market system of corporate ownership that produces not for needs but for profit under an economic system that requires eternal growth. We have become aliens in the evolutionary process with an obsession to grow and grow without having a moment of rest to enjoy the product of growth.

Political sovereignty honors democratic institutions based on development and stops the outsourcing of governance to elites who hijack decision-making, which has become the dominant political system worldwide. Vanguardism from right or left who take control of society are the hallmark of envelopment, as they form a barrier to the participation and mobilization of existing potentials.

Development through survival sovereignties can overcome the dangers of envelopment and can prevent the overloading of nature when needs are met and enjoyment is provided. Two beautiful examples, each of which could be adopted as the symbol for the environmental movement, are the hammock and the igloo. Made exclusively from what nature provides, the hammock provides a mobile bed, while the igloo is a house created by the reorganization of the ice. This shows that a balanced relationship with the environment can open ways for us to live and prosper.

Actions

Using nature for selfish purposes, instead of maintaining a harmonious relationship with the environment, has disconnected humanity from the path of evolution and has gotten us into deep problems that threaten our permanence on Earth. Awareness of the need for a balanced and respectful relationship with nature is growing globally. Unfortunately, part of this positive trend has been co-opted by the system that is responsible for our misfortune, which, at the same time offers us models and concepts, such as sustainable development, that suggest transformative action but keep a predatory model intact.

There is no easy exit route. If we want to increase our survival chances, we have no choice but to make the drastic decision to discard and abandon the dubious buzzword *sustainable development* and focus on *sustainable humanity*. This requires a shift from Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) to Sustainable Humanity Goals (SHG) that will imply a break with the current ecologically predatory economic system. It will pave the way for mobilizing all the world's positive forces for sustainability to rescue the future of humanity. Together they can carry out the necessary overhaul to a

sustainable humanity that ensures sustainability in the economic, ecological, social and cultural spheres.

Anthropocentrism, individualism, sectarianism, competitiveness and ecological parasitism must give way to cosmocentrism, communitarianism, cosmopolitanism, eco-compatibility and solidarity. This will require an extrasystemic solution driven by the moral reserves of humanity, which remain the vast majority, though often marginalized, co-opted, frustrated and demotivated. Losing respect for the tyrant and his power structures that permeate all aspects of life is not an easy task, but a necessary first step.

The last thing we must do is follow the tyrant's advice to be pragmatic, as typically advised by political and economic powers, dominant science and religious orthodoxy. A pragmatic slave is an eternal slave. When our survival is at stake, we must not hesitate to be iconoclasts.

Humanity has traveled from the gate of the cave to the brink of the grave. But fortunately, our journey is not yet over. Now we have the choice between sleepwalking to extinction and mobilizing the moral reserves of humanity to take command of our destiny. The cosmetic changes that world summits have been proposing for decades within the logic of the dominant system will serve no purpose and will only mean a slow death. Nothing less than an extrasystemic global *Rescue Our Future Movement* will be able to help us shape a better version of humanity. In the choice between extinction by inactivity and possible survival, action is the best prediction.

References

- Banerjee, S. (2003). Who sustains whose development? Sustainable development and the reinvention of nature, *Organization Studies*, 2003, Vol. 24
- Brundtland Report (1987). Our Common Future. World Commission on Environment and Development (Known as the 'Brundtland Report', after the name of the chairwoman of the Commission, Gro Harlem Brundtland)
- Cicovacki, P. (ed.) (2009). Albert Schweitzer's Ethical Vision. A Sourcebook. Oxford, Oxford University Press. Chapter 10 The Ethics of Reverence for Life. Originally published in *Christendom*, 1 (2), 1936
- Darwin, C. (1859). *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection, or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life*, 1859
- Darwin, C. (1860). Letter of Charles Darwin to Charles Lyell of September 28, 1860. <http://www.darwinproject.ac.uk/>, Darwin Correspondence Project
- Darwin, C. (1872). *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection, or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life*, Sixth Edition
- Drucker, P. (1985). *Innovation and Entrepreneurship*. New York, Harper & Row
- Holy Bible, Book of Genesis
- Holy Qur'an, Surah 30
- Jonas, H. (1966) *The Phenomenon of Life. Toward a Philosophical Biology*. Evanston, IL.
- Jonas, H. (1979). *The Imperative of Responsibility: In Search of an Ethics for the Technological Age*. Chicago, IL, University of Chicago Press, 1984 (orig. 1979)
- Nietzsche, F. (1873). On Truth and Falsity in Their Ultramoral Sense. In *Complete Works of Nietzsche*. New York, Cornell University Library

- Sankatsing, G. (1998). The Caribbean. Archipelago of trailer societies, Trinidad and Tobago Review, December 1998
- Sankatsing, G. (2016). Quest to Rescue Our Future. Amsterdam, Rescue Our Future Foundation
- Sardar, Z. (1999). Development and the Locations of Eurocentrism. In: Ronaldo Munck and Denis O'Hearn (eds.), Critical Development Theory. Contributions to a New Paradigm. New York, Zed Books.
- Schopenhauer, A. (1818). The World as Will and Idea. Three volumes. London, Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., 1909 (orig. 1818) Schweitzer, A. (1923) The Philosophy of Civilization. Buffalo, NY, Prometheus, 1987 (orig. 1923)