

10-16-2017

The Real Wealth of Nations: From Global Warming to Global Partnership

Riane Eisler
Center for Partnership Studies

Follow this and additional works at: <http://pubs.lib.umn.edu/ijps>

Recommended Citation

Eisler, Riane (2017) "The Real Wealth of Nations: From Global Warming to Global Partnership," *Interdisciplinary Journal of Partnership Studies*: Vol. 4: Iss. 3, Article 13. Available at: <http://pubs.lib.umn.edu/ijps/vol4/iss3/13>



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial 4.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/)

The *Interdisciplinary Journal of Partnership Studies* is published by the University of Minnesota Libraries Publishing. Authors retain ownership of their articles, which are made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution Noncommercial license (CC BY-NC 4.0).



THE REAL WEALTH OF NATIONS: FROM GLOBAL WARMING TO GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP

Riane Eisler, JD, PhD (hon.)

Abstract:

In a speech delivered September 16, 2009 in New York City, at the United Nations' special meeting on climate change hosted by the Caribbean island-country of Grenada, Riane Eisler proposed a new approach for prevention and mitigation of global warming. She placed our climate change crisis in its social and historical context. She highlighted the connection between high technology and an ethos of Domination in bringing on our current crises, and why successfully resolving them requires an understanding of the configurations of the Domination System and the Partnership System as two underlying social configurations. These social configurations transcend conventional categories such as right vs. left, religious vs. secular, or Eastern vs. Western, which fail to take into account the crucial interactions between the cultural construction of our basic childhood and gender relations and politics and economics. As a result, regressions to the Domination side of the Partnership/Domination continuum have punctuated our forward movement, including a disregard for both people and nature. She showed that going back to the old “normal” is not an option, and outlined how, together, we can build a new normal in which caring for people and nature is a top priority.

Keywords: Partnership System; Domination System; climate change; caring economics; gender; childhood; neuroscience; global warming; values; cultural transformation.

Copyright: ©2017 Eisler. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Noncommercial Attribution license (CC BY-NC 4.0), which allows for unrestricted noncommercial use, distribution, and adaptation, provided that the original author and source are credited.

It is an honor and pleasure to be here at the United Nations to speak with such a distinguished group of women and men, working to meet our global challenges, particularly global warming, dedicated to working together to help build the better future envisioned by the founders of the UN, wonderful people such as Eleanor

Roosevelt, whose legacy we now must move forward.

As those of you familiar with my work know, this enterprise of building a more equitable, peaceful, and sustainable future is one that I too am passionately dedicated to, not only as a scholar, writer, and activist, but as a mother and grandmother deeply concerned as so many of us are about what kind of future our children will inherit.

I have been asked to focus on two critical areas. The first area concerns matters directly connected to global warming, both mitigation and amelioration, because predictions are there will be catastrophic effects, particularly in some of the poorest world regions, and especially how we can ensure that the funds allocated to amelioration will be used to protect the most vulnerable, as well as what we need to do in the longer term, because to effectively address global warming and prevent other environmental and social disasters, we have to make some fundamental changes.

This takes me to the second critical area I have been asked to address, on which I will spend most of our time together, which is to put global warming and other current crises in their larger social and historical context, in the context of my research.

I am going to suggest to you that our global challenges—not only global warming but so much of the suffering, hunger, poverty, violence that afflicts our world—that these are all symptoms of an underlying dysfunction that has affected all aspects of our lives; that the melting of the ice caps and the meltdown of our financial system are not isolated, but symptoms of what my multidisciplinary, cross-cultural, historical research has identified as the configuration of a Domination system—the kind of system we have been trying to leave behind, be it man over man, man over woman, race over race, religion over religion, and yes, man over nature. And that to

effectively address our current crises, and most important, prevent new ones, we have to work together for a major cultural shift to the beliefs and institutions characteristic of a Partnership rather than Domination system.

And of course one of these institutions, and a very basic one, is economics. I am going to propose to you that we need fundamental changes in our economic system; that, as the President of the UN General Assembly, Ambassador Miguel d'Escoto so beautifully put it, to build a Noah's Ark for the existing economic system would be both inhuman and irresponsible.

So as the title of my talk, "The Real Wealth of Nations," which is also the title of my most recent book, signals, I will be paying particular attention to economics. And as the subtitle of my talk, "From Global Warming to Global Partnership," highlights, we must use this climate change crisis as an opportunity to go deeper, to accelerate this cultural shift—the shift in attitudes, beliefs, and institutions—from Domination to Partnership.

And this shift requires something we hear a great deal about today, that has become something of a cliché. It requires that we 'think outside the box' of the old cultural and economic categories, because, as Einstein said, we can't solve problems with the same thinking that created them. Returning to the old normal is not an option; we need a new normal.

So I will be sharing a great deal of information with you in the brief time we have together, but I want to start on a personal note, because people always want to know what led to what are now four decades of multidisciplinary, cross-cultural, historical research. You don't just get up one day and decide to start a study reexamining our past, present, and possibilities for our future.

My passion for this work is rooted in my very early life experiences. I was born in Europe at a time of massive regression to the Domination side of the Partnership/Domination Continuum—the rise of the Nazis, first in Germany and then in my native Austria. From one day to the next, my parents and I became hunted, with a license to kill. My whole world was rent asunder. I was a little girl as I watched with horror as a gang of Gestapo men broke into our home and dragged my father away, and it was only by a miracle that my mother obtained his release and we were able to escape. We escaped only by hair's breadth to Cuba, on one of the last ships admitted to Cuba that you may have heard about, because a movie was made about it, called *The Voyage of the Damned*. The *St. Louis*, a ship with 1000 Jewish women, men, and children fleeing the Nazis, was not admitted by the Cuban authorities or by any other nation in the Western Hemisphere. It had to sail back to Europe, where many on board were later killed by the Nazis, as would have happened to my parents and me had we been on that somewhat later ship.

So I grew up in the industrial slums of Havana, because the Nazis confiscated everything my parents owned, and there I experienced and observed yet another injustice, the terrible poverty, the enormous gaps between haves and have-nots. And it was also there that I learned that most of my family—aunts, uncles, cousins, grandparents—were murdered by the Nazis.

These traumatic experiences had a profound effect on me. They led me to questions that most of us have asked at some time in our lives: Does it have to be this way? Does there have to be so much cruelty, violence, and insensitivity? Is it, as we're

often told, inevitable, just human nature, or are there alternatives? And if so, what are they? These questions eventually led to my research.

I found very early that I could not answer these questions in terms of the old social

categories: right vs. left, religious vs. secular, Eastern vs. Western, Northern vs. Southern, capitalist vs. socialist, etc. None of these conventional categories describes an entire social system. And none answer the basic question of what kinds of beliefs and institutions (from the family, education, and religion, to politics and economics) support or inhibit our enormous human capacities for caring, for empathy, for sensitivity, rather than our capacities (because we also have those) for cruelty, insensitivity, and violence?

So I looked for patterns, drawing from a very large data base both cross-culturally and historically. And I began to see patterns: social configurations that kept repeating themselves. There were no names for them, so I called one the Domination System and the other the Partnership System.

All my books draw on this research. The first was *The Chalice and The Blade: Our History, Our Future* (now in 23 foreign editions). This book introduced the new social categories of the Partnership and Domination Systems to a broader readership. Since it drew from long span of history, including our prehistory, new findings from archeology, and the study of myth, it showed that there are strong indications that the first cradles of civilization oriented more to the Partnership side of the Continuum (and it's always a matter of degree, as no society orients completely to either system).

For example, in Europe, the "high civilization" of Minoan Crete, which, while not ideal, was more peaceful, had a more equitable distribution of wealth, and was more gender balanced. And before that, Neolithic societies like Catal Huyuk in Anatolia, again not ideal, but more peaceful, more egalitarian, including a more equal partnership between the female and male halves of humanity. These were all societies that honored and venerated our Mother Earth, as we still see in some indigenous traditions today. In other words, these were our own early Western

indigenous traditions, as I detail in *The Chalice and The Blade* and other books.

But then came the shift to the Domination side. And by way, when *The Chalice and The Blade* came out in China, published by the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences in Beijing, which publishes all my books, a group of Chinese scholars at the Academy got together to test my Cultural Transformation theory in Asian history, and found the same shift from Partnership to Domination. They wrote their own book, *The Chalice and The Blade in Chinese Culture*, which came out in 1995.

But perhaps most important is that we have in modern times been moving toward the Partnership side again. Indeed, all the progressive social movements have challenged traditions of Domination. The Enlightenment's Rights of Man movement challenged the 'divinely ordained right' of kings to rule over their 'subjects'; the feminist movement challenged the 'divinely ordained right' of men to rule over the women and children in the 'castles' of their homes; the abolitionist, civil rights, and anti-colonial movements, challenged the 'divinely ordained right' of one race to rule over another; the movements for economic justice, the antiviolence movements (be it the peace movement or the movement to end traditions of intimate violence, of violence against women and children in homes)—these movements challenged traditions of top-down economic rule and the use of violence to impose one's will on others (inherent in Domination systems, as violence is ultimately needed to maintain rankings of domination). All the way to the environmental movement, challenging another tradition of Domination: man's once hallowed Conquest of Nature, which at our level of technological development is about to do us in. But every one of these movements has been met by enormous resistance and periodic regressions, and of course I was born into one of these regressions.

So our job, the job of the UN, is to continue, support, and accelerate this Partnership Movement. And this is more and more urgent, as the mix of high technology and an

ethos of Domination and conquest could take us to an evolutionary dead end.

I want to clarify that by Partnership I do *not* mean a completely flat organization. There are hierarchies—there must be. We need parents, teachers, managers, and leaders. But there is a big difference.

In Domination systems we see *hierarchies of domination*. We all know these: rankings in which someone on top—be it in the family or tribe or nation—gives orders that must be obeyed, or there will be much pain. In rigid Domination systems, even death.

Whereas in Partnership systems, there are what I call *hierarchies of actualization*, and yes, we need new words for new norms. In these hierarchies of actualization, accountability and respect and benefit don't just flow from the bottom up, but both ways. Here, as we read today in the organizational development literature, power is empowering rather than disempowering. The use of these new words signals a shift from Domination to Partnership, so yes, we don't have to start from square one; there is forward movement, and we already have some of the building blocks.

I also want to clarify that the term Partnership System does not just mean cooperation. We are sometimes told that if people would just cooperate, all would be well, but people cooperate all the time in Domination systems: monopolies, terrorists, invading armies, etc.—all cooperate. Partnership Systems and Domination Systems are two very different social configurations—two very different configurations of beliefs and social institutions, as I will briefly touch upon as I now shift to what I promised: to focus on economics.

Because economics don't arise in vacuum. They arise in a larger social and cultural context, and they are very different depending on the degree of orientation to the Domination or Partnership side of the continuum. I am going to suggest to you that

the problem is not just unregulated capitalism, as we are often told these days. Yes, that is a problem, but what we're really dealing with is Dominator economics, whether tribal or feudal or monarchic, whether ancient or modern.

So in terms of this new understanding of economics, neoliberalism represents a regression to Dominator economics: a top-down economic system with those on top in control of the resources. 'Trickle-down economics' is really a continuation of Dominator traditions, in which those on the bottom are socialized, brainwashed, to content themselves with the scraps dropping from the opulent tables of those on top, and freedom, when used by those in control, means freedom for those on top, those in economic control, to do what they want—including the destruction of our natural environment, as we see around us.

This is an ancient economics of Domination, whether it's tribal, feudal, or mercantilist, whether it's ancient or modern. Indeed, the two large-scale applications of socialism, the USSR and China, also turned into Domination systems, and had horrendous environmental problems, because the underlying social system did not shift sufficiently from Domination to Partnership.

So we need to move beyond the tired old argument about capitalism vs socialism. We need to retain and strengthen the Partnership elements in both the market and government economies, and leave the Domination elements behind.

And we need to go further, to a new economic system that recognizes what old systems did not: that the real wealth of nations, the real wealth of our world, is not financial (as we saw when the derivatives, the credit swaps, melted into thin air). That the real wealth of nations consists of the contributions of people and of nature,

and that therefore we need what we have not had: economic systems that give visibility and real value to the most important human work—the work of caring for people, starting in early childhood, and caring for our Mother Earth. We urgently need this new economic system if we are to effectively address global warming and prevent further catastrophic problems. We urgently need it if we are to more effectively address seemingly intractable problems like chronic poverty and hunger. Indeed, we would not have global warming if we had had what I call a “caring economics.”

Of course, people tend to do a double take, don't they, hearing the words caring and economics in the same sentence. Isn't that a terrible comment on the uncaring **values** we have learned to accept as running economic systems?

This issue of values is central to what kind of economics, and what kind of world, we have. Consider that both capitalist and socialist economic theory failed to take into account the economic value of our life support systems. For both Adam Smith and Karl Marx, nature was there to be exploited, period.

As for the life-sustaining work of households—the “women's work” of caring for children, for people's health, for keeping a healthy home environment—for Smith and Marx, that was just “reproductive work,” not productive work. They were mainly interested in the market—Smith to extol it, Marx to excoriate it.

In reality, there is much more to economics than markets. To move forward and avoid all the social and environmental and financial problems stemming from the old economic paradigm, for starters, we need what I call a “full spectrum economic map.” This more realistic full spectrum economic map takes into account the life-sustaining economic sectors without which none of us would be here, without which there would be no economy, no workforce, nothing. It includes not just the market,

the government, and the illegal economic sectors but also households and the natural economy (without which there would be no economy—indeed none of us would be here) as well as the volunteer community economy.

Adding these additional three sectors (households, nature, and volunteers) is not only more realistic but, as I show in my book *The Real Wealth of Nations*, it is the basis for fundamental changes, including changes in how we measure economic health.

We are now measuring the wrong things. Consider GDP and GNP. These measures would actually be funny if the consequences weren't so serious. These measures of 'economic health' actually place activities that *harm* and take life (like making cigarettes, and the resultant medical bills and funeral bills from smoking) as part of productivity. In the same way, oil spills are great for GDP (the cleanup costs, the lawsuits, etc.), and so are the production of weapons and the medical and funeral costs from when they are used. All these add to GDP and GNP.

But not only do these conventional economic measures put negatives on the plus side; they give absolutely no economic value to the life-sustaining activities of the household economy and the natural economy (in poor countries often the fundamental and direct preconditions for survival). So an old stand of trees is only included in GDP when it's cut down, whereas the fact that we need trees to breathe and circulate our water is ignored. Similarly, the caring and caregiving work performed in households is given no value whatsoever, and economists speak of parents who do not hold outside jobs as "economically inactive," even though they often work from dawn to late at night.

Some people will say, "But we can't quantify the value of this work." The reality is that it not only can it be quantified, but it is being quantified. Thanks largely to the activism of women's organizations worldwide, many nations now have "satellite"

accounts that quantify the value of the work of caring for people and keeping healthy home environments. For instance, a Swiss government report shows that if the unpaid “caring” household work that has traditionally been considered “women’s work” were included, it would comprise 40% of the reported Swiss GDP! Other national reports show a contribution of 30-50%.

This is huge. Yet none of this information is found in conventional economic treatises, be they capitalist or socialist. So the issue is not a matter of metrics (though of course we need new metrics, and this is an area I am now working in and will touch on in closing); it’s a matter of values.

Economics is about what is valued. Classical economists will say this is a matter of supply and demand, and that is part of it, of course. But much more important are the underlying cultural values. The problem, and it’s a huge problem, is that present economic systems came out of times that still oriented much more to the Domination side of the P/D continuum.

To begin with, both capitalist and socialist theory came out of industrial times, and we are now moving to a post-industrial economy, so these theories are antiquated on that count alone. But much more important, as I noted earlier, is that they reflect and perpetuate the devaluation of the work of caring: for people, starting in early childhood, and for our natural environment. And this system of values is deeply entrenched in current economic thinking, policies, and practices.

Consider the fact that in the market economy, professions that do not involve caregiving (such as plumbing and engineering) are paid far more than those that do (like child care and elementary school teaching). So in the United States, people think nothing of paying plumbers, the people to whom we entrust our pipes, \$50 to

\$100 per hour. But child care workers, the people to whom we entrust our children, according to the U.S. Department of Labor, are paid an average of \$10 an hour, with no benefits. And we demand that plumbers have some training, but not that all child care workers have training.

This is not logical. It's pathological. But to understand, and change, this distorted system of values—and to effectively address seemingly intractable problems such as poverty and hunger—we again have to look at matters that are only visible once we recognize the configurations of the Partnership system and the Domination system. Once we do, we see that these irrational valuations reflect and perpetuate a gendered system of values that we inherited.

Many people, including politicians, think it's okay to have big government deficits to fund prisons, weapons, and wars—all stereotypically associated with men and masculinity in Domination systems. But when it comes to funding caring for people—for child care, health care, early childhood education, and other such “soft” expenditures—they say there's not enough money.

If we look back just a few hundred years, we see this devaluation of the feminine in stark relief. At that time, Western culture still looked like some of the most repressive societies do today. The norm was an authoritarian structure in both the family and the state. Wars and religious persecutions were chronic. Women and anything associated with them were so devalued that some theologians seriously doubted whether woman has an immortal soul.

Since then, there has obviously been movement toward the Partnership system, albeit against enormous resistance and periodic regressions. But the gendered system of valuations we inherited is still extremely resistant to change—so much so that when men embrace traits considered “soft” or “feminine” they are tarred with derisive terms such as “effeminate” and “sissy.” Anything stereotypically considered feminine

or soft, whether in a woman or man, is devalued. So men who are sensitive, caring, are despised as effeminate!

Another symptom of this devaluation of women and anything associated with them is that discrimination against the female half of humanity is still generally seen as “just a women’s issue,” to be addressed after more important problems are solved. I want to emphasize that we are not dealing with anything inherent in women or men, but with Dominator gender stereotypes; for example, many men are now doing fathering in the more hands-on, caregiving way once associated only with mothering. But so ingrained is this thinking in both our conscious and unconscious minds that many people are very uncomfortable talking about gender. So let’s put that on the table.

But let’s also recall what the great sociologist Luis Wirth observed: that the most important things about a society are those things that people don’t want to talk about. We saw that with race, and only when we started to talk more about it could we move forward. We’re now beginning to talk more about gender, and also moving forward—but much too slowly. Because this “women’s issue” is the elephant in the room. As long as women are subordinated and devalued, so will stereotypically feminine traits and activities such as caring, caregiving, and nonviolence be devalued—be it in women or men, in business or social policy.

Again, we must understand that this is not an issue of women against men or men against women, but a fundamental social and economic issue. Indeed, as I said, it’s the elephant in the room. It affects everything, including economics. It is hard to have caring policies—be it for people or nature—as long as caring and caregiving are systemically devalued.

Consider that we are told the “soft” or “feminine” is not economically efficient, when actually it’s very economically efficient, as I document thoroughly in *The Real*

Wealth of Nations. Here are two examples:

Hundreds of studies show the cost-effectiveness of supporting and rewarding caring in the market economy. To illustrate, companies that regularly appear on the *Working Mothers* or *Fortune 500* lists of the best companies to work for—that is, companies with good health care, child care, flex time, parental leave, and other caring policies—have a substantially higher return to investors.

The same is true of social policy. Indeed, investing in caring for people and nature is the most cost-effective investment a nation can make. As we move from the industrial to the post-industrial knowledge/information economy, economists never tire of telling us that the most important capital is what they call “high quality human capital.” Study after study shows that investing in children, in human capacity building, is essential—and this requires that we invest in caring work.

Good care for children will ensure that we have the flexible, innovative, and caring people needed for the post-industrial workforce. Both psychology and neuroscience show that development of these capacities largely hinges on the quality of care children receive.

Educating and remunerating people for caregiving will help close the “caring gap”—the worldwide lack of care for children, the elderly, and the sick and infirm. And it will eventually lead to a redefinition of “productivity” that gives visibility and value to what really makes us healthy and happy—and in the bargain, leads to economic prosperity and ecological sustainability.

There is movement in this direction, particularly in West European nations, especially Nordic nations such as Sweden, Norway, and Finland—nations that were able to move from extreme poverty (famines in the early 20th century) to societies with a generally

high standard of living for all. Today these nations not only rank high in the United Nations annual Human Development Reports in measures of quality of life; they are also in the top tiers of the World Economic Forum's annual Global Competitiveness reports.

These nations developed economic policies that combine positive elements of socialism and capitalism, but go beyond both, to an economics in which caring for people and nature is a top priority. They have government-supported child care, universal health care, stipends to help families care for children, elder care with dignity, and generous paid parental leave. These more caring policies, in turn, made for a healthy economy. Nordic countries don't have the huge gaps between haves and have-nots characteristic of Dominator-oriented nations. While they're not ideal societies, they have succeeded in providing a generally good living standard for all. They have low poverty and crime rates and high longevity rates. Their children score high on international tests. And studies show that workers in these nations are more satisfied and happier than people in countries like the United States where GNP is higher.

But this did not happen in a vacuum. These nations are the contemporary nations that have moved most closely to the Partnership side of the Partnership/Domination continuum. They have more equality in both the family and the state; concerted efforts to leave behind traditions of violence (they pioneered the first peace studies and the first laws prohibiting physical discipline of children in families, and have a strong men's movement to disentangle "masculinity" from its equation with Domination and violence); and, getting back to the elephant in the room, women have a much higher status (approximately 40 percent of their national legislators are female). As the status of women rises, men no longer find it such a threat to their status, to their "masculinity," to embrace more stereotypically feminine policies. So men too voted for more caring policies in these nations that sometimes call

themselves “caring societies.”

Nordic nations also pioneered environmentally sound industrial approaches such as the Swedish “Natural Step.” I just want to say again that what these nations show is that caring pays: it pays in human, environmental, and purely financial terms.

But to move to a more caring economics requires attention to the elephant in the room: the status of women. This is shown by empirical studies, although once again it is still ignored in conventional economic and social analyses.

The study “Women, Men, and the Global Quality of Life” conducted by the Center for Partnership Studies compared statistical measures on the status of women from 89 nations with measures of quality of life such as infant mortality, human rights ratings, and environmental ratings. We found that in significant respects the status of women can be a better predictor of quality of life than Gross Domestic Product (GDP).

Other studies, such as the World Values Surveys, also verify the relationship between the status of women and solving chronic problems such as poverty and hunger. There are many reasons for this. One, of course, is that women are half of humanity. But the reasons go much deeper, to the still largely unrecognized and undiscussed dynamics of Domination systems.

Consider, for example, that women represent 70% of those in our world who live in absolute poverty, which means starvation or near starvation. This is by no means to say that only women suffer economically from our Domination heritage. Men also suffer, and this is particularly true of the men at the bottom of the Domination pyramid. But women as a group earn much less than men in the market economy. And while women are responsible for most of the work of caring in families, including child care, health and elder care, housekeeping, cooking, collecting firewood,

drawing and carrying water, and subsistence farming, this work is not remunerated.

All this means that poverty is not intractable if we pay attention to the elephant in the room. And it also means that we can't avoid much of our world's misery, including further environmental disasters, unless we move to a caring economics in which the work of caring for people and nature is no longer so invisible and devalued.

I want to close now, as I promised, with two short, practical proposals. First, regarding global warming.

The richer nations, which have contributed so much more to global warming, also need to contribute more to mitigation and amelioration, to help poorer nations in Africa, Southeast Asia, Latin America, and the island states, where predictions are that the catastrophes will be most severe. But, and this is essential, we must ensure that these moneys really protect the most vulnerable: women, children, the elderly.

Here again we have studies we must pay attention to—for instance, studies showing that women are 14 times more likely to be fatalities in natural disasters. One heartrending study of what happened during a flash flood in a Southeast Asian nation shows that 90 % of the casualties were female. This was not only because women were not taught to swim, as it was not part of their accepted role to be independent; a major factor was that in these cultures, women are so rigidly dominated that they were not permitted to leave their homes without a male family member. This norm was so embedded in their minds that they stayed, and they drowned. This was not necessary—and it is inhuman not only to women but to children, since children are so dependent on women.

On the other hand, studies show that when women are involved in disaster response planning and training, there are far fewer casualties, not only of women but of

children and the elderly. One study showed there were no casualties when women engaged in disaster response preparedness.

So women must be equal partners, and women must take leadership in working with enlightened men. And we must use the UN, especially now its gender architecture mainstreaming program, to ensure this equal partnership, not only for global warming but for all areas of policy.

This takes me to my second specific proposal, a strategy I am working on with a wonderful group of people for long-term fundamental changes in economic thinking and policies. This is the Real Wealth of Nations public policy initiative, which proposes a strategy to help build foundations for a caring economics.

Many nations already have requirements for economic and environmental impact statements for evaluating proposed legislation and other policies. The Real Wealth of Nations Initiative proposes statements measuring the effect of any program or legislation on our real wealth: people's health, education, equality, democracy, human capacity development, and other quality of life indicators.

This initiative will help shift funding priorities by providing sample metrics and other foundations for policy makers to direct appropriate agencies to further develop and publicize metrics to advance sound priorities. You can find out more about it by going to <http://caringeconomy.org/implications-for-policy/> where you can download new metrics and other documents. I invite you to help bring this information into the United Nations as a means of moving our world's policies in a healthier more realistic direction.

I want to close with a challenge. You are in unique position to make a difference at a

time when we urgently need real change. Returning to the old normal is not an option, not in terms of global warming or any of our unprecedented challenges. We must create a new normal: more humane, sustainable norms. This is our job, and it will only happen as more and more of us become involved.

I invite you to join me in helping to accelerate the shift from Domination to Partnership worldwide. We can each play a part in this shift, if only by changing the conversation from capitalism vs. socialism to caring economics (you can find out about training for Community Presenters at www.centerforpartnership.org).

We must work for systemic change. And, as I have illustrated, we can't succeed unless we understand, and help others understand, the systemic importance of gender roles and relations: of the elephant in room. These so-called gender issues are a kind of glue that holds together either Partnership or Dominations systems.

This essential cultural transformation is an enterprise in which women have to take leadership, working with enlightened men. Together we can lay foundations for a future in which all children can realize their enormous human potentials—that better future we all so want and need. Let's do it—for ourselves, for our children, and for generations to come. I thank you.

Riane Eisler, JD, PhD (hon), is a social scientist, attorney, author, and social activist best known for the international bestseller *The Chalice and The Blade: Our History, Our Future*. Her book *The Real Wealth of Nations: Creating a Caring Economics* has been hailed by Archbishop Desmond Tutu as “a template for the better world we have been so urgently seeking,” by Peter Senge as “desperately needed,” and by Jane Goodall as “a call for action.” Dr. Eisler is president of the Center for Partnership Studies (www.centerforpartnership.org) and co-founder of the Spiritual Alliance to Stop Intimate Violence (www.saiv.net). She taught at UCLA, and now teaches online at the University of Alabama and

the Center for Partnership Studies, keynotes conferences worldwide, and is a consultant to business and government on applications of the partnership model introduced in her work. She has been a powerful advocate for the human rights of women and children, a tireless worker for social and economic equity, has received many honors nationally and internationally, and is included in the award-winning book *Great Peacemakers* as one of 20 leaders for world peace, along with Mahatma Gandhi, Mother Teresa, and Martin Luther King Jr.

Correspondence about this article should be directed to Riane Eisler at center@partnershipway.org/ Her website is www.rianeeisler.com