

# Orange Capitalism – and then what?

## A review of two books on the future of economy and society

Dawlabani, Said. (2013). *Memnomics – the next generation economic system*. NY: SelectBooks, Inc.

and

Scharmer, Otto and Kaufer, Katrin. (2013). *Leading from the Emerging Future: From Ego-System to Eco-System Economies*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.

### Reviewed by Kristian Stålné<sup>1</sup>

What caused the 2008 financial meltdown and where is capitalism heading after that? Or maybe we should rather ask where we as global society as a whole are heading, since economy is such a fundamental part of our lives and societies. This complex topic has been widely discussed with many analyses and speculations on the nature and development of economy and money. But what would economic development look like through an integral or developmental lens? I have found two such analyses of interest that seem to qualify and that are mostly compliant yet complementary with each other, but still very different in style and focus.

The first one is *Memnomics – the next generation economic system*, by Said Dawlabani (2013) who employs Clare Graves' double helix or Spiral Dynamics model as a developmental framework (Beck and Cowan, 2006), and the second one is *Leading from the Emerging Future: From Ego-System to Eco-System Economies* by Otto Scharmer and Katrin Kaufer (2013) that introduces an own developmental framework for socio-economic development. One of my research foci is on stage theories in adult development psychology that typically takes the individual, and to some degree the culture, as a study object, but I also have an interest in connecting adult development and integral perspectives with sustainability and societal development. Therefore my main interest in these books is whether and how they make this connection. Do they give a view on the stages on socio-economic development that are consistent with each other? How do they view the current and prevalent structures and state of affairs? Is there a problem and if so, what comes next and how do we make the transition?

---

<sup>1</sup> **Kristian Stålné** holds a PhD in structural mechanics from Lund University and is recognised as an Excellent Teaching Practitioner for integrating adult development perspectives in pedagogic theory and practice. He is a co-founder of ESRAD, the European Society for Research in Adult Development, organiser of its first meeting and part of a Swedish network of researchers that teach and apply adult development theories in various contexts. Kristian is affiliated with Malmö University, Sweden, where he teaches building engineering subjects such as structural mechanics and acoustics. He is also involved in a trans-disciplinary research project on holistic and meta-theoretical perspectives on energy saving, indoor health and sustainability in the building sector, funded by the Swedish Energy Agency. [kristian.stalne@mah.se](mailto:kristian.stalne@mah.se)



I will start by giving an overview on Dawlabani's analysis on the economic development and view on the financial crisis, and then compare and contrast with Sharmer's and Kaufer's perspective on the same. As said, my main focus is on the developmental frameworks they employ and how these can help us understand the grand challenges we are facing and some of the limitations of the current capitalist economic system. With help mainly from the second book I will map out some of these challenges and proposed ways of addressing them. Sustainability is of central concern in these and I will also relate the proposed developmental frameworks with other frameworks used in mainstream discussions along with some own suggestions for further studies on this vast topic. Finally, I will refer to a brief description of what a Turquoise economy would look like, according to Spiral Dynamics and Dawlabani.

## Mememomics – Spiral Dynamics Applied to Economic Development

Dawlabani's book takes the Spiral Dynamics model as a framework for analysing the economic system. Spiral Dynamics maps out eight value systems or vMememes, where each of them has as its purpose to solve the problems of existence that it perceives. By doing so it creates a new set of problems that will trigger the emergence of and will be addressed by the next value system. The rise and fall of each value system is described in terms of six phases: Inquiry, Introduction, Growth, Maturity, Decline and Entropy, although the vMeme will still be present as the next higher stage emerges. The values systems, or vMememes, are commonly referred to by colors and here very briefly introduce along with approximate time when they first emerged in human history (Beck and Cowan, 2006):

*Beige* (100 000 BC), focusing on physiological survival needs in the dawn of humanity;  
*Purple* (50 000 BC), associates with magical thinking in hunter gatherer tribes;  
*Red* (7000 BC), affirming own needs and will to exploit and dominate others;  
*Blue* (3000 BC), traditionalistic absolutism and self-sacrificing obedience;  
*Orange* (1000 AD), modernistic and industrial with rationality and scientific objectivity;  
*Green* (1850 AD), postmodern with pluralism, multiculturalism and human connection;  
*Yellow* (1950 AD), a functional integration of the previous levels' healthy aspects;  
*Turquoise* (1970 AD), identifies with the world as a holistic organism.

According to the Spiral Dynamics lens, the economic system can be seen as a consequence of our worldviews and our value systems, which in turn is a function of *life conditions*, and vice versa. Thus, the way the economy functions is a fundamental part of how we organize our societies. Another characteristic is that one level transcends and includes the previous one and that levels cannot be skipped, or rather *should not* be. This means that one should not try to impose a more complex economic system, or governance, on a culture than what is consistent with the life conditions and vMeme distribution of that culture.

The book focuses on the economic aspects of cultural development up to today's capitalism and market liberalism, followed by a detailed description of the development of the US economy leading up to the financial meltdown of 2008 and finally a discussion on a solution and next step economic system referred to as *functional capitalism*.

The first part gives the economic historic background according to the Spiral dynamics, beyond the first Beige value system or vMeme:

*Purple – the gift economy of the hunter gatherers*

The earliest form of economic activity took place in the form of bartering or gifting, which was an important if not necessary means of creating a peaceful existence between different tribes instead of pillaging and waging war against each other. The goods that were traded were food (from hunting and gathering as well as grain from early agriculture), artifacts, jewelry and precious metals.

*Red – the first civilizations and the emperor's coin*

As civilizations were born and grew to be complex and stratified, organized economic systems were created that allowed for exchange of goods and labor within the empire. The emperor would create money in the form of coins made of gold or another metal accompanied by laws to force the subjects to accept them as means of payment. We could refer to this as concrete money since they had an inherent value in the metal itself.

*Blue – nation states and national banks*

Along with the birth of nation states, national banks and industrialization, the use of banknotes or paper money backed by gold became wide spread (although banknotes first were used in periods in China already one millennium before). Despite some initial bank runs, when people lose their confidence in the banknotes and want to trade it back for gold, this new and more complex abstract form of money was established in society (the complexity aspect is not discussed in Dawlabani's analysis). With a stable currency that everyone trusted the new industrialized economy could flourish. Hallmarks of the Blue value system are trust, order, justice and stability, which are required preconditions for a functioning economy where you exchange goods, wages, and you can borrow and repay money, which paved the way for capitalism. This economic system was a huge step forward for society, but still one that showed several limitations, e.g. that the wealth of a state was dependent on the size of its gold reserve.

*Orange – market economy and capitalism*

Gradually the western mindsets and economies shifted towards an Orange mode of thinking, meaning more individualistic, with less centrally controlled and regulated economies, and positivistic towards scientific and technological progress, and towards economic growth. In the USA in 1971 the currency was shifted away from the Bretton-Woods framework, thus releasing the dollar from its connection to the gold standard and making it a fiat currency, i.e. one where the government guarantees its value. The mindset was to a great deal captured by Ayn Rand's objectivism, where man is (or should be) driven by reason and self-interest, and where the economic system in greatest extent should be removed from its constraints. In the beginning of the 80's the Reagan administration started a long-going trend of deregulation towards a laissez-faire market economy where all trust was placed in Adam Smith's invisible hand. This means that the individual's self-interest is assumed to be good for the system as a whole, a trend that was continued by the head of Federal Reserve and Rand-disciple Alan Greenspan.

One reflection I make here is that the economic system seems to be lagging after the philosophical, scientific and technological revolutions. According to Dawlabani the Orange economic system starts to dominate first in late 20<sup>th</sup> century, several centuries after the industrial revolution and enlightenment, which is typically associated as being Orange in integral settings. Still, this may be accurate since also value systems dominating in a population do lag behind this way, and that the economic system should be at least somewhat aligned with this.

The period from the 80's to 2008 can be characterized as a gradual shift away from the Blue regulatory, stable and industry and work output-related Main street economy to an Orange, market-driven, growth-oriented and speculative Wall street economy. Here the brightest minds of the country were busy, not curing cancer or inventing new clean energy sources, but creating innovative financial instruments that had less and less to do with the real economy of Main street, i.e. with creating jobs and relating to the real value of e.g. houses. One of the above mentioned deregulation was the abolition of the Glass-Steagall Act that made it possible for commercial banks insured by the taxpayers to take part in risky speculations. When the housing bubble burst in 2008 it threatened to make the entire economic system collapse, which was avoided by the great bailout of the banks by the new Obama administration. But since then no real revolution or transition to a new system has been seen.

*Green – equal distribution and democratization of information*

So what is Dawlabani proposing as a solution and way forward for the American economy after this Orange collapse? Perhaps an economic system based on the Green 6<sup>th</sup> level value system?! Well, not really. The characteristics of the Green value system are introduced quite briefly in accordance with two themes:

*Human bond and equal distributions*, which is obviously about the unequal wealth distribution and the 99 percent that has been frequently discussed after the financial crisis. The theme is not very elaborated and is dismissed by Dawlabani rather sweepingly:

The European Union is a good example of a system that champions Green economic policies as evidenced by their bloated social welfare programs. Green vMeme corporate practices have helped bring equality in pay to the worker, but that same system has taxed those corporations at such a high rate that innovation is often stifled. This system can unfairly burden a whole culture and bring it to the brink of financial disaster. (Dawlabani, 2013, p. 61)

*The democratization of information*, the second theme, is given considerably more attention and contains an interesting discussion on how the internet of things and the non-scarce nature of information have connected us globally and given us access to free information and paved way to open source collaborations. This has had consequences for the economy, e.g. in the media industry, where newspapers and magazines have gone out of business, peer-2-peer sharing of media, new business models such as crowdfunding have emerged and even gift based models (which could possibly be seen as purple mode economics).

Still, there is no consistent and functioning Green vMeme economic system described or discussed here. Shouldn't the Green economic system, whatever that is, have its cycle with all its

phases? Shouldn't stages *not* be skipped?! Instead of elaborating on a green system as a solution to the orange problems, Dawlabani moves on and proposes a Yellow system, which he refers to as *Functional Capitalism*.

### *Yellow – functional capitalism*

This value system is often characterized as being a synthesis of the healthy versions of all previous value systems, such as Orange emphasis of progression and applying scientific advances, Green concern for fair distribution and the environment, and Blue order and stability and so forth. Here one strives to integrate all perspectives rather than to see them as being in conflict with each other.

No such system exists yet on a national level. However, Dawlabani gives some concepts or design principles such as *Natural Design*, a Yellow concept based on insights from previous value systems adapted to the life conditions at hand, and *Distributed Innovation*, an application of *Natural Design* in the knowledge economy, that are practiced by the two companies Whole foods and Google that can serve as inspiration and example of economy at the Yellow level. The notion of *Conscious Capitalism*, as stated by Whole foods' CEO John Mackey, is described as integrating healthy aspects of Orange and Green values after an elaborate version of the triple bottom line: People, passion, purpose, profit and planet. And fueled with renewable energy. Dawlabani also discusses key politicians, economists and media personalities that are at that level in order to support the transition from Orange to Yellow.

Concluding, the struggle between the Blue and Orange value systems in the American economy I see as the most detailed and initiated part of Dawlabani's analysis. The previous two value systems, Purple and Red, are only briefly discussed and serves as a historic background, it would be great to have that more elaborated and related to other sources than the Spiral Dynamics framework itself. The Green value system, however, is in my view oversimplified. In order to integrate values at a higher level, the lower ones need to be accurately understood and described. And the key to do that, I believe, is to acquire a deeper understanding of the *life conditions* and problems that are associated with the Green value system and created by the Orange systems. Here I find the second book more elaborate.

## **Leading from the Emerging Future: From Ego-System to Eco-System Economies**

In order to get more attuned with the challenges we face on a global level and beyond the economic system I find Otto Scharmer's and Katrin Kaufer's book *Leading from the Emerging Future: From Ego-System to Eco-System Economies* closer to reality, to the current challenges and the limitations of the current capitalist economy. The book comes out with a flying start:

Finance. Food. Fuel. Water shortages. Resource scarcity. Climate chaos. Mass poverty. Mass migration. Fundamentalism. Terrorism. Financial oligarchies. We have entered an age of disruption. Yet the possibility of profound personal, societal, and global renewal has never been more real. Now is our time. (Scharmer and Kaufer, 2013, p. 1)

Scharmer and Kaufer are both economists and have their main focus in the lower right quadrant in AQAL terms, i.e. on systems, institutions and on global problems. They take a wide scope and list eight structural disconnects relating to nature, labor, capital, technology, leadership, consumption, coordination and ownership, which need to be addressed. But they argue that the disconnects and the challenges can be seen as symptoms of three major fault lines or divides on a psychological and cultural level; in our relationships with ourselves, in our relationships with each other, and finally in our relationships with nature and our planet.

## The Developmental Framework of Scharmer and Kaufer

As Dawlabani, and this can also be seen as an integral theme, Scharmer and Kaufer present an evolutionary economic framework, a stage theory for socio-economic development. This has much resemblance with the Spiral dynamics framework, although it seems not to be related to psychological development according to the field of adult development. The stages are, however, associated to a certain mindset or core belief and mode of technology. They refer to the stages as Economy 0.0, 1.0, 2.0, 3.0 and 4.0 that seem to be in good correspondence with the Purple, (Red)/Blue, Orange, Green and the Yellow value systems, respectively, as briefly follows up to 3.0:

*Society 0.0* is referred to as pre-agrarian, which seems to correspond to the purple value system in Spiral Dynamics where man is embedded in “mother nature”. The corresponding mindset is premodern awareness, typical of indigenous tribes.

*Society 1.0* is seen as state-driven society with stability as its main focus. The description of the logic corresponds to the blue value system (the previous red value system seems to have no correspondence in Scharmer’s and Kaufer’s framework, or could be included in this 1.0 stage). This stage corresponds to a traditional awareness.

*Society 2.0* is associated with the industrial revolution, the rise of business with competition on a de-regulated free market (*laissez-fair*) and mass-consumerism. The main challenge of the system is growth, clearly corresponding to Orange in Spiral Dynamics terms. Scharmer and Kaufer refer to this mindset as ego-centric awareness, which gives a hint that they see this as a non-desirable stage in itself, being main responsible for the above mentioned crises.

*Society 3.0*, or stakeholder-capitalism, is described as dealing fundamentally with negative externalities of the previous stage, such as poverty, exploitation of low-income workers and the environment. Examples are European style regulated social-market economy. Technological advancement is characterized by the second industrial revolution with oil, combustion engine and chemicals. The 3.0 mindset extends from the 2.0 self-interest to a stakeholder-centric awareness and the main logic of this society can be seen as being a reaction towards the previous 2.0 and dealing with its limitations:

Measures to correct the problems of Society 2.0 include the introduction of labor rights, social security legislation, environmental protection, protectionist measures for farmers, and federal reserve banks that protect the national currency, all of which are designed to do the same thing: limit the unfettered market mechanism in areas where the negative externalities are dysfunctional and unacceptable. [...] Stakeholder capitalism, or Society

3.0, as practiced in many countries, deals relatively well with the classical externalities through wealth redistribution, social security, environmental regulation, farm subsidies, and development aid. (Scharmer and Kaufer, 2013, p. 54)

Before going into the limitations of society 3.0 and moving on to the next stage, I will take a closer look at the most central problems that this stage is trying to address. It will be addressed in more detail due to its central importance to the question on the limits of the current economic system and of capitalism, and on possible ways forward.

## **The Challenges of the 3.0 Society or the Postmodern World**

In Dawlabani's analysis the Green value system is only elaborated on with respect to one theme, the knowledge economy, but gives only brief attention to the second theme that I think is of greater importance here: the distributional or social aspects. A third theme, perhaps of even more importance and also not more than briefly mentioned by Dawlabani, is the environmental concern and focus on sustainability. Both these themes can be described in terms of being in conflict with the modern Orange value system and with its most fundamental premises of economic growth. Here follows a description of the two latter themes and challenges according to Scharmer and Kaufer, but also with some other sources that I find useful and illustrative.

### **Sustainability**

Beginning with the aspect or theme of environmentalism or sustainability, the perhaps most fundamental premise of an Orange economy is that it should grow and the most obvious critique from an environmental or sustainability perspective is that there are limits to growth on a finite planet (Meadows, Meadows, Randers, Behrens III, 1972). In terms of ecological footprint we currently overshoot the planet's carrying capacity with 50 percent. This shift in perspective is sometimes referred to as going from an empty world to a full world (Costanza et al., 1997), where an Orange view of the world is one of abundance but Green views it as limited with a scarcity or recourse and a limited ability of the planet to absorb waste.

A common critique of the current market economy is that it fails to take into account externalizations, meaning that the environmental impact is not included in the price of a commodity such as an airline ticket that doesn't include the cost of the CO2 being emitted or the many ecosystem services that we take for granted. An ecosystem service is something that nature produces that is of value to us, such as fresh water, soil, the air we breathe or bees pollinating our plants. A response according to the Orange value system is to assign an economic value to these ecosystem services, which would also allow the economy to continue to grow since more things of value are added to the economy. Giving the ecosystem and its services a value would mean that they can be taken into considerations when we make decisions on whether we should exploit such a resource.

This commodification of nature and attempt to subordinate nature into the economy, which can be seen as an Orange or Society 2.0 logic, gets heavily criticized from many environmental activists and proponents, one such I find in George Monbiot (2014). Monbiot argues that giving things an economic value also means that it will be treated as any other exchangeable commodity

instead of a necessity for our survival. It can also be argued that we reinforce the view of nature as instrumental, i.e. as something that is there for the sole purpose of being exploited by us. It is meaningful to talk about financial capital and natural capital, but they should be seen as non-commensurable – you can't eat money.

Other examples of insufficiencies in the 2.0 mode of business to adapt to life conditions of a full world are manufacturing and material flows. This was succinctly summarized by Robin Wood in his keynote speech at the IEC 2014:

Linear economy: We dig holes on one side of the planet, we extract resources, we pump them through supply chains, then we go to the other side of the planet and in two years we deposit 98% of these precious resources in another hole. (Wood, 2014)

A typical 3.0 response to this this linear economy is to regulate and reduce the material use. Another alternative to the linear economy, a circular one, will be discussed in the description of Society 4.0.

Another aspect of sustainability of interest is energy, and using renewable energy is something almost everyone pays lip service to, but a transition from a society currently where roughly 85 percent of the global energy consumption comes from fossil fuels may be harder than one first could expect (Heinberg, 2009). In his *Crash Course* Chris Martenson (2014) emphasizes the close connection between increased energy consumption and economic growth, and where global oil extraction during the 00s has been at a constant level. Kjell Aleklett, president of ASPO, Association for the Study of Peak Oil and Gas, argues that the spike in oil prices in 2008 was a trigger to the financial crisis (Aleklett, 2012). In terms of energy we are possibly not only approaching a full world but one that is shrinking.

## Fair Distribution Between and Within Cultures

After these examples of how the Orange system fails to address sustainability challenges and the planet's limits to growth, let's turn our attention to the distributional or social aspects of the economy. With Scharmer's and Kaufer's global outreach they give emphasis to what they refer to as the socio-economic divide. An obvious illustration is that the richest 1 percent own 40 percent of the world's wealth, even 48 percent according to more recent data (Oxfam, 2015), while half of the world's population own just 1 percent. Often it is described that capitalism and globalism implies that the wealthy world externalizes its real costs to the poor. Starvation is not a sign of lack of food, but rather of poor distribution.

Other arguments of the benefits of striving towards a more equal distribution, but within cultures, are found in *The Spirit Level* by Richard Wilkinson and Kate Pickett (2009) who investigate the relation between GDP and other variables that they argue are of more relevance, such as life expectancy, health and happiness. They all increase with increasing GDP up to a certain point when the relation gets weaker and the curve levels out. In the industrial world, dominated by the Orange value system and above, economic equality then becomes a better predictor of these indicators of a good life.



For these problems capitalism and market liberalism appear not to be positive forces. Rather, they produce larger gaps Scharmer and Kaufer argue with support from studies made by the International Labour Organization in 2008. This is also in line with the arguments made last year by Thomas Piketty in the widely debated *Capital in the Twenty-First Century* (2014), where he discusses the inequalities in income and wealth that has increased after 1975, refuting the claimed effect of the Reagan era's "trickle-down economics" with deregulations and tax-breaks for the already wealthy. Capitalism is great at producing new wealth but not at distributing it, Piketty argues as he proposes a global wealth tax to counteract this.

A way of dealing with the material and economic inequalities and a system where profit has become more important than creating jobs, basic income has been discussed in greater extent, although it being an old concept. And the concept of a sharing is not limited to information and knowledge, a *sharing economy* with couch surfing, sharing of tools, car rides and different services have been discussed and practiced more, not least due to the new possibilities of connecting on the web.

In conclusion, Scharmer and Kaufer show that the 3.0 economy of the Green value system is much about opposing and transcending the limitations of the Orange 2.0 market economy. It does so by problematizing economic growth as an intrinsic goal in itself and by stating that the economy should be of limited and subordinate nature instead of the opposite. And that it should also act as a means towards satisfying social needs and increasing economic equality.

Still, Scharmer and Kaufer do not consider it to be enough to deal with the current crises: "There are three essential limitations of Society 3.0: It is biased in favor of special-interest groups, it reacts mostly to negative externalities, and it has only a limited capacity for intentionally creating positive externalities" (Scharmer and Kaufer, 2013, p. 54). They dismiss what some argue, to go back to a 2.0 society, 1.0 or even 0.0 state of economy, and proposes a way forward, to a 4.0 society. But what would that look like and how would we reach it?

## Society 4.0

*Society 4.0*, is characterized by co-creation and as being human- and life-centric. Money and the economy should serve the real economy and the well-being of all, and to be means to positive social change. Technological development, and more specifically the third industrial revolution (with renewable energy and information technology), is seen as a prerequisite to the 4.0 society. However, just as the economy, the information technology should be seen as being human-centric, i.e. means toward human well-being, growth and social creativity.

Where 3.0 can be seen as a reaction towards the problems of the previous stage and dealing with them separately, 4.0 offers a systems view and shift in perspective where the described problems are seen as symptoms of the divides described the introduction of the book. The shift in perspective is from problems to the underlying causes, to the system and inwards to ourselves. Thus, they argue that the challenges need to be addressed first on a personal/spiritual level, then on a relational and finally on an institutional level by creating social and cultural movements. When they go into the psychological processes necessary for change to take place they refer to *Theory U*, described in previous work by Scharmer (2009).

Scharmer and Kaufer gives several examples of how different interests are needed to be addressed and to work together instead of competing, for instance by addressing poverty and environmental issues at the same time. Here is a characterization of the 4.0 stage:

In the emerging 4.0 stage of our economy, the natural self-interest of the players extends to a shared awareness of the eco-system. Eco-system awareness is an internalization of the views and concerns of other stakeholders in one's system. It requires people to develop the capacity to perceive problems from the perspective of others. The result is decisions and outcomes that benefit the whole system, not just a part of it. (Scharmer and Kaufer, 2013, p. 56)

When it comes to material flow, the natural response to the limitations of a linear economy is a circular one, where material flows are kept in closed loops, either in a natural cycle and totally degradable or in technical cycles where they can be processed and reused. This is referred to as the Cradle to cradle design principle by Michael Braungart and William McDonough (2009) or as circular economy, and is taken as an example by Scharmer and Kaufer as a way forward.

In conclusion, I think the strength in Scharmer's and Kaufer's book lies in its rich description on cases and way of overviewing the current challenges and limitation of our current system. They don't back down from the big challenges. The book has as its main broad focus the socio-economic issues of the lower right quadrant in AQAL terms, but aims for making the connection to the other quadrants in its emphasis on taking action (upper right quadrant), in organizing and doing it together as a culture (lower left), and on the personal, psychological and spiritual aspect (upper left), and that these aspects are interdependent: "The matrix suggests that the evolution of economic structures follows the evolution of human consciousness – or, to be more precise, that they are highly interdependent" (Scharmer and Kaufer, 2013, p. 239). However, the book does not refer to any theory from the field of adult development or integral theory in further elaborating on what they mean by evolution of consciousness, a connection that needs to be further addressed. One first step is to relate it to and compare it with Spiral Dynamics, which will be done in the following section.

## **A Comparison between the two Developmental Frameworks and with other Perspectives**

Generally speaking, the two frameworks show a significant consistency in their description, but there are some differences in how they interpret and order historic and economic events. It may sound like an academic detail, but how things are ordered can have an effect on and be seen as a reflection of one's view on e.g. the financial crisis. Dawlabani sees the development of the US economic system in the last decades as in transition from blue to orange while Scharmer and Kaufer argues that it has moved from 2.0 (orange) towards 3.0 already after the great depression in the 1930's and then *regressing* during the Reagan years. "In the 1980's the neoliberal Reagan-Thatcher revolution began to move the country backward from 3.0 to 2.5, so to speak, by reshaping the institutional design in favor of deregulation, privatization, and tax reduction, particularly for the rich and super-rich" (Scharmer and Kaufer, 2013, p 58). Thus, their view of the current market oriented system as being a result of a regression is more problematizing than

Dawlabani's as they refer to 2.0 as an ego-system economy (although Ayn Rand herself would probably be ok with such a characterization).

Another inconsistency is that Dawlabani views the information revolution as belonging to the Green value system while Scharmer and Kaufer sees it as corresponding to Society 4.0 (the reverse relation holds to Google as a company that Dawlabani considers to be Yellow while Scharmer and Kaufer sees it as 3.0).

The examples above can be seen as illustrations of the difficulties of classifying different systems, economies, companies or design principles, at being at different stages. The Spiral Dynamics framework was firstly based on the study of individuals' values but is mostly employed in studying cultures. And Scharmer's and Kaufer's framework is not that stringently defined. Trying to classify concepts and systems, which can be seen as artefacts from a culture's certain value system, is all but simple and straightforward.

Scharmer and Kaufer offers, in contrast to Dawlabani, several case studies where they employ their framework in different cultural settings in addition to USA, such as Europe, Africa, China, Indonesia, India and Russia. Although it would be interesting to hear if Dawlabani or other proponents of Spiral Dynamics would agree with those descriptions, such as the interpretation that China can be seen as a 3.0 society and even on a path towards 4.0. Scharmer and Kaufer are also broader in their scope and see the economic system as very limited part of our society. Dawlabani's book seems to be more detailed and accurate regarding the description of what lead to the financial crisis, but I find Scharmer's and Kaufer's description of the grand challenges we face and the path forward as more useful.

I would also like to make a further connection between the developmental frameworks presented by Dawlabani and Scharmer and Kaufer, and a framework for sustainability that is more commonly referred to in mainstream discussions. Given these challenges and issues, an economy according to Society 4.0, or the Yellow value system, could be described as a synthesis and coordination of different spheres or dimensions, the most important being the economic, the social and the ecological. The most obvious framework to do so has been around since the 80s, the Brundtland commission's definition of sustainability (1987), where the economic, the social and the ecologic dimensions are taken into consideration and coordinated so that the needs of present generations are met without jeopardizing the needs of future generations. How this coordination is performed has long been discussed, in terms of whether they should be seen as three pillars (weak sustainability) or nested with the economic dimension subordinated the social dimension which in turn is subordinated the ecological (strong sustainability).

A few of my own suggestions on what could be regarded as Yellow economic systems are Tim Jackson's description of *Prosperity without Growth* (2009), where he proposes a route towards a sustainable economy. In academia the transdisciplinary subject of Ecological Economy (Costanza et al, 2007) has grown rapidly in interest, where it is argued, or rather demonstrated, how the economy needs to be subordinated to the ecological dimensions and to a full world of resource scarcity. Another good and balanced orientation and broad view on sustainability is also offered in *Garden Earth – From Hunter and Gatherers to Global Capitalism and Thereafter* by Gunnar Rundgren (2012).

Concluding, I find both books worthwhile reading and would recommend them to everyone who are interested in the future of economy. Although they differ in some details, I see them as consistent to each other and complementary, and they can aid for example those who want to broaden their interest from adult development or integral theory to a focus on the development of our societies and economic systems. They represent important steps towards a truly integral perspective on sustainability and the future of capitalism and our economic systems.

## What about a Turquoise Economy?

Finally, a few words on what would be regarded as a Turquoise economy according to Spiral dynamics. Scharmer and Kaufer haven't proposed any society 5.0, but Dawlabani's gives some brief characteristics of what this might look like:

When all the stakeholders identified in it are treated as *holistically interdependent*, a whole different set of values that is far more conscious begins to rise. Suddenly every stakeholder is meshed into an interwoven web that regards the planet as one ecosystem. This is the singular organism that all stakeholders plug onto to insure its long-term health. (Dawlabani, 2013, p. 257)

An underlying assumption in the definition of the Brundtland commission, as well as the basis for most discussions on sustainability in general and economy in particular, is that they are anthropocentric. Possibly, a Turquoise view would rather be based on a view on nature and the biosphere not as something out there for our purpose or something to take care of and to save, but as something we are.

## References

- Aleklett, K. (2012). *Peeking at Peak oil*. NY: Springer Verlag.
- Beck, D. E., & Cowan, C. C. (2006). *Spiral dynamics: Mastering values, leadership and change*. Malden, MA: Blackwell
- Michael Braungart and William McDonough (2009). *Cradle to cradle – Remaking the way we make things*. London: Vintage books.
- Brundtland Report (1987). *Our Common Future/Brundtland report (A/42/427)*. Geneva: World Commission on Environment and Development.
- Costanza, R., d'Arge, R., de Groot, R., Faber, S., Grasso, M., Hannon, B., Limburg, K., Naeem, S., O'Neill, R., Paruelo, J., Raskin, R., Sutton, P. and van den Belt, M. (1997). The value of the world's ecosystems services and natural capital. *Nature*, 387: 253–260.
- Costanza, R., Norgaard, R., Daly, H., Goodland, R., & Cumberland, J. (2007). *An Introduction to Ecological Economics* (e-book). Retrieved 2015-01-15 from <http://www.eoearth.org/view/article/150045>
- Dawlabani, S. E. (2013). *Mememomics – the next generation economic system*. NY: SelectBooks, Inc.
- Heinberg, R. (2009). *Searching for a miracle: “Net Energy” Limits & the Fate of Industrial Society*. Post Carbon Institute and International Forum on Globalization.
- Jackson, T. (2009). *Prosperity without growth? The transition to a sustainable economy*. Report for the Sustainable development commission, UK.

- Martenson, C. (2014). The Crash Course. Youtube lecture series, retrieved 2014-04-24 at <http://www.peakprosperity.com/crashcourse>
- Meadows, D. H., Meadows, D. L., Randers, J., Behrens III, W. W. (1972). *The limits to growth – a report for the club of Rome’s project on the predicament of mankind*. NY: Universe books.
- Monbiot, G. (2014). The pricing of everything. *SPERI annual lecture, hosted by the Sheffield Political Economy Research Institute*. Retrieved 2015-01-15 from <http://www.theguardian.com/environment/georgemonbiot/2014/jul/24/price-nature-neoliberal-capital-road-ruin>
- Oxfam (2015) *Wealth: Having it all and wanting more*. UK: Oxfam international.
- Piketty, T. (2014). *Capital in the Twenty-First Century*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge.
- Rundgren, G. (2012) *Garden Earth – From Hunter and Gatherers to Global Capitalism and Thereafter*. Regeneration.
- Scharmer, C. O. (2009). *Theory U: Leading from the Future as it Emerges*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.
- Scharmer C. O, Kaufer, K (2013). *Leading from the Emerging Future: From Ego-System to Eco-System Economies*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.. Kindle Edition.
- Wilkinson, R. and Pickett, K. (2009) *The Spirit Level: Why Equality Is Better for Everyone*. New York: Penguin.
- Wood, R. L. (2014). How can we build a thriveable future for humanity with the integral approach? *Keynote speech at the Integral European Conference, Budapest 2014*.
- World Commission on Environment and Development (1987). *Our common future*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.