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ABSTRACT  In this article, I refer to Eduardo Galeano’s challenge to exercise the right to dream and call on anthropologists to couple their knowledge with fearless imagination to work on behalf of a livable future that has yet to come. Galeano’s primer for the “looking-glass world” in his book *Upside Down* resonates with anthropological understanding of the historical role of difference as ideological infection and on the political economic forces that reproduce the violences that make world solidarities seem so impossible. The current condition of the world, marked by a lethal pandemic, worship of weapons and militarism, racialized hatred and nationalist fervor, environmental crisis and everyday structural violence, adds urgency to the multidimensional task to confront the profound challenges facing humanity, transcend seemingly impossible impasses, and build productive connection and collaboration. Invoking an example from my life and work, I argue for synthesis as Gina Ulysse puts it, bringing together the scholar and the responsible global citizen who goes beyond producing scholarship to putting knowledge to work in an effort at sustaining the earth and its living beings.
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Prelude in context of the Pandemic of 2020

New York, May 18: When in early February 2019, Paul Stoller invited me to contribute an article to this special collection on “The Anthropology of Wellbeing in Troubled Times,” I took the opportunity from my vantage point as an anthropologist trained and working in the U.S. academy, to offer my understanding of the state of the world, consider the stakes at hand, and call on anthropologists to couple their knowledge with fearless imagination to work on behalf of a livable future that has yet to come. As a person on this earth for nearly seven decades and immersed in anthropology for well over half my life, I recognize the need for conversation across multiple borders – lines that have potential to divide and conquer or that may be crossed, making possible deeper cooperation and collaboration towards the common good. The article that follows was submitted to the journal in December 2019 just as COVID-19 was making its way across the globe, soon to land in my hometown in New York where as of this morning, twenty-two thousand six hundred and nineteen (22,619) human beings are reported dead, and eighty-nine thousand, nine hundred and thirty two (89,932) people are reported dead so far in the United States, where the unemployment rate is now at levels not seen since the Great Depression. In the past two months and with written and photographic reports from the front lines, participant-observers (nurses, physicians, reporters) have been offering readers and viewers the gift of documentation and witness to the violence of this pandemic, the extent of which was – and is – preventable. The immediate
situation is horrific, and the short-term future is grim. It was also predicted. Among others, the American science journalist Laurie Garrett (1994) saw it coming as did anthropologist Carolyn Nordstrom (2009) whose concept of “global fractures” captures the fragility and unsustainability of the world where no one is invulnerable to the quakes along the lines, now broken wide open. The article I offer here remains essentially the same as I composed it prior to the pandemic, reflecting my understanding of the vulnerable local and global fractures on which we have been standing for way too long. Without being prescriptive, this article is a call for the unleashing of imagination and taking creative action in the interest of “life in the one world we all inhabit” (Ingold 2017: 22).

* The first word in the title of this article is “imagining,” which is the process of forming an image of something in the mind, something akin to dreaming, visualizing, thinking, supposing. The Oxford English Dictionary defines “imagining” as to conceive in the mind as a thing to be performed; to devise, plot, plan. To imagine is to form a mental image of something, perhaps a goal, an end to which one yearns to arrive, an achievement not yet actualized. Each of us as anthropologists, I dare say, puts our imaginations to work whenever we dream up a research or writing project, a course syllabus to teach, and on a more quotidian level, a meal we might prepare to serve or a friendship to cultivate.

As I’ve worked to prepare this article, the word “imagine” or the idea of “imagining” is suddenly front and center in my sights. I turn on the radio and there’s John Lennon:  

Imagine there’s no countries  
It isn’t hard to do  
Nothing to kill or die for…

I walk through an art gallery exhibit in Manhattan, and see an excerpt of a conversation between the novelist and social critic James Baldwin and anthropologist Margaret Mead. Baldwin shares, “I used to tell my mother, when I was little, ‘When I grow up I’m going to do this or do that. I’m going to be a great writer and buy you this and buy you that.’ And she would say, very calmly, very dryly, ‘It’s more than a notion’” (David Zwirner Gallery 2019). I read The Pursuit of Happiness by anthropologist Bianca Williams (2018), and come upon this, a core theme in her book about Black women and diasporic dreams: “While memories of slavery and discrimination definitely inform these women’s constructions of Blackness and Black identities, their experiences of pleasure and leisure also ground their imaginings of diasporic community” (2018: 9). And in my own recent publication, I include the words “anthropological imagination” in the title of a scholarly article centered in memory and history (Waterston 2019a).

For this article, I set myself up for a large task of the imagination: Imagining World Solidarities for a Livable Future. I do so in keeping with the quest for well-being in a troubled world.

I begin with an inspiration. On the last pages of Upside Down: A Primer for the Looking-Glass World (2000), a work with which I will be in dialogue throughout this article, the Uruguayan writer Eduardo Galeano dares readers to exercise the right to dream. “Suppose we rave a bit?” he asks, and he offers a long list of possibilities for an alternative world. In December 2018 as I’ve done at the close of other semesters, I asked my undergraduate
students at a public university in New York City to rave a bit, writing out on a slip of paper one thing they would change to make for an alternative world. With their individual responses collated, the world they imagine would have no poverty, people would not be hungry, Black people would not be demonized, hierarchies would be eliminated as would all the “isms” — racism, sexism and so forth; also gone would be weapons, military weapons and the militarism that goes along with them. People would have the food they need to eat, the water they need to drink, and the shelter they need in which to dwell. Nature would be honored and respected. Love would replace hate. Schools would provide all children the opportunity to love learning, love themselves, and love what their future looks like.

You may say they are dreamers. But they’re not the only ones. They articulate a vision of the kind of world that thinking people also yearn for. The vision expresses a way people could relate to one another as “giving together,” which anthropologist Tim Ingold defines as the meaning of “community” as from the Latin com (‘together’) plus munus (‘gift’) (2018: 47).

The world we are in is not the world of such vision. From the vantage point of the late 20th century, Galeano describes “A desolate, de-souled world that practices the superstitious worship of machines and the idolatry of arms, an upside-down world with its left on its right, its belly button on its backside, and its head where its feet should be” (2000: 307). “The world economy is the most efficient expression of organized crime,” Galeano asserts (2000: 6). He explains:

The worst violators of nature and human rights never go to jail. They hold the keys. In the world as it is, the looking-glass world, the countries that guard the peace also make and sell the most weapons. The most prestigious banks... harbor the most stolen cash. The most successful industries are the most poisonous for the planet... Those who kill the most people in the shortest time win immunity and praise, as do those who destroy the most nature at the lowest cost... Whoever is not a prisoner of necessity is a prisoner of fear, deprived of sleep by anxiety over the things he lacks or by terror of losing the things he has. The looking-glass world trains us to view our neighbor as a threat, not a promise. It condemns us to solitude and consoles us with chemical drugs and cybernetic friends. We are sentenced to die of hunger, fear, or boredom — that is, if a stray bullet doesn’t do the job first. (2000: 6-7)

It is dystopian, this dog-eat-dog world. A far cry from the image I have of a just world, the world of well-being I want, a livable future.

It gets worse. Typing notes, I write the word “dystopia,” which springs to mind Parable of the Sower, the novel by science fiction writer Octavia Butler. Published in 1993, Parable of the Sower takes place in a city outside of Los Angeles and the story begins in July of 2024, only a few years from my writing these words. The world has disintegrated. Water costs a pretty penny, a resource made scarce by climate disaster and the profit motive. Fires are ubiquitous. Total fear pervades. People live behind gates in neighborhoods cordoned off by walls. Outside, the dangerous hordes are ready to pounce, save the guns – an old Smith & Wesson .38 revolver, a nine millimeter submachine gun, a Llama automatic – designed to keep the riff-raff away. On the other side of the gates, dead bodies pile up – dead children, dead adults. They are just the outsiders, explains Lauren, the teenage Black girl who narrates the story, except when someone shoots wrong, killing one of their own. The novel and its sequel, Parable of the Talents also feature presidents of the United States of America. One named Christopher Charles Morpeth Donner will “suspend ‘overly restrictive’ minimum wage, environmental and worker protection laws” (1998: 24). His successor, Andrew Steele
Jarret, has plans to “revive the country.” The people don’t see him as the fascist that he is but think, “This is just what America needs.” In the years between 2015 and 2019 so the story goes, Jarret frightened, divided and bullied people, burned them alive, and covered it up with denials, threats, terror, and pay offs. In my country in 2019, the U.S. President Donald John Trump unleashed the agents of the Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) to raid, round up, arrest, imprison and deport immigrants in Los Angeles, New York, San Francisco, Chicago and other major cities across the country, one among his many draconian directives. In my country in spring of 2020, this U.S. President calls COVID-19 the “Chinese virus,” tweeting this demonizing, racist label to his followers, and he suggests people inject themselves with disinfectant to cure the virus while repeatedly refusing to take “any responsibility at all” for the death and destruction on his watch.

In a *New Yorker* article titled “Octavia Butler’s Prescient Vision of a Zealot Elected to ‘Make America Great Again,’” writer Abby Aguirre says Butler saw the *Parables* as a cautionary tale not a prophecy, and yet she could not see her plan through to write four more books in the *Parable* series because “the story is too depressing” (2017).

Butler’s cautionary tale rings too true for comfort in this most intense period for the world considering the material, environmental, and political conditions of life in these times. Today, the resurgence of ever more hateful ethnonationalism and the foul rhetoric that goes along with it, not least xenophobia and racialized hatred, is spreading like the wildfires wrought by climate change across the globe. Social, political, and economic inequities are expanding; people are suffering “stupid deaths” to borrow Paul Farmer’s expression (2011) while private, concentrated wealth continues to expand under global capitalism, a system that maintains conditions of scarcity and insecurity through a politics of fear and fragmentation, draconian policies, and practices that do more harm than good.

Further, Ingold writes “The world remains in the grip of a system of production, distribution and consumption that, while grotesquely enriching a few, has not only left countless millions of people surplus to requirements condemned to chronic insecurity, poverty and disease, but also wreaked environmental destruction on an unprecedented scale, rendering many regions uninhabitable and clogging lands and oceans with indestructible and hazardous waste” (2018: 5).

Any system that leaves millions of people “surplus to requirements” is evil. In Hannah Arendt’s terms, the power that makes human beings superfluous, that transforms them into something less than human, is by her definition “radical evil,” which is rooted in particular systems (Hannah Arendt 1994). “Never has the world been so scandalously unjust,” Galeano asserted in 2000 (28). Little did he know how bad it would get. The twin evils of capitalism and imperialism that Galeano says are referred to euphemistically and respectively as the market economy and globalization, “manufactures poor people and outlaws poverty” (2000: 13). He writes:

> The number of poor children who work… is uncountable. And the rest? Many are superfluous. The market doesn’t need them, nor will it ever. They aren’t profitable, they never will be. Ever more poor children are ‘born with a tendency toward crime,’ according to the specialists. They are the most dangerous category of the ‘surplus population.’ From the point of view of the established order, they begin by stealing the air we breathe and soon steal anything they can lay their hands on. Hunger or bullets tend to shorten their voyage from crib to grave. The system fears the young; childhood is a threat. (2000: 17-18)
In such a world “power sweats violence through every pore,” (2000: 271) Galeano observed. In such a brutal, structurally violent system, how can individuals overcome the barriers to fulfill their potential, and arrive at my student’s dream “for all children to love learning, love themselves, and love what their future looks like”?

The omnipresent, oppressive darkness is exhausting. It depletes, it’s almost paralyzing – but not entirely. Reading The Creative Spark by biocultural anthropologist Agustin Fuentes, helped me to re-invigorate. Fuentes writes, what makes humans distinctive is “our ability to dream things up and to make them happen” (2017: 271). Invoking Martin Luther King, Jr.’s “I Have a Dream” speech, Fuentes believes that King’s words resonate with so many people because “it draws on our shared capacities to imagine and create a better world…a capacity the human lineage developed over the last 2 million years” (2017: 271-272). “[Dreaming] makes us the creative species,” Fuentes proclaims, and he adds, “The initial condition of any creative act is collaboration” (2017: 272; 2).

There are thousands of anthropologists from all over the world who are or can work in solidarity across artificial or insignificant divides assuming they share the common value that there is inherent “goodness” to life and the living, and that they want, as an objective, that this earth and the living things in it to be sustained, to enjoy well-being, to flourish.

Recently, anthropologist Roger Lancaster issued a call for “universal liberation,” (2017) which is what the world needs now in order to move past the horrors wrought by radical evil and its companion, radical deception, which goes beyond the deliberate lie to add “a new variation to the old art of lying – that of lying the truth, the deliberate conversion of a lie into a reality” (Birmingham 2007: 32; Birmingham 2010: 74; Arendt 1994: 111). This form of deception, Hannah Arendt observed, “opens the door to the possibility of a 'lying world order' and [even][…] the threat of totalitarianism” (quoted in Birmingham 2007: 32).

Galeano asks, “Is the freedom to choose among [the] unfortunate ends, the only freedom left to us? The looking-glass school,” he says, “teaches us to suffer reality, not change it; to forget the past, not learn from it; to accept the future, not invent it. In its halls of criminal learning, impotence, amnesia, and resignation are required courses. Yet perhaps there can be no disgrace without grace, no sign without a countersign, and no school that does not beget its counterschool” (2000: 8).

There is no need to settle for the looking glass. Let us enter it instead, and unleash our individual and collective imaginations to explore the possibilities for an alternative world and how we might get there. Galeano gives us permission: “If we can't imagine what's coming, at least we have the right to imagine the future we want” (2000: 334). On this note, it is worthwhile to keep in mind an observation offered by economist and legal scholar Marcie Smith. In an interview in Jacobin, Smith notes that too often, progressives fail to be specific about “what kind of world we want, what kinds of productive relations we want, and what would it actually take to achieve them in the face of extremely powerful opposition” (Marcetic and Smith 2019).

How to begin? If we are in an “Upside Down” world, how do we put things “Right Side Up”? In the world I want, radical good replaces radical evil. That would require organizing society in its political-economic and social structures such that each human being is valued, not rendered superfluous. The social contract would require that each person be provided the means by which their potential may be fulfilled, enabled by prioritizing human needs over rapacious interests. In imagining what kind of world I want radical honesty replaces radical deception. The new normal would be a clear separation between factual truth and opinion,
and there would be consistent, honest confrontation of “interests” no matter how hard these may be to admit. In the world I would want for all the children and the children’s children to inhabit, difference would not be ideological infection but celebrated. In such a world, memory and history would replace what is today’s pervasive “obligatory amnesia” (Galeano 2000: 201). You may say I’m a dreamer. I say this is the start, an outline of core principles.

It occurs to me that anthropologists have at their fingertips access to necessary if insufficient ingredients for changing reality, for remembering the past, for inventing the future. Ingold propounds a kind of anthropology I believe is the norm in the field today, or at least it seems to be becoming so, which is “to share in [other people’s] presence, to learn from their experiments in living…” (2018: 8). He writes, “…anthropologists [have] an ethic of care… We care by bringing people into presence, so that they can converse with us, and we can learn from them” (2018: 131). In a world that suffers from “imposed homogeneity” to use Agustín Fuentes’s words (2017: 174) or “compulsory equalization” as Galeano put it (2000: 25), anthropology for much, if not most of its history, has advocated on behalf of diversity. We may not have achieved the goal Ruth Benedict purportedly claimed for anthropology, which is “to make the world safe for human differences” but it is a value most of us cherish (Haviland et al 2014: 142).

About compulsory homogeneity, Galeano says that it “works against the finest trait of the human species, the fact that we recognize ourselves in our differences and build links based on them” (2000: 25). When he writes, “The best of the world lies in the many worlds the world contains, the different melodies of life, their pains and strains: the thousand and one ways of living and speaking, thinking and creating, eating, working, dancing, playing, loving, suffering, and celebrating that we have discovered over so many thousands of years” (2000: 25-26) – when he writes this, I see what anthropologists do, day in and day out, to bring the best of the world to the forefront.

It also strikes me that anthropologists don’t recognize adequately the strengths they possess. Too readily, they buy into an idea that what anthropologists do is marginal and what they know is not all that important. Too often, they fail to acknowledge to themselves how much anthropologists have to contribute – how much they already do contribute – as allies in the global struggle for justice and equity. Of course, it is incumbent upon anthropologists to engage a process of reassessing the purpose and practices of what they do and thus, the purposes and practices of the discipline and the institutions that enable it. At the same time, they need to appreciate more than they do now that anthropology and anthropologists are pretty constant and persistent in connecting those parts of the past that are responsible for shaping the present and in exposing power by means of evidence, argument, and narrative. More anthropologists than ever before are not afraid to “get proximate” (Stevenson 2015: 17) to human suffering, which means getting up close and personal because seeing things only from a distance leaves out important perspectives.1 Critically applied and politically

---

1 This is evidenced by the increasing amount of publically engaged scholarship appearing in peer-reviewed journals, books, and other outlets such as blogs, podcasts, news articles and op-eds, including but not limited to the following titles sampled primarily from US anthropology: Collaborating for Change by Susan D. Greenbaum et al (2020); Cultural Anthropology: Contemporary, Public, and Critical Readings by Keri Vacanti Brando (2020); Engaged Anthropology: Politics Beyond the Text by Stuart Kirsch (2018); “Public Anthropology in 2015” by Angelique Haugerud in American Anthropologist (2016); Feminist Ethnography by Dana-Ain Davis and Christa Craven (2016), “The Power of Public Scholarship” by Paul Stoller in The Huffington Post (2016); Media, Anthropology, and Public Engagement edited by Simone Abram and Sarah Pink (2015); Public Anthropology in a Borderless World edited by Sam Beck and Carl A. Maida (2015); “Laying the Body on the Line: Activist Anthropology and the Deportation of the Undocumented” by Daniel Goldstein in American Anthropologist (2014); Decolonizing Anthropology: Moving Further toward an Anthropology for Liberation by Faye V. Harrison (1991); Engaging Anthropology: The Case for a Public Presence by Thomas Hylland Eriksen (2006); and Engaged Observer: Anthropology, Advocacy, and Activism edited by Victoria Sanford and Asale Angel-Ajani (2006).
engaged anthropologists recognize social injustice, which motivates them to study the causes and consequences of inequity. Those schooled in historical political economy and the comparative approach are trained to be present, to grapple with the horrors as well as the beauties of the world. Engaged scholarship reflects understanding that "detachment" constitutes a form of action. To pretend otherwise is to ignore the fact that distance and distancing are not at all neutral but have consequences, a form of complicity with those policies, practices and ideologies that harm those who are most vulnerable and that which is most vulnerable. Engagement means working with an eye toward ameliorating the problems and the suffering. Anthropologists who are engaged ask, “What can I as a person and what can my discipline offer the world in order to address a wide range of issues of profound public importance?”

To even imagine the “Right Side Up” world requires knowing what is amiss in the “Upside Down” one and why it is so. Anthropologists are knowledge experts who too often dismiss what they know as unimportant or irrelevant perhaps because they may think everyone knows it. Those of us who are educators and any one of us who has conversed with family members or acquaintances likely recognize that what anthropologists know is not common knowledge. Let us not forget that “the ideologues of fog, the pontificators of obscurantism” (2000: 308), Galeano’s phrases, have been and continue to be very successful in blanketing consciousness and confusing people. The pontificators, Galeano explains, “tell us that reality can’t be deciphered, which really means reality can’t be changed” (2000: 308).

Not true, engaged anthropologists push back on the pontificators.

Yet it is not enough to be knowledge experts. In my view, anthropologists need to take that knowledge and put it to work. Here I return to my earlier assertion, which is that anthropologists too often fail to acknowledge to their own selves the ways they are putting that knowledge to work. The anthropologist-artist-poet and activist Gina Ulysse argues for synthesis, that she defines as the “untapped potential [we have] yet to access” (2013, 2017).

Anthropologists need synthesis because for too long they have suffered the dangers of the split, such as the schism between the scholar and the responsible global citizen or between the artist in us and the anthropologist or between the artistic and the scholarly in representing what they have come to learn.

I suggest that anthropologists and the institutions within which they operate make a small shift that will have a big effect in moving towards the “Right Side Up” world. That move is a shift in perception about what counts as anthropology, which must go beyond producing scholarship to how we put knowledge to work. Let me illustrate with an example of an activity with which I am recently engaged and which, informed by Ulysse’s call for synthesis, I have come to recognize as engaging world solidarities in the quest for well-being and a livable future. The example is not about a study I am conducting or a book I am writing though I do see those activities as essential to making sense of the world and of knowing it.

Instead, this is a very local story. By that I mean it takes place where I live, which is a multi-ethnic city of 80,000 people just 30 kilometers (about 20 miles) north of Manhattan, New York. Two years ago, there was a murder in the city – one public high school student stabbed another to death – a Black girl killed a white girl. Underneath the incident of interpersonal violence is a story of how structural inequity, structural violence, and institutional racism produce trauma and destruction that only beget more traumas, more destruction. I come in as a 30-year resident of that city who supports public education, which is constantly under attack across the U.S. I responded to a call for what was billed as a collaborative effort to
“reduce the violence in the lives of children and youth,” the name of a task force to which I became a member. Over the course of the previous two+ years, my involvement deepened in part because I could see the parts of the “Upside Down” world in action – the forces of radical evil in play, the operations of radical deception churning, how difference was turned into ideological infection for the purpose of criminalizing poor black and brown children, and how memory and history were obliterated. All of these actions were in the interest of developing and implementing a hyper-punishment school policy guaranteed to reproduce radical evil. The proposed policy was to place armed police, euphemistically referred to as School Resources Officers, inside the schools. The practice of placing SROs in schools is documented by independent, scholarly research and by the federal government to result in the criminalization of young students for minor offenses by funneling them into the criminal justice system, a pattern that disproportionately injures Black/African American and Latinx students as well as students with disabilities (Waterston 2019b).

In contrast to what my college students imagined for an alternative world, the dynamics in my home community reflected the release of more racism, more demonization, more hierarchy, heightened securitization with weaponry that would benefit only rapacious interests, and the viewing of neighbors as a threat, not a promise. The situation was becoming ever more alarming as my local school system moved further from my own students’ vision of what schools ought to provide all the children.

Recognizing it was not enough to stop at analysis, I saw clearly how I might put such knowledge to work using scholarly skills I have too often taken for granted: how to identify what information to gather and how to get it; how to read and translate data; how to distinguish fact from opinion and knowing how and when to demonstrate the distinction; how to identify specific pernicious or rapacious interests and knowing what evidence would reveal them; and how to work collaboratively in community. Remarkably, the effort began to have positive effect; there was a shift in how people started to see the proposed draconian policy. Voices of hate and divisiveness though loud were revealed to be the few while people of good will proved to be the many.

At a crucial moment, the school board voted 8-1 against a draconian policy that would have placed those armed police inside the schools. As a result of this hard-won decision, some children’s lives may be spared. They have a better chance, now, to fulfill their potentials rather than be swept into the dustbin as waste.

This experience illustrates the value of “Think Global, Act Local,” despite the cliché that phrase has become. Like other social movements, this one was slow and steady not stunning or spectacular. That is where and how it happens, Galeano observed. “Without making a fuss,” he wrote, “these [local social movements] shoulder the task of reconceiving democracy, nourishing it with popular participation and revising the battered traditions of tolerance, mutual assistance, and communion” (2000: 32).

I have come to recognize that this is anthropology, an example of synthesizing the split self between the scholar and the responsible global citizen. This is not the first time I have been thus engaged. Where before I siloed such activity as community volunteerism or activism, this is the first time I have come to see it as central to the anthropological project. With that shift in my perspective, I have become more clear-eyed about how and what I can contribute in very specific ways. Liberated from old disciplinary expectations – for I no longer consider these activities as unfitting to anthropology – I now enter this space as an
anthropologist in solidarity with others to seek well-being and to craft a more livable future, one step at a time, one issue at a time, one struggle at a time. Having identified the kind of world I want, the kind of productive relations I want, I can see what in small steps it takes to achieve them even in the face of powerful opposition.

I have no illusions about what people of good will are up against in the “Upside Down World.” Reflecting on past attempts to build societies based on solidarity, Galeano declares them “shipwrecked, leaving us to suffer a universal crisis of faith in the human capacity to change history” (2000: 312). He cries, “Stop the world, I want to get off!” (2000: 312).

We cannot get off and we should not because collectively anthropologists are a powerful creative force. They need to claim the positive contribution they make, the struggle of which they are a part, and the legacy they intend to leave. Imagine the power of the combined contributions already made by every anthropologist across the globe in putting upright the “Upside Down” world. Should we think of our influence not in individual terms but as collective impact, I am certain anthropologists would be amazed and newly invigorated to keep at it. As they do, let them now praise imagination and be fearless in unleashing it. Let them dare to exercise the right to dream and together devise, plot, plan for the “Right Side Up” world, an achievement not yet actualized. More than a notion, the “Right Side Up” world is an end to which the world might yet arrive.
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