

Decentering: from Ptolemaic to Planetary (or Oneness) Paradigm

Rodney Shakespeare

Former Visiting Professor of Binary Economics, Trisakti University, Indonesia

Abstract:

This study aims to examine the historical evolution of dominant epistemological paradigms and their implications for political authority, human self-understanding, and planetary sustainability. Beginning with the Ptolemaic paradigm, which positioned the Earth at the center of the universe and legitimized Divine Right and human dominion over nature, the paper traces successive processes of “decentering” through the Copernican Revolution, the Enlightenment, and Darwinian Evolution. While these shifts progressively undermined theological absolutism and anthropocentric superiority, they failed to restrain human exploitation of the planet. Instead, evolutionary thought and the rise of *Homo economicus* reinforced competitive expansionism and imperialism, contributing to contemporary environmental crises. In response, the Planetary or Oneness Paradigm is advanced as a third and necessary decentering, this time of self-centered individualism. Grounded in the principle of *Tawhid*, this paradigm reaffirms divine unity, human interdependence with nature, and systemic interconnectedness. By correcting outdated assumptions about reality, it facilitates the transformation from *Homo economicus* to *Homo cooperans*, fostering social cohesion, shared purpose, and sustainable planetary wellbeing.

Keywords: Decentering; Ptolemaic paradigm; Copernican Revolution; Charles Darwin; Planetary Paradigm; Oneness Paradigm;

Introduction

Contemporary global crises, ranging from widening economic inequality and ecological degradation to social fragmentation, cannot be adequately understood without interrogating the epistemological paradigms through which reality, knowledge, and human purpose are constructed. Rodney Shakespeare (n.d.) argues that dominant worldviews have historically legitimized systems of hierarchy and domination by placing humanity, and particularly ruling elites, at the conceptual center of existence. The Ptolemaic paradigm, which framed the Earth as the privileged center of creation, reinforced the doctrine of Divine Right and endowed political authority with sacred legitimacy (Shakespeare, n.d.). This cosmology shaped not only early scientific understanding but also entrenched feudal structures, political passivity, and an implicit

justification for the unrestrained exploitation of natural resources, a pattern later echoed in modern anthropocentric economic systems (Daly, 1996).

The Copernican Revolution and Enlightenment thought initiated what Shakespeare identifies as the first major epistemic “decentering,” dismantling the theological foundations of absolutist rule and enabling the rise of democratic governance and individual agency (Shakespeare, n.d.). However, this shift did not fundamentally challenge humanity’s perceived entitlement to dominate nature. Instead, Darwinian evolutionary theory and nineteenth-century political economy further decentered humans metaphysically while simultaneously legitimizing competitive materialism through concepts such as “survival of the fittest” and *Homo economicus* (Spencer, 1864; Mill, 1848). As Polanyi (1944) later observed, the institutionalization of self-regulating markets transformed social relations into market relations, embedding competition and accumulation at the core of economic life. According to Shakespeare, this convergence of evolutionary thought, industrial expansion, and classical economics provided moral and scientific justification for imperialism, environmental exploitation, and perpetual growth.

In response to these limitations, Shakespeare advances the Planetary—or Oneness—Paradigm as a necessary third decentering, one that repositions humanity as an interdependent component of an integrated planetary system rather than its sovereign master (Shakespeare, n.d.). This paradigm resonates with contemporary ecological economics, which emphasizes biophysical limits and systemic interdependence (Daly & Farley, 2011), as well as with the Islamic principle of *Tawhid*, which affirms the unity of creation and the ethical inseparability of moral and material life (Choudhury, 2019). By rejecting the reductionist assumptions of mainstream economics and proposing a shift from *Homo economicus* to *Homo cooperans*, the Oneness Paradigm calls for an ethically grounded transformation of science, economics, and governance. Such a framework offers a coherent epistemological foundation for sustainability, social justice, and planetary wellbeing in an increasingly interconnected world-system.

The Ptolemaic paradigm identified the Earth as God's special creation

By contemplating the sun's apparent movement across the sky during the day and observing the fixed patterns of stars at night, early humans concluded that God (or Allah) had placed His special creation, the Earth, at the center of the universe. This understanding of a privileged creation carried several profound implications. It suggested that humans, plants, animals, and the world itself came into existence almost simultaneously; that creation had occurred only a few thousand years earlier; and that humans, as God's Children, possessed an inherent right to exercise dominion over the planet. These assumptions shaped not only cosmological beliefs but also humanity's moral self-understanding and its relationship with nature.

Ancient science subsequently systematized these observations into the geocentric Ptolemaic system, which became the dominant paradigm defining society's perception of reality. This Earth-centered worldview persisted for many centuries, despite the fact that as early as the third century BCE, Aristarchus of Samos had proposed a heliocentric model in which the sun, rather than the Earth, occupied the central position. Nevertheless, because the sun appeared to move daily across the sky, sensory observation and so-called "common sense" continued to reinforce geocentric theory, allowing the Ptolemaic paradigm to endure as the prevailing explanation of cosmic order.

Divine Right and Crusades

The Ptolemaic paradigm, widely regarded at the time as an accurate representation of physical reality, also proved exceptionally convenient for political rulers. By positioning the Earth at the center of the universe, it enabled kings and emperors to claim that their authority was divinely ordained. Rulers asserted that they had been placed in power by God (Allah) Himself and therefore possessed a Divine Right to rule. Under this worldview, political authority was not merely administrative but sacred, and obedience to rulers was framed as obedience to divine will.

As a result, any individual who dared to challenge the Divine Right was automatically branded as a satanic force disrupting God's creation. Such dissent was not treated as political disagreement but as heresy. Consequently, individuals faced extreme forms of repression, including the Inquisition, the use of torture devices such as the thumbscrew and the rack which could tear bodies apart and execution by burning at the stake. On a larger scale, this fusion of cosmology, theology, and power manifested in warfare, most notably in the form of Crusades. These were primarily waged against Muslims in the Holy Land, including Palestine and surrounding Mediterranean regions, under the banner of divine command.

However, the Crusades were not limited to conflicts between religions. They were also directed against fellow Christians when doctrinal conformity was perceived to be under threat. A particularly brutal example was the Albigenian Crusade (1209–1229), during which the Christian Cathars of southern France were subjected to genocidal violence. Approximately one million people were slaughtered, hanged, or burned alive. These atrocities illustrate how the Ptolemaic paradigm, intertwined with Divine Right ideology, functioned not only as a cosmological explanation but also as a powerful mechanism of political domination and mass violence.

Everyday Practicality and Circumnavigation

Despite its ideological misuse, the Ptolemaic paradigm was, in practical terms, surprisingly effective as a working model of physical reality. Celestial markers such as Polaris (the North Star) in the northern hemisphere and the Southern Cross in the southern hemisphere provided reliable reference points for navigation. Mariners were thus able to traverse vast distances with considerable accuracy using geocentric assumptions.

Indeed, employing these navigational tools, the Portuguese-led expedition under Ferdinand Magellan successfully circumnavigated the globe between 1519 and 1522. This extraordinary achievement appeared to offer dramatic empirical validation of the Ptolemaic worldview. For contemporaries, the success of global navigation under a geocentric framework reinforced confidence

in the paradigm, making it seem both scientifically sound and practically indispensable.

The Maintenance of the Ptolemaic Paradigm through Epicycle Theory

Even as increasingly precise astronomical observations revealed anomalies, such as the apparent forward and backward motion of planets and variations in their illumination, the Ptolemaic paradigm remained firmly entrenched. This persistence can be explained by the nature of paradigms themselves: they are not merely theories but deeply embedded mindsets. Once established, a paradigm dictates how new information is interpreted, ensuring that fresh observations are assimilated in ways that preserve existing assumptions rather than challenge them.

Accordingly, when confronted with data that contradicted simple geocentric motion, proponents of the Ptolemaic system developed the epicycle theory. This theory proposed that planets moved in small circular paths, or epicycles, while simultaneously revolving around the Earth. Although epicycle theory was fundamentally irrational and increasingly convoluted, it had a decisive advantage, it preserved the Earth's central position in the cosmos. By doing so, it upheld the cosmological foundation of the Divine Right, ensuring that political and religious authority remained unquestioned. In this way, scientific complexity became a tool for ideological preservation rather than a path to deeper truth.

Consequences of the Ptolemaic paradigm and *epicycle* theory

The Ptolemaic paradigm, together with epicycle theory, produced consequences of profound historical significance that shaped political authority, social organization, and human interaction with nature. *First*, by identifying the Earth as God's special creation, the paradigm legitimized absolute dominion within human society. Rulers were perceived as divinely sanctioned authorities and, as a result, gained absolute power over other humans. With only rare exceptions, such as the brief emergence of democracy in ancient Greece and the Roman Republic, political and social systems throughout history were predominantly feudalistic and authoritarian in nature.

Second, the paradigm reinforced the resistance of elites to change. Dominion is inseparable from power, and those who possess power rarely relinquish it willingly. Even in situations where reform was clearly urgent, political and social inertia tended to prevail. The persistence of epicycle theory, despite mounting empirical contradictions, illustrates a fundamental pattern in human history: necessary paradigmatic change is consistently opposed by powerful vested interests, particularly political and social elites whose authority depends upon maintaining the existing worldview.

Third, the Ptolemaic paradigm generated long-term political passivity. Because the world was understood as God's (Allah's) special creation, situated at the center of the universe, it followed that fundamental change was neither possible nor desirable. This worldview fostered the belief that humans already lived in the Best of All Possible Worlds. Consequently, political passivity became widespread, and the idea of improving social or political conditions appeared unnecessary or even improper. The paradigm thus inculcated a deep-seated resignation toward the status quo.

Fourth, the paradigm endowed God's Children—humans—with unrestrained dominion over the Earth's fauna, flora, and natural resources. While medieval societies were not inherently wasteful and often practiced frugality and careful husbandry out of necessity, the underlying worldview contained no principled limits on exploitation. There was little recognition that agricultural, marine, or mineral resources should not be exploited to their fullest extent, nor any widespread awareness of the need for future restraint or prohibition. In principle, the Ptolemaic paradigm embedded a latent entitlement to limitless exploitation.

Fifth, the belief that humans were God's Children also encouraged the expansion of population levels. This belief generated a psychological certainty that the maximum possible number of humans was both desirable and divinely sanctioned, reinforced by religious injunctions to multiply. At the same time, necessity demanded high reproduction rates, as hunger, starvation, disease, and war created harsh survival conditions. As a result, prolific human reproduction became both a theological expectation and a practical imperative.

In summary, the Ptolemaic paradigm stimulated a coherent set of beliefs: that the world was created only a few thousand years ago; that humans, as God's Children, were granted dominion over the planet and its resources; that rulers possessed dominion over other humans; that the world constituted the Best of All Possible Worlds and therefore could not be improved; and that maximum population reproduction was essential. Collectively, these beliefs structured centuries of political authority, social passivity, and human expansion, leaving a legacy whose consequences continue to shape contemporary socio-economic and ecological conditions.

The First Great Decentering – of the Rulers

A profound epistemic shock arrived with the Copernican Revolution, marking the first great decentering in human history this time, the decentering of rulers. Through meticulous observation and mathematical calculation, Nicolaus Copernicus articulated a radically new understanding of cosmic order in *On the Revolutions of the Celestial Spheres* (1543). His work demonstrated that the Earth revolves around the sun, rather than the sun revolving around the Earth. This single shift carried momentous implications: if the Earth moves around the sun, then it cannot be the center of the universe. If the Earth is not central, then neither are its rulers divinely positioned at the center of creation.

The political implications of this realization were immense. If rulers were no longer cosmically central, their claim to Divine Right was fundamentally undermined. Authority could no longer be justified as God-given simply by virtue of position. In this way, Copernican heliocentrism did not merely transform astronomy; it destabilized the theological foundations of political power. Rulers were symbolically and epistemologically decentered, opening the possibility that authority might be contingent, contestable, and subject to human judgment rather than divine decree.

The consequences of this challenge were potentially fatal for Copernicus himself. Had he been alive and active when his ideas became widely known, his fate would likely have mirrored that of others branded as satanic heretics—torture and death by fire. Copernicus escaped this outcome only because he received

the printer's proofs of his book while already on his death bed. His timing spared him from persecution, even as his ideas quietly began to reshape the intellectual foundations of Europe.

The process of decentering was then carried forward by Galileo Galilei, assisted by the mathematical refinements of Johannes Kepler. Through systematic observation and rigorous mathematical reasoning, Galileo substantiated and clarified Copernicus's heliocentric model. His *Dialogue Concerning the Two Chief World Systems*, published in 1632, publicly articulated this challenge to geocentric orthodoxy. As a result, Galileo too was branded a satanic threat to divine order. Although he was not executed, possibly because some officials within the Vatican recognized the validity of the new science, he was condemned to lifelong house arrest.

The decentering reached its scientific culmination with Isaac Newton. Building upon the observational work of Galileo and the mathematical advances of his predecessors, Newton articulated the Laws of Motion in *Principia* (1687). At this point, high-level scientific debate over cosmic mechanics effectively came to an end. The triumph of the new paradigm was famously captured by the poet Alexander Pope, who wrote: "*Nature and nature's laws lay hid in night. God said, 'Let Newton be!' and all was light.*" With Newton, the Copernican decentering was complete—not only in science, but in its far-reaching implications for authority, knowledge, and power.

Consequences of the Copernican Revolution

The Copernican Revolution generated consequences of immense political and social significance. *First*, it initiated the gradual decentering of rulers. By dismantling the cosmological foundation of Divine Right, the Copernican worldview weakened the theological justification for absolute authority. Over time, this epistemic rupture triggered a long historical process in which authoritarian power was increasingly questioned, constrained, and reconfigured within emerging political institutions.

Second, the decentering of rulers opened an entirely new horizon of political possibility. If authority was no longer divinely fixed, it became thinkable that political systems could be redesigned. This new sensibility found expression in the Enlightenment,

particularly through the work of the French *Philosophes* such as Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Denis Diderot, and Voltaire, whose ideas laid the groundwork for democratic transformation. The first major political manifestation of this shift occurred not in France but in America, where the American Revolution of 1776 successfully overthrew British colonial rule. The implications became even more profound in 1789, when the French Revolution dismantled monarchy, aristocracy, and the established Church. Under Napoleon, revolutionary France attempted to export these changes by overturning *ancien régimes* across Europe. Although militarily defeated at the Battle of Waterloo in 1815, France had already ignited democratic aspirations with enduring consequences for the modern world.

Third, despite these transformative political changes, the Copernican Revolution did not fundamentally alter humanity's relationship with the planet. Humans continued to perceive themselves as God's Children, entitled to exercise dominion over the Earth and to exploit it without restraint. At the same time, increasingly aggressive and rapacious forces were emerging. These forces combined exploratory voyages, economic expansionism, religious proselytization, and militarism, leading to the systematic "opening up" and occupation of foreign lands. Thus, while the Copernican Revolution decentered rulers, it left intact—and in some respects intensified—human dominion over nature, setting the stage for subsequent global expansion and environmental exploitation.

The Second Great Decentering – of God's Children

A second profound intellectual shock occurred with the publication of Charles Darwin's *On the Origin of Species* in 1859. This work fundamentally disrupted established ways of understanding reality and produced transformative effects on science, society, and religion, effects that continue to reverberate into the present day. Darwin's theory of evolution by natural selection challenged deeply entrenched assumptions about the origins of life and humanity's place within the cosmos.

Darwinian Evolution decisively dismantled the Ptolemaic belief that humans, animals, and plants had been created almost

instantaneously only a few thousand years ago. Instead, it introduced a radically different temporal and biological framework in which life emerged millions of years in the past and evolved gradually through countless incremental changes. Within this new paradigm, the diversity of living forms was no longer the result of a single, fixed act of creation but the outcome of long-term evolutionary processes shaped by variation, adaptation, and environmental interaction.

This reconceptualization of life had a far-reaching philosophical consequence: humans were no longer positioned as a uniquely privileged species standing apart from the rest of creation. Rather, *Homo sapiens* became understood as one life form among many, embedded within the same evolutionary continuum as all other organisms. In this sense, Darwinian Evolution initiated a second great decentering, this time of God's Children themselves, by challenging humanity's exceptional status and redefining its relationship with nature and the living world as a whole.

Consequences of Darwinian Evolution

Darwinian Evolution had profound consequences for humanity's understanding of the world and its place within it. Building upon the geological findings of William Buckland and Charles Lyell, Darwin conclusively demonstrated that the Earth and its living organisms were not created instantaneously in the recent past, but instead emerged through gradual processes unfolding over millions of years. This insight fundamentally undermined the long-held belief that humans occupied a uniquely privileged position in creation. Within the evolutionary framework, *Homo sapiens* came to be understood as merely one species among many, rather than the divinely distinct centerpiece of existence. As a result, humanity experienced a decisive process of decentering, or dethronement, from its former status as God's Children endowed with singular importance.

Beyond its cosmological implications, Darwinian Evolution also exerted a significant influence on human psychology and social thought. By emphasizing the universal struggle for existence, Darwin portrayed life as a continuous competition in which survival depended on the possession of evolutionary advantages. Within this framework, aggression and self-centered behavior came

to be interpreted as biologically necessary traits rather than moral failures. The intense competition for survival further implied the need for prolific reproduction, while scarcity of resources positioned all species, humans included, in perpetual competition both with others and among themselves. This evolutionary worldview, while scientifically influential, contributed to a broader intellectual climate in which conflict, rivalry, and domination could be viewed as natural and even inevitable aspects of life.

Justification by Science

Darwin's evolutionary framework ultimately produced a bleak intellectual landscape in which some of humanity's most destructive traits were not merely explained but actively legitimized. Within this worldview, aggression was interpreted as biologically necessary, self-centeredness as functionally rational, and indifference toward others as an unavoidable outcome of natural processes. The severity of this paradigm lay not only in its descriptive claims but in its normative implications: behaviors once subject to moral scrutiny were increasingly defended as scientifically inevitable. As a result, science itself appeared to provide ethical cover for domination, competition, and exclusion, reinforcing a fatalistic understanding of human conduct.

Homo Economicus and the Doctrine of "Greed Is Good"

Parallel to Darwinian biology, economic thought was developing similarly reductionist conceptions of human nature. In 1798, Thomas Malthus portrayed lower social classes as prone to uncontrolled reproduction, implicitly framing inequality as a natural condition rather than a social failure. This logic was later systematized by John Stuart Mill, who formalized the notion of *Homo economicus*, a rational actor defined by narrow self-interest and the relentless pursuit of utility maximization. In this framework, human behavior was reduced to calculative self-gain, rendering greed not only normal but socially productive. Although Mill's formulation echoed Adam Smith's emphasis on self-interest in *The Wealth of Nations*, it largely sidelined Smith's moral caveat in *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*, where sympathy and concern for others remained integral to social life.

The cultural resonance of this worldview was further reinforced through literature and social theory. Alfred, Lord Tennyson's image of "Nature, red in tooth and claw" captured the brutal competitiveness assumed to govern life itself, while Herbert Spencer distilled Darwinian ideas into the stark maxim "Survival of the Fittest." Together, these intellectual currents converged to produce a narrow, aggressive conception of humanity, one that viewed domination, rivalry, and exploitation as natural expressions of progress.

Empires, Expansionism, and Industrial Justifications

The fusion of evolutionary theory, economic rationalism, and political ambition coincided with the height of European imperialism and the acceleration of industrialization. Expansionism, resource extraction, and colonial domination were no longer framed as acts of greed or violence, but as historical necessities justified by science, economics, and civilizational mission. The ideology of the "White Man's Burden" provided a moral veneer for conquest, portraying exploitation as benevolence and domination as duty. Meanwhile, mainstream economics increasingly claimed the status of objective science, asserting that market outcomes, however unequal or destructive, were efficient, inevitable, and just.

In this convergence of science, philosophy, economics, and militarism, environmental concerns were rendered external and irrelevant. Nature became a passive stock of resources, while conquest and accumulation were normalized as rational responses to competitive necessity. In this sense, intellectual authority was mobilized to sanctify expansion wherever expansion was possible.

Today's Problem: A System Without Limits

These historical trajectories culminate in the contemporary global crisis. Modern societies remain structured around assumptions of endless material growth, aggressive individualism, and the psychological permanence of *Homo economicus*. Economic, political, and social systems depend upon continuous expansion, even as ecological limits are visibly breached. Governments speak the language of peace while preparing for conflict, and sustainability while accelerating depletion.

The absence of a solution appears structural rather than accidental. If self-interested rationality is assumed to be immutable human nature, meaningful transformation becomes inconceivable. Moreover, were global living standards to approximate those of contemporary American society, resource consumption would need to increase manifold, far beyond planetary capacity, especially given projected population growth toward ten or twelve billion. Under these conditions, future scarcity, conflict, and environmental collapse appear not as anomalies but as logical outcomes of prevailing paradigms. As things stand, the system offers no internal mechanism for restraint, and thus no viable solution within its own assumptions.

The Third Great Decentering—Of Self-Centred Individualism

Despite the gravity of contemporary ecological and civilizational crises, there is cause for cautious optimism. A profound intellectual shift is underway, driven by advances in sensor technologies, vast data aggregation, computational power, and increasingly sophisticated investigative methods operating at both microscopic and cosmic scales. Together, these developments are converging toward an unavoidable conclusion: reality is fundamentally relational. The long-standing assumption of isolated entities, whether individuals, societies, or nations, is being steadily displaced by an understanding of deep interdependence. This realization marks a third great decentering, this time of self-centred individualism, as humans are increasingly understood not as autonomous masters of their environment but as participants within complex, interconnected systems.

Planetaryity and the Sea of Consciousness

One articulation of this emerging awareness is encapsulated in the concept of *Planetaryity*. Planetaryity views humanity as an integral component of the Earth system rather than a species standing apart from it. Humans are biological organisms whose survival is inseparable from fragile ecological balances, a reality underscored by the rapid collapse of species and ecosystems following seemingly modest environmental disruptions. This ecological embeddedness challenges anthropocentric assumptions and demands a reorientation toward planetary responsibility.

Interconnection, however, extends beyond material and ecological dependencies. Emerging insights from quantum physics suggest that living systems may exist at the edge of—or potentially within—a broader “sea of consciousness.” While such ideas warrant careful and cautious exploration, they resonate with quantum measurement theory, which implies that observers cannot be meaningfully separated from the phenomena they observe. Moreover, quantum entanglement, famously described by Albert Einstein as “spooky action at a distance”, demonstrates forms of connectivity that transcend conventional spatial and causal boundaries. Together, these insights further erode mechanistic and reductionist conceptions of reality.

Planetary Interconnection and Islamic Tawhid

These scientific developments increasingly echo long-standing religious and metaphysical understandings of unity and interconnection. In Islamic thought, this principle is articulated through *Tawhid*, the doctrine of divine Oneness, which affirms that all existence is interconnected, indivisible, and continuously sustained by Allah. Within this worldview, God is not external to creation but is manifest through the unity and coherence of all that exists. Nature, humanity, and consciousness are thus inseparable dimensions of a single, integrated reality.

As modern science progressively uncovers patterns of relationality and interdependence, a unique opportunity arises to reconcile scientific insight with religious wisdom. The unification of science and religion does not entail the subordination of one to the other, but rather their integration into a shared framework capable of supporting ethical reflection, spiritual meaning, and moral responsibility. Such a synthesis provides a robust intellectual and normative foundation for the emerging Planetary or Oneness Paradigm, offering a pathway beyond domination, fragmentation, and ecological destruction toward cooperation, stewardship, and sustainable coexistence.

Planetary or Oneness Paradigm

At the core of the Planetary or Oneness Paradigm is the recognition that massive technological advances have vastly

increased potential productive capacity, making it theoretically possible for every individual in the world to attain a reasonable standard of living. However, material access alone is insufficient. For humanity to transcend the constraints of *Homo economicus*, material security must be guaranteed universally. *Homo economicus*, characterized by self-interest, competition, and social status pursuit, arises fundamentally from insecurity and inequality. Only when basic material needs are met for all individuals can the transformation toward *Homo cooperans*, cooperative and socially responsible behavior, be realized.

Material security is also essential for stabilizing global population levels. Empirical observation shows that societies with adequate living standards, robust health and education systems, and improved status for women tend to experience voluntary stabilization and eventual reduction of population growth. This occurs because children are no longer required to ensure parental care in old age, and lower child mortality reduces the necessity for high birth rates. Furthermore, as automation and technological progress increasingly reduce traditional employment opportunities, a universal Basic Income derived from the productivity of capital assets becomes necessary to guarantee material security and sustain economic participation.

The Planetary Paradigm directly challenges mainstream assumptions by systematically identifying fifty-nine foundational factual assumptions and demonstrating that all are false. Each assumption has been reversed, and the reversals provide the logical and practical foundation of the new paradigm (see Appendix One, BinaryParadigm.org). By interlinking these components, the Paradigm offers solutions to global challenges that currently appear intractable.

Material security for everyone fundamentally undermines the conditions that produce *Homo economicus*. When all individuals enjoy guaranteed access to resources, there is less fear, reduced status-driven competition, and greater awareness of planetary limitations. People can then choose to live more moderate, responsible, and ecologically conscious lives. As Mahatma Gandhi famously observed, “The world has enough for everyone’s need, but not enough for everyone’s greed.” Contrary to deterministic

assumptions of mainstream thought, human psychology adapts to changed circumstances; universal material security is therefore a prerequisite for transforming social behavior.

Building a Shared World View

Progress under the Planetary Paradigm requires the construction of a Shared World View grounded in a modern, accurate, and dynamic understanding of physical reality. Without such a foundation, attempts at global cooperation risk perpetuating divisions and creating new conflicts. The Paradigm, by systematically reversing the fifty-nine false assumptions of mainstream thinking, provides the intellectual architecture necessary for a coherent, scientifically-informed, and ethically-responsible global perspective. Over time, this Shared World View enables individuals and societies to align collective actions with ecological sustainability, equitable resource distribution, and cooperative social relations, forming the basis for a resilient and morally grounded planetary civilization.

Conclusion

This analysis highlights a transformative trajectory in human understanding, from the geocentric Ptolemaic paradigm to the Copernican and Darwinian decenterings, culminating in the Planetary or Oneness Paradigm. Each stage progressively challenges entrenched assumptions: first, the Divine Right of rulers; second, humanity's privileged status as God's Children; and third, self-centred individualism (*Homo economicus*). The Oneness Paradigm synthesizes insights from modern science, quantum interconnection, and ecological awareness with traditional metaphysical concepts such as Islamic *Tawhid*, emphasizing the deep relationality of all life and the moral necessity of cooperative human behavior.

By grounding social, political, and economic systems in universal material security, ecological stewardship, and a Shared World View, the Planetary Paradigm offers a practical and ethical framework to address contemporary global crises. It envisions a world where humans recognize their interdependence with nature and each other, fostering sustainable development, equity, and moral responsibility. In this sense, Oneness is not merely a theoretical insight but a guiding principle for restructuring human society toward cooperation, justice, and planetary resilience.

References

- Buckland, W., & Lyell, C. (n.d.). Contributions to geology referenced in Darwinian Evolution.
- Copernicus. (1543). *On the Revolutions of the Spheres*. N/A.
- Darwin, C. (1859). *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection*. London: John Murray.
- Galileo Galilei. (1632). *Dialogue Concerning the Two Chief World Systems*. N/A.
- Gandhi, M. (n.d.). Quote: “The world has enough for everyone’s need, but not enough for everyone’s greed.”
- Malthus, T. R. (1798). *An Essay on the Principle of Population*. London: J. Johnson.
- Mill, J. S. (1836). *Principles of Political Economy*. London: Longmans, Green & Co.
- Newton, I. (1687). *Philosophiæ Naturalis Principia Mathematica*. N/A.
- Shakespeare, R. (n.d.). *Decentering – from Ptolemaic to Planetary (or Oneness) Paradigm*. Former Visiting Professor of Binary Economics, Trisakti University, Jakarta, Indonesia.
- Smith, A. (1776). *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations* (E. Cannan, Ed., 1937). New York: Modern Library.
- Spencer, H. (1864). *Principles of Biology*. London: Williams & Norgate.
- Tennyson, A. L. (1850). *Nature Red in Tooth and Claw*. N/A.
- Udovitch, A. (1970). *Partnership and Profit in Medieval Islam*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- WEF. (2023) World Economic Forum, Geo-Economics, February.
- Weitzman, M. (1984). *The Share Economy*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press