



- 3 With the analogy of Pangaea in the idea of the Pananthropoi, I first seek to emphasize the “organic” character of the emerging all-encompassing society.[12] The Pananthropoi is not merely the result of an imposed political project, a capitalist conquest, a contrived plan of global elitists, a corporate conspiracy – but essentially driven by the quintessence of human nature, namely the ambition to always cross borders, tear down walls and go beyond. I see this capacity and will to cross borders, in a geographical as much as an intellectual sense, as a human trait that is overall stronger than its opposite – to build walls, to stay within marked boundaries or to withdraw. Surely, human beings have demonstrated a great capacity to segregate, to dominate, to control; yet ultimately these walls came down, these regimes were overturned. Somehow eventually the will and capacity of human beings to communicate seems greater than the will and capacity to disassociate, and I argue that this discrepancy within the dichotomy of social and anti-social behaviour, of communication and non-communication creates an agency *sui generis*, that is the driving force behind the gradual emergence of the Pananthropoi.
- 4 In that way, I see the concept of the Pananthropoi as related to Luhmann’s “world society”[13] or Beck’s “cosmopolitan society.”[14] However, the cosmopolitan society has the connotation of an individual choice, of a direction that the “cosmopolitan citizen” chooses, and that element of choice is largely absent in the conceptualization of the Pananthropoi: I emphasize that the all-encompassing society of the Pananthropoi largely emerges as a society *sui generis*, the choice of some perhaps, but not of all. And while the idea of the cosmopolitan society has a normative element to it (a presumption of shared values), with the Pananthropoi, I want to emphasize that an elevation of norms, values, and culture is not necessarily the essential trait of one all-encompassing society. Second, interconnection is the qualifying factor of the Pananthropoi, and not homogeneity of culture,[15] nor global consciousness or a cosmopolitan law.[16] Even though these qualities might (or might not) emerge within the context of the Pananthropoi, the first premise is connection and connection only.[17] The “invisible hand” that drives the making of the Pananthropoi is more inclined to reach out to meet another human being as a companion, friend, or partner, than to ignore it, or worse, control, dominate, segregate, or kill him or her. This is not to say that these inclinations might not equally be there, and history has shown that they are part of what humankind is capable of. Yet my argument is that their overall power is weakened and their agency is less influential than the power of the will to cooperate. The invisible hand of the *homo sociologicus*[18] does not just regulate, but communicate; this invisible hand does not create markets, but communities. The invisible hand that defines us as essentially social beings drives us to become one society, and one people.
- 5 Like Luhmann’s world society, the idea of the Pananthropoi refers to the aspect of growing global interdependencies, communication, and connectivity. With the Pananthropoi, I add to the debate on globalization, cosmopolitan society and world society a visualization of the long durée[19] of globalization: namely as an age-old process of integration of different societies into one all-encompassing society. World society “is,” or “will be,” or “might be” one day, however, the Pananthropoi is *always becoming*. The shape and content of this destination of globalization are essentially unknown other than that it will encompass all human beings, directly or indirectly like a wave in the Panthalassa. This immediately raises the question of the definition of human connection and I will discuss that later.
- 6 Third, with the social imagination of the Pananthropoi, I want to add to the debate an imagery of a process of growing connection and dependence that allows for a disrupted development. Through a process of continental convergence[20] or *societal convergence* (and growing interconnection) altered with times of continental divergence or *societal divergence* (isolation and separations), the Pananthropoi has been slowly developing until its presence has become visible in contemporary times. [21] While we might see connections falling apart, the long durée is clear: growing connection, and if this tendency continues, the grand finale of globalization is maximized connection. Nevertheless, we do not know what that is, or what it will look like other than that the Pananthropoi – that brief static resultant of previous movements consisting of connections between all parts – will be fragile. It might last only very short, until it will fall apart. Since human life is characterized by change, the ultimate maximized connection, *optimum iunctioni*, can only dissolve and never be permanent. The process of growing interconnection has therefore a quality that is more permanent and more intrinsic to human history, than the moment of maximized connection ever will be. The symphony itself is more important than the grand finale.
- 7 Fourth, the imagery of the Pananthropoi offers some insights in the dramatic eruptions and clashes that go hand in hand with social convergence. Globalization creates the Pananthropoi, as much as it creates fundamentalism, separatism, movements of withdrawal, and disintegration. Divergent tectonic forces caused the breakup of the original geological Pangaea, splitting the Pangaea up into its constituent parts.[22] Tectonic movements, whether towards divergence or convergence, caused earthquakes as sudden and unpredictable cataclysmic events, resulting from built up stress and friction;[23] they coincide with volcanic eruptions of catastrophic





















Two." *EWE (previously EuS)* 14: 75-88.

Schäfer, Wolf. 2013. "Pangaea II – The Project of the Global Age." *Globality Studies Journal*, No. 36, July 26, 2013.

Shaw, Martin. 1994. *Global Society and International Relations: Sociological Concepts and Political Perspectives*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Schiller, H. 1976 *Communication and Cultural Domination*, New York: International Arts and Sciences.

Scholte, Jan Aart. 1997. Global Capitalism and the State. *International Affairs* 73:427-52.

Sloterdijk, Peter. 2005. *Im Weltinnenraum des Kapitals*, Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Verlag.

Van Der Bly, Martha C.E. 2012a. "Proto-Globalization." *Encyclopedia of Global Studies*. M. Juergensmeyer and H.K. Anheier (eds.) Los Angeles, London: Sage.

Van Der Bly, Martha C.E. 2012b. "World Society Theory." *Encyclopedia of Global Studies*. M. Juergensmeyer and H.K. Anheier, (eds.). Los Angeles, London: Sage.

Van Der Bly, Martha C.E. 2012c. "Heterogeneity." *The Wiley Blackwell Encyclopedia of Globalization*. G. Ritzer (ed.). Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Van Der Bly, Martha C.E. 2007. "The Rise of One Heterogeneous World Culture." *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, 48 (2/3): 234–256.

Van Der Bly, Martha C.E. 2005. Globalization: A Triumph of Ambiguity. *Current Sociology*, Vol. 53(6): 875–893.

Wallerstein, Immanuel. 1976. "A World System Perspective on the Social Sciences", *British Journal of Sociology* 27(2): 343-52.

Wallerstein, Immanuel. 1984. *The Politics Of the World-Economy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Weizsäcker, Carl Friedrich von, 1978. *The Politics of Peril: Economics, Society, and the Prevention of War*, London: Seabury Press.

Weber, Max. 1958 [1905] *The Protestant Ethics and the Spirit of Capitalism*. New York: Scribner's.

Wegener, Alfred. 1966. [1916, 1929]. *The Origin of Continents and Oceans*. Translated from the fourth revised German edition by John Biram. London: Methuen & Co.

Weyman, Darrell. 1981. *Tectonic Processes*. London: George Allen & Unwin.

Yoshida, Masaki and M. Santosh. 2011. "Future supercontinent assembled in the Northern Hemisphere." *Terra Nova*, 23:333-338.