

My three critiques are as follows:

1. This paper underestimates the role and importance of the European Union. Especially since the election of President Macron and the improvement of the Eurozone economy, the EU led by Germany and France will be able to provide crucially needed global leadership. **Comment: I do not underestimate the exemplary role or importance of the European project, from its origins in the ECSC and EURATOM to the present, and hope profoundly that Germany and France will be able to provide the leadership needed to carry it forward. Time will tell, but it will be to the great advantage of all if this forecast proved correct.**

2. The paper seriously underestimates the role played by the neoliberals in constructing a compelling new narrative and a strong new power base which greatly influenced current norms in many countries. Some of this is covered in footnote 9 but readers of the paper could still be left with the impression that the last major change in politico-economic systems was just after the second world war and that changes since are mainly due to technology and globalisation. There was a clear further major shift at the end of the 1970s. This did not follow a major war but followed the construction of a new narrative and a new set of powerful institutions by the neoliberals. This was particularly true following the publication of the Powell Memorandum—one of the most successful strategic plans ever. **Comment: I agree entirely about the impact of neo-liberal economists – and, more importantly, their political patrons – in crafting a new narrative and socio-political paradigm in the past three decades. I touch on this in footnote 10 and in the following passage in the text: “Established structures and systems, moreover, need radical reform, including institutions of global governance, regional governance, regional security, and national political governance, “free markets” as we have defined them in the past 25 years, the relationship between education, training and employment; and systems of social coexistence shaped by rapid urbanization followed by globalization, that are now under stress in many advanced economies.”**

As Keynes said, **““Practical men who believe themselves to be quite exempt from any intellectual influence, are usually the slaves of some defunct economist. Madmen in authority, who hear voices in the air, are distilling their frenzy from some academic scribbler of a few years back.”**

That said, I’d argue that what we style “globalization” could not have emerged in the form in which we know it, without the precepts of neo-liberalism that reified markets, diminished governments, delivered the precepts of what became the *Washington Consensus*, and facilitated financial integration at global scale, not least through repeal of the Glass–Steagall Act of 1933.

3. If the proposed conference is to have the best chance of success, other actors besides governments will need to play a role in preparing the ground. Critically new narratives need to be developed and a powerful new movement needs to be constructed to promote these narratives. This needs to be made up of a series of interlocking networks operating at different geographical scales and involving different constituencies. These constituencies should include business, civil society, academia and think tanks, faith groups, media, new economy practitioners and the arts. **Comment: Again, I endorse this strongly. That is the import of the terse observation: “National and regional consultations, like those that led to the SDGs, would spark national debates, allow reciprocal learning, help dispose of prejudice, and undercut dangerous fact-free populism. The discussions should clarify the values that motivate each state’s objectives, and shed light on the norms and legal instruments that can advance them.” I’ve elaborated on this in my response to the referee’s comments.**

I support publication even without any changes based on my critique above.