THE VANCOUVER ASSEMBLY
“The Global Century”

During the first week of November 1998, the World Academy brought together in Vancouver, Canada, 87 of its Fellows, plus two Associate Fellows and 16 Junior Fellows—and a couple of dozen visiting experts and colleagues. The World Academy doesn’t go in for big meetings; this was the largest gathering in our recent history.

The theme, “The Global Century,” was described by Harlan Cleveland in a letter to all Fellows last summer (see pg. 3). The Assembly was organized by Paz Buttedahl, whose firm Buttedahl R&D Associates managed program and financial planning, travel subsidies, and local hospitality in Vancouver. Ivan Head, University of British Columbia, served as honorary chairman.

The Vancouver Assembly was funded by:
♦ the World Academy’s endowment;
♦ a UNESCO grant to help ensure the participation of Fellows from developing nations;
♦ a grant from the Richard Lounsbery Foundation in New York, of which Frederick Seitz is chairman; and by
♦ two extraordinary gifts from Garry Jacobs and his Dutch partner, Robert van Harten, in MIRA International, an international management consulting firm.

♦ A special grant from the Government of Canada to make possible the participation of 25 young people selected from Canada and “mentored” by Academy Fellows during the Vancouver Assembly.

In acknowledging the UNESCO grant at the opening session, President Harlan Cleveland said: “I am personally grateful for UNESCO’s tolerance in sending its check to a citizen of a country which left UNESCO several years ago and has not yet had the good sense to rejoin it as testimony to the quality of leadership being provided by its Director General Federico Mayor.”

THE FIRST GLOBAL CIVILIZATION

Walter Truett Anderson

Globalization is not a new process—it began when our ancestors began migrating out of Africa—yet in some ways it is new. Processes that have been underway for millennia are now accelerating.

One of these is human mobility: more people are in motion than ever before—not only on journeys of business or tourism, but also relocating permanently.

Information and communications technology is another: telephones, television, satellites and computers are forming a worldwide network that will soon link the whole planet and all its people.

We have entered into what has been called an age of open systems. Boundaries everywhere are moved, penetrated, renegotiated, sometimes obliterated. New connections are made between systems—economic, political, cultural, even biological—that were once separate.

All economic systems—our communities, the stores we shop in, the companies we work for, even our personal finances—are changing their boundaries, making new linkages within the increasingly interconnected global economy.
Although political entities such as nations are steeped in closed-system concepts and symbols, they are all becoming more open as well. A system of global governance is emerging—a multicentric network of regimes, customs, intergovernmental agencies, nongovernmental organizations, markets and agreements.

All the things we subsume under the heading of culture—all the arts, traditions, lifestyles, rituals, religions—become less isolated and distinct from one another, interpenetrate in new and often bizarre ways. As they do, we all become multicultural people.

And as ecosystem boundaries change, our gardens, farms, forests and waterways—even our bodies—become the new homes of visitors from all over the world.

Someday—perhaps—this vast evolutionary transition will reach its conclusion, and we will enter a stage of relative stability. But the present indications are that these changes will not only continue, but will continue at increasing rates of speed. What lies ahead of us in the coming decades is not merely a globalized world, but a globalizing one.

There is a stage in development of any system when it makes a fundamental change of state—when the egg becomes a chicken. And the global egg has hatched. The world in which we live is now truly one world, and we must learn to live within a global context.

This new world is the first global civilization, and the opportunities it brings us—for peace, prosperity, progress, rich and endlessly expansive personal lives—are limitless. But to realize those opportunities, we will have to create new mental maps that can show us how to get around in this world. We will have to throw away our two-dimensional maps of neatly-bounded systems.

Obviously this transition is a stressful, confusing and conflicted one, and many people come to the quite understandable conclusion that the solution is to get things back to where they were before. We see everywhere vestiges of closed-system thought, and also closed-system movements that seek to restore old boundaries and sever disturbing new connections.

These need to be taken seriously, yet in many cases they misread the nature of globalization—which is not simply centralization or homogenization.

Local and national governments, communities, small nongovernmental organizations and businesses of all kinds are absolutely essential and in some ways more important than they have been in the past. There is great diversity, but it is of a different kind. The many distinct subsystems in the new world will thrive and survive only insofar as the people in them become attuned to the other systems to which they are connected, and to the enormously complex global civilization of which they are a part.

**Four global futures**

This set of scenarios is constructed as a matrix: One axis represents technological and economic progress; the other represents sustainability and equity. The Canadian group that originally constructed these gave them the names of ships.

**Starship**—high sustainability and equity, continuing rapid economic and technological growth. A world in which an expanding global economy and wide deployment of new technologies serve to raise living standards everywhere, bringing unprecedented opportunities to participate in a global civilization.

**Windjammer**—high sustainability and equity, slowing technological and economic growth. A “green” scenario, with a diminishing interest in pushing the limits of growth, an emerging global consensus around the desirability of moderate, evenly-distributed prosperity, and integration of new and old technologies in such areas as medicine and agriculture.

**Bounty**—low sustainability and equity, high economic and technological growth. A world of much prosperity and global competition, complicated by social fragmentation and an immense, ever-widening split between the haves and have-nots.

**Titanic**—low sustainability and equity, slow economic and technological growth. The worst of all possible worlds, with technologies faltering, economies collapsing, increasing unemployment, intense regional competition, rusting industries and institutions, great social fragmentation.
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Walter Truett Anderson gave the opening address, “The First Global Civilization” (excerpts on page 1-2). At the second morning plenary, the theme was “Global Knowledge.” The panelists were Susantha Goonatilake, Alvin Weinberg, and Ivan Head. On Day 3, the theme was “Global Civil Society.” Elisabeth Mann Borgese traced the emergence of a “global civic culture,” illustrated by the development of the Law of the Sea and the “common heritage” philosophy that underlies it. Commentaries followed, by Edgar Gold and John Fobes.

Each afternoon a plenary session was held to hear from the five “tracks” in which the workshops were organized: development and economics; science and technology; cultures, religions, and civilization; politics, security, and governance; environment and population. Steven Rosell and Gordon Smith rode herd on this experiment in collective integrative thought.

The presence of young people—Junior Fellows of the Academy, and selected Canadian youth—enlivened each session, making the Assembly a genuinely intergenerational dialogue.

**Evening events**

At a gala dinner November 5th, Albert Sasson brought greetings from UNESCO, and the World Academy presented Special Awards, which honor colleagues for “exceptional contributions to global civilization” and “leadership in thought that leads to action.”

Donald Michael was unable to attend. He was honored in absentia with graceful words from Magda McHale. Luigi Mastroianni presented one Special Award, which carried with it election as an Academy Fellow, to Gloria Feldt; excerpts from her vibrant and vigorous response are on page 5. Noël Brown then gave the keynote address, which will be found on page 4. In presenting him with a Special Award, Harlan Cleveland said of him that through his work with the United Nations Environment Programme, “he came to be known worldwide as an advocate for sensitive and sensible policies to protect our planet.” A Special Award was also presented to Elisabeth Mann Borgese, just before she spoke at the Day 3 plenary (page 7).

On the Assembly’s second evening, four Fellows engaged in a “public debate” about the pros and cons of globalization, moderated by Ann Medina, a Canadian TV personality. On the platform were Margarita Marina de Botero of Colombia, Mahdi Elmandjra of Morocco, Ziauddin Sardar of the United Kingdom, and Ana Maria Sandi of Romania. Though there were plenty of differences among them, they readily agreed that globalization was a complex bundle of benefits and troubles that couldn’t be “decided” in a two-sided debate format.

On a dinner cruise their final evening, the hardworking Assembly participants had a chance to view some of the sights of Vancouver from the waters that are part of its beauty.

---

**What is “The Global Century”?**

Recent centuries have been characterized—especially by North Americans and Europeans—as historically dominated by Europeans and North Americans. Now we look out at a world swept by waves of change that erode all ways of thinking that hold any special groups of people in regions defined by geography as having a manifest destiny to lead.

The relevant region now seems to be the whole world we inhabit together. No people defined by ethnicity or belief can presume to be in charge. The term “global citizen,” which once seemed a sign of idealistic impracticality, now seems an accurate way to describe each of us.

Hence, looking beyond the year 2000: The Global Century. There will always be rules, or at least patterns of behavior, by which people are guided in their relations with each other, and with the natural environment in which humanity plays (like it or not) an increasingly definitive role. But in the global world just ahead of us, the human rules and patterns will need to be rethought and newly fashioned.

This is the very wide niche the World Academy is well placed to explore—“objectively, constructively, scientifically, in global perspective, and free from vested interests and regional attachments.”

— Harlan Cleveland, 30 June 1998—
... The record will show that I have spent half my life and all my career in the service of the United Nations.

What the record will not show is that it was a terrific inning – to use a sports metaphor – and great fun: much more laughter than tears.

But it was more. It provided me with a “distinctive” label, which gave me access to some of the most important sectors and sanctuaries of the world.

It enabled me to walk the corridors of power, and to build constituencies and partnerships with the scientific and academic communities, the artistic and cultural, the political and industrial, the spiritual and financial, and community and youth groups.

I am especially impressed to see so many young people here this week—global centurions in our program—and the extent to which they are being encouraged to become active participants in shaping the Global Century.

This reminds me very much of the Earth Summit in Rio six years ago, when a 12-year-old—Sven Susuki, from this very city Vancouver—gave world leaders a unique perspective, as only a child can, of what really was at stake and what they were being asked to do to protect her natural patrimony and secure her future.

It seems ironic that among all the people assembled at Rio, hers was one of the speeches that the world still remembers…

My career also gave me the freedom to roam around “Hollywood” – to remind studio-heads that the “earth” was the great story-line, and to persuade producers and directors to include environmental themes in sitcom, TV dramas, and soap operas. This was subsequently termed the Greening of Hollywood and [led to] the creation by Norman Lear of the “Environment Media Association,” which honored significant environmental works in TV and movies – an environmental Oscar.

I still believe that the entertainment arts are powerful and popular vehicles to communicate the unfolding drama of a threatened earth and mobilize support for its protection and enhancement. Those of us who follow climatic trends cannot help but be impressed by the extent to which disaster movies are preceding natural disasters and science fiction has literally become a prelude to real science.

In the company of astronauts I was privileged to walk through a mock-up at the Marshall space flight center of the soon-to-be-built space station and to get a taste of zero gravity.

It was here that I learned that politicians may do well to learn that in space, “where there is no gravity, there is no turf.” Turf battles are often absent and the driving impulse was cooperation and mutual support—something that we need to master as we seek to navigate the Global Century…

The UN experience gave me a higher appreciation of the fact that there are few callings more noble and meaningful than a career in the service of the earth.

And that is why it is so reassuring to be in your company this evening, the company of earth servers, of those who dare to envisage a future that advances the human story and elevates the human promise while enhancing our planetary home.

And despite the starkness of the reports, whether from Buenos Aires or Kyoto, Rio or Stockholm, and our failure to meaningfully address the well-known scourges of environmental degradation —ranging from rising levels of greenhouse gas emissions, toxic pollution, and solid waste, to the unsustainable use of our renewable resources such as fresh water, forests, topsoils, marine fish stocks—we cannot allow ourselves to be defeated in advance.

In any event, it’s too late for pessimism.

The Global Century may very well be a century for optimists and realists, for those who accept the challenge of an open moment in history and are committed to the birth of a planetary civilization and the expression of what is best in us.

And increasingly, I believe, we are inching our way toward a planetary consciousness and a new sense of responsibilities “for the whole.”

-continued on page 6-
A BIOLOGICAL CENTURY
Gloria Feldt
Luigi Mastroianni presented a Special Award (carrying with it election as a Fellow) to Gloria Feldt, President of the Planned Parenthood Federation of America. This is a part of her response:

Thank you, Luigi. It is a privilege to accept this award... You are remarkable people... I am in awe of the extraordinary intellect in this room tonight...

In June of next year, the earth will reach the 6 billion people level. I applaud your Youth Initiative because one quarter of the world’s population is under 25, mostly in the developing nations.

This creates population growth momentum and is the reason why, despite declining fertility rates, the world’s population won’t level off until about the year 2050 at approximately 11 billion people. Young peoples’ individual choices about childbearing, consumption, and related policies will determine whether population will level off at all.

The freedom to make responsible choices is under constant threat... Extremists are determined to decimate successful international family planning programs, which can enable sound population policies to be carried out with dignity and voluntary participation.

To create a social climate in the U.S. conducive to sound policies on population and family planning, Planned Parenthood Federation of America has launched its new Responsible Choices Action Agenda. I believe firmly that it is time for us to be on the offensive, not the defensive, proactive not reactive, to set the terms of the debate and put forward an agenda.

The Responsible Choices Action Agenda has three overarching goals: to increase access to services that prevent unintended pregnancy, improve the quality of reproductive health care, and ensure access to safe, legal abortions. A major component is called Global Partnerships.

We are very excited about Global Partnerships’ potential to build long-range partnerships between U.S. Planned Parenthood affiliates and family planning programs worldwide. We expect that there will be an enormous amount of information sharing and mutual learning. But the ultimate goal of Global Partnerships is to create a large, lasting, vocal, and influential constituency that will advocate for reproductive health and sustainable development—and will reinstate the U.S. stalled commitment to international family planning.

Sensible population policies worldwide depend on three factors: 1) sufficient liberty to make responsible childbearing choices; 2) access to reproductive health care services that make rights into realities; and 3) a social climate that both empowers women educationally and economically and respects women as capable moral decision makers.

If globalization is to be embraced in the next century rather than feared, it will be because basic human rights and dignity will be extended to earth’s every citizen so each person has a real stake in our collective future. There is nothing more fundamental to that than the ability to make our own responsible childbearing choices.

H.G. Wells said that when the history of the 20th Century is written it will be a biological century and Margaret Sanger will be its heroine. In this century we have fostered a profound revolution in the social and economic status of women, both causing and being caused by the technological advances in fertility control.

And what sort of history will the 21st Century be? I am not sure, but I do know that you and others like you and the values you represent will be the heroes...

Gloria Feldt concluded with words attributed to Prime Minister Abel Muzorewa of Zimbabwe:

Give the world the best you have, and sometimes you’ll get kicked in the teeth—but give the world your best anyway.
DON MICHAEL

One Fellow honored with a Special Award was unable to attend the Vancouver Assembly for reasons of health. Magda Cordell McHale presented the award in absentia.

Even in his absence, I am extremely privileged on the World Academy’s behalf to present a Special Award to our colleague Don M. Michael, graduate of Harvard and the University of Chicago, a social psychologist with a background in the natural sciences.

Now retired in California, Don Michael is Professor Emeritus of Planning and Public Policy at the University of Michigan, where he was also Professor of Psychology and a program director in the Institute for Social Research. He remains actively involved not only with the World Academy but with the Saybrook Graduate School in San Francisco, the Meridian International Institute, the Global Business Network, and the Club of Rome.

Donald M. Michael

To me and to many of my generation and the generations that follow, he is a planner of planners, a psychologist, a writer, often a poet, a friend—and most of all a teacher.

He teaches us that coping with change can be exhilarating and at the same time profoundly terrifying. Terrifying because of uncertainty, uncertainty that we have to acknowledge first to ourselves, then to others. We share with others these high levels of uncertainty because acknowledging and sharing is intrinsic to learning.

He teaches us that sharing uncertainty increases our capacity to live with it and learn from it. He also tells us that error is not a sin, nor is it synonymous with failure—that the only way to learn is to discuss our errors, embrace them, then use them.

For a quarter of a century and more, the bible of planners has been Don Michael’s well-known book, *Learning to Plan and Planning to Learn*.

The planning that is needed, he tells us, must be based on the acknowledgement of our present ignorance. As a planner, one is obviously a futurist. We have to create visions that can commit us passionately to what we might want to become—or to avoid becoming.

Future responsiveness, he tells us, forces us to concentrate on what we are and what we are doing. It also encourages community trust and openness, thereby stimulating additional forms of human potential. And ultimately, he shows us a way to live—by linking persons to persons, and persons to ideas, and thus to teach and learn from ourselves.

Moreover, thanks to the marvels of electronic communications, not only are we becoming a self-conscious global species, we have also become a single global audience living at the speed of light. We also live in a closed-circuit world where it is always prime time. The “camera does make witnesses” of us all. It also makes neighbors of us all.

Earth has become humanity’s neighborhood...We now have the capacity to laugh globally, cry globally, grieve globally—as we did last year with the deaths of the Princess of Wales and of Mother Theresa—celebrate globally, learn globally, empathize and care globally, share globally. If anyone has any doubt about this capacity, just think of the response to Hurricane Mitch, in Central America.

It is this capacity for global caring and empathizing that might yet distinguish the Global Century from any other in the annals of human history.

The whole earth is destined to become humanity’s common symbol, because “there is only one earth.” And this is not simply a clever marketing slogan, but an acknowledgement of the fact that earth is a cosmic masterpiece.

And it’s ours to protect, cherish, and enhance, the more so as we move toward the Global Century, where there are few road maps and no cruise director...If...the World Academy’s faith in the “human genius for problem solving” is any guide, then I believe we will choose a future that will indeed work for everyone.

The Global Century must be the century of restoration, celebration, and hope. The air may be filthy, but the skies are not falling and doomsday is late again this year.
...When a student asks me if one person can make a big difference, I like to cite Elisabeth Mann Borgese as Exhibit A.

She has worked always from outside government, operating from Halifax and Malta which are not usually regarded as world centers. Yet she has probably been more responsible than any other “citizen of the world,” first for spreading worldwide the idea that the world’s oceans are a global commons, and then for generating the global will to create a framework of law to reflect that idea.

By an extraordinary act of consensus thirty-one years ago, the UN General Assembly declared the ocean and its seabed to be “the common heritage of mankind.” More than fifteen years of negotiation followed, as governments eroded that principle by permitting coastal states to reach out 200 miles from their shores to control “exclusive economic zones.”

But for the sizeable hole-in-the-doughnut that remained, the negotiators agreed on ways to regulate the use of the seabed. And they provided for much stronger environmental protection, for scientific and military use of the open ocean, and for common use of the many narrow places in the world’s seas.

The resulting treaty, completed in 1982, is the most complex single document ever negotiated among nations. It even contains mathematical formulas, and required the collaborative use of computer modeling. In the end the United States wouldn’t sign the seabed provisions—but the White House later declared that the whole treaty had become “customary law.” (The White House sometimes thinks the government controls our customs as well as our laws.)

Through this whole process Elisabeth Mann Borgese has been a dedicated and effective gadfly, demonstrating the civil society’s power of persuasion. At the same time her International Ocean Institute was educating a whole generation to think of the oceans as a commons…

For her unremitting attention to matters of global importance, she certainly merits a parchment certifying to her “exceptional contributions to global civilization” and “leadership in thought that leads to action.”

VANCOUVER WORKSHOP SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science and Technology</td>
<td>“Future Developments and Impacts of Information Technology”</td>
<td>“Global Science”</td>
<td>“Global Implications of Genetic Engineering”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultures, Religions and Civilizations</td>
<td>“The First Global Civilization? A Postmodern View”</td>
<td>“Global Educational Development”</td>
<td>“Spirituality, Organized and Unorganized”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment and Population</td>
<td>“Assessing Ecological Vulnerability”</td>
<td>“Science as Problem and Solution”</td>
<td>“The Emergence of Subnational and Supranational Actors”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What are the prospects for global economic and social development in the 21st Century? What challenges and opportunities will it bring? How will it differ from the experience of the last 50 years? What strategies will generate optimal results? These were prominent among questions discussed in the three workshops on development and economics.

Ivan Head emphasized the central role of institutions in development. The Asian crisis clearly demonstrates the need for more adaptive and responsive institutions at the national and international level.” Harlan Cleveland stressed the emergence of uncentralized organizations and global standards as positive factors.

Discussion focused on the central role of individual human beings in development. “Greater freedom for human choice, greater rights and value for the individual, will be a dominant determinant of social policy,” said Ivo Slaus. “People are the engine of development.”

Looking back, the last 50 years have seen unprecedented progress for most peoples around the globe. There is a long way yet to go, but the human race has made greater progress in eliminating poverty than it had during the previous five centuries.

This recent progress has resulted from avoiding major wars, promoting democratic institutions, building social organization, broadening education, and spreading access to information. These factors could make for even more rapid development in the next century.

Yet there is concern that rising expectations and the still-growing gap between rich and poor will lead to increased social tension and conflict unless effective steps are taken to generate opportunities for all people to acquire the benefits of development.

Ivan Head emphasized the central role of institutions in development. The Asian crisis clearly demonstrates the need for more adaptive and responsive institutions at the national and international level.” Harlan Cleveland stressed the emergence of uncentralized organizations and global standards as positive factors.

Discussion focused on the central role of individual human beings in development. “Greater freedom for human choice, greater rights and value for the individual, will be a dominant determinant of social policy,” said Ivo Slaus. “People are the engine of development.”

The session on global science with discussion leaders Alan Weinberg and S. Toulmin again brought out the huge cultural divide between two perspectives on the nature of science that echoed through many of the science sessions. These were respectively, on the one hand current Asian discussions as well as the non-Eurocentric and feminist discourses in the West; and on the other hand, conventional culturally Eurocentric views held by some practitioners of science. The distance the Academy has still to travel to be a truly multidisciplinary forum for serious global discussions was well illustrated in this session.

Thistension between the two perspectives on science—an internalist Eurocentrist one and a contextual, cross-civilization one—was echoed throughout the entire track on science and technology.

---

The opening plenary session on the topic of Global Knowledge was led by Alvin Weinberg and Susantha Goonatilake. Weinberg, who is one of the last remaining members of the Manhattan Project, spoke of Scientific Millenarianism that had recently captured the scientific imagination. The new concerns have to do with the very long-term future—such as bolide impact, CO₂ warming, radi-
1998 was a big year for the World Academy’s “Religion and Governance” theme. In the Spring (May 14-16) the World Academy collaborated with the European Commission in a Brussels Seminar to explore alternatives to the predicted “clash of civilizations.”

During the rest of the year the World Academy and the European Commission generated joint policy seminars on this issue—at the World Future Society in Chicago, the State of the World Forum in San Francisco, and the World Academy’s own Vancouver Assembly.

The “Transmodern” Mindshift
In preparing for the Brussels Seminar, Mark Luyckx of the European Commission’s Forward Studies Unit and I had written a joint paper titled “Civilizations and Governance.” Published by the European Commission, it described a “transmodern” mindshift emerging in the nations of the Atlantic Community.

“It features,” we wrote, “a creative mix of rational and intuitive brainwork; an enthusiastic embrace of new information technologies; a tolerance, even celebration, of diversity; a conviction that protecting the physical environment has to be a central concern for every human being; a dawning realization that scientific discovery and technological innovation have made human beings the dominant actors in their own future evolution; a new openness to spiritual guidance as a basis for ‘private’ behavior and ‘public’ policy; and a move away from vertical authority toward ‘flatter,’ more ‘horizontal,’ organizations, away from ‘recommendations-up-orders-down’ management and toward more consensual decision-making.”

This mindshift, we suggested, “has implications for religions and their impact on governance in the early part of the 21st century.” One is that “organized religions will be sharing their turf with ‘unorganized spirituality.’” Another is that “their leadership, traditionally monopolized by men, will increasingly be shared by women.” Yet another is that “the acceptance of variety, the protection of diversity, and doctrines of tolerance seem more and more essential to security and survival.” A fourth trend is an increasingly global perspective, “a growing acceptance of globalization.”

The Brussels Seminar

They also arranged for the participation of the Rt. Rev. William Swing, Episcopal Bishop of San Francisco, and Avon Mattison of Pathways to Peace. These visitors, sponsored by the World Academy but funded by the European Commission, joined with 31 participants from Europe. They included EC officials and policy planners from a number of Ministries of Foreign Affairs in the European Union.

Testing the Hypothesis
The working hypothesis, about an emerging “transmodern” mindshift, elicited a very positive response from the nonwestern scholars—who saw in modernism a threat both to tradition and to progress.

Susantha Goonatilake saw the center of economic gravity moving toward Asia in the 21st century. But, reacting from a Buddhist perspective, he asked, “will we become still more cloned Europeans and Americans, and be condemned to play a secondary role in the knowledge and creativity society, or will we be able to go back to our cultural and religious roots in order to bring to the world our specific cultural richness and wisdom in the future management of a more sustainable and just world?”

Asked to analyze Muslim reactions, Ziauddin Sardar said that Islam is “working modernity out of our system... Change has to be made and accommodated, but the fundamental tenets of tradition, the source of [Islam’s] identity and sacredness, remain the same. So we may define a transmodern future as a synthesis between life-enhancing tradition – that is amenable to change and transition – and a new form of modernity that respects the values and lifestyles of traditional cultures.”

“The West has always seen Islam through the lens of modernity,” he added, “and concluded that it is a negative, closed system. Nothing could be further from the truth. Islam is a dynamic, open system with a very large common ground with the West.... Islam is intrinsically pluralistic. It considers that in essence every culture has a piece of the truth.” The implication was clear: Islam is rejecting, not the West, but ‘modernity.’ The transmodern way of thinking might open a door to a new dialogue with Islam.

Kim Tae-Chang was invited to add a Confucian angle of vision. “The Confucian way to identify ourselves is through family,” he said. “This could be the contribution of Confucian culture to the global society: helping with this broad family concept to transcend the boundaries of egoism and push toward solidarity with the actual and future generations, towards a more sustainable and just world.”

-continued on page 10-
RELIGION AND GOVERNANCE

-continued from page 9-

The time has come, he thought, for us to come together in a process of “trialogical imagination.” (“Trialogical means putting together past, present, and future so that the future will be better for everyone and not be biased by a concentration on the present or on the past.”)

Resonance and Reservations
Other testimony about current trends in religion also showed some resonance with the “transmodern” way of thinking.

The Grand Rabbi of Brussels, Albert Guigui, spoke of respect for differences as the “central idea of Judaism.”

Bishop Swing spoke of Christianity’s internal conflicts as occurring in “a world of possibilities.” Later he described recent efforts to develop support for “United Religions,” an attempt to reverse “the squandering of the treasure chest of spirituality which religions could offer the world if they could grow beyond mutual hatred to a place of mutual respect.”

“In the next 25 years,” said Bishop Swing, “we will see an increasing number of ‘spiritual refugees’ looking where to invest their souls.” Avon Mattison elaborated on that theme in her remarks on “Unorganized Spirituality.” She spoke of the growing number of “world servers,” an emerging constituency from all nations and diverse spiritual orientations who are dedicated to building Cultures of Peace, and who are disenchanted with narrow dogma evidenced in the growth of “literal traditionalism.” This “unorganized,” spiritually creative constituency recognizes the triple necessity of: international cooperation; religious unity amid diversity; and ethical, harmless conduct.

The Brussels Seminar also featured some lively thinkers on political and social trends.

* Robert Cooper of the U.K. argued that “less spiritual societies are more peaceful, because many causes of war can be linked to religion.” (He also contributed the Seminar’s best epigraph. “Adam to Eve: We are entering into a transitional phase . . . .”)

* Arthur Cordell questioned the “religious belief” in deregulation, which carries “the greater cost: the risk of exclusion.”

* James Dator contributed his normal ration of abnormal comments. A relevant example, among many: “Virtually everything ordinary people believe (if you ask them to state their religious beliefs) is heresy from the point of view of theologians of their faith. It is surprising to me that we fret so much about scientific ignorance, but not at all about theological ignorance, which is at least as great.”

* Lincoln Bloomfield: “I would characterize transmodern as a “package” of ecological-humanitarian-feminist-arms-control sensibility. This new current is in a race in the US, the EU, but also in India, with the traditional political-military communities. My recommendation to the transmodernists is that they keep looking to their rear-view mirror, not forgetting the other point of view.”

* Patrick Viveret (Centre internationale Pierre Mendes-France, Paris) sees the great Western religions as “part of the problem...They leave no place for silent contemplation of the divine in our lives and the cosmos. We are flooded by an invasion of definitions of God...Churches are so full of words on God that there is no place anymore for mystery and silence.”

A New Dialogue
“Our working together,” says Marc Luyckx, “seems to have opened the door to a new kind of East-West dialogue.” The new argument goes like this:

Modernity is no longer attractive as a central source of Truth. Tradition is seen as the enemy. With secularism as “the world’s most powerful religion,” no room is left for “a dynamic concept of tradition.” The modern way of thought is also too individualistic to make room for ways of thinking that give special value to family and other group rights and responsibilities.

Truth is at the center of things. But every culture has a part of the Truth. Every person converges toward it through his/her own culture, along his/her own path. But none gets to say, “The search for Truth is over, for I have found it.”

The transmodern hypothesis emerges as a rich tool of analysis. It seems useful both for analyzing conflicts within religions, and for recognizing conflicts that arise from beliefs about other people’s beliefs. Resolution of such conflicts becomes, as Tony Judge put it, an exercise in complex, non-linear, non-exclusive logic. That isn’t easy, but it’s not as difficult–or as dangerous and damaging–as wars brought on by differences that cannot be resolved by thinking and talking together.

Toward the end of the Brussels Seminar, Walter Anderson illustrated with a story how seemingly irreconcilable beliefs may turn out to be reconcilable: “In a small meeting, I made some critical comments about ‘absolutism.’ A woman present was quite threatened by this, and said that her religion was one of absolute faith. I asked her if she would expect me to believe the same things. She immediately replied: ‘Of course not. I only meant that these things are absolutely true for me.’

“What is significant about this,” he added, “is that she had no particular awareness of having made a complex and highly sophisticated adjustment of beliefs about belief.”
CULTURES, RELIGIONS AND CIVILIZATION

by Ruben Nelson

The Cultures, Religions and Civilization track was a post-certainty conversation along the road toward co-creating the first truly global civilization. In the session whose subtitle was “A Postmodern View,” Ruben Nelson, Rafael Echeverria and Stephen Toulmin observed that no society will leave the 21st Century with the same mythology and identity that it brought into it. The work of the next century will be to understand consciousness and cultures in new ways. Dr. Echeverria is convinced that peace is not possible if human thought continues to rely on an absolutist ontology and epistemology; we must learn to question the correspondence between the way things are and the way we observe them. Prof. Toulmin reminded us that civility is at the heart of civilization, and suggested that the cultivation of a wider and deeper civility is the overriding work of the 21st Century.

In the workshop on “Global Educational Development” Heitor Gurgulino de Souza, Maureen O’Hara, John Bis and Jim Dator explored the situation of a globalizing world in which—as persons, families, communities and organizations—we have to invest more and more energy in “keeping it (our worlds, lives and actions) together.” Our challenge is to move towards the creation of new, shared and grounded meaning and the communities which both create and result from such meaning. This transformative move is our only sure path to the deeper and wider civility of which Stephen Toulmin spoke. Jim Dator offered this thought as a source of hope: “In 100 years . . . all new people.”

In the workshop on “Spirituality, Organized and Unorganized,” Marc Luyckx challenged us with his understanding that every society is faced with the same essential challenge—learning to live, coherently and powerfully, as knowledge embodying societies. Each avenue to this new world has its own advantages and pitfalls. Our hope lies in our willingness to learn to recognize and support one another as persons and communities who are both caught in and committed to this common meta-task. And Prof. Ziauddin Sardar made it very clear that the global conversation will no longer be dominated by well educated, white males from Northern European and European-rooted countries.

POLITICS, SECURITY, AND GOVERNANCE

by Lincoln P. Bloomfield

This track featured three workshops to project international security, law, and politics into the 21st century. Each required an exercise in prediction, melding current problems and trends with guesses about the future impact of evolving technologies.

The workshop on Security took inventory of probable threats to international and domestic peace, sorting them into apparent “certainties” and “uncertainties.” For example, Russia was seen as a major uncertainty, while biological weaponry was deemed a certain threat requiring priority attention.

The Law workshop dropped that test and focused on the practicalities of international rule-setting in such realms as law of the sea, and creation of the international criminal court, opposition to which the United States was urged to reconsider.

The workshop on Politics focused on a personal narrative by the chairman which reflected larger changes in world politics as well as profound recent changes in attitudes toward both politics and power.

Discussion of all three “problem sets” highlighted a millennial challenge: It’s not only the revolutionary changes in trade and finance, but also the application of law, the management of security, and the process of governance itself that now demand imaginative rethinking at global, regional, and sub-regional levels.

It seems likely that military and “resource power” will remain in the hands of national states. Thus the players on the 21st century stage will include still-powerful states alongside increasingly influential “nongovernments” ranging from humanitarian NGOs to multinational corporations, transnational terrorist groups, and some privatized security functions hitherto the monopoly of inter-governmental organizations.
The workshop was chaired by Richard E. Benedick on the first day, Mohamed Kassas the second, and on the third day Luigi Mastroianni. Junior Fellow Frank Biermann served as rapporteur.

One Day 1 the workshops were asked to define, for their fields, the next century’s major certainties and uncertainties. After intense discussion, this group defined as certainties (1) the “accumulation” of people (population growth, urbanization, aging of some populations); (2) the degradation of the natural environment; and (3) the inevitable changes in the global climate.

The important uncertainties were judged to be (1) new threats to human health, for example from the cumulative effect of persistent chemicals or new diseases; (2) the impacts that global climate change may have; and (3) the interdependencies of various trends in population and environment.

On Friday, the working groups were to define major existing gaps in human knowledge and the most important opportunities to act. The gaps were in knowledge about biological diversity, the impacts and costs of climate change, the interdependencies of persistent chemicals, and the solution to the fresh water crisis.

As for opportunities, the group focused on three kinds of change. We need knowledge that is more holistic, dynamic, and applicable. We need to increase the “institutional transference” of knowledge; it should more readily cross boundaries between countries (especially from North to South), between science and policy, and between global and local levels. And we need to change the way knowledge is generated; changes were suggested for the education of scientists.

On the third day, the working groups were to develop concrete steps to be taken. On the population issue, the group urged the international health community (1) to double its efforts to grant access to contraception to all who need and want it, and to keep working on better methods; (2) to better address gender issues in family planning and the transference of disease; and (3) to alleviate the still-increasing imbalance of health resources between South and North.

On environment policy, the group suggested that the World Academy organize a Roundtable on how the world might better govern the global environment. The Roundtable might evaluate existing instruments, programs and organizations, and reflect on possible profound changes such as a new world environment and development body as part of the UN system.
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On January 1, 2000, computers that use a two-digit field to describe the year will see 1/1/00 and react as if it’s 1/1/1900 – unless they have been reprogrammed. Saving disk space was important in the early days of main-frame computing – and everyone knew that 79 or 89 referred to 1979 or 1989. But for the last decade the same programmers who took the shortcut have been warning those who would listen that there will be problems unless society gets on with the mammoth but doable task of rewriting computer code.

Well, people tended to deny the problem, thought it was someone else’s problem. Now we are faced with a range of dire predictions—some of which could set off civil disorder. For example Ed Yardeni, the chief economist for Deutsche Bank Securities, thinks that the Y2K problem will not be fixed in time and that breakdowns in computer systems will (with 70 percent certainty) bring on a global recession. A recession is the good news: Yardeni and others are far more worried about all the military hardware left over from the Cold War. Nuclear and missile systems are all vulnerable and system malfunction could lead to widespread disaster.

A growing number of experts say the danger is that computers unprepared for the millennium will fail, potentially causing everything from traffic lights to electric power grids to fail, sparking widespread economic and social dislocation. Note that the RCMP, Canada’s national police force, takes the threat seriously. It has cancelled all annual leave from the last week in December 1999 to the end of March 2000.

Note too that the Canadian Armed Forces have been ordered to prepare for what might be their biggest ever peacetime deployment—dealing with a wide range of possible problems (civil disorder to infrastructure failure) arising from Y2K.

Companies and nations are rushing to fix the problem. And it’s costly. In 1999, companies will spend nearly half their IT (information technology) budgets to fix Y2K problems. In 1998, corporations spent 29 percent of their IT budgets addressing the Y2K problem. In 1997 the number was a relatively small 5 percent.

Fixing the problems of old technology, fixing the Y2K problem, will slow investments in new technology, and slow growth for many computer companies. The worldwide cost of preventing potential Year 2000 computer failures will total $300 billion to $600 billion, with $150 billion to $225 billion of that to be spent by U.S. companies alone. (Note that computer systems account for an average of between 5 percent and 8 percent of corporate budgets.) Fixing the problem means not only re-writing code, but locating those chips that are embedded as parts of other systems. These chips must be removed or bypassed. Embedded systems can be found in refrigerators, car brakes, and elevator circuits – just about anywhere. All of these might be affected.

I call attention to the Y2K problem to point out how smart people reacted to a known problem. It is a problem that could have been addressed a decade ago. We knew the potential impacts, we just avoided them.
Fellows are strongly encouraged to take an active role in the future of the World Academy by identifying and nominating new Fellows.

There are no formal qualifications—such as age, or advanced academic degrees—for joining us. But the following criteria may help in selecting candidates:

1. Our (very broad) mandate is to keep a close eye on “the social consequences and policy implications of knowledge.”

2. Distinction or accomplishment in one’s chosen profession. A nominee should be a person who would qualify for membership in a national academy in his or her field.

3. A candidate should have shown active interests beyond a specialized field. Interdisciplinary interests and accomplishments are relevant.

4. A record of public service (not limited to government work as such) is helpful.

5. A global perspective. To be a Fellow of the World Academy is to be a member of global civil society, concerned for the welfare of an increasingly-interconnected global civilization.

The procedure for nominating a new Fellow is, first, to discuss the nomination with the prospective nominee; second, to obtain a biography or CV; and third, to identify another Fellow who will second the nomination.

Nominees should be people who would expect to take an active interest in the Academy’s activities, rather than viewing election to the Academy as an honor requiring no further engagement.

Nominees should also understand that nomination does not guarantee election. The number of World Academy Fellows is limited by charter to 500 worldwide.

The nominator should forward a nomination letter to the Director of Admissions, and arrange for a second letter seconding the nomination. The Executive Committee, which elects new Fellows, meets twice yearly; nominations are usually considered at these meetings.

Multiple nominations are not encouraged. Usually, a Fellow should not make more than one nomination a year.

These are general guidelines, not hard-and-fast rules. The World Academy seeks to be both fair and flexible in building and maintaining a fellowship worthy of “the Global Century.”

Admissions office:
Prof. Magda Cordell McHale
Center for Integrative Studies
S.U.N.Y. at Buffalo
Hayes Hall, 3435 Main Street
Buffalo, NY 14214, USA

The Vancouver Assembly provided the first opportunity for a large number of Junior and Associate Fellows of the Academy to meet face to face. We made our first meeting an occasion to introduce ourselves and provide a little background on our interests and goals. The composition of the group reflected the diversity of the Academy in general: in attendance were several international lawyers, two journalists, several biochemists, scholars of government, anthropology, international relations, organizational psychology and planning, among others.

The first item of business was to clarify

the extension of terms. All Junior Fellow appointments were set to expire December 31, 1998. After a discussion by the Executive Committee, it was decided that all active Junior Fellows would be re-appointed for another three year term. All active Junior Fellows will be sent a letter of re-appointment as a confirmation of this decision.

Future Activities
We only had a short time scheduled over lunch for our discussions, but the conversation was enthusiastic and stimulating. It was clear that everyone was eager to move forward with some activity in 1999. Here are some of the proposals:

- Design a web-conference to be held in Spring of 1999. Several currents of discussion were proposed, but the initial consensus was that we should have a couple of administrative tracks such as The Purpose of a Multi-disciplinary Academy or Approaches to Fundraising; one or two themes of our own design; plus one or two themes currently being followed by the Academy, such as Globalization or Religion and Governance.

- We would like to meet in the fall of 1999. A series of web-conferences was proposed as a way of planning, circulating papers, and advancing the overall level of discussion. These were seen as necessary in order to make any non-virtual/real-time meetings as productive and stimulating as possible. There is a possibility of finding a host/co-sponsor for a meeting in Ukraine or Croatia. We hope a few Fellows, especially from Eastern Europe, would be willing to help in the design of workshops and in securing funding.
EMILY HARTSHORNE MUDD
1898-1998
Founding Fellow of the Academy

Nancy Palmer

Emily Hartshorne Mudd was an internationally recognized social scientist and a giant in the field she helped to create: marriage and family counseling. Along with her husband, Stuart Mudd, she was also instrumental in founding the World Academy of Art and Science and, throughout the years, continued to be a moving spirit in the affairs of the Academy.

She served as Director until 1967. In this capacity she helped to shape the field of marriage and family counseling around the world. Under her leadership Marriage Council not only provided counseling services but also set up one of the first programs for training marriage counselors as well as the first program for evaluating clinical services. Recognizing the importance of sexuality in family life, Emily Mudd trained doctors in sex therapy both in Philadelphia and at the Masters and Johnson Institute in St. Louis where she served as consultant and board member. She authored many popular as well as scholarly works, including three basic text books, and helped Alfred Kinsey edit his monumental study, Sexual Behavior in the Human Female.

Emily Mudd was influential on both the national and the international scenes, receiving along the way numerous awards and honorary degrees in the United States and abroad. She was a founding member of the American Association of Marriage Counselors (now the American Association of Marriage and Family Therapists) and over the years consulted widely from Russia to Australia, remaining active in the field well into her late 80s. She also played an important role in the activities of the World Academy as long-time Treasurer and member of the Executive Committee. In addition she established two awards given by the Academy, the Stuart Mudd Award for contributions in microbiology and the Mastroianni-Segal Award for population, contraceptive development, and family planning.

While in 1933 marriage counseling was virtually unknown, today in the United States alone over 25,000 marriage counselors treat more than 2 million troubled marriages each year. This contribution to human happiness and well being is a fitting monument to Emily Mudd.

-continued on page 16-

MYRES S. McDOUGAL
Michael Reisman

Myres Smith McDougal was born in 1906 in the hill country of northern Mississippi. A classics major at “Ole Miss,” he was elected a Rhodes Scholar at the age of 20. At Oxford, he achieved a “double first,” a rare feat of academic excellence. His law degree was earned at Yale University in 1931, and he began in 1934 his long career as a law professor at Yale.

In 1935, while visiting the University of Chicago, he met Harold Dwight Lasswell, who became his lifelong friend and intellectual collaborator. Their joint work is unparalleled in the annals of higher education.

At Yale, Myres McDougal was a towering presence for six decades. Many were drawn to him because of the coherence and vividness of his intellectual approach.

Initially, it was spelled out in Property Law. He revolutionized the field, transforming it from a narrow study largely focused on the protection of private interests in land, to an inquiry about the adequacy and consistency of law – with policies for the optimal planning and utilization of all the spatial resources of a community in ways that would benefit the common interest.

After returning to Yale from government service in World War II, he shifted his focus to international law, which he transformed no less radically. He produced five major treatises on war, the sea, outer space, human rights, and interpretation. These, together, won him worldwide recognition and established him as the father of modern international law.

-continued on page 16-
McDougal’s style was that of the medieval master. He was a great teacher because he was passionately engaged in a life-long process of learning and creating. So his teaching was not simply a matter of imparting knowledge to his students; that was, he felt, beneath them. He taught by incorporating his students in his projects, by assigning them parts, working with them, teaching them as he learned from them. Lucky students became collaborators, but anyone who contributed to the process was acknowledged. For all his students, it was a thrill to be part of this large enterprise.

McDougal’s legal thought was forged in the crucible of Legal Realism at Yale in the 1930s. After World War II he set out, with Harold Lasswell, to create, on the ruins of Realism, a “jurisprudence for a free society.”

For 30 years, he refined his theory in his year-long seminar, “Law, Science & Policy.” The special vocabulary, the wide-ranging subject matter, and the intensity of the seminar made it part of the folklore of the Law School. Out of the seminar emerged the “New Haven School,” and the two-volume treatise, “Jurisprudence for a Free Society.”

McDougal’s focus has two main components—the relevant communities to be studied and the conception of law to be deployed. Both of these focal elements represent radical departures from traditional jurisprudence.

He insists, first, on a globally comprehensive conception of community, for his work is premised in the interdependence of the entire earth-space arena in which people interact. A corollary of this premise is that efforts to understand or influence decisions cannot succeed without keeping that interdependence in mind. In his community focus, he insists that processes of effective power as well as those of authoritative decision be incorporated.

McDougal insists that law, the second component of his focus, be conceived as processes of authoritative decision by which people clarify and implement their common interests. Thus he rejects behaviorism by insisting on a balanced emphasis on both perspectives and operations: what people say and think as well as what they do. He rejects formalism by insisting on a conception of law that incorporates both authority and control—that is, the normative expectations of relevant actors as well as their actual participation in decision-making.

He emphasizes the processes by which the institutions for making indispensable decisions are established, maintained, and changed. But he dismisses the notion of a constitution as a document, insisting instead on a theory of “constitutive process” in which authority and control actually operate.

He distinguishes this constitutive process from the public order of a community, the aggregate of decisions about the production and distribution of all values other than power. And he distinguishes in turn, within the public order, a civic order or domain of privacy, in which production and distribution are effected through less severe sanctions.

These focal components have been designed with an intellectual task or humanitarian goal in mind. The distinction between public and civic order is animated by McDougal’s concern for the maintenance of private domains protected by the coercive power of the organized community but insulated from its operation.

His insistence on an integration of authority and control as prerequisite to a meaningful conception of law is distinctive and may be one of McDougal’s major contributions to legal theory. The conception of the constitutive process is almost Copernican in its insistence that many postulates of right conduct in secular societies be tested with full attention to contemporaneous practices, rather than by reference to a totemized text.

The World Academy of Art and Science was a natural venue for McDougal, given his commitment to the use of knowledge as a means for shaping a world public order of human dignity. He came into the World Academy because of Harold Lasswell, his close friend and collaborator, who served as its president. But even after Lasswell’s death, he remained devoted to the ideals of the World Academy and followed its activities closely.

Octavio Carpena
Juan Jose Lucena
Dpt. Quimica Agricola
Universidad Autonoma, Madrid

Prof. Octavio Carpena (1920-1997), Professor Emeritus of Agricultural Chemistry at the Universidad Autonoma of Madrid, was an authority on plant science and nutrition. He became a recognized international expert in Citriculture.

He was often invited to other nations to help devise solutions to citrus nutrition problems and to improve yields and quality of citrus products. In 1970 he was elected president of the International Society of Citriculture. Prof. Carpena was also an excellent teacher. He guided the research work of more than a hundred doctoral and master’s candidates at several universities and institutes.

He served not only as example and preceptor to his co-workers and colleagues, he was also their kind and responsive friend. He is remembered as a gentleman with a strong personality and a generous heart.
Ctirad Škoda

Ronald W. Manderscheid

Dr. Ctirad Skoda, 76, director of the Psychiatric Demography Unit, Prague Psychiatric Center in the Czech Republic, died unexpectedly on April 15, 1998, in Switzerland.

Dr. Skoda’s life reflected the best features of the World Academy. He was broadly accomplished in arts and sciences, and concerned with improving the human condition. As a young man, he was trained in industrial engineering and served as a design engineer at the Skoda Works. His interest in classical music also flourished during this period, and he became an accomplished concert pianist.

In 1950, he received the M.D. degree from Masaryk University, and soon completed a residency in psychiatry. In 1983 he received the Dr.Sc. degree from Charles University in Prague. Between 1951 and 1997, he authored 269 scientific publications.

Throughout his career, Dr. Skoda was always concerned with the wellbeing of individual clients through his work in psychiatry, as well as the wellbeing of society as a whole, through his work in epidemiology. In 1997 he completed a large-scale study of psychiatric epidemiology in the Czech Republic, which has served a model for other Eastern European nations.

Dr. Skoda was a great host and raconteur. Each weekend he and his wife traveled to their country house near the home of Antonín Dvořák. We will miss his humor, wit, warmth, and contributions to humankind.
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