

# **Who should Govern on What Principles: The Future of Decision Making Combining Nudge with Scenarios to reach Eutopia**

**Prof. Dr. Elif Cepni**

Nisantasi University,

Maslak Mahallesi 1453. No: 20, 34398 ,Sarıyer – Istanbul / TURKEY

Email:elif.cepni@nisantasi.edu.tr

## **ABSTRACT**

The main aim of this paper is to discuss the theories of decision making, the problems of predictions and how to improve the tools of decision making at macro level for policy makers in our postnormal times.

Decision making is the process of identifying and choosing alternatives based on the values and preferences of the decision maker from several perspectives (psychological, cognitive, normative).

Decision theory (or the theory of choice) is the study of the reasoning underlying an agent choices. It can be broken into two branches: Normative (prescriptive) decision theory, which gives advice on how to make the best decisions given a set of uncertain beliefs and a set of values (how people ought to make decisions) and descriptive (positive) decision theory which analyzes how existing, possibly irrational agents actually make decisions (Grunig and Kuhn, 2013).

Political decisions or governmental policies are the part of normative decision theory. The values, beliefs and ideas of policy makers will have a great impact on the formulation of policies. “What is right” and “what is wrong” can have different answers of different individuals and groups. So how governments or institutions especially international ones should be governed is a very complex question. Making decisions is the most important job of executives and policy makers. It is also very tough and risky. Researchers have been studying the way our minds function in making decisions for half a century.

The problems of our time- energy, the environment, climate change, food security, financial security-cannot be understood in isolation.They are systemic problems, which mean that they are interconnected and interdependent (Capra and Luisi, 2014).

In many cases political leaders are unable to connect the dots. They fail to see how the major problems of our time are all interrelated. They do not see that their so-called solutions affect future generations. Even if they can see the problems in a holistic way they will face another important threat of “how to distribute power”. Sometimes global decisions may contradict with national ones or sometimes populism may dominate the decisions of policy makers.

There are big diverse groups in the world so the governance of humanity is not very easy.

Most people in our modern society especially in our large social institutions, use the concepts of an out-dated worldview, a perception of reality inadequate for dealing with our overpopulated, globally interconnected world.

The age that we are living is named more frequently as “postnormal times”. Postnormal times have been characterized by complexity, chaos and contradictions (Sardar, 2010).

The main aim of this paper is to discuss and show the need of new alternative decision- making systems which could eliminate the basic deficiencies of the current systems in an era which is called postnormal times. What are the main reasons behind the necessity of formulating new ways of thinking and using them in the formulation of new policies is another aim of the paper?

In post normal times we need to teach or nudge people on “how they can be more anti-fragile and enjoy the complexity of our daily life”. Modernity has brought significant quality improvements into our daily lives but also it has brought lots of problems with it. Citizens and consumers of today are experiencing a growing sense of alienation, loss of values and loss of flexibility (Zajda, 2009).

This is another attempt to show that we need a reconsideration of the relevance of the certainty and stability of the Newtonian paradigm in the decision making or governance process.

Key words: postnormal times, governance, complexity, systems view of thinking, irrationality, chaos, foresight.

## **1.INTRODUCTION**

On the one side it is believed that globalisation is creating the conditions for faster economic growth through access to ideas, technology, goods, services and capital on the other side many believe that globalisation causes rising levels of inequality and poverty. Half the world nearly three billion people live on less than two dollars a day.

Eighty-two percent of the wealth generated last year went to the richest one percent of the global population, while the 3.7 billion people who make up the poorest half of the world saw no increase in their wealth, according to a Oxfam Report (Richest 1 percent, 2018).

The UNDP defines “human development” as a “process of enlarging people’s choices”. So how we can increase the choices of people through sustainable development-more democratic- more humanistic way is one of the most important topics of the current and future global political agenda. Being a humanist means building bridges between north, south, east and west and strengthening the human community to take up our challenges together.

Today’s societies are interconnected and cannot act in isolation. So if there are conflicts among national and global priorities how the problem could be solved is still out of the main agenda of main powers. There are some very serious problems of the modern World that none of the countries or institutions can manage to solve by itself.

Poverty, disease (the Ebola virus, Tuberculosis, HIV etc), wars, terrorism, racism and the like.

Famine in parts of Africa, depletion of natural resources, the proliferation of nuclear weapons, deterioration in human rights and democratic freedoms, problems of business life brought with technological change are some other problems that may require common, collective and participatory solutions.

Also it is very difficult for national decision makers to prioritize different interests of different groups within the same country. Decision makers will rely on their beliefs, ideas, values and sometimes to their ideological camp. It is very likely that they will formulate their decisions under the attraction of populism.

Even at individual level there are serious problems in terms of formulating our decisions. According to Kahneman, Utility Theory makes logical assumptions of economic rationality that do not reflect people's actual choices and does not take into account cognitive biases (Kahneman, 2012). Cognitive biases are tendencies to think in certain ways that can lead to systematic deviations from a standard of rationality or good judgement, and are often studied in psychology and behavioural economics. Anchoring or focalism, availability heuristic, bias blind spot, cheerleader effect, conjunction fallacy, focusing effect, framing effect, hindsight bias, omission bias are some of them.

As Thomas Hobbes marked perhaps we are selfish and driven by fear of death and the hope of personal gain, perhaps we all seek power over others (Warburton, 2012). Even if we don't believe in Hobbes's picture of humanity still it is true that there could be a serious difference between individual good and social good. But could it be possible to take some important decisions both at national and international level by collective action. This view not necessarily will be against of sovereign states. In this postnormal times national states are becoming weaker. This is sometimes named as the globalization of individuals. The people of the world are more connected now. This is not very bad as it is claimed by Hobbes in Leviathan.

Richard Thaler in his book titled "Misbehaving" also lays out that our decisions deviate from the standards of rationality, meaning we misbehave. Thaler and Sunstein in their book titled "nudge" criticize the homo economicus view of human beings "that each of us thinks and chooses unfailingly well, and thus fits within the textbook picture of human beings offered by economists. It seems reality is different than theory.

David Orell in his book titled "Economyths" also tries to show how the science of complex systems is transforming economic thought. He claims that the main assumptions of economic theory must be replaced with more realistic ones. The economy is unfair, unstable, and unsustainable and economics needs a scientific revolution.

Empirical studies proved the fallacy of "rationality" assumption of the traditional economic theory. Behavioural economics, a branch of economics, is challenging long-standing economic theory and reshaping the making of public policy.

Leaders, policy makers, CEOs are not, or at least they are no more rational than most human beings in their judgments and the choices that they make.

Kahneman says that human beings rarely meet the criteria of rationality even when they are reasonable. People could be irrational and make lots of errors. So, if we take our nationalistic, religious, gender or race-based and cultural differences into consideration, rational decision making could be even more problematic.

When these errors are predictable, decision-makers could design policies that “nudge” us toward better choices.

In the formulation of their policies governments and international institutions can incorporate human factors into design and by using scenario planning methods they could become “choice architectures”.

Through this way we can create credible and sustainable organizations that serve society’s interest simultaneously with their own.

There is no Pareto-dominant policy and no single policy ensures that all individuals in society will be better off than they would be under any other policy. Different policies have different repercussions on different groups within society (workers versus financial markets, domestic creditors versus foreign creditors; borrowers versus creditors). Moreover, different groups are bearing different risks (Stiglitz, Ocampo, Spiegel, Davis, and Nayyar, 2006). Finding a common solution could be a very difficult task. In this stage scenario planning through the use of information technologies could be used as a decision-making tool.

There are different but similar definitions of scenario planning.

Scenario planning technique exploits the remarkable capacity of humans to both imagine and to learn from what is imagined (Bawden, 1998). It is an effective futuring tool that enables planners to examine what is likely and what is unlikely to happen, knowing well that unlikely elements in an organization are those that can determine its relative success (....., 1998).

Foresight has different definitions but at a very simple level hindsight means understanding the past insight means understanding the present and foresight is used as understanding the future.

In foresight studies generally three of them are used together but the impact of the past should not dominate the image of the future. The conduct of different surveys to determine future policies or strategies can be used at global or national level. Then an international or national authority similar to that of today’s ombudsman can lead the process. Combining results with the evaluation of scientific committees the decisions can be taken. It may solve credibility and time inconsistency problems of the processes in which decisions are taken by privileged minorities either politicians or managers.

The larger organizational units concomitant with economic growth are more likely to lead to bureaucratization, impersonality, communication problems, and the use of force to keep people in line.

Economic growth usually requires greater job specialization, which may be accompanied by greater impersonality, more drab and monotonous tasks, more discipline, and a loss of craftsmanship (Nafziger, 2006).

To have a wealthier happier healthier future we need to design new ways of thinking and also decision making tools. Decision takers can be transformed into decision makers.

Governments may use the contributions of these studies in their policy making and implementation process. We need a novel thinking in decision and policy making process. We need to change the understanding of the way we think and choose.

Every difference in the future (change) is a combination of what the world does and what individuals, governments and corporates do, or do not do, over time. So individuals cannot control the future because the world has a role, but they are not completely powerless either because they can influence the future.

If prediction and probability are limited ways of thinking about the future so could it be possible to use scenario planning at macro decision making level and what could be possible advantages of using scenarios? By designing multi-round decision making process similar to the Delphi technique how the combination of scenarios and nudge can improve the success of policies must be designed to work practically as well. We need a new economic model in line with a system design. We need to think about non-profit businesses, non-market, non-managed, non-money based activities, networks beyond the price system (such as sharing and collaboration).

Delors report also asserted that “Learning to live together, by developing an understanding of others and their history, traditions and spiritual values and, on this basis, creating a new spirit which, guided by recognition of our growing interdependence and common analysis of these risks and challenges of the future, would induce people to implement common projects or to manage the inevitable conflicts in an intelligent and peaceful way” (Living to Learn Together, 2014).

How a better (more democratic-wholistic-humanistic) global governance can be designed and could work in practice should be the most important agenda of all nations. We need national sovereign states but by changing the design of the united nations could we create wealthier healthier happier world order requires lots of effort and brave actions.

## **2. GOVERNANCE and MANAGEMENT**

The state has become increasingly dependent on organizations in civil society and more constrained by international linkages.

Governance differs from government both theoretically and empirically. In theoretical terms, governance is the process of governing. It is what governments do their



citizens. But it is also what corporations and other organizations do to their employees and members. Government refers to political institutions, governance refers to processes of rule wherever they occur (Bevir, 2012).

According to Chhotray and Stoker, governance is about the rules of collective decision-making in settings where there are plurality of actors or organisations and where no formal control system can dictate the terms of the relationship between these actors and organisations (Chhotray and Stoker, 2009).

So what is global governance? It is defined in the following form by the IMF.

*The ideal of global governance is a process of cooperative leadership that brings together national governments, multilateral public agencies, and civil society to achieve commonly accepted goals. It provides strategic direction and then marshals collective energies to address global challenges. To be effective, it must be inclusive, dynamic, and able to span national and sectoral boundaries and interests. It should operate through soft rather than hard power. It should be more democratic than authoritarian, more openly political than bureaucratic, and more integrated than specialized* (Global Governance, 2018).

Management could be defined as getting things done through other people or working with and through other people to accomplish the objectives of both the organization and its members.

How the system should be governed is still very disputed topic. The disputes between economic thought schools is still very deep. The debate is far from over.

Friedman who is known as the founder of monetarist school which is a successor of classical school once said “A society that puts equality -in the sense of equality of outcome-ahead of freedom will end up with neither equality nor freedom”. Following the ideas of Karl Marx communist regimes set out to create a state of uniformity among their citizens through programmes of social engineering and centralized economic management.

Many economists from all sides of economic thought schools have made significant contributions on the economic and political regimes of countries.

But our time is totally different than their time. Solutions to the major problems of our time require a radical shift in our perceptions, thinking and values. Postnormal times (characterized by complexity, chaos and contradictions), postnormal science (characterized by uncertainties, systems view of thinking, alternative perspectives, unknown unknowns, values) and human economy are the concepts that we need to take into consideration to define a new role for science (Cepni, 2017).

In many countries in many sectors senior managers are future illiterate or decisions are taken by using given, expert-oriented (expert-predicted) futures. But the future is not an extrapolation of the past?

Policy making and decision making and other aspects of the management of complex systems are becoming increasingly difficult. Management philosophies, approaches, and techniques were developed during simpler times. However, complex systems are dynamic rather than static, evolve or are driven into domains of instability, and emerge into new structures. There is now a growing gap or loss of fit between our systems-management capabilities and the real world.

Complex adaptive systems consist many diverse and autonomous components or parts (called agents) which are interrelated, interdependent, linked through many (dense) interconnections, and behave as a unified whole in learning from experience and in adjusting (not just reacting) to changes in the environment (CAS,2018).

So in such areas simple mechanistic view cannot be a solution to predict the future. We need new ways of thinking and making decisions.

At micro level in many commercial and non-commercial institutions still traditional strategic plans are used to foresee and reach to this foreseen future.

Strategic Planning is an organizational management activity that is used to set priorities, focus energy on resources, strengthen operations, ensure that employers and other stakeholders are working toward common goals. But now it is widely accepted that good management guards against anything that encourages the standardisation of thought and support original thinking. We need to see the world differently.

We are living in a new era of uncertainty for organisations to cope with. To respond to the interconnected threats the world currently faces (the human family are today interconnected as never before) is not anything that any state can do by her own.

Also at micro level organisation's "strategic readiness" to the challenges of an uncertain world is far from sufficient. A fear of not knowing is always with us and will be with us but we can design better decision-making models and could use it at micro and macro level.

### **3. CHANGING the WAYS of THINKING in the GOVERNANCE PROCESS- WE NEED EUTOPIA**

A line between what is natural, universal, and constant in humankind and what is conventional, local and variable is extraordinarily difficult (Modern Mind,2002).

Systems thinking is a fundamental perspective of future studies. It embodies some of the foundational principles of foresight, such as: every entity (thing) is a system that consists of parts (subsystems) and which is also a part of larger systems- a holon- Arthur Koestler's term popularized by Ken Wilber.

The new emphasis on complexity, networks, and patterns of organization is slowly emerging. The new conception of life involves a new kind of thinking- thinking in terms of relationships, patterns, and context.

In science, this way of thinking is known as “systemic thinking” or “systems thinking”, hence, the understanding of life. A central characteristic of the systems view of life is its nonlinearity: all living systems are complex-i.e-highly nonlinear-networks, and there are countless interconnections between the biological, cognitive, social, and ecological dimensions of life.

The new scientific conception of life can be seen as broad paradigm shift from a mechanistic to holistic and ecological worldview. A shift of metaphors- a change from seeing the world as a machine to understanding it as a network.

We are surrounded by complex adaptive systems. The stock market, the world economy, society, the biosphere and the ecosystem, the brain and the immune system, management teams, traffic and more are the examples of complex adaptive systems.

Business dictionary gives a detailed definition of complex adaptive systems:

*Entity consisting of many diverse and autonomous components or parts (called agents) which are interrelated, interdependent, linked through many (dense) interconnections, and behave as a unified whole in learning from experience and in adjusting (not just reacting) to changes in the environment. Each individual agent of a CAS is itself a CAS: a tree, for example, is a CAS within a larger CAS (a forest) which is a CAS in a still larger CAS (an ecosystem). Similarly, a member of a group is just one CAS in a chain of several progressively encompassing a community, a society, and a nation. Each agent maintains itself in an environment which it creates through its interactions with other agents.*

The new decision making process or governance should take culture-ethics-complexity issues into consideration and by using today’s information technologies should be more participatory, fair and credible.

There is one truth; our decisions are heavily affected by our cultural heritage. Although there is no common definition of “culture” it may be defined as “the unique combination of expectations, written and unwritten rules, and social norms that dictates the everyday actions and behaviours of people”.

In the decision making process we consider how the future could be different from the present. We consider and explore how the rules might change?

Strategic foresight is most interested in “what will change”. We would prepare contingency plans for surprises. We would be proactive. We work on “what if” types questions.

Generally our emotional energy is blind to probability but even if it is not we can not predict the occurrence of extreme events from past history. Risk is in the future, not in the past.



Ethics can be defined in different ways but if we define it as the rules by which people agree to live together then in this age of complexity we may even define these rules again to adjust our universal rules to the changing conditions of our time.

Also ethics shows us the relationship between “individual good” and “social good”.

Catastrophe theory, chaos theory and the problems posed by incomplete information, “fracta” is changing the meaning of the world knowledge. It is producing not the known but the unknown.

The fundamental values of humanity we may use education, science, culture and communication as the pillars of a new science and decision making or governance system.

To construct a united human community and making development a sustainable one we need a new management tool to differentiate growth and development.

In many countries in many sectors senior managers are future illiterate or decisions are taken by using given, expert-oriented (expert-predicted) futures. Is the future is an extrapolation of the past? How can a planner anticipate what will be “good” and “right” and “proper” tomorrow? The values of planners perhaps are narrow and are today’s values, not those which will be held by people in the future. This is a form of tyranny-the tyranny of the present as mentioned by futurist Alvin Toffler.

Growth is a quantitative whereas development is a qualitative concept. By using nudge and choice architecture tools (through scenario planning and other foresight methods) we can compare short term gains long term losses of all decisions.

Modern economies today have undergone a dramatic change. There has been a shift from large-scale material manufacturing to the design and application of new technology with R&D and human capital. The new information age has introduced significant productivity gains through increasing returns and learning by doing. This has challenged the traditional growth models based on competitive market structures.

A complex decision problem is present, if two or more of the following conditions are fulfilled: The actor pursues several goals simultaneously. Some of these goals are not very precisely defined, and it is even possible that contradictions exist between them. As Morieux shows, CEOs in 1955 pursued 4–7 goals. In 2010, 25–40 goals are pursued simultaneously (Grunig and Kuhn, 2013).

To what extent the creation of new especially shared knowledge is used in companies, in public and private institutions, in NGOs etc (from fixed to autonomous management) is not known very well.

The use of flexible methods in working groups, flexible utilization of open discussion and brainstorming, participant empowerment, future-oriented workshops on selected themes facilitated by experts are getting popular but at the final stage who takes decisions is getting us back to traditional top to bottom decision making model.

There are two differing conceptions about rationality of decision making.

Substantial rationality, on the one hand, demands that the goals pursued are the right ones, that is, the goals are rational. Additionally, the decision-making procedure must have a rational course. Formal rationality, on the other hand, requires only that the decision process be rational. As goals generally represent subjective values, they cannot be considered as right or wrong. Thus substantial rationality is not possible. Management science is therefore oriented towards formal rationality.

To have formal rationality we need to use future in a better way. Instead of shorttermism we may use very long time horizon. We may use wholistic view-economic-political-institutional-sociological-technological-environmental aspects together. We may use multi-discipline approach to foresee main changes of the future.

The Discipline of Anticipation can be used as a base of new decision making process.

Prediction does not work very well in the world of human affairs, because there is not good scientific theory of human behaviour.

In fact, there are many theories in psychology, anthropology, sociology and the like. All work to some extent, but they fail just as often. So there is uncertainty when predicting the outcome of a process involving human beings.

The objective would be not to be too right (which is impossible), but rather not to be wrong-not to be surprised. Surprise means, inadequate preparation, late response, risk of failure, even chaos or panic.

The power for people to influence their future is related to the quality of their vision and a vision is a concrete image of a preferred future state.

To have a vision, to be a visionary, or to change the part of the world no need to be a grand historical leader. We can use better tools of decision making for today's complex world (post-normal times).

Scenario Planning is inherently a learning process that challenges the comfortable conventional wisdoms of the organization by focusing attention on how the future may be different from the present (Wilson,2000).

Scenarios are a management tools used to improve the quality of executive decision making and help executives make better, more resilient strategic decisions.

Back-casting is one of the scenario techniques where you start with an imagined future and then create a path to it. The path could be constructed through analytical methods or through more creative methods such as "future history writing".

Foresight is different than forecast. "Forecast" is used as a term for predictions, foresight is a term that describes a more open perspective on futuristic thinking.

It focus on the identification of possible futures, potential issues, tendencies, and uncertainties, often using scenario method. It is similar to the term prospective analysis.

There are some pitfalls of scenario planning too. There are prejudices, wishful thinking and blind spots that could lead to lousy analysis. There can be other traps; process design, selection of participants, communication format and the others. But these deficiencies can be eliminated through well-designed procedures.

In this stage the online voting systems and suggestion collection method could be used.

A scenario is the full description of a future state and the path to that future. Some scenarios may include wild cards in it to show the possible future results. Of our current decisions. Wild cards are unlikely future events that would have great impact if they occurred.

To study the future is to study potential change-unveiling what is likely to make a systemic or fundamental difference over the next 10-25 years or more and it is not economic projection or sociological analysis or technological forecasting, it is a multidisciplinary examination of change in all major areas of life to find the interacting dynamics that are creating the next age (Giaoutz and Sapio,2013).

The emerging new scientific conception of life involves a new kind of thinking-thinking in terms of relationships, patterns, and context which is known as “systems thinking”. A central characteristic of the systems view of life is its nonlinearity: all living systems are complex- highly nonlinear-networks; and there are countless interconnections between the biological, cognitive, social, and ecological dimensions of life.

We may start thinking about “Could it be possible to change our ideas about “what is possible”? Is the wisdom of crowd (collective genius) possible? But of course Wisdom of the crowd requires trust, support by the government, enforcement.

Crowds can be mad as well. To be wise it needs to be diverse in its membership (Goddard and Eccles, 2013). We live in a turbulent world. Plans, strategies and policies are based on fixed goals. But the environment that we live and the conditions are changing very rapidly.

Corporate and government responsibilities are changing very rapidly. We the human beings own better social capital and can use collective intelligence in a better way.

#### 4. HOW THE GLOBAL GOVERNANCE THROUGH COLLECTIVE INTELLIGENCE CAN BE DESIGNED-

The theory cybernetics was the result of a multidisciplinary collaboration between mathematicians, neuroscientists, social scientists, and engineers- a group that became known collectively as cyberneticists.

To deal with the complex problems of postnormal time we need postnormal science which could bring many disciplines together.

If an international organization is established to govern the complex global issues could it be practical? Many radical changes started with utopic ideas.

By using today's information technology, the people of the world can vote to choose the governor of this institution. Let us call her "supra-national ombudsman" and she will act as the ombudsman of the earth and all living things on it.

Then if decision's degree is simple the problem will be well structured and consequences can be predicted quite easily so the decisions can be formulated through the direct votes of all people living on earth.

If the problem is complex than a detailed order can but into effect.

Scientific committees chosen through direct votes by all the people will work on the issues.

The suggestions and solutions of interested people and invited experts will be received. In the second stage possible scenarios and their possible consequences could be shared through online videos to all people governments and institutions.

Richard Thaler and Cass Sunstein suggested that if a particular unfortunate behavioral or decision-making pattern is the result of cognitive boundaries, biases, or habits, this pattern may be "nudged" by public policy makers toward a better option by integrating insights about the very same kind of boundaries, biases, and habits into the *choice architecture* surrounding the behaviour.

So if the problem is totally divergent and does not contain only quantitative aspects then the problem and the decision to be taken to tackle with this will be brought to the supra-national ombudsman. The collection of scenarios and suggestions of scientific committees will be combined (if nudging is necessary this will be added too) and will be listed again to people through direct online surveys.

The choices will be empowered by national governments. Of course in such a global order like the sovereign states limited their sovereignty in some issues through international agreements again states should come together to write the charter of this new institution.

What will be the sufficient majority to take a decision and how any country who does not obey the decision will be forced are the details that can be determined.

But it seems in today's postnormal times we need to destroy the world in theory before we destroy it in practice to make the world order more credible. Through this way the ability of governance systems to cope with change and uncertainty will be easier. Governments created bureaucracy-the rule of no one has become the modern form of despotism as Mary McCarthy described.

Regardless of how we describe the present-the digital epoch-the fourth industrial revolution age-second machine age-the new world order could be designed by the nations especially on complex problems. Trust must be brought back to the global governance. We live in a VUCA (Volatility-Uncertainty-Complexity-Ambiguity) world. Actors with different forms of authority and with different interest can not find common solutions to complex problems.

It is better to start working on the governability of such collective-participatory-

inclusive system. Thinking the unthinkable one is not a utopia. **Utopia** is a Greek word meaning “no place”. But it may be combined with Eutopia which means “good place”.

The similar system can be designed with in corporations. Andrew Chakhyan calls it “intrapreneurship” which means creating new ideas from within organisations. This utopic idea may bring us to eutopia.

## 5.CONCLUSION

The modern world individuals are isolated and helpless. Basic anxiety is characterized as a feeling of “being small, insignificant, helpless, endangered, in a world that is out to abuse, cheat, attack, humiliate, betrays, envy.

A new solidarity or new humanism, to reintegrate all countries in the universal community may be named as utopian by some decision makers or politicians. The meaning of utopian is misused. Utopic never means something which is unrealistic or unreachable. It means by choosing difficult road which requires a paradigm shift and radical changes (which may seem unrealistic or unattainable) we can shape the future in a better way. The history is full with the success stories of these kind of utopic ideas.

Changes in the world call for the development of a new humanism that is not only theoretical but practical, that is not only focused on the search for values – which it must also be – but oriented towards the implementation of concrete programmes that have tangible results.

The Italian philosopher Pico della Mirandola (1463-1494) expressed this point at the tender age of 24, when he developed the central concept of humanism in his famous *Oration on the Dignity of Man*, written in Florence in 1486: “God the Father, (...) taking man (...), set him in the middle of the world and thus spoke to him: ‘we have made you a creature neither of heaven nor of earth, neither mortal nor immortal, in order that you may, as the free and proud shaper of your own being, fashion yourself in the form you may prefer’.”

Global crises raise challenges that cannot be resolved by any single country. Societies are interconnected and cannot act in isolation. It is up to every one of us to bind the community of humanity together, to build a common space that excludes no one, regardless of continent, origin, age or gender.

Sustainable development is development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.“

We need new global governance model to assess the impact over the next decades of multimedia, the human genome project, biotechnology, artificial intelligence, organ transplants, superconductivity, space colonization, and myriad other developments.

How can a planner anticipate what will be “good” and “right” and “proper” tomorrow?



The values of planners perhaps are narrow and are today's values, not those which will be held by people in the future. This is a form of tyranny is was called -the **tyranny of the present** by the futurist Alvin Toffler.

As Nassim Nicholas Taleb states in his new book having the title "Skin in the Game"; we cannot control other people we can only control our own reactions to them. He also adds that the curse of modernity is that we are increasingly populated by a class of people who are better at explaining than understanding (Taleb, 2018).

The world is like the human body, if one part aches, the rest will feel it; if many parts hurt, the whole will suffer. The nature and character of nation's future development should therefore be a major concern of all nations irrespective of political, ideological or economic orientation. As we look toward the next centuries there can no longer be two futures, one for the few rich and the other for the many poor.

Every ecosystem, every species, very thing that happens in the air, or the water or on the land is affected by what people do or have done. This is why many scientists believe that it is time to proclaim an end to Holocene Epoch, which began some ten to twelve thousand years ago with the end of the last Ice Age, and recognize that we have now entered a new epoch, the Anthropocene in which human activity has come to rival nature as a force in the evolution of life on Earth (Anderson,2016).

Sustainable development is development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.

As Spinoza said "If facts conflict with a theory, either the theory must be changed or the facts". And Seneca said "Every new beginning comes from some other beginning's end".

## REFERENCES

Anderson, W.T. (2016). We The Planet, Evolutionary Governance and Biophilia in The Anthropocene, The Meridian International Institute.

Bevir, M. (2012). Governance, A Very Short Introduction Oxford University Press.

Bokova, I. (2010). A New Humanism for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century, UNESCO, Milan,

Capra,F and Luisi,P.L. (2014). The Systems View of Life, A Unifying Vision, Cambridge University Press, UK.

Chermack,T,J.(2011). Scenario Planning in Organizations, How to Create, Use and Assess Scenarios, Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.California.

Chhotray,V and Stoker,G. (2009). Governance Theory and Practice, A cross-Disciplinary Approach, Palgrave Macmillan.

Complex Adaptive Systems (2018).

<http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/complex-adaptive-system-CAS.htm>.

Dupre, B. (2011). 50 Political Ideas You Really Need to Know, Quercus Editions Ltd,

Giaoutzi,M and Sapio,B. (2013). Recent Developments in Foresight Methodologies, Springer, New York.

Global Governance. (2018),  
<http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/fandd/2007/12/boughton.htm>

Grunig,K and Kuhn, R.(2013). Successful Decision-Making, A Systematic Approach to Complex Problems, Third Edition, Springer.

Kahneman,D.(2012). Thinking, Fast and Slow, Penguin Books.

Learning to Live Together. (2014). UNESCO Publication.

Thaler, R.H. (2015). Misbehaving, the Making of Behavioral Economics, W.W. Norton & Compnay, Inc, New York.

Thaler,R.H and Sunstein,C.R.(2009).Nudge, Improving Decisions about Healt, Wealth and Happiness, Penguin Books, UK.

Orrell,D.(2012). Economyths, Icon Books, UK.

Richest 1 percent Bagged 82 percent of Wealth Created Last Year - Poorest Half of Humanity Got Nothing.(2018).Oxfam International, 22 January 2018, <https://www.oxfam.org/en/pressroom/pressreleases/2018-01-22/richest-1-percent-bagged-82-percent-wealth-created-last-year>.

Sardar, Z.(2010). Welcome to Postnormal Times, Futures, 42, 5 June 2010.

Stiglitz, J,E., Ocampo, J,O.,Spiegel, S.,Ffrench-Davis,R., and Nayyar,D.(2006). Stability with Growth, Macroeconomics, Liberalization, and Development,Oxford University Press.

Warburton, N.(2012). A Little History of Philosophy, Yale University Press, Great Britain.

Watson, P.(2002), The Modern Mind, An Intellectual History of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century, Perennial, New York.

Zakaria, F.(2009).The Post-American World, and the Rise of the Rest, Penguin Books, England.