

IS THERE SUCH A THING AS GOOD GLOBALISM?

Anthony M. Hodgson

CONTENTS	PAGE
1. Beyond Globalism and Anti-Globalism	1
2. The Complex of Current World Problems	4
3. The Solutions Are Out There	5
4. So Why Isn't it Happening?	6
5. The Manipulation of Power by Power	7
6. Filtering False From Real Conspiracies	8
7. Beating the Conspiracy Theory Impasse	9
8. Reframing the Field of Power	10
9. The Foundations of Effective Democracy	11
10. The Collaborative Society	14
11. Redesigning Society the Evolutionary Way	16
12. From New World Order to Global Integrity	17
13. From Closed Conspiracies to Open Collaborations	19
14. Assuming Intelligent Responsibility	19
References	21

IS THERE SUCH A THING AS GOOD GLOBALISM?

There is a tendency in scenario based thinking to fall into the trap of “gloom and doom” scenarios versus “golden age” scenarios with “business as usual” scenarios somewhere in between. The work here takes a different approach in which the aim is to uncover deeper structure that goes beyond this simple polarity and continuity. The paper was inspired by reading H.G.Wells’ The Open Conspiracy and Bertrand Russell’s Power in the context of contemporary issues of sustainability and the abuses of power which appear to thwart our attempts to achieve it. These thinkers and writers each in their way struggled to find a basis for a better society which acknowledged the need for a world order but not as an imposed domination by an unethical elite. They saw it rather as an emergent consequence of courageous scrutiny, benign principles and educated human collaboration rather than by means of tyranny, manipulation and cover up.

1. Beyond Globalism and Anti-Globalism

The debate and contention that surrounds world affairs today tends to be trapped in two opposite assumptions. One goes “globalism is good; anti-globalism is bad”. The other goes “anti-globalism is good; globalism is bad”. The thesis of this paper is that there is a more comprehensive way of viewing situation which is a good form of globalism largely unrecognised or supported by either faction. However, this cannot be achieved without a courageous look at the destructive forces that are the rightful concern of the anti-globalists. Without recognition and awareness of the destructive forces at work, those who work for good at any level, local or global, will not actually be at their own disposal. Rather they will be at the disposal of both internal and external forces that constitute a dual form of control that severely constrains and possibly destroys their latent capacity for consciousness and intelligent action. The direct result of this is lack of awareness of values, slavery to propaganda and conditioning, manipulability through fear, and atrophy of the capacity for inquiry into what is really going on.

Many people sense this difficulty as a kind of anxiety that is either uncomfortable and buried in pleasure seeking or distressing and fuelled by constant “bad news”. All this is taking place in a world in which a struggle is going on between the forces of homogenisation and the forces of diversity, between the forces of control and the forces of freedom. The pace of the context of this struggle is accelerating and complexifying, whilst the options offered for dealing with it are slowing and simplifying. It may be that we are running out of time.

“The result is a danger more grave than the victims’ conscious fears. For in a state of mind unsettled by breakneck change and bewildering technology, electors reach for ‘noisy little men’ and prophets of order. In increasingly complex societies – as they struggle to cope with rising expectations, gigantic collective projects, baffling demographic imbalances and alarming external threats – order and social control come to be more valued than freedom and human rights. Perceptions of society, undermined by moral irresponsibility, sexual permissiveness, an alienated underclass, terrorism and rising crime are the fuel of totalitarian ravanche and religious fanaticism.”¹

We are not actually a passive victim in this situation, but rather we suffer from “victim consciousness.” Actually we are actors in the situation which itself is being affected by the way we interpret and respond to the pressures. “There is a two-way

connection between present decisions and future events, which I shall call reflexivity... Human beings respond to economic, social, and political forces in their environment, but unlike inanimate particles of the physical sciences humans have perceptions and attitudes that simultaneously transform the forces acting on them.”²

How we understand our world in the next twenty years will greatly effect the kind of world that will exist at that time. We have reached a point in our historical evolution where a confluence of inexorable forces creates a delicate equilibrium in which the impact of conscious human choices may well be the determining factor as to the outcome. In order to recognise this state of affairs there a number of dominant assumptions in current societies and cultures around the world that need to be questioned. For instance:

- That everything is alright^a
- That what is happening is the usual mess which we have always had and we are still here^b
- That there are problems but they should be solved by others^c
- That there are problems and we have the means solve them^d
- That there are indeed inexorable forces before which we are helpless^e
- That we can solve the bad things by opposing them in “anti” movements^f
- That people in power will sooner or later take care of the problems^g
- That there is really nothing new in the current situation^h

Let’s begin from the last point. A physical analogy will help. A lake of defined size begins as a healthy body of water with a rich aquatic life. However, it becomes invaded by a plant species which is inimical to most of that life. In the early stage it is no threat, occupying just a small corner of the lake. It does, however, double in size every week. Eventually it comes to the notice of the authorities that something is happening. Committees are formed and debates follow. Time passes until the lake is half covered. A plan has been drawn up. The invading species can be cleared over a period of three weeks. A lone scientist points out that the lake is already half covered. The committee refers him to the plan. He refers them to the doubling time of one week. In the event, the lake is smothered well before the plan gets into motion. It takes only a week to cover the rest of the lake.

The point of this analogy is that, to the committee, the growth of the invading species is performing in the way it always has. Correct. But the limiting conditions of the finite size of the lake have been overlooked. Overlaid by a mental assumption that you can extrapolate in a linear way the early symptoms, the devastating consequence of reaching a limit “sooner than we think” are clear.

Now, for the lake, substitute “planet earth” and for the invading species substitute the expansion of man’s impact on the system. For the covering of the lake, substitute “irreversible biospheric conditions”³ What this amounts to has been well portrayed by Alex King and Bert Schneider in their book “The First Global Revolution” in which they state:

^a Consume and be happy, accept control for our own good

^b We stumble on from one crisis to the next but generally things are getting better

^c Solving problems of the job of governments

^d New technologies will deal with the problems

^e We must rely on faith in higher powers

^f The way to deal with things is protest against those in power doing the bad things

^g For example, the “endless war on terrorism”

^h History shows that things go in cycles

“... we are in the early stages of the formation of a new type of world society which will be as different from today’s as was that ushered in by the Industrial revolution from the society of the long agrarian period that preceded it. ... The world-wide significance of this revolution becomes vastly greater if one considers its mismanagement could endanger the whole human race.”⁴

2. The Complex of Current World Problems

The picture, of course, is far from all gloom and doom that might be inferred from this introduction so far. The last three hundred years of science and technology applied to human problems have generated many solutions and benefits which have been applied in specific domains. As we pile up trouble in an area we equally seem to innovate some way of dealing with it. This improves many of the measures we use to define progress. However, the assumptions which apply in the early stages of, say, applying a technology so often end up with unintended consequences and so we have seen over and over again that today’s solution becomes tomorrow’s problem. This goes further as the component parts of our world interact more intensively. Now we live in an interconnected planet in which problems link up with each other in ever more complex ways, where human processes impact on the scale of the biosphere and atmosphere and where there is no such thing as cultural isolation. The mathematical rules of combination show that the number of possible combinations of n items is 2^n . So with two things interacting we have four possible states. But with twenty things interacting we have well over a million. Yet our linear mind assumes some proportionality, around forty possible states. To break the linguistic habit of thinking isolated problems, the Club of Rome coined the word *problematique* for this expanding and intermeshing set of major challenges. In the early nineties they considered twelve areas where the current trends were largely unfavourable. Although published in 1991 their overview has changed little in the last decade. It is worth summarising.⁵

1. *Economic Growth*

Economic growth is fragile and is taking place in ways to further widen the gap between haves and have-nots. It is threatened by war. Growth of consumption poses increasing problems of depletion, waste and pollution. New business models are emerging that are “lighter” in their impact but there are still six billion people needing subsistence and satisfying life-style.

2. *New technologies*

Technologies have been invented and developed way ahead of man’s ability to understand the social and ecological consequences. There are technologies, however, that directly address some of the needs to support a more sustainable society even through investment in them is minuscule.

3. *Governance and the Capacity to Govern*

The political systems are generally either inadequate or plain failing through corruption and mismanagement.⁶ The reversion to pre-emptive strike policy, the disregard for international law and the hijacking of governance by political/corporate collusion are just a few issues.

4. *Mass Media*

The media are largely in the control of both power possessors and exploiters such that reporting of what is really going on is distorted and often harnessed to maintaining psychological states in society⁷ rather than conveying significant information. Mind control has reached a phenomenal scale through media reach and concentration of control.

5. *Global Food Security*

World food production could be adequate although too heavily dependent on unsustainable agricultural technology. Sustainable technology does exist.

Genetically modified organisms are very likely to reveal unintended consequences for ecological balance.

6. *Water Availability*

The availability and distribution of water is heading for a level of crisis that will most likely lead to “water wars”. Potable water is becoming commercialised like oil and yet is surely a human right.

7. *Environment*

The obvious point here is that if standards of living for the majority of people are to be achieved without radical transformation of the basis of that life-style, then we will run out of planet earth.⁸ The US consumes more than 50% of earth resources for around 6% of the global population.

8. *Energy*

Although climate change is a real threat, especially in its non-linear potential for global superstorms, there is no end in sight to increasing production of carbon dioxide as a consequence of energy demand. However, technologies do exist which could shift the balance towards renewables.

9. *Population Growth*

The question here is not just food and habitat but the mental health through meaningful lives and healthy society for most people. This is a problem even in the so-called developed world.

10. *Learning System*

Education is increasingly based on feeding people more and more specialised or irrelevant knowledge and atrophying the ability to question. Intelligent questioning is increasingly “politically incorrect” and diversion of specialisation or entertainment is constraining it to a conditioning process..

11. *Values and Religions*

Intolerance is rising on the back of increasing fear raising new post cold war tensions. A combination of the “war on terrorism” and religious fundamentalism is surfacing, largely divorced from real spiritual values.

12. *Materials*

The extraction of the lithosphere is still accelerating. The sequestration of the poisons presented is problematic. There are, however, some positive developments in the growing adoption of principles like The Natural Step.⁹

This overview is immensely summarised but serves to remind us that the agenda is massive and complex, given that all these areas also interact with each other in complex ways.

3. The solutions are out there

The commercialisation of intelligence has led to extreme specialisation. This influences the way society is organised and means that our awareness of the human situation emerges piecemeal. If the component problems were capable of being isolated (as in the past many of them have been) then traditional problem solving would perhaps ensure a future. But in the last fifty years awareness has grown of the interconnectedness of problems, where one solution may create unintended problems elsewhere. The issue of systemic interaction and balancing the world system now thwarts most policy initiatives..

However, sufficient good work has been done on many of the main problem areas of the problematique that a case can be made that the major component problems are soluble with existing knowledge. Potential areas like food, energy, water, even education can be vastly improved. The degradation of the lithosphere, biosphere and atmosphere could be turned around. Human health could be vastly improved with application of current knowledge. Appropriate information could be disseminated

rapidly freed from propaganda constraints. The economy could be regulated to be healthier and be less dominated by the absence of fair competition and by asymmetric financial management.

The emergence of a more comprehensive and interactive set of solutions (termed the *resolutique* by the Club of Rome) is still hampered by poor understanding of the mutual impact of component solutions. But the emergence of new sciences of complexity, system and interconnectedness show that if half an effort was put into this many new understandings would be generated. Studies show that these understandings can be mapped and modelled in ways that will reveal enabling policies which would accelerate a turn around.¹⁰ The question now is not that we cannot see some way towards dealing more intelligently with the complexity, but a rather different question:

Why is the knowledge that we have gained not being put into practice, more deeply researched and placed at the top of the political, business and civic agenda worldwide?

“...the major problems facing society are not physical but socio-political. These problems are based on the uneven distribution of power, both between and within nations. The result is oppression and alienation, largely founded upon exploitation. The deterioration of the physical environment is not an inevitable consequence of human progress, but the results of social organisations based largely on destructive values.”¹¹

4. So why isn't it happening?

The current situation reveals an extraordinary and widening gap between knowing and doing. It is not that no progress is being made but compared to the scope of what already could be, progress is disastrously slow. For example, effective action is basically stalled on issues such as: climate change, rich/poor divide, food, health, education, diversity and tolerance.

The problem is in human responsibility and governance. It is in the quality (or lack of it) in the leadership. Recent research on a standard for evaluating policy and political leadership distilled seventeen principles or criteria. How many of them do our current leaders practise and demonstrate?¹²

- 1) reflection in terms of 'rise and decline' and long term evolutionary processes
- 2) focus on long term 'weaving of the future'
- 3) thinking in terms of evolutionary potential
- 4) estimates of situations and dynamics, processes and mutation possibilities
- 5) thinking in historical terms without being bound by the past
- 6) emphasis on 'futuribles', grand designs and realistic visions
- 7) identifying, developing and focusing critical choices
- 8) emphasis on creativity
- 9) iconoclasm, learning and changing one's mind
- 10) concern with resources
- 11) sensitivity to power, but distinct from politics
- 12) concern with implementation
- 13) managing and utilizing crises
- 14) grounded in moral reasoning, value analysis and research
- 15) better interaction with societal thinking and research
- 16) acknowledging and coping with complexity
- 17) self-reflexiveness to assure constant quality improvement

It seems that the exercise of power in the service of acquisitive short-term values still far outweighs service towards a common sustainable future. There are many layers of power and they are degrading rapidly. We increasingly observe rule towards hidden (and not so hidden) agendas for accumulating power and resources on a global scale through:

- ❑ Exploitation through distraction
- ❑ Media manipulation and captive journalism
- ❑ Politics of power over policy
- ❑ Big business substituting for governance
- ❑ Monetisation of values to render everything into a market mechanism
- ❑ Promotion of cultural conflict as a means of control
- ❑ Blatant plans for world domination supported by hidden influences

In most developed nations there is a pretence at democracy but the meaning of this term has become itself so degraded that it now sits as a slogan on top of:

- ❑ Dominant socio-political belief systems which to criticise is to invite censorship, suppression or character assassination
- ❑ Elected dictatorships that remove democratic checks and balances
- ❑ Agendas buried under distraction and manipulation
- ❑ Priorities determined by self-serving short term interests
- ❑ Blatant neglect of the long term well being of society
- ❑ Cunning planning of the long term domination by the power holders
- ❑ Clinging to the established order to prevent evolutionary change
- ❑ Corruption of power through lack of moral fibre
- ❑ Increasing promotion of fear in society as means to develop stronger police states in the guise of 'protecting the people'¹³

These points, put plainly, seem extreme in relation to the banter kept up by the news media and by most commentators. But the test is *what is the gap between what is being said and what is being done? What is the gap between declared policies and actual results?*

5.The Manipulation of Power by Power

A key to understanding this is that only some of this is done blatantly. In practice a great deal of psychological and sociological knowledge has been developed over the last century to exploit the weaknesses in the human mind and keep us most of the time in a kind of hypnotic dream world. It is the modern equivalent of the old Roman method that served them so well of "bread and circuses" after conquering violence and offered peace on the conqueror's terms.

There are two basic psychological techniques that have been developed over the centuries into sophisticated covert operations.

Method 1 is *problem/reaction/solution*

In this approach, a problem must be emphasised or created to bring about the desired covert result. The problem must engender the sense of need in the population to see the overt solution as desirable. Once this is achieved then the hidden use for the solution can be implemented.¹⁴

Method 2 is *aggravation/isolation/facilitation*

This is the method of drawing a population into an aggressive state so they can be made to behave in an extreme way. The future recipients of this behaviour are isolated from the knowledge of the aggravation and then the unwitting aggressive agent is secretly 'facilitated' to get away with a hostile act. Hence the original perpetrators are overlooked in the search for causes.¹⁵

Now clearly, such methods defy belief in the propaganda dominated mind. But by deeper non-naïve reflection and by acknowledging immoral or amoral motives in power holders, they make sense of evidence that is otherwise odd. This clarification then becomes labelled as a "conspiracy theory". But once labelled a conspiracy theory the observation is of little use because enough has now been done to rubbish all "conspiracy theories" as crackpot. The result is that an important perspective for investigation is conveniently rendered undiscussable again. But, just a minute! What has happened here to the open society, freedom of enquiry and public accountability? Does this happen in areas of, say sustainability? Just one example can be mentioned by way of illustration. The Global Climate Coalition was set up by a consortium of major oil companies to promote the invalidity of global warming as a deliberate rubbishing of valid research. This was not their declared aim. They appeared to be concerned about climate change but their "conspiracy" was to rubbish it.¹⁶

The requirements of society based understanding necessary for a sustainable resolutique fly in the face of many of the desired conditions that current power structures require for their functioning. They are not necessarily evil as such, but their perpetuation in forms which exacerbate the urgent problematique are not helpful. And if the powers that be are unreceptive to revision and are pursuing their original agendas with more vehemence and appropriation of resources, then we are in for a catastrophic time. Some of these dearly held conditions for maintenance of power and economic growth are:¹⁷

- The consumer society - consumption is the only basis for an economy
- The duped society – drive the economy from wants rather than needs
- The fearful society – maintain order through maintaining fear eg war with terror

Schools of thought exist that dismiss all views that such 'conspiracies' are valid or treat them as simply a product of endemic social paranoia.¹⁸ For example, Karl Popper's view is that:

"the conspiracy theory of society cannot be true because it amounts to the assertion that all events, even those which at first sight do not seem to be intended by anybody, are the intended results of people who are interested in these results."

The American sociologist, Gordon Wood, sums up the case against the validity of conspiracy theories:

"In our post-industrial, scientifically saturated society, those who continue to attribute combinations of events to deliberate human design may well be peculiar sorts of persons – marginal people, perhaps, removed from the centres of power, unable to grasp the conceptions of complicated causal linkages offered by sophisticated social scientists, and unwilling to abandon the desire to make simple and clear moral judgements of events."¹⁹

6. Filtering False from Real Conspiracies

The falsity of these arguments does not lie in the absence of some paranoid tendencies in human beings and the vast amount of dubious theories of conspiracy. Rather it lies in the false logic that “because some bears are brown, then all bears are brown.” A further falsity is the assumption that because some events have “unintended consequences” that all events are unintended, especially bad ones like war and genocide. This form of argument also ignores that causal accounts that would have seemed at the time to be paranoid theories turn out later, as evidence comes out, to have been all too true.²⁰

Most of the literature criticising conspiracy theory treats it as a social epidemic and begs the questions (the unthinkable and undiscussable questions!) such as:

- ❑ Are there some events that have been planned and set up with intent and which has not been disclosed by those with the intent?
- ❑ Are there some people who believe they are doing one thing when actually they are an “unwitting agent” doing another on behalf of persons unknown to them?
- ❑ Are there processes and controls at work which deliberately set up disinformation or which otherwise hide or distract from what is really going on?
- ❑ Are there important facts for dealing with our current world situation which are deliberately withheld or obfuscated from general knowledge?

It is curious that any reasonably serious student of history can point to evidence that this type of manipulation has happened in the past. Yet the application of these questions to contemporary affairs is often considered to be “paranoid”, “silly”, “disrespectful”, “politically incorrect”, even “treasonable”. I wonder why that should be?

7. Beating the Conspiracy Theory Impasse

The dominant rubbishing of conspiracy theory, whether it itself be a conspiracy or not, creates what we will call the *conspiracy impasse*. The pre-emptive dismissal of anything which might point to what is or may be going on other than the “official view” renders the application of logic and fact finding impossible. This leads to the ridiculous situation characterised by the saying of William Burroughs: “The paranoid is the person in possession of all the facts”.

Some examples of current false logics are

- Because there are globalist conspiracies then all globalism is false
- Because some bad people have appropriated aspects of work of good thinkers then those good thinkers are bad
- Because an institution is corrupt then anyone associated with that institution is corrupt. (analogy - because a body is diseased any doctor associated with the disease is diseased)
- When a view was taken by a person at a previous time, that author would not change his or her view had he or she lived to see the emergence of new knowledge
- Because some things people do are bad then everything they do is bad

- Nobody can transcend the context in which they originated

To overcome this barrier of confusion we will introduce a concept from systems science. The principle is that the deeper structure of reality drives the surface behaviour. This is exemplified, for instance, in the biological principles of “autopoiesis”²¹ or self-generation of form. A living organism will tend to behave according to its inherent makeup which cannot be changed by external stimulus. If, in seeking understanding of events, we simply examine them at the event level we are looking at the waves on the ocean. If we dig deeper under the surface we begin to detect tides and local currents. But underlying that are the deep ocean currents which are determining the structure of massive systems, like the climate. What we are trying to understand beyond the “official view”, the “politically correct “ and the selective propaganda, is the *deep structure of influence and control* that is actually determining the climate of our world.

Here we can also draw on several decades of research and learning into the techniques of scenario thinking. This approach requires the practitioner not only to investigate and hypothesise deep structure behind events and trends but also to apply this under different sets of assumptions. Thus a set of scenarios is also a set of alternate realities. Further, each deep structure is kept “open” as a means of interpreting new information. To adopt this practice requires courageous self-questioning. Gary Chicoine, a leading researcher in the cognitive disciplines that support deep structure investigation and scenario building, puts it this way:

“Deconstructing the future creates fresh, open cognitive space for restructuring a shared destiny. There is far more to gain from this and far less to lose from it than people imagine. Most of the wagons circles as “defensive routines” around any given first scenario shared by a group of decision makers can and should be relaxed without paranoia.”²²

So a combination of deconstructing current belief systems or world views combined with investigation and of deep structure and held in a context of multiple-reality thinking, provides a for better framework for diagnosing the blockages to implementing a sustainable world system.

8. Reframing the Field of Power

In such a context it is clear that naive positive solutions will not work because they ignore negative forces at work in the situation which might have the dominant power. Also naive negative diagnostics will not work because not all seemingly negative situations are without redeeming features.

New extended frameworks are required to create new more realistic and complex interpretations which take into account the above two points. We are trapped in a two-fold logic of good and bad and therefore both intellectually and emotionally are trapped in extremes of polarisation. Imagine a weather forecast system in which the weather man was allowed only to say that the weather will be bad or the weather will be good. He could not say that the weather may be part good and part bad. He could not say that the outlook is unsettled and difficult to predict. At least in weather prediction we have acknowledged that the future is more complex and uncertain than simple binary logic. Yet we apply to human affairs even the intelligence of weather forecasting!

We need to shift from a polar logic to a fourfold logic. There is form of logic, excellent for taking readings of socio-political situations, which acknowledges four possible

states of causality all of which are likely to have some bearing on the truth. Bearing this in mind whilst reflecting on the rest of this paper will be helpful. In relation to the question in view, a situation will have a complex mix of factors, in varying proportions of:

- ❑ Positive and reliable conditions/information
- ❑ Negative and misleading conditions/information
- ❑ Ambiguous and varying conditions/information
- ❑ Indeterminate or irrelevant conditions/information

Thus as we look at what is going on, we need to temporarily suspend judgement and look more deeply into the situation and also look more widely as to the surrounding conditions. With some added flexibility from the fourfold reflections we might find the room to manoeuvre and be able to reframe what is going on and how it might be influenced. We can begin to construct a tentative view of what a resolutique that has some implementation power would have to take into account at what some aspects might look like. This moves us towards a first pass at answering our opening question: *Is there such a thing as good globalism?*

9. The foundations of effective democracy

We can see from our earlier diagnosis of the state of affairs, the problematique, and the observation that the means to turn the situation around and provide us with resolutique, are probably present somewhere on the planet already. However, we also proposed this as evidence that our core difficulty is that our socio-political processes are dominated and trapped in a system that apparently has no interest in such solutions in any realistic sense. This is a problem of power, its distribution and above all its quality.

Bertrand Russell addressed this issue directly in his discussion of the “taming of power”.²³ He saw this as the recovery of democracy. The observations and arguments he put forward are all too topical some half-century later. We still have not been able to tame the powers that are loose in our human affairs. Perhaps the most important starting point in discussing this is Russell’s observation that the merits of democracy are negative. It serves more to prevent certain evils rather than insure of itself good government. However, he does make the case for four areas that need serious attention and improvement if there is to be any effective democracy. These are in the areas of politics, economics, propaganda and education.

Where a minority has a monopoly on political power then the majority will, sooner or later, find themselves in some kind of serfdom or slavery. Modern slavery, of course, takes new forms such as credit indebtedness in a deliberately created consumer society. It is also manifest in a police state where civil liberties are severely eroded, as with distortions of law excused by a so-called “war on terror”. So an effective democracy will counterbalance the excessive power of a minority.

Equally, we see how majorities persecute minorities. So in the checks and balances of effective democracy, the rights of minorities must also be protected. The framing of law and its exercise become a key factor in embodying principles of fairness and balance. If law is distorted too far towards draconian control, usually on the excuse of war, then corrupt power is inevitable. Benjamin Franklin put it well in his saying “They that can give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety.”

The scaling of political democracy is important also. Democracy gives the citizen a sense of sharing in political power if the scale is small. However, issues that carry

most weight are almost always on a larger scale. An effective democracy will have well designed domains of relevance that ensure connection and feedback. The challenge in a world where the global issues are unavoidable, is how to structure the layers of relationship between the local and the global. The trend at the moment appears to be towards failure as massive zones of bureaucratic control increase the “democratic deficit”.

Russell’s case relating economics and democracy may seem heavily biased towards state socialism and state ownership. This is quite contrary to the development of market capitalism over the last fifty years. However, market capitalism has shown itself unable to deal with issues of effective democracy in the economic sphere. Some of Russell’s criticisms still starkly apply to contemporary affairs.

- ❑ “the humble investor can be politely and legally robbed”²⁴ still applies illustrated by Daily Mirror (Maxwell), Enron (Lay), Worldcom (Ebbers) and many others.
- ❑ “the situation is in no way essentially different when the State takes the place of a corporation ... the average citizen is likely to be still more helpless”.²⁵ For example, military systems, such as aircraft carriers and missiles, paid for by taxation are public property but what happens if the citizen tries to exercise the rights of ownership saying “don’t use it!”?
- ❑ “Under any form of socialism which is not democratic, those who control economic power can, without ‘owning’ anything have palatial official residences” and so on at public expense. They also find ways to operate outside the law.

Russell supported public ownership only if it is “supplemented by a democracy more thorough-going, more carefully safeguarded against official tyranny, and with more deliberate provision for freedom of propaganda (expression), than any purely political democracy that has ever existed.” He cites the USSR as an example of where this was not the case.

However the alternative extreme to the failed Soviet System is the failing Capitalist System which George Monbiot has characterised as “the captive state”.²⁶ The way economics is accountable to citizens is a major issue for effective democracy.²⁷

Dealing with propaganda has become increasingly important in a mediated world. How people increasingly acquire their “socially constructed reality” through dominant media is a big determinant of what people are seeing and believing; more subtly it is determining what they are not seeing but are being led to believe. In the current society we find a climate increasingly of gagging and “if you are not for us you are against us”. We can see that Russell’s principle “that there must be no penalty, official or unofficial, for any well-grounded criticism of prominent men” is decreasingly applied. Yet the other side of that coin is trial by tabloid media. Here the aim seems often to be destruction rather than criticism, the criterion of “well-grounded” being abandoned.

If, however, the state own the media, dissent or alternative perspective is filtered out as treachery or treason. We see this increasingly as the ineffective form of democracy we have today tends more and more towards an elected dictatorship.

The challenge to create an effective democracy is to provide for all viewpoints on an issue to be voiced and heard within the limits of not inciting violence and repression. To some extent the Internet is providing a more universal multi-perspective medium.

(Although this is being eroded by government regulation,²⁸ commercial monitoring,²⁹ and disinformation operations.)

Crucial information is being withheld from the media that reach the bulk of so-called educated citizens with deliberate policies to stimulate fear and distraction from what is really going on. The media's declared policy of "give the public what it wants" is a thin veneer. That this is an intentional action carried out by some power possessing people for well defined results is not a conspiracy!³⁰ It is a fact of the deeper structure referred to earlier.

The fourth factor which Russell points out as critical is, of course, education. "If democracy is to be workable, the population must be as far as possible free from hatred and destructiveness, and also from fear and subservience." The existence of propaganda is not going to go away, deliberate misinformation is not going to be eliminated and major distractions are not going to be switched off. This places the emphasis on what kind of education is needed. Wells is emphatic on this point. "The old-world teachers have to be reformed or replaced. A vigorous educational reform movement arises as a natural and necessary expression of the awakening Open Conspirator. A revolution in education is the most imperative and fundamental part of the adaptation of life to its new conditions. ...Before we can talk politics, finance, business, or morals, we must see that we have got the right mental habits and the right foundation of realized facts. There is nothing much to do with our lives until we have seen to that."³¹

The problem with education is that it is almost entirely dominated by maintenance learning which conditions the status quo. This is the case in any culture, Western or Eastern. This has at least two layers to it. One is the layer that the main thrust of education is conditioning to the prevailing knowledge. These are the "sins of omission" in education which means that it does not have, in Wellsian terms, an adequate Account of Life. The second layer is the distortion of propaganda which reinforces prejudice in the minds of the educated. These are the "sins of commission".

These two layers combine to create a kind of hypnotic instillation of beliefs without reason for supposing them to be true. This prepares the mind to be receptive to the mass suggestion of advertising and the popular press and mass hysteria which can be directed towards the enemy and lead to support of war.

In contrast education for effective democracy cultivates the enquiring mind, provides an overview of life that inoculates against propaganda and provides a platform for civic responsibility as well as individual development and evolution. "... just as we teach children to avoid being destroyed by motor cars if they can, so we should teach them to avoid being destroyed by cruel fanatics, and to this end we should seek to produce independence of mind, somewhat sceptical and wholly scientific, and to preserve as far as possible, the instinctive joy that is natural to healthy children. This is the task of liberal education: to give a sense of the value of things other than domination, to help create wise citizens of a free community, and through the combination of citizenship with liberty in individual creativeness to enable men to give to human life that splendour which some few have shown that it can achieve."³²

These four factors of politics, economics, propaganda and education, will not operate independently. They have to be part of a system which itself provides a structure that can nudge human behaviour in a direction counter to current trends. The paradox is that this structure, which we could call the viable social structure for mankind, will not be imposed by some centralised authority. Any centrally organised approach to this

will immediately suffer the corruption of power that the above analysis has been at pains to overcome or outwit. In the dictatorial society the ends justify the means. In the evolutionary society the means are the container for the ends. An effective democracy can only be arrived at by effective democratic means.

Part of education for effective democracy must be the continuing research into the principles of viability. These include variety and diversity rather than homogeneity, feedback rather than autocracy, and the holistic principle known as the Janus effect.³³ Any holon (viable component of a whole) must continuously resolve the dilemma of self-assertion and integration. Too much of the former is anarchy where the individual cannot deal with systemic massive challenges that require appropriate integration. Too much of the latter and the individual is trapped in a robotic conformity to a massive system that considers "it knows best".

Viability arises from intelligent co-operation. A viable society is a collaborative society.

10. The collaborative society

The collaborative society is a concept riddled with contradictions unless we sort out some clear meanings. The word obviously carries negative associations in its military-political use. A "collaborator" has been defined as a traitor who co-operated with enemy occupation. We are using it in its modern business teamwork sense of "collaborative advantage" where teams are more effective than mere collections of individuals. But the meaning goes further. It can also apply to the unorganised but emergent impact of diverse people from diverse backgrounds, who, often unknown to each other, are working for the same ends on the same values and on the same "wavelength".

This is what H.G.Wells meant by the "Open Conspiracy". Wells' vision would be well explained in modern thinking by the idea of emergence in complexity science, a discipline that was to develop nearly fifty years after his writings. In the book *The Open Conspiracy* he makes clear that he does not see the counter movement to oppressive domination as some equally centralised counter oppression.

"The Open Conspiracy itself can never be imprisoned and fixed in the form of any organisation, but everywhere Open Conspirators should be organising themselves for educational reform. (it) must be heterogeneous in its origin. Its initial groupings and associations will be of no uniform pattern. They will be of a very different size, average age, social experience, and influence."³⁴

Yet Wells also promotes the need for a World Order. This gets us into another minefield of meaning around the term "New World Order". The term "New World Order" has become one that polarises opinion very sharply today. It is associated particularly with US hegemony as the sole super power and world policeman. It is embedded in the actions of the Bush US administration and is based, among other things, quite explicitly on the "Grand Chess Board" strategy formulated by Brzezinski.³⁵ The New World Order is associated with the IMF, the World Bank, and with the World Trade Organisation, as well as the manipulation of the United Nations especially the Security Council. It is associated with globalism and globalization. The opposite pole is one of great suspicion of the New World order as a manipulative plot with layers of deep conspiracy, a rule by pseudo democracy and corporate interests and the destruction of the environment and community both locally and on a world scale. This counter movement is described as *anti-globalism*.

This polarisation is extremely unhelpful and itself smothers the issues that underlie this tension. This kind of simplification continues to obscure the more crucial issues that need addressing if there is to be a way out of the predicament. The approach here is more in the spirit described by Tom Barry: “Although largely a backlash movement – one that mobilises against the negative manifestations of economic globalization and the associated role of global economic governance – the main theorists and organizers have in the past several years taken tentative steps towards formulating alternative paths for the global economy and its governance.”³⁶

The first step is to make a distinction between *exploitative globalism* and *benign globalism*. Equally a distinction must be made between *aggressive anti-globalism* and *constructive anti-globalism*. The implications of this distinction are set out in the following box diagram³⁷ as four arenas of interaction.

	EXPLOITATIVE GLOBALISM	BENIGN GLOBALISM
AGGRESSIVE ANTI-GLOBALISM	An Arena of economic exploitation and exclusion confronted with hostile protest, demonstration and rejection leading to civil disobedience and repression through aggressive policing	An arena of philosophical recognition that the human-biosphere system and consciousness expansion has a global destiny but with no effective engagement with the exploited and excluded
CONSTRUCTIVE ANTI-GLOBALISM	An arena of constructive and courageous confrontation with the destructiveness of globalization based on deep analysis and creative thinking but ultimately ineffective	An arena for new types of dialogue that has the potential to co-create a balanced global-local system that purges the system of aggression, exploitation and non-sustainability

The Four Arenas of Interaction

I believe that Wells would support the fourth arena. Let’s look into this a little more. If we reject the three arenas which are essentially destructive and unsustainable, then it is clear we need an approach which can resolve the dilemma between individual and local freedoms and the need for unavoidable collaboration to deal with massive earth-scale systemic issues. I am placing the following contributions of Wells in this context of the fourth arena.

Written in the midst of the opening shots of World War II the ideas in the book entitled *The New World Order* are clearly not the same as or referring to the policies as implied in George Bush’s announcement under the same name at the time of the first Gulf War. The following quotations are hardly the stuff of current policies for world domination.

- “One of the more unpleasant aspects of a state of war under modern conditions is the appearance of a swarm of individuals, too clever by half, in positions of authority. Excited, conceited, prepared to lie, distort and generally humbug people into states of acquiescence, resistance, indignation, vindictiveness, doubt and mental confusion, states of mind supposed to be conducive to final military victory. These people love to twist and censor facts. It gives them power; if they cannot create they can at least prevent and conceal. Particularly they poke themselves in between us and the people with whom we are at war to distort any possible reconciliation. They sit, filled with the wine of their transitory powers, aloof from the fatigues and dangers of conflict, pulling imaginary strings in people’s minds.”ⁱ

ⁱ the applicability of this to the so-called “war on terror” with its “may last for years and years” and the treatment of dissenters in the US and UK is quite remarkable. The structural dynamics of manipulation is still there.

- “Any government propaganda is contrary to the essential spirit of democracy. The expression of opinion and collective thought should be outside the range of government activities altogether. It should be the work of free individuals whose prominence is dependent upon the response and support of the general mind.”^j
- “But there is no such background of an intelligently observant and critical world audience in evidence. There are a few people here and there reading and thinking in disconnected fragments. This is all the thinking our world is doing in the face of planetary disaster.”^k
- “...but if a sufficient number of minds throughout the world, irrespective of race, origin, or economic and social habituations, can be brought to the free and candid recognition of the essentials of the human problem, then their effective collaboration in a conscious, explicit and open effort to reconstruct human society will ensue.”^l

However, given the difficulties around the word conspiracy (which originated in a positive sense from the idea of breathing together – not a negative thing as such – all we humans share the same atmosphere!) we shall refer to the awakening linkage between people escaping the current New World Order trap³⁸ as the emerging Conscious Collaboration for *benign globalism*. This resonates with what Wells was groping for in the midst of the impact of two World Wars.

11. Redesigning society the evolutionary way

Another observation of Wells was that the universe can count above two. Most intellectual analysis cannot get beyond two and hence creates polarisation which then proposes that we have to decide on the one or the other, the black or the white, the left or the right (see the idea of a fourfold logic on page 8 earlier). That there is a struggle for supremacy is true but it, if polarised at all, better polarised by “up or down”. Down is into greater oppression, uniformity and exploitation – the New World Order of those pulling the strings of economic, political dominance through state terrorism and population mind control. Up is towards conscious evolution enabling economic sharing, effective democracy and the expulsion of violence as anything other than criminal insanity.

“We are, nevertheless, the grounds of an evolutionary struggle, in effect, and precisely as myth and legend have projected: the struggle between “higher and lower forces.”³⁹

The higher in the view taken here is the intelligence that can count above two. For example, it is able to reframe polarities as dilemmas and seek a higher order *resolution*. It is able to reframe the solving of conflict problems as *designing* a solution which listens to both sides of the conflict. It is able to think broadly and into longer range future and chart *pathways* to goals. Above all it does not confuse the

^j Apply this to the degree of spin exercised in the UK and the compliance of the media in fear mongering in the US.

^k Perhaps the advent of the Internet has slightly improved the situation but resources are also going into “cyberwars” to clamp down on dissent for the “official views”.

^l This brings out again the emergent view that Wells had of the open conspiracy. Marilyn Ferguson’s in her *Aquarian Conspiracy* noted that Wells as early as 1928 had predicted the power change needed to come “bottom up” rather than the typical “top down”.

distinction between knowing what can be done and seeing what it is wise and timely to do.

“Intellect, on the one hand, looks through its tunnel vision and asks only *Is it possible?*, and creates disaster. Intelligence, on the other hand, that mysterious “forward movement from above” asks *Is it appropriate?*, and will, if developed, use intellect to complete the movement from the “concrete to the abstract” as evolution intends.”⁴⁰

Thus, once the conflict between globalism and anti-globalism is reframed as a dilemma between benign globalism and constructive localism, then we can set about resolving the dilemma and charting pathways to do that. Any dilemma is not resolved in a one-off way but as a constant exploration in which each new step reveals more of the terrain that needs to be mapped and new kinds of step to be made. In dilemma resolution there is no doctrinal end state, no utopia that removes all problems. Resolution is a process of evolutionary adventure in which intelligence is challenged at each step of the way.⁴¹ What there is in effective dilemma resolution is the collaboration of people across the spectrum of concerns and values to chart a common pathway, to create a shared mental map. This map is itself evolving and its updating is highly participative. Wells expresses this condition thus:

“A map imposes no will on anyone, breaks no one in to its “policy”. And yet we obey our maps. The will to have a map full, accurate, and up to date, and the determination to have its indications respected, would have to pervade the whole community. To nourish and sustain that will must not be the task of any particular social or economic division of the community. The organization and preservation of that power of will is the primary undertaking, therefore, of a world revolution aiming at universal peace, welfare and happy activity.”⁴²

Note that “aiming at” is not a utopian formula but statement of value direction. To resolve a dilemma in unknown territory, we also need a compass⁴³ as well as map. A compass can help us keep our direction in fog or where the terrain is temporarily obscured until we can reach a better vantage point.

12. From New World Order to Global Integrity

So the proposition in this paper is that we counter the New World order with an alternative vision which we will call *Global Integrity*. The word “integrity” carries quite different meaning to order. It embraces the following associated meanings:

- ❑ Truth, honesty and openness
- ❑ Consistency with benign values and principles
- ❑ Containment without domination
- ❑ Viability of the whole and the parts
- ❑ Appropriate autonomy of the parts
- ❑ Participation of the parts in the whole
- ❑ Holarchy as distinct from hierarchy
- ❑ Consistency of means with ends
- ❑ Patience to keep revising for continuous evolutionary improvement

So global integrity is **not**

- ❑ The global hegemony of a super-power
- ❑ The domination of one culture by another
- ❑ The destruction of local viability by global efficiency
- ❑ The neglect of global problems through local insularity

- ❑ The control of global economics by self-interested financial and business oligopolies
- ❑ The constraint of enterprise and competition to improve

So integrity meets the criteria of viability mentioned earlier, that is variety and diversity rather than homogeneity, feedback rather than autocracy, and holistic principles. Any holon (viable component of a whole) must continuously resolve the dilemma of self-assertion and integration. Too much of the former is anarchy and cannot deal with systemic massive challenges where appropriate integration is needed. Too much of the latter and the individual is trapped in a robotic conformity to a massive system that considers “it knows best”.

In an interesting different angle on the nature of civilisation based on ecological types Felipe Fernandez-Armesto reflects that from an historical perspective there are probably structural factors that will frustrate any overly strong bid to sustain a homogeneous hegemony.

“The globalization of culture is likely to be a self-defeating phenomenon. Whenever people get involved in big entities, they reach for the comforting familiarity of their local, regional or national roots. That is why superstates tend to break up after a while; and why old identities sometimes survive centuries of immersion in big empires. If the peoples of the world ever do come to think of themselves as sharing a single global civilization, it will be a civilisation of a very heterogeneous kind, dappled with differences from place to place.”⁴⁴

New thinking in sociology is leading to a view of integrity that makes clearer what the preconditions of integrity are. For an holistic global integrity there must be sufficient alignment of qualities that define a new global meta-civilisation but which allow for a vast variety of qualitative differences and differences of scale and geography. A social integrity will demonstrate four dimensions.⁴⁵ First, that it has some degree of legitimate sovereignty in the sense of power to act and decide over a resource domain. The resource may be physical or virtual. In the case of the sole knowledge worker it is sovereignty of, say, thinking and research. Second, that it has some power of agency. This means it has the ability to act consistently and responsibly with attention and consideration to its impact on others. Third, that it has a recognisable identity which is appreciated and considered of worth by its context community. Fourthly it engages in reciprocity evoking trust reliability and engaging in partnership with other integrities. In terms of holarchical structure the first two dimensions are self-assertive and the latter two are integrative. An integrity exhibits the Janus effect.

What makes an integrity evolutionary, however, is certain core qualities that include open communication, legitimacy of interaction with and exploration of other perspectives, continuous redesign of itself and values alignment.

The important thing to recognise about this approach is that it bypasses the fixation we have with our institutions because rightly identified social integrities rarely coincide with institutional structures and organisational boundaries. Perhaps in a further evolution of society they will correspond again.

13. From closed conspiracies to open collaborations

To sum up, the case for good globalism is basically that it is a possibility, not an actuality, and that neither globalism nor anti-globalism as we presently see them will

resolve the inherent dilemma embedded in the tension they manifest. A conscious collaboration that is emergent, non-organisational but subtly organising itself is the most probable way an alternative to the New World Order will arise. If the new World Order continues to win the short term, it almost certainly has the seed of its own destruction built in. But this could take many generations, much as with the reent cycle of the USSR.

The challenge, therefore, if we are not to condemn our grandchildren to unimaginable suffering and oppression, is to see how far an awakening of conscious collaboration can be accelerated by means which are proofed against the corruption and misinformation of the way power is currently exercised. This will not come about or be successful by confrontation but rather through a curious property we could call open and transparent stealth.

“But unlike conspiracies in general this widening protest and conspiracy against established things would, by its very nature, go on in the daylight, and it would be willing to accept participation and help from every quarter. It would, in fact, become an “Open Conspiracy”, a necessary, naturally evolved conspiracy, to adjust our dislocated world.”⁴⁶

In mythology the many headed hydra was a monster that was hard to kill because you could only cut of some of its heads in any one encounter. Others took its place and grew rapidly. The conscious collaboration we need is like a benign hydra. It will be opposed, attacked and in parts even crushed. But it will draw on the enormous potential of the deeper human evolution which corrupt power fears.

14. Assuming intelligent responsibility

How are we to orient ourselves to the benign conspiracy of conscious collaboration towards good globalism?

There are three aspects of the challenge that need to be in balance. They are put simply

- A. Information about real current conditions
- B. Organisation consistent with the values of the task
- C. Personal action and experience

People who are not deliberately pursuing bad globalism or aggressive anti-globalism and yet who are stuck in a world view where some form of good globalism does not exist in their minds, need information. Assembling this information is not easy due to fragmentation, suppression and misleading fictions. The information organisation is improving but leaves much to be desired. People able to work on overview and synthesis are helping.

People need to make the step from isolation to collaboration. This is, however, fraught with difficulties due to the presence in society in epidemic proportions of defensive psychology which will collude with the abolition of impact and the perpetuation of keeping urgent issues undiscussable. This is bolstered by the pressures of ‘group think’ and other forms of unconscious group dynamic. Also, as we said earlier, this type of action must really be allowed to be self-organising through the emergence of self-referential groupings.

Personal action brings us to the issue “how can we contribute to improving the world if we cannot first improve ourselves?” It is interesting to note that Wells himself wrote the books *The Outline of History*, *The Science of Life*, *The Work*, *Wealth and*

Happiness of Mankind as much as a work of self-education and correction for a faulty education system, as works for the public.⁴⁷ The tendency to rush in with action before completing a basic research, overview and self-examination of assumptions is all too tempting. This natural tendency we have to want to run before we can walk is all the more pressured due to some obvious urgencies in the predicament that come to light more and more intensively as the situation is studied. A primary cognitive skill requirement is the ability to think in multiple realities, to deconstruct the future and to participate in innovative learning.⁴⁸

Because this is such a tough challenge and we will make many efforts, experiments and failures in the process, it is perhaps best to characterise our starting position as *groping for good globalism*. Half-conscious we must strive to do what little we can, expose ourselves to deep scrutiny of our understandings and link the “power of one” to the “power of many” in the cause of aiming for a sustainable future.

On the other hand, if this positive energy cannot be evoked and linked up with itself we may find ourselves overtaken by at least one of the following. The siturring up of conflict may reach epidemic proportions and lead to third world war. This will not be a replay of World War II but will have some quite new characteristics we are ill-prepared to cope with. Another possibility is that heedlessness of the impact of our doing son the planet earth will trigger discontinuous shifts in climate and evoke an unstable situation of super-storms and sea-level rises. Even if these two possibilities are avoided, a third outcome might be the abdication of humane governance to economic greed and the domination life style by oligopolies of immense corporate power.

Let's bring forth our positive energy and not be duped by ignorance of the negative forces we have to contend with.

REFERENCES

- ¹ Felipe Fernandez-Armesto *Civilisations* Macmillan 2000 p556
- ² George Soros *The Crisis of Global Capitalism – Open Society Endangered* Little, Brown and Company 1998 (Introduction)
- ³ There are several candidates here:
- Global climate change
 - Nuclear radiation spread
 - Oxygen depletion
 - Interdependence breakdown
 - Mass mental disease
 - Large scale atmospheric pollution e.g. chem trails
- ⁴ King and Schneider *The First Global Revolution* (1994)
- ⁵ A programme developing a new overview of the global problematique is being developed see www.crisisplanet.org
- ⁶ "...all prevailing forms of governance are increasingly becoming 'dead ends', unable to perform changing crucial functions. This applies both to democracies and to non-democracies, though to different degrees. The view that markets, civil society, non-governmental organizations and other social structures can compensate for this inadequacy is a chimera." Yehezkel Dror *The Capacity to Govern* Frank Cass Publishers (1994)
- ⁷ See the BBC programme "Century of the Self"
- ⁸ see for example the World Wildlife Fund *One Planet Living* web site
- ⁹ See <http://www.naturalstep.org/com/nyStart/>
- ¹⁰ Donella Meadows, Dennis Meadows, Jorgen Randers *Beyond the Limits - Global Collapse or a Sustainable Future* Earthscan (1992)
- ¹¹ Herrera et al, *Catastrophe or New Society? A Latin American World Model*.
- ¹² These are from pp139-149 in Yehezkel Dror *The Capacity to Govern* Frank Cass Publishers 1994
- ¹³ An exercise to test this view out with is to take the current UN resolution concerning weapons of mass destruction in relation to Iraq and apply them to the USA or the UK.
- ¹⁴ An example of this is the introduction of micro-chipping to safeguard children and old people. This moves society towards welcoming the help this gives. Introduce in addition similar technology for consumer convenience for health records to shopping. Then (twist ion the tail) reverse the popularity and broadcast manipulative changes to the microchip to control behaviour.
- ¹⁵ The inciting of the Japanese into retaliation on the USA, the isolation of the Admiral in charge of Pearl Harbour and the "mysterious" absence of shipping in the route of the Japanese aircraft carriers is a notable example. Hidden aim, to get the USA into World War 2 without the politicians having to try and persuade the nation by usual means. This principle is interesting if applied to decoding possible deeper structure scenarios behind the Sep 11 Twin Towers event.
- ¹⁶ Jeremy Leggett *The Carbon Wars* (1999)
- ¹⁷ See the BBC programme *The Century of the Self* on the invention of consumerism.
- ¹⁸ Popper *Conjectures and Refutations* Routledge and Kegan Paul 1963
- ¹⁹ Gordon S. Wood *Conspiracy and the Paranoid Style: Causality and Deceit in the Eighteenth Century* The William and Mary Quarterly 39 (1982) p441
- ²⁰ see note 13
- ²¹ Humberto Maturana, Francisco Varela, Robert Paolucci *The Tree of Knowledge: The Biological Roots of Human Understanding* 2000?
- ²² Gary Chicoine *Deconstructing the Future* a paper published in 2002 by Metabridge Limited as part of the programme of the International Strategy Research Group
- ²³ Bertrand Russell *Power* [publisher]
- ²⁴ Russell *Power* p196
- ²⁵ Russell *Power* p196
- ²⁶ "Corporations, the contraptions we invented to serve us, are overthrowing us. They are seizing powers previously invested in government, and using them to distort public life to suit their own ends. It is not hard to see why corporations might wish to infiltrate government. Their demands and those of the electorate are frequently in conflict. By by-passing the electoral process, communicating directly with ministers and officials, the can pre-empt legislation which might be popular, but could restrict their ability to make money." *The Captive State* Macmillan 2000
- ²⁷ Tom Barry *Global Economic Governance: Strategic Crossroads* Foreign Policy in Focus 2000
- ²⁸ For example, Chinese authorities banned the use of the Google search engine.
- ²⁹ "Internet users' Web movements are increasingly tracked for commercial purposes, above and beyond the expanded tracking government agencies are allowed to perform) often without court orders required) under recent anti-terror legislation.The rapid expansion of these commercially operated database systems, combined with the lack of meaningful controls on how they're used, suggest that they may be of even greater concern than DARPA's Total Information Awareness project that has received so much attention lately." Lauren Weinstein in *Wired News* 31 December 2002

³⁰ “Voice or no voice, the people can always be brought to the bidding of their leaders. That is easy. All you have to do is tell them they are being attacked, and denounce the peacemakers for lack of patriotism and exposing the country to danger. It works the same in any country.” Hermann Goering (quoted in David Icke *Alice in Wonderland and the World Trade Center Disaster* Bridge of Love Publications 2002)

³¹ Wells *The Open Conspiracy* p61

³² Russell Power p207

³³ Arthur Koestler *The Ghost in the Machine* (1967)

³⁴ H.G.Wells *The Open Conspiracy* Edited Warren Wagar Praeger 2002 p111

³⁵ Zbigniew Brzezinski *The Grand Chessboard – American Primacy and Its Geostrategic Imperatives* Basic Books 1997

³⁶ Tom Barry *Global Economic Governance: Strategic Crossroads* Foreign Policy in Focus 2000

³⁷ Hodgson *An Image of Global Integrity* Paper contributed to the International Futures Forum

³⁸ “The ultimate objective of American policy should be benign and visionary: to shape a truly cooperative global community, in keeping with long range trends and with the fundamental interests of human kind. But in the meantime, it is imperative that no Eurasian challenger emerges, capable of dominating Eurasia and thus also challenging America.” Doesn’t this rather assume we agree with American culture, values and methods? Perhaps not! Zbigniew Brzezinski *The Grand Chessboard – American Primacy and Its Geostrategic Imperatives* Basic Books 1997

³⁹ Joseph Chilton Pearce *Evolution’s End* Harper San Francisco 1992

⁴⁰ Joseph Chilton Pearce *loc cit*

⁴¹ I am indebted to Charles Hampden-Turner for his exceptional insights into the nature of dilemmas and their means of resolution. See, for example, *Charting the Corporate Mind* Blackwell 1990

⁴² H.G.Wells *The Open Conspiracy* Edited Warren Wagar, Praeger 2002 p 78

⁴³ I am indebted to discussions whilst participating in the *International Futures Forum* in Scotland where this metaphor proved very helpful in tackling complex issues in an interdisciplinary investigation.

⁴⁴ Felipe Fernandez-Armesto *Civilisations* Macmillan 2000 p562

⁴⁵ I am indebted to discussions of integrity with Professor Martin Albrow as part of the dialogues of the International Future Forum. Martin is working up this theory as part of his original research agenda.

⁴⁶ H.G.Wells *The Open Conspiracy* Edited Warren Wagar Praeger 2002

⁴⁷ “The mind is very self-protective; it has a disposition to abandon too great or too far-reaching an effort and return to things indisputably within its scope. We have an instinctive preference for thinking things are “all right”; we economize anxiety; we defend delusions that we can work with, even though we half realize they are no more than delusions. We resent the warning voice, the critical question that robs our activities of assurance. Our everyday moods are not the only antagonists of our religious moods, but they resent all outward appeals to our religious moods, and they welcome every help against religious appeals. We pass very readily from the merely defensive to the defensive-aggressive, and from refusing to hear the word that might stir our consciences to a vigorous effort to suppress its utterance.”

H.G.Wells *The Open Conspiracy* Edited Warren Wagar Praeger 2002

(Note: given Wells’ direct criticism of religions as institutions as one of the problems preventing open enquiry and cooperation, it probably makes more sense to the contemporary reader to substitute the word ‘spiritual’ or ‘conscious’ for the word ‘religious’ in the above passage. Author)

⁴⁸ Gary Chicoine *Deconstructing the Future* a paper published in 2002 by Metabridge Limited as part of the programme of the International Strategy Research Group