The winning essay in the second Utopian World Championship 2004

From Youth Maturity to Global Government: The Utopian Tapestry

By Cyril Belshaw

From Youth Maturity to Global Government:
The Utopian Tapestry
by Cyril Belshaw

Photos:
Cover: courtesy NASA/JPL-Caltech
Portrait, page 10: courtesy Kevin Davies

Read all about the Utopian World Championship at www.soc.nu/utopian. See "Notes on Redistribution" on page 95 if you want to download, copy and/or redistribute this book.

STIFTELSEN **framtidens kultur**

Contents

The Utopian World Championship

We are proud to present a new, revised edition of the two winning essays in the Utopian World Championship in two separate volumes, an edition that marks that more than eight years have passed since we embarked on a quest for the utopias of the 21st century by initiating a world-wide competition in visionary thinking and writing.

The concept for this project emerged out of an interest among the members of the artist group SOC. Stockholm for alternative societies, visionary thinking and utopian ideas. We launched the first competition in 2001 and have since had the honour to crown two Utopian World Champions. An American student and activist living in Sweden, who submitted his essay under the pseudonym T.R.O.Y., was elected the winner of the first championship in 2001 for his essay *The New Word Disorder*. The Canadian Professor Emeritus in anthropology, Mr Cyril Belshaw, won the second in 2005 with his essay *From Youth Maturity to Global Government: The Utopian Tapestry*.

The first prize in this contest is the equivalent of about 10,000 Swedish Krona in Euro. We also undertake to print the winning essays and distribute them to Heads of State, governments, organisations and other institutions. This reprint enables us to continue that work unabatedly. The documents are also available on our website for anyone to download and redistribute.

The course of the competition has, with some exceptions, been the same for the two rounds that have been completed so far. We have launched each round by issuing a call for entries and by offering those who want to participate to register on our website (www.soc.nu/utopian) during a limited period of time. The participants thereafter had several months to work on their essays and to post them on the website, at which point they also became available to the public. The first selection round produced a number of finalists, elected either by a reference group or by public vote, after which an expert jury and representatives of SOC.Stockholm read and evaluated the finalists' essays with the task to elect one winner. The name of the winner was announced at a public gala night, for which we also printed a first edition of the winning essay. During an extensive period after the gala we distributed the document, before the next round of the championship commenced.

Our quest for utopia has been a very exciting and highly rewarding one. It has been a most extraordinary experience for us to read all the comprehensive, thoughtful and well-written essays that have been submitted to the championship and we want to direct a warm thanks to all contestants for their outstanding efforts. Together, their works form a rich and diverse argument for the necessity of utopian thinking in our time, and a library of utopias that will hopefully continue to grow in the future.

Through the project we have come in contact with thinkers, writers and activists, who are spending their time creating, and studying innovative and beautiful ideas for new worlds or ground-breaking tools for the benefit of mankind, but also those who are putting their visions into practise. Their work gives us hope that the 21st century will become a century where the debate about the good society will flourish and prosper.

We would like to thank all the authors, the jury members and all other people and institutions that have helped us to realize this project. We want to direct a very special thanks to The Foundation for the Culture of the Future (Stiftelsen Framtidens Kultur) for financially supporting the Utopian World Championship and the printing of this edition, which is released in cooperation with Raketa Press. SOC.Stockholm has over the years also been supported financially by The City Council and The County of Stockholm (Stockholms Stad och Stockholms Läns Landsting) and The Swedish Arts Grants Committee (Konstnärsnämnden).

We recommend that you visit the project's website at www.soc.nu/utopian/ where you can get the latest news and detailed information about the project, and read many of the essays that have participated in the competition.

We would also like to take the opportunity to promote the book *Choosing our Destiny: Creating the Utopian World in the 21st Century* by Cyril Belshaw (Xlibris 2006, ISBN 1-4257-2243-1), which was published one year after he won the first prize in 2005 with the essay presented in this volume. In time of writing the book is out of print but a revised and updated edition is planned to be released as an e-book.

By Jon Brunberg and Annika Drougge, June 2009
Project managers of the Utopian World Championship

The Jury

Editors' note to the 2009 edition: The selection process of the second Utopian World Championship was divided into two successive rounds. Four people were invited to form a reference group, together with three members from SOC.Stockholm and the first champion. In the first round, the reference group selected five finalists. In the final round the two expert jurors read and evaluated the five finalists' essays and voted for one entry each. The entry that won the reference group's internal poll received one vote. Cyril Belshaw's entry recieved two out of three votes and he was declared Utopian World Champion.

Please also note that the biographical information of the jury's members that is presented on these pages, has not been updated for this edition and may have changed since the first edition was published in 2005.

The Expert Jurors

Tom Moylan is Glucksman Professor of Contemporary Writing in English and Director of the Ralahine Centre for Utopian Studies at the University of Limerick in Ireland. He has written extensively on utopian literature and on the method and practice involved in the utopian process.

His books include
"Demand the Impossible: Science Fiction and the Utopian Imagination"
"Scraps of the Untainted Sky: Science Fiction, Utopia, Dystopia"

Dr Lyn Carson is a Senior Lecturer in Applied Politics at the University of Sydney. She has written handbooks on consultation methods and many articles and book chapters on public participation. She is the author, with Brian Martin, of "Random Selection in Politics".

Dr Carson draws on her earlier experience as a local councillor to design and conduct consultation processes. She teaches courses about public participation in decision making and conducts research into deliberative innovations.

The Reference Group

Jon Brunberg is an artist and webmaster. Member of SOC.Stockholm since 1999. Project manager for the Utopian W.C.

Annika Drougge is an artist and pedagogue. Founding member of SOC.Stockholm. Project manager for the Utopian W.C.

Anthony T. Fiscella is a student of the Sociology of Religion at Lund University. The winner of the first Utopian W.C. 2001.

Mats Frick has a masters degree from the Marketing Academy in Stockholm in 1997. Writing a dissertation about the meeting between economy, management and architecture.

Karin Johansson-Mex is a producer for cultural and political projects. Organiser of the Skåne Social Forum, inspired by the World Social Forum.

Johan Malmström is an artist who has been involved in several collaborative experiments over the years. Founding member of SOC.Stockholm.

Alexandra Martins takes a Masters in Political Science at Superior Institute of Social and Political Sciences in Lisbon. Member of the Society for Utopian Studies.

Sonja Schmer-Galunder has a master's degree in Anthropology with a bachelor's in Economics.

The Jury's Motivation

The jury found Mr. Cyril Belshaw's essay 'From Youth Maturity to Global Government: The Utopian Tapestry' to be outstanding among many excellent submissions to the competition. The essay was given two votes out of three in the final and decisive poll, one by juror Prof. Tom Moylan and one as a result of the reference group's internal poll. Dr. Lyn Carson gave her vote to Per Norbäck's essay 'Demoex - think global, act local.'

The following was written by Professor Tom Moylan as a motivation for his choice of Mr. Belshaw's essay as the winner and we have chosen to let it express also the views of the other jurors that nominated his proposal to the first prize: "...Cyril Belshaw's 'From Youth Maturity to Global Government: The Utopian Tapestry' emerges as the best of a fine group of submissions. Belshaw's essay, and vision, is the most comprehensive and most challenging. He combines a sober and informed utopian realism with the best of imaginative utopian hope.

His most useful and empowering insight – the one that is formative for his entire framework – is his insistence on a holistic account of what must be done. Unwilling to accept the postmodern rejection of thinking in large, holistic, totalizing systems, he adopts precisely such an encompassing analysis and vision. This comprehensive cognitive mapping of what is, and what could be, therefore enables him to consider the smallest, most intimate personal detail and motivation along with the largest, most systemic considerations. This, of course, is a way of thinking that both Marxists and ecologists have understood, in their different but related ways, as they sought ways not only to understand society but to change it for the betterment not only of all humanity bur indeed all life.

Then, with this holistic perspective, Belshaw goes on to address two key elements of the forward plan: the education of youth and the governance of the world. He radically rethinks schooling, and does so in the best tradition of educational thinkers such as Neill, Goodman, and others. And he builds a vision of world governance that has deep roots in radical thought but is also to be found in the most cutting edge contemporary work, such as Michael Hardt's and Antonio Negri's Empire (not to mention the work of George Monbiot with whom he acknowledges his affinity).

As thinkers such as Herbert Marcuse and Murray Bookchin noted several decades ago, humanity already possesses the social wealth and technology to rebuild the world for the betterment of all. Belshaw too knows this and builds on this "post-scarcity" alternative.

Belshaw also connects with the insights of the 'critical utopias' of the 1960s and 1970s (see Tom Moylan, *Demand the Impossible*) which recognise the necessity for an open and critical ambience and system in any utopian agenda.

Finally, Belshaw is no idealist, thinking he can assert this vision and see it achieved. Indeed, he deeply understands the provocative, indeed pedagogical, quality of utopian thought and expression, and understands his own work in just such a light.

We can and will learn from this writer's work. He deserves the award of this championship competition."

Compilation by Jon Brunberg and Annika Drougge, March 2005

Mr. Cyril Belshaw: In His Own Words

In my high school years my economist father took me with him as an amanuensis when he studied the contemporary New Zealand Maori. Then the war came and eventually I found myself in the colonial (yes colonial) service in the Solomon Islands. Those three years were a major coming of age event, which I will never regret. At that time I managed a Master's degree in economics.

But, as in the case of my theory of innovation, those influences came together as I enrolled to obtain my Ph.D. in the London School of Economics. I wanted to fuse economics and anthropology, I wanted to use that fusion to help explain and advance development and as time went on to use anthropology to explain phenomena and change in the world of complex societies. I retained too an interest in international, global, affairs,

From my ultimate base in the University of British Columbia I was recruited to work for ECOSOC and UNESCO and devoted a great deal of energy to national (Canadian) and international scholarly organisations. This involved me in the International Social Science Council and similar bodies. I became editor of the international journal Current Anthropology and at the same time President of the International Union of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences. This enabled me, with Wenner-Gren Foundation support, to be in contact with, and travel to see, colleagues on most continents for a period of ten years.

Over these years and more my interest in the links between anthropology and public policy strengthened, In the seventies I refined a theory of innovation which was already present in my Ph.D. thesis and became addicted to it. Gradually the penny dropped. As I observed social change in the late twentieth century, and watched the public struggle with a their desire to get things right, and their frustra-

tions at not doing so, I realized that there was little focus. Publishers even said to me "The reading public is not interested in the future, only in immediate solutions."

How wrong they were. I didn't believe it. The public needed a voice of optimism and a sense of direction. So I worked toward my idea of a 21st century Utopia, one which will come too late for me to see. My theory gave me the reason for optimism. The holistic world view of anthropology gave me the sense of systemic world organisation. My fortunate experiences – and some bad ones – focused attention on what I believed to be the issues. So, thanks to SOC Stockholm, here is a beginning result.

It now remains to complete the job, which, again thanks to you, I am stimulated to do.

Cyril Belshaw
Vancouver, February 2005

From Youth Maturity to Global Government: The Utopian Tapestry

By Cyril Belshaw

Prologue

Studies of Utopia have in the past primarily focussed on imaginative literary expression, without worrying about the practicality of achieving what the mind imagines. There is a sense in which such work, valued in creating Alice in Wonderland mirrors and critical appraisals of inadequate human society, were precursors of later science and fantasy fiction.

In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries the focus partially shifted. On the one hand entrepreneurs endeavoured to create living, real, Utopian societies, localized in space, through colonies and communes. At the same time, led by Marxism or religious fervour, ideologies – the governance of behaviour through fundamental principle – took on an even stronger role in guiding political and socio-cultural action.

It is my contention that the twenty-first century can celebrate the evolution of Utopian propositions into forms which provide practical guidance for those of us who wish to create the best of possible worlds. This presentation is intended to be a step in that direction.

 At first sight, the subject matter of the two subjects I elaborate – education and world government – appear only marginally connected to each other, if at all. In fact the connection is fundamental on three grounds. The first is that an educational system which succeeds in creating youth maturity, and especially maximizing the broadest aspects of courtesy and understanding while minimizing aggression, anxiety and dysfunction, would be a major facilitator toward the goal of a just and effective world government. The second is that a just and effective world government, freed from the trappings of state nationalism, is an essential prerequisite for the principles of engendering youth maturity to become global, rather than a privilege of rich countries. The third is that a practical Utopian society must be based on holistic premises – in other words each facet of the societal continuum affects the capability of the other facets to perform optimally.[1]

---

1   For the concept of "social performance" and a discussion of the factors which contribute to its optimization, see my "The Conditions of Social Performance: an exploratory theory"; Routledge and Aldine 1970 republished in the International Library of Sociology series :"Social Theory and Methods", Routledge, 1996.

If this is so, then other social themes than the ones I have selected must be of similar importance. It would be beyond the patience of the readers of this essay for me to devote equal weight to them. But we must recognize them. Thus in a linking section entitled *Weft and Warp* I give the gist of the kinds of Utopian reforms which are needed in parallel to the ones I discuss at length, indicating the kinds of changes that must be envisaged.

An underlying theme is that we have at our fingertips all the technical apparatus that we need to achieve our goals. A basic premise is that most of humankind wants a peaceful globe without violence of any kind, yet respecting and valuing cultural difference and variety. Since we have the means, it is not unreasonable to have the ambition to reach the kind of global Utopia I envisage by the year 2100, that is within the century. Such is the current momentum of societal change. We have the choice of letting that momentum run its chaotic way unchecked, or of consciously deciding to guide it into paths we want to follow. It is, as never before, up to us.

There are multiple ways of arriving there, and billions of value-laden decisions to take along the way. Here the premise is that we, as peoples, must take steps to examine, evaluate, discuss the intermediary objectives – the ones to be defined as we move forward. However definitive I may seem in my ideas, they are just that. Ideas. I believe in them at this moment. But they need to be discussed, amended, replaced. All I ask is that in the discussion, the implication of the amendments be thought out, and traced through the rest of the argument for inconsistencies and further amendment. We must never forget the holistic pattern, that one decision affects all others. What you and I do now, individually and intimately, affects the 2100 outcome. In making decisions, we must never forget that.

Another premise is that cultures, whether local, professional or global are dynamic. The changes which took place in the twentieth century – little more than one lifetime – were fundamental to all societies in the world.[2] Some would argue, persuasively, that the rate of change increased exponentially, leading to inequities and anxieties about our ability to absorb the innovations. What is more, the changes have not been limited to technology or commercial practice or instruments designed to kill. In a very uneven way, they have included the most basic elements of human culture, from religious belief to marriage and sexual practice.

---

2   And sometimes creating reactionary backlashes.

Up to the present, despite the existence of pressure groups, powerful politicians and CEOs, the changes have been blind. There is one relevant rule of human life. However much we plan, scheme, and rationalize policies, the results of any action, public or private, contain unforeseen elements. Sometimes these are trivial, sometimes they completely frustrate the given objective.

Thus we cannot be 100% certain about what we do. This is not a plea for more research – we must accept uncertainty and, its concomitant, the learning experience of failures along the way. We cannot wait for the completion of a major study; we must act in good faith, with the best knowledge and sensitivity we can muster.

The cliché has it that the movement of a butterfly's wings in the Amazon will influence the state of mind of a hermit in the Himalayas. We cannot detect that tiny influence. What the cliché says is that what we do has ramifying effects on the thoughts, actions, emotions, planning, of others both near and far. We do not normally extrapolate the consequences of our individual acts to the analysis of the nature of the world order. Yet the pond ripples, and it would be good to judge the effects of our own actions, however humble, in terms of their rippling consequences.

At an intimate level, there is much that can be done. We can judge our own actions in terms of what we know about their effects. This of course is already being done. Husbands and wives ponder the effect of their words and behaviour on their partners. Sincere environmentalists amend their private actions, consciously working if not to improve, at least not to further damage, the environment as they know it. Parents work with theories and ideas about what works best for their children, and in doing so have at least some wider respect for social responsibility. The exercises will be the more effective the more they become spontaneous, as natural results of attitudes towards life. To handle this is of course a prime goal of activities which create maturity in youth.

The vast differences between the rich countries and the poor, not only in commercial wealth but in the opportunities presented to the human spirit, create obvious targets for action. Too often, this takes the form of "Let them be like us". Put baldly, the gross flaws in such an argument are obvious to all except the proselytizers of U.S. style capitalism. I have claimed elsewhere that the more centralized and detached a political entity, the more humans value small scale associations of great variety (from Churches to carnivals and cultural associations) within which they may find an identity.

Thus what we may call global values (e.g. embodied in international law and policy) both emerge from and impinge upon systems of significant *localized* values. Adaptation, resistance, judgement, positive excitement and anger are part of the dialectic. No great work can emerge which can take into account all the variations. But principles, such as those of understanding the nature and ramifications of change, the implications of reform, may be applied and respected.

I base my hope and optimism on two features. The first is the broad, continual, discussion of where we want to be in 2100, of values and ways of getting there. What I write now in 2003 is something I believe to be eminently feasible. But the goals I suggest, which I in vanity consider to be appropriate, will, as discussion continues and culture changes, turn out to be naïve, in need of much further refinement, probably as early as 2030.

The Responsibilities of Education

It is my intention here to examine critically the ways in which official policies relate to the maturation of youth, primarily through the educational system, primarily in richer countries. More and more frequently schools are being confronted by manifestations of societal ills – violence, depression et al. They are not equipped to remedy the problems they face, and there are difficulties bringing other community resources to bear on the issues.

Once we identify the tasks and challenges necessary to optimize the ways in which youths mature into responsible citizens, we may then design appropriate institutions to do the job. That design will be the Utopian goal to achieve prior to 2100 – in my view it should be achievable fifty years before that – indeed very soon – in much of the world. Special adjustments will be required to modify the institutions and ensure that they are effective in the poorer countries. In all instances the interaction of these ideas with indigenous values and systems will need careful culture-specific appraisal.

I start with suicide in its several forms.

In many parts of the industrial world, high school age youths are committing suicide in increasing numbers. As their age group rises as a cohort in the demographic scale, so the general figures of attempted suicide rise. In other words, the tendency toward suicide carries on into higher age groups.

Recently – I do not know for how long – the elderly had the highest suicide rates in such countries. Now the rates among the youth cohorts match those for the elderly. Unless there are fundamental transformations, the changing attitudes towards euthanasia coupled with the entry of present youth cohorts into the ranks of the elderly could produce a suicide explosion in forty years, if not before, that would shake the capabilities of society to respond.

I accept and advocate the right of the elderly to take their own lives, though I would prefer it to be in the context of psychological peace rather than age-induced depression. I do not accept it as a necessity in other age groups, for which the future is still an open possibility. That would not be my idea of the Utopia toward which we strive.

In Japan and other countries suicides take place as the young take their lives for fear of taking and failing examinations or similar tests. Family and peer pressure play a role: so do induced or real feelings of self-worthlessness in a demanding society.

A further form of suicide is ideological. This is particularly the case in Arab society, where young, well-educated people, especially including women, undertake acts of terrorism in which their own deaths are virtually certain – acts of martyrdom.

Close to suicide, perhaps virtually the same, thousands of young boys and girls are recruited into guerrilla and sometimes national armies, indoctrinated with the fever of killing, and thrust into the front lines where they are most in danger. It is well documented that many, indeed the majority, have been kidnapped to serve as cannon fodder. They are often in hysterical or drug-induced excitement, at the dangerous age of susceptibility. They take risks, voluntarily or under pressure, in which the likelihood of death, before or after episodes of looting and socially destructive seemingly inhuman acts, is high. They are removed from the world of normal society, pariah's to civilisation.

And then there are those whose alienation is not that of the body, but of the mind and its spirit. These are the habitual criminals, so often so long behind bars that they are totally unable to function outside of prison, and who commit acts so that they return. They do not kill their bodies, but their way of life has become virtually suicidal – often, at a young age, because of experiences "inside" prison, that breeding ground of anti-social behaviour.

The correction of the tendency among those who have already moved beyond school and university can only be modified by changes throughout culture, especially in the institutions which are held to be responsible for social control – including police and prisons – an issue that is fundamental to Utopia, but which will not be expanded upon here.

However, the first step in tackling the issue throughout all age groups lies with education.

Suicide is part of the nexus of concerns that include violence and harassment in schools, truancy, youth prostitution, youth homelessness, the recourse of youth to violence and gangs on the streets, abuse in the family, and drugs. These are not just urban problems. Until the idealisation of rural life in the sec-

ond half of the last century, it was well known that sexual abuse, family instability, incest, and violence were typical phenomena of *rural* living. They are more dramatic, more concentrated, less hidden, more newsworthy, and more frequently observed because the populations are higher, in cities. Although this is so, it is doubtful whether the statistical incidence is higher than in earlier years of the century, and it is certain that there have been periods in modern history, for example the nineteenth century, when the situation was much worse.

That is, though, beside the point. It doesn't matter what the trends are, except insofar as wrong publicity creates immoderate anxieties and backlashes. What *is* to the point is that there should be zero tolerance of any of these phenomena in a civilised society. I am not referring to the superficial remedies of authoritarian crackdown. I mean getting to the remedial basics.

The basics consist in the upbringing of youth, presently a joint responsibility of family, schools, youth organisations, religions and the State.

The family is having great difficulty. It has *always* had great difficulty, among rich *and* poor. Let us be freed from "traditional family values" which have done such a horrible job, and been the cover up for abuse. That does not mean throwing everything out. It means re-thinking responsibilities and dynamics.

Guilt. Anxiety. Hopelessness. From time to time these strike at all parents who take their responsibilities seriously. What, oh what, am I doing wrong?

What parents tend to do is to bring forward the learning that they acquired in their family of origin, and as they acquired a philosophy of parenting in their twenties and thirties. Parents themselves survived troubled times, in the late 'sixties and 'seventies battling authority with the assertion of permissiveness. When adults become responsible for loved children themselves, the two themes fight for dominance and balance. Parents blame themselves for not getting the balance right, for not foreseeing.

They cannot get the balance right. Nobody knows what that balance is, for each individual child. The outside influences are also so powerful. Parents must count themselves fortunate and extraordinarily sensitive if their offspring make the transition to adulthood reasonably well. Quite frequently, the path is first of natural rebellion which can take extremely dangerous turns beside the abyss of drugs and

alienation. Quite frequently, parents find that the children, now "friendren", have survived, matured, found new solid roads.

This is not to argue that, if parents do not *know* they should not try. Of course they will. Their efforts, whether misguided or highly sensitive, *will* have an effect, a positive one, when guided by love and support, come what may. It is almost the only principle that counts for sure. Parents, after all, are not the only variables.

There is the child itself. Life never will be a cakewalk. Despite the incidence of trouble, by far the majority of children become reliable adults. Even when they have inner pains, they function well, even creatively.

And they live in a challenging environment in which they are led by a myriad of influences toward a myriad of choices.

In what follows I am somewhat neglecting the influence of religion. This is a pity, but I can't do everything at this moment. Despite refusing the concept of a God or gods in human form, I am not one of those who believes that religion, or at least the search for spirituality, is insignificant. On the contrary, the search for spirituality, within or without the churches, is a major preoccupation, a resource, an intellectual and emotional drive, that has a major part to play in the lives of an increasing number of men and women. On the other hand, the influence of formal religion and the spiritual beliefs of parents on children is a part of family life, determined by parents. Further, the range and variety of belief and of the types of searching are now so great as to defy easy summary. For the growing young, seeking their own paths as they enter the enquiring teens, the range and variety are part of the almost infinity of choice with which they are confronted. It is that infinity of choice which evokes creativity, thoughtfulness, anxiety and despair, an infinity that continues well beyond school into adulthood. As each decade passes, the conscious part of that infinity expands, life juxtaposing simplicity and resounding chaos, in which the ears as well as our other senses defend themselves against both aggression and sensuality, often not being able to distinguish this from that.

The school is the place in which family influence confronts the perspectives of other families through the filter of other children's presence. It is the place where the influences of the media, of adult role models, of professional teachers, the contributions of churches and voluntary youth organisations, and

the policies of the State, come together, working out their pressures and contradictions in the minds and behaviour of children.

It is inevitable that education should thus be the focus of power rivalry, conflict and co-operation, demands and compromise. Ideally, the State should be in a position to take a detached view, to consider the meaning, objectives, philosophies and methods of education. This is not the case. The State is governed by men and women whose basic philosophies are *a priori*, joined with those of political allies in a mostly confrontational competition with oppositions. The State is strongly advised by bureaucracies who control data and implementation, who are a force for conservative continuity which fortunately somewhat counterbalances the potential swings of elected political opinion. Powers are variously filtered through intermediary bodies down to the school, or in some instances tightly controlled by the central government or a recognized religious hierarchy. Powers relate to the official objectives and philosophy of education, the curriculum, and budgetary influences on school practice.

Teachers, like any other professional corpus, have the responsibility for the direct contact with their client-pupils, and to a lesser extent with the semi-client-parents. It is this responsibility, together with their common experience of professional training, that binds them together, and constitutes the reality of their power base. Furthermore, the most significant reality in the exercise of educational policy is what teachers do with it. A fiat from above is useless if it does not fit well with the perceptions that the teachers themselves have of their realities, their philosophy, their responsibilities, and, increasingly, their material conditions. Even unintentionally teachers internalise their beliefs and practices in ways that are difficult to change, and of course sometimes they don't want to change, because what they do is a sacred pursuit.

It might be said that the way to change teaching is to change teacher training. Indeed, without this, change would be even more difficult. But if serious changes are to be contemplated – and I have not yet made my case for them – we must recognise that young newly trained teachers have limited influence and, perhaps, none at all within a religious hierarchy. It is not only that time must pass before they rise in seniority and their proportions increase – with the consequence that even newer ideas must enter the system with the young cohorts now the conservatives. It is that they are posted to schools as individuals, surrounded by those whose training belongs to an earlier period. They meet in committees, socialise, discuss issues, are rewarded, with and by those who belong to an earlier generation. Inevitably,

most of them will unintentionally modify their positions to conform to those of their peer group. Their impact is reduced. (They could have greater impact if posted en bloc to specific schools, more or less taking them over, at the expense of experience.)[3]

Some of this can be modified by major refresher training. This is not readily achieved by North American style "professional days", or by uncontrolled sabbaticals. It would require periodic freedom from classroom activities for substantial blocks of *required* refresher education.

There are other difficulties in teacher formation. What is to be taught to them? Subject matter? Pedagogical philosophy? The State's requirements? In these matters, wherein lies the "academic freedom" of the teacher? Does the teacher in fact have "academic freedom" that a university professor is supposed to have? I think not. The teacher has a responsibility for the vulnerable children of parents, and is thus morally responsible to those parents, whereas university faculty are supposedly guiding young adults. The teacher interprets responsibility by using skills the best way possible to influence young minds. In my view, those skills have technical components that can be taught, and personal, human components that training can influence but not control. Because of the latter limitation, the effectiveness of the classroom has, ultimately, to depend on the individual teacher who makes the institutional framework operate through personal qualities which technical skills support but do not suffocate. The freedom of the teacher lies in his or her application of those skills, *not in deciding what the ultimate classroom goals should be*.

Ultimately, then, I argue that innovation in the school system is the same as in any other context. It comes through the interplay of ideas and concepts that can come in all forms, formally and informally, which the individual teacher rejects or accepts. The rate of acceptance will be proportional to the degree to which the concept or practice "fits" the profile of culture of individual teachers, and can be incorporated into that profile.

You will find only a few small countries – some Pacific Islands, perhaps – where the main corpus of teachers individually share more or less identical cultural profiles. In all others, there is considerable va-

---

3   In the late 'forties I had the privilege of conducting research amongst units of the British armed forces. The then government was determined to change the culture of the by now professional officer corps. Young officers were indoctrinated with the new ideas, but as they were posted one by one to their regiments or squadrons they rapidly succumbed to the values and culture of the officers' mess.

riety. Within that variation, individuals who approximate each other in ideas and point of view may be grouped, more or less categorised. If one wished to do so, one could identify such groups. Educational innovation would have differing impacts on each such group. This is one potential influence towards diversity in the school system. Teachers with differing philosophies and methods can, theoretically, operate schools with differing philosophies and methods.

If there is truth in this, how much more so is it true of the third power group, the parents. Whereas teachers, despite their differences, have some common ground derived from occupational considerations, parents do not. Their variability is much greater, except in rural tribal communities. And in developed and developing countries they increasingly demand more variation in education. States, and teachers, confront increasingly multi-faceted parental cultures.

Some argue that the more varied and complex a society, the more important it is to use schooling as a cohesive force. (In some times and places, compulsory army service was justified in this way.) I confess to doubts about this, if the objective is Utopian, for in another context I argue that the State is not, fundamentally, holy. Yet in the shorter term, this is a practical consideration. Do we want the cohesiveness of the State to be weakened? Let us keep this in mind.

What should be the functional objectives of the school? Do they imply major innovation? In approaching these questions I am not implying that, for any function, the school is the only influence that is relevant or that is needed. The school, however, works with children for long hours, day after day. Its potential influence, through both teaching and the influence of peers, is as great as that of parents and it may be identified as the primary institution which exposes children to non-family society in a societally coordinated way.[4]

Such influences embody major ethical problems. If State schools were fully effective in carrying out their mandate, they would be imposing a single universal philosophy on children. The authoritarian and centralising dangers are modified by the essential individuality of both teachers and children, the existence of programme choices, and the counterbalancing effects of family and other outside influ-

---

4   Other institutions such as churches, sports associations and so on normally deal with segments of society, whereas schools, one way or another, penetrate all corners.

ences. Yet a single, universal, little modified, State system could move in the universalising direction and is contrary to my sense of the Utopian goal of a diverse culture.

There is also an incipient conflict between the goals of particular schools and the goals of parents, individually or collectively. One of the most dramatic illustrations came from special Indian schools in British Columbia. A now discontinued type of school, known as "residential schools", deliberately removed young children from their parents and communities (considered to be retrograde influences), transferring them to boarding schools. Later, in more subtle ways, Indian community day schools were sometimes staffed by dedicated, earnest and responsible non-Indian teachers who, as individuals, considered it their duty and mandate to be agents of change. In itself, this indeed might have been a legitimate mandate – it would in effect have been impossible for a school to have operated *without* engendering change of some sort. The issue here, though, is that, at least to begin with, many of the teachers did not have the skills or incentives to match their ideas about the goals of change to those of the parents. The child, unintentionally, became the location of a battleground between two sets of adults, overt or unseen. Even teachers in village schools were drawn into such conflicts. In extreme cases the tensions and misplaced mandates brought despair, neurosis in both teacher and pupil, and revolting abuse.

This is an extreme form of a tension which is frequent, teachers considering some parents to be irresponsible, uncaring, harmful to their offspring, ignorant about the educational needs and strengths of their children, causing anti-social behaviour; parents considering teachers to be using wrong methods, presenting irreligious values, encouraging laziness or pushing children too far.

To advocate no tension at all would be unrealistic and false. A major part of learning, as I shall reinforce, is to deal with tension and to work out the implications of inconsistency and conflict. It is from such bases that innovation takes place. However, whatever I may suggest by way of resolving issues, I am in no doubt that differences will continue in Utopia, and that, in reasonable ways, they should. When I set forth ideas about objectives for ultimate achievement I know I shall be establishing a battleground or, I would rather hope, a platform for debate.

By way of opening the subject, I once had ideas about an ideal base curriculum for a modern world. It was oriented toward mobility and the growth of the individual. The underlying theme was to maximise

the child's potential for communication as an adult. Thus the three-r's were essential – few disagree about that today. To literacy, numeracy and communication skills (including logic and rhetoric) were added those languages which worked as *linguae francae* across major segments of the world – English, German and Russian (for much of eastern Europe), Arabic, Spanish, French (for parts of Africa and Asia), written Mandarin, Malay, and Swahili (for East Africa). To this would be added comparative anthropology, world social and political history and geography, medical diagnosis, data searching and processing, and, for real mobility, basic motor mechanics, horse riding, sailing (with navigation) and outdoor skills. Such a curriculum was predicated on one specific goal – making it possible for young adults to move through the world anywhere with confidence and to move forward (with specialised advanced education) into their professions anywhere.

While such a model programme may be teasing to some, **all it does** is to demonstrate that current curricula are not writ in stone; that what is taught depends entirely on objectives. The major limitation of the above imagined programme was that the objective was narrow, too much based on instruction and too little on the nature of the child, and not suited to the needs of Utopia. But the limitations of the above extreme case are also present, if to a lesser degree, in **all** curriculum models. The very idea that one curriculum serves the needs of all students in all parts of society is and should be a non-starter. The major thread running through all good curricula is that they establish standards of rigour, discipline, clear thinking, and the processes of continuously acquiring and using knowledge.

If the above is not satisfactory, then what should most, if not all, schools do, in principle? There is a great deal.

Particularly in the second half of this century, schools have been experimenting with our children, often in the light of general theories which can be misinterpreted when put into practice, theories which, in the nature of things, have not been properly tested in terms of results. What I write now is of the same order. It is opinion, linked to some observation, some experience, and, I hope, some logic. In particular, *it is linked to ideas about what the end results should be*. Recall one of my foundation statements. There is no complete knowledge; anything put into practice will lead to unexpected results. What we do in schools will have profound effects on the future. The cautions of this paragraph will have major implications for the organisation of schools.

In 'fifties Canada I saw schools in which uniforms had been abandoned as a matter of theory. Uniforms were felt to be authoritarian, representing an expense for those not so well off. At the same time schools emphasised the skills of social interaction, the ability to get on with one's fellows. The solitary pupil was an anachronism. The children themselves stepped into the gap. Peer pressure dictated clothing, both boys and girls decided that what they wore had to be what youthful fashion dictated. Those who wore different clothing were open to derision. Within the peer dictates, some of the better off were seen to be better off by the expense of the clothes, the cars driven, the hair-dos and makeup of the girls. The concern for the visible aspects of group personality seemed to take priority over the content of school work, where conformity emerged naturally.

By the 'nineties more individuality was expressed. But the use of externals and clothing is still an identifier. This time it identifies group *difference* as well as juvenile peer-conformity. Gangs have their markers. Certain conformist schools mistakenly attempt to enforce clothing standards which reduce ethnic identification.

The most marked change in school ethos in many industrialised countries since the late 'sixties has been the formal redefinition of the appropriate tension between conformity and individuality, a redefinition which affects major changes in adult perceptions. In one sense, the group is re-asserted. Group projects frequently take the place of individual ones. Seating arrangements create eye-to-eye contact in the classroom, emphasising interactions, and hence peer control, in place of the more individualistic lines of desks.

On the other hand, the self is re-asserted. Therapies dealing with relationships in adult society often emphasise self-awareness, self-knowledge, the discovery of the past and of the child within; and self-assertion. Mishandled, as therapy often is, the "other" becomes secondary. The right kind of concern for the "other" will emerge only after the "self" has been discovered.

So in the school. In both schools and universities, there have been times, teachers, and classes for which self-expression is valued simply because it is the expression of self, with little or no regard to the quality of the expression. The fact that I thought it is quite sufficient to give me top marks. Indeed, since everyone in the class thought something, let's give them all top marks. Such caricatures have been realities.

However, even where such naive extremes have been in place, it is interesting to see both teachers and the public striving to establish something else, "standards". And it is more interesting to see children discovering that there is more to creativity than simple effort; discovering, as they step into the world, that they have been betrayed because they were not prepared for "standards"; that much of peer pressure "out there" is indeed about standards and performance rather than superficialities; and that there is excitement to be obtained from meeting intellectual challenges. The cliché has it: if there are rigorous and demanding standards in sports, why not in thinking?

Both themes need expression, and never will either disappear. To equip children for a world in which there is extensive adult non-work that I envisage for Utopia.[5] It is essential that they know themselves. It is a fundamental part of creative education that children learn how to explore, out of their own interests. They will not fully discover themselves in high school. Currently, most children do not discover their creative capacities until well into young adulthood. No school can place before a young person the whole total richness of the world and what the human capacity is capable of; no school can provide the total basis for choice.[6] But all schools can aim at encouraging intellectual – in which I include artistic and psychological – exploration, the discovery that one is capable of entering undreamed-of realms of creativity, the knowledge that the search for self-fulfilment is never-ending and wondrous. The emphasis on the mind and spirit implied in my last sentence does not reduce the significance of the bio-physical.

The truism that healthy minds emerge from healthy bodies is only partly true. Many great minds belong to those who are or have been physically and emotionally warped. Touch a great philosopher and you will find a troubled soul. What *is* true, on the other hand, is that *all* thought and self-expression arrives through the senses, is filtered internally as a result of sensory experience. Especially in the puritanical parts of the world, where the creative uses of some senses are denied, the ability of teachers to encourage sensory experience is strictly limited – and rightly so, since maturing children are especially vulnerable to sensory abuse and dysfunctional influence. Yet a balance can surely be attained in which

---

5   See the section Weft and Warp. Utopia will have less mandatory employment, more non-work activity.

6   How many school career counsellors even imagine the possibility of anthropology as a career, even if they know what the word means?

sensory experience is valued, and individually encouraged, and the links between experience, creativity, and damage are made known.

Furthermore, the world of physical activity intersects directly with the mind, its expression, and its choices. The physical and the mental are not opposites; they are part of one state. The choice of physical activity over desk activity is not a choice of body over mind. It is a choice in which body and mind unite to go in a specific direction. The application of thought and knowledge to sport and recreation makes this clear. Some children will make physical activity a greater part of their lives than others; almost all children should understand that this is not a separate, classified as different, part of life, but an integrated aspect. It will, like every other aspect, be used creatively by some and less by others, just as is music or scientific experimentation. But the bio-physical and the mental are fundamental, part of every single one of us, in a way that music or scientific experimentation is not.

To start the process of knowing one's self, then, is a primary goal of school education. The search for that knowledge will never end.

And at the same time, it is of utmost significance to limit that search for self. This will be done by placing it in context. But without balance and context an over-emphasis on the ego is likely to be hurtful, to the child, and to others. It will engender the continuous life-long question, the dominance of Who-am-I? Anxiety because I do not know myself, perpetual introspection, inhibition from action because it might not be right for me. In this field, even more than in all others, it is of major necessity to indicate also that I will *never* know fully who I am; that *why* I am who I think I am doesn't matter so much – it can't be changed retrospectively – as *who* I am. I must learn when to think about it and when to stop thinking about it. The importance of the search is to find out what my values are, what I would like to do in living my life, how I can get on with others, how I can communicate myself to others, and how to make some reasonable choices for myself.

Education is replete with paradoxes, contradictions, and oppositions. Successful education does not allow one theme to dominate, but to balance the contradictions in ways that alert the child without creating improper anxiety, that make use of the paradoxes for creativity, and that meet the needs of different children in different ways.

Thus self-expression is counter-balanced by awareness of and concern for others. I personally feel that *the primary underlying issue is courtesy and respect for others*. And I feel that somehow, all over the world, schools have limited success in conveying this message, and that very frequently the concern is treated as peripheral rather than fundamental. If there is no courtesy and respect for others a school simply cannot function adequately. An adult society cannot exist. The issue links to so many other aspects of society – violence, crime, autocracy, self-interest pressure groups, attitudes to work are rather obvious; I shall identify others.

Hence self-expression should not be confused with selfishness and egotism.

In my elderly superficial observations I see small examples of the confusion. Young people at all times and places have difficulty in defining their personal space. As I have said, anyone who encounters young people on public transport, in shopping areas, in souks, anywhere where there is a strong possibility of physical contact, is bound to get an elbow in the ribs, toes stepped on, the sensation of being pushed aside as the energetic young, in groups, steam ahead. One remarks on the natural courtesy of a youth who gives his, or more usually her, seat to an elderly person of no matter what ethnic community. One often feels that in such a case it is parental, not school, influence that has been responsible; and that peer pressure is against it through derision, especially amongst boys.

Trivial. Not at all. Fundamental. Which is why I repeat the point.

If courtesy is not taught in little ways, the large ones, when there, are hypocritical.

Some schools, of course, do in fact stress courteous behaviour. All should. How?

I do not like the word "tolerance". It implies that there is something about another's behaviour that I don't particularly like, but will tolerate. Yes, indeed, we often do run across behaviour which we dislike and tolerate. Often when we run across behaviour that we dislike and should *not* tolerate; we should do something about it.

What I object to is the easy way in which we can think of tolerance of rather than respect for others. It is not tolerance that should be emphasised in schools, but respect. Tolerance implies "Real weird he

digs classical music. Who cares?" or "They have such weird customs. I don't mind, though, that's for them". Patronising. On the contrary, respect for others implies "I wonder what he gets out of classical music? Makes him interesting." or "What they do makes considerable sense for them. Even though it's not for me, I'd like to know about it."

One of the results of the late 'sixties was the re-emphasis of the idea that discipline, however valued in sports, was unnatural in mental activity, and that "failure" was an assault on the persona. On the contrary, both discipline and failure are essential experiences for a truly civilised person who wishes to be capable of the fullest self-expression and the fullest contribution to total well-being.

However much a creative person enjoys the outcome of his chosen activity, there will be costs involved. To commit to the chosen outcome requires the payment of those costs. They include not only the material, but the psychological. If you are not prepared to pay the costs, you do not value the activity as highly as you thought. To summon the resources, internal and objective, to pursue a goal, it is necessary to have the discipline to pay, in effort, in materiel, in mental concentration, and, quite often, in going through boring and seemingly pointless stages and bits of training. You may have to suffer through boring instructors. To get to the fullest enjoyment of achievement it is necessary to be prepared to go through times when you ask yourself, is this all worthwhile?

You do not simply get an answer out of the air. There has been groundwork laid for those flashes of insight, of intuition, of bodily achievement, of controlled logic.

As I have said, and will repeat, there is no greater betrayal of a child's capabilities that to pretend to him or her that whatever they think is objectively as good as what someone else thinks, just because it is thought. That any thought is as good as another. That what matters is to do the thinking, and that the skills of communicating that thinking are insignificant. This sort of betrayal is not to be confused with the genuine attempt to encourage the emergence of the child's thoughts – and then to show, skilfully and gently, that those thoughts can be extended by the application of discipline – even by going through disliked procedures.

The betrayal I have mentioned is matched by another equal treachery, – the denial of "failure", the belief that the term "failure" has to mean the denigration of the individual, that it is somehow shock-

ing and should never occur. It is true that in the past, and still in the present, failure has been used as a punishing stick in that way; it has discouraged and destroyed individual talents.

The word "failure" should be brought back into current dialogue. It should be used with understanding as a positive element in life. To "fail" means that you have *tried*, that you have attempted something that is for some reason at this point beyond you. To fail gives you guidance. It tells you what to work on – it may even be lassitude or lack of discipline, but it can also be lack of a technical mastery, of understanding. It may even tell you that the subject matter will not, eventually, be for you.

Placed in a positive context, failure should be a challenge. It should alert both teacher and child that something requires attention. As a child I failed in both mathematics and French. My teachers dealt with the other pupils who understood and were not so mentally lazy. My father bought me a French tutor and in a couple of months I was top in the city's schools. I wish he had thought to do that in mathematics, for in later life I found, without knowing any math, that symbolic logic has an extraordinary appeal and value that my laziness undermines.

In my case the teachers did not have the will or the interest to advise someone who, to them, was a bit of an idiot and lazy to boot. Literature recounts many tales of dedicated teachers whose avocation is to find and nurture the wandering child, to bring him through the tests of discipline and failure. It is also full of accounts of harsh disciplinarians who have little interest but to give vent to their own internal problems, and in doing so stifle growth. For many talented men and women the suffering of school is something to eventually be put behind them, for adult life is their real school, the place where they find an outlet for their skills and even achieve fame. True. But many others fall by the wayside. And what a waste of school resources and energy to let the opportunity slip by.

Embrace failure. Let teachers resurrect it as a positive force. It will be there throughout life; it is a step on the path to achievement; it must be understood, not fled from. He who does not fail does not try; indeed is not alive.

At present we are going through what I hope is a blip on the hidden screen of Utopia. We are, quite properly, tying education to social goals; but the blip on the screen tells us that the primary goal is to train young people for employment. Vocational and/or practical education is, will be, and should be of

as much concern as the so-called academic, for this is the path that many will choose in life, and it is significant for the full life and recreation of many whose primary occupation will be less definable.

So here I address a problem of pedagogy. Let me illustrate. Many years ago I administered an educational programme for the United Nations which consisted of extending the horizons and knowledge of senior civil servants from developing countries, in almost all substantive fields, from social work to hydraulic engineering. The previous director of the centre, with great perspicacity, set in place a system in which he talked with each of the fellows to determine what, in their *theoretical* understanding they were lacking. At first the fellows resisted. What they wanted were the latest practical techniques and gimmicks. Each individually tailored programme, however, was designed to reinforce the *principles* from which the practical techniques were created, to create professional on-going contacts with the world of advanced knowledge, and to help the candidate to control, throughout hiser life, the flow of new information, techniques and ideas. He faced the issue that the "latest" today is the "out-dated" tomorrow; that education in the "latest" will be démodé by the time the student returned home. In other words, he aimed instead at broadening capabilities for life-long development, individually, instead of making the experience a one-shot, classroom kind of quickly out-dated and ephemeral instruction. In that context the experiment, for that was what it was, was "too expensive" to last, yet it was in truth a most efficient and long-lasting expenditure of resources.

Similar principles apply to "practical" instruction in high schools.

The reasoning is simple. If you train children with employment in mind, what precisely is that employment? You begin educating in that manner in the teens, but it will be four years (more if tertiary education follows) before the child is offering his or her services. In the present and future world, changes in the work place, in both technique and distribution of tasks, move so fast and unpredictably that you may be training for dead ends. Furthermore, unless there is a very close liaison with the *whole range* of employers, it will be inevitable that the skills represent only a portion of what is needed. How many schools train butchers in sushi techniques? (Some do.) How far behind were schools in adapting auto mechanics courses to the electronic age?

Furthermore, it is obvious that the work place itself will change many times during the career of the employee, and that an employee is likely to change jobs more frequently than at present. How can

schools keep up with the fast changes and movements in occupation? They can't, unless they specialise as technical high schools, which is not always to be recommended, and may not be what employment needs require.

What the school can best do is to educate, not train. Even for those whose major aptitude is practical, it is still the mind that counts. Skilled tradesmen and secretaries can adapt. They understand what lies behind the practice, they play with alternatives in their minds, they are not shocked but challenged if there is a technological revolution, and they have psychological command of what is needed to go through the adaptation. Schools that build programmes on the concept of a survey of employer-specific needs are doomed to fall short.

This is not to say that school and the work-place should be separated. Children should *know* what the workplace entails – not as a fixed static entity, but one that is always in fluctuation. Since time is limited, not all careers can be demonstrated by class activities. The notion of dynamics needs to be extended by indications that there are other worlds out there, other kinds of industry and commerce. And, especially for the more academically inclined, that boring subjects are sometimes of great advantage, from languages to abstract mathematics.

If the school is to combine practice and theory in generalisable ways, employers will still fret about the lack of trained applicants to do immediate tasks. As most Europeans have known – but maybe are losing sight of – that is the task for the employer himself. For that kind of training, there is no substitute for it being on the job, linked precisely to the issue of earning a living. A modernised concept of apprenticeships – which will have to be followed time and again by refresher training – still makes sense. Some large industries may be able to support class activities, either in-house or in association with training or technical post-high schools.

But don't dump this on secondary schools. They have too much to do to create the dynamic fundamentals and to nurture creative aptitudes.

One of the concomitants of undisciplined self-expression is the inability to communicate effectively and to discriminate between incoming messages. Disturbingly, many adults take manipulatory advantage of this.

Before World War II ideology was linked to political propaganda. Both the left but especially the right honed the skills of communicating falsity and manipulating half-truth. Crowd behaviour, mass rallies, manipulation of mass theatrical devices, endless repetition, slogans instead of thought – all these were common. Mostly, educators could see them for what they were. As a youth and young man I found that classes in logic and books which showed the nature of the techniques and the logical *leger–de–main* quite fascinating – of course using what I had learned to support my own prejudices!

It is extremely difficult to find such classes and books today. States still manipulate with propaganda, but, save for those which are ideologically founded, their positions are more subtle. They make use of PR firms and techniques, with communication models derived from advertising, but now being cynically distrusted as "spin". In the industrialised world the techniques of propaganda have been taken over by a kaleidoscope of pressure groups. Pressure groups organised around particular points of view and philosophies are a natural outcome of democratic life. But it behoves the citizen to see clearly the relationship between argument and data, to know the empirical base of points of view, the logic and assumptions with which it is upheld.

And this implies, even more, to nurturing the ability to appraise critically the numerous ideologies and unsupported scientific and folk claims with which all of us are confronted today. Without sacrificing independence of thought and respect for mavericks, youth needs to be able to make judgements about balderdash, mumbo-jumbo, "obscurantist bunkum, swirling hogwash, mendacious codswallop" and to be guided to simple expressions in their own language, avoiding the obscure language which is nowadays typical of corporations, politicians and academics.[7]

 Utopianly, a citizen society equipped to judge and think and appraise would, by its own standards and criticisms, reveal the strengths and weaknesses of arguments, and hence punish by scepticism those who try to win by playing tricks on the mind.

There is evidence that the public senses much of this. There is widespread cynicism about political statements, derision about the way the media fasten on a limited aspect of a "story" and repeat it *ad*

---

7   I am indebted to E. S. Turner's review of Francis Wheen, *How Mumbo-jumbo Conquered the World, a short history of modern delusions* Fourth Estate, 2004 in the *Times Literary Supplement* Feb 14th 2004 p. 36 for the choice of epithets.

infinitum until it goes away, neglecting the balancing data. While many fasten upon visual scenes of horror and distress, others know that this is manipulative, replacing thought and balance with blood and tears.

A few recognise that, while it is proper for children to know what demonstrations are about, what lies behind them, it is exploitative to include very young children in those demonstrations; it is abusive and brain-washing, especially at primary school age. By the secondary level, lessons in logic and rhetoric become essential for the formation of critical citizens, and teachers must be prepared to have their values and perspectives openly challenged and debated.

I am disturbed about other phenomena. The movements of the late 'sixties in the "West" properly shook up received ideas in almost all public fields, from sex to the environment. In part they did so by affirming the significance of the emotions, of feelings, of the subjective, and did indeed provide a much-needed corrective to the idea that logic is detached from the senses and is the only path to understanding. Paradoxically, however, one result was to create group tyrannies, ideologies that built dogma and used emotion, particularly anxiety, alienation and anger, to bind adherents together.

Out of that came positions that held certain beliefs to be absolutely right, positions shared by some, not all, parents and teachers. Schools become the loci for the transmission of such beliefs, whether they were about the dangers of nuclear catastrophe, global warming, over-population, depletion of non-renewable resources, crime, sexual harassment, and much more.

Here enters a matter of difficult judgement. Such issues are indeed a matter for study and education. They will not be understood in their complexity and balance at very young ages. They must be approached at later ages. By the end of high school, pupils should be in a position to approach such topics *independently* from the teacher and with an ability to work out their position after having looked at argument and data – they should be becoming adept at finding and thinking about both.

My problems are two-fold.

Many of the issues are presented in a highly charged emotional context in which adults transmit their own fears, *creating* anxieties, fears and even emotional upset in personae who are not ready for it. If this

matter is not dealt with, goes the message, the apocalypse will arrive. And it is going to be *your* task to deal with it. It will be on *your* consciences. Can anyone forget the strained faces of *primary school* children in the 'fifties and 'sixties as they expressed fears of nuclear catastrophe? Now the fear that strikes home most immediately is fear of sex=AIDS, of poverty; of violence on the street, of terrorism, of unemployment, even, in some parts of the world, of the possibility that the United States will destroy our religion and culture. Fear permeates the schools. Somehow we must replace it, not with over-confidence, but with balance, thought, belief that we *can* and *will* make a difference, not by taking the whole world on our shoulders, but by playing thoughtful roles where our capabilities count.

The second problem is that even well-meaning and just positions are frequently tainted by dogma; slogans replace thought. Time and again I see high school students praised in public when they trot out the latest fashionable position on a complicated issue, repeating *ad nauseam* already-tired clichés. We do not expect world-shattering innovation from high school students. But by the end of high school clear individual, even original, statements of position, which are not simply the regurgitation of a teacher's or parent's ideology, should be the norm. This is even more serious an issue in those parts of the world where the basis of learning is by rote, and based on fundamentalist beliefs.

My own statements here are condensed and hence somewhat simplistic. I must go further, although even then the legitimate debate will only be opened up, by no means concluded. I would like to see schools consciously and clearly organise their approach to teaching and engendering thought around the following kinds of ideas.

Children can be helped to comprehend that understanding can be achieved through two alternative but interlinked processes. The one is subjective, intuitional and aesthetic, making use of words *and other signs* (harmonies, shapes) characteristic of "the arts". The other is rational, logical and communicable through words or similar (mathematical) signs. In making judgements about the efficacy of what is revealed, ideally the nature of the mix of the modes should be assessed. In dealing with the more subjective, it is of course interesting to pursue the influence of the creator's history and personality. This, though, is a part of knowledge itself, as revealing how it came to be, *not* part of the judgement of the significance or otherwise of the ideas themselves. Youth must understand that *ad hominem* arguments are not arguments. Whatever the nature of the communicator, it is his or her statements that count, in themselves. (It is nevertheless legitimate to interpret the *meaning* of the statements, where they are

ambiguous, in terms of other signals the communicator may have given by his or her other statements and behaviour. Behaviour is then identified as statement.)

Both methods deal with ideas which consist of relationships, though differing in how they go about presenting them. Music consists of types of sound, notes, tones, movement, rhythm, harmonies, volume, all knit together into relationships which are the obverse of chaotic. Natural science includes the teasing out of explanations, that is relationships between this and that variable. So do the social sciences. Painting and architecture involve form. So it goes on. The horror of Hiroshima or 9-11 can be approached through art, communicating through visual form, the connotations of music, poems which link the act to feeling and experience, statements that show the relationship between nuclear action and catastrophe. It can also be placed in the context of, that is it can be related to, total war, generalisations about the dynamics of war and international politics, the state of the world society at the time, the linkage between that and the present, the proximal and fundamental causes of the events. All these and many more relationships are there to be explored, and full understanding needs them all. Although it is a statement of a relationship, it is superficial indeed for children simply to say "I think it was horrible". They must know there are other relationships involved, other generalisations to think about, approached through well constructed modes of thought and expression which we call disciplines. Disciplines are tools, tools that the young need to learn to use.

Within that mastery they may learn to criticise, be dissatisfied, with what the disciplines can do. There may here be the seeds of creative endeavour. But most of us cannot create, cannot innovate, unless we have the kinds of building blocks that schools can provide. (Yes, it is true that some creators and innovators find their building blocks away from school, even rejecting the institution. But disciplinary building blocks they do find, nevertheless.)

Even subjective assessments involve statements about more or less, that is about quantity, whether or not the quantities can be enumerated. There is more or less beauty, subjectively speaking. Ugliness is negative beauty.

When explanations are involved there is an inherent significance in the quantities. The arts deal with single representations, unique cases – the original painting is not more or less interesting because it is

replicated in prints; it is unique in its statements. The same applies to a theatrical or musical perform-ance, a sculpture, a book. That is, the single case has a certain validity, which is *dependent upon its success in communicating*. The communication may be contemporaneously ineffective, but received at some future time, which makes immediate judgement problematic. Popular approval may be ephemeral, yet the relationships involved, for example in "hard metal", are in communication, and are thus there to be teased out, examined, as part of "knowledge", both subjectively and objectively. Youth needs to know these things as part of the fundamental basis of what they are "learning".

In the critical examination of what is being communicated, teachers dealing with human affairs seem to place considerable emphasis on trying to reveal the hidden agendas, the unstated values, of what is there. Quite often I feel that such revelations sometimes come from teachers' own hidden agendas and political perspectives (in some parts of the world, not so hidden). Yet the validity of the principle is indisputable. My reservation can be dealt with by teachers inviting and respecting the same critical attention to their own presentations.

Matters of equal importance, however, are not so frequently addressed. We have already noticed the value of the single case, the unique and non-replicated statement. It is important to relate this to and distinguish it from, *explanation* in the more formal sense, not because of the nature of the revealed as-sertions, but because of the demands of the methodology.

This morning I was reading a front page story in a well respected and carefully presented newspaper. It dealt with ozone thinning for the coming summer, a matter of great concern and certainly a matter for school discussion. The main space in the story was contained in a full column on the front page. That consisted of repeated statements of concern, linked to such phrases as "It has been shown that". The identification of who had done the showing and how was not mentioned until a very short column concluding the story on an inside page. There was not the slightest attempt to communicate any reason for accepting or rejecting the findings by representing the pros and cons of the methodology and its locus in general scientific knowledge. The implication was that the results should be accepted because they came from a reputable scientific organisation. One assumes the results to be valid until someone comes along later with another story. This is unacceptable. It is as *ad hominem* as the dismissal of a politician's ideas because of his sexual peccadilloes.

Even where data *are* presented quite fully, citizen-children need to learn how to evaluate them. This applies especially to anecdotal and statistical material. Is the anecdotal to be considered as a unique work of art? Quite possibly. No more and no less. Since it is unique one can draw legitimate conclusions *subjectively*. Within the media anecdotal evidence does not have the same seriousness or sincerity of purpose as a major work of art. Most frequently the portrayal of incident communicates to the emotions on subjects – for example crime – that are open to consideration from the other, more logical, more enumerative methods. A citizen-youth must be aware of the values and emotional impact of the unique instance; but also to be able to place that in the context of knowledge obtained by other methods.

Frequently the media give the appearance of quantifying through repetition of unique cases. Day after day of attention to similar violent acts, for example. In doing so they usually, except for responsible articles and documentaries, ignore the disciplines that the implication of quantification demand. Statistical controls. Control of variables. Margins of error. Comparison in time and place.

There is another problem, which I find particularly in the presentation and methodology of medical research. Time and again we learn of a causative relationship discovered on the basis of a statistical enquiry, sometimes minimal, sometimes massive. Later, we find another study which, with similar methodology but a different set of variables, provides alternative or contradictory causation. Tucked away in a footnote you often find that the researchers are puzzled as to *how* the relationship comes about.

Statistics deal with *probability* not final proof. A statistical statement is almost useless *in itself*. It has meaning *only* as providing a serious hypothesis, unless and until it is embedded in the context of a wider theory of explanation, linked to *other* relationships by abstract general statements, which could, in principle, be disproven. If the researchers admit they don't know *why* the relationship exists statistically, their data must be treated with the utmost caution, as the subject for further research, *not* the presentation of a conclusion which has enormous implications for human life. The recent history of medicine surely shows this. At one time margarine not butter, now butter not margarine. What is the cholesterol implication of consuming eggs? Milk, dairy products, the effects of digesting fish. Generalisations about these and so many more technical nutritional and medical matters have, literally, been upset or modified within the past few *weeks* of my writing this.

And again, especially in medicine, while the statistical norm certainly matters, it is the individual organism which is at issue. The variations from the norm are as significant as the norm itself. Probability is just that, probability. It is *not* certainty about each and every instance. In many areas of study, the fact is that even one single instance which does not conform to the norm implies that the theoretical basis for the norm has been disproven as a generalised statement. There is something else at work. The human organism – and so many other fields of investigation – contains so many variables that the essential tool of statistics has to be treated with great caution, the only certainty being that it cannot remove doubt. Indeed, the single seemingly aberrant instance, if closely examined, may yield more theoretical innovation and understanding than the instances that are statistically normal.

Doubt. Uncertainty. Yet acting on the basis of what we know. These are major conundrums that youth have to be prepared for, have to understand if they are to live with the huge changes in knowledge that are being thrust at them.

Youth need that understanding, *and the acceptance of it* more than ever for psychological reasons. The unknown has always been a threat. Deep within ourselves, in primitive, perhaps irrational, fear, we do not know how to deal with it. It impinges on our personal lives every day, it is thrust upon us as a characteristic of the world, indeed of the universe. We correctly discuss the possibility of annihilation by projectiles from outer space.

What is troublesome is the serious anxiety and stress that comes from fear of the unknown. I am not concerned here with the modes of dealing with it, from religion to witchcraft, alternative therapies or fatalism, many of which at least have the possibility of relieving stress. What are more serious are the inhibiting features, the negative pessimism, inhibition of activity, chronic anxiety and depression, which flow. Suicide among youth. Alienation.

It is fundamental to serious education that children learn to deal with the unknown, especially before a personal crisis hits them. They must examine the validity and limitations of unique experience, learning from it but not turning it into dogma. A teacher who is sick may be ill because of the effects of a new detergent in the washroom. That is a matter for investigation. But if it turns into a dogma it can dangerously deflect investigation from some other causative possibility – even one that is at present not identified.

"Hey hey, ho ho! Get rid of Mr. Joe!" Slogans, demonstrations. The one thing they are *not* is argument. Unless on a massive scale, they are not even an indication of popular support. Sometimes, as perhaps in France, they are so predictable and frequent that they have little effect on the electorate (as distinct from a nervous prime minister) beyond satisfying the emotions of the demonstrators. In most cases they are so lacking in imagination that they do not qualify as theatre, and, like much of advertising, are counter-productive. In another sense, of course, they are an exercise in power; here I am more concerned with what they communicate. They do not replace either the objective study or the artistic representation of "truth" and "belief". It is certainly possible for youth to understand this and to analyse slogans objectively, whether or not they agree with the point of view.

It is a primary responsibility of school education to engender clear individual judgements about the presentation of information, and to show how youths can get to the sources themselves and at least be sceptical about inadequate materials, however persuasive the cause. What I have argued for is complex. In its sources, like everything else taught in school, it is embedded in subject matter which belongs in universities and beyond, that high school students cannot normally be expected to fully master. That in itself is not a reason for dismissing it. The principles *can* be (and often have been) taught directly in high school. And, with good pedagogical attention, they can be communicated indirectly as an aspect of normal studies.

To move toward the informed citizenship that is necessary in our Utopia, we must re-emphasise, especially in high school, the arts of logic, discourse, debate and rhetoric; the relationship between data, theory and judgement; the ability to search for, assess, and use data; the positive force of constructive criticism, both logical and aesthetic; the role of sensory experience in arriving at observations and judgements; and the ability both to speak and to write well-marshalled ideas. School children should be able to test the statements of teachers with confidence and skill, but on the basis of reasoned argument and data, and mutual respect.

We want our children (grandchildren) to be educated in such a way that they utterly reject slogans, false jargon, and improperly communicated data.

The social purpose of the school links, as I have said, with other objectives than the vocational. I have pointed out the distress of the elderly who find themselves unstimulated, bored, and alienated. We

know of the unemployment of youth. We know that most countries have high steady rates of unemployment and that one of the major difficulties in developing countries is linked to chronic underemployment. In other words, perhaps fifty per cent of the world's population has unwanted time on its hands.[8] To the extent that this is true – I ask you to suspend judgement on that issue for the meantime – the primary institution for properly handling the situation is, once again, the school. To be stated bluntly, schools must be able to help children to find ways to stimulate their leisure time and to obviate boredom, one of the most depressing characteristics of old age, unemployment, and youthful crime.

For this reason the educational system has a major responsibility, at least equal to the others I have outlined, to assist children in the task of discovering their self-directed creative and recreational capacities. Modern schools do some of this, by including courses in the arts, from music to theatre, and practical skills such as carpentry and metal-working, or transmitting cultural materials. However, when such activities are simply slotted into the timetable problems arise. They inevitably compete with one another for rare time slots, which include what most consider to be the basics, and the artistic courses become the target of parents who see them as "frills". The "practical" courses are almost always justified by vocational rather than avocational considerations.

To remedy this schools must be able to plan and justify the activities in terms of the principles I have outlined before. Most adults will have a hard time agreeing, since the underlying argument runs counter to the philosophy, which I shall continue to dispute throughout my theses, that Work is King. Hence those responsible for educational policy will have an uphill struggle to make those policies clear, consciously advocated, and fully planned. Creative Leisure is Queen.

Lying behind the discovery of the creative self is the challenge to learn to occupy oneself when not being supervised. A number of cultures deliberately used isolation in stressful conditions as a rite of passage. Self-reliance, even in highly interdependent communities, was necessary to survival. Isolation forced the young candidate for adulthood to know his inner being, and to know that being in its relationship to a potentially threatening nature, a nature with which the candidate learned also to be at peace. It was an exercise in being, and in spirituality. Such procedures could well be studied and adapted. So too could modes of meditation, relaxation, and emotional control.

----

8   I will be showing in another essay that this is likely to continue, and that, *properly handled*, our Utopia should want it, not reject it.

Similar exercises can expose the values and dangers of living with small groups, the mutual dependencies under stress, the uselessness of making a habit of ascribing blame to others or giving dysfunctional expressions of aggression, and learning the ways of small group diplomacy. For some young people will find their creativity not in the private actions of solitude but in the co-operation of acting with others toward a common outcome.

It will be for the pedagogues to work out such possibilities. The objective of drawing out self-reliance and unimposed creativity carries the additional benefit of improving self-knowledge and becoming sensitised to small group interactions which have implications for family life and the workplace as well as for unpaid positive activity.

The issues lead to the conclusion that the school course-ridden day is inadequate. Good schools already intrude into family life through the demands of home study. Perhaps more of that should be done in current school class time, moving some of the avocational activities – as is done with sports – outside the conventional school day, allowing creative home activity to take place in its natural setting, involving parental judgements about the possibilities, and permitting, for example, more inclusion of evening and weekend cultural activities in the youth's overall preoccupations.

Carrying this theme to its ultimate conclusion will require major changes in the organisation and operation of what we now call schools in our 21st century Utopian society.

Since the school has children in its care for such an enormous proportion of their time, and since those children are subjected to so many confusing, worrying and contradictory influences in their lives, the school cannot avoid being in a position of *nurturing*. It may not want to do so, it may not be mandated to do so, and it is almost certainly not equipped to do so. Yet in this responsibility it is almost equal to that of the family.

What I have written so far has dealt mostly with the mind. But the mind is inseparable from the body, the senses, the emotions, the influences, the interactions, and the memories. *Pace* some forms of psychoanalysis, the child is far from completely formed in infancy. What happens in school will be a major influence in creating the ever-dynamic or statically-confined persona.

A great deal of this cannot be *controlled* by the individual teacher, for it is a result of the complexities of the institutional *ambience*, peers and other teachers. Individual teachers do, frequently, detect problems of concern which range from attention disorders to malnutrition and the possibility of crime. They give of themselves through advice, discipline, listening and referral. By role definition they must give priority to the effects of what they detect to the operation of the classroom and the formal work of teaching itself. Very commonly the child's personal problems can show through surly indiscipline, avoidance of work, theft, obscenity, anger, nonchalant insolence, gang behaviour and violence – all the problems, in fact, that are found in the adult world, but in more vulnerable forms.

Consultation with parents may, but mostly are unlikely to, help, since teachers are not in a position to enter into family therapy. Teachers by themselves cannot create the remedies. Yet schools have to deal with concerns, just as they are now learning to deal with the "physically and mentally challenged" – oh, what wonderful and inadequate jargon to obscure the reality that the child, deprived or contorted with respect to hiser capabilities may or may not feel "challenged" but certainly needs attention and help. It is an inescapable responsibility that has serious consequences for school (what we shall soon call Youth Maturity Institute) mandates and organisation.

All of which intersects with the issue of behavioural discipline. There has been a school of socialisation that asserts that the only legitimate form of control is that of argument. The problem is that it doesn't always work…. And when it does it can sometimes breed conformity rather than courtesy.

Hit 'em and learn 'em in righteous anger and its sadistic extremes has gone by the board in many parts of the world. There, teachers must control their reactions, however provoked. On the other hand some parents encourage their children to express their angers, which can mean placing the self before others with insolence, refusal to heed, and rejection of what the school is trying to do – just as disruptive reactions as the surly introversion of unexpressed problems. More frequently than not, minor irritants of these kinds move through the classroom, as peers delightedly cheer the culprit on. Then follows open defiance, the use of appeal procedures to undermine the teacher, and the intervention of angry parents convinced they are not themselves responsible, or frustrated ones who do not know how to deal with situations that are out of control.

Indeed, in some areas I know of the school in effect has no effective powers of discipline and control, and would be totally lost if it were not for the decency of the majority of the children. There are, it is true, possibilities of assigning extra work or detentions, which the hard core can simply refuse to honour. When that happens, when violence breaks out, when there is habitual absence from the classroom, when there are drugs or weapons, the ultimate threat is there. Exile, banishment from the school. What a game! A game that tempts others who are toying with the lure of dropping out. To be officially pronounced unwelcome in the school, no longer hassled by authority, officially able to roam the streets – exactly what such delinquents want....

We do not want this in Utopia. Not only does it represent the loss of an individual to the common good, but it is an example to the half-alienated and is disruptive of those who have other ideals. It is an instance, potentially, of the spread of an anti-school innovation. Since parental responsibility is either not there or is lacking, the school itself must develop other tools, even though, without outside help, it cannot get at root problems such as dysfunctional family life.

There are two methods at least which might help. As I write this I read of an experiment in Toronto. Youths expelled for violence are identified as such and transferred to another specialist programme for them only. Instead of roaming the streets each student works (expensively) with a psychiatrist and a programme co-ordinator. In the pilot programme, fifty per cent of the students have been judged ready to return to regular schooling. At least for the others some education is achieved. My information does not reveal what happens if the youths refuse to cooperate, nor what kind of family involvement is in place. Nevertheless the thought behind such approaches deserves attention.

Another method, also being experimented with in various contexts, is to involve the children themselves in peer responsibility, and to give them some of the tools to do so. As in so many other cases, older methods which have gone out of psychological fashion (such as the use of prefects) have been ridiculed on the basis of extreme caricature. All methods, old or new, have their defects. Perhaps one should look again, and tease out the positive from the negative.

Many schools nowadays have some form of student council, a useful way of enabling, usually the better, pupils to voice difficulties and to organise events. There are also emergent student-teacher initiatives, such as plays and discussions, which aim at demonstrating such topics as the handling of violence when

it occurs, the difficulties of sex, or the release of anger. Even in primary schools selected children are trained in mediation, intervening in quarrels to persuade quarrellers to look at each others' points of view, to find ways out of the situation before it explodes.

Experiments of these kinds are novel, welcome, and full of hope. But they cannot deal effectively with every situation, and cannot always be on top of day to day incidents.

It seems that the old idea of a "school spirit" based on identification with the school, pride in what it attempts to do, rivalry with others, and internal pupil-based discipline, is worth another look. As with any other type of cultural or sub-cultural identity, it can go too far, with autocracy emerging, too much interference in private acts, too much peer pressure, and, in extreme instances, schools becoming rival-rous gangs. What is different nowadays, and even more we hope in the future, is that in the developed world the teachers who have the ultimate responsibility are better informed about such dangers and are likely to be more sensitive to their emergence.

Let us then consider re-inventing (where it has to be re-invented) the system of prefects for day schools. Let there be chosen leaders at various levels in the school, with responsibilities according to the degree of maturity that their age can handle. Senior prefects might very well act as disciplinary agents and intervenors under policies formulated by, or with the assistance of, the student council. Let them have the authority to discipline for designated infractions – giving detentions for example; to maintain order and respect on school premises and at school functions; to report serious infractions; to present constructive ideas to council and staff; in short to supervise, *on behalf of the student body*, standards of good order and courtesy.

One of the primary tools that street gangs use to reinforce solidarity and identity, is dress and body decoration. They do so naturally, out of spontaneous recognition of principles that are as old as human groups. Schools in many parts of the world, and especially North America, deliberately gave away this reinforcing tool. In some form, whether through simple uniforms or badges, it needs to return. It is one way of enhancing pride. I am on my mettle because I can be seen to be a *member* of the school that has a great team, organises volunteers for a social cause, puts on an exciting art show, or perhaps, even, is the place where academic achievement gets us going. At least when I'm wearing that uniform outside of school I behave; I'm noticeable and proud of it. [I'm well aware that the wearing of uniforms at schools

where state schools do *not* wear them is an identifier of difference that is often not acceptable and is even embarrassing to the wearers. Acceptance changes when the custom is *general*.]

The easiest part of this discussion is to write the words; the most difficult to interpret the principles in specific contexts, to give them pedagogical content and reality, to make them work. None of my statements can be considered as an absolute.

First and foremost it is the teachers who have the responsibility for method and content, for the specifics of classroom and school. They claim to be, and are, and should be, the professionals. It is what they have learned, their experience, their skills, that makes the difference. But those skills, as with any profession, must work in context, the context of societal aims, immediate culture, and changing knowledge.

One of the realities is that henceforth they will be working in a society that changes ever more rapidly, and that they must second-guess what the needs of the future may be. Is that to be toward some vision of Utopia, a world in which we wish ourselves to live, even though we may never see it in our lifetimes? Some vision of a better world? I hope so. But if so that kind of ultimate purpose needs discussion, needs teacher attention, needs definition, even though that definition is bound to change over the decades.

This is an area that lies beyond the horizons of teachers alone. Teachers are in a position to be arbiters of society, communicating (deliberately or without noticing it) their own values. But they do not have the mandate to *decide* where society should go. In that they are simply one set of citizens. Who then does? The interplay of parents, non-parent voters, political and community leaders, teachers, other professionals who, as we shall see, are involved with the same objectives.

Teachers then, as it were, interpret the objectives. The trouble is that the objectives, at this stage in our evolution, are not spelled out for society as a whole (except, for example, in fundamentalist religious schools or state systems), and can only be defined in simplistic and programmatic terms, tinged with political ideology. Just the same, some observations can be made.

One is that in a future world, in a Utopian view, society and culture not only *will* consist of varying groups, cultures or sub-cultures, with non-uniform ideas, but *should* do so. The reality of the statement for contemporary societies is beyond dispute. Look within your country. It is there.

To the extent that this is so, it follows that schools **must** themselves vary. The concept that each State school must have an identical, centrally determined, philosophy, curriculum, and pedagogy is now revealed for what it is, an ideology based upon a false socio-cultural premise, upon a false Utopian view that we should all be the same, and upon an impractical establishment.

Ideally, varying schools should match variations in child response to varying methods, varying parental philosophies, and variations in cultural realities, at least. Such clear matching is seldom practicable, but close approximations are possible. Perhaps the following principle is worthy of thought: schools and teachers within schools should have the utmost flexibility to exercise their ideas in directions which link with a recognised Utopian dream and educational philosophy; but no child should be forced into a particular school. Choice that is now available to some (the better off) should be available to all.

Such a principle implies that variation should not merely be between state schools and private schools, religious schools, schools for the rich and the not so rich. State systems themselves need to abandon the assignment of children to schools on the sole criterion of geographical proximity, a policy which derives from the false notion that equity and equality of opportunity imply pushing every child into the same cauldron. Equity and equality of opportunity imply the opposite, that every child should be in the school that suits him or her best. The identification of what is "best" will not be accurate. It involves parents' ideals and parents' knowledge both of the child and of the nature of each possible school, a knowledge that will undoubtedly change with time.

Hence movement of pupils between schools must be possible. And schools must provide parents with information – documentation, for example, about its educational philosophy and goals, its methods, its achievements, what it is trying to do better. *Every school in the system should be required to formulate and enunciate its point of view.* Every piece of data that bears on the parents' potential evaluation of the school should be public.

One specious argument against the idea is that once it is known that one or two schools meet needs better than others they will become elite, based on restricted entry. Of course that is possible, but it reveals inflexibility in the school system. (It may also involve prejudice and lack of knowledge of the alternatives.) It may encourage other schools to emulate. But in addition it will be the case that there will be no single definition of "better". Parents will not be like lemmings, moving in one single di-

rection. Schools that meet children's varied educational needs best require replication; others require down-sizing.

The two most difficult sources of inflexibility are teachers and buildings. If choice reveals that certain wanted types of teaching are not reflected in the distribution of teacher skills, then, at least in adjustment period, individual teachers will be in difficulty. The implications are that in the long run teacher education itself should teach less dogma and more adaptability; that there should be maximum support for teacher re-education; and that unadaptable teachers will have to go or be assigned elsewhere.

At present the conditions under which teachers do their work are highly variable, country to country, sometimes responding to bargaining conditions, sometimes to poverty, sometimes to religious ideology. However I do not know of any countries in which the conditions of work and education, except in some of the most expensive private schools, and then not in a Utopian sense, correspond to the need. Sometimes good principles have been subverted by union action and bargaining into privileged "rights".

Days off for professional education, in which the school closes; long summer vacations, originally to permit children to undertake agricultural tasks – such arrangements, fiercely union protected, are inflexible, inefficient, rule-bound, misused, and archaic. The first, for example, are often boring, not observed by individual teachers, and, while sometimes useful, are not administered to face up to improving and updating the skills of *individual* teachers. That requires more than the occasional discussion or lecture, but weeks of analysis and education. Teaching, especially in high school, is an ever-moving profession, in the roles required, and in the subject matter.

It is a normal fact of employment that teachers in most systems take their classes home with them, figuratively and also literally. Much of their work consists of out-of-class paper work, including marking and preparation. When classes take place throughout the day, either they stay very late at school, or work at home, with effects on their domestic arrangements. The short breaks between classes, or class time off, are seldom adequate to do serious work. Despite what the public regards as soft and privileged work time, teachers in most advanced systems are typically stressed out, under constant emotional and psychological pressure, especially when dealing with under-motivated, tumultuous children; to say

nothing of those with severe personal problems. Moves in several systems to mix "special needs" children into conventional classes, while highly desirable in theory, add to teacher stress (especially when the teacher has no education in the specialty of the needs) and divert him or her from attention given to the ordinary, who, in their own ways, are just as needy. Unless very special measures are taken, such moves are typical of the ways in which principles can come to grief because the material and organisational resources are not adjusted sufficiently.

If to these present difficulties we add the requirements of Utopia, without other adjustments, mayhem and breakdown could destroy what little is left of the high school system. Any reforms must be built around the capacities, physical and mental, of the staff – teachers **and others** – whose task it is to deliver.

In many systems the school year is built around terms divided by short breaks – one, two, or three weeks – instead of a concentration of holidays on a long two month summer break typical of others, during which the dynamic of school progress can be threatened. A number of breaks of around two weeks enables the progression of teaching with little interruption of the dynamic, especially if some of the breaks are designated for projects, independent study, alternative creative activities. Such breaks provide an opportunity for teacher refresher courses as well.

Teachers are not only over-worked but also inefficiently directed. Some systems provide, not just the occasional class off during the week, but up to an equivalent of classroom time for study and preparation. Initially, in systems where teachers are not accustomed to that, the provision of such time could be significantly abused. Many teachers are simply not used to the idea that handling the subject matter requires continual research and reading. Such teachers would not know what to do with their time, except paper work, until guided into its effective use. (Are there still teachers who have the time, the drive, the energy, the knowledge, to *contribute* to the growth of knowledge, to undertake research, however modest; even perhaps to involve their classes in that activity? Yes there are. They should be among the role models, though it is too much to make that a formal requirement until Utopia is here.)

An efficient educational system requires a surplus of resources beyond those immediately used in the classroom. Contrary to the drives of budget-minded administrators, if you show me an educational institution of serious intent in which all classrooms are being used at every minute of the day, and in

which there are no teachers outside the classroom, I will show you a static, unresponsive, bureaucratised, anti-educational operation, unable to meet society's needs.

Why? When considering the distribution of teachers, it should be obvious that they should be pedagogically sound and know their subject matter. In secondary schools particularly, it is not good enough to say, as some have, "Give me a class and I'll teach it anything." That is the sure way to superficiality. But teachers take ill, the Utopian system would require them to take time off for formal re-education, and they must have an opportunity to take real holidays that would involve being absent for terms. Redistribution among existing teachers, re-posting, now often means assigning teachers to subject areas of which they know little or nothing. Short term replacements are often temporary substitute teachers, which may often be effective in individual cases. But as a *system* it cannot be efficient. Such substitutes usually have to have other sources of income and cannot afford to place themselves in a one-line teaching career position; their standards and updating cannot therefore be rigorously controlled. Both these situations *require a pool* of subject-oriented teachers in the career stream available for replacement allocation. Members of the pool would not be in the classroom until called upon.

I have been referring to refresher education. The movement of school responsibilities into non-vocational and therapeutic fields will increase the range of required specialties, of differing combinations of skills. School professionals, just like health professionals, will in some instances be stimulated to re-combine their skills: a combination of language teaching and family therapy might be a case in point. And just like health professionals, or university professors in North America who are seeking promotion, they will require formal certification, from time to time, of their continued pedagogic and coexistent subject area skills.

As I write I am living in an urban area in which the distribution of the population is changing fast. Immigrants are arriving in substantial numbers, finding living space in new areas, and needing educational courses (such as language) which differ from those of the past. Some locations are no longer affordable for new growing families in the same numbers. Changing technology requires new subject matter which is unevenly developed and which requires altered forms of teaching and working space. New interactive multi-media teaching tools again require new forms of space to be effective – even bringing the home into the classroom (especially with web based distance learning). Old school buildings are sometimes emptying, and some cannot be adapted easily to new teaching needs.

Demographic forecasts are notoriously affected by value and political judgements and are seldom reliable in detail. Educational authorities are thus reluctant to spend large capital sums on new buildings when the trend that demands them may be applicable only, say, for six or seven years. They meet the need by throwing up temporary port-a-classrooms, which parents immediately identify as substandard and discriminatory.

Yet the flexibility afforded by mobile classrooms is clearly more desirable than the inflexibility of monuments hewed in stone. The unresolved problem suggests that the expenditure of money, efficiency of operation, and educational flexibility and quality will be best where buildings can respond to need from decade to decade instead of dominating and freezing the delivery of service. If this is so, then there is a major architectural challenge to design school buildings which can easily be moved from one location to another, which consist of modules of differing functions which can be combined and recombined to fit changing educational needs, and which, probably, are less expensive than conventional structures. Paradoxically, this may be more easily achievable in developing tropical countries, making use of traditional structures which can be removed and rebuilt with less cost. Here is a field for UNESCO innovation.

Someone has to take decisions and to provide resources in an environment in which, at least in the short term, resources are getting scarcer. The Utopian specifics will vary so much from one system to another that I can only write in generalities. But it should be clear by now that we need to re-think the structure and operation of what we now call schools, if they are to properly educate, nurture and create cohorts of well-adjusted future citizens. This is the Utopian, but achievable, goal.

The initiative to establish and design variable schools will come mostly from parents, from some teachers, and from some citizens. Since it is the community providing the funds, it is likely that what I will call the Youth Maturity Institute management authority will be vested in an overall board which allocates funds and authorises establishments. The board will need to represent the taxpayers and those who elect the political authority; it should also have representatives of parents and teachers (not in their self-seeking but in their professional capacities); and it might be beneficial to have representatives of senior high school classes. The danger in such a board is that each of these constituencies will provide members, elected or chosen, whose debates will result in some sort of majority opinion. The danger then is that the majority will be seen as having a political mandate to exercise that opinion

throughout the system, giving no voice to alternative philosophies and styles. This is the opposite of what we are endeavouring to achieve. Hence it seems essential that the terms of reference for such a board require as a matter of law that the board recognises the principles of school, now Youth Maturity Institute, variation.

As I have said, each Institute should be required to establish and publicise its philosophy and methods, paying special attention to its unique character. The initiative for doing this should come from both parents and teachers *and other professional contributors* acting in concert. Until Utopia becomes less confrontational there will undoubtedly be conflict between opposing philosophies; someone will lose out. The supervisory board needs to ensure that the Institute management council losers will be accommodated, that there is a school for them to join, or that one can be organised. Considerable initial adjustment is likely to take place, a necessary price for the achievement of the ultimate goals.

I deliberately placed the phrase "other professional contributors" in this context. There are now in fact examples not only of private schools in the conventional sense but of schools established by large industrial firms. Such schools are in response to two drives. One is the improvement in working conditions when working parents have on-premise schools (especially for younger children) with recreational as well as classroom space. Parents can visit in their breaks, and their children will be occupied instead of returning home to an empty house.

Another motivation, for upper year youth, is vocational training. It is very doubtful if adequate applied training for the workplace can be conducted effectively in conventional schools. It is often best done on site. Large firms can do this with either narrowly focused classes, in association with Institutes, leading to apprenticeships or by actually locating and financing upper year broad education on their premises.

The feasibility of such schemes does not have to be limited to commerce and industry: the civil service, hospitals, universities, large public service and charitable organisations also have roles. Education affects us all; it percolates throughout; the barriers should be of malleable rubber.

A similar principle works in reverse. The objectives of the Utopian Institute run far beyond the capacity of conventional schools to honour. This implies not that the objectives are wrong but that school capabilities must be altered to meet them. The most ineffective way of doing this is to throw money

at schools and teachers. For most teachers are not educated to carry out many of the tasks (such as therapy for a suicidal youth), and do not have the time or energy even if they were equipped to do so. And school management would have to undergo a revolution to assess and address the broadened role; managers notoriously find this difficult although there are many innovative school heads and principals trying new approaches which have to be dubbed "experimental".

We are dealing with the "whole" child. We are seeking a holistic education. The state of knowledge and professionalisation of society create more and more specialists who are dealing with various parts of that whole. Their perspectives need to be brought together, and *the use of their manpower optimised*. There is dreadful duplication, waste, uncoordination, and confusion, not in the best interests of the child.

In order to achieve our Utopian vision, the concept of "school" as an institution with a narrow mandate needs to be jettisoned. They should be replaced by organisations which are mandated and equipped to nurture children and youths in a holistic manner toward the objectives of individual maturation.

 As I have hinted, let us call these, until a better term is devised, "**Youth Maturity Institutes**."

First, each Youth Maturity Institute should have a management committee in which teachers, parents and representatives of youths from the final class should be represented. The task of the management committee should be to ensure that the teachers and staff in their day to day operation, act in accordance with the approved school philosophy, and to organise the operation of the Institute.

Second, each Youth Maturity Institute should have an advisory committee consisting of members appointed by the various bodies in the community concerned with the welfare of youth. To the extent that they bear upon the philosophy of the school and the needs of its operation, there could be included, for example, representatives of churches, youth organisations, social services, the media (not for "stories" but as being perceived as partly "responsible" for what goes on), police, medical services, employers, unions, and high school pupils. It would consider identified problems (such as drugs, violence, for example), the bearing of all of the services on each of those problems, possible co-ordination and changes of policy, not only in the Youth Maturity Institute but in the institutions which surround it.

As an example, in this committee it might be that representatives of the media are confronted with the ways in which their "stories" bear upon the objectives of the Institute.

Third, there would need to be a fundamental reappraisal of financing, the conception of "school hours", and personnel. We are dealing not only with the classroom where the teacher is paramount, but with recreation, individual and family counselling (not in the vocational but in the psychological sense) with wide ramifications.

What has to come is the re-direction of appropriate outside services into the Youth Maturity Institute itself. Social service youth and family counsellors should move their offices and operations into the Institute, be seconded into the Institute, and have their budgets identified as part of the Institute budget, subject to Institute management.

Other organisations which have a bearing on school programmes need to be brought more formally into the Institute budget and field of responsibility. For example, the Youth Maturity Institute, in the running of its theatre programmes, might contract with a theatre company or organisation to do part or all of it, to the benefit of both. Many organisations concerned with the culture of creativity, or the creativity of culture should be more intimately involved with Youth Maturity Institutes, both on premises and off. Such contact would have the additional advantage of introducing children to the hard reality of creation (without putting them off), giving the starry eyes something to focus upon.[9]

Since we are proposing an institution which has a holistic view of youth development, it follows that therapeutic and judicial functions should be removed from external organizations and integrated with the Youth Maturity Institutes. This gives the Institutes opportunities to adopt therapeutic and restitutional procedures in the case of violence and delinquency. It enables them, in each case, to focus on the troubled youth and to take as long as it takes, and by whatever means it takes, to reintegrate the youth into peer society. The use of therapy, even of medical knowledge, and of alternative ways of dealing with crime Utopianly come together in one set of coordinated actions which in a formal judicial system is limited by professional bureaucracies and often stymied by the state of the law. Healing circles, psychotherapy, peer group and parental influences will all be part of the considerations as the youth is

––––––––––

9   And it would have an effect on the role of and support for such groups

challenged to recognize the damage heshe has caused, and to make restitution to those who have been hurt. Incarceration will not be part of the answer, although indigenous methods of spiritual isolation may well be in some instances. Restitution, recognition, reintegration are the three 'r's.

Clearly parents are intimately involved. Frequently they react defensively, protecting the family boundary, or from the shame of guilt and perplexity. If a child acts aggressively or criminally the cause may not be in the family. Or it may be. We need medical and therapeutic analysis. Parents should not be fingered immediately as the culprits. But they must be brought to understand, helped to deal with the issues and change their habits, and given support, together with the child. Not even "special needs" teachers can do this by themselves. There has to be team work in the Institutes, another reason for stressing the need to use them to replace schools.

Paradoxically, the more such methods succeed the more inner tensions may arise, unless another theme is addressed. For underlying a certain percentage of delinquency is the attraction and excitement of taking risks. Street car racing, experimenting with drugs and sex, toting an AK47, using machetes in moments of hysteria. Logical argument will have only a small effect when such youth drives are paramount. Recognitions of consequences in dramatic form, the experience of devastation, will. But it requires a more widespread policy.

Bronislaw Malinowski's dictum "Let cricket replace warfare" has become a cliché, but deserves attention for all that. For the ills I am addressing it is far too soft. Many – not all – boys and an increasing number of girls want risky challenges, both mental and physical, without which they cannot move knowledgeably into adulthood. Show me a road racer and I will show you a school that is too bland in its challenges. This is an essential part of education, which cannot be completed in the classroom. Youth Maturity Institutes, as do a number of schools, for example in the Duke of Edinburgh's network, need to plan to encourage and support appropriate risk taking. Recently a Canadian private school decided to drop challenging winter skiing because of tragic deaths from an avalanche. On the assumption that all reasonable precautions were taken, the cancellation was a mistake. Risk taking implies just that, risk taking. Mollycoddling so that there are no risks defeats the purpose – and there will be accidents along the way, or the risk will not be there.

Schools are in fact better at devising intellectual risk taking tests - mathematical or chess challenges and competitions for example. But these reach only the elite. Professionals must devise ways in which the youth at whatever level, feels challenged, excited by even small accomplishments, prompted to risk the next stage.

Youth Maturity Institutes would accumulate an immense amount of experience and knowledge of direct interest to those dealing with social issues outside the Institutes themselves. Schools in my part of the world seem to have an almost nil impact on the fatally growing use of methadone. They are not equipped to do so. But Youth Maturity Institutes would be. I would find it very difficult to believe that such Institutes, operating effectively, would not know the sources of the drug. They could combine an attack on methadone with risk taking – for example assigning young at-risk victims to accompany police on inner city drug beats. Show them what doctors and nurses have to go through to deal with extreme cases. The synergy that comes from the juxtaposition of professionals with quite different perspectives will lead to many innovative ideas.

The needs of poor countries require special comment. In many of the poor countries' rural areas, despite the trauma of war, and migration disruptions, and the ever present threat of famine, floods, and the depredations of both nature and man, the absence of a sophisticated therapeutic and institutional structure need not hold back a movement to Utopian reform. In some societies there are already male age-specific initiation rituals which can be adapted to go the youth maturity route. This is seldom the case for girls, other than, say, the declaration of puberty. Closely knit communities and kinship bonds do not mean the absence of internal strife, and they are sometimes the very sources of dissatisfaction and emigration. Nevertheless, skilled attention to their positive elements can aid the process.

Despite this, poverty and a natural emphasis on the less personal processes of development create national priorities in which youth maturity may take a back seat. Thus the capability to establish functioning Youth Maturity Institutes will depend on the success of developing countries to gain reasonable levels of living – and hence upon other aspects of the Utopian globe which I hint at in the section Weft and Warp.

Much the same concerns relate to possible resistances from conservative religions, such as, perhaps, forms of Islam. It is *not* the intention of my discussion to advocate the forcible imposition of a par-

ticular form of Youth Maturity Institutes on specific cultures, where a Western model may not be appropriate. It would however be demeaning to assume the contrary, that modern Islam is somehow contrary to the principles of such Institutes. There are many educational practices in some parts of Islam which are contrary to the precepts of the Institutes – in some instances, for political reasons, violence is advocated; in others learning is by submission and rote. But no one can accuse reformist Turkey, pre-Saddam Iraq, or Iran, at least in the cities, of not having educational values and achievements which would be entirely compatible with their own variants on Youth Maturity Institutes.

There is no time to lose. We need the generations which Youth Maturity Institutes will create. Without those generations, the rest of the task of creating Utopia by 2100 will be a rough ride. For we expect the Institutes will minimize human tendencies to violence against and disrespect for others. This is needed to give us the risk taking courage to reform the totality of society. Fortunately, if we have the will, the replacement of schools with Youth Maturity Institutes need not be a long drawn out affair. It could be accomplished in many parts of the world by 2050. Globally, UNESCO (pending the United Nations changes I recommend later in this essay) could take a lead role in nudging States to take action, and spreading the word and the message.

Weft and Warp

The preceding section described ways in which a higher proportion of *today's* youth would internalise the fundamental attitudes of courtesy, understanding, and non-violence. When these attitudes and values move into the adult world, as they should do in this century, we will have a foundation for ideal global government.

However, such a Utopian result needs to be linked to reforms in other aspects of society. It is not the intent of this essay to cover all such aspects, but rather to concentrate on the two – education and global government – as instances of the goals and possibilities. To do otherwise would require a lengthy book.

In order to provide a link between the apparently disparate argued sections, and to counter the possible and persuasive charge: "Yes, but you can't deal with such matters in isolation" I shall give a brief summary of the kinds of topics which must be addressed in tandem.

We must work to eliminate the attitude that sexual relationships and family structure involve property rights in a partner's persona, this being a major source of violence, crime and punishment.

With echoes from Samuel Butler's *Erewhon* we should consider some aspects of ill-health in which individuals flout the consequences of their decisions to be matters of personal responsibility in which victims are beholden to society.

By contrast what we now identify as crime should be dealt with in new ways – for example, treating criminal behaviour as illness. Criminal law should be merged with civil law, so that perpetrators are confronted with the consequences of their acts. Courts should deal with restitution, recognition of wrongs done, and the return to civic balance rather than punishment *per se*. This should be accompanied by the near-elimination of prisons which are counter-productive.

Good global government will require major changes in the relationship between States (or their successors), including boundary adjustments. States would no longer be the prime sovereign entities, but rather local administrations on behalf of their citizens.

Industrial relations would require new ways of reaching agreements, especially including representatives of consumers and/or the public in the relevant discussions and agreements.

The organisation of capital will require reform. In particular, stocks should be replaced by loans, eliminating the gambles of the stock market. A universal currency would eliminate currency gambling.

We require a zero-based reform of taxation and expenditure. Such a reform will eliminate all present taxes, including customs duties, personal and corporate taxes, and their replacement by a single consumption tax. This will eliminate taxes which inhibit enterprise, establish complete universal free trade.

Thus customs operations will be concerned with illegal trade, not revenue.

As a result consumers will consider their options: consume more, pay society more, consume less, pay less in tax. This should have an effect on environmental choices.

Enterprises would not go scot free, in that they would be charged directly for environmental and social damage as an operating cost paid to society.

State military expenditures would be reduced to those necessary for obligations to the global government, rather than for State aggression, defence, or civil repression.

For global armed forces, equipment and training priorities will move to protection of personnel by the interception of fire power coupled with non-lethal techniques of disabling an enemy. This may have to include a re-appraisal and re-invention of chemical and biological instruments.

So-called welfare or social expenditures, which today have become the fiefs of special interests, would be replaced by guaranteed incomes appropriate to global regions. This would promote equity within individual societies and would eliminate the jockeying for position and the lobbying competition which occurs between groups of needy citizens.

Richer countries would contribute to the needs and guaranteed incomes of the poorer, with massive health, education and infrastructure support linked to responsible local administration, and the elimination of armed forces.

It will be evident that many of these measures have major implications for world government, so that some will be reflected in its design.

The Global Order

The major, but not the only, causes of strife between States, and armed struggle within them, consist in a parcel of inequities which lead to competition for power with the excuse of relieving them. (I say "excuse" because it is by no means unknown for the leadership to be motivated as much by personal aggrandisement.)

In past history the *creation and reinforcement* of inequities through imperialist and expansionist dominance was a major driving force. It was as though the struggle for survival required such dominance and aggression; otherwise the would-be aggressor would itself succumb to others. In the nineteenth century, architects of dominion defined powerful "civilised" States as those which could defend themselves against the assumed aggression of competitors. The aggression might in fact be turned against weaker peoples or against neighbours. The competitor saw that as jostling for dominance.

The Cold War may have been the last major vestige of such drives, although relatively new States (Indonesia) have adopted similar imperialist methods and the United States has not yet learned to use its power in a non-domineering manner.

One inequity is that of sheer size. When coupled with wealth, size lends itself to a non-democratic imbalance of military and diplomatic power between peoples. In the absence of an effective global government, the United States today stands out alone, its potential power weakened by ambiguities in the will to pay the price of such responsibility and foreign policies directed by the opinions and interests of the one population, especially but not only at election time. This is not global government; nor is it legitimized policing, especially since in many respects the United States refuses to ratify or observe some international laws and courts. It is possible that the United States will change, gaining confidence and experience as a global policeman, enforcing United Nations laws. In the immediate future that does not seem likely. Furthermore, the dominance of any one major power does not last for ever. The hegemony of the United States could well be replaced at some point by that of the European Union, or of China, for example, with similar results.

Is that what we want for Utopia? To depend on one or more Powers for this function would inevitably mean the imposition of that Power's values and perspectives on others. Global stability might come, but at the cost of diversity.

I will later be arguing that Utopian Global Government is better achieved through the association of political units which are closer to being equal. A Global Government of a few elephants surrounded by jackals and midges will achieve decisions only at the cost of great resentment, angers, jealousies, and frustrations which lead to distrust and the ignoring of inconvenient policies. The United States has been a front runner in undermining the United Nations family, frequently condemning the organisations for undoubted inefficiencies, trying to impose its own idea of efficiency, and withholding its legally agreed financial obligations without which the United Nations cannot be effective.

Apart from the United Nations, what Global Government there is consists of a spider's web of thousands of international agreements. Some are brought together in a substantive global grouping, as with the World Trade Organisation, nuclear non-proliferation and the painfully growing Law of the Sea. Others are regional in scope, with greater or lesser binding arrangements, from the European Union, to NATO, ASEAN, NAFTA, and all the other diplomatic acronyms. They have evolved rapidly in the past thirty years, demonstrating that behind the sabre rattling that has been going on, there is a trend towards settling differences by binding agreement.

A possible theoretical structure emerges from the confusion. First, there is a discernible culture of international values and goals, which brings together the representatives of national governments, elements in their populations which try to influence the policies, and international non-governmental organisations and multinational companies which have become lobbyists for their own positions, as well as acting in parallel with governments in the international sphere. Add in the United Nations family of organisations, and regional agreements, organisations, and laws. This is a diverse, competitive "organisation" which in another context I am examining as the culture of Wemovagla – the name derived from an acronym for the Web of Moral Values Globally Approved. Wemovagla is a tribe, an ethnos, which in the last two centuries is struggling to find its identity through ethnogenesis.[10]

---

10   The evolving draft may be checked for input at http://www.anthropologising.ca/writing/wemovagla.htm

Second, the gross inequalities between States govern the power structure when it comes to decision making and action. The larger States are as self-serving as any and are no slouches when it comes to bullying the smaller or weaker, as the recent disgrace of the failure of the World Trade Organisation to remedy the effects of nationalist subsidies, tariffs and trade barriers on Africa, Latin America and Asia clearly demonstrate.

Plans for a Global government must take into account such realities and overcome them.

Why should there be Global Government at all? Most observers would agree that the United Nations has not fully lived up to expectations. The operative word is "fully". The United Nations was set up with the primary task of preventing further wars between States. Its key instrument is the Security Council which gives a veto to the main victors of World War II, without reference to current power positions. There is little doubt that the Council with its vetoes clarified the relationships between those States even as they were embroiled in the Cold War, and was the locus and inspiration for diplomacy which prevented a further world war.

Since the *de facto* peace that has ended the Cold War, the role of the Security Council in *preventing* war between States has been diminished. The United States, with Britain, exercised their "right" to go to pre-emptive war against Iraq, an action which the United Nations charter forbids, save with Security Council authority. As many predicted, other signatories to the Charter may now feel justified in following suit – as with Israel's U.S-approved raid into Syria in 2003.

Through its Social and Economic Council and related bodies the United Nations has mounted vast campaigns of famine relief, refugee help and technical assistance with awe-inspiring success, both directly and through international NGOs. It resists nationalist strings being attached to such help, which endears it to recipient countries. Some donor countries, however, prefer bilateral aid which enables the donors to give contracts to their own citizens, whether or not such contracts are in the best interests of the recipients.

Failure is therefore not an operative word. Not doing everything its evolving mandates demand is a more just description.

And when that happens, despite some of its administrative inadequacies, it is not the United Nations *per se* that is at fault. The United Nations is a creature of its member States. If they do not want it to work, it can't. Although the United States is by far the largest financial contributor and has been generous with voluntary contributions, it tries very hard to turn the organisation into a fief, even to the withholding of contractual or agreed contributions when it is miffed.

Even when the Security Council gives its mandate and direction, the co-operation of willing States is in fact voluntary. The United Nations has no permanent military force, which makes logistics, communication, and scheduling a nightmare with slow reaction times as each contributing State places its own interpretations on the role of each contingent in a peace-making operation.

Although it is the creature of States, whose responsibility it is for any of its defects, in theory it stands above them all.[11] It is the only available coordinated and authoritative body to speak on behalf of the world community. We may not like its resolutions or concordats, but, theoretically, the world community has spoken. In the context of the war and occupation of Iraq the United States, in its actions, did not share the concept, frequently treating the United Nations as an organisation in parallel, rather than a superior organisation, both morally and legally.

"Theoretically, the world community has spoken". In practice this is not so. The resolutions, whether of the Security Council or the General Assembly, are the result of negotiations *between States.* It is the States who are responsible for any deficiencies which occur, including chronic under funding.

But an effective Global Government there simply has to be. We have to find a way to create a world order which will *dominate, discipline and co-ordinate States*, rather than the other way round, in the interests of the *peoples* of the world community. We must tease out the weaknesses, and create new instruments which will have the kind of strengths we need. This is not in order to sanctify Global Government. It is because if we do not have an effective Global Government the world is headed for man-made disaster. And then Utopian society will be further away than ever.

———————

11   President George W. Bush either does not understand or will not recognize this jural position. He gives the impression that his conception of the United Nations is that of just another country to be used or ignored at his will. The United States does not subject its policies to the oversight of the United Nations, but feels free to accept or reject that oversight as it suits. It is not the only country to do so, but it is the most obvious one, and its example encourages others to do likewise.

First, here are some of the functions desperately needed for a Global Government to carry out for the world – not only as a Utopian dream, but as a pressing necessity. We need Utopia. And the recognition of the functions will help to determine the new organisation and structure of Global Government.

1. As is required by the existing Charter, to ensure world peace and security.
2. To prevent **unilateral** armed action under *any* circumstances by *whatever* entity. A corollary to this function is to ensure the disarmament of States and all armies and militias.
3. To enable it to carry out 1 and 2 to establish its own rapid deployment force, occupation forces, and other military and naval units. These will be financed through a percentage charge on States calculated on the basis of their current expenditures on armed forces. Such Global forces will also be available to police sanctions and other laws established by the Global Government.
4. To outlaw arms, including small arms, within State boundaries. Unfortunately, this will not in itself stop mayhem, since one cannot outlaw machetes and knives.
5. To establish a global register of arms producers, production and distribution, with each arm coded for rapid identification (as is becoming the case with diamonds).[12]

---

12   In those parts of the world which can least afford it, men and women take up arms, financed out of destitution by drug traffic, brutal suppression, sympathisers cheering from the sidelines, and mystery. Attempts to impose arms embargoes are weak at best for so-called conventional and chemical-biological weaponry. For the latter, raw materials are not difficult to combine, and, like explosives themselves, not difficult to plant for individual or terrorist purposes. The hardware for their trajectory, however, is another matter; it is not necessarily different from other such weapons.

There is somewhat more success in controlling nuclear devices, and a great deal more determination. Whereas conventional weapons may blow up the combatants and far-away civilians, nuclear weapons, wherever they are directed, do damage to all of us, and are relatively limited in distribution.

Major industries support the arms trade. Its disappearance over night would create unemployment in producing countries, that is everywhere. Individual countries are in fierce competition to gain market share. While a few countries share the nuclear industry, income can be generated from peaceful power plants, and those countries with political power stand to gain financially from restriction.

Is this too cynical? I do not believe it is. In June 1995 the respected and sometimes iconoclastic **Economist** included one of its famous special surveys, this time on defence technology. The survey treated the armaments industry as an industry just like any other. From that premise the industry should be technologically and financially more efficient, as a contribution to its *growth*. There was no discussion of killing off an industry whose primary purpose is to sell devices which kill humans, destroy cities and cultural treasures, ravage the countryside, cause massive destitution and forced population movements, and a huge bill for the international community to clean up the mess. There is no will, and I can detect no movement, to suppress the trade in arms. Such suppression is supposed to be impractical.

6. To define terrorism and piracy and to make the planning, financing and exercise of terrorism and piracy crimes subject to international law superseding State law.
7. To codify and clarify all international conventions and treaties which place obligations on governments, organisations and individuals, and to provide for their enforcement through international courts and systems of policing.
8. To bring under its control and coordination the programmes of what is known as the United Nations family of organisations (UNESCO, FAO, ILO, WHO, WTO and the like) and other organisations established by global treaties (for example, fisheries, environment, airlines).
9. To establish, with the help of appropriate NGOs, including scientific and social scientific ones, long term dynamic development programmes with the aim of reducing global inequalities, expressing localised values, and enabling sustainable self-sufficiency in the context of world trade. The aim should not be the conservation of ways of life, which should be respected for their positive contributions, but to balance and create equity of opportunity in the global division of labour.

To some degree it is. Small arms and some large ones can be manufactured in primitive conditions, and escape rigorous controls. In today's world, however, they have limited value for major group violence.

When it comes to international action to stop the arms traffic, critics of the idea will point out how difficult it is to monitor the seas, the air, even forested land borders. Of course it is. But it is by no means impossible.

In the nineteenth century a few navies, operating under international treaties or their State's policies, succeeded in outlawing and reducing slavery to its minimum, despite the fact that slavery was economically significant, well financed, and well organised, with much public opinion on its side. Colonial governments, when they had the will, stopped it in Africa. Like smallpox later, it was almost eradicated.

If it had the will, Global Government could reduce the international arms traffic to a manageable minimum. I doubt if any State in the United Nations has the present will to initiate such a move, even though such a step does not in itself amount to world disarmament. A revised elected membership in the Global Government's legislature would almost certainly be prepared to do so.

Such a step requires supplementing by requiring junior levels of government, such as States, to introduce full registration of firearms of all kinds, and to eliminate them except for those deemed to have a necessary and positive function outside of human aggression. (Survival hunting might be one such exception.)

It also requires State disarmament, and the accord of power to the Global Government, which I shall argue for below.

In the present world it is too easy for those who use military force to escape international wrath. There is no excuse, save for self-defence. To remove the need for self-defence, the Global Government itself needs the power the United Nations does not have. While the constitution of the United Nations forbids resort to arms, the constitution is seldom used to expel a member. Under a Global Government constitution, States would not be members of the Global Government; populations would. States which defied the Global Government on such a matter would be replaced in law, declared invalid and outlawed, and assured that any gains made by force of arms would not be recognised. I will later argue for Trusteeship.

10. To fold emergency relief actions into 9.
11. To smooth the way for refugees and economic migrants, recognising that this implies social tension and change, and alterations in the demographic structure of the world.
12. To direct medical action and research to the types of programmes at present handled by WHO, creating a balance between the needs of tropical countries and others, and between "populist" demands (AIDS, cancer) and those which receive less press attention (malaria, the common cold, arthritis, macular degeneration). Where necessary create drug manufacture and research with the aim of distribution according to ability of societies to pay.
13. To enforce global environmental standards, and to compensate and assist those societies and States for which observance of the standards may create an initial industrial or other disruption. To make wilful environmental damage an international crime.
14. To organise massive support for the training of teachers, therapists and others concerned with youth, and their distribution for enhanced primary and secondary education, and, better, Youth Maturity Institutes.
15. To *require* States to observe conventions with regard to human rights, international courts, nuclear arms, ethnocide, genocide, and the like, *whether or not* the States in question have signed on to them.
16. To establish conditions under which political self-determination will lead to State "independence".[13] Currently the situation in such areas as Chechnya, West Papua, southern Sudan and Kurdistan are examples of a *prima facie* desire for such a change, amongst many others.
17. To make torture, detention without trial, capital punishment and similar offences internationally and effectively punishable, whatever the jurisdiction of the offending system may say.
18. To create an entity which, on behalf of the world's population, will begin the centuries-long task of finding another earth to colonize as a home for humans when the inevitable happens, and the forces of the universe turn this earth into blinding dust.

This is not intended to be an exhaustive list, for there are scores of other issues, from malaria and illiteracy eradication to maritime governance and rights of workers, embodied in the programmes of the United Nations family of organisation and in near-global treaties.

---

13   I put independence in inverted commas because, clearly, Utopian Global Government implies the transfer of many State powers to the global entity, as is, of course, already the case.

What is different about my proposal is two-fold. The first is the co-ordination of the work of Global Government and *all* the existing independent members of the United Nation family within *one* framework instead of a multiplicity. We shall see that the existing "organisation" is, almost, anti-Global Government. The principle requires major and far-reaching changes in the organisation itself. The second is giving Global Government strengthened legal and forceful powers. This requires fundamental changes in the relationship between States and Global Government.

The biggest bugbear ever to get in the way of a decent peaceful world is the entrenched respect for the autonomy of States, to whom all organisations in the United Nations family of organisations genuflect. Slowly, very slowly, this is modifying. Worse still, any State can get away with almost anything if it simply declares "My crime is my internal affair". Official torture, murder, rape, massacre, bloody internal war, ethnocide, political imprisonment of rather mild dissidents, exploitation of women and children, sexual slavery are blatantly occurring as I write, have occurred consistently throughout the full history of the United Nations, and will be occurring long after you have read this. Indeed these matters were not the primary *raison d'être* for the United Nations' creation. They will continue unless we have powerful, effective, Global Government.

The United Nations has achieved an enormous amount during its short life – half a century. The achievements go largely unnoticed because they are, in terms of the media, undramatic. They do not get attention up front. They seldom make front page headlines. They are based on hard, solid work, enormous diplomatic successes, carried out with minimal fuss and even fewer resources, and with enormously dedicated personnel. Refugee conventions and resettlement; protection of aid operations; development assistance; regional co-operation in research and development; arid land activity; major successes in the near elimination of disease; mass literacy programmes; mass self-help programmes; population control – one could in fact go on for volumes.

But the moment the United Nations comes up against determined State defiance, it is stuck. It can do almost nothing, except against the relatively weak. Its funds are withheld. Every single State has become an expert in using verbiage and hypocritical legalese to defy. The nose is thumbed.

Every single one of the numerous organisational weaknesses of the United Nations family is a result of the self-interest of States which have put their own power and autonomy first – from the national self-serving and inefficiently hypocritical staffing systems (despite the extraordinary dedication and

frustrated competence of the best international civil servants), to the replication of services between organisations, to the costs of translation, to the use of obfuscating UN-ese as a distinct language, to restricting the capacity of peace-keepers; to the enormous costs of massive governing bodies, to the proportion of funds used for administration rather than programmes; to power-maintaining rivalries and competition between organisations; to programme unworkability because of lack of local support or international resources; to overlapping rivalries and destructive competition with bilateral aid agencies; to lack of effective use of and decentralisation to competent NGOs; to dependencies on a coterie of "experts" instead of available NGO experts (there are notable exceptions to this); and so on and on.

One could in each case point to speeches in governing bodies deploring such defects, pleas to correct them, funds withheld because they have not been corrected. And one could find the powerful legal resolutions of the governing bodies that override these concerns by *mandating* the Secretaries-General to do exactly what they are in fact doing. Resources necessary for correction are not supplied. Frustrated reforms are contrary to the interests of some bloc, even of States which wish to "banish" incompetent civil servants in their own bureaucracies to one of the UN organisations, or to reward a time-server.

Privately, most States do no *want* the United Nations to be a Global Government. States mistakenly believe that the world can go on as it is, that the public will not rise up in anger at the way States are betraying the future of our grandchildren, are putting the very existence of the world as a planet in danger. States are trying to brainwash the public into believing that Global Government is a danger to their own independence and culture – as if that would matter a tinker's cuss if the globe exploded. States divide the world to conquer it, and in the process lose the war.

Consider one major phenomenon. The United Nations system consists of a *family* of organisations. It is literally forbidden for bureaucrats, consultants, or diplomats related to any of them to refer to UNESCO or WHO or FAO or the World Trade Organisation as in any way implying that they are part of, or subject to, UNO, the United Nations Organisation in New York. Forget a governing world system. Instead there is a getting together of grown up independent career-oriented rivalrous siblings.

Result. While some of the organisations are indeed children of one of the foundation organisations and maintain umbilical cords, and while some are not accorded full sovereign status, the primary ones do have that status. Around each of them is a panoply of Ambassadors from the Member States. While

there may be smaller executive councils with restrictive powers (of which the primary one is the U.N. Security Council), sovereignty is vested in each of their General Assemblies. Every single one has something of that kind, and most of them bring together full delegations (separate from the Ambassadors) from all the – what is it now – 180? Member States once every two or three years. UNESCO's can last up to two months, divided into large sectoral segments meeting simultaneously – and therefore requiring large delegations, to cover each segment, from each of the countries (which many countries cannot afford) – as well as committees and negotiations in the corridors and at restaurants.

In addition, Member States, concerned about the organisations poaching on the mandates of each other, and conducting overlapping activities, insist on intense liaison between them. This is not just general liaison, with, say, FAO having one man in New York who could link up with all the organisations, or even one man in each of the others such as WHO or UNESCO or ILO or WTO or UNICEF – all of which have to do with, say, agriculture or community development. No. It means that every department, every section, has to have someone ready at the drop of a hat to meet with colleagues in each rival organisation (not necessarily simultaneously) at some neutral location to discuss ongoing or proposed activities and to be ready to defend territory and to *object*. You can imagine the proportion of time spent on such exercises, especially in small sections or departments, diverted from substantive work.

Add this up financially – the cost of delegations to expensive capitals for the General Assemblies; the cost of Ambassadors and liaison officers in the same capitals (different Ambassadors for almost every organisation): the cost in time and travel to the organisations themselves for liaison meetings – and with the same money you could possibly create a permanent peace-keeping force, reasonably equipped, or triple the amount spent on development aid. Of course a few highly paid, hubris-creating, Ambassadorial perks would be lost....

Aha, say the critics, including politicians who are resisting paying up their countries' assessments, massive waste. Cut back the finances until they get their house in order.

Such remarks, unfortunately typically snide, ignore the fact that every single one of these major wastages, and others such as appointment of staff on the basis of geographical and national quotas instead of ability, derive from binding resolutions of the General Assemblies (composed of representatives

of the States themselves) of the organisations, or from equally directive decisions of their Executive Boards. The wastage in the United Nations family is not a result of international servants' decisions: it is the result of decisions by the Member States in the governing bodies–who often act as if they did not *want* the United Nations to work.

The actions of the United Nations with respect to Global Policy are, by constitution, limited and over-ruled by the reserved powers of States which they arrogate to themselves. The United Nations and associated organisations have massive bureaucracies for the implementation of policy, bureaucracies which sometimes, it is true, run away with their own hubris, especially since legislative control is so unwieldy. That leads the public to think of them as having strong executive governing powers.

This is quite wrong. The bodies are much more like associations of States whose resolutions are more like treaties than like laws. States adhere to agreements, or refuse to do so. Many policies are in place only for a minority of ratifying States, lacking global force since a ratification quorum may not be achieved. Important policies, such as the cultural heritage policies of UNESCO, or peace-keeping, are primarily paid for by contributions to special funds outside the restricted and be-ruled general budget. Some such contributions are entirely voluntary; some are governed by principles of payment, which, however, contributors can and do ignore.

Originally, there was some sense to the arrangements. The organisations were small, brilliantly staffed, well focused, a coming together of allies after a devastating war, gradually admitting everybody else who wanted to join. It was thought of less as Global Government – anathema to the peace-time allies – but as a safety valve putting a limit on international snarling, and finding useful international things to do to improve man's lot. Even the last function was in competition with bilateral programmes, which served State interests more directly.

Utopia sees this sort of self-serving Statehood as damaging and as standing in the way of achieving global policies that are urgently and desperately needed. ***Major policies can only be resolved, can only function properly, as global ones.*** Peace, world trade, the relief of disaster and poverty, violence, every-thing to do with eco-systems, the oceans, the high mountains, desertification, migration, the control of disease and its spread, nuclear policy – make your own list.

The functions of States and Regional Confederations in the global order are to ensure that communes, states or provinces, city governments, and so on, effectively express their local character, administer global laws and understandings in terms of that local character, and make sure that the populations they represent have effective mechanisms for placing their ideas, their point of view, their concerns, before the global policy makers. It is essential, for the Utopia I am conceiving, that the smaller levels of government (a) be sanctioned effectively for major and damaging breaches of world policy, and (b), equally significantly, have rights and obligations which enable them to vary appropriate details of global policy to conform with local cultures and conditions.

Let us approach the structure of the Global Government on the basis of what we know of the present.[14]

If you were to draw up an organisation chart for a State government, would you do the following? Would you divide up the operational tasks into the equivalent of government departments, to deal, for example, with agriculture and fisheries, with health, with labour, with trade, with culture, and so on? I imagine you would. You would also ensure that each department had an effective Director in charge, and an efficient staff to analyse and implement.

Would you then say that each department should have its own elected legislature, independent of whatever there was of central government, and without any obligation to create its rules and regulations to harmonise with other legislatures or departments? That the Ministers in charge should each be a kind of Prime Minister?

This in effect, is how world government is organised at present – a range of subject and policy areas, each with its own independent parliament. You might well say that Nation States are perpetuating a

---

14   Since writing the following paragraphs I have come across T. G. Otte's review of George Monbiot's *The Age of Consent: A Manifesto for a new world order* in the *Times Literary Supplement* Sept. 26, 2003 and found his book which is: Monbiot, George *The Age of Consent,* London Flamingo, 2003 According to the review, Monbiot's scheme for the democratization of the United Nations has something in common with my own. To that extent the heading "Lonely on a Cold Mountain" and the condescending assertion that "even" Monbiot accedes that his ideas are impractical are disproven by the fact that he and I come to similar conclusions independently. In other words, individuals are moving their thoughts in similar directions. However, in my view Monbiot is so scared of his own ideas he weakens them. He acknowledges the cost of a world parliament as overwhelming – but it would be far less than the combined General Assemblies of the total United Nations family – with which I would do away.

divide and rule system in order to prevent Global Government from being effective, or being in fact a Government. It is against their short-sighted interests. They are not ready for it. They must be at some time. We need them to start moving.

So the first major reforms of Global Government would be to:

1. Turn each one of the "family" of United Nations organisations into a *department* of the Global Government, e.g. for global security, military affairs, education, agriculture and fisheries, migration and refugees, culture and science, health, industrial and labour organisation, human rights, and so forth.
2. Change the rank of Directors-General to Directors, except for the one over-all position.
3. Terminate the General Assemblies or equivalents, except that for the Global Government (United Nations) itself.
4. Allow the creation of strictly advisory global consultative Committees of Experts, small in size, a-political, and "representative" *informally* of relevant sub-global differences (depending on subject matter they could be, for example, geographical regions, the nature of trade, cultural emphases.)
5. Restructure the bureaucracy so that it reflects ability alone, administered by an independent tribunal, without reference to group identity, using global examinations to sort entry-level candidates.
6. Vest the General Assembly of the Global Government with legislative powers *in all substantive domains.*
7. Construct it to reflect populations by election, not States by appointment.
8. The General Assembly to elect cabinet members for limited terms to oversee the departments mentioned in paragraph 1. They would constitute the executive and policy referral cabinet, chaired by a rotating President.
9. Laws to be enforceable on States and individuals, through World and Regional courts, appropriately supported, without treaty or ratification.
10. The Global Government to be the sole repository of military forces anywhere.

The listing of such principles and reforms is indicative of the major challenges facing reformers of Global Government. Vested interests already built into the system have prevented or stalled the application of timid, try-to-please-everyone changes that blue ribbon and other committees have recommended over the years. It might well be that only a global cataclysm or its imminent threat will force

those governments that have the power to change to face reality and act accordingly and in concert. Or, better, a general movement at the grass roots populations to mobilise a public opinion fed up with global chaos, sufficiently powerful to wake up State governments to the reality that to continue to obfuscate and defend their powers is to undermine, perhaps destroy, the well-being of the world, including themselves.

Such a re-organisation rests on the premises that inequities in size between voting units (now, States) should be reduced, and that States should be the in the middle, representing their people in their internal affairs and administering policies on behalf of Global Government. In other words, States should be as to Global Government as provinces, *länder*, Swiss cantons and states are to States. And it may well be that between States and Global Government are regional tiers of voluntary agreement.

This is the schematic pattern:

1. The division of the political world into electoral Districts. Each large State would be divided into Districts of, say, 10 million people. States between 5 and 10 million population would constitute one District. States with less than 5 million population would combine to create Districts of up to five million.
2. Election to the General Assembly would be on the basis of, say, two Delegates per District.
3. Enumeration for the above purpose would be by *residence* rather than by restrictive definitions such as citizenship.
4. States would be entitled to have *one* Ambassador each to the Global Government.
5. The General Assembly (or global parliament) would elect the Ministerial Cabinet.
6. The Ministerial Cabinet would appoint a Civil Service Commission which would then make *all* appointments to the bureaucracy in accordance with the budget.
7. The General Assembly would approve and amend budgets, preferably with a five year forecast.
8. Income would be based on an assessment to each State, linked to that State's GDP. States would be responsible for the transfer of that assessment to the Global Government within a fixed time period, delays in payment being subject to a penalty, the whole subject to an "ability to pay" rule set by the Ministry of Finance with General Assembly approval.
9. The Global Government would be the sole authority permitted to have armed forces. It would have its own military command structure and permanent military units, including rapid deploy-

ment forces, to contain and eliminate violent flare-ups, aggression between States or their internal units, genocide and the like. The military command would probably also be a police force to supplement State activity directed against such phenomena as piracy and contraband traffic (drugs, slaves, endangered species, cultural artefacts).

10. The operations of the armed forces would be controlled by a Minister, subject to Cabinet directives which would be ratified by the General Assembly.
11. There are to be no statutory vetoes.
12. There will be instances, as there are now, where individual States will be incapable of administering their own society. There need to be reasonably clear criteria which could be used to define such a condition, avoiding the danger of cross-cultural misunderstanding. This having been done, Global Government needs to re-institute the category of Global Trusteeship. The General Assembly would then ratify recommendations from the Cabinet to create or terminate a given condition of Trusteeship.[15] [See Appendix at end of submission]

The fate of human survival, let alone Utopia, depends on the success with which such reforms can be accomplished, and the effectiveness with which the reformed instrument tackles the issues.

Global Government consists of an organisation to create and carry out policies. Utopia will be reached if the policies are in conformity with more general civilized Utopian values. Writing about a re-organisation will not secure this. We have to set out what we Utopians believe in, and, as in every other domain of life, exert whatever tiny influence we may have to inch forward the generations who follow; to make it a little easier for them to move the next inch.

In the segment headed Weft and Warp I gave summary examples of Utopian principles which are capable of being put into practice within the century, and I have elaborated on the requirements of arms control. These are part of the Utopian context and thinking within which the ambitious project of creating a Global Government is situated. It will not do simply to concentrate on creating a world government, since we need to mobilize public action to tackle the surrounding and implied issues as well.

---

15   Examples of appropriate conditions might be: failure to maintain a level of living over a given number of years; internal massacres; breaches of human rights, failure to operate an educational system. Trusteeship could be a tool to back up the rapid deployment force (Rwanda) and could have been used to handle post-war Iraq pending the establishment of security and self-government. In a sense something like it has been used for Bosnia and Kosovo.

Furthermore, any global government must balance the global "civilized" values it expresses with the justified requirement that peoples – not just States – have their own systemic values they wish to preserve. Not only that, but there may be clashes between the local values and the global. Any attempt to impose, internationally, a particular moral code must do so, not simply by expressing a law in an international convention or legislation of the General Assembly, but by intimate and close analysis of the effects of such changes in particular cultures. What does the abolition of *de facto* slavery do? What are the implications of female circumcision or death by stoning for attitudes towards women (who then may be regarded as potential whores), the structure of the family, and the moral system? Thus the law makers must have more than the law itself in mind, but consequent actions to help restore the functioning of society in new forms. This is not an undertaking to be treated lightly, and may require socio-cultural advisory commissions to pronounce on the implications of each piece of legislation before it becomes law.[16]

Reference to the issues of human rights illustrates the complexities with which Global Government will have to deal.

The definition of civil liberties, of freedom itself, which seems so natural to those who live them, is not self-evident to others. It must always be argued for, defined, with passion and clarity and always against the erroneous perspective that civil rights conflict with security. When a Global Government is achieved, it will, I think, reach fruition because of a greater consensus about civilised values and freedoms and responsibilities. If this is not so, Global Government will have an uphill task to establish itself.

While it is relatively easy to define genocide as the physical destruction of members of a defined group[17], most of the time attacks against groups fall short of this. Attacks against indigenous peoples, minorities, and so forth are designed to strip them of property, prevent them from achieving a secure

---

16   I am in the process of studying and analysing the relationship between the "Web of Moral Values Globally Approved" and local cultures (from the United States to Papua New Guinea. A very preliminary draft may be viewed at http://www.anthropologising.ca./writing/wemovagla.doc.

17   As originally proposed, "genocide" included what we now call "ethnocide" but this broad definition was not internationally adopted so that internationally ethnocide without the physical destruction of populations, come under the heading of the right to cultural survival.

life-style, force them by social, political, and material pressure to conform to the culture of those in power (not always the majority).

Difficulties in definition arise for various reasons. Ethnocide is held to be the forceful destruction of an ethnos, or traditional culture, whereas attacks against other groups, such as religious cults or followers of alternative lifestyles, are handled separately in a different way. They must be, or else brought together analytically, for they are all cultural variants. Again, some instruments of social pressure are regarded by some as not reprehensible, even good. Religious proselytisation is a major issue of contention in some parts of the world, although its proponents are driven to it by their faiths. Education is a major changer of culture, bearing down on children whose only "defence" is that of their parents, who may be excoriated for resisting a "proper" influence. The Japanese argue that they want a homogeneous society, not one with ethnic variation (although they have religious and other significant disparities). Are such attitudes ethnocidal?

We cannot realistically interpret ethnocide as meaning no change whatsoever in cultural groups. Everything, from TV to the Internet, from pop music to universities, promotes change, and does so unequally. It is therefore necessary to be explicit for a Global Government to be able to face the problem.

Face it it must. The extreme cases are patently obvious. Rwanda, Burundi, Kurdistan, the Balkans, Brazil, Paraguay, Myanmar, Kashmir. There are troublesome middle cases: Mexico, First Nations of North America, Nigeria, Indian "tribals" and untouchables, and many others.

At least the extreme cases require intervention. At present interference is weak, devoted to human aid, but not facing the certainty that resolution cannot or will not always be achieved by State governments in power. It maybe that the new government of Rwanda is trying, without means, to achieve a just society. If so, it deserves very much more support than the world is giving it. If that support is given, and it turns its back on such a goal, the world is justified in dismissing such a government.

I use the term advisedly. State governments do ***NOT*** have a God-given right to be in power. Power has to rest in the people. God does not ensure this either. The people have to achieve their powers, governments to earn them. In Utopia both factors will prevail. But they will not arrive automatically.

And in some parts of the world there is no sign of movement in that direction. Again, I do not advocate intervention in marginal cases. But I do most certainly advocate intervention, and strongly, in those instances where governments have over decades shown themselves to be so incompetent as to destroy a reasonable viability of the country, a functional society, or a minimum material base of life. A part of Africa falls into this category. So do Myanmar and Haiti.

Kampuchea may possibly have been rescued from a similar fate by the most unusual kind of intervention, of the kind I am advocating as a first stage of Trusteeship, as was East Timor. That intervention came about through political negotiation and the failure of the Khmers Rouges to maintain their brutal power. That was an opportunity which the United Nations, to its enormous credit, seized. And in other situations, for example, in some parts of Africa, it may not be possible, or the problem may not be political rivalry as much as incompetence.

If a Global Trusteeship system had been in place it might even have helped Iraq and Afghanistan.

We have to stop using the art of being patronising to avoid human responsibility. The State governments in question are composed of adult, usually educated, mostly men. They have had the chance to prove their adequacy. It is not ethical, not human, not responsible, to abandon men, women and children, the very future of large parts of the world, to their fate. Destitution, corruption, greed, brutality, ill-health, misery, food crisis after food crisis, are not to be excused because the government belongs to a different culture, because of the sanctity of the State, because it (supposedly) does not affect us, because the people must solve their problems themselves. These, however justified they may have been at the time of retreat from colonialism, are pitifully wrong now.

A valid Global Government must be prepared to revive and re-define the idea of Trusteeship. It must be prepared to dismiss a State government and to intervene, not only with humanitarian aid (which in the long term can be dependency-destructive), but also with all the tools it can develop to initiate and stimulate the achievement of the *population's* objectives. The process may involve military intervention, coupled with the best of civil and aid administration.

The record of the international community with respect to the creation of appropriate tools is patchy to say the least. Bilateral aid is driven too much by country interests – the marketing of commerce, political influence. Multinational aid sometimes runs up against rivalries between aid donors, inexpert experts, crisis resolution. Both have high costs, and fail to learn from experience.

Again, the last phrase I use advisedly. Aid projects have frequently achieved excellent results, even where side effects have not been known. The improvement of rice strains, the monitoring of locust explosions, fish harvesting techniques, some eradication of disease, some educational advance, are only a few in a long list.

Yet very seldom are projects submitted to what I would call *developmental* evaluation. While there is now more attention given to hitherto unsuspected side effects – on the ecosystem or the socio-cultural system – objectives are almost always given in static terms rather than in the dynamic ones that genuine movement embraces. We need to *judge projects on their multiplier effects*, not on the way they reach a single target. It is as though we are content if we know that A moves to B, as if the world stops at B. We do not ask what happens after B, whether C and D will follow *ad infinitum*.

And it is not as if we have not been told that the objective, both to be valid and to be successful, should be defined in ways that meet the people's own concepts of their aspirations. We have. And many grass roots "developers" do just that – the more "grass roots" they are, the more likely the development. But government ministries, many regional officials, most official aid experts, avoid such disturbing problems by retreating into the position that "they know best". Only now are pastoral officers in East Africa beginning to understand that there are values to the cattle complexes and the indigenous uses of camels amongst the populations that they, the experts, were not cognizant of.

What do people want improvement for? What price in values are they prepared to pay to get there? What happens when the aid project comes to an end? Does it just die on the vine because it ignored the reality of the people? Or perhaps it is renewed as permanent aid *ad infinitum*? These are among the most often overlooked beginning questions.

There are many more such conceptual difficulties involved in the aid process. But I must not turn this into a disquisition. When is aid designed to stimulate a dynamic, and when is it merely self-satisfying charity or power-based intellectualism? There are answers already in the literature and in experience, but they are too often disregarded.[18]

The correction of inequities will be necessary every step of the way toward Utopia. It is not to be done in ways that remove decision-making from the populace. In fact one of the most important principles that community development tried to grapple with (mostly unsuccessfully, as the movement became bureaucratised) was to give people the right to say "No, no, and no again." A further problem is that often so-called self-help, correctly drawing on local resources in lieu of currency, inhibits the growth of entrepreneurship, since it inhibits the circulation of money.

These remarks are not intended to advocate the reduction of resources allocated for aid: far from it. The world is considerably below agreed targets, as minimal as 1% of G.D.P. States are not giving too much aid; they are using the process for selfish purposes and muddling the effectiveness. Even charitable non-governmental organisations are in fierce competition between themselves for public support and attention. The best ones know this and co-operate with one another; the best ones respond not only to crises but to long term solutions that minimise future crises.

As the poorer countries begin to solve their problems, to create increased levels of living and better qualities of life, so too will their expectations grow. New dangers then develop; dangers of aggression because the pace of improvement is too slow; and more determined and experienced demands for a better life. The objects are legitimate and part of the Utopian dream for everyone.

The richer countries naturally resist pressures that, at first sight, seem to imply a reduction in their own progress in order to help the poorer. Such a selfish position, though natural, is dangerous and self-defeating. It is necessary to open up borders of richer countries to competing products. How else are inequities to be addressed? And it has been clearly shown time and again that by doing so the rules of comparative advantage will in turn benefit the richer countries. Everyone ultimately gains. But blindly

---

18   Cf. my "Evaluation of Technical Assistance as a Contribution to Development", *International Development Review* vol viii no 2 pp 2-6 and 23, 1966t

the so-called educated world continues to deny its markets to those who need them, thereby also restricting its own progress.

Similar remarks apply to migration, the movement of populations. The pitifully tragic mass migration that is the response to violence and natural disaster cannot adequately be handled by international refugee organisations, however hard and selflessly they try. The scale in the 1990s was and now in the 21st century is enormous. According to the World Watch Institute, about 125 million people live elsewhere than where they were born (most legally and by choice). In the 'seventies there were about 2.5 million new refugees a year. In the 'nineties the figure rose to four million. There are 27 million internal refugees, whose plight is more serious than most of those who flee their country, and an estimated 10 million illegal migrants. Ten million people are removed from their homes by public works projects, such as dams, or roads, usually with insufficient attempts to soften the blow of a change of living.

Too often men and women in the field have to stand by, confronting massacres, unreasoning panic, mass death by disease, the distortion of humanity by starvation, psychological trauma. In the twenty-first century? In the age of Internet?

The unremitting tragedies have given rise to commerce similar to that of slavery in the last century. The illegal trade in population movement has the status of a massive industry, comparable to that of trade in some drugs. Thousands of dollars change hands in individual cases. Unlucky victims often find themselves literally in conditions of slavery, from Germany to California.

Global Government has to be able to respond quickly and to interfere if States refuse to admit help or to give help. It has to be able to declare such situations to be disasters as great as those of natural cataclysms, to be totally unacceptable to civilisation. It has to be able to act effectively.

Even more troubling are certain situations where, it seems, no amount of intervention, no amount of development-directed change, will help. I refer to regions of endemic disaster and poverty of resources. Here we must be careful once again to respect the values of the population that lives in such conditions. We must not assume that because life, to our eyes, is unbelievable hard, that it is therefore non-valued; that the population would be happier tucked in bed with television. *It is up to the people to decide.* If they don't want change, if they can manage, leave them alone.

But if they do want change, as a result of suffering, persecution, or wider horizons, they are right to seek it, and we are right, have a duty even, to help them on the way.

In some instances it can be argued that cases which are otherwise hopeless can, with education and communication, carve out niches in the world economy. Hong Kong, investment havens, resorts. It is unrealistic, however, to expect every difficult situation to be resolved like that, or that all such cases can support the subsequent population level.

Richer countries are still having trouble learning that it is not usually effective to revive dying industries. Populations cannot always be kept in place when industries die or are replaced. Adjustment includes population movement. If richer countries try to create artificial population stability within their own borders they subsidise ineffectively.

If this is true nationally, it is also true internationally. The population level in a few countries will simply not be viable, not because of high birth rates but because of lack or destruction of productive possibilities coupled with the inability to finance education that will make underemployed life acceptable.

The world as we know it today is the result of continuous migrations. Mankind has never been without them. Many were the result of military force, a process that we have nearly overcome. Others were the result of poverty, nomadism, the search for better pastures, and the restlessness of the human spirit which we can never do without. Diasporas are universally present, even in Japan. Even though many have been politically and culturally persecuted, that has been because of their very effectiveness. Their world linkages have promoted enterprise and trade. There is no reason to believe that their positive effects will not continue. Not only do they contribute to the dynamics of the host country, but they frequently re-invest in their countries of origin.

Thus a major tool for the reduction of inequities is steady migration, even if host countries initially pay a price that may not be returned until the next generation. To have optimal effects, migration should be spared the ups and downs of welcoming and hostility, and should be within the capacity of host countries to manage, provided the concept of management is long-term rather than in response to short-term costs and prejudices.

Global and regional governments have major policy responsibility.

The subjects that I have used to exemplify policy concerns for Global Government imply decision-making, adjudication, and the power to impose sanctions. Adjudication implies a structure of international courts. These are useless without the power to enforce court decisions, against States if necessary. Ultimately, that implies power.

Global Government will require military force to bring about Utopia. There is little doubt that in the first stages it would have to use every kind of pressure, with the threat of force, to induce recalcitrant States (and other organisations, for those there will be) to disarm. Threats are useless unless they are known to be real, as United Nations history has shown.

That implies a military command and military personnel. In Utopia, this would be the only one. En route to Utopia, States would be required to disarm on agreed timetables, perhaps transitionally transferring their personnel to Global Government command.

Global Government will not be cheap. How can we afford it? It is not enough to say, we cannot **not** afford it. We are at liberty to choose ultimate cataclysm for our descendants, to refuse to pay the price for achieving not only what we want but what is necessary for survival. In a separate essay, not here included, I propose a complete restructuring of State fiscal systems, which will simplify national and international public finances.

The challenges are huge, and only partly expressed here. But each one, considered in relation to the others, links to a coordinated march forward, offers hope to populations which may otherwise be cynical about or helpless in the face of the short-term, self-serving, futureless State political systems that so often seem to stand in the way of progress.

We desperately need Global Government. Let's get on with it. How?

Epilogue

I do not pretend that in the long run the ideas I have expressed will predominate. What is important is that this and the next generation consciously and conscientiously consider their implications – and the consequences for other aspects of life which I have not examined in detail. And that where alternatives seem preferable, the implications of those alternatives be specifically traced through the whole of the sought-for society. Educational alternatives have implications for finance and political structure and ultimately global government, for example.

The Epilogue is as much a part of the Utopian goal as any other part of this essay – for here I endeavour to look toward an answer to the question of the last section – "Let us get on with it. How?"

Don't let the magnitude of the task create a wall of impotence. Two considerations will help you crack through it.

First. Each one of us has responsibility and power. This is true whether we live in democracies or authoritarian polities. I am not talking about *taking power* in the political sense. I mean that every action we perform has consequences for the unforeseeable future. What we do now creates the future.

This is true in every aspect of life. Perhaps the most difficult one to imagine consists of change in intimate personal relations, a topic I have not expanded upon here. However I think you can see that the goal of appropriate youth maturation will have greater difficulties if family life remains largely defective and conservative. How can the Youth Maturity Institutes counter tendencies toward violence if in the associated families relationships are conceived of as being proprietorial? If lovers define their love as dominating, controlling, the actions and emotions of partners? We need to move away from such thoughts and attitudes.

I choose this example because it is the most intimate and personal. A change will not come by the use of a magic wand. It requires, first, the conscious acceptance of the principle that the concept of property over an individual is not welcome in interpersonal relations. It then requires that individuals in relationships try as hard as they can, without changing the principle into some kind of iron-clad

fundamentalism, to live up to the ideal. Some will succeed, some will not. But in time more will succeed – and the time may be far shorter than we anticipate. Note, for example, how gender and homosexual issues have changed in the past *thirty years.*

Now I must become a little abstract to demonstrate my point. Every change we are contemplating is technically an innovation. Let us consider the nature of innovation for a moment.

It begins with an individual taking elements from the existing culture – the idea of a circle which can be seen in nature (the moon, the eye), applied to wood or metal or stone, to create a circular object. The culture has a sled. Add the circular object to the sled and we have a wheeled cart.

All the "objects" we need to create the Utopia I describe are in existence. All I am doing is to combine them in different ways. Alternatives are possible. The scale of the possibility is a function of the size of the global culture, which permits the imagination of almost an infinity of combinations.

My inventor creates the wheel without the cart. Nobody pays attention. When he makes the cart however it has repercussions. Thought must be given to pulling and pushing it and loading it. If the terrain is mountainous or forested it will be of more trouble than it is worth. It is not an innovation because nobody else take it up. But if it is taken up, say on the plains, it has effects on commerce, the advantage of roads instead of tracks appears, lanes through the forest may be cleared. Beasts of burden have new uses. Once an innovation becomes real, it has numerous ramifying consequences.

The acceptance and spread of an innovation depends on effective communication of its desirability and character. In this world communication is ultra-rapid, although there are major nationalist, religious, ideological and other blocks which make it less than "perfect" in the economists' sense. However the velocity of communication is bound to intensify.

Note here the importance, once again, of the individual, that little scrap of humanity who makes decisions. It is the individual – however influenced – who makes the decisions, to communicate, and to adopt, reject, transform innovation. Even in those societies which reject, for now, the equality of women, the mobile phone has its place and ideas about violence in the home begin to circulate.

State governments, whatever their nature, seem to be much slower in responding to changes in social life. It seems to take them aeons to understand notions about marriage, conjugal rights, and homosexuality, even in the limited field of fiscal responsibility. To expect governments to take the lead in *initiating* the move toward Utopian goals seems to be a pipe dream as of now. They are too preoccupied with State rivalries and immediate crises. Statesmanship – the ability to take decisions with the long term future in mind – seems sadly lacking.

Thus my second consideration is to examine how individual initiatives and innovations may be mobilized to make a difference. Only strong persuasive and determined public opinion will ensure that governments pay attention. Fortunately there are now precedents for this. Since World War II and the definition of genocide there has been a steady increase in the effective influence of groups of citizens, bonded internationally, i.e. NGOs, upon the values of State governments and delegations, an influence which we can assume to grow, despite the opposition of the current United States government to it. This influence has been strongest in United Nations circles.

The "system" is not perfect - NGOs are human organisations with human rivalries and sometimes ideological agendas. But within this seeming chaos they are fora for the sorting out of ideas.

It would be encouraging to see the formation of a world wide organisation, an NGO, devoted to the discussion and implementation of Utopian goals within the 21st century. In my view, the task is too big for one such organisation to deal effectively and powerfully with all aspects of Utopian society and culture. Among its functions would be to co-ordinate the thoughts and actions of other NGOs concerned with aspects of the enterprise – education, world government, environment, for example. In fact, the driving force might well be a federation of major NGOs of all kinds.

George Monbiot questions the democratic representativeness and objectivity of the NGOs. To a great degree he is right. He overstates his case, however, when he suggest that such a grouping would be dominated by "animal welfare charities and cancer research trusts."[19] Remember, my proposal is not that the NGOs themselves constitute the global parliament, but that they come together to provide the dynamics to push governments in the direction of creating the true world government. Monbiot's

---

19   Monbiot, George, *The Age of Consent* London, Flamingo, 2003 p.81

point that they are self-appointed and self-serving is well taken, but we have nothing better, and their interests cancel out or complement each other on the global scene. Cancer research and animal rights do have a role to play in the creation of global values, as do such bodies as United Nations organisations within countries, Amnesty International, Oxfam, Medecins sans Frontières, the International Scientific Union, and several hundred others.

It would in effect be a lobby to push States to take the necessary internal and international steps to do the job. The will of the people, in the end, will prevail – but the people need to talk to each other, debate passionately and with logic to arrive at what it is they want. There will not be unanimity, and minority opinions and values must be respected and accounted for, but out of the cauldron will come a delectable dish, comprising many tastes.

Are there NGOs which will come together and take the first step on the road, well before the year 2015? Which will take the initiative?

Let the people decide! I do not wish to die before I can see this beginning.

Appendix on Global Trusteeship

The concept of Global Trusteeship needs considerable clarification if it is not to be misunderstood. Near-trusteeship UN operations have been reasonably successful in East Timor and Kampuchea, with the agreements of the populations involved, but unsuccessful in Kosovo. There are countries where the situations underline the difficulties in the application, such as Burundi, South Sudan, Myanmar and especially Iraq. But note that these difficulties stem partly from the structure of the United Nations, which is a far cry from Global Government, and from the vested interests of national powers.

Global Trusteeship will be most effective when national disarmament takes place on a world scale, although there will be some instances when a Trusteeship will need to be imposed when a country refuses to disarm. The decision to undertake Global Trusteeship will be most effective when it is based upon a Global Statute of International Law, adopted by an assembly which is that of the people, rather than governments. Only then will it have clear moral and legal authority.

The administration of a Trusteeship requires a civilian executive who is policy oriented. One of the U.S. failures in Iraq is to make use of an Ambassador with colonial style powers, but no experience in policy making under such circumstances, and no global mandate. Rather the operation is an extension of U.S. culture in which corporate executive and military power values dominate.

Thus a Trusteeship executive must have a United Nations force *under his civilian authority*. The force should be prepared and equipped for police actions rather than for military occupation, though that may be necessary in parts of a given country. The Trusteeship executive should work entirely through localized political power, wherever possible, using its authority to educate and/or force the political authority to take remedial steps. The executive may in the early stages, consult with a group of social scientists appointed by the International Social Science Council, as far as possible drawn from the country itself, plus outsiders specialising in the country's affairs: this to assist the Trusteeship executive in refining the problem issues and the approach to their resolution.

Apart from this, officials of the executive, drawn from Global Government resources, would in principle be stationed as advisers and monitors to ministries, regional authorities, and the like.

The duration of the Trusteeship would be of finite duration, open to extension. Usually country-wide elections would be expected in a year. Western ideas of appropriate election procedures would not necessarily constitute criteria – there are other forms which might be more appropriate in the short run, and which might be used to create approximate representation to avoid delays in handing authority back to the country.

After such a return to country authority, monitoring would continue until such time as the Trusteeship executive, by now relieved of executive powers, aided by the group of social scientists, could certify to Global Government that the country has satisfactorily resolved, or near-resolved, the issues that caused a Trusteeship to be mandated in the first place.

More about the Utopian World Championship

By Jon Brunberg and Annika Drougge

History of the Utopian World Championship

The Utopian World Championship was created by SOC.Stockholm, which was a Swedish artist group with the members Jon Brunberg, Annika Drougge, Pernilla Carlsson, Anna-Lena Lundmark, Johan Malmström, Tobias Sjödin and Karin Willén that existed between 1999 and 2006. The group had its base in an old shopfront store in central Stockholm, which served as its working space and public venue. Annika Drougge and Jon Brunberg continue to manage the project since SOC.Stockholm ceased to exist as a group in 2006.

We launched the first championship on March 10, 2001 – in cooperation with the artist group Swe. De – with an event at the venue Culturen, in the Swedish city of Västerås, and by issuing a call for participation that was distributed mainly through the internet and e-mail. The call resulted in a steady influx of registrations to our website and by the time of the deadline on June 30 2001, 78 people had signed up, of which 18 went on to post essays to our website. The election process commenced after the website was closed for submission in the end of August the same year. In the first selection round, internet users elected seven finalists in an online poll, and representatives from SOC.Stockholm completed the round by choosing three essays for the final among the remaining entries.

In December 2001 an expert jury began the work to select one winner from the ten finalists. The members of the jury were Rebecka Lettevall (PhD History of Ideas, Teacher at Södertörns college), Edward Soja (Professor, Urban Planning Department at UCLA), Sverker Sörlin (Professor, Environmental Sciences and Ideas at Umeå University), Bo Södersten (Professor, Economics at Jönköping International Business School) and one representative from SOC.Stockholm.[1] The winner, T.R.O.Y., was announced at *The Utopian W.C. 2001 Gala* at Gallery Enkehuset in Stockholm on January 19, 2002.

During the following years we presented the project in many different contexts. We took part in exhibitions and events in Stockholm, Reykjavik, Dublin, Helsinki, Riga, Toronto, Melbourne and Göteborg, and held a number of lectures about the project. We travelled to Australia to interview visionaries, academics, artists and activists and visited an intentional community in Findhorn, Scotland. We sent the first edition of the winning essay to Heads of State all over the world and delivered the document to Iceland's President in person.

─────────

1   Please note that the biographical information describing each jury member's profession and title has not been updated since the first edition of the document for the 2001 championship.

The second championship was launched in September 2002 at Kulturhuset (the House of Culture) in Stockholm as a part of the exhibition *The Public Opinion,* and was further promoted in other exhibitions, for example at Gallery Hlemmur in Reykjavik (2003) and Temple Bar Gallery & Studios in Dublin (2004). 153 people signed up for participation this time and 23 of them posted complete essays on the deadline April 30, 2004.

This time we invited four people to form a reference group, together with three members from SOC. Stockholm and the first champion, with the task to elect five finalists, which was accomplished by mid-October the same year. Two expert jurors; Tom Moylan (Professor of Contemporary Writing in English and Director of the Ralahine Centre for Utopian Studies at the University of Limerick), and Dr. Lyn Carson, (Senior Lecturer in Applied Politics at the University of Sydney)[2], evaluated the five finalists' essays and cast a vote each for their favourites. The reference group's favourite received a third vote. Cyril Belshaw was declared winner with two out of three votes with Per Norbäck as the runner up.

Mr. Belshaw was announced champion on a gala night at Färgfabriken in Stockholm on April 2, 2005, and travelled from Canada to receive his prize.

Notes on Redistribution

The contents of this book are copyright protected worldwide. If you want to copy and/or redistribute the book for commercial purposes you must obtain a written permission from the organisers or the author(s). You are however permitted to copy and redistribute the book for educational and non-commercial purposes and we encourage you to redistribute it to organizations and people who you believe would find it interesting. Please contact us beforehand to ask for permission if you are not sure whether your intentions to use the document fit with the above description. We also highly appreciate if you send us an e-mail to inform us on how you have used the document. You can contact us at jon@brunberg.se. This book can also be downloaded from our website.

---

2   Please note that the biographical information describing each jury member's profession and title has not been updated since the first edition of the document for the 2004 championship.