

Glenn Paige: The man who stole my friend.

Jim Dator
Hawaii Research Center for Futures Studies
Department of Political Science
University of Hawaii at Manoa, Honolulu
<dator@hawaii.edu>
<www.futures.hawaii.edu.

Glenn Paige, the Futurist.

Glenn Paige is one of a handful of people to whom I owe the deepest debts of gratitude for helping me see the world and my role in it from a perspective uniquely their own. First of all, Glenn has always been an inspiration as a futurist. When I arrived at the University of Hawaii in 1969, Glenn had already been appointed as the conference program chairman of the Advisory Committee for the Hawaii Governor's Conference on the Year 2000. Knowing that I had come to Hawaii primarily to teach futures studies (and Japanese politics) in the Political Science Department, where Glenn also taught, he immediately involved me in the work of that Committee.

That was no trivial thing. The Hawaii 2000 activities that Glenn spearheaded along with George Chaplin, Editor in Chief of the Honolulu *Advertiser*, were the first and still the best efforts towards what Alvin Toffler called "Anticipatory Democracy" that the world has ever seen. Certainly no locally-based, citizen-driven, futures-focused activity has involved more people, in all walks of life, all ages, ethnicities, classes, interests, and localities than Hawaii 2000. Being a part of that process gave me a chance that few scholars have--of testing out my ideas in the crucible of real experience; of engaging large numbers of people with many different perspectives in an exercise of imagining and inventing their own future. That experience of praxis profoundly shaped my understanding of "futures studies", helping me understand that it must stand on three legs of professional futurists, governmental and economic decision-makers, and futures-oriented citizens.

Unfortunately, too much of futures studies still teeters precariously on only two legs. It has become an insider's game between futurists and decision-makers--especially since big business has come to understand the great value of proprietary futures research--and so "the future" has been increasingly captured and colonized by special interests, against the commonweal. Although a great deal of talk and false starts have occurred, and in spite of a current flurry of interest in governmental foresight, for the most part Toffler's vision of Anticipatory Democracy has not been realized anywhere in the world. The Hawaii experience, conceived and animated by Glenn Paige, still remains the model that others should study, update and follow [George Chaplin and Glenn Paige, eds., *Hawaii 2000: Continuing experiment in Anticipatory Democracy*. University Press of Hawaii, 1973].

One of the many consequences of the Hawaii 2000 activities was the creation by the Hawaii State Legislature in 1971 of the Hawaii Research Center for Futures Studies at the University of Hawaii. I was appointed director of that Center by the governor who had been responsible for the original Hawaii 2000 activities, John Burns, and have remained as director ever since. That platform proved to be enormously useful to me in doing futures research in Hawaii, the Pacific region, and eventually worldwide, especially when the Center hosted the Secretariat of the World Futures Studies Federation during the 1980s, and I became Secretary General and eventually President of the WFSF. That enabled me to travel to a large number of nations in every part of the world and to see what the futures look like from many different cultures.

For all of that, I can only thank Glenn Paige a thousand thousand times.

Glenn Paige, the student of political leadership.

Glenn Paige was also one of the early founders of the study of political leadership. He taught classes about leadership at the University of Hawaii, and also chaired several panel discussions on leadership at world conferences of the World Futures Studies Federation. But I must admit that this was one area where Glenn and I disagreed. In part because I was enthralled by anticipatory democracy and the possibilities of electronic direct democracy, and mainly because I felt that many--if not most--political and economic leaders suffered from pathologies of power, I was quite skeptical. Of course, it was Glenn's intention to create leaders without those pathologies, but I tended to feel it was inherent in the job as currently structured, whether governments be so-called "democratic" or "totalitarian".

Glenn's major contribution to this field is his book, *The Scientific Study of Political Leadership*, published in 1977 by The Free Press, an excellent scholarly publishing company of the time. In it he showed that while most political scientists consider leaders and leadership to be foundational to their field, and there are a few hoary works such as the writings of Machiavelli that everyone refers to, there were very few serious studies of leadership. It was his intention to correct that by laying out the basic questions that need to be addressed in the new specialty of political leadership. While his scholarship was meticulous, quoting and analyzing everyone remotely concerned with the issue, and while he presented tables and matrices containing different styles and other aspects of leadership, I do not believe that he ever problematized the concept of "leadership" *per se*. He seemed to assume the necessity of leaders and leadership as a given, wanting only to advance the scientific study of it, while clearly also desiring to make leaders both more effective and more humane. He did not seriously imagine governments without leaders as far as I can ascertain.

But he soon did something even more daring: imagine governments without killing.

Glenn Paige, the inventor and activist of nonkilling governance.

It is as a visionary inventor and dogged activist for a nonkilling world that Glenn is without peer--though he has also inspired generations of young scholars and activists to pick up the challenge and carry it forward. As anyone reading this volume knows, Paige

defines a “nonkilling society” as “a human community, smallest to largest, local to global, in which there is no killing of humans, and no threats to kill; no weapons designed to kill humans and no justifications for using them; and no conditions of society that depend for maintenance or change upon the threat or use of lethal force. There is neither killing of humans nor threats to kill.” He goes on to make clear that “This does not imply that such a society is conflict-free, but only that its structure and processes do not depend upon killing.”

For many years, I have taught undergraduate and graduate courses on political design--imagining and creating new forms of governance. When I first began my graduate political design courses, I was obsessed with two "complaints" that I had against governments. The first is that all governments are fundamentally undemocratic, thwarting participation of some, while favoring other, groups and individuals. All governments also are unfuturistic, severely discounting the needs and wants of future generations while favoring some people and groups in the present. As soon as I encountered Paige's dream of a nonkilling society, I immediately added a third complaint to the other two: all governments are murderous, both using and causing killing as legitimate in the exercise of their power. Over the years, I have added three other complaints: that all governments are bureaucratic, placing the convenience of the governors over the needs of the governed; that they too nationalistic, privileging the nation-state over both smaller and larger units; and that they are patriarchal, insisting on a gender dichotomy that privileges men and violent masculinity, while marginalizing or oppressing other preferences. The goal of the class, therefore, is to invent and design systems that overcome these six complaints as well as other undesirable features of particular concern to the students.

This is an enormously difficult task. Very few graduate students in the humanities and social sciences have been taught to think of themselves as, and have learned to become, social inventors. And yet that is what futurists should be. Futures studies is modeled to some extent on architecture. Architects are trained to envision things that do not exist in the present, and to bring them successfully and sustainably into existence. Similarly, futurists imagine preferred human behavior, and the institutions that will facilitate it, and so should be able to build, test, simulate, improve and eventually implement new social institutions. I am in a department of political science. All structures of government are based on technologies and cosmologies over two hundred years old. There is no more obsolete and dysfunctional social institution than government. Commerce, communications, transportation, religion, education, even the family are structurally and functionally vastly different from what they were 200 years ago. But all current institutions of governance--even the newest--still are based on the assumptions and processes of the first modern government, that of the United States, as created by the "Constitution" of 1789.

When given a chance to create a new government (and there have been many such opportunities--the reconstruction of Germany and Japan and the breakdown of colonial empires and the creation of new nations after the second world war; the creation and then dissolution of communist nations at the end of the 1980s; the creation of a European Union now; and many more), we simply modify to some extent the form of the original

US constitution while keeping its foundational Newtonian cosmologies and technologies intact.

I want my students to do better. I urge them to rely on new or renewed cosmologies and technologies to envision, test, and create new forms of government that are not undemocratic, bureaucratic, patriarchal, unfuturistic, murderous, and dependent on the nation-state system. I can assure you this is not easy. Try it yourself, please.

Students struggle with all six complaints, but none is more challenging to most of them than is the idea that it is possible to establish a successfully functioning system of governance that is not somehow fundamentally based upon the right to kill. This is by far the most difficult complaint for them to even imagine, much less to incorporate fully and successfully in their design. Regardless of where in the world they have been born, raised, and educated, by the time I see them they have been convinced that killing is necessary. Most don't like it (though a few do see killing as ennobling), but none come ready to agree that a nonkilling world is possible.

In order to help them consider the possibility of nonkilling governance, I rely entirely on the work of Glenn Paige and his colleagues. Sometimes, I start out by asking students to discuss the following issues in small groups:

- 1a. List five reasons why (or conditions under which) a world without war is possible.
- 1b. List five reasons why (or conditions under which) a world without war is impossible.

We then discuss the reasons the students offered. Generally their reasons why nonkilling is impossible are more nuanced than their reasons why it is possible. Then I ask the same small groups to discuss the following:

- 3a1. How many people have you killed so far in your life?
- 3a2. How many people have you tried to kill but were unsuccessful?
Why were you unsuccessful?
- 3b1. How many people have tried to kill you?
- 3b2. Why were they unsuccessful?

So far, no one has admitted to having killed or tried to kill anyone, and very few say their own life has been threatened--unless they were in the military or some military-like position. That is, with very few exceptions, they are likely to have had their life threatened only if they threatened the lives of others.

I then tell my students of my experience of having never killed or had my life threatened (I have never been in the military), and that in spite of having gone to or lived in many very "dangerous" parts of the world (such as Southwest Washington DC in the 1950s and

to the USSR and North Korea during the worst days of the Cold War), I have always found people helpful, and not harmful, since I did not present myself as a threat to them.

At this point, I refer to Paige's work where she points out that we need to know why most people do not kill and never seriously try to kill, while others do kill. We need to see that killing is in fact rare, and caused, and not widespread and inevitable. We need to see that much killing is done only because it is valued and institutionalized as an essential activity of all governments, but that nonkilling governance is possible. But how can we create a transition between our present killing-accepting world to a world that does not accept killing of humans under any circumstances?

First and foremost, we need to believe that a nonkilling society is desirable and then that it is possible. We must start with that vision. If we do not really believe a nonkilling society is desirable and possible, then it is not possible. But if we will but believe it is possible, then it can be achieved by engaging in the other activities that Paige says are necessary. It is a question of vision, faith, commitment, and then a lot of hard work.

In order to get students willing to believe that the "impossible" world of nonkilling is in fact possible, I again may divide the class into different small groups. I give each group a card that has one of the following statements on it. They are to discuss their answers to the questions:

Is slavery justified? Is it OK for a person to own another person, and for people to be bought and sold in the market place?

Why do you feel that way?

Are women inferior to men? Are men rational, but women not rational, so that men should rule over women?

Why do you feel that way?

Are black people inferior to white people? Should only white people, and not black people, be given the right to vote in a democracy?

Why do you feel that way?

Are Asians inferior to Europeans? Should Europeans rule all Asian countries?

Why do you feel that way?

My point of course, which I emphasize after the small group interaction, is that once upon a time, and often for many thousands of years, all of these questions were answered in the affirmative. Slavery was considered natural, inevitable, good, and in accordance with God's will. God created women, blacks, and Asians as inferior to white men. Now, those views are no longer accepted as correct, and there are national and international laws against them. Although there may still be practices of slavery and gender/ethnic discrimination, they are no longer legitimate and praised as they once were.

If these once-inevitable, long-standing practices can be made illegal and rare, then so also can and should killing by governments be imagined as wrong, and made illegitimate.

Fortunately, even today, there are governments without armies and some without armed police. Unfortunately, all of them ultimately rely on the threat or use of killing force from some other source to come to their aid if necessary. Nonetheless, it is a first step.

I then briefly review Paige's five "revolutionary steps": 1. Believe it is possible and good to have nonkilling governance. 2. Gather empirical evidence of nonkilling. 3. Develop and test scientific theories about the causes of killing--what are the biological, cultural, linguistic, and institutional factors underlying killing and nonkilling? 4. Imagine and create institutions fostering nonkilling (this is very important: structure matters. We cannot rely on good intentions and "changed minds" only. Unless there are institutions encouraging nonkilling and thwarting killing, a nonkilling society cannot be sustained). 5. But obviously education is necessary. At least as much effort and money needs to be put into education for nonkilling as is put into killing now.

I should mention in passing that these five steps are very similar to the steps Paige laid out earlier as paths towards the scientific understanding of political leadership, again demonstrating the logical, thorough, fact-and-vision-based way in which Glenn thinks, writes, and acts.

There are often people in the class who will say, What about abortion? What about euthanasia? What about suicide? As important as those issues are, I have learned that discussion of them will prevent consideration of the fundamental issue and thus should be postponed until a later time. Focus only on killing by governments.

Since my students need to solve six complaints and base their governance designs on new cosmologies and technologies, we cannot go as deeply into nonkilling as we should. By no means do all students at the end of the class agree nonkilling governance is possible. But some do--many more than if Glenn Paige had never done his pioneering envisioning, writing, and activism.

And so a nonkilling world gets closer and closer.

Glenn Paige, the thief.

There is one final story I need to tell. Shortly after coming to Hawaii, I became friends with Glenda Saito—an intelligent, caring, vivacious person. She was one of a group of University of Hawaii students who met and talked about politics and the futures with the passion and optimism that was possible in the so-called "60s". One day, she told us she had fallen in love with a person she called "Joe." I was crestfallen. I knew what was going to happen next. As the old song goes, "Wedding Bells Are Breaking Up That Old Gang of Mine". Glenda was an important part of our "old gang", and now this person named "Joe" showed up, and we would seldom see her again. Glenda even told us that we knew "Joe" very well, but she would not tell us his real name.

A few days later, I left for a trip to Europe—to Bucharest, Romania, and a conference of the World Futures Studies Federation there. Bucharest was an interesting place to visit in 1972, and long way from Honolulu. The opening session was held in an old and

extremely ornate building in Bucharest the night I arrived from Honolulu, groggy and jet-lagged. As I was mounting the stairs and about to enter the room where the reception was being held, over the threshold from the reception area came a couple. At first I could not see who they were, and then I could not believe my eyes. Was I hallucinating? There, beaming down at me were Glenda and Glenn Paige, arm in arm and radiant. Glenda and "Joe".

I am not exactly sure what lesson I learned from that, but it should be pretty clear from what I have written that Glenn has always been well ahead of me in every aspect of love and life, while I have followed belatedly--but nonetheless followed--in his path.