

Anticipatory Democracy Revisited

Clement Bezold

Ph.D.

Institute for Alternative Futures (IAF)

Introduction

This paper “revisits” anticipatory democracy. The original use of the term was by Alvin Toffler, as his prescription for “future shock”, in his book by that title in the early 1970s. Toffler asked me to edit a volume of cases in the mid 1970’s, published as the book, Anticipatory Democracy: People in the Politics of the Future. I’ll reflect on some of the key sections of that book of 30 years ago. In this paper I’ll also “revisit” anticipatory democracy in light of a global scan of cyber democracy that I and my colleagues at the Institute for Alternative Futures conducted in 2000 and 2001, as well as current developments “transforming governments” at the state level in the U.S. Finally, I’ll give my sense of options in 2006.

This paper is being prepared for the Finnish Parliament’s celebration, in 2006, of the 100 year anniversary of being the first nation to give women the right to vote.

This is only a partial review. Anticipatory democracy involves a wide range of developments in futures and foresight, as well as in participation in government, particularly participation by the public. The book, Anticipatory Democracy: People in the Politics of the Future, is a major catalogue of activities in the 1970s. The global scan of developments in “Cyber Democracy”, more than 20 years later identify some trends, that support our conclusions in the 1970s, particularly how communications and internet enhancements to voting, other public participation, and to what government does. The third section provides reviews from 2006 of futures commissions, a core part of anticipatory democracy that we considered in 1978. These reviews focus on activities in U.S. states and communities generally including futures commissions in state court systems. These reviews were part of an exploration of “transformational initiatives” for state government in the US. Finally I will provide conclusions about directions for anticipatory democracy.

Anticipatory democracy – 1970’s

In the 1970’s, in the course of working with Alvin Toffler in encouraging foresight and greater public participation, Toffler asked me to edit a book that reviewed the various experiments in looking ahead and involving the public. The result was *Anticipatory Democracy: People in the Politics of the Future*.¹

¹ Clement Bezold, ed., *Anticipatory Democracy: People in the Politics of the Future*, (New York: Random House, 1970)

Anticipatory Democracy had been Toffler's prescription at the end of his best seller, *Future Shock*. In the Introduction to *Anticipatory Democracy*, Toffler wrote that:

“The simplest definition of anticipatory democracy (or A/D) is that it is a process for combining citizen participation with future consciousness.”

Toffler argued that representative government was the key political technology of the industrial era and that new forms must be invented in the face of the crushing decisional overload, or political future shock, that we faced.²

The book reviewed cases and arguments covering a wide set of areas for developments that marry greater future consciousness and greater participation.

I'll focus on a few of these, both because of the subsequent roles of their authors, and because of their significance for this revisiting of anticipatory democracy.

An Overview of Anticipatory Democracy Experiments

David Baker reviewed 15 of the leading experiments at the local, state and national level in the US in the 1960s and 1970s. These had multiple motivations. Some were explicitly focused on developing goals, some on growth or environmental issues, some on more general explorations of the future. Baker's review lead him to provide several key insights about their design: obtain adequate funding (\$100,000USD per year in the mid 1970s – or about \$360,000USD in 2005 dollars); face political realities; decide on the major research/goals topics early; build ties with the bureaucracy; design and implement a process that involves policy makers from the start; and present findings early and throughout the life of the process.³

There were specific case studies, a few of which retain transcendent significance. One is Newt Gingrich's article on Jimmy Carter's Goals for Georgia Program. Carter had been elected Governor of Georgia in 1970 and had created a public goals program. Gingrich was a professor of history and colleague of Toffler. Carter went on to be elected US President in 1976. Gingrich was elected to the US Congress in 1978 and went on to rebuild the Republican Party in the House of Representatives, becoming the Speaker of the House in 1995 – the first in 40 years. Both Carter and Gingrich were significant for foresight - more below.

In setting up Goals for Georgia, Carter had argued that in a democracy, no government can be stronger, or wiser, or more just than its people.⁴ Gingrich, in his review of the Goals for Georgia program, made several observations:

- One of the primary benefits of Goals for Georgia was the opportunity for community leaders to learn from each other
- It set the stage for the state government reorganization effort, by making bureaucrats and citizens more aware of current problems

² Ibid, Introduction by Alvin Toffler, pp. xii and xvii

³ David Baker, “State, Regional, and Local Experiments in Anticipatory Democracy: An Overview”, in Bezold, op. cit., p. 30–33

⁴ Newt Gingrich, “The Goals for Georgia Program” in Bezold op. cit p. 38

- Goals for Georgia did not explore a range of alternatives, nor did it have systematic public involvement, beyond the leaders, in building commitments as bases for future programs
- Georgia's personality, scandal, and trivia focused news reporting that make anticipatory programs difficult. "To be effective, anticipatory democracy must rely on thematic dialogues over time in order to enable the individual citizen to understand the problems, and respond by helping to develop serious alternatives." This is made more difficult by Georgia's traditionalistic political culture and by the need for sustained support by the governor to make such an effort permanent.
- The low level of citizen activism (in Georgia) is likely to make any Goals program dependent on the life of the incumbent administration. And without a network of supporters within government, goals programs would not be sustained.

This last point is important for anticipatory democracy – namely these future focused programs need popular support and the support of top leadership. When the top leader leaves, his or her successor can and often does ignore the effort. Alternatives for Washington showed that deep, significant involvement of the public (both active citizens and the general public) can create a base of support that transcends specific administrations.

In the 1960's and 1970's programs were held focusing on the year 2000. Hawaii 2000, is an example, which included leadership from the Governor and the Editor of the Honolulu's major newspaper, and University of Hawaii political scientist Glenn Paige. This had a major impact at the time and in setting up the state's plan. Unlike Alternatives for Washington, there was not as much friction in changing administrations. Yet Hawaii 2000 shows that the shelf life of a futures program is not likely to extend for multiple decades. In 2005 the state has begun a renewed effort Hawaii 2050, focusing on sustainability.⁵

Goals for Dallas

Many American cities have used goals programs to focus their community. Goals for Dallas was a prime example. Robert Bradley's review summarized it as:

- An effective leadership device, broadly framed in the range of goals it pursued.
- It catalogued aspirations and dreams of many within the Dallas community.
- It gave the city tools for anticipation and a structure that increases the leadership's sensitivity.
- But it was imperfect in that participation was focused primarily on the well off sectors of the community, and it failed to consider a range of futures and goals directly related to the lowest economic sectors of the city.⁶

⁵ for Hawaii 2050 see <<http://www.state.hi.us/auditor/Reports/2005/2050%20report.pdf>> and <http://64.233.161.104/search?q=cache:QsHk7DXIkD8J:www.futures.hawaii.edu/dator/hawaii/greenintro.html+%22Hawaii+2000%22+edited+by+George+Chaplin+and+Glenn+Paige&hl=en&gl=us&ct=clnk&cd=2>

⁶ Robert Bradley, "Goals for Dallas", in Bezold, Anticipatory Democracy, p. 87.

Alternatives for Washington

Alternatives for Washington remains one of the finest anticipatory democracy programs in the US. Governor Dan Evans initiated the program in 1974 stating that:

“Our future need be imposed neither by the personal interests of an elite nor the impersonal force of history. It can be determined by all of the people of the state if they are willing to... devote the effort to the task... I believe the citizens of this state can, in an orderly and rational manner, determine their future and assure such as privilege will also be available to generations yet to come.”⁷

Alternatives for Washington proved to be a unique combination of leadership, novel involvement processes, media involvement, and advanced facilitation. John Osman of the Brookings Institution was the lead facilitator. Governor Evans was the originator and leader of the process. Over 60,000 people in the state took part in the focus groups, surveys, or local meetings. The print and broadcast media in the state cooperated in distributing educational material and surveys. The public generated 11 alternative futures. Citizens voted on their preferences. This led to a set of policy preferences. The Governor then asked the public to take up the more difficult question of budget priorities. Tens of thousands of citizens gave their preferences for budget priorities.

The article in *Anticipatory Democracy* does not fully cover the second round of the program that took place in 1977. I was a visiting scholar at Brookings during the time Alternatives for Washington was going on. John Osman once commented that Governor Evans complained that the project had led to a different type of citizen activism. Typically most issue groups focused on their own issues, after their experience with Alternatives for Washington, groups were taking positions across the policy and budget spectrum. One criticism of AFW was the lack of engagement of state legislators in the process – leading to a lack of responsiveness to the Governor’s proposal of AFW based goals after the first round of the process. This was made more difficult when the next Governor, Dixie Lee Ray, essentially told her administration to ignore AFW.

Yet the AFW remains one of the most significant programs in terms of impact because of the depth of its involvement in the state, the range of alternatives it considered, and the focus on both policy and budget priorities. Five years after AFW ended the National Conference of State Legislatures asked me to put on a panel on goals and futures programs. I recruited a state legislator from Washington State. She went to the state budget office and asked for a tally of how many of the AFW recommendations had been put in place five years after the program ended. It was about 80%, in spite of the lack of active engagement of the legislature at the time and in the face of hostility from the next Governor. There had been enough increase in citizen and issue group understanding to get the proposals passed.

The significance of AFW was brought home to me when, in 2000 and 2001, we did the *Cyber Democracy Global Scan* summarized below.

⁷ Governor Dan Evans quoted in “Alternatives for Washington”, by Robert L. Stilger, in Bezold, *op. cit.*, p. 88

Legislative Foresight

A core part of representative democracies are legislatures. The most consistent participation citizens have available to them is electing their representatives. Legislatures then develop policies reflective of constituents' interests – at least theoretically. Anticipatory democracy includes not only the public goals and futures programs but greater “foresight” in legislatures as well. As described in the Anticipatory Democracy, there were significant discussions of foresight in the US Congress in the 1970s. I defined foresight at the time as “the systematic looking ahead”.⁸ The key functions of foresight in Congress⁹ included:

1. to improve early warning of issues, problems and opportunities that might become the subject of legislation;
2. to develop a greater awareness of the future in drafting and preparing legislation, including the preparation of forecasts of the primary or intended as well as the secondary or side impacts of legislation. These are known as impact forecasts;
3. to encourage the conscious coordination of policies across committees by identifying the cross impacts of legislation and setting priorities through the budget process and other mechanisms for establishing coordinated national policy;
4. to support oversight activities of Congress and committees.¹⁰

There were also important commissions focused on the operation of Congress, both for the House and the Senate. Each included recommendations encouraging foresight. In 1974 The House Select Committee on Committees recommended that each standing committee... shall on a continuing basis undertake futures research and forecasting on matters within the jurisdiction of that committee.¹¹ The House the Senate for There had been a series of activities working to promote foresight in Congress in the 1970s and early 1980s. These included the introduction of a bill by then Congressmen Al Gore and Newt Gingrich in 1983 to provide for the continuous assessment of critical trends and alternative futures.

Congress had established the Office of Technology Assessment to provide some of this analysis on major current or emerging technologies.

In Congress, legislative foresight and interest in futures generally was aided by a major day-long seminar in 1975 on “Outsmarting Crisis: Futures Thinking in Congress”, developed by the Committee for Anticipatory Democracy (particularly by Alvin Toffler and I) at the request of Sen. John Culver, Rep. Charlie Rose, and former representative John Heinz. This in turn led to the formation of the Congressional Clearinghouse on the Future¹².

⁸ Clement Bezold and William Renfro, “Citizens and Legislative Foresight”, Anticipatory Democracy, p. 116

⁹ Clement Bezold, Strategic Policy Assessment and Congressional Reform: The Future in Committee, Ph.D. Dissertation (Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1976)

¹⁰ Bezold, Anticipatory Democracy., p. 124

¹¹ Ironically that provision remains in the House Rules: see Charles W. Johnson 2000, How Our Laws are Made: Section VIII. <http://thomas.loc.gov/home/holam.txt>

¹² Congressman Charlie Rose, “Building a Futures Network in Congress”, in Bezold op. cit., pp. 105-113

Foresight in Congress circa 2006

Viewed from the distance of 3 decades, unfortunately foresight in Congress has declined. Part of this is the impact of increased partisan hostility. In the House of Representatives in particular hostility between the Republicans and Democrats has grown over the last 20 years. Greater foresight requires being able to deal with and explore the uncertainty of multiple alternative futures. A culture that does not respect fellow legislators is also not likely to tolerate uncertainty in statements about the future, or will see disagreements over interpretation of the future in a consistently partisan manner.

The Republican takeover of Congress brought with it the demise of Congress' OTA – Office of Technology Assessment, and the increase in partisanship and hostility, the Government Accountability Office (GAO), an arm of Congress has added foresight to its conscious focus. David Walker, the Comptroller General of GAO, who has made it clear that GAO's job is to support oversight, insight and foresight in the federal government.¹³ As part of its foresight work GAO provides a foresight report on major challenges of early 21st Century.¹⁴

Other Developments in Foresight

Beyond Congress, other parts of government continue to use futures approaches to enhance foresight. At the state level in the U.S., the Council of State Governments provides trend reports to the states.¹⁵ Likewise the National Center for State Courts¹⁶ as well as individual states provide trend reports (see the discussion below). In 2006, IAF and the Foresight and Governance Project at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars will restart the foresight database focused on the US now on WWICS website.¹⁷

Beyond the US there is more consistent and visible foresight work going on in Europe, particularly the UK, and in various parts of Asia. The EU is supporting a European Foresight Monitoring Network.¹⁸

Cyber Democracy

In 2001 IAF's for-profit subsidiary, Alternative Futures Associates responded to a request from Vivendi Universal Prospective, the futures think tank at the time, of the communications and entertainment company, then headed by Jean Marie Messier. They had requested six major futures reports on related topics. Ester Dyson did a report on the global digital divide. AFA's full

¹³ David Walker, "Doing What's Right", <http://www.gao.gov/cghome/uvaspeech.pdf>, accessed April 10, 2006

¹⁴ 21st Century Challenges: Reexamining the Base of the Federal Government <http://www.gao.gov/21stcentury.html>

¹⁵ see for example, Council of State Government, Trends in America: Charting the Course Ahead, June 2005, <http://www.csg.org/nr/csg/images/TrendsInAmericaFinal.pdf>

¹⁶ National Center for State Courts, Future Trends in State Courts, 2005, http://www.ncsconline.org/D_KIS/Trends/index.html

¹⁷ http://www.wilsoncenter.org/index.cfm?fuseaction=topics.home&topic_id=1414

¹⁸ European Foresight Monitoring Network, <http://www.efmn.info/>

report was presented and is available for review from the website.¹⁹ These developments are significant for their impact on Anticipatory Democracy.

Cyber Democracy involves the use of information and communications technologies to support governance. Cyber Democracy is a collection of new processes and old habits, of aspirations and fears, of specific detailed improvements in government services and enhancements in human evolution, of tremendous promise and terrible risk. Cyber Democracy focuses on the information and communication mediated aspects of democracy. In terms of Anticipatory Democracy, these advances can allow new or enhanced forms of consciousness, learning and participation. In democracies, we, as voters, get back what we invest in the process. Yet most democracies do little to train us on how to be citizens, particularly on how to develop shared aspirations and visions that could steer our polity or help us anticipate events. Cyber developments – through the internet and increasing artificial intelligence can also allow more rapid and pervasive manipulation and invasions of privacy.

The results of our global survey led us to two conclusions on the status of Cyber Democracy:

Initial experiments: Around the globe, but particularly in the most “connected” regions of the world, there are truly significant experiments in government administration. The experiments involve voting, political participation, providing the infrastructure for participation, and developing new forms of agenda setting. This report reviews leading examples of these critical developments.

Emergent possibilities: Current experiments only hint at the potential. There is a promising opportunity to invent and put in place new approaches that enhance the key values of democracy, particularly: freedom, equality, stability, majority rule with protection of minority viewpoints, participation, shared vision, and anticipation. In addition, the interactive nature of technology could enhance collective intelligence for shaping policy and implementing change.

Cyber Democracy includes at least five activities:

- **Cyber Administration** – Or E-government. The use of the Internet and other information and communications technology (ICT) to enhance government services. The Internet is helping to expedite a wide range of such services.
- **Cyber Voting** – Internet voting for candidates as well as for policies via initiatives and referenda.
- **Cyber Participation** – ICT-enhanced citizen interaction and input on policy issues or policy development apart from voting. This would include petitioning legislatures, electronic town meetings²⁰, enhanced polling and internet mediated policy dialogues.
- **Cyber Infrastructure** – In addition to connectivity, more specific cyber tools used to enhance participation, deliberation, and community building. These tools in-

¹⁹ Cyber Democracy 2001: A Global Scan For Vivendi Universal Prospective by Alternative Futures Associates available at <http://www.altfutures.com/docs/Cyber%20Democracy%202001%20-%20A%20Global%20Scan.pdf>

²⁰ see the latest summary from America Speaks:

http://www.americaspeaks.org/resources/library/as/about/as_program_report_0406.pdf

clude groupware and online community development tools, games and simulations, as well as polling and surveys.

- **Cyber Agenda-Setting** – The use of the Internet and other ICTs to enhance or redirect the political or policy agenda by established groups such as political parties and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and through emergent phenomena, particularly “swarm activism.”

The Promise of Cyber Democracy. More than half the US population and three-quarters of European citizens surveyed believe information technology will spark a renewal of democracy and civil society.

The Dark Side of Cyber Democracy. With the enhanced connectivity made possible by ICTs, come potential privacy violations by “big brother” governments, corporations, or terrorists; employment discrimination; loss of civic rituals and community; isolation into one’s own political community.

Anticipatory Democracy in the Context of Government Transformation

Another source of input on this tour of Anticipatory Democracy Revisited are the inputs to a project on the future of state government in the US: The Council of State Governments (CSG) States Transformation Initiatives: 2006-2010. In the U.S., CSG is a representative of all three branches (executive, legislative, and judiciary) at the state level. The Project is seeking to identify and promote the most important changes in government. CSG developed a list of models, approaches and best practices that its Transformational Project should consider – the list is below:

Models/Approaches

- Redesigning Government of Tomorrow – Anticipatory democracy/Futures commissions
- Budgeting for Outcome – Price of Government
- Legislating for Results – Performance measurement
- Managing for Results – Quality management
- Long-Range Forecasts – Legislative agenda
- Performance Budgeting – Vision/foresight-oriented
- Governing by Network – Public-private partnerships
- Charter Agencies – Reorganization, flexibility/efficiency
- Reexamining Leadership – Driving government performance

While each of these has aspects that are relevant to this article on Anticipatory Democracy Revisited, the ones that are most relevant are the ones that deal with Redesigning Government of Tomorrow, Long-range forecasts – Legislative Agenda and the Performance Budgeting – Vision/foresight-oriented.

In assessing the first topic, I developed an overview of futures programs, based on my observations for the 1970s on. The discussion in the first section of this paper above, from the book *Anticipatory Democracy*, provides my base for observing three decades of developments in this

area. For the CSG Project, the National Center for State Courts reviewed the history of futures commissions and related efforts in state courts. Since the 1990s over 30 state court systems in the US, have had some type of futures effort. Most of those states used the assistance or training material on scenarios and visioning developed by a team that I led from the Hawaii Research Center for Future Studies, the National Center for State Courts and the Institute for Alternative Futures.²¹ Below I summarize key lessons from futures commissions for local communities and state governments in the U.S., the National Center for State Courts summarizes the lessons from the judicial futures efforts.

Anticipatory Democracy/Futures Commissions

A summary of a model/approach for the Council on State Governments' session on 21st Century Transformational Initiatives (STI) effort March 4, 2006
By Clem Bezold, Institute for Alternative Futures

Futures commissions, and related efforts to look ahead, typically consider alternatives, develop shared visions, set goals, and set priorities. They can take many forms and can be statewide, focused on one branch, e.g. the judiciary (36 states have had these since the 1990s), or focused on the future of a specific topic.

They typically analyze current trends, develop forecasts and alternative scenarios. Many will develop a shared vision from which to generate audacious goals and strategies. Some link these to budget choices.

These efforts can be critical in giving government greater foresight, more conscious direction setting, and greater capacity to create positive change. They can also be less than effective and at times wasted endeavors.

They are most successful when they have strong leadership support (e.g. governor, chief justice), involve other key stakeholders, including the legislature and media, have public learning and public involvement components. The most active and those with the highest long term impact have included these factors. They also considered alternative choices in relation to goals and visions, and involved the public in choices or priorities related to the budget across multiple policy areas.

Different personality types, leadership styles, and personality preferences (e.g. MBTI types) affect how well leaders, stakeholders, and the public can support and take part in these efforts.

Like many government reform efforts, evaluation is seldom designed in from the beginning, and most futures commissions have not been systematically or comparatively evaluated for their long term impacts.

There are many emerging internet/web based tools for enhancing futures commissions and public participation generally.

²¹ Bezold, Clement, Wendy L. Schultz, Beatrice P. Monahan et al. Reinventing courts for the 21st century: designing a vision process: a guidebook to visioning and futures thinking within the court system (Williamsburg: NCSC, 1993). <http://contentdm.ncsconline.org/cgi-bin/showfile.exe?CISOROOT=/ctadmin&CISOPTR=15>

Futures commissions can stimulate imagination and creativity in considering options; track emerging trends and relate these trends to current policies; develop alternative scenarios; inform and involve the public and key stakeholders; and allow the public to link policy options and trends to priority setting for state policies and the budget.

These typically are one-shot activities. And their greatest weakness is their demise or lack of attention when a new governor or leader brings in a new administration.

There are efforts, such as in Kentucky, to make a foresight function more permanent, but in this case Kentucky is ahead of the rest of the country. And many of the functions mentioned above could be built into decision-making more consistently.

Bottom line: Futures commissions (using various names) can be important tools for Transforming Government. They require a significant commitment of resources for staff or consultants, participant travel, communicating with key stakeholders and the public, as well as attention and support from their sponsor, e.g. the governor and relevant leaders.

Judicial Futures Commissions

Summary of Model/Approach by National Center for State Courts for the March 4, 2006 Council of State Governments' session on 21st Century Transformational Initiative

Historically, state court systems have been reactive bodies. As the court administration discipline matured, state court judicial leaders recognized the need for courts to be more forward-thinking, to proactively address systemic problems, and to better position the courts to respond to change. In the late 1980s and early 1990s, judicial leaders for the state courts undertook an initiative to develop forward-looking visions and strategic plans.

The National Center for State Courts (NCSC) received a grant from the State Justice Institute (SJI) for a multi-faceted project. The grant supported the work of several state court futures commissions, national conferences [e.g., The Futures and the Courts Conference (May 1990)], development of a guide to strategic planning, development of a curriculum to assist courts in developing their capacities for conducting futures analysis and strategic planning, and a template for conducting environmental scans at the national level so as to support local, state, and national futures activities.²²

While state court leaders had flexibility to design their individual state futures/strategic planning effort to meet the individual needs and structure of the organization of their state courts, the basic phases of the approach were as follows.

²² NCSC continues to conduct annual environmental scans at the national level and publishes an annual trends document. The most recent edition, *Future Trends in State Courts 2005*, was published in November 2005. A copy of the publication is on the NCSC web site at www.ncsconline.org. Questions can also be directed to NCSC's Knowledge and Information Services at (800) 616-6164

- **Mission** – A mission statement was adopted as the overarching reference for all activities for the state court system and identified the formal and informal mandates with which the state court system was charged.
- **Vision** – An inspirational shared vision was established to encourage creativity and facilitate implementation of the strategic plan.
- **Futures Thinking** – The central element of futures/strategic planning was to extrapolate and express possible outcomes/futures based upon observed patterns of change over time. Futures analysis within state court systems served to identify the types of demands that courts face and to assess to potential and likely implications of those demands.
- **Strategy Formation** - A broad and creative range of options were considered to devise strategies that are supportable, implementable, and effective. Political considerations were also acknowledged and addressed as part of the planning process.
- **Implementation Planning** – Planning was required to ensure realization of strategies. Action steps for implementing the strategies and the resources needed to support the strategies were defined.
- **Managing Change** – Leadership was critical to maintain the momentum of the initiative, secure the needed resources to support the strategies, obtain buy-in from both internal and external stakeholders, and to take corrective actions as needed based on implementation experiences.
- **State Court Futures Reports** – Reports were issued documenting the recommendations coming out the futures/strategic planning effort. These reports are available through the NCSC’s web site at <http://www.ncsconline.org/WC/Publications/StateLinks/CtFutuStateLinks.htm>
The NCSC also issued a guide to strategic planning based on the experience of the Judicial Futures Commissions.²³ This publication can be found at http://www.ncsconline.org/WC/Publications/KIS_CtFutuCharting_a_Course.pdf.

The analysis of the futures reports identified recurring themes among the recommendations.

- Improving access to justice through multicultural improvements and user friendly forms and instructions for *pro se* litigants;
- Creating new and rehabilitative methods for solving problems and resolving disputes;
- Improving judicial performance through evaluations, education, and increased compensation incentives;
- Improving public trust and confidence in the legal system through increased knowledge and education;
- Modernization and integration of technology throughout the state courts;
- Structural consolidation of state court systems; and
- Improving family interventions in the juvenile and domestic relations courts.

While it is unclear how many futures commissions currently exist, initiatives to implement the recommendations referenced above are on-going across the country.

²³ *Charting a Course to Strategic Thought and Action*, by Kenneth G. Pankey, Jr. and Anne E. Skove with Jennifer R. Sheldon (2002)

Integral Futures: Values, Societal Evolution and Democracy

Anticipatory democracy is an aspiration supported by a set of trends in future tools, in societies and in government processes. Futures tools are broadening to include our deeper understanding and our values. Causal Layered Analysis, led by Sohail Inayatullah²⁴, and Integral Futures both provide richer tools. Likewise at the Institute for Alternative Futures we have been evolving “aspirational futures” approaches that help communities ensure that they are creating the future they really want.

An important and evolving concept for considering where and how anticipatory democracy might steer societies is integral futures or integral philosophy, with its related approach to spiral dynamics. Ken Wilber is most associated with Integral Philosophy²⁵ and Don Beck and Clare Graves with Spiral Dynamics. The basic argument is that societies mature and evolve, as individual humans do. There are a several levels of development. Ken Wilber notes that in the first tier there are 6 levels, “each of which believes that its value system is the only true, correct, or deeply worthwhile value system in existence. Those first-tier waves are, very briefly: **beige**: instinctual; **purple**: magical-animistic, tribal; **red**: egocentric, power, feudalistic; **blue**: mythic-membership, conformist, fundamentalist, ethnocentric, traditional; **orange**: excellence, achievement, progress, modern; **green**: postmodern, multicultural, sensitive, pluralistic... Those first-tier waves of development are followed by what Clare Graves called “the momentous leap of meaning” to **second tier**, which has, as of today, two major levels or waves of awareness: **yellow**: systemic, flexible, flowing; **turquoise**: cosmic unity, integrative, nested hierarchies of inter-relationships, one-in-many holism”²⁶ Laws for most societies are written at the highest average expectable level of development in their governance system.

This awareness of levels of development among within and across societies has been used in anticipatory democracy like programs in South Africa and other settings to increase the consciousness of participants and to develop strategies that more effectively accomplish shared goals.

Anticipatory democracy is a collection of tools and practices that bring more effective steering by the public. This integral viewpoint, using spiral dynamics points out that many individuals live within levels or memes that do not value those at other levels. Becoming conscious of these levels will be important for enhancing effective democracy.

Vision and Directions in Anticipatory Democracy

My view of the evolution of anticipatory democracy, and the advances and setbacks it has faced over 3 decades, reinforces the importance of developing shared vision. The more effectively efforts have developed shared vision, particularly across diverse communities, the more successful these efforts have been. Given the diversity of individuals – and the differing levels from which

²⁴ Sohail Inayatullah, editor, *The Causal Layered Analysis (CLA) Reader: Theory and Case Studies of an Integrative and Transformative Methodology*; Tapei, Tamkang University Press, December 2004. Available from February 9, 2005

²⁵ Ken Wilber, *A Theory of Everything: An Integral Vision for Business, Politics, Science and Spirituality*, Boston, Shambala, 2000.

²⁶ from Ken Wilber On line

<http://72.14.203.104/search?q=cache:pdptn4qZKZYJ:wilber.shambhala.com/html/misc/iraq.cfm+integral+politics+%26+Policy+ken+wilber&hl=en&gl=us&ct=clnk&cd=1>

they view their society, the task of developing shared vision is more challenging. Individuals at different levels may not accept, appreciate or recognize the legitimacy of those at different levels.

Yet it remains essential for to develop shared vision and to relate these to goals, priorities and tradeoffs. Alternatives for Washington did this in the 1970s and it had a transcendent impact on state policies. Goal setting in the context of values and vision are essential; as will be mechanisms for the public to provide input on budget priorities and tradeoffs. Budgeting for outcomes and other advances on the list above from the Council of State Governments project are providing better tools for doing this as well as experience that can move across jurisdictions.

Are there signs that evolution at the level of values and vision may be taking place that could give hope to a fulsome future for democracy. Yes. Society does “change its mind”. Societies changed their minds about slavery and women’s rights. The book in which this article sits celebrates the fact that Finland gave women the right to vote in 2006. This is one important step in equality for women. Currently there is a parallel trend toward equity and fairness at its early stages. As with slavery and women’s rights, statements of principles and vision statements precede change. In the area of “fairness” or “equity”, health is increasingly a place to observe this evolution. The World Health Organization’s, “health for all” vision, adopted by all nations of the world in the mid 1990s, includes the values of equity, solidarity, sustainability, ethics, gender and human rights is an example.²⁷ The US in complying with that vision set up our Healthy People 2010 Objectives for the nation with 2 overarching goals for this decade. The first overarching goal is longer years of healthy life; the second is “the elimination of health disparities”. And the US scientific body on health care, the Institute of Medicine, has developed a major report on quality – Crossing the Quality Chasm. Its six aims for health care include equity – that health care is equitable – the system should seek to close racial and ethnic gaps in health status.²⁸ The WHO Health For All vision, the Healthy People 2010 Goals, and the IOM report, are not significant for the outcomes they have generated thus far. They represent the early stages of society “changing its mind”. Just as there were major commitments to abolish slavery or give women rights that represented steps toward those ends. Anticipatory democracy will ultimately include the ability for societies (local, national, and global) to weigh and express their values and what they want for the world to be. While a slow process, this will, I believe, ultimately lead to a world with greater equity.

Conclusion

Anticipatory democracy is a collection of trends and is an aspiration in itself – genuine, enlightened participation with foresight. Its tools and applications grow and recede, in this case like a slowly rising tide. There are enormous challenges we face – from nature, our social and economic systems, and our fellow men. Our ability to anticipate specific events remains challenged, but our capacity to use futures tools to better understand the range of possibilities we face and to better choose and create the future we want are improving. The information and cyber revolutions will likewise enhance our learning and opportunities for participation even while threatening our privacy and security. Anticipatory democracy remains a needed advance for nations and for global governance.

²⁷ Health 21: The Health for All Policy Framework of the European Region of WHO:

<http://www.who.dk/document/health21/wa540ga199heeng.pdf>

²⁸ see Donald Berwick, A User’s Manual For The IOM’s ‘Quality Chasm’ Report, HEALTH AFFAIRS ~ Volume 21, Number 3, pp. 80–90; <http://content.healthaffairs.org/cgi/reprint/21/3/80.pdf>

Literature

Alternative Futures Associates (August 2001) *Cyber Democracy 2001: A Global Scan* for Vivendi Universal Prospective. Alternative Futures Associates, Alexandria, VA

<http://www.altfutures.com/docs/Cyber%20Democracy%202001%20-%20A%20Global%20Scan.pdf>

Berwick, Donald (1980) A User's Manual for the IOM's 'Quality Chasm' Report. *Health Affairs*. Vol. 21, No. 3, pp. 80-90. <http://content.healthaffairs.org/cgi/reprint/21/3/80.pdf>

Bezold, Clement, ed. (1970) *Anticipatory Democracy: People in the Politics of the Future*. Random House, New York.

Bezold, Clement (1976) *Strategic Policy Assessment and Congressional Reform: The Future in Committee* [Ph.D. Dissertation]. University Microfilms, Ann Arbor

Council of State Governments (June 2005) *Trends in America: Charting the Course Ahead*. Council of State Governments, Lexington, KY. <http://www.csg.org/nr/csg/images/TrendsInAmericaFinal.pdf>

European Foresight Monitoring Network. <http://www.efmn.info/>

Johnson, Charles W. (Jan. 21, 2000) *How Our Laws are Made*. Office of the Parliamentarian of the US Senate, Washington DC. <http://thomas.loc.gov/home/holam.txt>

National Center for State Courts (2005). *Future Trends in State Courts*, National Center for State Courts, Williamsburg, VA. http://www.ncsconline.org/D_KIS/Trends/index.html

National Conference of State Legislatures (July 2000) *Legislatures of the Future: Implications of Change*. National Conference of State Legislatures, Washington, DC

National Conference of State Legislatures (June 2000) *A Practical Guide to Futures Study*. National Conference of State Legislatures, Washington, DC

Pankey, Jr. Kenneth G...- Skove, Anne E. - Sheldon, Jennifer (2002) *Charting a Course to Strategic Thought and Action*. National Center for State Courts, Williamsburg, VA.

http://www.ncsconline.org/WC/Publications/KIS_CtFutuCharting_a_Course.pdf

de Rosnay, Joel (2001) *The Symbiotic Man*. McGraw Hill Publishing, New York

Schultz, Wendy L. - Bezold, Clement - Monahan, Beatrice P. (1993) *Reinventing courts for the 21st century: designing a vision process: a guidebook to visioning and futures thinking within the court system*. National Center for State Courts, Williamsburg, VA. <http://contentdm.ncsconline.org/cgi-bin/showfile.exe?CISOROOT=/ctadmin&CISOPTR=15>

United States Government Accountability Office (February 2005) *21st Century Challenges: Reexamining the Base of the Federal Government*. (GAO-05-325SP) United States. Government Accountability Office, Washington, DC.

<http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d05325sp.pdf>

Walker, David M. (March 17, 2006) "Doing What's Right". <http://www.gao.gov/cghome/uvaspeech.pdf>, accessed April 10, 2006

Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, Foresight and Governance Project,

http://www.wilsoncenter.org/index.cfm?fuseaction=topics.home&topic_id=1414

World Health Organization Regional Office for Europe (1999) *Health 21: The Health for All Policy Framework of the European Region of WHO*, European Health For All Series #6. World Health Organization Regional Office for Europe, Copenhagen. <http://www.who.dk/document/health21/wa540ga199heeng.pdf>