



# West and East: From equilibrium to harmony

*A new path for civilisations to manage  
sustainability and the global and knowledge age*

*Year 2002*

**Marie-Paule VERLAETEN**

Unit for forward and strategic studies  
Administration of economic relations

Ministry of economy

Industry street 6

B 1040 Brussels

Tel : 00 32 2 506 63 61

00 32 2 506 63 50

Fax : 00 32 2 503 53 93

e-mail : [marie-paule.verlaeten@mineco.be](mailto:marie-paule.verlaeten@mineco.be)



Pictures from : « Bread and Roses » de Ken Loach.

They want :  
« Bread and Roses »  
Ken Loach.

They are right.  
Marie-Paule Verlaeten .

## Table of contents

	<b><i>paragraphs</i></b>
Abstract	1 ⇒ 3
Introduction : the West and the East	4 ⇒ 8
Development : Equilibrium and Harmony	9 ⇒ 35
A. From harmony to equilibrium	9 ⇒ 23
B. From equilibrium to harmony	24 ⇒ 35
Conclusions	36 ⇒ 39
Bibliography	

## Abstract

- The paper discusses the concept of equilibrium** in the framework of world changes called « the global and knowledge age ». It criticises the process of catching-up in this new framework indicating that the first ones will remain the first ones which is already true as indicated by long run world indicators. **The proposed solution is to use another rationale that of harmony to be substituted for the equilibrium one on which catching-up is based on.** Contrarily to equilibrium the new rationale leads to decision processes and making under various sets of criteria. These ones may then more easily reflect all what makes the world civilisations. This therefore gives them new opportunities to blossom when managing the world changes further while achieving mankind's objectives which is a key issue for the future of the global village. In this framework also **a real path to decide in favour of sustainability appears.** Civilisations cannot escape from changing otherwise the global village will only be the place where market is operating at any costs. To change is not easy but it is not avoidable since some changes are already there. So the key issue is to frame and design some changes rather than others to achieve something high. Big countries from both the West and the East must therefore be courageous enough to speak differently at the world level so as to change the rules of the game, but not only, the game too. **At the long run this is the path to peace.**
- The paper is not a finalised one.** It is basically an attempt to open another discussion than the today's one about the intricacy of future likely trends coming from transitions to the global and knowledge age and sustainable development which each world civilisation has to face with. The paper is then like a path. It comes to birth from two preceding papers already internationally presented :

  - Strategic innovative societies
  - The West's paradigm

} see M.-P. Verlaeten (bibliography)  
and it will lead to other ones to help something « high » to come. **Hope !**
- Key words :** Equilibrium, harmony, « the global and knowledge age », civilisations, catching-up, human beings' talents, cognitive system, global village, utopia, sustainable development, path to peace.

## **Introduction : the West and the East.**

4. Somewhere on a milky way there is a planet called the **Earth**. From space it is like a blue orange. Some calls it now **the global village**. It has many people grouped according to criteria inherited from some past. The groups live in « worlds » where there are references called mainly culture, knowledge, technics, arts (letters included), language, power organisation and identity process. They feature some civilisations covering one group or more while appropriating space and time. Today there are six big civilisations :

- the chinese civilisation ;
- the indian civilisation ;
- the japanese civilisation ;
- the muslim civilisation ;
- the russian civilisation ;
- the western civilisation.

Some have several « children ». For instance, the western one has the U.S. and Europe and the muslim one has the arab one and the rest. The emphasis on civilisation requires to define the references used and civilisation as well.

5. **Culture. The set of ways by which a group develops some of its capabilities to know about the world, himself, man's life, man's destiny...and to act in this knowledge framework.** It helps to produce various sorts of knowledge but not only. Also to enjoy life, to have relationships with others, to be wise, to look at the world...It helps to represent or to symbolise the world

leading to arts' development therefore ;

**Knowledge.** It comprises **explicit knowledge** or **k. about things**, **tacit embodied knowledge** or **k. about doing things** and **self transcending knowledge** or **k. about originating sources for doing things but not yet embodied**. It is linked to culture. Knowledge has various fields but all civilisations have at least three ones related to the group as a species. They are : to know something about plants and food to feed it, to know something about health and treatment to keep it alive, to know something about how to defend it and to protect it from the outside. So knowledge combines at least agro-technical concern with cooking, medicine, pharmacopea and weapons ones. Knowledge is also related to the space on which a civilisation grows up. It is in this framework that knowledge about some plants as the cooking (and the drinking) made with these dominate as that upon some technical issues ;

**Technics.** The set of **applied processes** issued from knowledge (tacit embodied one dominantly) with **which men are helped to do the things and to operate processes to get the things doing ;**

**Arts.** Through these men reveal what they **feel** about the world, the life...Therefore arts' development reveals better than anything else the search for happiness, beauty...**harmony ;**

**Language. Ways to communicate** with oneself and the others of the same group about what is known, felt,

dreamt. It comprises therefore common accepted communication processes with their signs or symbols of writing and the sounds associated to these and marginal processes (from handicapped people for instance) ;

**Power organisation. Schemes and frames to empower laws and rules to get people from the group living together peacefully, being fed and being protected as a whole.** It has not all the time been applied for these purposes. Effective purposes influence strongly upon knowledge and technics' development ;

**Identity process. Valorisation of some ways of being within a group.** It comprises roles and caricatures of these ;

6. **Civilisation.** It is far more than the sum of culture, knowledge, technics, arts, language, power organisation and identity process. These are lonely its tangible aspects. It has also intangible ones, not less powerful, interacting sometimes strongly with the tangible aspects. To say it simply a **civilisation also carries values from various origins** (faith, philosophy, ethics, aesthetics, knowledge fields...) **according to which all what is done, represented, symbolised, felt...receive some legitimacy.** Some values dominate more than others. There are generally linked to either religion, philosophy or ideology. They give more power to certain people than to others. So the power organisation of any civilisation combines spiritual and temporal concern. **Values promoted by civilisations with core views from fields of knowledge shared by**

**dominant people lead to the rise of paradigms. This intricacy of dominant logics makes the mindset of any civilisation. Sometimes it appears like a labyrinth in which knowledge has to circulate and people have to live with « both » with increased difficulties. Then people have either to find the secret of the labyrinth or to give the good answer to some addressed enigma or to destroy what is like walls. Regarding knowledge (technics included) this means to understand that it is based on some representations of the things in its birth as during its development. As time is passing the usefulness of the representations change, for instance its decreases, and therefore it is time to get rid of these.** But this may be more difficult than it appears for in any dominant logic there are three components i.e.

- (i) **a corpus of knowledge** which determines the implicit theories and understanding ;
- (ii) **images of knowledge** which specify the appropriate processes of knowledge creation and justification ;
- (iii) **ideological values** which define the status of this knowledge within the sociocultural context including specially cultural, institutional and political aspects.

**When representations are strongly embodied into some civilisation's paradigms and thus mindset to change is even more difficult. But as time runs a civilisation cannot escape to get rid of some past otherwise it gets undervalued compared to others for it ceases to**

**offer contextualised solutions to people's problems or it stops to make people believe it can offer them this achievement.** In this respect neither man nor civilisation are eternal but « both » dream to be so. This leads to understand that **a civilisation has to promote evolving processes so as to get an open mindset. One efficient way is through human being, the source of all, being more and more empowered.** This is one of the main messages of this paper leading to develop the idea of empowered human resources through a systematic focus on human talents of any sorts. But before developing the idea one has to say a few words about an ongoing transition towards economic globalisation which objectively and subjectively challenges some civilisations more than others being the framework of the required changes. This will help us to develop a path for civilisations to manage this transition, but not only, having in mind two concepts i.e. equilibrium and harmony. **Harmony is the relevant one if people from the village want to get a better future. Harmony requires to empower human being elsewhere. Then civilisations will cease to be local. They will become mankind's ones being open to all children from the village. This is how civilisations will be able to manage sustainability and « the global and knowledge age » and therefore peace.**

7. Globalisation is an historical movement comprising waves of

external trade development, industrial production new settlement, direct foreign investment, mergers and acquisitions and increased externalisation of needed resources to increase private business' competitiveness but not only. To increase the power of some people has also to be said. Sometimes the global game is just like a vanity fair ! Today all the waves are there at the opposite of the past. The will of some to be the « master » of the world is also there ! Globalisation occurs in the framework of extended market economics at nearly all economies of the world village which increases competition. Furthermore market economics touches also new fields of responsibility (education, health...) so that globally competition matters more and more at the expense of any other concern and everywhere. Globalisation occurs also in the framework of an information revolution which makes dominant certain groups of the global village. Indeed, with the rise and the gradual diffusion of the information and communication technologies (I.C.T.), some groups have access to information from the whole village. They use it and their technics to be the first global operators i.e. to invest everywhere, to get the required resources from everywhere or put another words to boost their potential power, growth and profit, consuming what they can get from the global village they economically and finally dominate the more and more totally. Some people explain that this is « normal » since there is only one efficient economic model of which

some have acquired the relevant capability to manage before some others who will get it in the future plus growth and profit through a catching-up process. This process is predicated as a way to balance high and poor development or also hope in a better future and dishope about it. As such it implies an equilibrium process between two different sets of forces or more precisely civilisations or worlds. For reason of convenience let us call these ones the **West** and the **East** as some speak about the North and the South. There is an increased dialogue between the two worlds today. Indeed, the concern for some planet's parameters ( these of the climate change for instance ...) leads to increased uncertainties about the short future. For the world income level and its sharing too. Therefore the equilibrium process well known by economists is advocated. It is the rationale of the catching-up process which gives more and more legitimacy to global increased competition of whatever nature. Catching-up is symbolised and valorised through reference to the West's economic performances, style of living, way of being, knowledge's level..., values. This means referring to the West civilisation. Are all the groups of the global village happy with that ? Yes, when reference is made to purchasing power and the goods and services linked to it featuring the West. Indeed, the hope is to get a drastic and permanent improvement of the living conditions with catching-up. The East wants to have more...particularly it wants its kids and grand kids...to

have more. No, if it has to abandon what it is i.e. a civilisation. Here are some difficulties with the predicament, which may erode the East's culture as economic order and its results are going to do with the power of the political one and the identity process of the people. Indeed, the West civilisation is a very material one which has gradually abandoned any other references. More precisely, it is a civilisation in which **to have** is not only a path to reach **to be**. To have has gradually been substituted for to be. Therefore in western societies there are those who have and are and the others ranked on the scale of to be according to some constrained purchasing power and the society's welfare state. The access to goods and services produced with abundance by these societies depends upon the level of income and the welfare state. Today some workfare state is gradually being substituted for the welfare one to reduce public expenditure and to force people without job to work nearly at any conditions. Some call that « behaviour » a flexible one. They speak about a flexible labour market. Therefore in western societies there are now working poor to be added to simply poor people of any sorts. Poverty whichever its definition is increases in the West. This occurs in a **global world also featured by poverty sometimes so high that it put big amounts of people out from any living standard**. But in this global world I.C.T. are used to communicate i.e. to send messages according to which poverty like other (i.e many)disturbing factors will



disappear once people would have accepted some modifications to the society's rules, laws, behaviours, solidarity schemes and so on. Then in these flexible societies people could dream about american standards of living. Indeed, communication about some american miracle is rocketing everywhere at the expense of unbiased information about trends in income inequality, erosion to the education system and the social one, increased violence or of people being addicted to drugs....All these facts are veiled but explain why the jails are full in the US. **Communication is given to ensure that people from everywhere will share american values i.e. these of some people of the world : the richest part of it. Then other civilisations get gradually devalorised producing things out of dominant living standards, symbols and dreams.**

8. To sum-up it is communicated worldwide so as to equilibrate « rich » and « poor » people everywhere. More precisely the dreams of the poors are calibrated on the wealth level of the richs. In this framework any society's rationale from the West is to

avoid social wars without saying it. This is a fortiori true with a globalised economy i.e. an economy where competition increases continuously and enters gradually into non-economic fields leading to globalised societies or market ones. This explains why it is communicated about hope, patience...to have as an easy game once people from everywhere would have cleared their minds. **It is communicated about an ideal world or society : a single civilisation, an island of utopia !** Compared to the West and its equilibrium, **the East** has something like a treasure. Unfortunately, it is not aware of it. What is it ? It is **harmony**. A relevant example is China. Many foreigners have enjoined the visit of the forbidden city in Beijing. The curiosity then enters into their brain when hearing three names for three rooms :**perfect harmony (Zhonghe), preserved harmony (Baohe), supreme harmony (Taihe)**. Why such a focus on harmony and why to qualify it ? **Let us give some more light about harmony from the viewpoint of a westerner. It is not the lonely story therefore.**

## **Development: Equilibrium and harmony**

### **A. From harmony to equilibrium.**

9. What is harmony for a westerner ? Contrarily to **equilibrium** which is a **rationale** about **balancing dual forces's dynamics** departing from some hypothesis, **harmony is a state full of tangible and intangible « things » which co-operate in such a way that people resent harmony** or more precisely **the peace of it**. Harmony does not imply a dominant rationale. It has many. Therefore it is difficult to speak about it. By saying that one means that someone trying to rationalise harmony is easily lost at its periphery. Further harmony has its own language which is not that of equilibrium. Some say that the convenient one is poetry !All this does not mean that harmony and equilibrium are not compatible. Very often there are equilibria in harmony but disequilibria are also welcome. So presented harmony may appear like an order from an upper level than equilibrium implying sets of criteria while equilibrium seems to require a lonely set of the sets only. From this viewpoint equilibrium might be like an handicaped harmony being **advocated as an harmony by default when it is impossible or not thought to be possible to achieve a real ( or supreme) harmony**. So it is potentially unstable, its stability depending upon the preserved sets of

harmony. This is also true for its existence and unicity if any.

10. In the western thought, harmony has a perfect writing or more precisely spelling. It is music. But it is a music sung by God. Indeed, according to the bible, it is with some sounds that God from Christianity created the world. So, the music from God is the perfect harmony which at the beginning of all « materialised potential from God's nature or « supreme harmony ». For men this music as the world have a vocabulary and a grammar coming from mathematics. For example : Numbers are the real nature of the world according to Pythagorus. Therefore in the western thought some confusion rose between harmony (a lonely word being kept) and equilibrium because the later got a mathematical writing. This confusion was part of another one which very long during the western middle age opposed philosophers for Plato against those for Aristotle when discussing about the nature of the world and man. In this framework of duality Descartes gave a key contribution.

**Plato** ( $\pm$  -428 à -347) : the true nature of the world has its own world which is not that of phenomena. The true world is also this of human being, happiness and knowledge. To get an access to the true world or supreme harmony or simply the nature people should use mathematics first and dialectics after it to come back continuously on some accepted hypothesis. To be happy means to seek for the true

world i.e. the truth objectively and for to be being nested in it also. To live has to be managed in that framework also called the true or the objective one. So, according to Plato the nature or supreme harmony has an objective reality and thus definition ;

**Aristotle** (± -384 à -322) : there is an intricacy between two regions of the world but there is a method called rationalism (i.e. to identify exogenous causalities to phenomena : four sets of it i.e. the material, the formal, the efficient and the final ones) to be applied to phenomena to get risen the nature of the world. To be and to exist are in the same intricacy. To live means to manage the intricacy. Each has to do that. To learn how to manage with the others doing to same is part of the human wisdom. So, the nature or supreme harmony has a subjective definition for depending upon the learning process carried out by any existence. What is found is therefore relative. No objective truth is for no man could avoid to exist to reach its being ;

**Descartes** (1595- 1647) avoids to be for one philosopher against the other. He promotes Aristotle's rationalism (although keeping only two causalities instead of four i.e. the material and the efficient ones) to reach Plato's true world. The way to study the world is the path to awake the human being i.e. the human spirit for him to its (true) nature (to be a spirit from God's origin) which also belongs to supreme harmony. It is in that framework that knowledge rose in the West. Like Plato, Descartes recommends to come back

systematically on what is founded. To doubt always when producing knowledge and being. But he has no doubt about the potential power of the human mind when using his rationalism. Descartes sends therefore the western civilisation a message of hope. The truth can be reached. Contrarily to Aristotle for which the set of causalities comprises also the environment as a final causality which therefore may change the outcome of the other causalities, Descartes keeps not that causality. Therefore knowledge from the West rises at given environment concern. The fact that the nature or supreme harmony in which lays human being had dominantly a divine origin for the West explains why religious authorities tried to manage emerging knowledge and sometimes with cruelty. Indeed, knowledge was more or less viewed as trying to have leadership on dogma. Therefore researchers were guilty of abandoning the faith i.e. the single truth and then also the (single) nature of human being. This explains some underevaluation or devalorisation given by the West to other civilisations with as outcome bad behaviours towards people from these ones. Indeed, some people from the West were convinced there were alone to be endowed with a true nature, faith, knowledge. Then they believed they had to get the others often called the barbarians being « convinced » at any costs !

11. To sum-up **supreme harmony is the state of creation by God from**

**Christianity. Perfect harmony is the music sung by God to get supreme harmony.** This music has its grammar and vocabular from mathematics. **Equilibrium is part of some preserved harmony.** It is written with mathematics therefore gradually there will be some confusion between equilibrium and harmony (no more identified through three definitions). The confusion will be part of another one regarding the nature i.e. supreme harmony of the world and of man. Has nature an objective definition (Plato) or a relative one (Aristotle) ? In the West, the first one took leadership on the second. Further it gets a single religious origin. Rational knowledge developed in that framework. **Knowledge is a methodological approach to reach to be while always doubting about the results but keeping confident about the power of the mind. To know, to doubt and to be then, are intricated in the western thought. This is the vision of cartesian subjectivism which stuffed the West's paradigm and mindset. This was also the framework in which the West gave birth to various waves of knowledge. This one is a fragmented one dealing « badly » with interactivities or more precisely the dynamics of interaction. Nothing changes when causalities do not change.**

12. According to the preceding harmony is the state of creation which is born to human understanding through some music i.e. mathematical order applied to sounds set into dynamics

by God. To duplicate this order has been the concern of many westerners and since very very long. This has pushed up efforts to get rational knowledge. Models needed to develop it were proposed under two beliefs :

- to reach the real or the true world or the potential (religious meaning) of it by using it with no more reference either to Plato or Aristotle or just
- to be better equipped to understand some phenomena.

In the later case, Kant's message was going to prevail again Descartes'one : no one could reach the real world by using the mind. But it is possible to live and be happy in this framework.

**Economics** developed under the indicated concern about **the order of harmony**. It uses rational models but contrarily to the so called hard sciences (i.e those whose laws are mainly based upon experiments in labs), they share the common feature of coming from outside economics. Indeed, newtonian model of isolated atoms moving under the influence of forces transmitted through the ether (a concept not defined) was used and this from the XVIII th century up to now in main course economics. Newtonian model was welcome. Indeed, it was rational and furthermore written with mathematics. Therefore **economics got natural laws which made it rational and to the nature oriented.** Newtonian model will not be abandoned up to now despite the rise of new models at the end of the XIX th century and during the whole XX th one ( Relativity, quantum physics and beyond). It is difficult to get rid of

representations a fortiori when they are in the core of one's civilisation paradigm and mindset (see para 6). The analogy between economics and newtonian physics was the following :

1- Isolated atoms : isolated people -1

2- to move ↑ : to react ↑ -2

3- forces ↑ : selfishness ↑ -3

But **how to give birth to harmony (the true world) with selfish people** ? This was not only a relevant question but also a political one which required first individuals to have the right to decide in front of the political order always somehow arbitrary. So, there were historical periods needed to get some level of political emancipation and to design it. This was achieved at the beginning of the XVIII th century in England, later in France and not with the same statute given to individual recognised rights.

13. **The question of social harmony is the major concern of A. Smith** (XVIII th century). To him it is not obvious to predicate **that the law of selfishness is that of social harmony according to economics**. An invisible hand might well be required unless one can propose a new rationale going beyond selfishness. A french researcher (Dupuis from CNAM, Paris) did that at the beginning of the nineties. **Selfishness has to be thought to as selflove**. In this case people are not reacting like isolated atoms. They react so as to maintain a level of reasonable good relationships between themselves, the other's love being part of their

selflove, so as to get what they finally want whatever it is. So the rationale linked to (the emotional state of) selflove is to offer the others what one wants : to a certain extent to nourish the others' envy, jealousy...thinking they like what is wished. Then what to do if this should not be the case. How to be informed ? No good answer at the time of Smith. But as time run and market functioned the situation changed so that today everybody would answer that market is nothing else but a process to produce **such information**. But it is not a neutral process. Indeed, market operates through a mimetic process of understanding : one deals with the others as if they were himself, the others also. Or saying the same differently supply and demand must encounter otherwise there is no trade. Nothing will be captured. The market's theater is full of mirrors. The result of Smith being revisited by Dupuis is that an harmony between people devoting efforts to economic activities may rise from selfishness envisaged as selflove. **Atoms are not really isolated : links rise from selflove**. But this harmony is neither supreme nor perfect. Indeed, a question rises : **are all atoms enjoying the same influence to capture what they want**. A great writer like **Shakespeare** gave the answer : when some wants pride, honour, power amongst other things the rest of the people has wars, murders, violences and **the dynamics of history is men' passions**. The adressed question is important for it might explain many

discussions and since very long between the groups of the global village. Some dominant ones might have predicated « harmony » within some given country or between countries in terms of their selflove only. Then they had no great interest to reveal the real stake. They had interest to modify the words spoken while keeping unchanged the final target or today the global one. This explains poverty which goes on parallel with world's development. Today poor people are less poor than at the eve of the XX th century but rich people are also wealthier so that the income gap between the two groups has increased. Further poverty comprises poverty resulting from economic functioning and political decisions ( This poverty has been strongly stressed by the 1999 Nobel price of Economics: A. Sen) to be added to historical poverty ! At long run despite an income increase featuring the middle classes of the South the income gap between South and North has increased. In 1820, the average income of the richest countries was three times higher than that of the poorest ones, in 1913, eleven times, in 1950, thirty five times, in 1973, forty four times and, in 1993 (the late data), seventy two times. Today one fifth of the mankind gets eighty six percent of the world income. Compared to that another one fifth gets only one percent of the same income. Further the wealth of the poorest billion of people is equal to that of the hundred richest people. In the future the gap between South and North will increase. If today one

billion (on a total of six) people earn less than one dollar per day. In 2040 it will be more than two billions (on an estimated total of nine and an half). Poverty is not only a relevant parameter when comparing South to North. It is also a fact within the North. In the U.S.'s case for example, since 1979 ninety seven percent of the wealth's increase went to twenty percent of the population, the richest part of it. Today two millions people gets forty percent of U.S's wealth while this share was only thirteen percent twenty five years ago. With this trend in 2050 fifty percent of the U.S's wealth will belong to only two thousand people.

14. Influential power is not the lonely challenging issue. There is also the mirrors' society. Because demand and supply must encounter with an high level of plausibility to get potential growth which requires that market becomes a strong mimetic communication process as time run, **the market's society is that of mirrors**. We do not hesitate to say that this creates an existential fear. When people have to be basically the same to get increased markets **competition means to fight against oneself**. This is even more true when there is hypercompetition which challenges jobs and purchasing power of groups of people. Then people get the unpleasant feeling that one day with an high level of plausibility some will be down of...being. Then some get the will to survive at any costs for the « same others». What is then the

ultimate solution...just to get some good reasons...to kill i.e. to eradicate the fear not all the time symbolically only ! People then « play » the same role as brothers in the greek mythology or the West's faith : one brother kills the other then the same becomes the single. By saying all this we just want to say that **the focus on people's talents everywhere which is developed further in the paper is a rationale to break down the mirrors by empowering potentials i.e. differences. Peace at the village level is on this path.** This message may be difficult to get. Indeed, organised communication creates the feeling that the self is now the centre of all concern. But this is an illusion : each is a naked monkey, only the clothes are different. **Globalisation is also a bit that the monkey is blind and deaf. This is not the case therefore the cloning of being through market only is avoidable.** To get peace between the children of the village requires to get rid of the image of the mirrors. **Peace is the most ambiguous transition for the future.**

15. **The selfishness model evolved from Smith up to now. It became the famous general equilibrium (G. E.) model Walras gave birth to at the eve of the XX th century.** It is worth indicating that traders are conscious for Walras. They use their mind in this framework. According to cartesian standards G.E. is then an objective or a scientific model. More precisely, G.E. shapes economics in

an analogy with hydrolic physics for both are related to the circulation of floods. **To become an applied model requires to fine tune it with various society's knowledge and ethics. This is Walras' major message not very well understood by GE's economist after him.** Indeed, they gradually transformed it into an applied model as if equilibrium were the principle linking men ! Departing from Walras' rather ruff work mathematical developments and hypothesis featuring the set of equations « describing » the economy were used during the XX th century. They permitted to assimilate the vector of the points at which supply and demand encounters on each market to a saddle point issued from the game theory between non co-operative players of von Newman and others. G.E. was first finalised by Debreu (1958). To him also G.E. remains by nature a mathematical (scientific) model and not a way to describe the economic functioning and a tool to stimulate recommended economic policies.

16. From abundant efforts to fine tune G.E. after Debreu and neglecting Walras' major teaching, it came that :

① **Traders are selfish by nature.** They apply this rationale at maximising some utility functions (the consumption one for the consumer, the profit one for the producer) under well known constraints (the budget, the productions process) ;

⇒ So, **the human being is called an homo economicus** for a man is a rational economic operator by nature ;

② G.E. is a **price vector** i.e. **a way of communication between « isolated « players i.e traders »**; there is no other way to get informed otherwise GE is out of purpose ;

③ Prices carry on all the information about trading needed to play wherever trade occurs. When information change occurs, prices change too but the price vector converges naturally to a G.E. at a certain speed ;

④ G.E. exists, is unique and stable as long as no information change occurs ( and within some mathematical hypothesis); therefore each trader gets a price for what he trades ; He gets prices for what he has got since the production is not explicitly involved. There are prices for (traded) goods and services only. The rest has no price or more precisely might have prices indirectly i.e. through some externalisation of hidden costs leading to voluntary changes to market or traded prices ;

⑤ G.E. is pareto-optimal : no traders at this point has the interest according to his selfishness to refuse to trade for it cannot increase its utility without disturbing at least that of an other one. In case he will perturbate the game he will have to pay the cost of its decision. So with G.E. utility for each trader is maximal

whatever the contain is of each trader's utility basket. This is how to speak about general interest. Therefore there is a unique moment at which trade occurs. It is when G.E. is reached.

17. From the preceding, it comes that : G.E. is a **political desirable state**. This is true when :

a)- the only way to look at people is through selfishness: no other behaviour matters ;

b)- the only way to look at the society is through trade : no other social aspect matters ;

c)- the only way to look at economic activities is through trade : production, income creation and distribution are not parts of the reasoning ;

d)- the only way to look at potential output is through trading of disposable resources in hands of traders : no effort to get the resources matters for G.E. looks at achieved potential output and not at any path leading or not to it. It is worth indicating that in the West paradigm there is a belief according to **which the move from one G.E. to another**, mainly due to technological change, is globally favorable to men in an analogy with Darwin's metaphor applied to species. This move **is called the progress by economists** ;

e)- the only way to communicate is through prices. Since there is no demand without supply and vice versa, the price communication is embodied into a mimetic process of being leading to a world singularity i.e to be the same or more precisely to



belong to the brotherhood of the market. This is one of the major roots of existential murder for fraternity is not a natural peaceful law. On the contrary as indicated by western mythology and faith ;

f)-the only way to be is to compete : no attention is given to the shared wealth at the beginning of the game or at its end. The game is fair whichever its departing and resulting states are ;

g)- From this late point **G.E. and democracy are strangely in « love »**. Indeed,

- G.E. penalises poor minorities while democracy penalises rich minorities ;

- G.E. or market needs purchasing power (i.e traders having something to trade) therefore market's development on some given territory needs democracy as this one increases income distribution on this territory ;

- In this framework democracy needs market to push up the income creation without which there is no income distribution. But very often market growth needs politics and policies to fuel the engine at its beginning but not only during its evolution also ;

- When democracy does not achieve a better general interest than G.E. does, it is devalued at the opposite of G.E. which seems to cost less. This is a very strong reasoning when governments choose to reduce deficit without re-designing all public expenditure to achieve new priorities. This is the case today so general interest performed by democracy goes back compared to that of G.E ;

- After market gets global i.e.reaches other sources of purchasing power than the local ones, market gets « free » from local democracy. Its global dynamics matters at any costs. Therefore if it is required to break down democracy, there is a risk to get it . In this respect when people accept to modify laws and rules of a given society to get a more competitive economy they must be aware that they might have been accepting more than that ;

- Thus **once market gets global democracy has no other choice to survive than to get global too. This is one of the major world issue for the future.** To neglect it means to accept :

- **the market's society !**
- or**
- **the market's civilisation !**      ⇨
- with then market prices and values**
- or**
- that matter only !**
- **the mirrors' theater**

18. To sum-up G.E. looks at homo economicus only and prices i.e. a one-way communication process. This gives birth to social or trade relationships which are the society and to a general interest (fully compatible with selfishness) at which trade occurs. **G.E. leads to social harmony therefore but this is given the way to define man's rationale, the society etc...This may be the case in an utopian society or civilisation which is a high stylised caricature of the effective one.** Within it there is no place to environment since there are only

explicit prices for (traded) goods and services. Therefore, **sustainability is explicitly out of G.E.'s rationale.** Within it **democracy may disappear if market gets global and people do not care enough about democracy or cannot care being not empowered enough.**

19. G.E. developed in societies where individual rights extended since the XVIII th century but not without ceasing to question about the accessibility of these rights. In spite of religious values shared by western societies, political fights were required to endow people with extended recognised rights and to fine tune their accessibility. This is always true within the West and the rest of the global village. In some society like the U.K. or these from the anglo-saxon world for instance, the major aspect of the political fight was to conquest the leadership of individual liberty upon the state's rights. In some others like France the state's rights kept the leadership till the end of the XX th century the state being the symbol of a general interest whose nature was not that of the G.E.. General interest was part of political programm voluntarily pursued by the government. It was also a way to attract attention upon individual's responsibility and therefore to balance individual's liberty being pushed to become somehow absolute according to some people. What occurs in western societies did not lead « naturally » them to recognise the same rights and their accessibility to people from other societies which

whom they were in contact with till the end of WW II. Some other societies were colonised directly or indirectly. Long and difficult fights were thus required with sometimes extreme political rupture leading to the birth of some new political order. In the sixties political colonialism entered into a second move of fadding away but economic dependence went on prevailing rather long. In some parts of the global village this is always directly the case. Furthermore, **economic dependence towards the dominant group is everywhere reinforced through increased valorisation of the West civilisation at the opposite of the other ones. This goes on rising some new form of colonialism i.e. through the dreams !**

20. It is worth indicating that in the West market rationale benefited from the evolution of the meaning happiness. Indeed, as time run, the individual right to be happy on Earth took over the christian transition (through suffering) to this achievement in « Paradise », once people would have devoted their life as christian to the « Good ». The XVIII th century also called this of the « Enlightenment » and the french revolution eroded the legitimacy of the christian salvation process through which a salvator being said God's son supported the burden of men's sins till to be killed for these and save men globally i.e. the mankind therefore. They put the emphasis on individual personality and responsibility. As a consequence people got the right to manage their

efforts to be happy, happiness becoming an individual state featuring an individual nature. The XVIII th century is therefore a period during which increased legitimacy to individual passions and pleasures will be given this with a strong belief into human mind. Both together envisaged will create sometimes problems when individual pleasures is that of transgressing rules or accepted behaviours. A well known example of what was called libertinism is Sade (in France) when sexuality was in question. But during that century too differences between technology progress later called simply progress and happiness as between collective welfare and individual happiness were debated. As such very old questions about the nature of individual happiness and then how to get happy more frequently and with much certainty rose. These issues featured the XIX th century during which some people globally called the « Bourgeois » or the middle classes increased their political leadership while managing the economy to increase their well-being at the expense of people working for them. As time run, the middle classes with the emphasis on its material confort discovered that this sort of happiness was borrying. Put it another words it discovered that happiness was not the sum of tangible things. It could maybe be proxied as such but not enjoyed in the long run. This unpleasant state explained why some people got licentious or discovered again libertinism. The feeling of borrying

and this of social exploitation featured strongly the literature of the century respectively with Romanticism and Realism. The masterpieces of the later are the works by Zola and Hugo. During the XX th century, middle classes standards and values will be promoted, but not without political fights, to get social peace and to get increased home markets. This significantly after the big economic, social and political crisis of 1929 and WW II. Increased labour productivity will be passing on to increased nominal wages and some form of welfare state will be organised everywhere. In this framework, workers from the West discovered what the middle classes did before them. Departing from the first oil shock and with the rise of « the global and knowledge age » they discovered also that some of them were no more usefull to the market. To manage the feeling of losing utility some gurus then come saying that all will be improved with the rise of some new economy of which the Net one. But up to now no good study has been made establishing rather correctly which are the sizes of this new economy and its challenges and constraints! The only feature which has appeared is that it is a very speculative one.

21. Since Walras G.E. has never been the economic model according to which economic policy was recommended and applied since the eighties. This occured at that time after a period comprising the sixties and the

seventies during which economic schools like « Monetarism » and « Rationale expectations » favorable to inflation management as main macroeconomic policy took over « Keynesianism » : effective demand management, and economists looking at how to boost « Exogenous technical change » (Solow). Inflation macroeconomics supported by political activists opposed to increased state's intervention and weight led to rediscover **price macroeconomics embodied in G.E. : when prices are free to carry information about trade and to move accordingly, they clear all markets automatically**. The change of leadership in economic thought was welcome at a time featured by inflation and unemployment both latent before the first oil shock stronger after till the beginning of the eighties a moment at which the FEB organised a world depression to break down price expectations. The main new economic messages of price macroeconomics were :

- to cure inflation expectations through stable but constraining monetary policy ;
- to let private business freely decide upon resources allocation and technological change to achieve potential output.

Then potential output will be achieved at long run with a minimal inflation rate. Therefore price macroeconomics led to :

- market liberalisation (the financial one first) and flexibility (the labour one first) ;

- privatised activities being substituted for public monopolies ;
- increased autonomy of the monetary authority to manage inflation.

- Increased legitimacy to **competition : it is the fair game per se** ;

**Price macroeconomics** remained main course economics in the eighties and the nineties with the schools of « Supply side economics » and « Endogenous technical change » following the two ones already mentioned. It continued to be supported by political activists acting to reduce state's weight in the economy and the society. It spread out all over the world. It **is always the main macroeconomics today and everywhere**. It is worth indicating that some economists stress that « in the long run, the subject is dead ». This was said during a recent symposium of the Journal of Economic Perspectives which looked at the future of economics from different angles and suggested some answers. One of the most interesting papers indicated that economics failed in the search for general laws. It therefore blames current discontent on the orthodox general equilibrium model that underlies most of today's economic theory. It favours a shift from the current approach which has been called « loose-fitting positivism » (propose a model consistent with standard assumptions, then test it), to one based on « loose-fitting pragmatism (forget about canonical principles, just search for patterns in the data). This was said would be

consistent with the rise of complexity science within the scientific community generally. But can powerful economists accept that? For more details one should refer to the Economics Focus published by the Economist : in the long run, is the subject dead (See bibliography).

22. At the beginning of the eighties I.C.T. gradually rose. Finance was the first sector to use it fully. It then became informed about all world profit opportunities. During the eighties too banks lost leaderships on the sector in favour of funds operators. Credit policy lost leadership in favour of private saving policy. Profit rationale and worse speculative profit one took leadership upon any society targets. These two changes reinforce some waves of globalisation : that of portfolio investment to increase mergers and acquisitions having leadership on direct foreign investment, that of externalisation of needed resources to be competitive and profitable. And also the will of some people to master the world. In that framework price macroeconomics was perfect. But it is worth indicating that **asset prices contrarily to goods and services ones were not under control through monetary policy. Therefore there were bubbles everywhere.** Some have already disappeared (Mexico, Russia, Asia) but there remains some others in the U.S. and Europe. The eighties and beyond were also a period featured by the diffusion and digitalisation of I.C.T. Growth gradually bubbled in

the U.S. It featured a long period without inflation contrarily to the golden sixties. The accompanying unemployment rate was remarkably low but this being not only due to job's creation. Working poor, highly flexible workers increased parttime ones and unregistered people are also part of the « american miracle ». Therefore no natural G.E. prevails in the U.S. Europe with its remaining high unemployment rate gradually got « ill » of not being like the U.S. It applied through lately the same macroeconomic policy. The E.U. deciders communicate as if they were strongly protecting the European social model but it eroded globally when new occurring political coalitions had enough room for manoeuvre without the rise of some new ad hoc model. Further the deciders forgot to inform the citizens that in the U.S. case growth was boosted through defense expenditure directly and indirectly i.e. through various sorts of contracts with the business community. Researchs and analysis done at the O.E.C.D. indicated that clearly. Market nowhere has never been the main engine of growth and that since very long and everywhere. **Growth has always been a result of market and political decisions these ones being often dominant.**

23. The nineties and the beginning of the new century show that market or price macroeconomics is the dominant speech everywhere : **let's the markets function and american growth will be then.** Nevertheless at the international level this speech

favorable to free trade between West and East is also like a veil covering some forms of protectionism. Further some try to contest the society order issued from increased competition. They are more concern for the departing and resulting points of competition at long run than for it as the world fair game or sport ! There are now various examples : the cancelling of the M.I.A.(multilateral investment agreement) at the O.E.C.D., and the Seattle meeting of the W.T.O. The Bologna conference of O.E.C.D. about SMEs policy was also contested like the Washington meeting of the rich countries...or the Nice summit. That reveals a contest of the world organisation according to price or market economics. Why ? Because **a doubt on equilibrium being achievable through catching-up is born leading to rediscover the gap between equilibrium and harmony.** This contest is a very difficult one for competition has become the dominant principle of most world's agreements or treaties. It is protected by special bodies and sanctions as a religious doctrine. In fact, it is what it has become. So contesting people are now like heretics ! But heretics are right. Everywhere civilisations are eroded. Not only market economics dominates economic functioning but it gradually gives legitimacy to a global functioning i.e. a society's one according to main course economics dominantly. It leads to **market's society** a predicament of F. von Hayeck during the XXth century : « There is just one good way to

organise societies : it is **through what people are doing.** There is no other good model. Since people are ignorant no voluntary (i.e. political) model is good ». This predicament is an old one since it was given by Hume during the XVIIIth century. **It is relevant to keep it in mind since it is the hidden philosophy of most world's agreements or treaties today and tomorrow if nothing changes.**

## B. From equilibrium to harmony

24. **There is no equilibrium at national and international levels according to dominant applied economics. Yes, for some people it continues to be acceptable to say that with catching-up things cannot go wrong, on the contrary. There is even a new theory according to which the richer the world as a whole, the greater the chance that any given pre-industrial country will begin to grow (refer to the Economic Focus : simulating the century published by the Economist from January 8 th 2000). But for some others, today, there are more constraints on the world income creation and distribution than in the past and there is also a new theoretical statement to account for. All this requires not only to change the rules of the world economic game but to change the principles of it.** Here are just a few examples of constraints :
- Sustainability and public health require drastic changes in the ways to

produce, to consume and to pay. Who is really ready to accept that ?

- in the West if this might likely lead to a slowdown of the average income creation and distribution at least at medium run ;

- in the East if this might likely reduce development and when the greatest responsibility of what is on is due to the West's selfishness ;

Is this scenario avoidable ? No ! Some external costs to sustainability and public health are already there. They will be fully passed on to prices and growth as time runs.

· How the West will react when competition between its labour force and that of the East will increase and increase and for all skills. Are people from the West prepared to be more than flexible i.e. elastic ?

Is this scenario avoidable ? No ! It is part of the competitive strategy already there.

· How the East will react to a requirement to boost income distribution at a wide scale to push down poverty strongly as time runs with the accompanying social and citizenship policies.

Is this scenario avoidable ? No ! Asian experiences indicate that this is part of the sustained growth process.

· How West and East would decide upon better world resources sharing (soft water, energy, ...) or different waste management or « simply » about how to manage the climate change, etc...

**Soft water** : according to the Environment Outlook of the U.N.D.P., two thirds of the world population might enjoy an hydric stress (demand

is equal to 110 percent of water supply) in the next century if likely trends go on. In 2025, this would be the case of India and China. This will create roots of great difficulties which is a fortiori true when one keeps in mind that forty percent of the world population drink river water which is shared by several countries ;

**Waste** : Each year the world produces twelve billions tons of waste from households and the industries. The rich countries produce seventy five percent of this amount ;

**Climate change** : The changes (dry, rain, winds...) will more occur in the South than in the North. Therefore the poors of the world will more suffer than the riches. An revolution in the way available energy is used and in new sources is required.

Is these scenarios avoidable ? No ! For both the West and the East must now promote different international agreements otherwise there will be no more international ones which will induce global unstability and its costs. **There is also a theoretical statement leading to share doubts about catching-up.** In the past the village was not open economically. So, it was possible to approximate equilibrium in some part of it passing on the required adjustment (in terms of profitability for instance) to the rest of the village. Some called this process of harmony by default the way to socialise the market. But now how to get the same result with a globalised i.e. an open world economy ? **At the long run this transition might level down the world socio-economic standards, if**

**market wins against democracy .  
Choosing to move up globally and  
to restore the planet life require to  
vote for harmony instead of past  
economic equilibrium. That is how  
the village has to be managed in  
the future.**

25. How **to promote harmony at the world level ? By pushing political and private actors to bit upon people's talents systematically.**

Indeed, harmony comprises many sets. To discover these requires to get some way to materialise them. How ? By **tapping into people's talents to get strategic innovative societies and therefore new ways to develop.** Today technology literated people only matter. It is said that to achieve potential output to get more and more technology is not avoidable. This lets latent many other competences and capabilities. Economic history indicates this has output costs. Indeed, technological change has always required many other changes to boost growth. They came from the rest of the people. It has also suffering costs. Indeed, a society is like a bag full of people wanting to live and be happy. How can one continue to force a majority of the people to accomodate to market shocks from the viewpoint of what they have (i.e **are**) as capabilities, competences...talents. One might accept to go on like this if it was demonstrated that market organises an evolutionary process as the one predicated but not demonstrated by Darwin for species. There is such a belief called simply progress in the

West's paradigm in which equilibrium is nested (for more details see Verlaeten M.-P. bibliog). But today people question about this progress (Economic Focus : wat's progress, the Economist dated from july 31 st, 2000) Further, it still remains to demonstrate that this evolutionnary progress is the lonely way to evolve and the adequate one for human beings !

26. Within each society there has always been a way to bit upon human talents of any sort. That is to refer to people civilisation. So, today if people from the global village want to get a better future they have to tap into their civilisations and therefore a materialisation of potential for the future will emerge. Obviously nothing is perfect. Constraints will also appear. To tap into human talents means also **to empower people** not as producer or consumer only as it is the case today but **as inventors of many many possible futures.** Therefore changes to the political orders everywhere will rise. To look at civilisations does not mean to protect traditions, which may lead to a global mental attitude favorable to keep the things unchanged. **In the future each civilisation has to be looked at with the eyes of all children of the village. It has to be as opened as possible : each civilisation can be enriched by the talents of each child. To stop to close civilisation like tradition is will help the village' children to approximate various sets of hidden harmony, to preserve it and to get it more**



**perfect. This will transform local civilisations into mankind's ones. This requires to re-frame and re-design politics everywhere and thus international agreements. This is a long run ambition.**

27. Now some people might interrupt the authors of this paper by saying: « This is full utopia ». « Not at all » shall be the reply. Let us give some light on this answer. Today to get growth once must have enterprises : and thus entrepreneurs. But with hypercompetition as globalisation provokes **one has also to find a way to avoid SMEs being like flowers, here in the morning away at night !** To reduce SMEs fading away requires to use all comparative advantages a country has to get SMEs. The major one lays in the competences, capabilities..... ways of being or even dreaming about all it has. This means to systematically focus on human talents of any sorts. New entrepreneurship is nested here ! Further, to look at people's talents with the appropriate policy is also a way **to boost clustering i.e some process to get groups of SMEs on some local territory**. Indeed, it is now recognised that clusters emerge more easily where the intricacy of competences...is high. It is obvious to say that this requires to « dive » into human talents directly and indirectly through values and dominant logics favorable to these! The relevant example is the U.S.. Indeed, values and accompanying logics are favorable to invention, innovation or more simply to change. The mindset

of the society is open on these fronts and further policies favorable to skills being attracted from the global village are pursued. This explains the Silicon Valley and the blossoming of clusters in North Caroline. It is worth indicating that **the U.S. benefit also from an image of openness : that of being a country where all is possible to courageous people !** This image is inherited from the past. To the rest of the world the U.S. are definitely a pioneer civilisation i.e where each does not stop to manage its own talents while giving not too much importance to its falls down. At the long run the pioneers are winners ! This is the real empowerment of the american part of the western civilisation : **to give hope once each uses what is has i.e to empower what each is also**. This picture is so strong that it valorises all the american society despite its disturbances and cruelty ! **The focus on human talents as recommended in this paper is to give legitimacy to the same hope everywhere on this planet through appropriate society's decisions and efforts**. Therefore it is common sense to look at human talents and civilisations and to devote policies to that to get entrepreneurship and SMEs and therefore potential growth and employment. Moreover it is **also a relevant way to enter into the « Global and Knowledge Age »**. Indeed, this age is that of « brains being real assets » as long as brain are empowered as such and not contrained by market rationale. The « K.A. » is that of K. as indicaded by

the name but what is knowledge for people in charge of growth ? There are proxies of it. Here are some ways to proxy : to look at schools and universities titles, R&D expenditure, patents from various labs, prototypes from projet's development by people and organisations. But is that knowledge all the knowledge within a society ? Not at all, it is recognised and labelled k. which means k. about things and doing things which have occurred given the mindset of some civilisation. Thus it concretises some parts of explicit k., and tacit embodied k.. It does not rise not-yet embodied tacit (or self transcending)k. and therefore none k. is complete for effective k. is an interactive dynamics. **K. being proxied is only some part of potential knowledge from a given civilisation. How to concretise not-yet-embodied k. is the key question which requires to concretise all human talents i.e knowledge of any nature from a given civilisation. So this asks to look at what its mindset i.e its values and dominant logics so as to open it and boosting all knowledge then. This is what ones naturally gets when a systematic focus is given to human beings's talents.** There are different **sets of constraints**. The first is **the power structure related to the mindset**. It comprises groups of people empowered because they :

- (i) produce dominant logics i.e knowledge,
- (ii) appropriate images of the produced knowledge and

(iii) play as ideological operators.

But this is not enough **market** and **brain empowerment** have also to be indicated.

28. **Market** valorises some skills at the expense of others therefore it gives birth to some needs of effective k. and death to some other. Further sometimes there is no market for some brains or there are market failure. **To sum-up, market creates variation to the abundance of effective k. a given society has while civilisation designs the space of potential k. and shapes its ideological priorities.** Market interacts with civilisation. Indeed, it reveals also axes of needed e.k. which may or not be those shaping by civilisation. To enter the new age by continuing to neglect some parts of k. because of the market is irrelevant because contrarily to the past increased global competition changes the cards of the game all the time. So, the probability to get losses of invention and innovation and therefore wider constraints upon potential growth and development increases too. **Competition is a certitude but its content is not.** Today to be competitive means to be active on some potentials also. That has costs. Some countries therefore will be more competitive in the future because they can pay now these costs i.e. the anticipated ones of remaining competitive. But each country giving attention to its civilisation can discover space of potential k. on which to act to get a better future. Today SMEs need to innovate not

randomly but continuously just to survive. As indicated by **Schumpeter** in his approach to innovation **efficient firms tend to push out marginal ones, but not in a trend to equilibrium continuously. Disequilibrium is the normal state of innovative economies.** Further according to Nelson and Winter, the firm is a kind of biological organism whose genes are the routines in which operational know-how has been accumulated. The development of the firm is due to the routines which succeed in becoming dominant, and the firm itself is substantially anchored to its history and its knowledge. Routines become the competences on which the firm's functioning rests and through which it achieves its financial and competitive outcomes. **The firm has to organise some disequilibrium to expect to be a winner!** But today technical changes occur continuously contrarily to past discrete waves of it. Then how to manage disequilibrium? To get some answer one should refer to the resource-based view of the firm initially due to **Pewrose**. He hypothesises that **resources are scarce productive factors**, since they are not easily reproducible, and as such, **they determine a kind of Ricardian rent or quasi-rent of replication.** Differences in rents are not short term, since resources are not easily transferable, and the **disequilibrium is therefore destined to continue.** Thus there are distinctive capabilities, later called core competencies- these are firm

capabilities which confer a position of solid competitive advantage. But today globalisation erodes any solid competitive advantage. Therefore a firm must be aware of all its capabilities i.e. the core ones and the others. So, it must know what and where they are. This requires to tap into people's talents for all changes are part of the growth process and also to discover new forms of organisation for SMEs so as to transform them into cognitive systems. K. is a potential. It is like a seed. Men are the garden. Therefore k. is potentially abundant but this requires « cares » of any sort about men or better talents empowerment and everywhere. **People's talents to be focus on in the framework of people's civilisations is the best way to get potential knowledge effective. This orientation or better way to carve societies is not avoidable in the future.**

29. There is another not avoidable focus in the next century. It is **poverty to eradicate.** It is the major challenge to any civilisation. At the world level there are enough techniques and money but the global political will is missing. Further market does not care about the poor. It cares about consumers i.e. purchasing power. Market economics is fully compatible with poverty as long as any player applies the rules as it is required. G.E. is a rationale of playing wherever the space is it is not a philosophy of achieving mankind's objectives. To get these civilisations and thus societies must use politics and ad hoc

policies. Therefore any civilisation at any political level must opt for strategies pushing down poverty at manageable costs. This means it has to create value added with its resources endowment of which the major one is human talents. Poverty to reduce and jobs to create are linked. In the future there will be not enough jobs at the world level given likely trends. Indeed, labour productivity increases everywhere and for all activities. Further one has to account for robots being more than in the past substituted for human resources for reason of competitiveness and this not only for hard jobs but also intelligent ones. Indeed expected technical change will produce intelligent machines in the near future (The coming advances in computing power seem to make it possible by 2030). Regarding the creation of new jobs it is worth indicating that this will favour skills linked to new waves of compelling technologies already in progress such as robotics, genetics and genetic engineering and nanotechnology. Not all people have the required skills and further not all societies have enough wealth to pay high wages to these high skills. Therefore as it is already the case, the rich countries of this planet will benefit from high skilled high paid jobs leaving the rest to the rest of the village. Therefore the **focus on human talents and the re-orientation of applied policies on these is a key issue to give people jobs not in scarcity but in abundance.**

30. The preceding indicates that a focus on people's talents and appropriate policies which financial support therefore gives each group of the village the legitimate expectation of a better future. Some countries have already apply some parts of the recommended strategy. The U.S. for instance have since very long pursued a policy towards the attraction of some skills from the whole village. They have reinforced it recently. This is wise. Indeed, as indicated by O.C.D.E. in its 1998 report about trends of migrations : « To attract world skills is the main comparative advantage for the future ». **To conclude to focus on harmony through human talents pushing up and civilisation framework creates economic potentials and then new ways to equilibrate the world game between West and East. Then the children of both might dream about a world in which they will be both and not one at the expense of the other or one under the illusion of the other occupied to catch-up.**
31. Let us again illuminate the discussion very concretely by nearly quoting from B. Joy (See bibliography). The time we are living in is not only featured by I.C.T. genetics and related engineering matter also maybe more. The U.S. have major comparative advantages in the later field. In the U.S. genetics and related engineering develop strongly. This leads to patenting strategy to induce profit. Pressure is increased so as to get international agreements to use the

results of this genetics neglecting cascading effects which were part of the evolution of species and within these as time run. Indeed men are not able to get these effects which are out from single causality. Genetic engineering promises to revolutionize agriculture by increasing crop yields while reducing the use of pesticides ; to create tens of novel species of bacteria, plants, viruses, and animals ; to replace reproduction, or supplement it, with cloning ; to create cures for many diseases, increasing the life span and the quality of live ; and much, much more. But genetic engineering is not without danger. Indeed, the new botany aligns the development of plants with their economic, not evolutionary success. The dominant word between genetic and engineering is the last one. It means a causal mechanism that links actions to effects. For instance in the case of genes, genetic engineering moves genes but is not about genetics. Indeed it gives nobody understanding of the mechanism by which genes, interacting with each other and the environment, express traits. What occurs is the industrialisation of live by people with a narrow understanding of it. Not many political deciders care about such a change to the biological laws and therefore genetic engineering technology is already very far along. The USDA has already approved about 50 genetically engineering crops for unlimited release ; U.S. researchers have tested about 4500 more. In this framework Europe's insistence on labelling, to let people

choose what they are eating, is considered an irrational barrier to free trade. Face to genetic engineering and its lobbying groups has the **East some other comparative advantages issued from its human talents and civilisation?** It has **once one is concerned with public health and changes to the agriculture and food systems for instance.**

32. **Public health.** Here one has to mention chinese medicine as another way than genetics to account for health and for life. The west's medicine is efficient. But it has all the time had great difficulties to account for global concern about health to cure diseases. The west's medicine is a fully fragmented one. It is powerful on each segment given available technologies, purchasing power and institutionalised health care scheme. The more and more now people ask not only to be cure when being ill but before. Some prevention develops strongly. Today it leads to account for global concern about health therefore life with all its parameters (food, fresh air,...). China has some main comparative advantages in this framework with its medicine, pharmacopea, food and physical training. And it has not to catch-up. It is the leader. Further it can help to reduce the purchasing power constraint by pushing down a lot of costs of prevention and treatment. This is a world issue. The preceding was just an example a westerner has easily in mind. It matters not only for growth and

therefore development but also because to capture knowledge from everywhere has become a patenting strategy i.a profitable one. Some countries with abundant captured k. become therefore richer at the expense of others. Here China can be a main player by pushing up medicine...but this requires to come back on international agreements about property rights. Some changes are needed leading to another equilibrium between East and West. This is possible to get since the country is now a member of the WTO.

33. **Agriculture and food systems.** More and more people from the West are now concerned with the quality of what they are eating and therefore the ways crops and animals are growing up. Keeping in mind the mad cow affair they discover that they could be an endangered species like many others on this planet. They are now also aware that at the world level there are various problems to arable land : erosion, desertification, that water resources become scarce due to the ways agriculture is operating. Gradually they want changes because they are afraid. They want to come back to an agriculture with a global concern for global life. They do not want genetic engineering. But they have let down alternative knowledge to food people. This is a chance for countries from the East which have a long history of global life understanding. Again this is the case of China. Agriculture development is on the W.T.O.'s agenda for the next round. China can be a main player

pushing up worldwide concern for growth and another knowledge to food people and account for sustainability in this framework. This also will create jobs.

34. The aim of harmony is not only to help growth and development differently from the past. It is also to go beyond economic needs and rationale. It is to help people from everywhere to be happy or enjoy life remaining freely different. There are various ways to suffer on this planet. The way the economic game is been played with the power structure it implies is part of the explaining process. But it is not the lonely explaining. Many people of the village also believe they have to accept to suffer for being (religious message). But when they do not know. Further they were not aware that « to have » meant to abandon their differences or their real being. Generations and generations from the dominant groups have received these messages. It has featured there way to decide, to accept, ...to live. With a focus on everybody's talents a root to be happy is illuminated because people are helped to earn their living with their talents whatever they are. They get the right and the way to enjoy their differences. Then it leads to enter into a world where non-economic rationales and various values may blossom. Therefore new focusses on life can accompany living conditions everywhere. Industrial revolutions and agro chemical ones have boosted the productivity of men, plants and animals. But at what costs ? What

was called progress has many costs. Those of pollution of any sorts, degradations to basic life « territories » (ground, water, air), to the ozone layer, to the way see water is circulating, managing its temperature, the same with the levels of gaz around the planet...We are just at the beginning of the understanding process of what has been done to get growth, purchasing power, individual consumption, profit, progress and...selfishness and selflove. The village's future development is no more sustainable from that viewpoint. Men from the dominant group have accepted to suffer for many reasons amongst which more concern for money as dominant issue for happiness than for their live, their life which is in synergy with the other's one and the planet's one. Also some irrelevant vanity i.e. that of being different from the other neighbours. The next century is a precious momentum to modify this state. Technological change may help but it is not sufficient. **A new way to look at live is required and as a follow-up a new dialogue between world communities to manage the village.** A proposal has been made to the E.U.. For more details refer to Verlaeten M.-P. : The West's paradigm (bibliog.). The new way is first to deal with global life as an **harmony** (men+ plants+ animals+...) in which **men** from everywhere **are operating not to die** (even after a certain period) from pollution...mad cow disease...money to be captured or, lack of development, poverty but **to enjoy life. The right to enjoy global**

**life everywhere. This is real sustainability . From this viewpoint there is a globalisation to organise.**With this understanding another equilibrium between money and life will appear and less divorce between life to have and real life i.e to be will emerge. It is difficult to speak about happiness. But most will agree that it comprises tangible things and their quality and intangible ones such as to be well with the selfs, the others and the nature and to keep this state for the next generations...Therefore a focus on global life for everybody rather than on to have for some onely will increase individual happiness. It will also push-up values linked to real life like reciprocity, dignity, equity, beauty, space...silence...colours...From these new values new knowledge will rise as how to fine tune living conditions in accordance. For instance the beauty of space and the love for it has already given birth to new style of architecture using high resilient but light materials some playing with the light i.e. being particularity porous to it. Architecture in the future will be very much transformed into ways to harmonise parts of space rather than isolating ( i.e equilibrating) them strongly.

35. Amongst the new values emerging from the focus on people's talents everywhere is also the way people enter into communication. The intricacy between talents is not the market's one i.e. that of selfishness or selflove. It comprises many things to experiment. But this might appear

not very easy. Indeed, it is an understanding process of the other that the self begins and therefore of the self also. **Peace potentials are nested here: me looking at me and the others with their differences, with our differences, from the mirrors' images the others doing the same, for this leads to reciprocity to be substituted for equality of treatment based upon a shared (common) identity :to be according to the market's society.**

## Conclusions

36. Harmony is not an island of utopia. Market equilibrium and catching-up are but this is veiled with a strongly biased world communication process about materialised miracle. This helps to maintain the world power structure i.e. that of the self-love of some only !
37. Market or price equilibrium is the rationale of a game: the exchange one. It has nothing to do with achieving a mankind's and sustainable state of the world development. To get these civilisations and their societies must use politics and ad hoc political changes.

38. **Harmony is not a new game. It is human will continuously in search of achieving mankind ideals, performances, and global life sustainability. It is the garden of knowledge men need because it is the garden of the global understanding men dream about when dreaming about being. It is also a way to break down the mirrors of being the same while enjoying or suffering of the opposite. So it is the key issue to get peace on Earth. The time is then there to speak about harmony at the international level. Let us hope that some men from the village will be courageous enough to begin with. This is also a special call to big countries from both the West and the East « to speak differently at the world level...for the children...of the earth ».**

39. Notwithstanding the search of courageous people to change the world's game a **proposal has been made to the E.U.** during the two day conference intitled Rio +9 **to organise a global society dialogue in parallel to the business one.** Up to now no answer. For more details see Verlaeten M.-P.: The West's paradigm (bibliog.)



## Bibliography

### **Attali J.**

Bruits, PUF, Paris, 1977.

Dictionnaire du XXI e siècle, Fayard, Paris 1998.

Fraternités : une nouvelle utopie, Fayard, Paris 1999.

### **Bronk R.**

Progress and the Invisible Hand, ed Little Brown, 1998

### **CEPR**

The Growth of Firms in Theory and in Practice, discussion paper nber 2092, march 1999.

### **Huber G.**

L'Homme dupliqué : Clonage humain : effroi et séduction, L'Archipel, Paris, mars 2000.

### **Joy B.**

Why the future doesn't need us, Wired, april 2000  
[whythefuture@wired.com](mailto:whythefuture@wired.com)

### **Lagadec P.**

Ruptures créatrices, Ed d'Organisation, Paris, 2000.

### **Magazine littéraire**

La Renaissance de l'Utopie, Paris, mai 2000.

La Tentation du Bonheur d'Epicure à Pascal, Paris, juillet-août 2000.

### **O.C.D.E.**

A New Economy : The Changing role of Innovation and Information Technology in Growth, Paris, 2000.

### **Rodrik D.& Rodriguez F.**

Trade Policy and Economic Growth : A sceptic's guide to the cross-national Evidence, NBER paper nber 7081, april 1999.

### **Sachs J. & Warner A.**

Economic Reform and the Process of Global integration, Brookings paper on economic activity, 1995.

### **The Economist**

Economic Focus : simulating the century , january 8 th, 2000.

Economic Focus : the never-ending question, july 3 rd, 2000.

Economic Focus : what's progress, july 31 st, 2000.

Economic Focus : In the long run, is the subject dead ? march 4 th, 2000.

### **Verlaeten Marie-Paule**

Strategic innovative societies : some guidelines for a world fruitful discussion issuing a better future for the global village, avril 2000

The west's paradigm and the economic representation : the time to get rid of the past : for a global society dialogue, mars 2000

Pamphlet sur la communication, avril 2000

**Von Krogh G., Nonaka I. and Nishiguchi T.**

Knowledge creation : a source of value,  
MacMillan Press LTD, London, 2000.