

# **RECORD, Volume 24, No. 1\***

---

Maui I Spring Meeting

June 15–17, 1998

## **Session 48TS**

### **Surfing the Tsunamis of Change**

**Track:** Futurism

**Key words:** Futurism

**Moderator:** ALBERT E. EASTON

**Instructor:** JAMES ALLEN DATOR†

*Summary: Attendees first learn about the major waves of change that will bear down on us in the future. We all need to deal with demographics, the environment, technology, economics, politics, and cultural and global differences.*

**Mr. Albert E. Easton:** At this time, I will introduce Jim Dator. Jim is Professor, Department of Political Science, and Director of the Hawaii Research Center for Future Studies at the University of Hawaii in Honolulu.

**Mr. James Allen Dator:** I've been involved with future studies for an extremely long time. The Hawaii Research Center for Future Studies was established by the state legislature in 1971. We have a master's program in alternative futures. We give people degrees in future studies using a political science perspective that enables them to be consulting futurists. I was also president of the World Future Studies Federation, which is an international organization, with members in about 90 different countries. Having visited about 50 of those countries I learned that the future looks very, very different to people from different cultures.

I just want to say a few words initially about what future studies is and what it is not. First of all, future studies does *not* attempt to predict the future. It is not about crystal-ball gazing, and I'm not a soothsayer or a fortune teller. However, it isn't merely wishful thinking, either, or so imprecise that any idea about the future is as useful as any other idea. Future studies can be understood by a diagram. The core of future studies is that we study people's images and ideas about the future.

People get their ideas about the future from somewhere, but certainly not from academic training, because my program and the program at the University of

---

\*Copyright © 1999, Society of Actuaries

†Dr. Dator, not a member of the sponsoring organizations, is Professor, Department of Political Science and Director, Hawaii Research Center for Future Studies for the University of Hawaii, Honolulu, HI.

Houston are about the only two places in the United States that offer specific training in future studies. But people do get their images and they do act on the basis of those images, and their actions then influence the future. I'm going to say more about images of the future later.

From an academic point of view, the thing that makes future studies academically respectable (and from a consulting point of view, enables a futures consultant to say certain things with some confidence about the future) is that it springs from a theory of social change and stability: What is society? What are the components of society? What components change easily? What components change with difficulty? What causes these components to change? and all the rest.

Future studies is, or should be, connected to day-to-day administration and decision making. Most of the work that I do is with American state judiciaries and those in other countries of the world that basically have the American-type judicial system. Judiciaries basically are one of the few institutions in the United States that are able to take the future somewhat seriously. Generally they're involved in some sort of strategic planning, intended to guide their individual, personnel, budgetary, and other actions. And from my point of view, any planning activity should first be informed by futures research.

Futures research requires an enormous amount of popular participation, participation from everybody that is going to be planned for and administered to. The 50 years is fine from my point of view, but normally, I'm dealing with a 25–30 year time span, and the magnitude of actions so that the impact is greater. In any event, futures research is supposed to be useful to people.

Here are a couple of laws about the future. As I've already indicated, the future cannot be predicted because it does not exist. One of the problems of the English language is that it encourages us to think of the future as singular and we use a lot of metaphors that imply it's out there somewhere, it's vague, it's over the horizon. If we can get high enough or find some way to get out there, we can see it, but that is not the case. The future as a singular entity does not exist, but alternative futures can be forecast. I make that important distinction between a prediction and a forecast. A prediction is an attempt to say what's going to happen before it happens; a forecast is an "if-then" contingency statement, a logical deduction. If this is what you think is happening, then this is what the consequence will be, and there are a wide variety of alternative futures.

My organization is called the Alternative Future Option in the Department of Political Science, the Hawaii Research Center for Future Study, the World Future Studies Federation. I hope your organization uses that terminology. I don't use

futurism by the way; futurism to me is an ideology, and this is not intended to be an ideology. That is to say, various people have ideas about the future—pro-abortion, anti-abortion, the limits to growth, endless economic development—various individual views about the future that can be “isms.” But I'm talking about a wide array of alternative futures to be understood and forecast rather than a single future to be predicted. While it's true that the future cannot be predicted, preferred futures should be envisioned and created.

The major thing I try to do as a futurist is help people envision their preferred future, after having considered a wide variety of alternative futures, and then begin to move towards that preference. We don't predict the future, we invent it by creating the future as a vision, not as a blueprint. A good example might be sailing a boat in which you have a destination in mind, rather than riding on a railroad track in which you have to adhere to a certain route. You have a destination in mind, but as you sail, you check out what's happening around you and perhaps even change the destination on the basis of more knowledge. Changing course doesn't invalidate your initial vision. Your vision is what gets you started and gives you an idea of where you're going. But it's OK to monitor the situation around you on the basis of experiences and knowledge, and change or at least strengthen or modify your original vision.

We need people who are professionally trained in futures research and there aren't many. There are lots of people that will come to you and say they know the megatrends, the third waves, and all this stuff. You give them lots of money and they will tell you the future. I know and even respect some of them because they are people like you who desperately need and are betting your life, or at least other people's money, on what's going to happen in the future. But there are people that are trained in the sorts of ideas that I've developed and will be developing subsequently. And there's a lot of education that needs to be done from the very beginning to get people future-oriented. History is tremendously important, but the future is much more important.

At the same time, you need to create a relationship between futurists and decision makers, and that again is a difficult connection to make because most decision makers want to be told what the future will be. We have to engage you, the decision maker, in a process of envisioning alternative futures and creating a preferred future, and most executives are too busy for that. They say, to heck with it, I'll go buy someone else's future. And I say they'll be getting someone's idea and ism.

The way business is organized now, it doesn't matter anyway. Make any decision you want, move somewhere else, and never feel the consequences of what you've

done. But once upon a time in the old days, when you stayed in the business for a long time, you did feel the consequences and you were concerned about the quality of your future-oriented decisions.

But the most important thing lacking is citizen awareness of future studies, and awareness of the fact that there are indeed businesses such as yours, such as the U.S. military, and such as some of the large energy corporations, that take future studies very seriously, that do very competent futures research on a proprietary, secret basis. By using that information for their own advantage, we are moving into what I call "colonization" of the future, a state in which people who do understand the importance of futures research get this information and use it for their own decisions and actions, enabling them to colonize an element in time.

As a bleeding heart liberal, I don't like that. I think that the citizens ought to be involved in this activity, that we need something that Alvin Toffler many years ago called "anticipatory democracy"—a future-oriented form of democracy that we don't have at the present time. We barely have democracy, and it certainly is not very anticipatory; it is, at best, reactionary—concerned with the past rather than the future. That's sort of a whirlwind together.

**From the Floor:** I don't get it. You want to create what? I mean what's the difference between futures studies and planning for something, for education, for economy, for this or that?

**Mr. Dator:** Planners try to figure out what they call the most likely future and plan for it. I will tell you there is no such thing as a most likely future. The thing many people think is most likely is, in fact, highly unlikely, and a very bad thing to plan for. So the futurist tries to do away with guessing about what the future will be and plans for the alternative as well as for the preferred future.

**From the Floor:** You said that our democracy is not anticipatory, that we're just reacting to what's happened in the past, but you also noted that the pro-choice and pro-life forces are both working to shape the future the way they want it. And we have people battling over any number of issues: the death penalty, the growing movement of environmentalism. And people now are recycling the way they did 20 or 30 years ago, maybe the battle is in bad shape for the future.

**Mr. Dator:** Yes, one part of it. What we lack is a governmental structure to put all of those individual pieces together. Now maybe they aggregate by individual activity, but one of the perspectives I would like to share with you sometime in a more formal way is future generations analysis. What are the obligations that we have toward future generations? Both democracy and free market capitalism are the

best (they're not perfect, but the best) systems that exist for making sure that people living now have a voice in what's going on.

But the future doesn't exist; it doesn't vote and it doesn't have a political action committee. Organizations like this are usually focused on one aspect of the future. Even an environmentalist usually is concerned with some particular aspect of the environment rather than the whole picture, and that I think is what the problem is. One of the things that I try to do as a political scientist is to help government systems as a whole become more responsive to identifying the needs of future generations, and to see that the needs of future generations are balanced with those of present generations. That basically isn't happening now.

But I want to find out about your images of the future. Draper Kauffman developed the following four images of the future:

1. The future, and time in general, is like a roller coaster. Somebody has built the roller coaster, you've been placed in the car, someone has released the lever, and off you go. Sometimes this is very frightening, sometimes it's very boring, sometimes you have an absolutely clear idea of what's ahead, sometimes you don't have any idea whatsoever, but you have to go where those tracks are taking you.
2. The future is like a river that has a certain flow, and you're in a canoe that you have to paddle. You have to go more or less with the flow but, with the paddle, you can avoid rocks or, if it smooths out into a lake, you can continue rowing. So you have to go sort of with the flow, but you have the ability to take advantage of opportunities or minimize losses as you move down the river.
3. The future is like a gigantic ocean that has no particular flow or direction. If you decide to go somewhere, you have to build your own canoe and decide that you're going to get out on that ocean and simply sail to a place you've never been, like Hawaii. (Hawaii, as you may know, was one of the last places discovered by humans, was a myth in many of the early Polynesian and other oceanic cultures. They had a vision of a place called Hawaii that was among one of the many reasons they kept sailing.) You have an image of a vision of where you're going to go, and use that to move forward. Of course, it can lead to disaster and failure.
4. The future is a game of chance like Monopoly. You throw the dice, go as far as they say, and move back or forward, but there's very little ability to look ahead, very little direct consequence to what it is you're doing. You simply muddle along doing the best you can.

Please write down on a sheet of paper the one that is closest to your view. If there is a correct answer, unfortunately, I don't know what it is, but you are betting your lives that you know what it is. You're making decisions personally with your life. Those of you who are parents are telling your children don't do this or do that all the time because you have some idea about what life is like. And so finding out which of these things is characteristic is really important.

While we're doing that, I want to ask you one other thing. Since humanity began 10,000 or 20,000 or 40,000 or 50,000 or a 100,000 years ago, for a very long period of time, there was substantially no social change or very gradual social change. But within the last several hundred years, we have lived in a society that has prided itself on continuous and continuously more rapid social change, so the future has become less and less understandable and predictable.

Once upon a time, it was absolutely predictable, absolutely understandable. The future was going to be just the way the present was, which is just the way the past had been. And if you ever had a problem, you went up to granddaddy and said, What am I going to do? And he would say, When I was your age, I had the same problem and I went up to my granddaddy and said, What am I going to do? and he said, When I was your age, I had the same problem. As it was in the beginning, is now, and evermore shall be, world without change.

That's the way it was for a long period of time, and we are biologically and psychologically conditioned to think the future is that way. But with the scientific industrial revolution, with development, progress, economic growth, came the idea that there were new worlds that we could move to physically and begin life again. And we came as immigrants to a new land having to learn a new language, a new culture, and new ways of life where the past was sort of quaint and old fashioned and not relevant to our new life. That's the world we have built for ourselves. You guys would not have existed several hundred years ago, and certainly not a thousand years ago.

The fact that you have to join a futurism group and begin to think seriously about this is very difficult, very unusual, so what's next? Well, the official view of what's next is more of the same: continued growth. That's the official view, that's what I'm supposed to be teaching my students and what I'm supposed to be telling you. The purpose of a state university, of any public and formal education is to take people off of the farm, out of the fields, and make workers and managers out of them. And now, in the information society, we're supposed to make information workers and managers out of them and make them be able to see that the economy keeps growing.

Continued economic growth is the official view of the future. There are lots of uncertainties because this continuation breaks old rules and customs, but at least you basically know what you're supposed to do. Some people are saying it's all over, that, in fact, we can't continue to grow—that the environment won't permit it, that our psyches can't continue this perpetual change, that we're destroying the basic values of family, culture, and religion in this constant change, and that humans are an evolutionary experiment that's just not working out.

We are the only creature that does the sort of stuff we do. I don't see any other creature becoming an actuary and coming over here to think about the future. This perspective says that, instead of being a little lower than the angels, we're, in fact, just a blackhead on Mother Nature. What this is saying is collapse, that it's all over. The Asian crisis has been good for American business so far, but will it continue? How would I know?

I've given you two alternative futures, one is continued growth and many varieties, another is collapse for many, many different causes. A third alternative can be called a discipline society. It says look at all of this pursuit of endless wealth and gadgets and all the rest. It's worthless anyway, and if we're going to collapse, let's try to find a place where we'd like to land. Here in Hawaii as you may know, there are many native Hawaiians who would really like to return to a traditional lifestyle of 200, 300, 400 years ago. That's, in a sense, their vision. Others will say, no, I like my MTV, I wouldn't be able to exist without my G-3, I got to have the Internet, and I like some modern medicine so let's not go all the way back there, just to the place where communities mean something, where families mean something, where you can ask your father or your mother and they'll tell you the truth instead of fantasies. To do that, though, we have to decide what these basic values are, values of nature, values of our society, values from God, basic values that are being lost in the continued growth. And so then we discipline our behavior around these basic values. That's a third alternative, and there are many subtle differences within it.

And then the fourth alternative says our industrial society is already in the process of ending, but there is something new in the process of being born. And in a new society, if a transformation can occur before the collapse fully occurs, then we will have growth, but on a different scale, a different level with different values toward different perspectives.

Most planners and administrators and politicians and decision makers have a continued-growth view. Here in Hawaii, we are not growing economically but many of us are saying it's a wonderful opportunity for rethinking what we're doing, not just attract more tourism, but let's totally rethink what it is we're doing. There are many, but it's not a huge group, of people who are expecting a collapse. Are

you worried about the Y2K problem? Are you beginning to save up for that? That's just one of the many, many things we could collapse from. There are many organizations and individuals that are trying to persuade us to develop some sort of a disciplined society, and most futurists have some sort of a transformational vehicle. I certainly do. It doesn't mean it's true or false, just that these four images actually exist in our society.

May I get the results from the first exercise?

**From the Floor:** Thirty-four river, sixteen ocean, one game.

**Mr. Dator:** One game, and nobody's on a roller coaster.

**From the Floor:** No roller coasters.

**Mr. Dator:** One game, OK. And none in roller coaster, OK. All right, that's good. It wouldn't be good if you guys were actuaries and were either on the roller coaster or game players, that would not be good. I would personally prefer that more of you viewed this as ocean, but I guess you're all the middle man, right? And again, there is a correct answer to this. I took everything else about the future, you're betting your life and your client's and your children's life on it, but you don't necessarily know what it is.

Dator's second law of the future is that any useful idea about the future should appear to be ridiculous. It's very important to me as a futurist that you not like it, that you not agree with what I have to say, that you find my views offensive or irrelevant. Then I know I'm doing my job. If you all say, yes, he's great, yes, I feel exactly the same way, then I've failed and I may very well be failing because the reason for this is that I think that there is so much change going on at the present time, technologically caused change. I look primarily at technology as an agent of change. Electronic communication technologies are changing everything we do about work, changing our idea of places, time, and relationships. I also take the developments in artificial intelligence very seriously; most of what I do can and should be done by a robot, not by me. If you get really good at what you do, then an expert system can do it and only a handful of you will be needed and the rest of you can go do useful things with your lives.

Certainly things like judiciaries are tailor made for replacement by technology. That's the next contest for Big Blue, now that IBM's computer has beaten the world's chess champion. Next, we're going to have the "Supremes": the nine people on the Supreme Court behind a curtain and Big Blue behind a curtain, with a human jury feeding them questions. If you can't tell from the results which

answers came from the humans and which came from the computer, then we're going to make the humans go do honest work in terms of judiciary over computers and so forth. And genetic engineering clearly is the most important technology of the future, so an enormous amount of change is going on in that respect.

I am very, very uncertain that given the number of humans that are about to grace the face of the earth that earth can sustain it. When my grandfather was born, the world for the first time had achieved 1 billion people; when I was born, the population of the world was 3 billion. Now the population has reached 6 billion and, even though the pace has slowed, we still have serious problems with overpopulation.

What's true for the world as a whole is not true for all parts of the world. Some parts of the world are stabilizing or declining. Were it not for immigration, the United States would be an aging society just like most of Europe and Japan is. Russia and other former Soviet Union countries are experiencing very serious depopulation. So parts of the world are getting smaller, but the world itself is getting larger.

There are lots of consequences to this. In the beginning of this century, most people lived in rural areas, but now half of the population lives in cities. Fifty years from now, substantially more, perhaps three quarters of humanity will be living in integrated cities of some sort. It's very difficult for me to imagine that we can sustain that lifestyle or develop the knowledge necessary for humans to live like that.

Let me just mention one final thing about demographics. A 100 years ago, the world for the first time was roughly equally divided between whites and nonwhites, but because of different fertility rates between parts of the world that are growing and parts of the world that are not, the white proportion has decreased to about 20%. If these trends continue, white people ought to do everything possible to make friends with these other folks, not antagonize them. That's what I mean when I say you need to look for the surprising things, the ridiculous things. Whenever I'm tempted to reject something as stupid I decide to take a better look. That's the reaction I'm trying to develop.

Welcome to "the futures" (handouts distributed and four alternative future scenarios assigned to groups in audience). Choose a member of your group to be a reporter to take notes of your discussion and to make a three minute report to the other groups. Quickly read over the attached description of your future, then discuss it with other members of your group to see if you understand it. Whatever you may initially feel about the future in which you've been so suddenly placed, please

suspend your disbelief. You have no more control over your being in this future than you had over when and where you were born. This is your life; love it because you can't leave it.

In the next several minutes, make the best of the future you find yourself in, just as you obviously do in the present. Don't argue over whether you think it will happen as described or not, or whether you like it or not. Just accept it and try to respond positively to whatever you think is good and true to the world in which you find yourself. Don't dwell on the negative aspects except to understand them, and to develop a positive attitude towards them. It just doesn't get any better than this. Do not criticize or critique your future. Discuss it only to be sure you basically agree among yourselves what your future is like. Wherever the description is uncertain, each group should come up with its own conclusions about the future as quickly as possible. No one knows more about your future than you who are living it now. Have fun, enjoy yourself, be creative, be wise, be serious, think about things carefully, do your best.

After you've done that, describe what you think the typical actuary will be doing in the future in which you find yourself, especially what new or different problems society will be faced with, and how might you and actuaries in general help people deal with these problems. Who will your clients be in this future? Then discuss how probable you think your future is and to what extent you think it will happen or not, and how desirable it is.

Group one's future was the nation states of the 19th and 20th centuries are gone and with them, the dead hand of democracy and regulations. Nation states have been replaced by huge regional entities, the control of which is contested for by seven global transnational corporations which are the real rulers now. Global wealth is so enormous that infrastructure and all other general-use facilities are extensive, high-quality, and reliable. Each region and, in effect, the world is knit together by gigantic urban megalopolises with breadth and scope and efficiency. Never have so many people on earth been so materially well off as they are now. Never have so many people been multibillionaires. But, at the same time, there is a huge underclass of marginally employed or unemployable people worldwide.

**From the Floor:** First of all, we kind of saw that IBM or some big company would be running the show. There was really no middle class and we struggled to determine who the consumer was. We saw that the corporations are going to want actuaries to do the forecasting and look at the risks involved in running a big corporation, and possibly need us to develop some sort of social assistance program to keep the lower class from getting upset. We decided it would be very likely, and we've certainly seen it in the past several times around the world in past history.

**Mr. Dator:** Does the other group have anything to add or subtract?

**From the Floor:** Yes. We also talked about the social programs because that's where actuarial involvement would be fairly strong, particularly on the medical side and the property casualty side trying to figure out ways to protect the assets of the rich. We also felt one likely scenario would be that actuaries would be involved in a lottery program that would give hope to some of the people in the underclasses.

**Mr. Dator:** You understand lotteries real well.

**From the Floor:** It seems quite probable with a couple of exceptions. The concept of the nation states going away doesn't seem as likely. Also it didn't seem likely that the worldwide infrastructure would be built up. So we agreed that even though it's kind of likely, it's probably not sustainable long term.

**Mr. Dator:** Is this desirable?

**From the Floor:** Not particularly. It certainly has some good aspects.

**Mr. Dator:** Future two. The world is in the midst of an extensive and prolonged depression caused by the collapse of the old capitalist system of the 20th century on the one hand, and the surge of problems caused by a global environmental change on the other. Global warming, extreme climatic variations, sea-level rise, a decline in fresh water, food scarcity, soil erosion, pesticide contamination, energy insufficiency, and marauding hordes of environmental refugees. Enclaves of rich and super-rich exist in all cities, electronically communicating with one another and moving from enclave to enclave by air, but seldom venturing out into the dangerous countryside.

**From the Floor:** We realized the rich don't need us because they can self-insure and the poor can't afford us. Therefore, we have to become leaders of the marauding hordes. Actually, we thought most actuaries would be working in the enclaves of the rich and the super-rich helping to maintain whatever the economy was, working with resource allocations, investments—they still need insurance at that level. We also thought there would probably be actuaries involved in the environmental areas trying to figure out what to do about problems. We thought some of our actuaries would be working with the government to address the problems outside the wall, whether it be as social planners or creating order out of chaos or dealing with some kind of Social Security-type system to help deal with the problems outside.

**Mr. Dator:** And what about the probability and desirability?

**From the Floor:** The majority of the people at the table thought the probability was low, a few thought it was medium to low, and desirability—most of us did not see that.

**Mr. Dator:** Future three. Following a brief but intense dark age of economic, environmental, and eventually political collapse, the world now exists as a loosely knit web of self-sufficient, small communities. Some of these communities are formed on spiritual or religious beliefs, others are formed on the basis of sexual preferences. Some are matriarchies, some are patriarchies. Some practice one form of political ideology, others are open, liberal communities that encourage great diversity of views and lifestyle. Some are rural, others are entirely urban. All tend to be externally peaceful whatever their internal structures may be like. All are economically self-sufficient, trading only for the purpose of maintaining harmony and good will among neighbors, not for any economic purpose or advantage.

**From the Floor:** We decided that this was pretty close to Bismarck, ND. We decided that any time you have a family entity, you have some need for insurance. If it's a patriarchy or matriarchy, maybe the need for insurance in those communities would be very great because one would take care of all and so forth. Any community, no matter what technological level it was at, would need to protect the source of income and the entity. Maybe we're going back to the 17th century and how insurance worked then; it would have been not global but in smaller communities. So we felt there was a need for actuaries, but probably not as many as we have today. The probability that it could happen we put at zero because there would be no trading for any economic purpose or advantage. We decided if there were two humans left on the face of the earth, they would be trying to take advantage of each other. We decided it was a great place to retire. Whether it would be desirable, some days you'd like to find this place and spend a couple of weeks to forget about the world, but you always have to go back to reality.

**Mr. Dator:** Future four. All work is done by artificially intelligent, genetically engineered means. Humans are just one intelligence among many others, although humans are the only ones with feelings or souls. Humans, thus, stand out because they combine a marginal kind of rationality with maximum emotional and intuitive behavior. Energy-, resource-, labor- and capital-intensive industrial and agricultural practices of the past are gone. They're replaced by endless effortless, efficient, self-governing production—or should it be called growth—of nanotechnologies. All previous kinds of political and economic systems are gone as major forces in this world, though some old-fashioned human groups still try to keep them alive in remembrance of days and ways past.

**From the Floor:** Well, basically, it seems like everything was perfect and everybody's well off, and we had difficulty finding a role for actuaries. We went down a number of tracks and every time we ended up at: everybody has everything, so nothing is needed. Retirement funds wouldn't be needed, health care wouldn't be needed since people are genetically engineered. We thought perhaps people could still die, and thought about casualty insurance. But everything is so available to everyone we finally decided that there would be something like short term casualty insurance. In other words, if your house blew down or there was an earthquake, you might need a little bit of coverage while your house was being built, but that wouldn't take long at all. Baseball scores we figured would always zero to zero. We dealt with the emotional aspect of things, and maybe that's where things might happen. There might be disruptions and more business, but we still didn't come up with a role for actuaries on that route. We didn't think you could control the weather, so we came up with the casualty thing. We thought it was not probable, although it might be quite possible to some degree. How desirable? Well, we really had a hard time finding out what we'd do for excitement here, so we didn't think it was very desirable.

**Mr. Dator:** I know there's another Group Four, how did you guys compare?

**From the Floor:** We agree that there's not much need for "insurance." You don't have the need to form capital, and you don't have the need to insure against injury and death. We thought actuaries would be helpful in contingency planning or risk control. We thought maybe there would be more of a health focus in defining the health needs of the community. We also thought that the game theory might be a possible role. For the human population, there's going to be a more creative role. As far as probability, we're seeing some elements of that now. When our parents were actuaries, what they did a few years ago is not what the current actuary does. We're seeing a lot of the automation now with the PCs and so forth.

**Mr. Dator:** Often alternative futures are just variations around a common theme. I've tried to show that all of these scenarios have some feasibility and plausibility. I would urge you to think about them or some variation of them when thinking about your alternative futures. One of the important things is a point you made about spending some time understanding the past, understanding how different what you do now is from what happened when business began and how you have adapted or not adapted to the changes. As applied, future studies spends a considerable amount of time looking at past change. Second, you need to become active within your own society and community in thinking about these as real alternatives. How would we like to live and how could we begin to get an anticipatory democracy that is focused on helping us create a preferred future for our children and grandchildren and future generations.