Over the weekend of January 28-29, 2011, a group of World Order Models Project (WOMP) personnel met at 866 UN Plaza, New York City, NY, and the Robert Treat Best Western Hotel in Newark, NJ. The central question discussed was whether, and, if so, how WOMP should proceed in the future. At the end of the discussions, there was a general consensus that WOMP participants should indeed continue by addressing, from a WOMP perspective, the most pressing challenges facing humanity in the 21st century.

There was unanimous agreement that the five core WOMP values remain fundamental and of urgent importance: peace; economic well-being; social justice; ecological balance; and positive identity. (Alternative terminology: minimization of armed conflict; optimization of economic well-being for all; promotion of human rights and social justice; achievement of ecological sustainability; nurturing of positive identities.)

In addition, participants identified the need to address the world order dimensions of seven more specific topics:

- Biogenetics and the impacts of emerging technologies on family and social life, as well as political, economic, and cultural structures.
- Adequate governance and appropriate democratic participation in all contexts, ranging from local through national to regional and global interactions.
- Poverty throughout the globe; hyper-capitalism; how to make the international economic system more equitable and inclusive.
- The role of religious traditions in fomenting violence or encouraging tolerance, compassion, and peace.
- State terrorism and non-state terrorism (properly identified) and antidotes to these behaviors.
- Imperialism in all its forms, and the distinction between imperial globality and cosmopolitan globality.
- The meaning and manifestations of global or cosmopolitan citizenship, informed by human rights.

The status of women in various domains was also highlighted, as well as the need to examine the opportunities and challenges related to their rise. Given WOMP interest in global citizenship, there was discussion of how the concept of citizenship might change. In addition, many participants urged focusing on how the issues are interrelated, both to one another and to the state.

Several participants proposed that addressing the preceding set of challenges should be subsumed under the banner of promoting global social democracy. Others disagreed, noting problems with such labeling because of certain baggage and connotations that may be off-putting. Alternative labels, such as “inclusive democracy,” “solidarity democracy,” or “world domestic policy,” were discussed. Likewise, there was a call for a fundamental rethinking of other labels, such as the term
“global citizenship.” In general, however, it was agreed that language, while denotative, should be open, inclusive, and an invitation for dialogue among diverse people throughout the world, not proposed as a creed others should adopt. Premature specificity should be avoided within this context. Some noted that, rather than try to change the whole world at once, a promising strategy might be to do the hard intellectual work necessary to identify creative proposals for resolving specific festering conflicts. These can be useful for policymakers, activists, and peace researchers.

It was noted that there are other groups and organizations that are already dealing with the aforementioned problems and may be better equipped to address them. Suggested examples include the World Social Forum and the Chinese People’s Association for Peace and Disarmament. Nonetheless, it was agreed that today’s problems are serious and urgent enough to warrant intellectual initiatives and political activism by as many groups as possible, and that WOMP could play a special role in adding its voice and distinctive world order perspective to the discourse. Conversation with other groups should be initiated so that their experiences may be articulated and shared.

One fruitful proposition came from Earth Action, a network of over 2,600 organizations across the world that aims for a more just, peaceful and sustainable world. Its mandate to facilitate collective and concerted action offers a framework in which WOMP may disseminate its knowledge and specific policy recommendations to wider communities of practice. Indeed, it was agreed that the praxis of WOMP values should be encouraged through Earth Action and other appropriate outlets.

**Immediate Next Steps**

The participants agreed that it would be useful to establish a web site in which they could continue to discuss the issues on which to focus, to encourage further sharing about what the world most needs from both those who participated in WOMP I and those who might participate in WOMP II, to survey possible interest in forming working groups, and to explore forms of organization and administration that would be useful and feasible at this time. The need to identify the names of new people to recruit into the initiative was underscored. Resumes should be collectively sent to everyone on the roster below; it is hoped that we will have an initial set by July 1, 2001, at which time we will discuss the manner in which to proceed.

In sum, participants agreed that WOMP II should move forward to discuss the issues on which to focus and to explore how best to organize WOMP II. The practical mechanism of a website will be established for WOMP participants to continue dialogue and establish a forum where new ideas and fresh contacts can be discussed. The group asked Manuela Mesa and Bob Johansen to collaborate in setting this up; Lester Ruiz offered to assist in these efforts. A related web site could later be opened to disseminate participants’ thinking more broadly throughout the world. At the end of the conversation, most participants seemed willing to pursue explorations, at the least, based on what Richard Falk, in his paper, called “a shared value set” in order “to set forth proposals . . . [for] political changes . . . that could restore hope and inspire citizen engagement throughout the world.”
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