

The Legacy of Aurelio Peccei Twenty Years after his Passing and the Continuing Relevance of his Anticipatory Vision

Eleonora Barbieri Masini
2004 Aurelio Peccei Lecture
Rome, November 23, 2004

Introduction

I would like to begin by noting that I was fortunate to meet and get to know well Aurelio Peccei in the early 1970s, when we often worked together in Rome and were together in meetings and conferences of common interest.

Now in 2004 most people, if not all, are aware of living in a world undergoing great economic, social, political, and environmental changes and they understand the interrelation among these changes, as well as their global nature. As Edgar Morin wrote in 1994: "... not only are all parts of the world now more connected to the whole world, but the world in its globality is ever more present in each of its parts" (*translation by the author from the French*).

Aurelio Peccei since the end of the 1960s, or even before, was profoundly aware of the changes then occurring, their interrelations, and particularly of the global nature of these changes. This led him to coin the concept of the "World Problematique", which he first introduced in a speech in Buenos Aires 40-years ago.

In my Lecture today I will try to revisit and describe the seminal development of the anticipatory vision of Aurelio Peccei. His vision had a significant impact in the world in the last decades, even though in Italy, his native land and the country where he worked for a significant part of his life, his message had resonance only after his death, especially in more recent times.

Thus, I believe it is important for me to focus on the anticipatory aspects of Aurelio Peccei's thought. His vision of the future arose from a necessary and

concrete analysis of facts, something one would expect from someone with the mind of a manager. Even though Peccei often called himself a hopeless generalist and refused to think of himself as a scientist, his deep and seminal thinking had considerable scientific value. I think it is also worthwhile underlying the capacity that Aurelio Peccei had for listening to both scholars as well as international figures, be they thinkers or politicians, or heads of state. His ability to listen was by no means selective and he was ready to be informed by different cultures, thoughts, and religions in an open way, and if I may say so, with a certain humility so as to better understand how to put together a better action plan. Peccei had the capacity to listen to transcultural and interdisciplinary messages, with a view of discerning concrete actions to take to craft a better world for all humanity, irrespective of their differences. In this sense, one can talk of his capacity as a humanist, who had both a keen knowledge of the dynamical global economy and who, on the other hand, was capable of drawing lessons from his observations of the ongoing dynamics, always with the scope of better guiding and furthering important global decisions.

1. Aurelio Peccei as a Man and a Businessman, but Mostly as a Humanist

This part of my Lecture is based on Aurelio Peccei's book from 1976 "The Human Quality", as well as on the introduction by Umberto Colombo to the writings of Aurelio Peccei : "Lessons for the XXI Century", edited by the Fondazione Aurelio Peccei and published in the year 2000 by the Office of the Italian Prime Minister.

Aurelio Peccei was born in Torino in 1908, where he grew up. There, influenced by his family and the local social culture, he developed his life-view in which man, with his human resources and his desire for freedom, is the central element. He graduated from university in Torino with a degree in economics in 1930. Soon thereafter he acted on his desire to meet different people and visit new places and went to the Sorbonne with a scholarship and was awarded a free trip to the Soviet Union. All this occurred in the early 1930s. His knowledge of other languages and his proven desire to travel beyond Italy's borders brought him to FIAT, which gave him the opportunity to work and lead their activities in China, in Shanghai and Nanchang, in the mid 30s. He was joined there by his new wife, and they remained in China until the middle of 1938. In China, Peccei got to know

the country and its people, whose human capacities he held in high esteem all his life- which provides another example of his ability to be anticipatory in his thinking. Peccei highly admired the ability of the Chinese to undertake any kind of work, no matter how new or complicated it might be, and found their wisdom and patience, distilled from centuries of culture, very interesting.

Besides an Italian presence through the League of Nations, many Italian scholars and experts, tied generally to efforts (of mixed success) by the Italian Government, were in China in this period, for example in the aviation sector. However, the presence of Italians engaged in the private sector, like the group who worked for FIAT, was rather small. This was due in part to the difficult political and economic circumstances in China at that time, which worsened as a result of the Chino-Japanese war in 1937, and eventually led to a total break in the relations between Italy and China.

Aurelio Peccei, having returned to Italy at the eve of World War II, soon became involved in the anti-fascist movement and in the resistance, where he was a member of “Giustizia e Libertà”. During the war he was arrested, and tortured, and underwent a number of vicissitudes that only those who lived in that period, like me, even if I was a child then, can truly understand in their complexities and drama. At any rate, as Peccei wrote, this period served to make him better understand the importance of mankind’s inner capacity and strength, which allows men (and women) in terrible situations to defend human dignity.

His experiences in China and the dramatic period of the resistance confirmed his interest for the human potential.

After the war, Peccei was engaged in the rebuilding of FIAT and was involved, with the same energy and ability to look beyond the present, in various of the private and public efforts then underway to rebuild Italy, included the founding of ALITALIA. This myriad of activities was carried out without accepting any political or economic posts, which he could have easily have had given his role in the Italian resistance.

In any event, in 1949 his desire to experience and operate in a larger context, led him to accept to go to Latin America for FIAT to restart their operations there- operations that had been essentially halted during the war. He settled in Argentina, where he lived for nearly a decade with his family. During this

period, he started FIAT Concord, which built cars and tractors, and became rapidly one of the most successful automotive firms in Latin America. He poured enormous energies into FIAT's activities in the whole of Latin America and contributed to the industrial rebirth of this region, something for which he is still fondly remembered for in Latin America. During this period, however, he continued to maintain his broader interests in mankind, irrespective of social status, and kept an open eye for the political and social developments in other regions, including the Mediterranean. This led him in 1958, with the backing of FIAT, to found Italconsult and become its Chairman of the Board, a position he held until the 1970s when he became Honorary President.

Italconsult was an engineering and economic consulting group for developing countries, in which Italian firms were engaged. It operated under Peccei's leadership, on the whole, more as a non-profit consortium. Also in this activity Peccei left his imprinting: the development of human potential.

In 1964 he was asked to manage Olivetti. This large and established firm, which had been at the forefront in the development of typewriters and other office machines and which was also well known for its internal social policies and for supporting the links between industry and culture, was in significant difficulties at that time due to the profound changes occurring in the office machine sector. Peccei, with his foresight and his entrepreneurial vision, as well as his strong belief that the human potential can be the key to change, was able to turn the situation in Olivetti around and, also in this instance, was successful.

As a result of activities that started in the 1960s but continued into the 1970s, Peccei in 1972 was one of the principal artificers of the International Institute of Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA), in Laxenburg, Austria. This Institute was formed after considerable struggle, but then served as an important bridge between East and West, partly because its founders included the United States (through the National Academy of Sciences), the Soviet Union (through the Soviet Academy of Sciences), Italy (through the Comitato Nazionale di Ricerche) and various other countries in the then western and eastern sector of the world. IIASA became a meeting place for scholars and scientists of different countries and provided a bridging function for the scientific world, producing important studies in different fields, including climate change, energy and agriculture. IIASA still exists,

but its important role occurred before the fall of the Berlin Wall, an event which unfortunately Aurelio Peccei did not live to see.

It was during this same period, partly as a result of some of these activities and partly because his attention was focused more and more on global issues, that Peccei began to seriously worry about global problems, particularly in the area of the environment. He became involved in the World Wildlife Fund (WWF), becoming a member of its International Board and was a strong supporter of their mission, not only internationally but also locally in Italy.

At this point, I would like to summarize, from my point of view, the fundamental thrusts of the thinking and actions of Aurelio Peccei, which emerge from the brief sketch of his life given above. One can see a first, or initial, stage of development, which is centered on his ability as an entrepreneur and his knowledge of the global economy. This first stage, however, is overtaken by a second stage, where his capacity of ranging beyond a given enterprise, country, or even a continent, and to understand the linkages between disparate phenomena, plays a fundamental role. This is then followed by a final stage of development, what might be called his “red line” or the baseline of all his future activities. This is centered on his unstoppable commitment and sense of responsibility for mankind and its human potential, irrespective of wherever one lived or of whatever responsibility one had in life. Peccei recognized, in fact, the human potential of entrepreneurs and intellectuals, just as well as that of farmers, workers and artists, irrespective of whether they were in Russia, Latin America, the United States or in Italy, and he worried, till the end of his life, how to develop this human potential further, recognizing that this is the key to changing society into one that is more human.

In this respect, a phrase in the introduction of his 1976 book “The Human Quality” is quite telling. After an analysis of global problems which, as I shall discuss further towards the end of the Lecture, could have been written today, Peccei writes: ” Why do we have this general and incurable moral, political, social, psychological, economic and ecological crisis which, in different forms, subtle or explosive, touches us all, developed or not, making us lose our bearings and pushing us towards dark futures?” To overcome the difficulties he saw for the world in 1976, he asks further: “Don’t we need something quite different that what is being proposed by the various social actors, be they national politicians or the United Nations, on what is by now

a global chessboard?” He answers this question there by suggesting that what is needed “ is a true and proper mutation, a new way to live for man which would put him in harmony with the reality he continually manipulates, transforms, and creates himself”. This is the jump in human quality he discusses in his book. I believe that what is here quoted also gives a true sense of his thinking and the need for action he felt, and speaks to Peccei’s anticipatory capacity, which became so clear with his total engagement with and for the Club of Rome.

2. Peccei as Founder and Embodiment of the Club of Rome, and Some Connections to the Present

I want now to tie the story of Peccei’s life, with its achievements and often difficult struggles, which apparently were never felt that way, to the initiative that led to his founding of the Club of Rome.

To do so, I think it is important to go back to the book he wrote before the “Human Quality”. This is his 1969 book “The Chasm Ahead”, which was translated in Italian as “Verso L’Abisso”, a less effective title than the original one. “The Chasm Ahead” was identified by Dennis Meadows in the latest Club of Rome meeting, held in Helsinki in October 2004, as the book which helped start all the debate about “limits “, that has now lasted for over 32 years since the publication of “Limits to Growth”.

I think it is correct to start with this book which illuminates clearly the principles which then became the vision of the Club of Rome. This vision was one directed to the future, and this is the key to both Peccei’s and the Club of Rome’s message. I think it is important for me to underline this point, particularly since I have dedicated most of my life to future studies, albeit more in their humanistic and social aspects.

In “The Chasm Ahead” Peccei identified the following as key principles which emerge when thinking about the future:

- i. Humanity and the global environment are both parts of the same integrated macro-system. (How much has been said about this point, and how difficult and poorly heard message this has been in the last 35 years!)

- ii. Many of the components of this macro-system are at risk of breaking down, or even of totally being destroyed. (How many of these breakdowns have occurred since this was written?) I am glad some of these issues will be discussed at today's meeting after the Lecture, from climate change, to the destruction of marine environments, to the dangers facing forests in the Mediterranean area.
- iii. To face this increasing complexity and dynamical interactions among the various components, and to prevent continuous disasters, it is necessary to develop a new way of global planning.
- iv. Developing such a global plan and implementing it are a collective obligation of all groups that have the capacity to do so.

With these ideas, Peccei began to think in earnest how to concretely move them forward. His thinking crystallized after a chance encounter in 1967 with Alexander King, who was then the Director General for Scientific Affairs for the Organization for Cooperation and Economic Development (OCED) in Paris. Peccei and King decided to organize a meeting on April 7-8, 1968 of around thirty scholars at the Accademia dei Lincei in Rome, to discuss their ideas, which by now they shared, of the globality of problems facing mankind and of the necessity of acting at the global level. The meeting at the Accademia dei Lincei was not a success, partly due to the difficulty of the participants to focus on a distant future (a real disinterest even now, 40 years later!).

After the meeting there was an informal gathering of a few people in Peccei's home, which included Erich Jantsch (one of the great methodologists of planning studies), Alexander King, Hugo Thiemann and others. The Club of Rome grew out of this meeting of minds and people who were focused on the same problem. Perhaps more than anything else what helped the Club of Rome to get started was the will and perseverance of Aurelio Peccei, fully backed by Alexander King. Thus started what Peccei called "the adventure of the spirit". He was fond to state that: "if the Club of Rome has any merit, is that of having being the first to rebel against the suicidal ignorance of the human condition". Another quote of Peccei, in this respect, is particularly telling: "It is not **impossible** to foster a human revolution capable of changing our present course".

After a series of different attempts, which unfortunately I do not have the time to detail here but which are of interest to historians of future thinking, it was decided to ask a group at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology to

undertake a project for the Club of Rome. The project, which by now had become a clear objective for the Club of Rome, was to describe the “World Problematique” through a mathematical model that would be able to represent its various aspects and which could be used as a guide for future actions. The risky aspect for the Club of Rome was to want to have a mathematical model for the problems of the globe.

In the meanwhile, some clarification had occurred on what kind of an organization the Club of Rome should be. The Club of Rome should be small, with not more than 100 members; it should not have much funding, to preserve its independence; it should be apolitical, but transcultural (in terms of disciplines and cultures); and, finally, it should be informal. In a sense, it should be a non-organization, and one that should be dissolved once its objective had been reached. The Italians in the Club of Rome in those days were, besides Peccei, Adriano Buzzati Traverso (biologist), Altiero Spinelli (europeist), and Umberto Colombo (economist). As can be seen by the way the Club of Rome was organized, even here Peccei shows his foresight. This should be an interdisciplinary group that would focus on the long term, not therefore a group with a narrow vision, which would look at things only from a certain disciplinary bias, irrespective of how deep the discipline is, or from the standpoint of a given country, or region. It really needed to be transcultural. Unfortunately, as events have shown us in the last 30 years, this is what is still missing. Everyone continues to champion their own point of view, ignoring those of others (the ignorance that Peccei speaks about).

The MIT project of the Club of Rome originated from a concrete proposal made by Jay Forrester. Forrester, who for a number of years had been working on dynamical systems at MIT, outlined a mathematical model for the world which contained the, by now well-known, interdependent parameters of population; depletion of non-renewable resources; industrialization; food production; and environmental degradation. Forrester entrusted the project to Dennis Meadows, who at that time was a young researcher in his group. In this way “The Limits to Growth”, a report to the Club of Rome, was born. This report was presented publicly at the Smithsonian Institute in Washington on March 12, 1972.”The Limits to Growth” was translated into 30 languages and 10 million copies of the book were sold, helping the Club of Rome gain the world stage.

Dennis Meadows revisited the model in 1992. The first presentation of this reanalysis, in fact, was sponsored by the Fondazione Aurelio Peccei, and

occurred in the 2002 Peccei Lecture by Dennis Meadows, entitled “Beyond the Limits”. What emerges from this up-dating of the input data for the 1972 mathematical model is that humanity had already gone beyond the limits indicated in the original book. That is, from this new analysis it appears that we have overshoot the sustainability of our globe, as defined in the 1972 model. Meadows and his co-authors, as in the past, do not claim that they intended, or intend, to forecast the future through these model analyses. Rather, they hope that the model can point to alternative scenarios for possible futures. Indeed, the principal motivation for the new study, besides bringing the input data up to date and showing that mankind has indeed gone beyond the limits, is to encourage the citizen’s of the world to shoulder more responsibility for their own future. The message of the Club of Rome was therefore still alive.

A third volume has now appeared in 2004 and confirms what was written 12 years ago, that we have overshoot. That is, humanity has, unintentionally, gone beyond the limits of our globe. The unintentional nature of this phenomenon, reminds us of Aurelio Peccei’s thinking on the ignorance prevailing in our times. A quote from him in 1979 is very apropos: “The dominant cultural thinking privileges detailed analyses, which flood one with information, forgetting that only a desire for synthesis allows one to translate all this information into true and proper knowledge, and a source for wisdom”. How far away today appears this “desire for synthesis”, even in academic circles where one can almost only talk about specialization!

In the decade between 1970 and 1980 Peccei thought through and put into action a plan to sensitize high level decision makers to the need of their becoming more aware of their responsibility towards the survival of mankind. With the backing of Bruno Kreisky, then Chancellor of Austria, Peccei was able to convene an informal meeting of Heads of State in Salzburg, Austria. This was remarkable, as it is well known that Heads of State always meet in formal settings, which does not help them discuss what is truly important for their citizens. The informal Salzburg meeting of 1974, which occurred away from TV cameras, allowed a number of Heads of State to talk about some of the true problems of the world and the “World Problematique”. Besides Bruno Kreisky, the following Heads of State were present in Salzburg: Leopold Senghor, President of Senegal; Luis Echeverria, President of Mexico; Joop den Uyl, President of Holland; Olaf Palme, Prime Minister of Sweden; Pierre Trudeau, Prime Minister of Canada; as well as the representatives of the Prime Ministers of Algeria and

Ireland. This meeting, I want to re-emphasize, was truly informal, something that today seems unthinkable, but which was not easy even then. What emerged from Salzburg was the need to assume a collective global responsibility and the understanding that certain national aspirations, although desirable, can only be reached in the long term within a global context.

Other informal Heads of State meetings were held in West Berlin, also in 1974, and in Guanajuato, a city that is a symbol of Mexican independence, in 1975. One sees from these meetings that Peccei's scope was not only to bring the "World Problematique" to the attention of intellectuals, but also to that of true decision makers. These Heads of State meetings, even though they are one of the more interesting activities of Aurelio Peccei in this period, are not very well known. For that matter, as I will discuss shortly, also poorly known are his efforts to involve the young.

In parallel with this activity, during these years various projects and reports to the Club of Rome were made public and achieved world recognition. One of these was the report of Mihailo Mesarovic and Eduard Pestel in 1974 on "Surviving Development", which was extremely interesting from a methodological point of view, having divided the world in 10 regions. Although this report did not gain the fame of "The Limits to Growth", the disaggregated nature of its model proved very useful, and a number of countries used the model for decision-making purposes.

This project was followed in 1976 by the RIO project. RIO, which stands for "Reshaping the International Order" was directed by Jan Timbergen, Nobel Prize winner in Economics and, in contrast with the previous projects, was not based on a mathematical model. Nevertheless, the project contained some of the elements that were central to Peccei's vision. Namely, that in a project with global reach, it was necessary to have contributions from people with different cultural backgrounds and different ideologies. The RIO project was followed in 1978 by another project of a totally qualitative nature called "Goals for Mankind". This project was led by the philosopher and cybernetic, Ervin Lazlo, and tried to address the question of what were the common goals for mankind in a global world. This project illustrates well the developing thinking of Aurelio Peccei, since finding common goals for mankind was part of his vision.

In this same period, as an answer to an important need expressed by Peccei of thinking of education for the future, a project was prepared and published with the title of “No Limits to Learning”. This book demonstrates Peccei’s desire of defeating ignorance through an educational effort aimed at developing human qualities by directly improving each person, but also as a mean of avoiding damages to the environment and to society itself. This is very much in the spirit of the “red line” I spoke about earlier.

“No Limits to Learning” was led by three people of quite different backgrounds: Mircea Malitza, Rumanian and a mathematician; Mahdi Elmandjra, a Moroccan and a political scientist of international affairs; and James Botkin, an American and a higher education specialist. Once again the approach was intercultural and interdisciplinary. In parallel to this effort, another report to the Club of Rome appeared, written by Umberto Colombo and Dennis Gabor, Nobel Prize winner in Physics. Their study, entitled “Beyond the Age of Waste”, was more along the line of “The Limits to Growth”.

I believe that I have clearly demonstrated in the above what Giorgio Nebbia wrote recently in the 16 March, 2004 edition of the *Gazzetta del Mezzogiorno* in memory of Aurelio Peccei, 20 years after his death. Nebbia, in his article, identifies two key themes that guided Peccei’s actions and, indeed, his life: “attention to, and education for, the future” and “a vision for the future of humankind”.

This same spirit led Peccei to devote a good portion of his last years to the assembly of a group of young people under thirty, coming from different countries, with the firm belief that the Club of Rome also needed the input of the young on what could or should be their future. I participated fully in this endeavor and found it fascinating. Unfortunately, after Peccei’s passing the Club of Rome decided to discontinue this activity. I am happy to note that, 20 years afterwards, the Club of Rome has now decided to help a group of young people form their own allied organization, known as tt30 (think tank under 30), which is now beginning to take its first steps.

At the same time that he was deeply engaged with the young, the indefatigable Peccei also organized a variety of International meetings. I remember particularly a meeting in Tokyo in 1982 with the title “Approaching the 21st Century: Global Problems and Human Choices” which involved some leading world figures (here again, one sees Peccei’s

clear effort to make important decision makers become more aware of what are the choices for mankind). Two of them were Saburo Okita, one of the artificers of the development of the Japanese economy (we were then in the middle of Japan's economic boom), and Soedijatmoko, the then Rector of the United Nations University in Tokyo, who both became members of the Club of Rome.

Another important meeting took place in Budapest, also in 1982, on the theme "Food for Six Billion". This meeting, which occurred when the Berlin Wall still existed, benefited from the presence of important personalities in the Soviet Union and of other countries in Central and Eastern Europe as well as, of course, Hungary. Their contributions, as well as the support of the Director General of FAO, made this meeting particularly important. This meeting was organized jointly by Aurelio Peccei and by Jòzsef Bognar. Bognar who was one of the main persons responsible for the survival of Hungarian agriculture, which allowed for the coexistence of small privately owned farms with the large State-supported Agribusinesses. The former helped Hungary emerge from the crisis caused by the fall of the Soviet Union. I still remember the visit that we made on this occasion to Bàabolin, a farming enterprise, where, along with the traditional agricultural methods, they were experimenting, more than 20 years ago, with genetic modifications of animals.

The last meeting Peccei organized and participated in was in Bogotà, Colombia, on 15-17 December, 1983, with the striking and brave title of "Development in a World of Peace". This title was particularly brave for a country in a semi-permanent guerilla status, with very serious political and economic divisions. Co-organizer of the meeting with Peccei, was the President of Colombia, Belisario Betancour. Even today, this meeting is remembered by many Colombians for its vision and courage. I can attest the deep effect that these meetings had on the participants, like the one in Budapest that I was fortunate to attend.

It is interesting to note the venue of these meetings, both from a historical and geographical standpoint. Peccei was very much aware of the historical importance of events for the choices one makes, and guidance one has, of possible futures. Thus he held a meeting in Japan on responsible development, in the middle of a strong economic expansion; one in Hungary, with a model agricultural society, tackling the difficult issue of

food for the world in the future: and one in Colombia, where it is clear that for development peace is a necessity.

In July 1984, a few months after Peccei's death in March 1984, a Conference that Aurelio Peccei had helped co-organize with Pentti Malaska, the President of the Finnish Chapter of the Club of Rome, was held in Helsinki. Malaska, who is a mathematician, has for many years been engaged in future studies. In fact, Malaska is chiefly responsible for having future studies being part of the curriculum in all Finnish Universities and creating vibrant study Centers in this area in Helsinki and Turku. In addition, remarkably, he was able to form a parliamentary group that deals with topics related to the future, which has both consultative and decisional functions. In spite of uncertainties in the Club of Rome, which was even contemplating closing down, Malaska, with the help of various Finnish Ministers, was able to make the 1984 Conference, whose title was "Managing Global Issues, Reasons for Encouragement", a great success. The Conference began with an introduction by Pentti Malaska of Aurelio Peccei and his life-work, which he entitled: "Rebellion against Ignorance". It ended with a quote from Aurelio Peccei in which he stated: "I consider the Club of Rome first of all an adventure of the spirit and...if the Club of Rome be credited with any merit, it is to have been the first to rebel against this well right suicidal ignorance".

Helsinki was again in 2004 the venue for a meeting of the Club of Rome, 20 years after the 1984 Conference. The Finnish participants at this year's Conference particularly stressed the importance of this earlier meeting. They too remember well, and try to follow, the vision of Aurelio Peccei, as can be seen by the title chosen for the 2004 Conference: "Limits to Ignorance: The Challenge of an Informed Society". The second part of the title is interesting, particularly if we remember Peccei's statement on the necessity of wisdom more than information. It is nice to see that, what I called, the "red line" of Peccei's thought is still alive and well in many countries, twenty years after his death.

3 Peccei's Vision in Italy

I am a witness of how little heed was paid to the thinking of Aurelio Peccei in Italy, save for a few exceptions. Among these exceptions, I can cite the Italian chapter of WWF and my own Gregorian University, which invited

him to speak on various occasions and published some of his writing, and where still some of these texts form part of the course materials for our course on Human Ecology. Giorgio Nebbia, in the article quoted already, writes: “ The majority of economists, politicians, and businessmen in Italy made fun of Peccei’s theses. These attacks, and the ironisms he was subject to, saddened Peccei while he lived. However, today at a distance of more than thirty years the numbers seem to agree with him.....Shouldn’t we, perhaps, reread what Peccei wrote?”

Conclusions

I want to finish my talk by quoting the last writing of Aurelio Peccei: “The Club of Rome: Agenda for the End of the Century”. The importance of this document is perhaps attested by the fact that Senator Pell introduced it on June 28, 2004 in the Congressional Record of the United States Senate. This document was finished by Aurelio Peccei less than 12 hours before his death and was not reread by him, and in some way is considered his spiritual testament. The text survives because it was dictated to his Assistant, Anna Pignocchi, who then transcribed it. Peccei begins the document by pointing out that there are only 6,000 days before we will reach the year 2000 and then goes on to make number of observations, many of which are still totally valid today.

Here I will only point out a few of the points made by Peccei, chosen more by my own interpretation of this document than by a desire to be exhaustive. These are:

- i. What will happen in these 6,000 days will depend almost exclusively on what human beings will do and when and how they will do it
- ii. The growth of population in the world in these 6,000 days will be such that it will require great changes to take place
- iii. The relations between mankind and the environment will continue to deteriorate
- iv. Human society will grow not only in size, but also in the complexity and intricacy of its relations
- v. New technologies will continue to emerge and develop, like microelectronics, genetic engineering, etc
- vi. Fatal decisions will be made on whether or not to continue the arms race

- vii. We need to understand that there is a mission, or a series of missions, the human society must undertake before the end of the century (here Peccei clearly envisions a leading role for the Club of Rome).
- viii. In underscoring the growth in population in the developing world, Peccei notes the linked necessity of providing food, health care, education, housing, and particularly, work. The lack of these necessary provisions, or an insufficient response to these needs, will produce immense suffering but also the explosion of rebellions and of suppressed violence in these countries
- ix. The harmonious coexistence between man and the environment is not only something of immediate interest and crucial for our future survival, but is also a fundamental cultural value
- x. The necessity of solid governance for the world is fundamental
- xi. One of the reason we lack good global governance is due to the rivalry between East and West, and North and South in the world (I believe this holds true even now, 20 years after this was written)
- xii. The development of all of human kind, in its disparate variety, is essential, irrespective what may be the obstacles or the consequences
- xiii. Human development is the most important goal
- xiv. The idea of living in a non-violent society should become one of our basic cultural values
- xv. Peace is the principal and basic factor for development, the quality of life, and the fulfillment of each person. Non-violence should be viewed, not only as necessary at all levels and sectors in human society, but also as a key to the relations between human society and nature

These are Aurelio Peccei's last words, which seem to me point towards a growing level of concern on his part for the world. I do not believe I need to add anything more here, except to wish that my children and grandchildren and all other young people should have a different future than the one we are now heading for.