

Draft V 1- 050922

Draft Declaration for

“The International Institute for Sustainable Regional Economies” meeting, IISRE at UNBC in Prince George September 5~7, 2005, - an OISD initiative formulated in the Discussion Paper January 2004.

Introduction

Thank you everyone in Sweden and British Columbia for participating and investing time and effort in the initiative, and especially to UNBC’s faculty and administration for hosting the meeting and to the MSU group for traveling from Sweden to Prince George.

OISD are pleased to have been able to initiate the cooperation between MSU and UNBC, which includes the IISRE initiative. We also appreciate that without the positive participation from faculty and administration in MSU and UNBC and other members of the community at large in Sweden and Canada, we would not have been able to reach this stage, or continue to develop the initiative further. We sense fortitude in UNBC’s and MSU’s faculty and administration and in both communities in Mid Sweden and Mid British Columbia to develop the IISRE Initiative into something new and distinct. This is not only what the communities at home are crying out for and what is so badly needed in the rest of the world, but it also reflects the ethical values of UNBC and MSU and the legacy of the people. The initiative is also a vehicle that will drive the cooperation between UNBC and MSU and their regions.

It was the meetings’ decision that OISD would draft a meeting declaration on the IISRE initiative. The draft will be submitted via e-mail to MSU and UNBC for consideration and input.

We suggest that, MSU, UNBC and OISD will be able to reach a consensus of the wording of the declaration, no later than October X 2005.

As a footnote, it is our analysis that a virtual temporary institute to manage the comparable analysis as a test phase, will provide conclusive evidence that will support the hypothesis in the discussion paper, and hence, the evidence and incentive to formalize the institute.

Proviso

Any use of semantics and recapitulation of elementary knowledge is for reference purposes and to bridge understanding between readers with different backgrounds. We recognize politics and normative statements always will influence any discussion and also that we all make normative and value statements. We don't see that as problem, since politics obviously can only be understood with the use of natural and social science, and where the criteria is agreed, normative statements become objective. The problem is of course to agree on the criteria. Nor is it possible to have a good discussion and avoid having some statements and opinions construed as criticism. In the spirit of good academic standards, freedom and tolerance we anticipate good and constructive arguments.

To avoid too much redundant writing, we may frequently refer to the Discussion Paper of February 2004, as the base for the discussion and to the continuation report of January 2005 and the meeting memorandum of July 26, 2005.

The initiative is an OISD initiative and as such any use of first personal pronoun or noun as "we" to mean OISD. The acronym "DP" followed by a page number refers to the Discussion Paper. We have numbered the paragraphs so that it will be easier to reference when we discuss this document.

1. Discussion We recognize that we all, including ourselves in and outside the university, sometimes become stubbornly clinical over a few pre-selected facts, and de-select other facts and thoughts; like a pilot that lands at the wrong airport or runway because he or she de-selected facts.
2. We try to always keep in mind that there may always be another explanation to man made and natural occurrences and solutions that have not been thought of, and might be more or truly correct.

3. On that note, we would like everyone to consider that increased government transfer and private investment in a region will raise economic production and employment, and bolster a positive outlook, thereby masking (diverting) underlying fundamental issues that society is facing, which hence, un-addressed, will grow worse and the community may be worse off in the long term. The risk is that the symptoms are treated rather than the underlying disease in society that causes the social economic and ecological illness.
4. The statement “social satisfaction and political stability depends on economic production”, DP page 2, has been argued to be a normative statement a number of times during the past two years.
5. We are discussing this as an example because any agreement between participants in the initiative obviously depends on all participants attaching the same importance to each of the possible criteria.
6. *This writer has just finished his breakfast, which I would not have had without economic production, while if hungry I may have caused political instability. The problem of course is when unlimited human wants and thus economic production, usurp sustainable socioeconomic and environmental realities and causes such disparities and social conditions that cause political instability – sometime a bit of semantics can help a discussion.*
7. Since the initiative is interdisciplinary and inter-community, and as such, depends on close interactive cooperation between natural/social science, government, First Nations and private sector. The methodology of natural and social science sometimes causes a problem for cooperation between natural and social science. One reason is applying the inductive methods and controlled experiments that isolate cause from effect is more difficult in social science, which does not mean natural science is not dealing with indeterminacy. As Heisenberg showed in his Principle of Indeterminacy in 1927, also the behaviour of particles can only be generalized in terms of probability.
8. Both, natural and social science face conflict between determinacy, chaos and nonlinearity in the real world. As our observation and hence understanding of the world increases, we often find that the more determinant our theories become, the greater the danger is that there is a conflict with reality.

9. Though we stubbornly claim that the statement; “social satisfaction and political stability depends on economic production” and the distribution of real income in society, is a positive statement – is not yet proven false and not in conflict with reality.
10. We are not aware of any culture and society that has sustained them without economic production.
11. *The fundamental problem for social science, the world and also for economists, (because at least some are concerned foremost for the wellbeing of the society) is that human aspiration expressed in economic production is unlimited and has alternative uses, while the resources each generation has available to achieve their ambitions is scarce.*
12. The purpose of an economy such as the Canadian and Swedish or any other economy is to ration and allocate the resources between competing ambitions and claims of members of the society that makes up our economies at home and abroad.
13. As the human population impact increases, the question when can society afford to wait for the inductive methods to prove that a hypothesis is universally true, before taking action? When should society use deductive methods and take precautionary action based on hypotheses that are not yet proven to be universally true.
14. We trust the forgoing further clarifies the initiative as formulated in the discussion paper.
15. “A perfect functioning allocation mechanism in an economy is a utopia. A better functioning allocation mechanism in regional and local economies is not a utopia, but a better functioning society.”
16. We feel it may be beneficial for the discussion to briefly talk about some of the concerns we had before we launched the initiative in 2003 in cooperation with OUC.
17. The major concern was the apparent challenging complexity of the initiative, which some deemed a mission impossible. Considering that to succeed the initiative will require joint participation from natural and social science, and administration in two universities, and from government, both local and central, First Nations and private sector, in two distinct regional economies in two different cultures and countries.

Those who have lived and worked for a time in both countries know that there are more cultural differences than first meets the eye.

18. Canada and Sweden are two very different versions of democratic representative governed mixed monetary economic systems, with significant different political and judicial systems - the Germanic and Anglo-American.
19. British Columbia is a province or federal state in the federation of Canada, a former British Colony, which is still reflected in the country's culture and government, and as a member of NAFTA its' economy largely depends on the US. Sweden is an autonomous small member country of a European Union that from its commencement in 1958 is still seeking clarity of where it is going, and how to secure long-term ecological sustainable social and economic development, and hence political stability.
20. This touches on why we suggest a comparable analysis as a start-up catalyst project for the institute, also discussed in the continuation report of January 2005.
21. A further concern before we launched the initiative was how to move from attention and interest to action, as attention and interest have no commitment and do not accomplish anything if not followed by desire and action.
22. How would we possibly be able create the chain of attention, interest and desire to participate in the initiative and action to actually do so among key people, first within each category and then between the categories in Sweden and Canada.
23. **How to move forward on the agreement?**
24. The agreement of cooperation establishes a platform for cooperation, however, the value for society and for UNBC and MSU will obviously depend on the value of the joint research, knowledge, information and development the agreement produces.
25. Subsequently, the question is how the agreement can best be managed in a way that best serves society and, as such, benefits UNBC and MSU as institutions and consequentially benefits faculty and administration.

26. The major premise in the Discussion Paper is that the parties, with participation from government, First Nations and private sector, will form a joint institute with facilities in Canada and Sweden. The International Institute for Sustainable Regional Economies IISRE – working name.

27. Conclusion as presented in the meeting

28. The purpose of the deductive discussion paper is to involve the parties in a logical analysis of the proposition in the paper. If the parties arrive to the conclusion that the minor and major premise in the paper are true then the proposition in the paper is sound.

29. It is our analysis that the parties in principle are in agreement that;

30. The initiative addresses issues of significance for society - at home and globally.

31. The initiative has significance for UNBC's and MSU's purpose in society.

32. The initiative offers UNBC and MSU the opportunity to build an outstanding international and interdisciplinary organization that is distinctive in its purpose and responsive to the people of society that make up regional economies, at home as well as globally.

33. Subsequently, we suggest that the meeting is in agreement that the major and minor premises in the initiatives are true.

34. Possible difference

35. Where there seems to be a difference is whether an institute as proposed should be a joint independent institute or an institute imbedded in MSU and UNBC.

36. It is OISD's analysis that the major premise in the DP page 2, would best serve society. Recognizing that "what is best" is an unquantifiable generalization that is assumed to be true and means that the joint institute determinately will become a reality.

37. A business plan, budget, etc., must also be developed and consideration must be given towards organizational, financial, management, staffing and the cost benefit opportunity cost, and opportunity consequence analysis must be taken into deliberation.

What is the consequence of developing the initiative with one model or another model and discussion of a joint independent institute verses an imbedded institute model.

38. As a recap, the guiding standard for decisions that need to be made should be based on that which best serves society and consequently, benefits UNBC and MSU as institutions and faculty and administration.
39. It should also be emphasized that the development approach is an unbiased step-by-step approach. Nothing prevents starting with an imbedded institute and after the parties have acquired experience of the initiative and the cooperation, the institute may remain imbedded or be move into a joint institute with facilities in Sweden and Canada.
40. It was agreed in the meeting that we start with a virtual institute that will be embedded within each University, but virtually operated as a joint institute. We refer here to the continuation report of January 2005.
41. It is also our analysis that the Comparable Analysis approach is vital to move the initiative and the cooperation forward and provide value to both communities.
42. The virtual organization and the Comparable Analysis means we can empirically test the initiative before any long-term commitment is made.
43. Summarized, the agreement includes (a) traditional faculty-to-faculty cooperation between universities, and (b) the IISRE Initiative, the "International Institute for Sustainable Regional Economies (interim name), the major premise in the Discussion Paper February 2004.
44. So what are the -no rated - advantages and disadvantages of an independent institute that need to be considered and discussed? We have filled in our – "normative" - analysis of the advantages and we could simply not identify any disadvantages.

OISD

The IISRE Initiative Meeting Prince George September 5-7, 2005

Page 9 of 11

45. It continues to be OISD's analysis that a joint institute founded by UNBC, MSU and OISD with participation from government, First Nations, private sector and individuals would best serve society and best benefit UNBC and MSU.
46. We suggest that the meetings declaration and recommendation be as followed.
47. Reason for the declaration
48. The September 2005 meeting's accord is that the initiative addresses issues of significance for society in the regional economies UNBC and MSU serves, as well as globally, and hence, has significance for UNBC's and MSU's purpose in society and thus for UNBC's and MSU's development and their respective faculties and administration.
49. The meeting therefore implied that the initiative should go forward with a gradually experimental approach and with periodical evaluation that allow the parties to acquire more understanding of the initiative and the cooperation before making any long-term commitment.

Declaration

50. UNBC, MSU and OISD will jointly continue to positively work with the initiative within the framework set out in the Agreement of Cooperation between UNBC, MSU and continue the ongoing analysis if the initiative formulated in the OISD Discussion Paper of January 2004 involving government, First Nations, private sector and other universities as the parties may decide from time to time, through a joint board/committee governance of the initiatives.

The cooperation under the governance of the joint board/committee will include but is not limited to pre-research studies, research projects, pilot projects, conferences and seminars, and other activities the board/committee may decide that further the initiative and allied cooperation.

Recommendation

To facilitate the initiative in a rational way based on the forgoing consideration and the declaration the meeting recommends;

1. Two groups, one in Sweden and one in Canada, should be formalized with the task to manage, supervise and move the initiative forward in each region, with representation from the natural sciences and social sciences at UNBC and MSU, local and regional governments, the private sector in each region, and OISD.
2. Reporting to a board, OISD should continue to facilitate and administer the initiative for the purpose to manage and capitalize the initiative and to not burden faculty with administrative duties. OISD would incorporate a not-for-profit Part II Federal Corporation to facilitate the initiative; the first directors would be two from each MSU, UNBC and OISD.
3. MSU and UNBC should each choose a Chair and a Co-Chair for an agreed period, after which the Chair and Co-Chair will change place.
4. The board subsequently elects, executives and other staff categories as the board may determine.
5. OISD will continue the liaison facilitation functions, through Ray Strafehl and Lars Nelvig, in Canada and Sweden respectively.
6. OISD will draft interim by-laws governing the corporation and each committee of Canada and Sweden as needed.
7. Seed funding needs to be provided from the UNBC and MSU regions in the amount of XXXX.
8. This amount should be used to move the initiative into an operative research stage that offers economic and social value to the communities, in the following ways, to:
9. Allow OISD to administer the initiative with the Canada and Sweden liaisons including; prepare a detailed business plan and other informational documents required for the funding process, and to prepare and submit bylaws and charter documents to the relevant agencies.

OISD

The IISRE Initiative Meeting Prince George September 5~7, 2005

Page 11 of 11

10. The business plan should detail the proposed operation (student and scholar exchanges, research seminars, workshops, contracts, lecture series and conferences, etc) and proposed governance of the institute.
11. Allow OISD to pursue medium-term funding for the funding of the initiative and the operation of the institute from relevant and legitimate government agencies and private sector in Canada and Sweden.
12. Organize and prepare a joint UNBC/MSU/OISD conference to be held in Sweden in May 2006. With participation of 10-15 participants from the MSU region, and 10-15 from UNBC regions, drawn from faculty in the natural and social sciences at UNBC and MSU, and from regional governments and private sectors. The theme for the Conference to be decided, but might be; How can social and natural sciences researchers at UNBC and MSU mutually collaborate and collaborate with government, First Nations and private sector, to help identify and address problems that hamper sustainable regional prosperity and quality of life in regions such as their own and globally.
13. Prepare, and engage faculty in the natural and social sciences at UNBC and MSU, the regional governments and the regional private sectors, in a detailed comparative analysis of the UNBC region in British Columbia and MSU region in Sweden.
14. The comparable analysis must identify and study issues in the allocation mechanism that currently hamper investment in sustainable economic production to the erosion of social and economic well-being in the two regions. It must analyze government monitoring, information and intervention methods and systems in the two regions, identify research needs and formulate approaches to finding solutions for sustainable regional development.
15. Both the analysis and the conference must function as conduits for the identification of research issues for the subsequent attention of the institute and faculty.

British Columbia September 2005