1006

FUNDACION BBV CROSS-CULTURE ENCOUNTERS

CUENCA, SPAIN, 7-9 MAY 1993

#3 - HOW MUCH IS ENOUGH? ALTERNATIVES TO THE COMPETITIVE SOCIETY

SUMMING UP

FUNDACION BBV CROSS-CULTURE ENCOUNTERS

CUENCA, SPAIN, 7-9 MAY 1993

#3 - HOW MUCH IS ENOUGH? ALTERNATIVES TO THE COMPETITIVE SOCIETY

SUMMING UP

Michael Kirby*

ENCOUNTER IN CUENCA

The third Encounter of this series of the BBV Foundation met in Cuenca over three blue days in May 1993. In the hierarchy of topics chosen for the Encounters, this one was arguably the most important and the most urgent. Humanity might survive the cruel wars of cultural identity and of nationalism. It might endure the worst (and the best) which the global media can do to it. It might overcome the intolerance of discrimination and irrational hatred. But if the ecosystems of the world are thrown out of joint or if the competitive society helps to destroy the earth's environment and sharply divides its inhabitants into the haves and have-nots, the future may be very bleak. Such divisions may set running alternative models, such as religious fundamentalism, to win the hearts and minds of the

---

* President of the Court of Appeal, Sydney. Chairman of the International Commission of Jurists, Geneva.

have-nots. This may not produce the end of history. But it could result in reversals of freedom, progress, science and hope.

So the participants met in Cuenca. The poet Federico Muelas described this historic city as one "rising clear and proud, totally unjustified". It is a city of earlier battles between Islam and Christianity when they confronted each other in Spain. It was a city where the Inquisition, an earlier face of religious fundamentalism, "cleansed" the minds of its people. It was a city which saw a full measure of bitterness within human memory in the Spanish Civil War. Yet we met in peace, friendship and full intellectual freedom.

Our environment could not have been more conducive to the thoughts that leapt, like the towers of Cuenca, to impossible heights. We clung on to our aspirations, like the hanging terraces of Cuenca even though, at times, they seemed impossible to sustain at such a high level. To list the beauties of our meeting place would be impossible. The magical view from our windows at morning and at dusk; the spirit of the learned inhabitants whose ghosts still occupy the rooms of our meeting place, once a convent; the endless sensitivity to our comforts, including rich wine and food; the environment of flowers in which we met; and the dedicated co-workers who came with us to make it all possible.

A SEARCH FOR DEFINITIONS

So what did we do with these precious opportunities in order to be worthy of them? The learned monks of earlier centuries would have been proud of our definitional and analytical examinations as we sought to map out the agenda of our concerns.

We strove to define competition and to consider whether, as such, it was good or bad, innate or learned. Professor Paul Davies reminded us that competition was inevitably (to some extent at least)

exploitative. The question was how to secure the advantages of efficiency and creativity, whilst avoiding the disadvantages of selfishness and indifference. Professor Albert Galindo told us how competition was necessary for progress. But it is not necessarily fair, he said. Humanity must infuse efficiency with equity. Professor Jose Alcina recalled how unequal treatment had been the badge of the Western world - at least for the 500 years beginning with Spain's American pre-eminence. Yet ancient societies were also unjust and certainly competitive in war. Even in this convent we must beware historical flagellation.

Professor Luc Ferry reminded us that the focus of our concerns was not competition, as such, but the competitive society. What was this society? Adel Rifaat saw this as the essence of our attention. The world was increasingly divided between societies which were patriarchal and subject to rigid rules and those with competitive economies which put a high store on individualism - leaving the individual in charge of his or her "life's project".

Professor Yirmiyahu Yovel sought to capture the essence of the competitive society. It was one in which economic competition was the very foundation of social organisation; society was organised around it; it considered competition to be a desired goal; and accepted competitiveness as the very definition of rationality. In its extreme form this could be as brutal as the alternatives.

Professor Edward Chen, drawing upon a different culture of China in Hong Kong, offered five features of the competitive society:

1. Its acceptance of a private enterprise system of economics;
2. The government's acceptance of a *laissez-faire* attitude to economic regulation;
3. The existence and maintenance of the rule of law;
4. The permeating influence of an open democratic political

system; and

5. The social acceptance of a coherent value system, whether Christian, Confucianist or otherwise.

The real rôle, he deposed, was as to the exact function of the State in such a competitive society.

Talk of the competitive society led us to examine those societies which lie outside the walls. They were variously described as the South, although I warned that there are countries in the geographical South (Australia, New Zealand, South Africa and, almost, Singapore) which rejected this appellation. Other descriptions were offered: the under-developed societies; the developing world; and even the Third World, now made lonely by the disappearance of the Second. Professor Alcina rejected these divisions asserting that all societies are in transition and rigid differentiation was inappropriate.

Having described the focus of our attention, we turned to consider the alternatives to the competitive society. At the outset, our Chairman, Inaki Oyarzabal urged that we must strive to find another way. Luc Ferry said that there was no real alternative or, as Professor Yovel stated, no "big alternative". As Adel Rifaat put it: The third world had placed its faith in socialism; but this had crumbled and now only one modern model was available. We must embrace it and adjust it for the competing ideas which decry freedom.

Bahgat Elnadi warned of the imminent danger of fundamentalism and integrationalism. Professor Yovel said that excessive fallout of the competitive society was destroying its defences against the attractions of fundamentalism. Many participants recognised that the warm and comfortable world of fundamentalist religion was presenting itself to the deprived of the world as the radical alternative to the

modern competitive liberal society. Michel Foucher pointed out that this was so even in communities so far exempt from fundamentalism: Turkey, India and the States of the former Soviet Union. Professor Margaret Stacey warned against the totalitarian alternative. She suggested the need to reflect upon spiritual and other values. Professor Davies drew a sharp distinction between spirituality and fundamentalism.

This is not to say that the competitive society had no defenders. Toshiro Hirota of Japan considered that the competitive society was one which provided political and economic feedback to its members. The market was a kind of voting place. Even great challenges, such as the oil crisis, had been overcome in the past. They would be overcome in the future.

Some participants were doubtful that the question "how much is enough?" was a sensible and pertinent one, susceptible to a rational answer. Luc Ferry doubted that this was so. I myself pointed out that, whatever we said in Cuenca, little people in markets from Nigeria to Thailand would go ahead, day by day, with competition in the effort to survive. Paul Davies stated that it was hardly possible for prosperous developed countries to tell those in the phase of development that they could go no further for fear of harming the global environment. Professor Yovel said that it was essential to extend the question which should read "how much <u>of what</u>?". If it was how much of freedom, the answer was a great deal of freedom was tolerable. As one Indian philosopher put it: I should be free to swing my arm until it hurts another.

Some, by way of contrast, thought that the question "how much is enough" was possibly the most important question in today's world. One of the participants, Manfred Max-Neef, a member of the Club of Rome, has devoted a lifetime of study to the issue. He

suggested that it was susceptible to very precise and even scientific answers. He presented a matrix of items to chart the quality of life and to express the variety of human needs. He indicated that 17 items were taken into account in defining the quality of life in a given society. Paul Davies suggested that it would be difficult to quantify value systems of this kind. Professor Alcina was critical of what he saw as the excessively scientific approach of Max-Neef's model. He said that we should avoid the trap of the matrix and acknowledge the infinite complexity of human reality. Professor Yovel asked how freedom and dignity could be quantified. He suggested that a distinction might be drawn between the individual's quality of life and the standard of living of a collective or community. Margaret Stacey praised Max-Neef's effort to correct the monetarist models of the economists. In judging modern societies it was essential to go beyond economics, measured in financial terms, and to see the value to the economy and to society of unpaid or underpaid members such as women, children and immigrants.

A STUDY IN CONTRASTS

The Encounter in Cuenca was a study in contrasts.

Manfred Max-Neef contrasted his perspective, as a member of the Club of Rome, with the dominant language trap of economists who have such power in the world today. Edward Chen contested that co-operation was incompatible with competition. Toshiro Hirota told us that Japan might seem the most competitive of societies; but in fact it was subject to social forces working strongly against competition. It operated with institutional forces which controlled and directed the way competition operated (eg MITI). Yet Professor Hirota acknowledged that educational competition began for Japanese students even in primary schools. Their lives could be fixed by the ranking of their schools and universities. Was this

truly free competition?

Whenever participants suggested that competition was a bad thing, others would leap to its defence. Paul Davies, for example, pointed out how competition had been the engine of science. In that field it was healthy and creative. Professor Leonhardt G Hertzenberg, a survivor of the USSR, pointed out that competition could be good for a society: rescuing it from the sloth of complacency. I suggested that competition was inherent in the human desire to survive and to protect oneself, one's family and immediate circle of friends. But Manfred Max-Neef denied these contentions. He said that competition was not inherent in human nature. Margaret Stacey declared that unbridled competition could be "disastrous". And Luc Ferry pointed out that real competition was a relatively new phenomenon, at least in economic terms. In feudal society the serf could not really compete with the gentleman.

Mr Rifaat developed this theme. Feudal societies, with rigid rules, prevented competition which could allow the individual to flourish. Max-Neef saw a return to the spirit of solidarity of earlier times as a desirable outcome of a search for the alternative to the competitive society. Dr Hertzenberg said that, in the former Soviet Union, many were now suspicious of democracy because they saw the crime, disputation and lack of regulation that appeared to come in its train. Dr Chen doubted that we needed new social measures to control the environment. If economic growth was assured by competition all would come well in the end.

A review of these and other contributions shows the great variety and divergency of opinions expressed around our table.

A MULTITUDE OF PARADOXES

But the contrasts went beyond differences of opinion. Many participants displayed the paradoxes of the subject under

consideration.

Dr Hertzenberg drew attention to the paradoxical feature of life in the former Soviet Union. Its philosophy was committed against competition. Yet in actuality there were many features of competition: between the State and its organisations; between the open and the black-market and between the various political groups within the ruling party.

Messrs Rifaat and Elnadi contrasted the domination and humiliation of the competitive society inflicted by colonial powers with the acknowledgment that it provided the only real model and sole hope of rescuing countries such as their own (Egypt) for the world of modernity, individual freedom and escape from unquestioning fundamentalism.

Professor Hirota pointed to the paradox that Japan seemed highly competitive but its crucial decisions often fell far short of the truly open economic market.

Dr Max-Neef said that the worst behaviour of the multi-national corporation often became its best behaviour. If the multi-national corporation began to look after the environment it could lose out in the Third World scramble for economic development. Others would take the place of the corporate good citizen: offering low wages, poor environmental standards and submitting to low taxes. For Max-Neef humans were not just objects, otherwise slavery would be the preferred economic model. Yet he asserted that, in some parts of Asia, economic viability had been accompanied by effective social slavery. He painted the vivid image of the young outworker in Korea dying beside her sewing machine. In a paper for the conference Professor Peter Hodgson touched the same theme of modern slavery: Japanese golfers who attacked the game of golf with the same dedication as a vital economic goal.

Professor Pedro Etxenike described the paradox of a world of globalized economics in which politics was increasingly localised. The very localisation of politics made it difficult, or impossible, to correct the global imbalances.

Dr Edward Chen described, with evident pride, the economic successes of the "four tigers" (Hong Kong, Singapore, Taiwan and Korea). To those who criticised their human rights record he pointed out that they enjoyed greater average equality of distribution of wealth than societies of Latin America which aspired to human rights standards. For the four tigers, human dignity meant having a job and not being dependent upon others. Yet Dr Chen acknowledged that it was impossible to leave the market completely unbridled. It was necessary for the State to play a part to break down the dangers of collusion to which the market economy could sometimes lead, ending in monopoly and olygopoly as Professor Neumann's paper predicted.

I drew attention to the paradoxes of the present moment of human history. At a time when democracy seemed to be in the ascendant, there was unparalleled cynicism and disillusionment in democratic societies about politicians and political institutions.

Michel Foucher outlined the paradox that the Cold War had been a time, in Europe, of unrivalled economic prosperity and liberal democracy. With the end of the Cold War, Europe was faced with economic difficulty and disillusionment. Was it really necessary to European integration to have the competition and threat of the Soviet experiment?

ACHIEVING TRUE CROSS-CULTURAL COMMUNICATION

This Encounter saw an unrivalled effort to achieve a true dialogue between people of different cultures. We had Professor Hertzenberg from the former Soviet Union. We had Dr Edward Chen from Hong Kong and Professor Hirota from Japan to put forcefully the

perspectives of the Confucian societies of the East. We had Messrs Elnadi and Rifaat to express the viewpoint of the enlightened Arab world with its great gifts of civilisation. Professor Yovel shared with us the viewpoint of an Israeli scholar of international renown.

From far away Australia we had Paul Davies and myself, as well as a stimulating paper from Professor Bernhard Neumann. And to remind us of the special importance of the people of Latin America, Professor Alcide was always at hand.

Yet we lacked a participant from a sub-Saharan African state. There was no-one here from the poor states of the Caribbean. No representative spoke for the islands of Melanesia and Polynesia. On this occasion no-one was here from India and the poorer Asian societies. And Margaret Stacey pointed out that our perspectives were often "masculinist" with insufficient attention to the viewpoint of women, people of unpaid labour and those silent, unempowered voices for whom someone must speak.

WARNINGS ARE VOICED

Many warnings were voiced about the competitive society during the course of this Encounter. Professor Yovel warned that it was a naive belief, now common in the former states of the Soviet Union, that the competitive society would cure all the ills of the autocratic period. When this failed, disillusionment might be terrible. Mr Rifaat begged us to lift our sights from the exploitation within a competitive society to see the way in which its model had been extended to the whole world. Now, once a particular country or region was less competitive, it would be discarded as capital would flow to wherever goods and services could most cheaply be provided. We should now see the competitive society on a global level.

Edward Chen warned against too much "solidarity". He saw in

this idea the risk of collusion, ie the solidarity of General Motors and Ford or Mitsubishi and Toyota, just as Professor Neumann had cautioned.

Many speakers warned about the danger of unbridled competition for the environment. Dr Oyarzabal said that it was impossible for the world to sustain its current economic growth and development and still assure equal opportunity for all. Professor Santiago Grisolia put it vividly. Even if we talk only about the carbon dioxide exhaled by human beings, it would be impossible to allow the expansion of humanity at its current rate. Frances Thompson likewise warned of the loss of human dignity that was bound up in the explosive growth of the world's population.

Dr Hertzenberg warned that some in the former Soviet Union had got out of the habit of working hard and might find uncongenial the ethic of the competitive society. But Luc Ferry asked what the Western economists had to say about the higher and seemingly sustained levels of unemployment in Western countries. Was this really tolerable? Would it not lead to social breakdown?

Manfred Max-Neef asked whether the developing countries should continue to compete amongst each other to attract investors at the cost of despoiling their people and the environment? This was the saddest evidence of the loss of the sense of community, even amongst the poor.

Yet Dr Oyarzabal warned us against the pride of the poor and the pride of the rich. Too much pride does not go well on an empty stomach. Spain, at the height of its powers, had been too proud to do the work of its empire. A lot of work was left to the diligent people of the Netherlands who were soon economically predominant over Spain. Dr Hertzenberg mentioned how pride of the Soviet Academies had led to a refusal of co-operation with scientists of the United

States.

Michel Foucher warned that unemployment was not simply a curse of the developing countries. In Eastern Germany nearly a third of the people were unemployed and a great social drama was now being played out - spreading its impact throughout that most prosperous of nations. There was a possibility of future dislocation. It should not be assumed that democracy inevitably accompanied development.

Max-Neef warned that under-development was not a single problem susceptible of a single solution. Each country, like each individual, was separate and different, requiring particular attention to its special needs.

Rifaat and Elnadi constantly returned to the dangers of religious fundamentalism. This was not, they insisted, simply a problem of Islam. It could be seen in the impact of some forms of Hinduism, Judaism and Christianity. Dr Oyarzabal extended this thought. Extremism was not confined to religion. It was also to be found in the philosophy of the one party state and in populist politics which sought to over-simplify complex problems.

Margaret Stacey repeatedly addressed the social disaffection which the rampant competitive society had produced in the United Kingdom. Michel Foucher cautioned that, in the current social and economic environment, some commentators believed that Fascism might, after all, have a future in Europe. He also urged the greatest of attention to the danger of nuclear proliferation. Algeria, a fragile society, now had a large nuclear programme. We should all be warned of the danger that this could fall into fanatical hands. And in this, Algeria was not alone.

VIVID IDEAS AND IMAGINES

This Encounter was replete with vivid ideas and images placed before the table by all of the participants.

Manfred Max-Neef said that we were all descendants of the hunter-gatherers. The only difference is that we now gather in supermarkets. He asserted that "under-development" had been invented on the 20 January 1949 at 11 a.m. in President Harry Truman's Inaugural Address. And he asserted that were there no solidarity in our societies - if we were mindlessly devoted to competition - the poor would starve. He painted a vivid image of the solidarity amongst street salesmen in the cities of Brazil.

Edward Chen, who advanced the most valiant defence of the competitive society as the formula for the economic miracle of Asia, asserted, to the mild astonishment of participants, that in Hong Kong he would be regarded as a distinct "left-winger".

Leonhardt Hertzenberg agreed that there was an element of solidarity in all humanity. Cervantes had sought to raise a smile by his writing because he knew that humans liked to share laughter and happiness.

Luc Ferry presented a vivid metaphor. Humanity was on a bike, he said. We must keep going on the bike of competition or we might fall off. Yet how will we slow down the pace? How will we take time to look at the countryside and its beauties about us? For Ferry, one of the real challenges was that of turning the current, and likely future, state of high unemployment in developed societies to creative advantage.

Dr Yovel, extending this metaphor, said that the challenge was that of the bike-rider helping developing societies to clamber onto the same bike without falling off his own.

Manfred Max-Neef drew a vivid picture about the suddenness with which global capital had begun to shift about within the last twenty years outside the old empires. Yet if we think about it, this is unsurprising. The technology of informatics had made it possible.

Margaret Stacey suggested that we could all derive value from the ideas of Buddhism and other belief systems and philosophies which sought meaning in existence.

Dr Hertzenberg acknowledged that it was fine to be optimistic but cautioned that we should also postulate the possibility of a pessimistic outcome of our current global problems. This thought was picked up by Professor Alcina. Perhaps the dominance of Western people was purely temporary. Perhaps they would be replaced as the dominant force by peoples of different cultures. To escape this fate, Western people would have to lay emphasis upon education and a social system as competitive as that of the Jesuits.

Mr Rifaat warned that the miracles of Hong Kong could not be picked up and applied to the ninety percent of humanity who were living in incredible misery. For them there was a thirst to escape the pain of lives of despair. This often led to a turning to addiction - whether in drugs, television or fundamentalist religion.

Mr Elnadi spoke of the corruption which was rampant in many developing countries. It had reached such a point in one of them that the citizens, waiting for promised government aid, had publicly urged their leader to take 50% of the available aid for himself but at least to leave 50% to the needy.

Dr Hertzenberg, returning to the dangers of nuclear proliferation, pointed out that if a gun appears in the first scene of a drama, the risk was presented that it might be used before the end of the play. This is the risk which humanity must now anticipate.

Professor Hirota warned of the pathology of cancer cells in competitive societies. It was necessary for those societies to correct their own evils by appropriate administration of an effective medicine. Otherwise, the cancers might prove fatal. But was there

medicine which was effective?

Michel Foucher, returning to his theme of fundamentalist religion, painted the spectre that secularism in a country like India might be seen in the long eye of history to have been simply a temporary relic of Imperial rule. As India returns to Hinduism, the secular State might eventually be viewed as an alien idea imposed on the Subcontinent by the British.

And throughout it all, our Chairman stimulated and pushed us forward to new creative thinking. Dr Oyarzabal asked repeatedly whether the West would have the moral strength to meet the challenges of fundamentalism? Whether the developed world would be willing to pay the invoices for the unpaid costs which had taken such a toll on the global environment? Whether we would have the prescience to pay attention to the risks of fundamentalism in a way different from our refusal to treat communism seriously until it took control of a third of humanity? Whether Japan could truly be said to be a viable model of a competitive society? Or whether it was simply a kind of feudal state with a few ideas of competition and a brilliant symbiosis with modern technology as the keys to its success.

SOME PRACTICAL THOUGHTS

The Encounter did not meander solely in the realm of ideas. Each of the participants put forward a multitude of practical thoughts for confronting the social and environmental challenges of our time.

Professor Grisolia called to attention a new book *Man: An Endangered Species*. He urged a heightened sense of urgency about the impact of the competitive society upon the world's environment. He pointed out that the depletion of the ozone layer was beyond question. Skin cancers were rapidly increasing. Melanomas were increasing globally at the frightening rate of 10% per annum. The

control of global population was the most urgent necessity. Otherwise 20% of the earth's surface would dominate 80% - modern slaves who would not forever endure their predicament. As a practical measure to the rapid advance of the former Soviet Union, Dr Grisolia urged assistance to preserve the scientific infrastructure of the former Soviet state to the benefit of the successor countries.

Paul Davies made the same point. It was in the interests of all countries to persuade the scientists of the former Soviet Union to stay in the former States and not to cannibalise them for rapid returns to the economies of the West.

Pedro Etxenike said that the urgent priority to bring down the birth rate was to empower women to control births. This would require concentration on specific activities and the removal of the impediments which had been placed in the way of the education of women.

Alberto Galindo urged the need for practical measures to temper the unfair situations which had arisen from unbridled competition. It was necessary for humans to think globally and not simply locally or individually. Fortunately, modern communications provided a means for them to do so.

Margaret Stacey urged that we should accept and acknowledge the individual spark present in each person. This gave each person a value above the economic value. It emphasised the need to respect people often not respected in society: women, people of a different race and, I would add, people with disabilities or of different sexual orientation, different religions or of no religion at all.

Paul Davies urged that we must find efficient and environmentally friendly new industries to set up in the developing world to rescue countries there from the thrall of poverty. He urged, as a specific measure, that banks and other wealthy

institutions should stimulate the scientific capital of developing countries by bringing Third World students to developed countries to learn fundamental science which they could take home and utilise.

Dr Oyarzabal repeatedly emphasised the need, somehow, to identify the social and economic costs of development. We must build those costs into the equations of the competitive society so that future generations are not left to pay the bills of our time.

Luc Ferry warned against the dangers of scare tactics on the part of the environmentalists. He said that it was essential to establish the facts about global warming and the so-called "greenhouse effect". By the same token it was imperative that the "peace dividend" should go beyond political rhetoric. We should avoid the risk of allowing something as essential as the protection of the world environment to be captured by the industrial complex of developed societies.

Adel Rifaat urged that high priority should be placed upon giving hope to educated people of poorer societies. Unless they could find hope, and the prospect of escape from the trap of poverty, they would fall into the trap of authoritarianism and fundamentalist religions.

Pedro Etxenike suggested that whilst some environmental challenges were controversial others were not. The highest priority should be given to population control and water conservation. There were dangers in taking the wrong course in the protection of the global environment. But the greatest danger was to do nothing and time was running out. This, I reminded the participants, was the point made by Vice-President Al Gore of the United States in his important book *Earth in the Balance*.

Dr Hertzenberg suggested that we should not under-estimate the problem of securing population control. The instances of India and

China were recalled. The best protection against the rampant growth of population was economic development. And we should beware of the spread of nuclear weapons and the dumping of nuclear wastes - particularly in developing countries which might not have the self-control which had so far saved the world from self-destruction.

Mr Elnadi urged an end to the corruption of the Third World. He said that the deposit of huge sums of money in Western banks, which amounted to sheer robbery of the people of the South, should be put to an end by a concerted effort of the global community. Solidarity required at least this much.

Several participants considered that time had been insufficient to allow a full exploration of the topics of importance raised in this Encounter. Some urged a specific project on fundamentalism which could embrace the secular fundamentalism of populist politics, Fascism and authoritarianism. Other participants urged a new methodology so that the Encounters could be given more focus by the commissioning of papers which would review the main themes and encourage productive debate around them. Still other participants expressed the special value of an unstructured multi-cultural, multi-disciplinary exchange such as had occurred in Cuenca. Serendipity has its place. The impact of so many ideas required of all of us a reconsideration of our own fundamental thoughts.

ACROSS THE BRIDGE

And so the third Encounter came to a close. At its end some of us would cross the iron bridge that led to the old city of Cuenca. There, from a perilous height, our eyes would play upon the trees in the valley below. We would harken to the call of the birds and feel spring in the air. Casting our eyes about we would see the cathedral and the ancient seat of learning of this splendid city. In our minds we would recall the string trio at dinner and the urgent melodies of

Schubert and Beethoven. As we sped towards our homes - far and near - the exchange of intellects would continue before our mind's eye. Such an exchange is a precious thing. Appreciating it, we must each of us resolve to do whatever is possible to preserve this attribute of freedom for ourselves and to extend it to all others who do not now enjoy it.

The Encounter could not have occurred without the support of the BBV Foundation, the leadership of our Chairman, Dr Ignacio Oyarzabal, the tireless assistance of the Foundation's support staff and the attentive efficiency of Zelda West and her team. The translators helped us to bridge the gap of languages. And the magical environment of Cuenca will linger in our memory long after we have parted.