

## A Brief Guide to Planetary Management

Copyright © 2002 Joseph George Caldwell. All rights reserved. Posted at Internet web sites <http://www.foundation.bw> and <http://www.foundationwebsite.org> . May be copied or reposted for noncommercial purposes, with attribution. 8 September 2002; updated 10 September 2002.

This document provides a high-level guide to planetary management for Earth. It provides a statement of vision, mission, and goals. It sets forth concepts, principles and policy, and outlines the general approach to planetary management (PM). This “Guide” includes background information on the rationale for its statements of principles and goals. (In doing so, it is a little “rambling” at places. A more succinct guide may be issued at a later time.)

Since the form of planetary management proposed herein is based on a world thriving on the recurrent flux of solar energy – a solar civilization – the planetary management organization (PMO) embodying this planetary management system will be referred to as **Solaria**.

### Vision Statement

The vision for Earth is a planet with a “minimal-regret” human population of ten million people – a single-nation technologically advanced city-state of five million people, and a low-technology (hunter-gatherer) population of five million people distributed over the planet. A “minimal-regret” population is one that keeps the likelihood of extinction of the human species and destruction of the biosphere as we know it at low levels, and keeps the likelihood of long-term survival (of the same) at high levels. The rationale for this vision is (1) the fact that mankind’s large numbers and industrial activity are rapidly destroying the biosphere as we know it, and (2) the belief that a human population of the size and nature of the aforesaid minimal-regret population is sustainable in the long term, and will not adversely affect the rest of the biosphere. The vision is, further, that with the establishment of a minimal-regret population, Earth’s biosphere will return quickly (e.g., within a few centuries) to its diverse and flourishing state of a few thousand years ago – the healthy and stable (slowly evolving) condition in which it has existed – with mankind -- for millions of years.

For more discussion of the “minimal-regret” population, see the book, *Can America Survive?* (<http://www.foundation.bw> ). The rationale for a global population of ten million is that that is the population size that existed for millions of years in harmony with the biosphere. The role of the single-nation technological population is planetary management, which includes global population management / control – to keep the size of the globally distributed human population in check. The role of the globally distributed population of five million is to promote the likelihood of human survival in the long term, by reducing the chance of extinction from a single local catastrophe (i.e., destruction of the single nation). The Earth can certainly support more than ten million people on its recurrent “budget” of solar energy. It could support several hundred million, but at a much lower energy-per-capita level than for a population of ten million, and at increased risk of destruction of the biosphere and extinction of the human species. The approach taken in *Can America Survive?* is to set the population at as small a size as is considered necessary to maintain a minimal-regret population of ten million – to maximize the likelihood of human and biospheric long-term survival and high quality by

keeping the size and activity of human population at a very low level. Attempts to maximize the size of the human population (and industrial production) – and that is the approach of every other population policy effort of which I am aware – maximize the risk of destruction of the biosphere and extinction of the human species. The minimal-regret approach reduces the impact of man’s existence in the biosphere by keeping the utilization of solar energy for mankind’s purposes low.

For specificity, the name of the single-nation city-state may in the future be denoted as “Phoenicia” – so-called because it will arise out of the ashes of a destroyed industrial world, reminiscent of the Phoenix of ancient mythology. The city itself will be referred to as Phoenix. Other names certainly come to mind for a solar civilization, such as Helios or Sola or Solaria (for the city-state) and Heliopolis or Helium or Ciudad del Sol or Sun City (for the city).

### **Mission Statement**

It is believed that current human civilization will destroy itself in a global nuclear war, or perhaps in some other catastrophic event brought on by mankind’s exploding population (e.g., a disease similar to the human immunodeficiency virus (HIV), but more easily transmitted). It is intended to establish a minimal-regret population after that event. The current planetary system of government is best described as anarchic – it consists of about 200 independent states, each striving for large populations and high levels of industrial output, each striving to out-produce and out-consume the other, regardless of consequences to the planet’s biosphere. The momentum and power of the world’s industrial society is currently so great, however, that there is no point to attempting to establish a minimal-regret population at the present time. Any attempt to do so now would be ridiculed at best and quashed at worst. In the wake of global nuclear war, the survivors will see first-hand the folly of the world’s current way of global industrialization, and they will be very receptive to a promising alternative. It is at that time that steps will be taken to establish and maintain a minimal-regret population.

### **Goals**

Throughout history, much has been written about the “best” form of human government. For most of history, the discussion centered on the best form of government for a single nation. In recent times, for example, it has been argued that the “best” form of government is a mildly regulated democratic free-enterprise (capitalist) system. In the late 1800s, discussion focused more and more on the best form of government for the planet as a whole (i.e., for the entire globe, and for the entire biosphere). Generally, there are two alternative forms of world government that are widely considered and discussed. The first is **synarchy** – government by an élite of enlightened individuals. This form of government is as old as Plato’s *Republic*, but the term itself and the concept of applying it to planetary government stems from the writings of the French philosopher Joseph Alexandre Saint-Yves d’Alveydre in the 1870s. The other form of world government is that of a union of sovereign nations, along the lines of the League of Nations or the United Nations Organization.

Since Earth has never had a single planetary government before, it is not possible to speak from terrestrial experience about the “best” form of planetary government for Earth. The best that can be done is to consider alternatives, discuss them, and select a preferred alternative. To date, no form of human planetary population policy has been

proposed, other than the minimal-regret population, for which there is a convincing argument that it has a very good chance of maintaining a healthy biosphere and assuring the long-term survival of the human species. (The fact that the minimal-regret global population of ten million is a feasible population that satisfies both objectives is the fact that the planet and mankind existed in a healthy state for millions of years at this level.) The issue to address, then, is what sort of world government would be suitable as a means of maintaining / managing a minimal-regret global population of ten million.

Under the minimal-regret population concept, the world's organized human population consists of a single city-state of five million people. In ancient Greece, the philosopher Plato wrote extensively on the topic of social organization and government for a city-state. Most of his discussion on this topic is contained in the book, *The Republic*. (It is noted that the translation "republic" is not accurate – a more accurate rendering would be "society," or "state," or "constitution.") It is the goal of this organization, Solaria, to establish a planetary government system (for managing the proposed minimal-regret population) along the lines of the government proposed in *The Republic*.

In Plato's *Republic*, he discusses a government consisting of three main groups – the Guardians, who are subdivided into the Rulers (Government) and the Auxiliaries (Military/Executive/Police), and the rest of the population, who are engaged in economic activities (e.g., farming, manufacturing, trading). The Auxiliaries assist the Rulers in the execution of their decision. Saint-Yves' concept of synarchy was very similar to Plato's governmental system, but with perhaps more emphasis on economics. In Saint-Yves' concept of synarchy, the governmental authority controls religion, the military, and education. His philosophy is divided into three categories: education (culture, art, science), law (military, police, justice), and economy (unions, civil service, working class). In Plato's concept, the Rulers are philosophers selected on the basis of merit. In Saint-Yves' concept, the members of the Authority are "enlightened initiates" of spiritual science, and it is not clear how they are selected – they operate from "behind the scenes." Under Plato's concept, the third class (the "rest" of the population, other than the rulers) are involved in economic activities (e.g., food production), but they are conceived as belonging to various occupations, not to various income classes or groups. Under Plato's concept, education is provided exclusively by the state.

From recent history (i.e., the destruction of the Earth's environment and biosphere), it is very clear that the concept of leaving government "to the people," i.e., to the masses, has been a complete disaster. This was a very grave concern of Plato's. He regarded democracy as a very inferior form of government. Quoting from Desmond Lee's Introduction to *Plato: The Republic* (second edition, Penguin Books, 1974), "In democracy there is a radical lack of cohesion, because there is no proper respect for authority, moral or political. Democratic government is weak government, which plays on the weaknesses of the common man instead of giving him the leadership he needs; and it is liable to degenerate into a bitter class-struggle between the haves and the have-nots." Further, "It involved, said Thucydides, 'committing the conduct of state affairs to the whims of the multitude,' and it has been described by a modern writer as government by perpetual plebiscite. ... Democracy encourages bad leadership. The people's judgment of their leaders is not always good, and they can't be trusted to make the best choice. But quite apart from that, the popular leader, dependent as he is for his position (and perhaps his income) on popular favour, will constantly be tempted to retain that favour by the easiest possible means. He will play on the likes and dislikes, the weaknesses and foibles of the public, will never tell them an unpleasant truth or

advocate a policy that might make them uncomfortable. Like the modern advertiser and salesman, he is dependent on his public, and his position depends on selling them comfort and not telling them the truth. Sophist, salesman, and popular politician are on a par, and the people care little who their leaders are provided they 'profess themselves the people's friends.' Popular leaders are as devoid of true knowledge as are the people they lead. ...But that is not the whole story. The salient characteristic of democracy, we learn in Book VIII, is liberty – every individual is free to do as he likes. This gives democratic society a diversity and variety that are very attractive, but its effect is extremely disintegrating. There is a growing dislike of any authority, political or moral; fathers pander to their sons, teachers to their pupils, 'and the minds of the citizens become so sensitive that the least vestige of restraint is resented as intolerable.'”

Saint-Yves wrote mainly in the late 1800s. More recent discussion of synarchy is presented in *A New Dawn: Society and Politics in the Light of Initiatic Science*, Parts 1 and 2, Complete Works Vols. 25 and 26 of Omraam Mikhaël Aïvanhov, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, Prosveta, 1990, ISBN 2-85566-486-1 and 1999, ISBN 2-85566-777-1.

Some additional caveats are in order. While the purpose and topics of interest of Plato's *Republic* (read *Society*) and ours may be similar in many respects (i.e., the quest for a social organization for justice and right conduct; ethics, education, and philosophy as well as politics; survival), the situation or context in which we find ourselves today is quite different from that of Plato's time. The primary objective in Plato's day was survival and development and maintenance of the Greek city-state. The primary objective of Solaria is the survival and development and maintenance of the entire planet (or, more specifically, of the human species and a biologically diverse biosphere). Given this significant difference in circumstance, the manner of implementation of a Platonic social organization for planetary management may differ in some details. For example, war was then (for several centuries) recognized and utilized as a legitimate and useful means of population control. In our context – a destroyed world in the wake of global nuclear war – continual war may not be, and is probably not, the best means of population control, or a basis for long-term survivability of the species and the biosphere as we know it.

There is much literature on both Plato's *Republic* and on Saint-Yves' Synarchy, and it is not the purpose of this document to present much detail on either of these here. While either concept might serve as a general basis for a workable governmental paradigm for responsible management of a planetary population, there are a couple of features that, in the context of today's world, both culturally and environmentally, differentiate between Saint-Yves' Synarchy over the Platonic social organization as the basis for the operation of a planetary management organization, and may suggest a hybrid as a better solution.

The first distinction concerns the selection of the rulers. In Plato's concept, they are chosen by merit. In today's terminology, Desmond Lee notes that Plato's governmental construct might be termed "Managerial Meritocracy." In Saint-Yves's Synarchy, it is not clear how the rulers are chosen, or if they are "chosen" at all. Given the world's cultivated taste for meritocracy over the past few hundred years, it is quite possible that many people would favor meritocracy as a means of selecting its leaders. (In neither case do the masses choose the rulers, although it is understood that the governed consent to rule by the rulers.)

The second distinction concerns war. War was a constant fact of life in ancient Greece, a very important part of their culture and religion, and an established means of population control. After global nuclear war destroys the modern industrial world, it may well be that mankind comes to the realization that war – particularly in a technological age – is no longer a feasible means of population control. Sun Tzu noted that no society has ever benefited from sustained war. It may well be decided after the next great war that incessant war, and uncontrolled massive war, is no longer a desirable mode of human population moderation. And in this regard, Saint-Yves' Synarchy differs significantly from the social organization of Plato's *Republic* and times. If you read much about synarchy in general, and Saint-Yves' Synarchy in particular, you will see that there is a great emphasis on peace. (See, e.g., Aivanhov's referenced works for discussion; also his *Under the Dove, The Reign of Peace*, Prosveta, 1983, ISBN 2-85566-229-X.)

The **goal** of Solaria, thus, is to implement a planetary management organization along the lines of Plato's *Republic*, taking into account aspects of Saint-Yves' Synarchy. Specifically, the rulers will be chosen by meritocracy (from Plato), and the emphasis will be on peace over war (from Saint-Yves).

### **Some Additional Background Discussion**

Given the fact that what is being proposed is a hybrid of existing concepts, and significantly different from both, it may be that a new name would be helpful. Plato did not have a particular name for the society proposed in *The Republic* – his form of government is “republican” not in the sense that the governed choose their leaders, but in the sense that the rulers rule with the consent of the governed. And the term “synarchy” is now loaded with occult and “New Age” connotations. For these reasons, a new name might be desirable. The emphasis in our proposal is more on planetary management than on government in the traditional sense. For that reason, almost any “archy” word is not quite right. On the other hand, the planetary management that is being proposed is in fact a world government. In a sense, the planetary management organization is more similar to a regional franchise of an empire, such as the British East India Company or the Dutch East India Company. From the point of view of Synarchy (I will spell synarchy with an initial capital letter to indicate synarchy in the sense of Saint-Yves), the planetary management organization is in the nature of a concession or franchise (operating a planet, or a ship), where the behind-the-scenes power in control is an enlightened group of spiritual scientists, or adepts. Because of the “business” nature of the planetary management organization (goal-oriented operation of a planet), perhaps the words “corporation” or “company” might be appropriate, but for the fact that the entity controls all aspects of social organization and behavior. The characterization of the planetary management organization as a business enterprise is important, in that it puts the job of planetary management in perspective. It is fundamentally no different from managing a ship on a long voyage (e.g., Columbus, Magellan, or Henry Hudson), or a remote outpost of an empire (e.g., British India, Spanish New Spain). The characterization of a planetary management organization as a government has the drawback that it tends to lose track of the primary objective of managing the planet, since it focuses on social issues rather than long-term survival of the human species and maintenance of the biodiversity of the biosphere.

There is little point in introducing a new term if old ones (such as synarchy) will do. When Saint-Yves started his philosophical investigations of governmental forms, his concept of synarchy was simply a form of government by a group of aristocrats (to

counter anarchy), and did not include the concept of being controlled by a (real or imaginary) group of spiritual initiates or adepts – the Great White Brotherhood, or Universal White Brotherhood (or Great Universal White Brotherhood). That concept was introduced later, after he was visited by a mission from India. That mission introduced Saint-Yves to the traditions of Indian metaphysics. He was impressed, and added this aspect to his concept of synarchy (now perhaps with a capital “S”). The word synarchy is a combination of the Greek roots “syn,” meaning “together,” and “arche,” meaning “power.” It is conceived as a union of aristocracy (government by enlightened rulers) and democracy (participation of the people, government with the consent of the governed). For the time being, for want of a better term and subject to change, I will stick with the term “synarchy” as best representing the hierarchical governmental form of the proposed planetary management organization. The proposed planetary management organization is synarchic in nature, but not strictly in the sense of Saint-Yves. It is initially a goal-oriented, and eventually a self-optimizing system directed specifically to the problem of planetary management in a fashion that assures the long-term survival of mankind and the biosphere as we now know it. Perhaps the term “Platonic society” is better, since it was Plato who first introduced the concept.

It is important to note a very significant distinction between planetary management and traditional government. In traditional government, the role of government does not relate to “saving the planet.” It relates either to satisfying the desires of the ruler(s), as in monarchy or dictatorial tyranny, or in satisfying the desires of the people, as in anarchy and democracy. And those desires may be very varied indeed. The goal of planetary management, however, is very specific: to promote the long-term survivability of the human species and the biosphere as we know it. Because of this emphasis, a planetary management organization is in a sense very different from a traditional terrestrial government. It is much more in the nature of a profit-making corporation than a nation. The planetary management organization has an overriding purpose (to save the biosphere and mankind from extinction and from a significant loss of quality of life), just as a profit-making corporation has an overriding purpose (to make the stockholders wealthier). And this distinction makes a very significant difference in how things are run. The overriding factor in all decisions will be: how does this affect the likelihood of survival of the human species and the quality of the biosphere. The freedom of the individual and “human rights” will take definite second place to that consideration. The radical individualism and the radical egalitarianism that Robert Bork decried in contemporary American society will be gone. The cry will no longer be “Liberté, Fraternité, Égalité,” but “Survive, Survive, Survive.”

The planetary management organization is initially goal-oriented and eventually optimizing (evolutionary). It is useful, perhaps, to consider the five levels of the Carnegie-Mellon University (CMU) Software Engineering Institute’s (SEI) Capability Maturity Model (CMM) as a way of characterizing the quality of the organization’s management and operations. This model, which is a standard for quality management, conceives of five levels of capability of a software development organization: initial, repeatable, defined, managed, and optimizing.

The five capability levels of the CMM are defined as follows (from W. S. Humphrey and W. L. Sweet et al., *A Method for Assessing the Software Engineering Capability of Contractors*, Technical Report CMU/SEI-87-TR-23, ESD/TR-87-186, Preliminary Version, September 1987, Software Engineering Institute, Carnegie Mellon University,

Pittsburgh, PA 15213; reproduced as AD-A187230 by the US Department of Commerce, National Technical Information Service, Springfield, VA 22161):

1. Initial: The initial environment has ill-defined procedures and controls. The organization does not consistently apply software engineering management to the process. Nor does it use modern tools and technology. Level 1 organizations may have serious cost and schedule problems.
2. Repeatable: At Level 2 the organization has generally learned to manage costs and schedules, and the process is now repeatable. The organization uses standard methods and practices for managing software development activities such as cost estimating, scheduling, requirements changes, code changes, and status reviews.
3. Defined: In Level 3 the process is well characterized and reasonably well understood. The organization defines its process in terms of software engineering standards and methods, and it has made a series of organizational and methodological improvements. These include design and code reviews, training programs for programmers and review leaders, and increased organizational focus on software engineering.
4. Managed: In Level 4 the process is not only well understood, but it is quantified, measured, and reasonably well controlled. The organization typically bases its operating decisions on quantitative process data, and conducts extensive analyses of the data gathered during software engineering reviews and tests. Tools are used increasingly to control and manage the design process as well as to support data gathering and analysis.
5. Optimized: At Level 5, organizations have not only achieved a high degree of control over their processes, they have a major focus on improving and optimizing their operation. This includes more sophisticated analyses of the error and cost data gathered during the process as well as the introduction of comprehensive error cause analysis and prevention studies. The data on the process are used iteratively to improve the process and achieve optimal performance.

The SEI CMM is similar to the concept of ISO 9000 quality management. In both concepts, an organization is audited by a regional accreditation organization, and certified at a certain level of compliance with the criteria of the standard. The principal differences between ISO 9000 Quality Management certification and CMM certification are that (1) the CMM is directed specifically toward quality management of firms engaged in software development, whereas ISO 9000 is applicable to any type of organization; and (2) the ISO 9000 certification is based on a two-level scale (conformance or nonconformance) whereas the CMM is based on a five-level scale.

In terms of the CMM scale of quality management, at the present time, the planetary management of Earth is at the "Initial" level. It is chaotic and not at all managed or optimizing. The nature of the proposed planetary management organization is very much goal-oriented, and it is intended that it would operate at a level analogous to a CMM "Level 4" quality management organization. The "minimal-regret" planetary population concept is a first attempt at managing planetary human population (to assure a high level of likelihood of long-term survival of the human species and Earth's biosphere). The goal, initially, is to achieve a planet with a minimal-regret population. In the future, after a minimal-regret population is established, efforts will be directed toward

optimizing planetary management – one that will enable mankind to achieve a significant and meaningful destiny.

And this brings us to a very important issue. *Why?* Why establish a minimal-regret population and save the planet? Why does any of this matter? Well, some argue that it does matter, and some argue that it doesn't. I happen to believe that it does matter, that there is a reason and purpose to human existence. It is perhaps not clear to most people what that purpose is, but it appears that most spiritual scientists or spiritual philosophers reach the same conclusion – that the purpose of human existence is to provide a physical environment in which to develop the (non-physical) soul, in its quest, or journey, to “return to God.” The Earth is, in effect, a workshop or laboratory or stage on which human beings get to experiment, to play parts, to create, to develop, to evolve (physically, mentally, intellectually, and spiritually). They were created by God and continue at his pleasure, for his pleasure. “In the long run, we are all dead,” is a true statement, but it refers just to physical existence (of human beings, civilizations, solar systems, and galaxies). Here on Earth, it is the process that matters, not the ultimate end, since the ultimate end of physical existence is always extinction. There is little point to mankind's killing the biosphere, as it is now doing. Mankind has developed very much in the past few million years, and there is much more development that can be realized in the next several billion years of our solar system. I love Earth, I love the human species and its physical abilities, I love the biosphere as it has evolved, and I desire to see it continue. To date, human society has seen just the opening act of a very long play. I would like to see how the play ends. It is my play; I can influence how it evolves, and how I evolve in it. That is the purpose of the proposed planetary management organization. I want to choose and direct my own role in the play. That is *why*.

The search for the nature of existence and knowledge has intrigued mankind throughout its existence. There are a number of names that apply to this field of study, such as epistemology (“the branch of philosophy that studies the nature of knowledge, its presuppositions and foundations, and its extent and validity”), metaphysics (“the branch of philosophy that examines the nature of reality, including the relationship between mind and matter, substance and attribute, fact and value”), religious philosophy, and spiritual science, and there are many branches to the tree (e.g., Hindu Vedanta, Zen Buddhism, Christian Gnosticism, Hebrew Cabalism, Chinese Taoism, Islamic Sufism, shamanism, theosophy, anthroposophy). The really interesting thing is that, while the specific paradigms may differ somewhat, they all reach similar conclusions about the general nature of existence. If you read, for example, the works of the German philosopher Rudolf Steiner (see <http://www.elib.com/Steiner/Books> ) or Elisabeth Kübler-Ross (*Death Is of Vital Importance*) or Mikhaël Aïvanhov or Frank Maiello (<http://ddi.digital.net/~egodust/> ), the descriptions of the makeup and nature of human beings are remarkably similar.

You read a lot today on the Internet about characterizations of human society as a cancer on the biosphere (e.g., A. Kent MacDougall's *Humans as Cancer* at <http://www.islandone.org/LEOBiblio/SPB11HC.HTM> ) or a “metaparasite” (B. Deric Morris's *The State of the Human Species* at <http://home.earthlink.net/~eldonenew/species.htm> or <http://solutions.synearth.net/2002/09/05> ). Although these characterizations and analogies are arguably “right on the money,” they are in the nature of symptomatic descriptions. Perhaps they provide some insight, but they do little to diagnose the underlying causes of the problem, and they are not prescriptive in nature. The book



*Can America Survive?* described the symptoms and diagnosed the problem and described a feasible solution. It did not, however, provide any indication of how to conduct treatment to achieve or realize the proposed solution. This document prescribes treatment – a solution for planetary management that will restore the health of the planet and assure mankind's long-term survival in a richly varied biosphere.

Since the purpose of the present document is to present higher-level statements of vision, mission, and goals, it will not go into details on specific organizational features or management processes. The salient feature of the organizational structure is hierarchical. (Note the ISO 9000 quality management is intended for application to hierarchical organizations.) Since the purpose of Solaria is to manage an entire planet and solar civilization, it must deal with every aspect of human society, culture, knowledge, and technology. It must consider all of the aspects of human existence that were considered in Plato's *Republic*: ethics; education; philosophy and religion; society and politics.

Note that consideration of philosophy and religion is of central importance. Plato conceived of rulers who were philosophers. Saint-Yves considered (in his later work) control of government by behind-the-scenes spiritual adepts. In both concepts, religion played a central and crucial role in society. Religion permeated Greek society. Plato considered education of paramount importance. He considered that primary education's main concern was reading and writing, and the main subjects studied in secondary school were literary and humanistic: the history, literature, art, culture and traditions of his country and neighboring countries. This of course included the religious literature of Greece. At the university (tertiary) level, emphasis was on mathematics, science and philosophy. He viewed education of such great importance that it was to be provided exclusively by the state. Because of its crucial role in forming young minds, the curriculum was to be totally controlled and defined by the state. Because of changes in man's religious and spiritual view over the centuries, religious instruction will be in the nature of religious philosophy and spiritual science, as opposed to any particular religion (e.g., the Greek or Roman gods, Hinduism, Christianity, Islam). See, for example, <http://www.elib.com/Steiner/Books> .

Details on where the Solarian city-state will be located will depend very much on the outcome of global war. It is likely that most of the northern hemisphere (North America, Europe, Asia) will be destroyed and uninhabitable because of radioactive fallout. Much of Asia will be destroyed (India, China, Southeast Asia), because of the large number of large cities and industrial targets in those regions. Primary candidates for its location would appear to be South America, Africa, Australia, and New Zealand. These areas have few large cities that would be targeted, and it is likely that prevailing wind patterns would carry radioactive fallout out to sea for many large-city targets located on or near the seacoast (e.g., Rio de Janeiro, São Paulo, Caracas, Buenos Aires, Santiago, Lima, Sydney, Melbourne, Cape Town). Mystics see South America as the next great continent in mankind's destiny.

Solaria will exercise total control of the use of energy. For most of the world, this will necessitate insuring that no industrial development takes place, and that no large-scale or high-grade energy production facilities are allowed. This includes hydroelectric dams, fossil fuel fields (coal, oil, natural gas), biomass, and nuclear power generating facilities. The means of monitoring compliance with this policy will depend very much on the outcome of global nuclear war. If the surviving entity that prevails after the attack

has access to high technology (satellite surveillance, ballistic missiles), the control (surveillance and targeting) of energy production facilities may be done by means of missile warfare, as described in *A Winning Strategy for National Missile Defense (NMD)* (at <http://www.foundation.bw> ). If none of this technology survives the war, then more primitive means of surveillance and control will be used (e.g., the large dirigibles or air ships envisioned by Edgar Cayce in his reading of the Akashic Records).

The purpose of The Omega Project (<http://www.foundation.bw> ) is to make available materials that can be of assistance to whatever group prevails after the demise of the industrial world, so that they will understand the crucially important need for establishing and maintaining a minimal-regret population at that time. It is not the objective of The Omega Project to publish details on how to accomplish that. How it is accomplished will be detailed in the contingency plans of those organizations that intend to prevail in the wake of global nuclear war, if they survive it. The strongest surviving group (e.g., nation, religion) with the best contingency plan will assume control of the planet. May God favor their undertaking.

### **Author's note...**

With respect to the matter of war, my writings have often been misunderstood or misinterpreted. Some people claim that I am advocating war as a means of solving the planet's environmental and ecological problems. That is not correct, and it misses the point. I believe that global war is inevitable, and I believe that it will be an event leading eventually to a better world than we have today, and that would occur in the absence of it. In this sense, it is possible that global war may be desirable, since it may lead to a better situation for mankind and the biosphere. I believe, moreover, that the timing of global war is important. If global war occurs too soon, the damage to the industrial world is not great, and the world will simply reindustrialize and repopulate, and continue on the road to global disaster, possible extinction for mankind, and a ruined biosphere (e.g., no large animals; loss of mammals; inheritance of the planet by ants, spiders and cockroaches). If global war happens too late, the biosphere is also ruined. In other words, there is an "optimal" timing of global war, if it is to occur, and if it is to result ultimately in a saved or minimally damaged biosphere.

War is terrible, but the ruin or destruction or death of a biosphere is worse. I am not in favor of either, but war – even global war – is an acceptable price to pay for saving the biosphere from destruction. The issue is a matter of alternatives. We may not be able to choose exactly what we desire most. As I remarked to a correspondent recently, "The effects of war are terrible and horrible. But the economic development and peace that have placed billions in grinding poverty and disease, and have robbed many men of any means whatsoever of providing for their families, are also terrible and horrible. I do not advocate killing people with bayonets any more than I advocate killing them with the starvation and disease that prolonged peace and economic development have brought."

Sir Fred Hoyle (*October the First Is Too Late*) evidently also believed that the world would evolve to a population of ten million, but he saw that loss of much of the biosphere (e.g., all large animals), and its eventual total destruction, were also possible outcomes. While those outcomes are very possible, and in fact very likely, I do not believe that they are inevitable. I believe that with positive and prudent action, the biospheric catastrophe that global industrialization is causing can be arrested and avoided. We are in control of the planet's future. It does not have to be a dismal one.

Mankind has within its power to determine, today, whether the future is a glorious one on a delightful planet, or a living hell on a destroyed planet. The lifetime of the solar system is another several billion years. The current generation of mankind is in the process of determining the quality of life for mankind for the next four billion years. The choice is ours. It does not have to be a disaster. It *has to be* a success!

All of this said, I will here state, unequivocally, for the record, that I am not advocating global war or any war as a solution to the planet's problem. But I do believe that it will happen, and that it will lead to a better world. If a Platonic / synarchic society is then established with a minimal-regret population, mankind will have the opportunity to have a world of peace for a very long time. He will have the opportunity and time to "figure things out." If the world continues as it is now (globalization, industrialization, massive human population, gross intermingling of the human and other species), it will continue to have poverty, epidemic disease, and war – and a ruined biosphere. It is, however, unrealistic to imagine that human society will simply "evolve" to a Platonic / minimal-regret state. Most significant social changes on Earth come about in a revolutionary, not evolutionary, fashion. I believe that, and I am working toward the goal that, a Platonic / minimal regret state will come into being following global war.

In this context, it is interesting to note the observations of Omraam Mikhaël Aïvanhov (from *A New Dawn: Society and Politics in the Light of Initiatic Science*, Part 1, Prosveta, 1990) on the coming of the Aquarian Age. "Aquarius, therefore, necessarily involves a certain amount of breakage: it is going to have to break through existing structures in order to propagate its ideas of universality.... The Age of Aquarius will bring new life. ... Your ideal is to be immersed, with all other human beings, in the cosmic ocean of life, love, beauty and joy.... In the beginning, we shall witness some gigantic upheavals in the world, but these will give birth to a Golden Age. The new Golden Age will be the fruit of the Age of Aquarius."

On a Platonic / minimal-regret planet, there will be no war. A single planetary management organization will control Earth – for war, two nations are required. In a world without war, much of mankind's energy – apart from that required for managing the planet – can be directed toward evolution of man's intellectual and spiritual nature. Let us proceed to a glorious solar civilization in the Age of Aquarius.