

Handbook of Planetary Management

Copyright © 2010 Joseph George Caldwell. All rights reserved. Posted at Internet website <http://www.foundationwebsite.org>. May be copied or reposted for non-commercial use, with attribution to author and website. (Part 1: 6 June 2003; Part 2: 13 February 2010, updated 6 March 2010)

Contents

Handbook of Planetary Management.....	1
1. Introduction	1
2. What Can Be Done?	3
3. The Problem – Mass Industrialization	5
4. The Key to the Solution: Action Follows Belief	7
5. An Ally in the War against Planetary Destruction: The New Age / New Spiritualism Movement	9
6. Some First Steps.....	14
7. Situation Assessment, February 2010	17
8. Alternative Futures	21
9. How to Wage and Win Global Nuclear War	35
10. How to Establish a Long-Term-Sustainable System of Planetary Management	46

Part 1. Awareness

1. Introduction

For millions of years, during mankind's hunter-gatherer phase, the human population of Earth was on the order of five million people. With the development of agriculture and other technologies about ten thousand years ago, the

population increased to about 250 million at the time of the Roman Empire. With the advent of the fossil-fuel age on Earth in the late Middle Ages, the human population began to grow very fast. It now (2010) stands at about seven billion, and is increasing by about 80 million per year. The human population now consumes about 40 percent of all of the “current” solar energy usable by biological organisms, and more than half of all fresh water. It is the most numerous mammalian species on the planet, and the largest single species in terms of biomass. Massive human numbers and industrial activity are causing the extinction of an estimated 30 thousand species per year and are thereby destroying the ecological balance of the biosphere.

The large size of the human population will not continue for very much longer. The world’s petroleum supplies have been about half used up, and the remaining reserves will last for less than half a century at current rates of consumption. More significantly, the ecological balance of nature has been so disturbed that ecological collapse (significant and major change) is occurring long before the end of the petroleum age. Most of the human species live in abject poverty, misery, hunger, disease and squalor. Limits have been reached on agricultural food production, and the world’s fisheries are now collapsing from overfishing and pollution. The world’s natural-growth forests are being destroyed at a rapid rate, and will soon be gone from most parts of the world. Much of nature is being destroyed by human-generated pollution and destruction of natural habitat.

Although appeals to stop this destruction have been increasing in urgency and frequency for many decades, mankind as a whole has been totally unwilling and/or unable to stop the destruction of the biosphere. It is clear that human population growth will continue until the system

collapses catastrophically. There are many factors at work in this process of destruction, including human greed, ability to tap the massive energy stored in fossil fuels and thereby cause massive changes to the environment, addiction to the material benefits of industrialization, the stranglehold of the “religion” of economics on human culture (i.e., greater industrial production, both overall and per capita, is “better”), contempt for all other species, and the widespread belief that God will remove (“save”) all “good” people from the ruined planet (“End Times” concepts, such as Apocalypse, Armageddon, Tribulation, Rapture, etc.).

Dynamic systems almost always fail catastrophically. In the case of human industrial civilization, which is now causing massive changes to the planet’s environment and will soon exhaust the energy source (petroleum) that is enabling massive human numbers, it is obvious that the catastrophic demise will occur very soon (at the latest in a few decades when petroleum supplies exhaust, but more likely within the next few years). The only real issue to be resolved is how much more damage will be caused to the biosphere prior to the collapse and whether the human species survives. If industrial society could continue until all petroleum is exhausted, a substantial proportion of all of Earth’s species would have been exterminated. If industrial society ends very soon (e.g., by war, disease, famine), the “Sixth Mass Extinction” of the planet will end with the extinctions to date.

2. What Can Be Done?

As noted, the religion of economics has a very strong grip on human society. Although economic development and industrial activity have been totally responsible for the ecological destruction that is currently being wreaked on the planet, the myth that more economic development and

industrial activity will make things better is widely believed. Almost everyone believes that more industrial development will improve the standard of living for himself and his family, and that the associated ecological damage that occurs is not important.

A few writers have shown very convincingly how mankind's current global industrial activity is analogous to cancer or other serious disease (in this case, a disease that is destroying the biosphere), but few people are willing to accept that mankind in its current numbers is a pathogenic or parasitic organism. Most people simply do not want to hear that an estimated 30,000 species are being made extinct every year by human activity. Collectively, human society is in a state of mass denial that the biosphere is undergoing massive, immediate and irreversible change, that the large human population is completely unsustainable, and that human population collapse is imminent.

It is now impossible that the situation will improve by peaceful means. Globalization (global industrialization at high levels) has a stranglehold grip on human society. No world or national leader is willing to propose, or promote, or even accept a decrease in either the gross national product or the gross national product per capita. Global petroleum supplies will exhaust so soon that there is now no way for human population to decline slowly to sustainable levels. Human population increased in direct proportion to petroleum availability, and it will decline in direct proportion to petroleum availability. The fact is that billions of people will soon die – and not from old age! The coming die-off of the human species will be the direct consequence of either the decline in petroleum availability or mankind's destruction of the environment – global war, disease and starvation are just around the corner.

The significant issue facing the planet is not how to avoid catastrophic collapse, since that is now inevitable. The significant issues are what to do after it occurs, and how to prepare for the post-catastrophe era (to minimize the destruction being caused by global industrialization and to ensure the establishment of a long-term-sustainable system of planetary management after its demise). The Foundation websites have analysed and discussed this situation at length, and have presented examples of long-term sustainable human populations and organizations. One such population is a synarchic (Platonic) government of a “minimal-regret” population consisting of a single-nation high-technology population of five million people and a globally distributed hunter-gatherer population of five million people.

The purpose of the Foundation websites is to promote awareness of the human population problem, suggest solutions to this problem, and to help bring about conditions such that when the industrial world collapses, a better (i.e., long-term-sustainable) system of planetary management is established (set up and maintained). Much of the website material to date has been concerned with description and analysis of the problem, and a general discussion of solutions (see, e.g., *Can America Survive?*). Recently, more material has been presented concerning specific approaches to planetary management, or to ensuring that a rational (long-term-sustainable) planetary management system is established. This handbook is one more step in that direction.

3. The Problem – Mass Industrialization

Without modern industrialization, the human population did not have much impact on Earth's ecology. In a hunter-gatherer mode (on the order of five million people globally), it had practically no impact at all – it was just one minor mammalian species, living off the land. Even with primitive agriculture (on the order of 250 million people globally), it did not have a large impact. The world's tropical forests and oceans remained pretty much as they had for millions of years, and mankind's use of natural materials caused little impact on the planet's biodiversity. The big change occurred when mankind began to use modern technology, tap fossil fuels on a large scale, and increase its population dramatically. The planet can support a few hundred million people living under primitive (agricultural) conditions, or about five million living a high-technology lifestyle, without causing major disruption to the biosphere. Examples of long-term sustainable human populations are: about 5-20 million hunter-gatherers; or about 250 million primitive-agriculture people; or about five million high-technology people; or the latter together with a small number of hunter-gatherers (e.g., five million). In other words, the "carrying capacity" of the planet is from about five million people to a few hundred million, depending on the level of technology, and the greater the level of technology (energy use, pollution generation), the fewer the people that can be supported long-term. Whatever the total number of human beings, the macroscopic impact of the human species on the biosphere must be very small, for that population to be sustainable in the long term.

If mankind is to be able to stop the ongoing mass species extinction, it is necessary to dramatically reduce the level of industrial activity on the planet. Economic development and industrial activity are the problem, not the solution. The

problem is how to bring about and maintain a reduction in industrial activity, when almost everyone wants more.

4. The Key to the Solution: Action Follows Belief

Some see a solution by means of war. Because of all of the problems being caused by mass industrialization, the likelihood of occurrence of global war and the magnitude of its consequences are increasing. The main problem with war as an approach to solving the world's current ecological problem is that the very people who would win are the ones in favor of global industrialization! As long as most people believe that industrial activity is the solution to the world's problems, and that more is better, the survivors of a collapsed industrial world would simply rebuild industrial society, and the ecological destruction of the planet would resume. It does not seem likely that forceful action (violence) is a solution to the world's ecological problem. Too many people are committed to large human population and global industrialization, and too few seek a solution. If a small number of people tried to bring an end to this current world paradigm by force, they would almost certainly fail. Furthermore, a small group of people cannot control a large population against its will for very long. Global war will likely occur as part of the demise of the global industrial age, and it may be useful as a means of establishing a long-term-sustainable system of planetary management, but it is not relevant to maintaining such a system for a long time.

As long as most of the world's population is committed to (addicted to) global industrialization, it is unlikely that a different system of planetary management would arise. As Neale Donald Walsch has argued forcefully, however, action follows belief. If the survivors of a global catastrophe believe that a resumption of global industrialization will improve

things, then that is what they will seek to achieve. If, on the other hand, the survivors see clearly that global industrialization was in fact the problem – the very source of the planetary destruction – then they will seek to avoid a resumption of the industrial age. And this is the key to the solution.

Although almost no one at the present time is willing to decrease industrial activity to a low level, that attitude can be changed. As observed above, the industrial era will end soon, and it will almost surely end in a catastrophic collapse (global war, disease, famine, or whatever). When that happens, the survivors will see that large-scale industrialization has failed, and they will have experienced first-hand the destruction that it has caused. They will understand the disastrous consequences of a large human population and global industrialization, and they will be receptive to change. It is at that time that a significant opportunity will exist for significant and lasting change.

In order for the post-catastrophe surviving human population to be receptive to change, it is very important that they be fully aware of the reasons for the collapse of global industrial society when it occurs, and also aware of planetary management approaches that will avoid a repeat of the destruction caused by the present system. Establishing this awareness is the primary mission of the Foundation websites – to disseminate information describing (1) the state of the world, (2) the reasons why large-scale industrial society must collapse and do so catastrophically, and (3) planetary management approaches that will avoid further destruction and a recurrence of the experienced collapse. When most people of the world genuinely believe that global industrialization was the problem that destroyed the world, then they will act to prevent its re-emergence. It is at that

time that it will be possible to establish a planetary management system based on synarchic government of a minimal-regret global population of ten million people.

5. An Ally in the War against Planetary Destruction: The New Age / New Spiritualism Movement

I observed above that almost no one believes that global industrialization is the problem and that it is destroying the planet. *Almost* no one. There is a one group of people, however, that is appalled by the level of violence in the world and the destruction of nature by global industrialization, and who are also very much convinced that a transformation to a better world is both possible and imminent. That is the group of people who are generally called “New Agers,” but it also includes spiritualists and mystics. New Agers have a vision for a better world. They are optimistic that a new world order can be established in which people can live in peace with each other and in harmony with nature.

In addition to their viewpoint that world peace and harmony with nature are possible, New Agers possess another attribute that is very important – their large numbers. There are literally millions of people who are interested in New Age / New Spiritualism concepts. The only thing that is lacking is that, although these people are optimistic that the world is about to enter a new Golden Age of peace and harmony with nature, they (as a group) do not see exactly how this will happen, or exactly how it can be brought about. Moreover, they are not generally aware that they as a group are the key to solving the world’s problem. Many are convinced that the dawning of the Age of Aquarius will bring substantial and significant change, and that this change may even be turbulent and violent. Some are convinced, nevertheless,

that if enough people believe and hope for world peace and harmony with nature, this will happen.

While the New Age / New Spiritualism movement is a phenomenon of the last few decades, it traces its beginnings in spiritualist and personal development movements from ages past. There have been many writers in this field. Some of the more successful or better-known ones are Rudolf Steiner, G. I. Gurdjieff, P. D. Ouspensky, Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, René Guénon, Julius Evola, Frithjof Schuon, Jean Gebser, Neale Donald Walsch, Thom Hartmann, Gary Zukav, Michael Talbot, Fritjof Capra, and Laura Knight-Jadczyk, just to name a few.

New Age devotees will be strongly attracted to the synarchic government / minimal-regret population movement, since it aligns well with many of their principal interests and concerns. The term “synarchy” was in fact introduced by the 19-th century spiritualist, Saint-Yves d’Alveydre (although the concept was introduced much earlier, by Plato). The goal of world peace and harmony with nature is a common goal for New Agers. Except for the single high-technology city-state, all human population will be organized tribally. Thom Hartmann (*The Last Hours of Ancient Sunlight*) summarizes the five primary traits of tribal groups: (1) political independence; (2) egalitarian structure; (3) get their resources from renewable local sources; (4) have a unique sense of their own identity; and (5) respect the identity of other tribes. With an end to the sixth mass species extinction, the diversity of species in the biosphere will be promoted. The diversity of the human species, too, will be promoted, with the re-emergence of independent tribes all over the planet. The likelihood of plagues, epidemics and ecological disasters will be dramatically reduced, since the

gross intermingling of human beings and other species that characterizes globalization will cease.

The “evolutionary agenda” of Barbara Marx Hubbard (*Conscious Evolution*) will be realized: (1) meet basic food and shelter needs of all people; (2) limit our population growth; (3) restore Earth’s environment; (4) learn to coexist with other species; (5) learn sustainable economic development; (6) shift the vast military-industrial technological complex toward building new worlds on Earth and in Space; (7) redesign social and economic systems to enhance human compassion, cooperation, and creativity; (8) emancipate individuals’ unique potential and life purpose; (9) explore and develop the further reaches of the human spirit and the universe beyond the planet of our birth. Overall, “the planet makes its transition from its high-technology, polluting, and overpopulating phase to a system that fulfills its collective potential.”

The unified-planet goals of Neale Donald Walsch (*Conversations with God, Book Two*) would be realized: (1) an end to wars between nations and the settling of disputes by killing; (2) an end to abject poverty, death by starvation, and mass exploitation of people and resources by those of power; (3) an end to the systematic environmental destruction of the Earth; (4) an escape from the endless struggle for bigger, better, more; (5) an opportunity – truly equal – for all people to rise to the highest expression of Self; and (6) an end to all limitations and discrimination holding people back – whether in housing, in the workplace, or in the political system, or in personal sexual relationships.

The world vision of James Redfield (*The Celestine Vision*) would be realized: (1) overcoming poverty and world hunger; (2) preventing crime; (3) protecting the environment; (4)

saving the forests; (5) an end to mass terrorism and warfare; and (6) transformation of culture from planned obsolescence.

The vision of L. Ron Hubbard (*Scientology*) would be realized: A civilization without insanity, without criminals and without war, where the able can prosper and honest beings can have rights, and where man is free to rise to greater heights.

One of the fascinating aspects of the minimal-regret population proposed in *Can America Survive?* is the fact that it allows for and promotes both a high-technology society and low-technology societies on the planet. At the present time, the high-technology culture (Young Culture, in the terminology of Thom Hartmann) is exterminating the primitive culture (Older Culture). (It is also exterminating itself.) In a minimal-regret-population world, both cultures exist in harmony. The high technology culture (the synarchic government) promotes the survival of the low-technology culture – that is its primary mission, its reason for existence, its meaningful work (its secondary mission is advancement of scientific and spiritual knowledge). The low-technology society preserves the tribal community life that is so meaningful to human existence. Human beings are able to develop both in a high-technology culture and a low-technology culture. Both exist on the same planet in a symbiotic relationship: the high-technology culture protects the low-technology culture (and ensures its own continued existence) by preventing the rise of mass (global) industrialization. The low-technology culture, dispersed over the planet and with limited intermingling, promotes greater diversity of the human species and dramatically reduces the likelihood of human-species extinction from a localized

catastrophic incident (because of geographic dispersion and very limited intermingling).

When I said above that New Agers / spiritualists / mystics as a group do not see *exactly* how world changes can be brought about, I am referring to details, such as setting up a synarchic world government after the global collapse of industrialism. The New Agers know *exactly* what approach to use. It is the approach of mystics and spiritualists. It is the long-established “secret” to success – meditation (prayer), desire, visualization, planning, action, etc. (see Napoleon Hill’s *Think and Grow Rich* for more on this). All that is lacking is *specificity* and *clarity* in setting goals and objectives. Once the New Age community has a clear understanding of the nature of the global crisis (e.g., as described in Thom Hartmann’s *The Last Hours of Ancient Sunshine*), it may set specific goals to bring about a better world. Except for Hartmann, most New Age writers seem oblivious to the severity of the environmental crisis. As long as they and the New Age community are unaware of the nature and seriousness of the crisis, nothing will happen. Knowledge and awareness are very important. As Laura Knight-Jadczyk writes, “Knowledge / awareness protects, ignorance endangers.” Once they are fully aware, nothing can stop them. Action will indeed follow belief.

It should be emphasized here that information from spiritual sources has a high degree of equivocation (unreliability), and must be evaluated with a very critical eye. Much information from spiritual sources is false or misleading, like the messages of the Oracle at Delphi and channelling. Some, perhaps much, is total nonsense, like the ramblings in a dream. All such information must be carefully evaluated in the light of knowledge, using critical reason. In any event, these sources can provide useful clues to the nature of

reality, and may suggest useful alternative future paths to consider. The fact is that physical science has proved disastrous for mankind and for the biosphere, and spiritual science can provide useful insight and guidance.

The forces of global industrialization are very powerful. They are committed to and addicted to the complete destruction of the planet's biosphere. Stopping them will not be easy. The war against global industrialization will not be easy to win. The battle to establish world peace and a stable biosphere will involve much hard work, commitment, and sacrifice. And it will involve much faith. As noted in the Bible, "Prayer is essential in this ongoing warfare."

6. Some First Steps

In order for the New Age community – or any other community – to work enthusiastically and effectively on a particular program for achieving the ultimate goal of world peace and harmony with nature, it is necessary that they be aware of the problem, understand its nature, and believe in the program (i.e., believe that it is an effective and desirable way of achieving the ultimate goal and generally superior to other alternatives).

The Foundation websites propose a synarchic government of a minimal-regret population of ten million as a feasible and desirable means of achieving a long-term-survivable human population and biosphere. To encourage the adoption of this planetary management paradigm, the Foundation websites present detailed information on the nature of the crisis and the proposed solution. They also present suggestions for additional steps that may be taken to increase awareness and acceptance of the proposed solution, and that will increase the likelihood that the solution will be attempted and

successfully implemented. These steps include the following:

- Publication of the book, *Can America Survive?*, which presents a detailed analysis of the current state of the world and a rationale for implementing a minimal-regret population on Earth.
- Publication of articles that discuss various aspects of planetary management, synarchy, and the minimal-regret population.

There is no central organization coordinating the movement to establish a synarchic government of a minimal-regret population. There are several reasons for this. First, it is anticipated that at some point the national governments of the world will move against the synarchic-government / minimal-regret-population movement, since it is antithetical to all they stand for (i.e., the industrialized world, globalization). (There is substantial precedent prompting this belief – both France and Germany moved against Synarchy early in the twentieth century.) The vulnerability of this movement is substantially reduced by the lack of a central organization. Second, it is considered advantageous from the viewpoint of credibility and acceptance if the Foundation / synarchic / minimal-regret movement has no commercial interests, motives or basis. As long as the movement is a “grass-roots” one, and there is no central organization or headquarters, there is no need for large amounts of money to accomplish the movement’s goals. The “organization” exists only as an idea: with no physical or financial assets, there is nothing for the industrial world to attack or destroy. Nothing is more powerful than an idea whose time has come. The movement has no need for monetary funding – it is the power of conscious evolution that will enable it to come into being.

The general approach of the Foundation website is to make effective use of certain features of the present system of global industrialization to bring about a synarchic world government and minimal-regret population. The current system is so large and powerful, and so committed to destruction of the biosphere, that it cannot be overcome with a “frontal attack,” and its collapse will be so sudden, devastating and uncontrolled that it may destroy everything, including the chance to establish a long-term-sustainable system of planetary management. The key to establishing a long-term-sustainable system of planetary management will be to take effective advantage of some features of it, and retain some features of it, as it collapses (“Let no good crisis go to waste,” as the Obama administration asserts). The approach is, as in the martial arts (Tae Kwan Do, Karate, Jujitsu), to apply skill and leverage to use the opponent’s mass and momentum against him, to your advantage. One way in which this is being done is to make use of the Internet to disseminate information on planetary management – using globalization’s information-technology resources to educate people on the nature of the current destructive planetary management system and the long-term-sustainable system of planetary management that may replace it. Other ways in which the assets of the present system may be used effectively to replace it with a better system are discussed in the sections that follow.

Part 2: The Synarchist Manifesto

This Part (update of 15 February 2010) is dedicated to my son, Joseph George Caldwell IV (12 August 1960 – 18 January 2010).

It was the time of the preacher

In the year of '01
Now the preaching is over
And the lesson's begun

It was the time of the preacher
In the year of '01
Now the lesson is over
And the killing's begun

It was the time of the preacher
In the year of '01
When you think it's all over
It's only begun

Selected verses from "The Time of the Preacher,"
from *The Red Headed Stranger* collection, words
and music by Willie Nelson

7. Situation Assessment, February 2010

A lot has happened since Part 1 (Sections 1-6) of this *Handbook of Planetary Management* was published in June of 2003. Since that time, the system of growth-based economics has continued unabated and world population has continued to soar, from 6.33 billion to 6.98 billion today (February 2010; source: University of North Carolina world population clock at <http://www.ibiblio.org/lunarbin/worldpop>). Environmental damage continues to increase and the sixth mass species extinction continues. This is "business as usual" – large human numbers and industrial activity continue to destroy the biosphere. The significant thing that has changed, however, is that there is a growing agreement that global oil production is decreasing, i.e., we are passing "Hubbert's Peak" on "Hubbert's Curve" of global oil production (the exact peak is uncertain because of

substantial fluctuations in production, caused by variations in demand (caused by economic and demographic circumstances) and in supply (caused by discovery of new oil sources and exhaustion of existing ones)).

The purpose of setting up the Foundation website was to disseminate information about a proposed strategy for a long-term-sustainable biosphere and human population – the “minimal-regret” population strategy (consisting of a single high-tech nation of five million people and a globally distributed low-tech population of five million hunter-gatherers). The website has achieved this objective. The number of “hits” by visitors has increased from zero in 1999 when it was established to about 3,000 per month in 2003, to about 20,000 per month today. The works posted on the Foundation website are downloaded frequently throughout the day, and there are many links to the website from external servers. The concept of a minimal-regret population is now widely discussed and debated.

In the ten years since the minimal-regret population strategy was published in *Can America Survive?*, not a single feasible alternative global population strategy has been proposed. In the absence of alternatives, it appears that the minimal-regret strategy will be implemented upon the collapse of the current world economic system (growth-based economics, large human numbers and industrial activity).

This Part 2 (Sections 7-10) of the *Handbook of Planetary Management* sketches some alternative scenarios for the near-term future. The purpose of these sketches is to stimulate discussion and facilitate planning by those who seek to implement a minimal-regret population strategy after the collapse of the present planetary management system.

The title of this Part 2 is “The Synarchist Manifesto.” Although I have previously defined what I mean by synarchy, it bears repeating. Synarchy is a system of planetary management, or world government. My concept of synarchy is a single government similar to the government of Guardians proposed by Plato. The word “synarchy” was coined by the French mystic Alexandre Saint-Yves d’Alveydre in the late 1800s, as representing a unitary form of government opposed to “anarchy.” Synarchy refers to a single world government, as contrasted to the current anarchic system of a couple of hundred nations all competing for domination. Saint-Yves conceived three major institutions of social control: religion, politics and economics. In my concept of synarchy there is no role for any of these three institutions. There is but a single institution, the government, which manages the planet much in the same way that a captain and crew would operate a space ship – Spaceship Earth, in this case. To quote from my previous article, *On Synarchy* (posted at <http://www.foundationwebsite.org/OnSynarchy.htm>):

“In my concept of a single planetary management organization, there is no room for economics, politics, or religion as social institutions of control. With respect to economics, the primary role of the planetary management organization is to *prevent* industrial activity anywhere on the planet outside of the high-technology single-nation city-state. With respect to politics, the planetary management organization is operated as a mission-oriented business or military organization or a church, not as a political entity. There is no room for politics in this organization (although the hunter-gatherer tribes over the rest of the planet are free to adopt whatever political system they prefer). With respect to religion, although there is a fundamental and profound

role for the spiritual, religion plays no role in the organization (once again, the hunter-gatherer tribes are free to establish whatever religions they desire).

“In summary, the basis for the planetary management organization in my concept of a synarchic government of a minimal-regret population will not be political or economic or religious in its principal aspects or basis – it will be *spiritual* in nature. It will be committed to maintaining a long-term-sustainable system planetary management, one that will ensure the continued ecological diversity of the biosphere. It will be made possible and derive its authority and power from the support of people who desire to bring an end to the destruction of nature that the industrial age has wrought, and who wish to live in harmony with nature. No longer will humanity allow the operation of a multiplicity of sovereign industrial nations whose objective is to generate material wealth and wage war (apart from sex, the two favorite pastimes of “civilized” mankind) at the expense of nature, at the cost of extinction of tens of thousands of species per year.”

The word “synarchy” is often used today to refer to a One-World Government (“New World Order”) in charge of today’s planetary system of large human numbers and industrial activity. Except for the fact that a single organization is in charge of the planet, that use of the term – that version of synarchy – is not in any way similar to the concept of synarchy that I discuss and propose. My system of synarchy is a single system of planetary management based on a low human population that lives in harmony with the other species of the planet. It is long-term-sustainable for mankind and for the other species of the biosphere.

8. Alternative Futures

My view of the future is a probabilistic set of “world paths” or (in the statistical terminology of stochastic processes) “realizations.” In my conceptual framework, human beings have “free will” from their own perspective (this is not to say that they have “free will” at all, from a different perspective). I am free to choose simply to take in the view from the top of a building, or to jump off. Whichever I choose to do affects my “world path,” or future. At the present time, it appears that there are two main alternative futures for mankind and the biosphere, depending on mankind’s choices in the near future. This is not to say that some other future may not occur – the Earth may be destroyed next month by a giant asteroid, and that has nothing to do with mankind’s choices or actions. Or, mankind may in fact not have any choice at all in its future. In any event, the two alternative futures that appear most likely to me are the following:

1. Alternative Future 1: The current system of global industrialization continues as long as it can, leading to severe destruction of the biosphere as we know it and the likely extinction of mankind in the very near future.
2. Alternative Future 2: Global nuclear war occurs very soon, bringing an immediate termination to global industrialization. This radical change in the *status quo* opens the possibility for the establishment of a long-term-sustainable system of planetary management, such as a minimal-regret population (with continued stability (slow rate of evolutionary change) of the biosphere and existence of mankind).

Under Alternative Future 1, mankind continues to utilize petroleum and other energy sources to operate the current system of global industrialization (large human numbers and

industrial activity), for as long as it can. At current energy utilization (“consumption”) rates, there are perhaps another 40 years of petroleum remaining, 100-400 years’ worth of coal, and 100 years’ to 300,000 years’ worth of nuclear fuel, depending on whether the available uranium is used in once-through reactors or in fast-breeder reactors. The problem with energy is not its availability. The problem is that it enables high human numbers and industrial activity to continue, thereby causing the destruction of the biosphere (the sixth mass species extinction, in which an estimated 30,000 species are made extinct each year). Under this Alternative Future, mankind destroys its “nest” – the biosphere in which it evolved and exists today – and it soon becomes extinct.

The energy crisis facing mankind is not that current sources are being used up, it is that mankind is using energy at far too high a rate, to the point where it is making radical changes to the biosphere in which the human species exists. Under Alternative Future 1, it is estimated that in the absence of a global catastrophe the human population will slowly “taper off” at about nine billion people, over the next few decades. Unfortunately for mankind, the mass species extinction would continue during all of this period, with continuing severe damage to the biosphere. This process cannot continue for very long. Under Alternative Future 1, the biosphere as we know it is destroyed, and mankind along with it.

Under Alternative Future 2, global nuclear war occurs very soon, e.g., this year, next year, or within the next few years. The two main events that accompany global nuclear war are the reduction of human population to very low numbers and the accompanying reduction of industrial activity to a very low level. With respect to the sixth mass species extinction

that is being caused by large human numbers and industrial activity, two possibilities arise: the mass species extinction stops; or the mass species extinction undergoes an instantaneous “jump,” caused by the destruction of global nuclear war, viz., the large amount of radioactive fallout spread over the planet and the large amount of dust generated by nuclear surface bursts. Scientific opinion is that the smoke and dust from a global nuclear war would not result in a “nuclear winter,” and that relatively few deaths would occur from radioactive fallout. Under Alternative Future 2, there is a chance that the biospheric destruction that is currently ongoing comes to a halt, and that mankind may continue to exist. (For a compact summary of the reasons why nuclear war would not result in catastrophic damage to the biosphere, and is considered survivable, see “Is Nuclear War Survivable” by J. R. Nyquist, posted at WorldNetDaily’s website at

<http://www.wnd.com/index.php?fa=PAGE.view&pageId=634>

1. Nyquist points out that the 1883 Krakatoa volcano explosion, equivalent to 10,000 one-megaton bombs (substantially less than the total number of nuclear weapons possessed by all countries of the world), had negligible planetary weather effects, and the meteor that struck Quebec thousands of years ago with a force of 17.5 million one-megaton bombs also did not cause substantial damage to life on Earth. He also writes that although radioactive fallout would be expected to increase deaths from cancer, there were no documented deaths from radioactive fallout from the nuclear explosions at Hiroshima and Nagasaki.)

Under Alternative Future 2, if the biosphere is not destroyed (i.e., severely altered from an anthropocentric viewpoint) by global nuclear war, there are two main possibilities for the future of mankind. The first is that mankind simply “regroups” and re-establishes a growth-based economic

system, large human numbers and industrial activity are re-established, large-scale biospheric destruction resumes, the mass species extinction continues, and mankind becomes extinct. The second possibility is that, in the wake of the chaos of global nuclear war, mankind is successful in ending the economic system that is destroying the biosphere and establishing a long-term-sustainable system of planetary management, such as a minimal-regret population. In this case, mankind's presence has a negligible effect on the biosphere, the massive mankind-caused destruction of the biosphere ceases, and mankind continues to exist for a long time to come.

In considering the previous Alternatives, the central question of interest is: What is the likelihood of these two Alternatives? In my opinion, Alternative Future 1 is very unlikely, and Alternative Future 2 is very likely. My reasons for this opinion are presented and discussed in the paragraphs that follow. They have to do with several factors, including the occurrence of Peak Oil, the nature of the world's current planetary management regime, and perspectives and beliefs of people about the future.

In view of the fact that Alternative Future 1 likely leads to extinction of mankind (soon – in the very long run, all species become extinct), we shall not consider it further. Although Alternative Future 1 may happen, it is not an interesting future to contemplate – it leads to destruction and death, very soon. The paragraphs that follow discuss Alternative Future 2 in greater detail. Alternative Future 2 is an interesting future, inasmuch as it affords the possibility of a long-term future for mankind.

The quality of life for most people on Earth is very poor. The planet is in an extreme state of overpopulation, both from the

viewpoint of human beings, most of whom live in extreme misery, and from the viewpoint of other species, which are being made extinct at a high rate. The word **over**population definitely applies here, because it is large human numbers that is the direct cause of the current extreme biospheric destruction, including the extinction of an estimated 30,000 species per year. The extreme and significant overpopulation of the planet by human beings has been caused by the system of growth-based economics (debt-based money and interest). I have written much on this topic (see *The Late Great United States*, at <http://www.foundationwebsite.org/TheLateGreatUnitedStates.htm>), and I will not repeat the discussion here. The continual economic growth caused by this system reduces the amount of quality (natural) environment available to each person, and continued operation of this system will worsen the situation. Under this system, the number of people living in wretched poverty increases each year. In the past century, the number of very poor people has increased from under a billion to four or five billion. All the while the number of poor people has been increasing, the state of the environment and condition of other species have been also deteriorating. The system of growth-based economics destroys both nature and the quality of life for most human beings. The reason why it is supported by the planet's wealthy elite is that it generates massive wealth for them, and a high level of power (through control of scarce resources).

Note that it does not matter to most people – leaders or masses – that large human numbers and industrial activity are causing damage to the biosphere and leading to human extinction. They are indifferent to the concept of or prospect of the passage of Peak Oil, until they themselves are starving. The intellectual concept of their future extinction or that of their children means little to most of them, as long as

it is not happening right now. All they care about is their own lives and their present condition, no matter how wretched these may be. Only when they come to believe that their demise is imminent will they finally act. Up to that time, hope springs eternal in the human breast, and people will continue to believe that science and technology – another Green Revolution or oil discovery – will save them. They will not act – move, lead, follow, rebel – until they are starving to death and see no alternative to risking their lives and taking the lives of others. When they see that the future that they previously believed in is gone, they will finally act, if they can. At that time, when hundreds of millions are dying of starvation, they will listen to reason and follow leaders who promote the option that affords them the best chance of survival. They will not act on the intellectual concepts of biospheric destruction, mass species extinction, global warming, or Peak Oil. Their political leaders will not act on these concepts, because they care only for their current material wealth. They will act only when the system that gave them great wealth – growth-based economics, large human numbers and industrial activity – is collapsing. And it is for this reason that Peak Oil is of critical importance, for it is when Peak Oil occurs, and global oil production starts to fall, that the current system will collapse and significant change will occur. Incredibly, it is not the prospect of biospheric destruction or even human extinction that will motivate people to act for a new system of planetary management – it is the passage of Peak Oil and the actual collapse of the present system.

Many people now believe that the current system of planetary management (large human numbers and industrial activity; growth-based economics; interest) will not maintain or improve the quality of their lives, or the quality of their children's lives. They believe that the current system is

corrupt, pernicious, and will not change, and that the only means of meaningful change of this system is immediate and radical change, viz., *revolution*, not evolution. Until recently, the quality of life was acceptable for a large number of people, and some amount of food was available to almost everyone, even to most of the desperately poor. For this reason, revolution did not occur – it was conceivable to many people that, bad as things were, they could be worse under chaos, or anarchy, or any change at all (poor people tend to be very risk-averse). The devil you know is preferable to the devil you don't know. Now that Hubbert's Peak ("Peak Oil") is passing, material well-being will quickly deteriorate, and the situation will change dramatically, from one of abject poverty for billions of people but the starvation of only a few million per year in faraway places, to one of starvation of hundreds of millions of people per year and the immediate prospect of starvation for almost everyone, everywhere. People will see that there is no hope for continuation of the present system, both because of the end of the Petroleum Age and because the current system of growth-based economics is destroying the biosphere. Action follows belief. At this point – the point of belief – global war and revolution will occur. People will cling to life and sacrifice their freedom for a scrap of bread, but when it is clear that the outcome of continuing as is is certain death, and they have nothing to lose, not even life itself, then they move to action to change the *status quo*.

When exactly will Peak Oil occur? In the eyes of many, it will not be deemed to have occurred until global oil production drops substantially and hundreds of millions of people die from starvation in a year. Apart from the scientific evidence (on rates of discovery and depletion of oil fields), the first signs of the passage of the Peak have occurred. These include the recent violent fluctuations in the price of

oil and the world economic slow-down. Since petroleum is the primary factor underlying the human food supply, and since petroleum production is about to decline, within a year or so the number of people starving to death will start to rise markedly. In any society, all that is really required is a sufficient food supply (and perhaps defense) – everything else is “discretionary.” Since most of the human food supply is now enabled by petroleum, the food supply will start to decline fast as the world starts sliding down the back side of Hubbert’s Curve. Mass starvation does not have to happen immediately, or in direct proportion to the level of global oil production, because initially people can reduce consumption of oil by eating at a lower trophic level (i.e., consuming grain instead of meat). Eventually, however, there will simply not be sufficient food to feed a human population that is growing without bound (seven billion now, and increasing by about 80 million per year), even at the lowest trophic level. Since people usually do not resign themselves to starving to death, the political situation will become very unstable. Those in positions of power will realize that since there is not sufficient petroleum to satisfy global demand – not just for energy, but for food – and the only recourse will be to decrease demand by reducing the size of the human population (quickly, not by waiting for a “demographic transition”). This will be done through war. In their desperation, the people will clamor for war, and their leaders will be happy to give it to them. When the people of the world see that very few people will survive the global industrialized world, they will scream for their leaders to destroy the rest of the world, in their desperate bid to survive.

The most cost-effective modality of war to decrease demand for food or energy is nuclear war. Conventional war consumes vast amounts of petroleum, and is a very inefficient means to reduce population or demand for energy.

Biological and chemical warfare are not as attractive tools as nuclear warfare for population reduction, for two reasons. First, they are not easily controlled (managed). More importantly, they do not reduce the means of production, i.e., they kill only people and do not destroy capital goods (infrastructure) or the means of production (economic capital). Overproduction has always been a fundamental problem of capitalism. Conventional wars were useful means of addressing this problem because they consumed goods and destroyed infrastructure – chemical and biological warfare do not accomplish either of these. The killing of people (either directly or collaterally) was not a primary consideration in modern war, since economics thrives on scarcity; the greater the number of people who survive the war, the greater the scarcity, the greater their desperation, and the greater the power their leaders have for controlling their lives.

In the very near future, there will almost certainly be *some* nuclear warfare – a single or small number of nuclear detonations set off by small groups (not major states). The purpose of these attacks, conducted out of frustration or ideology, is to damage the present system of planetary management. They will not accomplish significant change. Guerilla warfare cannot be defeated, and it cannot win. In addition to sporadic nuclear attacks such as these, at some point there will be “controlled” nuclear war – low level but continuing – conducted by major global powers. The purpose of this type of nuclear war will in fact be to *perpetuate* the current system of planetary management, by stabilizing the demand for energy (food) through planned and managed population reduction.

It is noted that the use of nuclear war to reduce human population is not war in the conventional sense of two (or

more) parties attempting to defeat each other (or competing with each other). The world is now controlled by Corporatists. The initial use of nuclear war will be by the Corporatist system to reduce overpopulation – in very much the same fashion as nation-states have colluded to address overproduction in recent history. The world is already managed by a single world government, controlled by the wealthy elite, using growth-based economics as their tool. The initial nuclear destruction will be executed by the Corporatists, simply as a business decision. War in the usual sense can be represented as a mathematical game – two or more players competing. The situation just described is not a game – it is simply a statistical decision problem (i.e., a “game against nature”), a “one-sided” optimization problem. Perhaps the term “war” is a misnomer here, except for the fact that the Corporatists will disguise the population reduction exercise as a regular war – the people will not realize that they are being exterminated by their controllers simply to reduce demand for food to manageable levels, but will mistakenly believe that it is being caused by “the enemy.” This type of war will not even qualify as “the sport of kings,” since there is only one player (a game requires two or more players). Read Orwell’s *1984* for more discussion of the concept of the use of war as an instrument of economic policy (in that case, to manage overproduction, not overpopulation). The big difference between the nuclear war about to occur and conventional wars of the past is that while the primary function of the latter was simply to consume overproduction (i.e., to promote stability by reducing supply but maintaining economic activity (and energy utilization) at a high level), the primary function of the former will be to reduce demand (i.e., to promote stability by reducing overall economic activity (and energy utilization)), since the energy required to “drive” the system is decreasing. Formerly, a “king’s glory was in his population,”

and reducing population was never a primary objective. The future war will (initially) seek to reduce population, since there will be insufficient food to feed them, and the large number of starving people will threaten political and economic stability.

In addition to the use of war as an instrument to bring demand (for food) into line with supply, to bring about change to end human misery, or to stop the destruction of the biosphere, there is another important factor governing the use of nuclear war. This is the fact that the Moslem world is acquiring nuclear weapons at a fast rate, and they wish to use them. They wish to do so for two reasons: the “politics of envy,” in which poor peoples would prefer that no one had material wealth, if *they* cannot; and the eschatology (End-Times theology) of Islam, which asserts that the Twelfth Imam will return when global war occurs. Many disaffected and ideologically motivated groups now possess nuclear weapons, and they are “itching” to use them. The use of nuclear weapons in this context will correspond to war in the usual sense of battle among competing players, and it will be waged in accordance with the tenets of game theory (not just single-player (one-sided) statistical decision theory).

At some point, the single-world-government system of Corporatism (globalization; growth-based economics) will start to unravel. This may occur for any one of a number of reasons. (It *will happen* eventually, for no socio-economic or political system ever lasts for very long, and it will happen *very soon*, because of either the biospheric destruction (sixth mass species extinction) or Hubbert’s Curve / Hubbert’s Peak (decline in global production of oil, upon which the present economic system is dependent).) For example, it may occur because there is no honor among thieves, and one of the principal players in the global game of

Corporatism may decide to take over (the “politics of greed”). Or it may occur for an ideological reason, such as a group attempting to destroy the current system of planetary management (large human numbers and industrial activity; growth-based economics) because it is causing the destruction of the biosphere, the sixth mass species extinction and the extinction of mankind. At this point, after the fall of the global economic system, the waging of nuclear war will be conducted in the usual game-theoretic sense, involving more than a single player. The current system of growth-based economics is an exponential process. It is like an explosion. The problem with explosions is that they do not last very long. The end of the global industrial world – an instantaneous “spike” on an evolutionary scale – will occur very soon.

A problem with war (in the usual sense) is that once it starts it is difficult to contain, manage and control. Nuclear war is no different. For a detailed discussion of this, see my article *Why Nuclear War Must Be Global in Scope*, at <http://www.foundationwebsite.org/SeriousNuclearWar.htm>. For decades, the main nuclear powers were motivated not to wage nuclear war because of the policy of Mutual Assured Destruction, or MAD. Both sides saw that if nuclear war occurred, they would very likely both be worse (i.e., the leaders dead) off than if it did not. Conventional wars were waged because they were very profitable for the world’s arms producers and dealers, and manageable. (The term “conventional wars” includes not only symmetric wars between nation-states, but also guerrilla wars such as the so-called “War on Terror.”) During the Petroleum Age, the energy source used to wage war was petroleum, and it was very abundant / inexpensive. As global petroleum production starts to decline, the energy resources to wage conventional war will not be available in large quantity as in

the past. When this happens, the powers that be will realize that there are far more people on the planet than available energy resources can support, and that nuclear war is the most cost-effective way of reducing overpopulation – far more desirable than conventional war, since it uses little petroleum. It will be realized that, under peace (i.e., democracy, growth-based economics), the biosphere is headed quickly to complete and certain devastation, and that the alternative of global nuclear war, despite its severe shortcomings, is preferable in the sense that it opens a “window of opportunity” in which it may be possible to stop the biospheric destruction and eventually lead to the establishment of a long-term-sustainable system of planetary management. At this point, when the future under the present system is clearly disaster, the reason why MAD worked for so long will no longer apply (since the possibility of long-term survival under nuclear war will be more appealing than the certain death and extinction of no-nuclear-war), and nuclear war will occur.

It is important to recognize that action follows belief. At present, many people in many walks of life believe that the world of global industrialization is about to end. At present, all three Abrahamic religions accept an eschatological view of catastrophic End Times. The Moslems, in fact, believe that they can play a role in bringing this about by initiating global conflict. When global petroleum production starts to fall, millions will perish, and most of humanity will see no way that the present system can help save them. Many in the mystic community (e.g., New Agers, spiritualists) believe that the world is about to undergo a spiritual transformation (e.g., *The Wave*, as described in Laura Knight-Jadczyk’s *The Wave* series (Red Pill Press, 2007) and *High Strangeness* (Red Pill Press, 2008); available from Red Pill Press at <http://redpillpress.com> or from Mrs. Knight-Jadczyk’s

websites (<http://www.cassiopaea.org> or <http://qfgpublishing.com>); see also the Cassiopaea Transcripts at http://www.bibliotecapleyades.net/vida_alien/cassiopaeans/cassiopaeans.htm or <http://members.optusnet.com.au/ajwerner/allSessions.doc>).

The present system of planetary management is based on growth-based economics. Even some economists see the folly of this system. Here follows a segment from *Can America Survive?*:

Economics is the driving force that has corrupted mankind and is destroying the planet. Economics – the dismal science. In his 1930 essay, “Economic Possibilities for Our Grandchildren,” mathematician John Maynard Keynes observed the fatal limitations of economics as a long-term basis for human society:

“Some day we may return to some of the most sure and certain principles of religion and traditional virtue – that avarice is a vice, that the extraction of usury is a misdemeanor, and the love of money is detestable. But beware! The time for all this is not yet. For at least another hundred years we must pretend to ourselves and to every one that fair is foul and foul is fair; for foul is useful and fair is not. Avarice and usury and precaution must be our gods for a little while longer.”

Other economists have written forcefully against the present system. These include Nicholas Georgescu-Roegen (see *The Entropy Law and the Economic Process* (Harvard University Press, 1971, 1999)) and Herman E. Daly (see *Beyond Growth* (Beacon Press, 1996) and *For the Common Good* (with John B. Cobb, Jr., Beacon Press, 1989, 1994)).

The point is not whose view is correct in detail, but the fact that many people now accept that catastrophic collapse of the global industrial world is imminent. Since action follows belief, it would appear that massive revolution and war are also imminent. Whether revolution occurs is not very relevant to the issue of establishing a long-term-sustainable system of planetary management. The masses will not be running the planet, any more than the passengers run an airplane. The future will be determined by synarchic leaders who assume control of the planet. The new system will not be democratic – it will be synarchic. It will not be government by the governed, but operation of a spacecraft by a technical crew.

This section has discussed the likelihood and nature of Alternative Future 2. The essential features of Alternative Future 2 are the occurrence of global nuclear war and the establishment of a long-term-sustainable system of planetary management. We shall now address the issue of how to wage global nuclear war, and how to achieve the establishment of a long-term-sustainable system of planetary management.

9. How to Wage and Win Global Nuclear War

The US and the Russia both possess thousands of nuclear weapons, and they will eventually use most of them. Initially they will deliver the weapons to targets using ballistic missiles, and eventually they will deliver them by conventional means (airplanes, land vehicles, short-range missiles, “suitcase” bombs). They will use both “counterforce” and “countervalue” allocations. They will target enemy weapon facilities, energy sources (oil fields, coal fields, hydroelectric dams, uranium ore fields), and

population centers (cities). In order to maximize their “payoffs,” both sides will employ “randomized” strategies derived from game theory. Unless both sides annihilate each other immediately, they will employ “shoot-look-shoot” firing doctrines.

Many people do not realize how quickly or how soon the global industrialized world will collapse. Much of the collapse will occur in a few hours, following the initial salvos of the first stage of global nuclear war.

Unless it is over for everyone in a few minutes – and that just isn’t going to happen – global nuclear war will be a multistage affair, lasting for many years. There are far more cities in the world than nuclear weapons. After the initial simultaneous-exchange salvos, many cities will remain. The problem is that there will be no energy to operate them, and most will soon die. This takes some time. After the initial exchange, both sides will watch and listen to see which cities survive. This will be done by monitoring radio transmissions, since the global satellite system (including not just “spy” satellites, but also the Global Positioning System) will be one of the first casualties of large-scale nuclear war. Whenever a surviving city is detected, it will be destroyed with a nuclear bomb.

The significant weapon system that will survive the initial salvos of global nuclear war is nuclear submarines (nuclear powered and nuclear armed). While these can survive unsupported for many months, at some point they need re-supply. The victor must have hidden supply depots to keep its nuclear submarines operational for a couple of years. A year after the outbreak of the war, the submarines will destroy all remaining surviving cities. (They will identify surviving cities by monitoring radio activity.) Since cities

“die” slowly, this process may continue for a few years, engaged in by all powers possessing nuclear submarines (e.g., the US, Russia, China, and others). At some point, the planet will “grow quiet” – there will either be no activity at all, or a single remaining city. At that point, an apparent victor will emerge. The problem that it faces is that it may possess a nuclear submarine or two, but what it needs to assume control of the planet is a city-state that can manufacture all of the items needed to control and manage the planet. This is a nontrivial challenge, and it will require substantial advance planning.

The “End Game” of this global nuclear war will last many years – perhaps 1,000 years. The players having few nuclear weapons will either be quickly destroyed, or they will wait to employ their weapons until the war between the major players (US, Russia and China) is over. They will then seek to destroy whatever residual population remains of the survivor. The ultimate victor will be the “Last Man Standing.” The victor will be the party possessing the last operational nuclear weapon. Because of the uncertainties of global nuclear war, it is difficult to say which nation this might be. Groups that have the will and capacity to dominate the world include the US, Russia, Germany, China, India, Japan, the English-Speaking world, and the Abrahamic religions (Judaism, Christianity, and Islam). Which of them will survive is not at all clear. Because Russia has by far the most nuclear weapons, it is perhaps the most likely candidate to prevail. On the other hand, the Abrahamic religions have a tradition of global domination, genocide, and a world-view in which a Messiah will return to Earth following global destruction. Moreover, the Jews and Moslems believe in a physical Messianic kingdom, and the Moslems believe that they can bring it about by precipitating global war. The religion and world-view of the Jews has stood

them in good stead for thousands of years, and it could be the decisive factor. The fact that Judaism abandoned their central habitat and physical cohesiveness and scattered around the world, yet still cling to a belief of a “return” in the Last Days, fits well with the requirements for victory in global nuclear war. The victor will be the group that can “hold out” the longest, and still have a few nuclear weapons remaining after everyone else has used theirs. It could be that the Moslems, even though they possess just a few nuclear weapons, might “save” them until all seems “clear,” and then move to annihilate the apparent victor. As they say, all things come to him who waits.

It would appear that the Russians have the greatest chance of prevailing. They possess vastly more nuclear weapons than any other power, and in fact more than all other countries of the world combined. If in the initial large-scale nuclear exchange they “husband” their nuclear weapons, they can end up having thousands of nuclear weapons remaining, after all other groups have expended most of theirs. At that point, they can work to establish a single-nation high-technology state. If, through the years, any other city arises, it can be annihilated using one of their remaining weapons. If any other group possesses nuclear weapons, it will annihilate the Russian city-state. For Russians to survive, they must have many alternative locations ready to resume the role of the single high-tech nation state. This process may continue for a long time, but eventually, since the Russians have far more nuclear weapons than all other groups, they will end up with the last weapon, and remain the victor – the “Last Man Standing.” All they have to assure is the capability of re-establishing high-tech nation states, if and as they are destroyed by other groups. If they do not do this, then some other group may prevail.

Note that once nuclear war is first used after Hubbert's Peak passes, nations will continue to wage it, and prefer it to conventional war, since the energy resources (mainly, petroleum) required to wage conventional war will be diminishing. As soon as it is very clear that the nuclear destruction of a city or two is not the "end of civilization as we know it," but actually an improvement in the balancing of energy supply and demand, nuclear war will continue. Although they dreaded it for so long, people will quickly become accustomed to it, and some quite enamored of it, like the virgin who has just been introduced to sex. Because of their massive population and coal reserves, the Chinese will remain quite able to wage conventional war, even after suffering heavy losses from nuclear war. The Bible speaks of a large army from the East, of size 300 million, in the Last Days. In today's world, this can only refer to China. Since no other world power will be able to face them in conventional combat, they will be severely hammered by nuclear weapons, by both the US and Russia.

Perhaps the strongest indication that Russia may be the victor in global nuclear war is that Russian leaders believe that it is winnable, and they are preparing for it. Those who believe that global nuclear war is not winnable are already defeated. They will not make the preparations required to survive it, and they will not survive it. There are several things to keep in mind about global nuclear war: It is likely; it is imminent; it is survivable; it is winnable, and it is a long drawn-out affair. Many people believe that the occurrence of global nuclear war would mean the end of civilization as we know it. While that may be true in one sense, it is not true in another sense. While it is true that global nuclear war would bring about the immediate end of large-scale global industrialization, this is going to happen anyway within the next few years. "Civilization as we know it" – large human

numbers and industrial activity – will not last more than a few more years in any event, either because it is destroying the biosphere or because the energy to operate it will soon be gone (take your pick). All that the occurrence of global nuclear war would do is bring global civilization to an abrupt halt a few years before it would expire anyway – along with the benefit that the biospheric destruction being caused by large human numbers and industrial activity would immediately cease. Long-term-sustainable civilization will be a “solar” civilization of small human numbers living off “recurrent” solar energy. Technological civilization will continue. Even if all of the nuclear weapons in the world were detonated, this would not kill everyone. As mentioned earlier, there are far more cities in the world than nuclear weapons, and all of them possess technology. After the initial salvos of ballistic missiles have been fired, survivors will remain, and they will start to rebuild, since that is the nature of man. The war will continue, and some power will eventually prevail. Technology is “out of the box,” and mankind’s technological existence will continue.

The US is not likely to survive global nuclear war, for two reasons. First, it does not believe that it can, and it is not making preparations to survive. The US, it seems, has lost its will to survive. Perhaps this is because its culture has become so fragmented – the original culture that founded the country and made it great no longer exists. In its current state, it would appear that the US cannot possibly win global nuclear war, because winning global nuclear war requires much planning, preparation and long-term commitment, and the country is doing none of these things. The second reason why the US is not likely to survive a nuclear war is that its leaders have no interest in life in the post-global-nuclear-war era. While preparing for the first massive exchange of global nuclear war generates much wealth (i.e.,

operation of the military-industrial complex), the occurrence (waging) of global nuclear war does not generate wealth, and the outcome of global nuclear war is far less material wealth. The leaders of the US, committed to operating a system that generates material wealth for their Corporatist controllers, are interested only in the first of these activities (i.e., preparing for global nuclear war, not for waging global nuclear war or for living in a low-material-wealth post-global-nuclear-war world). If the US were to survive and win a global nuclear war, it would not be the materialistic, short-term-vision nation that we currently know, but a small “core” state dedicated to founding and maintaining a long-term-sustainable system.

The mindset of the American people is that global nuclear war would be “the end of the world.” In the 1950s and 1960s, the US government promoted a level of “Civil Defense” (I worked for a time doing research on this program, during my time at Research Triangle Institute). This effort was abandoned when it was realized that massive casualties would result from global nuclear war and there was little point to keep people alive if they could not be provided for – and used – in a longer term. Most of the research in global nuclear war conducted by the US in the 1960s centered on a single large-scale missile exchange, with little or no consideration of strategic planning – for war or for peace – after this exchange. (See some of my articles on global nuclear war at <http://www.foundationwebsite.org/OptStratPage1.htm> for examples of this research.) Although the US abandoned its Civil Defense program, other countries (“old” cultures, who plan to be around for a while) proceeded to prepare for the aftermath of global nuclear war, with the construction and stocking of underground tunnels. In the US, the only underground facilities are for active military personnel, not

for civilians. Russia has made and continues to make preparations to wage and survive the initial large-scale nuclear war, and to wage and survive subsequent nuclear war. China and other nations, such as Switzerland, are also preparing for global nuclear war and making preparations to survive it. The main US activity with respect to global nuclear war is in the field of ballistic missile defense, and short-term war. In global nuclear war, victory will go to the nation that develops and implements strategies and tactics that will span centuries, not just days, months, or years.

Why is it that US culture is defeatist with respect to global nuclear war, whereas other cultures are not? Part of this is the fact that some of the other cultures that might survive, such as Judaism, Russia, or China, are “old” cultures. (Current US culture is a “new” culture, which has existed essentially from just the 1960s. Present-day US culture (ultra-materialistic) differs much from the libertarian culture of the country’s Founders.) These cultures have existed for a long time, they are strong and cohesive, and they plan for the long term. Current US culture reflects its economic system – all that matters is the short term. Growth-based economics (debt-based money; interest) is an exponential process that cannot last long. Most financial decisions in the US are made on the basis of net present value (discounted cash flow, internal rate of return, economic rate of return), which reduces the effect of the future to nil. Under discounting, all decisions depend only on the amount of wealth that can be generated in the near-term future. This approach maximizes growth (unfortunately, it also assures that the lifespan of the system will be very short). The process of discounting the future corresponds directly to the charging of interest. Discounting and interest are the same process, just in reverse (i.e., they are “inverses”). The reason why all three Abrahamic religions originally banned

interest is that no society can remain stable or exist long-term if it allows it. Interest transfers all of a society's wealth from the borrowers to the lenders. Jesus' throwing the moneylenders out of the Temple in anger was symbolic of the antithetical nature of interest to things spiritual, such as living in harmony with man and with the biosphere. Discounting reduces the importance of the future to zero. Since Islam is now the only Abrahamic religion that still proscribes charging of interest, it is the only Abrahamic-religion culture whose spiritual views aligns with a long-term future for mankind.

To prevail in global nuclear war requires a long-term perspective, in which the future has the same "weight" as the present. The war will take centuries to win, and waging the "peace" following global nuclear war will last eons. American leaders are only interested in the accumulation of material wealth for their Corporatist controllers. If global nuclear war were to occur, this world would be gone. Because they have discounted the future to nil, and because the world after global nuclear war is of no interest to their Corporatist controllers, it is of no importance to them and they have no plans to survive it or win it – only in preparing for it (the production of the weapons of global nuclear warfare, such as ballistic missile defense systems, generates a lot of wealth). US culture, based on growth-based economics, has discounted the value of the future to zero. From this worldview, it has no future. (Democracy, it has been said, has a "design life" of about 200 years.) The US has no long-term strategic plan to wage, survive and win global nuclear war, and, unless it changes this mindset before it occurs, it will not prevail. Will it change its mindset? No, it will not. The government is under the control of the Corporatists. The US government is no longer "of, by and for the people," but for the wealthy elite, who do not care about the future of

mankind, of the biosphere, their nation (Corporatism is a global phenomenon – its members are “citizens of the world,” not of a particular nation), their race, or even their own children. The current system has a stranglehold on the citizens – the only way that they can survive is to cooperate with it. The American people are no longer free (individual freedom really disappeared when the government closed the Land Office, in the late 1800s), and they are no longer in control of their destiny. They are no longer in control of their government. They are now the servant of the government, and the government is in the control of the Corporatists. The Founders established a nation of, by and for the people, but the wealthy elite hijacked this government from the people. The only way America will change its current mindset is by violent means, such as coup d'état or revolution.

The recent US wars in Vietnam, Iraq (both the Gulf War and the current war), and Afghanistan reflect the US view of the future and their corresponding approach to war. This approach to war is based on a brief spasm, or paroxysm, of “shock and awe,” with no plans for the future. The US does not plan for the “peace” after the war. It does not have a long-term strategy, because it has discounted the future to zero. B. H. Liddell Hart once observed (in his book, *Strategy* (2nd revised edition, Meridian, 1991, page 338), “The object of war is a better state of peace – even if only from your own point of view.” US leaders (viz., the government) do not plan for the period after global nuclear war because that future is of no interest to their controllers. US leaders are interested only in preparing for the next big war, with no concern or interest in the future beyond its occurrence.

Except for public opinion, the US government does not even care if it “wins” its wars, in the traditional sense. In fact, it prefers *not* to win them, and to have them stretch out

interminably – as long as the public will put up with it. It is waging its wars simply to make money for the military-industrial complex – the wealthy elite who control the country. It is not totally unmindful of public opinion, however, and now that the US public is getting “fed up” with not winning the war in Iraq, it is simply shifting the war from Iraq to Afghanistan. Endless no-win war, the strategy described in Orwell’s *1984* for generating wealth and consuming surplus production, is the same strategy that it employed in Vietnam. For these wars to continue so long and be so costly, the US needs capable opponents who can wage guerrilla warfare against incredible odds, for a long time. These formidable adversaries are strong, “older” cultures. More likely places for these wars are Asia (e.g., Vietnam), the Balkans (former Yugoslavia; Slovenia, Croatia, Bosnia) and the Middle East (e.g., Iraq, Afghanistan); less likely places are Africa (e.g., Somalia, Sudan, Angola, Mozambique, Nigeria) and South America.

The power that prevails after global nuclear war will be a single nation. It will be cohesive and homogeneous. It will have a common language, race, spiritual view and culture. While this single nation may come out of an existing country or culture, such as Russia or Judaism, all existing countries as we currently know them will be destroyed. The group that survives will be geographically dispersed and capable of regenerating if and when one of its emerging city-states is destroyed by some other remaining nuclear power.

In any event, the victor in global nuclear war will have achieved the establishment of a synarchic system of government. The next step in Alternative Future 2 is the establishment of a long-term-sustainable system of planetary management.

10. How to Establish a Long-Term-Sustainable System of Planetary Management

At the point when a single power remains is the time at which a long-term-sustainable system of planetary management can be implemented. Whatever group survives will surely strive to implement it. They will have seen the absurdity of a system of continual economic growth with multiple nations as a long-term-sustainable system of planetary management. They will see that this leads to overpopulation and environmental destruction. They will seek to control human population at long-term-sustainable levels. Since the only known feasible strategy for doing this is the minimal-regret strategy, this is the strategy that they will likely implement.

To recapitulate, the minimal-regret population strategy consists of a single high-tech nation of a low population (e.g., five million) and a globally distributed low-technology population of five million hunter-gatherers. The role of the high-tech nation is to maintain the planetary human population at a low level, by prohibiting economic development anywhere on the planet. Technological development and activity will be allowed only in the single high-tech nation. The role of the low-tech nation is to reduce the likelihood of extinction of mankind from a single localized catastrophic event to a low level.

The establishment of a long-term-sustainable system of planetary management, after achieving victory in global nuclear war, requires advance planning and long-term commitment. A nation of five million or so does not require much energy to operate. This energy may easily be obtained from the planet's recurrent solar-energy budget (or any other source, such as fossil fuels (for a time),

hydroelectric, or nuclear). The main point to understand is that “an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.” It is very difficult to control a world of seven billion industrialized people, but relatively easy to control a world of five million hunter-gatherers (by suppressing any new industrial development). Prior to global nuclear war, it is not clear how the current problem of biospheric destruction can be solved. After global nuclear war, the problem is much more tractable – an exercise in maintenance.

To implement the minimal-regret strategy, the high-tech nation must be able to suppress economic development everywhere on the planet outside of it. Since technology is already out of “Pandora’s Box,” technological knowledge is everywhere on the planet. To implement the minimal-regret strategy, the globally distributed population must either be convinced not to use technology, e.g., via religion, or they must be “blasted back to the stone age.” Which of these approaches will be used will be determined by the victor of the global nuclear war. In the short term (of a thousand years or so), industrial development may be suppressed simply by using the nation’s remaining nuclear weapons to destroy emergent cities. In the long run, since the supply of nuclear weapons will eventually deplete or exhaust (and a small city-state is unlikely to be able to produce more), and since it is not possible to maintain control over a population for a long period of time either by political force or by religion, it would appear that the victor would have to use spiritual means to convince people to eschew technology. In either event, to assume control of the planet in the near term, the victor must possess a means of monitoring the entire planet, at least for several hundred years, until the globally distributed population “forgets” technology and reverts to primitive (nontechnological; hunter-gatherer) society. To do this, the victor must have access to bases

around the world. Some of these may be secret bases set up prior to the war, but for the most part they will be established after the war, making use of surviving infrastructure.

In making conjectures about the nature of mankind following the Petroleum Age (era of large human numbers and industrial activity), it is interesting to note the observations of psychics. They sense the catastrophic collapse of the global industrial world, as it approaches. They sense the coming change – the violent deaths of over six billion people – just as a beachcomber sees the precursor ripples of a tsunami before it arrives. They speak of global cataclysmic change, Earth Changes, Planetary Shift, an End of the Age, DNA changes, the Alien Invasion and The Wave. They see the imminent departure of six billion souls. They do not see, however, an end to mankind. Instead, they see planetary control systems such as mind programming, the Law of One, the Great White Brotherhood, Synarchy, dirigibles, global electromagnetic monitoring and control systems, and “in Russia there comes the hope of the world.” They see spirits, elementals, “soul containers,” the source of crop circles, and those “Left Behind.” While there is much fiction, nonsense – and many downright lies – in the words of mystics, spiritualists, and agnostic channels, there are also nuggets of truth and useful clues. People forget that almost all communication channels – whether physical or spiritual – are “noisy.” Just because a radio, television, or telephone channel is noisy does not mean that we should turn it off – this would lose the signal as well as the noise. Physical science offers no explanation for why things are the way they are, and where we are going. Spiritual science offers the promise of shedding light on these topics, and mankind would do well to take advantage of this source. Those who

would survive the coming changes would do well to pay heed.

I mentioned earlier that the establishment of a minimal-regret population will require the use of leverage, to take advantage of certain features of the present system of planetary management to establish a new system. This is accomplished through the use of nuclear weapons.

Although the construction of nuclear weapons requires much energy and knowledge, once they are built they can be deployed and employed by a very small number of people, over a long period of time, using little energy resources. By the time they are all used, the present system (global industrialization; growth-based economics) will be gone. In developing these weapons of mass destruction, the present system sowed the seeds of its own destruction. To accomplish the goal of setting up a minimal-regret population, it is important that these weapons be dispersed, and that the survivors of nuclear war know how and when to use them to suppress emerging industrial cities. This is the area in which the world's nuclear powers must now focus their attention, to ensure that they prevail. Until now, most work in global nuclear war (research and development, weapon deployment, employment strategies) has been concerned with short-term war, lasting for a few days. The major nuclear powers, including the United States, Russia and China, must restructure their forces to wage global nuclear war lasting for centuries, perhaps for a thousand years. Only by doing this will they – their culture – survive and prevail. Only by doing this will the planet progress from the current destructive system of planetary management to a long-term-sustainable system of planetary management.

Some Closing Remarks

As is clear from the preceding sections, the establishment of a long-term-sustainable system of planetary management involves the skillful and persevering conduct of global nuclear war. Many people do not understand how global nuclear warfare is conducted. I worked for a number of years at Hugh Everett's Lambda Corporation (at one time the leading organization conducting research on large-scale nuclear war and ballistic missile warfare), determining game-theoretic strategies for waging nuclear war, and I hence know something of the subject. (See <http://www.foundationwebsite.org/OptStratPage1.htm> for more on this topic.) Large-scale nuclear warfare involves ballistic missiles, and ballistic missile warfare happens very fast – decisions are made in minutes. Because it happens so fast, the strategies and tactics are worked out well in advance of the actual war, and these pre-developed strategies and tactics are implemented as soon as the conflict begins. These strategies and tactics are determined by the mathematical disciplines of statistical decision theory and game theory – the branch of statistics pioneered by John von Neumann, Oscar Morgenstern, Leonard J. Savage and John Nash. When a nuclear attack is initiated against the United States, the US President will be asked for permission to use nuclear weapons to retaliate, but the tactics used to wage the war will already have been developed – there is no time to do this “on the fly.” Who lives and who dies will have been determined long in advance. Many people may feel frustrated and angered that their fate will have been determined by a game theorist, a mathematical statistician, or an operations researcher, but that in fact is the way it is. US citizens were appalled and angered that US Presidents George Bush and Barack Obama pushed for the passage of trillion-dollar economic recovery programs within days, threatening that the entire global financial system might collapse if immediate action

were not taken. When nuclear war begins, the President will be told that he has about ten minutes to decide on the US response – whether to accept the annihilation of the US without a response, or whether to annihilate the perpetrators as well. Watch Stanley Kubrick’s *Dr. Strangelove* movie if you want to gain some insight into how global nuclear war is waged.

On Internet blogs, critics assert that my views on nuclear warfare and planetary management are “absurd” or “outrageous.” Although the prospect of mankind’s using its technology to destroy itself may reasonably be viewed as outrageous, my views on these subjects are not absurd, or even far-fetched. They are, in fact, conventional and traditional. In my professional career I worked for a number of years in the field of global nuclear warfare, consulting to the US Department of Defense. (Prior to interviewing for my first job after college, I was told to read Herman Kahn’s *On Thermonuclear War* as background material.) My subsequent work in global nuclear war and ballistic missile defense was conducted at the highest levels of national security clearance (e.g., Top Secret, SCI, SI/TK, Q). I know what I am talking about. I know how global nuclear war is waged. I worked for many years within the US defense establishment as a weapons systems analyst and system developer in air, land, sea and space military systems, and as manager of research and development and principal investigator in test and evaluation of electronic warfare systems. As Mrs. Laura Knight-Jadczyk asserts, “Knowledge protects, ignorance endangers.” During the ten years in which the Foundation website had been operational, many thousands of people from around the world have downloaded my books and articles, and yet no one has pointed out any flaw in my reasoning, or proposed any

alternative long-term-sustainable system of planetary management.

Most people do not wish to consider global nuclear war, or even want to discuss it. It seems almost as if they believe that thinking about it or talking about it might make it more likely to happen. It would appear that ignorance is prevailing, that people simply do not want to “think the unthinkable,” as Herman Kahn was wont to say. Global nuclear war is imminent, and people had better start thinking about it, if they want their culture to survive. (Note that when we are speaking of “surviving” nuclear war, we are referring to cultures, not to individuals. Most individuals will not survive global nuclear war.) The destruction of the biosphere and the extinction of mankind are very real possibilities, not just in the long-term future, but very soon. Without a concerted effort to solve them, these problems are not going to go away. Continued denial of them and refusal to address them assures that they will worsen. The era of Mutual Assured Destruction (MAD), which “saved” the world from nuclear war for so long, is over. Nuclear war is just around the corner.

Americans who consider my views on planetary management and global nuclear war to be extreme or outrageous should ask themselves why the Russia, China and other countries, such as Switzerland, are making preparations to survive nuclear war, while the United States is not. The waging of global nuclear war will be fought within and against industrialism – industrial powers against industrial powers. The protagonists will target targets of industrial economic value, because they represent the apparent threat. (In the long term, the real threats to their system are not other industrial powers, but factors such as the passing of Hubbert’s Peak, the destruction of the

biosphere and, above all, spiritualism (which is amaterialistic and traditionalist).) After the initial destruction, the surviving technological powers will continue to target emerging technological (industrial) city-states. It should be recognized that traditional cultures that eschew industrialism will not be targeted. Because of this, traditional cultures will survive. Any culture that wishes to survive in the long run, and which cannot or does not wish to aspire to being the single high-tech nation that survives global nuclear war can also survive, if it chooses to do so. All it has to do is eschew materialism (industrial development), in which case it is not a threat either to the parties waging global nuclear war, or to the single-nation city-state that survives it.

The Corporatists who are in control now desire only to play the very exciting game of growth-based economics and massive accumulation of material wealth. This game can be played only as long as the world has large amounts of energy (from fossil fuels and uranium) and the biosphere remains relatively undisturbed. When either of these conditions ends, the game is over. The Corporatists do not wish to play another game. When this game is over, they will “pick up their marbles and go home.” This game will be finished, and they will pass on, leaving a destroyed planet as their legacy. They do not care. They have no interest in life after fossil fuels, or life on a low-population planet, or life in a non-economic society. Their greed, selfishness, and callousness know no bounds. The fact that they will have destroyed the biosphere and reduced the quality of human life for all time, just to play their hedonistic game of greed for a few short years is of no concern to them. They are like the yeast in a fermenting beer vat – they explode in an orgy of growth, and then they die in their own excrement, and then they are gone, and it does not matter to them.

The fact that some human beings are evil and would sacrifice the future of all mankind for their pleasure and excitement is not surprising. Evil exists in this world. It is an essential aspect of physical existence. It creates game conditions. It is not surprising that the masses are simply accepting that the wealthy are destroying the biosphere in which they exist, and they look on, helpless, in ignorance and fear. What is surprising is that good people who realize what is happening and could act to do something about it, choose to stand by and do nothing to stop it. As Edmund Burke remarked, "All that is necessary for the triumph of evil is that good men do nothing." Are all the good men in our society cowards? What is occurring now is war – war between those who would destroy the biosphere and the future of all mankind for a few years of pleasure, and those who might prevent this. It is war for the survival of an anthropophilic biosphere and mankind. Those who are capable of preventing this destruction and choose to do nothing are little more than craven cowards.

Hitler killed five million people, and is condemned and despised for this. The Corporatists are in the process of terminating the entire human future. Ten million people could live on the planet for perhaps another 100 million years, say, before the next mass extinction. At 20 years per generation, that 100-million-year period could support 5 million generations, or 10 million people/generation x 5 million generations = 50 million million people = 50 trillion people. Through their destruction of the biosphere, the Corporatists are killing 50 trillion people – quite a few more than Hitler. How can mankind's philosophers, thinkers, spiritual and religious leaders, and philanthropists stand by and condone this massive destruction of human life? Have they no shame? Have they no courage? Have they no integrity? Are they hypnotized? Are they asleep? Are they

in a state of denial? – there is none so blind as he who will not see. What is going on? What do they think that the purpose of life, of their existence, is? – simply to watch the destruction of mankind without lifting a finger to prevent it? How great is their sin! Are they nothing but sheep? Is there no shepherd, no warrior, no David? The Corporatists have declared war on the human race, and they are winning. Will no one step up to the plate and be counted to resist them?

Many people are obsessed with a search for peace. Many believe that if you want peace, promote justice. Economists and politicians promise that if sufficient economic development happens, peace will happen. This is not true. The planet's biosphere is being destroyed by large human numbers and industrial activity. Peace will never happen. It is not an attribute of physical nature, and it is not in mankind's DNA or destiny. Peace is not in mankind's future, unless mankind achieves extinction. Global nuclear war and reduction of human population to low numbers will not achieve peace. I am not working to achieve peace, but to achieve a long-term-sustainable system of planetary management. The biosphere will always be a battleground. Change will always happen – it may be the only constant in the universe. All that we can control is our own small activity within that changing biosphere. Rescuing and protecting the planet's biosphere will be a never-ending struggle.

There are various ways to define peace. Christians would do well to recall Jesus' remark, "Do not suppose that I have come to bring peace to the world. I did not come to bring peace, but a sword." (Matt. 10:34).

The problem of operating a long-term-sustainable system of planetary management is similar to operating an airplane, a ship, or a business. In this case, the primary objective is to

reduce the likelihood of mankind's imminent extinction by maintaining the integrity of the biosphere. A secondary objective is the achievement of a reasonable quality of life. Achieving peace is not the objective. Accomplishing a long-term-sustainable system of planetary management is the objective. War and peace are simply states of mankind, or tools for accomplishing this objective.

Global leaders tout economic development as a pathway to poverty reduction. The goal of international development organizations such as the United Nations Development Program and the US Millennium Challenge Corporation is "poverty reduction through economic development." Economic development is not the solution to poverty. Economic development has destroyed much of nature and caused five billion people to live in desperate poverty. Economic development is the cause of poverty, not the solution to poverty. The only path to poverty reduction and a high-quality life for humanity is through reduction of human numbers and industrial activity to levels that are insignificant relative to the biosphere. When this is achieved, a certain level of peace, or calm, or stability, will have been achieved, but maintenance of it will require continued vigilance and commitment. In today's grossly overpopulated world, poverty reduction can be accomplished only with population reduction. When mankind's numbers and industrial activity are once more in harmony with the biosphere, then mankind will again achieve a high quality of existence. As has been observed many times, none of human society's problems can be solved as long as human society remains in a state of overpopulation.

There is a lot of discussion and argument over the term "overpopulation." See, for example, the Wikipedia article <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Overpopulation> and the

Wikiquote <http://en.wikiquote.org/wiki/Overpopulation>. Many people do not realize that economic development dramatically *reduces* the number of people that can be supported by the biosphere on a long-term-sustainable basis. The reason for this is that high-tech people consume many times – perhaps 100 times – more energy and other resources as low-tech people. Using this rule of thumb, the impact of a high-tech person on the biosphere is about 100 times greater than the impact of a low-tech person (primitive agriculture or hunter-gatherer society). High-tech people use more space, use more of the recurrent solar-energy “budget,” consume more resources, cause more (and more severe) pollution, and destroy more of nature than low-tech people (each high-tech person causes the destruction of about an acre of natural land, in conversion to infrastructure such as buildings and roads). Industrial production produces much waste that is not easily recycled by the biosphere (such as chlorine-based chemicals, which are not generally produced or consumed by natural organisms). Using the exemplar factor of 100, whatever level of low-technology human population can be accommodated without causing noticeable impact on the rest of the biosphere, the level of high-technology population that can be accommodated is at least one-hundredth times fewer. Hence, for example, if the biosphere can accommodate 500 million low-tech people on a long-term-sustainable basis, it may be able to accommodate perhaps only five million high-tech people on a long-term-sustainable basis. These numbers are illustrative. No one knows just how damaging the impact of high-technology society on the biosphere really is. These numbers are inferred simply from the approximate ratio of energy utilization for high-tech vs. low-tech people. The point is that, contrary to what economists may say or imply, economic development places much greater per-person demands on the biosphere’s resources, and the biosphere

can hence accommodate far fewer, not more, of them. The only means to long-term-survival is to keep human numbers and industrial activity as low as possible. For more discussion of this phenomenon, see my article *The End of the World, and the New World Order*, at <http://www.foundationwebsite.org/theendoftheworld.htm>.

In just a few years, the world population will have dropped from seven billion to at most a few hundred million. If you are still alive, you will find yourself in either of two situations. Either you will be a member of the nuclear power that has won the first stage of global nuclear war, or you will be living in a “post-apocalyptic” world that has no energy to run its fabulous machines, and is slipping back into simpler times. If you want to picture what most of the world looks like, consider the following passages from the *Bible* (extracted from *Can America Survive?*):

Jer. 1:14. From the north disaster will be poured out on all who live in the land.

Jer. 2:7. I brought you into a fertile land to eat its fruit and rich produce. But you came and defiled my land and made my inheritance detestable.

Jer. 3:2. Look up to the barren heights and see. Is there any place where you have not been ravished? By the roadside you sat waiting for lovers, sat like a nomad (an Arab) in the desert. You have defiled the land with your prostitution and wickedness.

Jer. 4:5. Disaster from the north. ...For I am bringing disaster from the north, even terrible destruction. A lion has come out of his lair; a destroyer of nations has set out. He has left his place to lay waste your land. Your

towns will be in ruins without inhabitant. The whole land will be ruined, though I will not destroy it utterly. *Therefore the Earth will moan and the heavens above grow dark.... All the towns are deserted; no one lives in them.*

Jer. 6:10. To whom can I speak and give warning? Who will listen to me? Their ears are closed so that they cannot hear.

Jer. 8:20. The harvest is past, the summer has ended, and we are not saved.

Jer. 25:31. The tumult will resound to the ends of the Earth, for the land will bring charges against the nations; he will bring judgment on all mankind and put the wicked to the sword....Look! Disaster is spreading from nation to nation; a mighty storm is rising from the ends of the Earth. At that time those slain by the Lord will be everywhere – from one end of the Earth to the other. They will not be mourned or gathered up or buried, but will be like refuse lying on the ground.

Jer. 30:11. ...Though I completely destroy all the nations among which I scatter you, I will not completely destroy you.

Jer. 31:40. The city (Jerusalem) will never again be uprooted or demolished.

Jer. 48:10. A curse on him who is lax in doing the Lord's work! A curse on him who keeps his sword from bloodshed!

Lam. 1:1. How deserted lies the city, once so full of people!

Lam. 4:9. Those killed by the sword are better off than those who die of famine; racked with hunger, they waste away for lack of food from the field.

In either case – a member of the surviving high-tech nation or a survivor of the destroyed industrial world – you have important issues to address: What will you do for food and shelter, and security? If you are a member of the technological nation that has won the first engagement, these concerns will have been addressed by the military's long-range planning. If you are part of this community, you have a "higher" issue to address: You will be faced with the decision of whether to work for the establishment of a long-term-sustainable system of planetary management, or for a re-establishment of the industrial society that is now destroying the biosphere. If instead you find yourself a denizen of the now-low-tech remainder of the world, you have some really basic survival problems to address. That part of the world – over ninety-nine percent of it – will quickly form into tribes and warlord fiefdoms. If you do not survive, you have nothing to worry about. If you do survive, you had better have a plan. As Nietzsche is said to have remarked, "A man without a plan is not a man." If your country is not making plans to survive global nuclear war, who is doing the planning for you? Visualize yourself in the post-apocalyptic world. Picture yourself in this situation within the next two years. You have no food, and you have no weapons. What will you do? Your first concern is physical survival, and you will work this out with your fellow survivors – or you will not. More importantly, your society is headed for a primitive existence for the next several million years. What will you do

for spiritual sustenance? The political and religious systems of your former world failed. What will replace them?

Many people might believe that all that matters after global cataclysm is surviving in the high-tech nation, and that if they end up in a “hunter-gatherer” world, then their life would be of no significance. But this is not the case. The members of the non-industrial world will have a superb opportunity for spiritual development – perhaps a far greater opportunity than the members of the high-tech nation, who in fact are at a disadvantage in developing spiritual capabilities because of the distractions of technology.

I mentioned earlier that it is my belief that the solution to the planet’s current crisis will be achieved (or, at least, understood) only by spiritual means. Mankind has opted to rely on physical science and established religions for guidance, and they have brought nothing but destruction and devastation to our biosphere and species, and impoverished our spiritual life. They have caused the problem and exacerbated it. Our political and economic system (growth-based economics) is based on destruction of nature and on economic slavery. Our religious systems are based on ignorance, blind faith, intolerance, bigotry, denial of facts and rejection of reason. As Einstein once remarked, the kind of thinking that caused a problem is unlikely to get us out of it. What will be different the next time? It is time to search for knowledge, truth and understanding, and to reject ignorance and denial. The solution to mankind’s problems lies in the field of spiritual science.

FndID(51)

FndTitle(Handbook of Planetary Management)

FndDescription(The purpose of the Foundation website is to promote awareness of the human population problem,

suggest solutions to this problem, and to help bring about conditions such that when the industrial world collapses, a better (i.e., long-term-sustainable) system of planetary management is established (set up and maintained).)

EndKeywords(planetary management; the collapse of complex societies; overpopulation; species extinction; environmental destruction; globalization; biospheric destruction; world government; solar civilization; human extinction; long-term-survivable human population)