

PLANETARY WELLBEING AMIDST CLASHING PREROGATIVES

by
Kevin Mugur Galalae

Abstract: Sustainability depends on three planetary imperatives: depopulation, globalization and decarbonization, which necessitate a new and global governing structure that has yet to be created and that will impose new responsibilities on people and states alike and will need to reconcile the conflicts that arise between individual, national, global and planetary prerogatives.

The foremost duty of parents is the wellbeing of their children; of leaders, the wellbeing of their nation; and of the United Nations, the wellbeing of mankind. It is however no one's duty to resolve the conflicts that arise between these different and clashing prerogatives and no one's duty to ensure the wellbeing of all life on earth and of the planet itself.

To resolve these clashing prerogatives we must first recognize them. And to recognize them we must understand the world we live in, as it is now and not just as it was in the past.

In our role as parents we have responsibilities towards our children: to love, feed, clothe, house, educate, care for, transport, protect and comfort our children so they will grow into healthy adults capable of being as good as or better parents than we are. This is what we must do as parents if our children are to thrive and our family is to be healthy. If we fail to fulfill our duties towards our children they will suffer and not grow up to be the best they can be, which will have negative repercussions on their children and will put our family at a disadvantage to other families. What we do and fail to do as parents ripples through our children and our children's children.

In our role as citizens we have responsibilities towards our fellow citizens: to be productive, pay taxes, respect social rules and norms, abide by the laws of the land and defend our nation against aggressors should the need arise. This is what we must do as citizens if our nation is to thrive and our society is to be healthy. If we fail to fulfill our duties towards our fellow citizens the nation as a whole will suffer and not be the best society it can be, which will have negative repercussions on this and future generations and will put our nation at a disadvantage to other nations. What we do or fail to do as citizens ripples throughout society now and into the future.

While we understand our roles as parents and as citizens well and fulfill our duties towards our family and towards the nation as best we can, we do not understand our role as members of the human species and as inhabitants of planet earth, thus as earthlings, and are unaware that we have responsibilities towards mankind as a whole and towards the planet we share. We are unaware of our responsibilities as human beings and as earthlings because these duties are new, as they arise from our membership in an increasingly interconnected and interdependent global community and are imposed on us by new realities that previous generations did not have to confront and contend with and by new knowledge about the impact we have on the environment by our sheer numbers, longer lifespans and increasing consumption.

In our role as human beings we have responsibilities towards the other 7.2 billion people on this planet and towards future generations: to respect their national integrity; to respect their culture, religion and political system; to allow the free movement of goods and services across frontiers according to existing agreements; to share the available natural resources with the rest of mankind by making them available on the free market so that everyone can buy them at the same price and meet their needs to develop and prosper peacefully rather than have to resort to military aggression to access resources that may or may not be found on their soil in quantities large enough to meet internal demand; to ensure that we live within our national means and not covet that which does not belong to us and that we can buy at a fair price or trade in a fair agreement; and to safeguard vital natural resources and not impinge on the resources of future generations and thus threaten our children's survival. This is what we must do as members of the human species if humanity is to thrive and our civilization is to survive into the future. If we fail to fulfill our duties towards mankind billions will suffer and neither humanity nor our civilization will be the best they can be, which will endanger peace on earth and the very survival of our species. What we do or fail to do as human beings ripples through history and determine whether our species and our civilization survive or die out.

In our role as earthlings, as inhabitants of planet earth, we have responsibilities towards the other lifeforms with whom we share this planet and towards the planet itself: to respect and protect the planet's life support systems, to safeguard and not impinge on the habitats of other species and thus threaten their existence, and to use natural resources sparingly and no faster than the planet can regenerate them. This is what we must do as earthlings if life is to thrive on earth and the planet is to remain healthy. If we fail to fulfill our duties towards life on earth and the planet itself we threaten not only our own existence but the existence of all life on earth and the integrity of the planet itself. What we do or fail to do as earthlings, therefore, ripples through the very fabric of life and determines if life on earth lives on or dies out.

In the first instance, in our role as parents, the wellbeing of our children is in our hands. In the second instance, in our role as citizens, the wellbeing of the nation is in our hands. In the third instance, in our role as human beings, the wellbeing of the species is in our hands. And in the fourth instance, in our role as earthlings, the wellbeing of the planet is in our hands.

To ensure the wellbeing of our children we have created the family. To ensure the wellbeing of our society we have created government. To ensure the wellbeing of mankind we have created the United Nations. But who is in charge of ensuring the wellbeing of the planet and of all life on earth? No one is. We have yet to create an organization and endow it with responsibility over the whole planet and all life on earth.

Those who want to eschew further responsibilities say that God is in charge of the planet and of all life on earth and while this is true for all other species God has no control over human activities and it is these very activities that threaten God's or Nature's integrity. The people who want to place our responsibilities on God's shoulders forget that human society is an entirely artificial construct and therefore entirely out of God's hands.

The first social structure we have created, the family, is almost as old as mankind. The second, government, is a couple of thousand years old. The third, the United Nations, is only 70 years old. And the fourth has yet to be. The sooner we create it the better because our planet is already falling apart in the absence of a planetary authority.

With the creation of each social structure conflicts arise between the new and the old social structures as well as between individual rights and freedoms and collective wellbeing.

When the institution of family came into being the individual was forced or compelled to abdicate the right to mate with whomsoever he/she wished to and was bound by social rules to commit both emotionally and economically to just one spouse or, as in the case of Islam, a limited number of spouses. While individuals lost sexual and economic freedom society gained a solid foundation, the family unit. To make the family unit possible individuals are forced to share their income with their spouses and to take care of the material and emotional needs of their offspring.

When government came into being individuals were gradually forced or compelled to abdicate to political bodies decisions related to property, defense, social conduct, education, infrastructure and trade, among other things. As a result, individual rights and freedoms have been curtailed and collective rights expanded, but through this abdication the individual gained other benefits: greater personal security, less work and more leisure time, a higher standard of living and more comfort, better and more food, better medical and old age care. To make government possible individuals are forced through taxes to give a percentage of their income to the running of government in addition to assuming a series of responsibilities that define citizenship in any given nation.

When the United Nations came into being in 1945, governments, and by extension their citizens, were forced or compelled to abdicate to the UN and its agencies decisions related to population control and resource sharing; the former being necessary to keep the peace between nations and the latter to allow all nations to develop. As a result, hard-earned rights and freedoms of individuals formerly protected by national constitutions have been suspended, which

could only be accomplished by bypassing democracy and circumventing or downright violating the rule of law and by erecting the illusion of individual rights and freedoms with respect to procreation and the use of resources. To make the United Nations possible, nations are forced through annual contributions to give a percentage of their gross domestic product to the running of the UN and its agencies in addition to assuming a series of responsibilities that define membership in the international community; responsibilities that were kept partially secret from the masses and privy only to the highest echelons of national executive bodies and international policy making organs.

The need to limit childbearing across the world to replacement level fertility, thus to two children per woman, is driven by the sound rationale that we live on a finite planet and that resources are limited and nations must live within their available resources if they are to prevent wars of necessity. This follows that the only way to ensure that nations live within their resources is to stabilize their populations so that they neither grow nor decrease, which can only be done by limiting fertility.

The second responsibility of the United Nations, that of resource sharing to allow all nations to develop and prosper, is driven by the rationale that vital raw materials are unevenly distributed across the world and the only way to ensure that all nations and therefore all people have equal access to these vital natural resources is to make them available at prices dictated by supply and demand on the open markets so that they can be purchased when and as they are needed irrespective where these resources are found in the world and without prejudice towards the purchasers.

Both prerogatives, to limit fertility and control resources, are vital to the preservation of international peace and to facilitating universal prosperity and constitute a paradigm shift from the previous international order based on military might and the system of unilateral action, of exclusive alliances, spheres of influence, and balances of power that buttressed and justified European aggression and that led to the colonial era and the two world wars.

The depopulation and globalization prerogatives replaced the use of force and ambitions for territorial aggrandizement and set the world on course towards global cooperation to secure better economic and social conditions for all, freedom from fear and want, and free trade and free access to raw materials.

Depopulation and globalization were made all the more acute by nuclear deterrence. The development of nuclear weapons by the Americans in 1945 and the Soviets in 1949 made war impossible as it would have led to the assured mutual destruction of all parties. A war that cannot be won is a war that must not be fought. And without the possibility of waging war the world had lost the means to reestablish balance between people and resources, balance that is periodically and inevitably lost because human beings procreate faster than they can increase food production. The balance between people and resources, furthermore, became all the more

precarious with the advent of the Industrial Revolution and the tremendous increase in per capita consumption of vital natural resources that this revolution brought about. Last but not least, the balance between people and resources was completely destabilized by advances in medicine, nutrition and sanitation, advances that enabled nearly every child born to survive into adulthood and nearly every adult to live a long life.

As industrialization advanced in the West but not elsewhere, the gap in per capita consumption between first world and third world nations increased and by 1980 became unbridgeable. This income gap threatened the international order established in 1945 because it made the sharing of resources through the free market impossible since developed nations outprice developing nations therefore cutting them off from access to vital natural resources, which led to the West's 800 million people consuming 50% of the world's resources while the Rest of the world's 6.4 billion people have to contend themselves with the remaining 50% of the world's resources; a distribution of wealth that is destabilizing and immoral and therefore unsustainable.

To close the wealth gap between the West and the Rest, the industrialization of the developing world was accelerated starting in the 1980s and, soon after, the pressure on resources and their impending shortage, as well as the pressure on the planet's life support systems added two new justifications for accelerating the depopulation program and the first justification for greening the globalization program, namely national security, now threatened by fierce global competition for vital natural resources, and environmental preservation, now threatened by climate change, loss of biosphere integrity, excessive biochemical flows, and unsustainable land-system use to name but four of the nine planetary boundaries identified by environmental scientists.

When the Planetary Wellbeing Organization comes into being, as it must, the United Nations and by extension all its members states and all people on the planet must abdicate control over the three Planetary Security Prerogatives that have emerged, namely: depopulation, globalization and decarbonization; so that peace among men, harmony between man and nature, and continuity between this and future generations can be accomplished and maintained.

In this new regime, our individual rights and liberties will be constrained not only by the needs and wants of the far too many people alive today, all of whom aspire to prosperity and justice, but also by the rights of all other species with whom we share the planet and that have no voice in our current political process yet have an equal right to life, as well as by the rights of future generations, thus by the rights of the planet itself and all life on it.

The way to reconcile these clashing and competing prerogatives is not by imposing order through the New World Order that deprives people of knowledge by seeding confusion, deception, and depravity so as to be able to manipulate them against their own will and wellbeing for the sake of planetary wellbeing, but by encouraging consent through a New Axial Age that empowers people with the knowledge and wisdom necessary to make the right choices,

assume responsibility and voluntarily limit their individual rights and liberties for the sake of planetary wellbeing.

How this is possible I detail in my book "[The Future of Global Governance](https://www.scribd.com/doc/277116203/The-Future-of-Global-Governance)" (<https://www.scribd.com/doc/277116203/The-Future-of-Global-Governance>), which I now make available free of cost, to each and all, and whose purpose is to give policy makers a clear direction and concrete solutions, as well as to enlighten people with knowledge of the overall plan so we all know what we must do and why and move irresistibly towards the same goals.

Looking at the world and at our civilization from this birds-eye-view and across the sweep of time, both past and future, we discern that the evolution of our social organization is like expanding concentric circles that encompass ever greater numbers of people over ever greater spans of time. The impeccable logic of this natural evolution has allowed us to keep up with the complexity of managing our human affairs not only within our planet's material limitations and despite our expanding ambitions, but also without the tyranny of time breathing down our necks.

The frustration we feel as individuals in this world of our own making is that with each social unit that we have created a greater degree of separation occurs between the individual and the decision-making bodies and a greater diffusion of responsibility and thus a smaller amount of influence for each individual since decisions are made based not only on the needs of many to the benefit of all, but also on the needs of other species and the benefit of all life on earth now and in the future.

This frustration can be transformed into liberation if the newest and latest social organization we are about to create, the Planetary Wellbeing Organization, is capable of not only fulfilling the three overarching goals of peace between man, harmony between man and nature, and continuity between this and future generations, but do it while reconciling the clashes that inevitably arise between individual, national, global and planetary prerogatives and doing so in the open and not in secret so that all of us can partake in the shaping of civilization and the mastery of time.

It will be a wild and bumpy ride so hang on to your breeches.