

**THE COMING  
GLOBAL COALESCENCE**



# THE COMING GLOBAL COALESCENCE

How powerful evolutionary forces are  
transforming seven billion individual humans  
into a single harmonious social organism

0>)(

By

Walter Szykitka

Published by the author through Create-Space

This work is not copyrighted and there are no restrictions on the duplication or distribution of its content, although attribution to its author and the website at [www.thecoallescence.net](http://www.thecoallescence.net) is appreciated.

Print versions may be purchased through the website; free digital and audio versions are also available for downloading.

The first edition was published in March 2011  
This second edition was published in June 2012

“The finally victorious way of looking at things  
will be the most completely impressive way  
to the normal run of minds.”

– William James



# Contents

|                                    |    |
|------------------------------------|----|
| Introduction.....                  | ix |
| PART I                             |    |
| The End Of The Triconsys.....      | 3  |
| PART II                            |    |
| The Advent Of The Coalescence..... | 39 |
| Afterword.....                     | 69 |
| Regarding This Second Edition..... | 71 |





## INTRODUCTION

It is impossible to overstate the importance of this moment in human history. Powerful forces at work in the world today are propelling the human race toward an extraordinary event – a flashpoint – in the evolutionary history of this planet, an event matched in significance on only two previous occasions.

The first extraordinary event took place incomprehensible aeons ago with the emergence, out of the agitated primordial stew, of a complex assemblage of molecules with the ability to reproduce itself, thus setting in motion a biological process that has resulted in the evolution of the spectacular variety of living organisms that inhabit the earth today, amounting to, by some estimates, more than a hundred million different species of microorganisms, plants, and animals, including *Homo sapiens*.

The second extraordinary event, which on the evolutionary timescale took place only yesterday, was the emergence in the human species of a uniquely high level of intelligence, producing an explosive acceleration in the pace of evolutionary change. Suddenly, lightning-quick technological invention, rather than biological diversity and natural selection, began driving the evolutionary process, and in a few ticks of the evolutionary clock the human species developed characteristics and abilities far beyond that of any other earthbound species.

And now, we find ourselves racing toward the third extraordinary event, an event for which the emergence of life and the emergence of human intelligence were but dim preludes. Call this third extraordinary event The Coalescence, the magical moment when the human race undergoes a dramatic metamorphosis by coming together – coalescing – into a single harmonious social organism, thereby lifting humanity onto another and higher plane of existence.

Given the present state of world affairs, such an optimistic vision of the future must seem wildly off the mark. Not so. Tracking the evolutionary forces at work today, and extrapolating their direction, makes it clear that this great social transformation is already well underway.

O>)(

The forces propelling humanity toward The Coalescence consist primarily of three simultaneous and mutually intensifying explosions: the population explosion, the technology explosion, and the communication explosion.

The changes taking place in each of these three areas clearly fit the definition of an explosion ("a large-scale, rapid and spectacular expansion"), and if they were to be charted on a graph, using the horizontal scale to indicate the time element and the vertical scale to indicate the quantitative element, each of the three would be represented by a gently upward-sloping line reflecting thousands of years of almost imperceptible change, until suddenly, in the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, the line takes off like a rocket, straight up and off the chart.

*The Population Explosion:* Following untold millennia, Earth's human population finally reached one billion a little more than two hundred years ago. But then it took only another 170 years to add the next billion, doubling by 1945. The next doubling took only 31 years, reaching four billion by 1976. And today, in 2012, the human population has surpassed seven billion!

*The Technology Explosion:* During that same period, developments in science and technology produced a flood of discoveries and inventions: electric lights, radio, television, the telephone, movies, cameras, computers, automobiles, airplanes, rocket ships, atomic bombs, and nerve gas, not to mention can openers, toasters, and electric toothbrushes! And the flood continues, at an accelerating rate. Two hundred years ago, the United States Patent and Trademark Office issued an average of 20 patents a year. Now, the annual rate is well over 200,000!

*The Communication Explosion:* Two hundred years ago the semaphore, a system of arms and levers that could communicate only as far as the eye could see, and one letter at a time, was the most effective means of communication over distance. In 1876, Alexander Graham Bell made his first successful telephone call to Mr. Watson in an adjoining room. Today, less than 150 years later, there are over five billion telephones capable of calling anywhere in the world by means of a planet-girdling network of wired and wireless connections. In 1928, Philo Farnsworth staged the first television demonstration. Today, just eight decades later, there are 1.4 billion television sets in the world, also connected to a planetary communication system that enables the simultaneous worldwide sharing of important events, such as the Olympics, a terrorist attack, a concert, a war, an assassination, or a New Year's celebration. In 1990, Tim Berners-Lee introduced the software that transformed the Internet into the World Wide Web. Today, 22 years later, more than two billion people, or nearly one-third of the world population, are connected to the Internet and use the World Wide Web to participate in borderless social networks and to access what is becoming the holographic repository of the totality of humankind's knowledge and information. Amazingly, many, if not most, are able to do so wirelessly with a mobile device the size of a pack of cigarettes. In February 2004, Mark Zuckerberg launched Facebook, the social networking site; today, just eight years later, it has more than 800 million users. Although a subset of the technology explosion, it is the communication explosion that is playing the central and crucial role in the next stage of the evolutionary process. If one were looking for a clue as to the accelerating speed of this (r)evolution, this would be the place to look.

O>)(

The significance of these three explosions is that each greatly increases the number and the intensity of human actions and

interactions. Each individual, like a single atom confined within the limits of Earth's biosphere as in a sealed container, generates social kinetic energy through movement and interaction with other "atoms." The greater the number of people, the greater the amount of human inter-activity, and the higher the level of social kinetic energy. Today, seven billion humans, with an assist from technology's multiplier effect and communication's amplifier effect, have finally raised the planet's social kinetic energy, its temperature, to a level that is no longer sustainable.

Until now, the evolutionary process has been driven by competition: "Survival of the fittest." "Every man for himself." "It's a dog-eat-dog world." With all due credit to the role competition has played in getting us this far, the unassailable truth is that those competitive forces have now brought us to the brink of social chaos and ecological disaster, clear evidence the competitive phase of human evolution has run its course.

Without recounting and analyzing the myriad twists and turns in human history that have brought us to this point – a task best left to historians – it is enough to observe that change happens when an existing situation is no longer either tenable or desirable, or when something better comes along.

And so it is that now, at this time, in this hour, the metamorphosis has begun, because our situation is neither tenable nor desirable. And fortunately, something better is on the way. Out of the chaos, something new is being born. Another way of living and working together. Another way of inhabiting this planet.

As the reality of our situation becomes clearer and more widely known, the forces of change will finally sweep away the present dysfunctional system, making way for the new world order destined to take its place. It is this social transformation, now underway, that will prove to be the planet's third extraordinary evolutionary event. And we are fortunate to be here to see it happen. The times could not be more exciting; the future could not be more promising.

Welcome to the Coalescence!

# **PART I**

“Turning and turning in the widening gyre  
The falcon cannot hear the falconer;  
Things fall apart; the centre cannot hold;  
Mere anarchy is loosed upon the world.”

–William Butler Yeats

“It was the best of times, it was the worst of times, it was the  
age of wisdom, it was the age of foolishness, it was the epoch  
of belief, it was the epoch of incredulity, it was the season of  
Light, it was the season of Darkness, it was the spring of hope,  
it was the winter of despair, we had everything before us, we  
had nothing before us, we were all going direct to Heaven, we  
were all going direct the other way. . . .”

–Charles Dickens

“Hooray! Hooray! Hooray! Suffering and dismay.  
There are bad times just around the corner;  
We can all look forward to despair.  
It’s as clear as crystal from Brooklyn Bridge to Bristol  
That we can’t save democracy and don’t much care.”

–Noel Coward

# THE END OF THE TRICONSYS

As this is being written, the global financial system is in its death throes, an event that will prove to be the beginning of the great transformational unraveling of the entire Triconsys.

The Triconsys – a word coined here – refers to the totality of laws and statutes, rules and regulations, systems and procedures, rituals and traditions that, collectively, constitute the fragmented, complex, and constantly evolving control system that has been designed, promoted, maintained and defended down through the ages by a triumvirate of business, political, and religious leaders, to the primary benefit of themselves. Its days are numbered.

The most significant element in the functioning of any society is the way it provides for the production and distribution of essential goods and services. In the evolving global society, all such economic activity has been controlled by a highly complex financial system, at the center of which is the concept of money.

However, with the collapse of the financial system, that concept has vaporized into a fog of incomprehensible financial instruments, including credit default swaps, collateralized debt obligations, and securitized subprime mortgages, to name only a few. As a result, no one can now say with any degree of certainty what anything is worth today or what it will be worth tomorrow.

Imagine a violent solar flare that washes over our planet with a powerful electromagnetic cloud and, in a nanosecond, wipes clean all computer records: checking accounts, savings accounts, credit cards, tax bills, loans, mortgages, pension funds, contracts, investments, insurance policies. All gone. Wiped out in the blink of an eye.

Because of the financial meltdown, we are fast approaching just such a moment, when all those numbers in all those computers will become as meaningless as a statement of account from Bernie Madoff.

0>)(

The concept of money is as pervasive as the air we breathe. It governs every aspect of our lives: where we work, where we live, how we live, how long we live. It consumes our thoughts, focuses our ambitions, colors our dreams, sparks our disputes, and stokes our anxieties. It's here, there, and everywhere. No wonder it is viewed with the same degree of inevitability and blind acceptance as a force of nature. Such as gravity.

Money, however, is not a force of nature. It is a concept, an idea, a figment of the human imagination. And it is real only to the extent that we allow it to rule our lives and our relationships with one another.

Money, which has been around at least as long as recorded history, is most commonly and simply defined as a "medium of exchange." And its utility is often illustrated by such examples as the ease with which it permits a shoemaker to exchange his labor for bread without having to search for a baker in need of shoes. On this simplistic level, the concept of money undoubtedly did serve some useful purpose in times past.

Today, however, money serves a far different and insidious purpose. Today, money is no longer a medium of exchange, if it ever was. The word "exchange" implies equality in the transaction, as in the dictionary definition: "To part with, give, or transfer in consideration of something received as an equivalent." The parties engaged in a transaction involving money are not in a mutual search for equivalency. In transactions between buyers and sellers, employers and employees, each side is seeking to advantage itself at the expense of the other. The seller wants to charge as much as possible; the buyer wants to pay as little as possible. The



worker wants to earn as much as possible; the employer wants to pay as little as possible.

Therefore, money is more accurately defined as a “medium of competition.” By its ability to digitize and dehumanize every economic transaction, money has become both the facilitator and the score-keeping mechanism in the Mother of All Monopoly Games called capitalism, a game in which we are all required to participate, whether we like it or not.

As the real economy and the financial system that controls it have become increasingly globalized and intricately intertwined, with the acquisition of money as the universal objective, every individual on the planet is forced to compete – directly or indirectly, on one level or another – with everyone else on the planet.

There are plentiful attempts to praise the beauty of this competitive game. It’s a familiar refrain: Competition forces everyone to excel, work harder, be more productive, become inventive, produce better products. If the “free” market is permitted to work its magic, Adam Smith’s “invisible hand” will guide human activity in the most productive and desirable directions and the entire human race will benefit, because a rising tide lifts all boats. As far as individuals are concerned, if they will work hard, be thrifty, honest and conscientious, if they will adopt the entrepreneurial spirit, and truly believe in themselves, they will surely prosper.

Nonsense. This game is rigged. The truth is that hard work, conscientiously and honestly performed, is no guarantee of success. There is, in fact, considerable evidence to support the belief that the reverse is true, that in our financially driven competitive economic system the decent hard-working people are the ones who get screwed, while those who are devious and manipulative and clever enough to figure out ways to advantage themselves within the workings of this labyrinthine financial system and its complex rules, with a bit of good luck thrown in, are the ones who walk off with the spoils. If they are born at the right time and in the right place or marry into the

right family; if they have the top lawyers, accountants, and investment advisors; if they learn how to execute a leveraged buyout, downsize a corporation, cook the books, lobby the government, bribe the authorities, romance the bankers, devise exotic financial instruments, and trade stocks on insider information, then the numbers in their bank accounts, their scores, will keep rising: five million, a hundred million, five hundred million, a billion, three billion. It is never enough, and the bigger the number, the more extravagant the praise. As the faces of these masters of the universe appear on the covers of *Fortune*, *Forbes* and *Bloomberg Business Week* magazines, and their successes are glorified and their lifestyles admired in glowing profiles on the pages within, the truth is that the rest of society is paying a terrible price for living under an economic and financial system that makes that kind of success possible.

It should come as no surprise that a number-driven game with competition as its energizing principle will produce losers as well as winners. And it should come as no surprise that the winners, with the power and influence of their wealth, will use their advantage to continue the pursuit of an ever-widening gulf between themselves and the losers. The much-glorified free market, it turns out, means that there are very few restrictions or limits on the ways in which the powerful are free to exploit the weak and the rich are at liberty to extort the poor.

Furthermore, because of its abstract nature, the concept of money is easily manipulated by those who claim the authority not only to set the rules by which it is used but also to actually define it, all to their advantage and everyone else's misfortune. Banks, for example, with a bit of legerdemain called "fractional-reserve banking," are able to create money out of thin air, while the United States Federal Reserve Bank does so by simply cranking up the printing presses. Actually, most money is best described as "virtual" in the sense that very little of it consists of paper currency and coins. Called e-money, most of it is represented by electronic bits and bytes either sitting on the computers of banks and various other financial institutions or whirling about the global ether at the

speed of light as it is traded back and forth between those institutions.

Most of such transfers that take place in the U.S. are processed through two services: Fedwire, operated by the Federal Reserve Bank, handles \$2.7 trillion on an average business day, while CHIPS (the Clearinghouse Interbank Payments System) handles \$1.5 trillion, for a combined total of \$4.2 trillion daily and \$1,050 trillion annually. Inasmuch as the U.S. gross domestic product is, by comparison, only \$15.3 trillion annually and the total U.S. money supply is less than \$10 trillion, it is obvious that there is much more involved in the financial system than the production, distribution and consumption of goods and services. To whose benefit?

Meanwhile, for individuals, all they know is that they need money in order to survive, and that their only path to obtaining it is to find a job. All the rest is but a mystery shrouded in the complexities of a financial system with rules that defy comprehension, drawn up by people they do not know, with motives that are less than pure, and consequences that are indiscriminately destructive to untold millions of hapless victims.

As for those who make the rules, if the rules get in their way, they feel free to simply change or ignore them. For one example of many, in the United States the Financial Accounting Standards Board has devoted millions of words to codify what they call Generally Accepted Accounting Principles, with the ostensible aim of accurately and transparently tracking business activity to establish a true picture of a company's assets and liabilities, as well as its profits and losses, and therefore its financial worth. Nevertheless, at the time of the financial collapse it was impossible to know the real value of the country's largest financial institutions. And when it was determined that their assets had plunged in value, making them effectively insolvent, the authorities let them off the hook by canceling the generally accepted accounting principle that assets must be "marked-to-market," allowing them to make up their own asset evaluations.

When the Maastricht Treaty was signed in 1992, creating the European Union, it was decreed, on Germany's insistence, that no member nation would be permitted to run a fiscal deficit greater than three per cent of its gross domestic product, until Germany found itself unable to meet that requirement, at which time the EU simply raised the limit to five percent. That was just the beginning. As nation after nation began falling short of its treaty obligations and the EU monetary structure began coming apart because of the financial crisis, the leaders started scrambling for ways to change the rules and procedures that might bring some stability to an increasingly chaotic situation, but to no avail. The fear is growing that there may not be a solution and that disaster is on the horizon. Their fears are justified.

Similarly, the United States Internal Revenue Service's tax code, consisting of 13,458 pages of dense regulations, purports to advance the objective of equity and fairness in taxation. But that pretense went out the window when the government, during the Bush administration, responded to rising complaints about the heavy tax burden on ordinary citizens by cutting taxes, but primarily on the very rich. Further, those 13,458 pages are totally ineffective in the prevention of widespread tax evasion by the use of offshore tax havens by the revered Fortune 500 corporations and by the use of numbered Swiss bank accounts by wealthy individuals.

In the same vein of perverse consequences resulting from regulatory malfeasance, the Securities and Exchange Commission, formed to protect investors from fraud and corruption, was found to be asleep at the switch (when not watching pornography on the Internet) while it ignored warnings that Bernard Madoff was running a massive Ponzi scheme. And it looked the other way when the most destructive flood of reckless financial transactions in Wall Street history triggered the collapse of the global financial house of cards.

Meanwhile, what's the result? After all the rules and regulations and government supervision, or lack thereof, what's the score? Who is winning? And who is losing?

According to the March 26, 2012 issue of *Forbes* magazine (that self-proclaimed capitalist tool), out of a world population of 7 billion, there are 1,226 billionaires with a combined net worth of \$4.6 trillion, and an average net worth of \$3.5 billion. Here are the Top 5, the cream of the crop, and what they are worth:

|                  |   |              |
|------------------|---|--------------|
| Carlos Slim Helu | - | \$69 billion |
| Bill Gates       | - | \$61 billion |
| Warren Buffett   | - | \$44 billion |
| Bernard Arnault  | - | \$41 billion |
| Amancio Ortego   | - | \$37 billion |

And how are these masters of the universe making out during this great ongoing global financial crisis? During the past two years, while major portions of the world population struggled to stay afloat in a sea of financial confusion and uncertainty, this elite club of the already-too-rich welcomed 115 new members into the fold, saw their average net worth increase by \$200 million, and their combined wealth grow by a trillion dollars!

One way to grasp the size of the \$4.7 trillion controlled by this select group of 1,226 is that it represents the ability to demand goods and services equal to an average of \$657 from each of the 7 billion men, women and children sharing the planet with them.

Meanwhile, the World Bank reports that in 2008, the latest year for which reliable statistics are available, 1.29 billion people (or more than one out of every five individuals on the planet) were living *below* a poverty level set at \$1.25 a day, while the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization reports that there are now one billion people who are chronically hungry and undernourished, and that every day an estimated 16,000 children die from hunger-related causes.

In its October 19, 2009 issue, *Forbes* magazine identified the 400 wealthiest persons in the United States, all billionaires, with a total net worth of \$1.27 trillion, an amount

greater than the total net worth of those who occupy the entire bottom half of the country's financial pyramid.

Two years later, in its October 11, 2010 issue, *Forbes* made no such broad statements highlighting the continued concentration of wealth, but rather chose to remind us why the rich getting still richer is a good thing:

“Who cares whether somebody is worth \$2 billion or \$6 billion? We do. That personal stash is a critical barometer of how well the nation – and, to a degree, the world – is doing. By creating wealth, the people on our list help shape epic financial innovation and entrepreneurship. Both Bill Gates and Warren Buffet are richer than they were a year ago, and that has had huge implications for philanthropic giving.”

Meanwhile, a recent study by the Paris School of Economics shows that the top 1 percent of American earners account for nearly 20 percent of national income, with the top 5 percent taking home a 48 percent share.

One disturbing consequence, among many, is that 35 million Americans, including 12 million children, confront hunger every day in the world's most powerful and wealthy country.

Such statistics surely prove that the present financial system is totally out of whack, a monstrous arrangement with zero concern for human suffering. And when objections are raised and pleas for relief or assistance are made, the answer is always the same: There is no money. The fact is, of course, that there is plenty of money. The problem is that it is becoming increasingly concentrated in fewer and fewer hands. Even during a slackening of economic activity, the capitalist nightmare, the rich can still find a way to get richer.

Now that the entire global financial system is coming apart, those who designed and controlled it are pretending not to know what went wrong. They are even more evasive when they are pressed for a solution. While presidents and prime ministers, central bankers and treasury secretaries, financiers and industrialists gather at high-profile conferences and go through the motions of trying to devise ways to get the

capitalist jalopy going again, those who have been the beneficiaries of this system suggest that it's basically sound and that a bit of tinkering here and fine-tuning there will do the job. But what they fail to realize as they attempt to get things back to the way they were is that their efforts are now futile, because this creaking, groaning, rattling Rube Goldberg contraption has already gone over the cliff.

O>)(

While the battle rages over where to place the blame, the disastrous failure of the global financial system is most easily understood as the inevitable collapse of a long-running variation of the Ponzi scheme made famous again by Bernie Madoff.

Carlo Ponzi and Bernard Madoff operated fraudulent scams in which they attracted investors with promises of high rates of return, returns they could deliver only as long as they continued to entice new investors since neither of them produced anything of value themselves. They simply returned some of their investors' own money, calling it interest, while using the rest to support their lavish lifestyles.

Ponzi's scheme collapsed in 1920 after running through \$8 million of his investors' money (\$85 million in current dollars). By the time Madoff's scheme ended in 2008, he had bilked his investors out of \$65 billion. As large as those scams were, they were on the level of chump change when compared with the massive fraud being perpetrated by the gigantic global Ponzi scheme called capitalism, which is also now finally collapsing.

Here is how capitalism is like a Ponzi scheme:

In the Ponzi and Madoff schemes, participants were promised a generous monetary return on their monetary investments. In the capitalist version, the investment is not money, but labor. As individuals invest their labor in the production and distribution of goods and services, they are paid wages that enable them to purchase and consume the goods and

services they themselves produce. Fair enough. This sounds like the standard description of the bedrock elements of an economic system. And it is the promise of a bountiful return on the investment of honest labor, presented in glorious high-definition color and high-fidelity Dolby sound, that drives the capitalist dream machine. In reality, however, the dream has become a nightmare.

The defenders of the capitalist Ponzi scheme can turn themselves inside out in an effort to explain and defend the indefensible, but in the end, the essence of the scam comes down to the following: the capitalist schemers who pay wages to the workers when they are producers are the same schemers who charge the workers when they become consumers, and they charge them more when they consume a product than they pay them when they produce the same product, the difference being a little something called profit.

In 2011, gross domestic product in the United States was valued at \$15.3 trillion. Of that amount, 90 percent went to the workers who created it, while corporations who produced nothing of value themselves skimmed 10 percent off the top. In other words, workers are paid \$9 to make a widget and then charged \$10 to buy the widget they themselves made.

It doesn't take rocket science to see the flaw in this arrangement. With the annual corporate skim amounting to \$5,000 for every man, woman and child, or \$13,000 for the average American family, it should be obvious that a game based on such a formula would have a limited life expectancy. As time goes by, workers must inevitably fall further and further behind.

Sooner or later, underpaid workers/overcharged consumers will find it impossible to keep buying what they produce, thus setting in motion a downward spiral in economic activity. If the demand for automobiles declines, so does the need for workers to make them. The result: unemployment, leading to a further decline in sales, then more unemployment, and so on, resulting in an accelerating downward spiral.

Such a situation represents a serious challenge to a



system that, like Ponzi's and Madoff's schemes, requires continuous and endless growth. Like all Ponzi schemes, the capitalist scheme must grow or it too will collapse. There is no provision for a sustainable equilibrium. That is why the slightest decrease in the growth rate of gross domestic product evokes a panicked hysteria on the part of the schemers, raising the fear that the economic engine might actually slow to a halt and then start to drift backward into a recession.

Under those circumstances, what are the capitalist schemers to do? How do they keep the economic cycle going forward when individuals begin to run short of money and can no longer maintain an ever-increasing level of spending?

Credit.

Without the concept of credit, which, like money, has been around a long time, this capitalist Ponzi scheme would have collapsed a long time ago. But the capitalist schemers, in their infinite self-preserving wisdom, have kept the game going by lending some of their profits back to their underpaid workers so they could keep spending, a strategy that has yielded two major benefits to the schemers. First, it did indeed keep the economy going longer than it otherwise would have, so they could continue to reap their annual profit skim. And second, it yielded another income stream in the form of interest charges on the credit they granted.

By the end of 2011, household debt in the United States totaled \$13 trillion. That's \$48,000 for every man, woman and child, or \$120,000 for the average American family. Meanwhile, per capita disposable income amounts to \$33,000. In other words, the average American carries a burden of personal debt equal to 18 months of disposable income.

All that lending is based on the assumption that it will be repaid, *with interest*. However, by mid-2007 a troubling increase in the number of families falling behind on their credit card and home mortgage payments sounded the alarm that the burden of debt had grown so large that it was no longer clear when it will be repaid, eventually leading to the far more troubling fear that it might never be repaid.

While this development alone was sufficient to reveal the critical flaw in the capitalist Ponzi scheme, it also served to expose a far more sinister and destructive game that was being played in the shadows. Not content with the obscene rewards they were already reaping from their control of the economic system, those who became the custodians of the world's monetary wealth – the commercial banks, investment banks, hedge funds, private equity funds, insurance giants, and financial services companies – had turned their attention to the creation of what amounted to a high-stakes gambling casino that had nothing to do with the production and distribution of essential goods and services but everything to do with their insatiable appetite for wealth and power.

Worldwide activity of the real economy, or what might be called gross world production, when measured in monetary terms, amounts to nearly \$80 trillion annually. Meanwhile, \$700 trillion in derivatives chips sits on the gambling tables of the international financial casino, or more than eight times the monetary value of the productive work of the planet's entire workforce. To what purpose?

The organizers of this capitalist version of a gambling casino began playing ingeniously designed games of chance with the prospect of heart-pounding winnings. With most of the planet's financial wealth in the possession of a relative handful of billionaires and multi-millionaires, one imagines that boredom must have set in. Already wealthy beyond imagining, perhaps they needed something exciting to do with their money. While the rest of the population engaged in the day-to-day drudgery required to survive, the gamblers chose to sit comfortably on the sidelines and make bets on every aspect of the economy they could think of. Will the price of oil rise or fall? Will the dollar become more or less valuable against the euro? Will interest rates go higher or lower? Will the S&P 500 index go up or down?

What's more, in their intoxication, they invented side bets so incomprehensible that they hardly knew what they were getting themselves into. And in order to make the games even

more exciting, they leveraged their bets beyond their ability to pay if they happened to lose, wagering, for example, \$10 million with \$1 million in cash and \$9 million in IOUs, essentially betting money they didn't have. Some bets by major financial institutions were leveraged as much as 50 to 1, a formula that proved to be disastrous.

Because then came those first clues that the entire monumental financial structure was on the verge of collapse: the decrease in consumer spending, followed by rising unemployment, leading to missed credit card and home mortgage payments, resulting in the unexpected rise in foreclosures that finally touched off a cascading series of financial disasters. As the financial bubble burst, all those trillions of dollars of reckless bets began exploding in the faces of those preening riverboat gamblers. The world's highest and mightiest financial institutions were found to be empty shells, brought to their knees by their self-congratulatory arrogance.

Suddenly, the gamers made an about-face. Lenders abruptly stopped lending, credit dried up, consumer demand took a nosedive, and the entire economic cycle began to grind to a halt. We slid into a global recession, on our way to a global depression, all triggered when the capitalist Ponzi schemers finally ran out of the required endless flow of spenders in what is essentially a demand-driven economic system.

Now what to do? With trillions of dollars of bets gone bad, and no longer confident that debtors could be counted on to honor their credit obligations, the capitalist Ponzi schemers turned to their governments as borrowers, and spenders, of last resort, as well as guarantors of their reckless gambles. In the United States they insisted that it was up to the government to borrow hundreds of billions of dollars and spend it to stimulate the economy, while risking several trillion dollars to guarantee their solvency. Never mind that, by the time the burden of saving the schemers' moneymaking machine was placed on the back of the government, the government was already in hock to the tune of \$13 trillion dollars. And never mind that this frantic appeal to governments was actually an indirect way of

expanding credit to individuals, since the burden and responsibility for repaying the growing government debt falls ultimately on the taxpayers and only delays the moment of reckoning.

Now each individual's share of the national debt, when combined with \$2.3 trillion of state and local government debt, and when added to consumer credit and residential mortgage obligations, rises to \$75,000, while each family's share climbs to \$195,000, or the equivalent of more than two years of personal disposable income. Furthermore, each trillion dollars the government subsequently borrows to stimulate the economy will increase each individual's share by another \$3,000.

The numbers herein refer to the United States economy. However, the American economy represents more than one-fourth of the world economy, and by its sheer size and weight, as well as its apparent success, it has influenced other developed and developing nations to follow its example, making this a worldwide economic crisis.

The strategy of using the government as a conduit for economic pump priming does not address the central issue of wealth concentration and is therefore doomed to failure. Lending trillions of dollars to governments increases rather than ameliorates the problem. The wealthy continue to rake in their usual profits from their control of overall economic activity, and by charging interest to the borrowers – individuals and governments alike – they are now also making money with their money, and the relentless wealth-concentrating machinery grinds on.

Furthermore, as each individual's share of the country's personal and national collective debt continues to balloon, as the government goes deeper and deeper into debt in their behalf, and as workers continue to be paid less than what they need to survive, it becomes increasingly clear that this mountain of debt can never be repaid.

While the financial collapse was triggered by the sudden increase in the number of individuals and families who

were no longer able to continue spending and, more importantly, no longer able to meet their debt obligations, it soon became apparent that governments, too, have reached a burden of debt so great that there is no longer any confidence that it can ever be repaid by the only potential source, the taxpayers. (See Ireland, Greece, Portugal, Spain, and Italy)

And thus comes the final jaw-dropping collapse of the world's biggest Ponzi scheme, made possible by greed, deception, fraud, and the viral concept of money, the most lethal idea ever coughed up by the human imagination.

O>)(

And thus begins the unraveling of the entire Triconsys. As the business-financial-industrial complex struggles to save itself, its intimate relationship with the political-governmental-legal system is being revealed, and what is becoming abundantly clear is that the one cannot exist without the other. Therefore, the collapse of the financial system must necessarily result in the disintegration of the political system.

Disputes over the relative merits of various political and economic systems form a long and contentious narrative. For most of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the human race was standing before an ideological crossroads where the choices were defined by two global superpowers with opposing views on how society should be organized.

To hear them tell it, each side was pursuing the righteous and benevolent goal of liberating humanity from enslavement by its evil opponent. This may be a complicated world, and the economic and political issues may be complex, but in the struggle for ideological domination the battle lines were clearly and simply drawn. It was the East versus the West, with the world neatly divided down the middle. It was the United States and its allies versus the Soviet Union and its satellites. Or to use the one-word labels each side chose for itself, it was “democracy” versus “communism.”

While each side claimed to represent a superior social system and openly attempted to convert the rest of the world to its way of thinking and its way of doing things, this was much more than an intellectual dispute among academic sociologists and political theorists. Rather, it was a struggle that featured the ruthless exercise of raw military and financial power by a succession of brutally ambitious world leaders and their minions, with each side attempting to define the contest in ideological terms as a way of justifying the pain and suffering being inflicted upon the rest of us. We were asked to endure the consequences, whether at the battlefield or on the home front, because it was all for a noble cause. The West was liberating humanity from the godless tyranny of the Soviet Union; the East was liberating humanity from the financial exploitation of capitalist America.

In conducting this deadly serious struggle for world domination, each side backed up its ideological arguments with threats to unleash upon the other vast arsenals of nuclear weaponry capable of destroying all life on earth. There was, in fact, a moment in October 1962, during the Cuban missile crisis, when those battling behemoths pushed the human race right up to the brink of annihilation. Although in the end we did get through it without being blown to smithereens, as many at the time feared, the subsequent release of documents, coupled with the reminiscences of some of the participants, confirms that it could just as easily have gone the other way.

That the lives of more than three billion people were put in jeopardy by two men playing a game of "nuclear chicken" should have been a clanging wake-up call to the world, a fire alarm in the night, declaring that something was terribly wrong with the way human society had evolved and that something had to be done about a situation that could only be described as insanely out of control.

However, nothing was done, either then or since, and we continue to face a serious threat from a frightening number of less-than-secure nuclear weapons in areas of social upheaval. The world remains a very scary and dangerous place.

The fact that we escaped the missile crisis without a nuclear war does not mean that that great ideological debate was without its dire consequences. Millions of people are dead today, just as dead as if they had been incinerated in a nuclear holocaust, as a direct result of that dispute. And billions of people have suffered and continue to suffer in their daily lives because of that great ideological disagreement. There is no one now living on this planet whose life has not been adversely affected in some significant way. The economic consequences of a costly arms race, the environmental degradation caused by nuclear testing and the development of chemical and biological weapons, the horrific proxy wars between and within impoverished nations fought with sophisticated weaponry supplied to their surrogates by the superpowers, the propaganda wars, the lies and deceit, the economic exploitation, these have all had their profound effect on people's everyday lives, from the largest metropolitan areas to the smallest third-world villages, not only in terms of the evil that has been done by this treacherous misuse of human and natural resources, but, sadly, by all the good that could have been done, but was not.

We had, therefore, the peculiar spectacle of two ideologies competing for the world's support and loyalty by each claiming to be more benevolent than the other, while at the same time using their capacity for malevolence as their most persuasive argument. Meanwhile, neither side could demonstrate that life was wonderful and trouble-free in that part of the world where they and their ideologies held sway, which would have been much more to the point. However, as long as they were locked in their life-and-death struggle with one another, fought militarily and financially rather than intellectually, with bullets and bombs rather than ideas, each could blame the distractions of the other's attacks for their failure to make life better for their own citizens.

But then, with the collapse and dismemberment of the Soviet Union, and its symbolic representation by the demolition of the Berlin wall, the overwhelming majority of

the world's population, standing before that great 20<sup>th</sup> century crossroads, made its choice and stampeded down the road marked democracy. In the great ideological superpower face-off, communism versus democracy, it was democracy that was finally declared victorious.

Or was it? Because then came the tough part. Democracy could no longer blame the distractions of an aggressively competing ideology for its own shortcomings. The world now waited expectantly for the dawning of a new age, for the ideology of democracy to deliver on its promise of peace and prosperity.

But wait! Much to our astonishment and profound disappointment, instead of peace and prosperity there was widespread political and economic chaos, the promised new world order notwithstanding. The Berlin wall was pulled down with much fanfare and celebration in November 1989. But within a few short years, the bubbles had gone out of the champagne. In fact, the party was over before it began. Only a handful of particularly aggressive entrepreneurs and shamelessly lawless opportunists have had anything to celebrate as a result of the collapse of communism. For the remaining masses, life grew worse, many even yearning for a return to communism.

What went wrong?

( > ) (

The situation is best understood as a reflection of the near simultaneous failure of both ideologies. In the timetable of human history, the collapse of the one will be separated from the collapse of the other by a mere heartbeat.

Beneath the raging debate over the relative merits of these two opposing “ways of looking at things,” their superpower proponents are found to have much more in common than in contrast, and what they have in common is what doomed the East's version of communism to failure and is what now dooms the West's version of democracy to a similar



fate.

To understand what these two ideologies have in common, it is necessary to maintain the distinction between each side's economic system (which concerns the production, distribution and consumption of goods and services) and its political system (which concerns the institutions and laws by which their citizens are governed).

On the economic side, the United States has supported and continues to support capitalism, defined as “characterized by private or corporate ownership of capital goods, by investments that are determined by private decision rather than by state control, and by prices, production, and the distribution of goods that are determined mainly by competition in a free market.” The Soviet Union, on the other hand, supported an economic system called communism, defined as one “in which goods are owned in common and are available to all as needed.”

As for the political side, the United States has promoted a system called democracy, defined as “a form of government in which the supreme power is vested in the people and exercised by them or by their elected agents under a free electoral system.” The Soviet Union, on the other hand, promoted a political system which they also called communism (contributing to some confusion by giving both its economic and political systems the same name), but which is more accurately called totalitarianism, which is defined as “a centralized government in which those in control grant neither recognition nor tolerance to parties of differing opinion.”

The East-West comparison is greatly clarified, therefore, by framing the ideological debate as between totalitarian communism on the one hand and democratic capitalism on the other, that is, a totalitarian political system combined with a communistic economic system versus a democratic political system combined with a capitalistic economic system.

The economic ideology called communism and the political ideology called democracy offer very little with which

to quarrel. What could be more idealistic than an economic system wherein all citizens contribute to society as much as they are able and take from it only what they need? That's theoretical communism. And what could be more attractive than a political system in which everyone is free to play a part and have an equal voice? That's theoretical democracy. But in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, neither theoretical communism nor theoretical democracy ever existed in reality.

In both cases, those ideals have been subverted by the relentless competitive struggle for power. In the Soviet Union, that struggle was fought primarily through its totalitarian political system, the winners of which were then able to control, and subvert the ideals of, the communist economic system. And in the United States, the struggle for power takes place within its capitalist economic system, where the winners, with their contributions, bribes and payoffs, were able to control, and subvert the ideals of, the democratic political system.

Thus, the reality behind the ideological labels of communism and democracy is that, in both cases, the aim of the game is not the welfare but the control of the people. And that is what the two sides have in common, that is, they both represent political-economic systems that make it possible for the few to exercise control over the many, through the manipulation of the political side in the East and the economic side in the West. It is that tendency for the powerful to become more powerful, while the weak get weaker, that ultimately doomed totalitarian communism. And it is a similar tendency for the rich to get richer, while the poor become poorer, that now dooms democratic capitalism.

(0>)(

As the wealthiest and most powerful nation on earth, the United States presents itself as the gold standard of democratic governance, presumably government at its best, the model that other nations should strive to emulate.

However, a closer look suggests otherwise, beginning with the president, the most powerful individual on the planet, and the preposterous process by which he is chosen to lead the nation.

Those who are determined to preserve this so-called democratic process promulgate a fraudulent deception with their stirring claim that “every vote counts.” While it may be true that “every vote is counted” (well, at least, most of the time), there is no truth to the claim that “every vote counts,” particularly when tested against the pragmatist's question, “What difference does it make?” If you were one of the 69,498,952 persons who voted for Barack Obama in the 2008 presidential election, can it be said that it would have made any difference whatsoever if you had voted for someone else or had not voted at all? Would the world be different? Would your life be different? And what are we to say about the relevance of the votes cast by the 62,957,659 persons who voted for someone else?

The fact is that each individual voter's effect on the political process, when inside the voting booth, is analogous to the effect to be expected if one person were to lean against a water-filled balloon the size of Texas. Nil.

The entire national process of choosing a president consumes an enormous amount of the nation's time, energy, and attention, beginning with the state-by-state primary campaigns, and continuing on through the primary elections, the nominating conventions, the national campaign, the presidential debates, and finally the election itself, all of which is accompanied by petitions, fund-raising efforts, rallies, demonstrations, direct mail campaigns, door-to-door canvassing, polls, television and newspaper advertising, press releases, investigations, exposés, spin doctors, campaign buttons, bumper stickers, sloganeering, sound bites, position papers, stump speeches, caravans, telephone banks, computer print-outs and on and on and on, while all of which is endlessly examined and analyzed and debated by the experts, historians, journalists, and other assorted pundits, commentators and

bloviators who work the radio talk shows, fill the newspaper columns and magazine pages, and pontificate 24/7 via broadcast and cable television stations and Internet web sites all across America.

What's the candidate's position on abortion? Did he have an affair fifteen years ago? What's his relationship to the oil industry? Would he permit gays in the military? What special interests have contributed to his campaign? What did he mean by that last comment? Who's responsible for that smarmy television ad? Did he smoke pot when he was in college? What would he do if someone raped his wife? Was that a trial balloon or is that what he really believes? What does he like to read? Didn't he just contradict himself? Did he change his mind, or is he lying? He got 46 percent of the vote in New Hampshire, but only 32 percent in Pennsylvania; does that mean he's finished? What do the polls show this week? Who is the New York Times supporting? What about the religious right? Will he be tough with China? Will he stand up to the Russians? Didn't he once attend an anti-war rally? And so on, blah, blah, blah, blah.

But what does it all mean? Ignoring the question of the individual voter's lack of influence on the system, even when viewed collectively – as though 130 million people were pushing against that Texas-sized water-filled balloon, 69 million pushing one way, 61 million pushing in another direction – what is the essential accomplishment of all this work, the expenditure of so much effort on the part of so many campaign workers, the attention devoted to the proceedings by the entire nation, step by step, argument by argument, month after month after month? In the end, one person is elected, and the others are not. In 2008 nearly 69 million people voted for the person who became President; but 61 million people voted for someone else. While the 61 million must have felt disappointment that their votes didn't get their candidate elected, and would have to therefore reasonably conclude that their votes didn't count for much, the 69 million whose candidate did get elected also have very little to cheer about

because now begins another enormous expenditure of national time, attention and energy with similarly disproportionately meager and totally unpredictable results.

After the election and the votes are counted, the victorious party celebrates, while the losers lick their wounds and begin to plot revenge. A couple of months later, the winner is sworn into office with much fanfare, but before long it becomes apparent that “the most powerful person on earth” can't get anything done.

While the process of choosing the person to lead the government may be insanely costly and complex, the business of actually governing takes that insanity to a whole other level. The massive organization that is the federal government, with its administrative, legislative and judicial branches, sucks up human energy like a black hole. Millions of people labor daily on the treadmills that move the conveyor belts that turn the gears of the national government. There, in monumental structures of marble and steel, an army of workers conducts the people's business. But in the end, the head-scratching reality is that, after all the time and energy that are poured into the mouth of this gigantic piece of ravenous political machinery, very little of real value comes out the other end. And what little that does emerge is seldom what the voters had in mind.

Although someone may have been elected by making certain promises, when in office the winner may move in an entirely different and totally unexpected direction, and there's very little the confused and disappointed voter can do about it. This has been known to happen. But it's not unlike the principle of double jeopardy.

A person judged innocent in a trial cannot be tried again for the same offense, even though new evidence may indisputably establish guilt. Similarly, it appears that a person elected president cannot be forced to run again (that is, tried again before the national jury of his peers), even though he has abandoned some, or most, of the promises that won the vote in the first place. Question: Can it be said that a vote counted when it was cast on the basis of a promise later broken?

But beyond that very real possibility of a major disappointment in the attitude and performance of the elected official, there is that black hole to be dealt with. Once elected, the candidate soon learns that, even with the best of intentions, it takes an enormous amount of effort to get something done. The candidate for office may promise a universal health care system, but when in office he discovers the problem to be considerably more difficult than first imagined, the primary reason being the intricately interwoven and mutually supportive relationship between government and the business-financial-industrial complex. It may be the voters, or most of them, who put the president in office, but it is the business-financial-industrial complex that determines what he can and cannot do.

In theory, democratically elected governments exist to carry out the will of the people and do for them what they are unable to do for themselves. In practice, governments bow to the desires of the powerful winners of a different contest, the economic competition.

Since this is the case, it is naïve to expect that governments will be guided by the interests of their citizens. In the case of health care, for example, while the needs of the people are well known, hundreds of special-interest groups will try to make their influence felt so that any possible changes in the existing system will not adversely affect their financial interests. Whether the subject is health care or any other issue of significance, attempts to create responsive legislation are subject to an unrelenting cacophony of protesting voices from the 3,000-plus lobbyists that roam the halls of Congress to protect and advance their clients' interests.

During hearings held by committee after committee in both Houses of Congress, Democrats and Republicans engage in fierce debate over the legislative details, each side offering amendments, and amendments to amendments, reflecting their diverse political philosophies and the interests of their campaign contributors. Eventually, some scrambled version of the legislation is passed in each chamber, and finally, after

many more months, if not years, of negotiating and maneuvering, during the final stages of which the Senate and the House of Representatives merge their two versions, the completed legislation is presented to the President for his signature, including an elaborate Rose Garden ceremony with television cameras rolling and pens being passed out to each of the players in this elaborate game following each presidential pen stroke in applying his authorizing signature. Even when the process has gone that far, despite the applause, smiles, and self-congratulatory handshakes, it still amounts to but one step in a very long journey before the citizen, who way back during the presidential election campaign was attracted to the candidate's pledge to create a universal health care system, receives any direct, personal benefit from the legislation.

Why? Because now begins the next complex and convoluted process: regulation and implementation. Passing legislation is often like creating a new industry. It can't be done overnight. So while the sick wait patiently in the national waiting room for their turn to see the doctor, the Washington bureaucrats, who are only doing the job for which they were trained, are busy drawing up the complex set of regulations that are going to govern every detail of the legislation's implementation, designing the bureaucracy that will operate the new system, creating the multitude of forms that the various participants will have to fill out and submit, establishing how many days from this procedure to that, specifying how many copies of each form must be completed and to which agencies the copies should be sent, outlining what those agencies are supposed to do with those copies when they receive them and within what time-frame, and so on and so forth, down to the least significant detail.

Meanwhile, a staff must be assembled and trained, budgets allocated, office space arranged, telephone lines installed, operations manuals written, and finally, several years hence, after the patient waited and waited and waited, the government may partially reimburse the cost of certain blood tests, provided the doctor fills out Form 1234 and the patient

submits Form XYZ within X-number of days from the submission of Form 789, and provided all forms are properly signed and dated wherever indicated with an X, then notarized, and finally approved by the appropriate agency. Otherwise, forget about it.

So it goes with most government programs and most government bureaucracies. This is not to say that the federal government does no good whatsoever. Something positive is bound to emerge occasionally. Many, perhaps even most, government workers try to do good. However, the important consideration is whether the relatively little good that is done is worth the time and effort it takes to accomplish it. The size of the federal bureaucracy, like the size of the federal budget, is beyond the comprehension of most people. What is not beyond their comprehension is how little they get in return for the taxes they pay. Every dollar a taxpayer turns over to the government represents the loss of a dollar's worth of purchasing power. A dollar can help put food on the table, a hundred dollars can help pay the mortgage, a thousand dollars can be the down payment on a new car. It's enough to make a taxpayer weep – or try to foment a revolution – when the federal government, because of its inefficient multi-layered tangle of complex systems and procedures, extracts in the form of taxes such an outrageously high price for the wholly inadequate services it delivers.

Consider the following: Of the three branches of the United States government, it is the executive branch, or the administration, that is generally responsible for running the massive federal bureaucracy, although the legislative and judicial branches have substantial bureaucracies of their own. The bureaucracy of the executive branch is, in turn, divided into fifteen cabinet-level departments: Agriculture, Commerce, Defense, Education, Energy, Health and Human Services, Homeland Security, Housing and Urban Development, Interior, Justice, Labor, State, Transportation, Treasury, and Veterans Affairs.

Whenever a person lists the essentials of life, they



usually begin with the big three: food, clothing and shelter. The federal government does not have a Department of Clothing, but it does have a Department of Housing and Urban Development, as well as a Department of Agriculture, which is the science of producing food, the first of the big three necessities of life.

Working with a budget of \$124 billion and a staff of 92,000, the Agriculture Department has organized itself into an operating complex that consists of 32 offices and agencies, as follows, according to the latest *United States Government Manual*:

- Agricultural Marketing Service
- Agricultural Research Service
- Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service
- Office of Chief Financial Officer
- Commodity Credit Corporation
- Cooperative State Research, Education and Extension Service
- Economic Research Service
- Office of Energy
- Office of Environmental Quality
- Farm Service Agency
- Federal Acquisition Regulation
- Federal Crop Insurance Corporation
- Food and Nutrition Service
- Food Safety and Inspection Service
- Foreign Agriculture Service
- Forest Service
- Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration
- Office of Information Resources Management
- Office of Inspector General
- National Agricultural Library
- National Agricultural Statistics Service
- National Resource Conservation Service
- Office of Operations
- Procurement and Property Management

Rural Business Cooperative Service  
Rural Development Administration  
Rural Housing Service  
Rural Telephone Bank  
Office of Secretary of Agriculture  
Soil Conservation Service  
Office of Transportation  
World Agriculture Outlook Board

How is it that, despite all that bureaucracy and the billions upon billions of dollars that pay for it, and despite the fact that, as a result of the technology explosion, only three per cent of the workforce is capable of producing the country's food supply as compared to the 25 per cent required just 60 years ago, how is it that nevertheless in the United States there are still millions of people who are malnourished? Is it not reasonable to inquire whether somehow, during the creation of this thicket of bureaucratic agencies, there has been a loss of perspective? Or is it too much to expect that the first order of business for a government department called the Department of Agriculture would be to see that everyone has enough to eat? It would appear from the list of agencies that make up the Department of Agriculture that the federal government knows everything there is to know about food *except* how to get it into the mouths of the hungry. Surely hunger, aside from the horrific pain caused by war, is the most profound source of human suffering that is also the most easily assuaged. What conclusion are we to come to other than that the reason our political and economic leaders do not solve this problem is, not that they are unable, but that they are unwilling?

Similarly, with an equally impressive budget and bureaucracy at the Department of Housing and Urban Development, how is it that when night falls the streets and doorways of America's urban centers are crowded with those unfortunate citizens who have no better place to lay their heads? And how is it that there is so much work that needs to be done – housing, schools, highways, bridges, hospitals – and

so many people who want to work but can't find jobs, how is it that the Department of Labor, with its army of theoreticians and statisticians, can't figure out how to marry these two problems?

Perhaps these questions are a bit too simplistic. In fact, they *are* too simplistic to be dealt with by a concept of government that has grown so complex that plain language and simple solutions are out of the question.

According to *The Statistical Abstract of the United States*, in 2007, in addition to the massive federal government and 50 state governments, there were 3,033 county governments, 19,492 municipal governments, 16,519 township and town governments, 13,051 school districts, and 37,281 special districts of various kinds, such as park districts, economic development districts, water districts, etc., for a total of 89,527 governmental entities, each with its overlapping circle of conflicting influence and authority.

That's just the United States. There are more than 200 national governments around the world, no two alike, each with its own method of choosing its leaders, its own bureaucracy, its own rules and regulations, its own money, and its own agenda and national interests. Although the world has largely abandoned totalitarian communism and chosen the way of democratic capitalism, it is far from united under this now dominant political-economic umbrella.

0>)(

Meanwhile, the effort to bring order to this diverse planet at a time when humanity is undergoing a turbulent period of accelerating change and explosive growth in population, technology, and communication is an effort that has failed big-time. The systemic absurdities rising out of the tangled mess that is the world's legal system are multitudinous. With over 200 "sovereign" nations in the world, each with its unique set of traditions, values and interests, the sheer volume of laws,

treaties and agreements is overwhelmingly ineffective.

An alphabet soup of acronyms testifies to humanity's never-ending and mostly futile efforts to bring disparate elements together in pursuit of a common purpose: UN, NATO, IMF, WTO, SEATO, UNESCO, AFL-CIO, IATA, OAS, NAFTA, and so on and on and on.

The largest and most comprehensive of such efforts is represented by the United Nations Organization and its 192 member states. Article 1 of the United Nations Charter states the following:

*The purposes of the United Nations are:*

*To maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace;*

*To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace;*

*To achieve international co-operation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character, and in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion; and*

*To be a centre for harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of these common ends.*

Article 102 of the United Nations Charter states:

*Every treaty and every international agreement entered into by any member of the United Nations after the present Charter comes into force shall as soon as possible be registered with the Secretariat and published by it.*

During its first 60 years of existence, from December 1946 to December 2006, the United Nations Secretariat published more than 2,200 volumes containing more than 158,000 multilateral and bilateral treaties. The most superficial survey of the world's political, economic and social conditions makes it clear that, despite all those treaties and agreements, the United Nations Organization has failed to achieve its declared purposes and that its 192 member nations are far from united.

Similarly, the founding document of the United States of America, the Constitution, declares in its Preamble:

*We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.*

Two hundred-plus years later, with a codification of federal laws filling 50 volumes, and another 50 volumes consisting of federal regulations, it is abundantly clear that the country's 50 states are not united, and that the people have still not formed a perfect union.

The United States has developed law-making, law-explaining, and law-arguing into a major industry. While Congress makes laws that apply to the entire nation, the states have their own smaller spheres of codification, as do the counties, towns, and villages in descending order, with never-ending debates about where to place the boundaries.

Once a law is enacted, bureaucrats begin to write detailed regulations to implement the law, staff is hired to handle the paperwork, inspectors and investigators are assigned to oversee its enforcement. Lawyers will study the regulations, attend seminars to learn their interpretation, become specialists in explaining their meaning, and in exchange for lavish fees, will guide those who want to abide by the law, or who are looking for loopholes in the law, or who have already broken

the law. Since every law eventually produces its share of lawbreakers, the judicial system will be called upon to try the accused and punish the guilty.

In the United States there are over 800,000 practicing lawyers, backed and supported by an army of assistants, pondering the existing laws and regulations, searching through vast computer-linked libraries for previous judicial decisions, composing long and windy arguments in behalf of clients who have transgressed rules they didn't know existed, or didn't understand, or didn't take seriously, or thought they could ignore with impunity, or who are perhaps either suing someone or being sued by someone in a dispute over a commercial transaction gone wrong.

All this is in addition to the inspectors, certifiers, notarizers, clerks, auditors, wiretappers, undercover agents, detectives, police, jailers, stenographers, bailiffs, court reporters, prosecutors, criminologists, justices of the peace, and judges administering family courts, civil courts, juvenile courts, criminal courts, appellate courts, small claims courts, courts, courts, courts. Meanwhile, the courts are clogged, the prisons are overflowing, and there is lawlessness on every level, including among the law-makers, law-explainers, law-arguers, and law-enforcers themselves.

O>)(

And where is religion in all this? Although most religions claim to be in touch with the world's maker and to be guided by holy principles, it is no secret of history that some of humankind's most horrendous crimes have been perpetrated (and continue to be perpetrated) at the urging of one religion or another and in the name of some almighty god. If the world's organized religions are a reflection of the gods they worship, then those gods are as unworthy of our worship as those religions are of our adherence. How else are we to judge the brutality of the Christian crusaders and Islamist jihadists?

Most religious leaders are not unlike political leaders whose main concerns appear to be maintaining control over the people within their spheres of influence. Obviously the welfare of the people is not uppermost. Otherwise how is it that, in those countries, or in whole regions of the world, where the population consists almost entirely of the adherents of a single religion, those religions have not produced a society that stands out as a bright and shining example to the world of the influence of the lofty principles upon which that dominant religious organization is supposedly based? (We might ask much the same question about capitalism. If capitalism is now the one true economic religion, handed down from on high, having outlasted infidel communism, and if capitalism is so great, why are there hungry and homeless people in the United States, the planet's most successful capitalist country?)

The contradiction between the prevailing social chaos and the universally proclaimed belief that we must all "love one another" exposes the titanic struggle being waged today between the good and evil sides of human nature. There are millions of people in tens of thousands of organizations around the world doing the best they can with what limited resources they possess to make this a better world. Meanwhile, however, the world's political and religious leaders acquiesce in a social and economic system that produces misery without limit, so that all the religious teachings about love, the political pledges of equality, and the economic promises of abundance are but empty platitudes.

As painful as the process may be for those who have strong convictions about a particular set of religious beliefs, in the final analysis rationality demands that we address the basis upon which organized religions claim the authority to speak in the name of God. Perhaps there is some logical basis for believing that the existence of a universe proves there is a universe-maker. However, by the same line of reasoning, as articulated by Bertrand Russell, one must also then conclude that the existence of a universe-maker proves that there must be a universe-maker maker, and so on, *ad infinitum*.

Even if one accepts the existence of God, we must next inquire into how it is possible to know what God thinks or demands of us, and whom it is who has the authority to speak on God's behalf. Additionally, one must ask, Which God? If one accepts the Bible, for example, as the Word of God, the next question is, which translation? And which interpretation of which translation? The Bible may be one book, but it has given rise to many religions and sects, each claiming to be the one true church. Or if one believes that the Koran is the revelation of God's will, which version, which interpretation, which sect? Which of the many variations of Islam are we to believe is the true version? Is it the one that promotes jihad? The one that enslaves women? The one that condemns music and dancing, practices sharia law, stones infidels? If there is a god, an almighty all-knowing god, how is it that he, or she, or it, is incapable of revealing what is required of us?

Religious leaders of all stripes have deluded themselves into believing that they speak for God and that they are authorized to tell us what to believe and how to live. In the name of God they attempt to control our diet, our sexuality, our dress, our language, our art, our sources of pleasure. But as with the political and business leaders, they are losing their control. Like all the others who presume to lead the rest of us, they have failed miserably. Their traditions and rituals, their holy books and sacred holidays, their strange superstitions and esoteric doctrines are revealed to be cynical instruments of control that cannot and will not prevail.

(0>)(

As the human species has evolved physically, so has it evolved socially. What has become distressingly clear is that the physical survival of the human species is now under threat because of the direction of its social evolution. The totality of the global social order, herein labeled the Triconsys, is now traveling down an evolutionary path that is driving us dangerously close to the point of no return.



The catalog of horrors is daunting: global warming; the depletion of natural resources; the contamination of air, water, soil, and food; war, starvation, and poverty; and an accelerating descent into a maelstrom of social chaos.

How we respond to this situation will determine whether we are fit to survive as a species. There are those who refuse to believe that the threat is real and are therefore reluctant to participate in a change of direction. However, such an indifferent attitude is necessarily limited to those who are either uninformed or do not feel personally threatened.

But whether ignored or derided, the threat is real. And we will rise to the challenge. Because we must. And because we can. As the Triconsys continues to unravel, the adaptive capacity of human intelligence and ingenuity will begin, bit by bit, byte by byte, brick by brick, and idea by idea, to construct a new social order, a process that is already well under way.

Say hello to the Coalescence.



## **PART II**

“The greatest challenge to any thinker is stating the problem in a way that will allow a solution.”

--Bertrand Russell

“Now there is one outstandingly important fact regarding Spaceship Earth, and that is that no instruction booklet came with it.”

--R. Buckminster Fuller

“Imagine there’s no countries, it isn’t hard to do; nothing to kill or die for, and no religion too. Imagine all the people living life in peace.”

--John Lennon

“Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can change the world. Indeed, it is the only thing that ever has.”

--Margaret Mead

# THE ADVENT OF THE COALESCENCE

Ready or not, this is it. With the advent of the Coalescence we have arrived at that moment in the evolutionary history of this planet when the human race finally crosses the threshold toward which it has been striving ever since the first stirrings of human intelligence countless millennia ago.

That threshold marks the point at which the entire global population – following a *Eureka!* moment of rational enlightenment and moral clarity – abandons, *en masse*, the present fragmented world of misery and strife (brought to you by the Triconsys) and crosses over into a united new world of peace and harmony (as a consequence of the Coalescence). The speed with which the Triconsys is disintegrating and the Coalescence is spreading strongly suggests that this great transformation – this planet’s third extraordinary evolutionary event – this global Coalescence – will take place within the lifetime of the majority of people living today.

0>)(

The essence of the Coalescence is connectivity, and its development is being driven primarily by the explosive growth in communication as dramatically manifested by the ability of individuals around the world to communicate with one another in real time; to network with others in the pursuit of common interests; and to access, as well as contribute to, the vast and continuously expanding holographic storehouse of humankind’s accumulated knowledge and understanding by

way of the worldwide web of electronic connections known as the Internet.

Advances in communication technologies are crashing over us in daily tsunamis of invention, innovation, and expansion. It is futile to trot out an array of statistics to try to capture the size and speed of this ongoing revolution because yesterday's numbers are out-of-date today, and today's numbers will be meaningless tomorrow. It is clear, however, that something extraordinary is happening here and that, whatever it is, every new connection, every new cell phone, computer, web site, or network advances the process.

It is worth noting that the speed of growth in communication far exceeds that for any other of life's essentials. We have still not succeeded in getting food to the mouths of all those who are hungry, but soon everyone worldwide will have, or at least know someone who has, high-speed access to the Internet. According to the International Telecommunications Union, the number of phone subscribers in Africa is approaching 30 percent of the population, while, according to the World Health Organization, only 10 percent have access to "flush toilets connected to a sewer," and none of the sewage – zero percent – is treated. While this may present itself as a case of misguided priorities (driven by the world's profit-hungry telecoms, no doubt), it is with some irony that universal access to the Internet (now at 35% worldwide) will, in the end, prove to be the key to providing universal access to food and to all of life's essentials. Including toilets.

( )>(

The accelerating advancement of the Coalescence is being facilitated by two communications-driven functions: education and organization.

Presently, the overwhelming majority of the earth's population is too consumed with their everyday struggles to give much thought to the political and economic forces that are

the primary determinants of the quality of their daily existence. It is not surprising, therefore, that they are, by and large, grossly and tragically uninformed and misinformed. Most of what is widely and publicly communicated — such as advertising campaigns, political discourse, financial advice, and religious doctrine — is deliberately manipulative and misleading. This is apart from all the treachery that goes on in the shadows and behind closed doors that never sees the light of day but exacts a hidden price from society somewhere down the line.

However, out of the jangle of conflicting opinions and theories, facts and fancies, lies and deceptions, it is inevitable that truth will emerge. The truth cannot be forever suppressed, and in this age of the democratization of communication, the light is growing brighter and brighter. In the end, everything will be revealed.

What are some of the truths that will emerge? Here are a few: War is folly. Competition is wasteful. Hatred is poisonous. Lies are destructive. Ignorance is dangerous. And our leaders are unworthy.

Here are some others: Peace is possible. Cooperation is constructive. Love is uplifting. Truth is irresistible. Knowledge is powerful. And self-reliance is liberating.

While all such “truths” may well be characterized as empty platitudes lacking any meaningful social significance or consequence, it is so only because global society, as now organized, has served to poison the human ethos. We are prisoners in a suffocating, destructive social matrix that prevents the flowering of all that is good and decent in human nature.

But it is communication that will prove to be the source of our liberation. It is through communication that we will come to understand how we have been deceived, how our leaders have failed us, how we have been made to suffer needlessly, how we have been played for fools. It is through communication that we will come to see how we have been denied the benefits of human ingenuity, how we have been

thwarted in our desire to live in peace, how we have been prevented from enjoying the simple pleasures of secure and bountiful lives with family, friends and neighbors. It is through communication that we will finally learn the truth that will set us free.

Call it the education of the human race.

O>)(

The other communications-driven function facilitating the advent of the Coalescence is organization. Until now, the Triconsys has kept the world's communication system within its embrace and utilized it successfully to dictate the way in which society is organized, with the primary objective of self-aggrandizement and self-preservation.

A totalitarian regime is able to maintain control only as long as the population is divided and fragmented. If its subjects become united in their opposition, a revolt against authority becomes a possibility, which is why the highest priority for a modern-day dictatorship is to maintain control of the media, while the first thing revolutionaries attempt to do is take over the local radio and television stations so they can communicate their message and coordinate with their followers.

However, since the flowering of the Internet, the game has changed considerably. While much of the impetus for the Internet's development was driven originally by the military and later by business interests who saw it as an organizational and marketing tool, an unintended consequence of making it available to the masses is that it grants to individuals the unprecedented ability to organize themselves. The dilemma for the authorities is that the roots and branches of the Internet have become so intertwined into every aspect of the social infrastructure that, unlike a newspaper or television station, it is now impossible to limit the Internet's empowerment of the masses without at the same time diminishing the communication system they themselves can no longer live without.



The use of the Internet as an organizing tool played a major, if not crucial, role in the election of Barack Obama to the most powerful office on the planet. Shortly thereafter, mobile phones were used to organize opposition movements in Moldova, with only four million inhabitants, as well as in Iran, with a population of 70 million. And then the Arab Spring burst upon the global scene, followed by the sudden emergence of the Occupy movement that quickly spread around the globe, made possible by the Internet's social networking capabilities and documented by the abundance of video-capable smartphones. This is a development that will only accelerate. While the planet's nervous system pulsates with waves of information, including reports on wars, scientific discoveries, political conflicts, economic dislocations, and environmental disasters, its organizing capacity (with 5 billion mobile phones and 2 billion internet connections) sits quietly on standby, waiting to spring into action, to spread the word, and to coordinate a unified response upon the inevitable arrival of that long-awaited "idea whose time has come."

O>)(

When the first television broadcasts began in the United States in 1939, there were only 2000 sets in existence capable of receiving the programs. By 1961, just 22 years later, 90 percent of American homes were equipped with television sets. That was also the year Newton Minow, Chairman of the United States Federal Communications Commission, famously characterized television programming as a "vast wasteland."

It is a mistake, however, to judge a tool by the use to which it is first employed. In the case of television, while Chairman Minow was sidetracked by the magical new medium's programming deficiencies, a Canadian professor, Herbert Marshall McLuhan, saw something more. That same year, McLuhan asserted in *The Guttenberg Galaxy* that the medium itself, rather than its early content, was considerably more significant in that it changed the perception of our planet.

He was right, of course. The immediacy and vividness of the images of events taking place around the world – wars, celebrations, natural disasters, sporting events, political turmoil – had the effect of shrinking the distances that separate us while increasing our familiarity with one another, as though we were all now living in what McLuhan called a “global village.” McLuhan encapsulated his insight regarding television with his other well-known coinage: “The medium is the message.”

We are confronted by a similar situation today. While we are in the early stages of a miraculous new medium, the Internet, combined with another technical marvel, the mobile phone, it is easy to miss the real significance of these wonders because of the endless twittering and texting, the distracted drivers and pedestrians with phones pressed against their ears, the acrobatic cats and dancing tots on YouTube. However, the McLuhan principle applies today just as it did during the early days of television. And this time the message of the newest media is that the distances between us have shrunk even further, while our familiarity with one another has also greatly increased, so much so that McLuhan’s “global village” has become what can now be better characterized as a “global family.”

Casting the human race as an extended global family is a useful metaphor in that it suggests an ideal of loving intimacy, warm companionship, mutual support, and routine cooperation. It is more than a metaphor, however. The human race *is* a family, an extended global family, although highly dysfunctional and far from ideal. But after a history of unrelenting and bloody familial mayhem that continues into the 21<sup>st</sup> century, it is the new media that are finally putting us on the road to reconciliation through a persistent and irresistible process of fact-finding, truth-telling, group therapy, consensus-building, and rational planning. It is only now, with the advances in communication, that such a process can take place on a global scale.

0>)(

As the collapse of the Triconsys continues, and as it becomes more and more obvious that it cannot be saved, the world's attention will turn increasingly toward the search for alternatives. While the search may take many forms and explore many paths, one of the most promising approaches is to attack the problem as a design and engineering challenge.

Perhaps the greatest single design and engineering achievement thus far by a group of people working together for a common purpose has been sending humans to the moon and returning them safely to earth. The mind boggles at the complexity of that effort.

But that was more than forty years ago. The scientific and technological advances since then continue to lift human capabilities to higher and higher levels, and there is now talk of sending humans to Mars, a distance of 150 million miles, more than 500 times the distance to the Moon.

As appealing as that challenge might be to those working on space programs, now is not the time to be devoting valuable resources to sending someone off into space. We are in crisis mode here on Earth, faced with the greatest challenge of all: survival in the face of growing threats from multiple sources. Now is the time to apply all of our intelligence, ingenuity and organizational expertise to finding a sustainable and peaceful way to occupy this planet so that every individual is assured access to all of life's essentials.

In 1969, R. Buckminster "Bucky" Fuller, the brilliant futurist whose many designs included the geodesic dome and who understood early on that we are all fellow passengers and crew members alike aboard Spaceship Earth, introduced the concept of The World Game, the objective of which was to demonstrate "how to make the world work."

Fuller's idea was to take an inventory of the world's human and natural resources and all of humankind's needs, feed the data into a giant computer, and then invite teams of experts to manipulate the data in a collective effort to find a way to organize society that would result in the success of all

humanity.

Anticipating that such a way could be found, Fuller proposed that a giant globe be constructed and equipped with a myriad of lights that could be used to report and illustrate the progress being made toward “making the world work.” He called that globe the Geoscope, and a couple of small prototypes were actually constructed. Fuller further imagined that news of this progress would circle the globe via radio and television, capture the attention and the imagination of the world's population, and ultimately result in the near-spontaneous transformation of global society as the vision of a superior way emerged.

Fuller's approach represented a combination of education and organization. He reasoned that if the public were presented (educated) with a convincing model of a more successful social structure (organization), they would adopt it. Although his World Game never got off the ground as he envisioned it, Fuller's proposal, while premature, suggested a rational strategy for the development of a successful way forward.

In a sense, the first stage of his proposal has been accomplished. Detailed inventories of the planet's human and natural resources as well as all of humanity's needs now exist, not in a single giant computer, as Fuller imagined, but in a giant network of computers. Linked together by the web-like connectivity of the Internet, the electronic files of government agencies, trade associations, international corporations, United Nations departments, colleges, universities, charities, philanthropies, and non-governmental organizations contain mountains of data relevant to the search for a way to “make the world work,” a search becoming increasingly urgent as the present system of things continues to disintegrate.

( )>(

With a tip of the hat to “Bucky” Fuller, the stage is now set for a 21<sup>st</sup> century version of his World Game. Called the Whole

Earth Design Project, it is being developed and sponsored by the Website [www.thecoalescence.net](http://www.thecoalescence.net). And you, dear reader, are invited to participate in its development and promotion

Since Fuller advanced the idea in the Sixties, two important developments have made such a project considerably more feasible: the exponential growth in the power of computers and the explosive growth in communication.

Since Fuller, computers have become far more capable of storing the massive amounts of data required to represent a complete inventory of the planet's human and natural resources, as well as the needs of the planet's population, and then designing the most efficient way of matching the two.

Also since Fuller, communication technologies have developed far beyond radio and television broadcasting that he envisioned as the way to inform the public of the Game's progress. Today the Internet offers the potential for massive two-way involvement, by observers and participants alike, rather than just teams of experts as Fuller originally proposed. Also, Geographic Information System (GIS) and other graphics software can communicate the project's progress to the public via the Internet much more effectively than Fuller's Geoscope.

And finally, the Internet, with its worldwide network of networks, is capable of facilitating the eventual universal adoption of the design that succeeds in meeting the agreed objective.

Meanwhile, with all this extraordinary development in computers and communications, a few fortunes have been made. Of course, that's to be expected. It's the capitalist way. However, for the celebrating participants in this dazzling electronic world, this coupling of invention and reward is a double-edged sword. On the one hand, the prospect of huge financial rewards is often the inspiration for the ongoing search for the next big thing. But on the other hand, those same outsized rewards contribute to the process of wealth concentration that lies at the heart of capitalism's destructive contradiction. Furthermore, in a bit of irony, the inventions themselves are contributing to the ultimate success of the anti-

capitalist Coalescence.

Many of capitalism's wealthy innovators eventually come to appreciate that much of their good fortune is the result of circumstances for which they cannot claim credit but for which they feel a sense of gratitude and therefore decide they want to "give something back." Present-day examples are Bill Gates and Warren Buffett, two of the three wealthiest men on the planet who have admirably committed major portions of their fortunes to a joint philanthropic effort to address some of humankind's most intractable health and environmental problems. Further to their credit, they have persuaded a few dozen of their fellow billionaires to join them.

However, while such efforts are commendable, they do not address the root cause of those problems, for if they did, they would be attacking the system that made it possible for them to accumulate their fortunes in the first place. And so it is with most philanthropists. Going forward, however, it is reasonable to expect that there will come a day, likely sooner than later, when one or more individuals from among the many fortunate ones will decide that a far greater ambition would be to try to find a cure for the deadly cancer itself rather than seek to mitigate some of its more horrific symptoms. In which case, there would be no better place to begin than by assisting in the development and promotion of the Whole Earth Design Project.

O>)(

For those who may, at this point, feel a twinge of excitement at the prospect of engaging in a project with such an ambitious objective, what follows is an exploration of certain aspects of the venture designed to draw you in, incite your imagination, and encourage your involvement.

In setting about to re-design society, there are two possible starting points. One begins with the assumption that most humans are naturally lazy, greedy, lying, deceiving,

thieving lowlifes who must be guarded against and kept under control lest they tear the house down. It also assumes that the human population is and will forever be engaged in one vast competitive free-for-all that also requires a control system to prevent chaos. Those negative assumptions are the starting point on which the present system is designed. It's a mess and a spectacular failure.

Now try to imagine a social system designed from the opposite starting point, from the positive assumption that most humans are kind, thoughtful, caring, hard-working, honest, upright citizens. Such is the appropriate starting point for the Whole Earth Design Project.

The contrast between these two approaches reflects a long-running debate regarding human nature. There are those who believe humans are greedy and selfish by nature, that it's in our DNA, as if cursed at birth (because of Adam's original sin of eating fruit from the tree of knowledge of good and evil?). For these people, there is little or no hope for change: This is how it has always been, and this is how it will always be.

There are others who believe we become what we become primarily in response to how we are nurtured, or taught, by the society into which we are born. And because society is presently organized on the assumption that people are essentially greedy and selfish, that is what people tend to become although pure and innocent at birth. The needed fix, therefore, is not to try to repair the existing system, whose most significant accomplishment is driving everyone crazy with grief and anxiety, but to replace it altogether with a system that assumes the best in people, rather than the worst.

Building a model of a society based on that positive assumption would quickly reveal that, for the first time in human history, it is now possible to transform the planet from one of scarcity into one of plenty, thereby eliminating the necessity of competing for limited resources. Collectively, we now possess a depth of knowledge and understanding of this planet's physical, chemical, biological, and electromagnetic

forces, as well as a more-than-adequate supply of human and natural resources, that make it possible to easily provide every individual on the planet with all of life's ten essentials, including clean and safe air, water, food, clothing, and shelter, as well as access to communication, information, transportation, health care, and energy.

Consequently, there is no longer any physical limitation standing in the way of our doing just that. What does stand in the way is the Triconsys, with its rigged financial system and suffocating blanket of systems and procedures meant to maintain order and see to it that we all stay in our assigned places in this giant capitalist money-concentrating machinery.

Given that the Triconsys has nothing to teach us other than what to avoid and what not to do, in developing an alternative the Whole Earth Design Project begins by rejecting the two most costly, inefficient and destructive instruments of control in the Triconsys toolbox: violence and money. In this way, the design begins from the ground up, so to speak, by first determining what needs to be done and the available human and natural resources we have with which to do it, and then devising the most efficient, effective and sustainable way to get it done.

( )> (

Violence, once employed, most often only begets more violence. Whatever violent message Osama Bin Laden and Al Qaeda intended to send to the West on 9/11, it triggered a response several magnitudes more violent in return. In retaliating for 3,000 deaths, the United States and a "coalition of the willing" embarked upon wars in Afghanistan and Iraq that, after ten years, have resulted thus far in more than 100,000 documented civilian deaths and the slaying of untold tens of thousands of enemy combatants. It is troubling to know that all that "shock and awe" destruction was inflicted upon people, civilian and military alike, who had nothing whatever to do with 9/11, while those who did, Bin Laden and his



elusive little band of jihadists, roamed for years in the mountains along the Afghan-Pakistani border. While the response of the United States to 9/11 finally succeeded in taking the life of the mastermind behind that awful event, it left behind a swath of death and destruction that only underscores the futility of using violence as a means of resolving conflicts.

The number of United States military fatalities during this retaliatory adventure has surpassed 6,000 – twice the number of 9/11 deaths those heroic troops were sent to avenge – not to mention the physical and emotional trauma inflicted upon those fortunate enough to survive the horror of battle. In addition to the fatalities, more than 47,000 veterans have been wounded in battle, and among those emotionally scarred there are now an average of 18 suicides daily for a total of 6,500 annually.

In addition to the cost in blood, the United States treasure committed thus far has reached \$1.3 trillion. Of this amount, the Congressional Research Service assigns \$802 billion to the Iraq conflict (an amount equal to seven years of Iraqi gross domestic product) and \$455 billion to Afghanistan (equal to 17 years of Afghan gross domestic product).

The scale of destruction that has already taken place and the lack of any expectation that things will get better in the foreseeable future surely establish that a violent response of that magnitude was disproportionate and a tragic mistake, and that there had to have been a better way.

In addition to the human suffering, war consumes enormous amounts of precious resources in the research, design, and manufacture of weaponry, which is then used to destroy stuff: homes, schools, libraries, hospitals, roads, and bridges, all of which must then be rebuilt. Annual military budgets around the world total \$1.4 trillion, 48 percent of which (or \$662 billion) is accounted for by the United States, with only 5 percent of the world population. It is distressing to think that the country that was once a beacon to the world is now the planet's leader in its ability and willingness to use violence as a tactic in the pursuit of national interests.

It is shameful that political and religious leaders, sitting comfortably in the safety of their fortresses, are willing to send their young men and women into battle to fight and die to settle disputes they can't settle themselves or to act as their proxies in the everlasting struggle for power. And it's tragic that those young men and women are willing to go. This applies to both sides of this most recent conflict.

When it finally becomes clear, as it certainly will, that violence is a dead-end and offers only pain and suffering in return for little of lasting value, there will be fewer and fewer individuals willing to risk their lives as pawns in someone else's game. "Suppose they gave a war, and no one came?" is a banner that is just over the horizon and marching in our direction. Leaders can't go to war by themselves.

Accordingly, the first principle on which the Whole Earth Design Project is founded is that the future shall include no provision for the use of violence as either a means of control or in the settlement of disputes.

O>)(

Of all the changes ahead, the one that most clearly reflects the depth of the coming transformation is the rejection of the concept of money, the other instrument of control utilized by the Triconsys. Admittedly, it challenges the limits of one's imagination to envision life on this planet without money, a concept that has so permeated nearly every aspect of our lives. But money, and what it represents, encapsulates precisely the issues at the heart of the coming transformation.

As someone once said, Money is the root of all evil. Well, *nearly* all evil. There are quite a number of people among us who are capable of conduct that has nothing to do with money but that most of us would agree is "evil." But the greater source of social harm, by many magnitudes, is the concept of money. Some call it the lifeblood of the economy, but a more apt metaphor casts labor as the lifeblood and money as the cancerous virus that infects the bloodstream and

threatens the life of the host. That's us.

Two characteristics of money mark it as a cancer on society. One is its role as economic intermediary; the other is its digital nature.

Increasingly, in this globalized society, we are all reliant on other people, most of whom are strangers to us and we to them. How many individuals were involved in providing that cup of coffee you enjoyed this morning? Each of the many steps along the way, from plantation to cup, was shadowed by a financial transaction with money interposing itself between the participants. While it is true that money serves as a facilitator of such transactions between strangers, it also formalizes the competitive and adversarial nature of the relationship, and thereby ensures that the parties are likely to remain strangers.

A society, after all, is made up of a group of individuals who have joined together – coalesced – in the mutual pursuit of some common interest or goal. Money, on the other hand, fragments society, leading everyone on the planet to compete with one another to possess it: neighbor against neighbor, village against village, state against state, nation against nation. As a result, the pursuit of money, rather than the actual production of goods and services, has become the primary objective of economic activity.

On a personal level, money sticks its nose into everybody's business, causing rifts between friends and neighbors while famously serving as the primary cause of marital and familial distress and disintegration. There could not be a more anti-social concept than money.

Furthermore, money's role as both the driver and the inhibitor of economic activity is devoid of any ethical or moral considerations. If you have enough of it, you can do whatever you want (fly into space!) or have anything done that your heart desires (a pyramid, perhaps?), no matter how harmful, useless, or degrading to other people. Without it, you're impotent, no matter how decent, honest, hard-working and conscientious you may be.

The other characteristic that marks money as socially cancerous is its digital nature. It is the score-keeping function of money that transforms all economic activity into a contest, an insidious aspect of which is that, whatever one's score, there is always a larger number. As a result, however successful one might be in this Mother of All Monopoly Games, there are more points to be scored, more dollars, yen, renminbi, and euros to be accumulated. And once the accumulators have experienced the high that comes with money's power and prestige, the addiction has been firmly established and it's ever onward in the relentless search for the next fix.

The attempt to digitally quantify the value of everything – an object, a service, an hour of labor, a plot of land – by assigning it a higher or lower number has led to the creation of a vast parallel universe of numbers. The planet is bathed in swirling clouds of financial data: commodity prices, foreign exchange rates, stock indexes, capital flows, stock and bond ratings, gross domestic product statistics, export-import figures, all chopped and diced into microscopic fragments or aggregated into massive sums as the analysis and financial games-playing require.

Referring to slicing and dicing, here, for example, are the incomprehensible itemized ingredients in a Verizon Wireless mobile phone bill:

|                                       |         |
|---------------------------------------|---------|
| Monthly access charges                | \$60.00 |
| Total messaging charges               | 1.05    |
| Federal universal service charge      | 1.58    |
| Regulatory charge                     | .13     |
| Administrative charge                 | .83     |
| Gross receipts surcharge              | 3.57    |
| NY Public Safety Commission surcharge | 1.20    |
| NY City 911 surcharge                 | .30     |
| New York State sales tax              | 2.67    |
| New York City sales tax               | 3.01    |
| New York Local McTd sales tax         | .25     |
| Total charges:                        | \$74.59 |

Here's another example, from an electricity bill:

|                              |          |
|------------------------------|----------|
| Supply                       | \$40.76  |
| Merchant function charge     | 2.42     |
| GRT and other tax surcharges | 1.04     |
| Basic service charge         | 16.80    |
| Delivery charge              | 36.91    |
| SBC/RPS charges              | 2.55     |
| Temporary NY State surcharge | 2.02     |
| GRT and other tax surcharges | 2.83     |
| Sales tax                    | 4.74     |
| Total charges:               | \$110.07 |

Of course, none of this slicing and dicing would be possible without computers. A single payment is sent to Verizon but is then divided up and sent off into eleven different directions with computers tracking every penny or fraction thereof. While only bits and pieces at this stage, these numbers are aggregated into economic statistics that are studied like the entrails of a sacrificial lamb by masters of the universe trying to divine the source of their next big financial heist.

Despite the presumption of precision and exactitude based upon the perceived concreteness of numbers, and notwithstanding the use of powerful number-crunching computers, sophisticated economic models, and a world-girdling speed-of-light communications system, economists are found to be incapable of either predicting or explaining economic trends. Their record as forecasters suggests that the “dismal science” is much more dismal than scientific.

And so it is that the world now confronts a destructive category-five financial hurricane. In September 2008, without warning and to most everyone's surprise, the first deadly blasts nearly blew away the entire global financial system. Now that the winds have subsided a bit, our clueless leaders, while still jittery about future prospects, have convinced themselves that the worst has past and that their dysfunctional financial system has survived. What they do not realize is that this is the

deceptively calm eye of the storm, and what awaits them is the full impact of the trailing eyewall, soon to deliver a final knock-out blast to the entire Triconsys and all the flawed and wasteful and dangerous leadership it represents. And good riddance!

This avoidance of the concept of money in the search for a better way is the key to the design project's success because it reveals the massive waste and inefficiency resulting from money's leading role in the functioning of the present control system. Within the so-called developed world, the amount of time and energy devoted to controlling economic activity overwhelmingly outweighs the time and energy devoted to the economic activity itself.

On the one hand, there is the productive side of the workforce: the farmers, carpenters, plumbers, electricians, roofers, landscapers, painters, welders, engineers, firemen, doctors, nurses, scientists, miners, fishers, factory workers, educators, sewing machine operators, truck drivers, and all the other hands-on laborers who represent the productive foundation of the economy by actually producing something.

On the other hand, there is the control side: the bankers, accountants, lawyers, investors, stock brokers, politicians, insurance salesmen, rating agencies, cashiers, toll collectors, ticket takers, meter maids, tax collectors, police, security guards, jailers, weapons manufacturers, members of the military, and the bean-counting paper-pushing bureaucrats and regulators with their army of assistants who toil ceaselessly in the care and feeding of a control system that is itself out of control.

The assignment of the workforce to one or the other of these two categories would quickly demonstrate that in developed countries control workers outnumber productive workers by a ratio of three to one. And that is far from the whole story.

Additionally, a considerable portion, if not most, of the workforce activity characterized as productive is actually in support of the control system rather than for the benefit of the

population at large. Office buildings, for example, are constructed and maintained for the use of control-system workers. They must be powered for heating, cooling, lighting, and transporting (elevators, escalators). They need to be furnished with telephones, fax machines, photocopiers, computers, printers, desks, and chairs, not to mention ink, paper, and wastebaskets. Add to all that the consumption of natural resources required to transport this huge army of non-productive workers from their homes to their offices and home again every working day, in time-wasting energy-consuming carbon-spewing nerve-wracking automobile-wrecking traffic jams, or in crowded buses, trains, and subways. To do what?

Another substantial waste of time and energy involves the so-called “free marketplace,” a term that embraces the space where producers and consumers interact. This profit-motivated, money-facilitated marketplace, in the final analysis, is driven by demand, as well illustrated by the near total collapse of the global financial system when the capitalist Ponzi scheme started to run out of spenders. Creating demand, therefore, is the primary objective of any commercial enterprise that has some product or service to sell.

A considerable segment of the workforce is devoted to marketing products by tempting and taunting you with slick packaging, appealing design, exciting advertising, celebrity endorsements, and promises of pleasure and wish fulfillment. The success of such campaigns is measured by the extent to which they can persuade you to buy something you never desired, or perhaps never even knew existed until the marketers dangled it in front of you. In a world where there is an overwhelming abundance of need, it is beyond wasteful to be devoting so much time and energy in the creation, and then the satisfaction, of needs that otherwise would not exist.

And finally, there is the gross inefficiency resulting from the disparities in the monetary value assigned to units of labor in various parts of the world. For example, the average hourly wage in southern China is the equivalent of seventy-five U.S. cents. In the United States the average hourly wage is \$18.

The result: Chinese workers are turning out products thousands of miles removed from their destination, requiring the expenditure of considerable resources for transportation that would be unnecessary if the products were sensibly manufactured near where they are to be consumed.

Another example: In Jamaica, the minimum hourly wage has recently been increased from the equivalent of eighty to ninety-two U.S. cents. The result: Jamaican workers sew garments that Americans will wear. In this case the raw materials, the fabrics, are first manufactured in the United States, transported to Jamaica where they are sewn into garments, and then shipped back to the United States. How inefficient is that?

In addition to the indignities heaped upon these underpaid workers, whose role in this globalized economic system is to do other people's work for them, there is also the degrading way in which the free market in human labor dishes out value judgments that result in a Jamaican worker toiling 19 hours and a Chinese worker three full days to earn the same pay as the average American worker receives for one hour.

This partial recitation of waste, inefficiency and devastation caused by some of the more egregious practices and procedures built into the existing financial system offers clear evidence that money belongs alongside violence as unfit for consideration as an ingredient in the design of a sustainable alternative social system.

O>)(

If one were to take an inventory of the human condition today, one standout feature would surely be the sharp contrast between our enormous potential for doing good and the oceans of misery we have created instead. How often we have heard the plaintive remark: 'If only we could all learn to live together, what a wonderful world this would be.' The Whole Earth Design Project aims to persuasively demonstrate just



how great the possibilities are, and that they are well within reach.

In their 1968 “White Album” the Beatles sang:

*You say you got a real solution.  
Well, you know, we'd all love to see the plan.*

The primary objective of the Whole Earth Design Project is to produce such a plan, one that will prove to be the real solution we are all looking for, the roadmap that will lead us to that wonderful world in which we all learn to live together.

O>)(

What follows is a brief summary of the design project as presently conceived, consisting of four stages, the first of which is now underway. If this is a venture that interests you, please visit the sponsoring Website ([www.thecoalescence.net](http://www.thecoalescence.net)) for more details and subscribe to the newsletter so as to be kept fully informed of developments in what promises to be a highly fascinating and educational research project with potential consequences of considerable value. Then, at such time as you feel ready, jump in with your own contribution of energy and creativity. Together, we can work it out, as follows:

**STAGE I: Confirm the project's feasibility.** Here's how:

For each of life's ten essentials (air, water, food, clothing, shelter, information, communication, transportation, health care, and energy), we will form a workgroup to draw upon the knowledge and expertise of the many individuals and organizations around the world who are active in that field to prepare a summary of the situation in regard to their particular assigned essential. In the case of water, for example, what is the condition of the planet's water supply? Is it safe? Is there enough of it? What are we doing with it? How many and where are the people without reliable access? Etc. And then, make a

plausible estimate of what would be required to meet the one-time goal of making that necessity universally available, and what would be needed thereafter to maintain its availability at that level.

Ordinarily, such an estimate would be expressed in trillions of dollars, euros, yen, or renminbe. In this case, however, the estimate will also include the cost calculated in units of labor. To continue the example of water, the relevant workgroup will estimate how many workers with each of the required skill sets (engineers, planners, ditchdiggers, plumbers, electricians, pump and filter manufacturers, etc.), laboring how many hours/months/years, would be needed to meet the pure-water objective. The calculations are to include, not only the labor required for the final assembly and installation of materials and equipment, but also the labor involved all along the entire chain of production beginning with the extracting and harvesting of raw materials from nature's bounty.

Then, based upon a consolidation and integration of all ten authoritative estimates, we will proclaim – with the fanfare from a million metaphorical trumpets – that there is enough for everyone! Further, we will announce, with the support of graphs, statistics, and charts, that the abundance of available human, natural and technological resources makes it possible to provide every individual on the planet with all of life's essentials; that an all-hands worldwide emergency effort could bring the planet's entire population up to a humane and sustainable standard of living in just a few short years; and that the maintenance of that standard would require as little as the equivalent of a day a week from each of us as our individual contribution to the smooth functioning of the newly designed economic system.

**STAGE II: Fill in the details.** Here's how:

Utilizing existing Geographic Information System (GIS) software, we will create the framework for a virtual world in cyberspace to serve as a template for the organization of a new economic model in the real world. We will begin by

geographically locating needs and resources by continents and regions, collecting the gross statistics from various government, trade, professional, and philanthropic organizations. Then, with the aid of a worldwide army of VIGs (volunteer information gatherers) – drawn to the design project by its dramatic declaration of possibilities – we will dissect those gross statistics by locating needs and resources down through increasingly detailed geographic layers until they identify and embrace the entire human population, city by city, town by town, neighborhood by neighborhood, home by home, and individual by individual, resulting in what amounts to the first Earth-wide census.

**STAGE III: Complete the winning design.** Here's how:

First, by assuming a post-coalescent world, that is, the world toward which we are all striving, one where we act as a global family, looking after one another, sharing burdens, celebrating life together. Next, by assuming an entirely new operating system in which violence and money are no longer elements of control. Therefore, no armies and no banks, and none of their offspring or various instrumentalities. Then, without regard to any matters financial, political, or legal, but with a laser-like focus on the simple and direct objective of providing everyone on the planet with all of life's essential goods and services, we will begin connecting resources with needs by way of the shortest and most direct routes.

By so connecting the “resource” dots with the “need” dots, out of the design project will emerge an economic model so dramatically superior to the one we have now that, if adopted, it would improve the lives of 99.99% of the world's population.

This begs the question: If it can be shown that this is so, what could possibly prevent the overwhelming majority of the population from adopting that system?

**STAGE IV: Promote the winning design.** Here's how:

By now the Whole Earth Design Project will have become a movement, with a capital M, supported by the millions who have participated in assembling the data. What will it be called? We could call it the Whole Earth Movement. Or The Coalescence. Usage will determine its name. But by giving it a name, it can serve as a banner under which all organizations and individuals trying to make this a better world can march in oneness of purpose.

Then, give this new movement a symbol, a logo, that can be used to express support. The early Christians had the fish symbol and now the cross, Jews have the Star of David, Churchill used the V for Victory sign, the anti-war movement had the peace sign, and the Nazis had the swastika. Here's a suggestion for the Whole Earth Movement:

(0>)(

What does it mean? You've been seeing it throughout this book. One version of its intended meaning is that a united world [0] is better than [>] a divided world [D]. Encourage those who agree with that sentiment to draw it in the sand, wear it on a button, stick it on a bumper, put it on a T-shirt, and include it in their email messages.

Next, armed with all the facts and a powerful message, we intend to launch the fiercest public relations, promotion, publicity and proselytizing campaign the world has ever seen. We will let it be known that – beyond the shadow of a doubt – under the proposed economic system there will no longer be cause for economic anxiety. No one will lose their home. Everyone will have enough to eat. No one will die of malaria. Everyone will have clean and safe water to drink and air to breathe. And so on, through the whole list of life's necessities.

By now we will have developed the project's virtual world in cyberspace, using Geographic Information System

software, and made it available to the public for inspection via the Internet in much the same way that Google Earth is available to the public. They will be able to zoom in anywhere on the globe for a closer look at local conditions or pull back for the larger picture. In this way the world can follow the design project's progress.

And by now we will have also developed an avatar program with which individuals can represent themselves while exploring their possible roles in the new economy. The beauty of the Whole Earth Design Project and the key to its success will be that each individual's participation will be discussed and agreed upon and then foreshadowed in the project's virtual world.

Thus, the new society will be collectively designed in cyberspace before being recreated in the real world, having had all the details, including each individual's role, worked out agreeably in advance. There will be much exciting and rewarding work to do during the one-off period of global reconstruction to bring everyone up to a humane standard of living. Thereafter, there will suddenly be so little work that for many adjusting to a life of leisure may prove to be the greater challenge.

When finally the vast majority of the population – 99.99 percent? – has signed on to the program, we will set a date, have a fantastic planetary celebration, and then get to work. There's an entire planet that needs healing and a whole new world of possibilities ready to be explored.

O>)(

Of the possible scenarios leading to the Coalescence, the above scenario – let's call it **The Design Scenario** – would be the least contentious. At a time when violence lurks around every corner, a planetary design project would represent a communication alternative, helping to deflect aggression by giving everyone an opportunity to be involved in planning a life of one's own choosing free of financial anxiety in

exchange for a commitment to play a small role in the maintenance of an efficient economic infrastructure.

Absent such a design project, the next best scenario – let’s call this one **The Metamorphic Scenario** – envisions the attainment of the Coalescence through an organic process resembling that which transforms a caterpillar into a butterfly, in this case driven by a combination of disintermediation and connectivity.

Intermediation is “the act of coming between.” A common complaint today is that modern life has become exasperatingly complicated. Why should that be? As time goes by, we get smarter. We discover things. We invent laborsaving devices. We do more with less. Shouldn’t life be getting easier? Safer? Simpler?

Blame all that complexity on the Triconsys and its ceaseless effort to “come between,” to be the intermediary involved in every human transaction and interaction whenever and wherever possible for the primary purpose of exercising control. Its laws and regulations, tests and inspections, taxes and fees, licenses and certifications are all forms of intermediation meant to support and protect a financial system that is itself the ultimate manifestation of intermediation.

As the Triconsys trembles precariously under the weight of its own complexity, it struggles to avoid total collapse by piling on more intermediation: increasing regulations, lengthening the application forms, expanding the terms and conditions, hiring additional inspectors and investigators, digging deeper into a person’s personal history, listening in on private telephone conversations, hacking into personal emails, and installing more body scanners and surveillance cameras.

Inevitably, according to The Metamorphic Scenario, people begin to respond with *dis*intermediation. As the Triconsys gets in the way, prevents important things from getting done, interferes with people’s lives and their lifestyles, and even threatens their very existence, the search for ways to circumvent its suffocating intermediations leads to the

discovery and establishment of a different set of connections driven by another set of principles.

Slowly at first, but with gathering speed, people with common interests are finding one another, developing cooperative relationships, forming networks, and freely exchanging information. As connections expand exponentially, the Internet and the worldwide web will morph into an alternative control system based upon communication, coordination, collaboration, and cooperation, seamlessly matching resources with needs and ushering in the non-violent, non-competitive, non-authoritarian, non-nationalistic, borderless, money-less society of the future.

The Coalescence has arrived!

O>)(

Or not. And if not, then what? If we fail to evolve, either by design or metamorphosis, an alternative sustainable social arrangement by the time of the final collapse of the capitalist Ponzi scheme, then we will find ourselves caught in the vortex of a third scenario, in this case appropriately called **The Apocalyptic Scenario**. And it won't be pretty. Rioting, looting, blood in the streets. People will get hurt. There will be pain. Unless . . .

According to the International Telecommunications Union, three out of four people in the world possess a mobile phone, and three out of ten are connected to the Internet. This level of connectivity offers a timely and propitious opportunity to avoid the apocalypse, if we will seize it.

How? By each of us pledging to do our part in maintaining calm and order when the end of the Triconsys comes. That means: no looting, no rioting, no hitting, no violence, no matter what. It also means that those among us who are the hands-on providers of essential goods and services and the maintainers of the physical infrastructure, that is, the productive workers, will continue to do our work, while those among us who have been laboring in the control system will do

all we can to support the productive workers and join them to make their load lighter even if it means getting our hands dirty and developing a few calluses.

If you will pledge to do so, and if you will urge your family, friends and neighbors do join you, and they do the same, and if the idea gains traction and continues to ripple through the collective consciousness, there is the possibility, by way of the amazing level of planetary connectivity, that the apocalypse can be avoided and we can proceed, despite the detour, to the Coalescence.

( ) > (

So to summarize: We are about to experience the third extraordinary event in the evolutionary history of this planet, the first extraordinary event being the origin of life and the second being the emergence of human intelligence. The third extraordinary event is speeding in our direction because of the explosive growth during the past two centuries in population, technology, and communication.

Until now, the driving force behind human evolution has been competition, leading inevitably to the concentration of power and wealth in the hands of the triumvirate of political, business and religious leaders who have been running the whole show through the use of misinformation, violence, and money. The third extraordinary event will mark the point at which the masses discover both the cause of their dire circumstances and the power of their unity to overcome and reverse those circumstances.

However this drama plays itself out, whether in the form of a deliberate design project, or as the net result of the trillions of little decisions made every day that are naturally trending toward connectivity, or as the humanitarian instinct in us all responds to the disastrous collapse of the Triconsys, we will survive, we will grow, we will finally be free to explore our true potential.

Onward to the Coalescence



## AFTERWORD

What was that? A serious prediction of things to come, or an outburst of wishful thinking? Was it a thoughtful proposal of a realistic plan of action, or a misguided fantasy that defies common sense?

Only time will tell. My hope is that its optimistic vision will find an audience and inspire action in pursuit of that vision. We are on the brink of chaos, if not extinction, and the only thing that can save us from a situation this dire is a planetary moral awakening. This book and the concept of the Coalescence it advances is an attempt to encourage such an awakening.

It is also meant to introduce a perspective into the great debate now taking place that I believe is unique. Otherwise, why bother? And so this book is offered as an opening statement on which to base a discussion of our options from a different point of view as we move into the future.

There is much to discuss. Unfortunately, there is little time. While those in charge of the present setup devote their energy to trying to save the Triconsys, you are invited to visit [www.thecoalescence.net](http://www.thecoalescence.net) and join in a discussion about how to replace it.

The future is right around the bend and coming on strong, ready or not. How it unfolds will depend on fresh ideas and energy. I understand you have an abundance of both. And that may make all the difference,

*Walter Szykitka*  
*1 January 2011*



# Regarding the Second Edition

Although much has happened during the past year and a half, and the unraveling of the Triconsys continues as predicted, the arc of the story remains the same.

What has changed is the decision to proceed with the launch of the Whole Earth Design Project. In the first edition, the design project was presented as a proposal and a request for some individual or group with the appropriate resources to set the idea in motion. Since that didn't happen, it was decided that the rush of events made any further delay unacceptable. The major change in this revised edition reflects that decision.

The sudden emergence of the Occupy movement made it clear that there is widespread dissatisfaction with the existing system. There is a great yearning for change. What is generally acknowledged, however, is that there is no clear-cut plan of action other than the soft focus on the present system's many shortcomings as symbolized by the disparity between the 1% and the 99%. There is yet no vision around which people can rally. It is that void that the Whole Earth Design Project hopes to fill.

I urge you to join in the promotion and development of that vision. There is much to do. The need is great and time is short. If not now, when? If not us, who?

W.S.

1 June 2012