

THIS IS A PRE-PUBLICATION DRAFT OF

The UP-TO Project

by
Charles Tandy, Ph.D.

A CHAPTER CONTRIBUTION TO

Death And Anti-Death, Volume 8

Hardback ISBN: 978-1-934297-10-0

Paperback ISBN: 978-1-934297-11-7

Editor: Charles Tandy, Ph.D.

Publisher: Ria University Press (Palo Alto, California)

Copyright © 2010 by Charles Tandy

[Copyright © 2010 by Charles Tandy]

**The UP-TO Project:
How To Achieve World Peace, Freedom, And Prosperity**

Charles Tandy

- §0. Preliminary Note on Human Nature
- §1. Preliminary Note on Terminology
- §2. The “UP”: Union of Well-ordered Peoples
- §3. The “TO”: Treaty Organization Acting for a Better Cosmos
- §4. Conclusion

§0. Preliminary Note on Human Nature

For many centuries it was often said that due to nature or human nature, stable world peace was not possible and perhaps not desirable. For many centuries it was often said that due to nature or human nature, human heavier-than-air flight was not possible and perhaps not desirable. For many centuries it was often said that due to nature or human nature, the banning of human slavery was not possible and perhaps not desirable.

According to the third-century-BCE Chinese prince and scholar, Han Fei Tzu: “King Yen practiced benevolence and righteousness and the state of Hsü was wiped out; Tsu-kung employed eloquence and wisdom and Lu lost territory. So it is obvious that benevolence and righteousness, eloquence and wisdom, are not the means by which to maintain the state.” (Watson, 1964).

The so-called “Parable of the Tribes” or “Prisoner’s Dilemma” helps explain why things sometimes go from bad to worse. Understanding the Parable or Dilemma may help us, individually and collectively, engender a future that goes from good to better instead of from bad to worse. Our apparent inability – in many past centuries – to ban human slavery, to engage in heavier-than-air flight, or to achieve stable world peace **cannot** be reduced to nature or human nature.

Schmookler (1984) explains the **error** of reducing all human problems to nature or human nature; Schmookler explains the Parable of the Tribes this way: “In an anarchic situation ... no one can choose that the struggle for power shall cease. ... **no one is free to choose peace, but anyone can impose upon all the necessity for power.** [And humans, unlike nonhuman animals, have the ability to modify their anarchic situation.]”

Evans (1995) also explains the **error** of reducing all human problems to nature or human nature; Evans explains the Prisoner’s Dilemma this way: “The prisoner’s dilemma describes a possible situation in which prisoners are offered various deals and prospects of punishment. The options and outcomes are so constructed that it is rational for each person, when deciding in isolation, to pursue a course which each finds [in terms of actual results] to be against his interest and therefore [in terms of actual results] irrational. ... Such a scenario postulates a lack of enforced cooperation; and to avoid the undesirable outcome, the actors in the drama need to be forced into cooperation by a system of [enforced] rules.”

§1. Preliminary Note on Terminology

My “UP-TO” proposal is meant to be a general outline or approach to achieve world peace, freedom, and prosperity. If “the devil is in the details,” I leave such details to those more qualified than I. Nevertheless I have to use words even to suggest the general proposal such as it is. These words may be easily misunderstood. Thus herewith below a preliminary note on terminology. (I suggest consulting *The Law of Peoples* by John Rawls if one wishes to attempt to improve on the terminology – i.e., the meaning of “peoples” and “well-ordered peoples”.)

I have chosen to use the word “peoples.” As a first approximation: By “peoples” I mean to include “states” (e.g., members of the United Nations) and “quasi-states” (e.g., Taiwan/ROC/ Chinese Taipei). Strategic ambiguity and strategic clarity each have their proper roles to play in human life and world betterment. Such decisions of ambiguity or clarity I leave to those actually involved in negotiating to achieve a better world. Given

such a concrete context, they (not I) may decide, for example, whether “quasi-states” should be included or whether only “states” should be counted as “peoples.”

I have chosen to use the term “well-ordered peoples.” As a first approximation: By “well-ordered peoples” I mean to include “democratic peoples” and “decent peoples” (somewhat along the lines suggested by John Rawls in his *The Law of Peoples*, but so as to be consistent with the previous paragraph). Here again I leave it to those actually negotiating the agreement or treaty to decide whether “decent peoples” should be included or whether only “democratic peoples” should be counted as “well-ordered.” **The UP part of the UP-TO proposal will be identified primarily with the term “well-ordered peoples”** (as distinguished from the broader term “peoples”). **The TO part of the UP-TO proposal will be identified primarily with the term “peoples”** (as distinguished from the narrower term “well-ordered peoples”).

Below, I do NOT say that the European Union MUST take the lead to achieve world peace, freedom, and prosperity. Again, I am not the most qualified person to decide this pragmatic question (of leadership in the present context). Nevertheless on this issue I wish now to express my opinion. My **opinion** is that the European Union **should** take the lead in achieving world peace, freedom, and prosperity. A detailed defense of this tentative opinion (“that the European Union should take the lead”) is beyond the purview of the present paper. However below I outline an “UP-TO” approach which I believe is doable at the level of international politics. For it to prove successful, it will require assistance from the United States. But I see the project as having a better chance of success if the EU (European Union) takes the leadership role. My belief or opinion is that it is in the interest of the United States and of the world for the United States to encourage the EU to take the leadership role in this unprecedented endeavor. So what exactly is the UP-TO proposal I am so excited about and want the EU and others to implement? First I will describe UP, then I will describe TO. ¹

§2. The “UP”: Union of Well-ordered Peoples

Immanuel Kant’s *Perpetual Peace*, published in 1795, is a remarkable piece of social science foresight.² In 1795, very few republics existed and no liberal democracies existed (e.g. consider civil rights issues related to slavery and women). Kant argued for republicanism and for an expanding concert of peaceful republics. He believed this approach (as distinguished from the universal membership approach) would eventually lead (in the 21st century?) to a global stable peace.

The UP proposal is a proposal for a terrestrial **Union of Peoples Well-ordered**. On today’s Earth, the People of China and the People of Russia are NOT well-ordered – but the EU Peoples and the North America Peoples, **among many others**, do have the actual substance of cultural norms and working mechanisms (rather than the mere form of words or documents or elections) that considerably support the rights of persons and that considerably tend to prevent war among such like-minded well-ordered peoples. Reminiscent of Kant, this is sometimes referred to by today’s political scientists as the world’s “**zone of peace**.”

Let me point out that although the UP and the TO are separate entities with separate terrestrial-extraterrestrial functions, they are nevertheless expected, with help from the EU and others, to be birthed on the same date and to be perpetually on speaking terms with each other. Signatories of peoples to the (terrestrial) UP are members of the UP **Voting** Council; signatories of peoples to the (extraterrestrial) TO are members of the UP **Advisory** Council. Likewise, signatories of peoples to the (extraterrestrial) TO are members of the TO **Voting** Council; signatories of peoples to the (terrestrial) UP are members of the TO **Advisory** Council.

The UP (**Union of Well-ordered Peoples**) idea is inspired in part by the Daalder and Lindsay proposal for a CD (**Concert of Democracies**). (The article by Ivo Daalder and James Lindsay is entitled “Democracies of the World, Unite”).³ While the UP and the CD concepts are not altogether identical, either realization may be expected to provide a number of benefits to world betterment,

including: (1) Strengthening and expanding the positive relationship zone of peace and peaceful activities among UP or CD societies; and, (2) Weakening the negative temptations of UP or CD societies, such as (A) crusading imperialism; (B) imprudent appeasement; and, (C) moralistic isolationism.

§3. The “TO”:

Treaty Organization Acting for a Better Cosmos

The TO proposal is a proposal for an extraterrestrial Treaty Organization Acting for a Better Cosmos. Before I explain the TO proposal in more detail, let me again point out that although the UP and the TO are separate entities with separate terrestrial-extraterrestrial functions, they are nevertheless expected, with help from the EU and others, to be birthed on the same date and to be perpetually on speaking terms with each other. Signatories of peoples to the (terrestrial) UP are members of the UP **Voting** Council; signatories of peoples to the (extraterrestrial) TO are members of the UP **Advisory** Council. Likewise, signatories of peoples to the (extraterrestrial) TO are members of the TO **Voting** Council; signatories of peoples to the (terrestrial) UP are members of the TO **Advisory** Council. **Note that the People of China and the People of Russia may indeed be founding (voting) members of TO but not of UP; on the one hand, they are peoples – on the other hand, they are not yet well-ordered.** (At some point in time in the 21st century, perhaps China and Russia will become well-ordered.)

Previously above I have explained the “Union of Peoples Well-ordered” (UP) idea. Now I present the TO (“Treaty Organization Acting for a Better Cosmos”) part of the UP-TO proposal. ⁴ I believe that both the UP and TO ideas are desirable and feasible for today’s world, even more so if implemented together (UP-TO). These two Concerts, acting more or less in concert, may have historically unusual (“doubly-synergistic”) abilities to transmute our outmoded world into a “transcivilization” of peaceful prosperous societies.

We may not know the actual or secret (classified) policies of the United States and others with respect to extraterrestrial space.

It is nevertheless true that over 100 nations (including all of the “major” ones) publicly claim to support the 1967 Outer Space Treaty (or have at least signed it). The purpose of the 1967 Outer Space Treaty is to promote the peaceful uses of outer space. But today, as we approach its half-century mark, the 1967 peace treaty continues to have no enforcement mechanism.

The TO would serve two functions: (1) as gateway between planet earth and peaceful space – this includes **enforceably** banning weapons and weapons-making from extraterrestrial space; and, (2) as midwife to an evolving Extraterrestrial Society.

As I proceed to discuss these two functions, I want to attempt to offer a **realistic vision** of future extraterrestrial technology. This should help us better understand how to think about TO (and UP-TO). **But realistic visions sometimes change. Accordingly, we will want TO to be flexible enough to change in case our “realistic vision” changes!**

It has been said that if your prediction of far-future technological capacities does not sound like science fiction, **then your prediction is wrong.** Accordingly, please momentarily assume that the following vision (which may sound like science fiction) is indeed realistic. You can then later critically examine the notes and bibliography to independently decide for yourself.

The astounding capacity of future technology can be glimpsed at by taking a **non-controversial** look at the future of extraterrestrial O’Neill Habitats and of molecular Drexler Technology (and their eventual melding together).^{5,6} I say **non-controversial** because the controversy in each case is over when, not if. Thus for present purposes we can overcome this dispute by simply talking non-controversially about these kinds of capacities in the far future (bypassing timeline predictions of near or far). Abundant extraterrestrial resources will be used to construct greener-than-earth, self-sufficient, self-replicating O’Neill Habitats in orbit around planets and suns. Accordingly, barring catastrophe, it seems highly likely that in the long run almost all of our multitudinous offspring will be permanently living and working somewhere in the universe other than on planet Earth.

Indeed, molecular Drexler Technology is not required for construction and development of extraterrestrial O'Neill Habitats ("SEG communities") – it just makes the task easier.

Historically one of the reasons that Terrestrial civilizations of old engaged in wars against each other was to gain more territory, and the power and glory that came with empire. (Human-caused global warming, human-made weapons of mass death and destruction, and a human-crowded global village did not yet exist.) As life grew denser on planet earth, the environment on which each organism depended increasingly consisted of other living things. But the development of advanced O'Neill Habitats (Sustainable Extraterrestrial Greener-than-earth communities, or SEGs) in orbit around a planet or a sun will mean multiple, self-reproducing biospheres; "unlimited free land" (freely available territory); and the realistic possibility of **intentional** (i.e., voluntary) communities for all persons. Instead of remaining in the community or culture of one's birth, one will be realistically free to experiment living in one kind of community or another. New kinds of cultures and communities will be enabled by the new extraterrestrial technology.

According to Carter and Dale (1974): "Most of the progressive and dynamic civilizations of mankind started on new land – on land that had not been the center of a former civilization." The following metaphorical insights have been widely quoted by SEG experts: "The Earth was our cradle, but we will not live in the cradle forever." "Space habitats [SEGs] are the children of Mother Earth." According to Carl Sagan, our long-term survival is a matter of "spaceflight or extinction"; all civilizations become either space-faring or extinct. According to the "mass extinction" article in *The Columbia Encyclopedia* (6th ed.): "The extinctions, however, did not conform to the usual evolutionary rules regarding who survives; the only factor that appears to have improved a family of organisms' chance of survival was widespread geographic colonization." ⁷

[3.1 Gateway Between Planet Earth And Peaceful Space]

The TO would serve as gateway between planet earth and peaceful space – this includes **enforceably** banning weapons and weapons-making from extraterrestrial space.

As explained above, eventually there will be many Extraterrestrials, few Terrestrials. We can understand the practical or special interests that might prevent us from banning weapons and their manufacture from today's Earth. **Indeed, someday there might be analogous practical or special interests in extraterrestrial space unless we engage in foresight today to proactively and enforceably ban weapons and their manufacture from extraterrestrial space.**

On the one hand, our political interests today may constrain us in our present time and place. But, on the other hand, our political interests today may free us with respect to future times and places (e.g. our extraterrestrial future). **What this means is that today we have a realistic prospect of proactively establishing the legal structure and enforcement powers needed for a world at stable peace in extraterrestrial space.**

If we wait until later, we may not be so free to "do the right thing" and establish stable peace in extraterrestrial space. Extraterrestrial space is immense; it is all of the universe except for a single small planet. Eventually it might even become feasible to extend stable peace to planet Earth and thus the entire universe.

It is my belief that the suggested Extraterrestrial Space Treaty Organization (TO) will make a fine gift to our offspring and, by the way, help present Earthlings as well. But if we want a good world at stable peace (whether that world be Terrestrial Civilization or Extraterrestrial Transcivilization), it would seem we must be willing to unblinkingly face up to the following questions: Is stable peace possible if each person or each people is passionately convinced that their worldview is basically good and correct – and that other worldviews are evil or bad or incorrect? If we could enforceably prevent each and every person from killing any person over a conflict (say, a conflict of worldviews), would

we do so? If so, how would we resolve our conflicts fairly or justly?

One advantage we have in facing up to these difficult questions is that we can use our imaginations to futuristically view ourselves as Extraterrestrials living in intentional communities (SEGs or O'Neill Habitats). We can further assume that a political structure there and then exists that we describe as a good world at stable peace. These Extraterrestrials of the future have liberties and technologies that Terrestrials do not have today. Yet humans today have the ability and perhaps the practical political will – via the TO proposal – to help insure humanity's **non-extinction** and promote human **flourishing** in a free and prosperous world at stable peace in extraterrestrial space (**almost** all of the universe).

I will assume that it is a fact that if today's Terrestrials are to produce such an extraterrestrial Treaty Organization (including effective enforcement provisions), it will require agreement from a number of Peoples. How many persons or peoples would accept or endorse a Space Treaty that effectively and enforceably bans weapons and their manufacture from extraterrestrial space? In this context (a good and practical legacy to our offspring), I should think we should be diligent enough to rally enough supporters. For example, TO might be signed originally by, say, twenty Peoples (including most of the "major" ones). **But the Treaty would be strongly effectively enforced by TO's Agency for a Better Cosmos (ABC) – NOT by Peoples/States – against ALL and EVERYONE, whether or not they sign the Treaty.** Once in force, I would expect many others to sign on – since the Treaty applies to them even if they do not sign it. Sooner or later the Treaty really would have to be strongly effectively enforced by the ABC against all and everyone, because eventually persons and communities will permanently settle in extraterrestrial space. (Such a Treaty also offers hope and inspiration to those of us of the present.)

Okay, you may say, this is a reasonable enough start, but what other liberties, responsibilities, and political structures would be appropriate for the Extraterrestrial World? So far, what we presumably have is a partial prototype for an Extraterrestrial

World at stable peace. But what about conflicts and the plurality of deeply held religious and philosophic worldviews?

[3.2 Midwife To An Evolving Extraterrestrial Society]

The TO would serve as midwife to an evolving Extraterrestrial Society.

What seems to me both practical and fair in this context is to think in terms of an Extraterrestrial Society of Intentional Communities. Each person is free to found new (intentional) communities. Each Community would determine its own membership requirements. Each Community would have **its own** culture of liberties and responsibilities; a member would generally be free to leave the community. A mechanism or set of mechanisms would be established to insure that each member is fully and properly informed of their liberty to leave the (intentional) community. (I suppose some communities might still allow their members the possibility of experiencing serious physical pain – but they would also allow a member to voluntarily leave their community. Too, I suppose banning animal cruelty and serious animal pain would be desirable and feasible. At least at first, this might mean with respect to animals that only domesticated or farm animals would be allowed permanent residence in extraterrestrial space?)

Note that some ("hermit") communities would consist of only one person. On old Terra, it was often difficult or impossible to leave one's community – sometimes expulsion effectively meant the individual's death. The sustainable prosperous context of the Extraterrestrial Society of Intentional Communities is radically different. If in the unlikely event this turns out not to be the case, then TO may not work exactly as envisioned by me. But whatever the case may be, the TO would have to be realistically flexible and convincingly knowledgeable of all relevant technology including on the cutting-edge and perhaps too the merely imaginable.

So at the level of the **Society** (of Communities) we have: (1) **Peace**: Weapons, weapons-making, and violence (including animal cruelty and serious animal pain) are strongly effectively

enforceably banned (and so-called “research” would not be permitted as a way to get around the ban); and, (2) **Freedom**: Every individual person is fully aware of and fully informed of their general liberty to leave their community. This too is strongly effectively enforced. The Society and the communities necessarily work closely together to fully insure the liberties and responsibilities associated with both **Peace** and **Freedom**. Also note that since there is "unlimited free land," this fact will additionally help prevent some old terra-style conflicts and resolve or manage others (this would include some old-style civil conflicts).

At the level of **Communities** (in the Society) we have: (1) **Intentionality** (voluntariness): Within the good-faith transparent enforcement of Society's basic principles of peace and freedom, each Community has wide latitude for experimentation. Although there is a general liberty of members to leave the (intentional) Community, this does not necessarily relieve such persons from certain good-faith responsibilities to the Community; and, (2) **Transparency**: Each Community must strongly, effectively, and transparently help enforce the Society's basic principles of peace and freedom.

I believe the political theory or moral-political approach I have invented above with respect to TO is unique and original. It differs from the "Law of Peoples" conception of John Rawls in that TO is meant to be structured so as to necessarily ultimately generate an Extraterrestrial Law of Persons. Yet TO takes seriously the distinction Rawls makes between a "political conception" and "comprehensive doctrines." (A political conception or model addresses persons only with respect to, or at the level of, citizenship. Comprehensive doctrines or worldviews, whether religious or secular, address the full range, or deep levels, of one's personhood and relationships.) In my "Society of Communities" theory, **Society** corresponds to a political conception or model, and **Communities** represent comprehensive doctrines or worldviews.

“Is stable peace possible if each person or each people is passionately convinced that their worldview is basically good and

correct – and that other worldviews are evil or bad or incorrect?” If you can sincerely and in good faith agree to my TO political conception (my approach above), the answer to this question appears to be YES, such stable peace is possible. If you can at most only agree to my TO approach as a temporary compromise, then the answer may be NO.

"If we could enforceably prevent each and every person from killing any person over a conflict (say, a conflict of worldviews) would we do so? If so, how would we resolve our conflicts?" If you can sincerely and in good faith (instead of merely as a temporary compromise) agree to my TO approach above, then stable peace in extraterrestrial space seems both possible and desirable. This approach, so I believe, realistically outlines a structure of stable peace for World Society and local Communities in extraterrestrial space – pointing toward conflict management in the new framework and encouraging subsequent projects to invent needed specifics.

According to TO, the architectures of extraterrestrial settlements will have to be PFIT (Peaceful, Free, Intentional, Transparent). Indeed, the architectures of all extraterrestrial structures will have to be congruent with PFIT. TO, via TO's ABC (Agency for a Better Cosmos), will proactively enforce the PFIT requirements. TO and ABC will have to be on the cutting edge of such changing technologies if they are to successfully fulfill their missions. PFIT **preplanning** and PFIT **retrofitting** of PFIT extraterrestrial settlements and structures will be an ongoing task.

§4. Conclusion

The political structure of island Earth, which is neither a Law of Peoples nor a Law of Persons, is unworkable. But at this unique point in history it is both desirable and feasible to establish a Terrestrial Law of Peoples (via the UP proposal). The political structure of extraterrestrial Space, which is neither a Law of Peoples nor a Law of Persons, is unworkable. But at this unique point in history it is both desirable and feasible to establish a Treaty Organization of peoples structured so as to necessarily

ultimately generate an Extraterrestrial Law of Persons (via the TO proposal).

At this doubly-unique terrestrial-extraterrestrial point in world history, UP-TO is politically doable. World posterity would be eternally grateful to the EU and others for playing leading roles in birthing the joint UP-TO project. A window of opportunity has opened to the world. It is an open invitation for the world to achieve peace, freedom, and prosperity for the first time in history.

Bibliography

Carter, Vernon, and Tom Dale (1974). *Topsoil and Civilization*. University of Oklahoma Press: Norman, OK. (Page 12).

Daalder, Ivo, and James Lindsay (2007). “Democracies of the World, Unite,” *The American Interest* (January-February 2007). Available free on the internet: <<http://www.the-american-interest.com/article.cfm?piece=220>>.

Diamond, Jared (2005). *Collapse: How Societies Choose to Fail or Succeed*. Viking: New York.

Drexler, K. Eric (1986). *Engines of Creation*. Anchor Press: New York. Available free on the internet.

Evans, J. D. G. (1995). “Prisoner’s Dilemma,” in *The Oxford Companion to Philosophy* (Ted Honderich, Editor), Oxford University Press: Oxford, UK. (Page 719).

Feather, Judith Light, and Miguel F. Aznar (2010). *Nanoscience Education, Workforce Training, and K-12 Resources*. CRC Press: Boca Raton, FL.

Ford, Brian J. (2009). “Culturing Meat For The Future: Anti-Death Versus Anti-Life,” In Tandy, Charles [Editor] (2009). *Death And Anti-Death, Volume 7: Nine Hundred Years After St. Anselm (1033-1109)*, Ria University Press: Palo Alto, California (USA). (Chapter 2: pages 55-80).

Gore (2006). Al Gore. ***An Inconvenient Truth: The Planetary Emergency of Global Warming and What We Can Do About It.*** Rodale Books: Emmaus, Pennsylvania. [This is the first book in history produced to offset 100% of the CO₂ emissions generated from production activities with renewable energy; this publication is carbon-neutral.]

Hall, J. Storrs (2005). ***Nanofuture: What's Next for Nanotechnology.*** Prometheus Books: New York.

Heppenheimer, T. A. (1977). ***Colonies in Space.*** Stackpole Books: Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

Hornyak, Gabor L., et al. (2008). ***Introduction to Nanoscience.*** CRC Press: Boca Raton, FL.

Kowal, C. T. (1988). ***Asteroids, Their Nature and Utilization.*** Ellis: Chichester.

Lewis, J. S. (1997). ***Mining the Sky.*** Helix Books, Addison-Wesley: Reading, MA.

O'Neill, Gerard K. (2000). ***The High Frontier: Human Colonies in Space.*** Apogee Books: Burlington, Ontario, Canada. (3rd edition). Also see: <http://www.nss.org/resources/books/non_fiction/review_008_highfrontier.html>.

Ratner, Mark A., and Daniel Ratner (2002). ***Nanotechnology: A Gentle Introduction to the Next Big Idea.*** Prentice Hall: New York.

Rawls, John (1971). ***A Theory Of Justice.*** The Belknap Press Of Harvard University Press: Cambridge, MA. Revised Edition, 1999. (Original Edition, 1971).

Rawls, John (1999). ***The Law of Peoples: with "The Idea of Public Reason Revisited".*** Harvard University Press: Cambridge, MA. This edition, 2001.

Rosen, Carol (2009). The Institute for Cooperation in Space (website): <www.peaceinspace.com>.

Schmookler, Andrew Bard (1984). *The Parable of the Tribes*. Houghton Mifflin Company: Boston, MA. (Page 21).

Seg-communities (2008). <www.ria.edu/seg-communities>. [Seg-communities = Self-sufficient Extra-terrestrial Green-habitats, or O'Neill communities.]

Sen, Amartya (1999). *Development as Freedom*. Anchor Books: New York. This edition, 2000.

Spaceflight or Extinction (2010). <www.spacext.com>.

Space Quotes to Ponder (2010). <www.spacequotes.com>.

Spaceset (2010). [Bibliography.] <<http://spaceset.org/p.bib.mm>>.

Stein, G. Harry (1979). *The Third Industrial Revolution*. Ace Books: New York.

Tandy, Charles (2010a). *21st Century Clues: Essays in Ethics, Ontology, and Time Travel*. Ria University Press: Palo Alto, California.

Tandy, Charles (2010b). “‘Wild-West’ Versus ‘Space-Age’ Systems Science: An Extraterrestrial Prisoner’s Dilemma?” <<http://www.ria.edu/papers/wildwest/index.htm>>.

Ulmschneider, P. (2006). *Intelligent Life in the Universe, Principles and Requirements Behind Its Emergence*, 2nd Ed. Springer Verlag: Heidelberg, Berlin.

Ulmschneider, P. (2009). “O’Neill-Type Space Habitats and the Industrial Conquest of Space,” In Tandy, Charles [Editor] (2009). *Death And Anti-Death, Volume 7: Nine Hundred Years After St. Anselm (1033-1109)*, Ria University Press: Palo Alto, California (USA). (Chapter 16: pages 469-494).

Watson, Burton (1964). *Han Fei Tzu: Basic Writings*. Columbia University Press: New York. (Page 100).

Williams, Linda, and Wade Adams (2006). *Nanotechnology Demystified*. McGraw-Hill Professional: New York.

Wilson, Mick, et al. (2002). *Nanotechnology: Basic Science and Emerging Technologies*. CRC Press: Boca Raton, FL.

Endnotes

1. With reference to my UP-TO related research, I would like to thank the philosophy department of National Chung Cheng University (Taiwan) for their “Visiting Scholar” assistance. I am also grateful to Giorgio Baruchello, Al Globus, Jack Lee, and Asher Seidel for their comments on earlier drafts or partial drafts. For previous UP-TO related work by me, see for example the reprint of my 2007 article – Chapter 13 (pages 177-188) of Charles Tandy, **21st Century Clues: Essays in Ethics, Ontology, and Time Travel** (Palo Alto, California: Ria University Press, 2010). Also see: <<http://www.segits.com>>.

2. Much of the UP section of this paper (§2) is based in part on John Rawls, *The Law of Peoples: with “The Idea of Public Reason Revisited”* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2001).

3. See *The American Interest* (January-February 2007). The article by Ivo Daalder and James Lindsay (“Democracies of the World, Unite”) is available at <<http://www.the-american-interest.com/article.cfm?piece=220>>.

4. Part of my inspiration for the TO idea comes from Dr. Carol Rosin and her website at <www.peaceinspace.com>.

5. “Extraterrestrial O’Neill Habitats” (or “SEG communities”) – See, for example: (A) P. Ulmschneider, “O’Neill-Type Space Habitats and the Industrial Conquest of Space,” Chapter 16 in Charles Tandy (editor), *Death And Anti-Death, Volume 7* (Palo Alto, California: Ria University Press, 2009). (B) *Seg-*

communities, <www.ria.edu/seg-communities> (2008). (C) P. Ulmschneider, *Intelligent Life in the Universe, Principles and Requirements Behind Its Emergence* (2nd ed.: Heidelberg, Berlin: Springer Verlag, 2006). (D) Gerard K. O'Neill, *The High Frontier: Human Colonies in Space* (3rd ed.: Burlington, Ontario, Canada: Apogee Books, 2000). (E) J. S. Lewis, *Mining the Sky* (Reading, Massachusetts: Helix Books, Addison-Wesley, 1997). (F) C. T. Kowal, *Asteroids, Their Nature and Utilization* (Chichester: Ellis, 1988). (G) G. Harry Stein, *The Third Industrial Revolution* (New York: Ace Books, 1979). (H) T. A. Heppenheimer, *Colonies in Space* (Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Stackpole Books, 1977). (For a more complete bibliography, see: <<http://spaceset.org/p.bib.mm>>.)

6. “Molecular Drexler Technology” – Molecular nanotechnology’s founder and founding book is K. Eric Drexler, *Engines of Creation* (New York: Anchor Press, 1987). This book is available free on the internet. Also see, for example: (A) Judith Light Feather and Miguel F. Aznar, *Nanoscience Education, Workforce Training, and K-12 Resources*. (Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press, 2010). (B) Gabor L. Hornyak et al., *Introduction to Nanoscience*. (Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press, 2008). (C) Linda Williams and Wade Adams, *Nanotechnology Demystified*. (New York: McGraw-Hill Professional, 2006). (D) J. Storrs Hall, *Nanofuture: What's Next for Nanotechnology*. (New York: Prometheus Books, 2005). (E) Mark A. Ratner and Daniel Ratner, *Nanotechnology: A Gentle Introduction to the Next Big Idea*. (New York: Prentice Hall, 2002). (F) Mick Wilson et al., *Nanotechnology: Basic Science and Emerging Technologies*. (Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press, 2002).

7. For such quotations as in this paragraph, see the websites *Spaceflight or Extinction* <www.spaext.com> and *Space Quotes to Ponder* <www.spacequotes.com>.