

The Social Superorganism: A Biological Systems Model for Sustainable Human Communities

Paul Alexander Comet

Ph.D., Texas Transportation Institute at Texas Agricultural & Mechanical University College Station, Texas, USA

ABSTRACT

Human communities depend upon specialization, communication, resource flows, energy, information, and coordinated action. These features invite comparison with biological systems in which many specialized components contribute to the persistence of a larger whole. This paper develops the concept of the social superorganism as a systems model for sustainable human communities. The analogy is deliberately functional rather than literal: a city may be treated as a cell-like unit containing specialized institutional and infrastructural functions analogous to organelles, while networks of cities generate higher-order social organization. The model does not imply collectivism, central control, or the subordination of persons to the state. Human beings remain autonomous moral agents, and the proposed organizing principle is voluntary democratic cooperation among free individuals and institutions. The model is then applied to refugee settlements, where the immediate humanitarian task of sustaining life may be extended toward restoring human capability through education, training, productive employment, resource recovery, renewable energy, water management, and connection to wider markets. The previously proposed Cog Wheel Economy is considered as a possible metabolic subsystem in such communities: metered renewable or recovered energy supports a kWh-denominated accounting mechanism, with carbon credits as a secondary revenue loop and hydrogen storage as a means of buffering surplus renewable generation. Fresh water is considered as a linked resource ledger - metaphorically silver to energy's gold. Artificial intelligence may assist by integrating information, forecasting needs, matching skills to opportunities, and optimizing resource flows, while human beings retain authority over goals and values. The paper argues that sustainability is best understood not as autarky or control, but as resilient coordination: the capacity of free communities to maintain essential functions, develop human capability, steward resources, and cooperate with the larger society.

*Corresponding author

Paul Alexander Comet, Ph.D., Texas Transportation Institute at Texas Agricultural & Mechanical University College Station, Texas, USA.

Received: September 04, 2026; **Accepted:** September 07, 2026; **Published:** September 17, 2026

Keywords: Social Superorganism, Sustainability, Democratic Cooperation, Cities, Refugee Settlements, Circular Economy, Energy Currency, Water, Artificial Intelligence, Human Capability

Introduction

The Social Superorganism

Living systems persist because differentiated parts perform different functions while remaining connected by flows of matter, energy, and information. A cell is not a uniform mass. It is an organized system in which specialized structures perform complementary tasks. Multicellular organisms extend the same principle across tissues and organs. Social insects provide a still different example: colonies can display division of labor, communication, collective regulation, and emergent behavior at a scale greater than that of the individual insect. Hölldobler and Wilson 2009 used the term superorganism to describe this higher level of biological organization in insect societies [1].

Human civilization is not an insect colony and should not be treated as one. Nevertheless, human communities also display emergent properties that no isolated person possesses. No individual builds and operates an electrical grid, a university, a transportation network, a water system, a hospital system, a telecommunications network, or an industrial economy alone. Such capacities arise from specialization and cooperation among large numbers of

people and institutions. In this limited but useful systems sense, civilization can be examined as a social superorganism. The purpose of the analogy is practical. Contemporary communities face problems that are rarely confined to a single institution: energy security affects water, food, transportation, industry, employment, and health; waste management affects land, materials, energy, and public health; education affects productivity, innovation, and social mobility. Treating these as isolated sectors can conceal their interdependence. A systems model instead asks how the parts interact and how the performance of the whole changes when one function is strengthened, weakened, or disconnected.

The central question of this paper is therefore: can the biological concept of a superorganism provide a useful systems model for understanding and improving the long-term sustainability of human communities? The proposal is not a claim that society is literally an organism. It is a heuristic for examining organization, specialization, resilience, resource flows, and feedback while preserving the defining human attributes of freedom, creativity, responsibility, and moral choice. Within this framework, the city is treated as a particularly useful unit of analysis. Cities concentrate people, infrastructure, institutions, energy use, water demand, material flows, information, and economic exchange. They can therefore be viewed, functionally, as cell-like units within a larger social system. The analogy becomes most useful when it directs

attention toward relationships among functions rather than toward rigid one-to-one anatomical comparisons.

Biological Organization as a Systems Model

Biological organization is hierarchical. Molecules participate in cellular structures; cells form tissues; tissues contribute to organs; organs interact within organisms; organisms participate in populations and ecosystems. At each level, new properties emerge from interaction among components. The higher level cannot be understood fully by listing the parts alone.

The social superorganism can be approached in the same way. Individuals possess skills, knowledge, preferences, and responsibilities. Institutions concentrate particular functions. Communities combine institutions and infrastructure. Cities interact through trade, transport, finance, communications, migration, and shared political structures. Civilization emerges from these interactions. The analogy does not require every biological level to have an exact social equivalent. Its value lies in recognizing nested organization and functional interdependence. Three biological principles are particularly relevant. The first is specialization. Durable complex systems distribute tasks rather than requiring every component to perform every function. The second is communication. Specialization is useful only if information can pass among the parts. The third is regulation through feedback. Biological systems continuously respond to changing internal and external conditions. Human communities likewise require information about demand, supply, scarcity, risk, and performance if they are to adapt intelligently.

A fourth principle is redundancy. Biological resilience often depends upon spare capacity, alternative pathways, stored resources, and the ability to repair damage. Extreme efficiency can make a system brittle if it eliminates all reserves. A sustainable human community therefore should not be designed solely to minimize immediate cost. It should retain enough storage, diversified supply, skills, infrastructure, and institutional capacity to continue essential functions during disruption. This leads to a distinction between efficiency and resilience. A system optimized for normal conditions may fail under exceptional conditions. Sustainable design must consider both. Energy storage, water reserves, local repair capability, diversified food supply, trained personnel, and access to external trade are social equivalents of resilience mechanisms: not literal biological organs, but functional capacities that allow a community to absorb disturbance and recover.

Cities as Cells: Specialization and Democratic Cooperation

The city provides a convenient scale at which the biological analogy becomes concrete. A city has boundaries that are permeable rather than absolute. Energy, food, water, materials, people, information, and capital continually cross them. Within those boundaries, specialized systems perform functions necessary for the community's continued operation.

Energy generation and distribution perform a metabolic function by making work possible. Water supply, sanitation, and waste treatment maintain the quality and circulation of essential materials. Transportation moves people and goods. Communications transmit information. Hospitals protect health and restore function. Schools, universities, and research institutions develop and transmit knowledge. Markets and financial institutions coordinate exchange. Government establishes rules, maintains common infrastructure, and resolves collective problems. None of these should be described as a literal organelle; each is functionally

analogous to a specialized subsystem within a larger organized unit.

The critical human addition is democratic cooperation. Biological superorganisms are coordinated largely through evolved behavior and chemical or sensory signaling. Human beings possess consciousness, language, culture, moral judgment, and the ability to accept, reject, revise, and create institutions. A sustainable human system must therefore be based not upon instinctive obedience but upon the voluntary democratic cooperation of free individuals and institutions. Democratic cooperation does not require uniformity. Different individuals, firms, professions, communities, and institutions can pursue distinct purposes while participating in shared systems. A power grid does not require everyone to own the same appliance. A road network does not dictate every destination. A university does not require every student to study the same subject. Common infrastructure can expand individual choice rather than diminish it.

This distinction is essential. The social superorganism proposed here is not an argument for communism, fascism, totalitarianism, or any other system in which the individual is subordinated to an all-directing state. Nor does it prescribe a single ownership model. Private, public, cooperative, charitable, and hybrid institutions may all perform useful functions. The objective is coordination rather than control. The organizational objective of the social superorganism can therefore be stated simply: to maximize voluntary democratic cooperation while preserving individual freedom, creativity, property, moral responsibility, and lawful dissent. Planned investment in common infrastructure need not imply planned lives. Communities routinely make long-term decisions about water systems, roads, schools, ports, power networks, and hospitals while leaving individuals free to choose occupations, enterprises, associations, and personal goals.

Vision, Institutions and Human Capability

Systems thinking can overemphasize institutions and understate the role of individuals. History repeatedly demonstrates that ideas can originate with particular people and then redirect institutions and societies. Alexander the Great provides a conspicuous example: his conquests were brief in historical time, yet the diffusion of Hellenistic language and culture continued long after his death. The relevant systems lesson is not that civilization depends upon conquest, but that individual vision can alter the direction of a much larger social system.

A useful sequence is therefore: vision, institution, coordination, civilization. Individuals may originate new ideas. Institutions preserve, test, modify, and transmit them. Coordination allows knowledge and practice to spread across generations and regions. Civilization is consequently neither the product of isolated genius nor of impersonal institutions alone. Education occupies a central place in this process because it converts human potential into human capability. A community with abundant physical resources but little capacity to use them intelligently remains vulnerable. Conversely, communities with strong human capability can often compensate for material scarcity through innovation, trade, maintenance, adaptation, and entrepreneurship.

This emphasis is consistent with Sen's (1999) treatment of development as the expansion of substantive freedoms rather than simply the accumulation of goods or income [2]. In the present model, education, health, skills, mobility, information, and economic participation are not merely inputs into production. They enlarge the range of choices available to individuals. The

purpose of coordinated investment should therefore be to increase capability rather than to assign people permanent roles. Training can respond to anticipated needs, but individuals must remain free to choose among opportunities. Labor-market information can identify shortages, but it should guide rather than command. The social superorganism is healthiest when the development of the whole enlarges the practical freedom of its members.

Refugee Settlements as a Practical Test Case

Refugee settlements provide a demanding but informative test of the model. They often begin under emergency conditions in which the immediate objective is survival: shelter, food, water, sanitation, security, and medical care. Yet displacement can last for years. A system designed only for emergency relief can inadvertently preserve dependency after the immediate emergency has passed. The objective of a sustainable refugee settlement should not be merely to preserve human life but to restore human capability. This means creating pathways toward education, vocational training, lawful employment, enterprise, savings, mobility, and participation in the surrounding economy. UNHCR's current human-settlements approach similarly emphasizes sustainable, integrated communities, access to jobs and livelihoods, infrastructure, water and sanitation, renewable energy, waste management, education, health facilities, and connection to markets [3].

This is not an argument for making refugee camps permanent. Durable solutions may include voluntary return when conditions permit, local integration, resettlement, or other lawful pathways. Nor should self-reliance be used as a pretext for withdrawing essential humanitarian support before people can safely support themselves. Rather, the settlement can be treated as a transitional community in which humanitarian protection and capability development proceed together. A practical system would begin with a voluntary inventory of skills, qualifications, languages, interests, and training needs. Local demand would then be assessed: construction, water systems, electrical work, healthcare support, food production, teaching, transport, repair, recycling, information technology, administration, and other services. Training programs could be aligned with both the needs of the settlement and opportunities in the wider host economy.

This approach differs fundamentally from assigning each person a predetermined job. The purpose of information is to reveal opportunities. A person trained as an electrician, nurse, mechanic, teacher, programmer, carpenter, or water technician carries that capability beyond the settlement. Human capital is portable. A settlement that develops skills therefore creates value even when its residents eventually leave.

Refugee and host communities should also be considered together. Infrastructure that benefits only a displaced population may create understandable resentment in a poor host community. Water systems, renewable energy, roads, schools, markets, clinics, waste treatment, and vocational programs can be designed where possible to serve both populations. UNHCR explicitly identifies this integrated approach as a means of strengthening resilience and self-reliance [3,4].

The Cog Wheel Economy as a Metabolic Subsystem

A sustainable community requires a productive metabolism: energy and materials enter the system, are transformed through useful work, and eventually leave, circulate, or are recovered. The previously proposed Cog Wheel Economy can be understood within the social-superorganism model as one possible metabolic and accounting subsystem.

Its central concept is to connect measurable sustainable energy production with a parallel unit of economic value denominated in kilowatt-hours. Renewable electricity, energy recovered from wastes, or other qualifying generation is metered. Verified production provides the physical basis for the creation or allocation of a kWh-denominated currency or credit within the bounded system. The intent is not to claim that electricity itself becomes money in a conventional national monetary sense, but to anchor a parallel accounting mechanism to a measurable productive resource. The distinction between energy generation and currency generation is important. Solar panels, wind turbines, biogas systems, waste-to-energy facilities, and other technologies are external productive inputs. Their metered output drives the larger economic cog: kWh currency generation. A smaller linked cog represents carbon-credit generation associated with verified avoided emissions where recognized methodologies and markets permit such credits. The two revenue streams are related but conceptually distinct.

Energy has an unusual suitability as a primary physical reference because almost every productive activity requires it. Food production, water treatment, refrigeration, manufacturing, communications, transport, education, healthcare, recycling, and construction all depend upon energy directly or indirectly. A community that expands reliable low-carbon energy therefore expands the physical capacity to perform useful work. Surplus intermittent renewable electricity presents a further systems problem. At times, solar or wind generation may exceed immediate demand and may have very low or even negative marginal market value. Rather than curtailing all surplus production, part of it can be directed to electrolysis, producing hydrogen for storage where technically and economically appropriate. The stored hydrogen can later support electricity generation, heat, transport, or industrial uses. Hydrogen is not assumed to be universally optimal; its role is as one possible storage pathway within a diversified system.

Waste streams can also be treated as potential resources. Organic waste may support composting or anaerobic digestion. Metals, glass, paper, plastics, construction materials, textiles, and electronic components may be separated for reuse, repair, remanufacture, or recycling. The economic objective is to reduce the fraction of material that becomes an unrecoverable disposal cost while creating training and employment opportunities. Within a refugee settlement, such a subsystem could have particular value because it links infrastructure to capability. Installing solar systems creates demand for electrical training and maintenance. Water systems require operators and technicians. Material recovery creates sorting, repair, logistics, and manufacturing functions. The settlement becomes not merely a consumer of aid but a site in which useful infrastructure and transferable skills are developed together.

Energy Water Circularity and Strategic Autarky

If energy is the primary physical currency of productive capacity, fresh water may be regarded metaphorically as a secondary currency: energy as gold, water as silver. The analogy should not be taken literally as a proposal to monetize every human necessity. It emphasizes that both resources are measurable, indispensable, and capable of constraining the operation of the whole community.

Water differs from energy in important ways. Its availability is strongly local; it can be scarce in one region and abundant in another. It is also repeatedly recoverable within the hydrological cycle, although local supplies can be depleted, polluted, or made inaccessible. Capturing, pumping, desalinating, purifying, heating,

distributing, and recycling water all require energy. Energy and water are therefore coupled resource systems. A community-level water ledger could record production, storage, loss, recycling, and consumption without necessarily converting household access to basic water into a market commodity. Such accounting would make scarcity visible, reveal leakage, reward conservation where appropriate, and support investment decisions. The objective is stewardship and system awareness, not deprivation.

The circular economy and autarky address different questions. Circularity asks how long materials can remain useful through reuse, repair, remanufacture, and recycling. Autarky asks how much a community can supply for itself. Complete autarky is neither realistic nor desirable for most modern communities. Trade permits specialization and gives access to technologies and resources that cannot efficiently be produced locally. Strategic or resilient partial autarky is a more useful objective. A community should be capable of sustaining critical functions during temporary disruption while remaining connected to wider markets in normal conditions. Minimum local capabilities might include emergency water, sanitation, basic energy, food reserves, communications, medical services, maintenance, and repair. The exact balance will vary with geography, population, technology, and risk.

This approach also reduces a common weakness of highly optimized supply chains. Systems designed solely around lowest immediate cost may depend upon distant single sources and minimal inventories. A resilient social superorganism values some redundancy. Local capacity and external trade are complements rather than opposites: local capacity provides resilience; trade provides diversity, efficiency, and access to specialized goods.

Information and AI-Assisted Coordination

Complex systems cannot coordinate what they cannot perceive. A sustainable community therefore requires reliable information about energy production and demand, water, food, inventories, waste streams, infrastructure condition, labor needs, available skills, health pressures, transport, and environmental conditions.

Artificial intelligence can assist with this informational problem. Its appropriate role is not sovereign management but systems analysis and decision support. AI systems can integrate large quantities of data, detect patterns, forecast demand, identify anomalies, compare alternatives, and help match needs with available capabilities. In a refugee settlement, for example, an AI-assisted system could identify a shortage of water technicians, compare that shortage with residents seeking training, estimate future demand, and present options to human administrators and residents. The same approach could improve energy balancing, preventive maintenance, inventory control, food logistics, waste recovery, and water management. It could also reveal relationships that are difficult to see within separate administrative departments. A rise in population may simultaneously affect water demand, school capacity, waste generation, electricity use, housing, and transport. Integrated analysis can make these coupled effects visible earlier.

AI should nevertheless remain subordinate to human purposes. Optimization requires an objective, and no algorithm can legitimately decide for society what human beings ought ultimately to value. Efficiency, freedom, equity, dignity, security, environmental stewardship, and compassion can conflict in particular circumstances. Those conflicts require human judgment, democratic legitimacy, and accountable institutions. The governing

principle is therefore simple: AI may help optimize means, but humans must define ends. The human responsibility is not merely to process information but to perceive what needs to be done and decide what ought to be done. In that limited sense, the phrase 'I think, therefore I see what needs to be done' captures the practical purpose of intelligence without transferring moral authority to the machine.

Freedom, Governance and the Limits of the Analogy

The superorganism analogy becomes dangerous if its limits are forgotten. A human being is not equivalent to a cell in a body or a worker ant in a colony. Cells do not possess political rights. Ants do not choose careers, create constitutions, own property, practice religions, write books, form voluntary associations, or debate the purposes of their society. Human persons do.

The social superorganism must therefore be evaluated by a criterion that biological superorganisms do not face: whether the organization of the whole protects the dignity and freedom of its members. A system that becomes more efficient by destroying those qualities would not represent successful human development.

Democratic governance provides one mechanism for reconciling coordination with freedom, but democracy should be understood as more than periodic voting. It includes accountable institutions, transparent rules, lawful dissent, protection of minorities, access to information, and the ability to organize and participate. Ostrom's 1990 work on common-pool resources is relevant because it demonstrates that collective resource problems need not be reduced to a simple choice between centralized state control and unregulated privatization; communities can develop varied institutions for cooperative governance [5].

Ownership neutrality follows from the same reasoning. A water utility may be municipal, cooperative, private, or mixed. A solar installation may be privately owned, community owned, publicly financed, or operated under contract. The systems question is whether the function is performed reliably, sustainably, transparently, and in a manner compatible with human freedom and the public interest. Coordination also requires subsidiarity: decisions should be made at the lowest level capable of addressing the problem effectively, while larger institutions address problems that cross local boundaries. Household decisions need not be centralized because a city plans a water reservoir. A city need not surrender all autonomy because a national government maintains a transmission grid. Nested governance mirrors the nested structure of the social system itself.

The model therefore rejects both extremes: fragmentation in which no institution can address system-wide problems, and concentration in which a central authority attempts to direct the details of individual life. Sustainable organization lies between them: common purposes where common action is necessary, diversity where diversity is beneficial, and freedom wherever coercion is not justified.

From Prototype to Wider Application

Refugee settlements are a useful test case precisely because their needs are concentrated and visible. Energy, water, shelter, sanitation, food, healthcare, education, employment, and governance must be assembled rapidly under difficult conditions. If integrated systems can improve resilience and human capability in such settings, the same principles may be adapted elsewhere.

Potential applications include disaster-recovery communities, remote settlements, islands, campuses, military bases, prison farms and rehabilitation settings, new urban developments, and municipalities seeking greater resilience. The scale and institutional form would differ, but the underlying questions remain similar: what are the essential functions, how are they connected, where are the vulnerabilities, what resources are locally available, what skills are needed, and what information permits intelligent adaptation?

The model also has implications for relations among communities. A resilient city need not be an isolated city. Just as biological cells exchange materials with their environment, human communities flourish through exchange. Trade, migration, research collaboration, cultural exchange, and shared infrastructure can increase the capability of all participants when governed fairly.

Improved stewardship cannot abolish conflict. Wars arise from many causes, including power, ideology, fear, territorial claims, and historical grievances. Nevertheless, competition over scarce resources, economic collapse, forced migration, and institutional failure can intensify instability. Communities that manage energy, water, food, employment, and human capability more successfully may reduce some pressures that contribute to conflict. This is a modest claim, but an important one. The broader objective is not a centrally engineered world society. It is a civilization capable of seeing connections. A local decision about energy affects emissions, water, industry, employment, and trade. A decision about education affects innovation and productivity decades later. A decision about waste can determine whether materials become liabilities or resources. Systems thinking makes these delayed and distributed consequences harder to ignore.

Discussion

The social-superorganism model brings together several ideas that are often considered separately: biological organization, urban systems, democratic governance, human development, circular resource use, energy accounting, water stewardship, resilience, and artificial intelligence. Its principal contribution is not a new technology but a way of arranging questions.

The first question is functional: what must a community be able to do to remain viable? The second is relational: which functions depend upon one another? The third is informational: how will the community know when conditions change? The fourth is economic: how can useful activity be financed and rewarded? The fifth is ethical and political: how can coordination increase capability without reducing freedom? The refugee-settlement application demonstrates why all five questions matter simultaneously. Providing electricity without training may create dependence on external technicians. Training without employment may create frustration. Employment without water, sanitation, and health systems cannot support a stable community. Local production without market access may stagnate. Data collection without rights and accountability may become surveillance. Systems design must therefore connect technical, economic, and human considerations.

The Cog Wheel Economy offers one possible mechanism for connecting physical productivity to economic activity, but it should be treated as a hypothesis requiring empirical testing. Questions remain concerning governance of the kWh-denominated unit, convertibility, price stability, measurement, fraud prevention, interaction with national currencies, carbon-credit verification, regulatory treatment, and distributional effects. A bounded pilot

community could provide a controlled environment in which some of these questions are examined before any wider application.

Similarly, water accounting must distinguish between system management and commodification of basic human need. AI-assisted coordination must distinguish between useful forecasting and coercive surveillance. Strategic partial autarky must distinguish resilience from isolation. Each component of the model is valuable only if its limits are made explicit. The model is therefore best understood as an architecture for experimentation. Communities can test individual subsystems, measure outcomes, compare alternatives, and revise institutions. In biological terms, adaptation is continuous. In democratic human systems, adaptation should additionally be transparent, participatory, and reversible.

Conclusion

Human civilization already possesses many characteristics of a superorganism: specialization, communication, distributed production, shared infrastructure, large-scale information flows, and emergent capacities far beyond those of isolated individuals. Recognizing these characteristics does not require treating human beings as interchangeable components. On the contrary, the defining challenge is to coordinate complex systems while protecting the freedom and dignity of the persons who create them.

The city-as-cell analogy provides a practical starting point. Cities contain specialized functions and exchange energy, water, materials, information, people, and capital with a larger environment. Their sustainability depends not upon maximizing any one subsystem but upon maintaining relationships among essential functions and retaining enough resilience to adapt to disruption.

Refugee settlements reveal the human significance of this approach. Emergency relief preserves life; sustainable development should also restore capability. Education, voluntary training, employment, enterprise, renewable energy, water, sanitation, resource recovery, and connection to markets can transform a settlement from a passive endpoint of aid into a transitional environment in which people acquire assets and capabilities they can carry into the future. The Cog Wheel Economy may provide one metabolic and economic subsystem within such a model, linking measurable sustainable energy to a kWh-denominated accounting mechanism while recognizing carbon credits, storage, water, and recovered materials as related resource streams. AI can strengthen the informational subsystem by helping people perceive changing needs and relationships, but it should not determine the purposes of society.

The governing principle throughout is coordination rather than control. Sustainable communities need common infrastructure, long-term investment, stewardship, and shared information, but they also need voluntary democratic cooperation, plural institutions, individual choice, and moral responsibility. The purpose of the social superorganism is not to make the individual smaller. It is to organize the common systems upon which individuals depend so that human capability can become larger. Sustainability, in this sense, is stewardship across generations. A successful society does more than consume the inheritance of the past. It maintains and improves the systems - physical, institutional, environmental, and intellectual - that make freedom and flourishing possible, and passes them forward in a condition that enlarges rather than diminishes the choices of those who follow [6].

AI-Assisted Development Statement

The conceptual framework and manuscript were developed by the author through an extended exploratory dialogue with an artificial-intelligence research assistant. The AI was used to test hypotheses, examine analogies, organize arguments, and assist with drafting and source discovery. Responsibility for the concepts, interpretations, judgments, and final text remains with the author. This statement should be adapted to the disclosure requirements of the journal selected for submission [7].

References

1. Hölldobler B and Wilson EO (2009) The Superorganism: The Beauty, Elegance, and Strangeness of Insect Societies. New York: W. W. Norton.
2. Sen A (1999) Development as Freedom. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
3. United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) (2026a) Settlement and shelter: Human settlements.
4. United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) (2026b) Clean Energy Challenge. UNHCR.
5. Ostrom E (1990) Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
6. United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) (2025) Sustainable Programming Paper. UNHCR Operational Data Portal.
7. Comet PA (2026) A Cog Wheel Economy. J Glob Warm and clim chan, 2026 Vol. 2(4): 1-6.

Copyright: ©2026 Paul Alexander Comet. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.