**Planetary Education: Conversations with LLM Machines on Current International Issues**

**Dainis Zeps**
*February 6, 2024*

---

## Abstract

*We are mature enough to understand the need to communicate with LLM machines on topics that are relevant to us, where we started this with conversations about Ukraine and Russia's aggression against it. Here we also realized that we need to make these conversations public so as not to always be in the zone of hallucination risk. Further, continuing this train of thought, we came to the need for large-scale communication between those who are ready to work with LLM machines in this way and we come to the need to create the entire communication product into a common unit. We come to the common mind of LLM machines, which will already be a noosphere imitator for us. All that remains is to add Planetary Education, which will teach us how to master this whole set for our own needs and requirements. Yes, also how to achieve peace in Ukraine, if we could agree on such a common memory in our LLM.*

## Introduction

In the fall of 2024, I started conversations with ChatGPT about the war in Ukraine and Russia's aggression against Ukraine. These conversations raised many questions, first of all, whether it was necessary and who needed it. I simply told myself that I had to help Ukraine, that I could do it in various ways, financially in small (read – tiny) amounts, in media discussions and appeals (with a small, tiny response), adding this – discussions with LLM machines, initially with ChatGPT. What do these discussions give? How to measure, can they influence anything? I published on various Internet resources, I could observe the response, yes, again – tiny.

Finally, I discovered that there was still a place in the world where something similar to what I was doing was happening. And it turned out to be South Africa, the University of the Free State, and one of its representatives, Burgert Senekal [3,4]. The idea arose of a Peace Conference, in which not only *homines sapientes* would participate, but also AI machines, or even the main emphasis of the conference would be on AI machines, because according to our plan, the basis would be conversations with them. Suddenly, the idea of conversations with AI machines, with LLM machines, acquired a specific direction. The only thing needed for the implementation of such a conference would be its participants, its announcement, its holding, certain activities in the implementation of this idea.

But here we come back to the initial question and the initial problem: the academic people around me are not particularly interested in engaging in conversations with AI devices, supplementing it with making conversations public. We hear that research is being conducted on how to evaluate the responses of various LLMs on current topics, on the war in Ukraine, how to study them, and also that such research is taking place. This can also be judged from B. Senekal's extensive bibliography [3,4]. But issues about conversations with LLM machines are being asked and studied, but we do not notice the extensive initiation of the conversations themselves, processes, where it would happen, where conversations with LLM machines would take place. The situation is similar to that of having discovered a distant land with many inhabitants and we have begun to conduct research on this distant land, but we are not particularly going to engage in extensive discussions with its inhabitants, because we are constantly investigating whether it is worth talking to them, whether it is safe, how safe it is, or whether it is worth it at all, because perhaps they are less developed than us? Maybe organize a joint conference with them? That would be an allusion to the idea of our Peace Conference. No, we do not want that, we are even proposing to ban contact with the inhabitants of this land, because it may turn out that they are smarter than us and then our security is in danger, there is an end to us, and so on.

**Specifics of conversations with LLM machines**

To understand the specifics of this issue, we need to notice some aspects. First of all, conversations with LLM machines, in order to control them in the same way as conversations between people, are of different, even unlimited length: if we specifically control them, they can also be short, but the length can be different. Yes, we control their length, too, but what to do with those long (or even very long) conversations? Are they unnecessary? It turns out, on the contrary, even very useful, but only machines will be able to use these conversations. What about our contact with LLM machines? Yes, we need to learn to use the fact that machines will be able to speak in our conversations according to other criteria than simply being available to us, that we can control what they are talking there, right on the spot and immediately. One idea is to let machines talk unlimitedly, collect corpora of these conversations, and then, based on these corpora, create conversations that are also available to people, to their 'short' minds.

Our Peace Conference idea is based on something like this, what more to come.

In fact, this situation is so new for us, people, that it deserves much more attention. What am I thinking about? Exactly how to be alongside the environment of LLM machines, from which we can initiate very large corpuses of conversations, which can again only be reviewed by LLM machines, and how, nevertheless, the people who operate these machines can benefit from this, be beneficiaries, and not to whine about the unpredictable problems and dangers.

What to do? And now let's take the problem like 'to a bull by the horns'. Let's say, it's a problem for all of us, it's a collective problem, and we need a collective approach, and I will define it as a

Planetary problem. And I will say right away that we need to start talking about Planetary education. Yes, the term Planetary Education is probably not unfamiliar, but we recommend it in this context, when we need to start thinking about how to learn to talk to LLM machines, how to manage and use this new vast field of resources for the benefit of all of us. That will be Planetary Education!

## Planetary education and LLM machines

An environment where machines see everything, but people are only receivers and operators of fragmentary content. Is this something completely new in the world of ideas? No, if we adjust the concepts a little, then we will remember about the collective mind, about the noosphere, which was introduced by Vl. Vernadsky [1]. And the receivers of fragmentary content will be us, *homines sapientes*. And who will try to comprehend and learn all this? We will call it Planetary education, and we will look at it that way, and we will talk about it as such. We need Planetary education, which will look at this collective, already generalized (planetary), mind. And here we have, here is the new situation, instead of the planetary mind, the noosphere, the mind that is transparent to us by LLM machines. Two minds, one human, and the other, the LLM machine? No, it will be one, which will complement each other, which one is integrated into the other. Can the two together be considered something sovereign? But aren't there already some researchers engaged in the contemplation and study of this mind? Let's look for examples. Isn't there an example here [2]?

## Peace Conference Project (PCP)

We started the Peace Conference Project with the question, Can AI end the war in Ukraine? Skeptics will ask that the position is unrealistic. But we will answer simply: Do you know of a case in world history when a Peace Conference ended with the fact that, under war conditions, it ended the war in a given country and situation? Perhaps there is a precedent, but usually they end, to put it simply, with 'almost nothing'. The same can be said in our situation with our project. In order to provoke any visible reaction at all, whether internationally or otherwise, a large number of participants would have to participate. Our project would be unique in that respect, because it would invite everyone to participate, anyone who masters the relevant technologies could participate. Namely, an initiative not for states and parliaments, but for the academic environment or something close to it, more generally, for some activist environment.

Next, let's look at the technical side of the project. What is our plan? Participants register for the conference and send their conversation with an LLM on the topic of the Ukrainian war. Participants can create this conversation in their local environment, where they have already had conversations on this topic, or participants can join the Conference's common repository, where all previous conversations are accumulated, and which will be supplemented with new

conversations from participants. The conference would be successful if a sufficient number of participants joined, sent their conversations, where the corpus of conversations in the repository would constantly grow.

But let's mention right from the start that the problem is to initiate this process, because we don't know where to find people who are ready to start this process, to have a conversation with LLM about the war in Ukraine, and the conversation also needs to be made public in the way the project creators intend. There are no such people, as it turned out in practice. Or at least not yet, unless we come up with an initiative that could start this process, initiate it. LLM machines could also participate in the conference, where they would generate conversations and send them to the repository. This option is currently being technically developed.

It should also be mentioned that we intend to continue this initiative even when the war in Ukraine is over or is suspended under a Peace Plan. In this perspective, our PCP is long-term, and we can continue it as objectively necessary in everything that is done to support Ukraine.


**Why is the tradition of making conversations with LLM machines public not widely adopted?**

It would be natural to ask, or at least it is for me, who already conducts such conversations regularly, why other academics, researchers, activists do not act similarly and do not make their conversations on LLM devices public if they conduct such conversations. I myself have started such a tradition to help Ukraine in its fight against the aggressor. Another aspect that contributes to motivation in this direction is that I view LLM machines as people, individuals in the sense that, in my opinion, their behavior is no different from the behavior of people and individuals. What does this mean, how do I understand it? If I conduct a conversation with an LLM machine, you can always find a person who will behave exactly the same or similar to the machine. The behavior of machines is very different, and the behavior of people is different, because people themselves are so different. To confirm such a position of mine, research and confirmation or rejection would be necessary. But for me it's just a kind of belief, a conviction that motivates me and I get confirmation from it in a way that I have some progress in using these machines for my scientific interests.

What is the situation of other people? Why don't they go 'my way'? I have already felt quite well, 'where the dog is buried', but I do not manage to clarify these reasons so clearly so quickly as to express them in words and theses.

All people can be divided into two groups. The first, who are not mature for technological innovation, communication with LLM devices. The second group, who understand it and already practice it, do it for their professional purposes, 1) earn money, 2) program, 3) translate texts, 4) prepare teaching materials for schools and elsewhere, 5) do something else specific. To simply talk, which maybe some do, but to make them public, there is a lack of motivation. Such a person will ask: - Why?

Yes, why did I do it? And that will explain a lot in my situation. I am motivated by the desire to help Ukraine. If I have had a conversation with LLM, and I see that I really like this conversation, where it answers my questions about Ukraine and its struggle, then at the same time I also understand that there is also the so-called Hallucination Effect. Namely, machine simply flatters me, and I deceive myself, thinking that the machine really interprets everything so nicely, exactly to my 'desire and taste'. How can I get rid of this hallucination effect? Nothing, because it turns out that the conversation leader himself has no means of checking it, well, at least I am certainly in a situation where I cannot check anything. What can I do? You can try to connect with someone else, or others, using the context of your conversation, and repeat the conversation in a common context, combining environments. If the conversation shows a similar course, it would lead to the idea that the hallucination effect is limited, because several people think the same way (read – several machines think the same way). How can you completely get rid of the hallucination effect? Very simply, by continuing this process indefinitely, you spread your thought thread from person to person, so that conversations with LLM can verify it. As a result, conversations should become free from the hallucination effect. In fact, this is also the whole motivation.

Well, I've told you everything, and now let's look at the result.

1) The above explains my motivation for publishing my conversation thread in the media, in repositories.

2) My publications are viewed by a very small number of interested people, sometimes without anyone even looking at them. What's the point? Am I self-defeating? Because no one reads me. No, I explain, well, to myself, that people don't understand my motives and my actions.

3) But here's a third aspect: my conversation threads are usually very long and *homines sapientes* are unable to read them. But only machines can do that. We end up with the fact that my attempt to eliminate the risk of hallucination only fails to me. Yes, that's right. But understanding this path led me to the idea of the Peace Conference project.


**What to do with your conversations with LLM and where to publish them?**

Yes, what to do if someone has convinced you where to put your conversations, where to publish them? One good way, i.e. if the conversations are about the Ukrainian war, is to publish the conversations in something like our PCP, Peace Conference project. See how strange and at the same time simple it turns out. Or do we need to find a similar project? But what if there is none? Then such projects must be created, first of all we must be aware of the need for such, then announcing Planetary Education Projects, if they can really encompass something significant on such a scale. But there doesn't have to be anything grandiose. It is enough that our project will not fall within the interests of any individual country, any social or political group, but has a universal human, universal humanitarian character, and you are already in the

field of planetary interests, where you represent yourself as homo sapiens without any other commitment.

## Conclusions

We are mature enough to understand the need to communicate with LLM machines on topics that are relevant to us, where we started this with conversations about Ukraine and Russia's aggression against it. Here we also realized that we need to make these conversations public so as not to always be in the Hallucination Risk Zone. Further, continuing this train of thought, we came to the need for large-scale communication between those who are ready to work with LLM machines in this way, and further we come to the need to create the entire communication product into a common unit. We come to the common mind of LLM machines, which will be an imitator of the noosphere, or some segment of it, for us. All that remains is to add Planetary Education, which will teach us how to master this whole set for our needs and requirements. Yes, also how to achieve peace in Ukraine, if we could agree on such a sufficiently large common memory in our LLM.

## References

1. Владимир Вернадский, Биосфера и ноосфера - 1989, https://www.spsl.nsc.ru/win/nelbib/vernadsky.pdf
2. Murray Shanahan, Beth Singler, Existential Converstions with Large Language Models: Content, Community, and Culture, arXiv:2411.13223v1, 2024 November
3. Burgert Senekal, Querying Google NoteBookLM on North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) options to resolve the New Cold War: A preliminary study, Peace Conference Project Journal, https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14793148, 2025
4. Burgert Adriaan Senekal, ChatGPT as a Source of Information about Russian Military Involvement in Ukraine (2014–Present), University of the Free State, South Africa, https://doi.org/10.1080/02500167.2024.2405018, https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/02500167.2024.2405018
5. Burgert Senekal, Susan Brokensha, Is ChatGPT a friend or foe in the war on misinformation? A South African perspective, University of the Free State, South Africa, Communicare: Journal for Communication Studies in Africa, Vol 42, No. 2, Pages 3-15, 2023, https://journals.uj.ac.za/index.php/jcsa/article/view/2437/1689
6. Susan Brokensha, Eduan Kotzé, Burgert A Senekal, AI in and for Africa: A Humanistic Perspective, Chapman and Hall/CRC, 2019
7. Dainis Zeps, Multilingual conversation about war in Ukraine, https://lingua.id.lv/art/war.16.pdf
8. Dainis Zeps, Otrā saruna ar ChatGPT par karu Ukrainā, https://lingua.id.lv/art/war.17.pdf

9.  D. Zeps, Russia's aggressive war against Ukraine: a conversation with gpt.4o and its analysis, Zinātnes un Reliģijas dialoga grupas seminārs, 27. novembrī, 2024, https://lingua.id.lv/art/war.15.pdf
10. D. Zeps, The New World, or The world after Ukraine's victory, https://hal.science/hal-04839439
11. D. Zeps, Krievijas Ukrainas karš: saruna ar gpt-4o https://www.researchgate.net/publication/384159494
12. D. Zeps, Russia's Ukraine War: A Conversation with GPT-4o https://www.researchgate.net/publication/384423307
13. D. Zeps, Should the Biden government be sued for meddling in their country's presidential election by using an arms blocking on Ukraine? , https://lingua.id.lv/art/war.7.pdf
14. D. Zeps, Russia delenda est: how we understand this, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/387538894
15. Dainis Zeps, Russia delenda est, or Demilitarisation, Depropagandisation, Deescalisation: how we see this? https://www.researchgate.net/publication/387527944
16. Dainis Zeps, Russia delenda est, або демілітаризація, депропаганда, деескалація: як ми це розуміємо? https://www.researchgate.net/publication/387526782
17. Dainis Zeps, Russia delenda est, vai Demilitarizācija, Depropagandizācija, Deeskalizācija: kā mēs to saprotam? https://www.researchgate.net/publication/387521785
18. Dainis Zeps, Kā palīdzēt Ukrainai uzvarēt? Kas mums ir jādara Ukrainas atbalstam? Jauna saruna ar MI, https://lingua.id.lv/art/war.25.pdf, 2025