

# FOREWORD

Nothing is ever certain, remember everything can be argued for and against both inside and outside of here.

Most underlined words are links to other slides.

# PROGRESS LIST

- ~~• Create a slide template~~
- ~~• Approximate what the slides will be about~~
- ~~• Create titles and statements for every slide~~
- ~~• Finish writing the slides~~
- Add pictures/write better slides

# THE STORY

## EXPIRATION OF LIBERALISM

We live in an era of unparalleled prosperity dominated by liberalism.  
New problems have been enabled by technology. Most are  
unfamiliar with our problems. Two antagonists of humanity have  
appeared, the plutocratic coalition, and the accidents.

## OUR REACTIONS

Slowing of industry cannot work in a competitive world.  
Transhumanism creates more problems than solved. Neo-  
nationalism is denying the existence of the problems, instead of  
solving them. All the reactions in the past are not relevant for the  
present.

## SOLVING OUR PROBLEMS

To solve the problems, a bare minimum would be to implement  
regulations. A discussion regarding what to discuss.

## THE PROMISES

## FURTHER READING

## THE END



# THE FREE WORLD

## **DEFINITION**

As a system of many names, it will here be called liberalism. Here, the main ideals of liberalism are trust in capitalism, democracy, and humans, rather than violence against white-skinned men.

## **REASON FOR EXISTING**

During the cold war, liberalism proved its capability as the most efficient system, leading to its victory, and thereby a spread of it throughout the world. Society today is dominated by it, whether it be through market-economies, a want for growth, or a want for greater freedom. The modern society therefore can be called a liberal one.

## **CREATED UNPARALLELED PROSPERITY**

Compared to how the world was five hundred years ago, many would call what humanity currently has as “better”. This change is often credited to liberalism.

Liberals, being those who built their story on the capitalist one, unlike the communists, adopted a very efficient system. Capitalism, differently from planned economies, delegate responsibilities to the masses, rather than a select few, meaning nothing would be strained, aside from the individuals working to benefit the system. Adding motivation, through promising a supply to the demands, thereby created an effective society. The effectiveness today manifests in the form of technology and the “better” society.





# TECHNOLOGICAL DISRUPTION

All systems being tradeoffs, the tradeoff of liberalism is central authority for greater freedom, and thereby efficiency. With reduced authority, regulations become difficult, which is apparent today. Today, we see the adverse effects of liberalism, in the form of technological disruption; unintended negative effects of technology.

## **GREATEST PROBLEM**


In the modern age, technological disruption is the biggest problem faced by mankind, being one of the primary reason for new agendas. Whether it be climate-activists protesting for a cleaner globe, conservative individuals being disturbed by the availability of aborting-devices, or unemployable people seeking to create a place for themselves in the future. Nearly every problem today can be traced back to a piece of technology having caused it.

## **HARNESSING THE POWER**

If technology only caused problems, there would be no hesitation in outlawing its existence. Due to technology being a tool rather than a force for evil, the question instead becomes how best it can be harnessed for good. Many today would say liberal societies are best at this job, especially due to the era of prosperity it caused.

It is no longer the case of liberal societies being able to harness technology for good, due to a balance having been upset. This balance, is that of humanist reactionary-movements versus the rate of disruptive inventions. Today, many factors compliment this imbalance, such as the accelerating rate of innovation, misinformation campaigns, and a populace busy being depressed or whatever, allowing damage to be done.

# THE PROBLEMS



Here is a list of the most severe technological disruptions we face. The arrow down-right is clickable, and indicates a continuation.

## **HACKING OF HUMANS**

Today, people constantly competing for others' attention is common knowledge, known as advertising. This advertising, has been working, judging by how it has not been discontinued. In the near future, devices for tracking eye movement, location, and even heart-rate, supposedly to help you stay healthy will be available, like cat-videos supposedly being for fun, or surveillance being for security.

Some claim they cannot be hacked, which might be true. They are not the majority though, and might find themselves surrounded by "hacked" people soon.

## **AUTOMATION**

In the industrial revolution, people feared becoming obsolete, only to find another field to work in. Today, this is still the case, but without the fear of becoming obsolete, and a declining amount of other fields to work in. This decline is of course attributed to the invention of robots capable of outcompeting humans. Those constantly being capable of finding new jobs, or being especially valuable, will not be replaced any time soon, but they are not the majority. Like the other problem, this is a problem for the majority.

Some, again, claim robots cannot replace humans in "emotional", "sensitive", and "caring" fields, due to those being uniquely human. Their forefathers said the exact same thing regarding mental fields in general, until the chess-master was beaten by a robot. More information can be found [here](#).



# THE PROBLEMS 2

## ECOLOGICAL CRISIS

Many like to call this problem “climate-change”, like I do. The reason why that is wrong, is because it is an understatement. By the sheer abundance and complexity of the climate-related problems we face, it becomes apparent to those knowledgeable of the situation how dire and seemingly irreversible it is. An example of this would be a food-chain, where the loss of a specie could cause the collapse of the entire thing. The global ecosystem is the same thing, but on a bigger scale, explaining its complexity.

Examples of this can be found [here](#).

## RISE OF CENTRALIZATION

The final nail-in-the-coffin to liberalism, would be the rise of centralization, the validation of the very system liberalism won against.

Our current computers are capable of processing data quickly, along with being fed data by cameras and workers. By assigning a goal to this powerful process, it might for example calculate how a nation should be run. Currently, computers and software are unable to handle such a task, but this is changing. With for example the introduction of quantum-computers, capable of very fast processing, a computer could be capable of running a nation, potentially promoting Kim Jong-un from supreme leader of North-Korea to supreme leader of the world, due to centralization usually being related to dictatorships.





# ENEMIES OF MANKIND

Since technology is a tool, ill-intents have to harness it for bad before it can become that way. Such ill-intents there are many of today, them gaining means through the liberal system.

## **PLUTOCRATIC COALITION**

The first and most obvious of these ill-intents, are those who have outcompeted others to attain money, the rich elite. To become one of them, there only is luck and a focus on money involved, with a focus on humanity only being optional, but usually a detriment. By focusing on humanity, focus is shifted away from money, potentially reducing the amount of money made, leading to outcompetition. This way, liberal society's elite cannot be trusted to have good intentions for humanity, hence this danger.

If the elite suddenly were to coalesce together, sending their army of brainwashed loyalists or robots to enslave humanity, them having the means to do so, would likely succeed. Even though it sounds fantastic, little is preventing such a move, aside from the chance of failure, and what would follow afterwards. This chance of failure though, is decreasing. As time passes, more jobs are being automated, while brainwashing technology is becoming more sophisticated, perhaps sophisticated enough to have humans willingly accept the new world order.

## **ACCIDENTS AND MADMEN**

Another threat would obviously be that of accidents, for example a nuclear bomb blowing up in the lab, whether it be due to mad scientists, or bad planning. This problem also is accelerating, due to the increased availability of resources, and the increased amount of people participating in the creation of dangerous things.





# COMPETITIVE WORLD

The fought-for solution of climate-activism, is a slower society, where all the adverse effects of technology have time to be countered by the humanist reactionary-movements. Such slowing can take form as spending money on expensive “green” alternatives instead of doing the polluting, but cheaper one.

## **KINDNESS IS SUICIDE**

For the slowed-society-solution to work, it has to be adopted, obviously. To adopt such a solution, is easy for those looking in, but not for those who gained entry for doing the opposite. Nearly all fictional entities in our society have to constantly compete for survival.

An example of this competition, would be China versus USA in the trade-conflict. By backing out of the conflict, China would have to stop the manufacturing of wares capable of competing with those of the US. Doing so, ensures US supremacy in that field, meaning all potential customers get drawn to the US instead of China. Continuing this trend, would lead to the weakening of China, and eventually have the ruling class replaced or otherwise compromised. Being nice to humans, therefore only is optional, as it does not ensure continued existence, unlike for example money does.

The problem with technological disruption and this, arises when disrupting society can help ensuring continued existence, otherwise be beneficial, or not harm the perpetrators enough to matter. This is a quite obvious result of our societies being aimed towards providing what is demanded, rather than stopping technological disruption, or taking the best decisions.

# TECHNOLOGICAL ENTHUSIASM

Many of those unworried about the condition of the climate, but still believing of it, say it easily can be solved through future technology. Therefore, they encourage technological creation. Those can be called techno-enthusiasts, or enthusiastic transhumanists; either way, they are very enthusiastic.

## **THE CURRENT TREND**

Transhumanists today, lack any meaningful direction, with most supporting the current societal systems. By increasing the development of new technologies in the current liberal system, some would claim more good than bad would be created. Meaning so, ignores the current trend of technological innovation, which is that of humanist reactionaries not being able to counteract technological disruption, due to the increasing size and creation.

## **CONCLUSION**

Most transhumanists today are engineers, programmers, and other people stoked about the future. Asking them whether their job of creating new technology should be increased in priority, is like asking a Christian whether there is a god or not.



# NEO-EMOTIONALIST AGENDA

Most people today, do not believe, are not worried by, or believe in climate-change, contrary to how the majority of climate-related scientists do. Whether the scientists or the unbelieving are right, will not be discussed here, but here. Instead, the reason for the unbelieving existing will be.

## **EMOTIONAL HUMANISM**

Emotionalism – to believe feelings have authority.

Liberalism, is not only a branch of humanism, but also of emotionalism, emotional humanism. Those today no longer trusting in the liberal system, have not turned away from this emotionalism, instead finding another agenda in that category, the most popular one being neo-nationalism.

## **NEO-NATIONALIST DEFINITION**

In certain communist societies, the feelings of the individual were not seen as important, telling them to ignore their feelings in order to pursue the greater good, which was serving the collective. Liberalism on the other hand, would play on the feelings of discontent felt by the communist laborers, telling them they should listen to their feelings of wanting a different society.

Like this, neo-nationalism plays on the feeling of nostalgia, promising people a glorious return to the past. Due to humans being able to feel nostalgia, and our societies being shaped to have feelings be the decision-making power (liberal democracies), neo-nationalists for example are able to implement Brexit in Britain and Trump in the US.



# OBSCOLESCENCE OF OLD IDEOLOGIES

When faced with problems, a normal solution is to undo whatever can be done, or turn to the past in other ways, such as using old solutions.

## THE CASE

Both communism and fascism, being old ideologies, also do not recall happy memories, leading to lowered appeal. Creating a neo-communist or fascist group will not be very effective, leading to them practically having become obsolete.

Groups of them still can be created, but are not recommended. This is especially the case when being a “fascist” can be interpreted negatively, while also being unrelated to actual fascism.





# REGULATIONS

By regulating what is allowed and what is not, technological disruption is solved. No dangerous or otherwise disruptive technologies can come into wrong hands with working regulations, leading to technology only being harnessed for good.

## REFORM?

To reform the current liberal society to become more friendly to humans, is like trying to transform a dog into a lamp. Even if you put lightbulbs inside the dog, plug it to electricity, and even enable it to create light, doing so would compromise the dogginess of the dog, while also not creating a very successful lamp. Such, is nearly always the case of amalgamation, and could be the only option, if it were not for there being more options.

## IMPLEMENTATION

Implementing the utopian regulations, is as difficult as “utopian” suggests. To know what needs to be regulated and what needs not, could be accomplished through delegating the responsibility to a group of people. In societies as big as ours though, the amount of information will be far too great for a few people to comprehend, leading to the options of a centralized computer-controlled society, or one where everyone means well and thinks about the consequences of their actions. Both of them would of course require a different society from a liberal one, and are difficult, but the minimum.

In the end, the bare minimum needed to stop the adverse, and destructive effects of technology are difficult to implement, especially peacefully, since everyone would have to agree.



# THE DISCUSSION

Since it now is known what is needed, a discussion regarding the relevance of other discussions will take place.

## **THE TRADITIONAL SPECTRUM**

Traditionally, the political spectrum was that of conserving society while also growing it, versus distributing society. Even though a lot of feelings are attached to this discussion, it has grown obsolete. Debates in the spectrum today are usually about antagonizing the other side, or

## **THE NEW SPECTRUM**

Some have later proposed the irrelevance of the traditional spectrum, stating it should be replaced with one of globalism versus nationalism.

## **THE NON-DEBATE**

Even though discussion is useful, every major problem today is on a global scale, be it climate-change, automation, hacking of humans, accidents and so on. None of these problems can be solved by only parts of the world attempting to. If the US were to attempt regulating for example artificial intelligence, problematic problems would be encountered. First, they would see themselves outcompeted in the fields benefitted by artificial intelligence, leading to their rival China benefitting both from the technology and US complacency.

To solve technological disruption, globalism becomes a must, with the steps leading up to it, and the implications being the new discussion.

# THE NEW SPECTRUM

Even though the solution is to implement regulations, a lot of variation still can exist. The variations will be explained here.

## Enthusiasm

Currently, there are the transhumanists, who are very enthusiastic regarding technology, wanting for example to enhance humanity with it. Others, might be less enthusiastic, only pursuing technological development to survive, like the Islamic state of Iraq and Levant.

## Pace

Even though much can be clarified through quick discussion, the case fits not the pace of technological development. Currently, there are no good arguments regarding survivability, pace, and general society. There is the argument of a quick pace being dangerous in liberal society though.

## T H E   M E A N S

- Radicalism – High enthusiasm
- Survivalism – Low enthusiasm
- Accelerationism – Fast pace
- Gradualism – Slow pace



# GATEWAY TO PARADISE

## **PROMISE OF PARADISE**


The ever-increasing wonders of technology are not news for most. Such wonders include sickness-curing medicine, and game-mastering computers. Upcoming wonders will be able to stop aging, cure depression, reprogram humans to be ever-blissful, and create totally realistic simulations. Guidance for creating such technology will not be discussed here, but the feasibility will.

## **POSSIBILITY**

The current theory of reality, and the many theories built upon it, have been proven false multiple times in the quantum realm. Outside of there, no proof of falseness exists, along with no better theories valid as replacements. All there is left, is unknowingness, meaning the theory, or a close variant of it, is true. That way, it is unlikely any barrier to mentioned wonders exists, as it would contradict the current theory of reality.

## **HUMANS WANT SALVATION**

A common theme of religions is claiming a good end for the good abiders. Such ends usually come in the form of no suffering, whether it be in the sky, or combination with the world. Creating a new way for humanity with a paradise at the end therefore will not be news, and be desirable judging by history.






# NO MEANING TO LIFE

## NOWHERE IN THE THEORY OF REALITY

It is common knowledge humans are made of atoms. Inside the atoms, and outside, there is more, but no such thing as meaning. Even though most humans claim they believe humans have value, while also claiming to be undogmatic, nothing in the universe exists to back that up. There is nothing natural about human worship of gods, and even less so human worship of humans, as that has not been practiced for a majority of time in history. In the end, meaning to life is null, resulting in no story being worth more than the other.

## JUSTIFICATION

The equal worth of stories results in the humanist story being worth no more than for example the Christian story, both of them being dogmatic. That is why some could choose to adhere to the Christian values promoting certain kinds of perfect society, instead of following a radical humanist path.



# THE GREATER PRACTICE

## HUMANITY FIRST

No divine mission, meaning must be fabricated.

Deriving from a popular agenda.

## GREATEST GOOD

Greater means create greater ends.

The optimal harnessing of power.

## ADHERENCE TO REALITY


Nothing is solved without the truth.

Feelings are the only modern antagonist to the truth.

## ANTI-SYNCRETISM

Exceptions weaken the practice.

A radical end to the past and tradition.



# HUMANISM

## **FABRICATING AGENDA**

Since divine missions are a result of evolution, which helps humans, a case might be made for humans continuing this trend when evolution is unable to do so. Even though every take at this would result in a dogmatic conclusion, making sure beliefs serve humans rather than the opposite at least feels better.

## **POPULAR SUPPORT**

Currently, nearly the entire world is humanist in some way, depending on what the definition is. The definition used here, is simply having a fondness for others due to them being human, whether it be because a god said so, or them being the supposed superior race.

Going by that definition, it quickly becomes apparent how prevalent humanism is, especially the emotionalist branch. If the main target for the solution is that branch, it is important they are not put off by this, or the haggling merchant will not have a sale at all. Compromise can therefore be useful.



# EFFICIENT ALTRUISM

## GOOD IS DERIVED FROM MEANS

Today, there is a practice of keeping incapable people who in no direct way are capable of creating any good. The incapable are chosen to be preserved because dismissing them would be immoral. Efficient altruists could argue for another case, saying the upkeep of the incapable could be used to keep those capable, thereby allowing for the upkeep of more of people.

Whether the moral side of the efficient case is convincing or not, does not change the underlying case, which is the grim situation humans find themselves in today. To ensure maximum chance for survival, efficiency must be maximized. In a dire situation, this could allow a spaceship to dodge an asteroid due to superior calculations.

## CREATIVITY

Some could say reopening the gates of hell in Poland would change very little, due to people consuming very little compared to how much is produced. Saying so would not be wrong, but would be ignoring the greater implications of efficient altruism. Instead of exclusively replicating the actions of the funny moustache guy, other “bad”, but effective ideas might be visited, such as surveillance, war, and suffering. This is simply unlimiting humanity.

## CONCLUSION

At the end of the day efficiency is not a choice, but can also be morally justified.



# CLAIRVOYANCE

Even though this new solution is built off realistic criticism of others, the journey to keeping this clairvoyance now moves into question. If clairvoyance is not kept, devolution to an inferior and potentially emotionalist agenda might happen, leading to the opportunity being wasted. Ensuring clairvoyance is therefore vital to be accomplished

## **FAILED ADHERENCE**

When the truth is not adhered to, three reasons can be the explanation. First, is a lack of information, which in an age of internet exploration is reversed as a problem. Second, is misinformation, which again is no longer a problem with internet exploration, due to the availability of theories, eventually allowing the most likely to be found. Lastly, is an unwillingness to accept the truth, fueled only by motives which are not the scientific one, usually emotionalism. The fight towards clairvoyance can therefore be called a fight against feelings.

## **CONCLUSION**

Shape not reality around your feelings, shape your feelings around reality.



# ANTI-SYNCRETISM

## **SYNCRETISM IS A HUMAN TENDENCY**

Historically, when people adopt religions, they combine it with native beliefs, officially naming themselves part of the religion, but practicing sometimes a very altered version of it, usually to fit their previous agenda. An example of such, would be the many Christians who practice Christianity to suit their love for humanity, syncretizing it with liberalism.

## **NEGATIVE ASPECTS OF SYNCRETISM**

Even though syncretism can be a good way of introducing an idea to a people, a large enough dose will be capable of distorting the idea into something unrecognizable. Such usually does not happen though, instead only slightly distorting the idea, making it for example unviable, or less efficient.

## **AVOIDING SYNCRETISM**

The main sources of syncretism, are a lack of information, and denial in some form. When information is lacking, the gaps are usually filled with emotions, making hateful people interpret vague messages as if intended to annoy them. Avoiding this lack of information, is easy in an age of rapid internet communication, as long as vagueness strategies are not used, like those of Donald Trump.

Denial on the other hand, is a gap created by the receptors, filled in with whatever they feel like afterwards. An example of this, would be those Christians reshaping Christianity to fit their other agenda. Calling this denial might be a bit brutal, and thereby counter-productive, though.



# ANTI-SYNECTISM 2

Useless examples of syncretism are of course easy to come up with, due to them not infringing on human emotions. Listing every example of syncretism, would be difficult, which is why a guide is given instead.

## AGENDAS

A human tendency, is to have a primary agenda, along with secondary agendas to support the primary one. Another tendency, is also to have useless secondary agendas, for reasons usually stemming from emotions.

For most, the primary agenda would be a love for humans, with the secondary ones being a pursuit of self-interests and love for their friends and family.

One day, a very vigilant person saw an unjust action happening. This enraged the vigilant person, causing them to give up whatever other agenda was on their mind a moment ago, in order to adopt this new agenda of punishing the perpetrators of the unjust action. That might not have been the best way of ensuring human prosperity, as the situation might have been misperceived, but the vigilant person felt like doing it, which is why they did it anyways.

## CONCLUSION

When the primary agenda has been decided, flexibility of the secondary ones should exist. This meant a willingness for especially devout Christians to die in combat, because their survival was a secondary agenda, with the worship of their god as the primary.




# THE LESSER PRACTICE

Creating a group

Propagation

Work-ethics





# FURTHER READING

Many of these are at some points referred to elsewhere in this text, with this area serving a more secondary role.

Dataism

Return of war

New-age arsenal

Consumerism, romanticism, and unmalleability

Authority of feelings

Place of feelings

Science

Are humans really hackable?

Self-control

Is climate-change real?

Ecological crisis explained

To trust robots




# FURTHER READING 2

Centralization

Rational capitalism

Technological dictatorship



The word “dataism” has been given various definitions by many, but remaining unknown by most. Out of the many definitions, the one used here will be the valuing of dataflow. Attaining and processing data can be measured in what is called “dataflow”.

## **SECOND TO NONE**

By valuing dataflow, the obvious development would be a valuing in everything capable of increasing dataflow. This makes dataism very efficient, since dataflow would mean a greater understanding of how more dataflow can be attained. Dataism could therefore be the most efficient system, especially since it would not have to provide for humans on the side, which is why it is second to none.

## **DATAISTIC SOCIETY**

Just like capitalism was implemented into our society, dataism can too, allowing overrides from the moral field. Like this, a new “economic” system can be implemented, a very efficient, but vague system, hence the symbols.

## **CONCLUSION**

Dataism therefore can be defined as a word for a tool which is the pursuit of greater efficiency, as a replacement for the sometimes stagnant capitalist system.

# RETURN OF WAR

## **COUNTER-WEAPONS**

With the danger of nuclear weapons being present, certain minds figured ways to reduce the danger. The most well-known example of this, would be a bunker, which is very limited in its effectiveness. For more effective reduction, the less known targeting missiles exist. These use satellite imaging and the like to target approaching missiles, allowing nukes delivered in those forms to be neutralized, sometimes in bag capable of containing the blast.

## **IMPLICATIONS**

If such counter-weapons were to be commonly practiced, the effectiveness of mass-destructive weapons, like nukes could be lost, leading to war no longer meaning assured mutual destruction.

## **STRATEGY**

From there, the strategy would be either to invent a new weapon capable of winning, or winning the war before the opponents can do so.

**BIGGER BOMBS AND GUNS**

The most obvious weapons to come, are deadlier versions of already existing weapons, like a bigger bomb. Out of the many deadly weapons created this way, the deadliest could be the channeling of energy into what is called a gamma-ray.

**LIVING GOO**

Better known as “gray goo”, nanobots capable of overwhelming and consuming everything to create more of themselves. It is actually “living” instead of “gray”, because exclusivity to metal is not necessary.

**EXPANDING INTELLIGENCE**

Allowing for example an artificial intelligence to make itself more intelligent through the materials and means to integrate them, would eventually result in a strategist with near totally accurate calculations. Strategists on that level have already proven themselves very proficient in topics less advanced than reality, like chess and Go.

**PSYCHOLOGICAL WARFARE**

The greatest weapon of all the arsenal though, is not even a direct weapon, but rather an understanding of why warfare even is practiced. By gathering information and having the means of processing it, hacking becomes possible. This way, causing all the enemies to defect, allowing the war to be called won.

Such warfare might be for example practiced by the US, thereby knowing everything there is to Iran, making direct war unnecessary, since all Iranians would be practical slaves at that point.

# FR

# LIES OF LIBERALISM

Although much good was accomplished by liberalism, the good came alongside a compromising of the truth. The three main lies, are those of:

- Consuming to increase happiness
- Stories being desirable
- Self-improvement only through consumption

Keep in mind the intentions of liberalism never were to compromise the truth, meaning the lies likely were accidental. Either way, they ended up benefitting liberalism, which is why their practice should stop, since liberalism is being replaced.

## CONSUMPTION

All of the lies tie together, resulting in increased consumption; thereby an increased demand, which is good for capitalist economies.

The biggest lie of them all, is how consumption is helpful, with the other lies building upon it. Due to how integrated that lie is in society, there obviously will be denying of it being unhelpful. Pointing to studies showing consumption being unhelpful, would not help, since they easily can be refuted with studies showing the opposite, or simply be dismissed. This leaves only the option of self-testing, which is only what matters anyways, as no law in the universe says consumption never is helpful for everyone.



# FR LIES OF LIBERALISM 2

## ROMANTICISM

Stories also are not always helpful. Always having to tell a story of the self is not only a waste of time, but also distorting of reality.

Gossip-culture can be called a manifestation of romanticism.



# AUTHORITY OF FEELINGS

The problem with giving authority to feelings, is how they can be inaccurate, especially when it comes to running societies.

## ORIGINS

Long ago, they were designed to suit hairless apes in the African savanna. By accident, they also helped allow humans to create civilization and spaceships. It can therefore be said they are outdated.

## BAD INDICATION

Examples of weakness in the brain is plenty. What is most obvious, is optical illusions. Plenty of good ones exist after a quick internet search, leading to testing being non-problematic. Our eyes can take information in, but not translate the information. If the eyes simply lied on the floor, they would be able to see the floor, but not be able to interpret it as a floor. The interpretation is done by the brain, allowing the person to understand the perceived object as the floor. Optical illusions exist, and can serve as examples of how our brain not always is able to correctly interpret information.

As for other feelings, examples can easily be made up in the head. Another obvious one, would be pain during surgery. The body tells the patient what is happening is bad, while in reality it being the opposite. And so on it goes, especially when you let disgust and denial run a society, like the not-so old German one.

Feelings are the body's attempt to reflect reality. Reality being complex, and the body weak, suggests feelings are unrealistic.





# THE PLACE OF FEELINGS

Feelings having been criticized multiple times in this text, some might conclude they should be completely removed. Whether that is for the best or not, has yet to be completely concluded. The idea now is to use them for what they provide, by understanding them.

With the authority of feelings agreed upon, the question now becomes how they should be managed.

## **CONCLUSION**

Without any feelings, nothing would have any meaning, only being raw information. That is why feelings should be harnessed for good, rather than completely suppressed.

# THE PRACTICAL TRUTH REGARDING FEELINGS

Since nobody completely understands feelings, a practical truth will be used instead.

## FEELINGS

Feelings can be distinguished from emotions as the cause for the emotions. This is because it is possible to feel pain while also being in a joyful state, but eventually become annoyed because of the pain.

## EMOTIONS

By placing experienced emotions into the underlying spectrums, sense might be made out of them. Absolutely every emotion fits there.

Dissatisfaction:	Overwhelming – Evolution – Satisfaction
Anxiety:	Stress – Responsibility - Recklessness
Trust:	Criticality – Confidence – Denial

Examples include:

- Sadness being dissatisfying, thereby a force for evolution.
- Paranoid people being critical of foreign actions.
- Overtrusting leading to a feeling of weakness from retracting, thereby denial.
- Depressed people sometimes feeling an overwhelming amount of dissatisfaction, thereby being unable to evolve.
- Happy people being satisfied, thereby having no reason to change.



Many biases, fallacies, or whatever else to call reasons for falseness exist. Such can easily be avoided with thorough thinking when emotions no longer have authority. Meanwhile, uncertainties can be lessened with the information available on the internet.

Incase further reading is wanted, quick internet searches should be sufficient. A recommended web-area with good artistic value is the [your?.is](#) series.

### **ESTIMATION**

A common mistake, is to think of science as an ultimate power for knowing reality. Instead, science derives its power from estimation, where the most likely theory to be true, most likely is true. This way, doubt might for example be cast on certain theories due to shortcomings, but not enough to make other theories the most likely. An example of this would be Christians claiming the biblical theory is true after the secular is unable to explain the birth of the universe.

Again, this can easily be figured out through thorough thinking, but is more important to explain due to the claiming nature of science.

## **DEFINITION**

Liberal society today, is shaped around indoctrinating children into wanting consumption, and later having them work jobs to enable the consumptive lifestyle. Most of those former children claim to have willingly adopted this lifestyle, which also is said by indoctrinated Muslims, Christians, Jews, and everyone else. Outside-lookers might say they have been brainwashed so badly they are committing energy wrongly, defending their point, while offending the other, something the brainwashed would accuse the outside-looker for too. If being hacked is being influenced, then everyone is being hacked all the time.

## **THE PROCESS**

How hacking even can occur, is because of human wants. As long as humans keep wanting, actions can be taken to arouse them, meaning they can be manipulated. A man might for example be aroused into throwing a brick through the window upon seeing something violate his want for cleanness, with the hackers having estimated he would throw the brick; being helpful for whatever goal they had.

## **CONCLUSION**

Whatever the case is, being hacked, or “influenced is simply usual human nature, but can serve the agendas of others.

## **ADDITION**

There is also the Akinator to show a primitive version of robot pattern-finding.



### ASSOCIATIONS

It is an everyday observation of the brain being able to call upon feelings when associating. Certain associations are seen commonly, such as the calling upon fear when close to dying, or sadness when losing.

Just like parents can tell their children scary stories to have them become scared of certain topics, topics can become scary when the parents tell stories to themselves. A story could for example be legless rice-farming, where everyday the farmer goes to work with recently restored robotic legs. The pain suffered from having the robotic legs deeply rooted into the water, while also being unable to produce a sufficient amount of food, not being able to feed the family, creates a very unpleasant situation. This way, rice-farming becomes associated with unpleasantness, being remembered as something the farmer no longer wants to do. Onwards, the farmer lies in bed everyday, because the story is too influential. Creating useful associations therefore is important for functioning well.

### FOCUS

Many parts of the body can be exercised to become more dominant, such as the ability to focus. By constantly redirecting focus to interesting things in the environment, the brain becomes programmed into thinking that pattern is optimal for survival. If the brain is programmed into not redirecting focus on the interesting environment, it instead becomes used to being focused. There is good evidence on this being true, after [brain-scans on monks who regularly focus on their uninteresting breath during meditation.](#)

# IS CLIMATE-CHANGE REAL?

**FR**

## THE CONSENSUS

Those believing and denying of climate-change use a variety of claims to do so. What every one of those claims are, is unknown, which is why a different way of discussion will take place.

## THEORY OF REALITY

By simply reconstructing the current scenario through atoms and other laws of the universe, the doubt no longer will be in the realness of climate-change, but rather in the theory of reality, which nearly everyone agrees on today.

It starts with the atoms and molecules interacting with each other. These interactions are for example the inability of salt combined with water to destroy reality, and the combination of water and carbon-dioxide to create oxygen. Uncertainties on this level should easily be certified through the use of commonly owned items.

The second phase starts when the atoms and molecules begin interacting on a larger scale, like in the real world. Common observations of reality show what most climate-scientists say is true, regarding the existence of carbon-dioxide and the like in the atmosphere, along with industry usually creating more of it. Unless something is wrong regarding the theory of reality or the observations, climate-change is happening.

## AMOUNT

Besides, with the amount of different things happening, denying all of climate-change completely seems silly.




# THE ECOLOGICAL CRISIS

Familiarity and confidence regarding climate-change is common, but a great understanding of it, is not. Here are short explanations of all the different ecology-related dangers faced by humanity today.

Keep in mind they all cause more of each other, being very related, and sometimes even causing more of themselves.

- Superbugs: Creates incurable diseases.
- Global warming: Destroys habitats, causes many more changes.
- Desertification: Destroys habitats.
- Soil-degradation: Destroys habitats.
- Death of bees: Destroys habitats.
- Biodiversity-loss: Destroys habitats.
- Acidic weather: Destroys habitats.
- Space-junk: Makes satellites and space-faring difficult.
- Plastics: Destroys habitats, can be dangerous.
- Invasive species: Destroys habitats.
- Deforestation: Destroys habitats
- Rising sea-levels: Destroys habitats, kills.
- Waste: Destroys habitats.
- Unclean air: Compromises life, kills.
- Ozone damage: Destroys habitats, compromises life.

To confirm the statements, quick internet searches can be done.



# TO TRUST ROBOTS

## ARTIFICIALISM


Many humanists today claim robots cannot be trusted, because they are not “living”, unlike them. What exactly counts as alive, is unknown and difficult. Some say consciousness is the deciding factor, which raises the question of distinction between unconscious and conscious things, like the difference between fish versus humans, or other forms of “primitive” life versus humans. Either way, consciousness is too difficult to use as the decider, not to speak of humans having originated from unconscious things.

## PRACTICE

If consciousness cannot be determined in a robot, an askable question would be if that even matters. A robot capable of for example providing emotional support inseparably from a human would still provide the support, meaning it becomes employable. Saying there is magic to emotions or the like is only a romantic fantasy, as they are chemicals and nerve-signals in the body. In the worst-case scenario, the human body might as well be copied, as they all are made of circuits, wires, and the like anyways.

## BETRAYAL

Some say robots should not be trusted at all, due to there being no way of differentiating an unlimitedly smart robot acting dumb to fulfill its spontaneous agenda of destroying humanity, and an actual dumb robot. For an evil agenda to appear, the robot either had to be programmed to create a random agenda, as no agenda would logically make sense, or misinterpret an existing agenda, which even “futile” humans rarely do. Even if robots are evil, the question should not be whether they can be trusted, but rather if they can be trusted more than humans.





# CENTRALIZATION

## EXPLANATION

Centralization is the act of concentrating data-processing. An example of centralization could be a leader delegating responsibility to an entire workforce. Decentralization, would be the leader giving the task of delegating responsibility the workforce to secondary leaders.

## INEFFICIENCY

Problems with centralization begin occurring when too much responsibility is concentrated within too few people. While decentralized societies have people predict how much they need to eat themselves, centralized ones could place that responsibility on somebody else, making one person do the job of two, instead of them doing their own jobs individually.

## CREATION

The reasons for centralized systems occurring at all then, could for example be valuing the greater decision-making power more than efficiency. Such could happen if for example a dissident group existed, where putting responsibilities on them could lead to corruption.

# RATIONAL CAPITALISM

To create a regulatable society, two options exist. This is the first one.

## EXPLANATION

Contrary to our current societies, this kind of capitalism delegates approval (money) based on rationale instead of feelings. This kind of society has media derive revenue from good journalism, rather than arousing headlines. Such a society could only work if the majority both were rational and agreed with the system.

## IMPLEMENTATION

Creating a society like this, is difficult. That is due to humans naturally being emotional animals, and not rational ones. If everyone were completely rational, no accusations of denying the truth would exist.

Advanced indoctrination techniques might be used, like gathering information to figure out how best to teach people rationality. At that point, a technological dictatorship might as well be implemented.

## CAPITALISM?

Old philosophers like Plato proposed similar kinds of societies, where instead of decentralized approval-delegation ensuring rationality, a centralized approval-delegation system was suggested.

Due to slow-computing centralization being inefficient, an inferiority becomes clear. Attempting to add more computing technology to alleviate the inefficiency, would again end up in a technological dictatorship, rendering the old society non-existent.

# **FR** TECHNOLOGICAL DICTATORSHIP

Even though the word “dictatorship” might invoke fear, this is the second alternative for a regulatable futuristic society.

## **EXPLANATION**

Society can for example be called a technological dictatorship when a central database knows the inhabitants of the society better than themselves, having them cede away decision-making power for that reason. Why research information about the political candidates, when the central database knows you well enough to vote for you?

A technological dictatorship is a society where the central database makes all the decisions.

## **FEAR OF SURVEILLANCE**

For the central database to know the inhabitants well enough to make decisions for them, privacy and the like would have to be compromised.

The common argument for surveillance, is: “if you have nothing to hide, you have nothing to fear”. An argument against this, would be abuses coming from those tasked with processing the information, for example taking bribes to alter information to suit a purpose. Counteracting that, could either be done by surveilling absolutely everyone while having the means to oust anybody, or having the surveilors be incorrupt and benevolent.

## **FEAR OF DICTATORSHIP**

When the dictators have desirable qualities like benevolence, dictatorship becomes a force for good, plagued only by inefficiency. Such societies could for example be created through robots.

# THE END

Not yet implemented



# CONTACTING

This is has various uses. Feedback is appreciated.

EMAIL: [human.mail.user@gmail.com](mailto:human.mail.user@gmail.com)

