

# NOTICES

- This is a method for helping mankind.
- Main part is read under 15 minutes.
- Most underlined words are links to other slides.
- Icons are links to other slides.
- All words used in this text should either be commonly known to English-speakers, or self-explanatory. If not, report them.
- Criticism is welcomed.

# MAIN PART

## EXPIRATION OF LIBERALISM

Definition and status.

Has an ineffective way of addressing technological disruption.

The greatest quality of liberalis, efficiency, is soon no longer.

Humans, the lifeblood of liberalism are becoming obsolete.

Plutocratic coup and accidents.

## OUR REACTIONS

Climate-activism is unadoptable and corruptible.

Neo-nationalism is denying the truth.

## THE SOLUTION

Requirements: regulations, uncompetitiveness

Technological dictatorship

Rational capitalism

## THE PROMISES

Survivalism

Transhumanism

## FURTHER READING

## THE END



# THE FREE WORLD

## **DEFINITION**

As a system of many names, it will here be called liberalism. It is based around the individual and granting them self-determination. This manifests for example by giving them power to approve of things, whether through voting or investing. Individualism, being focused on humans, allows liberalism to be classified as a type of humanism.

Since this was the prevailing idea of the cold war, society today is dominated by it.

## **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.

The way this was achieved will be explained later.

## **EXPIRATION**

In the section regarding the expiration of liberalism, reasons for its replacement or reform will be given.





# TECHNOLOGICAL DISRUPTION

## **TRADEOFF**

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.

Liberal societies are today many times more unable to regulate the negative effects of technology than before, due to a balance having been upset. This imbalance is of disruptive inventions being implemented faster than humanist reactionary-movements can respond. Factors complimenting the imbalance include: the accelerating rate of innovation, misinformation campaigns, and a populace busy with self-interests.

# RISE OF CENTRALIZATION

Another reason for the expiration, would be the rise of centralization; the validation of the very system liberalism won against in the cold war.

Liberalism never defeated communism because it was morally correct or had magical powers, but rather due to superior efficiency. This can be traced back to the nature of centralization and the different use of it by the two systems.

## CENTRALIZATION

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

## INEFFICIENCY

Due to the nature of human brains, running too much information through them would result in them being overloaded, thereby making them horrible for centralization. To counteract this, the amount of brains can be increased, which theoretically would work. In practice though, another factor would have to be dealt with, namely corruption.

Corruption happens when the interests of literally everyone, especially the rulers are not aligned with the state. Unlike in decentralized liberal societies, the superior incentive of emotional adherence is not fulfilled through practice of loyalty to the state, thereby causing abuses of power, corruption.





# RISE OF CENTRALIZATION 2

## HYPOTHETICAL SOVIET-UNION

In soviet Russia, the workers were lazy because it provided greater emotional satisfaction than working hard did. To counteract that, they assigned KGB agents to monitor everyone, as it would ensure nobody would get away with laziness. Since nobody were pressuring the KGB agents to work, they began becoming lazy too. That is why new KGB agents had to be assigned to monitor the previous KGB agents, but who would monitor these new agents?

The actual Soviet-union never having found an answer to that, ended up collapsing, which is why liberalism won the cold war.

## THE RISE

Today, with new technologies having been created, liberalism technically invented its own replacement. This is because of computing-power advances, solving the major flaws of centralization. Firstly, computers are able to take in endless amounts of information, only causing them to overload if improperly designed. Secondly, computers only have the incentives they are programmed to have, rendering them uncorrupt.

Now remains only creating software capable of running a state.

## THE DANGER

A rise of centralization is only dangerous for liberal societies, because it violates individualism. Where does the individual decide when a computer makes all the decisions for them? Because of this, liberal societies might eventually find themselves outcompeted.



# HUMAN OBSOLETENESS

## AUTOMATION

As part of the rise of centralization, people are losing jobs to robots. This loss of work comes from employees becoming unemployable due to superior options existing. If a company spends all their money on employing humans who require expensive salaries, their rival, who spends their money paying robots costing pennies in electricity, will have a clear advantage.

Those constantly being capable of finding new work, or being able to outcompete the robots, will not become obsolete any time soon, but they are the minority. Automation will be a problem for the majority.

## ROBOPHOBIA

Many today say robots never will take over “emotional” fields like psychology, caring for children, or “creative” fields like writing and painting. A quick internet-search will reveal the latter false, leaving only the former as a “uniquely human” field.

Intrinsic human specialty is only humanist dogma though. A commonly known fact, is of human brains having patterns in them. If true, would mean the brain is replicable, for example by robots seeking to take over human mental work. Whether there is “real” consciousness within the robots is irrelevant, since they will be able to replicate it.



# HUMAN OBSOLETENESS 2

## **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.

## **HACKING OF HUMANS**

Human obsolescence will not remain limited to work, due to human decision-making also becoming obsolete. By gathering information regarding an individual, patterns can be found. Through the patterns of an individual, hackers will be able to predict behavior like responses to certain stimuli. Using a computer to run thousands of simulations of responses, allows them to find the most useful outcome for their agenda. The individual will thereby play chess against a computer that not only knows every move, but also knows what the individual will do in advance. Losing that game of chess means having been outcompeted in knowing themselves. Unless humans act without patterns, hacking can happen.

## **IMPLICATIONS**

Since the individuals no longer make decisions, individualist systems like capitalism and democracy also are rendered obsolete. Why have elections when the system already knows who would satisfy the majority?







# PLUTOCRATS

## **RISE OF CENTRALIZATION**

A common fantasy of anti-capitalists, is of the elite banding together and enslaving mankind. They previously would have little reason to do so, due to the inefficiencies of centralized dictatorships. Today, with the rise of centralization, that problem is no more, leaving only their willingness and abilities to be questioned.

## **NATURE OF THE ELITE**

In liberalism, power is gained through approval, which is gained through providing something to approve of. When making something to approve of, a concern for humans is only optional, and usually distracting. That way, the leaders of the world have a tendency of not caring about humans, aside from themselves.

Additionally, searchable surveys show they tend to be psychopaths, sociopaths, risk-takers, and unempathetic.

## **THE COUP**

Once word spreads among the elite of a coup being viable, the worst and the most radical of them might band together to make an “investment”, like they usually do. They can afterwards unleash a robot-army or hack people into accepting the new world order. That way, they can force people or robots to work on immortality and a paradise for them without any resistance, granting them a good end.

Also, in a society with UBI the elite of the society very easily could eject the humans at any point, since humans are unintegrated.

Undisturbed, the elites are the most likely to benefit from the collapse of liberalism.

# CLIMATE-ACTIVISM

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.

## COMPETITIVE WORLD

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 lead to bankruptcy and collapse. Being nice to humans, therefore only is optional, as it does not ensure continued existence, unlike for example money does.

If a major entity decided to hamper their own means in order to set an example, nothing would force the other entities to replicate it. This could especially be the case if the other entities for example do not believe there are problems to be solved.



# CLIMATE-ACTIVISM 2

## SUPPLY AND DEMAND

The problem with technological disruption and a competitive world, arises when disrupting society can help ensuring continued existence, otherwise be beneficial for the perpetrators, or not harm them enough to matter. This is a result of our societies being aimed towards providing what is demanded, rather than stopping technological disruption, or taking the best decisions. Solving this would require people making the “correct” demands, something the climate-activists talk little about, focusing more on antagonizing the elite instead.

## DISUNITY

If the climate-activists were to enforce their demands onto all entities, there would be disagreement on what to enforce, due to no central authority existing. Saying all climate-activists want the same things, is like saying all Muslims want a certain thing. All Muslims worship Allah, like all climate-activists want to save the environment. Not all Muslims are terrorists though, like only some climate-activists support nuclear energy.

## CORRUPTION

To solve the disunity, an authority would have to be established. This could be problematic, since removing the elite is not part of the climate-activist plan, and anti-corruption also not being part. Elites with influence could thereby bribe the authority to allow them use of disruptive technologies, being an investment similar to moving a company offshore, which is common practice among the elites.





# 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, reasons for denial 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 no longer trusting in the liberal system, have not turned away from 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 equality, for example.

Like this, neo-nationalism plays on feelings too, playing on the feeling of nostalgia, promising people a glorious return to the past. Just like people can rally to protest due to feelings of vigilance and anger, nostalgia too can rally people to leave the European union.

Climate-change, being a problem not locally solvable, causes denial, due to not supporting their agenda. They adhere to feelings, not to reality.

# SOLVING THE PROBLEMS



## **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. That is easier said than done though.

## **UNCOMPETITIVENESS**

For those regulations to work, competition would have to either not exist, or be structured in a way allowing regulations to prevail. Implementing this could include a world with either a central authority everyone abode to, or a world where everyone agreed on regulating technology. Either way, it has to be everyone, as regulations hamper efficiency, allowing a more relaxed state to outcompete the stricter one.

## **REGULATORY SOCIETY**

As for creating a regulatory society, there are two options which both are extreme, but necessarily so.



# TECHNOLOGICAL DICTATORSHIP

## **EXPLANATION**

Society can 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. In this society 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**

If the dictator only accomplished the interests of the people, there would be nothing to fear. How a benevolent human dictator is created, is irrelevant for technological dictatorships, since robots rule. That is why knowing whether robots can be trusted or not should be addressed.



# RATIONAL CAPITALISM

## EXPLANATION

Contrary to our current societies, this kind of capitalism delegates approval (money) based on rationale instead of feelings, thereby making the previously mentioned correct demands. 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.

## RATIONALITY?

The definition is to think without feelings as authority.

## IMPLEMENTATION

Creating a rational society 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. The gap between freedom and a technological dictatorship would decrease, though.



# RATIONAL CAPITALISM 2



## INCREASED CENTRALIZATION

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 draw society closer to a technological dictatorship

## DECREASED CENTRALIZATION

Certain anarchists have proposed an ultra-decentralized society, where absolutely nothing is obligatory.

The problem there, is the fact feelings are adhered to more naturally than rationale is. That very decentralized nature makes turning the inhabitants rational impossible, firstly due to mandatory schooling and parenting being forms of centralization, and secondly because humans naturally are emotional animals. This is why a certain degree of centralization or obligation must be maintained.





# SURVIVALISM

## NO MEANING TO LIFE

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 humanist path.

## MAJORITY

Searchable polls show the majority of people want to use technology for normalization of the weak, rather than upgrading.



# TRANSHUMANISM

## **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.



# FURTHER READING

## T O P I C S

Techno-enthusiasm

Past agendas

Return of war

New-age arsenal

Lies of liberalism

Anti-syncretism

Efficient altruism

Science

Authority of feelings

The place of feelings

Self-control

Technological singularity

Fall of liberalism

## D O U B T S

Is the future far away?

Is climate-change real?

## C I T A T I O N S

Ecological crisis

History of humanist reactionary-movements

Andrew Yang



# **FR** 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.

# OBSOLETENESS OF OLD FR 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 therefore not be very effective, leading to them practically having become obsolete.

# 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

Saying all artists speak the truth, is saying all artists are scientists. Getting people's attention, which is the job of artists, is not a matter of telling the truth, or contributing meaningfully, but rather by understanding what people want to hear. "Want" not being limited to pleasurable sensations, means inciting anger, fear, and sadness also work. The job of the artist always was to draw attention and arouse; no writer can sell their books if no one wants to read them.

This romanticist culture has spread very far, turning many unrelated and preferably honest fields into romanticist battle-fields where artists compete. A famous example is the media, where only arousing headlines will be read, causing exaggeration and fake news. Many other fields which should not be involved in the art-industry include politics, where US presidents tend to have a background as actors, and science, where scientists purposefully exaggerate their finds, in order to make money.

## MALLEABILITY

Many people today do not think the brain can be altered. This is contrary to the common finds of neural plasticity.



# 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.



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.



# FR EFFICIENT ALTRUISM

## EFFICIENCY

Without an effective state, outcompetition will happen, and the state no longer can implement anything. Efficiency is therefore not a choice. Morally though, it can be considered “wrong”.

## 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.

## ANTAGONISM

Some say for example replicating the actions of hated groups, like the Nazis and communists would be bad, but efficient, meaning efficient altruists would do it. Through simple reasoning the efficiency gained through doing so would not outweigh the amount of alienation created. By antagonizing the efficient altruists, that kind of simple reasoning might be forgotten.

## CONCLUSION

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

# FR SCIENCE-RELATED TOPICS

## BIASES AND FALLACIES

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.

## ADHERENCE TO REALITY

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.

**FR**

# 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

Here are some theories regarding the place of feelings.

## **THEORY 1**

Without any feelings, nothing would have any meaning, only being raw information. Eyeballs in themselves cannot interpret information, only translate the reflection of photons into nerve-signals. Those signals would then have to go to the responsible area within the brain to be further translated into pictures. Those pictures, still would not have any meaning, which is why emotions are assigned to them. Something upsetting would not be upsetting if the brain could not be upset, hence the need.

An example of this is soldiers being incapable of combat after being shelled for multiple hours, since adrenaline, the hormone responsible for action, is depleted.

That is why feelings should be harnessed for good, rather than completely suppressed, as nothing having meaning would mean nothing being done.

## **THEORY 2**

If feelings are removed after having learnt what feelings are appropriate for what situations, feelings no longer become needed. This way, there will be more control when reacting to situations, since memories work more as a nudge, while feelings disrupt normal behavior to have themselves implemented.

Feelings therefore could be removed in developed humans to increase their performance.

# THE PRACTICAL TRUTH REGARDING FEELINGS

FR

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. If not, this needs to be reworked. If doing so, keep in mind the Barnum-effect.

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.





### 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.](#)

# FR TECHNOLOGICAL SINGULARITY

## EXPLANATION

Due to the tendency of technological inventions to accelerate the invention of new technology, some speculate a technological singularity could happen. An example could be a piece of technology being created every 10 seconds, after which the creation of the next piece is halved. It would go: 10 -> 5 -> 2,5 -> 1,25 -> 0,625 and so on, until eventually everything is invented in under a second.

Even if a technological singularity cannot happen, similar events might, leading to its implications still being relevant.

## REACTIONS

In a technological dictatorship, the central authority would already have predicted it, knowing the perfect response, leading to it being a non-problem.

To rational capitalist societies, there would be trouble though. Due to the abundance of new technologies available, the people running the society would have difficulty comprehending what to approve of and what not to approve of. Eventually though, the list of technologies to decide opinion on would be exhausted, and order would be restored.

Our current society on the other hand, if it even makes it to the point of technological singularity, would face a lot of problems. Due to the amount of options available from there, and the recklessness of emotional behavior, something bad is likely to result out of it. If normal society is shut down to regulate or delete the technologies, there would still be room for bad results. Either way, bad things might happen.

# FR IS THE FUTURE FAR AWAY?

Many hold the belief of technological inventions like super-AI and Dyson-spheres only being invented after thousands of years. A discussion regarding it will happen here. The culmination of this mindset is “Born too late to explore the world, but too early to explore the stars.”

## INACCURATE RELATIVITY

Young people have experienced less change than old, leading to them seeing their current era as the only one. This could be contributing the common thought of the future being far away.

## BUILDING THE UNIVERSE

Through understanding the process of technological development, the distance of the future can be determined.

It begins with a goal, like curing cancer, then a prototype, like a cancer-eating bacteria, and finally observations of the initial trials until the goal is accomplished. In the beginning, the cancer-eating bacteria might be retarded and kill its host, while in the end, it might have been given the correct changes to only target cancer-cells, thereby creating a new piece of technology.

Now the same process can be repeated for every other theoretical piece of technology, and their distance will be determinable. If information or understanding is lacking to make such estimations, then the estimator likely is not qualified to do so, obviously.

# 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.
- 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.

Remember the earth is the habitat of humans.

## **SOURCING**

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



# HUMANIST REACTIONISM

## EXPLANATION

Humanist reactionism is reacting to something in a way perceived as most beneficial to mankind. It usually only manifests within a heated moment, rather than when not in trouble, due humans usually acting that way, and humanist reactionism not usually being thought of.

## HAIR-STRAIGHTENERS

A type of hair-straightener was once invented. That hair-straightener had dangerous chemicals in it which made a hole in the ozone-layer. Scientists said having a hole in the ozone layer would give everyone cancer. People began protesting. The United-nations therefore made the hair-straightener illegal through nearly every country in the world signing the Montreal-protocol. Seems odd how no ozone-hole-denialist movement began counter-protests, but that is irrelevant.

## NUCLEAR WEAPONS

At another point in time, the atomic bomb was invented. Eventually there were enough such bombs to destroy the world. One day, during one of the many times nuclear bombs were supposed to be launched, some humanist reactionary would always fail the job they were given, resulting in humanity still existing.

**FR**

# ANDREW YANG

Many politicians today talk about past and semi-present topics, due to problems the people are familiar with usually leading to more approval. That way, new problems tend rarely to get introduced to the people. Andrew Yang is one of those rare politicians who introduces new problems.

# THE END

The age of liberalism is over. All current movements are flawed. No perfect solution exists, but many solutions do. Now only remains enacting one of them.

If technological dictatorships sounds scary, enacting the other solution as quickly as possible is vital. This is due to the superior efficiency of technological dictatorships.





# CONTACTING

This is has various uses. Feedback is appreciated.

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

