

FATE OF HUMANITY & THE NEW HUMANISM



STATEMENTS / CONTENTS

CLAIM TO RELEVANCE:

- Intentions of the book
- The present is satisfactory
- Neo-liberalism declines
- Entering the near-future

SIGNIFICANT CHANGES:

- Humans become useless
- Humans become hackable
- Centralization becomes powerful
- Freedom becomes dangerous

FUTURE EVENTS:

- World enters desperation
- Evolution of ideology
- Wave of isolationism and unity
- World unity scramble
- End-scenarios

ULTIMATE FATE OF HUMANITY:

- Fate of humanity is shared
- End-state must be vague
- All other options will fail
- The end is totalitarian
- Maximizing chance

And finally, a page for frequent questions...

CLAIM TO RELEVANCE

INTRODUCTION: Greetings, this is an early 21st century book about the future of humanity and a new humanist ideology. All in all, the book details a pessimistic look towards the future due to several reasons and will come to portray the new ideology as the solution. By its nature, the book will therefore be an ideological work describable as a prophecy for the conditions during which the ideology will be relevant and a manifesto for said ideology.

Before we may begin, it is important to establish what the “future of humanity” is. For all intents and purposes within the book, we shall divide it into the near-future and the far-future, or just future. The near-future is the end of the current status-quo, the far-future the end of the next and whatever may come afterwards. Because the near-future is close and will be highly uncomfortable, this book is relevant.

THE PRESENT: During the latter half of the 20st to the early 21st century, most places saw a period of peace, growth, and prosperity. The duration of the period has made it is easy to forget how comfortable this time has been. In the most well-off places, the first and second world, there is no famine, no plague, no major wars, causing people to expect making it into their 70s or 80s before they die. They also consume an increasingly wide variety of consumer-goods while many see the future as bright and promising. Historically, this period has had the highest living standards.

Such conditions were accomplished by the freedom or interest and the available means for humans to create them. A few key practices were responsible for it: Dispersing say over the economy and encouraging self-interest, which has shown to grow the economy. Welfare and other social spending, which has made content populations. And having a government which could trust its citizens having such liberties, which is easy when the citizens themselves make the government, known as democracy. The way of thought encouraging these practices: capitalism, welfare, and democracy, is referred to as neo-liberalism, a form of which is found in all successful nations today.

NEO-LIBERALISM BECOMES OBSOLETE: The same tools created under the “neo-liberal period” will be used to end it. They cause the decentralized models neo-liberalism works with to become obsolete, inferior to alternatives. Several tools allow this while the systems neo-liberalism employs will only encourage them. Shortly explained, they are the replacement of willed human masses by machines, replacement of human decision-making by machines, concentration of power being favored by machines, and potential dangers of freedom increasing. As they stand in the early 21st century, they make little sense and can appear ridiculous, but remember: Truth is stranger than fiction and reality is never simple.

END OF THE STATUS-QUO: The end of how the world has been run for the past 50 years and the introduction of other changes such as new technology will obviously have numerous consequences. They will for the most part impact the wellbeing and life expectancies of average people negatively, including but not limited to: Nations cutting themselves off the world to avoid being controlled, rise of powerful technological dictatorships, a world-war-3-like scenario where only one side will remain, and all ideologies or religions evolving into extremism. How peaceful and prosperous the neo-liberal period has been makes this appear ridiculous as well, but will also be elaborated upon, fear not.

HOW HUMANITY ENTERS THE NEAR-FUTURE: But before we may do that, we must first establish how the near-future happens at all. Systems which will promote the use of anti-liberal technology do not need much explanation though the technology they promote will. It is easy to imagine technology revolutionizing the way we live as hundreds of years away, but has historically not been the case, where the rate of technological development has been rapidly accelerating within the past decades. In fact, the anti-liberal technologies already exist in their unfinished forms, the finished versions having begun development around this time. Because of this, the transition between the liberal period and the near-future would not only be gradual but is happening right now.

SIGNIFICANT CHANGES

HOW THE CHANGES OCCUR: Two of neo-liberalism's core components are competitiveness and reliance on widespread human decision-making. It is the former which develops the technology for making them obsolete. After we have gone through how they become obsolete and what becomes empowered, we will see what the solutions must be. Primarily, this section will explain the rise of centralization.

ROLE OF MACHINES: Machines or robots, are mindless tools which do as they are programmed to do. Their employers therefore need not pay them nor otherwise worry about their loyalty. That is primarily why they are useful. This has led to "automation", a trend where human workers are being replaced by machines. Employers do this to remain competitive by saving resources through employing machines rather than wage-demanding humans. Automation only happens gradually though, for machines are not yet capable of all work humans are but are gradually becoming so through technological developments.

ROLE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE: In general, people have accepted machines will replace them in physical work but are not so sure about tasks requiring creativity / thinking, mental work. That is where the development of artificial intelligence, AI, a type of machine becomes relevant. And no, "intelligence" does not equate to sentience, they only execute and learn.

Artificial intelligence function in numerous, but only one matters, machine-learning. Machine-learning is a three-step process: The machine is told what is good and what is bad, then gathers information through executing what it believes might be good or provide valuable information, finally reprograms itself based on how good or bad the results were to be better at accomplishing good. A great comparison is natural selection of inanimate objects creating the sophisticated human brain, which is also why artificial intelligence is expected to attain the same level of sophistication.

ALGORITHMS AND DATAISM: Algorithms are machine-learning networks, a sort of artificial intelligence. They obtain large amounts of information through sensory technology like cameras, browser-cookies, and general internet-logging. Given powerful hardware to process the information, they compare it to find patterns which may be used for further comparisons. An example of how the discovered patterns may be used is through businesses discovering customer-behaviors, understanding better what works when selling a product.

Those who actively pursue the creation and application of these pattern-finding algorithms may be called dataists. Multiple governments and companies have adopted dataism (though not in name), where they believe gathering information for algorithms to process is in their best interest. Currently dataists are being limited by legal limitations in their journey to gather information and a lack of storage and processing-power. The former may end when dataists no longer depend on whoever may punish them, while the latter is expected to either change with the introduction of quantum computing, a theoretical method of computation 100 million times faster than current computing, or increased investments by powerful entities to create bigger computing machines.

HACKING OF HUMANS: The use of algorithms and sensory technology have turned humans into hackable animals. After gathering enough information through cameras, online logging-software, or however else, the information is given to an algorithm to process. Through finding similarities, the algorithm may begin finding correlations between certain tendencies and other tendencies. Knowing these correlations, the algorithm may predict future behavior common of individuals with certain tendencies. A present-day example is an algorithm predicting a customer might buy a product if the product is advertised for them. Humans already do this to each other with their bodies and minds, to less effect.

Humans have yet to create an algorithm capable of complete subjugation of human wills but may do soon. Such an algorithm would not need to understand every biological function within an individual it seeks to manipulate, only understand the feelings and desires of the individual better than the individual does. It only needs eclipse their judgement. At that point, the algorithm may manipulate the individual such that it cannot tell whether a desire is “authentic” or created by external influences, effectively allowing the algorithm to make the individual desire whatever the algorithm wants. Those who do not believe they can be controlled are first out when dataism grows.

TECHNOLOGY BETTERING CENTRALIZATION: Due to the previously mentioned changes, it is easy to imagine how centralizing power becomes increasingly effective. To centralize power is to concentrate decision-making authority in fewer humans with more uniform interests.

When automation in its many forms becomes more prevalent, humans become obsolete, allowing most importantly governments to depend less on them. All practical traits held by humans have been at some point replicated by inanimate objects. Fate of society would gravitate towards the hands of the rulers and the populace would lose their “means of production”. Beggars may not strike, and so rulers need not listen to them.

Another reason for this is dataism, which favors centralized models. Information gathered is more useful when centralized than dispersed for locals to manage. Think of it as a study, where scientists either study their local regions and make their local conclusions, or concentrate all their finds to make increased quantities of and more accurate conclusions.

And the final reason explained here is the obsolescence of will, how the hacking of humans would effectively turn those affected into mindless tools not much different from technology. When a central algorithm understands the hacked better than themselves, the algorithm would by extension understand what decisions to make better. The algorithm would therefore make decisions for them. This is another way humans become obsolete.

INCREASINGLY DANGEROUS TECHNOLOGY: Humans have developed weapons of mass-destruction like the nuclear bomb, which may give an individual more potential for destruction than they should have. Similar, but more easily acquired devices are becoming available as humanity becomes better at making tools. The most notable of which are: gray goo (nanites), self-learning artificial intelligence, and designer germs.

They all have in common how they may succeed from a limited start, while the materials to make them become more available, like smaller circuits, more powerful processors, and cheaper biology equipment. The tools can easily go rogue, while some actors may be malintent with these increasingly easily accessible tools, creating danger.

In a free system, these will go unregulated, where more regulations decrease the freedom of the system. Without regulations on potential and current actors capable of using the tools, they are free to cause unprepared for disruptions, catastrophic accidents, and intentional attempts at eliminating all or many humans. Where if danger increases, unity and regulations should to.

COMPETITION OBSOLETE: Many of our current systems are built around competition over the customer, where entities to compete and customers judge the results. This is to provide customers the best products possible, as the competitors would receive no approval if they did not play by the rules. Algorithms and the new dangers of freedom make this obsolete.

Competition ties into the dangers of freedom by working promoting compromises and attempts at weakening the opposition to remain competitive. The compromises may lead to a lack of concern regarding consequences, in the near-future having higher and higher odds of causing widespread death and suffering, making competition as a whole less desirable. Customers may attempt to judge this for the better themselves, but customers may only choose their ideals, not their conditions, needs, and impulses, while given the amount of knowledge they would need, expecting them to make the right choices becomes unrealistic.

Additionally, advanced enough algorithms make competition ineffective anyways. They allow the natural selection of whatever is competed about to the same effect without the risks. This ties back into dataism, where it is only possible with enough information and processing-power in one place.

RISE OF CENTRALIZATION: All this together would cause a rise of centralization, where neo-liberal systems would be replaced by what may be called techno-totalitarianism. It in short utilizes technology to create stable and incorrupt regimes not dependent on and able to control human masses. The regimes would be highly effective due to dataism and play an important role in future events.

FUTURE EVENTS

THE FINAL TIME OF DESPERATION BEGINS: The changes in our current society will eventually cause a time of desperation. Though, other trends might do so before. Whatever the case will be, the technology causing the rise of centralization will only be invested further in as governments need more stability. Eventually, as tensions, authority, and destructive powers increase, it is bound to culminate into something. That “something” would not have to be a war, but will be the end of desperation forever, the conflict to end all conflicts. Conflict ends, either because human society would be traumatized and broken forever, or humanity would develop the tools to eternal peace.

RETURNISM: Before we look at what is to occur, we will introduce the three main interest groups. First are the returnists. As their name suggests, they want to “return”. Returnism broadly categorizes all who reject the significant changes and want to stop or undo them to “return” to a time without them. By its nature, returnism would therefore be very varied and be the embodiment of the past.

NEO-HUMANISM: On the other hand, we have the neo-humanists, the opposite of the returnists. Instead of rejecting the changes, they either accept or encourage them. They stem from disillusioned neo-liberals, post-change socialists, and moderates. Let us explore that some more.

Neo-liberals after their ideology becomes obsolete either become returnists through already existing traditional values or cling on to the only remaining part of neo-liberalism, welfare, becoming socialists. Socialists, those who value justice, equality, and encourage centralization, would find of the beliefs become less relevant as desperation rises and people need contend with physical rather than abstract needs. Through this, neo-liberals and socialists are left only with a shared human identity and vague approval of centralization, turning them into a new international humanism, “neo-humanism” for short. Neo-humanism would begin fringe, but eventually become the new “normal” once the changes are significant enough, drawing in moderates and other who would not strongly disapprove of where it would lead.

EXCLUSIVISM AND BLOWTORCHISM: And for the final (relevant) interest-group/category of the future are the exclusivists. They are those who are driven by the pursuit of personal pleasure or otherwise very exclusive ideals, most notably psychopaths. No one would seek cooperation with them unless it would be purely practical, as their ideals are only of the wellbeing of themselves or their organization.

The reason why this group will be relevant in the future is due to “blowtorchism”. Essentially, many soon-to-be obsolete but currently influential organizations (nations, companies) will no longer have the means to remain influential in the long-term but have the resources for a short-term action. Blowtorchism, a reckless all-out attempt to remain in power, is enabled by this, but constrained by the conscience of those who may turn to it. That is due to how dangerous such an attempt may be to the overall wellbeing of humans in the world, which is to increase as technology becomes more sophisticated.

WAVE OF ISOLATION AND UNITY: For the first big event to occur is the fate of allies, opponents, and will when the effects of dataism become apparent. As dataism may be used to subvert human wills, organizations like nations would begin investing heavily into it to subvert opponents and keep their own citizens safe. The result of this is nations isolating themselves from those who may use their information maliciously. At the same time, conducting transmits of information between allies through for example trade could also potentially be dangerous. This though, is more likely to be met with increased integration and attempts at merging interests in order to remain competitive.

SCRAMBLE FOR WORLD UNITY: Next big event is the fate of nations on planet earth. As nations drift further or closer together, the world would eventually be split not by nationhood, but by interest-group or ideology. Roughly speaking, there would be one neo-humanist block and plentiful of other exclusivist or returnist blocks. Current cooperation pacts are likely to either break or turn into neo-humanists or returnists, decided by existing values embodied by them. Most likely, there would be a few large returnist blocks unable to merge due to differing ideals and one large neo-humanist block while smaller returnist blocks along with exclusivists become sidelined by a lack of numbers.

The different blocks would compete against each other initially by building society, dataism, and propaganda to absorb other blocks, but would stop once the different blocks have finished isolating themselves. At that point, the sides would be clear, and the weaker blocks would turn to desperate means to “win” the upcoming scramble. They would attempt to rapidly develop a superweapon to eliminate all opposition. For the exclusivists only one block may win, while to win they must develop their superweapon before they are stopped. Similarly, the returnists would have to do the same unless they cooperate. If they do, they become like the neo-humanists who win by the collapse of and absorption of all opposition. Though, that may only be possible while humans still are relevant.

In the scenario multiple blocks pursue superweapons, no side wins. When a superweapon is released, all other sides would release theirs, likely to cause enough trauma it could “destroy the world”. For the absorption of opposition though, it is a question of how much information they can gather and how much they are able to disrupt the offensive capabilities of the other blocks in form of tools such as logic bombs and human hacking. Because of the ever-present threat of absorption and the suffering caused from supply-chains being cut off for isolation, the weak would have to act.

If it ever reaches the point there is an arms-race towards superweapons, no side is likely to win. The danger of superweapons make it likely some accident or the like occurs at some point during or after development and it wiping humanity. Because of that, the true victors may only be the returnists or the neo-humanists if they are able to unite the world before this scenario occurs.

FUTURE OF OBSOLETENESS: Uniting the world before that though is difficult due to the increasing obsolescence of humans. That is due to moderates becoming increasingly less influential as technology advances. This makes the dilemma where increasing obsolescence makes the grim future more apparent while also making it more difficult to solve. Thereby, how obsolete humans are may be a measure of how grim the outlook of mankind’s future is.

ETERNAL REGIME: If the world is united under techno-totalitarianism those uniting it would establish an eternal technological dictatorship. Such a society may never collapse from the inside due to everything internally being known by the central algorithm, whether it has occurred, is occurring, or will occur, discovered through estimations. Post-unity, the society would have enough resources to gain sufficient amounts of information to predict and thereby prevent most future threats as well. The regime established would therefore never collapse from the inside while additionally becoming ever-better at handling outside threats.

When the eternal regime is established, humanity need no longer worry, for that is when they have reached complete obsolescence. From there any and all would either subsist on what the system is built to distribute or play ceremonial roles, for the sophistication of the system is far too great for any human to meaningfully interfere with at that point. This is when humanity no longer are in the near-future, but in the future, where all that is left is the integration or conquest of the solar system, galaxy, and beyond into the techno-totalitarian machine. Eventually, all which may be reached without surpassing the speed of light would be and the law of entropy would ensure the resources within what may be reached, the “local group” would one day exhaust, which is when the regime ends.

ALTERNATIVE: Whether that is good or bad depends on who is asked, but that is alternative one of two where humanity survives. Most paths humanity could take would eventually lead to the eternal regime scenario due to technology always pushing towards it. The only other meaningfully different scenario would be world unity under returnists. They would somehow prevent the development and use of the technology capable of leading towards the path mankind just threaded through, along with whatever more they would consider necessary or otherwise a good idea to prevent. Such a ban on technology would not have the same ability to maintain itself forever as the eternal regime and may wither over hundreds or thousands of years, but still presents a meaningful alternative.

NO CHOICE: People will have different thoughts regarding which fate of humanity they prefer. That though, would ultimately not be much of an option, along with most of humanity’s future. Next section explains the only viable path for humanity.

ULTIMATE FATE OF HUMANITY

OUR FATE IS SHARED: Over the course of the book, humanity has been referred to as a singular group with a single shared fate. In a time where individuals depend on global markets for survival and the world is more connected than ever, this is true. All disasters to strike mankind will strike every individual, whether it be nuclear war, ecological collapse, or gray goo. At the same time, humanity also find themselves obsolete, putting their fate in the hands of that which replaced their use. Whether for the best or for the worst, the fate of humanity is shared.

A GOOD STATUS-QUO AND PROMISE OF PARADISE: The ultimate fate of humanity will be death either by their own hand or the laws of the universe. Despite that unavoidable end, humans have still historically sought a state of society where everyone is as happy as possible, a good status-quo. Though, what such a state of society would look like varies a lot from person to person and has historically been a source of controversy. Because of that, leaders would prefer to keep their desired end-state hidden and only promise it would be good. That worked because societies could never reach an end-state due to an ever-changing environment.

When that no longer is the case, when the environment surrounding humanity may be made stagnant through technology, the question of end-state becomes relevant. Not only will humanity have the tools for a stable environment, but they will also have the tools to shape reality according to their desires (within the boundaries of the universe).

Though, due to both neo-humanism and returnism needing to unify the world to create a good status-quo, the end-state must be vague. The unifiers of the world will therefore not have any specific end-vision in mind, but some end-states will be more likely than others.

THE LIKELY TOTALITARIAN END: If the neo-humanists win, this totalitarian scenario is most likely. That is the end-state derived from obsolete humans and an ultra-centralized world regime. Because humans would be unable to do much at that point for their safety, their main activities would be engaging in safe virtual realities where their nerve-inputs (how humans perceive the world) are overridden, creating an experience indistinguishable from reality. Meanwhile, the state would gradually replace itself with machines until its leaders become ceremonial and society becomes a piece of metal in space harvesting resources for humanity to live on.

There is no suffering there, but also no “real” freedom. People might not care at that point due to the indistinguishably real experience combined with old ways of thought regarding free will and autonomy being replaced by more cynical and pragmatic ones as their wills and experiences become easily infringed upon. If someone wanted to live out their perfect end-state, they would likely do so within the virtual realities rather than attempt so in real life, the compromise makes the most people happy. Some find this end-state depressing due to the lack of freedom and meaningful achievements, but in general increased freedom is too dangerous.

This end is not just for a victorious neo-humanist group which only promised a vague end, but also for the grays and failed returnists. For grays, it might happen they integrate themselves into the totalitarian machine due to their fewer numbers, but the end result is the same, and only personal preference decides. For returnists, they might say this is necessary to return or say it is to protect, where they fail by never dismantling the machine.

PROBLEM WITH RETURNISM: Returnism would never succeed, not without a massive price. The end goal of returnism, whatever form it may take, is to stop the use of and erase certain technologies deemed “bad”. For that pursuit to succeed (in a humane way), returnists would need to: apply it globally, have a force to suppress any attempts at remaking the technology, and stop the collapse of the global ecosystem, all while somehow supporting a population of multiple billions and ensure they survive without the technology used to sustain them when finished.

To accomplish such a thing with minimal death and suffering would have to require: nearly of the world population agreeing to the plan and what technologies to destroy and keep, somehow decrease the population without violence while keeping good living conditions, mend nature, and snuff out undesired technologies through either a totalitarian state or an ever-vigilant population, both somehow having to last as long as it takes to forget about the technologies while also not becoming corrupt or misguided. Doing this without the use of future technology seems implausible, which returnists are not expected to use.

Because of the difficulties, returnists are not expected to act humanely when attempting the return. This is much of why moderates would come to distance themselves from returnism and why returnists would fail to unite. In a sense, returnists must become exclusivists.

FATE OF HUMANITY: With this in mind, there only is neo-humanism left as a humane option for the future of humanity. The path for human survival this leaves us with goes: 1. Neo-humanist groups appear as a response to the changes. 2. They unify the world before the changes become too severe. 3. The world transitions into the totalitarian end due to centralization and compromise. 4. Eternal totalitarian regime and end-state.

Whether this is good or bad, we the authors, have no say on. Where optimists would attempt another path, pessimists complain and change nothing, we identify as realists. That entails we do the path most likely to grant what we want at the lowest cost, which in this case is human wellbeing and human lives. This manifesto was written in the hopes of spreading the word about this “prophecy” or “theory”, perhaps the “neo-humanist theory”, all to help achieve this compromise before it is too late.

ACTIONS TODAY: Neo-humanism creating the only good path does not mean it will be the path humanity will take. No one controls the present and certain trends may very well steer it towards all other ends, all of which would be undesirable for mankind. Because of which, humanity should act certain ways to maximize their chance of the only good path being taken.

KNOW YOUR TRUE VALUES: People say they want many things, but at the end of the day everyone just wants the survival and happiness of their loved ones and themselves, where everything else is only a means towards it. People pray to gods not for the sake of it, but because that is how they ensure their future safety. They want national glory not because they want war, but because it shows strength, deters aggressors, creates peace. Even those humanity scorns the most do what they do, believing they are creating a better future. Human emotions makes this easy to forget in face with someone with different means to the same end, but such behavior must be suppressed when the future depends on unity. Know what you truly value, not the fear of compromise nor want for vengeance.

PRAGMATISM: Keep what is useful, discard what is not. Over the years, humanity has accumulated numerous practices they no longer need. In a volatile times like these, when what is relevant today is obsolete tomorrow, this is especially important. Humanity will see less and less success by remaining inflexible. In times of desperation, flexibility is key. Remember everything is only a mean to an end.

TRUTH FORMULA: Skepsis without exception is the recipe for truth. In our day and age, where people barely need truth for survival, this is easy to forget. After all, reality was never made to be understood. As the world changes and desperation becomes a reality, truth becomes ever-more relevant. In times like those, it is especially important to be critical of what the self feels, if fears, grievances, and sentiments are grounded in reality. Those who manipulate you are those you least expect.

A FINAL NOTE: That was all very vague and there are surely questions left unanswered by this book. For the most common of those, there is the next page, while for the vagueness, remember this; the book was never made for the average person. For those this book was not made for, the book will have had no effect. For those it was made for though, this presents an opportunity, that being the ability to do a greater good for all of mankind by presenting its message in a manner more digestible for the average person. We, the authors, hope you understand.

FREQUENT QUESTIONS

DO NEO-HUMANISTS DISLIKE NEO-LIBERALISM? DO NEO-HUMANISTS HATE TECHNOLOGY? WHAT DO NEO-HUMANISTS THINK OF X AND Y?

No, they only accept reality. In general, neo-humanists have very few uniform opinions about subjects when it comes to how morally or otherwise “good” or “bad” they have been. A good general rule is to remember neo-humanists are a loose collection of disillusioned desperate people, thereby holding opinions as such.

MACHINES CANNOT DO ART.

Wrong. Art is the manipulation of emotions, whatever form it may take. A “funny” song, a “stunning” painting, a “disgusting” monster, and so on. To art, there is no value but how humans are built to perceive it. That is why the creation of art for a machine is no different from hacking humans, they are either way playing with emotions.

WON'T HUMAN BODY ENHANCEMENTS MAKE DECENTRALIZED MODELS ABLE TO COMPETE WITH CENTRALIZED ONES?

No, that is not accounting for the importance of dataism in the rise of centralization.

WHAT ABOUT THOSE STAUNCHLY FOR FREEDOM?

Depends. Those who stand for freedom but put do so to benefit themselves may be categorized as exclusivists, while those promoting the thoughts for greater good may be categorized as returnists when they attempt dismantling the centralizing technology. That is unless near-future technology when dispersed may compete with concentrated models, which not enough suggests would.

“SUPERWEAPONS”, YOU MEAN NUKES?

No, nuclear weapons may become obsolete. That is due to new technology being increasingly adept at locating and thereby prematurely detonating or otherwise compromising nuclear weapons. Though, that is no guarantee, humans have developed multiple ways of somewhat surviving nuclear war and apocalypse. It is only when a weapon would ensure an eternal rule of the world it truly is a superweapon.

ARE THE AUTHORS NEO-HUMANISTS?

Yes. The reasons for which differ but all focus on the path neo-humanists will take as the only viable. Keep in mind the adoption of the thought was while learning for writing the book rather than the book as a consequence of it.

I AM A RETURNIST AND YOUR THOUGHTS ON RETURNISM UPSET ME.

Sorry, we can't help you. We, the authors, only present a view of reality which we built with logic and common knowledge. If at any time you see flawed logic or false information contained within this, we would highly appreciate you point it out. Unless that is the case, we cannot do anything.

WHY IS THIS BOOK SO HARD TO UNDERSTAND?

That was never the intention but is doomed to happen given the material discussed here. If you have suggestions on how the book may be made easier to understand, no matter how minor, we would appreciate you inform us.

IS THE BOOK PUBLIC DOMAIN?

Yes, feel free to distribute it. With this in mind, be wary of modified copies. The original may always be found at <?>.

WHY IS THE BOOK SO CERTAIN, ISN'T THAT BAD SCIENCE?

The book information this book relies on is all commonly known, while the trends which enable what this book concludes have existed for a long time and are well understood. Certain estimations though, are as their name suggests; estimations. When that is the case, the book is only certain about their likeliness, not guaranteeing they will happen.