

HUMANS AND EVOLUTION: ON THE NEXT SPECIES

超える

К Х И а

倖運 に l a m o

l a p a m z a と知る

選ぶ o i l a y u n

生きる テ r e p a l l a o b m a p

挑ま. K l e l x b a p Д. a l l a .

Learn at luck

Know by chance

Think through choice

Live as life

Challenge. Survive.

-The Five Pillars of Evolution-

Andre Smaniotto

"Pxi Shi"

永い海岸わ夜に歩く,
永遠な考えわ皆力と т і а ъ х ъ а д . а л а .
В а й が Ю р а 場所にわ若才くデ来りました,
心の中に古い... Д у ъ њ н а а р д а м ナマエを固まる.
Д е н н а 私が日と月を見る
上げテと落
Х у ъ н ч у の у ъ ш а л に わ Д у ъ њ н а から
私の内と言う来るゆく -
Д е е р а н д . е с т а д . о ж а д . е к а
言複永的響く
私の耳の中に.
С т и г а л К і е л о の ч у に わ
月 г а и т а , え え と , и з а わ ц и г а に
何 д . а л л а な ぜ な ら д у 何
惑ゆく...

"Pxi Shi"

Nagai kaigan wa yoru ni aruku,
Eien na kangae wa minnachikara to t'aehwad.aala.
Vai ga kono basho ni wa jakusaku de kurimashita.
Kokoro no naka ni furui.. Dynna ardam, namae o katamaru.
Dianna, watashi ga nichu to gatsu o miru
Agete to raku...
Hwun chu no yshal ni wa dyyna kara
Watashi no uchi to iu kuru yuku -
Ceeran diasta d.ouzha dieka
Fukuoto eiteki hibiku
Watashi no ji no naka ni...
Stigal Kieluo no chu ni wa
Zuki gaita, eeto, iza wa ciga ni
Nani d.alla nazenara du ka
Mado yuku...

"Five Poems"

Strolling along an endless beach at night,
Endless thoughts pursue in all their might.
We came to this place young in age.
Old in spirit... Identity forged through action.
Everyday I watch the sun and moon
Rise and fall
From a lake in the woods
I have come to call my home.
Their tides echo infinitely in my ear...
I see the moon in the sky
And wonder what it is doing there.

"道光, Урам б1аьхo"

ここわ道光の下 д у ь н е わ エンエミに成つてを肩ざし д е р а

Ю р а 脅場所の中に х1у м а а'а □と得る無い.

私の命□と夢 д.а и р а.

ここわ道光の下私わ д е р р и г'аを闘い.同 д а и м т е р р а.

ここわ道光の下, л а т т аの上.

勢いの м а ц а л л аから私の н е1を溶ける.

又,私わ裸デ立つ.道光の下, л а т т аの上.

天の к и й р аに с а ь р м а кを似る.

"MichiHikari, Uuram Bwaexuo"

Koko wa michi hikari no shita

Dynie wa enemy ni natte wo tozashi deera

Jara obibasho no naka ni humma'a to eru nai

Watashi no inochi to yume d.aira.

Koko wa, michi hikari no shita;

Watashi wa Derriga o tatakai. Onaji daa'im terra.

Koko wa michi hikari no shita, latta no ue.

Ikioi no macalla kara watashi no niaw o tokeru,

Mata, watashi wa hadaka na tatsu.

Koko wa michi hikari no shita, latta no ue.

Ame no kiira bu, saermak o niru.

"Street Lights, Street Fights"

Here, under the street lights,

The world becomes my enemy.

Here, in this terrible place, nothing can be gotten.

My life and dreams vanish.

Here, under the street lights, I fight everything.

Like I always have...

Here, under the street lights, above the ground.

The hunger for power dissolves my flesh,

and I stand naked.

Under the street lights, above the ground,

Like a dragon in the sky.

HUMANS AND EVOLUTION: ON THE NEXT SPECIES

超える

К Х И а

ISBN-13: 978-1-4675-0640-3

Unpublished Work © 2011 Andre Smaniotto

All images contained herein are sole property of the author

TABLE OF CONTENTS – 鈔 ɡ а й т а м

0. Preface and Corpus Hermeticum
1. Intro (ю ь х ь)
2. Adaptationszx (к о л г о х 1 у м а)
3. Mutation, Half-Breeds, and Chaimaras
 変わせ, ч 1 а ь н к ь а, ш и ь 属
4. Religion and the Soul 宗教 又 精神
5. Originszx 源
6. Alchemy and (Magick?) 变術 と 魔法
7. Speciation 属 д. а н
8. The Problems We Face 問題 в о в ш а х к х е т а
9. What We Can Do (в а і 何 и й ш х и л а д. а н)
10. Realism, Idealism, and Anarchy 真实 又 理想 又 ㊦
11. Variationszx 偏差類
12. Possibility 可能
13. Limitations 限
14. The Body and Functions 体 又 г 1 л л а к х е р а
15. Identity (к о р т а л а ц а)
16. Survival at all Costs (к 1 е л х ь а р д. а л а)
17. Natural, Artificial, and Synthetic Evolution
 当然, 術的, 混論 к х и а
18. Design and Evolution (к х о л л а м 又 к х и а)
19. Re(volution) 革命
20. Others' Ideas 外 の о и л а
21. Art, Folklore, etc... 芸術, н а х т у ь й р а, 尚...
22. Imagination 想像
23. Death and Immortality – (в. а л а р 又 永 遠 о ь м а р)
24. Rumor and Absurdity – (х а б а р 又 珍 答)
25. God and the Like 神 又 о ц у в о с т а р а
26. Prosthetics and Organics (х 1 у м а 術 と х 1 у м а 生)
27. Natural, Artificial, and Synthetic Selection
 当然, 術的, 正反合成 х а р ж а
28. Elementszx 性要素 (水, 炎, м о х, л а т т а)
29. Sacrifice and Gainszx (с а г 1 а 又 1 a 1 a)
30. Fate and Choice 選 т к ь а 運命
- 30.5 Introns, Exons, Genes, Fate, and Consciousness

31. Process, Design, and Application 処理, 柄, д. е х а р
32. On the Mind... 心の 1e x ь
33. What Becomes of That Which Is?
иза м у ъ л х а д. а л л а, 何 が 成 り ま す 何?
34. Creation and Evolution Theory in Science
К х о л л а 又 к х и а 理論科学中
35. Internal and External: Physique and Cognition
К и й р а 又 х и й р а 身體 т к ъ а 認識
36. Energy and Life 氣 又 命
37. The Possibility of Transformation 変わせ х и л а м е г а
38. Symbolic Evolution 印 進化
39. Nature (а м а л)
40. Evolution in History 歴史 中 進化
41. Worldview "itsumo" д у ъ н е н а н いつも 風景
42. Rectifying Creation Theory and Revisiting Evolution Theory
к х о л л а 理論 正しい 又 к х и а 理論 訪再
43. A Puzzling Story 迷ウ т у ъ й р а
44. Theoretical Culture and Evolution 理論文化-л е р а 又 к х и а
45. Conclusion ю ъ х ъ и г

0. PREFACE AND THE CORPUS HERMETICUM

..And as all things were made by the contemplation of one, so all things arose from this one thing by a single act of adaptation. In this way, the little world (microcosm) was created according to the great world (macrocosm). In this manner marvelous adaptations will be achieved...

1. INTRO (Ю Б Х Ъ)

First, I would like to say that people are stupid. They put all these efforts into these major projects, thinking they're so great, but they end up dying anyway. Now, this brings me to my point about evolution. There has to be a greater purpose to it, namely immortality, or at least near immortality. I find it humiliating that all these events took place on earth (and possibly other places, but mostly this book will be concerned with life on earth) only to give birth to species that not only dies, but lives almost the longest knowing this. Yet still, after all these centuries people have not come along any further. True, we have improved our standards, ways of life, and theories, amongst other subjects as well, but the fact of the matter is that we still remain ignorant to the future. Not just the future of our lives, but the future of our species as well. If we are to become anything in the vast space of the universe, must at least evolve. As I will demonstrate, my goals and ideas for and about evolution into the next species are not subtle. They are intended to do something, to have an effect, and to produce an outcome.

Are we simply existing just to rot as human beings? No. We must not. A new, better species has to emerge. Evolution is not a process that should be broken, but it would seem as if the emergence of people has done just that. People, at the top of life's hierarchy for centuries upon centuries would seem to be in a place with nowhere else to go. As we cannot digress as a species (at least no situation I have heard of even suggesting digression), then we can only remain where we are or progress. For you see, by remaining where we are as a species, we upset nature's plan. But, how long can we fight nature's plan?

It is only a matter of time before people progress into a new species. Why do these people debate and waste time about how life began? They need to focus more on what life can become. While we are rotting here as the same species we have always been, other species continue to evolve. Here is a perfect example, for instance. Don't ever wonder what I had to do to get this book written. Understand that sometimes you must do whatever it takes to do something, and evolving is no exception to this rule.

This book must be read in two ways, and this will become clearer as the book goes

on. To be quite frank, it must read in the context of the assumption that people are incapable of evolving into a new species, as well as in the context of the assumption that they are capable of evolution. My thesis clearly states that people are incapable of evolving, and describes reasons as to why this is. However, my point in writing this book is two-fold. First, it is to prove this hypothesis, which is based on fairly solid evidence. My second purpose though, is to inform the reader that people must (find a way to) evolve. This is how I reach the idea of the second context. Why spend all this time trying to prove such an abstract thesis, just to go against it in the end? It is because I will tell you right now that people must evolve. Whether they are capable or not does not matter because ultimately, they must. My thesis would contain the problem, and its validation might shed some light on a solution. Life is not worth living if our species (and life) can no longer evolve, but there is startling evidence that this is in fact the scenario. My thesis thus present the problem, and I propose a solution, even though there might not be one.

Essentially, this book asks two questions. Can humans evolve, and if they cannot, how can they? Not much of a win-win situation, but I feel it my duty to try to do whatever I can because I know and feel that these are and will be major problems that I just might be able to offer some insight about.

2. ADAPTATIONSZX (к о л г о х 1 у м а)

People are the only species that does not adapt to their environment. Rather, we adapt the environment to suit our needs. While this may seem like an adaptation we gained when we evolved into intellectual beings, it really is not. Adaptations function by merging with an environment, and not by changing it. Although the ability to mould our environments is a powerful ability, it is not an adaptation because it limits our abilities to live in tune with nature and its plans. By losing our ability to adapt, we have also given up our ability to evolve. Relying on vice and ability is not as advantageous as relying on chance and nature because they destroy our ability to understand and live with the unknown. By becoming part of the unknown, that is adapting, and that is how we should evolve, but we do not. We rely on what we know we can do instead of leaving ourselves at the mercy of nature and things we don't know.

As a way of promoting evolution, I propose that humankind sacrifices most or all of its abilities to adapt the environment to its ideas, and falls back on the way the rest

of life on earth functions; that is by adapting TO the environment. Our desires to design our lives has robbed us of our instinct, and in turn, our ability to adapt and possibly evolve. After all, any animal that cannot adapt is useless. If we are to evolve, we must first reclaim our ability to adapt. Now, I would like to talk more about how adaptations arise.

3. MUTATIONS, HALF-BREEDS, AND CHAIMARAS

変わせ, ч1аьнкьа, ш

и ь 属

First, allow me to state that although mutations are a means to evolution, they are not considered to be an evolution, and there are other ways to evolve. A mutation is little more than a large adaptation. They are adaptations that promote a change in some of the species, like a catalyst. In order for an (advantageous) mutation to have an effect on evolution, it first must change the species, and then be spread in large amongst the population. This raises the ideas of how much a species must be mutated to become a new species, and how many in the population must undergo this process. I'll refer back to these two ideas shortly. For now, let me examine the spectrum.

In any situation, there is an original species, called the OR (short term for original race). In the species mutations arise, and I'll call this group the mutations. While they may have some adaptations, they are not very important or noticeable. The next group, called the mutants, have made more adaptations, but they still resemble the OR somewhat. Roughly around the halfway mark (about 50% OR with 50% mutations) the mutants become half-breeds, thus forming a new species. Chaimaras are not half breeds. Where the half breed is fifty percent OR and fifty percent new species, chaimaras are two different species that have been brought together to form a hybrid species. They are like a mutation only in that they still result in a new species. Through adaptation abilities, nature selects two different species, brings them together, and forms a new species with new adaptive abilities. When dealing with humans, chaimaras are not as common as a half breed phenomenon, but remain a possibility for evolution nonetheless.

The amount of mutations in a population must reach a tolerance point before the new species can actually become a species. Just because one or so individuals have

becomes chimeras or half-breeds does not mean that a new species has emerged. Their numbers must reach a point where there are enough mutated members to reproduce and survive before the species can be called a new one. Remember, it only takes one evolution to make an evolution, but many to make a new species. While that may seem redundant and not so important on our discussion on (how to bring about) evolution, it is still important to the larger picture of speciation after evolution.

Next, I would like to discuss how mutations arise, but first I will discuss nuances. An evolution is a mutation; it is most likely several of them, but a mutation is not an evolution in itself unless it causes enough change in a creature of being. Several smaller mutations may have this same effect, too.

4. RELIGION AND THE SOUL 宗教 又 精神

Why do religions see people as the pinnacle of creation? Maybe because they are... but, doing so only limits our ability to evolve, much like removing our ability to adapt does. Although I see humans as a completely superior and different form of life, I do not see us as the pinnacle of evolution. No, we are merely stepping stones to whatever is to become the pinnacle of evolution. In this, I see religion as an inflation of ego; not in the sense of making us more than we are, though they do that well, but rather in the sense of limiting us to what we can become. We can all be the "greatest people," but it is all meaningless without the possibility of becoming a new species, and that is what religion blinds us to by making us the pinnacle of creation. For surely, the climax of creation has not occurred yet, and may never, but these religious orders preach everything as if we are in the twilight of existence, as if we cannot evolve. But, we can, and that is where I depart from organized religion. I am not shunning religion, just simply departing from it.

By the term soul, I mean mind, or rather, identity. The soul is a person's life and experiences, short and simply defined. While I am not doubting the existence of such a concept, I am doubting the effectiveness of its existence. Being spiritual is great, but it does nothing for evolution, nor does evolving spiritually. As people evolve into a new species, what becomes of their souls? Where did we acquire souls from anyway? Were they part of evolution?

5. ORIGINS 源

This section deals with beginnings, and all different types of them. I really do not like to get involved in creation theory debates because I find them pointless. Whether life was created or evolved from nothingness, it still comes from nothing. Though I can entertain both views (at once if I needed to), I do however dislike the title evolution being placed alongside the category of creation theory. Ultimately, something had to be created, namely a world, that would allow evolution to take place. Perhaps the world evolved out of nothing, but who am I to say? Then, where would this "nothingness" have come from? From there it becomes a vicious cycle.

Anyways, my point is that evolution theory needs a new name. Evolution is not about studying where life came from. Rather, evolution is about the future, namely the future of human beings. See, when I hear evolution I do not think it concerns origins of life. That is best left to philosophical study. I think it has to go more like where our species is going instead of where it came from. Evolution should be more of a study of the future than of the past, although it does not hurt to include the latter.

6. ALCHEMY AND (MAGICK?) 変術 と 魔法

Well, enough theory for now... Theory is useful in understanding, but there must be a time for application, and that is what this section is mostly about. The question is how does our species evolve? As I stated earlier, mutation and chaimara/hybrid are one way. Another way that was mentioned was through traditional adaptation. Though I speak lowly of humans' ability to adapt the world to them, I find the idea somewhat useful in using alchemy and possibly magick as a means to evolution because the end result would lend itself more to traditional adaptation anyway. Though adapting something to our needs and wants is a human quality, it can be something done to have a more natural effect, namely creating an adaptation. An adaptation resulting from changing something just might work. Alchemy and some forms of magick are very good at changing things, so this might become a new way of adapting and in turn evolving. In the least, these two schools clearly demonstrate our survival at all costs mindset that we need so desperately to achieve.

So, if we can transmute part of us into something else that has adaptive value, it might just eventually trigger an evolution. For example, if I transform my one leg into

a plant, I better be able to adapt to the situation; namely because I will not be able to move to another spot, although I could still move in place. This type of action would have to trigger an evolution because it would force me to adapt.

7. SPECIATION 属 だ な

What of the next species? Can you imagine the possibilities? The abilities? Once an evolution has occurred, the next phase logically is speciation. The rest, or at least most of the members of the species population evolve. Obviously, speciation will take longer for people because there are so many of them. Another important point is what defines a species. Logically, the new species will not be able to breed with the old humans. Perhaps they will live together in society, but a species can only reproduce really with the same species unless somehow humans would be able to interbreed with the new species, resulting in a third hybrid species. That is better left to time and nature to decide though. The chapter on half-breeds and chaimaras explains this idea.

Of course, speciation would be much more rapid if our species is forced to evolve as a result of a more immediate threat, but that is dependent upon outside factors. Most likely, speciation will be rather slow, except for places that require an evolution more than others. More on this can be found in the chapter about the different types of selection.

8. THE PROBLEMS WE FACE 問題 ぼ ぶ し あ け け た

First, we face the problem of how does the human species evolve? In considering this we must also consider if it is even possible for humans to evolve. Next, we must ask what kind of evolution it will be. Artificial, natural, and synthetic evolution are three different examples of this. They are discussed in a later chapter. Then, we face the problem of what we need to evolve, or what is required of us to do so.

One major problem we face as a species is the ultimate destruction of the earth. As the sun begins to age, earth will become uninhabitable, and eventually it will be destroyed. This is what leads me to believe in the need for evolution. Something

must happen between then and now that saves our species from extinction. Evolution, the dawning of the new species seems to be just the thing to do that. If we can evolve, perhaps our (new) species can also someday inhabit other worlds as freely as it does upon earth.

The next problem we face is the possibility of evolution. This problem is based upon the question of whether or not human beings can even evolve. If we cannot, are we to just watch our species become useless? No. There must be a way even if there is not. Whether people were created or they evolved, nature must have more of a purpose for our great species than to remain the same. To think there is all this diversity amongst other lifeforms, but yet people have remained the same for all these years leads me to believe that nature intends a major evolution for our species.

By giving up or losing our ability to adapt, we have lost the ability to evolve. That which cannot adapt cannot evolve. Humans use a very different process to survive than that of other animals, and other life. Where other life adapts to the world, people (prefer to) adapt the world to themselves and their ideas. I call this reverse adaptation, or artificial adaptation. Now, we will observe some examples.

Fish can breathe water, as can other aquatic lifeforms. People cannot, but surely it is advantageous to be in the water, especially underwater. Water is a muscle relaxer, and purifying agent, as can be seen by bathing and swimming. This is why it would be advantageous to live underwater. Low and behold, we instead develop devices for underwater travel and breathing. It may be better than not having them altogether, but it destroys what our true goal of aquatic life should be. We sacrifice the ideal of living underwater permanently for a temporary one. True adaptations must be permanent, that is, they must be part of a closed system.

The same is true of flight. Where birds have their own energy to use their wings, we use an external fuel to fly in devices. The flaw in all of this is setting our sights on usefulness instead of ideals. Just as a sub can only breathe underwater for so long, a plane can only stay in flight for so long. Actually, you should not expect hundreds of tons of anything to stay in the air, no matter how much fuel there may be. Do you see the difference now? If we were to adapt the ability to fly or breathe underwater, we should be able to do so almost infinitely, or at least on our own source of energy instead of relying on devices with limitations. Sure these ideas sound great in theory, or even in practical use, but they destroy our ability to evolve by presenting us with an artificial, or reverse, adaptation. Perhaps a levitation or water breathing

potion might be a better example of an adaptation than our traditional devices. That is another matter altogether though. I am no chemist, and certainly not an expert one, at that.

The same holds true for insects and lizards that can walk up and down walls, and crawl along ceilings. Here again, humans can mimic that ability with ropes and climbing gear, but it is still not a real adaptation because it relies on something, or an energy source, outside of our bodies. An adaptation must change the body so that it is better equipped to deal with a situation, not change the situation altogether (that is artificial, or reverse adaptation). Take the example of a tree. Although they cannot fight to defend themselves, trees are well equipped to live longer than us, and generally speaking, they have the ability to not feel pain. Here again, we can prolong life via artificial means like medicine and body building, and we can endure pain by wearing layers of clothing and other things, but we aren't modifying the actual body, only supplementing it with external things.

Yet another problem we face is that of how to rewire the mind. Surely, this is no simple task, but it must be done. This is a major problem because mindset may prove to be critical asset in the process of evolution. This problem is discussed in detail in a later chapter, though.

9. WHAT WE CAN DO (в а і 何 и й ш х и л а д . а н)

Research, and believe. Believe that we are part of nature's plan. Research all you can. Whatever you do, do something. What we can do is never stop trying to evolve. Try to be something greater than a human being, and believe in the efforts. Again, I say research because there is an answer, and while it may not be the most pleasant thought, we must do something. For you see, sacrificing everything to evolve is more important than living as a human. Humans are the only creatures that are aware of their demise, and we learn this at an early age. Yet, we do nothing to try and stop it. This is as disgraceful as it is humiliating. We know the end result of life, but we cannot find a way to change. But, we can. By evolving we will become new, beautiful, and powerful creatures ready to fight and stand the test of time, instead of just being aware of it.

I generally do not support evolution theory because it holds people to the same

guidelines as other lifeforms. As we have already discussed, people are not like other forms of life because we use different types of adaptations, and this is part of the reason why we cannot evolve. I also tend to disregard evolution theory because if people, and all life, evolved from the same original organism, then I should still be able to fly, breathe water, walk up water, crawl on ceilings, and live a long painless life like that of a tree. Nothing holds up here. I can do none of these except by artificial means, and that may never lead to an evolution of any kind. Enough evolution theory bashing, though. It has useful points, few and far between, but so does almost anything. Chances are, if I knew the whole truth, I would not even be writing any of this begin with. So although evolution theory bashing is Something We Can Do, it is not the main point of this chapter.

So what can we do? The seeming million dollar question... for surely, an evolution into a new species is no simple or light matter. This is especially true for humans, who like to believe that they are the epitome of creation and life. You may ask why this is such an important question. The reason is this: It is our catalyst question. It is the type of question, which when answered, will lead to a very real result. Why is this our catalyst question? Simply because we must do something if we are to evolve into a new species. Without our ability to adapt, we must find another way to evolve. That is, we must DO something, or become more active in our efforts. Obviously, we must find a substitute for adaptation, "revert" back to "simpler lifeforms" and "relearn" how to adapt. Note that when I speak of substitutes, though, I do mean things like the previously described reverse artificial adaptations that people are so used to using, but rather, a substitute that will actually lead to and promote evolution. What type of thing can you substitute for adaptation? We must find that out. Substitutes for adaptation will be discussed in a later chapter. This chapter is still about what we can do to aid in the process of evolving. So, while finding these substitutes is something that we can do, those specific options are discussed elsewhere.

Besides locating and utilizing a type of substitute adaptation, we could always "relearn" how to adapt. I say "relearn" in quotes almost jokingly because it is ironic that we should have to do so while other creatures are still evolving in front of our very eyes. Rest assured that this will be no easy process to regain because we are not used to using it, and opposite ways of thinking are never easy to correct or change. We spend so much time and effort on getting things to work the way we want them to, that we lose sight of how they should really work. Also, we must learn how to rewire the mind into a more traditional "problem-adaptation" mindset before we lose the ability to

do so all together. For once we forget how to adapt, we also forget how to evolve.

10. REALISM, IDEALISM, AND ANARCHY

真實 又 理想 又 ㊦

Foremost, I only speak of anarchy in this book to suggest a blending or possibly a balance of realism and idealism. Essentially, that is what anarchy really is. Realism refers to that which is real, and idealism refers to that which is beyond reality. Traditionally, realism covers the realm of material things, and idealism covers non-material things. I dislike those definitions because non-material things can be real, and material things can be idealized. Anarchy, in my definition, is a blend of these two major branches of thought, whether balanced or not.

What does any of this have to do with evolving our species? For starters, we are talking about reality and ways to change it, applying both idealism and realism, or possibly a mixture of both at once. We must consider what we can really do to achieve an idea or an ideal. Anarchy is often spoken of in its relation to government, but this is not anarchy in its true form. In true form, anarchy is about everything. Everything logically includes life itself, anarchy might ultimately prove to be very useful in our discussion of evolution, especially when broken down and analyzed at the philosophical level, as my definition at the beginning has done. Remember that anarchy is eternal. It is the design of everything, and it does whatever it wants. This is examined in the chapter about creation and evolution, and again in the chapter about choice and fate.

11. VARIATIONSZX偏差類

Now I shall touch upon the topic of variation. In other animals, variation leads to the creation of new species. This most likely applies to plants and bacteria (etc) as well. Darwin and other evolution theorists observed this clearly in plants and animals. For example, a differently shaped vestige or body part within a species gives rise to a new species which all have the new variation. However, this process does not seem to apply to humans (or at least not in the same way). Variations in modern humans does not beget a new species - only a different race. so, if variations cannot be introduced into the human population, then how the hell are we supposed to evolve? Point in fact: Have you ever observed a human that is not human?

Now, although there were previous species of humans (which are now extinct) they (all??) gave rise to one single species of modern human beings. Even though we say now that they were different than our current species, honestly, I see this more as a response to the (changing) world, environmental triggers, trial and error with survival strategies, etc. than as the development of a new species. Even in modern humans, mutations function differently than in other lifeforms. Whereas other forms of life tend to benefit, adapt, and evolve as a result of mutations and variations, people tend to suffer. Point in fact: Most human mutations result in deformity or illness where they are supposed to be a new survival mechanism. Variations in the human population and gene pool only create different races of the same species. If I have time I would like to discuss this issue at the individual level as well, but that is daunting when we need to keep our eyes on the big picture.

Why are humans so different than other lifeforms when it comes to the topic of evolution? For instance, can you actually say you have ever seen a different race of a tree or dog species? No. Not at all. Never. Only different "breeds." So, why is this? My best guess comes from philosophical thought. Perhaps humans are the end result of evolution (unless we find life beyond earth, but that is a different scenario, and might not even change anything). What does this mean? I cannot say - I am not a god... Perhaps people can only evolve into a single next species, whereas other lifeforms have various possibilities. This is my other theory, but it is not so different than the first when we take into account the all of the possibilities of speciation of other life on earth. So in short, are humans the end result of evolution, or a bizarre stepping stone toward that agenda?

Or maybe our different races are really different species. That would not surprise me. I have always kind of felt that way to some extent. Plus, if we allow the theory we might just be able to explain some things... Not that any one is better or worse than another; just different, period. Then I think of elves, dwarves, and humanoid monsters - Classically, we say these are their races, but actually they would be different species. Folktale or not, the same principles apply. Point is, an elf is not a human, but we say that is their race instead of their species. The eleven race, or the eleven species? Which sounds better? How about if we find humans or something (similar) beyond the earth? Would they still be human? Either we are looking at the wrong picture, or our classifications are wrong. I guess it all comes down to breeding compatibility. Ask yourself, can an elf breed with a human? But remember, sometimes lines are drawn in mere sand, and in some places the winds blow over

hundreds of miles an hour.

12 -N- 13. POSSIBILITY AND LIMITATIONS 可能 又 限

In my opinion, the possibilities of the next species to arise from human beings are either endless, singular, or none. Perhaps the entire (majority) species will evolve into one new species, or a whole bunch of different species. The limitations are only limited by what we limit ourselves to, as there is much potential, especially for change, in the human species. However there are limitations for evolution; the first being we cannot regress. The second one would be that we cannot evolve into better humans. That has already happened, and it is not an evolution. Evolution gives rise to a new species, not a better form of the same one.

The next matter concerning possibility is location. By location, I mean places on earth and beyond. Currently, people live on land on earth. Could we evolve into a species that lives underwater, or one that can fly, or one that can live in currently uninhabitable areas like volcanoes or very cold places? Could we (eventually) become a species that can live in space, or on other planets that are now uninhabitable? This idea actually makes the most sense to me. After all, why are space and other planets there if we cannot live in them? Sure there are places that people cannot live, but that does not mean that the possibility is not there to evolve into a new species that could withstand those environments and conditions. Adapting to live in the cold may be simpler than adapting to live in the vacuum of space or the harsh atmosphere of another planet, but they are still and always possibilities. My point is that evolution may have a greater purpose for people than to be land dwellers on earth.

14. THE BODY AND FUNCTIONS 体 又 г 1 л л а к х е р а

Obviously, evolution will include new bodies for our species. More than anything, we need bodies that last longer, if not forever. To accomplish that, one way is by reducing functions. The less functions one's body needs or has, the longer it will last. Of course I suggest removing our ability to adapt the environment, or at least switch it with the ability to adapt TO the environment. Next, I suggest removing all higher intelligence abilities such as words, art, numbers, thought, and the like. Communication will still exist, as it always will (more on this later) but not in the

misused manner in which it currently exists. All of these "higher abilities" are merely a waste of time and energy. By removing useless and overused functions, we come to a simpler way of functioning, and perhaps also find a way of "force evolving" new bodies.

As for our new bodies... what will they look like, or rather, what will they become like? In a few of the following chapters I will discuss some of the potential ideas in much greater detail. For now though, allow me to discuss the basics. As human beings, we can either become inorganic beings, or a new organic species. Either one, or possibly a mix. Whether or not we can choose our evolution is a question of a later chapter. More than likely, we will either evolve into a new organic species because that would be simplest considering that is already what we are, or a synthesis of organic and inorganic because that is the next logical step after organic beings. Jumping that step and becoming inorganic beings evolved from organic is still a possibility, though not as likely. That seems like a second or third evolution. Logically...

First evolution would be organic to new organic, or organic to synthetic. Second would be new organic to synthetic, or synthetic to inorganic. Third would be synthetic to inorganic. However, organic to inorganic is always a possibility, and reverse possibility can also exist.

15. IDENTITY (к о р т а л а ц а)

More than anything, it is necessary for us to give up our ideas about identity. They are wasteful and degrading. Do any other animals have things like identity? No. They have separate existences, but they do not seek to "define themselves" by establishing an identity like people do. They simply live as they are without trying to become something else. Making an identity is just a way of becoming something else besides what one really is. Have people forgotten their animal instincts so much that they need to create identities? An identity is the destruction of one's true self because by creating an idea of who we are, we ultimately lose our instincts.

In terms of evolution, identity is important to discuss because it must be eliminated. The next species' individuals will be so alike that there will be no need for identity. It is not necessary or beneficial to have such differences between individuals because it corrupts them. We lose our sense of instinct, and lose sight of what is really important. By eliminating ideas of identity, we will become more like other lifeforms

on the earth.

Imagine a (human) species that all look the same... would look very impressive... no ugly people; no fighting over who looks better. No identity, thus no need to compete. No overblown egos, either. I do not really support monotony or conformity. Variety is helpful to some extent, but identity is a large problem with people. I am not suggesting to make everyone the same like utopian idealists try. Rather, I mean that the next species will be so accurately created that they have no need for (physical) identity, at least not on any level besides maybe mental identity.

16. SURVIVAL AT ALL COSTS (к л е л х ь а р д . а л а)

First, we need to reconsider the idea of survival of the fittest. Sure, it is a great idea, and it creates longer lasting creatures, but it does not stop them from dying. Again, I restate my main question. Why give rise to a better species if all they do is die anyway? The focus of human evolution needs to be survival at all costs. Creatures become so concerned with being fitter than another that they lose sight of the ultimate goal, survival. I could spend my whole life trying to be fitter than the best athletes, only to die of a resulting health problem. Sure, survival at all costs includes survival of the fittest, but it also encompasses much more. For example, it may include something like survival of the wisest. Just because a creature is fit does not mean it is smart, or vice-versa. As humans are typically seen as the fittest species, they are also the smartest (on earth anyway??), but that still doesn't complete survival at all costs. Other areas might include spirituality, creativity, or purposeful. While these other areas might not make us a fitter species, they obviously do something, if not just help define survival at all costs. For example, does drawing a picture make us a fitter species? Probably not; but again, it serves SOME purpose, and thus helps demonstrate survival at all costs. Maybe not the most extreme example, but still an example nonetheless.

We need to rid ourselves of the delusion that survival only matters at the species level. Why? We need to concern ourselves with survival at the level of the individual, too, because people are so different than other creatures. As such, they deserve, or should at least have longer lives (like that of a tree). After all, what is the point in living only sixty or seventy years knowing that you are going to die the entire

time? There is no point in any of it. We must realize that, in humans, survival must extend past the continued existence of the species and into the realm of the individual. It is like we are working against ourselves to secure a future that we will never be a part of, and we must stop that.

17. NATURAL, ARTIFICIAL, AND SYNTHETIC EVOLUTION 当然, 術的, 混論 К Х И a

As with anything, there is always more than option. Though they must lead to the same result, as only one history exists, there are still other possibilities. The trick, you see, is to incorporate alternative possibilities into actual history. Perhaps if we are willing to try hard enough, we can change the course of history, or allow alternate timelines to emerge into actual existence. Things are not always what they seem, and although life is ultimately a one way journey, we do not have to let this be the case. I am not suggesting that we can change what has happened, but rather, what is to become of the world. Change the course, and therefore the very fabric of what history IS, and let what has already happened be.

Life tends to naturally evolve, and it will. However, where there is nature, there must also be artifice, as well as a synthesis of the two. Since natural evolution tends to come around on its accord, I will go into detail about it before the others. Life will become simpler or more complex over time, depending on which is more advantageous. Eventually changes become evolution, giving rise to a new species. The problem with people is that they try to change things instead of letting nature change them. This leads to an inability to adapt, and in turn evolve, as I have already discussed. Because humans as a species refuse to let nature change them, they will remain the same species that they are. While we may not be an inferior species, this type of thinking leads to a dead end. How are people to evolve if they will not allow themselves to change? We must succumb more to nature, in all of its forms, to allow us to evolve.

While I generally do not like artifice, as it is a uniquely human characteristic, and therefore not a universal one, I still see some applications of it. First, that which is artificial can be made to have more natural qualities. Let us discuss houses for example. A common house generally has no natural features, being a work completely of artifice. Now consider a grass hut. It is made of natural materials, thereby having natural qualities. While neither building says anything about evolution, the two

contrasting examples illustrate the difference between nature and artifice. Now, consider evolution, being mostly a natural phenomenon, in terms of artifice. How can people achieve an artificial evolution if it supposed to be a natural idea? Well, first we must let our artifices become more natural in their qualities, if not just eliminate them altogether. Secondly, our artifices must have more to do with our bodies rather than things like the world, communication, mind, ideas and the like. Other animals do not have "capacities" like these, and because of their absence they are forced to rely more upon their bodies. This is what allows animals, and plants for that matter, to evolve while humans seem to have lost this ability. But, we can reclaim it. By asking what we can become instead of what we can do, we can change what we are. Finally, by combining our artifices with nature we can also bring about synthetic evolution. Design, for example, is a nature and artificial synthesis.

18. DESIGN AND EVOLUTION (к х о л л а м 又 к х и а)

People possess a higher degree of design abilities than other animals. This causes them to often design things that are utterly meaningless. Other animals make things that they require to survive and reproduce, such as nests, hives, and dens. Understand that these are two very different ideas. People design things that they really do not need. We seem to have placed all of our designing skills in the wrong place. Such a unique and creative ability should be used only to design the next species' bodies. Our ability to design has taken away nature's ability to design and redesign us. Perhaps we should just totally disregard our ability to design, and simply let nature design us.

19. RE(VOLUTION)革命

Why couldn't people live in the world the way it was? Why do they always feel the need to change and establish things? Is it because they think they are better than nature? Or is it because they are scared that they are not better than nature? Either way, it is pathetic. There is no reason to complicate things that are already complicated enough, and yet, people love to do that. Why do people make rules? What gives them that ability? And what makes them believe that there should be consequences or penalties for not obeying made up rules? Have you ever seen a deer

instate a draft to go to war with the wolves? No. Nature knows no rules. It knows patterns and principles. There are no penalties for going against those principles though. Nature works in one way: this happens, then this happens as a result. People work more like this way: if you do this, then this happens, but we are also going to do this to you because we FEEL a certain way about said action.

See, in nature there are no feelings. So what makes people think they are better than nature? Nature's pattern is action and result. People's patterns are action, result, plus penalty or bonus. How disgraceful we have become to nature and its wondrous principles by establishing societies with laws and consequences that mean nothing to nature. Society is a shameful joke because in the end, nature's principles still take priority over the world of people and society. Have we forgotten about nature so much that we actually believe that we should tell people what they can and cannot do? A return to nature is what humankind needs to reawaken itself, not a hierarchical society that fails in the end anyway. Stop making shit up, and stop avoiding the real hierarchy.

20. OTHERS' IDEAS 外 の お い っ ぱ

First of all, allow me to point out that many of the ideas in this book are my ideas about other peoples' ideas. I will try to state them here in this chapter, and when I discuss them individually in other chapters. Next, let me point out that two ideas that are central to one of my main points are not my own, but the synthesis, the resulting hypothesis, and solutions are my own.

First is the idea that people do not adapt to the environment, and rather that they adapt the environment to themselves. Originally, this was not my own idea. It has been hinted at by others, and by now it is almost a plain fact. Second is the idea that people cannot evolve. This too has been hinted at by others, and with more evidence it could become a simple fact. While both ideas are close to being observable facts, they still require more proof, so they will remain other peoples' ideas for the time being. Thus, I must give credit here to the others' ideas, since I cannot say that they are truly my own. No matter how much I believe in the accuracy of their statements, the credit really belongs to them until I can prove their validity. Even then, the original ideas still belong to them, although I might gain some of my own credit in establishing a more formal theory.

While those two separate ideas are not my own, their synthesis, which is one of the core matters of this book, is my own (as far as synthesis goes...). Had both ideas come from the same source, the synthesis would not be my own, but the synthesis is drawn from two separate sources, and this is verifiable. Thus, it is my own to some extent, as well as partly theirs. The synthesis of these two ideas is also one of my major hypotheses, central to the discussions in this book. The main purposes of this book are to determine whether or not this hypothesis is true, and solutions to the problem presented by the hypothesis.

That being said, my synthesis is that people cannot evolve because they have lost the ability to adapt. While this statement relies directly upon two other source ideas, each with its own author, the synthesis is truly my own. It took years of going back and forth between the two ideas to find a link, but when I did, it all made perfect sense, even before any full-blown elaboration. It is now a straight-forward synthetic statement which makes more sense than the two ideas do in isolation, though isolation is still good for detailed analysis.

Others' ideas might also appear in this book in some form, but generally, they are more like formal theories, thus more widely known and recognizable without any specific citation. These two major ideas however, and the third of my synthesis, are less commonly known ideas, so they needed a little more explanation in this chapter.

While I generally do not like Darwin, he has some decent ideas for animals, plants, and other lifeforms. People are different though, as well as qualitatively different. As far as we know, humans may not even be capable of evolving. What humans need is a quicker and more radical process if we are to become anything of worth, and this is where Darwin fails miserably, in the realm of people and evolution. Unlike animals, people can know and alter the future. Maybe this is what we should do, know and alter the future, including our bodies, and not the world around us. Our focus is in the wrong place, but a focus is easy to change, for it is nothing but a mere fixation.

21. ART, FOLKLORE, ETC... 芸術, な っ ち ゅ っ ぱ , 尚...

People have always depicted mythical in drawings, writings, and legends. Could they serve as a link in the next step of our evolution? Creatures like goblins, nymphs, dryads, dragons, beast-gods, and golems resemble a synthesis between human and something else. For example, a dryad might be a synthesis between a person and a

tree, and a dragon might be a synthesis of a person and lizard, or a golem might be a synthesis of a person with inanimate stones. Do they suggest an evolution through synthesis? I would say so. However, the synthesis must lead to a RECURRING new species to really be effective. Sure, one person could evolve into a half person and half plant, stone, or animal lifeform, and be said to evolve. What I am more concerned about though is the ENTIRE species, especially because humankind has a unique ability to develop preferences. More on that later, though...

22. IMAGINATION 想像

Look at all the forms of life and inanimates on earth, and imagine what people would look and be like after an evolution. What do you see? Is it a simple or complex evolution? Is it the same for all people, or different for different types of people? Where are they living? People imagine all sorts of things, but we have not been able to imagine what we will become as a result of evolution. I feel imagination is one of the key triggers to evolution; the others being design and application. To apply, we must first design, and to design, we must first imagine because it will certainly take a lot to evolve a species as elaborate as humans. Though it is not the actual mechanism to evolve people (again those would be design and application), imagination still serves as a trigger to those functions.

To be brief, we, as a species, are constantly evolving alongside other lifeforms on this planet and god only knows where else. But are we doing it right? Imagine if we did... Though the answer is still no. Do we even have a choice in the process? We shouldn't. Yet, people have a way of playing god and intervening in things they shouldn't. That said, imagine how powerful we would be by now if we would just continue the process of evolving like our animal ancestors. Imagine the wonder of a world that you rejected as you choke on your false sense of humanity.

23. DEATH AND IMMORTALITY (в . а л а р 又 永遠 о ъ м а р)

Here we come to the main point of my ideas about evolution. In all logic sense, one would think the real point of evolution is to create a perfect being. Ultimately, creating better creatures leads to a perfect being, or something so close to perfection that it can be said to be perfect. The purpose of evolution, therefore, is to eliminate

death, and thereby achieve immortal beings. This would be much like man evolving into godlike beings, or some other immortal lifeform. Where we as a people (and probably other animals) fall short of this is that survival should mean survival. Survival should not mean staying alive as long as we can, but rather overcoming death. Prolonging death is one thing; surviving death is another. At its core, that is what survival is truly about.

Yet, how do we become immortal beings? Sure, we could use our human techniques, but they only seem to prolong life and not focus on the real meaning of survival. Immortality or even longer lifespans would certainly be an adaptation to spring from an evolution to a greater lifeform. More than likely, it is something a species would earn, rather than something it gives to itself. We must struggle against nature, thereby learning how to become immortal creatures. We must learn to adapt to an infinite universe and timeline in order to become immortal.

Did you ever wonder why everything kills you so easily? Why? Because life was not meant to exist the way it is. This idea is discussed in another chapter. It was meant to exist as a self-contained, self-sufficient system which would pave the precursor path toward immortality. But, it is not. Why? Probably because life came about completely by chance in a universe or multiverse of possibilities. Thus, when we remove our "desire" to "expand," only then will we forfeit our dependence on the "external world," become self-sufficiently contained things, and begin our ultimate journey toward immortality. So again, why wasn't life meant to exist the way it is? Because it is so easy to take away. And, that is why our "theoretical" stones and rocks are still ultimately better lifeforms. They have nothing to lose.

24. RUMOR AND ABSURDITY (x a b a p 又 珍答)

Can humans even evolve? That is the most important question. My answer is this - if you think you cannot evolve, then you cannot; if you think you can, then you can. Remember also that just because an evolution occurs, it does not mean that it affects the entire species. This is especially relevant with people. Of all the creatures on earth, people must be one of the species with the greatest diversity. Maybe some of us will remain humans while others evolve into the next species. By the way, when I speak of the next species, I am referring to people specifically because we are the MOST

EVOLVED species. Why? Simply because that is the most important, and the fact that I am human, so that is what I should be most concerned about.

Then there are the three different types of evolution: artificial, natural, and synthetic. Since humans have more capacities than other life, we have more knowledge of options than them, also. While natural and synthetic evolution would occur almost by themselves, humankind might still be able to evolve artificially over time.

25. GOD AND THE LIKE 神 又 o c y b o c t a p a

Whether people evolved from earlier lifeforms, or a god created them separately was never really important to me. It is a good and interesting debate, but it is not the point of this book. The point, in case you missed it, is what people can evolve into, and the NEXT MOST EVOLVED species. Did god create fish to evolve into monkeys, thereby making people, or was it all by chance? Either way, something made the fish which ultimately became people. If people evolved from earlier life, then they can certainly evolve into a new species. If a god created people separately from other creatures, then evolution becomes trickier because it is left more in the hands of god to create a next most evolved species. The possibility still remains though because people could also become more like god, thus maybe creating a new species. Or perhaps, god has left it to people to evolve on their own. Or maybe, god will just simply create a new species.

Maybe god created us in the image of god so that we could become more like god, that is, evolve into godlike creatures. For although we may have been created in the image of god, there is still a large qualitative and quantitative gap between us and god. Though we may have been created in the image of god, we are not god, or gods for that matter, but that doesn't mean that we cannot evolve into more godlike creatures. Just as the other creatures god created can evolve, so can we. That is the function of a creature, to evolve. Or maybe we cannot evolve. Maybe the gods made us in their image so that we could not evolve. Then, I ask, what is the purpose in living, if not to evolve, especially when we could always become more like god?

26. PROSTHETICS AND ORGANICS (x 1 y m a 術 と x 1 y m a 生)

Prosthetics and organics lead to different types of evolution. The former leads to artificial evolution, and the latter to natural and synthetic evolution. However, they can be made to encompass all three forms of evolution. For example, pills can be used to replace a natural diet. Prosthetic food can eventually lead to a slightly different kind of natural evolution. Another example going the other way would be something like using sticks for earrings. An organic object can be used to make an eventual artificial evolution. When dealing with prosthetics and organics, it is important to consider the thing itself, the way it is being used, and what purpose it is serving. Again, most of these methods would lead to synthetic evolution because of all the factors involved, but either way pure processes can still occur. The boundaries are easily crossed.

27. ARTIFICIAL, NATURAL AND SYNTHETIC SELECTION

当然, 術的, 正反合成 x a p ж a

Natural selection happens slowly over long periods of time. An organism determines what it needs, and then finds the means to get it. Artificial selection happens quickly, most likely as a result to an immediate problem. It also happens as the result of humans intervening in the life of another organism. Natural selection can be seen as a way of eventually getting an upper hand on the environment, and is more or less triggered by a preference rather than a necessity. Artificial selection is triggered more by necessity than by preference. Where the triggers of natural selection can be categorized as internal, the triggers of artifice are external.

Here we must revisit the idea/ideas of mutation and speciation. Mutations happen in individuals, and speciation takes place after reproduction, ultimately leading to evolution. In natural selection, a few mutations will slowly lead to a new species over time. In artificial selection, mutations will occur in many more individuals at the same time, resulting in quicker speciation and evolution. This point will become more meaningful in our discussion of humans, but for now let us look at some basics in this example about a bird.

Let us say that this bird finds a new and better source of food, more specifically, a new type of insect that gives it more energy. The insects however, live underground, out of reach of the flying bird. The bird might stay on the ground, and hunt just those insects, eventually losing the ability of flight, or it might lose its wings for more finger-like claws. This is a natural adaptation because it happens as a result of preference. The extra energy might help the bird reproduce more. Although this evolution had a trade off in that the bird becomes flightless, it is still a natural selection example because it is a matter of preference, likes and dislikes, than a matter of immediate survival necessity. As a side note, remember that not all adaptations require a trade off. This scenario just happens to involve one.

Now take the bird and place it in another scenario. This time, migrating birds have disrupted the native bird's insect food source. Now the bird is forced to look for a new food source altogether. Again, it finds those underground insects, but now it is forced to stay on the ground and dig for them because it has no other food source. Again, the bird becomes flightless because it no longer needs to fly, and adapts claws for digging. Same result (by chance), but here there is an external pressure causing the mutation and resulting evolution. By external, I mean that the pressure comes from a source beyond the bird's control. The native bird could have adapted sharper talons to fight off the migrating birds, likely restoring its old food source, and surely, both scenarios would be examples of artificial selection. This is a matter of unfolding forms though. The point here is that different scenarios require different types of selection and adaptations.

Natural selection is based on like/dislike and benefit/trade off principles. If a creature likes something, then it will seek it eventually, possibly giving up something for it. If it dislikes something, then it will not seek it. Usually, something that has benefits will be sought after more than something that is novel or appealing. A creature might even seek something with benefits even if it dislikes it, though this is not as likely to happen. This process is lengthy because it involves measuring the quality of information.

Artificial selection is much quicker because it involves measuring quantity of information. For instance, some hard to reach food is still better than no food. There is no time to measure quality because there is no time to establish preferences. The demands being placed on the organism require it to change or die.

Between natural and artificial selection, there is another process known as

synthetic selection. It results from both internal and external triggers, as well as from preference and necessity. Both must be present, though not in equal proportions necessarily. Synthetic selection can be swayed closer to natural or artificial, but at least a small amount of both must be present to produce a true synthetic selection. Let us examine our bird in yet another situation. This time the scenario will lead to synthetic selection.

The bird wants more food, possibly to feed more offspring, or to increase its energy in hopes of making more offspring. Whatever the reason, the point is that the bird has established a preference. Normally, our bird would have to learn to fly faster, maybe adapt larger wings to fly at greater speeds or travel greater distances, thus naturally evolving like in the first example. However, the situation becomes more complicated again because of the other migrating birds eating all the food. Now the situation is two-fold. Our bird wants more food, energy, and offspring, and is also forced to deal with the migrating birds. There is more than one solution to this problem though because, as I said, synthetic selection can be weighted to different sides of the natural and artificial scale. The adaptation might result as more a matter of preference, or more as a matter of necessity, depending on the detailed circumstances of needs and wants, but either way synthetic selection results from a mixture of both in some amount.

Now our bird is in a very difficult position. Not only must it find a new source of food, but it must also find one that can make more energy, or feed more offspring. What does the bird do now? It adapts through synthetic selection, and it does this in one of three ways, balanced synthetic, natural-based synthetic, or artificial-based synthetic. Things get complicated here, but not if we know where and how to draw boundary lines. I will try to define each process as best as I can, although things vary in different situations. The three kinds of synthetic selection happen in order of the amount of external demand that is present. The more pressure present in a scenario, the quicker the solution must occur. At its limits, synthetic selection would almost appear to be either natural or artificial. However, a small influence from both must be present to truly constitute an example of synthetic selection.

Natural-based synthetic selection means that the desired preferences' need to activate outweigh the weight of the immediate problem, or that there are more internal preference triggers than external demands. Our bird's desire to feed more young might be more important than the need to find more food for itself. Or, the bird might need to find more and better food before it can worry about finding a steady new food

source for itself. Taking this route, the bird might change its diet to fish and fruits, evolving new mechanisms to eat them with, so that he can feed the young, and then later find a new source of insects to steady its own diet.

Artificial-based synthetic selection means that there are more, or more powerful external triggers that must be attended to, but there is also an internal desire to establish a new preference. The external; demand(s) must be dealt with first because they present immediate danger. Later, the internal preference can be established after the external pressures are slated. Often these will occur as a chain effect of an earlier immediate adaptation. Here, the bird may evolve larger wings and sharper talons to quickly fight off the migrating birds. Once the threat of immediate danger is nullified, the bird might use his larger new wings to hunt his old food source quicker, thus gaining more food and satisfying his internal preference.

Balanced-synthetic selection means that the external pressures are equal in number and quality to the newly established internal desires. For example, the need to find better food, and the need to find a new food source altogether are both present in equal demands. This requires more immediate action than natural-based synthetic selection because more external pressure triggers are present. Our bird must deal with his changing taste buds, as well as his disappearing food source. So, he might evolve a longer tongue that will let him scare off the migrating birds, and also allow him to dig up those tastier, energy rich insects.

Let us leave our bird alone. He has seen enough problems for now. How does all of this apply to humans? This is, after all, the main subject of the book, and I probably should not be talking about birds to begin with. Yet, if the bird can use all these types of processes to evolve, then so can humans. However, humans have a much greater knowledge of selection. Thus, they can almost use these processes by choice rather than by chance, as our bird has done. Essentially, we can create our own adaptations almost on command. This is also seen in the way that humans breed various species to achieve a more desirable one.

28. ELEMENTSZX 性要素 (水, 炎, м о х , л а т т а)

Ahh... the wind, the water, the earth, and the fire... These make up my favorite

subject to discuss. There is so much to talk about them. Isolation, combination, interaction, balance, and nullification, to name just a few topics off-hand. Though, what part do they play in evolution, particularly in the evolution of humans into a new species? Well, you will see. Let us begin with the human body.

The human body contains and makes use of all four elements constantly. Water flows through our blood, air flows through our organs, the brain and nervous system involve fire in some form of electricity as in the firing of synapses, and ultimately our bodies can be said to be made of earthen materials. So, what does this have to do with evolution? I can go on for years about this subject, but for now we will take it lightly.

Let us say we simply increase the amounts of elements in our bodies. More synaptic firing would occur in the nervous system, thus resulting in more knowledge or energy. More water flowing through the blood stream might allow us more flexibility and balance, or the ability to breathe water. More air flowing through the organs might increase lifespan or energy production, or give us the ability to fly. An increased amount of earthen materials might make stronger bodies, or allow completely new structures to develop. These might not sound like adaptations, more like performance enhancers, but given enough increase or enough time, they could eventually become adaptations and eventually lead to an evolution.

Increases are just one way, albeit the most likely way, to bring about an adaptation or a mutation. Changing interactions might be another route. Perhaps if we changed the water in our blood streams into fire, then a mutation, adaptation, and subsequent evolution might occur. Not a very easy process, but never rule out possibility. Air in the blood stream might lead us to adapt a new water breathing mechanism. Again, these things must be researched and studied carefully before any application, but they should not be ruled out as possibilities of evolution.

There are many more ways to go in our discussion of how the elements might lead to evolution, but first let me remind the readers of a very important point here. It is going to take every last stone you can throw, and probably ones that you cannot even pick up, to knock down the wall imposed by my central hypothesis. If humans cannot evolve because they can no longer adapt, then why are we even trying to find a solution? Well, how about why not? It just feels as if something important is missing if I cannot evolve into a better creature, or if my kids, or their kids, will never be able to evolve. Who knows!? But, if we are going to try to start somewhere, the elements

seem like the best place to start. They reek of power and possibility. Even if they cannot cause an evolution, a little power is better than nothing, and goes a long way.

However, at least it can be said that in their current configuration, the elements that the body is composed of fails miserably. For you see, they are not configured correctly. Case in point - you cannot design a system based on air and airflow and expect it to be effective. Just like bike and car tires, one small hole, leak, or even a slight increase in the air system causes the whole system to fail. In people, this leads to death, as well. What is this good for? Absolutely nothing. Indeed, the elements are powerful when configured properly, but they are not. Now, if we were to compose the entire human body out of air, for example, the result would be much more powerful and effective than the current half thought and poorly designed configuration. Hell, a being consisting of purely air could do almost anything it wants, while we cannot even put a pin into our necks without dying.

Who designed this shitty system? God? No... God is too intelligent to do something so stupid and half-assed. Did chance design this system and configuration? Maybe... That would at least explain why the human system is so poorly thought out, misconfigured, and designed to fail. So why have we not altered the configuration of elements that compose the body? Surely, if I were to hold fire for long enough, my hand would turn into fire. Or, if I stay in the water long enough, I would become a more aquatic animal. Yet, composed of all four elements as we may be, their configuration fails us miserably, especially when it comes to airflow and solid objects. You see, to evolve we must alter or change the configuration of elements within the body. This why fire would make better blood than water, and why air would make better skin than earthly matter.

29. SACRIFICE AND GAINS (c a r l a 又 1a1a)

Well, it is a very specific place to start a chapter, since they usually start broad and narrow down, but it is an appropriate place to start because it has to do with humans, the major focus of our topics. Here I will examine the human tail. Didn't know you had one? For the moment, let us suppose that you did. Now imagine really hard, a strong, full sized human tail, complete with working muscles and full control over them... Do you feel more balanced? Do you suddenly have a place to hold

things when both of your hands are full? Do you have a way to pick up things without bending down all of the time? Do you have yet another way to smack somebody you are mad at? Do you have something to keep you occupied when you are bored? Do you have something more to lose?

Now, take all those great feelings about ease, control, and advantage, and throw them down the drain because you do not really have tails. Ever wonder why? Probably the same reason we do not have wings... Now, do you want to know the real reason? It is because people do not know how to adapt. Sure, we can make wings or a tail that look and function like a real adapted one would, but there is always something missing, namely an internal fuel source. What good is a tail or a set of wings that we have to plug into an outlet, or recharge all the time? Other animals' body parts do not work like that. They work on demand. Humans have sacrificed the ability to adapt for the ability to create things we can use. This goes back to the idea of artificial adaptation. Sure it works, but only temporarily. We have lost truly genuine adaptations for a variety of ultimately useless workaround solutions, and who truly wants something like that when they could have the real thing?

Enough about what we have lost as a species because it would seem we have lost so much that there is no more to lose. How about what we have gained? Well for starters, we have the unique ability in nature to create and use things which allows us to adapt the world to us instead of allowing us to the world. This is part of my major thesis, explained in detail elsewhere. For now, let us continue down our list of gains. We gained bipedal motion. Although not the most efficient type of motion, it does have some advantages, and quite generally, we excel at its application. Some might argue that our species has also gained the capacity for thought, that is the intent to application to action, but doubts remain as to whether we have do actually have this ability, or if all creatures have the ability of thought in some form. Although it may be a powerful ability, thought is still not as useful as a tail. One might argue further on this point, saying that we have better memory as well, but when faced with fighting a bear or a tiger, it becomes a trivial "adaptation" as well. Here again, even our imaginary tail would serve us better.

You might be tempted to say that we have gained more freedom than other lifeforms, but I ask again, how free am I if I can never live in the water, or have that human tail that I want so badly? Sacrifices and gains are not always balanced. In terms of evolution, neither topic is very clear. Sometimes it is hard to see if an adaptation is truly useful, or if it is just taking the disguise of being useful when it is

ultimately useless.

30. FATE AND CHOICE 選 τ κ β α 運 命

Why life unfolds the way it does goes back to the design theory. The design can take whatever paths it wishes before onset, but once the design is set in motion, it must be followed. One might argue that there is no design, but there is obviously something, even in a design that has no parameters. The design would have to be no design; but this still implies that something must followed and moved toward something, even if it randomness or nothing. There is a trade off in this consequence, one that I did not notice without careful thought. The form that life takes is always a representation of all the other forms it did not take, as well as the one it did take. Why? Because there must be a trade off to balance the chaos of possible choices. Again, with the form of people evolving from trees, life did not go that way. Although it could have, it did not need to because another form was already unfolding.

Of all the forms it could have taken, life only takes one design in the end. Sure, events could have unfolded differently, as in the human from tree example, but only one form is needed for life to continue. That being said, people could, in turn, evolve into this, or that, or something else entirely, but they will eventually take one form because that is all that is needed. So while the design may already be set, originally it could have unfolded in any number of ways. With that said, we will move back to the trade off. Why would the form of life that has unfolded also include a representation of all the forms that did not unfold? One might say that it does not need a reason. Many things happen without a reason, but I will try to provide some insight anyway.

You see, at its core, life knows that it could have unfolded in any number of ways, and it knows that only one form is needed for it to continue. Because it knows this, it can represent forms that it did not take in the one that it did take. It knows this all because it is a result of all the forms it did not take, as well as the one that it did take. Thus, life knows what it is, and what it is not, by the way it unfolded, and the way it did not. Certainly, it is possible to know something by what it is not, and what it is not by what it is. Life knows this better than anything because it does not need to know if it simply is. You see, life is what it needs to know. Being transcends knowledge, therefore life is what it is, and what it is not because it is everything it needs to know.

This includes all the forms that life did not take thus far, and probably all the forms that it will not take, although they are still possibilities.

What does this all mean, though? What does it mean to represent or include all the forms that life did not take, into the form that it did take? It means that we represent the original design before it was set in motion. Let us look at our humans who evolved from trees as one example amongst countless others. How do we represent that previously possible scenario in our current state, as people who supposedly came from primates? Well for starters, we know possibility. We know that it may have been possible to evolve from trees if that had been the design. From this, we also know of impossibility, since once the design was activated, impossibility becomes a possibility. You see, we represent forms of life that did not happen in both our knowledge of the possible and the impossible. Since we know these ideas, or rather, that we are these ideas, played out in time, we can represent them.

Now, this trade off has consequences. Its complexity will infinitely confuse us, but it also reminds us that no matter what happened, or could have happened prior, only one mode is needed to continue. In a sense, it stabilizes and distracts us. It causes us to live in wonder of the powers of life, but also gives us faith that these powers know what they are doing.

30.5 INTRONS, EXONS, GENES, FATE, AND CONSCIOUSNESS

After all this time, perhaps we will get down to the business of how things really work and function. Foremost, we know that genes replicate themselves, but the information that is replicated can change, usually over "longer" periods of time outside of the immediate timeframe. Why is this? Well, I am no scientist, and certainly no genetic researcher, but any insight is always better than none. Plus, I have picked up on a few ideas and theories. Supposedly, it goes something like this:

Introns replicate themselves constantly onto a new "point" or "location" in space. This replication is always exactly the same information, albeit a new destination. Some fancy technical computer terminology might help here. Introns are "prebound" not in the sense that they speed anything up functionally like computer prebindings, but rather in a more biological and philosophical meaning of the word. We cannot stop introns from replicating, and it is in that sense that they are prebound. They have to function and copy themselves. They do this automatically and innately. Stopping this

process would result in death, and even then they might still continue to function to some extent. Think of introns as your fate or your destiny.

The concept of exons is more alien to me. Maybe it is this way because I am a strict determinist (ever try to run from fate?), and the concept of introns is more interesting to me. However, a renewed interest in consciousness has also had the effect of renewing my interest in genetic theory. See, apparently introns need to "attach" themselves to something to ultimately create a functioning gene. Just because we can say that they are prebound in themselves, does not mean that they do not require a host to function. Otherwise they would fail if they have nothing to copy onto. The main difference between the two is that introns replicate, while exons "update." An exon is that hypothetical place where the intron replicates itself to. That "place" is constantly changing, so the exon attempts to update the location while also allowing the intron to replicate to an unchanging process. This updating function is very similar to the functioning of consciousness, in that both refresh and refine the same information. Exons may even be where consciousness comes from, if we can say that fate and instincts are products of introns.

These two parts, as well as smaller sub-parts, and possibly some other factors (divine intervention and chaos theory, for instance) form a working gene. As we know, genes ultimately form functional lifeforms. So, what is going on with our gene is basically exact replication of a function, instruction, and information to a new location (maybe for a new reason?) using the same modality in a slightly different way. Again, I stress that I am no geneticist, and humans may never know the truth behind the theory, but the important part is how this relates to evolution theory. So, here we go!!!

Exons refresh and update, so they are logically good candidates for bringing about an evolution. This can be exemplified by our capacity for consciousness, which seems to crave change and novel things for some reason, as well as survival of the fittest. Introns however, are very poor candidates for evolution. They are the solid wall of tradition and fate, neither of which favors immortality or evolution. So, maybe these need to be "changed" in order to bring about any sort of meaningful adaptation or evolution. Surely, changing our introns would change our genes and bodies, and perhaps even remove the need for them.

How to do any of this is another story completely, and a mystery. As of now, I am merely a theorist looking for a way to apply. But, it can be said to never give up hope and always keep trying. After all, the benefits of evolution at this caliber far

outweigh the risks of losing everything whilst trying. As I learn more about how to put any of this into action, I will update and refine, but for now, all I know is that it definitely involves changing that which "cannot" be changed. Isn't that the real goal of evolution? In short functional notation, introns are recyclable replication units that must bind together "unused" regions to create a final product at a place called an exon, which then carries out the higher functions of a gene.

31. PROCESS, DESIGN, AND APPLICATION 処理, 柄, d. e x a p

So, after all this hype, how are we going to put this into practice? Well, a good place to start would be with practice itself. Why not start there? Start there, and see what happens is all that I can really say for sure... Once a design is discovered or thought of, we can process the thought of the design, and figure out ways to apply things from there.

32. ON THE MIND 心 の て x ь

The human mind is a powerful tool, no doubt essential to our survival. Our powerful intelligence no doubt has given our species more powerful survival skills, but survival is not the only goal of life. Beyond survival there is also a need to evolve, and this is where our minds fail horribly. Before you proceed to label me a negativist, please allow me to explain.

Our minds are wired and designed unlike those of other forms of life. Other lifeforms are mentally able to mutate and adapt to the challenges of the world. A mutation arises from a need to adapt to a "problem," or a difficult scenario. This does not happen in people. In fact, mutations in humans result in something negative or useless. The reason for this is simple logic. Our minds are wired for normality. We like things to go our way, and our way only. We are not wired for change or flexibility in adaptations like other species. Again, this is tied into the central concept that humans do not adapt to the world around them, and instead adapt the world to their ideas. While this may sound advantageous for survival purposes, it is a complete disadvantage in terms of evolution, if not a nullifier altogether. It makes us lose track of the larger processes of life, namely purpose and evolution. Allow me to demonstrate:

Suppose you and a few other people, wired in the manner previously described (without the ability to adapt) were the only people wired and designed in this manner.

The rest of the people have all been rewired and redesigned, and now possess the ability to adapt. Also, we will say that because of your inability to adapt, your survival skills have improved so that you can live "considerably longer." Now, suppose you have lived ten thousand years as a normally wired person... You have witnessed one (if not more) evolution(s) of the redesigned human beings into another species (let us say humans that can fly, breathe water, and live longer for comparison purposes). In the process you have become meaningless because there is a new species that exceeds your own. Sure, you may be living alongside them, for a while too, but is there really any point in living alongside them if you can never become like them? You see, it becomes a question of purpose. What point is there in living if you cannot become a greater species than you already are? It is like Socrates meeting Taoism - the life that cannot become something greater is not worth living. Although I do like either one's idea in isolation, the synthesis rings incredibly true here. This is yet another example that sometimes to achieve a higher goal we must do things that we do not like.

This is where people and the human mind fail miserably. We want things to go a certain way. We do not like to adapt. The idea frightens us because it is alien to us. We like to think that we are at the top of some hierarchy or lifeforms, but we are not. There must always be a next species. We must rewire our minds so that we remember what it means to need to adapt, and in turn, evolve, before we become meaningless creatures wired only for survival and no higher purpose.

33. WHAT BECOMES OF THAT WHICH IS?

и з а м у ъ л х а д . а л л а , 何 が成ります何?

That which is, is what it is because of it is, and not because of what it can become. No matter what the thing may be, until the thing becomes something else, it is said to be of itself. So, when a thing can no longer become something else, it becomes what it is. Life is no exception to this rule. So, when life becomes what it truly is, what becomes of it then? The human species is a great example of this state(ment). Have we reached a point where we can no longer become something else?

It has been said that humans do not adapt to their environments, and I have come to learn this is very true. Anti-adaptation is not a "solution" to a "problem," but it does mean that there is truth, if not pure truth in this statement. Have we as

creatures of some creation really forgotten what it means to adapt? A species as large as the human populace requires more room in various locations. We have more than one specific environment to adapt to, unlike other species which have learned to adapt to their native environment. This also raises the question of why we are as dispersed as we are, but I will have to get back to that in a while. For now, let us simply concentrate on the concept of what happens when a species forgets how to adapt. Inability to adapt to an environment ultimately means the death of a species. As in the case of people adapting the environment to themselves, this is a new idea, and newer ideas cannot always stand up against the test of time.

Why change the way something has been if it has proven to be successful? Is that worth the risk of not knowing? Compromising surefire success for an increased amount of less assured success is a dangerous idea, especially when it involves reversing or changing processes. What makes people think that they do not need to learn how to adapt? Are we so different from any other animal that we think that we can go against nature and try to change our environment(s) instead of adapting to them? No, we simply are not. By going against nature's method of adaptation, we may have learned our own survival methods, but we have also placed ourselves in a situation where we can no longer evolve. We have thereby become meaningless without the ability to evolve. A life that cannot evolve into something new is pointless. We seem to have destroyed the very essence of what it means to be alive. Perhaps if we had not so readily forfeited these abilities, then we might be living underwater or in the sky.

Humans, being such a powerful and populated species need to be able to adapt to more situations, since we encounter many environments (especially over a lifetime). Other species adapt to their native environments, and this is why you will never see a bear living underwater, or a fish hovering next to an airplane. The human species' native environment needs to be larger. The entire earth, and in time, places beyond, need to become our native environment. If we are going to evolve, we must see the world in this manner.

Next point in fact is the question of life emerging from an original lifeform. If this is so, then why all the diversity, and why is there no ultimately adapted lifeform? Why? Because people have forgotten ourselves, and our true place in nature. We have tried so hard to be what we are, and have forgotten to try to become something else and something more. What point is there in not being able to become a plant, breathe underwater, or fly in the sky? We have learned ways to survive, but not ways to adapt to a larger native environment. Survival is good, but it is only an illusion.

Living means more than surviving just to survive.

Living means surviving to become something, something better than what it is. By focusing on survival, and forgetting evolution, humans have doomed themselves to a fate of being unable to evolve. So what becomes of that which is? Does it keep becoming what it is, or does it stop becoming altogether? Does it become nothing because it has become useless?

What becomes of that which is? How does that which is become something else? Does the process of becoming lead to a state of infinite becoming, or does it stalemate itself into a position where that which is can no longer become anything else? Is the human animal designed to become another species, or are we destined to remain as we are? What factors are involved in the process? Can we become something else by autonomy, or must we act?

34. CREATION AND EVOLUTION THEORY IN SCIENCE

К х о л л а 又 к х и а 理論科学中

When then, does the body require a next phase of adaptation, and when does the mind become less important in evolution? While there are benefits of an evolution of mind, and as great as our cognitive abilities may be, our bodies fail miserably at surviving. Take for instance, a stone. It may not be able to do much, but it has the physical endurance to exist through multitudes of generations in relation to that of a human lifespan. How can we as a species become more like this hypothetical stone in terms of our physical makeup? And why can we not trade in our bodies for new or better ones?

Is there even a point in living with bodies that a simple tree branch can destroy in less than a second? Is there any reason to accept any of this? For all of our cognitive powers, I cannot answer any of these questions. I cannot find a reason as to why some stupid stones are physically better than us, laughing at us the whole time. However we were created, we were not created correct. People deserve lifespans of hundreds of years. Perhaps the answer lies in our next evolution, or perhaps it lies in our ability to shape our next evolution. But, these things take time. Are we to stand by and watch hopelessly when we should be living for at least hundreds of years? Can we do nothing but watch these damned stones laugh in our faces?

Even a tree seems to be a more fit organism than us. Although they cannot defend themselves, they can live through multiple generations of human lives when left to themselves. Why is nothing about people permanent like stones and trees? Have we blindly given ourselves into Buddhist thought and teachings? Well, maybe it is time to knock down and destroy each and every last statue of the Buddha, and then just maybe, we will learn something about permanence. If we cannot do anything permanent, then why do anything at all?

Then there is always science, and oh boy, that is a good one, too. I have come to learn that we must fight science, as well, even if that means dying in the process of trying. Now, if we could do away with all of this chemistry nonsense, we just might be onto something. Why then do we need it to live, if it only becomes absent after death? I call this the great illusion of chemistry. Where Darwin and others were trying to explain how evolution functions, I am trying to explain how we can change the processes of natural selection, adaptation, and evolution, so that they might actually achieve something purely beneficial for humankind. Life is a game that none of us can ever win, but we can all lose without even having to try. Life either goes on or it doesn't. Thought is like poison and addiction.

35. INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL: PHYSIQUE AND COGNITION

К и й р а 又 х и й р а 身體 т к ъ а 認識

Perhaps if we had better bodies we would not even need minds. Minds do not really do very much anyway, and they tend to fail more often than not. Though the body fails in extreme circumstances as well, at least it does something. Ultimately, everything functions at the biological level anyway because it has to. And again, a mind needs a body to work, if it does. Here too, can anyone actually prove the existence of a mind? No. So stop trying, and realize that if the mind is anything at all, it is only part of the body anyway. The "mind/body problem" has always been precarious, but we are going to settle this once and for all, finally, and in so many words, by the way. After all, the body is simply the symbol of the mind. Anyway, it does not matter if the mind survives. What does matter is that the body survives. So, maybe we can use our "great minds" to make and design new, better bodies.

36. ENERGY AND LIFE

氣 又 命

Ultimately, life comes from energy which permits us to live. But what is energy really, and why do we need it to live? Why can we not make our own energy, or find a way to survive without it? Or why don't we simply just become pure energy? That seems the most feasible solution. Life from life? Maybe, but this is not always true. Many things that have energy are not alive. Or, are they (to a lesser degree)?

37. THE POSSIBILITY OF TRANSFORMATION 変わせ х и л а м е г а

So realistically, people are incapable to evolving because they cannot adapt. What more could we become? Gods or monsters? Anything that has a better shot at surviving, not only on earth, but other planets, and maybe even the space between, even if only used for traveling. Again and again I ask myself, what point is there in living in a universe we cannot even experience? what we need is a change, and a change needs a catalyst, maybe even a miracle is needed in this case. Or maybe our species cannot evolve into a new one because we are meant rather to transform. Though the two words are closely related, a transformation generally implies a more radical type of change than an evolution.

But the question resounds... Transform into what? And why? Well, we must look at our catalyst(s), or our miracle. You see, to transform, or even evolve into a life worth living, we must kill death. So then, let the death of death be our catalyst and our miracle. And what is our result? Life. Life that actually lives, and continues to live. Life that actually has chance amongst the stars, the planets, and the entire universe. Yes. Life that can truly live as it wants (and probably should). Now ask yourself what that type of lifeform would look like. Or better, what that lifeform would be like as a lifeform that would not have to look like anything, only be.

So then, enough idealism for the moment. The big question and the time for answers is at hand. First, why transform instead of evolving? Well, we must transform if we cannot evolve because this life is stupid and pointless. If we can evolve, then good. All the better. My writing will not be in vain. Whatever the case, one must happen, and it must be powerful enough to destroy the bonds that painstakingly chain us to this all but forsaken planet and world. A whole world awaits us out there, and I am not talking about space ships flights of our artifice. No. Not at all. What I am talking about is a new creature that actually participates in the "larger"

universe.

So let the miraculous transform or evolve us, and let our catalyst burn like the very fires of hell as the death of death approaches and changes us into beings of pure life, the way it should have all been from the very start. To hell with death. To hell with humans. To hell with this planet for the sake of unexplored worlds. And, to hell with this failure of a design for life. May you all become life! In the REAL WORLD!

38. SYMBOLIC EVOLUTION 印 進化

Life must ultimately evolve into a symbol if it's to truly succeed. Simply, it must become a pure function, as a symbol is. Sure, we may lose our humanity to some form of existential nihilism, but we gain immortality in the process, and there is no cost too great for such a grand achievement. We MUST break free of our humanist tradition, or it will be our undoing. There is nothing great about humanity. For even if we only retain our ability to think and communicate as some form of a symbol, it is still better than dying. How sad it is to think that all the millennia of evolution have been for naught... But, let it be said that a symbol never dies, but rather, it always functions. Yes. We must become more like that symbol, and less like life. A symbol is as a symbol does, and a symbol will be as it always was.

39. NATURE (а м а л)

So, we have come full circle in our discussion, only to arrive back where it all began; at nature. What more is there to say? Nature rules the universe. It always has, and it always will. It is as simple as that. Maybe I have been writing blind, though. As I write now, I have come to understand that perhaps ultimately, people (and all of life) were meant to evolve into nature. Yes. That could be the answer. We should evolve into an everlasting part of nature. Somehow, someday, this is what we must do. It will be nature's finest example of evolution and selection, to become a part of nature itself, a spectacle mirrored only by the galaxies in the universe.

40. EVOLUTION IN HISTORY 歴史 中 進化

It is traditionally held that people evolved from one starting location, and spread, thus populating more regions over time. However, I slightly disagree with this idea. Perhaps things were not so absolute. Maybe a few different groups began evolving around the same time in different locations. The idea of a changing earth would also lend support to this idea. The world was not always the way it is now, especially when viewed from a large evolutionary timescale. Thus, we cannot say where people began, or if they all began in the same place at once or separately, with any certainty. Our immense diversity as a species also supports this idea. If we all evolved from a single location, or even animal type, we should and would be more alike.

41. WORLDVIEW "ITSUMO" д у ь н е н а н いつも 風景

After all this talk about the future, and how things should be, we come half circle in our discussion, but only because I am sick of hearing these other theories. After our hundred and eighty degree topic change, we arrive back at creation theory, where it all must have began, but only because it has some things to do with evolution; namely with prior evolution. When writing about evolution, shouldn't the Darwinist perspective work? Maybe in a very limited sense. Life may have evolved from simple cellular lifeforms, and I am not really arguing with that, but more on that point later. For now, we need to discuss the details, and this is where Darwin and creation fail. Darwin makes sense in the sense that life could change from simple organisms into more complex ones. I will even go as far as to allocate this same courtesy to creation theory, although they do not. Creationists feel that people were made separately from other species. This is not as far out there as it seems. We might even be able to apply this way of thinking to Darwinism. Or maybe it is all backward, and people came from simple forms, except people, who may have evolved separately.

If not, the stage is still there for people to become something "special." Where both theories completely fail is not in the progress of evolution, but in the act of creation itself. Darwinism is typically attached to big bang theory, and I do not believe that Darwin actually felt or meant that to be. Big bang theory is that a huge energy force created the universe from nothing, but where did all of this energy come from, and how could affect nothingness? Nothing comes from nothing, always and forever, so I find it hard to believe that an entire functioning universe could come from nothing, even with massive amounts of energy. Creation theory holds that in the beginning there was only god, and god made the world. Now we are presented with a more

difficult problem. God made the world out of nothing, but god can do that, quite unlike the random energy concept of big bang theory. Notice how the presence of god here might also justify the creation of a multiverse, as well as a universe. I am no expert on that idea though, and there is no point getting sidetracked here. So, god made the world from nothing, or god made the world from god, since that is all there was. Only god has the power to make things from nothing, and unlike big bang energy, god needs no cause.

In that, we may arrive at a synthesis of the two ideas of creation. Maybe god made the big bang. HELLO PEOPLE!! Why aren't we looking more in that direction? Why? Because people want to "play sides" in things that they will never know, like science or religion, for perfect example, when they are all part of the same thing anyway. Besides, where did all this initial nothingness come from? Nothingness cannot ever exist, except in death, and that is different. Even the existence of nothingness would imply something, thus an existence of nothing is still more than nothing. To even understand nothingness we need something to compare it to. I am not going into great depth about how initial nothingness came "to be," if it really did, though.

What I am talking about is this: Perhaps the universe has always existed, though not in its present form, because things do change, even though "space" is finite. The universe is not expanding, and it is probably not under the control of a designer. It has just always existed (not always the same) in a finite and definitely shaped form. Sure, things change, but the universe itself is unchanging, as it always has been. This is where the multiverse comes from. Different "courses" create different universes, so on and so on. Darwin does not address any of this, and neither does creation theory.

How does evolution fit into the model of the ever-present universe, or as I should really say, my innate universe theory? I have my ideas about that, but first we will address evolution and creation theorists in their relationship to an "innate" universe. Complex organisms arose from simpler ones in a universe that has always been there. So, stop putting evolution theory alongside the big bang. I am so sick of hearing this, and it destroys the beauty of both theories. On the other hand, creationists might follow that the world has always been here, and that god made people specially from other creatures, or at least that god "guided" events toward the creation of a higher lifeform.

The point and difference of belief of both views is not so important, as I am not favoring one over the other. I have my own views, especially ones concerning the world. There are too many technical issues involved in the matter for me to end up with something besides my own theory, anyway. What is important for these two schools of thought to recognize is that the universe has always been here, and will always be here. It is at the same time both finite in space, and infinite in time. Things may change in the universe, but the basic layout has always been the same way.

Life, however, is finite in time. It is here that we compete with the universe and the multiverse. It is here also that we must change and evolve. By becoming more infinite in time, like the universe, this will add meaning to our lives. In formal logic, my worldview might sound something like this: If anything, then something, always.

The same is true of people and their psyches. Humans tend to do the same thing because that is what they have always done, besides things that they have to do anyway, which is still the same concept. This reminds me of the central theme of Tale of Two Cities. People do what they do because that is what they have always done and known, just as the universe and multiverse have always been doing what they do. So, people, stop putting your hard earned money into a "Big Bag" of a theory, and stop making up tales of creation. That is not how the shit works. It is just the way that the world is, no start and no end, the same way it has always been, forever.

42. RECTIFYING CREATION THEORY AND REVISITING EVOLUTION THEORY

к х о л л а 理論 正しい 又 к х и а 理論 訪再

If people evolved from monkeys, then there are many things wrong with the picture of evolution. First of all, why did not all of the chimps evolve into hominids? Surely, it would be more advantageous for the entire species to evolve instead of just some. The answer is not very simple, and will be revisited elsewhere. Simply put as it can be, the answer is that things do not always happen how they should, are meant to, or in ways that make sense. That being said, we move on to the second point. If primitive hominids evolved from the chimpanzee, then why are there no living transitory hominids left when there are still living chimps? Surely, there are still chimpanzees alive, so how is it that a more evolved creature's entire species ceases to exist while the original species continues to exist to this very day? My point is that there should still be transitory species alive because the common ancestor is still alive.

The chimp has survived for millennia, while our hominid ancestor of slightly different species have not even survived for hardly any time. They may have evolved into modern humans, who are more capable, but some of the transition phase hominids should still exist, just as our common primate ancestor, the chimp, continues to exist in its own form to this very day. Thirdly, and perhaps most importantly, is the question of why modern chimpanzees no longer evolve into primitive hominids. Did they just magically stop evolving one day? If primitive hominids evolved from the chimpanzee, what is to stop them from doing it all over again?

This would "solve" our second "problem" by creating new transitory hominids in modern time. Yet, it does not because apparently chimps can no longer evolve for some reason, when they all should have evolved together in the first place. Here again, things do not always happen as they should, or in ways that make sense, as much as we sometimes want them to. When speaking of things as complex as the way life unfolds, it is dangerous to think in ways that are logical because things do not always happen for a reason. Sometimes, things just happen, and there is nothing logical or even realistic about the processes.

Pointing out the flaws of evolution theory is not the purpose of this chapter, and I am not discounting the theory as a whole, but like anything, it has its fallacies, things it cannot account for. Most of those being in terms of consistency and explanation. Questions like why the modern chimpanzee does not continue to evolve into primitive hominids makes me question the theory's validity because it provides no answer to, or explanation of the question. Validity results from knowing why, and to a lesser degree, knowing how. Why did hominids evolve in the first place, and how did they do this?

Here I must diverge from strict science, and return to creation theory, only to return to a very concrete answer. I choose no specific creation theory, for there are many of them. Perhaps those forces that are in charge of the world and time will not allow things to happen except in the way that they have been assigned to happen. This would allow hominids to evolve once in history, and explain why chimpanzees magically stopped evolving into hominids. This is what has been assigned by forces that cannot be controlled, or even understood, so that is what will happen. Call it fate, or call it divine intervention. It may not be the most verifiable solution, but it is still an answer to a question that evolution theory is relatively vague about.

Now, let me explain more clearly. Most people are familiar with some sort of creation theory. Most creation theories hold that people were created independently

of other animals, with better capabilities, and usually in the design of the creators themselves. Surely, if chimpanzees turned into primitive hominids, then this transformation could still be witnessed today, but it is not this way. Why? Because people were created independently of other animals, just like animals are created independently from other lifeforms. A mushroom, for example, will never evolve into a tree, just as a fish will never evolve into a bird. Why? Because lifeforms are created independently of other lifeforms, in a very broad, creation theory kind of way. A lifeform may become more adapted as a species over time, maybe changing its characteristics, but it cannot become another lifeform because that is the way it has been designed.

Design always implies a designer, even if it is some force that is not understandable. Design must always follow protocol because that is the way that things work. For certain, things will never work in a way that they do not work. Why then did humans not evolve from trees? It is the same as asking why chimps no longer evolve into hominids. That is not the way that the world works, or was designed to work. People may have come from a chimpanzee mutation, but they were also created independently from them by a force that is beyond control or understanding acting upon them. Even if there is no reason for the design, it still must happen that way because it is a design. A design needs no reason to exist, only events that follow the design. Just because events in history set the stage for chimpanzees to mutate (into people eventually), this does not mean that people are not an independent design of some transcendental power.

My point is this. We could have been designed to evolve from a sunflower if that had been the design. It just so happens that the design was for us to evolve from the monkey, and for monkeys to stop evolving after so long a time. It is the way things are, always have been, and always will be. It is not an evolution theory entirely, because if life really was about survival of the fittest, all lifeforms would evolve into one ultimate lifeform. They didn't though, they still do not, and may never. Plus, that little kid you beat up all the time most likely would not even exist to begin with. Things happen according to a design that is unchangeable, not according to some theory that permits and allows for change. Nevertheless, this still impacts life, as well as how it unfolds and evolves. Perhaps all people will die in a mass extinction, and entirely new lifeforms will emerge. Perhaps we have been designed to evolve into a new species, or perhaps we are the end result of evolution. Certainly, we cannot change what has been assigned, nor can we ever know. We might get clues here and there, but there is

a difference between knowing and fully knowing. The design of life is something that cannot really be known, anyway. After all, it is something that must be experienced. Unless we evolve into gods or demi-gods, but that is discussion for another chapter. Wouldn't that really disturb both the evolution and creation theorists...??

43. A PUZZLING STORY 迷ウ т у ь й р а

Take this example into careful consideration. Consider not just the outcomes, but also the paths. Being a small pet collector, I used to collect small animals, some store bought, and others from the wildest parts of nature. Now, here is the setup. It all started with a large aquarium I bought, and the more I think about, the more I realize that something was odd with this tank from the start. Oddly enough, this was the only tank I ever cracked with a heat lamp, but since it did not shatter the rig and only cracked it, I was still able to use it. Being also a fortune teller, I am aware of omens and things of the like. Science or not, an omen is still an omen. Things get stranger though as the story goes on. At the time I bought this tank, I was still living in my parents' house. This is important because I kept the tank after I moved away. Now, for the animals. First, I had some little lizards I bought from the store, plus wild frogs and toads, for a total of like five or six animals in the tank. Strangely enough, one of the lizards falls in the water bowl and drowns. Next, the frog eats the other lizard, barely able to swallow the thing whole. Strange, or bad chemistry? Maybe both. Anyway, I keep the frogs and toads a few weeks after all of this nonsense, then some back to lake I got them at, and the others die in the tank. So, I clean it out, and go to the store to get some really nice geckos. Actually, this is when I cracked the tank, since geckos need a stronger heat lamp than frogs and toads. I put one gecko in the tank, and the next day go to the store to buy another one. I put the second one in the tank, and either they were fighting (missed it if they were) or one just died for some reason. By the way, I also uprooted a small plant from the lake to put in the tank. It had almost died but I managed to save it, and it grew some of the smallest and prettiest leaves I have ever seen or could imagine. Now, I am moving out of town to go to technical school. So, I bring the tank with me and get some really cool geckos out there, and really take care of them this time. However, before I ever get a chance to go to the pet store, I go to open the cage to clean it out really good, but all of a sudden I am staring at about two dozen full grown beetles. I never put them in the tank, and no one even had access to it except me. It is like they just appeared, multitudes of them, and fully grown. I should have kept them as pets, but I wanted geckos. So, long story short, I end up

trashing the tank because it is still cracked, now riddled with beetles. Mind you, there was a nice lid on this tank, too, so they did not crawl in the top. So where did all of these full grown beetles come from? Again mind you, that this is all taking place three months and an hour's drive from where I started keeping small pets at my parents' house.

Were there eggs in some of the natural stuff I had picked to put in the tank? Probably not because I never had beetles to breed them, and I never seen the young beetles in there. Did they sneak into the tank? No. There were no beetles in my apartment or my parents' house, and there was always a nice lid on the tank. Did they grow from the decaying animals that died in the tank? Maybe. I do not know. I am no expert on biology to say for sure, although I do not think beetles grow from dead things like maggots tend to do. Did they spontaneously generate, possibly fully grown? It has been said that bugs can do that, though I forget the theory and its name. But, beetles of all types of insects that could generate? I should have kept them to study this matter, but the whole scenario scared me because I was never expecting something like that to happen when I was supposed to be putting my nice new geckos in the tank. I do not want to keep beetles anyway because god only knows what they will turn into. I just wish I knew where the hell they came from, how, and why. In the end, I get my geckos a new tank and they do great. I have not had this type of problem with beetles ever since. This was one of the strangest things I think I have ever experienced.

What does this story have to do with evolution? Well, we will figure this out when we discover the "origins" of two dozen, simultaneous, full grown beetles in a fish tank, in an apartment, in the big city, on the fifth floor. I guess the moral here about evolution is that a puzzle is as a puzzle does, and a puzzle is not as the pieces was...

44. THEORHETICAL CULTURE AND EVOLUTION

理論文化- л е р а 又 к х и

а

We often say language to be the greatest invention of humankind, but language is only as useful as the theory it describes, and a theory is only as useful as what it does. After all, what does anything, including theory, do besides evolve? In short, evolution is as evolution does, but do we really know how anything works? At least it is true that a theory is no good if it has no point...

45. CONCLUSION ю ъ х ь и г

In the beginning there was whatever was there. In the end, there will be the end. Meanwhile, everything keeps evolving. So, where did I lose you? You have heard my arguments, and other peoples' theories. This kind of thing does not happen at once. Or, maybe it will. No one knows. The point is to never give up hope.

To each his own. Let all do as it will, and observe what happens. Maybe humans are capable of evolution, and can evolve into wonderful new creatures. Maybe they cannot evolve, and will stay as the same species. Or as I hinted earlier, perhaps we will all die in a mass extinction, and a new species will replace us. I have become so lost in my writings in this book that I have no clue what to believe anymore.

If we take my thesis at face value, and say that people are not capable of evolution, then that would seem very true. However, it does not portray a very inspiring future, and it destroys part of my purpose for writing this book. Honestly, I cannot give an answer. As true as my thesis rings, something keeps reminding me how badly I want to evolve, or even see others evolve. Nevertheless, time will go on, and hopefully one day people may learn the truth. For now at least, mass extinction is always still an option...

*Can humankind evolve? Why not? Is it true?
How long are we doomed to live in useless
bodies in a merciless universe? Why have we
fallen so far from nature? What can we do?
What more can we become? What does it really
mean to be human? The discussion of evolution
has become popular in recent years, but this
short book touches on aspects of the "debate"
that have gone largely unmentioned. A first time
author takes a fierce stab at some of the most
difficult issues of modern thought and biology.*

*Find out what you never even thought about,
and how it relates to your future and the future of
all "human beings." Each step closer is a step
closer to a different tomorrow. This book
focuses on all sides of the discussion of
evolution, and pulls no punches in the process.
Can this novice author save humanity from the
harsh mistakes of past? The choice is yours to
make as well, so as you read, ask yourself "is
this the life I really want to be living?"*



This book was distributed courtesy of:



For your own Unlimited Reading and FREE eBooks today, visit:

<http://www.Free-eBooks.net>

Share this eBook with anyone and everyone automatically by selecting any of the options below:



To show your appreciation to the author and help others have wonderful reading experiences and find helpful information too, we'd be very grateful if you'd kindly [post your comments for this book here.](#)



COPYRIGHT INFORMATION

Free-eBooks.net respects the intellectual property of others. When a book's copyright owner submits their work to Free-eBooks.net, they are granting us permission to distribute such material. Unless otherwise stated in this book, this permission is not passed onto others. As such, redistributing this book without the copyright owner's permission can constitute copyright infringement. If you believe that your work has been used in a manner that constitutes copyright infringement, please follow our Notice and Procedure for Making Claims of Copyright Infringement as seen in our Terms of Service here:

<http://www.free-ebooks.net/tos.html>



**STOP DREAMING
AND BECOME AN
AUTHOR YOURSELF
TODAY!**



It's Free, Easy and Fun!

At our sister website, Foboko.com, we provide you with a free 'Social Publishing Wizard' which guides you every step of the eBook creation/writing process and let's your friends or the entire community help along the way!

LOGON ONTO FOBOKO.COM

↪ and get your story told!

FOBOKO.COM