

A Serious Cause for Worry

The following quotes come from two of mankind's more substantive thinkers. They are by no means unique with regard to expressing their concern over mankind's future. Since they adequately make the point, I will not suffer the reader with additional quotes.

"It is important for the human race to spread out into space for the survival of the species. Life on Earth is at the ever-increasing risk of being wiped out by a disaster such as sudden global warming, nuclear war, a genetically engineered virus or other dangers we have not yet thought of."

Stephen Hawking
Lucasian professor of Mathematics
Cambridge University, UK

"I was happy and indeed honored to receive a copy of your letter to Allan Greenspan together with its informative supporting material. I fully endorse your argument and congratulate you on your courage and energy in putting it forward so forcibly and so widely. My own concerns have been in the same direction for more than thirty years..."

One aspect of your Greenspan letter struck me forcibly – "it is actually our thought process that is responsible for the predicament we find ourselves in." I couldn't agree more. Unless we find the means to change our thinking I can see little hope in solving the supreme problem of humanity – its impending extinction."

Alexander King
Founder of the Club of Rome
(*One of the World's preeminent think tanks*)

Questions abound in our everyday life. They are mankind's bridge between the present and the future; between the known and the unknown; and at times, between the known and the unknowable. Socrates recognized the significance of using questions over two thousand years ago. Their importance to the progression of knowledge remains unchanged to this day. What has changed is the implication in the answers that today's questions provoke. When Socrates raised the question; "what is the meaning of life?" – he was addressing it to individuals in his immediate environment. As a result, the answers which his questions provoked initially stood to impact upon only one city state, Athens. However, when a modern thinker raises the identical question, some of the answers necessarily contain the possibility for the elimination of all sentient life on earth. This is the epitome of all self realized tragedy, the fact that today's answers possess the inherent potential to eradicate the very thought process from which they originate.

This quandary has led mankind to adopt a paradoxical mode of thinking. It amounts to the answering of questions by the raising of additional questions for which immediate answers are not logically possible. This is done by hinging questions that pertain to the present on to questions that

relate to their possibility future. This has the effect of producing a "logical impasse" that causes the initial questions and their respective answers to appear inconsequential. Today, we see the final result of this progression toward what can best be termed the "penultimate trivial question." It concerns itself with the existence and potential use of an ultimate destructive capability for which no conceivable human benefit is possible. The question asks whether or not any nation can win a war when its adversary possesses a similar technology which includes the possibility for world destruction.

The debate around this question is purposely profound, couched in a language of sound, fury and passion, because no one wants to admit to the need to answer it. By doing so, it means that the threat to the future survival of mankind is already imminent. And so, the debate and the machinations that it spawns continues unabated as technocrats pretend ignorance, thus giving license to the continued advancement of our destructive capability. In affect, it is therefore the 'logical impasse' inherent in the 'penultimate trivial question' that is preventing an effective rebuttal to the idea of reasonable disarmament. It does this by causing one to remain dependent upon the future for any specific limitation in destructive capability that is dictated by the present. This same dynamic is what has also allowed the military to develop into a fiscal monster that is truly insatiable – one that the world can no longer economically afford. Were there no 'logical impasse' in this equation, the impetus to continue to fortify would have been lost to reason long ago.

Because it hasn't been, practically all of the world's major financial institutions (along with the countries they serve) have been forced to acquiesce to the concept of "unreasonable extension." For, if you can't understand the limitations inherent to a process that you must nonetheless support, then the demand upon your resources becomes unpredictable. This makes financial institutions collectivized under the FED vulnerable to an inability to maintain access to sufficient money to guarantee future lending. Obviously, the further out that complexity pushes the need for military funding, the more problematic everything becomes.

These dynamics indirectly incentivise financial institutions to engage in questionable practices for the purpose of remaining solvent. From there, it's only a short hop, skip and a jump for many to believe that they have the right to transfer this easement to themselves. Corporate principals are notoriously guilty. Under the umbrella of manipulated legality they have taken this practice to new heights by claiming exoneration from moral/ethical constraints under the guise of doing business for profit. Once unleashed, this infection has proved unstoppable. It's now to the point where unjustifiable "greed" is in evidence almost everywhere. In the simplest of terms, this breakdown in human rational is a prescription for bankruptcy – individual, as well as institutional. Consistent with the obvious, the world now finds itself in an economic dilemma of global proportion with no resolution in sight. And, the whole thing can be traced back to the fact that the bulk of all investment and loan imbalances are directly attributable to the military, which successfully placates the many principals involved through the "fear" of war.

It's ironic that man's destructive capability continues to grow in order to maintain an 'impasse' that prevents its use. While at the same time, the process of maintaining that 'impasse' is causing a worldwide economic crisis that all but insures its use. In short, we have a process that is deemed to be "logical" creating an irreversible resultant that is destined to annihilate the very process that creates it. This is truly insane!

It is hard to verbalize the tragedy of humanity asking if it can survive its own "creation." The only word adequate to describe this predicament is absurd. It therefore follows that the single greatest achievement of our century is the reification of the absurd. This reality is so obvious that billions of people the world over now stand in fear of the result. Although their message is clear, their understanding of the problem is not. If we are to stand any chance of turning this thing around, we must understand what's going on. To do that, let's begin by taking a look at how we got to where we are today.

In 1905, Albert Einstein advanced the results of a vision. That vision introduced a new age. It subsequently became known as the Atomic Age. Central to its being understood is the theory of Relativity. In its extended form, this theory suggested that matter could be transformed into energy that was no longer traceable to its source. In effect, Einstein was declaring the existence of a linear disconnect, the implications of which not even he could have imagined. Although his ideas initially met with substantial resistance, they gradually gained acceptance. Science would prove itself capable. Philosophy and theology wouldn't. Nearly forty years later, in the year 1945, the first atomic bomb was exploded near Alamogordo, New Mexico. The union between science and technology had been consummated while the world looked on in awe.

What no one in 1945 could have anticipated was the success that science and technology would have in their pursuit of the atom. In 1952 the first Hydrogen bomb was exploded at Eniwetok. It represented yet another step in a process that was surely leading to the potential for world destruction. It's doubtful if anyone knows when mankind first achieved this potential. And, although some scientists still speak in terms of "world destructive" capability, it's evident that we can't differentiate between being destroyed once or 200 times over. It's definitely the first time that's most worrisome. Those who survived the year 1945 were soon to become involved in a controversy which continues to rage today. It concerns the role of the atom in the future survival of mankind. Although the basic substance of this controversy remains unchanged, elements crucial to its proposal and solution have changed radically.

Einstein's ideas inevitably set mankind upon the wheel of destiny. Once demonstrated, the atomic phenomena could never again be ignored. But the problem didn't stop there, and this is what needs emphasizing. The continued unfolding of the atomic potential (along with advancements in tangential fields) wound up causing a definitive alteration in the association of idea to "time" – one that manifested itself in the continuous escalation in the complexity of language. Also hidden in this transition to complexity was a subtle yet insidious corruption of the continuity of language itself, or the very unity upon which reason depends in order to envisage and articulate its singularity.

Nonetheless, this liability managed to find acceptance within scientific circles, by allowing linear theorists to connect what would have otherwise been disconnected results (from new experimentation) to preexisting theory. From there, it gradually made its way to the masses. Unable to understand the meaning and purpose of life; and vulnerable to pain inflicted by another; thus driven by insecurity from cradle to grave; the loss of God to evolution made mankind vulnerable to the need to "defend" itself from all those promoting unwanted change. Science's linkage to the advancement of defense; which then transitioned to "necessary" offense; coupled with demonstrable advantages in everyday convenience for those who could afford it; pretty much consummated the seduction. The problem was that this transition in language was not benign.

Language is a tool by which the human mind understands and represents its reality. It is comprised of words and grammatical rules that govern their use. Words are incomplete representations of dichotomy; and, their continuous proliferation stems from the consequence that each idea is an incomplete characterization of the all encompassing dichotomy we call the self – i.e. "non-being encompassed by being." The idea of dichotomy is therefore necessary to the foundation of language, in order for language to remain relative to us.

Dichotomy is the proposal that equal opposing positions can be contained within a single idea by way of language. Rules of grammar dictate the structure by which this occurs. This is what makes language relative to consciousness. Consciousness, or the awareness of self, is the ability of mind to determine the difference between itself (as a form of something) and the absence of itself (as a form of nothing). These two forms constitute the most basic dichotomy. They pervade by necessity all idea. They are commonly referred to as time and space. This makes time and space fundamental to both consciousness (the awareness of self) and language (specific aspects of that awareness) if both are to remain relative to each other. The dichotomy 'something/absence of something' is known as time/space. This conjoining of difference pervades all idea by necessity, even to the defining of reality, because ideas (via language) cannot come to exist "ex nihilo."

Historically, man has been able to deal with 'time' by visualizing it to be fundamental to quantification by way of language. However, he has remained unable to deal with the concept of "space" in the same way. This is because, all that language is able to say about space is that "it must be." Mind is understandably uncomfortable with something which it must admit exists, but which it can say nothing else about. In an attempt to overcome this disconnect, the inference in the dichotomy validated by language (time/place) was applied to the dichotomy that eclipsed language (time/space). To complete this misnomer, space/time was then substituted for time/space. This inverted or unipolar form of the latter inferred an endless continuum to which mind might gain access. Einstein's theory unmasked in definitive terms the illusory or "subjective" nature of this new iteration and suggested that science return to the fundamental dichotomy of time/space. Without doing so, Einstein felt that it was impossible to understand anything about the true nature of reality.

He then went on to question whether the union of time and space actually constituted a dichotomy at all. This bombshell had the effect of forcing man to choose between chaos, as the basis for its language, or God. In other words: to believe in consciousness solely by way of language – minus the ability to consider beginning or end (thus implying chaos) – or, to believe in the consistency between beginning and end without the ability to validate one's existence by way of language (thus necessitating God). The stage was now set for a major confrontation in idea, but it never came.

Plato correctly held to the transcendence of quality. But, the road that led from Socrates to Einstein proposed a convincing argument for the transformation of quality into quantity. Hegel, foreshadowing Einstein, saw quantity in a more aberrant way – or, as a route to the "becoming" of certainty. In other words, Hegel felt that quantitative change could yield certainty by way of the continuous refinement of process – but, this goal hinged upon the necessity to exclude temporal constraint from the equation. Since the viability of doing so couldn't initially be tied down one way or the other, the truth in Hegel's claim was considered to be "undefeatable." This stalemate opened the door to the eventual elevation of 'process' to the role of "primal" cause. But, it didn't do so immediately, because dichotomy was inherent to the initial structure of language. Hence, time/space and not space/time ruled the day.

Hegel undoubtedly proposed an interesting hypothetical. And on face value it not only seemed possible but logically unassailable, due to the injection of the idea of "indeterminableness" into the equation. However, there remained one fly in Hegel's well conceived ointment. Man was mortal and therefore temporally limited. Hence, the only way one could embrace Hegel's conclusions without admitting contradiction was to transfer identity from the self to the genre of self. Without doing this, the possibility for the endless refinement of inquiry, that was deemed essential to the realization of certainty, quality, and hence reality itself, successfully eluded logical connectedness. With this new idea of "open-endedness" there also came the vision of endless opportunity which justified all kinds of inquiry. Science and its supporting mechanisms then adopted this cause for their own.

Using Hegel's supposition as their justification, the purveyors of science unwittingly wound up facilitating an alteration to language that eroded the importance of individuality for both man and man's idea of God. Once in evidence, advocates were quick to redefine "primal" cause by characterizing science as a functioning custodian of both mankind's present and future. However, any possibility that this claim was valid, remained viable only in the interim between Einstein's initial proposal of idea and the reality for world destruction that his ideas would promulgate. Without guaranteed continuance of the human factor, the possibility for rendering 'objectivity' from 'subjectivity' (in order to realize certainty) fell apart. This opened the door for legitimate questions with regard to science's foundational "purpose." Unfortunately, nothing substantial materialized!

In addition to yielding uncertainty in the form of the potential for world destruction, science's relentless manipulation of language inadvertently caused it to lose its ability to support dichotomy. Without dichotomy as a foundation for stabilizing consciousness, idea rapidly began to lose the ability to control itself. Stripped of its qualitative moorings, insecurity began to infect the human element. This caused consciousness to focus on the need to acquire excess. With the rush to obtain more and more, faster and faster, with less and less expenditure of energy, the earth is now being pushed to its very limits even as its population continues to irresponsibly increase. It doesn't take a genius to realize that this is a prescription for imminent catastrophe!

The latest manifestations of this breakdown in language can be seen in the attempt to give linguistic legs to quantum mechanics. The result is an onslaught of oxymorons that attempt to link linearity to that which is innately unknowable for man – "limitlessness." It is unknowable, because by nature our functionality is limited in both duration and hence capability. Nonetheless, words like "finite-unbounded, unboundedness, undecidability, indefiniteness" and a host of similar process oriented terms continue to grow, thus contaminating language ever further. They do this by implying that process is 'primal' to everything else and therefore holds the key to the meaning, purpose and continuance of life. By way of this simple deception, purpose is thought to be found outside of one's self in an incomplete, fabricated, objectivity, to be endlessly choreographed by science. This boast is in stark contrast to purpose being found within one's self by way of the subjective correlation of one's limited capability into a consistent understanding – one that prompts associated action necessary to the maintenance of seeing one's self as a time dependent singularity.

Confused by escalating complexity, man has capitulated to the scientific method which promotes unipolar (non-dichotomous) thinking that inherently denies conclusion. This has happened, even though the complexity involved prevents the self from associating idea to the inherent limitations by which it conceives itself to be a recognizable constant. Nonetheless, unable to ascertain the

truth in this matter, man has unwittingly given way to a dependence upon "science as savior." Even though science is capable of improving many aspects of mankind's existence, the results of its sole reliance upon 'time altered thinking' seriously complicates everything else human. Because of the inherent complexity involved, it prevents the individual from confirming his/her own reality by way of it. This fracturing of mankind's psyche cannot help but cause indecision and frustration which then surfaces as apathy and/or hostility.

Before science and technology had risen to their present degree of sophistication, mankind played out its aggressions through the selective destruction of itself; i.e. the French Revolution, World War I & II and the Russian Revolution. Although this definitely wasn't pretty, it did serve to resolve conflicts while leaving the human potential intact. Today however, as a result of advanced weaponry, each new conflict between nations accelerates the risk for the destruction of all sentient life on earth. This fact is undeniably self-deprecating. Unfortunately, we have yet to factor the fundamental reason for why all this is occurring into the equation, in order to come up with a possible solution to reverse the outcome. And, without doing so, it's evident that we can't save ourselves!

I don't want to beat a dead horse here, but this obviously bears repeating. It is the continuous alteration of human language and the ideas it can or can no longer sustain (because of our thought process's march into complexity) that is actually at fault here. And, science and its supporting technologies bare a large part of the blame. That's because they've given themselves over to total reliance upon the linear process and its uncapped complexity – thus creating a monster that dwarfs our ability to understand its relevance, either individually or collectively. It only stands to reason that we can't control what we can't understand. This in turn puts human survival up for grabs. With existing weaponry in the hands of politicians this exposure increases exponentially.

For those wrestling with the abstract nature of this material, let us now consider some actual examples of how the corruption of language, in league with an ultimate destructive capability, translates to vulnerability. In their most basic form the concepts of offense and defense appear to constitute a dichotomy. This means that for every offense mind can conceivably determine a defense. Military strategists through the use of hindsight agree that this is true. However, the continued impact of the quantitative thought process upon knowledge, and its associated impact upon reality, through the manipulation of matter, has now altered this simple truth concept. As knowledge has increased the efficiency of its destructive capability, it has resulted in a reduction in usable 'time.' I refer to the 'time' critical to the consideration and response required to achieve an effective defense. At present, in the context of strategic thinking, there is no longer "sufficient" time in this equation for conscious reflection.

Today, it takes approximately seventeen minutes for a nuclear armed missile to travel between the two strongest nations on earth. Submarine based missiles require just seven minutes to achieve the same result. Countries whose chief antagonists border one another, like Israel and Syria or India and Pakistan have less than 4 minutes to respond to incoming threats. Under the auspices of creating a "missile defense shield" to "protect the world against terrorism mounted by rogue regimes," we now see the placement of potentially offensive nuclear capability within minutes of several major nuclear powers – China and Russia to be exact. This act cannot help but destabilize the global equation immeasurably, because both countries will need to find some way to try and offset this new threat. Bare in mind that the identification and subsequent verification of any potential threat from these previously misnamed "peace keepers," reduces retaliation time (for vulnerable weapon

systems) to under two minutes – provided they are going to be launched and not destroyed in the incoming attack. Daily, technology seeks ways to decrease this 'time' interval. And, based upon the past, there is no reason to believe that it will not be successful.

Four minutes is obviously an insufficient amount of 'time' in which to initiate a defense. The appearance of the word **retaliation** into this ongoing controversy indicates this. Retaliation suggests the use of offensive weapons to achieve defensive goals. This idea differs from the idea of defense, because it does not employ an inherent act of containment in its meaning. Consistent with that, the weapon systems involved exceed the capability of mankind to survive their use. And, without human survival, the concept of defense is obviously meaningless.

How then are we to understand the idea of retaliation as it relates to the idea of defense? It should be rather obvious from the weapon systems involved that retaliation is not an acceptable alternative for defense. An attempt to solve this contradiction has resulted in the linking of the idea of retaliation with that of **deterrence**. To deter means to discourage through fear. This marriage of idea, resulting from necessity, provides clear and tangible proof (for the first time in human history) of the existence of a basic and incontestable **FLAW** in the quantitative thought process that supports and otherwise validates the scientific method.

To discourage by means of fear is not a consistent extension of a scientific process that uses quantitative analysis to determine the specific nature of its result. Instead, its presence in this chain of reasoning suggests something much more climatic. It proves that neither science or the method by which it achieves its result (the quantitative thought process) can ensure the continued survival of mankind if FEAR cannot contain the human factor.

Proof of the finality of this conclusion lies in the fact that retaliation is already programmed into the computer systems of most nuclear capable countries. This program concretizes an approximation of the minimum amount of quantifiable data required to engage the retaliatory capability. This threshold varies from country to country depending upon computer system capability. The less sophisticated the system the greater the need to lower the threshold. The lower the threshold the greater the possibility for error. Paradoxically, the more sophisticated the system the greater the potential for malfunction. This mindless intervention has become necessary, because mind realizes that it can – **NO LONGER FUNCTION IN THE REDUCED 'TIME' INTERVAL ALLOTTED TO IT FOR DECISION MAKING WITH REGARD TO NUCLEAR WAR.**

It is ironic that the final decisions regarding world survival rest with the machines of our contrivance by default, since they alone possess the ability to implement retaliation in the ever shrinking parameters of 'time' to which they so heavily contribute. So where does that leave us?

Here's where it leaves us – **AN ACT THAT REQUIRES ONLY A FOOL TO BEGIN, CAN SET INTO MOTION THE MOST COMPLEX TECHNOLOGY ON EARTH TO COMPLETE. ONCE BEGUN IT CANNOT BE REVERSED, BECAUSE THE 'TIME' NECESSARY TO ACHIEVE REVERSAL NO LONGER EXISTS IN THE CYCLE. MIND SIMPLY CANNOT FUNCTION QUICKLY ENOUGH TO INTERVENE.**

As Stephen Hawking correctly concluded in the quote offered at the beginning of this paper, the threat we face is not just nuclear. Chemical, biological, environmental, and other yet to be named

threats – that continue to materialize out of the mind's of “mad scientists” – up the ante considerably. Dr. Harold Strunk, a retired US military expert with extensive experience in the area of anthrax (a naturally occurring bio-toxin) stated:

"a sugar cube quantity of anthrax could theoretically kill 100 million people. However, in reality that number would be much less, because of the problems associated with its dispersal within a population."

Not to be deterred from creating the "ultimate destructive weapon," researchers then refocused their efforts upon optimizing the delivery system. Quoting from another well accredited source, Dr. William Campbell Douglass, we can clearly see where this whole thing is going.

"With the advent of genetic manipulation (i.e., recombinant engineering), some most incredible and deadly viruses can now be manufactured with little difficulty. One devastating possibility would be to combine the highly-contagious influenza virus with the genes of either the anthrax toxin, the botulism virus, or the toxin from plague.

If this type of designer virus were unleashed upon a population, infection of almost all of the populace would be certain, especially in the cities, and death would very quickly follow. There would be no treatment and diagnosis would be difficult at best (because of insufficient time). This is not science fiction. This is today's reality."

And, for the nay-sayers out there, that will attempt to discount the anthrax threat – it's not just anthrax that is a cause for worry. As the Wall Street Journal reported as far back as April 23, 1984:

"Some of the bio-weapons being designed by the Soviets are almost beyond human comprehension. Russian scientists are attempting to recombine the venom-producing genes from cobras or poisonous spiders with ordinary viruses or bacteria in such a way that once they infect the body, these organisms will produce deadly, paralytic cobra or spider neurotoxins."

Even if we assume a "kill rate" from these bio-toxins in the neighborhood of 1% of the total population (70,000,000 human casualties plus animal deaths) the effect upon civilization would be catastrophic. To start with, panic would collapse the world's economic system immediately. This would cause agricultural output and its distribution to grind to a halt and famine would quickly set in. Need driven greed would then translate itself into anarchy, thereby destroying all semblance of law and order. Plague from the unburied would further complicate everything immensely. Nations already engaged in an economic tug of war would find themselves pitted against one another in a contest for survival. In this scenario, nuclear weapons would become just one more tool in the process by which to leverage advantage. This is not a pretty picture to be sure. If your constitution can still bear more, and you are interested in just how "fragile" of an environment into which all this 'madness' is being injected, you can access statistics from my web site at: <http://www.edenorg.com/edp-08.htm>. This data was collected from a wealth of demographic studies on "critical issues" commissioned by the United Nations.

This 'insanity' characterizes a scenario that is the climax to a destiny upon which mankind was placed over sixty years ago. And, it looms ever closer in a world beset with increasing confusion and unrest. Having borrowed the quantitative thought process used by science, almost every aspect of modern life is experiencing a "word lag." It occurs as mind attempts to understand the

implications of its interface with increasing complexity. The result is destabilizing to all the basic indicators that previously ensured local, national, and world stability. This begins with the family unit and stretches all the way to the economic and political interaction between super powers.

Make no mistake here, there is no immediate solution to this problem. That's because contaminated language, along with the ideas and realities it sustains, is heavily entrenched into all aspects of our daily life. Through its use, it is providing mankind with a hope that is relative to a 'time' that is other than his own. Its main focus is not on the present, but the future. By this simple change of emphasis, the special gift of individuality is successfully confused. In its place, each human person becomes just another cog in the great wheel intent upon forging a better more efficient tomorrow – irrespective of its cost in today's.

This process continues to be billed as a worthwhile sacrifice for the children. And although this was once thought to be true, the increasing probability of world destruction casts a very real shadow on this optimism. The fact is that we can no longer guarantee the sanctity of either tomorrow or the children who would innocently play in it. Because of that, human logic can no longer substantiate the continued extension of its reality into the future, until the destructive capability it now possesses is defused. No other objective has ever been more important!

The only hope of the World is a moratorium on new weapons coupled with the systematic reduction of existing ones. Obviously, I am not the first to suggest it. The problem is how to achieve it. I believe that unless the controlling elements of all major powers can be made to understand that a self-destructive alteration has occurred to the language by which each presently defines their objectives, world disarmament is impossible.

It only stands to reason that if disarmament is to occur, it must be by way of a "single" idea that is advantageous to all principles, individually and collectively, throughout all aspects of their definable 'time.' The only thing capable of satisfying this criteria involves the containment of our thought process to quantify ad-infinitum and thereby destroy us. This threat is also the only form of certainty that is capable of being universally understood and thus embraced. At this point in time, the failure of the quantitative linear thought process to ensure the continued survival of itself (even by way of its most efficient use) clearly demonstrates a fundamental FLAW that mankind has managed to coax from its latency – one that is both undeniable and potentially terminal to all of us.

To continue to employ contaminated language as a sole denominator for the purpose of problem solving, either internal to national boundaries or across international ones, is therefore suicidal. Due to its contamination, language is no longer able to convincingly convey intentionality to oneself and therefore another. In other words, we can no longer define by way of human limitation, a constant rate of change that is universally applicable to the constant state of change which self must necessarily impose upon itself during the consideration of itself as an enduring singularity. The result is a fundamental breakdown in "trust," which causes everyone to be suspect of the innuendo underlying another's stated intent or purpose. This is a totally unacceptable basis for critical communications intended to resolve impending conflict between countries with global destructive capability.

Consistent with resolving this liability – THE ILLUMINATION OF THE EXISTENCE OF THIS INHERENT FLAW MUST CONSTITUTE THE FIRST STEP IN THE DE-ESCALATION OF THE HOSTILITIES THAT NOW THREATEN THE CONTINUED SURVIVAL OF MANKIND.

Don't be deceived into thinking that there are any exceptions here. Due to the linear construction inherent to all languages, all are affected by this temporal contamination. Only the degree involved varies. This universality constitutes a justifiable reason for why we must establish a NEW means by which to make "inquiry" – one that is relative to identifying a viable approach for reducing our shared exposure. The mechanics for doing this are embodied in the Eden project, a global stabilization initiative whose approach is already validated by principals from 28 international organizations. Its singular focus is on developing a qualified "complimentary" body of knowledge that is wholly devoted to the "SURVIVAL" of mankind, as opposed to the quest for certainty.

Although the cost of implementation is negligible, and this project will be self supporting once it is functional, it still isn't operational because of the perceived threat it poses to self absorbed private interests intent upon insuring their own advantage. This stonewalling MUST stop or we're all as good as dead!

A basic understanding of the Eden project can be considered on the Internet at www.edenorg.com. Select the "Site Map" indicator on the top of the home page to gain access to the entire site. A basic offering of its theoretical underpinnings can be found there also. This project can begin on a moment's notice or as soon as funding materializes. Its ability to impact upon global dynamics promises to be positive, all encompassing, and immediate. I would be glad to discuss particulars with potential partners. Its core objective is to bring all cultures together for the purpose of trying to determine an alternative understanding that will forestall the eventuality that currently contaminated language is poised to impose upon mankind.

If your wondering what other options exist, there are NO other options that are capable of turning this whole mess around. They don't exist, because our thought process is inherently predisposed to prevent us from seeing them. That's because its wholly fixated on the future, a fact that necessarily precludes the qualification and implementation of any solution that manifests in the present.

Given the immediacy of the existing threat, and in light of the above insights, the challenge with which I now confront obstructionists is to either join in this effort to try and preserve the human factor, or justify to those you claim to love why you won't. Doing nothing is clearly self condemning at this point. The facts are now in. The free ride is over. Whatever achievements the scientific method claims for itself, they all pale in comparison to the threat it has managed to perpetrate upon mankind. So science now aside, we must get on with the task of saving ourselves before it's too late. Hence, it's time to pull your own weight on this one, or get out of the way. It's just that simple! Offenders know who they are, so there's no need for additional finger pointing.

I know of no other way to turn this mess around short of the admitted intervention of God into the affairs of man. If mankind is to reassume control over its own destiny, some form of multi-lateral action along the lines suggested above must be initiated immediately. If it is not to be, then destiny will direct mankind into Armageddon and the heavens will find cause to resound, because of the inadequacy of human thought to recognize and operate within the boundaries of 'time' capable of insuring its own survival.