

Bird of Liberty

A girl should be two things: classy and fabulous.

Coco Chanel

A man's face is his autobiography. A woman's face is her work of fiction.

Oscar Wilde

To call woman the weaker sex is a libel; it is man's injustice to woman. If by strength is meant brute strength, then, indeed, is woman less brute than man. If by strength is meant moral power, then woman is immeasurably man's superior. Has she not greater intuition, is she not more self-sacrificing, has she not greater powers of endurance, has she not greater courage? Without her, man could not be. If nonviolence is the law of our being, the future is with woman. Who can make a more effective appeal to the heart than woman?

Mahatma Gandhi

In 2019, my dear friend Marianela Mirpuri launched a project she had dedicated, already since a long time, a deeply thought over the years. It is about HERA, a city of women - and since its beginning she invited me to get involved in it.

We had already been talking about this magnificent project, entirely conceived and thought by her. Of course, it is not a city "for" women, a place of exclusion of men - for such a thing would have no sense.

After all, married to Zeus, Hera was not only the Greek goddess of women - she was also the goddess of family, of marriage and of the birth of children.

HERA will also be a city, but it already is and will be much more. In addition to the city itself, HERA brings together several other initiatives, ranging from perfume to social projects, from communication projects to design, from fashion to cinema, to housing or literature.

But if, on one hand, there are inclusive and integrative projects like HERA, on the other hand social political movements spread all over the

world, particularly in the beginning of the third millennium, have sought to separate people, to create conflicts, to divide - as if such divisions were something natural, as if a better world could automatically be born from them.

Marianela Mirpuri's goal was never to divide, but to unite.

All of us men have a feminine part in our souls, and women also have something masculine in their deepness. We share the same world, the same dreams, the same pleasures, flavors and loves. Even in biochemical terms, such dynamics is the same.

The brilliant anthropologist Ashley Montagu, who lived between 1905 and 1999, said that the role of women was to teach men to be human. He was absolutely right. Our mothers have taught us this since before the first moment. For the word "human" shares the same etymological origin with "humus", earth.

"Human" and "humus" launch themselves into the Indo-European expressions **dhghomon* and **dhghem*. But, while the former indicated the ideas of "kindness, politeness, refinement", worthy of what is human; the latter was the idea of god, of the overwhelming forces of the earth, of genesis, of birth and, therefore, of discovery.

One is a strong abstraction. The other is pure root.

For the writer Henry Miller - author of celebrated and accursed works like *Tropic of Cancer*, *Tropic of Capricorn*, *Sexus*, *Plexus* and *Nexus* - man is an abstract being, linked to mathematics, to the stars, while woman is a deeply intuitive being, immersed in the roots of existence itself.

Thus, the origin of "humus" is linked to the idea of god - and it is this divine dimension, of birth, of genesis, that characterizes women. And it is with this divine dimension that women teach men to be human.

Both Indo-European words generating "human" and "humus" are born from a common, deeper root, **D* which meant "light", from where we have our word "splendor".

That is why, surely, Coco Chanel said that "a girl should be two things: classy and fabulous". We can *translate* "classy" as "elegant" - after all, the etymological meaning of the word "elegant" indicates "that which is elected, chosen", that which stands detached from the whole. And "fabulous" arises from "fable" - from the Indo-European **bha*, as our first phonetic articulations, when we are newborn, still in a short time of life, meaning "talking, telling stories" - what immediately leads us to the *Thousand and One Nights* tales with Scheherazade - one of the most feminine works ever.

And, for all these reasons, Oscar Wilde would not hesitate to say that "a man's face is his autobiography. A woman's face is her work of fiction",

because while a man is usually an abstract action that tells a story of Narcissus, therefore biographical; a woman is the imagination linked to the earth, a fiction that reveals us love.

We must not forget that Narcissus was a hunter, a male, and Eco, a mountain nymph, was a delightful female character.

Hegel would certainly have liked to speak about such a condition. But no! This difference doesn't happen as a dialectical overcoming, through conflicts. One is entirely inside the other - something that only quantum physics would be able to reveal us later.

It is about a vision regarding men and women - men being strongly abstract, and women being deeply integrating - where the most interesting is the fusion of these worlds, generating what the quantum universe and the Lupasco's logic of the "included third" illuminates.

Those who see the conflict, the division between opposites, are separate - but they are not different worlds, because what we deny in the Other is something we fight inside ourselves. Meanwhile, they are spirits belonging to the mechanical logic of the past.

Before someone come condemning me for not defending third, fourths, fifths or more sexual genders - which happen in the world of thought - I must warn to the fact that I do not exclude any form of articulation of these universes and that, in last instance, despite their apparent variety, they just tell us about the two essential laws of thermodynamics, without value judgments.

With reason, John Cage argued that, regardless of gender, human beings form many different "types" or "families". In the late 1980s we talked at length about this during one of our delicious lunches when I argued that the biological classification and such a complex network of variations, beyond gender, formed a non-linear system. John was more focused on those variations, which make us meet people throughout life and identify with them, as if we belonged to a same "human species", different of the others. Because of this, there are also a lot of people with whom we have no identity, as if they were "from another planet". What fascinated me was the articulation between these two great dimensions of the human. Biology conferred a certain unity between we all.

Thus, **HERA** is a project for the female dimension - which only exists with the male dimension - and inside which we have a gigantic diversity of worlds.

One of the things that always impressed me deeply was that man considered himself superior to woman... certainly because he is stronger

physically! This is a limitless stupidity!

There can be no superiority between different beings, in the same way as there can be no love between absolutely equals.

We are different and equal. The dimension of difference eliminates the possibility of superiority; while equality, even if relative - established by what we know - turns love possible.

A person can love without being reciprocated, but in such a case, it will be about a narcissistic love, contrarily to what is generally thought. He or she who loves alone, even though his or her apparent object is the other, is loving him or herself.

The word "love" was born from the Indo-European **leubh* which pointed us to the ideas of "care", "desire", "love", also generating the term *libido*.

Yet in prehistoric times, the old meaning of the Latin expression "amare" - which generated many words that designate "love", such as the French "amour" or the Portuguese "amor" - indicated the idea of "connection", of "union", of "care" and as if it could be surprising, the root **K*, essential base of the word, revealed the image of a cosmic movement, which involved everything.

Isn't that what we feel when we're in love?

Can passion among human beings be denied?

Thus, a city of women is also a city of men. One inside the other.

In this fabulous context, at the end of 2019, Marianela Mirpuri invited me to create, within the scope of **HERA**, an **Observatory for the Future of the Humanity**, as I have been doing since the 1980s.

The challenge concerned a project through which it would be possible to freely observe the world, without barriers or ideological frames of any kind, to each person be able to establish, independently and freely, a deeper conception of the world in which we live.

Because one of the basic demands of the project was the absence of any type of ideological persecution or surveillance, it was decided to exclude party politics and institutional religions. After all, being free, there could not exist any kind of proselytism.

All human oppressions over thousands of years had the elimination of freedom as the first foundation.

History shows us, with great exuberance, that when there is a prohibition of thought, of manifestation of ideas - what we think and what we

manifest - the disaster, social and economic, is assured.

The word "observatory" - which has historically been closely linked to the observation of astronomical phenomena, of the cosmos - appeared from the Latin *observare*, "to observe" in English, which in turn arose from the fusion of the Latin particle *ob*, meaning "to", "towards something" or "about something", and the old Indo-European root **ser* which indicated the idea of "protecting".

In this way, the old etymological meaning of the word "observatory" literally tells us of something that is "oriented towards protection". Once again, this orientation immediately reminds us of the female condition. It is not about hunting, but healing.

Unexpectedly by many, the idea of an *observatory* keeps, in its oldest roots, the principle of care, healing, attention, which inevitably implies the future. After all, one will not take care of something if he or she is not thinking about the future!

On the other hand, this doesn't mean that an observatory deals with any type of futurology. On the contrary! We take care of the future by understanding more deeply the present and the past - particularly what, in the present, is change, discovery and invention.

We can never forget that the present is a kind of complex and non-linear synthesis of the past, and that there is no new without what preceded it. If something is "totally" new, it will be something else.

Thus, the idea of an **Observatory for the Future of Humanity** indicates a precise concept: something, a condition, a project through which elements of the present that can represent an impact on the future reality are observed and analyzed.

However, we must always keep in mind that the present is everything we know, everything that forms us, and that many times, much of what indicates the future is "invisible" in our daily lives, without we realize it.

Since the 1980s I have developed and worked on this kind of project, with "observatories".

From 1987 to 1996, for about ten years, I was one of the coordinators of the first worldwide video art and electronic art festivals at Monte Verità, in Locarno, Switzerland, together with René Berger, Rinaldo Bianda and Lorenzo Bianda. René Berger was one of the most fascinating philosophers of the 20th century, a brilliant spirit and an unforgettable friend. Together we have carried out several projects over more than twenty years.

The Locarno Festival also held an International Meeting of thinkers, a

kind of symposium that defined itself as a true observatory of the world. In both, we counted with the participation of great personalities such as Nam June Paik, Francis Ford Coppola, Basarab Nicolescu, Bill Viola, Edgar Morin, Daniel Charles, Joseph Brenner, Pierre Levy or Pierre Restany among many others.

In 1990, in Milan, Italy, I met Lucrezia De Domizio, Baroness Durini. A great articulator of artists and thinkers, she had been responsible for much of Joseph Beuys' career in his later years. We became close friends and I immediately started to participate in her newspaper RISK Arte Oggi, launched in that year of 1990. RISK Arte Oggi was, without any doubt, the most important art and culture newspaper and magazine of Europe at that time. It was a fabulous planetary observatory in written form with the participation of personalities such as Harald Szeemann, Pierre Restany, Bruno Munari, Bob Wilson, Saverio Monno, Lina Wertmüller, Max Lüscher, Umberto Eco, Carlo Ponti, Philippe Queau, Renzo Piano and Gillo Dorfles among many others.

In the early 1990s, I created in Lisbon, Portugal - with Berger, Rinaldo and Lorenzo Bianda - the first Euro Video Festival, which also had a planetary observatory where, in addition to René Berger, we counted on the participation of the quantum physicist Basarab Nicolescu, of the musicologist Laura Kuhn or the physicist José Mariano Gago among others.

In the mid-1990s I participated in the creation of what would become the prototype of the first university on the Internet, in partnership with UNESCO and the École Polytechnique de Lausanne, with René Berger, Edgar Morin, Madeleine Gobeil, Basarab Nicolescu and Joseph Brenner among others. The project was called *Observatory of the Future*.

In 2003, Lucrezia De Domizio introduced me to the physician and art collector Alberto del Genio. We became immediately friends and created, that same year, an Academy of Arts, Music, Science and Philosophy in Punta Campanella, Amalfi Coast, between Positano and Sorrento, a place described by Homer as the meeting place of Ulysses and the Mermaids. This project has been characterized, since its inception, by a program of a transdisciplinary observatory on a worldwide scale.

Two years later I created another observatory, this time in the city of Trancoso, in Portugal. On that occasion, we counted with the participation of Dan Shechtman, awarded the 2011 Nobel Prize in Chemistry for the discovery of quasicrystals. We had also the participation of Roy Ascott, Lester Brown, António Cerveira Pinto or Gyorgy Darvas among many others.

These were some of the observatory projects that I have created or helped to create over the years.

Sensitized by Marianela Mirpuri, the Cascais City Council, through the hands of its Mayor, Mr. Carlos Carreiras, determined the famous Casa de

Santa Maria to be the headquarters of the **Observatory for the Future of Humanity**. It is an emblematic building of the city, built in 1902, designed by architect Raul Lino.

The initial idea was to gather in Cascais, every year, some of the most brilliant scientists and thinkers on the planet, and put them in direct contact with people so that they could, through their experiences and discoveries, observe the reality in which we live.

Everything was ready when the world was surprised by Covid-19, paralyzing and confining about four billion people around the world in a lockdown that reached ninety countries.

Heavy rules of social distance were imposed by governments around the world, turning unfeasible the **Observatory for the Future of Humanity's** initial program.

Almost everywhere, several cultural entities started to hold events virtually, through computers and communication networks in real-time. But, this made people inevitably isolated from each other and the number of these events soon became gigantic.

To make the meetings through a virtual strategy would be to create another event equal to the thousands that followed, with people at a distance, which did not make any sense, because one of the objectives of the observatory was to turn each person a free observer in direct interaction with philosophers, scientists, artists, musicians and thinkers.

This was no longer possible, at least for a while.

But, times change and everything is made of change.

Paralyzed in their homes, people began to experience an unprecedented situation in the entire history of humankind.

The questioning of the ideals of freedom arose a little everywhere. In the name of health security, the constitutional right to come and go has been suspended - but the arguments for this suspension were often contradictory and incoherent. Statistical data was often inconsistent with the draconian measures adopted by the various governments.

The truth, the meaning of what was being said, in the ordinary day-to-day conversations, has come to be increasingly questioned by billions of people.

Political groups emerged that, in the supposed defense of the dignity of minorities, established rules for the prohibition of behavior and even the prohibition of words and phrases.

Like zero-sum and non-zero-sum games and the two essential principles of thermodynamics, we know two types of freedom: positive and negative.

Positive freedom is the one argued by Hegel, which characterized Humanity until the appearance of the Greek Miracle around the 6th century BC. It means to do whatever we want, freely.

But, the fabulous Greek revolution, which inaugurated what we call the Rule of Law, the spirit of democracy or the principle of the presumption of innocence among other civilizing pillars, established for the first time in History another type of freedom, which is created when each one of us is able to establish his or her own borders, his or her limits of rights, in order to guarantee the freedom of the other. This is what the old proverb tells us: my right ends when the other's right begins. It is a question of negative freedom, when each one of us, autonomously, limits his or her freedom in respect for his or her next, without the need of a superior authority, with a despotic or police nature.

Arthur Schopenhauer said that "we can do what we want, but we cannot want what we want". He thought on positive freedom. In one way or another, positive freedom is always conditioned by something higher. For this reason, Muslims, for example, refuse to accept that freedom may exist. For them, all human beings are, in some way, slaves. But if we cannot want what we want, as Schopenhauer said, we can want what we do not want... we can design our territory of freedom.

As it is easy to understand, an essential element for us to establish negative freedom is the truth, is to know the world. Direct knowledge is an illusion. We never know things directly, but through what we already knew before. This happens both in the world of ideas and even in neurological terms. That's what Werner Heisenberg, and before him Emanuel Kant, said when he argued that what we know is our way of knowing.

Thus, what we call knowledge - even when it is about discovery - implies a construction, and such a construction is founded on liberty.

Without this knowledge, we cannot self-regulate and the principles of the Rule of Law and democracy will be condemned to disappear under the yoke of tyranny - even if it will pretend justified itself with intentions of a universal salvation, with alleged principles of kindness, protection of human and Nature.

That is why freedoms of thought and expression are so fundamental. Without them, there is no such a thing which we call *civilization*.

There is yet another extremely interesting phenomenon about freedom.

While positive freedom - which designates the absence of limits in

human action - implies tyranny and a limitation in the world of ideas; negative freedom - which means self-limitation in the field of action - requires the absence of limits on the elaboration of thought and its manifestation.

The statement "I disapprove of what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it" - mistakenly attributed to Voltaire, is a famous example of this phenomenon. In fact, this statement was written by the British writer Evelyn Beatrice Hall, who lived between 1868 and 1956, in the book *The Friends of Voltaire*, published in 1906 under the pseudonym of S. G. Tallentyre.

The idea attributed to the French philosopher did not concern the absence of limits on human action, such as murder, sexual violence or torture, for example. It pointed to the negative freedom, for which free knowledge, despite all its apparent contradictions, is essential.

Only with free thinking can we establish the foundations of what each one of us believes and, thus, equip us with the capacity to be able to freely design our own "territory of freedom", in order to not offend the right of the other.

Catholic Church's inquisition, apartheid, nazism, fascist and communist tyrannies, political persecutions and the submission of women as inferior beings over thousands of years only happened because there was no freedom of thought and expression. If there were, these collective insanities would never have lasted long and the weapons of despots would never have silenced so many millions of people over so many centuries, because even tyrants are supported by human beings who, however corrupt they may be, will have among them those who at some point will become aware.

Even if there is no truth, even if people are manipulated by lying information, freedom of expression will unleash in their expansion from person to person a continuous fabric of discovery, which will, sooner or later, restore the truth.

For this reason, all dictatorial regimes radically limit freedom of expression, of course always in the name of an alleged defense of the welfare and security of all.

Those who, intentionally or not, confuse freedom with exploitation of the next, with crime, as it is typical in references to the *laissez-faire*, think while positive freedom - do not understand the meaning of freedom as an essential element of civilization.

Whoever does not believe in the principle of negative freedom, does not believe in the other, does not believe in the human being as responsible.

It is terrible to live under the yoke of tyranny. Freedom always implies, inevitably, the respect of each person in relation to his or her next - and it is,

beyond the free elections, the condition par excellence of democracy.

The paralysis forced by the plague of the 21st century intensified an interesting and frightening phenomenon worldwide, which became known as the "politically correct".

"Politically correct" literally means to alter the truth, to lie, so as not to offend any person or group of people, even though the lie may compromise the historical truth.

No normal person can be in favor of apartheid, for example, but that doesn't give him or her the right to deny History.

Memory is an essential civilizing tool. It is only through memory that we can know and criticize ourselves. It is the instrument of discovery and change. Without memory we would be condemned to a state of collective amnesia and all the miseries of all times would be free to be relaunched by new tyrannical spirits. What we say of each person's "inalienable rights" only exists because there is memory.

Thus, there is no acceptable justification for the "politically correct".

Beyond all that, the "politically correct" is the denial of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, published by the United Nations in 1948, as its Resolution 217, at the Palais Chaillot, in Paris - Bill of Rights which was directly or indirectly adopted by all hundred ninety-three members of the United Nations.

The principle of "politically correct" contradicts the Charter already in its preamble, when it states that "human beings shall enjoy freedom of speech and belief..."; and, even more specifically its Article 18, which states: "Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship and observance"; or the Article 19: "Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers".

Thus, defenders of the "politically correct" deny the highest point of the international law, until now unparalleled in the history of humankind, the result of thousands of years of wars and destruction, of centuries of reflection and the struggle for human freedom and dignity - and contradict ideas of great thinkers, like Nelson Mandela when he said, referring to the United Nations Charter: "To deny people their human rights is to threaten their own humanity".

It is natural that it is not possible to defend "lack of education", the

disrespect towards others or the world in which we live. After all, such "politeness" is at the root of the "human". But while the "good education" and respect are conditions for negative freedom, "politically correct" belongs to the universe of tyranny.

The "politically correct" is often based on the claim that historical truth belongs to specific groups of power. But, this statement pertains to the principle of positive freedom, of tyrants. It is not a universal assumption. It doesn't happen when there is freedom of thought and expression.

The principle according to which history is always written by the winner, told by Hermann Göring - mistakenly attributed to Winston Churchill - is not acceptable. And not allowing history to be written by the winner is the work par excellence of historians and serious journalists. In fact, Göring said during the Nuremberg trials: "The victor will always be the judge and the defeated will always be the accused".

Even Karl Marx said something similar when, in 1873, he said that when a crisis arose, it was not "a question of whether this or that theorem is true, but whether it sounds good or bad, pleasant or not to the police, whether is useful or harmful to the Capital".

That is, the important thing would be the political objective of the statement and not its historical truth because, according to this principle, historical truth could not exist.

As for the quote attributed to Churchill, it did not happen. What happened was one of his famous word games. On the twenty-third of January 1948, in the House of Commons, Churchill said: "For my part, I consider that it will be found much better by all parties to leave the past to History, especially as I propose to write that History myself".

In one way or another, the thought that says about the truth as "written by the winners" has existed long before and has been repeated over the centuries, taking on new forms and always indicating the idea that the truth belongs to the holder of power.

And, again, it is easy to notice that this can only be true where there is no freedom of thought and expression.

In several countries, various political interest groups have been determining words that could or could not be said, with the naive - to say the least - pretension to defend their members, such as the defense of fragile minorities.

But, if these prohibitions apparently were characterized by the noble and praiseworthy objective of protecting people, making them untouchable by offense and humiliation, what they did, in fact, was to eliminate freedom, without which we do not constitute the difference, and with it the conscience.

And it is worth underlining: all societies that were dominated by this type of prohibition, making words and thoughts taboos, inevitably plunged into economic disaster - because economics is language and knowledge.

Another fundamental aspect, which is often hidden by the facts themselves, is peace.

We speak of peace many times automatically, without thinking, without reflecting on its meaning.

We take peace as a lull, associating it with friendship, with love. But, there may not be peace even in times of lull, when friendship and love are present. It is enough to observe everyday life to realize this.

Again, a quick dive into the origins of the word may illuminate the issue.

The word "peace" comes from the Indo-European **pag*, which indicated the idea of a kind of mutual "prison", where one party is "obliged" to the other - from which our expression "pact" also arose.

Peace and pact share common origins.

There is no peace without some kind of "pact", without some kind of agreement that creates strong links of association through which we bond each other in a mutual and voluntary way.

And by its very nature, the pact can only exist if there is respect for truth, transparency, freedom.

Therefore, on any scale we could consider - the life of a couple, the relationship between friends, the daily life of a company, the relationship between people on the streets of a city, commerce, education - truth and transparency are the essential pillars of peace.

Restriction of truth and freedom is the basic condition of war, of conflict.

The pandemic caused by Covid-19 made impossible, at least until the world return to the normality we knew before, the initial program that would characterize the **Observatory for the Future of Humanity**.

So, I decided to create a kind of "channel" on Internet, with free access for everyone, that would disseminate open information about the human, from the arts to the sciences, from medicine to music, from philosophy to technology.

At the same time, I dedicated myself to writing a small book that would serve as a historical milestone for the project and which could turn each person into an observer. That is the origin of the **Bird of Liberty**, this little book dedicated to Marianela Mirpuri.

Both the "channel" on Internet and this book are part of the **Observatory for the Future of Humanity**, which, in turn, is integrated into the **HERA** project, created and directed by Marianela Mirpuri.

This little book is distributed internationally by Amazon. It is also available, free of charge, at academia.edu - a platform for academics from all over the world, with the aim of facilitating the free circulation of research articles and reflection works, as a way to accelerate research and questioning on a planetary scale.

The book consists of two fields - one visual and the other literary.

For this book, I collected one hundred and eighty images relating to the last about five thousand years of History, which were randomly distributed constituting three sets of eighty images each. These images were combined, again using random operations, and generated eighty digital prints - which are a fundamental part of the book, but which can also exist independently of it.

It is about mysterious engravings, with information sometimes hidden, non-verbal, to be discovered by the reader. The complexity of the montages makes the discovery not evident, reflecting the mental structure of each person.

They are invitations for discovery and reflection.

Then, in a totally independent operation, I plunged into my library and searched - somewhat randomly - for works by different authors that covered about three thousand years of History. They were my books, which have been with me since I was a teenager.

I opened them also a little at random and copied what I had underlined in the course of the past fifty years or so. Phrases, thoughts of the most diverse authors. I collected one hundred and sixty fragments.

They are fragments that establish, in a certain sense, a deep connection with my soul, with some of the ideas that have formed it over the years.

There is perhaps just one exception, to Carl Sagan's thoughts, which I took from his TV programs which I saw when I was young.

Therefore, they are much more than a simple collection of quotes.

These thoughts were distributed, also at random, on the pages opposite to the engravings. The sizes of the letters were also determined by chance.

Then I collected eighty taboo-words, that is, eighty "politically incorrect" words, prohibited ones.

The distribution on the pages was also done at random, without any kind of intention.

Now, when we read the texts, time to time we notice the emergence of a strange network of relations between the ideas, and between them and those taboo-words. Words that reinforce or deny statements, making us question what we read.

Such a strangeness, which is sometimes also present between sentences, but which emerges more particularly with the taboo-words, reveals us not only the absurdity of their prohibition but also the nature of the use that is sometimes made of certain expressions, intentionally, contradicting and denying their historical significance.

In respect to the integrity of the authors I have not changed a single word. For example, when an author writes "man" to designate "human being", I kept the original form.

We therefore deal with two coherent sides of a same coin. If, on one hand, the prohibition of certain words limits our freedom and distorts the truth, denying historical facts; on the other, the intentional misuse of other words - giving, for example, adjectives of libertarians to totalitarian tyrants - intensifies the historical distortion.

We are experiencing a phenomenon that seems to consolidate the idea of the end of History - not the Hegelian idea advocated by Francis Fukuyama, but the end of History produced by super information, as I have written since the 1980s.

Here, this little book, reveals itself as a kind of oracle without questions or answers. A mysterious oracle of the *zeitgeist* where, in the tangled labyrinth of information, each one reads himself, what he or she knows, designing a continuous revelation.

The word "oracle" indicated the process of magical revelation in response to a question.

However, now there are no more specific questions or answers, but the free observation of what each one of us are while culture, while civilization.

Something that brings us closer to the conception of time that the ancient Greeks called *kairos* - as if we were on a spaceship, admiring our small planet.

Therefore, the book can be read as desired. You can open at random, follow a diachronic line or establish any type of path. The order, then, is that of the reader and of the moment.

The **Observatory for the Future of Humanity** was thought for the world. Therefore, from its beginning, English was established as the official language.

The choice of English as the official language is not a disrespect to Portugal. On the contrary, the **Observatory for the Future of Humanity** is a project that, like the fabulous Discoveries made five centuries before, but in an inverted way, expands from Portugal to the world, taking all people, each one of us, as critical observers.

As the philosopher Agostinho da Silva liked to affirm, Portugal represented the planetary maritime expansion from the 15th century onwards; now, five centuries later, the country becomes, once again, the interface of the world - this time being a singularity that, like a pulsar, expands again, but in a different sense, while ideas and free-thinking.

But, there is still one more idea about this project.

Most children believe that their parents are brilliant, genius. This is because it is the reality.

On the other hand, it is also true that there are children who never really get to know their parents and, of course, there are exceptions of parents who are not geniuses. But they are exceptions, most people are brilliant.

Children more easily believe in their parents' genius not because they are less capable than them. Parents have more repertoire, it is a fact, but children are more open and faster. They believe this because they are closer to them and are intelligent to notice it. Over time, gradually, we are closing ourselves in the routines of our lives, slowly erasing for the human and for the world.

If we were able to get to know people more deeply, we would surely fall in love much more throughout our lives.

Each human being is a fabulous universe.

Carl Sagan said that "the surface of the Earth is the shore of the cosmic ocean. On this shore, we've learned most of what we know. Recently, we've waded a little way out, maybe ankle-deep, and the water seems inviting. Some part of our being knows this is where we came from. We long to return, and we can, because the Cosmos is also within us. We're made of star stuff. We are a way for the Cosmos to know itself" (...) "The nitrogen in our DNA, the calcium in our teeth, the iron in our blood, the carbon in our apple pies were made in the interiors of collapsing stars. We are made of star stuff".

In 2019, a team at the Queen Mary University of London reported to have detected the presence of glycilonitrile in a solar-type protostar known as

IRAS16293-2422 B, about 450 light-years from Earth. Such substance is a pre-biotic molecule which existed before the emergence of life.

Seeming to evidence Sagan's ideas, this research was carried out with success also at four other institutions: the Centro de Astrobiología in Spain, INAF-Osservatorio Astrofisico di Arcetri in Italy, the European Southern Observatory, and the Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics in the United States.

As Carl Sagan said, the Cosmos is within us. The human is the most important thing in our lives.

When we get to know each other better, understand the human's design better, when most of us will be able to design their own limits, all major social and environmental conflicts will be automatically resolved.

Emanuel Dimas de Melo Pimenta

Cascais 2020