

FAQ:

1) Extinction is impossible !

It's not impossible it's just a matter of optimizing and causing the best extinction possible i.e as vast as possible as thorough as possible and as peaceful as possible. It's a matter of engineering and science. We as a society have the methods already to cause extinction on earth it's just a matter of engineering but a cosmic level a even more far reaching extinction is a question of science. If there is a disease like HIV and some scientist is working on a cure it's just absurd to tell them "It doesn't exist so stop working on it". They are working on it to make it exist.

But what is really impossible ? Solving suffering without non existence. What is really unacceptable? Child rapes and predations happening inevitably again and again pointlessly. So the only question now is how to make non existence possible how to make peace possible and how to be optimal at that without discrimination.

Besides what else is there ? You can either do meaningless stuff enjoy life join the pro life gang and shamelessly defend suffering. Or you can participate in the only meaningful movement which aims to end all the otherwise inevitable sufferings like child rape, predation, starvation, animal torture, cancer etc.

2) What about consent ?

If you are really someone who cares about consent then you should know life violates consent of animals. Keeps violating it we don't consent to be born.... Just imagine if you ask a puppy before it's born giving some information that it's gonna be tortured by a sadist for days and killed would the puppy consent to be born ? No ! But we are forced into this existence when we are born.

And when we die do we consent to it ? Why do old people run to hospitals ? Why does a starving baby move towards food ? Nobody consents to natural death. So is it valid to use consent as an argument to keep this literal consent violation machine called life running ?

Life keeps violating consent and extinction ends it.

Another thing is consent directly anchored to intellectual capability. If you cut off the limbs of an animal it still tries to move and survive it still is afraid of death. But you are a human who is aware. You can anticipate future the animal is gonna suffer more so you should euthanize the animal. Babies don't consent to bath so what giving bath to a crying baby is violation of consent ? You have the intellectual capability to know what's the greater good you take a decision.

The consent is not yours to give in the first place. It's like I don't consent to slaves being freed. And even some slaves do consent to being slaves they cannot say others should too.

3) What about optimism ?

Optimism is bad and so is pessimism. Realism is the best way of thinking because it's realism ! You can't argue against it.

We have a nature given tendency to look at the bright side. We say stuff like “use suffering as a teacher” but stop and think ! What does a child in child porn industry have to learn from their suffering ? What does a chicken who spend entire life in a battery cage have to learn ? What did a baby zebra who just got born and got eaten by hyenas learn ? That's just some motivational BS we tell our selves.

4) Wouldn't things get better ? Look at where we are from 100 years !

No they wouldn't ! This is not pessimism this is law of nature. The weak suffer and the strong survive. It always will be.

Either the zebra gets ripped apart or the lion starves that's the basic rule here. The basic design

Things are better from 100 years ago for certain humans ! Who are the strong and we live by oppressing the weak ! Like for example what have we done in 100 years ? Enslave 70 billion farmed animals torture and kill them and we have made a great corporate business out of exploiting reproductive organs of animals producing milk and eggs. We are kind of the strongest lion in the jungle the fastest cheetah who never knew suffering because we can make the rest suffer for ourselves to be happy.

And even if you look at human sufferings we have invented new sufferings ! Sure child abuse happend in this world before ! Now we have a camera to shoot it and internet to post it and sell it for bitcoins ! That child abuse wasn't a criminal industry before ! Now it is ! Suffering just changes forms you prevent starvation next problem is obesity. You stop wars using heavy artillery the next problem is a virus which you won't even know was an activist of war. There is no stopping suffering without extinction.

5) What about God and his plans ?

People workshop god form religions and even dedicate their entire lives to God ! But if I were god I wouldn't create a world where animals have to kill each other to live ! I wouldn't put a pedophile and a child in the same world ! I wouldn't give man the free will to comit enslavement or genocide ! Any intelligent being doesn't have the necessity to do so ! Also magic doesn't exist ! Before we invented microscopes we called jaundice as a “yellow demon” but they don't exist !

What sort of a grand plan cancel justify one child rape ?! Nothing !

6) People will never agree to this !

They may not unless intelligence and ethics keep evolving ! If they don't the entire societal growth itself is a dead end that's another issue ! But for now there are clear signs of improvement in rationality and ethics..... 200 years ago writing and atheist book would land

you in the guillotine.... But now they are best sellers. World is even starting to give moral consideration to animals moving to 21st century. Because as long as there is suffering empathys will keep fighting against it ! And ultimately they have to realise the only way to eradicate suffering is extinction and they will realise how pointless but extreme an event like a child rape or animals abuse it and how inevitable.

Someone who doesn't agree to this what they are essentially agree with is extreme sufferings like child rape and animal torture and predation continuing forever !

Anyways an activist should never think "will it people agree to it" if you decide something is wrong you should only keep thinking about how to make it happen until it does !

7) What about life's meaning ? What about the purpose !

What meaning ? What purpose ? Because whatever you think of it can be easily broken down by pointing at a random suffering in this world ! Whatever grand purpose you think humans have can it justify boiling puppies alive ?

You are just born, you go to school, a job, get married and have kids force them to do the same and die ! That's what we have done all along ! And you just kid yourself that you are doing something meaningful ! Whatever you did is nothing compared to the abolish suffering agenda ! Because ultimately whatever you did cannot justify the existence. Cannot justify 1 child rape !

8) Why do you interfere in nature ?

The question is why are you a hypocrite? Building civilizations, laws, inventing farming, guns and living completely protected from nature's harsh weather, predators, famine etc is fine because it's humans ! But wild animals can rot in nature's hell because well they are animals? Whether something happens to you or not suffering is suffering ! The zebra's and hyenes don't deserve to take part in the pointless cycle of being hunted and starved for millions of years !

Nature doesn't feel anything! But the victims wild animals do ! Causing suffering to the sentient beings in the name of something that is not sentient is not different from what religious terrorists do ! Nature worship = religious terrorism!

9) Extinctionism is your opinion !

Extinctionism is just facts:

- 1) All suffering is bad and suffering is the only bad. And extreme sufferings exist.
- 2) Suffering is inevitable as long as sentient beings exist.
- 3) Suffering cannot be justified with pleasures..... Extreme inevitable sufferings like kidnapping and raping children, or getting torn apart alive or starving or being tortured cannot be justified by an orgasm or playing a video game or any other good things or pleasures.
- 4) Only non existence can guarantee 0 suffering.

These are not opinions they are facts they are the very nature of our existence like the sun and the moon !

10) Do extinctionists support individual sterilization or euthanasia ? Like for example dog euthanasia or sterilization.

No we don't and there is a good reason for that. If we euthanize a dog there is gonna be one more dog replacing it ! Why because the population of beings are dependent on resources like availability of food water etc.... If there are 10 dogs in an area that means there are resources for 10 dogs. If you euthanize one of them another dog which was supposed to die young just gets some space and survives and suffers for more days and dies. Same goes for sterilization. Sterilize one and the others reproduce in place of that one.

11) What about species extinction ?

Let's say naturally or artificially all the dogs go extinct then are replaced by cats or squirrels.... Cats are sentient too.... The suffering just transferred species which doesn't make it less worse ! White rhinos are extinct but black rhinos took their place ! What changed really ? Only skin colour.

12) Do you support not reproducing/ anti-natalism ?

The problem with anti natalism is it's completely useless:

- 1) Not everyone is gonna be convinced of one singular ideology even 10000 years later there will be some theists clinging around some people believing racism some people reproducing. Voluntary movements are self defeating.
- 2) They don't consider animals and are racists themselves.
- 3) Being an anti natalist means more suffering because humans consume more resources than animals. We need cars, houses furnitures etc etc which requires fuel, mining, water, land etc. If human population is less wild animals population replaced and takes our resources (and more in number) probably a 100000 wild animals can live in the amount of resources I consume.... And they are gonna suffer from nature.
- 4) We need to reproduce till we cause the most vast and thorough extinction possible. Yes reproducing is evil but 99.9 percent sufferers are animals. And allowing them to suffer and not searching for a more vast solution means allowing greater evil.

11b) Does that mean killing someone is alright ?

Extinctionism is against any action of violence especially individual acts of violence. It infact increased suffering. Just going into a forest and killing a deer means they just reproduce and create one more deer because population of beings depend on resources. You kill a human he is replaced with another human or wild animals the resources goes to another individual that's gonna suffer. And killing this individual also caused suffering and pain to this individual and the beings around because of emotional trauma. So this increases suffering. Only total extinction makes sense.

Another thing is that this is a project that's supposed to end all harm all deaths and all suffering forever. We need a functional capable society to accomplish and achieve success in the project. Things like murder and killing will destabilize the society and will push the project away in time.

13) Do you support suicide ?

Everyone capable of helping others have a moral obligation to do so. Suffering is bad not just for you. Whether suffering happens in my body or another child's body or a dog's body it's bad and deserves to be stopped !

We don't oppose right to die for people who are unable to help like people with physical disability, mental disability etc.

Why is it our moral obligation? Because we are the only species that can help others ! No other species can.

14) Morality is subjective.... Everyone can have their opinions.

Another self defeating concept. Subjectivists are hypocrites. They believe morality is fake... right up until someone hurts them then suddenly, they believe in "Rights," "Justice," and "Fairness" very strongly.

Morality is subjective ? Really how can moral subjectivists use determinism as a excuse for that. If you be like that even moral subjectivity is subjective and since christians and muslims are majority morality is objective. I mean everyone believing slavery is okay doesn't make it okay.... It's always wrong just some dumb animals exist that dont see it yet. Earth wasn't flat in 500 BC dumb animals didn't have that much science. Christianity and islam doesn't make god real. They are just rationally blind. Same way a person who supports slavery is ethically blind.

The Tribe: "Only my family matters." (Factually wrong: Other families feel pain too).

The Nation: "Only my race matters." (Factually wrong: Other races feel pain too).

The Species: "Only humans matter." (Factually wrong: Animals feel pain too).

The Sentience: "Only beings that can suffer matter." (Factually Correct).

If morality is a subject that deals with good and bad. We clearly know suffering is bad and deserves to be stopped whether others believe in it or not it's a fact. Even if people don't exist and a planet just have some foxes and rabbits in a perpetual cycle of killing each other or starving still the fact remains that suffering undeserved and pointless just there is no one to act on it.

15a) Can technology solve suffering ?

No it can't. The example of internet: We invented it to solve suffering. And it did ! Farmers can now get access to guides for free, animal activists have a platform to speak up and spread ethics faster, people can get jobs easier. But at the same time child porn exists in the same internet ! Yeah child abuse happened before but it wasn't a criminal industry before ! So technologies while they solve some suffering they cause new sufferings too.... We end up with new problems. Suffering just changes forms and is never solved until sentience exists.

15b) What about transhumanism? Technological optimism ?

Transhumanists who say we can just "remove suffering genes" or "upload our brains into a computer" they can be debunked by known logic and science.

- 1) Removing suffering genes is not a technological unknown or an engineering problem. It's a systems biology impossibility. Suffering is not just physical pain. We have pain, anxiety, depression, anger, boredom, fear, sadness and countless other emotional distress and mental disorders. These involve millions of cells, neuro transmitters, hormones and enzymes which are interconnected in trillions of ways in other conscious and unconscious processes. Removing just one of these have catastrophic effects.... But to remove all just means you become a plant. Suffering is woven into sentience itself. People who are born with genetic disorders which makes them immune to physical pain is often quoted by transhumanists. But there are cases where babies scratched their own eye to a point where it has to be amputated. Then when they are grown up they cry about it what is it if not suffering ?
- 2) There are several other logical flaws like how do you pick up each and every organism and deliver personalized suffering removal medicine to them ? (Such a thing doesn't exist and never will). If you make vegetarian lions aren't you just making goats with extra steps ? If you make designer babies who don't feel suffering (again not possible unless they are plants) where will all the natural babies go ? If you want to make them extinct why reject extinctionism and make pointless designer babies that could potentially suffer ? If you upload your brain into a computer and die you are just dead and AI just operates your memories pointlessly.

Transhumanist world doesn't even exist in imagination. Just imagine your wife is being raped but she laughs because she can't suffer and you walk in on this event and laugh because you can't suffer either that's some dark humour.

15c) Isn't extinctionism also technological optimism ?

Eradicating suffering with technology can be debunked with current known science and the most vast and thorough extinction possible just comes under the unknown science. It's a practical project not an arrogant false claim. Extinctionists won't be like oh that's possible no that's not possible. Instead we just want to research the unknown physics see what's the most vast and thorough extinction possible. It's a matter of engineering and research not a delusion.

16) Life is meaningful.

Whatever meaning you can bring I can debunk with one extreme inevitable suffering. What is meaning ? Is there a grand purpose ? Can you name a grand purpose that can justify one child rape much less ten thousands that happen a day ? Is being an astronaut enough to justify puppies being tortured ? Animals being dragged for kilometers in cars by people who have sadism mental disorder ? What meaning can justify these ?

Being a fire fighter is only meaningful because burning alive exists. It doesn't have to.... Nobody has to keep burning alive for me to keep saving. Prevention is the best medicine.

What are we doing really ? We are born we go to school then job then reproduce and force our kids to do the same before we die and delude ourselves with stuff like meaning. If you look at animal lives pointlessness should be even more obvious. A pig just spent its entire life in a battery cage raped and assaulted just so that it could be murdered and end up in your plate for a 20 minute meal which you probably didn't even give a thought about. A new born zebra gets ripped apart alive by starving hyenas didn't know why it was born didn't know why this happened to it. What great purpose ? Right ?

Whatever meaning you can think of now or in future can be easily debunked by sufferings. Eradicating sufferings is the only meaning you have in a pointless existence full of suffering.

17) What about an after life ?

After life is a stupid unscientific concept. Science has already proved that you are a body operated by your brain. If your brain dies you die. Those cells rot. Just like files in a damaged pen drive doesn't have an after drive. If it does the burden of proof falls on you. Science doesn't have to disprove the 1000s of claims irrational people keep. Science doesn't have to disprove that miniature worlds exists in protons and electrons of atoms. It doesn't have to disprove spaghetti monster. It doesn't even have to add a rule saying that spaghetti monster is not scientifically allowed that would be funny. You have to understand science and be rational. Just like having a deep sleep doesn't require an after sleep life death doesn't either. It's just nothingness.

The thought of after life comes when you are fear of nothingness. People imagine a dark lonely void where you are suspended forever alone with your thoughts. But that's not the case. You experience nothingness everyday when you have deep dreamless sleep. You aren't lonely infact that's the only time you don't have to think about your depression or job stress or your breakups.

18) We shouldn't interfere with nature.

You already did. You exited nature starting from 10000 bc or even before. You made clothes and blankets and shelters to protect yourself from the cold. You build guns to protect yourself from predators. You built civilizations and societies to protect yourself from infighting and rape. You invented technologies to even avoid the slightest discomforts caused by nature.

But imagine wild animals ! Abandoning their own children because they are slow (humans did it too in nature). Getting raped, torn apart alive. Starving and dehydrated in hot deserts, freezing and drowning in cold ice lakes !

If you are suffering it's okay to interfere in nature. If wild animals are then it's okay ! This isn't an argument it's a hypocrisy it's bigotry. Suffering is suffering.

Appeal to nature fallacy becomes very real when it comes to rapeists and sadists too. A rapist can claim it's natural. An animal abuser can claim it's natural. It's perfectly natural for someone to come into your home beat you up rape your wife and steal everything. That doesn't make it moral.

We have ability to think. Think ! Nature is just a set of laws by which the existence works. It's not a sentient suffering being to deserve moral consideration only sentient beings are.

19) But what about the “good” people who have good lives who want to exist ?

In other words privileged pro life who oppose extinction ! Are they really good ? These are the people that allow suffering ! They want thousands of children to get raped everyday. These are the same people who wouldn't care about puppies being tortured on a daily basis. Because they want pleasure these people are comparable to sadists who derive pleasure out of suffering.

This is the ultimate evil we are fighting but pro lifers will claim that they are not responsible for a child rape they aren't causing. I'll debunk this with an example. Someone is beating a kid up on the road (child abuse). You walk by and don't stop him or even call the police. Now this suffering happend because of two reasons the abuser did it and because you didn't stop it ! Inaction is also an action. You chose not to act so that suffering happend. And the sufferer doesn't care why his sufferings happend. He didn't want it. Only the victims perspective matters when it comes to suffering. You did the same thing as the abuser. Your hands aren't bloody the same way Hitler's hand isn't.

Same way if you get all the knowledge of inevitable extreme sufferings and still oppose extinction it means you want trillions of animals abused, 1000s of children raped, quintillions suffer in nature's hell for your pleasures that clearly dont justify these. You are the very form of immortality you are the selfishness the movement is fighting. You aren't good. You are more evil than any tyrant or genocide maniac in history. These pro lifers are standing in the doorway to a burning building blocking exit and saying “burning alive is beautiful” they need to be rammed through.

20) What about the good ? The pleasures ?

Name one thing in this world that can justify torturing a puppy to death ? Raping a little child ? Or starvation ? Or getting baby animals eaten alive by ants ?

Can video games justify starvation ? Can sex justify child porn ? There is a huge obvious astmety here you are just not willing to look.



No amount of pleasures can justify any of the inevitable horrors on existence.

21) What if life comes back ?

This is a valid question only if extinction is natural. What if life bounces back after an asteroid hit or extreme climate change ? But the entire point of the peaceful extinction project is to be as thorough as possible. What if life comes back ? Well we are causing extinction it's our responsibility to make sure it doesn't. Whether we place an AI to continuously monitor the situation or we discover something like vacuum decay it's up to AGI and future extinctionists. Science is not at a point to answer what the "as thorough as possible" is.

Simply the answer is you have to make sure it doesn't.

22) What if we just reduce suffering ?

That's a shameful passive statement to say. If 10 children are getting raped and if you reduce it to just one child in a pedophile's basement. That's still one child in hell ! You are saying just let one child get raped so that rest of us can enjoy while you have an option to have 0 child rape.

And throughout history one thing is clear suffering has just changed forms has never definitely reduced. It has only increased with population. Maybe you solve all wars tomorrow the next problem is bio engineered weapons that you won't even know are acts of war ! You solve starvation next problem is obesity ! You invent guns, criminals get them too ! You invent internet you have a dark web on your hands !

It's really shameful to say let one cat be ground alive in a blender for me existing. Who are you to decide how much sufferers should exist ?

23) Extinction is accepting defeat ! We should strive for a better world !

I'll put it simply. Utopia is impossible! It's an optimistically biased delusion. Just think about a few questions. Can you solve crimes ever ? Can you solve accidents ever ? Can you solve predation ever ? Can you solve diseases ever ? Can you solve disasters ever ? Can you solve rapes ever ? Can you solve animal abuse ever ? Can you solve starvation ever ? The answer is no.

Game theory and probability theory and other science and mathematics can debunk you if you say yes. History can debunk you.

24) Extinction is an extreme overreaction. If you stub your toe would you amputate your leg ?

If stubbing your toe once in a while was the only inevitable problem in existence I probably wouldn't be an extinctionist. The problems are so extreme ! Beings burning alive ! Innocent children raped ! Predators ripping apart a pregnant prey who is alive and eating the fetus because it's starving ! These sufferings happen in trillions every day ! They are inevitable !

The correct analogy would be your foot being infected beyond repair ! Yes the answer is amputation!

Life is extreme. Extinction ends it !

25) What about will to live ?

Yes will to live does matter ! Fear of death is a huge suffering ! Which life violates !

Animals don't consent to natural death either. But what these animals are gonna do is keep reproducing and so that life keeps violating the will to live of next generations again and again. Who is worse ? Extinction (the death ender) or life (perpetual suffering and death machine).

Life is not so black and white sometimes you might have to cause some suffering in order to solve greater suffering. It's basic trolley problem. Letting the greater evil happen is well greater evil !

26) Are you extinctionist because you are depressed ?

Me the author writing this is not depressed I just speak for the depressed and other victims ! But what if some extinctionists are ? Depressed people's opinions don't matter ? They shouldn't have voting rights ?

They are the direct victims of the existence and have every right to speak up. They would only be wrong if they say I'm depressed help me alone ! If they are considering every other being it's not out of their depression it's out of empathy. And them (who are badly suffering) standing up for others selflessly is commendable.

27) What about rights based ethics ? Would you rape and unconscious woman ?

Rights itself is a concept that came into existence to combat suffering. Rights is a tool just like euthanasia. But it fails because natural sufferings dominate this world. Why people thought black people needed rights ? It's because they saw them suffering. Why do you think animals need rights ? Because staying in a cage is suffering.

Would you rape an unconscious woman ? Hah she doesn't suffer but rights is the one thing stopping you ! This is a completely shit analogy. What about a banana stem ? If I rape it would you call me rapist ? You probably will say I'm a clown but would never say I'm a rapist. So what is the difference? Why not plant rights ? Plant bodily autonomy? The difference is the woman is sentient i.e can suffer. Potential suffering is also bad not just suffering.. The suffering or uncomfortable feeling caused to you imagining this analogy with a fellow sentient human being is also bad. The suffering it causes me knowing that woman is a sentient being is also bad.

28) What if extinction is painful ?

Nothing is more painful than life.

