

What future does Yuval Noah Harari, one of the most famous modern thinkers, predict for us?

Audrius Ožalas, deputy editor-in-chief of the portal 15 min., published an interview with Yuval Noah Harari* in February 2025.

“A large part of the suffering in the world is caused by the pursuit of meaning” “If you truly know the truth about yourself and the world, nothing can make you unhappy,” says the famous Israeli historian, visionary, and writer **Yuval Noah Harari**. In his latest research, he turns his attention to artificial intelligence and warns about it. What will happen to humanity when artificial intelligence starts making decisions for us and creating new things, from new medicines to new weapons, from new religious texts to new types of money? – asks the author, giving an exclusive interview to **“Penkiolikai”**.



Yuval Noah Harari

We coordinated the interview with Y. N. Harari for a long time. Initially, the plan was to meet in Israel. Later, his representative wrote that we could perhaps meet with the writer in London. And in the end, the conversation took place via electronic networks – in fact, this is not at all surprising considering the essential topic of this conversation – artificial intelligence, digital networks, which are increasingly invading our lives. There is nothing

surprising about Y. N. Harari's own schedule – he is one of the most sought-after, valued authors of books in the world. At the Frankfurt Book Fair, I had the opportunity to see him speaking to packed halls and constantly in the spotlight. Y. N. Harari's book "Sapiens", which has gained immense popularity, has turned him into an almost visionary, speaking not only about our, humanity's, past, but also outlining guidelines for what may await us in the future. His latest book, Nexus (published in Lithuanian by Kitos knygos, translated by Elena Belskytė), is dedicated to artificial intelligence and the author's warnings that with its uncontrolled development, we are entering a stage when computers may no longer need humanity.

In this conversation, we examined what is changing with the development of artificial intelligence, how it can be used not only for progress, but also for increasing control, how it differs from all other technologies. Of course, primarily when thinking about humans. About why they are so self-destructive and why they do not learn from past mistakes. And do we have any meaning on this Earth?

- Already in the book Homo Deus, you warned that new technologies can take away our power. What happened in the 8 years after the book was published? What made you worry about it so much that you devoted an entire new book to new technologies?

– Over the past eight years, artificial intelligence has developed much faster than we expected, and now humanity is in danger of losing control of this technology. Artificial intelligence has enormous positive potential. It can help create the best healthcare system in history and help avoid ecological collapse. But it is also very dangerous. Artificial intelligence is the most powerful technology ever created by humanity, because it is the first technology that can make its own decisions and generate new ideas on its own. An atomic bomb cannot decide what to attack, nor can it invent new bombs or new military strategies. Meanwhile, artificial intelligence can decide for itself whether to attack a specific target, can invent new bombs, new strategies and even new artificial intelligences. The most important thing to know about artificial intelligence is that it is not just a tool in our hands – it acts independently, doing things that we did not expect. What will happen to humanity when millions of non-human forces start making decisions for us and creating new things – from new medicines to new weapons, from new religious texts to new types of money?

But my new book is not just about artificial intelligence. Nexus traces the history of information networks, starting from the Stone Age. I wanted to provide a

historical perspective on the AI revolution, after examining the impact of previous information revolutions.

For example, how the invention of the book led to the emergence of the Bible and Christianity. How the invention of printing sparked a wave of conspiracy theories, witch hunts, and religious wars in 16th-century Europe. And how the Soviets used modern information technology to create their own secret police. The book examines the interaction between information technology and people. AI experts often have difficulty assessing how new technology will affect things like religion, culture, and politics.

“Computer experts tend to take a naive view of history.”

When the Internet came along, tech giants promised that it would spread truth and freedom, bring down dictators, and strengthen democracy. That didn't happen. Today we have the most advanced information technology in history, but people are losing their ability to communicate with each other. Democracies around the world are being undermined. A knowledge of history can help us understand why this is the case. Computer experts tend to have a naive view of history.

– One of the main things that worries you, as you mentioned, is that this is the first technology in history that can make its own decisions and learn to exploit us. We see that the process is happening very quickly. How much time do you think we still have?

– We don't know. Artificial intelligence is developing much faster than expected. We are used to organic evolution, which is relatively slow. From single-celled organisms like amoebas to multi-celled organisms like dinosaurs and humans, it took several billion years. But digital evolution is millions of times faster. Previously, experts thought that artificial intelligence would never master human language. Now ChatGPT is able to create texts better than the average person. It understands language perfectly. It understands the semantic field of words better than most people. It can also build arguments, logically connecting one sentence to another. And ChatGPT is still a very primitive artificial intelligence. It is likely that artificial intelligence will be improved for thousands or even millions of years. If ChatGPT is an amoeba, what do you think an artificial intelligence Tyrannosaurus Rex would look like?

And we are only accelerating the artificial intelligence race because everyone is afraid of falling behind. For example, in warfare, artificial intelligence is increasingly used to control weapons systems, say, drones, as well as to select

targets. How far are we from fully autonomous drones that decide what to attack themselves? Such technologies could determine the course of the war in Ukraine, and neither side wants to be left behind.

– Although you yourself are critical of artificial intelligence, there are quite a few scientists who argue that it can bring great benefits to humanity. You yourself quote Marc Andreessen. Where does this belief come from, and what fundamental mistake do you think they are making?

– I completely agree with people like Andreessen that artificial intelligence can bring enormous benefits to humanity. The problem is that AI enthusiasts only look at the potential benefits and underestimate the risks. Let's compare AI to an earlier great technological revolution—the Industrial Revolution of the 19th and 20th centuries. Industrial technologies like steam engines and telegraphs brought us enormous benefits. But they changed all our social, economic, and political structures, and no one was sure how to create good industrial societies. So people experimented, and some of these experiments had terrible consequences.

“Will we have to go through another cycle of global empires, totalitarian regimes, and world wars to figure out how to use AI without doing harm?”

One of the most costly experiments in the construction of an industrial society was modern imperialism. Imperialist thinkers, politicians, and parties argued that the only viable industrial society was an empire. The argument was that, unlike traditional agrarian societies, the new industrial societies were much more dependent on foreign markets and foreign raw materials, and only empire could satisfy these unprecedented appetites. Imperialists feared that industrialized countries that had not conquered colonies would be cut off from access to essential raw materials and markets by more ruthless competitors. Some imperialists argued that acquiring colonies was not only essential for their own survival but also beneficial to the rest of humanity. They argued that only empires could spread the benefits of new technologies to the so-called underdeveloped world. As a result, industrial countries such as Britain and Russia, which already had empires, expanded them greatly, while countries such as Italy and Japan set about creating them. Equipped with mass-produced guns and artillery, powered by steam and controlled by telegraph, industrial armies conquered much of the world. Industrial empires oppressed and exploited hundreds of millions of native people. It took more than a century of suffering for most people to realize that industrial empires were a terrible idea and that there were better ways to build an industrial society and secure the raw materials and

markets it needed. Stalinism and Nazism were also costly experiments in building industrial societies. Leaders such as Stalin and Hitler argued that the Industrial Revolution had unleashed enormous powers that only totalitarianism could control and fully exploit. They cited World War I—the first “total war” in history—as proof that survival in the industrial world required totalitarian control of all aspects of politics, society, and the economy. They also argued that the Industrial Revolution had dismantled all previous unjust social structures and made it possible to create new, perfect societies. In creating a perfect industrial society, the Stalinists and Nazis learned to industrially kill millions of people. Trains, barbed wire, and telegraphed orders were used to create an unprecedented killing machine. Looking back, most people today are horrified by what the Stalinists and Nazis accomplished, but at the time their bold visions mesmerized millions. In 1940, it was easy to believe that Stalin and Hitler were making exemplary use of industrial technology, while the hesitant liberal democracies were on their way to the dustbin of history. The mere existence of competing recipes for building an industrial society led to costly conflicts. Both the World Wars and the Cold War can be seen as debates about how to do this properly, with all sides learning from each other while experimenting with new industrial methods of warfare. During these debates, tens of millions of people died, and humanity came dangerously close to self-destruction. The Industrial Revolution, among other catastrophes, also disrupted the world’s ecological balance and caused a wave of extinctions. The survival of human civilization was also threatened. We are still unable to create an industrial society that is ecologically sustainable. If it was so difficult for humanity to master steam power and the telegraph, how much would it cost to master artificial intelligence? Will we have to go through another cycle of global empires, totalitarian regimes, and world wars to figure out how to use artificial intelligence without causing harm?

“Dictatorships are much more vulnerable to algorithms than democracies.”

– How does technology affect politics, culture? You say that new inventions threaten democracy, but in essence they pose an even greater threat to totalitarian regimes.

– In a sense, artificial intelligence threatens democracies and is a tool of dictators. By spreading anger, fake news and conspiracy theories, algorithms undermine democratic discourse. Algorithms allow the creation of the first total surveillance regimes, in which the entire population is monitored 24 hours a day. Most importantly, artificial intelligence facilitates the concentration of all information and power in a single center. In the 20th century, distributed

information networks, such as those in the United States, worked better than centralized information networks, such as those in the Soviet Union, because the “apparatchiks” in a single center simply could not effectively analyze all the information. Replacing the “apparatchiks” with artificial intelligence could make Soviet-style centralized networks superior. However, artificial intelligence does not only mean good knowledge for dictators. First, there is the problem of control. Dictatorial control is based on terror, but algorithms cannot be terrorized. In Russia, the invasion of Ukraine is officially defined as a “special military operation,” and calling it a “war” is a crime punishable by up to three years in prison. If a chatbot on the Russian Internet calls it a “war” or mentions war crimes committed by Russian soldiers, how can the regime punish that chatbot? The government could block it and seek to punish its human creators, but that is much harder than disciplining human users. Moreover, authorized bots can develop a different opinion on their own simply by noticing patterns in the Russian information space. Given the ability of artificial intelligence to learn and change, how can Putin’s engineers ensure that their AI never develops different views?

"Modern societies, like ancient societies, fall prey to conspiracy theories and mass illusions."

The Russian Constitution makes sweeping promises that "everyone is guaranteed freedom of thought and speech" (Article 29, paragraph 1) and that "censorship is prohibited" (Article 29, paragraph 5). It is unlikely that any Russian citizen is naive enough to take these promises seriously. But bots do not understand ambiguous language. A chatbot, instructed to adhere to Russian laws and values, can read the Constitution, conclude that freedom of speech is a fundamental Russian value, and criticize the Putin regime for violating this value. How could Russian engineers explain to a chatbot that while the Constitution guarantees freedom of speech, the chatbot should not actually believe in the Constitution and should never hint at the gap between theory and reality?

In the long run, authoritarian regimes could face an even greater threat: instead of criticizing them, artificial intelligence could start to control them. History shows that the greatest threat to autocrats has usually been their own subjects. No Roman emperor or Soviet prime minister was overthrown by a democratic revolution, but they have always been at risk of being overthrown or turned into puppets by their own subjects. If an autocrat in the 21st century gives artificial intelligence too much power, that autocrat could become its puppet. The last thing a dictator wants to do is create something more powerful than themselves that they cannot control. Dictatorships are much more vulnerable to algorithms

than democracies. Even a super-Machiavellian artificial intelligence would have difficulty amassing power in a decentralized democratic system like the United States. Even if an artificial intelligence were to learn to manipulate the US president, it would face resistance from Congress, the Supreme Court, state governors, the media, large corporations, and various non-governmental organizations. In a highly centralized system, it is much easier to seize power. In order to take control of an authoritarian network, an artificial intelligence only needs to manipulate one paranoid person.

- Don't you think that the assessment of these technologies is partly related to the constant pessimism of humanity towards the advent of new technologies. In the 16th century, with the advent of printing technology, there were also many critics. Speaking of later times, let's remember that H. D. Thoreau, who wrote about the telegraph in his work "Walden, or Life in the Woods", said that our inventions are often just beautiful toys, perfect means to achieve imperfect goals. This was back in 1854. The same was true of many other means of communication. How is artificial intelligence different from others?

– Humanity is not only pessimistic about new technologies. Many people, especially businessmen and investors, are extremely optimistic. People like Elon Musk and Mark Zuckerberg are spending billions of dollars to realize their technological dreams. Artists like H. D. Thoreau don't have those resources. That's why it's the job of philosophers and historians to warn the public about the dangers of new technologies. "

"I hope people will read my books more as books of questions than as books of answers."

As I said earlier, we're not denying the potential benefits of technology. We're just urging caution, because there are potential dangers. Take the printing press, for example. Yes, it helped people like Copernicus spread scientific ideas. But very few people bought Copernicus's book. In 15th and 16th century Europe, the biggest bestsellers were religious treatises and witch-hunt manuals. In early modern Europe, printing presses fueled religious wars and witch hunts. Historians familiar with the history of printing were not surprised when social media fueled the spread of fake news and conspiracy theories and undermined trust in science.

– ***I really liked your statement that "if we sapiens are so wise, why are we so self-destructive?" Is this self-destructiveness encoded in our nature? And do***

you think people understand the meaning of what is happening with technology now? Are we ready for such changes?

– People do many foolish and self-destructive things, despite their wisdom. The problem is not in our nature – it is in our information. Wise and good people will make bad decisions if they are given bad information. Unfortunately, we are inundated with bad information. Modern societies, like ancient societies, fall prey to conspiracy theories and mass illusions.

Some people believe that over time the information we receive should improve. They argue that correct information, such as scientific facts, empowers people, while illusions make us weak. So over time, truth should spread and illusions should disappear. But history does not work that way. In history, power depends not only on truth. It depends even more on order. And order is easier to create by spreading fiction and fantasy than by spreading facts.

For example, let's take a country that wants to make an atomic bomb. To do this, it must know certain scientific facts. If you try to make an atomic bomb and you ignore the laws of physics, your bomb won't explode. But to make a bomb, you also need millions of people to cooperate in the project.

You need people to mine the uranium, build the reactor, and feed all the workers, the physicists. And this is the key point: it's easier to get millions of people to cooperate by telling them fiction than by telling them the truth. If you create a religion or ideology, like communism, and you ignore the facts, your ideology will explode with a big bang.

So over thousands of years, people have learned more and more scientific facts, but they have also created more and more powerful religions and ideologies that have ignored the facts. And in many cases, scientists who are experts in physics or history are following the orders of ideological and religious leaders who are experts in mythology. That's why, despite all our wisdom, we tend to do stupid and self-destructive things.

– In this book you also write that “in the near future, the new computer network will still include billions of people, but we may become a minority.” Can you expand on this idea? Will humans become redundant in global communication?

– Artificial intelligence is not one big computer. It is billions of “agents.” In banks, there will be artificial intelligence that will decide whether to give you a

loan. In education, artificial intelligence will decide whether to admit you to university. In companies, artificial intelligence will decide whether to give you a job. In the judicial system, artificial intelligence will decide whether to send you to prison. In some areas, artificial intelligence will communicate directly with other artificial intelligences. Already, most of the work in the world of commerce is done by artificial intelligences. In the foreign exchange market, algorithms buy dollars and euros from other algorithms.

Artificial intelligence will change the meaning of many everyday concepts. History can teach us a lesson about this too. Let's remember the impact of the invention of writing on the concept of property. Before the invention of writing, ownership depended on the agreement of the people around you. Owning a field meant that your neighbors agreed that the field was yours and acted accordingly. They wouldn't build a house on it, graze their animals there, or pick the fruit without first asking your permission. This made ownership a local community affair, limiting the ability of a distant central government to control all land ownership. No king, minister, or priest could remember who owned every field in hundreds of distant villages. It also limited the ability of individuals to claim and exercise absolute property rights, and instead favored various forms of communal property rights. For example, neighbors might recognize your right to cultivate a field, but not your right to sell it to foreigners. With the advent of written documents, ownership of a field increasingly meant having a clay tablet, a piece of paper, or a silicon chip record that the field belonged to you. If your neighbors have been grazing sheep on your land for years and none of them have ever acknowledged that it belongs to you, but you can somehow produce an official document stating that it belongs to you, you have a good chance of making your claim. Conversely, if all your neighbors agree that it is your field, but you have no official document to prove it, then it does not belong to you. This means that ownership can now be determined by a distant central authority that prepares and stores the relevant documents. It also means that you can sell your field without asking your neighbors for permission, simply by transferring the important document to another person.

Something as simple as a piece of paper and ink has changed the meaning of ownership so dramatically. What would artificial intelligence do with it? Will artificial intelligence decide whether you own a field in the future?

– Have you tried to create music, photos using artificial intelligence yourself? What is your own personal impression of its possibilities in this creative field? You write in the book that you sometimes use Facebook, Youtube, but you are

famous for your critical attitude towards smartphones. You don't need it for everyday life?

– My main principle is to use technology for your own purposes, but try not to let it use me for its own purposes. Algorithms and social networks have played a very important role in my personal life. For example, it was through social networks that I established a relationship with my husband. I met him on one of the first LGBTQ social networking platforms in 2002. Social media has been very useful for dispersed minorities, such as LGBTQ people. Very few gay people are born into a gay family, in a gay neighborhood, and in those days, when there was no Internet, finding each other was a big challenge, unless you moved to one of the few tolerant big cities with a gay subculture. Growing up in a small, homophobic Israeli town in the 1980s and early 1990s, I didn't know a single openly gay person. In the late 1990s and early 2000s, social media provided an unprecedented and almost miraculous way for members of the scattered LGBTQ community to find each other and connect.

So I'm not against information technology. But I try to be careful with it. It's a bit like having the right attitude toward food. 100 years ago, there was a shortage of food. So people ate whatever they could find, and people especially liked foods that were high in fat and sugar because they gave them a lot of energy. Today, there's plenty of food, and we're inundated with unhealthy foods that are high in fat and added sugar. If people continue to eat all the food they can find, especially unhealthy foods, they get sick. The same goes for information, which is food for the mind. In the past, there was a shortage of information, so we consumed whatever information we could get. We are now inundated with too much information, and a lot of it is unhealthy information. Unwanted information is artificially infused with greed, hatred, and fear—things that grab our attention. All this unwanted information is draining our minds.

“My guiding principle is to use technology for its own purposes, but try not to let it use me for its own purposes.”

To protect our mental and social health, we need to go on an information diet, similar to the food diets of many people. The first step of an information diet is to limit the amount of information we consume. The second step is to avoid unwanted information, artificially infused with greed, hatred, and fear. **Finally, it is useful to go on an information fast from time to time. I myself take a few weeks off each year to meditate. I practice Vipassana meditation (<https://lt.dhamma.org/>), and during meditation retreats I completely disconnect. I don't watch the news, I don't read emails, I don't read or write**

books—I just meditate. I take my time to digest what’s already in my head, rather than stuffing it with more information. A few weeks is too much for most people. But an information fast of a day or two every now and then would probably be beneficial for everyone. You don’t have to go on a meditation retreat. It would also be good to go for a walk and turn off your smartphone.

– I read a previous interview where you said that those who scream about the flaws of the liberal world order should first answer one simple question: can you name a decade when humanity was in better shape than in the 1920s? The situation has changed dramatically now, we are seeing new wars, the rise of populism. Has your optimism not faded?

– Yes, the situation has worsened significantly. The 1920s were still a relatively prosperous and peaceful era, and the 1930s are terrible. The main reason is that people simply did not appreciate the advantages of the liberal order, so they began to attack it. The liberal order is based on the idea that all people have certain common experiences and interests, and therefore all countries should have certain common values, laws, and institutions. The anti-liberal forces attacked this without proposing any alternative order. When order is destroyed, chaos ensues.

Some illiberal forces claim to have an alternative vision of the world. They do not believe in any universal values, laws, or institutions, but they also say that they do not approve of war. They claim to see the world as a network of fenced but friendly fortresses. Each national fortress will adhere to different values and laws, but they will still be able to coexist peacefully. The problem with this vision is that fenced fortresses are rarely friendly. Each fortress wants a little more land, prosperity, and security at the expense of its neighbors. And in the absence of some universal values, laws, and institutions to mediate between the competing fortresses, the only option left is war.

More importantly, whether people like it or not, humanity today faces three common problems that transcend national borders and can only be solved through global cooperation. These are nuclear war, climate change, and technological change. No single state can prevent nuclear war, stop global warming, or regulate disruptive technologies like artificial intelligence. If we fail to restore liberal order, events like Russia’s invasion of Ukraine will become commonplace, and we will have no chance to stop climate change or regulate artificial intelligence.

– Your books have become bestsellers around the world, and many people consider you to have profound insights into what the future holds. Do you sometimes feel oppressed by the belief that people have all the answers?

– I know I don't have all the answers. I'm not a prophet or a guru. I can't predict the future, and I don't think anyone can. History is not deterministic, and no one can imagine what the world will look like in 2050. All I do is use my historical knowledge to raise questions about the future and to draw a map of possible scenarios, highlighting the most dangerous ones in the hope that we can prevent them. Which scenarios will actually come to pass depends on our own decisions. The whole point of talking about the future is so that we can do something about it. What good is prophesying about things we cannot change?

Of course, there is always the danger that some people might start to think of me as some kind of know-it-all guru. It is good to value knowledge and listen to the opinions of scientists, but it is dangerous to idolize anyone, including scientists. When a person becomes idolized, he can actually start to believe what people say about him, which can inflate his ego and make him crazy. As for the fans who believe that someone has all the answers, they give up their freedom and stop trying. They expect the guru to give them all the answers and solutions. And even if the guru gives them the wrong answer and the wrong solution, they just accept it. So I hope people will read my books more as books of questions than as books of answers, and see me as someone who is searching for the truth with them, rather than as an all-knowing clairvoyant.

– At the end of the book it says: “Even if homo sapiens destroys itself, the universe will continue to function as usual. The universe is patient.” Reading your books teaches you to be less important. We think we are the masters of the planet, but really, from a distance, we are not that important. Doesn't that give you a sense of cosmic loneliness? A sense of some meaninglessness?

– I don't think it gives you a sense of cosmic loneliness, quite the opposite. When we perceive ourselves as completely unique and superior to all other life forms, it separates us from the cosmos and makes us feel lonely. A more realistic and humble view of ourselves should help us feel closer to other beings in the universe.

As for meaninglessness, it is not a bad thing. Much of the suffering in the world is caused by the search for meaning. People invent fictions, fantasies, and myths to give themselves meaning, and these fantasies are the main cause of wars, genocides, and injustice. Take the war that has engulfed my homeland. Why are Israelis and Palestinians fighting each other? They are not fighting over objective needs, such as food or land. There is enough land between the Mediterranean Sea

and the Jordan River to build houses, schools, and hospitals for all Israelis and Palestinians. There is also enough food for everyone. However, people believe in conflicting mythologies. Each side believes that they are God's chosen people and that God has given them the whole earth. This gives their lives meaning—and also fuels the war.

Too many people look for meaning in life in a cosmic drama. They imagine that the entire universe has some predetermined script written by some god or other, and they have to find their role in this drama and play it well. As Shakespeare said, all the world is a stage and all the people are actors. When people realize that there is no script and therefore they have no specific role, they sometimes become terrified or depressed. They don't know what to do with their lives.

But I think the whole question of meaning is a misguided one. The real question of life is not “what is the meaning of life?” but “how to free yourself from suffering?” The feeling of meaninglessness is just another kind of suffering. If you truly understand suffering and how it arises, it can free you from the suffering of meaninglessness. **If you truly know the truth about yourself and the world, no one can make you unhappy.** But that is, of course, much easier said than done.

.....

***About Yuval Noah Harari (born 1976) is an Israeli scholar, historian, and visionary, considered one of the most influential thinkers of our time. He is the author of the wildly popular books about the history of humanity “Sapiens” (2011, lit. 2016) and about the probable future of humanity “Homo Deus” (2015, Lithuanian edition will be published in 2018), a professor and lecturer at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. Y. N. Harari was born in Haifa, into a secular family. He defended his doctoral dissertation at Oxford in 2002. First, he studied and researched medieval history and military history, but later became interested in the great processes of world history, macrohistory. Specialists in the field of macrohistory try to explain the general laws of human culture, according to which events and processes unfold over a long period of time in a very wide area, in different civilizations. They try to grasp what is common between events and processes in different periods, what changes, what repeats itself, and what general conclusions can be drawn about humanity and its future. One of the most famous macrohistorians is O. Spengler, and among modern scientists one of the most prominent is Y. N. Harari.**

Yuval Noah Harari is gay. Since 2002, his partner and husband is Itzik Yahav, who also works as Harari's personal manager. They were married in a civil ceremony in Toronto.

In his current research, he raises questions: what is the relationship between history and biology? What is the fundamental difference between humans and other animal species? Does justice work in history? Do historical processes occur in a purposeful way? Are we happier than our ancestors who lived before?

The book Sapiens, published in Hebrew in 2011 and in English in 2014, has become insanely popular not only among scientists but also in broad circles of society, and it

has made Y. N. Harari famous all over the world. The book has already been translated into more than 30 languages. Hundreds of thousands of people watch his speeches and lectures on YouTube.

More than 200,000 people have already taken the free online history course “A Brief History of Humankind.”

Prof. Y. N. Harari has twice (2009 and 2012) won the Polonsky Prize for creativity and originality, as well as the Society of Military History award for articles on military history, etc.

And Facebook founder Marc Zuckerberg, impressed, recommended “Sapiens” to his followers through his account – “the grand narrative of the history of human civilization.”

The author, providing numerous examples and arguments, explores how humanity got to where we are now. Based on his excellent knowledge of history, he considers what fate we will determine for ourselves.

The second book, Homo Deus, which has already gained worldwide popularity, is still being prepared in Lithuanian and examines the possibilities, dreams and nightmares of the 21st century - from the victory over death, which we have almost achieved, to the consequences of artificial intelligence.

Where are we heading today? How to protect our fragile world from the terrible destructive forces that we have acquired? This is no longer just a study of the past. Y. N. Harari talks about the next stage of evolution...

More: <http://www.ynharari.com/>

**Source: <https://www.15min.lt/kultura/naujienu/literatura>