



Powered by Humanize AI Detector — humanizeai.pro

AI DETECTION REPORT — 2026-06-23

Very likely human-written

0%

LOW LIKELIHOOD OF AI

0%

AI-generated

0%

AI-assisted / paraphrased

100%

Likely human

Analysis

- Average sentence length close to human norm: note the passage uses a mix of medium-length sentences rather than consistently long AI-like structures, aligning with a human average near 23.2 words (AI 29.2) and supporting a human-written verdict.
— *“Project 2029: A Plan to Reshape Britain seems to be the work of the Centre For A Better Britain and Policy Exchange, who are both UK think tanks.”*
- Shorter concluding sentence pattern is present toward the end of the second paragraph, a human tendency to tighten conclusions.
— *“Their suffering largely goes unnoticed, until they find the red or black pill communities of the Manosphere, where their pain is acknowledged enough to be exploited [24].”*
- Pronoun subjects and a direct, personal voice are present, contributing to a human-like narrative stance rather than the formal, nominalized subjects often seen in AI text.
— *“The person who’s not like you probably didn’t choose to be exposed to that either, or how it can cause us to replace understanding with anger.”*

Submission metadata

Submitted: 23 Jun 2026, 12:52

Timezone: UTC+01:00

Word count: 2083

Character count: 13120

Sentence count: 67

Language: English

Detector model version: HAI-DX v4.1





These results indicate the probability of AI-generated content. They are not a definitive verdict.



How We Score

This report is generated by Humanize AI Detector. Scores reflect the likelihood that text is AI-generated and are not definitive. Detector accuracy: 96.3%, false-positive rate: 1.1% (benchmark: MAGE-2).

Mini-FAQ questions

- **What does this % mean?**
The percentage represents the model's confidence that the text was generated by an AI tool. Higher values indicate stronger AI signals; lower values indicate the text reads as human-written.
- **Does this mean cheating?**
No. This report is a probabilistic signal, not a definitive verdict. AI-assisted writing is widespread and legitimate in many contexts. Use this report alongside human judgment.
- **Can I dispute a result?**
Yes. False positives can occur on highly polished or formulaic human writing. Reach out to support@humanizeai.pro with the Report ID for a manual review.





● AI-generated

● AI-assisted / paraphrased

● Likely human

Not to be confused with Project 2029 by the Democratic Party in America, Project 2029: A Plan to Reshape Britain is the UK's version of an American authoritarian playbook titled Project 2025 that seems to be informing policy [1] over there at present. Project 2025 was crafted by The Heritage Foundation, a fundamentalist Christian think tank tied to a similarly fundamentalist legal advocacy group known as the Alliance Defending Freedom or ADF. After both organisations helped overturn [2] American abortion rights, their attempts to chip away at UK abortion rights [3] have apparently become emboldened.

Project 2029: A Plan to Reshape Britain seems to be the work of the Centre For A Better Britain and Policy Exchange, who are both UK think tanks. Incorporated in December 2024 as Resolute 1850, the now renamed Centre For A Better Britain is a think tank reported [4] to be a modelled on The Heritage Foundation, which has ties to both the Reform party and the ADF. Policy Exchange is an established and influential think tank [5] that has faced scrutiny [6] for withholding funding information despite being a registered charity. More recently, the charity commission received a complaint [7] alleging that because Policy Exchange's reports and opinion pieces [8] now repeatedly advocate for right-wing policies, they're failing in their duty as an educational charity to remain uncontroversial. Policy Exchange launched Project 2029 around May 2026, though as numerous articles link the Centre For A Better Britain to Project 2029 [4], either directly or via their previous Resolute 1850 name, Project 2029 looks to be a collaborative effort between them and Policy Exchange. Akin to America's Project 2025, it seems their intention is for Project 2029 to inform government policy in the UK.

The Project 2029 webpage makes truth claims without going into specifics or providing evidence, though perhaps their most ironic claim is that stakeholders and quangos are influencing our country. Despite not substantiating their claims, they go on to ask questions about widespread legislative, judicial, and parliamentary reform. It always makes sense to be wary of those who make a claim without providing evidence, fail to ask questions of their own truth claim, and instead ask what should be done because of it. Their page cleverly groups questions under a few headings that echo voter concerns, but history tells us [9] that actions justified by a boogeyman seldom work out well, and given that rigorous evidence is required [10] to justify actions on a countrywide scale, wariness here seems more than appropriate.

The Conservatives, Reform and Restore have pledged to leave the European Convention on Human Rights, though it may be possible to amend the 1998 Human Rights Act which enshrined the convention's human rights into UK law, it's more likely to be repealed [11]. Both Restore and Reform are also committed to repealing the Equality Act 2010 entirely, while the Conservatives intend to remove the public sector equality duty section from it. As with the other sections that protect anyone from discrimination [12] based on their age, race, religion, sex, pregnancy or LGBT+ status, that section relates to discrimination in or from public services like police forces, schools, councils or the NHS.

It's unclear whether some other legislation [13], like a Bill of Rights, will ultimately replace either of them, at least in part, but even partial removal of people's rights and protections serves only to increase the power [14] of those who have taken them, and at the cost of our freedoms. This causes knock-on effects [15] in potentially all areas of public and private life, but perhaps most starkly when squeezing the populace for someone else's financial gain.

Around the time Project 2029 was launched, the former Chair of the Equalities and Human Rights Commission, along with the shadow minister for equalities and a former head of political strategy for No.10, went on stage to talk about Project 2029 and their intentions for the UK. While they will likely repeat their talking



points in an attempt to normalise their aims, of particular note was the suggestion that decriminalising abortion was not sufficiently debated in parliament, which is used to illustrate that parliament is no longer fit for purpose. Given Reform's apparent stance[16] on abortion, and that abortion rights are an iceberg that fundamentalist Christians intend to melt in the UK [4], it's alarming to hear a shadow minister for equalities imply that decriminalising abortion needs any further debate.

Unlike the United States, overturning abortion rights in the UK will probably be framed more on humanitarian than religious grounds, though Christian fundamentalism in the UK may be rising [17] among some demographics, and as some have noticed recently, those with the influence can quickly polarise views [18]. Strict roles and gender stereotypes [19], womanhood defined by her body, and deconstructing the rainbow [20] are positions held by fundamentalist Christians, and now that the definition of man and woman has been ruled biological for purposes of equality law, the UK's shift toward alignment with fundamentalist viewpoints does not appear insignificant.

Division as a Mechanism

Different demographics experience disadvantage, vulnerability and power in varying degrees across differing parts of life, and some perhaps feel that the increase in equality over recent decades has caused negative repercussions for their demographic. Through a certain lens, their assessment isn't wholly wrong, and members of a demographic can be driven by a number of factors, but disinformation sometimes distorts complex issues, meaning there's likely nuance to be had.

Men and boys might do what's expected of them, though increasingly often and especially for those who are younger, this may result in not only unemployment [21], but also a lack of partner appeal [22], as women become more able to support themselves, and are less compelled to experience the behaviours they dislike. From their perspective, the problem perhaps isn't socialisation instilling those behaviours, nor wealth inequality, instead it might be immigration or other people gaining rights. They feel adrift, left behind or lonely [23], and healthy expression is perhaps unlikely, due to the repressive version of stoicism glorified by our society, and further insight often locked behind a therapeutic paywall. Their suffering largely goes unnoticed, until they find the red or black pill communities of the Manosphere, where their pain is acknowledged enough to be exploited [24].

Immigration is an issue for plenty of demographics, and though fraught with concerns over job competition and cultural cohesion, sometimes the nuance missed is that of chronic underinvestment of services that some claim immigrants have no right to stretch further. The same applies to housing, where chronic underinvestment and especially hereditary land ownership don't always come up. Nor how the concept of religion itself [25] contributes to difficulties with integration, as it swells the number of differences between two people, and may compound this by making each party feel strongly about their views and practices.

Women and girls often suffer the consequences of misogyny from an early age, and some now increasingly fear immigrants [26] and certain transgender people [27] too. Sometimes this is because messaging suggests that both groups are disproportionately predatory, and in the latter case accessing their safe spaces by pretending to be what they say. From their perspective, at times they need look no further than how transgender people react when asked about pronouns, or how unobliging they are when asking not to be called cis. If they aren't respected in a conversation, it's understandable some find it difficult to believe they'll be safe and respected elsewhere. Although what perhaps gets lost in translation, is why transgender people can be reactive, or the lack of prior incidents [28] while sharing those spaces in the past, and each side likely fails to notice their similarities, up to and including their fears. Rather than addressing the various types of violence perpetrated by some members of other demographics, their focus is on moral panic [27] instead.

Fabricating a zero-sum game





It's easy to see how division is sowed, and how each demographic is misdirected toward blaming the other. In the red pill community of the Manosphere, where men are weighed by their wealth and physical prowess, misogyny and patriarchy are reinforced. Immigration may need to be controlled, but the nuances of hereditary land ownership, chronic systemic underinvestment in housing and services, and the possible impact of our conduct abroad can get lost along the way. Due to unfavourable messaging about transgender people, some have participated in furthering a stereotype of what it means to be them, and on an identity surrounding reproduction. Accusations of negative attitudes toward the rainbow are now deemed discrimination via stereotype, and part of that rainbow now face less social inclusion.

Those invisibly sowing our division have caused each demographic to focus less on addressing the cost of living, unemployment, investment in public services, misogyny, misandry or wider wealth inequality. The blame is instead placed on each other, while those trying to keep you distracted, try their hardest to convince you that equality is a zero-sum game.

This may not be easy

I'd like to believe that most of us only hold people fully accountable, when they could have controlled their actions, and that distinction is significant because it has implications for empathy. While it's important to hold people accountable for what they choose to do, I also think it's crucial to keep in mind that which they didn't choose nor have any control over. Because fostering empathy within those confines can lead to improved understanding of why someone holds their beliefs or behaves in a certain way, and that can reduce the magnitude of your reaction towards them.

An increased inclination to wrap pain up in anger is one such example, specifically from being exposed to a society that often teaches us we're stronger when we repress feelings instead of understanding them. The person who's not like you probably didn't choose to be exposed to that either, or how it can cause us to replace understanding with anger. People don't get to choose their birthplace, nor their body or brain, initial family and caregivers, education, indoctrination or socialisation, and sometimes they don't pick their employment status or even which rabbit hole social media nudges them down either. They didn't choose the inequality that oppresses most in society, or how it does so in differing ways, nor did they pick why we're pitted against each other.

When both the absence of choice and its consequences are more fully recognised, two people with differing views might engage using a logical, empathetic foundation of similarity and improved insight as to why the other person holds their beliefs. This foundation makes it easier to interrogate an argument instead of person making it, especially when they treat their own thoughts and feelings less as inherent truth, and more as potentially rational and proportional data points, where anything falling short of that inspection isn't failure but opportunity instead. While irrational and disproportionate thoughts and feelings make everyone beautifully human, trying not to act on them before they're inspected can make both yourself and society a great deal more beautiful.

Along with resisting the disinformation and misinformation now rife in much of the media, we can each attempt to repair division by engaging more constructively with one another. This is worth pursuing because when we're more united, we solidify everyone's rights and become more able to address wealth inequality. Encountering viewpoints that differ from your own may cause disbelief, frustration, dismay, invalidation or fear, and it's easy to become angry and direct that outward as hatred. When you catch those feelings welling up, I encourage you to mentally direct them toward something invisible, be it far above or way down below you, or maybe an old bully or teacher, though crucially just anywhere else. This will all likely take practice, and failing just reminds us that we're all wonderfully human, though if you're able, please try and remember that next time you could achieve one of the best parts of what it is to be human; the opportunity to meet someone with empathy, understanding, curiosity and warmth.

I know none of this sounds easy, though I beg you to persevere. Because if society remains divided, the





people sowing our division will be least affected by lost rights or greater wealth inequality. And what I imagine they'll never tell you, is that not only does everyone deserve equality, but stood side by side we can demand it, because equality is far from a zero-sum game.