

# HOW THE AUTISTIC MIND DOESN'T WORK

By Andrew Robinson

# Contents

<a href="#">The Most Difficult Science of All</a>	4
<a href="#">A Short History of Humans</a>	5
<a href="#">Sociability</a>	7
<a href="#">Lying</a>	10
<a href="#">Self-Delusions</a>	11
<a href="#">Imagination</a>	16
<a href="#">A Short History of Civilization</a>	18
<a href="#">Sociability</a>	18
<a href="#">Lying</a>	21
<a href="#">Self-Delusions</a>	22
<a href="#">Imagination</a>	24
<a href="#">Universe 25</a>	28
<a href="#">A Short History of Autism</a>	34
<a href="#">Sociability</a>	40
<a href="#">Lying</a>	45
<a href="#">Self-Delusions</a>	46
<a href="#">Imagination</a>	47
<a href="#">Optimal Outcomes</a>	48
<a href="#">APPENDIX A: TO ALL MY AUTISTIC BROTHERS AND SISTERS</a>	51

The purchasing price of this pdf book is \$0.00

[It may be obtained at http://www.theboywholived.me](http://www.theboywholived.me)

© Copyright 2015-2018 by Andrew Robinson

All rights reserved.

Written and published in the United States of America

# The Most Difficult Science of All

The most difficult science in the world to study and practice isn't quantum physics or rocket science or computational chemistry, the hardest thing in the world to study is yourself (or what you see in others that reminds you of yourself) and that makes psychology the most difficult science in the world<sup>1</sup>. Unlike those other sciences, the biggest problem faced by psychology is that there is no way to objectively separate the observer from the observed. In psychology there can be no physical standard, like a ruler, by which you can compare your mind to something else in reality. In psychology, it is one thing to admit you may have fixable flaws, but it is quite another to admit that just because you are normal, doesn't mean that you are without any inherent, subtle, and permanent flaws. So it should come as no surprise that unlike every other science in the world today, psychology is still loitering within the developmental stages, having made very little progress in the last few hundred years since its official inception.

I am an outcast in a very socially-oriented world because I am autistic. It is though I am on the outside looking in and this has enabled me to make objective observations about your behaviors in a way that no other type of person can do, since many of your psychological rules of behavior don't apply to me. That is why this is a book, not about how the autistic mind works, but about how the autistic mind doesn't work. There are already a zillion books out there on how the autistic mind works and if any of them actually explained how the autistic mind works, there wouldn't be a zillion books out there, there would only be that one book that actually explained how the autistic mind works. So rather than repeat history, I thought I would take the road less travelled and explain the autistic mind from a different angle than you are used to seeing. This is no token homage to all that has been said before, this book is different because I am different.

First things first, if you want to understand how other people's minds work, you first must understand how your own mind was made to work. This requires showing you how your mind works in ways you never thought of it working before, and then I'm going to compare that to the mind of an Autistic, because the way your mind works is not the way the autistic mind works. My unique psychology can then give you a new perspective, not only about Autistics, but about yourself.

---

<sup>1</sup> **CRACKING THE SKULL OPEN** by AEON. <https://aeon.co/essays/why-can-t-we-treat-mental-illness-by-fixing-the-brain>

# A Short History of Humans

Animals don't evolve during times of peace and quiet, they evolve during times of hardship. That's because evolution is a result of the *SAID* principle (the *S*pecific *A*daptation to *I*mposed *D*emands). The more pressure placed onto an animal to adapt, the more reasons it will have to either migrate<sup>2</sup> to another area, change/ evolve, or face extinction<sup>3</sup>.

Humans and proto-humans developed on the plains of the Serengeti, located in present day Kenya. At no other place and time in history was this possible. It was a confluence of events with its resulting new demands that came together in an environment where a so-called higher-intelligence could develop and thrive<sup>4</sup>. What events are we talking about?

A few million years before the Serengeti grasslands existed, there were thick, damp rain jungles instead<sup>5</sup>. Far to the East, the violence of India ramming its way into Asia had caused Saudi Arabia to rotate and break away from Africa. As it broke away, the motion of Saudi Arabia pushed up the Kenya Dome and surrounded it on all sides with rift valleys, and right smack in the middle of the Kenya Dome was the Serengeti Plain<sup>6</sup>. As a result, Serengeti lost much of its previous moisture supply. The jungles of Serengeti became forests and lemurs were forced to evolve into tree-spanning primates<sup>7</sup>.

Meanwhile, far to the south, the continent of Antarctica slowly crawled across the surface of the Earth until it came to rest directly over the South Pole. Over open water, ice can only form in sheets 30 feet thick or less<sup>8</sup>, at which point ice will break apart under its own weight, but over land, ice can easily accumulate into miles thick behemoths – and ice can absorb tremendous amounts of heat. Why is this important? As Antarctica positioned itself over the South Pole, the amount of accumulated ice caused the average global temperatures to drop 16°F<sup>9</sup>. Once again, this in turn affected global weather patterns, so the Serengeti lost even more moisture and forests gave way to grasslands. Now it was the primates turn to evolve<sup>10</sup>.

Ice sheets began to accumulate over Greenland, just like they did for Antarctica, as Greenland was inching its way up towards the North Pole. The North Pole is not yet quite occupied, but it is surrounded by quite a few major continents (North America, Asia, Europe), so while ice can build up to mile thick behemoths on Greenland and neighboring continents, they aren't quite as stable as the ones in Antarctica. All it takes is a little nudge to turn the glaciation on or off in the Northern Hemisphere. Those little nudges come in the form of the Gulf Stream<sup>11</sup>. During times of full blown northern glaciations, average global temperatures drop an additional 16°F.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>2</sup> **THE ROLE OF EXTINCTION IN EVOLUTION** by David Raup. <http://www.pnas.org/content/91/15/6758.full.pdf>

<sup>3</sup> **MINIMIZING THE POPULATION EXTINCTION RISK BY MIGRATION** by Michael Khasin et al. <http://arxiv.org/pdf/1201.5204v4>

<sup>4</sup> **ERRATIC ENVIRONMENT MAY BE KEY TO HUMAN EVOLUTION** by Charles Choi.

<http://www.livescience.com/25793-changing-environment-human-evolution.html>

<sup>5</sup> **FOREST AND SAVANNA CAN SWITCH QUICKLY** by Lin Edwards. <http://phys.org/news/2011-10-forest-savanna-quickly.html>

**STUDY: ANCIENT WHALE SWAM HUNDREDS OF MILES UP AFRICAN RIVER** by PhysOrg.

<http://phys.org/news/2015-03-ancient-whale-swam-hundreds-miles.html>

<sup>6</sup> **EAST AFRICA'S GREAT RIFT VALLEY: A COMPLEX RIFT SYSTEM** by James Wood et al.

<http://geology.com/articles/east-africa-rift.shtml>

<sup>7</sup> **FOUND: YOUR OLDER PRIMATE ANCESTOR** by Michal Lemonick.

<http://science.time.com/2013/06/05/found-your-oldest-primate-ancestor/>

**LEMUR'S EVOLUTIONARY HISTORY MAY SHED LIGHT ON OUR OWN** by Science Daily.

<http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2008/02/080225213413.htm>

<sup>8</sup> **ICEBERGS** by D. Diemand. [http://curry.eas.gatech.edu/Courses/6140/ency/Chapter10/Ency\\_Oceans/Icebergs.pdf](http://curry.eas.gatech.edu/Courses/6140/ency/Chapter10/Ency_Oceans/Icebergs.pdf)

<sup>9</sup> **65MILLION YEARS OF CLIMATE CHANGE** by David Lappi. [http://jonova.s3.amazonaws.com/graphs/lappi/65\\_Myr\\_Climate\\_Change\\_Rev.jpg](http://jonova.s3.amazonaws.com/graphs/lappi/65_Myr_Climate_Change_Rev.jpg)

<sup>10</sup> **UNDERSTANDING CLIMATE'S INFLUENCE ON HUMAN EVOLUTION** by the National Research Council.

[http://www.ldeo.columbia.edu/~peter/site/Papers\\_files/Climates-HumanEvolutionFinal.pdf](http://www.ldeo.columbia.edu/~peter/site/Papers_files/Climates-HumanEvolutionFinal.pdf)

<sup>11</sup> **THE GREAT OCEAN CONVEYOR** by Wallace Broecker.

[http://pordlabs.ucsd.edu/Italley/sio210/readings/broecker\\_1991\\_ocean\\_conveyor.pdf](http://pordlabs.ucsd.edu/Italley/sio210/readings/broecker_1991_ocean_conveyor.pdf)

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*

All the while Antarctica and Greenland were slowly moving to their respective Poles, the continent of South America was busy rotating clockwise until it aligned up and joined with North America. When this occurred, it formed a great oceanic divide, spanning almost the entire distance from one pole to the other. This in turn affected global oceanic circulation, resulting in the very warm waters of the Gulf of Mexico being diverted to the Arctic via the Gulf Stream and the so-called Conveyor Belt. This very warm Gulf Stream water carries just enough heat to trigger occasional warm spells in the Northern Hemisphere called interglacials. Interglacials are very short lived (~13,000 years) compared to the glaciations, which are very long lived (~100,000 years). After tree-dwelling primates transformed into plains-dwelling humans, these humans then migrated throughout Africa, including the Sahara Desert. The name, “Sahara Desert”, is a misnomer, since most of the time the Sahara is not a desert but a verdant savannah. The Sahara alternates between desert and savannah with each glaciation/interglaciation cycle<sup>13</sup>.

In evolutionary biology, it has been noted that evolution does not select for larger brains or higher IQs, it selects for fitness. Since brains are high-maintenance, resource-hogging organs – the anti-thesis of evolution – evolution rarely selects for larger brains. If an animal has an exceptionally large brain, like humans do, there has to be an exceptionally good reason for that brain to be that big<sup>14</sup> (which will be discussed in the next chapter). An Ice Age, with its exceptionally large climate swings imposing exceptionally large demands on animals to specifically adapt to them, obviously is that exceptionally good reason.

As the human population expanded throughout Africa, those that lived in the Sahara Savanna were forced to leave when the Sahara Savanna started transforming into the Sahara Desert. The number of mass migrants was sufficient for our ancestors to first colonize the Middle East, and then from there, the rest of the world<sup>15</sup>.

That the first humans were noble hunter-gatherers is a falsehood, seeing as the first humans were ignoble scavenger-gatherers and not hunter-gatherers. Humans favorite and easiest to acquire source of nutrition was scavenged marrow from the long bones of animal carcasses left behind by predators, hence the reason fat tastes so good to us and why, unlike what used to be hard-to-find carbohydrates, fat can satiate our appetite<sup>16</sup>. So while humans have this silly little delusion that they are “super predators” and that they are “at the top of the food chain”, yet compared to real life predators, humans are petite, delicate animals. Why even a small 40 pound domestic dog can easily take on a typical 200 pound adult human male. So it should come as no surprise, humans originally were not the kind of animal that could go it alone on the open plains of the Serengeti, as they would have been easy pickings for real life predators. Just running for cover would have been a suicide mission. Trees stands weren’t large enough for primates to form great herds, like the Wildebeest could do. When resources in one cluster of trees was used up, how was it proto-humans could have moved from that cluster of trees to another distant cluster of trees, on an open hostile plain, in which the grass was just as tall (three feet) as proto-humans were at the time? By sticking together in coordinated, small, stable groups.

---

<sup>13</sup> **DYNAMICS OF GREEN SAHARA PERIODS AND THEIR ROLE IN HOMININ EVOLUTION** by Juan Larrosoana et al.  
<http://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0076514>

**6,000 YEARS AGO THE SAHARA DESERT WAS TROPICAL, SO WHAT HAPPENED?** by ScienceDaily.  
<https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2016/11/161130141053.htm>

<sup>14</sup> **METABOLIC COSTS OF BRAIN SIZE EVOLUTION** by Karin Isler et al. <http://rsbl.royalsocietypublishing.org/content/2/4/557>

<sup>15</sup> **THE HUMAN JOURNEY: MIGRATION ROUTES** by National Geographic.  
<https://genographic.nationalgeographic.com/human-journey/>

<sup>16</sup> **SCAVENGING AND HUMAN EVOLUTION** by Robert Blumenshine. Published by Scientific American, October 1992.

<sup>17</sup> **NON-AFRICANS ARE PART NEANDERTHAL, GENETIC RESEARCH SHOWS** by ScienceDaily.  
<http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2011/07/110718085329.htm>

While the brain of humans might appear to be different from that of other animals, it is only different in terms of quantity and not quality<sup>18</sup>. An evolutionary psychologist by the name of Robin Dunbar objectively observed that in primates, the bigger the brain the bigger the circle of friends. In fact, according to Dunbar's observations of a primate's brain size vs number of associations, humans have a brain size proportional to what should be a group size consisting of about 150 individual **adults**. That number, 150, is called Dunbar's number and it has been scientifically confirmed that humans do indeed have a Dunbar number of around  $150 \pm 50$ <sup>19</sup>. Since humans have been shown to have about six “degrees of separation” from one another, apparently the only reason for humans to have such large brains is so they can form stable, small groups consisting of around  $(150 * 6 =) 950$  individuals, otherwise called a tribe or small village, and the best way to form stable, small groups is to first make them want to be sociable.

## Sociability

Apparently, the best strategy for humanoids to survive major glaciations, was to evolve into tribal animals. Huddling behavior in herd animals, is a common example of behavior that evolved to withstand major glaciations<sup>20</sup>. Since humans are not herd animals, their unique behaviors weren't just for warmth. To understand why, you first have to understand what sociability is.

Simply put, the purpose of socializing is to form stable self-organizing groups, but socializing is far from simple. Human socializing is an extremely complicated function requiring lots of brain power. Socializing is so complicated that it would take many University textbooks to explain it all. I am going to give you the condensed version and save you some time and homework. Sociability is a measure of how much time a person will prefer to spend together with other members, as well as how many members they will spend time together with. It requires familiarity and homogeneity – or in other words, it requires everyone in the group to think and be alike. Socializing then is like glue, and in fact, that is exactly how it is described in scientific literature, e.g. – as social cohesion or social bonding. When the social bonding within a group is strong enough, people will feel pride to be associated with that group and they will show much enthusiasm for its collective activities.

To form stable groups requires it be socially organized right down to the last person. One way that sociability accomplishes that is by genetically predisposing people to self-organize into hierarchies. For hierarchies to work, members must automatically fulfill roles within those hierarchies<sup>21</sup>. Human social hierarchies are divided into two scales: vertical and horizontal cohesion<sup>22</sup>.

---

<sup>18</sup> **WHAT WAS HE THINKING? STUDY TURNS TO APE INTELLECT** by Seth Borenstein.

<http://phys.org/news/2012-06-line-blurs-animal-monkeys-math.html>

**RESOLVING DISCONTINUITY: A MINIMALIST DISTINCTION BETWEEN HUMAN AND NON-HUMAN MINDS** by Derek Bickerton.

<http://icb.oxfordjournals.org/content/40/6/862.full>

**THE AMAZING INNER LIVES OF ANIMALS** by Tim Flannery.

<http://www.nybooks.com/articles/archives/2015/oct/08/amazing-inner-lives-animals/>

<sup>19</sup> **VALIDATION OF DUNBAR'S NUMBER IN TWITTER CONVERSATIONS** by Bruon Goncalves. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1105.5170>

<sup>20</sup> **HUDDLING RATS BEHAVE AS A 'SUPER-ORGANISM'** by PhysOrg.

<http://phys.org/news/2015-09-huddling-rats-super-organism.html>

<sup>21</sup> **SOCIAL FEEDBACK AND THE EMERGENCE OF LEADERS AND FOLLOWERS** by Jennifer Harcourt.

<http://www.cell.com/current-biology/abstract/S0960-9822%2809%2900554-5>

**UNDERSTANDING OF NORMS: CHILDREN OVEREAGERLY SEEKING SOCIAL RULES** by ScienceDaily.

<https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2016/10/161005102031.htm>

**KNOWING ONE'S PLACE IN A SOCIAL HEIRARCHY** by ScienceDaily. <https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2016/12/161207133548.htm>

<sup>22</sup> **UNIT COHESION AND MILITARY PERFORMANCE** by Robert MacCoun.

[https://www.law.berkeley.edu/files/cs/Unit\\_Cohesion\\_and\\_Military\\_Performance\\_Ch5\\_MacCoun\\_Hix.pdf](https://www.law.berkeley.edu/files/cs/Unit_Cohesion_and_Military_Performance_Ch5_MacCoun_Hix.pdf)

On the horizontal social scale we have family, friends, acquaintances, peers, and co-workers. At this level there are many sub-groups, or cliques. People often will belong to more than one sub-group, some of which will overlap the range of other sub-groups in purpose. Some sub-groups will be strongly established whilst others will be informal and weak. The ways in which a sub-group agrees to interact or engage with other sub-groups is called culture or protocol.

On the vertical social scale, the most visible and prominent role are the leaders. There are many other roles besides the leaders at this scale, the most easily discerned ones, as determined by General Systems Theory, being the enforcers, recruiters, protectors, teachers, builders, creators, Shamans, and so on. It is also home to the mentor and protégé, whose purpose is to penetrate between horizontal levels and promote people between horizontal levels. The purpose of the leader is for individuals to have someone in common to mimic or copy, and thereby have a way to act in unison – or in other words, to ensure that everyone in the group thinks and acts alike. In **THE HOBBIT: BATTLE OF THE FIVE ARMIES**, when Dwarf King Thorin resolves to ride to the top of Ravenhill and kill Azog, the leader of the orc's, Thorin makes it very clear he is going to do this because he knows the loss of the orc's leader will make it possible to defeat them. No one decries this as a poorly thought out plot device or as being unbelievable or stupid, in fact, quite the opposite occurs: they applaud and expand upon it. People believe that when they are leaderless, they also become without direction, lost and hopeless, and it's true – without a leader, tribes will become unstable and disintegrate. People are incapable of being fully independent without a leader to imitate and follow.

While there are two types of social hierarchies, there are three types of relationships: dominant (vertical scale only), communal (horizontal scale only), and reciprocal (between scales, e.g. – business or mentor-protégé relationships). For example, one unspoken protocol is that individuals can conduct business within their social hierarchies, but neighboring tribes are limited to strictly business-only relationships<sup>23</sup>.

Humans were a perfect fit in their original environment, blending in with nature so the environment would be self-sustaining. On the plains of Serengeti, the limited resources there meant limited group sizes, and this became their Dunbar Number. If the group size was too small (about 600 adults or less), they were vulnerable to hostile takeovers and likely to be killed off or absorbed into other groups. If the group size was too big (about 1200 individuals or more), they were likely to splinter into feuds or warring factions. Limited population densities were also a reflection of limited resources. While distant neighboring groups would have been tolerated and maybe even welcomed, if a neighboring group decided to move in a little too close, humans were (and still are) preprogrammed so the neighborly friendliness would disappear and turn into competition (hence the reason there is no such thing as “friendly competition”). If the competition became too intense, it would escalate into war. War was a good thing under these circumstances, as it is one of Nature's methods of population density control, and it helps keep a natural balance between consumption of resources and the environment's ability to recuperate.

It should be obvious by now that individuals that are not a part of a local tribe will fall into three categories: a friendly but distant neighbor, the competition, and an enemy<sup>24</sup>. It would be counter-productive for tribes to freely intermingle because they must know who they can share resources with and who they must befriend, ostracize, or kill. To help in this endeavor, nature has preprogrammed humans with feelings of repulsion to foreign (not-tribe) culture or relationships. This forces individuals to be inclusive to people or ideas that are acceptable to the group, and to be exclusive to people or ideas that are not acceptable to the group<sup>25</sup>.

<sup>23</sup> **THE STUFF OF THOUGHT: LANGUAGE AS A WINDOW INTO HUMAN NATURE** by RSAnimate.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3-son3EJTrU>

<sup>24</sup> **GROUP MEMBERSHIP ALTERS THE THRESHOLD FOR MIND PERCEPTION: THE ROLE OF SOCIAL IDENTITY, COLLECTIVE IDENTIFICATION, AND INTERGROUP THREAT** by Leor Hackel. <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0022103113002060>

<sup>25</sup> **PEOPLE SELECTIVELY REMEMBER THE DETAILS OF ATROCITIES THAT ABSOLVE IN-GROUP MEMBERS** by MedicalXpress.

<http://medicalxpress.com/news/2014-04-people-atrocities-absolve-in-group-members.html>

One of the best ways to protect your social status or social standing is by bullying others whom you feel socially threatened. Bullying applies to a spectrum of behaviors and not just one. At one end of the spectrum we have teasing, while at the other end of the scale we have torture or murder, and in-between we have lots of room for lots of different things that are also considered bullying behavior because that is one big spectrum there! Bullying incidents almost always start out on the low end of the scale and escalate from there. The degree of escalation depends on the experience of the person doing the bullying and how the recipient responds to the bullying. Since it is human nature to bully, everyone naturally tries their hand at it at one time or another, to test their limits at engaging in it, therefore it is a myth that bullying is only done by people without emotional self-control.

One very prominent indication of sociability is the ability to share things, like time or food or other resources. It is closely related to the concept of cooperation<sup>26</sup>, but whereas sharing is done for strengthening personal social bonds only, cooperation requires that you know what to expect from other's in your group, that you automatically know and fulfill a required role within the group to achieve a common goal (something we have already discussed), in addition to wanting to share required resources in order to accomplish that goal for the common good of your group.

All social animals have the ability to automatically know what to expect from other animals like themselves called "Theory of Mind". Theory of Mind has often been called "mind reading", although it isn't really mind reading in the literal sense that people can actually read each other's minds, but is the ability to predict what another like-minded person in your group is thinking or going to do because you know they have the same mindset or Theory of Mind as you do. It is nature's way of preprogramming tribal members to think and act alike so they will all have similar attitudes, ideals, goals, and activities and thereby act in unison without even having to think about it<sup>27</sup>. Theory of mind is what leads to things like empathy or rapport.

While a built-in, preprogrammed Theory of Mind enables group-wide cooperation, it also makes people vulnerable. Having the same Theory of Mind means that your plans and thoughts would be transparent and predictable to your enemies, so nature had to provide a way for people to protect themselves from this type of exploitation, yet still remain transparent to the people within their tribe. The way people could protect themselves from "mind reading" was called lying.

---

**'US VERSUS THEM' SOCIAL TRAITS MAY HAVE EVOLVED IN MONKEYS BEFORE HUMANS** by ScienceDaily.

<https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2016/07/160720094643.htm>

**THE SCIENCE BEHIND SPITE** by Physorg. <http://phys.org/news/2015-04-science-spite.html>

<sup>26</sup> **COOPERATIVE COMMUNITIES EMERGE IN TRANSPARENT SOCIAL NETWORKS** by Physorg.

<http://phys.org/news/2015-03-cooperative-emerge-transparent-social-networks.html>

<sup>27</sup> **HOW WE UNDERSTAND PEOPLE AND WHY IT'S IMPORTANT** by Medical Xpress.

<http://medicalxpress.com/news/2014-06-people-important.html>

**SOCIAL COGNITIVE NEUROSCIENCE: A REVIEW OF CORE PROCESSES** by Matthew Lieberman. <http://www.scn.ucla.edu/pdf/Lieberman%20%282006%29%20Ann%20Review.pdf>

# Lying

Lying is a tactical strategy used to protect tribes from being exploited by other tribes or outsiders. It does this by providing protection from “mind reading” as a result of other people having the same Theory of Mind as you do, but they are not a part of your tribal or your circle of friends<sup>28</sup>. It does this by ensuring that outsiders cannot be sure what another tribes members are really thinking or feeling or planning. Lying in this case was a way for one person to bribe, request, seduce, solicit, or threaten outsiders while simultaneously maintaining a polite fictional relationship between them. Lying also protects oneself from loss of social status, such as by being able to deny mutual knowledge to others so you can do or say things “under the radar”. It allows you to say, “You misunderstood my intentions” or, “You read me wrong”, even though none of that is true. Lying can also appear as innuendos, sarcasm, and metaphors<sup>29</sup>. Children love to relate with each other about their lying escapades, indicating the fact that lying is also a social function that elevates their social reputation<sup>30</sup>.

Because lying is so ingrained, most people aren’t even aware of how much they constantly tell lies<sup>31</sup>. For example, a lying robot seems much more believable as a human than one that doesn’t<sup>32</sup>. People even lie about lying, calling it “being diplomatic”, “half-truths”, “white lies”, “reading between the lines”, “stretching the truth”, “plausible denial”, “euphemisms”, and so on, and so it is widely practiced and accepted even though they lie and say it isn’t acceptable.

People enjoy lying so much, they will even pay you to entertain them with lies (or as they diplomatically refer to it, as the ability to “suspend disbelief”). These forms of entertainment are called “movies” or “TV shows”. So we can see that lying ... uh, I mean acting, is very thoroughly ingrained into the human mind and culture and politics and religion and so forth and so on. When people “act” just for the fun of it, they call it “playacting”. When people “act” to your detriment, you say, “It was all just an act”, as in ...

MAN : I’m leaving you!

WOMAN : You mean you really don’t love me? *That this was all an act?*

<sup>28</sup> **A COGNITIVE NEUROBIOLOGICAL ACCOUNT OF DECEPTION** by Sean Spence. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1693447/>

<sup>29</sup> **THE STUFF OF THOUGHT: LANGUAGE AS A WINDOW INTO HUMAN NATURE** by RSAnimate.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3-son3EJTrU>

<sup>30</sup> **UNDERSTANDING OTHERS’ THOUGHTS ENABLES YOUNG KIDS TO LIE** by MedicalXpress.

<http://medicalxpress.com/news/2015-10-thoughts-enables-young-kids.html>

**THEORY-OF-MIND TRAINING CAUSES HONEST YOUNG CHILDREN TO LIE** by Xiao Pan Ding et al for Psychological Science.

[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/282569498\\_Theory-of-Mind\\_Training\\_Causes\\_Honest\\_Young\\_Children\\_to\\_Lie](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/282569498_Theory-of-Mind_Training_Causes_Honest_Young_Children_to_Lie)

<sup>31</sup> **GOOD WORKING MEMORY CAN MAKE YOU A BETTER LIAR** by ScienceDaily.

<http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2015/06/150620113506.htm>

**EVERYONE IS PRETTY MUCH LYING ALL THE TIME, ACCORDING TO PROFESSOR WHO STUDIES DECEPTION** by Bill Kilby.

<http://www.vice.com/read/everyone-is-pretty-much-lying-all-the-time-according-to-a-professor-who-studies-deception-511>

**THE MINISTRY OF TRUTH** by Elijah Millgram. [https://aeon.co/essays/orwell-was-wrong-doublethink-is-as-clear-as-language-gets?](https://aeon.co/essays/orwell-was-wrong-doublethink-is-as-clear-as-language-gets?utm_source=feedburner&utm_medium=feed&utm_campaign=Feed%3A+AeonMagazineEssays+%28Aeon+Magazine+Essays%29)

[utm\\_source=feedburner&utm\\_medium=feed&utm\\_campaign=Feed%3A+AeonMagazineEssays+%28Aeon+Magazine+Essays%29](https://aeon.co/essays/orwell-was-wrong-doublethink-is-as-clear-as-language-gets?utm_source=feedburner&utm_medium=feed&utm_campaign=Feed%3A+AeonMagazineEssays+%28Aeon+Magazine+Essays%29)

**THE TRUTH ABOUT LYING? CHILDREN’S PERCEPTIONS GET MORE NUANCED WITH AGE** by ScienceDaily.

<https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2016/10/161005160909.htm>

**HOW’S YOUR POKER FACE? WHY IT’S SO HARD TO SNIFF OUT A LIAR** by MedicalXpress.

<http://medicalxpress.com/news/2014-05-poker-hard-liar.html>

<sup>32</sup> **LIAR ROBOT** by Liz Garbus. [http://aeon.co/video/technology/liar-robot-why-robot-that-lies-is-a-more-credible-humanoid/](http://aeon.co/video/technology/liar-robot-why-robot-that-lies-is-a-more-credible-humanoid/?utm_source=feedburner&utm_medium=feed&utm_campaign=Feed%3A+AeonMagazineEssays+%28Aeon+Magazine+Essays%29)

[?utm\\_source=feedburner&utm\\_medium=feed&utm\\_campaign=Feed%3A+AeonMagazineEssays+%28Aeon+Magazine+Essays%29](http://aeon.co/video/technology/liar-robot-why-robot-that-lies-is-a-more-credible-humanoid/?utm_source=feedburner&utm_medium=feed&utm_campaign=Feed%3A+AeonMagazineEssays+%28Aeon+Magazine+Essays%29)

All the drama queens and drama kings of this world love it, and they can never seem to get enough of it, but for lying to be effective anywhere else, you must not let anyone know you are lying<sup>33</sup>. That would be counterproductive to the meaning of the word, so it implies you must always deny when you are lying or that lying can be good as well as bad. The one lying often also needs to disarm their target of the idea that they are being lied to by giving them false reassurances that the deceiver would never lie to the deceived.

Lies or deceptions come in many forms and one form of lying is called illusions. Illusions are the brain's way of lying to the mind. The purpose of an illusion is to provide "perceptual shortcuts" that enable quick decisions to be made on sight alone, with little forethought. Illusions were quite beneficial for human survival on the plains of the Serengeti. Today, even after you learn to recognize a particular optical illusion and come to know that it is an optical illusion, your mind still cannot make the brain-created optical illusion disappear, therefore you can have no control over your illusions<sup>34</sup>. It is not the purpose of this book to explain illusions, I only mention this in passing to illustrate just how entrenched and important lying is to the functioning of our brain and our mind<sup>35</sup>.

The most remarkable thing about lying is that lying is so in-grained that people even lie to themselves! When a person believes in the lies of another person, it is called "being deluded", but when a person lies to themselves, it is called "self-delusion".

## Self-Delusions

Humans are in a unique position to look out over the world and be able to comprehend what they see. It isn't that humans actually do this, it's just they have this capability to do so. And when they look out over the world, what do they see? They see what the Buddha saw: a world full of unavoidable suffering and pain, a world where the end goal of all living things is to die, and a world chock full of lethal epidemics. They also can comprehend that life isn't meant to be fair, with some people having more than their fair share of suffering or good luck than others, while others having more than their fair share of happiness or bad luck. The world appears to be naturally unjust, as well as downright unfriendly, violent, and without empathy for the pain or suffering it can cause others:

*"The universe may be programmed to evolve towards self-consciousness, but it is quite prepared to wipe out not merely individuals, but whole species and even planets in the process. The cosmos is no respecter either of Upanishadic sages or millions of seeds, young insects, fish-fry or, for that matter, dinosaurs should serve as an awful warning to us. The survival of the evolutionary process itself and the drive towards self-consciousness is all-important, that of specific gene-types a good deal less so; but the survival of the individual or group is – except to the individual or group itself – of no account whatever. Humanity, in short, is dispensable"* **(BEYOND BELIEF, Peter Lemesurier, pg 173)**

<sup>33</sup> **WHEN THE TRUTH HURTS** by Jess Whittlestone,

<http://aeon.co/magazine/philosophy/is-it-ever-worth-not-knowing-the-truth/>

**REALITY IS DISTORTED IN BRAIN'S MAPS** by ScienceDaily. <https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2015/02/150212092508.htm>

<sup>34</sup> **OPTICAL ILLUSIONS: YOUR BRAIN IS WAY AHEAD OF YOU** by DNews. <http://news.discovery.com/human/evolution/optical-illusions-you-brain-way-ahead-130823.htm>. See also <https://www.pinterest.com/pin/313422455289255430/>

**HOW BELIEVING CAN BE SEEING: STUDY SHOWS HOW CONTEXT DICTATES WHAT WE BELIEVE WE SEE** by Science Daily. <http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2008/02/080215103210.htm>

**FILLING-IN AND SUPPRESSION OF VISUAL PERCEPTION FROM CONTEXT — A BAYESIAN ACCOUNT OF PERCEPTUAL BIASES BY CONTEXTUAL INFLUENCES** by Li Zhaoping et al. <http://journals.plos.org/ploscompbiol/article?id=10.1371/journal.pcbi.0040014>

**AUDITORY ILLUSIONS** by Scientific American. <http://www.scientificamerican.com/podcast/episode/auditory-illusions-10-04-25/>

**SCIENTISTS WORK THEIR MAGIC ON 'SHRUNKEN FINGER ILLUSION'** by Science Daily.

<https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2016/03/160331133415.htm>

<sup>35</sup> **FUTURE GLIMPSES.** <http://blog.speculist.com/brain/future-glimpses.html>

Even when a person is very successful, this existential fear of the pointlessness of life emerges in the fear of losing their fortune,

*"The fear of excessive good fortune is deeply ingrained in man. There is an instinctive sense that the gods envy human success. Psychologically this means that the conscious personality may not go too far without taking the unconscious into account. The fear of God's envy is a dim realization that inflation [read: self-delusions] will be checked"* **(EGO AND ARCHETYPE, Edward F Edinger, pg 32)**

Deep down inside, everyone has made the same observations about the pointlessness of all life; of living in a world full of things whose only purpose seems to be to discourage and depress us to the point of making us wonder what the point of even trying is, and this is the part of life where delusions come to the rescue from all that depression and discouragement, and delusions do this by giving humans false reasons to live life<sup>36</sup>...

*"With her cunning play of illusions the soul lures into life the inertness of matter that does not want to live. She makes us believe incredible things, that life may be lived. She is full of snares and traps, in order that man should fall, should reach the earth, entangle himself there, and stay caught, so that life should be lived..."* **(COLLECTED WORKS OF JUNG, Vol 9i, para 56)**

*"There is, however, a strong empirical reason why we should cultivate thoughts that can never be proved. It is that they are known to be useful. Man positively needs general ideas and convictions that will give a meaning to his life and enable him to find a place for himself in the universe. He can stand the most incredible hardships when he is convinced that they make sense; he is crushed when, on top of all his misfortunes, he has to admit that he is taking part in a 'tale told by an idiot.'" **(MAN AND HIS SYMBOLS, Carl Jung, pg 76)***

Most of the higher forms of life on Earth have this functionality to one degree or another. Take spiders for example. If we try to imagine the Theory of Mind of a spider, there are many spiders that have this delusion that they are invincible and that no other predator can be a threat to them. How do I know this? Because when the time is right, these certain spiders will leave the safety of their colony, and with reckless abandon and abnormally high levels of aggression, they will go out and try to find a new area to start a new colony. Just as you would expect, these are spiders on a suicide mission, and the vast majority will be snapped up by birds or other insect eating predators. But a few of these "brave" (read: stupid) spiders will by sheer dumb luck, find a new place where they can start a new colony, and the territory of their tribes will expand, and their numbers will proliferate. Evolution has selected this particular behavior among these spiders so that when their colony is big enough, certain members of that colony will start to entertain this suicidal delusion that they can do anything and go out and start a new colony, all by themselves, and be the hero.

<sup>36</sup> **STUDY: SELF-DELUSION MAY BE A WINNING SURVIVAL STRATEGY** by ScienceDaily.

<http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2011/09/110914131352.htm>

**BECOMING A VAMPIRE WITHOUT BEING BITTEN: A NEW STUDY SHOWS THAT READING EXPANDS OUR SELF-CONCEPTS** by MedicalXpress. <http://medicalxpress.com/news/2011-04-vampire-bitten-self-concepts.html>

**WHY DO PEOPLE NEED SELF-ESTEEM? A THEORETICAL AND EMPIRICAL REVIEW** by Tom Pyszczynski et al.

<http://psycnet.apa.org/index.cfm?fa=buy.optionToBuy&id=2004-13724-007>

**THE EVOLUTION OF OVERCONFIDENCE** by Dominic Johnson et al. [http://fowler.ucsd.edu/evolution\\_of\\_overconfidence.pdf](http://fowler.ucsd.edu/evolution_of_overconfidence.pdf)

**NEGATIVE SPIRITUAL BELIEFS ASSOCIATED WITH MORE PAIN AND WORSE PHYSICAL, MENTAL HEALTH** by ScienceDaily.

<http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2015/09/150923125336.htm>

**BRAGGING AS A STRATEGY: WHAT BOASTING BUYS, AND COSTS, A CANDIDATE** by ScienceDaily.

<https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2016/10/161005095613.htm>

Does it work? Yes, but at the expense of more than a few individuals lives<sup>37</sup>.

So it should not be hard to imagine that one thing delusions can do, is provide the impetus for people to invest in recklessly risky ideas with all their heart to the utmost degree<sup>38</sup>. An example of this is a very common delusion I see a lot of, for example, when a business person has an idea for something that in reality is mediocre, but becomes possessed with the delusion that it is a fantastic idea, causing them to over-promote it, which in turn triggers the same delusion in other people like themselves (via rapport), causing those people to buy into the idea that the mediocre idea is fantastic. Who knows, sometimes by sheer dumb luck, mediocre ideas can go on to become great ideas. Nature, in other words, leaves no stone unturned in order to provide a way to saturate the world with diverse forms of ideas, sometimes mediocre ideas that often have unexpected benefits.

Delusions are obvious to everyone except the one inflicted by one, hence the reason you can see someone who is arrogant, egotistical, or overly-religious and yet that person will fail to recognize it in themselves<sup>39</sup>. Some delusions come in poorly fitted disguises, like the power of positive thinking<sup>40</sup>. Still other delusions are subtle, for example, the placebo effect<sup>41</sup>.

Since delusions provide meaning and purpose to life, so that life can be lived, to rob a person of their delusions would be the equivalent of stripping them of life, leaving them void and null and with no reason to live. In other words, people have a need for self-completion and delusions provide that capability<sup>42</sup>,

*"When a primitive man is unable to think out a problem for himself, but has to ask his tree, or his snake, or his fetish-object for advice, he is really consulting a part of his [mind] that is not located within himself but is found only in projection to the tree or other object. Such an object is, of course, taboo – sacred dread – and no one may injure it or even touch it without doing serious damage to the man for whom it is sacred. In some cases the projection has actually involved the man's soul or his life, so that if the tree should be cut down the man himself would die. To us this seems like the crassest superstition, but the same mechanism persists and is still effective among civilized people, and we can even observe it in ourselves at times"*

**(THE I AND THE NOT I, by M Esther Harding, pg 181)**

This fetish-object exists in today's civilization in the form of certain political affiliations, religious beliefs, and sports teams that one believes in. It is disguised under various other names such as mascots, amulets, icons, or emotional support animals, just to name a few. It is why people become aggressive and even downright violent when you question or talk about their fetish-object in an outspoken manner that is not flattering to their fetish-object.

<sup>37</sup> **SPIDERS: SURVIVAL OF THE FITTEST GROUP** by ScienceDaily. <https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2014/10/141001184414.htm>

<sup>38</sup> **DELUSIONS OF EXPERTISE: THE HIGH STANDARD OF PROOF NEEDED TO DEMONSTRATE SKILLS AT HORSERACE HANDICAPPING** by Matthew Browne. [https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Matthew\\_Browne/publication/259110637\\_Delusions\\_of\\_Expertise\\_%0B\\_Proof\\_Needed\\_to\\_Demonstrate\\_Skills\\_at\\_Horserace\\_Handicapping/links/53f7f39e0cf24ddba7db294b.pdf](https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Matthew_Browne/publication/259110637_Delusions_of_Expertise_%0B_Proof_Needed_to_Demonstrate_Skills_at_Horserace_Handicapping/links/53f7f39e0cf24ddba7db294b.pdf)

<sup>39</sup> **WHY WE THINK WE'RE GOOD AT SOMETHING WHEN WE'RE NOT** by ScienceDaily.

<http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2014/04/140402095056.htm>

**BELIEVING THAT OTHERS UNDERSTAND, HELPS US FEEL THAT WE DO, EVEN WHEN WE DON'T** by ScienceDaily.

<https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2016/10/161005095503.htm>

<sup>40</sup> **SMILE OR DIE** by RSAnimate. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=u5um8QWWRvo>

**YOU CAN DO IT, BABY!** by Leslie Garrett. <http://aeon.co/magazine/psychology/why-telling-kids-to-dream-big-is-a-big-con/>

**DON'T THINK TOO POSITIVE** by Gabriele Oettingen for Aeon.

<https://aeon.co/essays/thinking-positive-is-a-surprisingly-risky-manoeuvre>

<sup>41</sup> **THE PLACEBO EFFECT: SHOULD DOCTORS BE PRESCRIBING SUGAR PILLS?** by Walter Brown. Scientific American, Jan 1998.

**WHAT IF AGE IS NOTHING BUT A MIND-SET?** by Bruce Grierson.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2014/10/26/magazine/what-if-age-is-nothing-but-a-mind-set.html?smid=tw-share&r=0>

<sup>42</sup> **SELF-DECEPTION AND SURVIVAL: MENTAL COPING STRATEGIES ON THE WESTERN FRONT, 1914-18** by Alex Watson.

[http://www.jstor.org/stable/30036385?seq=1#page\\_scan\\_tab\\_contents](http://www.jstor.org/stable/30036385?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents)

*"This special sense of personal relation to the sacred object may be compared to the irresistible influence on certain people of particular objects, such as an amulet that is believed to protect from danger or infection, a mascot that is supposed to bring good luck to a military unit, or a fetish that is essential to one's feeling of well-being. Sexual fetishism is a well-known example of this compulsive dependence. On a religious level, the veneration of relics of saints, icons, sacred pictures, or the cross is an example of such an influence"* (THE I AND THE NOT I, by M Esther Harding, pg 183)

A very common delusion is hero worship. I discussed this in my first book, **THE BOY WHO LIVED**<sup>43</sup>. You see hero worship in all the most popular movies. You even see hero worship in history books, where a single man can be elevated to hero status, just by mere words alone and not by actually doing any of the things they are imagined to have done<sup>44</sup>. Hero worship demonstrates for us how delusions can evolve into make believe stories that are believed to be fact, and by implication, that each and every delusion is a like a story that allows us a glimpse behind the mask of the storyteller, revealing what the deluded are really made of. That is why delusions tend to be very unique because every person uses a different combination of fantasy props to give their life meaning and purpose<sup>45</sup>.

Another very common delusion that I have observed, is the belief in the existence of a spirit or soul. Again, whenever people encounter phenomena that defy logical explanation, people resort to imaginary explanations instead, and the animating principle of what gives beings life, is one such mystery. The way people can think and feel and have personalities, is another such mystery. So people can see that we have life and personality, but they cannot see or explain what gives us life and personality, so they invent a spirit and soul out of thin air, which they can then mentally project onto us and, abracadabra! viola!, they now an explanation of how we can have life and personality. So now we are in a position to answer the question, why are people more intelligent than animals? Because people have more of this imaginary spirit or soul than animals do. This never really explains anything and cannot be proven to exist outside of our imaginations, hence the reason the soul or spirit qualify as delusions, but like any delusion, if you really take a hard look at it, it falls apart. For example, where does your spirit and soul disappear to when you fall asleep? What happens to the spirit or soul when a person is brain dead or unconscious? How is it that brain damage can also damage your personality? Does damaging the brain, damage the spirit or soul? Suddenly, that which gives life and enables you to perceive, cannot logically exist.

As another example of a personal delusion, as a teenager, I once had a fellow teenager tell me that I had to put on an act in order to attract women; that I had to think positive and imagine myself being the best looking guy in the world so that women would wonder what made me special and what made me believe I was so attractive. He said I had to imagine that I was invincible and powerful so that I would project power and confidence to all the women around me. But I never did that because I thought about what would happen after you attracted a woman and then she saw a frog instead of a prince? He also talked as though women were trophies instead of a person you would actually love. What I began to learn from this incident, was that people are attracted to delusions more so than to reality.

<sup>43</sup> **THE BOY WHO LIVED** by Andrew Robinson. <http://www.amazon.com/The-Boy-Lived-Andrew-Robinson/dp/146698158X>

<sup>44</sup> **TECH'S ENDURING GREAT-MAN MYTH** by Amanda Schaffer. <http://www.technologyreview.com/review/539861/techs-enduring-great-man-myth/>

<sup>45</sup> **SOCIETALLY-ENGAGED ADULTS SEE THEIR LIVES AS REDEMPTION STORIES** by ScienceDaily.

<http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2015/03/150309124152.htm>

**CLIMATE OF DOUBT** by Lois Parshley. <http://aeon.co/magazine/psychology/dowsing-for-water-is-a-test-of-faith-and-science/>

You tell yourself that you don't want to believe all this "nonsense", that delusions don't occur for anyone except the most mentally ill, but you would be mistaken, for example, half of all people can be easily convinced of the existence of events that never happened, even to themselves<sup>46</sup>! I suppose the other half of all people are the ones who are convinced of the existence of things that don't exist, like their beliefs in a spirit/soul, the supernatural, miracles, ESP, positive thinking, snake oil, placebo, hero worship, any religious belief, and most political beliefs. People only want to believe what they want to believe, facts be damned. Delusions are a useful psychological tool, but as soon as that tool has served its purpose, like any outdated tool, you discard it for a newer and better one. In other words, delusions evolve by self-destructing and then starting a new delusion with a new purpose. So don't get me wrong, delusions are good things that allowed ancient humans a way to fool themselves into leaving the safety and comfort of their homes, and travel the world. Instead of remaining where they were, stagnating or locked in the jaws of depression, delusions motivated humans to do things they couldn't otherwise imagine doing, and no delusion would be possible if it weren't for your imagination.

*"Don't part with your illusions. When they are gone you still exist, but you have ceased to live"*

**(Mark Twain)**

---

<sup>46</sup> HALF OF PEOPLE BELIEVE FAKE FACTS by MedicalXpress. <http://medicalxpress.com/news/2016-12-people-fake-facts.html>  
CAUGHT RED-MINDED: EVIDENCE-INDUCED DENIAL OF MENTAL TRANSGRESSION by Bethany Burum et al.  
[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/301697344\\_Caught\\_Red-Minded\\_Evidence-Induced\\_Denial\\_of\\_Mental\\_Transgressions](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/301697344_Caught_Red-Minded_Evidence-Induced_Denial_of_Mental_Transgressions)

# Imagination

People never perceive the world as it actually is<sup>47</sup>. As Carl Jung said,

*“All that I experience is [mental]. Even physical pain is a [mental] image which I experience; my sense-impressions...my own [mind] even transforms and falsifies reality, and it does this to such a degree that I must resort to artificial means to determine what things are like apart from myself”*

**(COLLECTED WORKS OF JUNG, vol 8, para 680)**

Instead of directly perceiving the world, what actually happens is the outside world is filtered, first by our senses due to their limited responses, then by our brains due to its limited capabilities. So in order to make sense of a world in which we are twice removed, nature has given us the ability to imagine how the world might work; to imagine that life has meaning or that life after death exists<sup>48</sup>. Imagination is the foundation upon which every interpretation or philosophy ever conceived is based on. If I could sum up this ability in two words, those two words would be “magical thinking”.

Magical thinking has provided us with a coping mechanism by which humans can operate or survive in a Universe of unknowns and unknowables. They are the imagined rules by which the unknown or unknowable thing operates, so we can fool ourselves into believing we are able to understand and interact or engage with it without fear. Technically, magical thinking is pure nonsense but it is extremely useful nonsense nonetheless. Does it always work? Of course not, but when it does, it works...just like magic! Magical thinking works often enough and is simple enough to follow, that it became another one of the dominant modes of human perception.<sup>49</sup>

Behind the philosophy of science, otherwise called the pursuit of truth, is the unspoken assumption that our interpretations of the world can reflect non-imaginary truths, so long as our imaginations are forced to coincide with actual physical reality instead of our fantasies. Science does this by attempting to find any flaw in the logic, demonstrable experiment, reasoning, or justification of a claim. Any such flaw would be grounds to discredit an interpretation and that is what the scientific method really is all about in a nutshell: finding flaws. It is also why there isn't really a list of do's and don'ts of a proper scientific methodology (although there are some general guidelines that work under limited conditions).

---

<sup>47</sup> **THE BRAIN TREATS REAL AND IMAGINARY OBJECTS IN THE SAME WAY** by ScienceDaily.

<http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2015/03/150306073732.htm>

<sup>48</sup> **AFTERLIFE BELIEF PRESERVES HOPE WHEN THINKING ABOUT DEATH, NEW RESEARCH SUGGESTS** by ScienceDaily.

<http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2015/05/150514095606.htm>

**HOPELESSLY MORTAL: THE ROLE OF MORTALITY AND SALIENCE, IMMORTALITY AND TRAIT SELF-ESTEEM IN PERSONAL HOPE** by Arnaud Wisman. [https://kar.kent.ac.uk/48673/1/Hopelessly%20Mortal\\_Cognition%20%26%20Emotion\\_2015.pdf](https://kar.kent.ac.uk/48673/1/Hopelessly%20Mortal_Cognition%20%26%20Emotion_2015.pdf)

**ATHEISTS INSPIRE THOUGHTS OF DEATH IN MANY AMERICANS** by Stephanie Pappas.

<http://www.livescience.com/50872-atheists-remind-people-of-death.html>

<sup>49</sup> **THE MAGICAL LEVEL OF CONSCIOUSNESS** by Gertrud Ujhely. <http://journalpsyche.org/articles/0xc0a3.pdf>

**PARANORMAL, SUPERSTITIOUS, MAGICAL, AND RELIGIOUS BELIEFS** by Kia Asrnio.

<https://helda.helsinki.fi/bitstream/handle/10138/19774/paranorm.pdf>

**THE INTUITIVE MAGICIAN: WHY BELIEF IN THE SUPERNATURAL PERSISTS** by Bruce Hood. <http://evolution.binghamton.edu/evos/wp-content/uploads/2010/01/IntuitiveMagician.pdf>

**WHY ARE WE HUMANS SO PRONE TO BELIEVING SPOOKY NONSENSE?** by Nigel Warburton. [https://aeon.co/opinions/belief-in-supernatural-beings-is-totally-natural-and-false?utm\\_source=feedburner&utm\\_medium=feed&utm\\_campaign=Feed%3A+AeonMagazineEssays+%28Aeon+Magazine+Essays%29](https://aeon.co/opinions/belief-in-supernatural-beings-is-totally-natural-and-false?utm_source=feedburner&utm_medium=feed&utm_campaign=Feed%3A+AeonMagazineEssays+%28Aeon+Magazine+Essays%29)

**THE 7 LAWS OF MAGICAL THINKING – HOW IRRATIONAL BELIEFS KEEP US HEALTHY, HAPPY, AND SANE** by Matthew Hutson.

<https://www.amazon.com/Laws-Magical-Thinking-Irrational-Beliefs/dp/0452298903>

Please note that finding flaws is not the same thing as fault finding or nit-picking, it's about discovering cracks in the logic, methods, or communication of an idea. Because not all scientists practice the scientific method (or they make mistakes), this is why any discovery or claim must be put up for peer review – so that it can be subjected to scrutiny for any flaws. To believe anyone's interpretation of reality without doubt (the opposite of skepticism), is called blind faith, ignorance, or just plain gullibility.

What does finding flaws entail? According to people who have actually researched this (Ronald Giere<sup>50</sup> for example) in order to communicate an interpretation without any flaws in it, you must be able to know how to:

- 1) Make logically consistent and valid statements.
- 2) Justify statements using deductive and inductive reasoning.
- 3) Make valid conditional arguments.
- 4) Know what makes a guess "educated" and not a fantasy.
- 5) Justify a scientific hypothesis, e.g. – what makes a good test of a hypothesis.
- 6) Know and understand the difference between causation and correlation, and valid forms of each.
- 7) Justify a statistical hypothesis (e.g. – understanding that correlations are not the same thing as causes).
- 8) Justify a causal hypothesis.

The existence of science clearly demonstrates humans are expertly capable of discerning fantasy from reality with great precision, yet we can objectively observe that most of the time they choose **not** to exercise that capability<sup>51</sup>. Don't get me wrong, without magical thinking, the world that we know of today would not exist, after all, it was the magical thinking behind alchemy that indirectly led us to the science of chemistry, and it was the magical thinking of astrology that indirectly led us to the science of astronomy<sup>52</sup>. More importantly, magical thinking is what allowed humans to survive for hundreds of thousands of years, but humans have yet to learn that while imagination is limitless, reality is quite a bit more limited.

Now that we have come to understand how humans have many mental abilities that on the surface appear to be inferior or bad qualities, yet in the original environment in which they developed, they were very beneficial. It is now time to understand how, in today's world, how these former beneficial abilities have become detrimental to our ability to reason and exist.

---

<sup>50</sup> **UNDERSTANDING SCIENTIFIC REASONING** by Ronald Giere.

<http://www.amazon.com/Understanding-Scientific-Reasoning-Ronald-Giere/dp/0030630681>

<sup>51</sup> **MAZES AND BRAINS: WHEN PRECONCEPTION TRUMPS LOGIC** by MedicalXpress.

<http://medicalxpress.com/news/2015-12-mazes-brains-preconception-trumps-logic.html>

**WHY FACTS DON'T CHANGE OUR MINDS** by Elizabeth Kolbert for The New Yorker.

<http://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2017/02/27/why-facts-dont-change-our-minds>

<sup>52</sup> **PARADIGMS LOST** by David P Barash. <https://aeon.co/essays/science-needs-the-freedom-to-constantly-change-its-mind>

# A Short History of Civilization

Between 500,000 to 50,000 years ago, humans were not in process of evolving so they could move into a house on a crowded street in the middle of a crowded city, and then rarely ever visit or talk or trust their next-door neighbors, yet that sums up exactly what modern civilization has been like for the last 5,000 years of history. The Big City has brought humans together in massive herds of millions and millions of humans, far exceeding their Dunbar Number. Just because we don't live in tribes anymore doesn't mean we have outgrown our ingrained, preprogrammed tribal mentality<sup>53</sup>. Transitioning from a tropical jungle to a concrete jungle has been very detrimental to the natural functioning of a tribe-based mindset because when people are placed in unnatural environments that do not and cannot conform to their natural mindset, they can only become dysfunctional, and our present world is very much dysfunctional<sup>54</sup>. Belonging to a herd instead of a tribe has made everyone feel anonymous or like "just another face in the crowd", instead of part of a warm and cozy tribe or small village.

All the war mongering, fanaticism<sup>55</sup>, racism, terrorism, rages, and generalized hatred/disdain people have for each other in today's world are not mentally healthy behaviors, they are symptoms that something is wrong. What is wrong is that humans are living in a socially dysfunctional environment and in turn that dysfunctional environment it is turning people into dysfunctional beings. There is no escaping it. Unlike drugs, you just can't say no to psychology.

## Sociability

Social functioning is not something seen only in humans. Primates, in general, are all uniquely social in their own way<sup>56</sup>. There are many mammals and insects<sup>57</sup> that are social as well. Elephants are my favorite, but are humans superior at social cognition than these other animals, say, for example, the other primates? Take a look at human's social cooperation in their wanton destruction of the environment, the many extinctions they've caused, their mass murdering of other humans in wars, their males blatant disregard for the females of their species (sexism), their universal racist attitudes, and all the other rampant and pure hatred humans have for nature and each other. Now try to tell me that a reasonable answer to that question could be anything other than no.

---

<sup>53</sup> **AUTOMATICITY OF SOCIAL BEHAVIOR: DIRECT EFFECTS OF TRAIT CONSTRUCT AND STEREOTYPE ACTIVATION ON ACTION** by John Bargh.  
[http://www.yale.edu/acmelab/articles/bargh\\_chen\\_burrows\\_1996.pdf](http://www.yale.edu/acmelab/articles/bargh_chen_burrows_1996.pdf)

<sup>54</sup> **THE 99 PERCENT -- DEVELOPMENT AND SOCIALIZATION WITHIN AN EVOLUTIONARY CONTEXT** by Darcia Narvaez.  
[https://www3.nd.edu/~dnarvaez/documents/17\\_Fry\\_Ch17dpf-edited.pdf](https://www3.nd.edu/~dnarvaez/documents/17_Fry_Ch17dpf-edited.pdf)

**EVOLUTIONARY MEDICINE AND FUTURE OF HUMANITY: WILL EVOLUTION HAVE THE FINAL WORD?** by Arthur Saniotis and Maciej Henneberg. <http://www.mdpi.com/2076-0787/2/2/278>

**GROUP SETTINGS CAN DIMINISH EXPRESSIONS OF INTELLIGENCE, ESPECIALLY AMONG WOMEN** by MedicalXpress.  
<http://medicalxpress.com/news/2012-01-group-diminish-intelligence-women.html>

**ANCIENT DNA CAN BOTH DIMINISH AND DEFEND MODERN MINDS** by ScienceDaily.  
<https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2016/12/161230103543.htm>

<sup>55</sup> **HOW EXTREME BELIEFS, NOT MENTAL ILLNESS, MAY FUEL MASS SHOOTERS** by Michael S Rosenwald for The Washington Post.  
<https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/local/wp/2016/05/25/how-extreme-beliefs-not-mental-illness-often-fuel-mass-shooters/>  
**ANDERS BREIVIK: EXTREME BELIEFS MISTAKEN FOR PSYCHOSIS** by Tahir Rahman et al for the Journal of the American Academy for Psychiatry and Law. <http://www.jaapl.org/content/44/1/28.full.pdf>

<sup>56</sup> **MOTHER CHIMPS CRUCIAL FOR OFFSPRING'S SOCIAL SKILLS** by PhysOrg.  
<http://phys.org/news/2013-09-mother-chimps-crucial-offspring-social.html>

<sup>57</sup> **SOCIAL BRAINS: DO INSECT SOCIETIES SHARE BRAIN POWER?** by PhysOrg.  
<http://phys.org/news/2015-06-insect-societies-brain-power.html>

Most people don't like a person who is aggressive and violent, yet this is exactly the type of person you would want to have defending you from danger. In the very distant past, aggressive and violent types of people would have taken on the social role of the protector of the group but in today's dysfunctional world, the protector has become the thug or murderer. The social role of the protector hasn't changed, only now that they have no tribe to protect anymore, they are just simply being hostile to everyone because the vast majority of people are correctly perceived as "not-tribe"

58

Everyone dreams of having a great leader come forth and rescue them from the ills of today's civilization, but natural born leaders did not evolve to govern herds, but only small to medium-size tribes, so all of our leaders-to-be in today's world will only be dysfunctional ones. The irresistible social urge to always choose a leader for yourselves, means that to maintain that illusion of the great leader, followers must respect their leaders more than they do anyone else. For example, people in the workplace will not talk to or treat the CEO the same way they would treat the janitor. They will show a respect for the CEO that they would never show to the janitor, no matter what kind of person either one of them are on the inside. This preferential treatment and respect given to leaders, makes leaders very susceptible to delusions that they are of great importance and their judgements are superior to all others. This delusion is called hubris, which is similar to delusions of grandeur<sup>59</sup>, and while such a delusion could have been beneficial 12,000 years ago or more, it is completely dysfunctional in today's dysfunctional world.

People still have an irresistible urge to belong to a tribe, so it is possible for an individual to join a group where they do not even like the members of that group, if the urge is strong enough. This requires them to deceive the group by hiding their true feelings, whenever those feelings are not acceptable to that group. In this case, the person involved does not engage with others in their "group" but rather merely interacts with them. Relationship types like this become muddled and society itself transforms into one series of fictional relationships after another. People rarely had a need to maintain fictional relationships under the natural tribe mentality, but under the herd mentality, fictional relationships have become the rule instead of the exception.

Tribes are small groups that need to be widely separated from each other, but displacing humans from widely spaced tribes to closely spaced herds has triggered their built-in proximity alert, leading to relentless cut-throat or "dog-eat-dog" competition and the never ending thirst for war. You might wonder where the social function of empathy is in all of this<sup>60</sup>, but its existence is still firmly entrenched in the human mind, because without empathy there could be no wars. That's because empathy is what makes people want to "join the cause". In fact, empathy is the only thing able to bring people together for things like lynching's or cults or revolutions or wars.

---

<sup>58</sup> **THE SCIENCE BEHIND SPITE** by PhysOrg. <http://phys.org/news/2015-04-science-spite.html>

**SOCIAL EVOLUTION IN THE SHADOW OF ASYMMETRICAL RELATEDNESS** by Daniel Krupp et al.

[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/275668579\\_Social\\_evolution\\_in\\_the\\_shadow\\_of\\_asymmetrical\\_relatedness](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/275668579_Social_evolution_in_the_shadow_of_asymmetrical_relatedness)

<sup>59</sup> **LADY THATCHER AND TONY BLAIR USED 'HUBRISTIC LANGUAGE', RESEARCH FINDS** by MedicalXpress.

<http://medicalxpress.com/news/2013-09-lady-thatcher-tony-blair-hubristic.html>

<sup>60</sup> **THE COLLABORATIVE ROOTS OF CORRUPTION** by MedicalXpress.

<http://medicalxpress.com/news/2015-08-collaboration-corporate-corruption.html>

Another negative aspect to social cohesion within the framework of modern civilization is that when groups form, so do the boundaries that define, form, and protect that group<sup>61</sup>. These boundaries show up by way of segregation and exclusion. Those are methods to limiting the flux of people from entering and exiting a tribe and therefore provide group stability, but in today's civilization, that filtering function is still there and being used, only now it has transformed into elitism, sanctification, prejudice, and racism<sup>62</sup>.

Outsider influences can lead to unintended alliances and rivalries that, in turn, can split a group up into detrimental factions, therefore attacking outsiders can insure tribal stability, including having a socially shared contempt for the outsiders. Individuals within a group will identify with that group, meaning that the group comes to represent them as a person (self-completion), and any attack/compliment on the group is viewed as a personal attack/compliment on their own established social reputation within that group. This group identification often leads to resentment for outsiders, since outsiders haven't been initiated into the group and therefore are viewed as unable or unwilling to understand their group<sup>63</sup>.

In a social hierarchy, reputation is everything and it must be jealously guarded because your identity within a tribe is dependent on it. To lose your reputation is to lose everything that represents who you are, and therefore to lose your reputation would be like a death. A recent peer reviewed scientific journal article talks about how a person's perception of themselves can lead to bullying behavior, so if you feel that you should have more friends than you actually have (although it is a delusion, it is also probably true), you will resort to bullying behaviors<sup>64</sup>. We can also read from **THE PSYCHOLOGY OF ENVY**<sup>65</sup> that the more popular a person is (or the more popular they believe they are), the more prosocial they will become. This doesn't occur because these people aren't natural bullies anymore, but it occurs because they are trying to appease other people who might be detrimentally envious of them, i.e. – they are trying to head off people who will bully them because they are popular/ are at a lower social status than they are. So, as I pointed out before, a bully is rarely ever someone without emotional self-control as the world today claims they are.

Bullying is also a way to obtain resources or boost your reputation by way of exploitation. Bullying that is excessive or exploitive is the point when bullying becomes dysfunctional. Dysfunctional bullying is but one step away from being anti-social. In fact, being a practical joker is a socially acceptable way to do anti-social things. Most people do anti-social things in private but make their effects public. One example I've seen is in public restrooms in the workplace, where a typical anti-social act is usually performed by overflowing one or two of the toilets, sometimes over and over again. Doing anti-social things is a common way for people to express their anger and frustration against our dysfunctional world<sup>66</sup>.

---

<sup>61</sup> **HUMAN PREJUDICE HAS ANCIENT EVOLUTIONARY ROOTS** by PhysOrg.

<http://phys.org/news/2011-03-human-prejudice-ancient-evolutionary-roots.html>

**THE EVOLUTION OF INTERGROUP BIAS: PERCEPTIONS AND ATTITUDES IN RHESUS MACAQUES** by Neha Mahajan et al. <http://mail.ts-si.org/files/doi101037a0022459.pdf>

<sup>62</sup> **THE SCIENCE BEHIND SPITE** by PhysOrg. <http://phys.org/news/2015-04-science-spite.html>

**NEUROPSYCHOLOGY OF SOCIAL GROUPS** by MedicalExpress.

<http://medicalxpress.com/news/2014-01-neuropsychology-social-groups.html>

<sup>63</sup> **FRIEND OR FOE: BABIES CHOOSE SIDES EARLY** by ScienceDaily. <http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2013/03/130312092920.htm>

<sup>64</sup> **CHILDREN WHO OVERESTIMATE THEIR POPULARITY LESS LIKELY TO BE BULLIES** by ScienceDaily.

<http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2013/08/130810063012.htm>

<sup>65</sup> **THE BRIGHT SIDE OF A DEADLY SIN: THE PSYCHOLOGY OF ENVY** by Niels van de Ven.

[https://pure.uvt.nl/portal/files/1157239/Proefschrift\\_Niels\\_vdVen\\_131109.pdf](https://pure.uvt.nl/portal/files/1157239/Proefschrift_Niels_vdVen_131109.pdf)

<sup>66</sup> **ANONYMITY AND ANTISOCIAL BEHAVIOR** by Jamie Madigan.

<http://www.psychologyofgames.com/2010/02/deindividuation-and-antisocial-behavior/>

**CHICAGO KIDS TAKE ON BUNKER MENTALITY, NO 'FRIENDS'** by Melinda Burns.

<http://www.psmag.com/books-and-culture/chicago-kids-take-on-bunker-mentality-no-friends-23798>

Our viewpoint of the world, the way we imagine things work, the way we relate to other people, the way we imagine things to be, are expressed by our philosophies. In our civilization, we see philosophy the most in the form of mottos such as:

“Winning is everything”

“Second place is first place loser”

“Win at all costs”

"Nice guys always finish last"

I bring up these particular philosophies up because I have already described to you the purpose of competition, so it is impossible that any of these mottos is an invitation to a bout of “friendly competition”. I’ve heard the delusion that competition can teach teamwork and cooperation, but I don't see that happening anywhere in civilization. In fact, to call someone a loser is to insult them, not compliment them. Competition only leads to “dog-eat-dog” mentality, cut-throat competition, scandals, and cheating. I remember in High School being told to never say anything good about competing sports teams. They were the competition we were supposed to “utterly crush” and despise, yet these other High Schools had ordinary people just like you and me in them. Why are we are taught to treat other people just like ourselves as if they were our mortal enemies? Now you know why.

## Lying

Living in a world where most everyone your meet is not of your tribe, permanently engages people’s tribal defense mechanisms, and lying is no exception. Whereas lying used to provide a way to protect one from mind-reading by their enemies, only now it has become a way for many individuals to exploit and manipulate others for selfish or immoral purposes because everyone is correctly perceived as being “not-tribe”. Lies meant to protect a tribe now become a way to protect only yourself, hence the reason some of the most popular lies are, “I love you”, “I understand you”, “I’m alright”, “Good morning”, and “Trust me”. If you lie and get caught, people will scold you by lying and saying that lying is wrong, but it is only wrong in the context of today’s world.

# Self-Illusions

Have you ever noticed how humans have such a propensity to form addictions? It is like they want to be addicted. Humans have long been addicted to things like caffeine, alcohol, workaholism, speeding, and when it comes to religion or politics, fanaticism, which is a form of addiction. These ubiquitous addictions are mild to moderate in their effects, but the most interesting addiction to me was the use of cocaine as the main ingredient of snake oil for most everything people wanted a cure for in the early 20th century. That's when I realized that in the old days, before people knew anything about the biochemistry and neurological effects of drugs, all they knew was magic and superstition. They would be willing to try anything as a cure for what ailed them, but sometimes, every once in a while they would try something that altered their minds and it altered them in such a way that it reinforced their own delusions with matching hallucinations or warped perceptions.

These delusion-reinforcing kind of drugs then became "sacred" and people yearned and searched for other drugs that would magically connect them to their delusions, just as the people of today also still yearn and search for the magic pill that will cure them of whatever comes their way: cancer, colds, flu, obesity, someone else's autism, etc. When people consumed cocaine laden snake oil, the cocaine made them feel great and powerful, and that delusion alone was enough to reinforce their other delusions that they were being cured or at least getting much better. Medicinal drugs, vitamins, and weird home remedies are the new snake oil of the early 21st century, so don't ever think of snake oil pitches as dishonest advertising, think of it as the dishonest demands of people's relentless search for a new snake oil due to the result of unreasonable delusions. Delusions that at one time allowed a depressing reality to magically transform into an exciting fantasy, have become the foundation for addictions, elitism, sanctification, and superiority complexes.

Psychological addictions are really a form of extreme belief – you will blindly believe in something you want so badly, that you will believe anything make believe about it that justifies you getting it. A psychosis is characterized by "a distorted or nonexistent sense of objective reality"<sup>67</sup> taken to an extreme, so extreme beliefs can be almost indistinguishable from a psychosis, because it is normal self-delusional behavior taken to an extreme. For example, mass shootings are most likely fueled by hate filled extreme beliefs of one kind or another (usually religious or philosophical), and not because of any mental illness<sup>68</sup>.

I saw an ad the other day, describing a new American car as having all new "aggressive styling". The problem is, there is no such thing. Objects do not possess a property called "aggression" and aggression is not something that can be measured, aggression is only a behavior of animals. Rocks can't be aggressive because they do not possess personalities and likewise, cars can't be aggressive because they do not possess personalities. They can have color or texture, but not aggression. Aggression outside of any animal behavior is imaginary, so the styling of a car can only delude people into pretending that the car looks aggressive.

---

<sup>67</sup> **THE FREE DICTIONARY** by Farlex. <http://medical-dictionary.thefreedictionary.com/psychosis>

<sup>68</sup> **HOW EXTREME BELIEFS, NOT MENTAL ILLNESS, MAY FUEL MASS SHOOTERS** by Michael S Rosenwald for The Washington Post. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/local/wp/2016/05/25/how-extreme-beliefs-not-mental-illness-often-fuel-mass-shooters/>  
**ANDERS BREIVIK: EXTREME BELIEFS MISTAKEN FOR PSYCHOSIS** by Tahir Rahman et al for the Journal of the American Academy for Psychiatry and Law. <http://www.jaapl.org/content/44/1/28.full.pdf>

How do car manufacturers accomplish that? Well, one very popular way of adding "personality" to vehicles is to give them "faces": the headlights substitute for the eyes; the grill substitutes for the teeth or mouth; etc. From the front of a vehicle, you can be inspired to imagine that the headlights are "eyes" or the grill is a "mouth", so a Mazda 3 has a "happy face", while the modern Chevy Camaro Z1 has an "angry" or "aggressive face". But why have an aggressive style when you can have an assertive style? Why the appeal to aggression instead? To be aggressive is to put others on the defensive; to intimidate the opposition from even thinking of competing. That car companies would offer cars with "aggressive" styles and that there are so many people out there that want "aggressive" styles says a lot about the psychology of people. It says people want to intimidate other people; they want to force themselves onto other people and assert their superiority; they want to fight for a position in traffic and devastate anyone that dares to get in the way. Would they be any different in their politics or family life? I think not.

I had an enlightening conversation with a very religious co-worker some years ago. I found myself having to constantly defend myself for not being a religious person or one who would believe in any alleged supernatural claim. As a result, I earned a reputation of being outspoken in regards to not being religious so this one very religious man wanted me to challenge him with the most difficult questions or issues faced by his religion. I thought he might be mentally unstable to be asking a question like that but I humored him anyway and asked what his purpose was in having me challenge him. He said it was to help strengthen his faith. At the time that didn't even make sense but I just had to see where he was going with this, so I accepted his request. He sat down with me and we started a discussion which, while the first few things I brought up were good arguments, he had heard them all before and he simply deflected them with the usual denial or double-think that religious people regularly engage in. Rather than point out the errors in his reasoning, which I already knew never seemed to work on delusions anyways, I stepped up the discussion. At that point, he was unable to deny or deflect the things I pointed out and he remarked how excellent my arguments had become. He then stood up, smiled, politely thanked me for the challenge, and walked away. That was it! It took me a few days to understand the importance of this event, but when I had finally understood it, I was amazed: a very religious man had wanted me to effectively challenge his faith so he could continue to practice believing in his religion even in the midst of the most damning evidence or logic. He wanted an unbreakable faith that no amount of reasoning or facts could ever change. Believing in his religion no matter what, was more important than believing in reality no matter what...and no, he wasn't mentally unstable, he was perfectly sane and rational<sup>69</sup>.

Therefore, after reading this, if you believe that armed with this knowledge you can now go out into the world and save people from their delusions, you too are only deluding yourself. After all, can you tell a person hallucinating on LSD that their drug-induced hallucinations are not real? No, but even if you could convince them, would it make the hallucinations seem any less real? Heck no! There is no reasoning with a person that is hallucinating any more than there is no reasoning with a person that is delusional. The most you can do is try to dispel a delusion, but that isn't an easy task. Even when a person finally becomes disillusioned with a particular delusion, they will abandon it only to have them go out and find yet another delusion to become attached to again. You can't win so don't try<sup>70</sup>.

---

<sup>69</sup> **NEGATIVE SPIRITUAL BELIEFS ASSOCIATED WITH MORE PAIN AND WORSE PHYSICAL, MENTAL HEALTH** by ScienceDaily. <https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2015/09/150923125336.htm>

<sup>70</sup> **HOW FACTS BACKFIRE** by Joe Keohane. [http://www.boston.com/bostonglobe/ideas/articles/2010/07/11/how\\_facts\\_backfire/](http://www.boston.com/bostonglobe/ideas/articles/2010/07/11/how_facts_backfire/)  
**THE PROMISE AND PERIL OF REAL-TIME CORRECTIONS TO POLITICAL MISPERCEPTIONS** by R. Kelly Garrett et al. <http://wp.comm.ohio-state.edu/misperceptions/wp-content/uploads/2012/07/GarrettWeeks-PromisePeril-CSCW-final.pdf>

# Imagination

Remember how I pointed out that the existence of science clearly demonstrates humans are expertly capable of discerning fantasy from reality with great precision, yet most of the time they choose not to exercise that capability? Many scientists in today's dysfunctional world have given up on their former pursuit of truth and are now resorting to the study of their own poorly thought out imaginations and mislabeling it as "science"<sup>71</sup>. For example, let us take a look at the ever popular Flying Saucer fad, which seems to have a disproportionate number of experts with PhDs within its ranks. We all have the ability to know for a fact that ET piloted Flying Saucers only exists in people's imagination, as Ronald Giere, author of **UNDERSTANDING SCIENTIFIC REASONING** explains,

*"Those who believe that at least some unidentified flying objects (UFOs) do contain intelligent aliens are able to cite lots of 'facts' to support this belief. Why is it that scientists do not pay more attention to this 'evidence'? What makes the belief in an expanding universe scientifically acceptable and the belief in extraterrestrial visitation unacceptable? At the end of Part Two we will examine several examples in which the 'facts' fail to provide genuine evidence for the hypothesis in question. You will thus learn what distinguishes real science from mere speculation or pseudoscience"*

(**UNDERSTANDING SCIENTIFIC REASONING, Ronald N Giere, pg 6**)

Fast forwarding to the end of Part Two we read,

*"The basic data consist of REPORTS of UFO sightings, not the EXISTENCE of what was reported. This distinction is crucial because the fact that some people have reported such things has been verified by many investigators. There can be no doubt that people have made such reports. That the people in question actually saw or experienced what they say they did, however, is open to question"*

(**UNDERSTANDING SCIENTIFIC REASONING, Ronald N Giere, pg 166**)

There is no reason to believe in the existence of Flying Saucers outside of people imagining them to exist, yet many people still choose to do so anyway. I can't count the number of very well-educated people with PhDs, who have jumped on the UFO bandwagon and should know better, but still go through the motions of believing with nothing real to ever show for their efforts.

Now take a look at Global Warming<sup>72</sup>. Since 1900 AD, there has been a slight warming trend of +1.25°F in average global temperature, but that does not compare to the warming trend that occurred during the Medieval Warming Period of 1100-1300 AD, when it was +2.55°F warmer than it was in 1900 AD. During the Medieval Warming Period, Greenland had much less ice than it does today. In fact, the Vikings had farmsteads at Brattahlid, Greenland where they were able to grow grain and raise dairy cattle there – why do you think the Vikings named it **Green**land? Why do you think scientists also named this period in history the Medieval Climatic **Optimum** instead of the Medieval Climatic **Catastrophe**? 100 years after the Medieval Climatic Optimum ended, the Little Ice Age of 1400-1850 AD, reversed the Medieval Warming Period temperatures by -1.3°F. The fact that we are still not as warm as it was during the Medieval Climatic Optimum, can be proven by the fact that,

<sup>71</sup> **OFFLINE: WHAT IS MEDICINE'S 5 SIGMA?** by Richard Horton.

<http://www.thelancet.com/pdfs/journals/lancet/PIIS0140-6736%2815%2960696-1.pdf>

<sup>72</sup> **WHY WE NEED TO STOP THINKING SO MUCH ABOUT CLIMATE CHANGE** by Brandon Keim. [https://aeon.co/opinions/why-we-need-to-stop-thinking-so-much-about-climate-change?utm\\_source=feedburner&utm\\_medium=feed&utm\\_campaign=Feed%3A+AeonMagazineEssays+%28Aeon+Magazine+Essays%29](https://aeon.co/opinions/why-we-need-to-stop-thinking-so-much-about-climate-change?utm_source=feedburner&utm_medium=feed&utm_campaign=Feed%3A+AeonMagazineEssays+%28Aeon+Magazine+Essays%29)

**THE GLOBAL WARMING PRIMER** by Andrew Robinson. <http://www.theboywholived.me/index.htm?41>

*“The cultivation of grapes for wine making was extensive throughout the southern portion of England from about 1100 to around 1300 (Lamb 1965). This represents a northward latitude extension of about 500 km from where grapes are presently [in 2002] grown in France and Germany. Grapes were also grown in the north of France and Germany at this time, areas which even today do not sustain commercial vineyards...vineyards were found at 780 meters above sea level in Germany. Today they are found up to 560 meters. If one assumes a 0.6-0.7°C change/100 meter vertical excursion, these data imply that the average mean temperature was 1.0-1.4°C higher than the present...further botanical evidence which suggests a climatic shift to a colder time is the lowering of the tree line by 70 to 300 meters in the Alps (Lamb 1977, p. 436). This observation is supported by the remains of peat deposits and forests at higher elevations than they presently occur. A similar 100-200 meter lowering of the tree line also occurred in Northern Germany. Iceland experienced a 300 meter lowering of the tree line to the present day levels” (Geoscience Research Institute, THE LITTLE ICE AGE, Richard D. Tkachuck, <http://www.grisda.org/origins/10051.htm>)*

Then there is the matter of Dark Matter. In order to explain the observation that the outer 2/3rds of all galaxies are uniformly rotating much too fast for gravity to keep the stars in their orbits and from sailing off into space, “scientists” have decided to pretend that there must be another form of matter that somehow magically matches the distribution of each and every star, in every galaxy, star-for-star. As an example, our Sun has an orbital velocity of 220 km/sec, which is 60 km/sec too fast<sup>73</sup>. At that velocity, it would take 5.3 Suns worth of Dark Matter to keep the Sun from catapulting off into space. Supposedly there is this huge amount of Dark Matter floating around our Solar System, yet not a single speck of this 5.3 Suns worth of Dark Matter is anywhere to be found between our Sun and anywhere else within the distance between any of its neighboring Stars<sup>74</sup>. So we are talking about very dense matter, yet it magically has an index of refraction of exactly one, so it is perfectly transparent, optically and thermally, in every sense of the word, all in violation of a great many laws of science, such as Stepen-Boltzman’s law, Snell’s law, etc. This Dark Matter also magically does not interact with ordinary matter much in any way except for its extremely selective gravitational interaction, so selective that 5.3 Solar Masses of it has absolutely no gravitational effect on the orbits of the Sun’s planets or inbetween nearby stars (also with extreme amounts of Dark Matter), yet Dark Matter only has a gravitational effect between the Sun and the center of the Milky Way galaxy. Dark Matter can only be imagined to be somewhere out there and never demonstrated to be right here. The fundamental prediction of Dark Matter that Dark Matter exists, is a failed prediction because, by definition, no one can directly demonstrate that Dark Matter exists.

In the past, it was not considered scientific reasoning if you had to first disbelieve in any LAW of physics (much less MANY laws of physics), in order to justify a hypothesis and “make it work”. That is a very unscientific process but the fact that so many scientists have hopped on the unscientific bandwagon of dark matter, indicates modern day science is based more on popular fads than on science. You could replace the term “Dark Matter” with “invisible pink elephants”, and still these “scientists” arguments, reasoning, and conclusions would remain completely unaffected, hence the reason I said before that the theory of Dark Matter is not what is flawed in today’s world, but the ability of modern day science to teach or require scientists to think rationally, logically, and objectively. Dark Matter is clearly blind faith nonsense and not actual science<sup>75</sup>.

<sup>73</sup> DARK MATTER by Prof. Barbara Ryden. [http://www.astronomy.ohio-state.edu/~ryden/ast143/Oct\\_16.pdf](http://www.astronomy.ohio-state.edu/~ryden/ast143/Oct_16.pdf)

<sup>74</sup> SERIOUS BLOW TO DARK MATTER THEORIES? NEW STUDY FINDS MYSTERIOUS LACK OF DARK MATTER IN SUN’S NEIGHBORHOOD by ScienceDaily. <http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2012/04/120418111923.htm>

When I was diagnosed with MS (Multiple Sclerosis) at 49 years of age, the doctors tried explaining what it was, but they seemed to have difficulty explaining it to me. They claimed it was autoimmunity against myelin because MS always tested positive for antibodies for myelin. Then I asked them why MS only attacks the central nervous system and never the peripheral nervous system, seeing as they both have identical myelin? Didn't they know that the immune system serves two purposes: the first being to protect against foreign invaders and the second for clean-up after the damage is done? So in the case of Multiple Sclerosis, myelin that is collateral damage due to other causes will still need to be targeted for clean-up by having T-cells release antibodies for the myelin fragments. Having antibodies for myelin doesn't prove that it is due to an autoimmune reaction against myelin<sup>76</sup>, but why do I have to tell doctors with PhDs this truism?

A politically scientific example of imagination gone unchecked is communism. For years, the American Government drilled the message into the minds of all Americans that communism was part of some imaginary "axis of evil" and therefore an ever present danger. Communism was supposed to be taking over the world and would eventually destroy it, so we had to be ever ready to fight and be ever vigilant to detect and root it out from where it could be hiding. People even went so far as to accuse their fellow citizens of being communist spies. Years later, we discover from history past that none of this was true, that communism was never ever a threat to the world or to America, it was never a part of some "axis of evil", nor had it ever infiltrated or had plans to infiltrate our civilian ranks<sup>77</sup>. The communist delusion is an especially important one because it highlights the psychological danger of failing to separate imagination from reality.

Yet while imaginary things just happen inside our heads, as Albus Dumbledore told Harry Potter in **THE DEATHLY HALLOWS**, "...why on earth should that mean that it is not real?",

*"If a man imagined that I was his arch-enemy and killed me, I should be dead on account of mere imagination. Imaginary conditions do exist and they may be just as real and just as harmful or dangerous as physical conditions. I even believe that [mental] disturbances are far more dangerous than epidemics or earthquakes. Not even the medieval epidemics of bubonic plague or smallpox killed as many people as certain differences of opinion in 1914 or certain political 'ideals' in Russia"*

**(COLLECTED WORKS OF CARL JUNG, Vol 11, para 17)**

---

<sup>75</sup> **COSMOLOGISTS SHOULD BE MORE SKEPTICAL OF DARK MATTER** by Stuart Clark. [https://aeon.co/opinions/cosmologists-should-be-more-skeptical-of-dark-matter?utm\\_source=feedburner&utm\\_medium=feed&utm\\_campaign=Feed%3A+AeonMagazineEssays+%28Aeon+Magazine+Essays%29](https://aeon.co/opinions/cosmologists-should-be-more-skeptical-of-dark-matter?utm_source=feedburner&utm_medium=feed&utm_campaign=Feed%3A+AeonMagazineEssays+%28Aeon+Magazine+Essays%29)

<sup>76</sup> **MYELIN OLIGODENDROCYTE GLYCOPROTEIN** by World Public Library. <http://www.worldlibrary.org/article/WHEBN0002863161/Myelin%20oligodendrocyte%20glycoprotein>

<sup>77</sup> **McCARTHYISM** from Wikipedia. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/McCarthyism>

Unlike real things, imaginary things can never directly harm you unless you react to them as if they were real. If you don't react, they will have absolutely no effect, unlike physically real things, which if you don't react to them can cause harm. Let me give some examples:

- A person is jay-walking and sees a truck approaching their path. They know that if they don't get out of the way, they will be harmed. The person runs, trips on the sidewalk curb, falls and breaks their arm.
- A person is jay-walking and imagines a truck approaching their path. They know that if they don't get out of the way, they will be harmed. The person runs, trips on the sidewalk curb, falls and breaks their arm.

The real condition and the imaginary condition resulted in the same indirect effect, the same as if both events had been real. But on the other hand, the direct effects are a different story...

- A person is jay-walking and sees a truck approaching their path. They know that if they don't get out of the way, they will be harmed. The person does nothing and is greatly harmed.
- A person is jay-walking and imagines a truck approaching their path. They know that if they don't get out of the way, they will be harmed. The person does nothing and nothing happens to them in return.

In the distant past, imagination was the foundation by which beneficial delusions and lies based themselves on, but imagination has now become the fodder by which detrimental paranoia and phobias feed upon, paranoia's and phobias such as Global Warming, communism, government conspiracies, or even certain acts of terrorism.

# Universe 25

All functions of the mind were originally meant to be beneficial, but what happens when you take a beneficial function and exercise it in situations where it didn't develop to be used in? What you wind up with is a dysfunction.

In the 1960's there was a scientist, John B Calhoun, who did research on utopias. Utopias are the ultimate goal that every civilization would like to achieve. John used mice and gave them everything they could possibly need: food, water, perfect nesting grounds, freedom from predators, comfortable surroundings, and plenty of play space to roam around in. Everything went as expected: the mice were happy and proliferated. The elaborate constructs the mice were housed in were called "Universes" and they gave John a good feeling. He wrote about one in particular: "Universe 25"<sup>78</sup>. Like all the other Universes, the mice were given everything they needed to live the good life so the mice thrived and experienced explosive growth until there was no more room to grow and then, just like all the other Universes, they then experienced an explosive demise! John's good feelings were gone. Why didn't the mice just stop breeding until they naturally stabilized at some equilibrium point with the space they had? In short, what went wrong? Well actually, nothing went wrong. What happened is exactly what should have happened. You see, for one thing, they weren't just mice, they were spoiled brats who learned to expect and demand that everything go their way and only their way. Without a predator or a natural disaster or an epidemic, the mice were never living in a utopia, they were actually living in a dystopia. Another thing was these animals were apparently preprogrammed to self-destruct when their population reached a certain size and/or density. It was nature's backup population control plan in case all other natural checks and balances failed. It means that there can be no utopias, as humans have always imagined them.

We are not that special or unique in this Universe as we constantly try to delude ourselves into arrogantly believing. For example, the human brain does not stand on its own, it is comprised of the bits and pieces of all the animal brains that led up to the evolution of the human brain<sup>79</sup>. Behaviors in other animals appear in humans, and vice versa, just not to the same degree<sup>80</sup>, so if mice are preprogrammed to self-destruct, how do we know if humans aren't preprogrammed to do the same? Don't discount or dismiss this possibility out of hand, after all, many of the behaviors described in Universe 25 are exactly the same type of behaviors we have been seeing in escalating proportions in humans in recent history: children mass murdering other children, epidemics of child molesting priests, grown men sexting each other in the Halls of Congress, and people too busy making ends meet to take the time to raise their own children at home by themselves, and so on. For evidence of a Universe 25 already taking root in today's world, just watch people while they drive – the majority of drivers are neither reasonable (logical-minded) nor prudent (err on the side of caution) nor courteous (polite to others)<sup>81</sup>.

---

<sup>78</sup> **DEATH SQUARED: THE EXPLOSIVE GROWTH AND DEMISE OF A MOUSE POPULATION** by John Calhoun.  
<http://tomax7.com/HeyGod/misc/MousePopulationStudy.PDF>

<sup>79</sup> **RATS, REASONING, AND REHABILITATION** by ScienceDaily. <http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2015/03/150330084250.htm>  
**MONKEYS AND HUMANS SEE VISUAL ILLUSIONS IN A SIMILAR WAY, STUDY FINDS** by PhysOrg.

<http://phys.org/news/2015-09-monkeys-humans-visual-illusions-similar.html>

**CHIMPS: ABILITY TO 'THINK ABOUT THINKING' NOT LIMITED TO HUMANS** by ScienceDaily.

<http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2013/04/130403141442.htm>

**FROM MICE TO MEN: WHAT CAN WE LEARN ABOUT PERSONALITY FROM ANIMAL RESEARCH?** by Samuel Gosling.

<http://gosling.psy.utexas.edu/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/PsychBull01-M2M.pdf>

**WHY CROWS HOLD FUNERALS** by Mindy Weisberger. <http://www.livescience.com/53283-why-crows-hold-funerals.html>

**WILD AMERICAN CROWS GATHER AROUND THEIR DEAD TO LEARN ABOUT DANGER** by Kaeli N. Swift et al.

<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0003347215003188>

<sup>80</sup> **STUDY REVEALS RATS SHOW REGRET, A COGNITIVE BEHAVIOR ONCE THOUGHT TO BE UNIQUELY HUMAN** by MedicalXpress.

<http://medicalxpress.com/news/2014-06-reveals-rats-cognitive-behavior-thought.html>

<sup>81</sup> **NEARLY 80 PERCENT OF DRIVERS EXPRESS SIGNIFICANT ANGER, AGGRESSION, OR ROAD RAGE** by ScienceDaily.

<https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2016/07/160714091346.htm>

People rely on a social framework to provide self-completion but it just isn't there anymore so people turn to religion, science, technology, and engineering to solve all their "problems". While religion, science, technology, and engineering have made everything in civilization convenient and comfortable, they are also taking all the challenge out of life, and without a challenge; without imposed demands on their existence, just like with Calhoun's mice, there is not only no reason to evolve, it might even be a reason to regress. It seems that civilization has turned humans into spoiled-brats and that in turn has engaged the "use it or lose it" syndrome. Case in point: since 1884 until 2004, the typical person's IQ (Intelligence Quotient) has dropped a whopping 14 points<sup>82</sup>!

An apocalypse is a major worldwide disaster in which people learn something valuable from it, but the lesson doesn't teach them anything new, it teaches them what they should already know but have repressed. It is a revelation of what's behind the illusory curtains civilization has erected in order to make civilization possible. People that are no stranger to disasters, already have glimpses of this other reality, that is, the non-make believe reality they are so far removed from in today's world. One such person that I know of like that is Rebecca Solnit. As Rebecca said in her book, **HOPE IN THE DARK**,

*"What startled me about the response to disaster was not the virtue, since virtue is often the result of diligence and dutifulness, but the passionate joy that shone out from accounts by people who had barely survived. These people who had lost everything, who were living in rubble or ruins, had found agency, meaning, community, immediacy in their work together with other survivors. This century of testimony suggested how much we want lives of meaningful engagement, of membership in civil society, and how much societal effort goes into keeping us away from these fullest, most powerful selves. But people return to those selves, those ways of self-organising, as if by instinct when the situation demands it. Thus a disaster is a lot like a revolution when it comes to disruption and improvisation, to new roles and an unnerving or exhilarating sense that now anything is possible".*

What's the revelation being hinted at here? These people that are no strangers to major disasters, are once again experiencing what it is like to live in a world without a civilized mentality, but a tribal mentality instead, so that they can once again engage each other in meaningful ways in a social world in which you feel you are wanted and needed and loved by that world instead of being just another anonymous face in a sea of people. This will become painfully apparent to everyone during the coming apocalypse. I say the "coming apocalypse" because a huge number of people everywhere are predicting one, and when people believe in something that strongly, it will affect how they react to the world in that regard and turn it into a self-fulfilling prophecy. And I think they know it will occur because deep down inside, they know they deserve it. They are destroying the world via a 6th mass extinction event and they have destroyed their psychological connection to the world by eliminating their tribal roots for a dysfunctional civilized one, so it will be a demonstration of their karma in action.

---

<sup>82</sup> **IF MODERN HUMANS ARE SO SMART, WHY ARE OUR BRAINS SHRINKING?** by Kathleen McAuliffe for Discover Magazine.

<http://discovermagazine.com/2010/sep/25-modern-humans-smart-why-brain-shrinking>

**RESEARCHERS SUGGEST VICTORIAN-ERA PEOPLE MORE INTELLIGENT THAN MODERN-DAY COUNTERPARTS** by Bob Yirka.

<http://phys.org/news/2013-05-victorian-era-people-intelligent-modern-day-counterparts.html>

**MICROSOFT STUDY CLAIMS HUMAN ATTENTION SPAN NOW LAGS BEHIND GOLDFISH** by MedicalXpress.

<http://medicalxpress.com/news/2015-05-microsoft-human-attention-span-lags.html>

**ATTENTION SPANS** by Microsoft. <https://advertising.microsoft.com/en/WWDocs/User/display/cl/researchreport/31966/en/microsoft-attention-spans-research-report.pdf>

Throughout all of history, humans have spread from one area to the next, always thinking only in terms of their own survival and invariably destroying their environment and their health along the way. They do this by constantly meddling with things they don't understand (especially when it comes to maintaining a balance of nature). So wherever they go, they have consistently and constantly decimated entire populations of sentient beings<sup>83</sup>. The epitome of what meddling, bungling, deadly humans can do to their environment was displayed on Easter Island<sup>84</sup>. Therefore, abilities which once allowed humans to thrive along within their environment, are now causing them to flounder. You would think that all it would take to fix this problem is to put humans back into their natural element, but it is too late now to try and do anything about it now. The human "Masters of the Universe" have had thousands of years to get their act together and if they haven't been able to get their act together by now, they will never be able to get it together.

When Columbus and company invaded the New World, the first thing that happened was a mass die off of all the natives, because the natives weren't immune to Old World diseases<sup>85</sup>. They had not evolved to tolerate such alien Old World diseases. By not allowing the immune system of people to evolve and become resistant to certain diseases, they have become dependent upon vaccines instead of evolution, so if the vaccines ever disappear, humans will be decimated. Even if the vaccines don't disappear, that won't stop the diseases from evolving into more virulent forms<sup>86</sup>.

Ever since civilization was first instituted, the evolution of humans has come to a grinding halt. Think about it, for example, in the case of vaccines. Before vaccines were ever invented, what did people do? They would die of disease. To be more specific, 1-in-3 **children** would die before the age of five. And what was wrong with that? Nothing. It is the way Nature has always worked because Nature has a natural balance and a natural uber-moral aspect to it. It is humans that lack balance and morals. What I mean is, vaccines may or may not be safe (some people do have very severe, sometimes even deadly allergic reactions to some vaccines) and certain vaccines may or may not trigger (a word not to be confused with "cause") autism, but they do stifle evolution of a species. Humans did not evolve to have vaccines. Vaccines are unnatural and they prevent Nature from actively engaging in natural selection for creating a more fit species. 1-in-3 **children** are being born into this world and surviving what would have killed them in the past, and that allows them to procreate and inject their non-optimal genes into the rest of the general population. Given enough time, everyone would have the genes that doesn't protect them from death due to a particular disease and so someday, when the economy collapses and maybe an apocalypse occurs, it will result in no one being able to fund technologies of any kind anymore, and vaccinations will come to an end. The result will be much worse than it would have been otherwise, had vaccines not been invented. That's because at this point in history, far more than 1-in-3 **children** will die before the age of five when that happens because humans have stifled evolution and don't even know it.

---

<sup>83</sup> **330-POUND BEAVERS: WHAT EARTH WOULD BE LIKE WITHOUT US** by Walt Bonner.

<http://news.discovery.com/animals/330-pound-beavers-what-earth-would-look-like-without-us-150831.htm>

**PATCH DISTURBANCE AND THE HUMAN NICHE** by John M Logan. <http://www.dieoff.org/page78.htm>

**DISTURBANCE, PATCH FORMATION, AND COMMUNITY STRUCTURE** by Simon A Levin et al.

<http://www.pnas.org/content/71/7/2744.full.pdf>

<sup>84</sup> **RETHINKING THE FALL OF EASTER ISLAND** by Terry Hunt.

<http://www.americascientist.org/issues/pub/rethinking-the-fall-of-easter-island>

<sup>85</sup> **POPULATION HISTORY OF INDIGENOUS PEOPLES OF THE AMERICAS** from Wikipedia.

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Population\\_history\\_of\\_indigenous\\_peoples\\_of\\_the\\_Americas](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Population_history_of_indigenous_peoples_of_the_Americas)

**1491** by Charles Mann. <http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2002/03/1491/302445/>

<sup>86</sup> **SOME VACCINES SUPPORT EVOLUTION OF MORE-VIRULENT VIRUSES** by ScienceDaily.

<http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2015/07/150727143139.htm>

Take a look at all the skeletons of ancient humans before the advent of agriculture, about 15,000 years ago. One of the first things you will notice is how perfect their teeth are compared to modern day humans<sup>87</sup>. How did they get such straight and large pretty teeth without having to see a dentist to get braces? If you are really perceptive, you will also notice that these early humans had thicker bones. Only super-athletes have bones that thick and strong as a typical human had 15,000 years ago<sup>88</sup>.

It was all during this time (from 15,000 years ago to today) that civilization was forming, that the World's major religions were developed. So do you think these religions would have been beneficial or dysfunctional like humans were starting to act? To answer that question, let's look at one of the older (established circa 3000BC) and most popular of these religions, the Abrahamic religions.

As always, let's start from the beginning, and we can start by examining an ancient text called the book of Genesis. Genesis says that in the beginning, the **male** only God, Jehovah/Yaweh/Allah, made the Heavens and the Earth. Since the only angels mentioned in the Bible have **male** only names, we know that at this time, God populated Heaven with **male** only angels. Some people claim that angels are described as having no sex, so this male naming thing is only figurative, but **male names** aren't the only reason that we know it isn't just figurative, just read ahead to learn about how the Tabernacle proves they were all **males**.

The first human to ever be created was the **male** Adam. As an afterthought, God created Eve, and Adam was the kind of **man** who would **blindly follow any orders** that Eve gave **without question**, no matter how immoral the request. So when Eve told Adam, "Eat of the apple", Adam blindly obeyed without question or hesitation.

Genesis tells us of another man named Abram/Abraham, and God really, really liked this man. The best thing God liked about Abram was that Abram would **blindly do anything** God told him to do **without question** or hesitation, so when God told Abram to **murder his son**, Abram **blindly agreed to do it without question**. Murdering your own son is immoral in the same way that sexually molesting your son is immoral, so if God had asked Abram to **sexually molest his son**, would Abram still have **blindly agreed to do it without question**? Of course he would have. This makes Abram the most vile kind of immoral person that can exist, because both God and Abram **both had knowledge of good and evil, yet they both freely ignored this knowledge** when discussing what to do with Abram's son. You could never reason with a person that thinks like that, since whatever they do, they do it whether they know it to be immoral or not. They just don't care. Had I been there in Abram's place, I would have told God that, even if this whole murder-your-own-son thing was a charade, that I was a moral person and wouldn't agree to murdering anyone, even as a hypothetical request. So my question here becomes, why couldn't God have just asked Abraham to offer his son up for adoption as evidence of Abram's faith/love for God? Wouldn't an adoption be any more or less proof that Abraham's faith/love for God was so great, that Abram would be willing to sacrifice something dear to him to someone else, rather than to lose God's love or respect? It certainly sounds a lot more morally sensible instead of having Abraham commit murder or sending his underage son on an unwilling suicide mission.

---

<sup>87</sup> MALOCCLUSION AND DENTAL CROWDING AROSE 12,000 YEARS AGO WITH EARLIEST FARMERS by PhysOrg. <http://phys.org/news/2015-02-malocclusion-dental-crowding-arose-years.html>  
INCONGRUITY BETWEEN AFFINITY PATTERNS BASED ON MANDIBULAR AND LOWER DENTAL DIMENSIONS FOLLOWING THE TRANSITION TO AGRICULTURE IN THE NEAR EAST, ANATOLIA, AND EUROPE by Ron Pinhasi et al. <http://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0117301>

<sup>88</sup> AGRICULTURE, DECLINING MOBILITY DROVE HUMANS' SHIFT TO LIGHTER BONES by PhysOrg. <http://phys.org/news/2015-05-agriculture-declining-mobility-drove-humans.html>

Abram's blind faith obedience to even an immoral request, made God so happy that He swore to Abraham that he would have lots of descendants and they would all inherit a so-called "Promised Land". Fast forwarding 400 years into the future, we find lots of Abraham's descendants wandering the Sinai desert. Funny thing is, Abraham's descendants were all still just like Abraham because they too had absolutely no moral compass. So when God told Abraham's descendants to **go and kill every man, woman, suckling babe, and animal** in the Promised Land, they all **blindly agreed to do it without question** (an immoral event that was repeated multiple times thereafter<sup>89</sup>). Please make note of the fact that the people living in the Promised Land were not threatening or hurting or attempting to go to war with any of Abraham's descendants. They were just minding their own business. So to go to war against them would be an unprovoked war and therefore an immoral act in itself. Yet the first group of descendants to approach the Promised Land had no problem agreeing to do anything God asked of them without question, but they were too afraid of it's inhabitants to go though with God's dirty deeds, even though God had also promised to supernaturally help them achieve success doing it. It was at this point God passed the offer on to their children instead. Since their children also had absolutely no moral compass and readily agreed to **blindly do anything that God asked them to do**, and they weren't afraid of the Promised Land's inhabitants to go through with it, **God dearly loved them because of this**.

Had I been there in the Wilderness with Abraham's descendants, standing before the Promise Land, I would have told God that even if this whole hostile takeover of the Promised Land was a charade, like asking Abram to murder his son might have been, that I was a moral person and wouldn't agree to mass murder, racial/religious/ethnic cleansing, serial abortion, or animal cruelty. I would say that I would expect the God of the whole entire Universe to be able to naturally cause all the people in that land to peacefully vacate without me having to do anything immoral to make it happen, so that I wouldn't have to be an accessory to a crime of God's many dirty immoral deeds asked of me. Unfortunately, since I have a built-in moral compass and I follow it, I guess that is why I'm not one of God's chosen people, but I also guess I should thank God I'm not.

While wandering about the Sinai desert, Abraham's descendants carried a portable template or map of what Heaven is like, called a Tabernacle (a permanent version of the Tabernacle would be created later and be called the Temple). So using the Tabernacle as our map, what is Heaven like? Just outside the Tabernacle were a series of courtyards (<http://www.angelfire.com/nt/theology/temple.html>). In order of appearance, starting closest to the Tabernacle Tent and working your way out within the Inner Courts, was the **male only** Court of Priests, the **male only** Court of Levites, the **male only** Court of Men, followed by the Court of Women, and finally, the Outer Courts. Now the Court of Women was as close as women were allowed to be next to the Tabernacle. The Court of Men was as close as different races/foreigners were allowed to be next to the Tabernacle. The Tabernacle Tent itself was subdivided into two rooms: the Holy of Holies and the Holy Place. The Holy Place was reserved for the **male only** priests. These priests, save one, symbolized the angels in Heaven (hence why angels have **male only** names because they could only be men on pain of death). In the very heart and core of the Tabernacle, the place where the **male** God resided, was called "the Holy of Holies", and **only one male** priest could enter it – the High Priest – and even then only once a year. For Christians, the High Priest symbolizes the **male only** Jesus. Jesus himself had an inner circle of friends, who were **male only** descendants of Abraham, called Apostles.

---

<sup>89</sup> 1 Samuel 15:2-3, Hosea 9:11-16, Ezekiel 9:5-7, Exodus 12:29-30, Leviticus 26:21-22, Isaiah 13:15-18, Deuteronomy 13:13-19, etc.

We are now in a position to clearly understand and see how God engaged in favoritism with Abraham and all his descendants, which explains the very racist tone of Genesis and Exodus, but what was the explanation for the extreme segregation of sexes? Another book in the Bible, Leviticus, tells us because women were considered "unclean" -- you know, because they all had that "icky girly" once-a-month thing. So knowing that the Abrahamic religions are virulently sexist, racist, and hate mongering, the question becomes, is this the kind of religion you would want to pass on to your children as an example of what they should grow up to be like? Not if you are a moral person.

Today there are 3.6 billion people on this planet that blindly accept that kind of thinking without question and have made it their religion of choice. A scary thought concerning this is to think about how many people in today's world still act like they are descendants of Abraham? I know people who go to work for a company, but before they are hired they sign a non-disclosure agreement, part of which asks that you never say anything bad about the company or attempt to sue them no matter what they do or say. You are just supposed to blindly follow orders and obey them without question, but if you are not the type of person who likes to do that, at least just stand by and watch while other people do. This is especially true if you work for the military or police. So apparently, the more things change, the more they stay the same. The real life world today behaves exactly like Abraham's immoral descendants did, and will, without hesitation, blindly follow any order without question<sup>90</sup>. So even people's religions are horribly dysfunctional in today's world – and to an immorally terrifying degree!

People believe that because they have never been diagnosed with a mental illness or disorder, that they are therefore without any mental flaws. They naively believe that there could never be anything inherent in the behavior of normal human beings that is defective or that they could not be aware of. Nothing could be preprogrammed into their minds that would compel them to do things that were illogical or harmful to themselves and to others. But as I have shown, they are very wrong. In the last few years, there has been a seeming explosion of mental abnormalities or an inexplicable epidemic of mental illnesses. The reality is humans have brought much of it upon themselves. This makes mental illnesses a shared misfortune<sup>91</sup>. There is one mental illness in particular I would like to single out, due to its relevance to all that we have talked about so far, and that mental illness is called autism.

Autistics would be considered, by non-Autistics, to be dysfunctional even in an optimum environment, but what do you call a dysfunctional person living in a dysfunctional environment? How can you get a dysfunctional person to adapt to a dysfunctional environment? You would be just adding one dysfunction on top of another, and that is what the autistic person faces today, so welcome to the world of autism.

---

<sup>90</sup> **PROGRAMMERS ARE HAVING A HUGE DISCUSSION ABOUT THE UNETHICAL AND ILLEGAL THINGS THEY'VE BEEN ASKED TO DO** by Julie Bort for Business Insider.

<http://www.businessinsider.com/programmers-confess-unethical-illegal-tasks-asked-of-them-2016-11>

<sup>91</sup> **IS MODERN LIVING LEADING TO A 'HIDDEN EPIDEMIC' OF NEUROLOGICAL DISEASE?** by ScienceDaily.

<http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2015/08/150806091328.htm>

**A MAD WORLD** by Joseph Pierre. <http://aeon.co/magazine/psychology/have-psychiatrists-lost-perspective-on-mental-illness/>

**MADNESS MADE ME** by Nikki Castle.

<http://aeon.co/video/psychology/madness-made-me-when-mental-health-care-fails-the-human-being/>

# A Short History of Autism

People are possessed by this idea that autism is something relatively new and that it has been on the increase for the last 30-60 years to the point of becoming an epidemic. This is not even remotely true.

*“The finding that ASD is as common in the adult population as it is among children contradicts the idea that people can eventually ‘grow out of’ ASD. However, it also suggests, contrary to popular belief that ASD is not in itself becoming more prevalent. It may simply be easier for children now to obtain an ASD diagnosis than it was for previous generations”* (**ADULTS WITH AUTISM SPECTRUM DISORDER** at <http://www.autismspectrum.org.au/sites/default/files/PDFuploads/Adults%20with%20ASD.pdf>)

What are the statistics upon which autism “epidemic” rates are based on? The CDC (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention) has a program they fund called the ADDM (The Autism and Developmental Disabilities Monitoring Network), and this is the sole source of USA’s statistics. So what did the ADDM actually report? The ADDM polled all 50 states for autism rates, but only one state fully reported their rates, while another 10 had only partially reported. I say “partially reported” because many states had only one county report in<sup>92</sup>. Arizona, for example, had only one out of 15 counties report in: Maricopa. So how trustworthy do you think the statistics for those 11 states are, much less the entire country? Other problems we find with the autism rate statistics is the fact that the statistics are only based on 8-year olds. In and of itself, that is not so bad except by the time those 8-year olds reach 21, up to 25% of them will have lost their diagnosis<sup>93</sup>. Seeing as autism is a genetically based developmental disorder, this would not be due to anyone being cured of their autism, but rather it would be due to misdiagnosis or improper diagnosis. That's because genetics isn't curable and the diagnosis of it is not a science but a profession. The autism rate also neglects the fact that girls are vastly underdiagnosed<sup>94</sup> due to a male bias that permeates our society and the medical profession<sup>95</sup>, and it ignores the fact that minorities are underreported because they do not have the same access as the privileged majority does when it comes to medical treatments<sup>96</sup>. Think about the states that didn't report any statistics, states like California or Texas or New York. Those states could have made a huge difference in the autism rate, don't you think?

<sup>92</sup> **PREVALENCE OF AUTISM SPECTRUM DISORDER AMONG CHILDREN AGED 8 YEARS — AUTISM AND DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES MONITORING NETWORK, 11 SITES, UNITED STATES, 2012** by CDC.

<http://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/65/ss/ss6503a1.htm>

<sup>93</sup> **OPTIMAL OUTCOME IN INDIVIDUALS WITH A HISTORY OF AUTISM** by Deborah Fein et al.

<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/jcpp.12037/abstract>

<sup>94</sup> **DOCTORS ARE 'FAILING TO SPOT ASPERGER'S IN GIRLS'** by Amelia Hill. <http://www.theguardian.com/lifeandstyle/2009/apr/12/autism-aspergers-girls>

**COGNITION IN MALES AND FEMALES WITH AUTISM: SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES** by Meng-Chuan Lai.

<http://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0047198>

<sup>95</sup> **AMBIENT BELONGING: HOW STEREOTYPICAL CUES IMPACT GENDER PARTICIPATION IN COMPUTER SCIENCE** by Sapna Cheryan.

<http://depts.washington.edu/sibl/Publications/Cheryan.%20Plaut.%20Davies.%20%26%20Steele%20%282009%29.pdf>

**SEX-SPECIFIC MEDICAL RESEARCH WHY WOMEN'S HEALTH CAN'T WAIT** by Brigham and Women's Hospital.

[http://www.brighamandwomens.org/Departments\\_and\\_Services/womenshealth/ConnorsCenter/Policy/ConnorsReportFINAL.pdf](http://www.brighamandwomens.org/Departments_and_Services/womenshealth/ConnorsCenter/Policy/ConnorsReportFINAL.pdf)

**MOTHERS LEAVE WORK BECAUSE THEY DON'T WANT TO BEHAVE LIKE WORKING MEN, STUDY SUGGESTS** by ScienceDaily.

<http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2014/03/140307083834.htm>

**BARBIE COULD DAMPEN A YOUNG GIRL'S CAREER DREAMS** by MedicalXpress.

<http://medicalxpress.com/news/2014-03-barbie-dampen-young-girl-career.html>

<sup>96</sup> **BIAS, BETTELHEIM AND AUTISM: IS HISTORY REPEATING ITSELF?** by Lynne Soraya. <https://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/aspergers-diary/201001/bias-bettelheim-and-autism-is-history-repeating-itself>

**CHILDREN OF COLOR AND AUTISM: TOO LITTLE, TOO LATE** by Areva Martin.

[http://www.huffingtonpost.com/areva-martin/children-of-color-and-aut\\_b\\_6133354.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/areva-martin/children-of-color-and-aut_b_6133354.html)

Or how about Montana or North Dakota or Hawaii? What about all the many counties that didn't report any statistics, like all the counties outside of Maricopa county in Arizona? In Arizona's case, that's 2.618 million out of 6.627 million people (or about >40% of the State's population) who did not report anything. Since the other 39 states represent 79.5% of the U.S.A.'s population, we have no clue how (in)accurate the 1-in-68 autism statistic could be. In other words, the 1-in-68 statistic is completely untrustworthy.

How could anyone, with the least little bit of background fact checking, ever believe the accuracy of the 1-in-68 autism statistic? We really have no factual idea what the autism rate here in the States might be. Yet as you will shortly see, autism is nothing new and has been around as long as humans have been around. Working our way backward in time, we can follow the evolution of autism, starting with the **DSM (AMERICAN PSYCHIATRIC ASSOCIATIONS DIAGNOSTIC AND STATISTICAL MANUAL OF MENTAL DISORDERS)**...

**DSM-V.** Released in 2013. To be classified as autistic under the DSM-V, you first had to have been born with it. That meant it wasn't something that you acquired over time, so if a person had a car accident in which they incur some brain damage that causes them to act autistic, they are not considered autistic. The DSM-V takes this concept even further and says that if you have any other disorder or illness which could mimic or cause a person to act autistic, then they are not autistic.

The next criteria for autism are that it must limit or impair everyday functioning. A better way to put this would be to say it requires outside support to prevent problems. The more support required, the more severe the condition is considered to be.

Finally, the last two criteria would be (to paraphrase the DSM-V), having little to no interest in initiating social interactions (along with unusual responses to social overtures), and being so fixated on certain interests to the point of limiting or excluding people from their fixation, so much so that they resist attempts by others to focus on something else for them. These fixations can be rituals, routines, repetitive motions, or certain subject matters.

So if you find yourself meeting all the above criteria, you would fall under the heading of autism spectrum disorders.

**DSM-IV.** Released first in 1994 and then again as the DSM-IV-TR in 2000. These editions defined autism almost the same as the DSM-V with the exception that it sub-divided autism up into multiple subdomains such as Aspergers, pervasive developmental disorder, and autistic disorder. Under the DSM-V, Aspergers would either fall under Autism Spectrum Disorder, Level 1, or under a non-autistic domain.

**DSM-III.** Released first in 1980 and then again as the DSM-III-R in 1987. Autism was listed under the term, autistic disorder. The criteria for determining if someone was autistic were simpler than the DSM-IV. To be classified as autistic under the DSM-III, you had to have been born with it, had a pervasive lack of responsiveness to people, if you could speak you would have echolalia in some form (such as metaphorical or pronominal reversal of words), have bizarre responses to your environment (such as resistance to change, peculiar interests, or have attachments to objects), and be absent of any delusions or hallucinations – the last of which had the effect of disconnecting autism from schizophrenia.

**DSM-II.** Released in 1968, autism was only mentioned as a type of behavior under childhood type schizophrenia.

Let's stop here for a moment. Prior to the DSM-II, there was no diagnosis for autism. Autism was a type of behavior and not a condition. Had I been diagnosed as a child before 1980, I would have been judged by the criteria listed in the DSM-II, which means I would have been declared a schizophrenic and not as an Autistic. To be classified as schizophrenia back then was basically a death sentence and would have meant that I would have been institutionalized for life. Think about what that would mean today. Schizophrenia, for the longest time, was considered as either demon possession or a punishment from God. Terrible drugs were administered, the side-effects of which were often worse than the disease itself. As bad as the drugs were, unbelievably the alternative was even worse: straitjackets, blood-letting, solitary confinement, electro-convulsive therapy, insulin treatment, and lobotomy were commonplace treatments for schizophrenics. Even in the 21st century that we live in, we can still read documented stories of autistic children being treated to chemical restraint, electro-shock therapy, and industrial-strength bleach enemas.

**HANS ASPERGER.** Hans authored a paper by the title of **AUTISTIC PSYCHOPATHS IN CHILDHOOD** in 1944. What he described in that paper clearly was autism, but people interpreted his work as describing a subdomain of autism, which they then named after him and included in the DSM-IV in 1980. While this subdomain of autism was dropped starting with the DSM-V in 2013 (but not from the ICD-10), it turns out this may ultimately have been a mistake.

**LEO KANNER.** Leo authored a paper by the title of **AUTISTIC DISTURBANCES OF AFFECTIVE CONTACT** in 1943. Leo Kanner's paper on autism described autism as possibly being an extension of a loveless marriage or poor parenting, but it is interesting to see how Leo's ideas caught on with the public in the guise of the refrigerator mother instead of his clearly stated possible link of a poor marital relationship. People didn't like this interpretation so it was dismissed and repressed so people today have completely forgotten about Kanner's research in this regard, and that is a mistake. Kanner told the truth and what he observed was factual, it was his interpretation that was off.

So what else would explain the refrigerator mother/father or poor marital relationships among parents with autistic children? What if autism is the cause and the refrigerator mother/father is the effect, instead of the other way around? What if becoming a refrigerator is a way to cope with autism in your children? Maybe it is a way of giving up and minimizing all the drama that autistic children can bring?

So what have people done to help parents so they won't become refrigerators? Not a thing because nobody wants to talk about it, even though it is most likely true.

One of the other most notable things in his paper (to me at least) is Leo noticed that the parents and caretakers perceived that an Autistic was synonymous with being feeble-minded (pg 247), despite having otherwise high IQs or having savant-like qualities (pg 245). The other notable thing about this paper and the one by Asperger, is that they treated autism as a disorder all by itself, and not a co-morbid condition of childhood schizophrenia.

**DSM-I.** Released in 1952, it had pretty much the same verbiage as the DSM-II.

**PAUL EUGEN BLEULER.** Paul was the person who invented the word autism sometime between 1908 and 1911, to help describe another newly discovered mental disorder he called schizophrenia. He used autism to form the four A's of schizophrenia: loosening of associations, disturbances of affectivity, ambivalence, and autism. Unfortunately, Paul's misattributed link between autism and schizophrenia was firmly entrenched in psychiatrist's minds until the release of the DSM-III in 1980.

**THE DISTANT PAST.** The word autism itself is derived from a Latin word meaning a person who lives in their own world, and the corresponding Greek word for autism is idiot, and idiot was often used by psychologists and psychiatrists to designate hopelessness and/or severely mentally retarded. Wikipedia has this to say in regards to Idiocy under the subheading of Disability...

*“In 19th and early 20th century medicine and psychology, an 'idiot' was a person with a very severe mental retardation. In the early 1900s, Dr. Henry H. Goddard proposed a classification system for mental retardation based on the Binet-Simon concept of mental age. Individuals with the lowest mental age level (less than three years) were identified as idiots; imbeciles had a mental age of three to seven years, and morons had a mental age of seven to ten years. The term 'idiot' was used to refer to people having an IQ below 30. IQ, or intelligence quotient, was originally determined by dividing a person's mental age, as determined by standardized tests, by their actual age. The concept of mental age has fallen into disfavor, though, and IQ is now determined on the basis of statistical distributions”.*

**(WIKIPEDIA)**

Just like autism was once considered a myth of the childhood-only disorder, autism and mental retardation were at one time considered the myth of being just two names describing the same thing<sup>97</sup>, even though we now know they clearly are not the same thing. Part of this confusion was due to terminology. Psychologists today do not speak of mental age but they do speak of developmental behaviors appropriate for a person's age group. Autistics are always very far behind their peers, socially speaking, and this is what oftentimes causes people to derogatorily claim that Autistics “are mentally retarded”, or more accurately, that they do not “act their age”. Some social conventions and behaviors that seem so obvious to non-Autistics, are not at all obvious to Autistics, and that is the reason many people also often claim that Autistics “have no common sense”.

Waverly, Massachusetts has the honor of being the first place in the United States to open up a mental institution for the feeble minded in 1848, and it specifically was open to accepting idiots, i.e. -- Autistics. Other countries had similar institutions such as the one at Waverly, Massachusetts. The Burgholzli Psychiatric Clinic is one of the most memorable of these institutions to me because it produced what I consider one of the greatest psychologists of all time: Carl Jung (1875-1961). Jung did not consider anything off limits to analysis by psychology and that included psychotic ideas, religion<sup>98</sup>, dreams, art, politics, the paranormal, and so on. Jung said that anything that interested humans wasn't just something personal, but something that in some way could reveal how the human mind works. I have read of Jung's works, I find it easy to entertain the idea that Jung conversed with many autistic people at Burgholzli and gained his very advanced ideas of the psychology of humans from them that was not possible any other way. This is entirely plausible since Paul Eugen Blueeler was Jung's boss, and remember it was Blueeler who invented the words autism and schizophrenia in 1911. I wish that Carl Jung were alive today; I so much wish that I could have had long conversations with him about how the human mind works at his villa in Kuessnacht on Lake Lucerne near Bollingen.

---

<sup>97</sup> **AUTISM STRUCK BY SURPRISE** by MedicalXpress. <http://medicalxpress.com/news/2015-06-autism-struck.html>

<sup>98</sup> **RELIGIOUS THOUGHT AND BEHAVIOUR AS BY-PRODUCTS OF BRAIN FUNCTION** by Pascal Boyer.  
<http://www.pascalboyer.net/articles/Boyer2003ReligionTICS.pdf>

There are three kinds of autism diagnoses: proper diagnosing, misdiagnosing, and missed diagnosing. We have already covered proper diagnosing so now let's take a look at the other two...

Misdiagnosis occurs most often when people do their own self-diagnosing. It has started becoming a sort of fashion trend for people to confess that they are “autistic-like” or “somewhere on the autism spectrum”. This is complete nonsense and sometimes is an excuse for negative behaviors. Be aware that there are lots of conditions that people have that are “on a spectrum”: Paranoia<sup>99</sup>, neurosis<sup>100</sup>, and delusions are all part of a spectrum and everyone experiences these conditions to some degree, but at what point do these things become a disorder requiring treatment? It is when you require outside assistance that most people would consider “unreasonable” for someone who was not atypical because the condition creates problems functioning in day-to-day living.

Note that **autistic-like** is another term for **pseudoautistic**. Pseudoautism is very common, especially in conjunction with certain other disorders like Tourettes. That is why you hear about many Autistics who “outgrew” their autism, but when you take a look at their case history you will find that they had certain other co-morbid disorders like Tourettes, so that when they outgrow their Tourettes (a common occurrence), they will, as if by magic, also “outgrow their autism”. That's because they were never actually autistic to begin with. There can be no such thing as “outgrowing autism” and any claims to the contrary are detrimental to the reputation and self-worth of actual Autistics everywhere.

The APA had a public discussion on how autism was diagnosed before 2013 and how it would be diagnosed thereafter. In regards to autism, most of that discussion centered around the fact that if there was some other condition that could explain a person's autism-like symptoms, that other condition should be the sole diagnosis with autism left out of the equation, even as a co-morbid condition. Therefore many former disorders/syndromes with a commonly issued co-morbid autism diagnosis were eliminated, such as Tourette's syndrome, Fragile X syndrome, Rett syndrome, Timothy syndrome, Tuberous sclerosis complex, Down syndrome, Angelman syndrome, PTEN macrocephaly syndrome, Joubert syndrome, Landau-Kleffner syndrome, Prader-Willi syndrome, and Neurofibromatosis. Autism no longer is associated with any of these disorders or syndromes anymore, even as a co-morbid condition. For example, if someone is diagnosed with Tourette's or intellectual disability, they cannot also be autistic because the Tourette's or intellectual disability explains the autistic-like symptoms<sup>101</sup>. The intellectual disability diagnosis partly explains some of the autism rate increase, since many people that formerly would have been diagnosed as intellectually challenged are now being diagnosed with autism<sup>102</sup>.

People who self-diagnose commonly misunderstand the difference between primary symptoms and secondary symptoms. Primary symptoms are what are used to diagnose a disorder, whereas secondary symptoms might or might not occur but are unessential for a diagnosis. Autism has a very limited number of primary symptoms which do not vary much from one individual to another, i.e. – the criteria listed in the DSM, but people with autism have an almost unlimited number of secondary symptoms which vary tremendously from one individual to another. While some of these secondary symptoms may even be common in autism (poor eye contact for example), they have no diagnostic value whatsoever. Some secondary symptoms can even be unintended side-effects of the primary disorder.

---

<sup>99</sup> **UNDERSTANDING PARANOIA** by MIND. <http://www.mind.org.uk/media/622396/understanding-paranoia-2014.pdf>

<sup>100</sup> **UNDERSTANDING NEUROSIS** by Ozodi Thomas Osuji. <http://www.nigeriavillagesquare.com/articles/understanding-neurosis.html>

<sup>101</sup> **OVERHAUL OF OUR UNDERSTANDING OF WHY AUTISM POTENTIALLY OCCURS** by ScienceDaily. <http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2014/08/140812142005.htm>

<sup>102</sup> **INCREASING PREVALENCE OF AUTISM IS DUE, IN PART, TO CHANGING DIAGNOSIS** by MedicalXpress. <http://medicalxpress.com/news/2015-07-prevalence-autism-due.html>

Another reason for misdiagnosing is ignorance. Many doctors are doctors simply because that's where their parents or job counselors told them the money was and/or that is where the jobs were. They not only don't love their job, they probably don't even like their job, which is why they aren't interested in keeping up with the latest news in medicine, they aren't interested in what is happening at the forefront of technology or knowledge, they are just there to collect paychecks. Lots of people in lots of other disciplines are like that – it's a worldwide cultural thing. I'm sure you know what I'm referring to: the mechanic who just can't ever seem to fix a certain problem with your vehicle or the chief financial officer who can't balance their own checkbook or the senior manager who is not a people person and never has been. Diagnosing mental disorders is not always the easiest thing in the world to do, and since many doctors are just there to collect paychecks, they will take the easy way out and pick the least likely to be competently challenged diagnosis. Since autism is currently in an epidemic status, it's a safe bet that you can get away with misdiagnosing your clients with autism, as they have often done in the past with ADHD or schizophrenia, and so forth.

Then there is missed diagnosing. Again, lots of parents don't want their child to be diagnosed with autism so many of them are in constant denial of its existence. Sometimes this denial could lead to maltreatment (not to be confused with mistreatment), as the parents will attempt to force their child to not act autistic.

The other causes of missed diagnosing are racism and sexism. If a boy is autistic, typically the husband will be furious or devastated and his viewpoints over this issue will dominate the household, but if a girl is autistic, the husband won't care as much or not at all and the condition will be "forgotten" – and since women have a more accommodating and supporting network than men, this allows autism to be undiagnosed in women unless it is severe. As for race, minorities always tend to be underrepresented in all areas of health, including mental health.

# Sociability

The social life of humans is only possible because it is in people's nature to be hypersocial. We have learned that it is the reason why humans have such large brains since much of the functionality of the brain is geared towards being sociable. Socializing is not a logical function, it is a special ability or gift, and like any other gift or special ability, it cannot be taught – either you have it or you don't, and Autistics don't have it. Although Autistics can fake being sociable, they can't do it very convincingly or for very long.

So what happens to all that brain-space when it isn't dedicated to socializing like it was supposed to be? It leaves room for a lot of other things in your brain. Brains developed to analyze and perceive things, so what happens is that either the person's IQ goes up, or their information processing power increases, or both<sup>103</sup>. I call it “your brain on steroids” and I think this is the reason why Autistics tend to be savants<sup>104</sup>. Note that, since autism often results in magnified senses, it will in turn result in everything else being magnified in their life, including behaviors and their immune systems. It explains why Autistics will tend to be anxious, depressed, angry, irritable, confused, have low self-esteem, impulsive, compulsive, lethargic, and so on, since thinking “too much” can lead to neuroticism<sup>105</sup>.

Don't confuse being unsocial with being anti-social. While Autistics avoid being social, they don't abhor it or try to undermine it in other people's lives – which is what anti-social implies. From my own personal observation, I think my Dunbar number is a three, but if I try really hard, I can get it up to maybe a five or six. The important thing to note here is that, like most other Autistics, my Dunbar number is not zero. Although I want to be left alone, that does not mean I want to be all alone. I just want to limit the number of people in my life, but what few people are in my life, I need to have very intense relationships with them. In other words, what Autistics lack in quantity they make up for in intensity. This is why I have had people tell me that I am "clingy" or I "come on too strong". Naturally this makes it very difficult to start a relationship, much less have the lasting sort of relationships like the kind Autistics want and need because that type of behavior scares off non-Autistics.

---

<sup>103</sup> **INFANTS' SUPERIOR PERCEPTION LINKED TO LATER AUTISM SYMPTOMS** by ScienceDaily.

<http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2015/06/150611122950.htm>

**AUTISM STRUCK BY SURPRISE** by MedicalXpress. <http://medicalxpress.com/news/2015-06-autism-struck.html>

**5 EARLY SIGNS OF AUTISM ALL PARENTS SHOULD KNOW** by Carolyn Gergoire.

[http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/early-signs-autism\\_5665e849e4b072e9d1c70838](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/early-signs-autism_5665e849e4b072e9d1c70838)

<sup>104</sup> **LINK FOUND BETWEEN CHILD PRODIGIES AND AUTISM** by ScienceDaily.

<http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2012/11/121109111246.htm>

**AUTISM RISK GENES ALSO LINKED TO HIGHER INTELLIGENCE** by ScienceDaily.

<http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2015/03/150310105232.htm>

**LINK BETWEEN AUTISM GENES AND HIGHER INTELLIGENCE, STUDY SUGGEST** by MedicalXpress. <http://medicalxpress.com/news/2015-03-link-autism-genes-higher-intelligence.html>

**COMMON POLYGENIC RISK FOR AUTISM SPECTRUM DISORDER (ASD) IS ASSOCIATED WITH COGNITIVE ABILITY IN THE GENERAL POPULATION** by T-K Clark et al. <http://www.nature.com/mp/journal/v21/n3/full/mp201512a.html>

**INFANTS' SUPERIOR PERCEPTION LINKED TO LATER AUTISM SYMPTOMS** by MedicalXpress. <http://medicalxpress.com/news/2015-06-infants-superior-perception-linked-autism.html>

<sup>105</sup> **IS NEUROTICISM FUELED BY OVERTHINKING?** by ScienceDaily.

<http://medicalxpress.com/news/2015-08-neuroticism-fueled-overthinking.html>

The social person's mind is stimulated by words and phrases and it is stimulated in the same or similar ways that Autistic minds are not<sup>106</sup>. For example, I was listening to a small group of women the other day when one of the women blurted out, "I got a ticket the other day for going five miles over the speed limit" – which started a chain reaction. The other women responded by saying, "I feel sorry for you" or "My brother got a ticket the other day and..." and soon everyone is going back and forth talking about all the times they or someone they know got a ticket. An Autistic sits there and wonders what does any of this have to do with the original statement? From my many observations growing up, I know what this is; it's called "small talk". Soon someone will mention "motorcycle" as in, "All motorcycle cops are mean when it comes to giving out tickets" and the next thing you know, the topic of conversation shifts to all things motorcycle related and on and on it goes, the topic changing on a regular basis but nothing is ever really being said. If you are Autistic, this is all pointless and serves no purpose and is completely off subject to the original statement of, "I got a ticket the other day for going five miles over the speed limit". You aren't exploring ways to avoid tickets by following the law and going over which laws you can get tickets for and what to do to legally avoid getting tickets. In the meantime, non-Autistics are thinking that you aren't joining the conversation so you must be anti-social or are in a bad mood or depressed but none of that is accurate. If we do speak up and say something, it might be something like, "I've watched you drive and you are always speeding. You are lucky they didn't catch you going even faster than you were, like you normally do" or "I don't worry about getting tickets because I don't speed. Only people who break laws like speeding need to worry about getting caught, so stop doing it", all of which will be followed by...<crickets chirping>. These kinds of comments most likely would be a conversation killer if not a friendship killer. As an Autistic, I just cannot get into small talk but non-Autistics love it. They can go on and on and on and it makes them happy and they get very animated while doing it. I just get bored. That's because small talk is a preprogrammed social function<sup>107</sup> that Autistics lack.

I see the same thing when I listen to men. For example, as I was listening to a group of men talk about cars the other day, a few things they said indicated to me that they had some accurate knowledge about cars, but then someone would turn around and say something blatantly false to the group. When that person remained unchallenged, that person would continue the fake discussion, going into great details about something they were magically making up (BS'ing) on the fly. In this particular instance, the topic had changed to Hybrids. I could tell no one in the group knew anything at all about Hybrids (except me of course) and this man was talking about how all Hybrids had a motor integral to each wheel, the motor being attached like a brake rotor. Furthermore, every single person he had ever talked to or heard of that had a Hybrid, said that they got nowhere near the mileage advertised except under very specific conditions not normally possible in everyday driving, therefore Hybrids were supposedly not very good cars to have. None of it was true but all I decided to do was nod my head and pretend to listen to his nonsense. This person was making things up so they could give the illusion that they were very knowledgeable about things for which they really knew nothing. I believe in this case BS'ing was also a social status enhancer and part of the "male bonding ritual".

---

<sup>106</sup> **'MIND READING' THANKS TO METAPHORS** by MedicalXpress. <http://medicalxpress.com/news/2015-03-mind-metaphors.html>  
**PEOPLE WHO USE THE SAME KINDS OF FUNCTION WORDS ARE MORE LIKELY TO FIND A ROMANTIC MATCH** by MedicalXpress.  
<http://medicalxpress.com/news/2014-02-people-kinds-function-words-romantic.html>  
**LANGUAGE STYLE MATCHING PREDICTS RELATIONSHIP INITIATION AND STABILITY** by James Pennebaker et al.  
[http://www.richslatcher.com/papers/Ireland2011\\_PSci.pdf](http://www.richslatcher.com/papers/Ireland2011_PSci.pdf)

<sup>107</sup> **CHITCHAT, SMALL TALK COULD SERVE AN EVOLUTIONARY NEED TO BOND WITH OTHERS** by ScienceDaily.  
<http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2015/12/151214185550.htm>

The point of all this is that if you take away social functionality from people, they will no longer be able read each other's minds. What seems obvious to you is not obvious when you logically look at it. Why should I logically feel sorry for if you got a ticket for speeding when you speed all the time anyway without regard for what the law says about it? Your preprogrammed social functionality will make you feel sorry for someone who got a speeding ticket because feeling sorry is a way to bring you together socially. Why shouldn't I call your bluff when you tell stories of "the big one that got away"? Your preprogrammed social functionality will make you feel like you are bonding with other males in the group so you enjoy those stories.

Compared to autistic people, the typical person loves to socialize on a grand scale. It's in their nature to be that way because they have an inborn predisposition to socialize, so it should come as no surprise that it is also in their nature to be concerned about their social reputation – something that Autistics by nature are not concerned about. A recent peer reviewed science journal article discusses how normal people would donate more money when being watched by others than they would when they were not being watched, there being no difference in behavior for Autistics under the same circumstances because Autistics don't care what other people think about them (this is true in general, although they do care about what the very few people that are in their lives think about them)<sup>108</sup>.

Intimate relationships are especially difficult for Autistics to understand. Say a man and a woman are starting out as "just friends" (which is a fictional relationship, as indicated by the "just friends"), and the man (as usual) only wants to have sex with the woman and not an actual committed relationship. Can the man just come out and say, "I only want to have sex with you"? No, because if the man just comes out and asks for sex, he destroys the woman's illusion of having a friendship. This then becomes a game and the purpose of the game is for the man to ask for sex whenever possible, without destroying the woman's illusion of being "just friends". Does that make sense? No? Let me try to explain: a common request that I used to hear men indirectly ask women for sex was, "Would you like to go to my car and check out my new car stereo?". If the woman thinks the man is using this as an excuse to have "backseat sex" and says, "You just want sex", the man can deny it and say, "No, I really do have a new car stereo, you are reading too much into my intentions" and she will be shamed. Likewise, if the woman knows the man just wants sex, she can turn him down by saying she isn't interested in stereos of any kind. The man then can't complain and ask, "Don't you like me?", because she can deny it and say, "No, I really don't like car stereos, you presume too much". By deliberately being ambiguous like this, both parties can resort to "plausible deniability". An Autistic might wonder why you couldn't answer any question, indirect or not, with a direct answer, not understanding that veiled or ambiguous questions are an accepted method with a past history with of working well with socially-minded people, to reduce friction, not offending others, or for not destroying friendships (whether genuine or fictional). Remember though that understanding healthy social relationships is difficult enough when you are autistic, but it is magnified when much of what you see today is dysfunctional.

---

<sup>108</sup> **NEUROSCIENTISTS PINPOINT SPECIFIC SOCIAL DIFFICULTIES IN PEOPLE WITH AUTISM** by MedicalXpress.  
<http://medicalxpress.com/news/2011-10-neuroscientists-specific-social-difficulties-people.html>

Because Autistics have a different Theory of Mind than non-Autistics do, non-Autistics often observe autistic people interacting on the Internet with other people and then mistakenly label that as “socializing”, just because that is what they would be doing if they were in their shoes. They forget that socializing is all about interacting and engaging, not just interacting. Autistics can interact with others but they do not engage them very much or very often, especially on the Internet. That is not the purpose or a capability of the Internet. The Internet can never be a substitute for socializing, **social media on the Internet can only be an extension to an already existing social life**. This is because the Internet does not teach us how to share and respond to others, especially in person when it really counts. If you want to help your autistic children to grow up and be independent adults, you should teach them only how to minimally interact with other people, without any expectation that they will engage with those other people. Anything more than simple interaction would be dangerous (since they will never be able to tell who really is their friend and who is not) and anxiety-producing. It is not selfish or harmful for unsocial people to avoid friendships or companionship, so learn to accept it.

So the question is, can Autistics have the same Theory of Mind like non-Autistics do? Of course not<sup>109</sup>, just like non-Autistics cannot understand Autistics, Autistics cannot understand non-Autistics. Since thoughts are a prelude to actions, when Autistics try to fit in according to the way they naturally think non-Autistics act like, they will do it openly and transparently, instead of conservative and restrained, because their attempts will be based on logic instead of not-so-logical social functions. Their approach will be all wrong because logic can't create social cohesion<sup>110</sup>; that's not a function or purpose of logic.

One thing we have learned about mentally healthy people, is that they will spontaneously pick a leader in the absence of one<sup>111</sup>. They choose leaders to tell them what to do in their religion, their government, their local community, their household, impromptu sports events...they choose leaders for everything it seems. Being a leader is so important, most parents dream of their children growing up to be great leaders. Forget that dream if you have an autistic child. When Autistics are placed in the same situations as non-Autistics, no spontaneous leadership ever merges. Autistics just don't play follow-the-leader like non-Autistics do. Normal, everyday mentally healthy people are preprogrammed to pick a leader and follow them without question. There are exceptions but exceptions are not the rule. Non-autistic people will follow many of their leaders, real or imaginary, to the death, if required. I believe it is this lack of follow-the-leader quality in Autistics that rubs non-Autistics the wrong way the most. Autistics do not “respect” authority or assigned leaders any more or any less than they do anyone else. Internally Autistics have no social bias, they have no regard for the social standing of people, and they have no desire or need to succumb to the role of a follower or a leader. Autistics will judge you by how you act and not by your status or reputation or your social rank. Sometimes this may make it seem like Autistics are opposition-defiant but in reality that is never true because it isn't that Autistics disrespect authority, it's because they respect or disrespect regardless of their social status or social standing. For example, an Autistic in the workplace will treat the CEO the same way they will treat the janitor. This kind of behavior can flatter the janitor but infuriate the CEO.

---

<sup>109</sup> **UNDERSTANDING THE AUTISTIC MIND** by ScienceDaily. <http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2011/01/110131153257.htm>

<sup>110</sup> **NATURAL SELECTION CAN FAVOR 'IRRATIONAL' BEHAVIOR** by PhysOrg. <http://phys.org/news/2014-01-natural-favor-irrational-behavior.html>

<sup>111</sup> **SOCIAL FEEDBACK AND THE EMERGENCE OF LEADERS AND FOLLOWERS** by J Harcourt in Current Biology. <http://www.cell.com/current-biology/retrieve/pii/S0960982209005545>

Non-Autistics will try to make sense of autistic behavior by trying to mind-read something they can never be able to mind-read. They will naturally assume that Autistics have hidden agendas or that they hate them or that they like being disagreeable and they assume all that because a social person most likely WOULD be like all those things if they were in that situation in place of the Autistic. The non-autistic person, without ever realizing it, is projecting their own feelings, thoughts, and sociability onto the autistic person. It also makes it so the non-autistic person will most likely start mistreating that autistic person due to all that negative judgment. This is why Autistics stand out as people who are easily bullied. They are even bullied in ways you cannot imagine, such as being unfairly stigmatized by academia, the media, and society in general. So while Autistics have no need or desire to be social, Autistics do have a need to avoid drama or conflict or ridicule. They want to go about their business and be transparent to the world while doing it and it should be obvious why that is. When you are alone, the focus is off of you since you are not interacting with others, and there will no opportunity for conflict or be a source of someone else's drama. It should come as no surprise to realize that many Autistics DO want to learn what socializing is all about, but not because they want to be social, but so they can understand enough of it so that they can have just A friend or A lover – but only just one. You will never meet an autistic socialite or an autistic pimp.

Autistics do not "suffer" from autism, they only suffer from the way people (mis)treat them when they act autistic. While being autistic is not a problem, being autistic in a non-autistic world is<sup>112</sup>. Can Autistics fake small talk or BS'ing, for example? Yes, but not very convincingly for obvious reasons, so it mystifies me why certain organizations will try and train Autistics to put on a phony act of being social and engage in limited small talk. When are they going to learn to stop trying to make Autistics into little copies of themselves! Work with Autistics, not against them; accept Autistics, don't reject them. Autistics are not social and there is nothing wrong with not being social and there is nothing wrong with being autistic. The more you try to change Autistics to act like you and not be themselves, the more you are making it apparent you don't like Autistics the way they are. It reminds me of a scene in **FINDING NEMO** where Nemo is taken to a sunken submarine wreck where some sharks are having a "Fish Anonymous" meeting. During the meeting, they have a conversation that goes like this, "Fish are friends, not food. Except stinkin' dolphins! Dolphins! Yeah, they think they're so cute! [mimicking a dolphin] 'Oh, look at me, I'm a flippy little dolphin, let me flip for you! Ain't I something?'" ... and that's what your autistic children feel like you're telling them to be like when you tell them to go out on the playground and make friends. It's like you're telling them to go out and be a cute flippy little dolphin and make everyone happy by doing so, but all it really does is just make your kids feel like flipping you off. The children know they aren't missing a thing by not participating in recess the way you want them to, but displeasing you is yet another source of conflict and potential drama, so Autistics are forced to comply to yet another person or organization or institution demanding that they be social like they are. And then you wonder why Autistic children tend to grow up having anxiety issues?

*"People think it's very hard to be funny but it's an interesting thing. If you can do it, it's not hard at all. It would be like if I said to somebody who can draw very well, My God, I could take a pencil and paper all day long and never be able to draw that horse. I can't do it, and you've done it so perfectly. And the other person feels, This is nothing. I've been doing this since I was four years old. That's how you feel about comedy—if you can do it, you know, it's really nothing. It's not that the end product is nothing, but the process is simple. Of course, there are just some people that are authentically funny, and some people that are not. It's a freak of nature"*

**(Woody Allen)**

<sup>112</sup> **AUTISM MAY HAVE HAD ADVANTAGES IN HUMANS' HUNTER-GATHERER PAST, RESEARCHER BELIEVES** by Jared Edward Reser.  
<http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2011/06/110603122849.htm>

Just as you have learned to accept and live life without certain special abilities or gifts, certain things like maybe the ability to draw well or be good at math or play a musical instrument or be good at a certain sport or to be funny, so learn to live and accept your autistic child who is without the ability or gift to be social.

## Lying

Temple Grandin coauthored a book about the unwritten rules of social relationships, where she mentions the fact of how normal children love to lie, whereas autistic children do not<sup>113</sup>...

*“Lying can indeed be stressful to many children on the autism spectrum. The stress can be so severe as to be immobilizing for them...Patricia Rakovic, a speech/language therapist in Rhode Island...as an experiment, she broke the group into AS [Autism Spectrum] students and non-AS students and individually asked each group their opinions on the subject of honesty, telling the truth, white lies, etc. Their different reactions demonstrate the disparity that exists between people with AS and their NT [non-AS] counterparts when it comes to the subject of honesty. Pat explains: I had no idea what would happen when I approached these two groups on the subject of honesty and lying. The group of typical boys immediately latched onto the subject. They all began talking at once, quickly organized who they would lie to and what they would lie about. They even broke into role play as they demonstrated what might happen in different situations. For the most part, they lie to their parents, teachers and other adults about misdeeds. They spoke about white lies and when they would tell them and why. They also talked about not lying about big things such as someone they saw doing drugs. When they mentioned their friends, it was interesting in that they said they would lie to them pretty much about everything – they thought it was pretty funny. They LOVED the exercise and were animated in describing how they can tell if someone is lying by their tone of voice, eye contact, posture, rate of speech, etc. Contrast their reactions with the same question posed to my group of AS students. They did not respond the same. Many of them were adamant that they never, ever lied. They had rules for themselves: ‘You never should lie to anyone’ and ‘You should tell the truth.’ In their minds these rules were absolute; there was no hierarchy to honesty.”*

**(THE UNWRITTEN RULES OF SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS by Temple Grandin et al, pgs 217-218)**

This inability or unwillingness to lie is one of many things that socially handicaps the Autistic. We can see that the non-autistic person's concern with socialization leads to lying, which in itself isn't such a bad thing. What it is bad is when people become offended or even downright hostile when you tell the truth. People say that lying is a very bad thing to do, but judging by people's reactions when you blatantly tell them the truth, that too is a lie, for more often than not, the consequences of telling the truth can be far, far worse than the consequences of telling a lie.

---

<sup>113</sup> **LIFE'S EXTREMES: PATHOLOGICAL LIAR VS. STRAIGHT SHOOTER** by Adam Hadhazy.

<http://www.livescience.com/17407-pathological-liars-honest-psychology.html>

**LIAR, LIAR, YOUR PREFRONTAL CORTEX IS ON FIRE** by Kate Melville.

[http://www.scienceagogo.com/news/20050904005107data\\_trunc\\_sys.shtml](http://www.scienceagogo.com/news/20050904005107data_trunc_sys.shtml)

**PREFRONTAL WHITE MATTER IN PATHOLOGICAL LIARS** by Yaling Yang et al. <http://bjprcpsych.org/content/bjprcpsych/187/4/320.full.pdf>

# Self-Delusions

We have seen how Autistics are not the type of people to lie to others. As we have also already learned, Autistics tend to be more logical than non-Autistics are, and that makes them tend to be more rational<sup>114</sup>, and the more rational a person is, the harder it gets to acquire and maintain delusions, since delusions are the opposite of rational. Since a delusion is basically a form of lying to yourself, the bottom line is that Autistics aren't very good at engaging in delusions, yet they still have the same preprogrammed functionality to have delusions, but their autism will have an effect on what types of delusions they could ever be possessed with. For example, non-Autistics are prone to engaging in hero-worship, but since Autistics are unsocial, and hero-worship is based on the social importance of having leaders to obey and follow, the Autistic will not be prone to hero-worship. While they could be persuaded to engage in hero-worship, it will not be maintainable and as soon as the smallest inconsistency or exaggerated claim is discovered, the image of the hero will be destroyed. Yet even if the Autistic temporarily engages in hero-worship, their idea of what kind of person should be a hero will be at odds with what the general population believes should be a hero. In fact, most of an Autistic's delusions will not correspond with a non-Autistic's delusions, making the Autistic delusions all the more harder to sustain.

The same thing applies in the case of religion, since all religion is based on delusion (read: faith). From the Autistics I have observed, while some of them are religious, their ideas of what a religion should be, as expected, are very different from other people. A not too uncommon idea I have seen within their religious ranks, is the theory that everything has a discrete form of molecular consciousness. Some things have more conscious than others, but the Universe itself, in its entirety, is the ultimate in a conscious, thinking entity. This belief reminds me of animism without the spirits, the spirits having been replaced with properties of a spectrum of consciousness.

I have seen in myself, as well as in other Autistics like myself, that when an Autistic is persuaded to join a religion, it most likely will not last. While an Autistic person can engage in fanaticism, over time, as the Autistic takes in more and more knowledge of the belief system, they will be discouraged more and more as they come across beliefs that are illogical, inaccurate, and make believe. They will not constantly continue to overlook inconsistencies in their dogma or creeds as non-Autistics do.

---

<sup>114</sup> PEOPLE WITH AUTISM MAKE MORE RATIONAL DECISIONS, STUDY SHOWS by MedicalXpress. <http://medicalxpress.com/news/2008-10-people-autism-rational-decisions.html>

# Imagination

Carl Jung was a great scientist. He wrote about his observation of how the human mind worked and one of those things he observed was how the mind was polarized or divided up into two opposites. Everything in the human world seems polarized because the human mind is polarized: Love and hate, light and dark, yin and yang, Republican and Democrat, and so on. By forcing everything into black or white categories, it simplified things enough so that when quick action or quick thinking was required, you had this ready-made solution. Does polarized thinking always work? Of course not, but it works often enough and is simple enough to follow that it became the dominant mode of human reasoning. This is why people (in general) will take any idea and fanatically force it to one extreme or the other so there cannot be any gray area<sup>115</sup>. It's like their example of the question of whether a glass of water is either half-empty or half-full. The reality is the glass is always completely full, the contents being half-full of water and half-full of air, but their limited imagination prevents them from consciously understanding that.

The way the mind is structured affects how people think and perceive and philosophize and it is narrow-minded because it is strictly human-like thinking and philosophizing. Because the only things they can imagine are human-like things, they delude themselves into believing that it is also the only way to think and perceive, thereby limiting their ability to be aware that there millions of different ways to correctly perceive and think and philosophize about the world. When someone else comes along that doesn't think in these specifically human-like ways, they ostracize or shun that person, labeling them as "dysfunctional" or pretending like they can't see this other way of thinking/perceiving.

What if every time you engaged a person, they "buted heads" with you? After a while you might begin to imagine that they were irritating you on purpose. You would begin to imagine that maybe they don't like you or that they were hostile to your presence. Autistics lack rapport because it is a preprogrammed social function, and the opposite of rapport is called "butting heads". This is because rapport really means "having something in common". That "something" isn't sports or hobbies or special interests, although they are part of it, the number one thing you need in common is a socially-oriented mindset as previously described. It means you need to share the same delusions, and communicate in the same way using the same lies, and have matching imaginations. You would choose the same types of words and tell similar types of stories. That is why Autistics will never fit in. Autistics are not prone to delusions, they hate to lie, and their thinking is dominated by concrete, logical thoughts<sup>116</sup> instead of by their imaginations. Without those things, Autistics cannot have rapport with non-Autistics. Without rapport, you can't hold conversations about the same things very often, you can't BS or "shoot the breeze" with them, and without anything to discuss or feel or think in common, you cannot relate to one another and get along with each other.

---

<sup>115</sup> **HOW EXTREME BELIEFS, NOT MENTAL ILLNESS, MAY FUEL MASS SHOOTERS** by Michael S Rosenwald for The Washington Post. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/local/wp/2016/05/25/how-extreme-beliefs-not-mental-illness-often-fuel-mass-shooters/>  
**ANDERS BREIVIK: EXTREME BELIEFS MISTAKEN FOR PSYCHOSIS** by Tahir Rahman et al for the Journal of the American Academy for Psychiatry and Law. <http://www.jaapl.org/content/44/1/28.full.pdf>

<sup>116</sup> **PEOPLE WITH AUTISM MAKE MORE RATIONAL DECISIONS, STUDY SHOWS** by ScienceDaily. <http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2008/10/081015110228.htm>

*“Conversation is our primary mode for conversation...conversation involves subconscious changes in what our bodies are doing, allowing for synchrony between people speaking with each other and reflecting how people feel about each other. It helps to mark and perpetuate social hierarchies, replacing the physical social grooming common among primates with a speedier verbal version. It can even reveal whether a close emotional relationship is flourishing or failing as couples and friends who are able to use positive affect in conversation are able to sustain their bonds over longer periods of time.”* (What Really Happens When We Talk by Sophie Scott on Aeon. <https://aeon.co/videos/there-s-a-lot-more-to-conversation-than-words-what-really-happens-when-we-talk>)

When you repeatedly can't get along with someone, you either label them as your enemy or you ostracize them. Yet even when an Autistic goes out of their way to try and relate to someone they like, their autistic nature will only make them come across as argumentative and/or know-it-alls or even as dangerous because of their ability to dispel delusions...welcome to the world of Autism! Imagine, no matter where you went, you inadvertently butted heads with everyone you met. That would not only make it hard to find a job, it would make it hard to keep job, as well as make it hard to find and keep friends – not that Autistics need many friends, after all, their Dunbar Number is usually around 5 or 6, but what very little friends they need are difficult if not impossible to find.

Autistics would like to share with you their issues with being autistic in a non-autistic world but no one will listen – really listen – because rapport is not something you can teach. While non-autistic people would hear the words coming out of the Autistics mouth, they wouldn't feel them or understand them or relate to them. It will be like talking to a brick wall as much for them as it will be for you. Generally this is why, when you try to communicate with Autistics in any way that is useful to them, you wind up irritating them instead of helping them. So take it from an Autistic, that it is very hard to try to peacefully live alongside other people who are not the same as yourself.

## Optimal Outcomes

The fact is that you are dysfunctional because you have made your world that way, and I am dysfunctional because I do not fit into any of your worlds, dysfunctional or not, but dysfunctional does not mean broken – and you cannot fix that which is not broken. That is why one person cannot say to another person that, “I'm going to help you become a better person”, when you yourself are dysfunctional. Being dysfunctional simply means one is outside of their natural element, like a fish out of water. If you want to help a fish that is out of water, all you have to do is put it back in the water. Likewise, Autistics are not broken, they are like fish out of water, so all you have to do is see through all of that dysfunction and recognize that Autistics aren't broken, they are just different and need to be treated differently... that's all. The question is, what kind of environment is the kind of environment that Autistics can thrive in?

Any socially-oriented environment is most definitely not the right environment for an Autistic. Many treatments intended to “help” Autistics, are the type of treatments that concentrate on socializing, as if socializing was all that matters in this world. This is clearly the wrong approach. The first thing people need to do is to realize there is nothing wrong with being unsocial. Secondly, people need to realize that being socially isolated is not painful for autistic people, it is pleasurable. Thirdly, people need to realize that most Autistics have no desire to be cured of their autism. So learn to accept and embrace the lack of sociability in your Autistic progeny.

Schools are another dysfunctional environment for Autistics, and for two reasons. The first reason should be obvious and that is the classroom is (surprise!) a socially-oriented environment. Think about it. You are placed in a room in close proximity to other people, people you are expected to get along with (or at least not butt heads with them). At the front of the classroom is an authority figure, who is a social person that will expect you to be social in return, such as making proper eye contact, giving facial expressions indicating if you are bored or listening, smiling back when they smile at you, and on and on. The second reason schools are an example of a dysfunctional environment is that Autistics do not learn the same way that non-Autistics do. Autistics don't simply rote memorize everything they are supposed to learn like non-Autistics do<sup>117</sup>. That approach doesn't make sense. Autistics want to truly understand what it is they are supposed to be learning, why it is important to learn it, and what practicality did it have in everyday life or a career. Non-Autistics can learn things that way but Autistics do not function like that. Autistics are capable of far more than anyone ever gives them credit for, you just have to know how to cultivate their spark<sup>118</sup>. They tend to be late bloomers who might appear to be very confused at first (mostly because of the way non-Autistics present information), so don't expect them to perform well at first. In general, don't expect them to ever perform well on tests. While some Autistics can perform well on tests, many cannot because tests are always presented by non-Autistics as a competition, and Autistics are not at all well suited for competition. So in other words, schools are a perfect way to set up an Autistic for failure<sup>119</sup>.

Let's talk about therapies. There are lots and lots of therapies out there for Autistics and guess what? None of them work. How do I know that? Because unless we are seeing the vast majority of Autistics coming out of those kinds of environments who continue to go on and find and keep a job for three years or more, and/or go out and find and keep a romantic partner for more than three years, then those therapies aren't working. The true marks of being independent or non-autistic, just isn't there. My advice is don't waste your time or money unless you don't know what else to do. On a socially functional scale of zero to 100, if your child is a five or less, therapy can raise that by about 10 or 20 points. On an absolute scale, 10 or 20 points is still not acceptable (as in cured) but on a relative scale it is huge. If your child is already at 10 or 20 points, it will have very little effect.

What about diets? Two things I did not talk about having a "brain on steroids" can do: cause an Autistic to tend to have an over-active immune system<sup>120</sup> or be oversensitive to tastes and textures. In other words, this can tend to turn an Autistic into a picky eater and/or have allergies. Since an Autistic will tend to be allergic or oversensitive to tastes and textures, a bland diet is the most likely diet to not cause problems with your autistic child. This does not mean or prove that diet will make your autistic child's behavior better or worse, it only means if they are allergic/oversensitive to some taste or texture that you are unaware of, eliminating it will improve their health, both mentally and physically. You cannot change which behaviors will get better or worse or remain unchanged and remember that no one has ever been able to claim that any diet is 100% effective at anything<sup>121</sup>. Also remember this: if you stop a vitamin/nutritional supplement regimen and a particular behavior returns, it means you are not addressing the root cause with dieting

---

<sup>117</sup> **LEARNING BY REPETITION IMPAIRS RECALL OF DETAILS, STUDY SHOWS** by ScienceDaily.

<http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2014/06/140623142021.htm>

<sup>118</sup> **OVERHAUL OF OUR UNDERSTANDING OF WHY AUTISM POTENTIALLY OCCURS** by ScienceDaily.

<http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2014/08/140812142005.htm>

**AUTISM STRUCK BY SURPRISE** by MedicalXpress. <http://medicalxpress.com/news/2015-06-autism-struck.html>

<sup>119</sup> **LEARNING IN AUTISM** by Michelle Dawson et al.

[http://gersnbacherlab.org/wp-content/uploads/papers/1/Dawson\\_AutisticLearning.pdf](http://gersnbacherlab.org/wp-content/uploads/papers/1/Dawson_AutisticLearning.pdf)

<sup>120</sup> **THE IMMUNE RESPONSE IN AUTISM: A NEW FRONTIER FOR AUTISM RESEARCH** by Paul Ashwood et al.

[http://www.bowdiges.org/documents/files/Immune\\_response\\_in\\_autism.pdf](http://www.bowdiges.org/documents/files/Immune_response_in_autism.pdf)

**THE "MISSING LINK" IN AUTOIMMUNITY AND AUTISM: EXTRACELLULAR MITOCHONDRIAL COMPONENTS SECRETED FROM ACTIVATED LIVE MAST CELLS** by Theoharis Theoharides et al. <http://www.mastcellmaster.com/documents/autism/Autism-The-Missing-Link-extracellular-mt-DNA-Autoimmun-Rev-8-2013.pdf>

because you are not addressing what is causing the deficiency in the first place. An acute deficiency of a certain vitamin or nutrient will not prove they aren't getting enough of that vitamin/nutrient, but rather something else is wrong and causing an over-consumption of that vitamin/nutrient. The same logic here applies to the bacteria culture of the gut in Autistics. So when it comes to diets, go ahead and experiment within reason all you want, but don't get your hopes up because it will only be a false hope.

Note that when I speak of therapies and dieting, I am talking about Band-Aids. Putting a Band-Aid over a problem doesn't make the problem go away, it can only hide it. There is no conspiracy to hide a cause or cure for autism when there is no cause or cure that exists. So the next time you hear of a cause or cure or promising treatment circulating on the Internet, or within your own social circles, or in the Press, just remember: it's just another lie/delusion<sup>122</sup>.

The point of all this is to learn to live with your autistic progeny despite their lack of social gifts or social abilities, that way, every time your autistic loved one sees you, you won't remind them that they are not acceptable as they are or that they need to change in order to be acceptable. Who needs that hanging over them for the rest of their life? There is an old saying that, "When you change, the world changes with you", so if you want to see your autistic progeny change for the better, try changing your attitude towards them instead.

---

<sup>121</sup> **IS DIETARY SUPPLEMENTATION APPROPRIATE FOR CHILDREN WITH AUTISM SPECTRUM DISORDER?** by MedicalXpress.

<http://medicalxpress.com/news/2015-06-dietary-supplementation-children-autism-spectrum.html>

**VITAMINS CAN DAMAGE THE BODY'S OWN DEFENCES** by MedicalXpress.

<http://medicalxpress.com/news/2013-11-vitamins-body-defences.html>

**CAENORHABDITIS ELEGANS NDX-4 IS A MUTT-TYPE ENZYME THAT CONTRIBUTES TO GENOMIC STABILITY, DNA REPAIR** by KD Arczewska et al. <http://europepmc.org/abstract/MED/21111690>

<sup>122</sup> **WHY DEBUNKED AUTISM TREATMENT FADS PERSIST** by ScienceDaily.

<http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2015/02/150226154644.htm>

# APPENDIX A

## TO ALL MY AUTISTIC BROTHERS AND SISTERS

I have a message that I would like to convey to all the Autistic savants and geniuses in the world today:

**STOP!**

Stop giving away your best ideas because the people of this world don't deserve it. Stop giving away your best ideas because all they will do with them is either exploit them in order to rake in large profits off of them<sup>123</sup> and/or find a way to weaponize them<sup>124</sup>. So stop giving away your best ideas unless you want to share in this world's karmic fate. For now, just keep your best ideas to yourself where they belong, safe and sound from this dysfunctional world.

Some of my autistic brothers and sisters have special abilities that other people don't or can't have...you know what I'm talking about. My message here is still the same:

**STOP!**

Stop demonstrating your special abilities, no matter how remarkable they are, because the people of this world don't deserve it. Stop showing off your special abilities because people will not like you or treat you any better for it. It is like you are a clown putting on a show for their entertainment, and nothing more. For now, just keep your special abilities to yourself where they belong, safe and sound from this dysfunctional world.

---

<sup>123</sup> **WHY HILLARY IS RIGHT TO TAKE ON PHARMA'S PRICE GOUGING** by Rana Foroohar.

<http://time.com/4046041/hillary-clinton-martin-shkreli/>

**50 HOSPITALS CHARGE UNINSURED MORE THAN 10 TIMES COST OF CARE, STUDY FINDS** by Lena H. Sun.

[https://www.washingtonpost.com/national/health-science/why-some-hospitals-can-get-away-with-price-gouging-patients-study-finds/2015/06/08/b7f5118c-0aeb-11e5-9e39-0db921c47b93\\_story.html](https://www.washingtonpost.com/national/health-science/why-some-hospitals-can-get-away-with-price-gouging-patients-study-finds/2015/06/08/b7f5118c-0aeb-11e5-9e39-0db921c47b93_story.html)

<sup>124</sup> **'I'VE CREATED A MONSTER!' ON THE REGRETS OF INVENTORS** by Rebecca J. Rosen. <http://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2011/11/ive-created-a-monster-on-the-regrets-of-inventors/249044/>