



Digital Proofer

The DELUDE

Authored by Yoji K Gondor

6.0" x 9.0" (15.24 x 22.86 cm)
Black & White on White paper
92 pages

ISBN-13: 9781481015370
ISBN-10: 1481015370

Please carefully review your Digital Proof download for formatting, grammar, and design issues that may need to be corrected.

We recommend that you review your book three times, with each time focusing on a different aspect.

- 1 Check the format, including headers, footers, page numbers, spacing, table of contents, and index.
- 2 Review any images or graphics and captions if applicable.
- 3 Read the book for grammatical errors and typos.

Once you are satisfied with your review, you can approve your proof and move forward to the next step in the publishing process.

To print this proof we recommend that you scale the PDF to fit the size of your printer paper.

On the subject of
Comprehension
&
Delusion

A Philosophical Journey

*The **DELUDE***
An absurd way of life!

By
Yoji Gondor

Unpublished work © July, 2012

- *What typically the deluded fool says is not right or even wrong; it is downright stupid.*
- *The concept of the "delude" forwards the inference that man is not guaranteed rationality; man is merely capable of being rational.*
- *A general acceptance of an opinion does not guarantee accuracy, nor is sufficient proof of validity or of falsity.*
- *Thought is not a physical object, and can be only understood by the actions generated by its exteriorization or projection.*
- *We must note that some univocal statements can be, at times, equally true and false. For example we can state that: today is Monday, and that can be true if and only if today is in fact Monday, and implies the cyclical real-time validation.*
- *Snobbism, accompanied by a craving for superior social standing sometimes leads to bigotry and racism. This is achieved not by elevating yourself, but by an attempting to denigrate some others; that fits a delude's route to fulfill his desired exclusive social status.*
- *The metaphysical description of God as "nothing greater can be conceived" is particularly puzzling to the fools mind. Can God be the implied fancy of the infinity concept?*
- *When we grasp that our understanding of our universe amounts to about nothing, then, in fact, we know something.*
- *You can create enemies by speaking the truth; however they are better than the friends obtained by flattery.*
- *At times facts are in front of us; the blind can't see them, the deaf can't hear them, and the idiot can't believe them!*
- *It is no profit in pleasure; only hard work can bring it along. And what we do when we got the profit, make use of it to get some pleasure?*

- *An un-kept promise is like a rainy day; useless, cold and depressing!*
- *Delude – an individual who will strongly dedicate entire life to a single idea, which can be useful or destructive to his own life.*

CONTENTS

Foreword	6
Chapter 1 – The way to deluded knowledge	8
Chapter 2 – Understanding and the delude	9
Chapter 3 – The mind of the delude	16
Chapter 4 – The deludes was to comprehension	21
Chapter 5 – The public life of a delude	30
Chapter 6 – About our universe creation	40
Chapter 7 – The soul and genetics	46
Philosophical quotes	50
Proverbs	52
References	54

FOREWORD

At times, the subject of philosophy is unjustly considered merely a pointless and entangled reasoning in futile and conceptual web of abstract intricacies. In this writing I seek to point out the inherent beauty of philosophical matters and achievements, and the philosophy's timeless impact on the progress of human condition. Of course, all this is also praise to the significant capability of human mind and the immense intellectual achievements that are reflected in the classic philosophical work. This book illustrates my delight in the study of philosophy, and consists of thought concerning applied epistemic matters placed in a current context, along with practical consideration of logic, rationality, metaphysics, morality, and more. All this is considered in a manner related to casual human activities, and not purely a study inclined towards intellectual abstraction. The focus of this writing is a study of the familiar ways of developing erroneous comprehension or accumulating knowledge in an improper way that is presented against classical views of making sound judgments. I point out a number of universally valid laws/rules of thought, and describe the established pathway to some sound natural or trained understanding. Furthermore, I reflect about some of the well-known defective views. I want to reveal to the reader opinions of logical implication along with the typical philosophical component of undeniable puzzling charm.

The passionate pursuit for sensible knowledge is constructive if implicitly it is accepted that the grasp of full and definite truth is beyond our natural or biological abilities. Without a coherent way to understanding, we become incapable of meeting contingencies of a mature life, a requirement that is essential for a civilized existence. In this writing I compare the generally agreed view of reality, and contrast it with the commonly established defective view, a view that I assign to the intellectually deficient; the deluded individual. Our mental concepts are the only basis that provides a context of the lone "reality" we can possibly comprehend. The coarseness in which we sense the physical world is not adequate in satisfying all the conditions necessary to the full and accurate comprehension of all elements or distant specifics of this majestic universe. The philosophical use of logical reasoning is essential for connecting events or thoughts, and provides appropriate understanding of

multiple random empirical observations. We expect to see logically connected events, and when an event seems to belong to the mysticism that is impossible to sensibly validate, it raises many questions regarding not only about the event itself, but also about our own capacity of logical comprehension.

Mentioned in this writing also are some instances of philosophical themes that have assisted me in improving my logical-comprehension of diverse topics. By reading Aristotle I came to the realization that equality is of two distinct types; numerical and also proportional. Furthermore, I realized what is required for a person to achieve "greatness". A great person does great things, and is not hitherto "great" when it is only capable of doing great things or only meditating of acting but never carries it out. The uncertainty related to the reality of recognized or anonymous greatness still needs to be clarified.

Hitherto, the philosophy has had a fundamental influence on the development of human existence. Some philosophical concepts have a direct impact on society, some others have pure theoretical value, and are a part of humanity educational enchantment. The ancient moral philosophies of Confucius and the Daoism of Lao Tzu, have eternally enhanced the moral structure of Chinese society. Philosophical views, such as Buddhism and Yoga, which have been initiated in Indian sub-continent, have encircled the world and continue to have a great influence of those who discovers them. The philosophy that stemmed in Greece and rest of Europe has deeply influenced the western way of life; from Plato's Republic to perhaps the communism, the greatest negative social experiment that is based on Karl Marx's work, Das Capital. A number of philosophical works can be qualified as speculative philosophy, and nevertheless are of paramount intellectual importance. For example, Kant's brilliant discourse on "pure reason" definitely qualifies as transcendental dogmatism, and does share the space with the spiritualism of some religions. This form of dogmatism is difficult to invalidate since of the subject is presented in a neat, brilliant, and organized way, but nevertheless with an obscure and insurmountable intricacy. Kant's work is simply speculative philosophy, however the work is monumental in itself, and evocative of the construction of a beautiful crystal cathedral, with the observation that the cathedral does not have an entry door, and can't be practically occupied for God's worship. The cathedral is only an object of timeless beauty,

elegance, contemplation, and of even divine inspiration; however it does not have a practical use.

Philosophy is, at times, preoccupied with the power of rhetoric for the sake of mental fascination, fancies, complications and assumptions, not for the simple and direct description of the truth itself. Contemporary philosophy, it seems, has lost its straightforward way in the search for the truth. It wanders all corners of the thought in search for significance and sometimes infests the minds of others with baseless fabrications. Reading philosophy often feels like laboring in a gold mine, where tons of rocks must be removed before we get to a beautiful gold nugget; a philosophical proposition of timeless beauty. However, with all the mentioned difficulties it is fact that the subject of philosophy has progressed immensely in the last century. Attempting to minimize the contributions to comprehension by philosophers such as Ludwig Wittgenstein or Jack Derrida is futile.

The source of this writing is varied and reflects my reflections on the philosophical issues; some originated from my learning in school, from books, and some from the internet. The main source for this book is my accumulation of notes with regard to philosophical matters. The book handles many interesting ideas and reflections that sometimes do not seem connected to each other. It is like a journey in the world of philosophy that looks at old ideas in a new modern context. It is now easy to look back and see discrepancies in the old philosophical work, now when we gained much scientific knowledge that has resolved many of the old generation *mysteries*.

The intended user for this reading is an individual with a broad and varied interest in philosophical topics and concerned with the state of the human condition. Despite the richness of any language occasionally the author finds it difficult, if not impossible, to identify an expression which closely fits a concept. I regret that at times I was not able to find the words that completely articulate what I was trying to articulate. As an author is seldom satisfied with his work, and must at some point arrive to the end of his writing, it will consider it done only when the writing is abandoned. At this point, I believe that this writing will positively raises sufficient spiritual interest to be worth sharing with others.

The bibliography lists about 100 references, the majority of which are original sources that have inspired me and generated reflection on the subject that is presented in this book. It provides the foundation of what I present here as the “agreed upon reality”. The references provide a basis upon which an apparent and established classical way of getting to sound or to erroneous and ridiculous conclusions is based.

Chapter 1
THE WAY TO DELUDED KNOWLEDGE

The extent of knowledge a person accumulates is unequal among individuals with respect to both quality and quantity. As a result, individuals differ in both the details of their knowledge and in viable prospects to correct understanding, or comprehension, that is available to them. This clarifies the disjointed assessments, among individuals, regarding even the simplest and most routine events. Without a grasp of basic epistemic concepts, a person can pass through life restricted by the influence derived from the rigid mold of the common sense, by the influence of commonly shared points of view, or a strong and misguided passion; in this way it becomes deficient in the ability to deploy the essential constraint of obligatory cautious skeptical reason.

If the sense-data received by our cognitive system is vague, then we have a wide array of solutions to be considered as potential paths to understanding. Accurately selecting the correct path, which ought to be chosen toward valid understanding, is difficult. Over time, I have observed a pattern of commonly accepted views of what we call reality; *the agreed upon reality*. Some of these views defy our typical way to comprehension; some of us have the outstanding capacity to see into the future clearer and further than most. Many of these individuals can attain status of celebrities and even the outstanding reputation of a *genius*. On the other side of the range, a totally bizarre, but nevertheless familiar, view of a mentally mutilated and therefore dysfunctional individual resides. The strange being, which exists as opposite to the genius, is the delude¹. The deludes' main characteristic is that he holds a preponderance of delusional opinions that are assigned to common events, and also by his intrinsic ability to frequently self delude.

The delude is an individual that is predisposed to accept as true incoherent opinions, some that his own cognitive system generates. We can perceive such an individual as a fool, as a jerk, or even a normal person due to his supplementary personal traits as personality and character. At times, folks are saying nothing, while

¹ Delude - (noun), is defined here as an individual that is predisposed to develop illogical opinions of even the most elementary and basic events.

they appear to say something notable; silence can be, at times, understood as great eloquence. The quiet person can be attributed many qualities: thoughtfulness, temperance, moderation, patience, and respect. If that is rightfully so, it is another matter. If the delude is outspoken, then his mental chaos can be easily sensed, and it does become what we call a fool, more precisely a deluded fool. The classical definition of a fool is equivocal, I do not envision him in this work as a jester, a member of a noble household who provided entertainment, but as a mentally deficient person; an objectionable idiot. Even some mental condition such as paranoia or schizophrenia possibly has the "delude" condition as its basis for forming, but that is not the scope or competence of this writing.

Even when a person is born possessing a healthy mental state, the familial and environmental assault during childhood with deluded opinions and behavior can be the basis for an individual to develop into a delude, an 'individual in a deluded mental state.' In this writing, the label fool, or imbecile, is interchangeable with the underlying primary conditions of the delude. The probabilistic distribution of mental states will guarantee that an individual's intellectual qualities are randomly spread along the potential range, the genius and the delude exemplifying the opposite ends of the scale. Nevertheless, both are definitely and perpetually present. Hitherto, much attention and praise has been paid to the conception of 'the genius', while 'the delude' was somehow overlooked. Understanding the complex conditions that assist the becoming of a delude is meaningful; conditions that can trigger a person to have a painful, destructive, anti-social, and undesirable life. By joining the use of reason along with empirical observations, an attempt here is made to describe a rational person's conscious actions. Also considered are some cognitive shortcomings supplemented with personal reflections regarding the defective development of the intellect. The delude is someone that habitually acts mindlessly, who can't handle an event contextually, not the wandering person that enters sporadically into the space of irrational action; a place that a common being conscientiously struggles keep away from. The delude does not suffer from a physical brain deficiency; his shortcomings reside in the area of accumulation of legitimate knowledge and an inadequate way to comprehension.

Adopting a skeptical perspective is not only beneficial but also required for properly understanding logical concepts. There are

times when an object exists in reality, although not within human experience. Without direct observation, an object is experienced by means of logic, many of which can be misrepresented yet considered part of the state of affairs. Therefore, a sort of skeptical shield must be in place to protect the observer from possibly illogical or unfounded positions being adopted. Only when logic overcomes the skeptic concepts, which sifts out what is not proven factual, can the inexperienced events be considered valid by reason alone. Certainly, it is detrimental to accept as knowledge not only what is personally experienced, but also what is contributed as a sort of indirect experience derived from social context; both individual and group knowledge. For example, we accept that there exists and have formed a mental conception of the continent of Africa, even we never been there. The concept of delude forwards the inference that man is not guaranteed rationality, but is merely capable of being rational.

I point out from time to time some humorous situations. Humor itself is a significant and pleasant activity of the human mind, requiring creative imagination, and also understanding. It is difficult not to locate a particular humorous pleasure in the observation of the foolishly mindless acts of the delude. The actions of a delude do not justify the inflexible judgments often exemplified; his actions ought to be regarded as random acts, acts disconnected from the common necessities of predictable behavior. Various circumstances and contexts (understanding, social, religious) provide an opportunity to describe particular situations that fit the mentality of the delude. While I worked on the manuscript I wondered what is the boundary, or even if a boundary exists, between a common views of the world, the agreed upon reality, and the deludes view of it. A delude is not a person who enters accidentally the illogical word of irrational behavior; the delude is a person who permanently resides in that unfortunate world. A genuine delude has no skeptical worries or awareness of his condition, and will not entertain, even remotely, the belief that he could possibly be a delude. In fact, the delude is certain that he is not a delude, of course his certainty is visibly erroneous. In this writing, the delude is simply an abstract container, allowing me to point out what I believe it is a delusional way of understanding.

"Psychology, it is said, deals with thinking as it is; logic with thinking as it should be."
- - Edmund
Husserl

The foundation of our thinking, the basis of establishing knowledge, is formed early in life. What is the adult person's moral or social responsibility in the positive mental development of our children? Can we protect our young from forming a defective mental foundation, which would not allow for sound thinking, a foundation that would produce endless troubles? The obligation to shield the immature from building a defective logical foundation indispensable for sound understanding later in life should be an important social task. Once the sound and proper mental foundation is formed, the young can easily acquire additional knowledge, and has the proper basis and mental capability for rejecting defective forms of belief. We should shield our children from learning inconsistent things, such as reading fictions, until their mind can distinguish between a true story and a synthetic one. If a defective foundation for thought is formed, the consequence is the likelihood of inducing unintended countless instances of irrational behavior. This has the potential to harm to the individual and those near him. We ought to accumulate knowledge to satisfy the need of social inclusion, and we must guard that the accumulated knowledge is valid. Without valid knowledge, our lives come about as being lost in an isolated and unfamiliar place.

"A person may imagine things that are false, but he can only understand things that are true; for if the things are false, the apprehension of them is not the understanding."

-- Isaac Newton

Politically, the condition of the delude does generate the prospect that he will develop to become a goal for prejudiced manipulation, a target of a carefully crafted propaganda, a senseless object and easy target for the power of rhetoric, such as the excessive calls to nationalism or similar craze. The seed that would make one person become a delude could be implanted into one's mind at early age, and sophisticated plans could be used in schools to make the young disposed to empty nationalism and bigotry, with the expectation that the future citizen would become a 'dummy,' well-disposed and easily convinced to support political faction plans. Acquiring the agreement of an educated citizen is not a trivial matter; getting the desired consent of a delude would be easy. The usefulness of the naïve and pre-biased deluded individual

can have important political and social consequences, particularly in a democratic setting. The obtuse desire to keep the general population at a lower, malleable, education level to cause the majority of the population to develop into straightforward fatalities for propaganda; it is, at times, equally beneficial and frivolous. I have no knowledge that such an attempt has been put into action. Nevertheless, the idea of such experience is not singular or unheard off.

Chapter 2 The DELUDE ways to COMPREHERNSION

No particular probability is universally probable: for what is improbable does happen, and therefore it is probable that improbable things will happen. -- Aristotle, Rhetoric.

Our primary evidence of our universe existence consists of the structure of perceived mental sensed objects along with the inferences we derive from them, and that conforms to the acquired private reality as it is symbolized in our current mental context. We are continually obliged in trusting our senses, even in the cases of illusions the senses themselves remains accurate. However, the perception rooted in sense-data in it is not direct and absolute, but diluted by various mental and biological factors involved. I equate knowledge to be the totality of the mental objects that we experienced and hold, with our mental content.² The existences of mental impressions are commonly not feasible without our sensing of external objects, but we must account for such things as mental impressions generated by basic innate ideas. Raw knowledge requires mental validation and by inference becomes an assumption that is subject of acceptance or doubt; and subsequent it becomes an opinion. The opinion is handled by our comprehension processes. It is evaluated and becomes a belief that subsequently and inductively becomes a new formed opinion. Plato's famous view that knowledge is *justified true belief* points to the proper validated knowledge. In this writing, the concept of knowledge includes the acquired sense-data impressions [raw knowledge] along with the accumulation of new and intricate mental objects that are a consequence of inference gained by inductive or deductive reasoned examination. [*a sintesi*]³ knowledge] It includes both deductive and inductive inference, along with sensible knowledge; where sensible entails knowledge acquired through intuition or some form of intellectual perception. A new *a sintesi* judgment can also be partially rooted in an earlier held belief. The raw knowledge is gained by sensual observation such as seeing and listening, by measurement, by reading, by doing various tasks. The raw

² I am referring here to personal knowledge, and not knowledge is stored in books or computers, for example.

³ A sintesi – basic innate knowledge, based on observation along with connected inferential or reasoned factor.

knowledge is merely an observation, and therefore is always logically valid. The *a sintesi* knowledge is inferentially established by our cognitive processes supported by empirical innate, and a priori elements; is not always evidently identifiable as sound knowledge. Sintesi knowledge can emerge also as intuitive a priori knowledge stimulated by practical empirical actuality. For example, the geometric concept of a circle can be inspired by observing the full moon on a night sky.

The comprehension act itself also becomes a new *a sintesi* knowledge object we call belief. Therefore, a belief is a cognitively validated knowledge object. To achieve *a sintesi* knowledge we can start by acknowledging a basic-truth that is a form of knowledge, indisputable true, and used as a base foundation for sensible thinking. Basic truths do not require demonstration, and they are obviously valid; their denial would definitely lead to contradiction. One example of a basic truth: *Two halves equals one unit*. All understanding is resting of its logical beginning, the basic truths. It is also true that some knowledge cannot be empirically perceived, and therefore it must be inferred from associated effects. For example we cannot directly see/sense electricity even when it's undeniably present, we merely detect its manifestation by flipping some switch; in this way electricity it is in some way similar to a ghost. Some truths and even facts cannot be established rationally. At times facts are in front of us; the blind can't see them, the deaf can't hear them, and the idiot can't believe them! The wall of skepticism and the imperfection of language need to be conquered before we can assert any knowledge as certain. The alternate way to obtain *a sintesi* knowledge is the start from a single proposition regarded as true, and authenticate it by other coherent propositions that are available to us and are supportive of its validity. Self-evident truth (basic truth, based on intuition?) is the basis of rational understanding that is the start points of *a sintesi-ing* other complex structured truths. The source of knowledge can be: abstract – called *a priori*, empirical – called *a posteriori*, or basic innate knowledge based on inferential or reasoned fact – called *a sintesi*. There are persuasive skeptic views with regard to the legitimacy of a priori knowledge primary foundation; however precise epistemic branches such as mathematics do base their core concepts on it's definiton. The *a posteriori* knowledge provides verifiable, objective forms of knowledge. Our senses do provide us incomplete knowledge about

the objects they examine, and that knowledge is complemented by our mental processes with additional elements generated by previous acquired knowledge. For example we'll see a dog with three legs, that will trigger an awareness event that would point to previous knowledge which suggests that dogs have four legs, and a skeptical inspection of the event is deployed. For example, we also can see a car parked away from us, but we can't tell the brand of the car or the if it's engine is "running" or not. By getting closer to the car we can acquire additional sense data and grasp the model of the car, and observe if the car engine is running. My point is here that we can acquire objective knowledge by our senses, that knowledge is verifiable but not complete. The *sintesi* knowledge is a contextual acquired knowledge coupled to the individual distinctiveness, and because of that it can be safely called subjective knowledge, or contextual knowledge. Sintesi knowledge is prone for generation of new ideas, some of them account for phenomena such as creativity. For example: it is likely that a the combined knowledge about a portable CD player and development of solid state devices such as an MP3 players has generated the creative *sintesi* idea of the famous Ipod.

As an absolute concept, knowledge also integrates the conscious and the unconscious mental content. For example knowledge about swimming, riding a bicycle, or expressing emotion is learned but the technique is not consciously identified before experiencing it. Knowledge presents itself as a puzzle; not all the new acquired objects fit in, and it becomes established only when the entire puzzle is suitably completed. The total mental knowledge content will allow the rejection of illogical or hallucination objects, and in such situation we can say that our cognitive system is self-correcting and does provide for a function of error/pattern detection.

Ignorance itself is defined not as the negation of knowledge but as a circumstance in which a conclusion is reached without the awareness of the absence of essential required aspect about the object or absence of base necessary for sound rational assessment. Furthermore, a person that has cognitive difficulties even in properly evaluating basic knowledge that qualifies as *basic truth*, is a delude.

Delude (1) – a person who holds false believes in spite of evidence of the contrary. Furthermore, at times a delude is incompetent to

validate even a basic truth as a consequence of his inherited genetic construct.

Delude (2)– a person that inherited faulty genetic structures or accumulated improper knowledge that dispose him to be cognitively incapable to soundly validate simple information. Listed below are some of it's essential characteristics:

- An individual that holds false opinions against valid objections and resistant to all reason
- A delude is unable to correctly evaluate the validity of things fundamentally simple as the “basic truths” (such as: you have one apple and give one apple away, and therefore you have no apple left)
- It has a mental condition characterized by inadequately holding false beliefs and regards them as valid.
- A person who involuntarily misleads himself

Delusion implies that the incoherent belief or impression is firmly held despite being contradicted by what is generally accepted as reality or it was soundly refuted by a rational argument; typically a symptom of mental deficiency. A *prime delude* is not a victim of an external act of delusion, but he self-deludes himself by incorrectly assesses logically uncomplicated information. The delude stubbornly holds as legitimate illusionary views of reality that leads to a permanent general state of delusion. From early in life, the delude accumulates erroneous beliefs that create difficulty in acquiring additional valid knowledge, an occurrence which undermines his mental foundation needed for logical comprehension. This state of mental development is the basis for future mental conditions as idiocy, stupidity, foolishness or even obsessive conditions such as paranoia.

Before we arrive to desired knowledge, we must refine our capability to proper comprehension. This accurate and valid comprehension of basic events becomes a form of primary decision making. Without proper ways to correctly evaluate the simplest of events we become unable to construct the basis for our future comprehension necessities, and cannot gather valid knowledge indispensable to being rational. At times also we must discard some acquired knowledge that has been identified as invalid and return to original thought, and start on a new logical path that expectantly will

lead us to a new and valid understanding. Thousands of years the humanity has accumulated knowledge, and any of us only can grasp a small quantity of it, even thou it is there, available, for our specific use. It say that the trouble in acquiring valid knowledge is that we are, in a way, fighting against a faceless enemy, and allowing us taking appearance for reality. Many dangers undermine our path to sound understanding, here are some: perception, belief, subjectivity, bias, emotions, intuition, guess, illusion, rhetoric, faulty confidence, and even dishonesty. The danger of accumulating improper knowledge wrongly shapes the most important parts of our life including our family, social life, employment, political, or religious life. The darkness of ignorance is what makes the reaching of understanding nearly impossible, with the comment that the absolute reality and perfect understanding reside only in the mysterious and abstract metaphysical space.

We must note that some univocal statements can be, at times, equally true and false. For example we can state that: *today is Monday*, and that can be true if and only if today in Monday indeed, and implies a cyclical real-time validation. The statement that *today is Monday*; can be determined objectively, independent of feelings, opinions, and prejudices, then again it is not always valid. Our logical system is closely coupled with the concept of systematic time, without which it cannot properly operate. Time is essential for such tasks as ordering, and indispensable for fundamental relations as the cause/effect. We must guard about the absence of the sound logical connection, some effect might follow a cause, however the logical connection is nonexistent; the cause is not the reason for the particular effect, and therefore we perceive appearance to be reality. Furthermore, the time concept provides means of systematic sequencing of the stream of actions that are chiefly packed with random events.

A generally accepted opinion is not, on that basis, guaranteed valid or a proof of its accuracy; equally it is not proof of its falsity. Similarly, a beautiful and suitably constructed sentence that satisfies the stringent norms of grammar and eloquence is also not guaranteed, by that alone, its logical correctness. I seek in this writing to travel in the space of human understanding primarily by the use of the theoretical rationalistic approach, by the use of the reasoned fact. Reason alone does not provide a path to direct knowledge, however it provides as the ability to properly grasp the

facts, it only assists in sound comprehension. Thinking is not a physical object, and can be only implied by the actions generated by its exteriorization or projection. We can't sense acts of thinking; we only observe a person's actions that provide inference of the thinking that lead to initiating of such actions; that is if we are not intentionally deceived. Therefore, and external observation of an action will be mapped to the act of thinking that lead to such an action. Sound thinking would imply that we hold our opinion if we don't grasp enough insight regarding the subject examined; any displayed projection about the subject would be a waste. If we project our opinion, by speech or action, about such an event it will reveal our state of mind and expose some content of our thinking. In some cases the action could attempt to divert our attention to the wrong or deceitful conclusion, only the exteriorized projected intent of thinking can be directly detected.

We need to admit that from time to time hypotheses may possibly lead to logical absurdities, or to vague transcendental opinions; also we must assert that from total skepticism no logical argument is possible. It happens at times, the absurdity to which and argument leads us in assessing some fact is different than the absurdity some other argument leads to; in reference to the same deed. However, when rationality induced by logical thinking is replaced with biased mental fancies or immanent impulses then the infinity of wrong conclusions are the basis of choice for the mind. The way that leads to legitimate knowledge is provided by observation and logic; personal opinions can be sensible and logical, however, we must be careful that the empirical evidence of the senses does not contradicts them; as David Hume recognized. To be validated, to exit the hypothetical realm, all knowledge and truth must be confirmed. It is self-evident that just because some event or quality is possible or even probable, that alone is not adequate proof of its existence. There can be a substantial and subtle difference between what happens, and between what we expect to happen. Our wishes and desires cannot always be fulfilled; there is willing of the possible, and sometimes also the willing of the impossible or even the willing of the absurd. It is useless to warn the thoughtless person that generalizations do not logically validate a particular event; he has mastered the way to arrive, with great confidence and pride, to erroneous conclusions. At times, we desire to have a particular exoteric conclusion of a argument or syllogism and then try to reconstruct the premises and the middle term by manufacturing "facts", and that way we

frequently we arrive to some wanted artificial/biased conclusions; the delude is expert of such compositions. The deludes' ability to distort even the simplest requirement of logical thinking is definitely monumental.

It is inaccurate, yet I must say, that deluded fools are never someone we personally know. From time to time we observe someone who acts in an irresponsible manner, a pompous, rude, or a vulgar person. A stupid, an incompetent, a man for which reason and rationality is a source of inconvenience, a person who knows everything about all things, a person opinioned about the unknown, a person confident in his arbitrary and unfounded judgment: in this case, likely you meet a *delude*⁴. I accept as true that humans are deeply complex; it is next to impossible to completely understand much about there state of mind. Regardless of solidly founded opinions; I believe that one can yourself act foolish if you dare to advance a strong and inflexible opinion of anyone. We can always rightfully judge people's actions, but we should not attempt to judge the people themselves; it is not the same thing. A bad action is not an indication of a "bad", incorrigible person; in the same time a "good" action is not descriptive of an always "good" person. In time of crisis, ones character and abilities come to be openly known, abilities that are not likely to foresee. If the delude has also of bellow par natural mental capabilities, then sometimes he is also called an *imbecile*ⁱ. I learned from a Japanese proverb about a standard way to detect an imbecile: "*When a finger points at the moon, the imbecile looks at the finger*". The delude it is a universal characteristic of the human condition, not specific to any ethnic group but belongs to the entire human species, and is bound together to similar others by the unfortunate mental state. The delude acts in a repulsive way, he ignores the world perception of his character, and moral clashes with others are inevitable. It is safe to say that the delude is not an admired being, and he is certainly lonely in his miserable life. We all realize that a little fire warms us, and can grow and become hazardous. Ask the deluded fool to start a fire to warm us, and he will become an involuntary arsonist. Give the deluded fool a knife; he will turn into a murderer; in the deluded fools world such exaggerations are customary. Talking to the delude can be a difficult task; when someone asks meaningless questions,

⁴ *delude* – is an atypical or joyful person, content, confident of his phony wisdom, absurdly detached from any current or civilized perspective. A traveler without a scope, aim or purpose.

as deludes commonly do, what is the merit if one answers them? At times the delude becomes silent when he is incapable of a good answer, but he continues to listen. The silence is inwardness, not neutral but private and possibly cowardly. Naturally, we know that only the dead are truly quiet, and that the delude is simply hiding. However, if silence is indifference concerning a negative act, by that alone it becomes a spineless, pretend, and a deplorable action that is an obstruction in realizing the fundamental requirements of an upright social life. The delude typically takes things according to their first appearance, and it needless to say that he arrives frequently at very odd and erroneous conclusions. This condition leads to large accumulation of invalid knowledge and biased judgments: when prejudices have taken root in the delude's character, it is a hopeless endeavor to attempt to seek changing of his opinions. It is a natural aim of any individual to better himself and to become a better person as he can possibly be. On the other side of the spectrum is the delude's life; they can become "great" only accidentally and for a short period of time. We all possess distinct abilities to learn, some are innate, embedded in our genetic structure, others abilities are facilitated by our acquired knowledge. For the ordinary people, there is certain benefit in making a few mistakes early in life; that is not factual for the delude. The common person "learns" from his own mistakes, and it provides an opportunity to avoid them in the future. The delude does not easily "learn"; the delude processes robotically any mistakes, and turns them around, sadly, in a way that fits his character. The delude is a shameless form of a human automaton. We can safely state that the deludes are unable to learn from others: learning is an important undertaking that makes possible some understanding of the complicated world around us.

I assert that any chain of reasoning cannot possibly have an absolute *a priori* initial basis; its cognitive foundation is inherent in our mental physical structures. I have observed, and beyond the skeptical barrier that individuals do not poses identical innate abilities to handle logical tasks. A reasonable explanation would be that the brain persistently develops new logical structures that are genetically shared. Thinking itself synthesizes the mass of information available, and orders it in a new way; in this sense logically sound inference can be assigned to thinking, and therefore can account for undeniable progress. Thinking can at times, reveal us a new truth by connecting some previously unconnected or concealed facts. It is again self-evident that more one person

knows, more he understands that much more is unknown, and the task for discovering the entire truth becomes unattainable. It is now generally agreed that it is not possible any longer, due to the enormous amount of the collected scientific data and the complexity of the subject, for the common humans to follow and understand the thought processes of modern theoretical scientific development. For example, only the highly trained individuals can account for the ongoing development of the scientific discoveries that bases their continuation on sophisticated mathematics, physics, or technological advances. More and more the attention to detail and worry is required not to abandon the rational/scientific path for the mysterious and synthetic way of unsound thinking.

The granularity that we detect/sense the physical reality is limited by our biological construct, however we have developed many tools that assist us in collecting data regarding our universe. We gain knowledge of our universe by studying our planet and also by analyzing the rays of light, radiation, and particles that originate in some other area of our universe that have reached our planet. We generalize our observations as universally valid and hesitantly assume that our small part of the universe characterize the construction of the entire universe. Without doubt, we learned various things by leveraging the remarkable cognitive power of our mind. Furthermore, we also learn continuously of new things in similar way, by inductively extending the borders of our gained knowledge. By finding a plant leaf, a learned person can reconstruct the particular qualities of the tree that the leaf comes from, and logically can assemble much inference on the nature of the tree itself.

Some things are understood from careful study, other things are learned from practical experience. For example there are distinct ways in which we can learn mathematics, a foreign language, or swimming. Theoretical study is sufficient for learning mathematics. For acquiring a new language the theoretical study is supplemented by practical application, while for swimming the practical exercise is at the core of its learning. You also analyze former historical events; the history provides us the knowledge needed to inductively acquire a logical and reasonable view and expectation of the future. The fool is not much interested in any of these ways and of the usual effort of learning; he bases his actions on endless sustenance from of his natural intuitive ability.

The construction of new judgments must be positioned on the foundation that already is believed valid by us; a defective foundation will cause us future unmanageable troubles. We must say that it is hard, if not impossible, to even suggest the possibility of the comprehension by our mind of the objective reality, even we can doubt its factual existence. Similar to intuition, a belief it is not a form of a useful perception; it can apply error in our mental processes, and therefore tamper with the validity of the overall perceptions. Psychology deals with such forms of thinking, when the mental object is disconnected from any kind of logical validation. False irrational principles generally spring from conflict with themselves or with sensory evidence. Is there a mean to establish a valid and true connection between consciousness, the objective reality, or the absolute logical truth? We also must consent that it is easier to have multiple rational minds come to the valid/true result that come to the same false result. At best, we must attempt to depend on "*the agreed upon reality*"⁵, a view that is shared among a large number of reasonable individuals. It is not the best solution, but I can't even imagine of one more suitable to the circumstances. This is what my inquiry tries to do; to point to some rational form of "*the agreed upon reality*", and then to highlight the totally strange and disconnected view, a view easily proven illogical; the view I assign to the delude.

The development of philosophy was carried on parallel with other scientific discoveries and progress of other numerous fields of knowledge. It is apparent that the quantity of contemporary published work in philosophy is considerable, and one person can't possibly grasp it all. Only after some time, some philosophers' work will continue to be meaningful and important, and take a place among the classics works. I have read little of the traditional opinions regarding philosophical work, and I was interested in reading the published philosophical writings themselves; or a good translation. Unintentionally, totally unplanned, one subject matter came to my attention; it is the universal concept of a defective mental view of reality. Here is where the delude idea comes from. As I mentioned earlier, the delude is a person who necessarily possesses a functional physical mind, nevertheless his foundation of

⁵ *The agreed upon reality*— an accepted view, a consensus, of an event or object state.

understanding was built in an erroneous way that induces a predisposition for illogical/biased judgment. It also certainly possesses cognitive inclination for being "deluded", by having qualities acquired from his ancestors by DNA inheritance. Arrival to our present human condition of our physical and mental capacities is a consequence of long time biological evolution. The physical structures of our brain that facilitates systematical/logical thinking are also genetically inherited and a consequence of a genetic transfer from the early condition of our ancestors; it is obvious that our capacity of logical thinking is not uniform among the members of a group. I question if the emergence of the delude is avoidable, and it is appearance is factually a consequence of a mistaken and unfortunate condition that facilitate an individual in acquiring an unstable initial foundational knowledge. Once the illogical knowledge has taken roots, more additional such data piles up in one's mind, making near impossible to reset all and start from the beginning in building again a valid form of such foundational knowledge.

Numerous people have attained timeless honor in an equitable way, such as artists, scientists, original thinkers, or leaders. In the philosophy, the universal moral contributions of Socrates, and Kong Zhongni⁶ have endured the centuries and yet preserve inspiring soundness and veneration. In mathematics and science, geniuses as Pythagoras, Euclid, Isaac Newton, Euler⁷ have contributed in a resounding manner. For example, the mathematical truth presented by Euclid mathematics is eternal, and our modern mathematics adds to it new dimensions; it never attempts to doubt or repeal it.

For flying in space we base our calculations on the Isaac Newton's contribution to the classical physics. Albert Einstein's vibrant and amazing theory of relativity has enchanted our senses for decades by its intellectual boldness and exquisite vision; however the intricate task of proving or invalidating it is ongoing; a nearly impossible task that is typical with regard to any hypothetical advanced theory. Let's take a look at some famous people that have gained much prominence, even though their ultimate merits are actually doubtful. Various military commanders have achieved vast

⁶ Kong Zhongni - known in the western world as Confucius.

⁷ Euler – Famous Swiss mathematician who is the author of "*the most beautiful formula ever*". ($e^{i\pi} + 1 = 0$)

power and fame by gaining military superiority over their opponents; by becoming impressive strategists and tacticians, by their readiness for battle, by using technological advances in generating weapons, and also by the use of barbaric style cruelty. Historians place Julius Caesar, Alexander the Great, Sun Tzu, Hannibal, Attila the Hun, Genghis Khan, Napoleon Bonaparte among the most successful army strategists and commanders. At times, the war is judged not for the courage and heroism of the soldiers, but unfortunately for the large count of victims or casualties. Many have made excessive use of their power that ultimately brought about destruction, including their own. Some have aspired to conquer the entire world, and the outcome was, time after time, a devastating failure. Only a delude (or fool) will set an aim so much outside of his objective possibilities, as conquering the world really seems to be. In not so far away time Adolph Hitler has followed his delusion to unite the world under his General Government by using the technical advances of his nation and the power of his army; now he is remembered mainly for his cruelty and the criminality of his war. Looking back in time, Hitler had no real chance of conquering the world, was then he basically a delude?

We dedicate significant attention to the ones that surprises the common person by their totally ridicule manners, a conduct on which this book attempts to rest some light on. It is the abstract and lonely world of the idiot, of the stupid being, of those in the similar mental condition that have gained our attention generally in a few writings and proverbs. This is the world of the delude that we see at times happy or cheerful only. What is the happiness to such a being but the attempt to satisfy of all possible wishes; that is not even remotely possible. From here on, I will include some personal views and opinions, but please be aware that we might involuntarily cross the boundaries of the delude's world, and sadly, all we may not be aware of it.

Chapter 3 THE MIND OF THE DELUDE

The whole problem with the world is that fools and fanatics are always so certain of themselves, but wiser people so full of doubts. – Bertrand Russell.

The material world is real; the difficulty stands in our approach and capacity to determine it. I posit the opinion that the spiritual component emerged later, and that the material world first existed. The self-evident fact is that we, the human beings, are in essence mere collections of biologically clustered fundamental particles.⁸ The physical matter was required to have been present before the mind; the matter has been the foundation for the creation the biological structures of the life form. Later, the life form acquired what we call mind, and therefore the mind is a consequence of the matter quality, and a proof of it's existence.⁹ I wonder about the singular moment when inert matter has become life; and the journey from the initial form of life to the spiritual human manifestation there is an remarkable pathway. During time, life representation traveled from a senseless state, to the development of sensory perception (unconscious or simple consciousness), memory storage, and to the development of complex consciousness and cognitive states. After a life ends its existence, the physical matter that fulfilled the life object returns to its inert physical condition. Besides it existing physical structures, the mind accumulates memory objects. The memory object is a physical impression applied to our brain structures; it can be acquired thru sensory perception, emotions, innate thinking, or are result of association of multiple memory objects; we call this knowledge. Various forms of knowledge is also gathered and stored in the memory of computer systems, and that is commonly called "data". The "data" itself the basis of what we call raw knowledge. For example we can see, in time, planes flying in the sky, which leads us to a new generalized object that is not generated by a particular plane, but by our cognitive processing and

⁸ Steven W. Hawking – "The fact that we human beings – who are ourselves mere collections of fundamental particles of nature ."

⁹ A materialistic view that physical matter that is required as basis of our life form.

generalization of the common properties of the multiple sensed planes. It is common knowledge that we can acquire by observation, and it would facilitate the availability of the object for cognitive processing, when needed. It is reasonable to assume that knowledge is stored in memory clusters: for example the memory cluster "cars" would include such varieties as Ford, Cadillac, etc. One unanswered question regarding memorization is that if by repetition do we generate a stronger memory impression of the same object, or we generate multiple memory impressions that would improve our chance to locate it when needed. Besides the common episodic memory, the procedural memory objects are stored in the un-conscious part of memory and are triggered by events similar to those that generated them. For example we created a memory object when learning to swim. When the next time we swim, then we are automatically able to duplicate from the memory the previous successful swim motion pattern. The procedural memory is not an instinct, whoever it acts similar and it is so close that does not make much difference. While awake, our memory continuously processes the visual sensation objects. When coming at home, for example we are neutral when scanning the living surroundings. At times, we become aware of any visual or non-visual change happened while we were absent. This scanning of our surroundings is done continuously and at the sub-conscious level; this is a form of background cognitive processing, associated with forms of processing as intuition or instinct. That does provide us an involuntarily awareness of change in our surrounding, by the means of change detection of patterns and provides awareness events as a consequence of cognitive comparison of similar stored and new memory objects. In our room, a missing large vase would be detected and turned into an awareness act, for example. Additionally, this undeniable event does prove that the memory seems to order the memory objects with respect to what we call time, and the cognitive processing can differentiate the same object compared to an early one. The memory objects are managed by the cognitive function, and decisions are made to dispose (forget) some selected objects. Some memory objects are determined to be unimportant, it is unusual that one person remembers what he had for breakfast last week, while this data in new, whoever the cognitive processing has decided that it is unworthy of long time storage and therefore discarded quickly. Memory content is a significant component of our private cognitive context.

We can cautiously articulate that we can sense the visual color of an object only by detecting the light rays reflected by the object, and we are not capable to sense the object itself. Diverse objects and events provide opportunity for sensual perception, however they are not the sensation itself, as is obviously widely understood.¹⁰ It is commonly agreed that the human being has nothings to go on other than a collection of nerve stimuli that gather fancies generated by the world around him. It is evident that in our sense experience we only have access to representations generated by our nervous structures, and not to the actual physical objects themselves.¹¹ For example, if we sense a cup, the cup is not directly experienced by our intellect, but our optical nerves generate a self alteration related to sensing the cup, a modification that is detected by our brain and become temporarily part of our conciseness. But there is more than the sense experience in the human world, it is fact the abstract ideas are not consequent from sense perceptions, but from specific cognitive processes, and therefore from the innate power of our mind. Regardless of how detailed we perceive an object, is it that sufficiently adequate? For example we glance at a rock, we see its shape, color; later we can determine its weight and tell about it's chemical composition, however we can't directly determine it's atomic structures; what our senses detect is valid, nevertheless not complete. We can supplement our understanding of the rock by inductively adding general properties that we believe similar materials as the particular rock contain. The external perception of an object is complemented by our mental processes with additional memory stored data of related objects and also complemented by the inductive power of our mind applied to the particular object. The modest understanding we gathered about our universe is primarily due to the ability of our senses, and also complemented by our ability of rational thinking.

Simply, I say that our belief system is formed as a consequence of the cognitive validation of acquired knowledge, and later we accept the result as our private reality. Proven knowledge is methodical, and the true beliefs mutually support each other. If a false belief is held, the induced contradiction requires abandoning

¹⁰ *Objects sensing can also can be named the objective component of our realism.*

¹¹ *Sense-only way to reality. Concept eloquently presented by Stuart Mill: "In our sense experience we only have access to our mental representations, not to objects themselves."*

valid beliefs, and in this way the new structure of beliefs becomes unstable. In many particular contexts, the epistemic principles are uncommonly high, and it is difficult, if not even impossible, for all our beliefs to count as valid knowledge. The cognitive validation is a form of interpretation of multiple sense-data along with the contribution due to our cognitive processing. Data is validated in a hierarchical way; it can be regarded as true, undoubtedly true, desirable, maybe true, and unlikely true, false, disgusting, and so on. The sensed data is later stored in the physical memory as a memory object, and does include the impression of the object itself along with a component that encapsulates its properties. For example we look at the moon, and store its physical impression, its name, shape, and color, size, along with the emotional component present; we associate this with the earlier acquired properties of the moon stored due to processes as learning or earlier observation. If we observe a nice flower; the sense object is a "*flower*" object with its particular properties, also let's say that the flower has the color red. The color red is also associated with an object "*color*" in our mind, and one of the color properties is the "red", however even the color "red" is an object, due to many variations the color "red". Therefore, not only that we store sense-data as complex memory objects, but also these objects seem linked to other objects creating a web of connections. It appears efficient that this pattern of storage also implies that our memory object processing is in fact parallel and distributed. The life evolution processes have been responsible for developing such an effective system, not atypical if we take into account the overall biological complexity of the human beings.

We must realize that sense-data is neutral from a logical perspective. At times, the empirical evidence of an object is hidden by some transformation. As an example, sugar exists in solid form as crystals, but it is present in a cup of coffee and can be detected indirectly by us as "sweetness" only; this is a mode of circumstances the delude is not cognitively equipped to comprehend. The deluded fool believes that some extraordinary people can, in fact, walk on water, but he ignores the fact that water can also be found in solid form, as frozen ice, and that we all, in that case, can walk on it. We also can't sense other people's pain, however we can indirectly detect it from person's acts of exteriorization of it, and understand it as compared to our similar past pain events.

The sensed empirical data is processed by on cognitive

structure, and then classified into areas of understanding – either rational, moot knowledge, or invalid/unsound knowledge. The foundationalists claim that the structure of our belief system inherits its validation from a number of undisputable guarantees (basic truths) that forms its basis. In this context, our belief system, then, is seen as having the architecture of a house, with its foundation firmly supporting its structures. Also, the human anatomy will fit the foundationalists' paradigm, with the point that the entire system is constructed around a rigid structure. Coherentists take our belief system to be like a basket or a nest, with our beliefs mutually supporting each other as the inter-tangled branches form a basket wall hold the object together, rather than relying for their justification on a foundation block. Both these paradigms seem legitimate and fitting to particular situations, and also a grouping of them seems appropriate. The deludes' belief system includes malfunctioning cognitive structures, and has an unstable basis with random and unproven characteristics. A delude does not possess any means to rationally validate new acquired data, and it is manage to assign meanings to it in a synthetic, objectionable, way. It is the defective foundation of delude's cognitive system that makes it is next to impossible to untangle the mystery of his mental structures or to anticipate his rehabilitation. A delude's minds go much further, and their cognitive structures connects unconnected ideas, and the result is that they arrive at unsound and annoying conclusions. Ignorance itself believably belongs to the cognitive power; inference or connection of multiple perceived but unrelated events is that gives the fool the possibility to dive deep in the dark area of the human condition. The perception, validated by delude's defective mind, does allow the fool to infer conclusions shameful for a rational being. The deluded fool does enjoy sensuous consciousness, the immediate knowledge collected by senses; however it does process it in such a strange way that scares even the mighty devil.

In the cases where the perception of an object is a pure hallucination generated by the deludes' mind, the perceived object might not exist in the "actual" reality.¹² Now the real relation between perception and object is destroyed, only the empty perception lingers causing a mysterious chaotic mental state. This purely immanent mental process is separated from nature, but inherent in the life of a delude. An object has properties that can be

¹² Actual reality, we refer here to the agreed upon reality.

detected by our perception [human perception] but also properties that are detectable by our, a priori, analytic mental processes and, furthermore, properties unknowable to us due to the absence of a base needed for our mental processes to be initiated.¹³ At times, a delude become very original and independent thinker, his way to achieve this status is by denying the common “*agreed upon reality*”. We all memorize perceptions and associate them with other memory objects previously stored in memory; this is an automated process, not too much to do with the objective reality. The delude assumes that he knows all the truth, and he is delusional that he can’t ever be wrong; hence your opinion cannot possibly count as valid, and requires to be quickly discarded. Accepting especially external opinions would mean that the delude must discard some of his old opinions or acquired bias, and that would possibly undermine the entire foundation of his thinking. Once on the delude’s way, it is very difficult, if not impossible to return to a rational condition.¹⁴ A delude’s cognitive “*plumbing*” is defective, and the consequence is a continuous flood of unexplainable opinions or unconnected feelings. Only validated knowledge can let the holder to be tranquil and provides shelter from the indecisive conflict of emotions.

Most will agree that an *instinct* is not simply a reflex, but a robotic inherent disposition to a particular action triggered by some external stimuli. Necessarily, we must reject dogmatic views regarding instincts nature, and follow the strict path of scientific method in evaluating it. Instincts are present at birth, not learned, and resident in the subject’s unconscious memory. Instincts seem to be “*hard-wired*”¹⁵ in the brain and commonly appear in every healthy member of the particular species. One such instinct belonging to the human species seems to be the small babies crying when hungry, or by smiling when satisfied. The *intuition*, typically is connected to the meaning by the ability to sense or know automatically without the help of deductive reasoning process, and implies the ability to acquire understanding of events without any inference, and consequently detached from logical characteristic of thinking. *Intuition* is a knowing, a sensing that is beyond the conscious

¹³ Simply implied here is the presence of previous experience with similar objects with properties that are inductively associated to the currently sensed.

¹⁴ We say that once the deeply entrenched biased opinion is imprinted in ones character it is difficult, if not impossible, to remove it.

¹⁵ Hard-wired, in this context it means a physical component.

understanding, and provides us with beliefs which we cannot logically validate. The *intuition* is not a form of true perception, and can apply error in our mental processes with regard to particular facts, and therefore tamper with the validity of the overall perceptions. The danger of empty intuition is that provides an automated context for our senses, thinking, and actions. The flawed genetic transfer that is accountable for such properties as intuition is potential responsible for the emergence of such mental conditions that the deluded fool is a victim of.

The genotype¹⁶ of an individual is constructed from the merger of genomes¹⁷ inherited from its parents. Parent’s genome inherits the genotype of its ancestors; therefore the individual’s genome is an ancestral inheritance of genetic characteristics. The genotype of an individual also contains much physical characteristics of its ancestors, sometimes far back from the chain of temporal existence. The transfer of physical characteristics do not exclude structures of the brain such as logical structures and deep memory impressions that seems to be stored in the receiver sub-conscious mind, and account for such properties as logical capabilities, instinct and intuition. The inherited logical capabilities can be seen as a result of evolutionary elements that allow the individual to draw assistance from it’s ancestors experience. Instinct assists the person or species to automatically adjust and deal with essential events, while intuition is generating acts of awareness based on inherited experience of its ancestors. The intuition can be based on ancestral memory¹⁸ impression objects stored in sub-conscious, and activated in consciousness by select events. The intuition can be seen at times as irrational, and can apply error in our mental processes concerning particular objects, and therefore tamper with the validity of our finding. In such context, the intuition is an automated and primitive tool of immediate an invalidated “*decision-making*”. In the delude’s world the activation of instinctual events are triggered in a flashy way, and not as customary for its species. This is a mental malfunction, and observers interpret it as an abnormal behavioral condition. Also when the delude becomes aware of an intuition event, then he again, fails to process this

¹⁶ Genotype – An organism’s genetic constitution.

¹⁷ Genome – The entire DNA content of an organism

¹⁸ Ancestral memory – the memory that includes the memory objects of ones ancestors.

information as typical, and amplify again and distorts the meaning of event in a way particular to his defective mental structures. Does this inheritance of ancestral genotype imply that once the delude condition was earlier constructed then it is forward passed genetically on to the new generations of individuals, and that once a fool your descendants will also inherit a predisposition for foolishness?

Commonly, when a delude speaks, his message is improperly expressed in a disorganized way, and near impossible to comprehend; this is a clear indication of his mental confusion. His words and sentences lose their meaning, in this mental battle with communicating reminds an educated man of the concept of chaos. Deludes are expert at developing erroneous acts of thinking in a loaded emotional layer. We know that rational judgments require un-interrupted logical connection from the initial premise to the final outcome of the conclusion to which they arrive. Deludes learn to live with the absence of a rational train of reasoning, and they can easily replace valid premises with some stemmed from their own synthetic/irrational mental processes. Most of the deludes are seen as misologists, as people who do not enjoy logical argumentation. But the truth it seems to be hidden elsewhere since habit is acquired, instinct is not.

Is the foolishness a random and unavoidable human condition? Is the large amount of randomness that determines our fate responsible for the emergence of such a condition? It is undeniable that randomness generates patterns describable in mathematical terms; therefore the existence of the deluded condition is not only probable but also likely, if not guaranteed. We ought not to underestimate the element of chance in the event stream of our lives, most are independent of our being and hopeless to foresee. Furthermore, our responses to the critical events are based on decisions that spring from random experiences that have modeled our understanding; adding a new dimension to complexity of our life experience. Bad luck and good fortune are both frequent and natural in our lives; both are random sequences of predictable events.

Chapter 4

THE DELUDE'S WAY TO COMPREHENSION

Where all is but a dream, reasoning and arguments are of no use, truth and knowledge nothing – John Locke

Various hypotheses are, without a doubt, only baseless imaginary and arbitrary fabrications of our mind. At times, we tend to hunt for formulas and observation that support our fancied generated assumptions, and neglect or even discard valid detail that seems, at first, to contradict our incomplete understanding. We ought to trust only what is completely known and is not possible to be doubted; furthermore all our knowledge must conform to the precise methods, such as pure mathematics, or it is based on accurate empirical observations. Human understanding is furthermore limited by our minds imperfect power of comprehension, and by our natural inclination to prejudices or bias. Due to such difficulty, or even due to our inability to distinguish true from false, we are forced to occasionally regard doubtful as certain. This prejudiced condition is accountable for damage or even destruction of the logical judgment, and generates an intellect suitable for the deluded mind. In the social context, to be worthy of the name deluded *fool*, univocally a person is required to conclude that he has already collected adequate knowledge, life experiences, and that he has a valid insight of the world surrounding him. He is inevitably self-centered, secure, confident, and enthusiastic to confront all or any contests of the amazing wonder we call life. There is no excuse that feels unreasonable or inappropriate for the delude; any excuse will furnish him additional needed confidence. As time goes on, the delude gains greater and greater confidence, and this is the way he isolates and shields himself from the doubtful and ever inquiring individuals around him. It's deludes mental structures that provide automatic cognitive paths to avoid any potential difficulty, and the response to any demanding situation is well prepared in advance. All the perceived agreeable intentions are instantly recognized, and the success does reinforce a deludes' self-confidence, as the failures responses follow existing cognitive paths that lead to assign responsibility and fault to anyone else. The frequent triumph in assigning fault to others provides a delude with additional phony and damming self-confidence. For some, a delude seems endlessly happy, and that he is ludicrously optimistic; this is false appearance,

as the delude is disconnected from the time or place, and of the events that happened around him. He frequently detects early a possible satisfactory outcome, "*the light at the end of the tunnel*", and became joyful on that regard; but not considering the fact that it might not be the end of the tunnel light he senses, but the headlights of an approaching train.

The endless number of attributes of possible perceptions is also an obstacle on the path to certainty with regard to the acceptable view of an object. Also, it is evident that various prejudices will place judgment outside the realm of rational space. Now comes the delude, this is not a suitable view for him since he can't risk to expose his own concealed and secretive prejudice. How a delude can possibly consent to be prejudiced when conclusively he is incapable to grasp the concept of prejudice and its roots. Careful listening would help out the reduction of the existing prejudiced effect. A delude is not competent, even with the best intention, to pay attention to a complex or a lengthy argument. Careful listening typically provides a good opportunity to defuse an opponent's argument, positive listening is a way that assists in gathering additional useful data that facilitates an improved interpretation of a particular condition, provides a path to better comprehension that guards against illogical prejudice. In fact this is a disagreeable detail; a delude regards the suggestion for lengthy listening as empty words intended to disguise the simple truth that is early on transparent to him, only intended to deceive him, and therefore it becomes merely a waste of time. A delude automatically believes that he comprehends the root cause of things, and that his own opinions of anything are definitely the necessarily valid ones. Indeed, from the beginning of the argument, a delude become skilled to hastily speculate about a conclusion, he is familiar with and very skilled at the art of "*mind reading*". A delude lives at the present time, also for him the past, and ever the future is easy to anticipate and comprehend, in some limited way he is comparable to a mystical prophet. In general, deludes have difficulty coping with changes that occur in time. If you tell one time dependent truth to a delude he may perhaps take that to be the absolute and eternal truth, and he cannot account for any temporal change. If the situation changes the fool frequently assumes that there is some attempt to mislead him, as the change that occurred in time are rejected. The initial statement, that pleased the delude, is the one he demands to be actual. Is a cherry tree blossom a valid reality?

Yes, it is indeed, but only in within the constraint of time; in the spring-time.

For instance the stone which by nature moves downward cannot be habituated to move upwards, not even if one tries to train it by throwing it up ten thousand times. – Aristotle, Ethica Nichomachea.

The foundation of delude's knowledge was built early in life, his character was formed in an unmistakably erroneous way that can be altered or improved slightly with education. A preparatory coaching of the mind is required for supporting rational inquiry and of a logical argument. The delude learns early in life to act on first impressions, to doubt other people's opinion or actions, to base its judgment on initial reflections that easily leads him on the dark path of false opinions. When false opinions occur along strong emotional outbursts, they are guaranteed to generate strong memory impressions, to persist forever, and in such context they prompt irreparable damage to the delude's capability of future sound judgment. The delude deploys reasoning that aims not at the truth, but at the rhetorical triumph over an opponent or at unconditionally making his own position prevail; that provides him with a sense of pride, comfort, and superiority in his private world of dystopia¹⁹.

A deluded fool is incapable to perceive or accept what is true or what is false, only events that matches his preconceived prejudice are validated as true by his defective cognitive system. One must discard the prejudice that the truth is required to be something easy to identify or it is well or easily known to us. In thinking, we must gain knowledge of about the endeavor for arriving to sound conclusion, and we need to distinguish what is accurate or what is vague in the input data we receive. We must admit that truth is equated with certainty, and it is in divergence with irrational opinions.

Ignorance, the root and the stem of every evil. -- Plato

To gratify his enormous ego, the delude needs to ignore, or discard any opinion that is not generated or easily validated by his cognitive ability. Confident and secure, he does not suppose to need learning about anything new. He is hopeful that life will be

¹⁹ *Dystopia – a negative utopia: place where all is not well.*

improved by prospect of chance alone, and he is an avid and optimistic about his future reward of such endeavors that involve pure chance, such as gambling is.

Highest are those who are born with innate knowledge. Next are those who get possession of knowledge by learning. – Confucius

Changing an opinion when additional previously unknown or relevant detail is acquired is commonly and reasonably expected. The delude becomes frequently stubborn; he promptly rejects the soundness of any argument contrary with his preconceived point of view; or after he has “sealed” his opinion. Not that the delude does not understand about the changing particulars, but he dislikes to be seen as inconsistent, as doubtful.²⁰ A deluded fool considers his stubbornness a form of determination that provides him with a great deal of tranquil confidence. He does not anchor his determination on rational thinking, on certainty, but on his desire to be seen as unwavering. Gathering additional data can simplify decisions, but also can make some decisions to a great extent complex, difficult to reach. Simple opinions, based chiefly on perceptions alone, and without the burden of logical exploration, or held without doubt, are those are the ones that fit well the mental condition of the confident delude.

A delude is certain, secure, and without any doubt, that people cannot possibly ever sense his intentions; for this would comprise the use of an impossible endeavor to seize his cagily hidden thoughts that are well disguised in his secretive mind. He feels a good deal of security and sanctuary in the concealment of his opinions or intentions, takes frequent actions under the gloomy curtain of deep secrecy, while some others are not tolerated to disturb or to scrutinize his privacy. Greatly shielded by his secrecy, the deluded fool finds easily ways to take evil actions and, in the same time is decided to maintain an honest and positive self-image. He carries out un-ethical things, but he consider to be safe from discovery due to his self-assurance that is not ever probable, or even possible, for other to know the facts he hides so vigilantly. If challenged, he will illustrate a show of strong emotional indignation, and from now on he will feel justified to do whatever wrong feasible

²⁰*Not being consistent, not being always decisive is seen as a weakness for the fool, and he tries avoiding it.*

targeting the “unfair and negative person”. In such a situation the fool does not value family ties, long personal relations; the need for vengeance is so strong that it overrides any concept of moderation or civilized manner. The acts of a delude can become criminal, the gravity of the facts are no match compared with the desire or drive of a delude in satisfying his need for revenge. Revenge is a hidden concept that the delude believes is the root of suitable and rightful justice and a path to self-respect.

By doing the same thing over and over again, as diabolic machinery, a delude does uncover a pattern of himself and his actions; if not for the inquisitive probabilistic representation, the life of the delude would be deeper concealed in the darkness of mystery. When a delude feels rejected by his peers, he becomes very angry, and explodes with reckless and destructive acts of self-protection. Who can put up with the situation that an “*Intelligent and self-confident man*” as him can ever be accused of the things he doubtless did, when it is not even probable that these private acts can be established without doubt? When the result of his own actions does harm the delude in an unambiguous and recurring way, sadly his mental condition does not tolerate time for reflection or to calmly evaluate the valid cause of the inconvenience. His character foundation is so unstable, he bases his entire endeavor on the synthetic belief of his undeniable superiority, and he feels victimized, even oppressed by the others near him. Despite his inadequate mental condition, from time to time a delude happens to have qualities or genetic traits that provide him some justifiable sense of pride and self-confidence. There is no boundary or measure that bound his pride and pleasure in his qualities; little he understands that his negative character load does, in fact, nullifies all his qualities. A delude's behavior is somewhat similar to a drunk. One can get drunk and does not even know where in the world he is, and, in that case, the conflict with the social structure has usually a miserable outcome.

A crime is always negative, therefore the punishment is the negation of the negative, and thus, even unpleasant, it becomes a logical positive act. A human action commonly implies will and intention, but the choice for “*no action*” is also, factually, an action. Deludes do not do intentionally evil things, they do things that they perceive to be good or useful for them, and such things frequently become evil to others. It is said that if we discover that we made an

error or done an evil act, it is best to apologize and repair the damage done by that action; if not then the error becomes, later, sort of a crime. Furthermore, the fool does not understand that to say something nasty and to revoke it is not the same as never having said it at all.

To have faults and not to correct them, this, indeed, is to have faults. - Confucius

Deludes like to plan things. If the outcome of an action planned by a delude does not generate the desired result, then fault is assigned to something outside the delude's accountability. Later, the same action is planed again and again, in spite of the previous failures. For a non-delude the circumstance is becoming increasingly clear that the action planning is the cause of the repeat failures. This situation creates a negative consistence in the delude's behavior; in this way that the fools erroneous actions and outlook are dammed to persists forever. It is a general truth that: *"one does not know what one does not know"*. As with additional discovery, either can be empirical or logical knowledge is gained by reflection, as more and more detail is becoming relevant it brings along some additional physical or logical implications. It is always the case that at some point we understand that more understanding can be acquired and that it is indispensable to validate a conclusion. This is where the deluded fools mind fails to attain a reasonable inference, and sometimes does travel along the metaphysical paths of occult, illusion, or even delusion²¹. The deludes might irrationally believe something that is true, lets assume that he believed that the heaven does not exist because he scans the sky during the night using a powerful telescope and he determines that the haven can not possible be there because he could not see it; nonetheless he rejects the today's astronomical discoveries. One might accidentally believe what is true; for example we have no good reason to believe that our friend it is at home. However, we stop by his home to see him, and indeed, he is home; a coincidence. Like in the Gettier clock paradox problem, by observing a stopped clock we are disposed to believe it without skepticism. Nerveless, the context in which the clock was observed, it also might allow us to believe what accidentally happens to be true. For example, if the clock in the Gettier paradox would be stuck at an hour much different that the

²¹ *Delusion – any false opinion that a person persists in.*

observed hour, then the observation context would possibly induce doubt regarding of the accuracy of the clock. If the clock was showing the noontime, and the observer has read the clock in the evening, immediately that would trigger a awareness event regarding the possible clock malfunction. We also have to agree; that a stopped clock shows at least one time a day the correct time, it is just the coincidence of reading the clock at the time it is on time that puzzles us. By sensing the clock itself we can not determine it's functionality, unless it has a "indicator hand" that shows the seconds, something that we are able to visually sense. In that case we can become aware if the clock internal mechanism is functioning, without being an absolute guarantee of its accuracy. Furthermore, we cannot count the reading of the clock as absolute knowledge, unless we strictly believe that the particular clock is always on time, and it cannot ever be stopped/defective; which is absurd.

A genuine delude is never insincere, because does not know what is to be sincere; he frequently acts in *"bad faith"*, and consequently all hope for a good outcome is lost. Arguments end miserably when one-side *"clams up"* when disagrees with some of the opponent's statements; this is the "senseless outrage of silence". As Hegel believed, the refusal to defend a point has a barbaric root; the barbarians' language skills were not sufficient developed to sustain a rational conversation. Confucius observed: *"Silence is often advisably but indifference is both criminal and wrong"*. The classical saying: *"Insist to stay in silence or openly admit your ignorance"*, is that fear that motivates a delude to be silent, and makes them eager to avoid such a negative circumstance. Being a deluded fool that has not acquired any knowledge in his youth is like a crane, standstill and looking for a fish in the middle of a pond filled with rainwater. Now imagine the confidence a delude gains by fishing in such a pool formed from rain water, against the advice of many, and catches a coy fish; ignoring that the fish is not wild, but got away from some neighborhood container during the storm. In these circumstances, the fool's arrogance becomes agonizing.

Does a man of sense run after every silly tale of hobgoblins or fairies, and canvass particularly the evidence? I never knew anyone that examined and deliberated about nonsense that did not believe it before the end of his enquiries. David Hume -- Letters

Setting up a psychologically valid *goal* requires that the *goal* must be in the space of obtainable goals; this is a severe source of pain and misunderstanding in a delude's life. His goals are largely un-reachable, in a useful order, or suitable time. The deludes' goals are commonly exceeding the goals of his successful peers, and his attempts to overpass their successes rightly end in failures; this is due to the absence of required qualities or pre-requisites. A delude disagrees with everyone around him who has opinions he can't grasp, even if this person happens to be his doctor or teacher. His cognitive power is always called for to validate any opinion or action, even when is naïve to do so, the deluded fool pays little attention to others earned professional credibility. To absolutely trust others is not possible for a delude, even when their expertise and mastering of a specific subject is formerly acknowledged. The experiences and defective learning during the childhood years linger in the deludes mind, it becomes the primary knowledge he relies on in evaluating matters as an adult. The childhood years gathered knowledge remains eternally entrenched in his mind, at both consciousness or at the unconscious level and determines in a important way the way the individual responds to the life situations.

The human mind is capable of anticipation, and that is based on an extension of empirical observation to a priori judgment and therefore this leads to a *sintesi* knowledge object.²² It is the need of anticipation that has initiated the need to know and understand, the need of a priori judgment, the need to go further and further into the unknown, and made the inductive, analytic, or synthetic discovery possible. This mind quality is essential in our universal endeavor of handling future events, of "*decision-making*". It is important and satisfying to arrive to proper decisions, and that is attempted by means of personal determinations made and based on the cognitive processing of totality of memory objects accumulated by our mind; by acquired knowledge. By agreeing that a sound anticipation is not always within our rational reach, we must acknowledge the presence of the unknown data, data not available to us at the time when we are arriving to such a conclusion. We can decide, based on a probabilistic analysis, what the near future likely might be. The distant future could have its foundation based on the outcome of near future events; those near events are feasible to foresee, and the look at the distant future can be seen as walking

²² This judgment outlines the base of rational, or irrational thinking.

on some stairs, and that every step is only understood as we move on, and become the knowledge basis for the next step. In addition, when the near future is surprising to us, it as well alters the foreseen anticipation of any further potential events. The larger is the pool of memory objects²³ that we hold, or more are the details about such objects that are actualized by awareness of the need to the aim of our decision, the increased is the difficulty to cognitively process them, and therefore to arrive to an adequate decision. In fact, a decision inherently implies foreseeing the future, and the chance of this has been already earlier dismissed. Therefore, the decision making, even indispensable to us, is not more that a mindless adventure, an act about impossible to be rationally validated. Only in the world of the deluded fool, the decision-making is simplified to a wish, a guess, or a selection of a choice, therefore simplifying the task, and thus eliminating the agonizing task of endless search for a better decision.

Common sense is the collection of prejudices acquired by age eighteen. – Albert Einstein.

Some decisions seem automated; such decisions are made without much mental effort or need for reflection. One of the automated decisions making processes is the so called the "*common-sense*". It handles usual events that were prior experienced or learned. As an example, the "*common-sense*" will dictate to go to some known place on the shorter path, if that is also provides sufficient safety; the common-sense does ignore the present particular need. "*Common-sense*" based generalizations are based on facts collectively known and agreed on, and involves dialectical reasoning; reasoning that is common, defeasible²⁴, and fails the requirement of typical logical soundness. The "*common-sense*" does not comprise the personal rational substratum of typical decision-making, therefore does not possess the required objectivity for actual sound judgments, and are assumptions that we bring un-reflected to our experience, assumptions that presume things are as their first appear, with the fallacious multiple avenues this condition can lead too. The concept of "*common-sense*" has been called against and in resistance to numerous scientific advances and

²³ Objects held as knowledge

²⁴ Defeasible – in this context, we assume that common-sense can be overturned by further events.

usually may reject calls to change, or even to scientific progress. The “*common-sense*” is sometimes said to be sound practical judgment; the denial of “*common-sense*” concept commonly leads to outright contradictions. In this context, “*common-sense*” is regarded as an obstacle to abstract or logical thinking; it has its basis on personal experiences, tradition, and it is also has particular significance in the context of specificity of different cultures. Therefore, the “*common-sense*” judgment is suitable and can be used reasonably from time to time for handling simple, frequent repeating matters in an automated way; then it can be regarded as sound, practical, judgment. “*Common-sense*” is not fit to handle complex decision-making tasks, such misuse of the concept is fallacious; in a typical way it would require a favorable reception of new development or progress; that alone it is incompatible with the mind of the delude, even that he bases many of his decision on that alone. “*Common-sense*” is learned, and does not apply to unknown situations; furthermore it seems that it is necessary for satisfying the validation requirements of a particular condition as intuitive²⁵, and therefore it is linked in a physical way to intuition. The link between intuition and the “*common-sense*” object is always present. The counter-intuitive event does never satisfy the requirement of the “*common-sense*”, and this is another logical link to intuition, an inverse one. Because the automated “*common-sense*” decisions are pre-made or trivial, and are not logically validated in the actual context, they can be called arbitrary. The “*common-sense*” concept implies the requirement of logical reasoning as well the necessity to collect sufficient amount of evidence prior to coming to a valid conclusion or judgment. In the same time the “*common-sense*” rejects its own requirement, and it becomes an automated, non-reflected, judgment and it is not dependent of any cognitive or logical constraints²⁶. The “*common-sense*” and intuition alike are memory objects tightly coupled together, and they seem to share some attributes. Is also intuition a valid decision making tool, is the “*common-sense*” a subset of what we call intuition? This only with the condition that the “*common-sense*” actually exist, and it is not understood as simple/primitive decision-making mechanism that provides us sometimes the ability to absolutely murder the truth.

²⁵ *Common sense – it complies with the intuitive view, and can't exist as counter-intuitive.*

²⁶ *Common-sense – implies the rational decision making, when at the same time does not satisfy that requirement.*

The ability possessed by men without having been acquired by learning is intuitive ability. - Mencius

One of the deluded fool universal defy is concerning the understanding of mathematical concepts. He wonders if these concepts are required in the social context. If the projection of pure mathematical truth necessary on the real world, in an empirical way, or it is necessary to be project able onto the physical facts. Lets give for example a simple addition $2 + 2 = 4$. A delude is confident of his accuracy of resolving such an expression. But if empirically objects are applied the terms, then the expression becomes equivocal. If we add 2 apples with 2 fishes then the result of 4 is undefined. 4 what, wonders the delude? To the mathematician, the concept of infinity is indispensable for describing indeterminate, boundless, or unknown quantities. About the concept of infinite space or the infinity itself, specifically in mathematics, we have a starting point, for example an axiom from which we can construct objects, later by creating greater and greater units they are leading to the induced transcendental or synthetic properties of these units, units that continue to exist only as a extension of the capacity of abstraction of our minds. A number sequence can be infinite, nerveless; any given number in the sequence it is a fixed quantity. Any object can be imagined larger and larger until we cross the border of transcendental assessment and the outside border becomes undefined, unknown. An object, as our universe is, is expanding and in this circumstances cannot possibly be infinite. For example $\text{infinity} + \text{number} = \text{infinity}$ is not a true equality, the $\text{infinity} + \text{number} = \text{infinity} + \text{number}$ is the true equality, and in these particular instance the infinity has ended to be assumed infinite. Any object can be infinite as size, in our imagination, and that it is a quality of our minds, and not a property of any real object. Therefore time can be perceived as a sequence of objects (seconds, minutes, etc), but time is always real, and it does not cross the boundaries of transcendental space; an action reserved only to our minds, the intuitive space. Objects unknown to us in entirety, due to our limited power of perception, should remain defined as unknown, and not part of our speculative/a priori perception. As we comprehend now, infinity is an atypical concept, and does not follow the established mathematical properties of numbers. For example $\text{infinite}/\text{infinite}$; infinite^*0 ; 1^{**}infinite ; 0^{**}infinite ; $\text{Infinite}^{**}0$; $\text{infinite}-\text{infinite}$, are example of indeterminate expressions.

The limit of any quantity divided by zero leads to infinity. As an example, 5 divided by 0 (zero) leads to infinity. If I have \$5 and I don't share it then I'll have it forever? Is that what it really means? Yes, the delude contemplates the indeterminate form of the infinity, but he hopes that someday the truth about all this will become clear him, and his hope is based that only things he has to do is to be patient, very patient. When we learn counting, we make the tacit assumption that every integer has a successor, and that clearly leads us again to the concept of unbounded infinite. The fundamental geometric object, the strait line, is based on the assumption, that we can extend a line indefinitely in both directions. Can we even have mathematics without the concept of infinity? In mathematics we have the necessary numbers: 0,1,infinite. 0 is the origin; the measure between the 0 and 1 is the scale of the mathematical object, and infinite in the limit of the sequence. The subject is even additionally complex; we have to note that the infinitum contains, besides integers and rational numbers, irrational numbers. Mathematics requires the concept of infinity; it is used as a number but is not a part of any number set. Real numbers such as $\pi/2 = 2*2*4*4*6*6/1*3*3*5*5*7*7*8...$ does prove that even finite numbers can be represented by infinite series. -- John Wallis (1616-1703)

In our world ruled by random and accidental events can all ever lead to any continuous/infinite series or only the concept of time can possibly provide such an abstract framework? Infinite sets violate one of our deepest-rooted experiences, namely that *"the whole is greater than the part."* There are as many points along an infinite line as there are on a finite segment of it. We also can assert that if the entire universe would be filled only with abstract mathematical points, the universe will still be empty. We learned about the peculiar properties of infinite sets.²⁷ Is our universe infinite, or it has an outside boundary beyond which it does not exist? The possibility of the universe being finite or infinite both seem to defy our natural senses, for it isn't clear that we can go forever in any direction without reaching the edge, is our universe bounded or unbounded.

²⁷ Georg Ferdinand Ludwig Philipp Cantor (1845 – 1918) was a German mathematician, best known as the inventor of set theory.

The *"common sense"* is a very inadequate tool for dealing with the concept of infinity. As noted by the German scholar Nicolaus de Cusa (1401-64), the infinite can neither have a center neither a circumference; rather, any point could be viewed as a center, just as to any observer at sea the horizon seems to be equally distant in all directions, regardless of the observer's position. Our understanding of our universe does not comply with this description, and we therefore must accept that the universe is finite.

- a) The universe has started with the "big-bang" of some singularity, from a point that can be considered the center of the universe, this defies the condition that the infinite has no center.
- b) The universe is said to be expanding (proved by Hubble²⁸ discoveries), expansion implies a moving boundary, inconsistent with the requirement of the infinite.
- c) The size of the universe is estimated by astrophysicists to 10^{12} light years, therefore significant but finite.

With the agreement that our universe is finite, we can reasonably ask the question if there is only one object that we call now universe? I am not aware of evidence that either is one or many such galactic objects as the one we belong to; also there are no logical restrictions that it must be unique. We can reasonably imagine that in space exist many objects outside ours that belong to the universe. Also we can speculate that our galactic object can potentially be a part of some other grandiose universe object. Metaphysics must be proven certain to be logically validated, and not only be seen as probable; that only fits Devil's colossal powers. Abstraction itself is beyond the realm of actual time or actual physical space, and uncertainty will emerge when we apply abstract concepts to real world elements.

Scientific knowledge cannot be based on unfounded assumptions even if later the assumptions are proven valid. At times, we are skeptics about what we know, also about the

²⁸ Edwin Powell Hubble – was an American astronomer who profoundly changed our understanding of the universe by demonstrating the existence of galaxies other than our own.

unknown that we can't possibly know. A delude commonly struggle in handling concepts as formal logic or mathematics. Arithmetic sets up laws for numbers, for their relations and combinations, however they are the products of colligating and counting the numbers that are cognitive activities, tasks not suitable for the mind of the delude. Deludes mathematical knowledge can sometimes be limited only to counting, especially counting money. For the deluded fool, the happiness is to be found in pleasure, or in what gives him pleasure. However, there is no genuine benefit in pleasure; only hard work commonly brings along material profit. And what we do when we obtain some profit, waste it to get some pleasure? Craving for money and riches is common for the foolish person, and this far beyond the material things required for a comfortable or a worry free life. By not being capable of grasping this truth, it provides him with a harsh way of universal disappointment and means of self-destruction.

Chapter 5 THE PUBLIC LIFE OF THE DELUDE

In the part of this universe that we know there is great injustice, and often the good suffer, and often the wicked prosper, and one hardly knows which of those is the more annoying. --Bertrand Russell

Disallowing in itself forbids a certain action, and as a consequence it commonly induces a passionate desire for self-determination; an anticipated risk of a reprimand is the penalty one has to accept as a price for satisfying the need for such independence. Tell a person that he is forbidden to do no matter what, and he will feel a burning desire to do just that, you have infringed on his freedoms; kids are notorious to act this way. That is a basis that having too many rules, laws, or demands generates a state of revolt. A foolish person genuinely considers that all the laws and regulations are enacted to protect and to sustain only worthy people; especially those as distinguished as he is. He supposes that he belongs to an honored group by people similar to himself, and that most other people don't deserve such sympathetic attention. The delude can become truthful, honest, when it fits his short-time distinct personal necessity. He is a philanthropist, racist, bigot, shameless, environmentalist, or whatever gratifies his present-day need. How come that we demand equal and free rights for everyone, when in fact if everyone will be seen as equal it would do not justice to the delude's world. To be equal it implies the need to be free, and freedom is an equivocal concept. The deluded fool imagine that he is above the basic requirements of the common law, it is above the basic requirements of typical individuals; the delude is like a monument that ought to be admired but not troubled with too many rules. There are myths of racial superiority, religious superiority, or intellectual superiority, and this is truly joyful to the deluded fools; they do perceive to belong to all these groups.

It is our responsibilities, not ourselves that we should take seriously -- Peter Ustinov

The reasonable population will not abuse the privilege to own a gun, but the criminals will do; that is the proven way. One can perish by swimming in the lake, can be burned by fire, it can be

killed by driving a car or by flying in an airplane. [In fact flying in a plane is pleasant, crashing and burning is the setback]. We do not ban the deep water, the fire, or the fast ways of transportation because of the danger to our lives, but we tend to desire to ban guns that are merely inert objects intended to provide self-protection, or merely a sense of security. No doubt, guns are only designed to injure their target. While water, for example, it is indispensable for sustaining our natural life, the guns are not; and there lays the fundamental difference and divide. We can have guns or not, it makes little real difference. We also can say that guns can be dangerous if are handled by deluded fools, however that is simply an opinion.

When a delude is in the position of power much harm will be done to anyone in his path, people will suffer; they will be wrongly incarcerated if a delude's effort succeeds. It is obvious that we should outright disallow crime and the criminals; then there will be no need for the gun itself. This is the paradox we cannot handle, the deluded condition and behavior is not yet formerly acknowledged. We might necessitate acquiring an official certification of anyone we call here a deluded fool, and specific legal provisions need to be enacted to protect the general population from such a miserable and dishonorable condition. Until we are capable of achieving that, we'll not find the collective harmony of mind and the tranquility we, as a society, seek. The delude deeply believes that the only path to achieve peace is to violently destroy whoever it is seen as an enemy. They are unable to grasp the difference between some group of victimized people, and the government that oppresses them. Peace by violence is an absurd but not an unheard of concept. Commonly, wars are waged against the armies, against soldiers and not against civilians or their property. But deluded fools will not be stopped on wanting to kill anyone even when only slightly associated with the perceived enemy. An appeal to patriotism or nationalism is not a confirmation of some "wrong doing" or a guilty sentence of our rivals; as the delude is certain to accept as proper. The deludes feeling of certain superiority does give them much confidence in their powers and in fact they seem not to fear anyone in their arrogant actions. We must fear those who fear nothing, as they do not follow the natural desire for self-preservation. In the war, the deluded fool is either the shameless coward, or if he is a fearless hero. He's disregard or absence of understanding of war field danger, makes him bold in taking reckless action that others

consider too risky. He, who knows nothing, neither doubts nor fears anything.

We all shall agree that the safeguard of person's property is a principal requirement of any progressive state. The deludes are hypersensitive concerning their material possessions; it allows them to illustrate authority, and noticeable significance. The unequal economical development of countries, along with cultural differences, has created in the worlds far away, places where the population preserved a simpler way of life; the people living there are sometimes perceived as barbarians. This is very enjoyable for the deluded fool, as he take pleasure in the hardship and suffering of others; that reassures him of his privileged place he enjoy as belonging and being a part of a particularly advanced society; if that happens to be the case. We all learn that conflict involving society and the individual is not a meaningless theoretical issue but a matter of negative and tragic personal experiences. Nothing can be further from the truth than the facts evaluation that is solely based on political interpretation; but the fool will not agree with such an opinion that he considers ridiculous. Well, the deluded fool mind does grasp these circumstances in a way consistent to his character; this is not the right way, not even a wrong way; this is the fool's way.

As it ought to be, our government is attending the obligatory requirements of our "money" oriented society. A government falls short in it's duties if it fails to make valuable the capable; the worthy citizens. The essential need of the ordinary citizen and the corporate structure are occasionally not supportive of each other, at times they are contrary. However, the government is obliged to action in the best interest of the country in such a way that it's measures will meet both the need of the common person and also will facilitate a sound environment for the corporate operation. At times, the corporate need is different of the need of the social structures, and a brutal conflict can arise. The government must choose on the side it will endorse.

For a privileged minority, Western democracy provides the leisure, the facilities, and the training to seek the truth lying hidden behind the veil of distortion and misrepresentation, ideology, and class interest through

which the events of current history are presented to us. -- Noam Chomsky, Manufacturing Consent.

A political dialogue, that now and then can be rightfully called a clash, will often occur. In such a circumstance, the faction that poses large amount of resources (such as money) will use its assets and operate to influence (or buy) the naïve voters as a mean to sway the government actions.

It appears that our mind accepts as a form of knowledge validation the presence of multiple interrelated sensations regarding a singular event, and that without additional burden of proof. The accumulation of sizeable amount of interrelated sensed knowledge (not necessarily true or even rational) is capable to produce a continuous state of overwhelming awareness of an event and induces an obsessive concern about the particular circumstances. The validation is strongly, and at times irrationally, held as absolute and also is accompanied by a strong or emotional element. This is without doubt a strange property of our mind, which is widely exploited for a number of reasons; mainly in advertising or for political motivation. Propaganda is method in which the same statement is systematically and repeatedly publicized, until the listener cognitive function is overwhelmed, and accepts the event as truthful even when a cautious consideration of the message would prove it to be untrue, partially true, or a direct lie. This devastating and obsessive form of mental awareness can become overwhelming for a person, and in this way can cause severe problems. Its success in manipulating cognition and shape perceptions propaganda is a dangerous tool that should be prohibited. The act of propaganda is a planned, and systematic attempt to pass on misinformation with the intention to deform or amplify sensation, manipulate cognitions, and induce a sought after behavior. The matter becomes overwhelmingly significant for the particular person, and the continuous awareness of the event brings about an obsessive paranoid mind state. Regardless what such a fixation is: political, religious, nutritional, environmental, health concern, it can become a form of extreme preoccupation. For example the obsessive concern and unremitting awareness about the environmental issues can be fairly compared to a deep and overwhelming religious experience.

The common victim of well crafted propaganda acts is the person who are do not poses enough capacity for proper comprehension and is vulnerable to calls to patriotism and nationalism, to half-truths, slogans, and sympathetic to points they beforehand prefer. The wise commonly make their own decisions, the ignorant is not capable of that, and is generally compelled to follow public opinion. Because of that, the deluded fools are commonly easy victims to sessions of "propaganda", and I wonder if it is possible that certain group would find irresistible that many citizens remain in a mental state that allows this sort of mental manipulation. In such an absurd state of affairs, groups would manipulate the schools to limit the amount of logical knowledge a student is exposed too, and it will impose that the student becomes sensitive and responds strongly (and proudly) to calls to patriotism. In this situation, the delusional voter might have the characteristic that will allow being effortlessly prone to cast his vote as preferred by a controlling block of society. You can't easily influence the best and the brightest about false political points by using political propaganda; that is an easy task only when the targeted are the foolish people. Our democracy is based on numerical and not a proportional equality, which would favor the inclination for having more people in the "dumbest" category, the ones more predictable to successfully control. It is beneficial to certain specialized groups that the number of easily controllable people is rather large, and there is a wish that the common citizens complete their basic education in such a mater that they become easy targets of such acts of "propaganda". This sort of coercion is not direct but developed in subtle ways, such as the use of "educational lobbying" ads just before the election. Those are the ads, which are not defined to be political, but which encourage the listener to take some pre planed or indirect political action. One good example is the conflict between the corporate necessity during the industrial "globalization" and the conflicting social need of a post-industrial society. The corporations themselves are not sensitive or have responsibility for the social context, never less their influence of the body of government do create the conditions for the increased social-misery, as the social responsibility is not a useful component of the corporate progress. A delude easily falls for the carefully staged corporate "propaganda" and becomes a strong supporter of whatever the corporations wish for. Another worthy example would be the current "global warming" situation, where some corporations that are prone to lose revenue due to increased pollution controls

are pursuing people by using ridiculous means of persuasion that promotes fake scientific knowledge based on political or business concerns. We should disallow the deluded fool to vote, but that would require for us to properly identify the person's regretful mental state development, which is not reasonable to expect.

Being the citizen of the state, no matter how little influence his voice may have in public affairs; it is required to do your basic duty of providing your opinion and preference; to cast an election vote. At this time, our democracy implies inclusion of our species only, the humans, and ought to guarantee the inclusion of all members of a society. Regrettably, some omission exists for such conditions as incarceration or mental health. It does not seem significant that a number of non-convicted criminals happen to be free, and therefore they are capable to cast a vote. Allowing the incarcerated to vote also would facilitate to smooth up their inclusion in the society, and it would assist in their successful and desired reintegration. If those incarcerated were subjected to mindless act of oppression, and joined the anti-social life from the need to self-preservation then their miserable condition deserves a voice. At times, oppression is the root of social criminality and is the oppression what has to be prohibited for the situation to return to normal.

The democracy is based on counting the electoral votes, and the side of larger quantity counted numbers wins the particular contest. The individual vote has the same weight if either is carried out by a mother or by a whore, with the observation that a whore also can become pregnant and therefore become a mother. Democracy must be required to guarantee the absolute inclusion of every member of society; no exception is sensible. As I mentioned earlier, the deluded mental condition can induce a person to vote against his own personal interest, as "influenced" by others. Allowing the deluded fools to vote does harm to a democracy, and in the same time we stated that everyone must be included; this seems to be a paradox that can't be resolved. The danger would be in the intentional "creation" of large number of deluded and foolish minds by certain social segments, thus distorting our true democratic balance and principles.

We hang the petty thieves and appoint the great ones to public office. – Aesop

At times, the delude wishes that he were a decent, a "good" person, and a respectable member of the society. Yes, indeed a delude has no proper or sophisticated awareness of such a concept and destroys himself in the act. The extreme acts the goodness the deluded fool can think of are a shrine of stupidity and carelessness, a miss understanding of what a good is, and a confusion of what a just action requires. In this way the fool becomes unjust; and the unjust is malicious to everyone, just or unjust alike. A delude is ignorant of human nature; it is possible that a just man can do well to bad people and harm the good people, that is not justice but in the fool's world it is the norm. A just person is generally honored by society, and commonly expected to be so. The unjust is penalized by society, when the opportunity emerges. Therefore the life of the unjust person is unpredictable, in some way it can even become dangerous, and he has frequently to adapt to circumstantial changes and generates a sense of un-security that is very unpleasant to the fool. Doing just or unjust things are also conditional of any consequence and of any foreseen reprimand. Let's envision that just and unjust people will, both, wear certain magic ring that can turn them invisible. What can we guess the actions of the just man or unjust men could be? Could be the just man can become unjust when the fear of consequences of being unjust fade away? It is commonly agreed that those powerful are more likely to be unjust because negative consequences are not expected. A man, who wounds and harms us by intention, does become our enemy over that account. This is not the case regarding the deluded fool; if he harms us, many times it is unplanned or unintentional, nerveless he might regard himself as a friend to everyone. Safely, we can say that we should be good with people of right action, and bad with people of evil actions; therefore the actions and not the people should be what we judge. Bad people, if they even exist, can occasionally do good things. Injustice against one single person can be seen as small or insignificant, unless the victim happens to be you. On the same concept, a delude that is also ignorant of the human nature can get to have bad people he respects as friends, and consider many good people as enemies.

As an environmentalist, a delude is not equipment with the cognitive capability that would make possible for him to grasp a situations multiple perspectives. The deluded fool cannot detect the disjoint points of reference of a particular situation. For example, if a delude acquires awareness and concern about the forest, he will not

be capable to find an understanding that will allow for the trees, animals and humans to coexist in such a space. Sometimes a delude will devote his life to a cause as the protection of the environment when his failures of the social life develop into an intolerable inconvenience. The delude will become an environmental extremist, not too much else can be expected. A disconnect between his own negative impact on the environment and the environmental cause he cares much about is generally the rule²⁹. Occasionally environmental evils are ignored when some destructive action is also able to produce profit so great, that it influences bodies of the government, and the protection of the natural place or the environmental issues are disregarded. In the deluded fool's world both the environment and the need for our natural resources cannot be mentioned in one single sentence. His mind would not allow any potential rational and civilized dialog regarding his cause. He cannot tolerate, and rejects any calls to restraint or conciliation. He will join news or environmental organizations that will pressure the government in doing things they should not do, or even attempt to pressure government to do things that they cannot possibly do. Only his inflexible view he believes to be important, no rational dialogue of this matter it is even feasible; the deluded fool has made his mind and it is not mutable.

Our constant discontent, and selfishness, is for the most part rooted in the impulse of self-preservation and doubt of our real social status. Snobbism and craving for a superior social standing sometimes leads to bigotry and racism, and this is achieved not by elevating yourself but by an attempt to denigrate some others; that fits the deluded fool's route to fulfill his desired a exclusive social status. Some deludes are frenzied by racism and bigotry, lacking the realization that racism and bigotry are factually irrational. One has the right to dissent, a right to side with anyone, and even a right to be an idiot! However, you have no right to lie, and to hide bigotry as political view. Sometimes racists usually know full well what they stand for, but will simply deny that some attitudes and policies are racist. That such a position is indeed merely an apparent form of empathy is rather clearly expressed by one's denial of factual discrimination and racism as a major problem of any mixed society. The quest for liberty has motivated some to leave their ancestral

²⁹ For example, the fool loves the feel of a pristine forest; never less he'll drive there with his oversized monster polluter truck.

land, to leave their native social context, and to search for a new life and meaning. Arriving in a new land, those in search of freedom are simply called "immigrants". Rarely they are widely welcomed in a new country, and therefore are becoming secondary class people in a new setting. We must agree that this leads to some inequality, with the observation that all unjustifiable inequality is injustice. By searching for justice in a setting that inequality will not allow them to achieve it, is what dams such adventurers. It is sometimes assumed that immigrants indeed torture themselves to remove forms of possible happiness that is occasionally mingled in their miserable existence. It is more difficult to be a poor and borderline welcome person in a rich country, than being poor as anyone around you.

As David Hume one said: *Does a man of sense run after every silly tale of hobgoblins or fairies, and canvass particularly the evidence? I never knew anyone, which examined and deliberated about nonsense that did not believe it before the end of his enquiries.*

Only a few realize that the weaker citizen's civil rights must, as well, be vigorously protected. The shameful group of the deluded fools becomes the victim of the false opinions and victimized by the careless use of the power of eloquence. In a democracy, we assume that people are well informed and have a decent opinion of their need. The deludes confusion is also present with regard to the choice of his vote; should he cast the vote for his own private benefit, or vote for the "common good", or as sometimes they are mislead by rough politicians. Even when the delude believes in the concept of democracy, seldom he does also believe in equality or even civil rights. Without liberty, "free choice" does not exist; in such circumstance it is not possible to achieve a genuine democracy. Absence of liberty is responsible for the emergence of various forms of oppression. The liberty and therefore the protection of civil rights is essential for a democratic society, even the unappreciative deludes must be included. It also would be appropriate and unselfish if we would allow the inclusion in the democratic issues of all other species, for example such as the birds or fishes. We can also envision an extended democracy in which all species of animals, all plants, all the states; the planets, stars, and even galaxies can be included. For far too long the human species regards itself as self-important in an absolute way, and its relation to other species is downright a form of despotism.

The delude is commonly fearful of changes, and for that reason alone he disguise his worries and rejects political changes that are seen by most as progressive. We know that sometimes the scientific view is passed thru the filter of religious belief, and the rejection of progressive change is then based on faith alone. Routinely, the religious influenced thinking are harshly opposed to change, even when the change can be called indispensable progress, and the benefits to human condition are indisputable. The history has many illustrations of resilient and passionate opposition to the scientific discoveries initiated by diverse religious clusters. Lets recall the astronomical discoveries from last centuries that, in fact, discovered that the world is not the center of the universe. Many, based their action on religious beliefs, and have rejected the scientific discovery based on faith alone. The religious man believed and enjoyed the concept that him, along with his God, is the center of everything, including the universe. Dislocating man from his sacred and significant place could not be easily allowed; he was fighting furiously against any attempt, scientific or not, to be dislocated. Violence and killing of science "heretics" was the mean of purging the world of the bad news messengers, the bad news that man and his planet is not as they liked it to be. Yes, the scientific discoveries are, at times, not welcome, when the news is not pleasant or helpful. You must be a delude not to accept the truth, sometimes the damming truth, regardless of what unwanted implications it brings along. By rejection of the complicated science that led to the some discovery, and also by fallacious *ad hominem* attacks against its messengers/ the scientists, the deluded fools are shielding themselves from news they dislike. At times, the uncertainty and also the opposed opinions of scientists regarding same matter, it is a source of great pleasure and opportunity to chose a side that fits fools careless opinion. The delude does not embrace the scientific or political reality, they like their world to remain as they perceive it, and therefore they can differentiate as strict political conservatives.

Particular social habits are responsible for creating mass actions, such as the criminal version of some acts has sprung from the irrational religious exaggerations and interpretations. Western cultures has created a tolerance for acts of discrimination, abuse, and oppression of groups of people branded suspect/inferior. There is a tendency of rigidity and prejudgment of social sections, without any regard to the official, and well promoted, value of liberty, dignity

and civil rights. The anti-violent/criminal opinion is so strong, that even pets are required, against their natural instincts, to be non-aggressive, or meet self-destruction even when under unbearable stress. Is not the pets need that is protected, but the slaughter of the pet is a consequence of the society that can't "tolerate" easily acts of violence; and become violent itself in the classification of caring. The violent members of the society are jailed, and it is done so efficiently that millions of citizens could be simultaneously locked up in jails. Sometimes the desire for this perfection is so strong, than even the mentally ill, and innocent are locked up because they belong to some undesirable social group. Sometimes a jail culture is developed, and it does generate a sad business as a, for profit, jail enterprise; this along with army of self-absorbed lawyers who are eager to protect, for a proper fee, the rights of those to be incarcerated. The consequence of this is that some individuals and groups become socially oppressed, and this can transform in a genuine state of war. The oppressor will use its social power and the legal system intricacies or weaknesses to delay or dismiss any legal actions of the oppressed. At times, the oppressed has no reasonable way to be a social responsible person, and, as his personality and environment dictates, he will become an anti-social person, a criminal. Can we conclude that oppression does generate criminality? Even in our time, some oppressed will be abused and jailed, and declared a social outcast. The oppressor does enjoy his power, and likely, why not, continue his miserable anti-social acts.

A delude has his own original opinion about generally everything, and in particular to controversial social dilemma as the homosexuality is. The homosexuality is a form of sexuality, a form fulfilling strong sexual desires, however not in a traditional, heterogeneous way. The strong sexual desires and pleasures associated with the sexual act are a consequence of the species essential requisite of procreation. This intense desire was biologically formed, and intended to improve the odds for the species survival and perpetuation. In both, the heterogeneous and also in the homosexual relations, the aim of the relation is in many ways similar. The difference is than in a man/woman relation also the intended natural component of the sexual intercourse, the prospect of procreation, is also preserved. Therefore in heterogeneous relations the sexual activity has a dual meaning, while in the case of homosexuality the procreation component is missing. In the heterogeneous acts, all sort of artificial and medical

avenues, and the search also to avoid the procreation component, for strong pleasurable experiences are simply the ones thought after. An addiction to the frequent sexual thrill is mostly a norm and not an exception in the modern societies. In the past, even bestiality, sex of humans with some different species members, was recorded. It is said that the homosexual condition is not natural to the human condition, and it has the root in the habit, perhaps in addiction, and the restless search, for the strong pleasure experiences or in particular cases it is a search for meaning or identity. For now, the homosexual couples cannot form a traditional family, that is due to they cannot procreate, and the family they could generate would not contribute to our species perpetuation. Perhaps time will come when medical advances will make possible that the genetic traits of a same sex couple to be merged in the creation of an offspring, but at this time that is just an idea that belongs to the imagined future. Even thou, this achievement will imply an asexual process, and the procreation component will again be absent as part of the sexual contact. Could a future homosexual family achieve to acquire together its own biological children, whom can call themselves brothers and sisters? The union between man/woman, man/man, or women/woman, could be extended to any people in the society and for other reason than the satisfying the sexual desires; such as financial, or political. If a deluded fool interacts with others in his neighborhood, then the caring that is asserted and implied confuses him. You should love your neighbor, it is a usual saying, but the deluded fool loves the neighbor only is special conditions, for example if it is sexually attractive. The concept of marriage is not uniform among cultures, or among religions. Some cultures allow only restrictive membership to marriage and families, while other allow for multiple members to join the family. The western model that only a woman and a man form a marriage and it is the basis of a new family has spread around the world, while only a few cultures allow for multiple members to join in one marriage. The western cultures also allow for example a man marrying a number of wives, however only in a succession that allows having one wife at a time, and a divorce of the previous wife separates the relationships. This state of evens have generated a need for a process called divorce, that necessitate separating children from some parents or own siblings, and in general it is a highly destructive and unnatural process. While some old ways of less restrictive marriage has its shortfalls, they seem to be able to support a more solid foundation for the institution we call here a

family. As it is now, it seems that the base of what we call now marriage has many negative consequences, and it will, because of that, vanish in the future

To feed someone and not respect him is as raising pigs, to love someone and not respect him is as keeping pets. – Mencius.

The deluded fools love for animals is open and unmistakable. He likes pets such as dogs, and cats. Like most of us, he also loves the animals in the natural condition that leave wild in a natural setting, such as deer, or bears. In a deluded fool view, the life of other animals is inferior, and regards them irrational. Most animals know fear, consequently anticipation, therefore are capable of rational thinking. Regarding the animal rights matter, the deluded fool acts in a way characteristic to his mental condition. He becomes resentful of the people that abuse animals, but he becomes careless, even violent towards the animals, when he follows some other need that is contrary to animal rights. The deluded fool is not a vegan³⁰, and he can hardly reconcile the need for meat as food, and the accepted rights of animals. A delude is not a balanced person, and this logical conflict does bring him to a condition of shameful confusion and erratic behavior. Deludes also demand that certain services to be made available to them by the city, at times without the comprehension what it is possible and what is not. For example the delude is not able to grasp that the city is not there to pick the trash after you, but it is there to provide the bucket so you can place your trash in it.

Be kind, for everyone you meet is fighting a hard battle. – Plato

None of us like to have faked friends, better live alone than among enemies. When the underlying reason for friendship is some sexual attraction, then we must agree that a sexual partner sees you as a body and not as an intellectual partner; that is probable not a genuine friendship. We, the humans are social beings, that treat is deeply embedded in our being. We have the natural necessity to desire being together to others for no obvious reason. This necessity has perhaps developed in time; it has provided some

³⁰ . *Vegan – a person who does not eat any animal products, including eggs, milk*

comfort and safety during critical times. It is obvious that "one can not break his own chains, but it can break the chains of his friend"; a practical and vital concept that would justify some reason for mutual friendship.

Yes, the delude does need a life partner, and sometimes he becomes successful. The marriage becomes a bridge amid the moral obligation versus the desirable pleasure; this can be mental or plain bodily pleasure. There is no real benefit in pleasure, and a delude has no opportunity to understand the meaning of such a concept. The delude tries to cope with the new reality, for example a marriage has its benefits. If he can hold a job, a carrier is not suitable for him, then things can become temporarily promising. His character does require much devotion from his partner, and also respect; but how anyone can respect a delude? For some only certain financial means are available to achieve some form of happiness, and for some it is the only thing, and the material accumulation becomes their mighty desire. In this case, even the marriage becomes a business with must be properly managed by the selfish and appalling person, the fool.

Yes, the deluded fool does love the freedom, the freedom to go undisturbed on his own desolate way.

As Bertrand Russell said: *The whole problem with the world is that fools and fanatics are always so certain of themselves, but wiser people so full of doubts.*

We all know that people are distinct and also, in the same time, similar, and that all have character traits we regard as positive or not. We either can say that all people are imperfect, or we can say that all people are perfect in their own particular way. Not the deluded fool, his assured that about everyone is undoubtedly less significant than himself; that gives him a sense of unquestionable feeling of superiority. The deluded fool's pursue for significance and comfort necessitate him to search for synthetic aims to personal needs. If he can identify any means to reach his happiness than he will seize coherent or fanatical measures to accomplish it. The exquisite projected look that the style and fashion provides can offer some prospect for the delude to attain his wishes, and to provide him a way to put forward an undeniably unique personal statement. Some deluded fools are very much attracted by the fashion world, and, it seems, for them only the appearance is important and allows

him, with some advantage, to look down at the people whom are not fashionable enough. In this case, the delude will spend endless hours and much available means to become vanguard fashionable. The fashionable beauty is subjective, a belief that fashion is beautiful cannot be judged either true or false, and therefore becomes a private reputation. The subjective nature of fashion does provide the delude a certain shield he needs to deflect attempt of judgment or doubt regarding his self-assured fashionable good taste. This is a powerful and profound way in which a delude achieves a clear status of superior and distinctive taste that he proudly and strongly extended to all other of his personality traits. As I mentioned earlier, a delude is not a known to be balanced, extreme and mindless acts does characterize his any endeavor.

Humans are definitely social beings; they naturally thrive in communities. The settled view is that friendships are natural and positive relations among community members; they provide emotional support and boost an individual's meaning of happiness. When people, who are equal in most standards, establish mutual understanding, compassion and trust towards each other they originate an opportunity to become friends. Having no friends is considerate socially harmful and can potentially generates emotional harm. Fake "friends" are useless. From a skeptical view, most happiness and almost all untested friendships are based on pure illusion; therefore the real usefulness of such a relation becomes a mirage and insignificant. Most of the common people would develop naturally a number of friendships, with a few very close friends. This is somehow impossible for the delusional person, due to its difficulty of reasonable understanding even of basic events. One component for the possibility for friendship is sharing of similar views on diverse topics. The similarity of views will generate some agreement and solidarity that is paramount to a balanced relationship. Unfortunately, unequal intellectual level and the *private context*³¹ and the different views of the same situation will generate disagree that would be an obstacle in building a friendship relation. Here is an example where of a different view of some unique situation:

³¹ Private context - the totality of mental physical structures and along with the memory objects accumulated by an individual .

John Searle, a slusser professor of philosophy (text bellow), presented to us a polished and beautiful linguistic sentence, with precise structure and generative grammar with regard with the look at the mind compared with a computer program; writing inductive of reader's delight:

The reason that no computer program can ever be a mind is simply that a computer program is only syntactical, and minds are more than syntactical. Minds are semantical, in the sense that they have more than a formal structure, they have a content. --- John Searle, Minds, Brains and Science

Here is a computer scientist view/transformation:

The basis that no computer program can replicate a mind is basically that a computer program has a strict coding syntax grammar, while minds are more than syntactical. Minds encloses embedded meaning in addition to the logical structure, in the sense that they possess more than a strict structure, they include data objects.

Now here is the fool's view:

All computers can't compare with the human mind; they are dumb. Computers do the thinking their own way, nevertheless brains are smarter than the computer can ever be. The brains know a lot, because they remember what they learned.

This views, that describe the original Searle text, and are intended to be similar as content, are distinct due to the "personal" *private mental context* of the writer. The *private context* determines the selection of specific words that would facilitate the translation of the identical text in conformity to the writer's context. The intended meaning of the text, subject of the transformation, is desired preserved. By deconstruction, a neutral view can detect components of the specific *private context* that is projected on the new form of the text presentation; it becomes a new view of the composition. To generalize this, even I know it is not advisable, the private mental context of individuals are essential for generating friendships, and opposing views of similar situation would become barrier in developing authentic closeness, required for a genuine friendship.

Chapter 6 ABOUT OUR UNIVERSE CREATION

No human thing is of serious importance. -- Plato

People are many and diverse, and all collectively are what is called *humanity*. The humanity search for understanding of our universe has included the search for the origin of our world, and for the Creator of our universe. Religion identify the Creator by many names; e.g. Allah, Buddha, God, and so on with the note that most religions envision the Creator as a singular entity. From a transcendental argument of the existence of the Creator, to the religious belief of pious human behavior as required by Creator's revelations it is a long way. Most religious have their structure rooted on miracles, myths, superstition, or unquestionable belief. All this confirm and reinforce the patterns of a traditional religion, they also stimulate the imagination, invalidate the gap between a dream and actuality, and it provides a small opening to a mystical world inhabited by the Gods, the dead, and the spirits.³² The pursuit for understanding about the nature of the Creator has taken the metaphysical or spiritual pathways, sometimes ignoring, or even rejecting, the proper scientific evidence that is also necessary for a sound understanding. At times, the ritualistic approach of discovery shifts to a metaphysical form of enquiry regarding the Creator, and that implies a transcendental extension of the intellect toward the concept of infinity, which is obviously impenetrable. The metaphysical path of discovery of our Creator is infinitely difficult, and definitely improvable. Hitherto, the relation with the Creator was based mostly of the mystic spirituality of religion that was not restricted by the boundaries that lead to magical or metaphysical consideration of the Creator. Be not deceived, even what is now regarded as magic does conform to the laws of nature, even when understanding of the means is unidentified. Form the point of scientific method; we have difficulties in establishing the nature of the Creator, while the sound integration of mysticism, metaphysics, and science seems to be residing only in the realm of imagination.

³² *Mircea Eliade, 1951*

Here we must admit that true religion is a very private and a personal experience aiming at harmony and the complete truth, and can become a personal and intimate path toward the search of the wisdom and the spirit of the Creator. At times, human accepts of a religion that is unmistakably in contradiction to the scientific fact that definitely leads to an erroneous interpretation of Creator's nature. Some religious divide was not merely restricted to the members of a single groups but expanded against entire countries, or inward have been extended across the threshold of homes, setting families against each other; even placing father against the son or mother against own daughter. Particular groups tried to gather all humanity to join in their religion, while other religions were on the path of annihilation of anyone who has not shared their views. We must state now that a number of religions groups have unfortunately chosen a long path that undertakes them farther and farther from the legitimate way of getting to apprehend and achieves closeness to the wisdom required understanding about our Creator. The search for our Creator we must, in additionally to the religious revelation, follow the path of scientific discovery, that we'll provide us the eternal legitimate and complete truth concerning the nature of the creation. By abandoning the logical inquiry, our search can wonder in the deep darkness of illusion that takes us further and further from our purpose, this is what the deluded fool commonly does. As Saint Augustine distinctively articulated, an interpretation of the religious wisdom must be revised when it confronts properly formulated scientific knowledge. This is valid in special when a new scientific paradigm emerges, one that requires that the previous scientific learning be revised or even discarded. Hitherto, the scientific wisdom has been volatile, and that is a justified reason for the religious doctrine to remain unwavering, in the hope that new scientific discovery will reconcile with the religious way. In some particular cases, we must discard the proved scientific wisdom that is well connected to rationality, to allow for dogmatic religious belief; this is not a true religious belief, but the belief of the deluded fool. Any true religious belief is required to satisfy the requirement of rational thinking; a logical contradiction with the physical reality, or contradicted by our senses, indicates that we deviated from the right path of discovering the Creator and that we now follow the deluded fool's way.

There are many paths to the top of the mountain, but the view is always the same. – Japanese proverb

It is self-evident that when we grasp that our understanding of our universe amounts to about nothing, then, in fact, we know something. We say that the universe beginning started with *nothing*, the creation *ex nihilo*. Nothing itself is impossible not to exist; the concept of nothing is at least a word. In mathematics the representation of *nothing* is zero; zero is a number, a part of the foundation of mathematics, and it is also a word. Nothing is not a number, but a primitive concept that represents the nothingness. Is nothingness part of the actual reality? Can "*nothing*" exist as self and be more than a word? In this context, "*nothing*" may point only to physical matter, or does include some spiritual characteristic? Where the Creator was in this initial setting of nothingness, before the universe creation? The creation of the material universe from *nothing* does imply that the Creator does not meet our usual physical anticipation, and that it existed beyond the concept of *nothingness* and it must existed in an immaterial state only, spiritual; if the Creator existence is to be logically justified. If our Creator formed all the fundamental material particles from his action alone, and it was not also creating itself in the process, then the Creator cannot be material. To support an argument that the universe was created; we must accept that the universe can't be infinite unless we accept that the Creator also created itself, and it is part of the universe that was created. Can matter be created by action alone or by some action that springs from an immaterial cause? In the famous Einstein's formula $e=mc^2$ there is a direct equality relation between matter and energy, can we infer that matter can emerge from nothing else but energy alone? The light ray, due to its dual characteristics, seems to be the only link that can connect the non-material world/energy with the material one. We can question if the Creator is a being like or it is a possible fantastic process. Some hypothesis forwards the opinion that the universe was created by the "*big bang*", and that the universe expansion is presently ongoing. The "*big bang*" may have created a new physical cosmic object that is a component of the universe, whoever it is not the grand universe itself. This theory is based on the former existence of a dense singularity, and its expansion that has created some cosmic object that we call universe. Never less, the singularity by itself can be seen as the "universe"; its expansion is a transformation, a change to the state of the universe and not an act of creation. If we indeed exist; consequently the Creator of our universe exists, but not in a strict interpretation that stems from a

narrow interpretation of the universe or the Creator; that has as its basis in imagination, fear or downright ignorance.

There was a need for the Creators acknowledgement, as the originator of the universe. If the Creator is eternal, the universe, the Creators' work, is not also guaranteed to be eternal. The famous Thomas Aquinas sentence "*nothing greater can be conceived*" does incorporate the vast unknown in human understanding; therefore the unknown is attributed to the Creator. One common concept does also satisfy the Aquinas sentence, and that is the widely used concept of infinity. There is nothing greater than infinity, nothing more mysterious than the infinite space or time, nothing more mysterious than the Creator. It seems that there is a relation among the concept of infinity and the mighty Creator, can the Creator be sometimes seen as the actualization of the concept of infinity? It is undoubtedly beyond human capabilities to comprehend the vast complexity of our universe from our remote place in our galaxy. We must follow the universal laws of nature, and learn what is possible about our world. Finding the Creators place in our universe can be revealed to us by careful attention to our world, using the power of our mind and origin our endeavor on the scientific discovery and logic.

Is life in our solar system self-contained, or it is part of the life actualization in the entire universe. The distance between stellar systems is immense, this would deter earth-like life forms for spreading among cosmic objects, about make it unattainable for the life forms that exist on our planet to propagate and continue their existence in the other part of the universe. The conditions that originated the emergence of life in our solar system are probable to be general in the whole universe, and therefore the conditions for life initiating are present universally. Here we assume that every small part of the universe does represent the properties of the entire universe, and that is not a guaranteed generalization. Is the duration of creation small, about instant, or does imply some duration. The creation of life might not be not on an interval scale easily comprehended by us, the humans. In fact, the creation of the life on earth might not be yet completed, and our struggle to understand our imperfections is just our absence of understanding of the facts' about this event. It is potential that our solar system was created directly by the Creator, however the emergence of life happened much later and independent of the original system creation, and that

was due to the intrinsic properties and qualities of our solar system. The theory of evolution hypothesizes that life evolved from some previous condition to some new and improved biological structure. The theory of evolution does not apply to material, lifeless objects, and does not account for the change from an inert material state to the new condition of life. Creation is not evolution - creation implies changes from the inert physical material form to a new state; the life from. The life could not begin its evolution if it was not first created, and therefore both theories are valid, even thou the mystery of the creation processes are not agreeably comprehend yet. Furthermore, can the evolution be an afterward stage of the initial creation process, and therefore the creation is still ongoing? From the initial stage of life creation there is a long road and mysterious transformations before arriving to the actualization of the life form we call a human being. Perhaps it is improper to say, that evolution has been observed also in the case of technological progress, and that most new products are an improvement (an evolution) with regard to the previous one. For example a computer, or an automobile is continuously improving, and that can be characterized as technological evolution. The Second Law of Thermodynamics that simply asserts that the entropy in a system increases with time, I wonder if evolution is factually a path to introduce unmanageable complexity in a system and therefore a component that leads to unsuspected obliteration.

In our imagination, fantasies, or dreams we can place ourselves as the most important creation of the Creator, selfish and perhaps arrogant belief, however an eternal component of the human's existence. The earth has not ended with the stop of some forms of life, as the dinosaur's existence, but has changed, and other forms of life, and other species. Now the man is the dominant species on earth, however there is no guarantee that the future does hold a place for human life on earth, and we should not imply that human are necessary species for the life on earth to persist.

To apprehend the universal truth, the intellect must poses infinite power since does extend its understanding from particular to the infinite. The uncertainty is not about the Creator's obligatory nature, but about the Creator's questionable actuality. Could the universe self-create itself from nothing, and not assembled from matter already created? No doubt that the Creator is in harmony with his own creation, also the Creator is in harmony with the laws

of nature, and with the scientific discovery; things that the Creator itself established. Also we must acknowledge that our physical world, the Creator accomplishment object, cannot be eternal in this state. In various religions, the wisdom and the Creator's revelation is found in holy books that are translated in numerous languages. The Jacques Derrida's deconstruction theory affirms that we do carefully dismantle some text and then reconstruct it ourselves, in a new personal context. Despite the richness of any language sometimes the writer finds difficult if not impossible to find an expression that exactly fits the concept. In this context, the translation becomes merely a personal interpretation. Even more, the deconstruction denies the possibility of an exact translation due the dualistic hierarchies embedded in the original version of the text, and therefore much meaning is lost in the translated books. This is a very serious and unresolved religious matter. The deconstruction asserts that in any text, there are inevitably points of equivocation that alter its meaning. It is also true, that a secret world of the unknown meaning is sometimes revealed by the method of deconstruction. A committed effort toward the rigorous analysis of the literal meaning of a text, and also the search of hidden meaning in the neglected parts of the text, sometimes point towards discovery of alternative new meanings. It happens that the found *detail* and meaning gains more significance that the full text that also incorporates the *detail* and gains illogical meaning as isolated from the context in which its meaning was created. It is also potential that certain text meanings are potentially veiled under the metaphorical meaning of the text, and not as direct literary translation. It is no wonder that various religious believers do travel to the original place of initiation of a religious faith. Being in the original of the religious acts it must be comforting, and also places the believer in the true spatial context of the religious act it helps in a better understanding and avoidance of the wrong meaning or interpretation. Pilgrimages to holy sites have a deep and true meaning, and are essential for the genuine religious experience.

By discovering his power of the intellect, man placed itself as a grandiose focal point of universe, as the greatest creation of our Creator. For any man, any point could be viewed as a center of the earth just as to any observer at sea the horizon seems to be equally distant in all directions, regardless of the observation position. Looking around on the starry night, we might have the feeling that

the distance is even in all directions and we are in the middle, in the center, of the cosmic space. Any exploration must have a start point needed for any spatial orientation and that is why our planet is the origin in all our exploration, either religious or scientific. For the profane, perhaps the realization of the "big-bang" has provided a new special point, as the counter of our expanding universe, while the center of our inquiry and exploration remains to start from our planet, a place long established in our experiences. Therefore, the concept that the man is in the center of the universe is valid, and based on our deeply entrenched view of the world. In that regard, we must declare that the man, his planet and world is forever situated as our point of origin toward the mysterious space.

Regardless how long the path toward finding about the Creators is, the scope of the travel is to discover the true nature of the universe Creator. It is also obvious that man cannot discover the act of creation unless it is so desired and allowed by the Creator. Is the struggle between religions that attempt to prove that the only path to the true Creator is by following its own ways, is nothing to say that "only one road leads to Rome" when we know the metaphor is that "all roads lead to Rome", the same as all religions anticipate to lead toward the understanding of the Creator. We can *imagine* an invisible man, the invisible cannot be perceived by our external visual sense, but it can be sensed by our mind. The invisible man is not an innate idea, and it has the roots in the external and also the internal mental *world* of our mind. The invisible man is a "*man*" and also has the attribute of being not detected by our vision senses; however it is possible that it can be distinguished by hearing, touching, etc. If it cannot be detected by all external senses, then can we call it reality? Some, as the Creator, is detected only by the cognitive qualities our mind alone, and is not detected by our external sensual perceptions. How can we be sure that the Creator is, when we are required to detect reality by the use of our external senses? Is the contrary also true, can we detect an object by our senses, but the mind can refuse to acknowledge its existence? We also must agree that, at times, we assume that what we can't see what does not exist; as a dog with five legs for example. We certainly can't see electricity, but we must admit its existence by its cause to effect connecting principle. We generate electricity at one end, and we can detect its existence at some other end, by the use of the qualities of our external senses. We can state that the Creator has not been an entity possible to be sensed

as a perception, or we, the humans, could not identify such an occurrence. The Creator can be defined as an objective cause reflected by the power of our mind, and unless we accept our mind as a tool for some inferred sensual-perception, we must agree that the Creator is no perceivable by our senses.

Some religions have their foundation on strict interpretation of religious doctrines do base its judgment on inflexible opinions, and are contrary to any formal way of judgment, illogic, and are unmistakably outside the scientific though. This is the common condition associated with the deluded fools' religion, a religion that can be in deep conflict with the common law and the scientific principles. One of the big and universal misunderstandings is that some heretics suppose that scientific inquiry is not, and cannot be, a legitimate religious activity. To assume infinite power to the Creator is a simple solution and provides and answer to all and every question or unknown about our world. It is very simple, and a convenient way to reduce all inquiries of everything, including the unknown, to an irrefutable belief or justification. From a transcendental argument of the existence of the Creator, to the religious belief of pious human behavior as required by the Creator it is a long way that cannot be followed on a rational route. Does religion emerges from the transcendental capability of human mind? True happiness lies in what is eternal, therefore the search of the happiness can lead us to acceptance of the promise for eternal life. I tie the concept of the existence of the Creator with an assumption of our wishful desire for eternal life. Is seeking the eternal life by our religious belief an attempt to gain independence from the cruelty of time? How is a human to live in a world dominated by chaos, suffering, and absurdity without the hope for guaranteed future tranquility? Therefore, the concept of heaven was necessary and a place where happiness is to be realized, and where the eternal life is not only possible but also a promise. It is a promise of spiritual immortality, in a new and perfect material body. The heaven does not exist in our physical world; therefore it was moved in a cosmic/unknown space by most religions.

No testimony is sufficient to establish a miracle, unless the testimony is of such a kind, that its falsehood would be more miraculous than the fact that it endeavors to establish. -- David Hume, An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding.

My grandmother Maria, a person of whose memory I deeply cherish, told me that during a storm, fish and frogs were falling from the sky along with the rain. She asked me not to share this with others from the concern that I would be a target of ridicule since the fact was not easily believable. Was this a miracle? Even thou this story can be seen as a doubtful, I have never questioned the truth of the fact that my grandmother shared with me. After years and some reflection I became aware again of her story, and I came to some possible logical explanation; some tornado/twister might have been the cause of the fish being lifted and moved in the atmosphere and later were falling down in a distant place. I am wondering of the concept of a miracle, can it be also that we have no good understanding of its cause, and therefore we can call and event of unknown cause a miracle.

The Christian religion not only was at first attended with miracles, but also even at this day cannot be believed by any reasonable person without one.
- David Hume, An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding

The need for the existence of the Creator as the initiator of entire universe perhaps have been started as a sensible idea meant to provide the need for particular understanding of the universe, a task that greatly surpasses our natural abilities. Yes, we need an undeniable good answer for all creation questions about the unknown, and what a more powerful way that to assign it to the all-powerful Creator. Deluded fool's unquestioned belief in the absolute correctness of his inflexible religious believes and therefore a personal view of the Creator can come near a state of mental incapacitation, or in other words, a borderline mental disorder. Supernatural details simply pack up our doubts in the desired concept of a unit that is helpful but contradictory. The impression of the Creator is not seen uniform by people, and our experiences compound with theoretical learning has modified the way our mind perceives. From a skeptical view, some hypothesis of the creation of the universe transcends the materialistic perspective, and it that is called faulty science. Some religions assume that the Creator is presently and closely involved in the activities of our personal lives. The skeptic can reasonably doubt the Creators involvement is our private life by pointing out that all the prayers in the world can't "crack a nut", or that the Creator can easily transform a boat into a house, but it is not known to ever has done so. If the Creator did not like the people of the world he has the power and it would send

misfortune and destroy them. But it does not; there are many people all over the world. That alone is enough proof that the Creator loves the humanity he created, if he is as envisioned by various religions.

We can't deny the possibility of anything rooted on skepticism alone. From only a materialistic point, the creation of the universe is unfeasible to validate, and therefore the need to allow other theories is necessary.³³ To be valid, a theory about the creation of universe, must be anchored in the space of natural sciences, it must exit the metaphysical space, and be confined to the predictable view of scientific discovery. Furthermore, any theory for the creation of universe must satisfy the necessities of the "reasoned fact" paradigm, and also the materialistic view of the "matter of fact"; otherwise, it must be discarded; as we have no valid logical ground to initiate our judgment. Before we accept a theory for the creation of the universe we must eliminate any conflict between empirical observations and the logical component. Beauty is materialization of the concept of beautiful; emptiness is the materialization of the concept of empty; is the universe is the actualization of the physical matter? Regardless, outside the scope of the religious life, the actualization of the universe is ongoing, and therefore the question is not about the reality of a Creator, but the inquiry must be concerning the nature of the Creator.

³³ Materialism asserts that matter cannot be created from nothing, however materialistically a new form of matter is merely a transformation. The emergence of matter only from a form of energy does not satisfy the materialistic paradigm.

Chapter 7 THE SOUL AND GENETICS

Death may be the greatest of all human blessings. --
Socrates

Soul - in Greek language it is a word that distinguishes the living body from or inanimate matter. Platonists say that man is a soul using a body rather than a composite of the soul and body. The inference is of this is that the nature of man originate wholly in the soul, and that the body is a temporary dwelling for man. Plato has struggled to guard the purity of comprehensible essences, the universality and the nonmaterial component of intellectual awareness, as well as the sensible dignity of the soul, from the "blemish" of the material world. An empirical investigation of the soul is not assumed possible. Is a simple or several complex concepts fit better the description of the soul? Can the soul be a stream, the functionality of a body that is immortal, and it is transmitted from a body to another, thru gestation, and procreation? The same soul is emerges from the beginning of human being, from the soul of the first person alive. Can the soul enjoy absolute freedom locked in its physical body? When we say that after the dissolution of the body his ego is annihilated, perishes, and does not exist after death, is that acceptable to satisfy our personal ego? Is the emergence of the soul concept a justification or denial of such a meaningless outcome?

And some woman, like the females of other animals - for example, mares and cows - have a strong tendency to produce offspring resembling their parents. -- Aristotle, Politica.

It is reasonable to believe that Socrates and Plato have noted some similarity of distinct human beings, and also the inheritance of some properties that have been exported from parents to their offspring. This inheritance can be easily clarified now by genetics. The veiled mystery of human genetics is likely partially accountable for the emergence of the soul concept, the results of the genetic mechanism are easily identified, while the intricacy of genetics is still away from being well understood. Was in fact Socrates so confident of the existence of the soul that perhaps made him give up his life with the conviction that life is in fact

eternal, and conceivably death is only a transformation and a blessing? Socrates, and also Plato, believed that life and even consciousness persists after the body has perished. It is implicit that the soul does not necessitate a material body to exist, and he departs the body at the end of the existence of life. Is the soul, after it leaves the body; becomes some sort of an angel? In the dogmatic expectation of religions, the body will return to the nature, by discomposing, and the soul will "rise" to "*heavens*" and be eternal. Because this, the importance of the soul should be infinitely more important than that of the temporary body. How the increased number of immortal souls can be explained in the case of the large population growth? Either a number of new souls are to be created, or the same soul might populate numerous bodies, or there is no good explication or explanation to account for this circumstance. Is then reasonable to assume that, as a matter of fact, the souls cannot factually exist, or soul is as fire, once started does spread itself and moves itself to a new medium? How can we justify the disappearance of the soul of the dinosaurs, or are the dinosaur souls still present lingering around in the body of today's life forms? Some believe that only the uncivilized and inconsiderate and deluded fools will imagine that spirit or the soul is something disconnected from the physical body. There is a correlation between the soul and genetics, we cannot account for our changes to adapt to our environment on other way that by the theory of evolution, and the export of gained biological improvements by genetic processes. Certainly the theory of evolution cannot account for beginning of life. The soul is similar to a spark, on one instance ignites life in a new body, this at conception time. At some point the soul is unable to subsist in the inadequate body; the body then become lifeless again, in a material only state, and returns to the inert physical state of nature. Similar to a radio that comes to "life" when the stream of electrical power is allowed to travel to its circuits and actualize its functionality (an abstract form of life?), or later becomes silent (lifeless) when the power is interrupted.

The connect between the soul and genetics is apparent, and we can assume that the actualization of the "soul" is embedded in the genetic construction of a being. The genetic construct is changing in time, and the possibility of life emergency by soul actualization is not therefore guaranteed. Is there a possibility of changes in the genome construct of a being to deny the soul possibility and actualization of a life being? The modern human

changes and the environment that he leaves is might be changing faster then the body can improve and adapt to it. What if "*genetics*" will fall behind, and not anymore able to correct or improve the subject to the faster changing environment? Is there a limit for the physical body in its chance and ability to adjust to the changing external environment, and in what condition the body cannot, any longer, adjust to the change? The "*genetics*" promote the change in a person, and that change can be later passed on to a future offspring; the amount of change is very small and the new change requirements are so dynamic that sensible genetics changes are not even possible anymore. Are the "*genetics*" able to improve the future physical body to the changes in environment that have destroyed it ancestral source, and continue from any point in the development line? Can the rate of change, faster then the human body can handle, be a source for its annihilation or destruction of our species. Some genetics changes must be unlearned, and the roll back to some old patterns and conditions, once it is destructive to continue on the current biological path. Biological enhancement provided by genetics is not an accident, but a necessity for the required correction to adhere to biological need of the ever changes of the natural settings in which life flourish. Slowing down the change in our natural existence setting is perhaps required for our future species survival. Our technological progress facilitated the environment change that is now beyond the capacity of our genetic mechanism to forwardly adjust to it and possibly find means to correct it.

As it is sensibly expected, the delude hastily rejects the complex intricacy of the genetic process, it is better suitable for him to embrace simpler concepts such as the reincarnation is; the spiritual rebirth of the soul in a different new body. This can provide elucidation for sharing and propagating the physical and spiritual characteristics that are common among the related members of a family or group; this do account for existence of absolute similarities of character or physical appearance, without having to need for existence of the reality of genetic processes. The soul is held to be perpetual, with occasional descend into the state of material existence, absorbed in the illusion of some recompense possible only in the physical world reality. He sees no difficulty in accepting that the doctrine of the reincarnation, even when at times, this includes the passage of the soul into a non-human, into an animal body. The concept of reincarnations offers the opportunity of a

connection from the pure spiritualism mode to the inert physical matter. The reincarnation is seen at times as superstition, and in that setting it is suitable only as a barbaric/uncivilized concept. The belief in reincarnation has ancient roots; the idea thrived mainly in the oriental cultures and later was entertained by some in the west. The popular Hinduism conveys that the soul is repetitively passed from one physical body to a new one through the physical cycle of death and birth. The reborn and reincarnation is done on account of desire: a soul wishes to be re-born to fulfill his desire for worldly pleasures, which can be only enjoyed merely by populating a physical body. The delude is readily disposed to embrace the religious belief that the soul will be held accountable and subject to judgment and even punishment after the body is dead, along with the promise of the eternal possibility for existence after the physical life existence. A view is that the soul qualities are spread in a pool along with traits of other souls, the new souls characteristics are constructed from a set of this traits of this pool that later comes into physical reality in new reincarnations.

The progress in the scientific understanding of the human being has provided much insight regarding the human condition and has provided an alternative basis for what inductively lead to the emergence of the concept of the soul. Now, the concept of soul does not require a travel in the world of imagination and synthetic reasoning. The soul can be seen as the spiritual and indispensable component of the human being, a component that separates us from the inert physical state, and that accounts for our feelings, emotions, desires that cannot be justified by the properties of the physical matter alone. Certainly, the definition of the soul must be revised to include the new scientific discoveries, and some details, as the concept of the reincarnation, must be perhaps discarded. As David Hume noted, the future is the projection of the past, and as human development is predictable. It is that humans are not changed much in the last thousand years, as for example how can one say that he is a better man then Aristotle, to give one example.

The study of ancient Chinese DAO philosophy does entail the concept that the human body vanishes, dissolves like everything else, in the infinite process of change; a fact not probable to be refuted. The destruction of our body, as the destruction of the entire universe would be simply only a transformation. Also the new scientific theories seem to erase the divide between the material

and spiritual objects, and the physical matter itself is seen as a mere pattern of vibration. That would close the theoretical gap between what a body and soul is, and the reincarnation could merely mean that multiple beings could be constructed from same elementary particles, but at different time.

Related Quotes and Proverbs Supplement

PHILOSOPHICAL QUOTES

ANCIENT QUOTES

The prosperity of a FOOL is a heavy burden to put up with – Aeschylus

The desire for imaginary benefits involves the loss of present blessings. – Aesop

That if anything is possible to inferior, weaker, and stupider people, it is more so for their opposites. – Aristotle

Delight, or the judgment or the lust of pleasure, destroys the judgment of prudence – Aristotle

For instance the stone which by nature moves downward cannot be habituated to move upwards, not even if one tries to train it by throwing it up ten thousand times. – Aristotle

People form true opinions, but because their moral badness sometimes they do not say what they really think. – Aristotle

Others might equal his intelligence, but not equal his stupidity – Confucius

Be not ashamed of mistakes and thus make them crimes. – Confucius

When I told him one thing he understands ten – Confucius

Once harm has been done, even a fool understands it. – Homer

Ignorance - the root and the stem of every evil. – Plato

Wise men talk because they have something to say, fools because they have to say something. -- Plato

Any man can make mistakes, but only an idiot persists in his error. -- Cicero

CLASSIC QUOTES

The fool doth think he is wise, but the wise man knows him to be a fool. --
William Shakespeare

Of all thieves fools are the worst; they rob you of time and temper. --
Goethe

*The best way to convince a fool that he is wrong is to let
him have his own way --* **Josh Billings**

*A fool's brain digests philosophy into folly, science into superstition, and art
into pedantry. --* **Bernhard Shaw**

*A stupid man's report of what a clever man says can
never be accurate, because he unconsciously translates
what he hears into something he understands --* **Bertrand
Russell**

*Deficiency in judgment is just what ordinarily is called stupidity, and for
such a failing there is no remedy --* **Immanuel Kant**

*A fool's brain digests philosophy into folly, science into
superstition, and art into pedantry. --* **George Bernard
Shaw**

Many assumptions are imaginary and arbitrary inventions of our mind. --
Rene Descartes

*Man is at bottom a savage, horrible beast. We know it only in the business
of taming and restraining him, which we call civilization. Hence it is that we
are terrified if now and then his nature breaks out. But it is unnecessary to
wait for anarchy in order to gain enlightenment on this subject. A hundred
records, old and new, produce the conviction that in his unrelenting cruelty
man is in no way inferior to the tiger and the hyena. --* **Arthur
Schopenhauer**

Many people would sooner die than think. In fact they do. -- **Bertrand
Russell**

Delight in misfortune of others remains the worst trait of human nature. --
Arthur Schopenhauer

In the part of this universe that we know there is great

*injustice, and often the good suffer, and often the wicked
prosper, and one hardly knows which of those is the more
annoying. --* **Bertrand Russell**

*'This better to be silent and be thought a fool, than to
speak and remove all doubt. --* attributed to **Abraham
Lincoln**

PROVERBS

GERMAN

*What can you expect from a pig but a grunt?
Stupidity and pride grows on same tree.*

LATIN

Empty pots make the most noise.

GREEK

FOOLS know everything about everything.

JAPANESE

*Waiting for luck is the same thing as waiting for death
Fools and scissors require careful handling.
When a finger points at the moon, the imbecile looks at the finger.
The ignorant have their virtues, just as the wise have their fault.*

MIDDLE EASTERN

*Give counsel to a fool and gain a foe.
Explain to the crazy and they understand; yet fools won't change their minds.*

RUSSIAN

*If you hang a melon from a poplar, you are sure to find a fool who will think the poplar is a melon tree.
Fools complain much about good times until they have bad times to complain about.
When a FOOL wants to increase the number of his fish, he puts pikes into his carp ponds.
The fool has the most trump cards.*

*Only a FOOL grows fat on hopes.
There is no FOOL that will not say a wise word now and then.
The FOOL is satisfied with himself, the wise man with the world.
God can satisfy all wise man but not a single fool.
The wise man says: I am looking for truth, and the FOOL: I have found the truth.
The words of the FOOL belong to the wind.
A wise man won't call a fool a fool, but a fool will always call a wise man a fool.*

INDIAN

*Long is the night to him who is awake, long is the chain of existence to the foolish who do not know the true law.
The fool who knows his foolishness is wise at least to that extent; but the fool who thinks himself wise is called a fool indeed.
If a fool associated with a wise man even all his life, he does not perceive the truth even as a spoon does not perceive the taste of soup.
The fool that has not acquired any wealth in his youth is like a crane that stays on one leg, staying in the middle of a pond with no fishes.
Fools indeed do not praise giving. But the wise man, rejoicing in charity, becomes in that (account) happy in the other world.
How can be one fool of greed being a religious man?
It is better to leave alone; there is no companionship with a fool.
By a craving for riches the foolish person destroys himself.
It is better to leave alone; there is no companionship with a fool.*

SOME OTHER

*Joke with a fool at home, and he will joke with you in a square. -- Spanish
If the fool knew how to be silent he could sit among the wise. -- Czech
If a fool holds the cow by her horns, a clever man can milk her. -- Yiddish
Inconsiderate people forget after the favor is done, just as a boat is abandoned after crossing the river. -- Tibet*

REFERENCES

The following is a short list of the most important references that have influenced my thinking during the last years. The opinions here are reflection and many induced opinions based on reflection when reading the named material. Additional data was gathered during the school years and from various other sources such as internet, magazines, TV shows, etc.

Etica Nicomachea, Aristotle. Translated by Richard McKeon, Random House, NY. (1941)

Physica, Aristotle. Translated by Richard McKeon, Random House, NY. (1941)

Organon, Aristotle. Translated by Richard McKeon, Random House, NY. (1941). Includes Categoriae, De Interpretatione, Analytica Priora, Analytica Posteriora, Topica, De Sophisticis Elenchis.

Physica, Aristotle. Translated by Richard McKeon, Random House, NY. (1941)

De Caelo, Aristotle. Translated by Richard McKeon, Random House, NY. (1941)

De Generatione et Corruptione, Aristotle. Translated by Richard McKeon, Random House, NY. (1941)

De Anima, Aristotle. Translated by Richard McKeon, Random House, NY. (1941)

Methaphysica, Aristotle. Translated by Richard McKeon, Random House, NY. (1941)

Politica, Aristotle. Translated by Richard McKeon, Random House, NY. (1941)

Rhetorica, Aristotle. Translated by Richard McKeon, Random House, NY. (1941)

De Poetica, Aristotle. Translated by Richard McKeon, Random House, NY. (1941)

Basic Writings, Martin Heidegger. By David Farrell Krell, HarperSanFrancisco (1992). Includes: Being and time, Hegel's concept of experience, On the way to language, ...

Socratic Dialogues, Plato. Translated by W. D. Woodhead, Nelson (1953). Includes: Euthyphro, The Apology of Socrates, Crito, Phaedo, Gorgias.

Discourse on thinking, Martin Heidegger. Translated by John M. Anderson, and E. Hans Freund, HarperTorchbooks (1969).

The Infinity and Beyond, Eli Maor. Princeton University Press (1991).

Philosophical Investigations, Ludwig Wittgenstein. Translated by G. E. M. Anscombe, Blackwell Publishing (2001).

Science and Philosophy, Alfred North Whitehead, Philosophical Library Inc. New York (1948).

Thus Spake Zarathustra, F. W. Nietzsche. Translated by M M. Bozman. E. P. DUTTON & Co. Inc, New York 1933).

Discourse on Metaphysics, Leibnitz. Translated by Dr. geo. R. Montgomery E., w York (1933). Also includes: Correspondence with Arnauld, Monadology.

Tractus Logico-Philosophicus, Ludwig Wittgenstein.
Translated by D. F. Pears & B. F. Guinness, Routledge &
Kegan Paul, London (1974).

Ethics, Benedict de Spinoza. Translated by James
Gutmann, Hafner Publishing Company (1949).

The Analects, Confucius. Translated by D.C. Lau,
Penguin books (1979).

Critique of Pure Reason, Immanuel Kant, Translated by F.
Max Muller, The Macmillan Company, NY (1907)

The Impact of Science on Society, Bertrand Russell,
Simon and Schuster, NY (1953)

Purity of Heart, Soren Kierkegaard, Translated by
Douglass V. Steere, Harper TorchBooks, New York
(1938)

Science of Logic, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel,
Translated by A. V. Miller, Humanity Books, NY (1969)

Political Writings, Rousseau, Translated by Frederick
Watkins, Nelson books, Toronto (1953)

Democracy and Education, John Dewey, The Free Press
(1916)

A Treatise of Human Nature, David Hume, Oxford, At The
Clarendon Press (1978)

Prolegomena to Any Future Metaphysics, Immanuel Kant,
The Paul Carus translation, revised by James W.
Ellington, Hackett Publishing Company, Indianapolis.
(1977)

Two Treatises on Government, John Locke, Palladium
Press (2000)

The Wisdom of Confucius, Translated by William
Jennings, Books, Inc. Publishers, New York, Boston.
(1900)

What is Called Thinking, Martin Heidegger, Translated by
J. Glenn Gray. (1968)

Man's Search for Meaning, Viktor E. Frankl, Pocket
Books, New York, London, Toronto, Sydney. (1984)

Wisdom of Love, Soren Kierkegaard, Translated by
Howard and Edna Hong, Harper TorchBooks. (1962)

Hundred Ways of Elegant Saying, Gun-Than-gKon-
mChok-bsTan-Pa'i-sGron-Me, Central Institute of Higher
Tibetan Studies, Sarnath, Varanasi. (1991)

Key Philosophical Writings, Descartes, Translated by
Elisabeth S. Haldane and G.R.T. Ross, Wordsworth
Classics (1997)

The Republic, Plato, Translated in English by Benjamin
Jowett, The Easton Press, Norwalk, Connecticut. (1980)

On the Way to Language, Martin Heidegger,
HarperSanFrancisco (1959)

An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding, David
Hume, Edited by Eric Steinberg, Hackett Publishing
Company, Indianapolis. (1977)

Philosophical Writings, Rene Descartes, The Franklin
Library, Pennsylvania. (1982)

Civilization and Its Discontents, Sigmund Freud,
Translated by James Strachey, W.W. Norton & Company,
NY – London. (1961)

The Works of Schopenhauer, Edited by Will Durant, PHD,
Garden City publishing Company, NY (1028)

Logic, Immanuel Kant, translated by Robert S. Hartman
and Wolfgang Schwartz,
Dover publications Inc. NY (1974)

The Dialogues Between Hylas and Philonous, George
Berkley, Hackett Publishing Company (1986)

Either/Or, Soren Kierkegaard, Translated by David F.
Swenson and Lillian Marvin Swenson, Anchor Books.
(1963)

A Brief History of Time, Stephen W. Hawking, Bantman
Books. (1988)

Acts of Religion, Jacques Derrida, Routledge Publishers,
NY (2002)

The Inhuman, Jean-Francois Lyotard, Translated by
Geoffrey Bennington and Rachel Bowlby, Stanford
University press, Stanford California. (1991)

Faith and Reason in Islam, Averroes, Translated by
Ibrahim Y. Najjar, Oneworld books, Oxford. (2004)

The Last Days of Socrates, Plato, Translated by Hugh
Tredennick, The Penguin Classics. (1962)

Essays and Aphorisms, Arthur Schopenhauer, Translated
by R. J. Hollingdale, The Penguin Classics. (1981)

The Prince, Niccolo Machiavelli, Translated from italian,
Dover Publications Inc. NY (1910)

The Concept of Anxiety, Soren Kierkegaard, Translated
by Reidar Thomte, Princeton University press, New
Jersey. (1980)

The Essential Husserl, Basic Writings in Transcedental
Phenomenology, Edited by Donn Welton, Indiana
University Press. (1999)

The Trial and Death of Socrates, Plato, Translated by
Benjamin Jowett, The Heritage Press, NY. (1963)

The question Concerning Technology and Other Essays,
Martin Heidegger, Translated by William Lovitt, Harper
TorchBooks (1977)

The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge,
Jean-Francois Lyotard, Translated by Geoff Bennington
and Brian Massumi, University of Minnesota Press.
(1988)

Leviathan, Thomas Hobbes, edited by Edwin Curley,
Hacket Publishing Company. (1994)

Philosophy of Right, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel,
Translated by T.M. Knox, Oxford University Press. (1967)

The Problems of Philosophy, Bertrand Russell, Oxford
University press. (1959)

Essays of Schopenhauer, Arthur Schopenhauer, Willey
Publishers. Includes: wisdom of Life, Art of
Controversy, Studies in Pessimism, Art of Literature,
Councils and Maxims on Human Nature.

Origin of geometry, Edmund Husserl, Translated by John
P. Leavey Jr. University of Nebraska Press. (1978)

Beyond Good and Evil, Friedrich Nietzsche, Translated by
R. J. Hollingdale, Penguin Books. (1969)

Philosophy in a New Century, John R. Searle, Cambridge
University Press.

(2008)

Making the Social world, John R. Searle, Oxford
University Press. (2010)

Manufacturing Con\$ent, Edward S. Herman and Noam
Chomsky, Pantheon Books, New York (2002)

The Essential Chomsky, Edited by Anthony Arnove, The
New Press, New York London (2008)

COPYRIGHT NOTICE

All Rights Reserved.

No large part of this work may be reproduced, electronically or in print, without prior permission of the author. At this time, the author do allows the publishing of small segments of the work, limited to a total of 500 words, when the author is acknowledged and given proper credit. No large segments of this work, such as entire chapters or the entire work, can be copied, reproduced or published without the prior permission of the author.

Proof

Printed By Createspace



Digital Proofer