Noesis

The Journal of the Mega Society

Issue #210, October 2022

About the Mega Society

The Mega Society was founded by Dr. Ronald K. Hoeflin in 1982. The 606 Society (6 in 10⁶), founded by Christopher Harding, was incorporated into the new society and those with IQ scores on the Langdon Adult Intelligence Test (LAIT) of 173 or higher were also invited to join. (The LAIT qualifying score was subsequently raised to 175; official scoring of the LAIT terminated at the end of 1993, after the test was compromised.) A number of different tests were accepted by 606 and during the first few years of the Mega Society's existence. Later, the LAIT and Dr. Hoeflin's Mega Test became the sole official entrance tests, by majority vote of the membership. After that, Dr. Hoeflin's Titan Test was added. (The Mega Test and Titan Test were also compromised, so Mega Test scores after 1994 and Titan Test scores after August 31st, 2020 are currently not accepted; the Mega and Titan cutoff is 43 - but either the LAIT cutoff or the cutoff on Dr. Ronald K. Hoeflin's tests will need to be changed, as they are not equivalent.) The Mega Society now accepts qualifying scores on The Hoeflin Power Test and on The Ultra Test. Both tests are still being scored. The Mega Society publishes this irregularly-timed journal. The society also has a (low-traffic) members-only email list. Mega members, please contact one of the Mega Society officers to be added to the list.

For more background on Mega, please refer to Darryl Miyaguchi's "A Short (and Bloody) History of the High-IQ Societies" —

http://miyaguchi.4sigma.org/BloodyHistory/history.html

—and the official (redesigned) Mega Society page,

http://www.megasociety.org/

Noesis is the journal of the Mega Society, an organization whose members are selected by means of high-range intelligence tests.

Brian Wiksell (P.O. Box 366, Solana Beach, CA 92075) is the Administrator of the Mega Society. Inquiries regarding membership should be directed to Brian Wiksell at the aforementioned P.O. Box or the following email address: bwiksell@megasociety.org

Opinions expressed in these pages are those of individuals, not of *Noesis* or the Mega Society.

Editorial

Richard May, Ken Shea

The current issue of *Noesis* takes a look at high-range intelligence tests, the nature of creativity, the US medical system, metaphysics, information, and strange encounters (origins unknown).

In the leadoff position, the trio of Chris Cole, Richard May, and Rick Rosner once again find their seats in a roundtable discussion with Scott Douglas Jacobsen in "Debunking I.Q. Test Claims Discussion (Parts 2 & 3)".

Topics include: challenges in attempting to gauge scores above four standard deviations, the refreshingly-widespread sanity among high-I.Q. society members, the success of various Hoeflin tests, Paul Cooijmans's notion of 'associative horizon', Rick Rosner's pitch for a show prominently featuring high-I.Q. folk, messianic posturing, and incredible I.Q. claims.

──

Two important messages before moving on to the next *Noesis* contribution.

First, Chris Cole has said about the adaptive test, currently in development: 'A group of Mega members is working on this. Contact me [chris@questrel.com] if you'd like to help.'

Second, Scott Douglas Jacobsen is soliciting volunteers for interviews: 'I want to interview more of the Mega Society membership or qualifiers.' Scott is particularly interested in having a discussion with members/qualifiers who haven't been interviewed yet. If intrigued, please contact Scott at the following email address: scott.douglas.jacobsen@gmail.com

──

Moving on, Bob Williams, member of the Triple Nine Society (a fellow Hoeflin society), returns for Part 5 of an interview series with Scott Douglas Jacobsen. Issues discussed include: the possible links between psychopathology, latent inhibition, creativity, intelligence; the notion of a 'general factor' with intelligence, creativity, and personality; the nature and neurochemistry of creativity in artistic versus scientific endeavors; and, how 'the personality traits of true geniuses' and intelligence generally impacts an array of life outcomes - the good, bad, and the ugly.

Next, Benoit Desjardins, a member of the Mega Society and the OlympIQ Society, draws upon his personal clinical healthcare experience to reflect on overwork and inefficiencies in the medical sector. Within "The American Medical System and Physicians", Benoit Desjardins and Scott Douglas Jacobsen explore: the burnout and overwork epidemic in healthcare, the health effects of overwork, human rights violations, poor working conditions for physicians, the lack of real problem solving in society, and pervasive medical quackery in the United States.

After that, the founder of the Mega Society, Ronald K. Hoeflin, returns with the next five (of fifteen) chapters derived from Dr. Hoeflin's 2021 book *A Metaphysical Map of Reality*.

The last issue of *Noesis* encompassed five chapters on the natural sciences, whereas below you will find five fresh chapters on the social sciences.

"The Metaphysics of Psychology" covers, e.g., fanaticism according to Aldous Huxley, decision making, skepticism towards the 'unconscious' by satirical writer Karl Kraus, Sigmund Freud's esteem of neurosis, systematic desensitization, and the complicated nature of desire.

"The Metaphysics of Political Science" covers, e.g., the dangers of reason, diverse political factions, the dichotomy of anarchy and tyranny, the dichotomy of politics and statesmanship, and despairing insights from Will Rogers, Rodney Dangerfield, and H.L. Mencken.

"The Metaphysics of Economics" covers, e.g., cynical economic justifications for war, the occasionally-tortured intersection of economics and morality, runaway inflation, the promise of invention, economic incentives, and the chimera of unlimited economic growth, and anarchism's maximization of individual freedom.

"The Metaphysics of History" covers, e.g., Katherine Anne Porter's fatalistic take on personal history, censorship in history, the trademark satirical wit of P.J. O'Rourke, the art of historical accounting, and Mahatma Gandhi's impression of colonialism and pacifism.

"The Metaphysics of Law" covers, e.g., potential overlap of morals and law, Samuel Johnson's word on the value of law, abolition of slavery, and an assertion by the Roman statesman Cicero about the international 'consensus of opinion' and the 'law of nature'.

Then, Ken Shea ruminates on the inflated meaning the word 'information' has gathered over the latest decades in a contribution titled "On the Very Idea of Information". Can applying field theory, complexity theory, and process philosophy counterbalance the overheated jargon so prevalent among technophiles in the so-called 'Information Age'? Is the notion of such an age simply another contrivance - a contingent, self-serving, and historically-rooted narrative?

In "Summary Reflections on the Current Epistemological Crisis of Science" Ken Shea further considers the philosophical implications of information being mind-dependent.

After that, Richard May walks the reader through a series of personal reflections regarding UFO and UAP (unidentified aerial phenomena) episodes in "Non-existent Aerial Phenomena". Hypotheses about what is *actually* occurring range widely from 'flocks of geese and the planet Venus' to 'interdimensional brane-world phenomena'.

May-Tzu concludes with definitive statements in "A Flock of Geese" and "The Benediction".

The publication of the next issue of *Noesis* is tentatively scheduled for April 2023.

Noesis #210, October 2022

Contents

Debunking I.Q. Test Claims Discussion (Parts 2 & 3)

Chris Cole, Richard May, Rick Rosner & Scott Douglas Jacobsen

Chris Cole is a longstanding member of the Mega Society. Richard May is a longstanding member of the Mega Society and Co-Editor of *Noesis*: The Journal of the Mega Society. Rick Rosner is a longstanding member of the Mega Society and a former editor of *Noesis*: The Journal of the Mega Society.

They discuss: major warning signs of something awry; the minor, or subtle, warning signs; 4 standard deviations above the norm; the successes and failures of the Mega Test, the Ultra Test, the Power Test, and the Titan Test; 4 and 5 sigma above the norm; the principal design of the Adaptive Test; other extraordinary high-I.Q. societies; associative horizon; the Mega Test; the claims about the Mega Test; legitimate testing; extrapolations well beyond the norms of the mainstream tests; the motivation behind making claims well beyond the norms of the most used mainstream I.Q. tests; the more egregious I.Q. claims in 20th century; and the big lessons in debunking phony I.Q. claims.

Keywords: Adaptive Test, Aleph Society, Chris Cole, debunking, I.Q., intelligence, Keith Raniere, Marilyn vos Savant, Mega Society, Mega Test, Power Test, Richard Feynman, Richard May, Rick Rosner, standard deviation, The Plurality IQ Society, Titan Test, Ultra Test.

Scott Douglas Jacobsen: You have all been around the block. Your membership in the Mega Society has spanned decades. So, you've seen controversies, failed high-I.Q. societies, and proclamations to this-or-that I.Q., even individuals who spun off into fraudulent activities, messianic posing, and criminal behavior. As a note on collectives of high-I.Q. people, when it comes to claimed high-I.Q. societies, what are the major warning signs of something awry, not quite right, with it?

Richard May: The major warning signs of statistical and psychometric incompetence, fraud, or madness are usually quite subtle. Please see below.

Rick Rosner: You got to start with the disclaimer that most people in high-IQ societies are well-behaved, relatively normal people who like taking tests and solving puzzles, and there are only a few lunatics. And because the ones I belong to don't get together very often, you don't have a chance to see any warning signs developing.

Although, in the case of one guy from many years ago, you could see a guy who was kind of being physically dominant and, I guess, mentally dominant getting increasingly frustrated that people didn't understand him or believe his theories. So, it was just an increasing belligerence or pre-belligerence. I guess, a skosh of megalomania.

Noesis #210, October 2022

Chris Cole: The major warning signs are the ones you list: fraudulent activity, messianic posing, and criminal behavior.

Jacobsen: Following from the previous question, what are the minor, or subtle, warning signs?

May: I get slightly suspicious if someone comes up with the most brilliant Theory of Everything ever, explained in a newly invented language of neologisms, which only the inventor of the theory himself can understand, especially if the theory makes no falsifiable predictions and none of those few who claim to understand the theory can explain it in their own words. I'm also slightly suspicious of, e.g., taxi cab drivers or barbers, who have conclusively proved Einstein's theory of special and general relativity wrong.

If someone claims to be the most intelligent person in the history of our solar system or to be the actual God of the Bible, then this level of measured intelligence may be beyond the current development of psychometric science, even with the Flynn effect. I'm probably too skeptical sometimes.

Also, branding of one's associates by high-IQ types is often unnecessary in my view.

Rosner: Again, I don't hang. I have no basis or nothing to talk about regarding this. It is not like I was living with a high-IQ person who slowly went crazy, besides myself. Really, in the last few years, I've gotten less crazy, more lazy. Lazy has replaced crazy.

Cole: The minor warning signs are incredible IQ claims. As a rule of thumb anything above five sigma is not credible as is anything that has not been normed using regular statistical methods.

Jacobsen: Why is 4 standard deviations above the norm (e.g., mean 100, S.D. 15, I.Q. 160) such a difficult barrier to break in finding highly intelligent individuals?

May: Almost no one in the alleged "real world" is interested in measuring intelligence beyond the 4 sigma level. Where would you find a large sample of individuals beyond the top 1-per-30,000 level of intelligence to study? This level of intelligence is not a target level for standard IQ tests developed by psychologists. Why should it be? Which professions require IQs beyond the 4 sigma level? Even Nobels in physics probably depend more upon a mathematical ability sub-factor of general intelligence than upon super-high IQ per se. Two physics Nobel laureates didn't qualify for inclusion in Lewis Terman's study of the intellectually gifted, because their IQs were not sufficiently high! In addition Nature may sometimes not be 'politically correct'. What if cognitive differences were discovered among various human sub-groups? For example, what if a growing number of trans-species individuals, who identify as advanced AI units, were found to be better at arithmetic addition?

[Editor's Note: In 1965, Richard Feynman won the Nobel Prize in Physics. The biography of Richard Feynman by James Gleick, *Genius: The Life and Science of Richard Feynman*, has the following to say about the famous physicist, 'his score on the school IQ test was a merely respectable 125'.]

Noesis #210, October 2022

Rosner: Several reasons, one, there aren't that many people. 4-sigma level is one person in 30,000. Although, in real terms, it's less rare than that because the average IQ of people on the street is like 105 or 110. The people with IQs of 35 are institutionalized. You don't see them around. It's rare. That's one problem.

Problem two, it is hard to test. All the good high-end tests take dozens of hours to do well on. Thing two-and-a-half, many people who might score well on them might be successful and may not want to waste their time putting in 40 or 50 hours in something that doesn't compensate them.

They could be trading stocks or coding or doing business deals or getting laid. None of which taking an IQ test helps.

Cole: High range tests require high range questions which are hard to create. Plus there is not much of a market.

Jacobsen: What have been the successes and failures of the Mega Test, the Ultra Test, the Power Test, and the Titan Test in identifying highly intelligent persons – despite being compromised?

May: There is evidence that uncompromised tests work better.

Rosner: Maybe, some smart people still trickle in. The Mega Test has been compromised since, probably, the late '90s or the internet made it possible to contaminate the questions by throwing around answers in chat rooms.

The Mega Test was the most successful in finding high-IQ people because the most people took it when it was published in *Omni* magazine. 4,000 people took it. It's more than any other test ever.

Which means, though, more people have taken the Hoeflin tests than tests by any other author, though probably a strong second and possibly somebody who has overtaken Hoeflin because he has written dozens of tests is Paul Cooijmans, who has been writing tests for decades and has cranked out quite a few.

[Editor's Note: Cf. http://www.miyaguchi.4sigma.org/index.html]

Some of his tests have certainly been taken by more than 100 people. In the aggregate, thousands of people must have taken Cooijmans tests. With the success of the Hoeflin tests, they have found, depending on the cutoff, hundreds of high-IQ people.

Some of those people got together and some people were mentored by other high-IQ people, and had their lives improved, including myself. So, the success of the Hoeflin tests is the large numbers of people who have taken them.

Noesis #210, October 2022

For years, I, and sometimes with partners or being asked to consult, pitched TV involving high-IQ-type competitions. The same kind of shit as *Project Runway* or *American Idol*. A talent search, but instead of for fashion designing or culinary skill or singing skill, it was for raw intelligence.

This is an idea that comes to people not infrequently, but just has never been turned into a show. But if you had a show that did that, that would be the most successful project ever to find high-IQ people because millions of people would see the show and tens of thousands of people, if there were high-IQ tests associated with the show, would try those tests.

But that project has never happened, which I think is stupid because reality shows are about following assholes around with cameras and there are plenty of high-IQ assholes. Not as a percentage of high-IQ people who are, as I said, mostly decent, normal-ish people.

But if out of 100 people who have managed to score 160 on an IQ test, there are probably a half-dozen who you could productively, entertainingly follow around with cameras.

Cole: First of all Ron Hoeflin is a talented question framer. Next he spent a lot of effort validating his questions. Finally he normed them several different ways.

Jacobsen: In principle, what is realistically needed to test between – let's say – 4 and 5 sigma above the norm, reliably and validly?

May: Perhaps advanced AI can be used to develop significantly improved high-range intelligence tests. Other neurobiological methods of assessment of the general factor of intelligence, 'g', may eventually make IQ tests obsolete. For example, measures of biological traits such as pitch discrimination ability (of sound frequencies), among other such physical measures, have been found to have surprisingly high correlations with general intelligence. This may be the way of cognitive ability assessment in the future.

Rosner: You need experienced test-builders. You need a decent amount of people to norm the problems on, to make sure the problems can actually measure high-IQs. You need their other scores to see what scores getting those problems right correspond to.

As I said, you need some kind of widespread exposure. You have to let hundreds of thousands of people know that the test exists. Ideally, that it's something fun and/or cool to do.

Another condition is that it would be really, really helpful if the test took less than 20 hours to take. It would be helpful if someone could spend 20 hours or 10 hours on the test and score near the ceiling, which is not a common thing among these tests.

Cole: To avoid spoilage you need question schemas, not single questions. Then you need a way to automatically collect many samples. Presumably this would be on the Internet. A group of Mega members is working on this. Contact me if you'd like to help [Ed. chris@questrel.com.].

Jacobsen: What is the principal design of the Adaptive Test, inasmuch can be stated at this time? (Is this series the first announcement of the test, by the way?)

Cole: Cf. www.mental-testing.com. There are some articles in *Noesis*. Let me check with the team.

Jacobsen: What other extraordinary high-I.Q. societies have been observed by you – the highest, most inclusive, most exclusive, the most multi-planetary, least reliant on D.N.A. prejudice, most non-carbon-based, und so weiter?

May: The Plurality IQ Society

Top 0.000000000000000000000000 … % of Multiverse

Previously the highest-IQ group founded was the Aleph Society, which sought to have at most fewer than one member per Multiverse potentially qualifiable. However, the Aleph is found to be insufficiently selective in its admissions criteria for several reasons. First, it only considered 3 dimensions of space and 1 dimension of time per universe. We feel that it is necessary to include all theoretically possible multiple dimensions of spaces and of times per universe of the Multiverse.

(For multiple-time dimensions see, e.g.:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Multiple_time_dimensions

https://arxiv.org/abs/0812.389

https://bigthink.com/surprising-science/there-are-in-fact-2-dimensions-of-time-one-theoretical-physicist-states/)

Secondly, the Aleph only sought the highest IQ 'individual', including AIs, in the Multiverse 'now', i.e., at only one point in 'time' relative to one (1) observer, the Wormhole Officer (formerly called the Membership Officer). To remedy this we 'now' recognize that to whatever extent possible technologically, the Wormhole Officer must be a time traveler.

Thirdly, it is not sufficient that our psychometric instruments selecting at the Aleph level be culture free. Our IQ tests must also be genome free, i.e., free of any genetic influences upon performance. Speciesism is even more common than racism and gender-bias. We seek genetic justice in our member selection testing criteria. For example, in the past and even today, species with brains are unfairly advantaged over species without brains, including, of course, AIs. Why

should an Isaac Newton have an IQ advantage over a slug, simply because a Newton has a brain? This obvious bias must be eliminated.

NB: All of the non-members of the Plurality IQ Society are Full Non-members and Official Non-members.

Jacobsen: What is the system of thought or the psychometric philosophy behind [associative horizon](#)?

Rosner: In my mind, when you get hit with a hard problem, one that might take more than ten hours to figure out. Part of it is how many different angles can you come up with on the problem. How many parts of life can you apply? How many possible analogies can you apply? How many keys are on your key ring to approach the problem?

When he talks about associative horizon, it is how many associations can you possibly come up with, with the symbols or whatever, that constitute the problem. To some extent, taking one of these high-range tests is profiling the author, trying to figure out, maybe, them, Hoeflin problems have a Hoeflin flavor to them to let you know if you are on the right track. Other test makers have flavors similar to them, too.

It may be similar to their culture, say. The person building the problem found something in their world and boiled it down to an analogy. There is a popularish puzzle that is 7 d in a w." You have to figure out what the "d" and the "w" are. It's 'days in a week.' The problems can get tough. Another easy one. "5,280 f in an m," 'feet in a mile.'

So, "106 billion p who e l." The "e" "l" is tough. You have to figure it out. It is 'people who ever lived.' So, for a lot of IQ problems, they have at least some aspect of that. Decoding, figuring out what the symbols represent.

Then it is an exercise in figuring out what could the "p" and the 'p in e l' stand for. "6*10^23 As in an M." My numbers might not be right. But 'atoms in a mole,' it is a test of cultural literacy.

Often, there is further manipulation done to the symbols, so you have to work through two or three transformation or link two or three transformations to figure out the problem. It is how much cultural literacy do you have or do you give yourself, and then the flexibility for combining these things.

It is how much different stuff can you bring to bear on a fairly obscure or convoluted problem.

Jacobsen: How did you first come to find the Mega Test?

May: Actually I don't remember. It was about 40 years ago. I probably met Ron Hoeflin through my membership in the Triple Nine Society. This was probably my initial connection to the Mega Test.

Rosner: Some guys in my dorm told me about the Mega. I must've already been IQ braggy. Yuck.

Cole: Saw it in *Omni* Magazine.

Jacobsen: What were the claims about the Mega Test – and your score(s) in each section on it – by Ronald Hoeflin, the media, and others?

May: Ron Hoeflin told me that I was the 2nd person to obtain a perfect score on the 24 verbal analogies, I believe. I think Marilyn Vos Savant was the first. I certainly didn't tell many people, beyond my girlfriend. I remember showing a copy of the Mega Test to one young woman, thinking she might be interested. She just laughed and laughed. Neil Blincom of Mr. Pecker's original, illustrious National Enquirer tried to interview me once when I was Membership Officer of the Triple Nine Society. I pondered this offer deeply for a fraction of a second. I remembered Chris. (never forget the decimal point) Harding's interview, "World's Highest IQ Genius is an Unemployed Janitor" and decided not to be interviewed. I avoided the media.

Rosner: So, the claims were the Mega was the world's hardest IQ test. By hardest, having the highest ceiling, a perfect score would get you, for instance. I think after the sixth norming, after Ron looked at 4,000 test submissions that came through *Omni*. I think the ceiling became 190 S.D. 16 or a little over 5.6 sigma. The first time I took it, I got a 44, which was 23 verbal problems right and 1 wrong and 21 math right and 3 wrong. I took it a second time and got a 47, which was 1 math wrong, I think. It doesn't matter whether math or verbal; I got 1 wrong the second time.

[First norming by Ron: http://www.miyaguchi.4sigma.org/hoeflin/megadata/firstnorm03.jpg

Sixth norming by Ron: http://www.miyaguchi.4sigma.org/hoeflin/meganorm.html -Editor's Note]

What does that translate into for me, after the fourth or fifth norming, my 44 wasn't high enough to get me into Mega. Marilyn herself turned me down for admission. My score might have corresponded to 172. Then after the sixth norming, after all these scores came in, I think a 44 got you a 180. I think the Mega cutoff is a 176. There you go. The 1-in-a-million level. Next question.

Cole: *Omni* called it the "world's hardest IQ test." Interpretation of scores can be found in Hoeflin's normings.

Jacobsen: How does the internet complicate legitimate testing in the high-range?

May: The internet facilitates cheating on tests and meeting other cheaters to work with.

Rosner: The Mega came out in '85. The Titan, the sequel to the Mega, came out in '90. Most people got on the internet in the mid-to-late-'90s. For those tests, it complicated and contaminated them because people went on message boards and threw answers around. Some of which were correct. That was problem one. Problem two was once Google came along; you could put in the words to the analogy and the fourth word would pop up. The analogies were half of the Titan and the Mega.

The 24 verbal problems were all analogies of the type "find the fourth word." Most of those could be instantly solved using a decent search engine. Tests are different. The Cooijmans tests, which I consider the most challenging of the internet-era tests, can't simply be solved by plugging things into a search engine. You still have to figure a lot of shit out. The most general issue with these tests and the internet is just sharing answers. Beyond that, it is a pain in the ass to make sure that the problems on the test can't be solved through easy searches. Chris Cole and his group of people, who are working on this test that are resistant to having answers shared, are working on tests that give each test-taker the same general problem, but the specifics of the problem are fresh. So, somebody else's answer on this problem is not going to help you because, even though the problem should score the same – getting it right should reflect the same IQ level, you can't just post what you got on answer 12. They've been working on that for well over a decade.

It's coming along. Anyway, next question.

Cole: The Mega and Titan tests have been spoiled on the Web. The Power and Ultra tests are at risk.

Jacobsen: Some, in fact more than a few, claim extrapolations well beyond the norms of the mainstream tests, e.g., the WAIS and the SB, which cap out at or around 4-sigma. Assuming legitimacy of the claims, then, the individuals would be highly intelligent, but the claims can range between a little over 4-sigma to 6-sigma. How is this extrapolation generally seen within the high-I.Q. communities at the higher ranges?

May: I don't know how others generally perceive unsound or bogus extrapolations of IQ scores.

Rosner: I think the skepticism of super-high scores is generally more for specific claims than for the entire idea of being able to have an IQ that high. I think most people in the high-IQ community believe it is possible to have an IQ close to 200. But I think most people also have a reasonable idea of the rarity of scores like that. Adult IQs, the deviation scores, are based on a bell curve, where between 0 and 1 standard deviation, you have 34% of the population in a bell-shaped distribution for something like height. Between 1 and 2 SDs, you've got 14% of the population. Between 2 and 3, you've got about 1.5% of the population. Between 3 and 4, you've got roughly one-half percent of the population.

Let's see, about 4 SDs, that's only one person in 30,000 should score above 4 SDs. One person in 3,000,000 above 5 SDs. What is it? 1 person in 750,000,000 above 6 SD or so; somewhere, I've fucked it up, according to the standard bell curve. People also like to say that at the very far ends; there are more outliers than on the normal bell curve. That there are more high-IQs than would be given if it were a perfectly bell-shaped distribution.

But even so, you shouldn't see more than a half-dozen or ten or twelve or whatever, people, with scores above 6 SDs. So, Paul Cooijmans has the Giga Society, which has 7 or 8 members. It is for people with IQs that are supposed to be one in a billion. So, there are 8 billion people on Earth, 8 members of the Giga Society, so that makes a certain sense, but not really. That's as if everybody who could score at that level has taken one of his tests. That's just obviously not true. So, way too many people scoring at the one in a billion level. It's not like the Giga Society has 300 members.

Cooijmans is pretty rigorous in his norming and testing. So, if you have taken a Cooijmans test and scored at or close to the Giga Society, legitimately, Cooijmans has written in the past about people's attempts to cheat on his tests, but I don't think there has been a successful attempt in decades. So, people are pretty accepting that if you get a Giga level score on his tests; that you're legitimately pretty smart. The claims of super high-IQs, there are legit claims based on performing well on ultra-high IQ tests or kicking ass as a kid on a test like the Stanford-Binet or the Wechsler. Someone can say, "As a kid, I scored a 200," or something.

That's another thing I won't go into. People who claim high-IQ scores and are lying are generally not sophisticatedly lying. They're saying something that cannot hold up at all. I don't know if there are many or any sophisticated lies about having a super-high-IQ. So, then there are people outside the high-IQ community who are skeptical about the whole thing, but no one is really worried a lot about it, because: who gives a shit?

Also, if you want to say something, or know something that I'm not aware of, that contradicts what I'm saying, go ahead.

[Editor's Note: See 'IQ Percentile and Rarity Chart' here: https://www.iqcomparisonsite.com/IQtable.aspx]

Cole: Hoeflin's norms all involve some extrapolation. I find it reasonable up to the Mega level (about 4.75 standard deviations).

Jacobsen: Following from the previous question, what seems like the motivation behind making claims well beyond the norms of the most used mainstream I.Q. tests?

May: It's a shame Einstein did physics. He could have been on Facebook (now called Meta, I guess).

Rosner: Going off my own experience, I kind of felt like a loser based on when I was about 20. I'd fucked up a lot of opportunities for myself. Then somebody told me about the previous

world's hardest IQ test, which was a Kevin Langdon test. It ran in *Omni* or *Games* Magazine. I took it and scored 170. I went, 'Wow, that's a good score.' When Mega came along, I took that. I liked that validation that it gave me. Even though it is a ridiculous thing, I kind of feel like it might be analogous to a guy who can bench press 500 lbs.

It's kind of a goofy thing. You wouldn't tell that guy it is goofy to his face, but the Sven Magnason. He is 6'4" and weighs 310 lbs. and eats 200 grams of protein a day to get that or support that huge bench press and has hypertension and his joints will be fucked in 10 years. It's a kind of a goofy thing. It is amazing the guy can bench 500 lbs. It is this ridiculous thing. It is a very obscure sport. Sven Magnason is not playing in the NFL for 1.8 million USD a year. He probably works in a warehouse and does strength training on the side.

It doesn't translate into the kind of fame or success that you might want. So, it is a niche kind of sport.

Cole: Vanity is one motivation.

Jacobsen: What are some of the more egregious I.Q. claims in 20th century by groups and by individuals? This is a free forum.

May: In the 20th century — maybe being the smartest man in America was a fairly egregious claim. Top 1 per billion high-IQ societies may qualify if such came into existence in the 20th century.

Rosner: I don't know. Anybody can go on the internet and type whatever they want. One of the craziest claims I saw I mentioned before: Somebody had a site or has a site claiming Jesus had an IQ of 300. The idea that somebody with the deep wisdom of Jesus meant Jesus had a huge IQ. His estimate based on nothing: If smartest people have an IQ of 200, then Jesus must have an IQ of 300. William Sidis, people claim 259 based on extreme achievements as a young person, at least it is based on his history and is a fairly earnest attempt to estimate a very smart young man's IQ.

It is kind of egregious and not based on him being tested. Oh! Some of the most egregious are in the last 15 years; some insane moms, one mom out of Colorado, maybe 18 years ago, got a hold of the answer key to an earlier edition of the Stanford-Binet. Stanford-Binet gets revised every 15 or 20 years. I don't know. You can still find psychologists who will give an earlier version. In the stacks of libraries. Probably, the Norlin Library at the University of Colorado, she found an earlier edition, found an answer key. Then taught her kid all the answers, so, that kid scored, at age 3 or 4, like a 10-year-old, which, the way they calculate childhood IQs, gave him an IQ well over 300. She tried to get herself and her kid famous off this.

It, eventually, fell apart because the kid did not have a 300 IQ. So, that is pretty egregious. But! Doable if you're not an idiot about it, I believe. But anybody who would do it would be a kind of idiot. First of all, I don't know. How much would a 4-year-old be into it? But if you took a

6-year-old and got a 6-year-old into it, "We're going to ride this pony into a T.V. show, your acting career." It has never happened, but it is not impossible. Because Alicia Witt was a child actor, an actor now. Great actor and great kid actor, one of the things that makes for a great kid actor is a 4-year-old who can read.

Because if you can give a 4-year-old – Alicia Witt could read at 3 – a script and the kid can read the script and memorize the script rather than having to be told shit line by line, and if the kid is smart enough to do that, then the kid is smart enough to take direction. Alicia Witt was at least a kid actor because she was super fucking smart. So, I'm thinking if you had a motivated 6-year-old and a creepy parent. I even started working on a screenplay on this or thought about it 30 years ago as a good plot. Like a lot of shit I do, I didn't do anything with it, except the mom did it and a shitty job in real life.

The right combination of psychopathic parent and bright, motivated kid. That team could believably sustain the bullshit that that kid has an IQ of 300+ for quite a while. Although, nobody has done that. Yes, that would be egregious.

Cole: Before they were banned by Wikipedia, there were many articles by groups making incredible IQ claims.

Jacobsen: What seem like the big lessons in debunking phony I.Q. claims from the 20th century?

May: "The first principle is that you must not fool yourself and you are the easiest person to fool." — Richard P. Feynman

Rosner: [Laughing] A lot of stuff underlying a lot about high-IQ is "Why?" Why claim to have a high-IQ? Why work your ass off to get a super high score on these tests? Why sweat debunking it? In retrospect, you can see why you might want to hold people who might claim super-high-IQs up to scrutiny, at least given Raniere, the NXVIM sex cult, swindler of the Bronfman's who is in prison for life now. One of the pillars of his duping people was using a high score on the Mega Test to claim to be one of the smartest people on Earth, though he didn't really push it.

Because once he gathered enough acolytes, I don't know enough about him to know how often he dragged out his IQ. But it seems that once he was surrounded by dozens of followers; that he didn't need to do that. He could rely on his charisma and manipulation skills, and also being at the top of a pyramid of people with good manipulation skills. He was smart enough to recruit charismatic actors, TV stars. A couple actors from *Smallville*. People with actual show biz careers. One of his selling points and one of the selling points of Scientology can help you succeed professionally in shit where what it takes to succeed, like acting, can seem nebulous. So, he didn't need to haul out his IQ a lot because he was surrounded by TV stars who were helping him recruit other people into his cult. He, certainly, deserved a lot of scrutiny, perhaps a lot sooner than he got the scrutiny. There's another guy who is pretty culty who has a bunch of

acolytes who espoused a bunch of scary shit. So, that's one reason to scrutinize claims of super-high-IQ because people can be up to no good, but those people are fairly rare. Of the 60, 80, 100, people who have qualified for the Mega Society over the past 40 years, 95 or more percent of them are completely normal, undangerous people.

The biggest danger might be that they might be really funny, like Richard May, is a completely decent guy who happens to be extra smart and extra funny. Super-high-IQ people mostly aren't to be feared. What were we talking about? I always talk myself way away from the question.

[Question repeated by Jacobsen.]

That, I guess, let the babies have their bottles for the most part, let high-IQ people be high-IQ people, it doesn't hurt anyone, except for a few cases. Those involved in IQ fraud, the fraud is pretty transparent.

Most of the high-IQ lying is some desperate asshole who is 25 and going to undergraduate parties at his school. That guy finds a freshman girl and says, "Oh, people don't understand me. I have a 205 IQ. I graduated high school at age 5." It's that abject bullshit. There are more sophisticated attempts, but not that much more. Because the payoffs are pretty low. Even lower than getting a hand job from a freshman girl, the end.

Cole: "It's hard to be right." — Richard Feynman

[End of Part 2 of Discussion]

Chris Cole, Rick Rosner, and Richard May discuss: fraudulent activity; messianic posing; criminal behavior; the three interpenetrating cubes problem; above 4 standard deviations above the norm; the hardest IQ test; and IQ.

Scott Douglas Jacobsen: What would you define as fraudulent activity in a high-IQ community or an individual?

Rick Rosner: Making claims that you know aren't supported by your performance on tests.

Chris Cole: Fraud takes many forms just as it does in common law. Because of the Internet, tests with fixed questions are particularly vulnerable to cheating.

Richard May: I have nothing to add.

Jacobsen: What would you define as messianic posing in a similar regard?

Rosner: If you end up with a cult, that's messianic posing.

Cole: The common language definition of messianic behavior will serve.

May: I have nothing to add.

Jacobsen: Similarly, what about criminal behavior?

Rosner: If you end up in jail for the rest of your life, if the FBI has a thick dossier on you because you are considered a potential threat in certain ways, that's criminal behavior. The FBI has dossiers on lots of people because, historically, the FBI has done good things and asshole things.

So, if they have a dossier on you, because you're a legitimate psycho who has the potential to do bodily harm to people for some weird political reason, then there you go.

Cole: Again I have nothing to add here to the common language definition of criminal behavior.

May: I have nothing to add.

Jacobsen: On the Mega Test, why was the three interpenetrating cubes problem seen as the most difficult?

[Editor's Note: http://www.miyaguchi.4sigma.org/hoeflin/megadata/top100.html

The three-cubes problem is number 36/48 on the Mega Test.

Cf. http://www.miyaguchi.4sigma.org/hoeflin/megadata/bestitems.html]

Noesis #210, October 2022

Rosner: It is widely agreed that the three interpenetrating cubes problem was the hardest problem on the test. So, the problem that is agreed upon as likely being the correct answer has not, as far as I know, been proven to be the correct answer.

Interestingly, you can look it up. It depends on what shit is online. But at various times since the '90s, it has been agreed upon that the correct answer is floating out there. But you can't be sure that you've found the consensus correct answer.

But the figure, the geometric figure, that corresponds to the consensus correct answer can be found in popular culture, but I won't tell you where.

Cole: It's the only problem on the test where the answer that Ron accepts has not been proven. There are a few of these on the Titan.

May: It was certainly the most difficult, but my spatial ability is not sufficiently high to understand why this is so.

Jacobsen: Above 4 standard deviations above the norm, why should there be more scrutiny more than any other cutoff?

Rosner: Isn't there some claim that "extraordinary claims require extraordinary evidence"? You could argue that because claiming to have one of the world's highest IQs gets you more than claiming to have a 120 IQ.

In practical terms, not so often, it can get you on a quiz show. It can get you on the cover of *Esquire* magazine. It can get you interviewed. It can get you on TV. It kind of got me laid once. I was going to get laid anyway. But it was part of that package that got me laid, I guess.

Cole: A credible high range score requires credible high range test questions, which are hard to formulate and norm.

May: I have nothing to add.

Jacobsen: What was the hardest IQ test you've ever taken in the high-range? What lesson can be learned for test-makers from this?

Rosner: I say that I've had a lot of success, but I'd say that I've had the most difficulty with Cooijmans' tests. Because he brings in stuff from a lot of areas. I don't want to say too much about his tests because he doesn't want people talking about his tests and helping other people. But by the time the Mega Test had been published in *Omni*, it had been through a number of revisions with hinky problems getting knocked out or revised until they were clear and bullet-proof. The answers were tight. I think Cooijmans talks about the pleasure of when an answer clicks into place: that click of satisfaction of when you know you found the answer.

Noesis #210, October 2022

I would say that on some of Cooijmans' problems. The click is, maybe, not as loud as on some Hoeflin problems. On Cooijmans' problems, you can find some really good answers that aren't as good as the intended answer. That's, maybe, the mark of one type of really good ultra-high-IQ test.

That there are stopping points. On multiple choice tests, those are called distractors. There are answers among the choices that seem right for various reasons if you're taking desperate stabs at an answer.

On high-IQ tests, you can come up with answers that make a lot of sense. But do they make as much sense as the intended answer? No. But you've fallen for an inferior answer. On tough tests, a lot of problems on hard tests are finding the signal among the noise.

I'm writing a book in which somebody or the recipient of what he thinks is a coded message, thinks that it is a true message because it is based on the first letters of four consecutive sentences. That spell out a word.

The odds that this would happen by chance are 26 to the 6th power, which is 676 squared, which is 400,000 to 1. Then you have to knock that down because there are a zillion four-letter words. So, anyway, the odds are tens of thousands to one that it's not a coded message, especially since it is specific to the character situation.

So, the character reasons that it is likely a true signal. And on a tough IQ problem, you'd like the numerical coincidences to have an unlikelihood of, at least, 1 in a 1,000. When you look at a number sequence, you see a pattern. Then you say, "What are the odds that this pattern would arise by chance?"

On some super-hard IQ problems, there are more than one pattern to be found. Again, you have to ask yourself, "Was this intentional or accidental?" A tough-ass IQ problem really pushes the limit in finding the signal among the noise.

Cole: The only high range test I took was the Mega.

May: The Mega Test and the L.A.I.T. are the only high range tests I've ever taken.
I did not distinguish myself on the latter.

Jacobsen: Is IQ declining in importance now?

Rosner: IQ as IQ is declining in importance because it is a product of the middle of the 20th century when people really believed in it and used it to skip kids a grade, or not, to put them in gifted classes, get admission to magnet schools.

At some point, probably in the '50s, you might be able to get laid by your IQ. Since debunked, it has a greasy feeling about it, weirdo, creepazoid. The Cal. State schools, today, decided to get rid of the ACT and SAT altogether and the SAT is an IQ surrogate.

They decided it is not helpful, not worth the shit people go through to prepare for the tests. We can see enough about a student without some IQ surrogate in their admission packet. I'd say intelligence is increasing in importance because we are tiptoeing up to artificial intelligence.

When we talk about AI – and AI is a misnomer right now; AI means "machine learning." Eventually, AI will mean "Artificial Intelligence." We will need ways to mathematicize and to come up with metrics of the power of thought in brains and in other stuff.

So, old school IQ declining; new school AI shit increasing.

Cole: IQ seems to be about as important now as it was when I was young. The SAT has some problems because it has become easy to improve a score via tutoring, but that is being addressed.

May: There is a theoretical possibility that Nature, specifically natural selection might not be entirely "politically correct." Theoretically there could be differences among human groups that evolved under different conditions. E.g., If only females could bear children, then males would be the expendable 'gender'. A small number of healthy males could impregnate a large number of females and the group would survive. A large number of males, if males did not bear children, and a small number of females would not allow the group to survive. Hence, there could be more variability among males, including cognitive variability, because males would be more expendable, than among females, i.e., there would be more male 'geniuses' and more male idiots.

Fortunately we now realize that there are no biological differences between males and females. Gender is a purely social construct. We now realize that men can menstruate and have babies too, if given a chance. The only important differences are among large numbers of pronouns, all referring to identical nouns.

Bob Williams Interview (Part 5)

Bob Williams & Scott Douglas Jacobsen

Bob Williams is a Member of the Triple Nine Society, Mensa International, and the International Society for Philosophical Enquiry. He discusses: schizotypal traits; schizotypal personality traits and temperament; the prominent tests of creativity; impulsively nonconformist and prone to divergent thought; measuring creativity; creativity over the lifespan; BigC (true genius); Johnson and Bouchard; negative correlation between very high levels of creativity and very high levels of intelligence in brain efficiency; PFIT; Wai, Lubinsky, and Benbow; Rex Jung; Arthur Jensen; original creative insights into a unified work; developmental cascade effects; drugs; true genius tend to isolation; true genius tend towards no progeny; high intelligence or high creativity; cold hard truths; countries leaders.

Keywords: Arthur Jensen, Benbow, Bob Williams, Bouchard, creativity, genius, intelligence, I.Q., Johnson, Lubinski, PFIT, Rex Jung, schizotypy, Wai.

Scott Douglas Jacobsen: With schizotypal traits and temperament as an association with creativity, is it possible to parse schizotypal traits into the individual traits to associate with some common, accepted definitions of creativity?

Bob Williams: Schizotypy is associated with verbal and artistic creativity. There are presumably some who have, nonetheless, shown a more technical form of creativity. John Nash, comes to mind. The form of schizophrenia known as Introvertive Anhedonia is negatively associated with creativity. The commonly found association between schizotypy and creativity is that there is a reduced latent inhibition.

Measuring and predicting outcomes relating to creativity is more difficult than doing those things relative to intelligence, because intelligence is a very general trait that is well understood structurally (as in a hierarchical factor analysis). The thing that schizophrenia and intelligence have in common is that they are both additive polygenic traits and, therefore, can be measured via polygenic scores. The best material I have seen on the genetics of traits is Robert Plomin *Blueprint: How DNA Makes Us Who We Are*, Penguin Books Ltd., 2018. Plomin mentioned that today schizophrenia, like autism, is treated as a spectrum. In this book, Plomin commented: "In several diverse populations the researchers found that people with high polygenic scores for schizophrenia were more likely to be in creative professions."

It is my understanding that the ratio of highly creative people with schizophrenia to non-creative people with schizophrenia is small. Even so there is a clear link.

Jacobsen: Following from the previous question, if we do so, what do particular parsed aspects of schizotypal personality traits and temperament tell us about their association or correlation with creativity?

Williams: As I mentioned in the first answer, the most important link is a lowered inhibitory function. This particular trait is discussed repeatedly in *The Cambridge Handbook of the Neuroscience of Creativity* (2018) Rex E. Jung (Editor), Oshin Vartanian (Editor). But, if you ask a psychologist about the traits associated with schizophrenia, he will probably list other behaviors, such as hallucinations, disorganized thinking, extremely disorganized or abnormal motor behavior, thought and movement disorders, etc.

This is a related, side topic: In the book referenced above, Kyaga mentioned that people majoring in technical fields, more often than others, had siblings with autism. This suggests a path from a spectrum behavior that involves shared genes that lead to elevated ability in those who share the genes, but where the spectrum disorder prevents it from showing up in the affected (autistic) person. There may be a similar finding relative to creativity and schizophrenia. In fact there may be good studies of such a relationship, but I have either not seen them or have forgotten the source.

I think the best way to describe the relationships between schizophrenia and creativity is to note that among true geniuses, elevated levels of schizophrenia are helpful or even essential. But if one observes the presence of schizophrenia in an individual, there is not the same high probability (the presence of high creativity). To me, the zones between the elevated levels of psychosis and neurosis (per Hans Eysenck) and elevated standing on the schizophrenia spectrum seem to be either overlapping or identical.

Jacobsen: Do any of the prominent tests of creativity truly measure creativity? Are these reliable and valid, or simply leaving more questions unanswered?

Williams: The answer to that question strikes me as depending on the perspective of the observer. In the most basic sense, the tests of creativity consist of tests of remote association, fluency, divergent thinking, etc., which are not direct measures of creativity. From the perspective of a researcher who wants a wide range of abilities shown (low to high ability), the Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking (and similar tests) produces this kind of measurement. This is where the issue of artistic creativity and scientific creativity can be seen. A test, such as the TTCT will produce similar results for people in science or in arts, so the researcher may be quite happy with the results as measuring "creativity," even when the kinds of creativity are very different.

Although some researchers argue that intelligence is a factor in creativity, the more important factor is personality, as measured by the Big Five. The most important of these five is Openness to experience and Conscientiousness (a negative indicator).

[Five factors are: openness, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism. -Ed. Note]

Noesis #210, October 2022

For the record, a few of the other tests that are used for measuring creativity:

Divergent Thinking (a general category)

Remote Associations Test (a general category)

Creative Personality Scale

Creative Achievement Questionnaire (CAQ; a self report)

―――

Jacobsen: If someone is impulsively nonconformist and prone to divergent thought patterns, do these necessarily imply a higher creativity?

Williams: I think the answer is "not." As with other behavioral relationships, there is a statistically higher probability of the co-occurrence of nonconformity and creativity, but I doubt that this is a necessary pair. Sometimes we see the unusual behavior and tend to generalize it, while we simultaneously ignore normal behavior paired with creativity (or another variable). When ability increases to the point of astonishing achievement (creativity), I expect that the odds of seeing very unusual behaviors increases to the point that there is at least some present. It is difficult to reach a confident conclusion about such trait correlations without proper statistical studies to show how strong an effect is and how it may vary between groups and life conditions. Most educated people are familiar with a lot of the names of artistic and scientific geniuses, but may not know the details of their lives.

Another aspect of behaviors is that, if we look closely at individuals we would consider to be not extreme, everyday folks, we would still find lots of unusual behaviors, including some that might happen more often among highly creative people. My take on Plomin's comments about spectrums of traits is that these apply to many of the things we observe in both exceptional and "normal" people.

Jacobsen: If experts are measuring creativity or proposing measurements for creativity within the human population, technically, these could be scaled for comparison, not necessarily a Gaussian curve or something like this, but this seems like a natural consequence. Some people score higher on a creativity measurement than others, whether quantitative or qualitative, so would count as more creative. Yet, the question arises about lifespan effects. In that, some aspects of creativity may decline over time, remain stagnant, or may increase over time. In principle, is ranking creativity a prospect before us?

Williams: Any test that has some validity in measuring creativity will produce a distribution. The exact shape of the distribution may vary as a function of how the test is designed and the population to which it is applied. I have never seen a creativity distribution curve, such as the ones that are commonly shown in intelligence literature. If we think about the likely output of a

biographical list of honors received for creative work, I would expect that it would show a near zero value for most people and only show positive results for people who are obviously creative. In the sense that we can see creativity, it mirrors intelligence in the sense that it is not hard to identify someone who is shockingly brilliant or who is obviously retarded. Tests are not needed and even middle level effects (above or below average) are obvious enough that our observations are unlikely to vary much from measurements. In the case of creativity, I think someone can easily see brilliant composition and see that most people show much less ability.

Jacobsen: What happens to creativity over the lifespan?

Williams: Age effects presumably show up in various categories of creativity. It certainly happens in scientific creativity. As for artistic creativity, I am less confident that it is a strong effect. It is easy enough to recall conductors who continued to perform with little decline in quality, up to near the end of their lives. I can think of some classical music performers who did much the same. The things that the brain has to do to create art are certainly different than the things it has to do to write and solve equations that describe the physical universe. We see that Nobel Prizes (in science) are overwhelmingly given for work that was done early in life. Einstein's Miracle Year (1905) included four profound papers that changed physics; he was 26 years old.

Jacobsen: Who does Piffer count as BigC (true genius)? What are his examples of ProC via professions and creative people in them?

Williams: I recall a mention of a few true geniuses in a paper that was probably Piffer, but I don't know if I still have it or not. The ProC category includes both the arts and the sciences. Most people are more familiar with the true geniuses in the arts and sciences.

ProC, as I understand his meaning, is a category that is not about genius, but about people who are able to have successful careers that are based on their high levels of creativity. The names of these people will be known to many of their career peers, but not to the general public. Those who are widely known are usually those who were closely covered by the news media (various reasons, often unrelated to their actual creative output).

Jacobsen: Akin to Johnson and Bouchard's work showing the top 5 g loadings, does a similar factorization exist for creativity within measurements of creativity? This is a helpful representation of an advancement on the research of g, as 1) a factor in life and 2) a consistently measurable phenomenon in global information processing within the remit of the human nervous system.

Williams: As we discussed in an earlier set, Piffer has argued that a general factor is unlikely. Researchers have done principal components analysis and factor analysis relating to creativity, but I have not seen claims that they have found and shown expert agreement that there is a general factor. These have clusters of related traits that might define a factor that is common to the clustered components. Certainly, there is little mention of a general factor in the creativity

literature. There is more support for a general factor of personality (Rushton was writing about this near the end of his life.), but papers on personality are not focused on a general factor of personality in the same way as is common in intelligence research.

Intelligence is powerfully related to quality of life and achievement. At low IQ, life outcomes can be harsh, but this doesn't happen for low creativity. A person with very little creative ability may still have a happy and productive life, unless that lack of creativity is the direct result of low intelligence. Creativity matters when it is high enough to sustain a livelihood or to produce an eminent artist, engineer, or scientist (as we previously discussed). Below the Pro-C level creativity is much less important at the individual level.

Relating to Johnson and Bouchard's work, I learned something from Wendy Johnson that I had previously overlooked. The loading of a given factor is dependent on the structure of the test from which it was extracted. For example, if there are more or fewer test items that relate to a given broad ability, that broad ability will show a higher or lower g loading. This explains some of the differences that are reported for the g loadings of various factors. In their work, Johnson and Bouchard used the largest battery of tests that has ever been reported and extracted a structure of intelligence that is probably the most true to nature that exists. The reason I was discussing this with Wendy was that I was curious about the high g loading of the Pedigrees test. Bouchard mentioned the test multiple times as the highest g loading of any test. I later discussed it with him and learned how the test works and that it dates back to the relatively early days of intelligence test development.

Jacobsen: Could there be a negative correlation between very high levels of creativity and very high levels of intelligence in brain efficiency? Where, a highly intelligent brain uses less energy than a less intelligent one to come to a more parsimonious answer to a problem. Whereas, a highly creative person may require more resources burned in their brain to construct more elaborate novel constructs. If so, this would imply a disjunction between high intelligence and high creativity. Unless, a highly intelligent brain with high creativity, somehow, does require less energy than a highly intelligent and less creative person, but still would need less to get a creative result than an unintelligent person with high creativity.

Williams: That's an interesting thought. I don't think there are any studies of glucose metabolism as a function of creative output. I think the problem lies in the nature of the end product. In the case of intelligence, Haier's work shows that more efficient brains are more intelligent. This initial hypothesis has turned out to be a general condition in which various measures of brain efficiency show that high efficiency (in networks, tissue integrity, etc.) is an indication of high intelligence. These observations necessarily apply to narrow tests, such as doing a puzzle, and not to complex end results, such as designing a rocket engine or writing artificial intelligence software. Such tasks happen over long time periods. But we can relate the lab experiment (efficiency measurement) to the very long task because the task is strongly related to a latent trait (g). Without efficiency measurements (they may exist, but I haven't seen them) for creativity, we have the relationship between established creative ability and multiple end products, but the efficiency part is missing. A number of relatively recent papers have

argued that there is a connection between intelligence and creativity, which may provide an indirect link to brain efficiency.

My impression is that some creative people work very fast and some plod along with lots of revisions, but both manage to reach finished works that meet the face value of high level creativity. I once watched a film of Picasso painting and was amazed at the speed with which he created a painting, but he would then overpaint it multiple times (also quickly). We occasionally read about symphonies and novels that were produced over long spans of time and those (Mozart) that were done quickly. It is not obvious that brain efficiency is a factor in these, but it may account for such differences. Curiously, Jensen described how Beethoven started the composition of a symphony from a simple structure, then went over it repeatedly, making changes that increased its complexity and appeal, until the final version was achieved. This is similar to what Picasso was doing, except that Picasso did not add complexity but simply changed the impact of the painting repeatedly, until he had a result that suited his intent.

The efficiency hypothesis may, in fact, be reversed for creative output. It is the inefficient brain that is likely to bring in more remote associations because of low tissue integrity, less efficient networks, and low inhibition. These are probably going to cause increased glucose uptake rates in the brain.

Jacobsen: With the PFIT network as important for intelligence and problem solving, could there be a generic partially diffuse network rather than a singular structure (a lobe, etc.) responsible for much of the conscious problem solving determined as intelligence or I.Q., where much of the rest of the brain is devoted to sensing, motor skills, and feeling? Something like a diffuse network functioning outward from BA10 for conscious discrimination and associational matrix problem solving making sense of the data fed through BA10 through a field of conscious thought.

Williams: Network study is a big thing now that researchers have tools to study white matter tracts (diffusion tensor imaging in particular). The network that I have seen mentioned repeatedly, in connection with creativity, is the default mode network. It clearly plays a role in creativity. Some studies have focused on the interplay between networks, suggesting rapid switching from one network to another, in much the same way as early computers used task switching when they did not have preemptive multitasking. My guess is that, with increasing study and improved imaging tools, there will be models based on networks, switching, and interplay. These presumably will also involve creative task execution. Given the central role of BA10 in intelligence, I would assume that it is also central to creative processing and performs the same integration function.

Jacobsen: How important are Wai, Lubinsky, and Benbow, currently, to the higher study of intelligence?

Williams: They have a near monopoly on the topic. Most intelligence research is focused on the middle of the IQ spectrum. Julian Stanley started the Study of Mathematically Precocious Youth

when Camilla Benbow was working with him (probably a student). SMPY became a longitudinal study that had 5 cohort groups. Benbow inherited ownership of the ongoing study from him and it continues today as the most productive study of very bright individuals. It has been ongoing for about 50 years, so there are data for important life outcomes. One of the most significant findings of the study is that there is a large difference within the top 1% of intelligence, favoring increasing intelligence. Among the variables that increase with increasing intelligence are the number of doctorates, peer reviewed publications, STEM publications, STEM doctorates, income, and STEM tenure.

Jacobsen: How does Rex Jung see the different forms of creativity scientific and artistic emergent from a single source in creativity, so fundamentally the same?

Williams: When I asked him if he thought that artistic creativity and scientific creativity are the same, he said "yes." I think this was based on the two things he used as primary markers: the alternative uses test and the Creative Achievement Questionnaire. With those two items, the difference (scientific/artistic) is presumably not evident.

Jacobsen: How did Arthur Jensen see intelligence as more integral to scientific creativity than artistic creativity, so, in a sense different from Jung, something more fundamental to scientific endeavours than artistic?

Williams: As I recall, Jensen believed that intelligence was not a significant factor in artistic creativity, but was probably a significant factor in scientific creativity. My perspective on this is that the depth of knowledge of a scientific discipline is strongly correlated with intelligence and that knowledge is an essential ingredient in manipulating scientific ideas. Creativity in science is often seen in the formation of an unlikely hypothesis, followed by the task of validating it from experiments and mathematical models. If we compare that to the creativity of an artist, we see that art demands idea generation that makes a subjective impression on the viewer. This is quite different from the scientific product that is supported by testing, replication, modeling, etc. In science, there is nothing subjective about getting something right; there is a subjective zing to seeing the brilliance of new insight.

Jacobsen: Based on your speculation, how would individual flashes of creativity integrated over time with non-creative activity provide a basis for comprehension of creativity regarding output? In this sense, intelligent integrative activity would be necessary, not for creativity, but for unifying the original creative insights into a unified work.

Williams: As a speculation, I would say "yes." In any case, "intelligent integrative activity" would be necessary for combining the "multiple flashes of creativity." This idea would be an interesting one for someone to pursue as a study. I doubt that it has been done and imagine that it would at least be possible, using an approach such as interviews, self-reports, etc.

Jacobsen: What about developmental cascade effects? Where, a singular large change in a brain network or structure in early life alters overall brain structure and processing through development into full maturity leading to a much more novel neurology compared to the general population. I would assume this happening in dysfunctional ways more than functional ways as a matter of the law of averages.

Williams: It certainly makes sense that this would turn out badly most of the time. One way that such developmental issues can be observed is via fluctuating anisotropy (FA). This is commonly used in biological sciences as an indicator of developmental instability. It is simply a measure of non-symmetry, based on bones in the wrists, ankles, etc. The idea is to measure where there is little fat. More FA means lower IQ (and other issues). The correlation with IQ varies widely from about zero to 0.40. One reason for the range of correlations is that head size is a confound. There is a similar relationship between facial symmetry and IQ. Various studies have found that people can guess IQ from photographs of faces. And one study showed that childhood environmental factors are associated with SES. These generally support the notion of early developmental problems having long-term impact on the individual.

Jacobsen: Are there drugs, prescription or not, that, in fact, increase creativity for the duration of efficacy in the body?

Williams: Yes. One of the well known factors is alcohol. I even recall a study of creativity among people who were evaluated when they were drunk. In *The Cambridge Handbook of the Neuroscience of Creativity* there are discussions of particularly strong drinking problems among writers. This book also discusses clinical drugs that have some impact (positive and negative) on creativity. These generally fall into categories of dopaminergic drugs, sedatives, serotonin reuptake inhibitors, antidepressants, moodstabolizing drugs, and the often mentioned recreational drugs (remember the 60s). This category is an example of an inverted U distribution, where more of the drug is initially beneficial, but a point is reached when the impact of the drug (on creativity) declines because the individual becomes impaired.

Jacobsen: Why does true genius tend to isolation?

Williams: Various researchers have written about the personalities of true genius. These rare creative people typically suffer from nasty dispositions. Jensen: "In many creative geniuses, this potential for actual psychosis is usually buffered and held in check by certain other traits, such as a high degree of ego strength. That psychoticism is a constellation of characteristics that persons may show to varying degrees; such persons may be aggressive, cold, egocentric, impersonal, impulsive, antisocial, unempathic, toughminded, and creative. This is not a charming picture of genius, perhaps, but a reading of the biographies of some of the most famous geniuses attests to its veracity." [Benbow, C. P., & Lubinski, D. J. (Eds.). (1996). *Intellectual Talent: Psychometric and Social Issues*. Johns Hopkins University Press.]

Jacobsen: Why does true genius tend towards no progeny?

Williams: The personality traits of true geniuses (discussed above) do not bode well for a social life and may be at least part of the explanation for why they often do not marry. There is a well established negative correlation between IQ and fertility rate (measured relative to women) which has been argued in the literature as the cause of a slow but real decline in mean IQ in developed nations. In the case of geniuses, this is presumably a factor.

Jacobsen: If you could pick only one high intelligence or high creativity, which would you choose?

Williams: For me, the answer is simple: intelligence. The reason is simply that the baggage that accompanies high creativity is not appealing. In general, higher intelligence leads to mostly desirable life outcomes, while high creativity often does not.

Jacobsen: What are the cold hard truths known about intelligence research and about theoretical constructs proposed to explain intelligence now?

Williams: I love this question as it hits directly at the things that are widely not understood, even by bright, educated people.

Mother Nature did not create brains according to a PC project plan. Instead, she opted to make intelligence hugely important and did not compensate people who happen to fall at the low end of the spectrum. I think a good way to view intelligence is by a list of correlates. There is at least one positive correlate that does not imply a desirable outcome: myopia, correlated at about $r = 0.20$ to 0.25 (given by both Jensen and Storfer). It is not the result of "nearwork." Jensen: "Children in classes for the intellectually gifted (IQ > 130), for example, show an incidence of myopia three to five times greater than the incidence among pupils in regular classes." [from *The g Factor: The Science of Mental Ability*]

Otherwise, positive correlations are beneficial, while negative correlations are not. The "cold hard truth" of this is that life is increasingly more favorable at higher and higher levels of intelligence and is increasingly more difficult at lower and lower levels. I made the list below a couple of years ago, to illustrate the unfair nature of the IQ spectrum:

- Positive (+) correlation with intelligence
- Income longevity general health life satisfaction body symmetry
- Vital capacity
- Grip strength
- Educational achievement (grades, years completed, difficulty of major)
- SES (a product of intelligence, not a cause of it)
- Speed of mental functions, including response to a stimulus and sensitivity to a short stimulus
- Memory
- Learning rate
- Number of interests (held with competence)
- Job performance

Noesis #210, October 2022

- Brain efficiency (relative to glucose uptake rate)
- Sperm quality
- Negative (-) correlation with intelligence smoking
- HIV infection
- Crime
- Time incarcerated
- School dropout
- Teen pregnancy
- Fertility rate
- Illegitimate births
- Unemployment

At the national level, mean national IQ correlates positively with per capita GDP, economic growth, economic freedom, rule of law, democratization, adult literacy, savings, national test scores on science and math, enrollment in higher education, life expectancy, and negatively with HIV infection, unemployment, violent crime, poverty, % agricultural economy, corruption, fertility rate, polygyny, and religiosity.

The correlates I listed range from moderate to small, but are important because small effects can coexist and are usually small because of the presence of large amounts of noise. When very large groups are considered, noise tends to cancel out, which is why national level comparisons typically have high correlations. An examination of the lists reveals that several factors relate to physical wellbeing. This is frequently discussed in the literature as relating to an overarching fitness factor that encompasses physical health, mental health, intelligence, and physical robustness.

These correlates are all the more cold and hard, when we consider that intelligence is determined at the moment of conception ["Using DNA to Predict Intelligence"; Sophie von Stumm, Robert Plomin; *Intelligence* 86 (2021) 101530.]; the environmental impacts are negative (lower intelligence); and the range of intelligence is huge. Group differences in mean IQ (or *g*) account for group differences in the factors I listed for national outcomes.

Jacobsen: What countries leaders take these seriously without ideological commitments to distort them?

Williams: Some years ago, a friend loaned me a book about Indonesia. There was a fair amount of discussion in it about the highly diverse population and the realistic understanding of how intelligence was a factor that differed between the internal groups. I unfortunately cannot recall the title of the book and am not sure if it was discussing the time Sukarno was president. I think that was the case.

Otherwise China is very much aware of the importance of intelligence and in conducting intelligence research on a large scale. This huge effort is discussed in Haier, R. J. (2017). *The Neuroscience of Intelligence*, Cambridge University Press. Western nations have gone in the wokePC direction of denial and counter productive policies. I don't see a path towards rational, factual thinking (about this issue) in the West.

Noesis #210, October 2022

The American Medical System and Physicians

Benoit Desjardins & Scott Douglas Jacobsen

Professor Benoit Desjardins, MD, PhD, FAHA, FACR, FNASCI is an Ivy League academic physician and scientist at the University of Pennsylvania. He is a member of the Mega Society, the OlympIQ Society and past member of the Prometheus Society. He is the designer of the cryptic Mega Society logo. He is a member of several scientific societies and a Fellow of the American College of Radiology and of the American Heart Association. He is the co-Founder of the Arrhythmia Imaging Research (AIR) lab at Penn. His research is funded by the National Institute of Health. He is an international leader in three different fields: cardiovascular imaging, artificial intelligence and cybersecurity. He discusses: the poor working treatment of physicians in the United States; exposing the treatment of physicians; the biggest inroads in sheer viewership or consumption; productions; other proposals at every medical center hypothesized to help with the issue of overwork; the simple and obvious solution; working 36 hours in one period; working 90-100 hours in a week; the social life of the physicians; cruelty; patients kill their physicians; the level of burn out; some of the more egregious examples of (mis-)treatment of physicians; deceased or now-disabled colleagues; human rights violations; International Labour Organization; common statements from physicians; humane working conditions; and the future of the American healthcare system.

On the Work Conditions of U.S. Physicians

Scott Douglas Jacobsen: What was the earliest known, to you, exposure to the poor working treatment of physicians in the United States?

Dr. Benoit Desjardins: I realized it as soon as I started my training in the U.S. when I was forced to work 68 hours without sleep. I had been on call at the hospital two nights in a row, had worked 58 consecutive hours without rest, and was driving back home. As I crashed into my bed, I received a phone call from my chief resident asking me why I was not at the hospital as I was on call again for a third night in a row. I was unaware of it and explained the situation. He ordered me to get back to work. I drove back exhausted to the hospital and could have easily been killed in a car accident. I worked ten additional consecutive hours until I crashed on the call room floor. They found me unconscious later that morning. It was my first exposure to the poor working conditions of U.S. physicians.

Jacobsen: Who have been the most vocal people about exposing the treatment of physicians from 50 years ago to 10 years ago?

Desjardins: In the U.S., it was common for post-MD medical trainees (called "residents") to work 90-100 hours per week and up to 36 hours without rest. In March 1984, 18-year-old Libby Zion died at a New York hospital from a prescription error by a resident doing a 36-hour shift. It led to an investigation on the effect of resident fatigue on patient safety. New regulations were passed in 1987 limiting residents in New York to work no more than 80 hours per week and no more than 24 consecutive hours. In 2003, the ACGME (the body regulating medical training in the U.S.) extended the rule to all residents. They also limited resident calls to once every third night and implemented one day off per week. For comparison, in Europe, residents cannot work more than 48h per week. Note that these new rules only apply to residents in training, not to the U.S. practicing physicians who regularly work up to 120 hours per week and up to 72 consecutive hours without sleep.

Jacobsen: Of various productions about the issue, what ones seem to have made the biggest inroads in sheer viewership or consumption?

Desjardins: Around ten years ago, some physicians started to expose the poor working conditions of U.S. physicians. Dr. Pamela Wible noticed an epidemic of suicide among physicians, and she began accumulating data. So far, she has documented 1,620 suicides of physicians caused by their poor working conditions, a clear underestimate of the true incidence of the problem. She publicized her results in a TED talk ("Why doctors kill themselves," March 23, 2016), maintains a blog, and wrote books on the poor treatment of U.S. physicians. Since then, many articles, blogs, books, medical conferences, and documentary movies have covered

the poor treatment of U.S. physicians. As a result of these initiatives, physician wellness is now a topic addressed by every U.S. hospital and medical school.

[Editor's Note: https://tedmed.com/talks/show?id=528918]

Jacobsen: There will be variations on a theme with the presentation of the same legitimate complaint of overwork and poor working conditions for U.S. physicians. However, some will 'get' it more. In that, they'll hit the message and the reality, correctly. Which productions have been the most incisive and factually accurate?

Desjardins: On April 8, 2019, *the New York Times* published the op-ed article "The Business of Health Care Depends on Exploiting Doctors and Nurses" by Dr. Danielle Ofri. The op-ed discussed how the U.S. exploits healthcare workers with poor working conditions that would be unacceptable in other fields and countries. In June 2019, Dr. Pamela Wible wrote a book entitled *Human Rights Violations in Medicine*, tabulating and illustrating with real examples 40 different ways in which the U.S. violates the fundamental human rights of its physicians. It includes sleep deprivation, food deprivation, water deprivation, overwork, exploitation, bullying, punishment when sick, violence, no mental health care, etc. In 2018, Robyn Symon produced a documentary movie on physician suicide and poor working conditions entitled *Do No Harm* (donoharmfilm.com). It is available for rent on Amazon and Vimeo. In 2004, Dr. Kevin Pho created a blog (KevinMD.com) on physician issues. Several recent articles and interviews on his blog have focused on the poor working conditions of U.S. physicians.

Jacobsen: What are other proposals at every medical center hypothesized to help with the issue of overwork akin to yoga mats?

Desjardins: The U.S. lacks interest in identifying and solving real problems. It goes well beyond healthcare and applies to poverty, violence, corruption, gun control, climate change, etc. Band-Aid solutions are proposed, and the root causes of problems are rarely addressed. Physician working conditions are treated similarly. Every hospital and medical school is now addressing physician wellness, given the massive levels of physician burnout. They discuss yoga mats, meditation, eating healthy, exercising, and sleeping well. But they don't address 120-hour work weeks, 72 consecutive hours of call shifts without rest and lack of access to food and water, physicians dying on the job, getting strokes on the job, destroying their health.

Jacobsen: Have any tried the simple and obvious solution by taking issue with the prefix "over-" in "overwork" to deal with overwork of physicians?

Desjardins: No. There is a lack of interest in identifying the real problems and offering needed solutions. There is only one solution to the overwork of U.S. physicians: getting more physicians (or physician equivalent healthcare workers). The U.S. has 2.6 physicians per 1000 people (WorldBank data). The European Union has 4.9, ranging from 3.7 in the Netherlands to 8.0 in Italy, with much healthier populations. Despite the smaller number of physicians in the U.S., the country has the highest healthcare costs globally: $11K per capita in the U.S., compared to $5K per capita in the European Union. If the U.S. increased its population of physicians, the costs

would rise since U.S. medicine is a business with unlimited spending. Hospitals have started to explore substituting physicians with less qualified healthcare workers to decrease costs. The frightening consequences of this approach have been well documented in the 2020 book by Dr. Al-Agba and Dr. Bernard, *Patients at Risk: The Rise of the Nurse Practitioner and Physician Assistant in Healthcare*. The book provides examples of poorly trained N.P.s and P.A.s, allowed to perform physician-level decisions and actions, resulting in preventable patient deaths.

Jacobsen: If working 36 hours in one period, what are the impacts, known in medicine and psychology, on the human brain?

Desjardins: Lack of sleep for 24 hours is, according to the CDC, equivalent to having a blood alcohol content of 0.10, higher than the legal driving limit of 0.08. Among the many side effects, it creates drowsiness, impaired judgment, impaired memory, reduced coordination, increased stress level, and the brain shutting down neurons in some regions. Lack of sleep for 48 hours affects cognition. The brain enters brief periods of complete unconsciousness known as microsleep, lasting several seconds. Lack of sleep for 72 hours will have more profound effects on mood and cognition and can lead to paranoia. Chronic sleep deprivation has a lasting impact on general health and creates high blood pressure, obesity, diabetes, heart disease, and depression.

Jacobsen: If working 90-100 hours in one week, what are the impacts, known in medicine and psychology, on the human body?

Desjardins: In a 2021 study by WHO and ILO, long working hours (> 55h/week) led to 398 000 deaths from stroke (35% risk increase) and 347,000 deaths from ischemic heart disease (17% risk increase). Dr. Maria Neira from WHO stated that "Working 55 hours or more per week is a serious health hazard". Now imagine how much worse of a hazard for physicians forced to work more than 55 consecutive hours without rest. I cannot find any studies specifically looking at the health effects of 90/100-hour workweeks. Japan has the term "karoshi" to describe death by overwork, and employers are held criminally responsible for such deaths. No such laws exist in the United States.

Jacobsen: Obviously, when everyone is stressed out and overworked in, sometimes, life-and-death circumstances, it is difficult to make an argument for consistent civility and reasonable social engagement. How do these working conditions – and work expectations – impact the social life of the physicians amongst one another, and the physician-to-patient interaction?

Desjardins: Overwork increases the divorce rate in female physicians, not in male physicians. Many physicians do not have much social life since they work constantly. They mainly interact with other physicians at work, not outside work. Sometimes burned-out overworked physicians have been rude to their patients, especially surgeons.

Jacobsen: Something easily wading beneath the surface here: Cruelty. People aren't going to behave nicely, sometimes, in high-stress environments, where their life and livelihood are under question, including the health care worker. Although, it's asymmetrical on oath alone. Physicians take the Hippocratic Oath; the general public's patients don't. Also, a larger aspect is institutions. How were physician friends killed in the midst of maltreatment due to working conditions in medical institutions? How have physician friends been permanently disabled due to the work conditions?

Desjardins: Thousands of U.S. physicians have been killed or disabled because of poor working conditions. It has been extensively described in the literature. In my circle of colleagues, which extends beyond my current institution, three of my close radiology colleagues have been killed, all in their 30s, and many have been disabled for life. One was killed at work under circumstances that are still hidden. Two were killed in car accidents after driving back home in the middle of the night after their workday, completely exhausted. A colleague developed a stroke during his workday resulting in a permanent physical handicap. Another colleague was on his 97th hour of work on a week in which he was not allowed to sleep much or eat much. His body failed under these poor working conditions, and he became blind during work. He was rushed to the E.R., where they diagnosed a work-condition induced hypertensive urgency with bilateral optic nerve damage. They pumped him full of medication until part of his vision returned. But he remains physically disabled for life due to the poor working conditions.

Jacobsen: How many patients kill their physicians every year in the United States? How does this compare to other countries with metrics if any?

Desjardins: There are, unfortunately, no statistics on that. In my city, physicians are frequently assaulted by their patients. Some have been stabbed in the face, and some have been killed. The local news media almost always downplay it. Physicians are killed in other countries, too, notably in China. Physician suicides from the poor U.S. working conditions are also downplayed. When a physician jumps from the roof of their hospital, the local authorities simply throw a tarp over the body and don't report it in the news media. Hospitals simply do not want the bad publicity from having a series of physicians jumping to their death from the roof of their hospital due to poor working conditions, like what recently happened in some N.Y. hospitals.

Jacobsen: What is the level of burn out in your field? What is the formal definition of "burn out" – whatever terms people want to use to describe physicians simply being taxed beyond reasonable limits and – not even requested – demanded to work more, as in your case?

Desjardins: The current level of burnout in my field is up to 70%. There has been a debate on whether physicians experience burnout, moral injury, or basic human rights violations. Burnout means physical and mental collapse from overwork. Moral injury indicates damage to one's conscience when witnessing horrible conditions violating one's moral beliefs or code of conduct. In 1948 the U.N. General Assembly adopted a Universal Declaration of Human Rights, a standard for properly treating human beings. Human rights violations are violations of the rules in this declaration. Physicians experience all three categories of injuries: burnout, moral injury,

and human rights violations. It is a symptom of a toxic healthcare system, with working conditions massively out of compliance with safe labor laws from all other industries.

[Editor's Note: https://www.un.org/en/about-us/universal-declaration-of-human-rights]

Jacobsen: What are some of the more egregious examples of (mis-)treatment of physicians?

Desjardins: There are many examples in the literature. Some U.S. physicians are forced to work up to 72 consecutive hours without rest. In my circle of colleagues, which extends well beyond my current institution, many of my colleagues experienced mistreatment. A physician friend recently started a new job in breast imaging. At the end of her first workday, which included a half-day orientation, they put her on probation for not reading her daily quota of 100 studies. At the end of her second workday, she became more proficient with her new work tools and read 98 studies, two studies short of her daily quota. They fired her immediately. Another physician friend was starting a new radiology job and went to lunch at the hospital cafeteria on her first day. She was forcibly dragged back to her work cubicle before eating a single bite, yelled at by administrators, and told physicians in her practice are not allowed to eat during the workday. Many physicians are required to work non-stop with no breaks for eating and no bathroom breaks and finish their regular workday in the middle of the night. They sometimes must sleep on the floor of their office at the hospital as there is not enough time to return home before their next shift. Dr. Pamela Wible identified several extreme examples of mistreatment: physicians being forced to work during a miscarriage or a seizure, surgeons collapsing on their patients because of dehydration and hypoglycemia because of their lack of access to food and water during work, and physicians falling asleep on their patient during medical rounds due to massive exhaustion.

Jacobsen: When speaking of your deceased or now-disabled colleagues, what happens to a body as parts of it simply shut down, especially in, basically, peak health years, e.g., the 30s?

Desjardins: For deceased colleagues, their body gets cremated or eaten by worms. For disabled colleagues, their health remains affected by the damage to their bodies for the remaining of their lives and deteriorates faster as they get older. They develop chronic diseases, such as high blood pressure, sooner than other workers, making their bodies deteriorate faster and increasing morbidity and mortality.

Jacobsen: For the UDHR, what human rights violations are discussed the most in the literature?

Desjardins: I would say violations of Article 23 (Everyone has the right to work, to free choice of employment, to just and favorable conditions of work), Article 24 (Everyone has the right to rest and leisure, including reasonable limitation of working hours), and Article 25 (Everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and of his family, including food).

[' **Article 23**

1. Everyone has the right to work, to free choice of employment, to just and favourable conditions of work and to protection against unemployment.
2. Everyone, without any discrimination, has the right to equal pay for equal work.
3. Everyone who works has the right to just and favourable remuneration ensuring for himself and his family an existence worthy of human dignity, and supplemented, if necessary, by other means of social protection.
4. Everyone has the right to form and to join trade unions for the protection of his interests.

Article 24

Everyone has the right to rest and leisure, including reasonable limitation of working hours and periodic holidays with pay.

Article 25

1. Everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and of his family, including food, clothing, housing and medical care and necessary social services, and the right to security in the event of unemployment, sickness, disability, widowhood, old age or other lack of livelihood in circumstances beyond his control.
2. Motherhood and childhood are entitled to special care and assistance. All children, whether born in or out of wedlock, shall enjoy the same social protection. ' -Editor's Note]

Jacobsen: Is the International Labour Organization, in any way, involved in rectifying these working conditions? Are there any countries anywhere with comparable working conditions, though, perhaps, lacking the advanced expertise and technological sophistication of the U.S.?

Desjardins: Among the risks for physicians identified by the ILO is "Physical and mental fatigue stemming from the specific conditions of this work" and "Danger of being violently attacked by unsatisfied patients." So, the ILO has identified some of the risks and has proposed some solutions (Improving employment and working conditions in health services, 2017). In that paper, they discuss the European Union 2003 Working Time Directive, setting work limits to 48 hours per week, minimum daily rest periods of 11 hours, weekly rest of 35 hours, and allowing derogations for some doctors. They do not discuss the working conditions of U.S. physicians. Every country has different working conditions for physicians. India, China, and African Countries have difficult working conditions, given limited access to medical technology and the low physician to population ratios. But among the most industrialized countries (G-20), the U.S. and China have the worst working conditions for physicians.

Jacobsen: What are common statements from physicians about the working conditions? The emotional and psychological states rather than the facts and figures of the situation from colleagues who have survived, and continue survive, the insufferable work environment expectations.

Desjardins: The physician workforce has undergone a progressive zombification as it evolved within the current system. Physicians develop learned powerlessness to affect the system and deference to authority. They understand that working 72 consecutive hours without sleep is illegal and inhumane in every other profession except their own but are forced to do it by their hospital administration. They know that they will continue to become victims of crimes committed by corrupt prosecutors. They understand that the U.S. population is strongly anti-physicians and anti-science and will never be their ally. They know that the U.S. healthcare system is collapsing faster than anyone predicted. So, they bear the insufferable work environment and count the days until they can afford to abandon their medical careers or die on the job.

Jacobsen: Have American physicians simply left states to other states, even to other countries for humane working conditions?

Desjardins: Definitely. Physicians frequently move out of state because of working conditions. In some departments, large portions of several divisions leave en masse to practice elsewhere or abandon their medical career. Most would like to move out of the U.S. into countries with better working conditions for physicians, such as Canada, the U.K., or European Union countries, but immigration and licensure issues prevent them from moving abroad.

Jacobsen: What does this bode for the future of the American healthcare system?

Desjardins: The American healthcare system is collapsing. A massive shortage of healthcare workers is rapidly worsening, made even worse by the treatment of U.S. healthcare workers during the recent pandemic. The three-year probation time recently imposed by a judge on a massively overworked nurse for a fatal mistake will likely have a massive negative impact. These factors decrease the interest of foreign healthcare workers to move to the U.S., reduce the appeal of Americans to enter the medical field and make healthcare workers retire earlier. They have caused the development of healthcare deserts in 80% of the counties in the U.S., which lack access to the medical workforce, hospitals, or pharmacies. The present situation is bleak, but the future will be even more dismal.

[End of Part 2 of Interview]

Professor Benoit Desjardins, MD, PhD, FAHA, FACR, FNASCI is an Ivy League academic physician and scientist at the University of Pennsylvania. He is a member of the Mega Society, the OlympIQ Society and past member of the Prometheus Society. He is the designer of the cryptic Mega Society logo. He is member of several scientific societies and a Fellow of the American College of Radiology and of the American Heart Association. He is the co-Founder of the Arrhythmia Imaging Research (AIR) lab at Penn. His research is funded by the National Institute of Health. He is an international leader in three different fields: cardiovascular imaging, artificial intelligence and cybersecurity. He discusses: cruelty; burn out; treatment of physicians; 'alternative' medicine; ignorance; masquerading as knowledge; Dr. Oz-ification of culture; scientific illiteracy; deceased or now-disabled colleagues; UDHR; International Labour Organization; Dr. Oz; defense mechanisms or infrastructure to protect themselves from the litigious patients; and those with fewer means and less authority in medical institutions.

Keywords: American, Benoit Desjardins, Medicine, physicians, quack medicine, science, United States.

On the Medical System in the United States

Scott Douglas Jacobsen: How is the U.S. comparable to the Middle Ages with patients blaming physicians for illness?

Dr. Benoit Desjardins: It is often taught that the U.S. has been the only country since the Middle Ages in which people blame physicians for their diseases. There is no personal accountability anymore in the U.S. Every problem Americans face is someone else's fault. They blame most problems on immigrants or rich people, but they blame healthcare problems on physicians. If a woman delivers an imperfect baby, she blames it on the physician and tries to extort money. If a man develops lung cancer after chain-smoking for 50 years, he will often go over his past medical record with lawyers to see if a physician could be blamed for his cancer. Sometimes they discover early imperceptible evidence about cancer and then try to extort money from physicians. Most U.S. courtrooms in medical-legal trials are like the courtroom from the movie *Idiocracy*, where massively ignorant, scientifically illiterate people try to blame top physicians for patients' diseases. The U.S. medical-legal system has been the laughingstock of the entire planet for more than fifty years.

Jacobsen: Outside of individual violent reprisals by former or current patients, what about the legal repercussions? Where, individual patients may have legitimate claims and may not. However, in a litigious culture, as in the U.S., this can be a major issue. The general litigious culture may become magnified in a context of life-and-death, and general illness issues. So, what happens?

Desjardins: An entire sector of the U.S. "justice" system has been created to blame physicians for patients' diseases. There are thousands of primarily frivolous lawsuits filed against physicians in the U.S. every year. Corrupt prosecutors use four well-known techniques of

deception to extort money: (1) they suppress published scientific evidence supporting the correct actions by physicians, (2) they commit massive perjury against physicians, (3) they use flawed reasoning techniques from con-artists to fool jurors, and (4) they pay unqualified "experts" to misrepresent the standards of medical practice in court. In addition, U.S. judges threaten physicians with jail time if they try to prove in court that they followed correct science, after corrupt prosecutors suppress published scientific evidence. In other countries, using deception to extort money is a crime. In the U.S., it is the modus operandi of a 55-billion-dollar financial extortion industry against physicians and hospitals, affecting up to 80% of U.S. physicians in some specialties.

Jacobsen: Also, how is the court system in Pennsylvania?

Desjardins: In the past ten years, Philadelphia has been exposed in the medical literature and at medical conferences as having one of the most corrupt, scientifically illiterate medical-legal systems on Earth. The Philadelphia "justice" system frequently commits crimes against innocent physicians.

Jacobsen: What are some fallouts or likely outcomes from this idiocy?

Desjardins: It has led to a severe shortage of physicians in Philadelphia. Physicians have left the city by the boatload, sometimes more than 50% of entire divisions resigning en masse, and we experience significant difficulties recruiting. Several city hospitals have permanently shut down in recent years, and many more are on the verge of shutting down.

Jacobsen: How does this impact the future of the field to recruit sufficiently qualified, even talented, individuals? Where do they go? What about those better physicians in the field who can hack it – the workload and the B.S., but don't want to deal with the sheer tonnage of nonsense and risks to livelihood?

Desjardins: In the past ten years, my clinical section, which is in desperate need of more radiologists, has not been able to recruit any radiologists. We have even offered some promising recruits the possibility to work remotely. By never setting foot in Philadelphia, this eliminates their chances of getting assaulted or stabbed in the face by patients. Still, they refused as they do not want to be associated with the city of Philadelphia for the reasons described above.

Jacobsen: How do U.S. physicians keep one another in check, too, in case of malpractice – so back to higher levels of healthcare education and authority?

Desjardins: A tiny portion of lawsuits against physicians are genuine cases of malpractice due to poorly trained or incompetent physicians. Checks and balances are in place to either address the educational shortcomings or remove the practice license if necessary. Most lawsuits are crimes committed against excellent physicians by corrupt prosecutors in cases of bad outcomes or complications, which are part of expected outcomes in medicine. There is no lesson for

physicians to learn from these cases. They are discussed in the literature and at conferences to educate physicians about the corruption and scientific illiteracy of the U.S. "justice" system and prepare them to become crime victims.

Jacobsen: Have physicians built any defense mechanisms or infrastructure to protect themselves from the litigious patients, when they inevitably arise, or the top-heavy bureaucratic culture?

Desjardins: There is a malpractice insurance system for physicians, a 55-billion-dollar industry. When physicians become victims of too many frivolous lawsuits, the cost of their malpractice insurance rapidly increases until, at some point, they cannot afford to pay the exorbitant fees and are forced to abandon their medical careers. Physicians practicing in cities with the most corrupt medical-legal systems tend to leave their medical profession early, worsening the massive shortage of physicians.

Jacobsen: How does this – the litigious patients out there and the maltreatment of healthcare professionals by institutions – impact those with fewer means and less authority in medical institutions, e.g., nurses, nurse-practitioners, and the like?

Desjardins: Nurses and nurse-practitioners have their own malpractice insurance system, although physicians and hospitals are the main targets of prosecutors. Nurses also have difficult working conditions, including forced overtime. But they cannot be exposed to working conditions as poor as physicians, as nurses have a union. For example, nurses are "officially" not allowed to work more than 12 consecutive hours in most states. It does not include occasional forced overtime. Some physicians are required to work up to 72 straight hours. It would be illegal and inhumane to make nurses work as long as physicians.

On Medical Quackery in the United States

Jacobsen: What are common cases of individuals able to use the term "doctor," "physician," etc., by law, or not, when, in fact, no legitimate training or grounds for the claims to the titles exist?

Desjardins: Many professions outside medicine use the term "doctor." Any Ph.D. in any field has the right to be called a "doctor," for example, Dr. Jill Biden has a doctorate in educational leadership. Dr. Phil McGraw (Dr. Phil) is not a physician but provides medical advice on T.V. He has a Doctorate in Psychology but is not a licensed psychologist. In the healthcare field, Doctors of Osteopathy (D.O.s) have the right to be called "doctors" and practice medicine in the United States. but cannot practice medicine in some other countries. Chiropractors and naturopaths are called "doctors" and practice healthcare but are not physicians. They constitute a hazard to healthcare and are not allowed to practice in most countries. There are cases of individuals pretending to be physicians who practice medicine without training until they are exposed.

Jacobsen: There's plenty of bullshit remedies out there in the public sold by the boatload. What about medical institutions who buy into them and begin to practice them? What are cases of this? Are there any consequences for individuals engaged in giving out known ineffective treatments?

Desjardins: The medical community scientifically assesses remedies to determine their effectiveness. If they are proven ineffective, respectable institutions will not adopt them. Some physicians dispense some ineffective or dangerous therapy and can lose their license. Recently U.S. judges forced physicians to administer ivermectin (horse deworming medicine) to COVID patients, an act of pure idiocy. It reflects the mind boggling scientific illiteracy of the U.S. justice system. Physicians who have administered such medication have been fired for incompetence and stupidity.

Jacobsen: Also, what are the problems with 'alternative' medicine, naturopathic medicine, and so on?

Desjardins: They don't work. Just look at the late Steve Jobs.

Jacobsen: I wrote a short article critical of Naturopathy in British Columbia, Canada, a while ago – a quickie. A while goes [by], I received a lengthy email or digital letter from the President of the British Columbia Naturopathic Association (B.C.NA.) at the time. Obviously, the person was displeased. I responded with the same so-called baseless critiques towards this individual, once, saying I would only do it a single time, but covered the territory well.

It was enough to deal with the issue. They were orthogonal to the evidence-based claims, so wrong, pointless – by my estimation, and such lightweight critiques, even a young independent journalist could deal with them. Yet, these forms of alternative practice are present, proliferating, and have been with cultures forever, though more complex in the nonsense with technology. It's simply less excusable as medicine and meta-analytic studies' powers give, not deep insight but, a modicum of reasonable thou-shalts and thou-shalt nots of good health guidelines in general, as you stipulated earlier.

People seem entitled. Professionals who spend their time thinking and researching narcissism claim a rise in narcissism over decades. Entitlement is a facet of narcissism. How is the Dr. Oz-ification of culture and medicine halting progress on the front of proper treatment of dis-ease in American society?

Desjardins: Some individuals with top credentials in a specific field sometimes become self-appointed experts in entirely different fields. Dr. Mehmet Oz is one of those. He is a retired Ivy League Professor and cardiothoracic surgeon from Columbia University. He is a scholar with top credentials in a highly specialized field, who has become a television personality and started providing general health advice. He has promoted pseudoscience, alternative medicine, faith healing, and paranormal beliefs. Dr. Scott Atlas, a prominent neuroradiologist from Stanford, was appointed by Trump as a coronavirus advisor, an area in which he had no expertise. He

then spread massive misinformation about COVID and advised against the official policy of the CDC. Pseudo-experts are tools that ignorant, corrupt people use to spread misinformation in the U.S. These pseudo-experts halt progress of good evidence-based medical policy and affect the quality of care.

Jacobsen: Other than Dr. Oz, who are other ignorance-mongers becoming rich off offering fake medicine?

Desjardins: There are several, especially given the rapid growth of social media. But the most prominent media personalities doctors are Dr. Andrew Weil, a physician and expert in integrative medicine, and Dr. Phil McGraw, a T.V. unlicensed psychologist. Weil has a net worth of $100 million (similar to Dr. Oz). McGraw has a net worth of $460 million. They both offer good and bad advice and are both very entertaining.

A Metaphysical Map of Reality:

The Social Sciences

Ronald K. Hoeflin

(The Upper Portion of the Feedback Loop that Focuses in D)

Chapter 6: Psychology

Chapter 7: Political Science

Chapter 8: Economics

Chapter 9: History

Chapter 10: Law

The Metaphysics of Psychology

Ronald K. Hoeflin

Contents:

1. Fanatics, Aldous Huxley

2. Decisions, Robert Herrick

3. Knowing Oneself, Albert Camus

4. Psychologists' Knowledge of the Unconscious, Karl Kraus

5. Neurosis in Psychologists as of Value, Sigmund Freud

6. How to Immunize Someone to Fear, Maxwell Maltz

7. Rational versus Neurotic Desire for Pleasure, Nathaniel Branden

8. What We Desire to Accomplish, Orison Swett Marden

1. Fanatics, Aldous Huxley

In *Psychologies: Webster's Quotations, Facts and Phrases* (pg. 1) Aldous Huxley, author of *Brave New World,* is quoted as follows (numbers added for subsequent analytical purposes): "(1) Defined (2) in (3) psychological (4) terms, (5) a fanatic (6) is (7) a man (8) who (9) consciously (10, 11) overcompensates [= (10) over (11) compensates] (12) a secret (13) doubt."

Suggested classification:

A: (1) Defined

AG: (2) In

G: (4) Terms

GQ: (3) Psychological

Q: (5) A man

QD: (6) Is

D: (7) A fanatic

DA: (8) Who

DG: (12) A secret

AQ: (13) Doubt

U: (11) Compensates

N: (10) Over

D': (9) Consciously

My justifications for these classifications are as follows:

A: (1) Defined can be classed in A since this word leads one to anticipate, A, a definition to follow.

AG: (2) In can be classed in AG since in the expression "defined in terms" the word "in" links the anticipatory word "defined," A, and the goal-object word "terms," G.

G: (4) Terms can be classed in G since terms are concepts as expressed in words, which can be regarded as goal objects. G.

GQ: (5) Psychological can be classed in GQ since this word links the goal-object word "terms," G, to the quiescent manifestation, Q, of having the character of being of a psychological nature.

Q: (6) A man can be classed in Q since a man can be regarded as consisting of all the quiescent manifestations, Q, that make an entity a man, as in Aristotle's definition of a man as a "rational animal," where "rational" and "animal" each amount to a descriptive quiescent manifestation, Q.

QD: (7) Is can be classed in QD since in the expression "a man is a fanatic" the word "is" links the quiescent words "a man," Q, and the drive words "a fanatic," D.

D: (8) A fanatic can be classed in D since a fanatic is an agent or drive- bearer, D, with the harsh and persistent drives of a fanatic.

DA: (9) Who can be classed in DA since in the expression "a fanatic who" the word "who" links the drive words "a fanatic," D, and the subsequent words that collectively lead one to anticipate, A, what a fanatic is.

DG: (12)A secret can be classed in DG since a secret can be regarded as a goal object, G, that an agent or drive-bearer, D, wishes to keep hidden from others.

AQ: (13) Doubt can be classed in AQ since a doubt exhibits a lack of confidence in what one pretends to anticipate, A, has the quiescent characteristic, Q, of being true.

U: (11) Compensates can be classed in Us since this word suggests that one has achieved a unified, U, adjustment in one's thoughts such that what one says one believes expresses what one thinks one actually believes.

N: (10) Over can be classed in N since this word negates, N, the purported successful adjustment in one's thoughts implied by the word "compensates."

D': (9) Consciously can be classed in D' since this word suggests that one is deliberately lying to oneself and hence that one is a subordinate agent or drive- bearer, D', due to this tendency to self-delusion.

2. Decisions, Robert Herrick

In *Psychologies: Webster's Quotations, Facts and Phrases* (pg. 5) American novelist Robert Herrick (1868-1938) is quoted as follows (numbers added for subsequent analytical purposes): "(1) it (2) is (3) a significant fact (4) of personal psychology (5) that (6) a crisis (7) of (8) decision (9) takes (10) place (11) before action results (12) to calm (13) the disturbed mind."

Suggested classification:

GQ: (3) A significant fact

Q: (4) Of personal psychology

QD: (5) That

D: (6) A crisis

DA: (7) Of

A: (8) Decision

AG: (9) Takes

G: (10) Place

DG: (1) It

AQ: (2) Is

U: (11) Before action results

N: (12) To calm

D': (13) The disturbed mind

My justifications for these classifications are as follows:

GQ: (3) A significant fact can be classed in GQ since "fact" can be regarded as referring to a goal object, G, while "a significant" can be regarded as referring to a quiescent manifestation, Q, that makes a noteworthy impression.

Q: (4) Of personal psychology can be classed in Q since these words can be regarded as referring to the mental quiescent manifestations, Q, that occur within a person's mind, e.g., calmness after a crisis.

QD: (5) That can be classed in QD since in the expression "of personal psychology that a crisis" the word "that" links the quiescent word "of personal psychology," Q, and the drive words "a crisis," D.

D: (6) A crisis can be classed in D since a crisis typically precipitates a drive, D, to take action.

DA: (7) Of can be classed in DA since in the expression "a crisis of decision" the word "of" links the drive words "a crisis," D, and the anticipatory word "decision," A.

A: (8) Decision can be classed in A since a decision is anticipated, A, to lead to some course of action.

AG: (9) Takes can be classed in AG since in the expression "decision takes place" the word "takes" links the anticipatory word "decision," A, and the goal- object word "place," G.

G: (10) Place can be classed in G since a place can typically be regarded as a goal object, G.

DG: (1) It can be classed in DG since this word can be regarded as referring to an abstract goal object, G, from the perspective of an agent or drive- bearer, D.

AQ: (2) Is can be classed in AQ since this word can be regarded as amounting to "is anticipated, A, to lead to the consequences mentioned next."

U: (11) Before action results can be classed in U since an action with a specific result, as in this case, amounts to a unified, U, activity.

N: (12) To calm can be classed in N since this calming effect negates, N, the crisis that preceded it.

D': (13) The disturbed mind can be classed in D' since such a mind can be regarded as belonging to a subordinate agent or drive-bearer, D', subordinate because a disturbed mind has not yet reached a point of mature judgment.

3. Knowing Oneself, Albert Camus

In *Psychologies: Webster's Quotations, Facts and Phrases* (pg. 1) Albert Camus is quoted as follows (numbers added for subsequent analytical purpose): "(1) To know oneself, one should assert oneself. (2) Psychology (3) is (4) action, (5) not (6) thinking (7) about (8) oneself. (9) We continue to shape our personality (10) all our life. (11) If we knew ourselves perfectly, (12) we (13) should die."

Suggested classification:

DA: (1) To know oneself, one should assert oneself

A: (2) Psychology

AG: (3) Is

G: (4) Actin

GQ: (5) Not

Q: (6) Thinking

QD: (7) About

D: (8) Oneself

DG: (9) We continue to shape our personality

AQ: (10) All our life

U: (11) If we knew ourselves perfectly

N: (13) Should die

D': (12) We

My justifications for the foregoing classifications are as follows:

DA: (1) To know oneself, one should assert oneself can be classed in DA since "one should assert oneself" involves exerting a drive, D, while to subsequently know oneself is to be able to anticipate, A, how one would deal with any situation.

A: (2) Psychology can be classed in A since this is a field of knowledge, and knowledge involves the ability to anticipate, A,. what will occur in that domain of inquiry.

AG (3) Is can be classed in AG since in the expression "psychology is action" the word "is" links the anticipatory word "knowledge," A, and the goal- object word "action," G.

G: (4) Action can be classed in G since action can be regarded as a goal object, G.

GQ: (5) Not can be classed in GQ since in the expression "action, not thinking" the word "not" links the goal-object word 'action," G, and the quiescent word "thinking," Q.

Q: (6) Thinking can be classed in Q since thinking involves entertaining mental quiescent manifestations, Q, about something, in this case oneself.

QD: (7) About can be classed in QD since in the expression "thinking about oneself" the word "about" links the quiescent word "thinking," Q, and the drive word "oneself," D.

D: (8) Oneself can be classed in D since it refers to a person, i.e., an agent or drive-bearer, D.

DG: (9) We continue to shape our personality can be classed in DG since "we" refers to agents or drive-bearers, D, while "personality" refers to an abstract goal object, G.

AQ: (10) All our life can be classed in AQ since it involves the anticipation, A, of persistent quiescent manifestations, Q, that could be found throughout a person's life.

U: (11) If we knew ourselves perfectly can be classed in U since such knowledge would involve a unified, U, understanding of one's entire pattern of behavior in any situation.

N: (13) Should die can be classed in N since dying negates, N, one's life.

D': (12) We can be classed in D' since this word refers to oneself as a superordinate agent or drive-bearer, D', superordinate because knowing oneself per-fectly would be attainable only by a god-like person.

4. Psychologists' Poor Knowledge of the Unconscious, Kraus

In *Psychologies: Webster's Quotations, Facts and Phrases* (pg. 1) Austrian satirical writer Karl Kraus (1874-1938) is quoted as follows (numbers added for subsequent analytical purposes): "(1) My (2) unconscious (3) knows (4) more (5) about (6) the consciousness (7) of (8) the psychologist (7) than (9) his consciousness (10) knows about (11) my (12, 13) unconscious [= (12) un- (13) conscious."]

Suggested classification:

DA: (1) My

A: (2) Unconscious

AG: (3) Knows

G: (4) More

GQ: (5) About

Q: (6) The consciousness

QD: (7) Of; than

D: (8) The psychologist

DG: (9) His consciousness

AQ: (10) Knowing about

U: (13) Conscious

N: (12) Un-

D': (11) My

My justifications for the foregoing classifications are as follows:

DA: (1) My can be classed in DA since this word links Kraus as agent or drive-bearer, D, with his unconscious knowledge as anticipatory, A.

A: (2) Unconscious can be classed in A since the unconscious is anticipated, A, to know things about the mind of a psychologist.

AG: (3) Knows can be classed in AG since in the expression "unconscious knows more" the word "knows" links the "unconscious" as a source of antici- pations, A, and "more" as a quantity of information as goal object, G.

G: (4) More can be classed in G since this word refers to a quantity of infor-mation as goal object, G.

GQ: (5) About can be classed in GQ since in the expression "more about the consciousness" the word "about" links the goal-object word "more," G, and the quiescent words "the consciousness," Q.

Q: (6) The consciousness can be classed in Q since "the consciousness refers to the quiescent manifestations, Q, that occur in a conscious mind.

QD: (7) Of; than can be classed in QD since in the expression "the conscious-ness of the psychologist" the word "of" links the quiescent words "the consciousness," Q, and the drive words "the psychologist," D; and "than" links the quiescent manifestation, Q, of the clause that precedes this word, and a subse- quent clause that there is a drive, D, to add.

D: (8) The psychologist can be classed in D since a psychologist is an agent or drive-bearer, D.

DA: (9) His consciousness can be classed in DG since "his" refers to the psychologist as agent or drive-bearer, D, while "consciousness" refers to a goal object, G, belonging to the psychologist, namely his conscious mental thought.

AQ: (10) Knowing About can be classed in AQ since "knows" is anticipatory, A, while "about" anticipates the quiescent manifestations, Q, in Kraus's unconscious mind.

U: (13) Conscious can be classed in U since what is conscious is a unified, U, survey of what one can consciously identify in one's own mind.

N: (12) Un- can be classed in N since what is "unconscious" is a negation, N, of what is conscious.

D': (11) My can be classed in D' since this word refers to Kraus as a superordinate agent or drive-bearer, D', superordinate by virtue of his unconscious knowledge being superior to the psychologist's conscious knowledge.

5. Neurosis in Psychologists as of Value, Sigmund Freud

In *Psychologies: Webster's Quotations, Facts and Phrases* (pg. 1) Sigmund Freud is quoted as follows (numbers assed for subsequent analytical purposes; words in brackets added here): "(1) A certain (2) degree (3) of (4) neurosis (5) is (6) of (7) inestimable (6) value (8) as (9) a drive, (10) especially (11) to [one (12) seeking to be] (13) a psychologist. "

Suggested classification:

DA: (1) A certain

A: (2) Degree

AG: (3) Of

G: (4) Neurosis

GQ: (5) Is

Q: (6) Of value

QD: (8) As

D: (9) A drive

DG: (11) To one

AQ: (10) Especially

U: (12) Seeking to be

N: (7) Inestimable

D': (13) A psychologist

My justifications for the foregoing classifications are as follows:

DA: (1) A certain can be classed in DA since in the expression "a certain degree" the words "a certain" link the agent or drive-bearer, D, who is making this estimate, and the anticipatory word "degree," A.

A: (2) Degree can be classed in A since this degree anticipates, A, how much neurosis is desirable, namely not a lot or a little but some intermediate degree.

AG: (3) Of can be classed in AG since in the expression "degree of neurosis" the word "of" links the anticipatory word "degree," A, and the goal- object word "neurosis," G.

G: (4) Neurosis can be classed in G since having a neurosis is having a mental goal object, G, namely one involving excesses of one sort or another.

GQ: (5) Is can be classed in GQ since in the expression "neurosis is of value" the word "is" links the goal-object word "neurosis," G, and the quiescent words "of value," Q.

Q: (6) Of value can be classed in Q since what is of value is what confers some degree of quiescent satisfaction, Q.

QD: (8) As can be classed in QD since in the expression "of value as a drive" the word 'as" links the quiescent words "of value," Q, and the drive words "a drive," D.

D: (9) A drive can be classed in D since what is called "a drive" is a drive, D.

DG: (11) To one can be classed in DG since a drive that is of value to someone links the "drive" factor, D, and the goal object factor, G, of being the "one" who benefits from this neurotic drive.

AQ: (10) Especially can be classed in AQ since this word leads one to anticipate, A, that this drive will be of quiescent value or satisfaction, Q, to, in particular, one who aspires to be a good psychologist.

U: (12) Seeking to be can be classed in U since these tacitly understood words involve the attainment of a unified, U, goal, namely that of becoming a good psychologist.

N: (7) Inestimable can be classed in N since this word amounts to a negation, N, of the notion that the value of a neurotic drive can readily be estimated, in this case for attaining the goal of becoming a good psychologist.

D': (13) A psychologist can be classed in D' since this word refers to a superordinate agent or drive-bearer, D', since a psychologist has attained a respected profession.

6. How to Immunize Someone to Fear, Maxwell Maltz

In *Psychologies: Webster's Quotations, Fact and Phrases* (pg. 1) Maxwell Maltz is quoted as follows (numbers added for subsequent analytical purposes): "(1) It (2) is (3) an old (4) psychological (5) axiom (6) that (7) constant exposure to (8) the object (9) of (10) fear (11) immunizes (12) against (13) the fear."

Suggested classification:

QD: (3) An old

D: (4) Psychological

DA: (5) Axiom

A: (6) That

AG: (7) Constant exposure to

G: (8) The object

GQ: (9) Of

Q: (10) Fear

DG: (1) It

AQ: (2) Is

U: (11) Immunizes

N: (12) Against

D': (13) The fear

My justifications for the foregoing classifications are as follows:

QD: (3) An old can be classed in QD since in the expression "I recall an old psychological" the words "an old" link the quiescent words "I recall," Q, which expresses the quiescent manifestation of a memory, and the drive word "psychological," which expresses the drive to enunciate an established axiom in that discipline.

D: (4) Psychological can be classed in D since this word reflects a pur- portedly established view of psychologists as agents or drive-bearers, D.

DA: (5) Axiom can be classed in DA since in the expression "psychological axiom that" the word "axiom" links the drive word "psychological," D, and the anticipatory word "that," A.

A: (6) That can be classed in A since this word leads one to anticipate, A, an explanation of what the purportedly established axiom of psychology is.

AG: (7) Constant exposure to can be classed in AG since in the expression "that constant exposure to the object" the words "constant exposure" link the anticipatory word "that," A, and the goal-object words "the object," G.

G: (8) The object can be classed in G since these words refer to what we call a goal object, G.

GQ; (9) Of can be classed in GQ since in the expression "the object of fear" the word "of" links the goal-object words "the object," G, and the quiescent word "fear," Q.

Q: (10) Fear can be classed in Q since fear is a quiescent dissatisfaction, Q.

DG: (1) It can be classed in DG since this word refers to "it" as an abstract goal object, G, from the standpoint of observing agents or drive-bearers, D.

AQ; (2) Is can be classed in AQ since this word can be expanded to mean "is anticipated to yield such-and-such a quiescent manifestation, Q."

U: (11) Immunizes can be classed in U since to immunize someone amounts to a unified, U, activity that benefits the person being immunized.

N: (12) Against can be classed in N since this word expresses a negation, N, of the fear being immunized against.

D': (13) The fear can be classed in D' since fear would be the state of a subordinate agent or drive-bearer, D', since fear reduces a robust and confident response to the object of fear.

7. Rational vs. Neurotic Desire for Pleasure, Nathaniel Branden

In *Psychologies: Webster's Quotations, Facts and Phrases* (pg. 1) Nathaniel Branden (1930-2014), an early colleague of Ayn Rand, the Russian-born American philosopher who advocated the virtue of selfishness, is quoted as follows (numbers added for subsequent analytical purposes): "(1) For the rational, (2) psychologically healthy (3) man, (4) the desire for pleasure (5) is (6) the desire (7) to celebrate (8) his control (9) over (10) reality. (11) For the neurotic, (12) the desire for pleasure (13) is the desire to escape reality."

Suggested classification:

QD: (2) Psychologically healthy

D: (3) Man

DA: (1) For the rational

A: (8) His control

AG: (9) Over

G: (10) Reality

GQ: (6) The desire

Q: (7) To celebrate

DG: (4) The desire for pleasure

AQ: (5) Is

U: (12) The desire for pleasure

N: (13) Is the desire to escape from reality'

D': (11) For the neurotic

My justifications for these classifications are as follows:

QD: (2) Psychologically healthy can be classed in QD since "healthy" indicates a state of quiescent satisfaction or well-being, Q, while "psychologically" refers to the psyche or mind, which is the core of an agent or drive-bearer, d.

D: (3) Man can be classed in D since a man is an agent or drive-bearer, D.

DA; (1) For the rational can be classed in DA since to be "rational" pertains to a man or person as agent or drive-bearer, D, who rationally anticipates, A, what actions are likely to succeed in resolving his or her drives.

A: (8) His control can be classed in A since such control is anticipated, A, to lead to the satisfaction of his drives.

AG: (9) Over can be classed in AG since in the expression "his control over reality" the word "over" links the anticipatory words "his control," A, and the goal-object word "reality," G.

G: (10) Reality can be classed in G since "reality" refers to the domain of goal objects, G, deriving from the Latin word *res* meaning "things," as our English word "republic" derives from the Latin words "res publica" meaning "public things."

GQ: (6) The desire can be classed in GQ since in the expression "one's desire to celebrate" the word "desire" links the goal-object word "one's," G, and the quiescent word "celebrate," Q, celebrating expressing a quiescent satisfaction, Q.

Q: (7) To celebrate can be classed in Q since celebrating expresses one's quiescent satisfaction, Q.

DG: (4) The desire for pleasure can be classed in DG since "the desire" refers to a drive, D, while "pleasure" refers to a goal object, G, for such a drive.

AQ: (5) Is can be classed in AQ since this word amounts to saying "is antici-pated, A, to yield such-and-such quiescent manifestations, Q."

U: (12) The desire for pleasure can be classed in U since such a desire amounts to a unified, U, achievement, when satisfied.

N: (13) Is the desire to escape reality can be classed in N since escaping is a negation, N, of one's contact with reality.

D': (11) For the neurotic can be classed in D' since a neurotic is a subordinate agent or drive-bearer, D', compared to a psychologically normal person.

Noesis #210, October 2022

8. What We Desire to Accomplish, Orison Swett Marden

In *Psychologies: Webster's Quotations, Facts and Phrases* (pg. 2) Orson Swett Marden is quoted as follows (numbers added for subsequent analytical purposes): "(1) It (2) is (3) psychological (4) law (5) that (6) whatever (7) we (8) desire (9) to accomplish (10) we (11) must (12) impress upon (13) the subjective or subconscious mind."

Suggested classification:

DA: (3) Psychological

A: (4) Law

AG: (5) That

G: (6) Whatever

GQ: (7) We

Q: (8) Desire

QD: (9) To accomplish

D: (10) We

DG: (1) It

AQ: (2) Is

U: (12) Impress upon

N: (11) Must

D': (13) The subjective or subconscious mind

My justifications for these classifications are as follows:

DA: (3) Psychological can be classed In DA because a psychological law is devised by psychologists as agents or drive-bearers, D, and its being a law means it can be used to anticipate, A, what happens in the mind.

A: (4) Law can be classed in A since a law expresses a rule that can be anticipated, A, to be reliable.

AG: (5) That can be classed in AG since in the expression "law that whatever" the word "that" links the anticipatory word "law," A, and the goal- object word "whatever," G.

G: (6) Whatever can be classed in G since it refers to any goal object, G, that pertains to what the rest of the statement is about.

GQ; (7) We can be classed in GQ since in the expression "whatever we desire' the word "we" links the goal-object word "whatever," G, and the quiescent word "desire," Q.

Q: (8) Desire can be classed in Q since it can be regarded as referring to the quiescent manifestation, Q, of desires in the mind.

QD: (9) To accomplish can be classed in QD since the one who wants to accomplish something is an agent or drive-bearer, D, while its accomplishment would amount to an observable quiescent manifestation, Q.

D: (10) We can be classed in D since this word refers to an agent or drive- bearer, D.

DG: (1) It can be classed in DG since it refers to an abstract goal object, G, from the perspective of some agent or drive-bearer, D.

AQ: (2) Is can be classed in AQ since this word can be construed as meaning "is anticipated, A, to lead to such-and-such a quiescent manifestation, Q."

U: (12) Impress upon can be classed in U since whatever is successfully impressed upon the mind is a unified, U, achievement.

N: (11) Must can be classed in N since this word negates, N, the possibility of any alternatives.

D': (13) The subjective or subconscious mind can be classed in D' since these aspects of the mind can be regarded as subordinate agents or drive- bearers, D', subordinate by virtue of not being, by contrast, objective or conscious.

The Metaphysics of Political Science

Ronald K. Hoeflin

Contents:

1. Reason as the Voice of God, Ursula K. Le Guin

2. Accomplices, Voltaire

3. Pendulum Between Anarchy and Tyranny, Albert Einstein

4. Partisanship, Will Rogers

5. Statesman versus Politician, Harold Macmillan

6. War, Karl von Clausewitz

7. Honest Politicians, On Being an, Rodney Dangerfield

8. Government as Inevitably a Failure, H. L. Mencken

1. Reason as Playing God, Ursula K. Le Guin

In *Society and Politics: Webster's Quotations, Facts and Phrases* (pg. 18) science-fiction writer Ursula K. Le Guin is quoted as follows (numbers added for subsequent analytical purposes): "(1) Reason (2) is a faculty (3) far larger than mere objective force. (4) When (5) either the political (6) or the scientific (7) discourse (8) announces (9) itself (10) as (11) the voice of reason, (12) it is playing God, (13) and should be spanked and stood in the corner."

Suggested classification:

QD: (4) When

D: (7) Discourse

DA: (5) Either the political

A: (6) Or the scientific

AG: (8) Announces

G: (9) Itself

GQ: (10) As

Q: (11) The voice of reason

DG: (12) It is playing God

AQ: (13) And should be spanked and stood in the corner

U: (1) Reason

N: (3) Far larger than mere objective force

D': (2) Is a faculty

My justifications for these classifications are as follows:

QD: (4) When can be classed in QD since this word links the "voice of reason" as a quiescent manifestation, Q, with the "discourse" as the drive by which this voice of reason announces itself, the voice of reason occurring "when" or at the same time as the discourse that announces it.

D: (7) Discourse can be classed in D since a discourse would be a set of words by which some thought or feeling exerts a drive, D, to express itself.

DA: (5) Either the political can be classed in DA since the political would involve how a governing authority as agent or drive-bearer, D, exerts an influence on affairs by which their subsequent occurrence can be anticipated, as through the efforts of a dictator, president, legislature, or the like.

A: (6) Or scientific can be classed in A since science attempts to anticipate, A, the course of events through a theoretical framework that encompasses how events typically follow one another in nature.

AG: (8) Announces can be classed in AG since this word leads one to anticipate, A, what is announced as goal objects of the announcement.

G: (9) Itself can be classed in G since this word amounts to the goal object, G, that is purportedly announced by political or scientific reason "itself."

GQ: (10) As can be classed in GQ since in the expression "itself as the voice of reason" the word "as" links the goal-object word "itself," G, and the quiescent words "the voice of reason," Q.

Q: (11) The voice of reason can be classed in Q since the word "voice" refers to the quiescent manifestation, Q, of reason's "voice," the word "voice" being used metaphorically, but in a literal sense refers to an audible quiescent manifestation.

DG: (12) It is playing God can be classed in DG since "God" would be the goal object, G, that rational political or scientific discourse purports to represent.

AQ: (13) And should be spanked and stood in the corner can be classed in AQ since these words refer to how any claim of political or scientific reason to play God by anticipating, A, the quiescent course of events, Q, that reason demands, a demand that should be treated as childish effrontery that deserves to be punished.

U: (1) Reason can be classed in U since this word is the central theme that unifies, U, this entire quotation.

N: (13) Far larger than mere objective force can be classed in N since these words negate, N, the view that reason is limited to what politics or science regard as objective truth, presumably pushing aside other sources of truth.

D': (2) Is a faculty can be classed in D' since this faculty is that of a subordinate agent or drive-bearer, D', since it is limited to political or scientific thought without regard to other modes of thought, such as those generated by the other phases of the feedback loop besides the DA or A phases, which are a mere fraction of the whole.

2. Accomplices, Voltaire

In *Society and Politics: Webster's Quotations, Facts and Phrases* (pg. 23) Voltaire is quoted as follows (numbers added for subsequent analytical purposes): "(1) The wicked (2) can have only (3) accomplices, (4) the voluptuous (5) have companions in debauchery, (6) self-seekers have associates, (7) the politic (8) assemble the factions, (9) the typical idler (10) has connections, (11) princes (12) have courtiers. (13) Only the virtuous have friends."

Suggested classification:

D: (11) Princes

DA: (12) Have courtiers

A: (7) The politic

AG: (8) Assemble the factions

G: (9) The typical idler

GQ: (10) Has connections

Q: (4) The voluptuous

QD: (5) Have companions in debauchery

DG: (6) Self-seekers have associates

AQ: (13) Only the virtuous have friends

U: (1) The wicked

N: (2) Can have only

D': (3) Accomplices

My justifications for these classifications:

D: (11) Princes can be classed in D since they are men who are dominant agents or drive-bearers, D.

DA: (12) Have courtiers can be classed in DA since the ones who have courtiers are princes, whom we have classed in D, and their courtiers are those who can be anticipated, A, to be able to help the prince to rule, either through their wealth or their military prowess.

A: (7) The politic can be classed in A since the politic, i.e., people with political skill, anticipate, A, being able to influence factions that accept their point of view.

AG: (8) Assemble the factions can be classed in AG since the ones who assemble the factions are the politic, whom we classed in A above, while the factions they assemble are groups of people they can influence as goal objects, G.

G: (9) The typical idler can be classed in G since an idler lacks ambition or drive, which puts him or her in the category of a goal object, G.

GQ: (10) Has connections can be classed in GQ since connections connect the idler as goal object, G, with various quiescent satisfactions, Q, such as drugs.

Q: (4) The voluptuous can be classed in Q since such persons are focused on sexual or other satisfactions, Q, e.g., lavish food and drink.

QD: (5) Have companions in debauchery can be classed in QD since those who engage in debauchery are agents or drive-bearers, D, who seek the quiescent satisfactions, Q, of debauchery.

DG: (6) Self-seekers have associates can be classed in DG since the self that is a self-seeker is an agent or drive-bearer, D, while the "seeking" he or she engages in is the drive, D, to benefit the self, and the "associates" amount to people as goal objects, G, who can help enable the self-seeking.

AQ: (13) Only the virtuous have friends can be classed in AQ since the virtuous are able to anticipate, A, what is right as a quiescent satisfaction, Q, while the friends are people who appreciate the virtuous person and his or her quiescent satisfactions, Q, i.e., notions of what is right or wrong.

U: (1) The wicked can be classed in U since they have a unified, U, interest in pursuing what is wrong or criminal in nature.

N: (2) Can have only can be classed in N since these words negate, N, having anything other than what is specified. N, namely accomplices, i.e., partners in crime.

D': (3) Accomplices can be classed in D' since they aim to do what is wrong as subordinate agents or drive-bearers, D', to their leaders, the masters of crime.

3. Pendulum Between Anarchy and Tyranny, Albert Einstein

In *Society and Politics: Webster's Quotations, Facts and Phrases* (pg. 18) Albert Einstein is quoted as follows (numbers added for subsequent analytical purposes): "(1) Politics (2) is (3) a pendulum (4) whose (5) swings (6) between (7) anarchy (6) and (8) tyranny (9) are (10) fueled (11) by perpetually (12) rejuvenated (13) illusions."

Suggested classification:

D: (1) Politics

DA: (2) Is

A: (3) A pendulum

AG: (4) Whose

G: (5) Swings

GQ: (9) Are

Q: (10) Fueled

QD: (6) Between...and

DG: (9) Tyranny

AQ: (7) Anarchy

U: (12) Rejuvenated

N: (11) Perpetually

D': (13) Illusions

My justifications for these classifications are as follows:

D: (1) Politics can be classed in D since politics can be regarded as the art of ruling others by politicians, who are agents or drive-bearers, D.

DA: (2) Is can be classed in DA since in the expression "politics is a pendulum" the word "is" links the drive word "politics" D, and the anticipatory words"a pendulum," A.

A: (3) A pendulum can be classed in A since a pendulum can be anticipated to swing repeatedly back and forth, to and fro.

AG: (4) Whose can be classed in AG since in the expression "a pendulum whose swings" the word "whose" links the anticipatory words "a pendulum," A, and the goal-object word "swings," G.

G: (5) Swings can be classed in G since swings can be regarded as observable goal objects, G, displayed by pendulums.

GQ: (9) Are can be classed in GQ since in the expression "swings are fueled" the word "are" links the goal-object word "swings," G, and the quiescent word "fueled," Q.

Q: (10) Fueled can be classed in Q since the fueling is a quiescent satisfaction, Q, that supports the swinging of the pendulum.

QD: (6) Between...and can be classed in QD since in the expression "between anarchy and tyranny" the words "between...and" link the quiescent manifestation, Q, of the word "anarchy," Q, and the drive, D, to add the word "tyranny."

DG: (9) Tyranny can be classed in DG since the tyrant is an agent or drive-bearer, D, who tyrannizes over others as goal objects, G.

AQ; (7) Anarchy can be classed in AQ since anarchy involves not being able to anticipate, A, what actions as quiescent manifestations, Q, others will choose to exhibit next.

U: (12) Rejuvenated can be classed in U since this action successfully maintains the repetitious unity, U, of the pendulum's swings.

N: (11) By perpetually can be classed in N since this word negates, N, any cessation in the swings of the pendulum.

D': (13) Illusion can be classed in D' since an illusion is a mental image created by a subordinate agent or drive-bearer, D', subordinate by virtue of not being able to see the fruitlessness of the goal each swoop of the pendulum will manage to achieve, since it will be undone by its own excesses, leading to a swoop to the opposite extreme, and so forth presumably ad infinitum.

Noesis #210, October 2022

4. Partisanship, Will Rogers

In *Society and Politics: Webster's Quotations, Facts and Phrases* (pg. 22) humorist Will Rogers (1879-193) is quoted as follows (numbers added for subsequent analytical purposes): "(1) The more (2) you (3) read (4) and (5) observe (6) about (7) this (8) politics (9) thing, (10) the more you've got to admit (11) that each party (12) is worse than the other. (13) The one that's out always looks the best."

Suggested classification:

Q: (1) The more

QD: (4) And

D: (2) You

DA: (6) About

A: (7) This

AG: (8) Politics

G: (9) Thing

GQ: (10) The more you've got to admit

DG: (3) Read

AQ: (5) Observe

U: (13) The one that's out always looks the best

N: (12) Is worse than the other

D': (11) That each party

My justifications for these classifications are as follows:

Q. (1) The more can be classed in Q since reading and observing "more" amounts to an observable quiescent manifestation, Q.

QD: (4) And can be classed in QD since this conjunction links the quiescent manifestation, Q, of the preceding word, namely "read," and the drive, D, to add the next word, namely "observe."

D: (2) You can be classed in D since this word refers to an agent or drive- bearer, D.

DA: (6) About can be classed in DA since in the expression "you (read and observe) about this" the word "about" links the drive word 'you," D, and the antici-patory word "this," A.

A: (7) This can be classed in A since this word leads one to anticipate, A, an explanation of what the word "this" refers to.

AG: (8) Politics can be classed in AG since in the expression "this politics thng" the word "politics" links the anticipatory word "this," A, and the goal-object word "thing," G.

G: (9) Thing can be classed in G since a thing amounts to a goal object, G.

GQ: (10) The more you've got to admit can be classed in GQ since "you've" can be regarded as referring to a person or persons as goal objects, G, while "to admit" would be an observable quiescent manifestation, Q.

DG: (3) Read can be classed in DG since to read involves an agent or drive-bearer, D, looking at a page of text or some analogous goal object, G.

AQ: (5) Observe can be classed in AQ since to observe political activities involves noticing quiescent manifestations, Q, of a political nature and thereby being able to anticipate, A, how similar activities are likely to proceed.

U: (13) The one that's out always looks the best can be classed in U since these words sum up a unifying aspect of politics that Rogers wishes to draw attention to.

N: (12) Is worse than the other can be classed in N since these words indicate that each party is, viewed from a certain vantage point, worse than the other and hence a negation, N, of the other in terms of goodness or badness.

D': (11) That each party can be classed in D' since these words refer to political parties that each show negative qualities when they are in power and hence are run by subordinate agents or drive-bearers, D', by virtue of their lack of consistent goodness.

5. Statesman versus Politician, Harold Macmillan

In *Society and Politics: Webster's Quotations, Facts and Phrases* (pg. 20) Harold Macmillan (1894-1986), Conservative Prime Minister of the United Kingdom from 1957 to 1963, is quoted as follows (numbers added for subsequent analytical purposes): "(1) At home (2) you (3) always (4) have (5) to be (6) a politician. (7) But (8) when (9) you're (10) abroad (11) you (12) almost (11) feel yourself (13) a statesman."

Suggested classification:

D: (2) You

DA: (3) Always

A: (4) Have

AG: (5) To be

G: (6) A politician

GQ: (9) You're

Q: (10) Abroad

QD: (7) But

DG: (1) At home

AQ: (8) When

U: (11) You feel yourself

N: (12) Almost

D': (13) A statesman

My justifications for these classifications are as follows:

D: (2) You can be classed in D since this word refers to a person as agent or drive-bearer, D.

DA: (3) Always can be classed in DA since in the expression "you always have" the word "always" links the drive word "you," D, and the anticipatory word "have, A.

A: (4) Have can be classed in A since this word leads one to anticipate, A, what one always has to be or to do.

AG: (5) To be can be classed in AG since in the expression "have to be a poli-tician" the words "to be" link the anticipatory word "have," A, and the goal- object words "a politician," G,

G; (6) A politician can be classed in G since these words refer to a class of persons that amounts to a goal object, G.

GQ: (9) You're can be classed in GQ since "you" refers to a person as a goal object, G, while "are" links this goal object to some quiescent manifestation, Q.

Q: (10) Abroad can be classed in Q since being abroad is an observable quiescent manifestation, Q.

QD: (7) But can be classed in QD since this tacitly understood conjunction links the quiescent manifestation, Q, of the words that precede it, and the subsequent words that there is a drive, D, to add.

DG: (1) At home can be classed in DG since "home" refers to a goal object, G, in this case the United Kingdom, from the perspective of observing agents or drive-bearers, D.

AQ: (8) When can be classed in AQ since this word leads one to anticipate, A, those times when the subsequently mentioned quiescent manifestations, Q, occur.

U: (11) You feel yourself can be classed in U since these words refer to a unifying, U, feeling that pervades the times when one is abroad as Prime Minister. N: (12) Almost can be classed in N since this word leaves open some negative feelings, N, that oppose the feeling of being a statesman.

D': (13) A statesman can be classed in D' since this word refers to a superordinate agent or drive-bearer, D', compared to being a politician, since the word "statesman" connotes a higher and more dignified status than the word "politician."

6. War, Karl von Clausewitz

In *Society and Politics: Webster's Quotations, Facts and Phrases* (pg. 17) Karl von Clausewitz is quoted as follows in probably his most famous statement concerning war (numbers added for subsequent analytical purposes): "(1) War (2) is (3) not (4) merely (5) a political act (6) but (7) a real (8) political instrument, (9) a continuation (10) of political intercourse, (11) a carrying out (12) of the same (13) by other means."

Suggested classification:

D: (1) War

DA: (2) Is

A: (3) Not

AG: (4) Merely

G: (5) A political act

GQ: (7) A real

Q: (8) Political instrument

QD: (6) But

DG: (10) Of political intercourse

AQ: (9) A continuation

U: (11) A carrying out

N: (12) By other means

D': (13) Of the same

My justifications for these classifications are as follows:

D: (1) War can be classed in D since it amounts to a drive, D, to achieve ends that are political in nature.

DA: (2) Is can be classed in DA since in the expression "ware is not" the word "is" links the drive word "war," D, and the anticipatory word "not," A.

A: (3) Not can be classed in A since this word leads one to anticipate, A, the opposite of what is stated next.

AG: (4) Merely can be classed in AG since in the expression "not merely a political act" the word "merely" links the anticipatory word "not," A, and the goal-object words "a political act," G.

G: (5) A political act can be classed in G since a political act can be regarded as a goal object, G.

GQ: (7) A real can be classed in GQ since in the expression "a real political instrument" the words "a real" refer to a goal object, G, since "real" derives from the Latin word *res* meaning "thing," a thing amounting to a goal object, and the subsequent words "political instrument" can be regarded as a quiescent manifestation, Q, since such an instrument has various observable characteristics that amount to quiescent manifestations.

Q: (8) Political instrument can be classed in Q since such an instrument, as with a gun or explosive, exhibits various quiescent manifestations, Q, such as the ability to render an enemy soldier dead, or the ability to render an enemy fortress destroyed.

QD: (6) But can be classed in GQ since this conjunction links the quiescent manifestations, Q, or preceding words, and the drive, D, to add subsequent words.

DG: (10) Of political intercourse can be classed in DG since such intercourse can be regarded as a goal object, G, from the standpoint of observing agents or drive-bearers, D.

AQ: (9) A continuation can be classed in AQ since what is continued is antici-pated, A, to exhibit its quiescent manifestations, Q, into the future.

U: (11) A carrying out can be classed in U since these words refer to a war as a unified, U, activity.

N: (13) By other means can be classed in N since these "other means" refer to a negation, N, of the usual means by which political actions are carried out, such as democratic elections, or at least political speeches.

D': (12) Of the same can be classed in D' since these words refer to war as a quasi-political activity, so that war is treated as a version of political activity but carried out by soldiers rather than politicians, soldiers being subordinate agents or drive-bearers, D', because compared to politician, their lives are at greater risk.

7. Honest Politician, On Being an, Rodney Dangerfield

In *Society and Politics: Webster's Quotations, Facts and Phrases* (pg. 17) comedian Rodney Dangerfield is quoted as follows (number added for subsequent analytical purposes): "(1) I (2) get (3) no respect. (4) The way my (5) luck is running, (6) if (7) I (8) was (9) a politician [(10) then] (11) I (12) would be (13) honest."

Suggested classification:

QD: (6) If

D: (7) I

DA: (8) Was

A: (9) A Politician

AG: (10) Then

G: (11) I

GQ: (12) Would be

Q: (13) Honest

DG: (4) The way my

AQ: (5) Luck is running

U: (12) Get

N: (13) No respect

D': (11) I

My justifications for these classifications are as follows:

QD: (6) if can be classed in QD since this word begins the quiescent manifestation, Q, of a clause, following which there is a drive, D, to add a "then" clause.

D: (7) I can be classed in D since this pronoun refers to Dangerfield as an agent or drive-bearer, D.

DA: (8) Was can be classed in DA since in the expression "I was as politician" the word "was" links the drive word "I," D, and the anticipatory words "a politician," A.

A: (9) A politician can be classed in A since being a politician leads to certain anticipations, A, such as dishonesty.

AG: (10) Then can be classed in AG since this word leads the preceding anticipatory "if" clause to the next clause as goal object, G.

G: (11) I can be classed in G since this word now stands for a goal object, G, to which the property of being honest is ascribed.

GQ: (12) Would be can be classed in GQ since in the expression "I would be honest" the words "would be" link the goal-object word "I," G, and the quiescent word "honest," Q.

Q: (13) Honest can be classed in Q since being honest is an observable qui-escent manifestation, Q.

DG: (4) The way my can be classed in DG since "my" refers to Danger- field as an agent or drive-bearer, D, while "way" refers to a goal object, G, that is being linked to Dangerfield, namely a pathway that he is stuck with.

AQ: (5) Luck is running can be classed in AQ since "luck" refers to a quiescent manifestation, Q, that one is being led to anticipate, A, is a trait of Dangerfield.

U: (2) Get can be classed in U since this word refers to a unified, U, response to Dangerfield on the part of others.

N: (3) No respect can be classed in N since these words refer to the lack or negation, N, of respect for Dangerfield on the part of others.

D': (1) I can be classed in D' since Dangerfield is referring to himself as a subordinate agent or drive-bearer, D', subordinate due to the lack of respect he thinks he gets.

8. Government as at Best a Failure, H. L. Mencken

In *Society and Politics: Webster's Quotations, Facts and Phrases* (pg. 26) cynic H. L. Mencken is quoted as follows (numbers added for subsequent analytical purposes; word in brackets added): "(1) Government is actually (2) the worst failure (3) of civilized man. (4) There (5) has (6) never (7) been (8) a really (9) good (10) one, (10) and (11) even those that are most tolerable (13) are arbitrary, cruel, grasping and unintelligent."

Suggested classification:

D: (4) There

DA: (5) Has

A: (6) Never

AG: (7) Been

G: (10) One

GQ: (8) A really

Q: (9) Good

QD: (11) And

DG: (12) Even those that are most tolerable

AQ: (13) Are arbitrary, cruel, grasping and unintelligent

U: (1) Government is actually

N: (2) The worst failure

D': (3) Of civilized man

My justifications for these classifications are as follows:

D: (4) There can be classed in D since this word expresses a drive, D, for the audience to pay heed to what is stated next.

DA: (5) Has can be classed in DA since in the expression "there has never" the word "has "links the drive word "there," D, and the anticipatory word "never," A.

A: (6) Never can be classed in A since this word leads one to anticipate, A, the opposite of what is stated next.

AG: (7) Been can be classed in AG since in the expression "never been... one" the word 'been" links the anticipatory word "never," A, and the goal-object word "one," G.

G: (10) One can be classed in G since this word refers to any government as goal object G.

GQ: (8) A really can be classed in GQ since in the expression "one [that was] really good" the words "really" link the goal-object word "one," G, and the quies-cent word "good," Q.

Q: (9) Good can be classed in Q since "good" refers to anything that is a quiescent satisfaction, Q.

QD: (11) And can be classed in QD since this conjunction links the quiescent manifestation, Q, of preceding words, and subsequent words that there is a drive, D, to add.

DG: (12) Even those that are most tolerable can be classed in DG since "those" refers to any government as a goal object, G, while "most tolerable" refers to the point of view of an agent or drive-bearer, D.

AQ: (13) Are arbitrary, cruel, grasping and unintelligent can be classed in AQ since these words refer to what presumably can be anticipated, A, to inevitably have these quiescent manifestations, Q.

(Note that the four negative traits mentioned can be classed in D, Q, G, and A, respectively. "arbitrary" is due to a drive, D, that is unimpeded by other factors.

"cruel" involves imparting a severe quiescent dissatisfaction, Q.

"grasping" refers to the desire to accumulate wealth or property as goal objects, G. And what is "unintelligent" is what fails to anticipate, A, outcomes intelligently.)

U: (1) Government is actually can be classed in U since these words refer to the unified, U, outcome of government activity.

N: (2) The worst failure can be classed in N since a failure is what one would prefer to negate, N.

D': (3) Of civilized man can be classed in D' since these words refer to pur-portedly superordinate agents or drive-bearers, D', by virtue of the word "civilized," but are actually subordinate by virtue of their egregious "failure."

The Metaphysics of Economics

Ronald K. Hoeflin

Contents:

1. Causes of War, Simone Weil

In *Economics: Webster's Quotations, Facts, and Phrases* (pg. 3) Simone Weil is quoted as follows (numbers added for subsequent analytical purposes): "(1) What (2) a country (3) calls (4) its (5) vital (6) economic (7) interests (8) are not (9) the things (10) which enable its citizens to live, (11) but (12) the things which enable it to make war. (13) Petrol is more likely than wheat to be the cause of international conflict."

Suggested classification:

D: (2) A country

DA: (3) Calls

A: (1) What

AG: (4) Its

G: (7) Interests

GQ: (5) Vital

Q: (6) Economic

QD: (11) But

DG: (12) The things which enable it to make war

AQ: (13) Petrol is more likely than wheat to be a cause of international conflict

U: (10) Which enable its citizens to live

N: (8) Are not

D': (9) The things

My justifications for these classifications are as follows:

D: (2) A country can be classed in D since this word refers to an entity that is anthropomorphized by saying it "calls" something by a certain description.

DA: (3) Calls can be classed in DA since what "calls" is a country as an agent or drive-bearer, D, while what it calls is a description anticipated, A, to be accurate.

A: (1) What can be classed in A since this word stands for the description that is later given of what a country anticipates, A, to be its vital economic interests.

AG: (4) Its can be classed in AG since this word leads one to anticipate, A, the "interests" as goal objects,G, that are anticipated.

G: (7) Interests can be classed in G since this word refers to the interests of a country as its goal objects, G.

GQ: (5) Vital can be classed in GQ since this word links the interests of a country as its goal objects, G, with the domain of the quiescent manifestation, Q, that those interests occupy, namely economic ones.

Q: (6) Economic can be classed in Q since this word describes the sort of interests as quiescent manifestations, Q, that are referred to as vital to a country.

QD: (11) But can be classed in QD since this conjunction links the quiescent manifestation, Q, of preceding words, Q, with subsequent words that there is a drive, D, to add.

DG: (12) The things which enable it to make war can be classed in DG since these "things" amount to goal objects, G, e.g., petrol, while "it" refers to the country as agent or drive-bearer, D, that has a drive on occasion to make war.

AQ: (13) Petrol is more likely that wheat to be a cause of international conflict can be classed in AQ since these words lead one to anticipate, A, the quiesa-cent manifestation, Q, of petrol as a more likely cause of war than wheat.

U: (10) What enable its citizens to live can be classed in U since such enabling amounts to a unified, U, activity, namely the production of wheat and the like.

N: (8) Are not can be classed in N since these words negate, N, such things as wheat as a more important cause of war than, for example, petrol.

D': (9) The things can be classed in D' since such things as wheat are made by subordinate agents or drive-bearers, D', compared to those who produce petrol as the ones responsible for international conflict.

Noesis #210, October 2022

2. Moral Rightness and Economic Necessity, Anonymous

In *Economics: Webster's Quotations, Facts and Phrases* (pg. 1) we find the following quote from an anonymous source (numbers added for subsequent analytical purposes): "(1) Many people (2) convince themselves (3) if (4) it (5) is (6) economically necessary, [(7) then] (8) it (9) is (10) morally right. (11) That (12) is not always (13) the case."

Suggested classification:

QD: (3) If

D: (4) It

DA: (5) Is

A: (6) Economically necessary

AG: (7) Then

G: (8) It

GQ; (9) Is

Q: (10) Morally right

DG: (1) Many people

AQ: (2) Convince themselves

U: (11) That

N: (12) Is not always

D': (13) The case

My justifications for these classifications are as follows;

QD: (3) If can be classed in QD since this word links the quiescent manifestation, Q, of the clause that immediately follows the word "if", and the drive, D, to add the next clause, the "then" clause, that follows the "if" clause.

D: (4) It can be classed in D since this word refers to the drive, D, to do something that seems economically necessary.

DA: (5) Is can be classed in DA since in the expression "it is economically necessary" the word "is" links the drive word "it," D, and the anticipatory words "economically necessary," A.

A: (6) Economically necessary can be classed in A since these words lead one to anticipate, A, that something is economically necessary, e.g., stealing money to purchase food.

AG: (7) Then can be classed in AG since this word links the anticipatory "if" clause, A, that occupies the span QD, D, DA, and A, and the goa-object "then" clause, G, that occupies the span G, GQ, and Q.

G: (8) It can be classed in G since this word refers to the deed as goal object, G, that one surmised is economically necessary.

GQ: (9) Is can be classed in GQ since in the expression "it is morally right" the word "is" links the goal-object word "it," G, and the quiescent words "morally right," Q.

Q: (10) Morally right can be classed in Q since what is morally right is generally thought of as a quiescent satisfaction, Q.

DG: (1) Many people can be classed in DG since such people can be regarded as goal objects, G, from the standpoint of observing agents or drive- bearers, D.

AQ: (2) Convince themselves can be classed in AQ since to convince someone is anticipated, A, to lead to a conviction regarding the truth of something, while "themselves" refers to the people whose minds adopt such convictions as quiescent manifestations, Q.

U: (11) That can be classed in U since this word refers to the foregoing words as a unified whole, U

N: (12) Is not always can be classed in N since these words negate, N, the truth of the foregoing words.

D': (13) The case can be classed in D' since the assumption presented in the opening sentence would be adopted by a subordinate agent or drive-bearer, D', by virtue of its not inevitably being a truth that only a weak mind would consider inevitably true.

3. Advertising, Sinclair Lewis

In *Economics: Webster's Quotations, Facts and Phrases* (pg. 2) writer Sinclair Lewis is quoted as follows (numbers added for subsequent analytical purposes): "(1) Advertising (2) is (3) a valuable (4) economic (5) factor (6) because (7) it (8) is (9) the cheapest (10) way (11) of selling goods, (12) particularly if the goods (13) are worthless."

Suggested classification:

D: (1) Advertising

DA: (2) Is

A: (3) A valuable

AG: (4) Economic

G: (5) Factor

GQ: (9) The cheapest

Q: (10) Way

QD: (6) Because

DG: (7) It

AQ: (8) Is

U: (11) Of selling goods

N: (13) Are worthless

D': (12) Particularly if the goods

My justifications for these classifications are as follows:

D: (1) Advertising can be classed in D since advertising exercises the drive, D, to sell goods.

DA: (2) Is can be classed in DA since in the expression "advertising is a valuable" the word "is" links the drive word "advertising," A, and the anticipatory words "a valuable," A.

A: (3) A valuable can be classed in A since what is valuable is anticipated, A, to have worth, i.e., something desired for its uses or qualities.

AG: (4) Economic can be classed in AG since in the expression "a valuable economic factor" the word "economic" links the anticipatory words "a valuable," A, and the goal-object word "factor," G.

G: (5) Factor can be classed in G since this word amounts to an abstract goal object, G.

GQ: (9) The cheapest can be classed in GQ since in the expression "factor (because it is) the cheapest way" the words "the cheapest" link the goal-object word "factor," G, and the quiescent word "way," G.

Q: (10) Way can be classed in Q since this cheapest way would be a quiescent satisfaction, Q.

QD: (6) Because can be classed in QD since this conjunction links the quies-cent manifestation, Q, of preceding words, and subsequent words that there is a drive, D, to add.

DG: (7) It can be classed in DG since this word refers to an abstract goal object, G, from the standpoint of observing agents or drive-bearers, D.

AQ: (8) Is can be classed in AQ since this word can be elaborated to mean "is anticipated to yield the following quiescent satisfactions, Q."

U: (11) Of selling goods can be classed in U since selling goods cheaply would amount to a unified, U, successful activity.

N: (13) Are worthless can be classed in N since what is worthless is the nega-tion, N, of having worth.

D': (12) Particularly if the goods can be classed in D' since these words refer to goods that are produced by subordinate agents or drive-bearers, D', subordinate because the goods they produce are commonly worthless.

4. Inventors, J. Paul Getty

In *Economics: Webster's Quotations, Facts and Phrases* (pg.3) billionaire J. Paul Getty is quoted as follows (numbers added for subsequent analytical purposes; words in brackets added here): "(1) The man (2) who comes up with (3) means (4) for doing or producing (5) almost anything [(6) that is] (7) better, faster or more economically (8) has his future (9) and (10) fortune (11) at (12) his (13) fingertips."

Suggested classification:

D: (1) The man

DA: (2) Who comes up with

A: (3) Means

AG: (4) For doing or producing

G: (5) Almost anything

GQ: (5) That is

Q: (6) Better, faster or more economically

QD: (9) And

DG: (10) Fortune

AQ: (8) Has his future

U: (13) Fingertips

N: (11) At

D': (12) His

My justifications for these classifications are as follows:

D: (1) The man can be classed in D since a man is an agent or drive- bearer, D.

DA: (2) Who come up with can be classed in DA since in the expression "the man who comes up with" means the words "who comes up with" link the drive words "the man," D, and the anticipatory word "means," A.

A: (3) Mans can be classed in A since a means anticipates, A, what it is a means to accomplish.

AG: (4) For doing or producing can be classed AG since in the expression "means for doing or producing almost anything" the words "for doing or produc-ing" link the anticipatory word "means," A, and the goal-object words "almost anything," G.

G: (5) Almost anything can be classed in G since these words refer to the goal objects, G, done or produced.

GQ: (6) That is can be classed in GQ since in the expression "almost anything that is better..." the words "that is" link the goal-object words "almost anything," G, and the quiescent words "better...," Q.

Q: (7) Better, faster or more economically can be classed in Q since these are quiescent satisfactions, Q.

QD: (9) And can be classed in QD since this conjunction links the quiescent manifestation, Q, of preceding words, and subsequent words (or in this case word) that there is a drive, D, to add.

U: (13) Fingertips can be classed in U since fingertips are a unified, U, means, U, of accomplishing anything.

N: (11) At can be classed in N since this word negates, N, being at a distance.

D': (12) His can be classed in D' since this word refers to a superordinate agent or drive-bearer, D', superordinate because of his inventive abilities.

5. Runaway Inflation, Dixie Lee Ray

In *Economics: Webster's Quotations, Facts and Phrases* (pg. 2) scientist and politician Dixie Lee Ray, described in Wikipedia as "idiosyncratic" and "ridiculously smart," is quoted as follows (numbers added for subsequent analytical purposes): "(1) The reality is that (2) zero defects (3) in products (4) plus (5) zero pollution (4) plus (6) zero risk (7) on the job (8) is equivalent to (9) maximum growth (10) of government (4) plus (11) zero (12) economic (11) growth (4) plus (13) runaway inflation."

Suggested classification:

D: (10) Of government

DA: (9) Maximum growth

A: (7) On the job

AG: (6) Zero risk

G: (3) In products

GQ: (2) Zero defects

Q: (12) Economic

QD: (11) Zero growth

DG: (5) Zero pollution

AQ: (13) Runaway inflation

U: (1) The reality is that

N: (8) Is equivalent to

D': (4) Plus

My justifications for these classifications are as follows:

D: (10) Of government can be classed in D since those who govern are exerting drives, D, to make society fit their preferences. n

DA: (9) Maximum growth can be classed in DA since such growth applies to the drive factor, D, of government, that is anticipated, A, to grow maximally under these specified circumstances.

A: (7) On the job can be classed in A since a job is anticipated, A, to generate income for the worker.

AG (6) Zero risk can be classed in AG since such risk applies to jobs, which are anticipated, A, to yield products and the income for workers their sale yields as goal object, G.

G: (3) In products can be classed in G since products are the goal objects, G, that jobs yield.

GQ: (2) Zero defects can be classed in GQ since such defects pertain to products as goal objects, G, and amount to high quiescent satisfaction, Q, for purchasers of the products.

Q: (12) Economic can be classed in Q since economics attempts to measure the value or quiescent satisfaction, Q, yielded.

QD: (11) Zero growth can be classed in QD since zero economic growth would amount to no increase in quiescent satisfactions, Q, for people as agents or drive-bearers, D.

DG: (5) Zero pollution can be classed in DG since pollutants are undesirable goal objects, G, that people as agents or drive-bearers, D, seek to minimize.

AQ: (13) Runaway inflation can be classed in AQ since inflation is an antici-pation, A, of the value or quiescent satisfactions, Q, that a given unit of money can be expected to yield in the future.

U: (1) The reality is that can be classed in U since this reality amounts to a unified, U, concept that the six actors mentioned collectively describe.

N: (8) Is equivalent to can be classed in N since these words negate, N, any deviation from the equation that is described.

D': (4) Plus can be classed in D' since each factor added by the word "plus" amounts to a factor produced by subordinate agents or drive-bearers, D', such as government officials, or workers on various jobs, or scientists measuring pollution, or economists measuring inflation, etc.

6. Liberal Economists, Noam Chomsky

In *Economics: Webster's Quotations, Facts and Phrases* (pg. 1) leftist intellectual Noam Chomsky is quoted as follows (numbers added for subsequent analytical purposes): "(1) Unlimited (2) economic (3) growth (4) has (5) the marvelous quality (6) of stilling (7) discontent (8) while (9) maintaining privilege, (10) a fact (11) that (12) not gone unnoticed (13) among liberal economists."

Suggested classification:

A: (1) Unlimited

AG: (2) Economic

G: (3) Growth

GQ: (4) Has

Q: (5) The marvelous quality

QD: (6) Of stilling

D: (7) Discontent

DA: (8) While

DG: (10) A fact

AQ: (9) Maintaining privilege

U: (11) That

N: (12) Has not gone unnoticed

D': (13) Among liberal economists

My justifications for these classifications are as follows:

A: (1) Unlimited can be classed in A since this word leads one to anticipate, A, something that has no limit, in this case economic growth.

AG: (2) Economic can be classed in AG since in the expression "unlimited economic growth" the word "economic" links the anticipatory word "unlimited," A, and the goal-object word "growth," G.

G: (3) Growth can be classed in G since this word indicates an economic goal object, G.

GQ: (4) Has can be classed in GQ since in the expression "growth has the marvelous quality" the word "has" links the goal-object word "growth," G, and the quiescent words "the marvelous quality," Q.

Q: (5) The marvelous quality can be classed in Q since these words refer to something that gives quiescent satisfaction, Q.

QD: (6) Of stilling can be classed in QD since in the expression "the marvel-ous quality of stilling discontent" the words "of stilling" link the quiescent words "the marvelous quality," Q, and the drive word "discontent," D.

D: (7) Discontent can be classed in D since it amounts to a drive, D, to act on one's discontent or feeling is uneasiness.

DA: (8) While can be classed in DA since in the expression "discontent while maintaining" the word "while" links the drive word "discontent," D, and the antici-patory word "maintaining," A. The anticipatory phase, A, is already occupied, so this word becomes part of the AQ phase instead.

DG: (10) A fact can be classed in DG since a fact can be regarded as a goal object, G, from the standpoint of observing agents or drive-bearers, D.

AQ: (9) Maintaining privilege can be classed in AQ since these words lead one to anticipate, A, the persistence of the quiescent quality of privilege, Q.

U: (11) That can be classed in U since this word refers to "a fact," meaning the maintaining of privilege because economic growth stills discontent.

N: (12) Has not gone unnoticed can be classed in N since these words refer to the negation of ignoring something of significance to liberal economists.

D': (13) Among liberal economists can be classed in D' since they are treated as superordinate agents or drive-bearers, D', because Chomsky shares their political point of view.

7. Privileged Persons as Depraved, Mikhail Bakunin

In *Economics: Webster's Quotations, Facts and Phrases* (pg. 3) socialist and anarchist revolutionary philosopher Mikhail Bakunin (1814-1876) is quoted as follows (numbers added for subsequent analytical purposes): "(1) It (2) is (3) the peculiarity (4) of privilege and of every privileged position (5) to kill (6) the intellect (7) and (8) heart (9) of (10) man. (11) The privileged man, (12) whether he be privileged politically or economically, (13) is a man depraved in intellect and heart." The reason an anarchist would be so super-sensitive to privilege seems to be that it gives one person power over another, whereas the anarchist prefers to maximize each individual's freedom from external control. Every institution tends to demean its inmates, as was demonstrated by the long series of film documentaries by Frederick Wiseman with such titles as "Blind," "Deaf," etc., the most famous being "Titicut Follies" about an institution for the criminally insane in Bridgewater, Massachusetts. But of course total anarchy would be a mess, so societies have to figure out how to adopt moderate but not unpleasantly excessive control over the inmates of the various social institutions.

Suggested classification:

DA: (3) The peculiarity

A: (4) Of privilege and of every privileged position

AG: (5) To kill

G: (6) The intellect

GQ: (7) And

Q: (8) Heart

QD: (9) Of

D: (10) Man

DG; (1) It

AQ: (2) Is

U: (12) Whether he be privileged politically or economically

N: (13) Is a man depraved in intellect and heart

D': (11) The privileged man

Noesis #210, October 2022

My justifications for these classifications are as follows:

DA: (3) The peculiarity can be classed in DA since the one who has this peculiarity of being privileged is an agent or drive-bearer, D, while that privilege is anticipated, A, in Bakunin's view, to kill the intellect and heart of man.

A: (4) Of privilege and of every privileged position can be classed in A since privilege can be anticipated, A, to exert excessive control over others if there are no restraining rules.

AG: (5) To kill can be classed in AG since killing is anticipated, A, to render a goal object, G, dead or defunct.

G: (6) The intellect can be classed in G since it can be regarded as a sort of abstract goal object, G.

GQ: (7) And can be classed in GQ since in the expression "the intellect and heart" the word "and" links the goal-object words "the intellect," G, and the quies- cent word "heart," Q.

Q: (8) Heart can be classed in Q since "heart" refers to the quiescent feelings, Q, that people have in reaction to the situations they encounter.

QD: (9) Of can be classed in QD since in the expression "heart of man" the word "of" links the quiescent word "heart," Q, and the drive word "man," D.

D: (10) Man can be classed in D since man refers to people as agents ordrive-bearers, D.

DG: (1) It can be classed in DG since it refers to an abstract goal object, G, from the standpoint of observing agents or drive-bearers, D.

AQ: (2) Is can be classed in AQ since this word can be expanded to "is antici-pated, A, to yield the following quiescent manifestations, Q."

U: (12) Whether he be privileged politically or economically can be classed in U since it refers to "privilege" in all its forms as a unified, U, whole.

N: (13) Is a man depraved in intellect and heart can be classed in N since to be depraved is something that one would prefer to negate, N.

D': (11) The privileged man can be classed in D' since Bakunin considers such men to be subordinate agents or drive-bearers, D', subordinate by virtue of their depravity, which is a trait that superior human beings would want to avoid.

8. Prostitution, Kate Millett

In *Economics: Webster's Quotations, Facts and Phrases* (pg. 2) feminist writer Kate Millett is quoted as follows (numbers added for subsequent analytical purposes): "(1) Prostitution, (2) when (3) unmotivated (4) by (5) economic need, (6) might well be defined as (7) a species (8) of (9) psychological addiction, (10) built on self-hatred (11) through repetitions of the act of sale (12) by which a whore (13) is defined."

Suggested classification:

QD: (2) When

D: (3) Unmotivated

DA: (4) By

A: (5) Economic need

AG: (6) Might well be defined as

G: (7) A species

GQ: (8) Of

Q: (9) Psychological addiction

DG: (10) Built on self-hatred

AQ: (11) Through repetitions of the act of sale

U: (1) Prostitution

N: (13) Is defined

D': (12) By which a whore

My justifications for these classifications are as follows:

QD: (2) When can be classed in QD since in the expression "prostitution, when unmotivated" the word "when" links the word "prostitution," which can be regarded as at least partially a quiescent manifestation, Q, and the drive word "unmotivated," D. The word "prostitution" is more importantly assigned to the U factor because it is the central theme of this quotation. We later find another air of words that successfully occupy the Q phase.

D: (3) Unmotivated can be classed in D since what motivates is what serves as a drive, D.

DA: (4) By can be classed in DA since in the expression "unmotivated by economic need" the word "by" links the drive word "unmotivated," D, and the anticipatory words "economic need," A.

A: (5) Economic need can be classed in A since these words lead one to anticipate, A, that the proceeds from prostitution commonly satisfy such needs as food, shelter, clothing, etc.

AG: (6) Might well be defined as can be classed in AG since in the expression "economic need might well be defined as a species" the words "might well be defined as" link the anticipatory words "economic need," A, and the goal- object words "a species," G.

G: (7) A species can be classed in G since these words can be regarded as indicating the goal objects by which prostitution can be defined when economic need is excluded.

GQ: (8) Of can be classed in GQ since in the expression "a species of psycho-logical addiction" the word "of" links the goal-object words "a species," G, and the quiescent words "psychological addiction," Q.

Q: (9) Psychological addiction can be classed in Q since such an addiction can be regarded as a repetitious quiescent satisfaction, Q.

DG: (10) Built on self-hatred can be classed in DG since the "self" aspect can be regarded as a goal object, G, while the "hatred" aspect can be regarded as a motivating drive, D.

AQ: (11) Through repetitions of the act of sale can be classed in AQ since these words lead one to anticipate, A, repeated quiescent manifestations, Q, of the act of sale, which perhaps enhance the prostitute's feelings of self-worth because such sales show that men approve of her feminine appeal.

U: (1) Prostitution can be classed in U since this word convers the entire range of actions as unified successful acts, U, associated with prostitution.

N: (13) Is defined can be classed in N since a definition excludes or negates, N, activities that lie outside the definitio.

D': (12) By which a whore can be classed in D' since a whore would amount to a subordinate agent or drive-bearer, D', given the prostitutes low s approval or status in society.

The Metaphysics of History

Ronald K. Hoeflin

Contents:

1. Personal History, Katherine Anne Porter

In *Histories: Webster's Quotations, Facts and Phrases* (pg. 6) essayist and fiction writer Katherine Anne Porter (1890-1980), author of the novel *Ship of Fools* (1962), is quoted as follows (numbers added for subsequent analytical purposes): "(1) I (2) have (3) not much interest (4) in (5) anyone's (6) personal (7) history (8) after the tenth year, (9) not even my own. (10) Whatever (11) one was going to be (12) was all prepared (13) before that."

Suggested classification:

D: (1) I

DA: (2) Have

A: (3) Not much interest

AG: (4) In

G: (5) Anyone's

GQ: (6) Personal

Q: (7) History

QD: (10) Whatever

DG: (9) Not even my own

AQ: (8) After the tenth year

U: (12) Was all prepared

N: (13) Before that

D': (11) One was going to be

My justifications for the foregoing classifications are as follows:

D: (1) I can be classed in D since this word refers to Porter as an agent or drive-bearer, D.

DA: (2) Have can be classed in DA since in the expression "I have not much interest" the word "have" links the drive word "I," D, and the anticipatory words "not much interest," A.

A: (3) Not much interest can be classed in A since these words lead one to anticipate, A, little or no interest in something to be mentioned subsequently on the part of Porter.

AG: (4) In can be classed in AG since in the expression "not much interest in anyone's" the word "in" links the anticipatory words "not much interest," A, and the goal-object word "anyone's," G.

G: (5) Anyone's can be classed in G since this word refers to any person as a goal object, G, of Porter's interest.

GQ: (6) Personal can be classed in GQ since in the expression "anyone's personal history" the word "personal" links the goal-object word "anyone's," G, and the quiescent word "history," Q.

Q: (7) History can be classed in Q since a person's history would amount to the event as quiescent manifestations, Q, that that person experienced or encountered.

QD: (10) Whatever can be classed in QD since this word inks the quiescent manifestation, Q, of the preceding sentence, and the drive, D, to add the subsequent sentence.

DG: (8) Not even my own can be classed in DG since these words amount to "not even my own history," where "my own" refers to Porter as agent or drive- bearer, D, while "history" now refers to those events as goal objects, G, that she experienced or encountered.

AQ: (9) After the tenth year can be classed in AQ since these words lead one to anticipate, A, that the quiescent manifestations, Q, of anyone's experiences after the tenth year would not have been of interest to Porter.

U: (12) Was all prepared can be classed in U since these words refer to anyone's experiences up to the tenth year as a unified, U, set of experiences from which the remainder of the person's life could be forecast.

N: (13) Before that can be classed in N since these words negate, N, the im-portance of experiences after the tenth year for forecasting the rest of the person's life.

D': (11) One was going to be can be classed in D' since these words refer to a portion of one's life that would be that of a subordinate agent or drive-bearer, D', compared to the first ten years.

2. Witnessing Uncensored History

In *Histories: Webster's Quotations, Facts and Phrases* (pg. 5) Margaret Mead is quoted as follows (numbers added for subsequent analytical purposes; words in brackets added here): "(1) For the very first time (2) the young (3) are (4) seeing (5) history (6) being (7) made (8) before (9) it (10) is (11) censored [from (12) their ability to see it for themselves] (13) by their elders."

Suggested classification:

D: (2) The young

DA: (3) Are

A: (1) For the very first time

AG: (4) Seeing

G: (5) History

GQ: (6) Being

Q: (7) Made

QD: (8) Before

DG: (9) It

AQ: (10) Is

U: (12) Their ability to see it for themselves

N: (11) Censored from

D': (13) By their elders

My justifications for these classifications are as follows:

D: (2) The young can be classed in D since they are agents or drive- bearers, D.

DA: (3) Are can be classed in DA since in the expression "the young are for the very first time" the word "are" links the drive words "the young," D, and the anticipatory words "for the very first time," A.

A: (1) For the very first time can be classed in A since these words lead one to anticipate, A, that what the young can do by seeing history uncensored is done for the very first time.

AG: (4) Seeing can be classed in AG since in the expression "for the very first time seeing history" the word "seeing" links the anticipatory words "for the very first time," A, and the goal-object word "history," G.

G: (5) History can be classed in G since history can be regarded as a goal object, G, insofar as it can be "seen."

GQ: (6) Being can be classed in GQ since the word "being" links the goal-object word "history," G, and the quiescent word "made," Q.

Q: (7) Made can be classed in Q since the being "made" of history is an ob-servable quiescent manifestation. Q.

QD: (8) Before can be classed in QD since this word links the preceding clause as an observable quiescent manifestation, Q, with the drive, D, to add the subsequent clause.

DG: (9) It can be classed in DG since this word refers to an abstract goal object, G, from the standpoint of observing agents or drive-bearers, D.

AQ: (10) Is can be classed in AQ since this word can be interpreted as amounting to "is anticipated, A, to yield such-and-such quiescent manifestations, Q."

U: (12) Their ability to see it for themselves can be classed in U since these tacitly understood words amount to a unified, U, vision of what is happening, rather than a collection of second-hand reports.

N: (11) Censored from can be classed in N since these words negate, N, the young's seeing history for themselves uncensored.

D': (13) By their elders can be classed in D' since the elders amount here to subordinate agents or drive-bearers, D', by virtue of stunting the ability of their offspring to see history unfiltered for themselves, an action of lame obstruction in order to promote a biased view of history.

3. U. S. Presidents, Treatment of, P. J. O'Rourke

In *Histories: Webster's Quotations, Facts and Phrases* (pg. 5) libertarian satirist P. J. O'Rourke (born 1947) is quoted as follows (numbers added for subsequent analytical purposes): "(1) In our brief national history (2) we (3) have (4) shot (5) four (6) of our presidents, (7) worried five of them (8) to death, (9) impeached one (10) and hounded another out of office. (11) And when all else fails, (12) we hold an election (13) and assassinate their character."

Suggested classification:

D: (2) We

DA: (3) Have

A: (4) Shot

AG: (5) Four

G: (6) Of our presidents

GQ: (7) Worried five of them

Q: (8) To death

QDF: (9) Impeached one

DG: (10) And hounded one out of office

AQ: (1) In our brief national history

U: (12) We hold an election

N: (11) And when all else fails

D': (13) And assassinate their character

My justifications for these classifications are as follows:

D: (2) We can be classed in D since it refers to agents or drive-bearers, D.

DA: (3) Have can be classed in DA since in the expression "we have shot" the word "have" links the drive word "we," D, and the anticipatory word "shot," A.

A: (4) Shot can be classed in A since this word anticipates, A, how many were shot to death (Lincoln, Garfield, McKinley, and Kennedy), Reagan having also been shot but not killed.

AG: (5) Four can be classed in AG since in the expression "shot four of our presidents" the word "four" links the anticipatory word "shot," A, and the goal-object words "of our presidents," G.

G: (6) Of our presidents can be classed in G since these presidents amount to goal objects, G, of our abuse of our president.

GQ: (7) Worried five of them can be classed in GQ since "five of them" refers to presidents as goal objects, G, and "worried" refers to the quiescent dissatis- factions, Q, five of them had to deal with that were so severe that they died soon after leaving office (I do not know which five O'Rourke means, but no doubt Franklin Roosevelt would be one of them, since he died shortly after winning his fourth term in office after worrying his way through the Great Depression and much of the Second World War.

Q: (8) To death can be classed in Q since death would amount to a quiescent dissatisfaction, Q.

QD: (9) Impeached one of them can be classed in QD since "impeached" would be a quiescent dissatisfaction, Q, while "one of them" would be a president (presumably Donald J. Trump) as agent or drive-bearer, D. (Trump was actually impeached twice but there were not enough votes in the Senate to remove him from office, so the impeachment was just a sort of public scolding, in Trump's case for extremely trivial and partisan reasons.)

DG: (10) And hounded one from office can be classed in DG since this one was Richard Nixon as goal object, G, while the hounding was a drive, D, on the part of Nixon's critics which led to Nixon's resignation, even though the left praised Nixon for cozying up to the nasty communist Chinese government.

AQ: (1) In our brief national history can be classed in AQ since these words ead one to anticipate, A, the quiescent manifestations, Q, subsequently listed of how we have molested a good many of our presidents.

U: (12) We hold an election can be classed in U since each election, in O'Rourke's view, amounts to a unified, U, opportunity to molest our presidents yet again, even if they have not yet been successfully shot, worried, impeached, or hounded out of office.

N: (11) And when all else fails can be classed in N since a failure amounts to a negation, N, in efforts to drive a president out of office.

D': (13) And assassinate their character can be classed in D' since a president whose character has been assassinated is thereby treated as a subordi-nate agent or drive-bearer, D'.

4. Clichés in American Elections, Newt Gingrich

In *Histories: Webster's Quotations, Facts and Phrases* (pg., 4) U. S. Republican politician Newt Gingrich is quoted as follows (numbers added for subsequent analy-ticalpurposes; the text incorrectly substitutes the capital letter "T" for the accented lower-case letter "é"): "(1) In every election (2) in American history (3) Both (4) parties (5) have (6) their (7) clichés. (8) The party (9) that (10) has (11) the clichés (12) that ring true (13) wins."

Suggested classification:

QD: (3) Both

D: (4) Parties

DA: (5) Have

A: (6) Their

AG: (7) Clichés

G: (8) The party

GQ: (9) That

Q: (10) Has

DG: (1) In every election

AQ: (2) In American history

U: (13) Wins

N: (12) That rings true

D' (11) The cliché

My justifications for these classifications are as follows:

QD: (3) Both can be classed in QD since in the expression "(we can see that) both parties," where "we can see" is tacitly understood and serves as a quiescent manifestation, Q, while "partis" refers to agents or drive-bearers, D, so that "both" links the Q and the D factors.

D: (4) Parties can be classed in D since it refers to people as agents or drive-bearers, D.

DA: (5) Have can be classed in DA since in the expression "parties have their" the word "have" links the drive word "parties," D, and the anticipatory word "their," A.

A: (6) Their can be classed in A since this word leads one to anticipate, A, what word or words this word is leading up to.

AG: (7) Clichés can be classed in AG since this word leads one to anticipate, A, what clichés as goal objects, G, are meant, although these goal objects are not spelled out but are left to the reader's recollection or imagination.

G: (8) The party can be classed in G since these words refer to an American political party as goal object, G.

GQ; (9) That can be classed in GQ since in the expression "the party that has" the word "that" links the goal-object words "the party," G, and the quiescent word "has," Q.

Q: (10) Has can be classed in Q since this word leads into the subsequent words that present the quiescent manifestation, Q, of what the party "has," namely that it "rings true."

DG: (1) In every election can be classed in DG since the word "election" refers to a historical goal object, G, for which American voters exercise the drive, D, to choose one candidate or another.

AQ: (2) In American history can be classed in AQ since these words lead one to anticipate, A, that the a survey of every election in American history will exhibit the quiescent manifestation, Q, of what is stated next.

U: (13) Wins can be classed in U since winning amounts to a unified, U, accomplishment.

N: (12) That rings true can be classed in N since these words negate, N, the notion that clichés that ring false lead to a win for the party that has put forward such clichés.

D': (11) The clichés can be classed in D' since such clichés that have the ring of truth and lead to a win are put forward by superordinate agents or drive- bearers, D', superordinate by virtue of having put forward sinning clichés, in contrast to the losing clichés of the opposing party.

5. America's Abrupt Degeneration, Georges Clemenceau

In *Histories: Webster's Quotations, Facts and Phrases* (pg. 3) Georges Clemenceau, who was Prime Minister of France from 1906 to 1909 and from 1917 to 1920, is quoted as follows (numbers added for subsequent analytical purposes; word in brackets added here): "(1) America is the only nation (2) in history (3) which (4) miraculously (5) has gone directly (6) from (7) barbarism (8) to (9) degeneration [(10) but] (11) without (12) the usual interval (13) of civilization."

Suggested classification:

D: (3) Which

DA: (4) Miraculously

A: (5) Has gone directly

AG: (6) From

G: (7) Barbarism

GQ: (8) To

Q: (9) Civilization

QD: (10) But

DG: (1) America is the only nation

AQ: (2) In history

U: (13) Of civilization

N: (11) Without

D': (12) The usual interval

My justifications for these classifications are as follows:

D: (3) Which can be classed in D sinc this word refers to America as a collection of agents or drive-bearers, D.

DA: (4) Miraculously can be classed in DA since in the expression "which miraculously has gone directly" the word "miraculously" links the drive word "which," D, and the anticipatory words "has gone directly," A.

A: (5) Has gone directly can be classed in A since these words lead one to anticipate, A, where America has miraculously gone.

AG: (6) From can be classed in AG since in the expression "has gone directly from barbarism" the word "from" links the anticipatory words "has gone directly," A, and the goal-object word "barbarism," G.

G: (7) Barbarism can be classed in G since this word serves as a goal object, G, indicating from what condition America has gone.

GQ; (8) To can be classed in GQ since in the expression "barbarism to de- genration" the word "to" links the goal-object word "barbarism," G, and the quis- cent word "degeneration," Q.

Q: (9) Degeneration can be classed in Q since it refers to an observable qui-scent manifestation, Q, indicative of a decline in morals and the like. Clemenceau may have had in mind the raid transition from the Wild West to the Roaring Twenties.

QD: (10) But can be classed in QD since this tacitly understood conjunction links the quiescent manifestation, Q, of preceding words, followed by the drive, D, to add subsequent words.

DG: (1) America is the only nation can be classed in DG since these words refer to America as a goal object, G, from the perspective of observing agents or drive-bearers, D, like Clemenceau.

AQ: (2) In history can be classed in AQ since these words lead one to antici-pate, A, the quiescent manifestation, Q, of historical events.

U: (13) Of civilization can be classed in U since civilization can be regarded as a unified, U, pattern of civility.

N: (11) Without can be classed in N since this word negates, N, the presence of something, in this case civilization.

D': (12) The usual interval can be classed in D' since "the usual interval" has a prosaic tone that makes its participants seem colorless compared to their barbarous predecessors or degenerate successors, hence as subordinate agents or drive-bearers, D', as when we glamorize people like Wyatt Earp or Al Capone compared to, say, Henry Ford or Andrew Carnegie.

6. Artistically Written History, Aristotle

In *Histories: Webster's Quotations, Facts and Phrases* (pg. 2) Aristotle is quoted as follows (numbers added for subsequent analytical purposes): "(1) The artistic representation (2) of history (3) is (4) a more scientific (5) and serious (6) pursuit (7) than (8) the exact (9) writing (10) of history. (11) For the art of letters goes to the heart of things, (12) whereas (13) the factual report merely collocates details."

Suggested classification:

GQ: (3) Is

Q; (4) A more scientific

QD: (5) And serious

D: (6) Pursuit

DA: (7) Than

A: (8) The exact

AG: (9) Writing

G: (10) Of facts

DG: (1) The artistic representation

AQ: (2) Of history

U: (11) For the art of letters goes to the heart of things

N: (12) Whereas

D': (13) The factual report merely collocates facts

My justifications for these classifications are as follows:

GQ: (3) Is can be classed inn GQ since in the expression "(artistically written history) is...more scientific" the word "is" links the tacitly understood words "artistically written history," which serve as a goal object, G, for consideration, and the words "more scientific" which serve as the quiescent manifestation, Q, that Aristotle ascribes to artistically written history.

Q: (4) A more scientific can be classed in Q since being "scientific" can be regarded as an observable quiescent manifestation, Q.

QD: (5) And serious can be classed in QD since in the expression "more scientific and serious pursuit" the words "and serious" link the quiescent words "a more scientific," Q, and the drive word "pursuit," D.

D: (6) Pursuit can be classed in D since any pursuit involves a drive, D, to pursue.

DA: (7) Than can be classed in DA since in the expression "pursuit than the exact" the word "than:" links the drive word "pursuit," D, and the anticipatory word "exact," A.

A: (8) The exact can be classed in A since what is exact is anticipated to get all the details correct and accurate.

AG: (9) Writing can be classed in AG since in the expression "the exact writing of history" the word "writing" links the anticipatory words "the exact," A, and the goal-object words "of history," G.

G: (10) Of history can be classed in G since history can be regarded as a set of events as the goal objects, G, for their written representation by historians.

DG: (1) The artistic representation can be classed in DG since a "representa-tion" can be regarded as a goal object, G, while what is "artistic" can be regarded as involving the drive, D, to write artistically.

AQ: (2) Of history can be classed in AQ since history consists of the attempt to anticipate, A, by means of the quiescent manifestation, Q, of writing about history, what happened in the past.

U: (11) For the art of letters goes to the heart of things can be classed in U since this "heart of things" is a unity, U, captured by successfully writing history.

N: (12) Whereas can be classed in N since this word indicates that a negation, N, of the foregoing clause is to be given in the subsequent clause

D': (13) The factual report merely collocates details can be classed in D' since such uninspired writing can be regarded as what would be written by an inferior historian, who is accordingly a subordinate agent or drive-bearer, D', com-pared to a gifted historian who writes artistically.

7. Sacredness of Historical Writings, Cervantes

In *Histories: Webster's Quotations, Facts and Phrases* (pg. 2) Miguel de Cervantes, author of *Don Quixote,* is quoted as follows (numbers added for subsequent analytical purposes; words in brackets have been added here to flesh out the 13 categories): "(1) History is a sacred kind (2) of writing (3) because (4) truth (5) is (6) essential (7) to (8) it, (9) and (10) where truth is, (11) God himself is found, (13) so far as truth is concerned."

Suggested classification:

QD: (3) Because

D: (4) Truth

DA: (5) Is

A: (6) Essential

AG: (7) To

G: (8) It

GQ: (9) And

Q: (10) Where truth is

DG: (2) Of writing

AQ: (1) History is a sacred kind

U: (11) To be found

N: (13) So far as truth is concerned

D: (12) God is

My justifications for these classifications is are as follows:

QD: (3) Because can be classed in QD since this conjunction links the quies-cent manifestation, Q, of the preceding clause, and the subsequent clause that there is a drive, D, to add.

D: (4) Truth can be classed in D since this word amounts to "the search for truth," which refers to the drive, D, to find truth.

DA: (5) Is can be classed in DA since in the expression "truth is essential" the word "is" links the drive word "truth," D, and the anticipatory word "essential," A.

A: (6) Essential can be classed in A since what is essential to an endeavor is anticipated, A, to be there of necessity.

AG: (7) To can be classed in AG since in the expression "essential to it" the word "to" links the anticipatory word "essential," A, and the goal-object word "it," G.

G: (8) It can be classed in G since this word refers to history as a goal object, G, of study and representation in writing.

GQ: (9) And can be classed in GQ since in the expression "it and where truth is" the word "and" links the goal-object word "it," G, and the quiescent words "where truth is," Q.

Q: (10) Where truth is can be classed in Q since these words refer to truth as a sought after quiescent manifestation, Q.

DG: (2) Of history can be classed in DG since "history" can be regarded as the goal object, G, of historical writing, regarded from the perspective of observing agents or drive-bearers, D.

AQ: (1) History is a sacred kind can be classed in AQ since history tries to anticipate, A, the quiescent manifestations, Q, of what happened in the past, which is characterized as "sacred."

U: (11) To be found can be classed in U since this finding amounts to the attainment of a unified, U, achievement.

N: (13) So far as truth is concerned can be classed in N since these words negate the presence of God where truth is not concerned.

D': (12) God is can be classed in D' since God amounts to a superordinate agent or drive-bearer, D', inasmuch as he purportedly exerted the drive to create the entire universe.

8. Pacifism?, Mahatma Gandhi

In *Histories: Webster's Quotations, Facts and Phrases* (pg. 3) world-famous pacifist Mahatma Gandhi is quoted as follows (numbers added for subsequent analytical purposes): "(1) Among (2) the many (3) misdeeds (4) of (5) British (6) rule (7) in India (8) history (9) will look upon (10) the act (11) of depriving (12) a whole nation (11') of arms (13) as the blackest."

Suggested classification:

G: (1) Among

GQ: (2) The many

Q: (3) Misdeeds

QD: (4) Of

D: (5) British

DA: (6) Rule

A: (9) Will look upon

AG: (10) The act

DG: (7) In India

AQ: (8) History

U: (11) Of depriving...of arms

N: (13) As the blackest

D': (12) A whole nation

My justifications for these classifications is are as follows:

G: (1) Among can be classed in G since this word groups together various misdeeds as a set of goal objects, G.

GQ: (2) The many can be classed in GQ since in the expression "among the many misdeeds" the words "the many" link the goal-object word "among," G, and the quiescent word "misdeeds," Q.

Q: (3) Misdeeds can be classed in Q since a misdeed amounts to a quiescent dissatisfaction, Q.

QD: (4) Of can be classed in QD since in the expression "misdeeds of British" the word "of" links the quiescent word "misdeeds," Q, and the drive word "British," D.

D: (5) British can be classed in D since the British were a group of agents or drive-bearers, D.

DA: (6) Rule can be classed in DA since the ones who exercised this rule were the British as agents or drive-bearers, D, while the rule they exercised could be anticipated, A, to have various consequences, in this case the negative consequences being emphasized.

A: (9) Will look upon can be classed in A since to look u0on British rule in India is done in order to anticipate, A, how good or bad its consequences were.

AG: (10) The act can be classed in AG since an act is anticipated, A, to affect various goal objects, G, in various specific ways.

DG: (7) In India can be classed in DG since India is a place as goal object, G, as considered from the perspective of onlooking agents or drive-bearers, D.

AQ: (8) History can be classed in AQ since historical writing tries to antici-pate, A, the observable quiescent manifestations, Q, that emerged from various decisions made in the past.

U: (11) Of depriving...of arms can be classed in U since this action can be regarded as a unified, U, program with discernible consequences, in this case purportedly bad ones not specified in this quotation.

N: (13) As the blackest can be classed in N since these words indicate that this action should have been avoided or negated, N.

D': (12) A whole nation can be classed in D' since these words refer to India, which can be regarded as a collection of subordinate agents or drive-bearers, D', subordinate because they were under the rule of Britain.

The Metaphysics of Law

Ronald K. Hoeflin

Contents:

1. Morals and the Law, Niccolo Machiavelli

2. Wisdom Acting on Experience to Benefit Mankind, Samuel Johnson

3. Abolishing Slavery, George Washington

4. Despotism, Daniel Webster

5. Remorselessness of the Law, Rudyard Kipling

6. Breaking the Law, Isadore Duncan

7. Consensus of Opinion as Laws of Nature, Cicero

8. Mystery

1. Morality and the Law, Niccolo Machiavelli

In *Law: Webster's Quotations, Facts and Phrases* (pg. 4) Niccolo Machiavelli is quoted as follows (numbers added for subsequent analytical purposes): "(1) Because just as (2) good morals, (3) if (4) they (5) are (6) to be maintained, (7) have need of (8) the laws, (9) so the laws (10) if they are to be observed, (11) have need of (12) good (13) morals."

Suggested classification:

GQ: (1) Because just as

Q: (2) Good morals

QD: (3) If

D: (4) They

DA: (5) Are

A: (6) To be maintained

AG: (7) Have need of

G: (8) the laws

DG: (9) So the laws

AQ: (10) If they are to be maintained

U: (13) Morals

N: (11) Have need of

D': (12) Good

My justifications for these classifications are as follows:

GQ: (1) Because just as can be classed in GQ since in the expression "(the foregoing remarks hold true) because just as good morals" the words "because just as" link the tacitly understood words "the foregoing remarks hold true," which refer to remarks that amount to goal objects, G, and the words "good morals," which refer to positive quiescent manifestations, Q.

Q: (2) Good morals can be classed in Q since such morals lead to positive quiescent manifestations, Q, such as fewer murders, thefts, etc.

QD: (3) If can be classed in QD since this word links the quiescent manifestation, Q, of the clause it introduces, and the subsequent clause that there is a drive, D, to add.

D: (4) They can be classed in D since this word refers to "good morals" which involve drives, D, to do the right thing.

DA: (5) Are can be classed in DA since in the expression "they are to be maintained" the word "are" links the drive word "they," D, and the anticipatory words "to be maintained," A.

A: (6) To be maintained can be classed in A since these words lead one to anticipate, A, that something, in this case good morals, are to be maintained or preserved.

AG: (7) Have need of can be classed in AG since in the expression "to be maintained have need of the laws" the words "have need of" link the anticipatory words "to be maintained," A, and the gal object words "the laws," G.

G: (8) The laws can be classed in G since these can be construed to be goal objects, G, as in the written words in which they are formulated.

DG: (9) So the laws can be classed in DG since these words refer to the laws as goal objects, G, from the standpoint of observing agents or drive-bearers, D.

AQ; (10) If they are to be observed can be classed in AQ since "if" anticipates, A, the quiescent manifestation of being "observed," Q.

U: (13) Morals can be classed in U since morals amount to the unified, U, behavior of the people in acting on what is considered right or wrong.

N: (11) Have need of can be classed in N since these words negate, N, the option of omitting what is stated next, namely "good morals."

D': (12) Good can be classed in D' since good actions are those of superordinate agents or drive-bearers, D', superordinate by virtue of making in most cases right choices rather than wrong ones.

2. Wisdom Acting on Experience, Samuel Johnson

In *Law: Webster's Quotations, Facts and Phrases* (pg. 15) Samuel Johnson, the great lexicographer, is quoted as follows (number added for subsequent analytical purposes, word in brackets added here): "(1) The law (2) is the last (3) result (4) of (5) human (6) experience (7) acting (8) upon (9) human (10) experience (11) for [= to attain] (12) the benefit (13) of the public."

Suggested classification:

Q: (3) Result

QD: (4) Of

D: (5) Human

DA: (6) Wisdom

A: (7) Acting

AG: (8) Upon

G: (9) Human

GQ: (10) Experience

DG: (1) The law

AQ: (2) Is the last

U: (11) For [= to attain]

N: (12) The benefit

D': (13) Of the public

My justifications for these classifications are as follows:

Q: (3) Result can be classed in Q since a result can be regarded as an observable quiescent manifestation, Q.

QD: (4) Of can be classed in QD since in the expression "result of human" th word "of" links the quiescent word "result," Q, and the drive word "human," D.

D: (5) Human can be classed in D since humans are agents or drive- bearers, D.

Da: (6) Wisdom can be classed in DA since one is wise if one can harness one's drives, D, to an effective means that can be anticipated, A, to resolve those drives.

A: (7) Acting can be classed in A since to act leads one to anticipate, A, something that is acted upon.

AG: (8) Upon can be classed in AG since in the expression "acting upon human" the word "upon" links the anticipatory word "acting," A, and the goal- object word "human," G.

G: (9) Human can be classed in G since humanity can be regarded as a collection of goal objects, G.

GQ: (10) Experience can be classed in GQ since experience amounts to quiescent manifestations, Q, had by humans as goal objects, G.

DG: (1) The law can be classed in DG since it can be regarded as a goal object, G, such as written laws, from the perspective of observing agents or drive- bearers, D.

AQ: (2) Is the last can be classed in AQ since these words lead one to anticipate, A, the quiescent manifestation, Q, of the law as a final or ultimate human achievement.

U: (11) For [= to attain] can be classed in U since an attainment can be regarded as a unified, U, outcome after a long struggle.

N: (12) The benefit can be classed in N since what is a benefit is the negation, N, of a harm.

D': (13) Of the public can be classed in D' since the public consists of various subordinate agents or drive-bearers, D'.

3. Abolishing Slavery, George Washington

In *Law: Webster's Quotations, Facts and Phrases* (pg. 7) George Washington is quoted as follows (numbers added for subsequent analytical purpose): "(1) I (2) Never (3) mean, (4) unless some particular circumstance should compel me to do it, (5) to possess (6) another slave (7) by (8) purchase, (9) it being among my first wishes (10) to see some plan adopted (11) by which slavery in this country (12) may be abolished (13) by law."

Suggested classification:

D: (1) I

DA: (2) Never

A: (3) Mean

AG: (5) To possess

G: (6) Another slave

GQ: (7) By

Q: (8) Purchase

QD; (4) Unless some particular circumstance should compel me to do it

DG: (9) It being among my first wishes

AQ: (10) To see some plan adopted

U: (13) By law

N: (12) May be abolished

D': (11) By which slavery in this country

My justifications for these classifications are as follows:

D: (1) I can be classed in D since it refers to George Washington, who was an agent or drive-bearer, D.

DA: (2) Never can be classed in DA since in the expression "I never mean" the word "never" links the drive word "I," D, and the anticipatory word "mean," A.

A: (3) Mean can be classed in A since this word leads one to anticipate, A, an explanation of what Washington never meant.

AG: (5) To possess can be classed in AG since in the expression "mean to possess another slave" the words "to possess" link the anticipatory word "mean," A, and the goal-object words "another slave," G.

G: (6)Another slave can be classed in G since these words refer to a slave as a goal object, G.

GQ: (7) By can be classed in GQ since in the expression "another slave by purchase" the word "by" inks the goal-object words "another slave," G, and the quiescent word "purchase," Q.

Q: (8) Purchase can be classed in Q since it amounts to an observable quies-cent manifestation, Q.

QD: (4) Unless some particular circumstance should compel me to do it can be classed in QD since "me" refers to Washington as an agent or drive- bearer, D, while "some particular circumstance" refers to an observable quiescent manifesta-tion, Q.

DG: (9) It b eing among my first wishes can be classed in DG since "my" refers to Washington as an agent or drive-bearer, D, while "first wishes" amount to goal objects, G, that Washington had in mind.

AQ: (10) To see some plan adopted can be classed in AQ since "to see" is anticipatory, A, while "some plan adopted" refers to an observable quiescent mani-festation, Q.

U: (13) By law can be classed in U since a law abolishing slavery would amount to a successful unified, U, achievement.

N: (12) May be abolished can be classed in N since these words refer to the negation, N, of slavery.

D': (11) By which slavery in this country can be classed in D' since slavery involves slaves as subordinate agents or drive-bearers, D', in view of their involun-tary servitude.

4. Despotism, Daniel Webster

In *Law: Webster's Quotations, Facts and Phrases* (pg. 6) Daniel Webster (1782-1852), an American statesman and orator, is quoted as follows (numbers added for subsequent analytical purposes; word in brackets added here): "(1) Whatever government (2) is not (3) a government (4) of laws, (5) is a despotism, (6) let (7) it (8) be (9) called (10) what (11) it (12) may [(13) be called]."

Suggested classification:

D: (6) Let

DA: (7) It

A: (8) Be

AG: (9) Called

G: (10) What

GQ: (11) It

Q: (12) May

QD: (13) Be called

DG: (1) Whatever government

AQ: (5) Is a despotism

U: (4) Of laws

N: (2) Is not

D': (3) A government

My justifications of these classifications are as follows:

D: (6) Let can be classed in D since this word urges people to undertake the drive, D, to permit or enable something to be of some sort.

DA: (7) It can be classed in DA since in the expression "let it be" the word "it" links the drive word "let," D, and the anticipatory word "be," A.

A: (8) Be can be classed in A since this word leads one to anticipate, A, an explanation of what one ought to let a government be.

AG: (9) Called can be classed in AG since in the expression "be called what" the word "called" links the anticipatory word "be," A, and the goal-object word "what," G.

G: (10) What can be classed in G since this word stands for a goal object, G, that one might wish to call a government.

GQ: (11) It can be classed in GQ since in the expression "whatitmay" the word "it" links the goal-object word "what," G, and the quiescent word "may," Q.

Q: (12) May can be classed in Q since what something "may" be called amounts to a quiescent manifestation, Q, that it might exhibit.

QD: (13) Be called can be classed in QD since these tacitly understood words imply an agent or drive-bearer, D, who does the "calling" of a government by some name as a (typically) audible quiescent manifestation, Q.

DG: (1) Whatever government can be classed in DG since the word "government" refers to a goal object, G, from the standpoint of observing agents or drive-bearers, D.

AQ: (5) Is a despotism can be classed in AQ since these words lead one to anticipate, A, that the government without laws has the quiescent manifestation, Q, of being a despotism.

U: (4) Of laws can be classed in U since laws can be regarded as a unified, U, body of rules of conduct that have been successfully adopted.

N: (2) Is not can be classed in N since these words negate, N, the meaning of the remainder of the clause in which it occurs.

D': (3) A government can be classed in D' since these words refer to any government created by subordinate agents or drive-bearers, D', subordinate insofar as they have neglected to adopt laws by which the people under that government are to be governed.

5. Remorselessness of the Law, Rudyard Kipling

In *Law: Webster's Quotations, Facts and Phrases* (pg. 7) English writer Rudyard Kipling (1865-1936) is quoted as follows (numbers added for subsequent analytical purposes): "(1) But (2) remember (3) please, (4) the Law (5) by (6) which (7) we (8) live, (9) we are not built (10) to comprehend a lie, (11) we (12) can neither love nor pity nor forgive. (13) If you make a slip handing us you die."

Suggested classification:

QD: (1) But

D: (2) Remember

DA: (3) Please

A: (4) Th Law

AG: (5) By

G: (6) Which

GQ: (7) We

Q: (8) Live

DG: (9) We are not built

AQ: (10) To comprehend a lie

U: (13) If you make a slip handling us you die

N: (12) Neither love nor pity nor forgive

D': (11) We

My justifications for these classifications are as follows:

QD: (1) But can be classed in QD since this conjunction links the quiescent manifestation, Q, of whatever was said before, and the drive, D, to add subsequent words.

D: (2) Remember can be classed in D since this imperative verb is intended to instill the drive, D, to remember something.

DA: (3) Please can be classed in DA since in the expression "remember pleas the Law" the word "please" links the drive word "remember," D, and the anticipatory words "the Law," A.

A: (4) The Law can be classed in A since the law leads one to anticipate, A, what is not permissible behavior.

AG: (5) By can be classed in AG since in the expression "the Law by which" the word "by" links the anticipatory words "the Law," A, and the goal- object word "which," G.

G: (6) Which can be classed in G since this word stands for the law as a goal object, G.

GQ; (7) We can be classed in GQ since in the expression "which we live" the word "we" links the goal-object word "which," G, and the quiescent word "live," Q.

Q: (8) Live can be classed in Q since how one lives consists of observable quiescent manifestations, Q.

DG: (9) We are not built can be classed in DG since "we" indicates goal objects, G, that are built, while the building of these goal objects involves a drive factor, D.

AQ: (10) To comprehend a lie can be classed in AQ since such a comprehend-ding involves an anticipation, A, that lies are quiescent manifestations, Q, that not merely occur but can often occur.

U: (13) If you make a slip handling us you die can be classed in U since these words indicate the unified, U, nature of the law, its remorselessness.

N: (12) Neither love nor pity nor forgive can be classed in N since these factors all indicate negations, N, in how a person living by the law behaves.

D': (11) We can be classed in D' since this word refers to people who adhere absolutely to the law, and hence to people who are superordinate agents or drive-bearers, D', due to their perfect obedience to the law.

6. Breaking the Law, Isadore Duncan

In *Law: Webster's Quotations, Facts and Phrases* (pg. 7) dancer Isadore Duncan is quoted as follows (numbers added for subsequent analytical purposes): "(1) We may not all (2) break (3) the Ten Commandments, (4) but (5) we (6) are all (7) certainly (8) capable of (9) it. (10) Within us (11) lurks (12) the breaker of all laws, (13) ready to spring out at the first opportunity."

Suggested classification:

QD: (4) But

D: (5) We

DA: (6) Are all

A: (7) Certainly

AG: (8) Capable of

G: (9) It

GQ: (10) Within us

Q: (11) Lurks

DG: (12) The breaker of all laws

AQ: (13) Ready to spring out at the first opportunity

U: (3) The Ten Commandments

N: (2) Break

D': (1) We may not all

My justifications for these classifications are as follows:

QD: (4) But can be classed in QD since this conjunction links the quiescent manifestation, Q, of the preceding words, and subsequent words that there is a drive, D, to add.

D: (5) We can be classed in D since this word refers to us as agents or drive-bearers, D.

DA: (6) Are all can be classed in DA since in the expression "we are all certainly" the words "are all" link the drive word "we," D, and the anticipatory word "certainly," A.

A: (7) Certainly can be classed in A since this word leads us to anticipate, A, the certainty of what is stated next.

AG: (8) Capable of can be classed in AG since in the expression "certainly capable of it" the words "capable of" link the anticipatory word "certainly," A, and the goal-object word "it," G.

G: (9) It can be classed in G since this word refers to our capability of break-ing the law regarded as a goal object, G.

GQ: (10) Within us can be classed in GQ since in the expression "within us lurks" the word "us" refers to us as goal objects, G, while "lurks" is the quiescent manifestation, Q, that is supposedly within us all.

Q: (11) Lurks can be classed in Q since this word refers to the observable quiescent manifestation, Q, of breaking the law that supposedly lies hidden in all of us as a potentiality.

DG: (12) The breaking of all laws can be classed in DG since "all laws" can be regarded as referring to goal objects, G, while "the breaking of" can be regarded as referring to the agents or drive-bearers, D, capable of exhibiting this activity.

AQ: (13) Ready to spring out at the first opportunity can be classed in AQ since these words lead one to anticipate, A, the quiescent manifestation, Q, of ths springing out of law breaking ascribed potentially to all of us.

U: (3) The Ten Commandments can be classed in U since they purport to encompass the unified, U, totality of God's commandments.

N: (2) Break can be classed in N since to break the Ten Commandments is to act contrary or negative, N, to them.

D': (1) We may not all can be classed in D' since these words refer to us as subordinate agents or drive-bearers, D', by virtue of our potential for breaking one or more of the Ten Commandments.

7. Consensus of Opinion as Laws of Nature, Cicero

In *Law: Webster's Quotations, Facts and Phrases* (pg. 12) Roman statesman Cicero (106-43 B.C.) is quoted as follows (numbers added for subsequent analytical purposes): "(1) The consensus (2) of opinion (3) among all (4) nations, (5) on (6) whatever (5) matter, (7) may (8) be (9) taken (10) as (11) the law (12) of (13) nature."

Suggested classification:

GQ: (6) Whatever

Q: (7) May

QD: (8) Be

D: (9) Taken

DA: (10) As

A: (11) The law

AG: (12) Of

G: (13) Nature

DG: (5) On matter

AQ: (2) Of opinion

U: (1) The consensus

N: (3) Of all

D': (4) Nations

My justifications for these classifications are as follows:

GQ: (6) Whatever can be classed in GQ since in saying that '(nations, by consensus,) may, on whatever matter (take a position that amounts to a law of nature)," the word "whatever" links the goal-object word "matter," G, and the quiescent word "may," Q, as in "may take a position of such-and-such a kind."

Q: (7) May can be classed in Q since what one may do, as in taking a position, amounts to an observable quiescent manifestation, Q, as when the position is spoken or written for all to see.

QD: (8) Be can be classed in QD since in the expression "may be taken" the word "be" links the quiescent word "may," Q, and the drive word "taken," D.

D: (9) Taken can be classed in D since taking something involves a drive, D, to take it.

DA: (10) As can be classed in DA since in the expression "taken as the law" the word "as" links the drive word "taken," D, and the anticipatory words "the law," A.

A: (11) The law can be classed in A since a las leas one to anticipate, A, what is invariably true.

AG: (12) Of can be classed in AG since in the expression "the law of nature" the word "of" links the anticipatory words "the law," A, and the goal- object word "nature," G.

G: (13) Nature can be classed in G since nature can be regarded as referring to all goal objects, G.

DG: (5) On matter can be classed in DG since "matter can be regarded as the substance of which all natural goal objects, G, consist, and those goal objects are observed from the perspective of agents or drive-bearers, D.

AQ: (2) Of opinion can be classed in AQ since an opinion anticipates, A, the quiescent manifestations, Q, about which the opinion is concerned.

U: (1) The consensus can be classed in U since a consensus is a unified,. U, opinion that peoples of various nations have struggled successfully to reach a consensus—although Cicero is undoubtedly wrong to assume that any such consensus will never change, as a law of nature would presumably never change. Scientific progress was very slow in his time compared to now, which no doubt ex-plains this error on his part.

N: (3) Among all can be classed in N since "all" negates the possibility of any exception.

D': (4) Nations can be classed in D' since each and every nation amounts to a collection of subordinate agents or drive-bearers, D', namely its human inhabitants.

8. Mystery

In *Law: Webster's Quotations, Facts or Phrases* (pg. 9) British Statesman Edmund Burke (1729-1797) is quoted as follows (numbers added for subsequent analytical purposes): "(1) It (2) is (3) hard (4) to say (5) whether (6) the doctors (7) of (8) law (9) or (10) divinity (11) have made the greater advances (12) in the lucrative business (13) of mystery."

Suggested classification:

QD: (3) Hard

D: (4) To say

DA: (5) Whether

A: (6) The doctors

AG: (7) Of

G: (8) Law

GQ: (9) Or

Q: (10) Divinity

DG: (1) It

AQ: (2) Is

U: (11) Have made the greater advances

N: (13) Of mystery

D': (12) In the lucrative business

My justifications for these classifications are as follows:

QD: (3) Hard can be classed in QD since that is hard is the quiescent manifestation, Q, of saying something on this topic, while the one for whom it is hard to say this is any agent or drive-bearer, D.

D: (4) To say can be classed in D since to say something requires a drive, D, to say it.

DA: (5) Whether can be classed in DA since in the expression "to say whether the doctors" the word "whether" links the drive words "to say," D, and the anticipatory words "the doctors," A.

A: (6) The doctors can be classed in A since these words lead one to antici-pate, A, in what field of inquiry these doctors are doctors of.

AG: (7) Of can be classed in AG since in the expression "the doctors of law" the word "of" links the anticipatory words "the doctors," A, and the goal- object word "law," G.

G: (8) Law can be classed in G since law can be regarded as a goal object, G. that doctors of law have pursued the study of.

GQ: (9) Or can be classed in GQ since in the expression "law or divinity" the word "or" links the goal-object word "law," G, and the quiescent word "divinity," Q.

Q: (10) Divinity can be classed in Q since the divine can be regarded as con-cerned chiefly with what we need to do or think in order to attain the greatest quiescent satisfaction, Q, such as eternity in heaven after death.

DG: (1) It can be classed in DG since this word refers to an abstract goal object, G, from the perspective of agents or drive-bearers, D.

AQ: (2) Is can be classed in AQ since this word amounts to 'is anticipated, A, to deal with the quiescent manifestations, Q, mentioned in the remainder of this statement.

U: (11) Have made the greater advances can be classed in U since such advances purportedly amount to a unified, U, achievement.

N: (13) Of mystery can be classed in N since mystery concerns the unknown, which is the ignorance of something.

D': (12) In the lucrative business can be classed in D' since such a business would presumably be undertaken by superordinate agents or drive- bearers, D', superordinate because of the lucrative aspect of the business.

On the Very Idea of Information

Ken Shea

'A culture morally and functionally fails which does not let its crazies, its artists and its saints, its scientists and politicians, claim, on occasion, a higher law than its own congresses can pass, traditions permit, or conscience conceive.' -William H. Gass

'There is, I think, no theory-independent way to reconstruct phrases like "really there"; the notion of a match between the ontology of a theory and its "real" counterpart in nature now seems to me illusive in principle.' -Thomas Kuhn

'History has thrown up many physical images for the underlying rational order of the world: the universe as a manifestation of perfect geometrical forms, as a living organism, as a vast clockwork mechanism, and, more recently, as a gigantic computer.' -Paul Davies

The tendency throughout the preceding couple thousand years of human intellectual history has been to project idiosyncratic fantasies about the operations of the world onto the environment, temporarily calling the shifting results 'Truth'. Mystics and myriad geometers, the so-called Pythagoreans, brightened at 'the Music of the Spheres'; Pierre-Simon Laplace constructed an impressively-mechanistic 'Clockwork Universe'; the latest fad has been to delineate the cosmos using computer jargon. Historians have traditionally been wont to paint neat pictures in which, e.g., The Age of Faith, The Age of Discovery, The Age of Reason, and the ultramodern Age of Information eclipse one another. The philosopher Alfred North Whitehead delighted in subverting these easy notions: 'The earlier period was the age of faith, based upon reason. In the later period, they let sleeping dogs lie; it was the age of reason, based on faith.' Actually, the theoretical physicist Paul Davies found that, 'History suggests that each age appeals to its most impressive technology as a metaphor for the cosmos, or even God' (Davies, *The Mind of God*, page 96). Is the computer metaphor even appropriate? The physicists Paul Davies and Richard Feynman expressed reservations about stretching the algorithm business. In a paper titled 'Simulating Physics with Computers', published in *International Journal of Theoretical Physics*, Richard Feynman explained, 'the possibility that there is to be an exact simulation, that the computer will do exactly the same as nature' necessitates 'that everything that happens in a finite volume of space and time would have to be exactly analyzable with a finite number of logical operations. The present theory of physics is not that way, apparently. It allows space to go down to infinitesimal distances.' [1] Because, according to Paul Davies, physical theory employs 'quantities that vary continuously' [2] (cf. Werner Heisenberg's uncertainty principle), Davies and others have noted the disanalogy between nature and computer algorithms. (In recent years, the shortest unit of time measured was 247 zeptoseconds, gauging a zippy light particle traversing a hydrogen molecule [3]; Planck time is supposed to be ~5.4×10^{-44}/s.) At any rate, even if a simulation were possible, the philosopher and part-time meteorologist John Searle has long distinguished, ontologically, a hurricane from its simulation. In turn, the mathematical physicist Frank Tipler was forlorn about the possibility of inhabitants discerning the underlying substance of the realm they purportedly are ensnared in. 'There is no way for the people inside this [potentially AI-] simulated universe to tell that they are merely simulated, that they are only a sequence of numbers being tossed around inside a computer, and are [therefore] in fact not real', Frank Tipler conjectured. Follow the white rabbit, eh? Taking a step back and obviating 'the fallacy of misplaced concreteness' (Whitehead) can help to put the idea of mind-*dependent* information in its place.

'Simulation, one must remember, applies *only* to models. The computer, on cue, manipulates a set of hypothetical assumptions about reality, not reality itself. It may do this to study the long-range or extreme implications of those assumptions, or perhaps to play off assumptions against one another. In all that it does in this mode, the computer can never be "wrong." Its simulations will always be coherent and logically consistent. Of course, what it is doing may have no relationship whatever to the world outside its program. Yet, because it offers a manageable little "reality" of its own, it may tempt its user's attention away from the messy, frustrating angularities of imperfect daily life. This is especially apt to be the case where hypothetical "facts" take the place of data for the sake of the simulation' (Roszak, *The Cult of Information*, page 69).

There is the sense that consensus is breezily assumed about the word 'information', e.g., the philosopher John Searle rightly notes that fellow philosopher of mind David Chalmers once preferred the 'information theory' connotation of the word 'information', consistent with believing that 'any physical "*difference that makes a difference*" in the world is information' (Searle, *The Mystery of Consciousness*, 'David Chalmers and the Conscious Mind', page 155). The problem with David Chalmers's overdetermined 'information theory' conception of 'information' is that a bat walloping a baseball becomes 'information' in the conceptual scheme. How much sense does *that* make? Consistent with Alfred North Whitehead's quip that the modern era is still feeling the hangover of 'the age of reason, based on faith', the fervor of the 'information theory' camp makes an impression. John Searle found, 'The intensity of feeling borders on the religious and the political' and, also, 'I have encountered more passion from adherents of the computational theory of mind than from adherents of traditional religious doctrines of the soul. Some computationalists invest an almost religious intensity into their faith that our deepest problems about the mind will have a computational solution. Many people apparently believe that somehow or other, unless we are proven to be computers, something terribly important will be lost.' John Searle also remarked on the 'howls of outrage' when Roger Penrose 'attempted to refute the computational view of mind'; Searle conjectured on the source of these passions: 'My guess is that these strong feelings may come from the conviction of many people that computers provide the basis of a new sort of civilization - a new way of giving meaning to our lives, a new way of understanding ourselves. The computer seems to provide, at last, a way of explaining ourselves that is in accord with the scientific worldview and, perhaps most important, the computational theory of mind expresses a certain technological will to power. If we can create minds simply by designing computer programs, we will have achieved the final technological mastery of humans over nature' (*ibid.*, pages 189-190). Parsing the sermons of Marvin Minsky and Ray Kurzweil, one understands where John Searle is coming from.

The 'Singularity' hype partly owes its genesis to philosophically conflating data and information and, consequently, believing that any physical 'difference that makes a difference' qualifies as information. 'Once the faculty of memory was metaphorically conceded to the machines, their mindlikeness was free to soar to superhuman heights. For if thinking is essentially data processing, as the cyberneticians insisted, then the mind that holds the most data is potentially the superior mind, especially in the complex modern world, where there is too much information reporting in for human brains to handle' (Roszak, *ibid.*, pages 37-38). The futurist and excitable businessman Alvin Toffler lends a flavor of the zeitgeist's frenzy and persistent confusion between information and data. 'An information bomb is exploding in our midst', the reader is almost alarmed to learn: 'People and organizations continually crave more information and the entire system begins to pulsate with higher and higher flows of data.' Can I buy you a drink first?

In any event, the theoretical physicist Paul Davies is quite right in suggesting the following: 'It seems to me that, if one perseveres with the principle of sufficient reason [see Arthur Schopenhauer's *On the Fourfold Root of the Principle of Sufficient Reason*] and demands a rational explanation for nature, then we have no choice but to seek that explanation in something beyond or outside the physical world - in something metaphysical - because, as we have seen, a contingent physical universe cannot contain within itself an explanation for itself' (Davies, *The Mind of God*, page 171). [4] Three modalities seem obvious candidates for overcoming the explanatory gap left by scientific materialism: field theory, complexity theory, and process philosophy. [5] To take a few examples more or less *seriatim*, the developmental biologist Rupert Sheldrake has proposed the notions of 'morphic resonance' and 'morphogenetic fields' to account for bidirectional (e.g., downward) causation - and varying degrees of freedom - at different levels of complexity within self-organizing systems.

> 'The action of the morphogenetic field of a morphic unit on the morphogenetic fields of its parts, which are morphic units at lower levels, can be thought of in terms of the influence of this higher-level probability structure on lower-level probability structures; the higher-level field modifies the probability structures of the lower-level fields. Consequently, during morphogenesis, the higher-level field modifies the probability of probabilistic events in the lower-level morphic units under its influence.
>
> In the case of free atoms, electronic events take place with the probabilities given by the unmodified probability structures of the atomic morphogenetic fields. But when the atoms come under the influence of the higher-level morphogenetic field of a molecule, these probabilities are modified in such a way that the probability of events leading towards their actualization of the final form are enhanced [cf. Gerald Edelman's *Topobiology*], while the probability of other events is diminished. Thus the morphogenetic fields of molecules *restrict* the possible number of atomic configurations which would be expected on the basis of calculations which start from the probability structures of free atoms. And this is what is found in fact; in the case of protein folding, for example, the rapidity of the process indicates that the system does not "explore" the countless configurations [see 'randomness'] in which the atoms could conceivably be arranged.
>
> Similarly, the morphogenetic fields of crystals restrict the large number of possible arrangements [see combinatorics] which would be permitted by the probability structures of their constituent molecules; hence one particular pattern of molecular arrangement is taken up as the substance crystallizes, rather than any of the other conceivable structures.'
>
> 'When so many new physical principles and physical fields have been introduced in order to account for the properties of atoms and sub-atomic particles, the conventional assumption that no new physical principles or fields come into play at levels of organization above that of the atom seems remarkably arbitrary. It is in fact little more than a relic of nineteenth century atomism [cf. scientific reductionism]; now that atoms are no longer regarded as ultimate and indivisible, its original theoretical justification has vanished.
>
> From the point of view of the hypothesis of formative causation, although the existing body of quantum theory, developed in connection with the properties of atoms and sub-atomic particles, sheds much light on the nature of morphogenetic fields, it cannot be extrapolated to describe the morphogenetic fields of more complex systems. There is no reason why the morphogenetic fields of atoms should be considered to have a privileged position in the order of nature; they are simply the fields of morphic units [cf. holons] at one particular level of complexity' (Sheldrake, *A New Science of Life: The Hypothesis of Formative Causation*, page 83-85).

The subject of 'nineteenth century atomism' and mechanistic science - recall Pierre-Simon Laplace's ludicrous 'Clockwork Universe' - is a serviceable jumping off point for the discussion of complexity theory and the primary dilemma it helped to overcome. Temporal linearity was formally assumed for hundreds of years - informally, for millennia - based on the second law of thermodynamics and what became known as 'time's arrow', informing a unidirectional type of causation. (It is also interesting to note that the 'commonsensical', asymmetrical view of time is basically incompatible with quantum theory and the idea of 'reversed-time causality'.) The original thought was that entropy and disorder were invariably rising with the passage of time, and the prediction based on the assumption of increased entropy was a progressively-chaotic world. The issue for mechanistic scientists in the twentieth century became explaining how the number *and* sophistication of self-organizing systems could be increasing if disorder was supposed to be rising as a function of entropy over 'linear' time. Why is reality getting more patterned, in other words? Ervin László has commented on 'the evolutionary paradigm' and rejoiced that 'a new system, scientific in origin and philosophic in depth and scope, is now on the rise. It encompasses the great realms of the material universe, of the world of the living, and of the world of history' (László, *Evolution*, page 9). László believes that 'the evolutionary sciences' bridge the lacunae once dividing 'the physical, the biological, and the social realms', or the physiosphere, biosphere, and noosphere favored by Teilhard de Chardin and Ken Wilber. The immediately preceding theorists appear to agree with László that, 'One kind of evolution prepares the ground for the next. Out of the conditions created by evolution in the physical realm emerge the conditions that permit biological evolution to take off. And out of the conditions created by biological evolution come the conditions that allow human beings - and many other species - to evolve certain social forms and organizations' (*ibid*., page 4). The reader can probably guess where this is all headed. By harmonizing 'the physical, the biological, and the social realms' [6] under the rubric of complexity and 'the evolutionary paradigm', the way is paved for what Ervin László reckons 'the grand synthesis that unites physical, biological, and social evolution into a consistent framework with its own laws and logic' (*ibid*., page 5).

Ken Wilber remarks that order was birthed out of apparent chaos in the form of 'emergents' and complex systems. 'The new sciences dealing with these "self-winding" or "self-organizing" systems are known collectively as the sciences of complexity - including General Systems Theory (Bertalanffy, Weiss), cybernetics (Wiener), nonequilibrium thermodynamics (Prigogine), cellular automata theory (von Neumann) [cf. Stephen Wolfram's *Cellular Automata and Complexity*], catastrophe theory (Thom), autopoietic system theory (Maturana and Varela), dynamic systems theory (Shaw, Abraham) and chaos theories' (Wilber, *Sex, Ecology, Spirituality*, page 22). The door to a 'grand synthesis' is open because the physical, biological, and social domains are receptive to and 'express the same general laws or dynamic patterns' vis-à-vis complex, self-organizing systems (*ibid*., page 16). Admittedly, the 'new sciences' adopt a nested-hierarchy design (a suggestion repugnant to scientific materialists *and* postmodernists alike) per 'deep structure', in which the biological is built on the physical and the psychological is, in turn, built on the biological. Ludwig von Bertalanffy said that, 'Unity of Science is granted, not by a utopian reduction of all sciences to physics and chemistry [i.e., scientific reductionism], but by the structural uniformities [articulated through emergents] of the different levels of reality' (Bertalanffy, *General System Theory*, page 87). The notion of a widespread, deep-structure hierarchy has, believe it or not, been part and parcel of human intellectual history, concretized in the 'Great Chain of Being' (cf. Aldous Huxley's *The Perennial Philosophy*). Although natural philosophers like Johannes Kepler and Isaac Newton almost certainly did not intend to reduce more sophisticated biological and psychosocial structures to cruder material forms, generations of future scientists succumbed to the siren call of reductionism.

'What was originally a mere working model to facilitate the interpretation of scientific observation has now hardened into the dogma of a material world outside mind. This hasty jump was driven by the psychological need to fill a vacuum: scientists couldn't operate without a way to think about the World in terms of its underlying reality. While constructing abstract characterizations of the choreography, they needed a way to visualize the dancer. And then, because proper introspection had never been part of their professional skillset, they simply took the World at face value. To this day we pay the price for such a lazy blunder.'

'Science merely models the patterns and regularities of the World [7][8] without providing any insight into its underlying nature [cf. metaphysics/ontology]. It doesn't tell us what the World is, only how it [ostensibly] behaves.' -Bernardo Kastrup ('Afterword' to Rupert Spira's *The Nature of Consciousness: Essays on the Unity of Mind and Matter*)

'Most people believe that science is gradually inching its way towards an understanding of the fundamental reality of the universe. However, until consciousness becomes the focus of scientific interest, researchers will still be seeking the fundamental reality of the universe in a thousand years' time.' -Rupert Spira (*The Nature of Consciousness*)

Even though Ervin László fretted about the 'persistent contradiction' between, on the one hand, a 'mechanistic' world slated to run aground due to the second law of thermodynamics (cf. heat death) and, on the other hand, *unpredictable* novelty and self-organizing systems, Paul Davies believes a reconciliation is possible. 'Typically, complex, open systems can have incredible sensitivity to external influences, and this makes their behavior unpredictable, bestowing upon them a type of freedom. What has come as a surprise is that open systems can also display ordered and lawlike behavior in spite of being indeterministic and at the mercy of seemingly random outside perturbations. There appear to exist general organizing principles that supervise the behavior of complex systems at higher organizational levels, principles that exist alongside the laws of physics (which operate at the bottom level of individual particles). These organizing principles are consistent with, but cannot be reduced to, or derived from, the laws of physics' (Davies, *The Mind of God*, page 182). The novel emergents of complex systems will remind some readers of the principles underlying the process philosophy of Alfred North Whitehead, who preferred viewing Reality through the lens of 'actual occasions', enjoying greater autonomy and experiential upside compared to Joe Blow's grim prospects in a standard mechanistic scheme. 'Central to Whitehead's philosophy is that God is responsible for ordering the world, not through direct action, but by providing the various potentialities which the physical universe is then free to actualize. In this way, God does not compromise the essential openness and indeterminism of the universe, but is nevertheless in a position to encourage a trend toward good' (Davies, *The Mind of God*, page 183). It is interesting that the astronomer Fred Hoyle perceived Reality similarly in that Hoyle grokked a 'superintelligence' at play in the cosmos, preparing the quantum mechanical stage for the strutting, apparently-individualized players.

'What is it that the common people take for knowledge? What do they want when they want "knowledge"? Nothing more than this: Something strange is to be reduced to something familiar.' -Friedrich Nietzsche

'Our mistake was expecting science to provide us with a world view, when we now see that it shows us only half the world - its physical, calculable, testable, significantly controllable, half. And even that half is now unpicturable; it can't be visualized. So science no longer presents us with a model for even half of the world.' -Huston Smith

'This is what technology does. It peels back the shadows and redeems the dazed and rambling past. It makes reality come true.' -Don DeLillo (*Underworld*)

Noesis #210, October 2022

[1] https://s2.smu.edu/~mitch/class/5395/papers/feynman-quantum-1981.pdf

[2] https://bigthink.com/starts-with-a-bang/even-in-a-quantum-universe-space-and-time-might-be-continuous-not-discrete/

[3] https://www.livescience.com/zeptosecond-shortest-time-unit-measured.html

[4] The ancient philosopher Plotinus bridged the so-called physical and metaphysical, the immanent and the transcendent, in a tidy way. 'We may treat of the Soul as in the body - whether it be set above it or actually within it - since the association of the two constitutes the one thing called the living organism, the Animate.' Put another way, the key concern should be the temporal interaction of the two elements. Cf. 'From the organized body and something else, let us say a light, which the Soul gives forth from itself, it forms a distinct Principle, the Animate; and in this Principle are vested Sense-Perception and all the other experiences found to belong to the Animate' (Plotinus, *The Enneads*, Stephen MacKenna translation).

[5] A fly in the ointment of scientific materialism for Aurobindo is that, 'If pushed to its extreme, it would give to a stone or a plum-pudding a greater reality and to thought, love, courage, genius, greatness, the human soul and mind facing an obscure and dangerous world and getting mastery over it an inferior dependent reality or even an unsubstantial and evanescent reality' (*The Life Divine*, page 674).

[6] Erich Jantsch calls these three domains the 'cosmic, biosocial, and sociocultural. Michael Murphy insists they be more simply called, 'physical, biological, and psychological'.

[7] 'In and by itself, the blunder of associating science with materialism would probably have been of limited consequence. But in conjunction with a second blunder, it has had the devastating effect of causing our culture to dismiss all legitimate paths to true insight. This second blunder is our culture's elevation of science - an incomplete method - to the position of ultimate arbiter of truth, as opposed to a pragmatic approach for producing technology and informing philosophy.' -Bernardo Kastrup ('Afterword' to Rupert Spira's *The Nature of Consciousness: Essays on the Unity of Mind and Matter*)

[8] Theodore Roszak provided a few insights on a salient feature of technology. 'What is a mature technology? One that finally generates as many problems as it solves.

As we have learned from every earlier wave of invention, machines are jinnis that get out of control. They reshape the world in unforeseen ways. The railroad and the automobile "solved" the problem of rapid transportation - only to finish by depleting our store of nonrenewable fossil fuels, fouling the air, and destroying the integrity of cities. Modern medicine "solved" the problem posed by numerous infectious diseases, only to finish by giving us the population explosion, ever-more-resistant strains of bacteria, and the ethical dilemma of protracted senility.

The computer "solved" the problem of fast, cheap data processing in a business culture drowning in red tape and paperwork, only to finish by destroying the rights of privacy, concentrating the political and commercial control of information in ever fewer hands, mesmerizing our children with bad art and pernicious nonsense, and menacing us with "computer errors" vast enough to paralyze whole societies. A clever few find ways to work around these vices and maximize the advantages of each new technology; the computer-proficient can sound quite smug about their command of databases and on-line resources. Many earn well from new, more sophisticated media. But the sum total of good and bad gets visited on the rest of us - and especially on the generation to come, who are simply born into the technology's inevitable downside.'

-Theodore Roszak (*The Cult of Information: A Neo-Luddite Treatise on High-Tech, Artificial Intelligence, and the True Art of Thinking*)

Theodor Roszak also manages to disabuse true believers in the fictional 'fact/value dichotomy', the fallacy of 'facts' which are supposed to swing free of priorities and prejudices. 'All the machines they [initiates of the 'cult of information'] confront are operating in obedience to programs that are based upon assumptions and values. What they have before them is not, in some purely neutral sense of the term, "raw data" that are being offered up for their judicious consideration - though that is how the crisis managers tend to describe the matter, with total professional detachment. They purport simply to be providing objective information on demand. But this information has been edited, shaped, weighted, and ordered; it reflects priorities perhaps of a highly ideological kind' (*ibid*., page 229).

Summary Reflections on the Current Epistemological Crisis of Science

Ken Shea

'And here we encounter once more the Gödelian limits to rational thought - the mystery at the end of the universe. We cannot know Cantor's Absolute, or any other Absolute, by rational means, for any Absolute, being a Unity and hence complete within itself, must include itself.' -Paul Davies (*The Mind of God*)

Rupert Spira, rephrasing philosopher John Searle's insistence that so-called 'information' is intrinsically mind-*dependent*, served up a tacit critique of the paradoxical 'view from nowhere', a truly 'mindless' perspective unhappily nourished by the conceits of scientific materialism.

'The world or an object *is* the experience of it. We have no evidence of a world that exists outside our experience of it. Nor is it even possible to have such an experience, because experience itself is the touchstone of evidence.' -Rupert Spira (*The Transparency of Things*)

Accordingly, I generally perceive the contemporary mainstream scientific enterprise, which groundlessly assumes Reality swinging free of Awareness, as partial *at best*, in terms of the overriding metaphysical presuppositions.

The mainstream scientific conception of the world, in fact, actually strikes me as incoherent, the mind-dependent map unreconciled with the supposedly mind-independent territory; note the word 'conception' above, a mind-generated event. The experience-independent 'world' that scientists frantically labor to catalog and describe, nonetheless, <u>simply does not exist</u>.

The process philosopher Alfred North Whitehead and quantum physicist David Bohm, I gather, implicitly tried to redirect the path, commandeer the steering wheel, of reductionist 'nothing but' science away from the crazy blind alley it was confidently intent on barreling down.

It still seems to me that mainstream scientists have not properly interpreted/integrated quantum theory (cf. Roger Trigg's *Beyond Matter: Why Science Needs Metaphysics*).

There are, consequently, a myriad of unbridled, metaphysically-irresponsible speculations flowering luxuriantly amongst the otherwise hard-nosed scientific brood. I can only scratch my head over the impulsive, uncharacteristic audacity.

In any other field, these untestable speculations would be - rightly? - impugned amongst these same, ostensibly level-headed scientists.

Put another way, Hilary Putnam was justified in lampooning Bernard Williams's preposterous, because self-contradictory, 'Absolute Conception of the World', apparently revealed by recent fundamental physics or some other contingent human project.

What if the chaotic, fraught state of the world today and the fractured, dissociated state of mainstream science are not two separate problems? Metaphysician Frithjof Schuon: 'That which is lacking in the present world is a profound knowledge of the nature of things.'

Noesis #210, October 2022

Non-existent Aerial Phenomena

Richard May

'Non-existent Aerial Phenomena', a.k.a, Unidentified Aerial Phenomena or Unidentified Flying Objects or Off-world Vehicles or Transmedium objects

"All truth passes through three stages. First, it is ridiculed. Second, it is violently opposed. Third, it is accepted as being self-evident." — Arthur Schopenhauer

I've never seen a UFO or UAP, as they are now called. Change the name, end the problem? I don't even know anyone who has seen a UFO, as far as I'm aware. I used to wish that I'd see a UFO, but no longer. I've learned more about Too Close Encounters of the Skinner box/Theater of the Absurd kind.

When I was a high school nerd, somehow I obtained a book entitled *Flying Saucers From Outer Space* by Major Donald E. Kehoe. My father told me that the subject of the book, i.e., that there were UFOs and that they were extraterrestrial was just his opinion. So I was pretty convinced even then that Major Kehoe may have been right.

I also remember a book by Aime Michel on Flying Saucers. I'm sure Philip Klass, and "The 'Amazing' James Randi" are correct that UFOs are flocks of geese or the planet Venus. But, sometimes I'm even skeptical of the *professional Skeptics*. Upton Sinclair said something to the effect that it's hard to convince someone of something if his income depends on not believing it. I would add to his income "or his world view depends upon not believing it."

I've never joined a UFO group and only own maybe three or four UFO related books.
I was guilty of listening at one time to late night talk radio, as I sat at my computer, multitasking. I thought that I could distinguish the 10% signal from the 90% noise. But the way I connected the dots it was obvious that some significant percentage of UFO observed phenomena were real and unknown (oops, if true, there goes the precious Fermi 'paradox') and covered up by every authority, particularly the military and the intelligence communities; Indeed, they had a *duty* to cover up the UFO phenomenon in my opinion, for reasons of national security and, e.g., the fears of religious fundamentalists that UFOs were 'demons' or 'demonic'.

I do not expect to change anyone's views on the matter of UFOs or any other subject. Presumably I'm not even wrong in what I have written below. In any case we are each 100% correct 100% of the time in our differing, mutually exclusive views.

There has been an unknown UFO phenomenon and many layers of coverup, which were themselves covered up. No less a whatever than John Brennan, former head of the CIA, says there appears to be something going on here vis-a-vis UFOs. See the quote and link below. Some Conspiracy Theories are conspiracy facts. — Everyone giggle or smirk now. — You

couldn't keep something like *that* secret. Everyone with a high IQ knew about the Manhattan Project.

_____

Oddly Michio Kaku, co-founder of string theory, does not seem to think that every UFO phenomenon is a flock of geese, the planet Venus or bunk to be debunked.

"Over 400 declassified UFO sightings defy the 'normal laws of physics'. Theoretical physics professor Dr. Michio Kaku discusses the hundreds of UFO encounters that Pentagon officials recently unveiled":

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EtDzYytzA_0 — 5 minute video

Here is another Michio Kaku video on UFOs. — 15 minute video

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YebZyAzLZuc

_____

Swiss psychiatrist C.G. Jung analyzed the mythic/psychological nature of UFOs in his 1959 book *Flying Saucers — A Modern Myth of Things Seen in the Sky*. Jung was aware that some UFOs appear on radar, but was not concerned with whether UFOs exist in the external physical world.

A copy of C.G. Jung's fascinating 1957 letter on UFOs is found at this link:

https://www.openculture.com/2013/05/carl_jungs_1957_letter_on_the_fascinating_modern_myth_of_ufos.html

A free copy of his book as a PDF for download is available here:

https://ia801707.us.archive.org/14/items/carl-jung-flying-saucers-a-modern-myth-of-things-seen-in-the-skies-0_202012/Carl%20Jung%20-%20Flying%20Saucers_%20A%20Modern%20Myth%20of%20Things%20Seen%20in%20the%20Skies%20%280%29.pdf

_____

In very brief summary Dr. Jacques Vallee, astrophysicist and computer scientist, is "the man" in my view…

https://www.amazon.com/Jacques-Vallee/e/B001K8JD8Q%3Fref=dbs_a_mng_rwt_scns_share

He may know more than he can say, either for reasons of actual U.S. national security and/or because he could have been threatened. I suppose that theoretically Vallee could be a brilliant disinformation agent.

This is certainly not his reputation. But what he does say is sufficiently stunning.

Vallee thinks that unidentified flying objects are neither flying nor objects in the ordinary sense, but interdimensional brane-world phenomena. Regarding the interstellar visitors from another planet hypothesis, he would agree with Niels Bohr's famous assertion, "Your theory is crazy, but it's not crazy enough to be true."

Please see:

https://www.amazon.com/DIMENSIONS-Casebook-Contact-Jacques-Vallee/dp/1933665289

Vallee thinks that the "physics of information" may be of central importance to the UFO phenomenon. The physics of information is beyond my pay grade, but here is a link to Seth Lloyd of Cal. Tech. and M.I.T., explaining what is meant by the physics of information in general, not in relation to the UFO phenomenon.

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XirbbUxOxiU

UFO events are in Jacques Vallee's view part of some sort of control system of unknown purpose, probably a variable-ratio random reinforcement schedule, à la B.F. Skinner, i.e., a form of operant conditioning.

See: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Operant_conditioning

UFOs have been with us throughout our history. (Charles Fort thought that we were property.) Harvard psychiatrist John E. Mack said that the people he examined who claimed to have been "abducted by aliens" were not lying, nor were they crazy, but added that he had no understanding of what was going on. He came to support the 'interdimensional' interpretation of the alien abduction phenomenon mentioned above.

The first link below is to a brief biographical sketch of John E. Mack on Amazon books.

https://www.amazon.com/John-E.-Mack/e/B000AQ4TWY%3Fref=dbs_a_mng_rwt_scns_share

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/John_E._Mack

Professor Mack was encouraged in his research into the alien abduction phenomenon by his friend the American philosopher of science Thomas S. Kuhn, author of *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*.

I'd like to add that if UFO phenomena are interdimensional (brane-world phenomena), this in no way precludes that they are also interstellar and/or time travelers, if time travel is possible. I think Dr. Vallee would agree. Of course, an interdimensional hypothesis regarding the origins and nature of UFOs may be extremely difficult or impossible to disconfirm experimentally, perhaps analogous in this respect to string theory or the Many-Worlds Interpretation (MWI) of quantum mechanics. Some have suggested that the methods of military counterintelligence may

be more appropriate to apply to the UFO phenomena than the scientific method, q.v.: *What do they know about us*: https://thedebrief.org/what-do-they-know-about-us/

The history of unidentified aerial phenomena and the cover-ups is well documented in *UFOs and the National Security State*, volumes 1 and 2, by historian Richard Dolan.

https://www.amazon.com/UFOs-National-Security-State-Chronology/dp/1571743170

Dr. Vallee thinks that even today after decades of investigation the nature of the UFO phenomenon is not understood by those in positions of authority in the U.S. military-intelligence communities. How embarrassing for the 'experts', if true.

"Quote of the Week: I think some of the phenomena we're going to be seeing continues to be unexplained and might, in fact, be some type of phenomenon that is the result of something that we don't yet understand." - Ex-CIA Director John Brennan

https://thedebrief.org/washingtons-ongoing-uap-problem/

I don't think anything substantive will come out of the current hearings about UAP. Some of the sessions are closed to the public. Presumably having closed sessions is more open and transparent, an indication that there is nothing to the UAP but flocks of geese and the planet Venus. But maybe some of the geese have long, dangerous appearing bills. Thomas Jefferson would be so proud of them.

I wrote the above before the hearings were over or before I knew that they were over. I didn't watch them.

https://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-61474201

I guess the geese aren't talking. In the sessions closed to the public they probably discussed how the geese were able to fly in from Venus, flapping their wings really hard against the vacuum of space, while holding their breath. "You can't handle the truth" about geese or swamp gas.

The large numbers of new acronyms is, of course, absurd. We've been lied to from the beginning for reasons of national security. I understand the once justified need to disinform the public. There have been cover-ups of cover-ups of cover-ups. Trust in government is low in the U.S. and has been for very many years. Investigation of the history of reports of unidentified aerial phenomena and their cover-ups will not diminish this mistrust.

But the clincher is that the military-intelligence authorities and the 'experts' (people with at least 3 Ph.D.s), even after many decades of investigation, still apparently do not know what UAP are! Information may have been privatized decades ago, rather than remaining in the possession of some ultra-secret government group; E.g.: "Hey, Lockheed-Martin dudes, please tell us what this metal is, if you can." There may be no secrets on paper, allegedly a CIA rule for "beyond top

secret" stuff. And eventually people who each knew only a little on a need-to-know basis will die off, some even of natural causes. This increases security.

Even worse we, or rather high ranking members of the U.S. military and intelligence communities, may have made "deals" with UAP occupants (perhaps interdimensional brane-world, time-traveling interstellar beings, either biological entities, AI units, cyborgs or some combination of the preceding). E.g., deals of the form: "You can continue to abduct our citizens for study, a hybridization program or whatever your purposes are, but please give us some advanced technology that we can militarize," could have been made. If the U.S. can't stop the abductions anyway, then this would have been a good deal for us (and completely illegal and unethical, of course). I realize that this speculation sounds more than a bit psychotic.

https://thedebrief.org/washingtons-ongoing-uap-problem/

"THE BLACK VAULT – DOCUMENT ARCHIVE
WELCOME TO THE BLACK VAULT DOCUMENT ARCHIVE"

https://www.theblackvault.com/documentarchive/

Current Government Document Page Count Within The Black Vault: 3,080,991

You've stumbled upon the largest privately run online repository of declassified government documents anywhere in the world. With more than 2 MILLION pages of documents to read, on nearly every government secret imaginable, The Black Vault is known worldwide for getting down to the truth… and nothing but.

Every page, photo and video you see below in this 'FOIA Document Archive' was obtained through the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) or through other means of accessing U.S. government public information.

Begun in 1996, at the age of 15, John Greenewald, Jr. began hammering the U.S. Government with FOIA requests to obtain information. The Black Vault is the result of that more than two decade effort. Enjoy!"

It is somewhat surprising how much interest the U.S. military and intelligence communities have had and continue to have in "flocks of geese and the planet Venus," i. e., *classified* interest. "It's easier to think outside the box, if the box isn't entirely intact." — Frederik Ullen.

_____

Below is what I wrote previously on UFOs, published on 12/22/2020, more than a year before the subject had become far more kosher and considered at least by some less "woo woo" (from Scott Douglas Jacobsen's Interview 5 — a bit of sarcasm and irony). But after "Do you suppose we would comprehend the technology of a civilization a thousand or more years older than our own?" below, I should have added: "or the science, technology and culture of a species of off-world beings in which the *average* level of cognitive-mathematical ability was equivalent to that of John von Neumann?" Commenting on the well-known Hollingworth 1942 study Children

above 180 IQ (based upon Stanford-Binet scores) Grady M. Towers wrote in his essay "The Outsiders" (https://prometheussociety.org/wp/articles/the-outsiders/) that, "The implication is that there is a limit beyond which genuine communication between different levels of intelligence becomes impossible." Towers is writing about intraspecies communication. This finding generalized to interspecies communication would seem to have even greater implications for the human understanding of hyperintelligent non-Earth dwelling beings. We humans will not be capable of understanding hyperintelligent non-Earth dwelling beings and they will not be capable of understanding us, even if they attempt to do so.

Jacobsen: "May's Paradox" asks, "Why, if a multitude of New Yorkers exist in Manhattan, evidence of New Yorkers, such as automobiles or subways, is not seen?" Why?

May: Obviously there is no evidence of New Yorkers existing, such as automobiles or subways, in New York City. That would be a Conspiracy Theory. May's paradox should have been called the May paradox. The clear absence of evidence for the existence of New Yorkers makes May's paradox analogous to the Fermi paradox.

_____

In the SETI program we have searched for years for signals in the hydrogen frequency. As was pointed out in a YouTube video by Dr. Michio Kaku, there is no particular reason to assume that advanced alien life would use the hydrogen frequency to send signals, even if one assumes that such beings would use radio signals at all. Dr. Kaku also points out that if the extraterrestrial communications used spread-spectrum signals, such as we humans use even now in our cell phone signals, then we would not even recognize the alien spread-spectrum signals as signals. Please see the quote and link below, added after the original text of the interview:

"Viability of quantum communication across interstellar distances The possibility of achieving quantum communication using photons across interstellar distances is examined. For this, different factors are considered that could induce decoherence of photons, including the gravitational field of astrophysical bodies, the particle content in the interstellar medium, and the more local environment of the Solar System. The x-ray region of the spectrum is identified as the prime candidate to establish a quantum communication channel, although the optical and microwave bands could also enable communication across large distances. Finally, we discuss what could be expected from a quantum signal emitted by an extraterrestrial civilization, as well as the challenges for the receiver end of the channel to identify and interpret such signals.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.105.123033 "

Given the exponential and unpredictable course of the growth of human technology, it seems entirely possible that a civilization even a few hundred years more advanced scientifically and technologically than our own might accomplish things in ways that we could not understand at our present level of scientific-technological development.

Do you suppose we would comprehend the technology of a civilization a thousand or more years older than our own? "Any sufficiently advanced technology is indistinguishable from magic" — Arthur C Clarke. So where are the smoke signals?

Noesis #210, October 2022

Just for fun let's take the Roswell, New Mexico UFO crash myth. Of course, it's just a Conspiracy Theory. The so-called Roswell incident has been explained — at least twice. Last time it was said to be a weather balloon. It might just as well have been a flock of geese or the planet Venus, I suppose.

But let's be silly and play devil's advocate. Suppose an unexplained extraterrestrial craft or vehicle had crashed there in 1947 after WWII. Presumably the US. military would have little or no interest in such an event. There would have been no suspicion that it might have been a Russian or German device after World War II. There would have been no military interest. There would have been no interest if not duty of the U.S. military to study and reverse engineer the advanced off-world technology for American national security. So a possible crash of some sort would not have been investigated.

But if what was discovered was thought to be an unexplained craft or an "off-world device," as they are apparently called today, of some sort, then a high-ranking military officer or perhaps the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff or our President would certainly have gone on the radio and told the U.S. public: "Fellow Americans, an unknown craft appearing to be extraterrestrial in origin has crashed in Roswell, New Mexico. We do not know its origin or understand its method of propulsion. The technology is far superior to American technology or that of any other nation on Earth. A few small gray (?) humanoid bodies have been retrieved from the crash site. They're not thought to be Americans. We don't know yet with certainty if these beings are Christian or Jewish. But we can be sure they are Baptists. At this point in time it is apparent that the U.S. military cannot control its own airspace. — But, hey, don't worry about it! — America is number one, the greatest power! — Have a nice day."

The Brookings Institution report on the possible consequences of advanced extraterrestrial contact concluded that when a more primitive civilization encounters an advanced civilization, the more primitive civilization is damaged by the contact would certainly not be considered relevant by those in authority. The conclusion that religious fundamentalists would be highly unreceptive to contact with an advanced extraterrestrial civilization would also certainly be ignored as irrelevant.

_____

Below are a few crackpot books of Conspiracy Theories, perhaps good for a few laughs:

Wonders in the Sky: Unexplained Aerial Objects from Antiquity to Modern Times by Jacques Vallee (Author), Chris Aubeck (Author)

A free copy of the above mentioned 482 page book can be obtained as a pdf here:

https://ia601201.us.archive.org/35/items/JacquesValleeChrisAubeckWondersInTheSkyUnexplainedAerialObjectsFromAntiquityToModernTimes/Jacques%20Vallee%2C%20Chris%20Aubeck%20Wonders%20in%20the%20Sky%20%20Unexplained%20Aerial%20Objects%20from%20Antiquity%20to%20Modern%20Times.pdf

UFOs: Generals, Pilots, and Government Officials Go on the Record Paperback – August 2, 2011 by Leslie Kean (Author), John Podesta (Foreword)

UFOs and the National Security State: Chronology of a Coverup, 1941-1973 Paperback – June 1, 2002 by Richard M. Dolan (Author), Jacques F. Vallee (Foreword).

A cottage industry of woo woo, no doubt. Everyone with a high IQ knew about the Manhattan Project. You couldn't keep something like *that* secret.

And in any case there are no conspiracies, ever. The Watergate break-in and subsequent Watergate cover-up were certainly not conspiracies. Project MK-Ultra was certainly not a conspiracy. Industrial espionage certainly does not involve conspiracy. — The belief that there are ever conspiracies is no more than a meta-conspiracy theory.

_____

In summary the UFO hypothesis of visitation by advanced extraterrestrial beings is not crazy enough to explain the facts. This has been displaced for Vallee by his hypothesis of UFO visitation by advanced brane-world transversing beings, which may in addition be extraterrestrial and/or time travelers; Beings present since our antiquity, with an unknown agenda and a Skinnerian control system for humans, choreographed perfectly to off-putting absurdity. Such parsimony — interdimensionally!

_____

Material of interest:

The Enduring Enigma of the UFO — astronauts speak — by Dean Radin

https://noetic.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/S21_Shift_RADIN_EnduringEnigmaOfUFO.pdf

Pursuing Unidentified Aerial Phenomena and 'Impossible Futures' — by Jacques Vallée

https://thedebrief.org/jacques-vallee-the-pursuit-of-unidentified-aerial-phenomena-and-impossible-futures/

UFOs: Shifting the Narrative from Threat to Science, Leslie Kean, August 11, 2021

https://thedebrief.org/ufos-shifting-the-narrative-from-threat-to-science/

Report on the UFO wave of 1947 by Ted Bloecher, introduction by Dr. James E. McDonald

https://img1.wsimg.com/blobby/go/d5fae458-45bc-4779-a43a-bb96d172f15b/downloads/1947%20UFO%20Report%20-%20Bloecher.pdf?ver=1655488608148

NASA Launches Study of 'Unidentified Aerial Phenomena', October 24, 2022

https://www.washingtonexaminer.com/policy/defense-national-security/nasa-launches-study-on-ufos

Noesis #210, October 2022

A Flock of Geese

I saw a flock of geese today.

Flew in from Venus straightaway.

Geese from Venus, I'm quite certain;

Nothing Cosmic behind the curtain.

May-Tzu

The Benediction

One Tarot unifies QM with GR.

Infinite maths vary from world to world,

moment to moment.

Everywhere you turn, a Messiah of Fools.

What more could be needed,

blessed with such an excess of truth?

May-Tzu

'Only a glimmer sometimes splits mind's sky
Justifying the ambiguous providence
That makes of night a path of unknown dawns
Or a dark clue to some diviner state.'

-Aurobindo ('A Glimmer', *Savitri*)