



What is Intelligence?

Sam Fryman

What is Intelligence?

Sam Fryman

CONTENTS

Introduction	2
Chapter One – What is Intelligence?	3
Chapter Two – What is Human Intelligence?	9
Chapter Three – Evolution, Morality and Society	14
Chapter Four – Intelligence, Emotion and Intuition	34
Chapter Five – Intellect and Intuition.	46
Chapter Six – How Society is Repressing Your True Intelligence	72
Chapter Seven – Intelligence and Hypnosis	78
Chapter Eight –Intelligence, the Media, Kundalini and Sexuality	94
Chapter Nine – Intelligence, Psychology and Spirituality	110
Chapter Ten – The Psychological Flaw in the Modern Scientific and Atheistic Mind	117

Introduction

Most, if not all of us have been through a school and state education system which from day one has assessed what it described as our “intelligence”, and in many cases has judged us as “high” or “low” on that self-same system’s opinional basis.

In the main, we are assessed by tests devised by academics and so called “psychologists”, such as the famous Binet test of IQ, which in the final analysis is merely an assessment of certain skills in verbal and numerical reasoning.

Then we have other perspectives on the subject, suggesting different kinds of intelligence, as implied for example by the title of the book “Emotional Intelligence” by Daniel Goleman, which though we have not personally read, we know has influenced many people.

Then again, we have the transcendental meditation guru, the Maharishi Mahesh Yogi, well known for his connection with the Beatles and other major celebrities, who spoke of the concept of “creative intelligence.”

Next there is for example so called “animal intelligence”, such as the cunning plans devised apparently by some species of animals, for instance that shown by cats in cunningly stalking and capturing their prey, or alternatively, that exhibited by the angler fish, which almost incredibly has a kind of fishing rod suspended from its head enabling it to capture its prey, just as a human with a man-made fishing rod does.

Which information itself raises the question – are other animals intelligent in the same way as humans are? Is their intelligence just different *in degree*, or it is different *in kind*?

But in answering this, surely we must address an even deeper question, which is to ask - just *what is this intelligence per se* which we talk about in such glib terms? Where does it come from, and why do some beings and species seem to have so much more of it than others?

And finally, how is this intelligence, which has made us the predominant species in the entire animal world, functioning in the modern human world today? Is it serving our best interests, is it helping us create a happy and peaceful world, and if not, why not?

Chapter One – What *is* Intelligence?

Let us start with a typical dictionary definition:

Intelligence: the ability to think and learn: the ability to learn facts and skills and apply them, especially when this ability is highly developed

We would like to re-define this more precisely as follows:

Intelligence is the faculty which enables the possibility of the understanding of, and where appropriate, the power of action with regard to all things.

Surely this is the context in which “intelligence” becomes a vital and truly meaningful concept to us?

It is like the genie which can give us unlimited wishes – we understand Nature and other people, and then we know either how to gain power over them, or else how to behave correctly in relationship to them.

Why?

Because our goal in life is to solve all our problems and satisfy all our desires.

Therefore, such a faculty of knowing and understanding the reality of Nature and the human world surrounding us is the only meaningful definition of the term.

But in practice we see that the standard dictionary type definition stated above, as *the ability to learn facts and skills*, is what society in general is regarding as “intelligence”, and not the definition we have given here.

To put it slightly differently, we are saying that “real intelligence” is a faculty of *potentiality*, whereas the dictionary is currently telling us it is more concerned with the accumulation of “facts”, “information” and “skills.”

And that is what our current educational system and society generally regards as intelligent.

That is, the man or woman who has read a lot of books and crammed a lot of facts into their mind is called intelligent, or who has made some extraordinary efforts to acquire a “skill” such as playing the piano expertly or speaking a foreign language, which we see also in general means this same accumulation of knowledge, together with some mechanically learned, parrot fashion routines of dexterity of tongue or fingers.

There are some people for example who can perform the solution of the geometric toy/puzzle “Rubik’s Cube” in sixty seconds or less, but does this mark them out as truly *intelligent* or is this something that any “idiot” can do given enough time, motivation, information and practice?

(for those who don’t know, descriptions of Rubik’s cube are freely available on the Internet or in encyclopaedias).

Of course the ability to solve *how* to do Rubik’s Cube is a different proposition, rather than to find a ready-made solution and learn to carry it out swiftly by extensive practice, and surely indicates a different *kind* of intelligence.

And it is the latter kind of “skill” which we would describe as “intelligent” rather than merely the ability to perform a sequence of memorized procedures like a well trained parrot.

Equally therefore should we distinguish between the performance of an “expert pianist” and the person who composed the music.

The person who expertly plays the piece of music is showing a sometimes startling ability to memorise and carry out a complex physical task, a physical skill.

But is it really so remarkable, when we consider the average concert pianist *after a preparation and training period of years and decades*, spends around seven hours or more a day practising the skills which they display before us in just a brief few minutes?

Obviously none of us who are unwilling to commit ourselves to a similar level of training, which at minimum is going to take months of constant effort, and more likely years, can ever hope to equal his or her skills, and naturally find dazzling such a highly trained display which is the product of so much unseen tortuous concentrated effort, that it almost defies belief, just as the performance of the person who gets into “the

Guinness Book of Records” for being fastest at solving the Rubik Cube does.

On the one hand this makes the world a fascinating place, in that there are so many highly skilled people who have these peculiar talents, or are willing to make extraordinary efforts, such as those who painstakingly take weeks or months to arrange a pattern of countless thousands of dominos, which by the knocking down of a single one are then made to topple one another in some kind of spectacular and amusing display.

But on the other hand, are such skills really of any *human value*, are they anything more than just clever and very time consuming tricks?

Above all, are they any sign of the real intelligence we have discussed?

And the answer we would suggest is emphatically *no*.

The person who composes a piano concerto is usually a very different being than the one who plays it almost flawlessly before an audience in a packed concert hall, just as the actor like Laurence Olivier or Richard Burton who performs brilliantly some speech from a Shakespeare play is different than the original poet or bard who created the words or drama.

Of course performing is a kind of “art” or “science” in itself, a skill of a different nature than composing music or writing words in a meaningful sequence and format.

And thus we get to the issue also of exactly what is an “art”, or speaking even more generally, what is “art”?

For example, in a well known educational mathematics text “What is Mathematics?” by Richard Robbins and Michael Courant, one chapter poses the question –

Is mathematics a science or an art (or both)?

We think we know what a scientist is – someone who does experiments, collects data, and then formulates theories and conclusion where possible based purely on evidence and rational reasoning and “facts.”

But what on earth is an artist?

Surely this is an issue of “intelligence”?

For at the very least, the “artist” like Picasso, Salvador Dali, Mozart or Beethoven become famous and possibly rich according to this extraordinary “art” they display, to a degree that is possessed by only a very few of the population in any era.

But the “artist” is not the same as the “scientist” surely in the general way in which their “intelligence” functions?

The difference superficially is that the scientist *appears* to be devoted to rationality, whereas the artist *appears* to work with the so called *imagination*.

The point we are making here, is not to necessarily authoritatively *answer* these questions, but to point out the *vagueness* of the terms we use, and the consequent vagueness, and to some degree therefore *invalidity* of these questions we so freely imagine we can pose expecting a valid and conclusive answer and explanation.

i.e. if we are not crystal clear on what an “art” or an “artist” is, how can we legitimately ask such a question as “is mathematics an art or a science?”

Let us ask a scientist for example, where the imagination is located in the brain. They can tell us to some degree where such things as “the speech centre” or the part related to sight (“the visual cortex”) seem to be, but where is this thing called “the imagination” located?

And in everyday terms what is the imagination anyway?

Surely it is the ability to mentally create pictures or images in our minds, or even sights, sounds or smells – therefore *sensory experiences* – that don’t exist in our current “external reality”, just as we apparently do “involuntarily” in the dream state.

It is our ability to produce “what if” scenarios.

We could *imagine* for example - *what if* we won a few million pounds or dollars on a lottery, what would we do?

Then we see pictures in our mind of whatever it is that our desires formulate for us – the grand mansion in the country perhaps, the

luxurious car, or the handsome man or beautiful woman whom we rightly or wrongly imagine we could get if only we had all that money.

And we see at other times, not only will our imagination, our “what if” faculty conjure up ideas in our minds based on our desires, it will also do so when we have fears, for example - what if our heart stopped beating, or what if the powers that be decided to launch a nuclear war?

Whole books, novels and plays are written it seems wholly on the basis of this “what if” faculty of imagination, and we spend huge amounts of our lives indulging in or obsessing upon these *unreal fantasies* produced by our own minds or the minds of others.

So is this imagination a sign of intelligence?

A famous best selling novelist like J K Rowling of Harry Potter fame is definitely regarded as of high intelligence isn't she?

But if we asked her to come up with a cure for cancer, or fix our computer, likely she couldn't do it. Or is it just she is concentrating the efforts of her “intelligence” and “mental power” in the wrong place to do such a task?

And we might ask in passing, in a world full of serious unsolved problems, whether of war, disease, crime, economics, terrorism and so on, if it is really an *intelligent* thing to do, to create huge masses of fantasies, whether in film or book form, if this power of mind could be used to solve these serious human problems instead.

Then we have the work of the non-fiction authors, who write books on philosophy, or yoga, or religion, or “spirituality.” Are these persons the ones whom we should regard as truly intelligent, or are they merely deluded, and manufacturing plausible or implausible fantasies, as the case may be?

So again, we are going to at least for now, trample upon or side-foot away all these ideas, and redefine intelligence in the following way:

The faculty to correctly perceive and act in regard to reality.

For what is the use of imagination if we do not see what is real and deal with it accordingly?

If we imagine that a car coming towards us as we cross the road is a “cellophane taxi” as John Lennon wrote in his “Lucy in the Sky With Diamonds”, we may not successfully get across the road in one piece.

If we imagine the enemy who tries to attack us with a knife is a nice person whom we can reason with and preach words of love and kindness at to fend him away, we may get stabbed or even killed, if our assessment is not real.

So it appears that *intelligence* is *not* imagination, though it may use this faculty of imagination to carry out its “experiments.”

Then there is the question of whether there is some kind of “intelligence” in Nature.

Again, this question pre-supposes that we have defined properly what we mean by intelligence, and further that we are *agreed* about our definition.

But the reality is, many people, especially those of a scientific persuasion, define intelligence as a purely human or animal quality.

They doubt even the idea that plants have some kind of intelligence, as their basic definition of intelligence is that possessed by some kind of sophisticated nervous system, such as the human or animal brain, or in simpler life forms such as starfish they say it has a “neural net” – i.e. a set of neurons or brain cells that carry out the “intelligent” behaviour, but not a cumulative, organised and specialised mass of brain cells in a single location which we would call a “brain.”

But let us for the moment cast aside this issue of whether plants or lower animals have intelligence, as we would define it, and let us now look deeper into what *human* intelligence actually *is*.

Chapter Two – What is *Human* Intelligence?

If we look in a science or biology text book, we can see pictures of the comparative sizes and structures of the various animals including the human brain.

We discover that not only is the human brain the largest with the exception only of a few species like elephants or possibly dolphins, but is by far the largest as compared to body size, and more importantly perhaps is far and away the most complex in structure and most convoluted.

In a sense however it might be considered a tragedy that such species as dolphins appear to have effectively gone up an “evolutionary blind alley” in terms of the fact that they have massive brains in comparison to all the other fish and animals apart from man, but not the physical structure to properly control their environment.

No dolphin is ever going to build a space rocket and visit the moon, because it doesn't have the limbs to invent and manipulate the tools that would be required to do so, regardless of whether it has the power of intelligence or not to create such tools and machines.

But therein lies the next question.

Is it merely this lack of ability to walk on land on two legs and manipulate tools with the hands that is holding the dolphin back, or is it we have got that something extra in intelligence terms which *none* of the other animals has got?

And there is of course a huge debate on this subject.

For example, there is one anecdote (i.e. story, let's not call it *research* or *evidence* because we don't know if it's true or false) that a dolphin once responded to a sequence of whistles which counted up from one, two, and then three, by replying with *four* whistles of its own, thus supposedly illustrating its ability to *count*, to understand the concept of *numbers*.

And lately, another story and “piece of research” is suggesting that dolphins can recognise themselves in the mirror, and use the mirror as a tool to check themselves out.

Perhaps the equally interesting question here is to ask whether this is really a sign of *intelligence* or rather of *vanity*?

Some people could also argue that the fact that dolphins don't walk on land and build space rockets and computers doesn't mean they are less intelligent, they might even be *superior* in intelligence.

For example, a so called "enlightened" man or woman, or for that matter someone high on drugs does not desire anything much from the material world, due supposedly from some deeply satisfying or thrilling inner state of consciousness.

So perhaps, this argument goes, that because dolphins are "enlightened" creatures in comparison to us and constantly in a state of "inner bliss" they don't bother to create the nasty polluting technological world that we do, they just send their high pitched "Morse code" to one another and spend a lifetime of swimming, acrobatics, eating, dating and mating, which for many humans plausibly would seem to be a heaven of sorts, and further explain perhaps why dolphins seem to have a slightly roguish smile etched permanently upon their faces.

Based on this kind of thinking, some people even worship dolphins, and go swimming with them to pick up on "the good vibes."

Whilst we are not condemning people for finding ways to make themselves feel better that don't hurt others, and we regard dolphins as fascinating and wonderful creatures, again, we must point it wouldn't be truly *intelligent* to indulge too deeply in these imaginings without any greater evidence.

Then there are the chimpanzees whom supposedly have been taught a few hundred "words" in sign language.

But before getting too deep into the whys, wherefores and maybes of these experiments, and their conclusions, let's remember that firstly, parrots can quote a line of Shakespeare, but don't show any other indication they know what they are talking about, and presumably all that we have hit upon in "teaching them language" is that they have a remarkable facility for recognising and imitating bird, animal and human speech sounds, which would in theory suggest this facility is a definite evolutionary asset.

But do we find for example, such birds using this facility to imitate the noise of a tiger to deter approaching predators, and even if they did, would this indicate a “human-like” *intelligence*, or merely some kind of *instinctive* “learned response” acquired “accidentally” somehow over thousands or even hundreds of thousands of years of evolution?

So some animals, such as the aforementioned angler fish, which has an almost humanly designed fishing rod dangling from its own head, clearly don't have the size and complexity of brain which would indicate an order of intelligence which could have “thought up” such a strategy.

The current scientists and biologists reject the concept of “intelligent design” – i.e. of some kind of intelligence immanent in Nature that functions *like our own, only greater* but see these events as the occurrence of an extremely long sequence of accidental refinements by “genetic mutation” over huge time periods.

That however, is a different question, and not one we will dwell on in this chapter.

But in terms of this issue of animal versus human intelligence, these experiments showing signs of human-like “intelligence” and “behaviour” in animals all apparently have a motive.

The question is – is there anything *unique* about *human intelligence*, or are we “just the same” as all the other animals?

And surprisingly for some readers no doubt, we are going to say – *hang on, it doesn't actually matter very much.*

It appears for example that gorillas – also a species possessing very large brains, we note - have a kind of curiosity when examining things which looks almost human, and any number of animals use some kind of a tool in one way or another, even if it merely is collecting twigs to build a bird's nest or a beaver's “dam.”

And do cats or dogs dream as some studies seem to suggest?

Maybe they dream about other cats and dogs. Who knows, and frankly *who cares?*

For yes, without answering the previous question, surely already we accept they have some semblance or aspects of what we call “human intelligence.”

But even a mongoloid child can learn to speak and function in many ways as a “normal human being”, yet no other species of ape can learn to talk in verbal terms.

No other kind of species has any sophisticated kind of tool use, such as we would see in building a simple house such as an African native’s mud hut or an Eskimo’s igloo.

But let us compare the behaviour of *humans*, even in so called “savage” or “primitive” races.

For example, one black African race of hunter/gatherers it was revealed in a fascinating documentary film, use a clever technique to find water which no other animal has ever had the sophistication to employ.

Their technique is to catch a monkey and tie it to a tree. Then they feed it on a cake of salt for a while.

The monkey unwittingly loves the addictive taste of the salt, but little does it realise that this will produce in it a burning thirst.

Then the native humans untie the monkey, and it hurtles at top speed to the nearest waterhole, which it has on its endless journeys already located, and the humans simply chase after it and locate the water hole.

What an “elegant solution” as they like to say in mathematics!

This is but one small sign of the superiority and *the genius* of the human brain, the human intelligence.

So though we can admire and love the remainder of the animal and plant kingdoms, and note with fascination that clearly some level of intelligence is manifesting itself through at least the animal sector of them, why is there such enormous interest in the fairly primitive expressions of the development of intelligence throughout the animal kingdom as compared to humans?

Scientists deny the concept of “intelligent design” in Nature, meaning that they deny that there is any kind of “universal intelligence” in any

way *conscious* and thereby comparable to our own, which is orchestrating everything we see in Nature.

But surely, the point is, that wherever this *design* is coming from, in humans, the architecture, machines, computers and space rockets that we make unquestionably *are* products of *intelligent design*.

And we credit other animals and maybe even some kinds of species of more primitive life-forms like starfish with having *some* of this *intelligence*, which we find only in a dramatic and properly blossoming form in the human animal.

So there is surely only *one* kind of intelligence in fundamental terms, which is merely displayed to a different degree in different species according to the relative size and sophistication of their brains.

The only question then remaining is whether the existence and expression of this intelligent quality is totally confined to an animal “nerve net” or “brain”, or whether it can exist in a different form, independently of such a structure.

So for the moment our conclusion here is that, we have identified as “intelligence” this capacity for analysis, contemplation, imagination, expression and design that humans have, as existing in other animals to a lesser degree, and only fundamentally different in humans as to its magnitude, just as amongst human beings themselves, only a small proportion would be regarded as authentic geniuses in any way.

Chapter Three – Evolution, Morality and Society

Now we have discounted as *relatively* unimportant the debate regarding whether there is any special quality in humans not available to other species, the need surely is to find out how to make that human intelligence function in our own best interest and that of the race.

In this connection, we might also ask as some *species* of biologists do, what is it that the complex human brain is really *for*?

The evolutionist will tell us that it is an instrument which gives us maximum evolutionary advantage, in that it enables us to develop skills and strategies, including tool and machine use, which give us a superior advantage over other species, and even of other subdivisions of our own species who have not sufficiently developed or utilised their mental equipment.

For example, in the cold war, and continuing international struggles, so called *intelligence*, is regarded as the primary weapon in gaining advantage over “the enemy.”

By *intelligence* in this context of course, is meant “intelligent gathering and analysis of information for purposes of military advantage” but we should definitely point out that it takes a great deal of “intelligence” of any kind to win such a *war of information*.

But there is an interesting corollary of this model of *intelligence used as a weapon*, which is that if the brain and its intelligence is just there for Darwinian reasons of *survival* and *reproduction*, then what in society, regardless of the existence or non-existence of a “god”, we describe as *ethics* or *morals* play little or no part in this, except in what the biologists describe as “culture.”

The evolutionary biologists say we need our big brains, not only for the power of intelligence as a weapon to design ways of defending from and attacking our enemies in other species or our own, but also to form coherent social groups.

The principle there, is presumably that in groups lies power, and therefore survival advantage. Most animals gather in herds, or families, because this gives much more protection than lone animals which can be picked off much more easily by predators.

Part of the reason for this, is for example, that animals can warn each other of the first appearance of a predator and therefore have the opportunity to take some kind of evasive action, before the stalking animal is too close to fend off or escape.

But on the other hand, animals do not always easily live together in crowds as each demands its own territorial space, mating rights and so on, and obviously where a lot of animals occupy the same space, more potential conflicts can arise.

Thus we see in various species all kinds of ritual battles, like those of stags or goats butting each other with their horns, and gorillas making their chest-thumping displays to similarly claim their rights to dominance on some patch and in some group.

Some biologists have reported that amongst ape groups, there are much more complex behaviours going on, for example, that two apes may form an allegiance to support one another against a more powerful ape who tries to dominate the group, in order that they may also claim their territorial and mating rights.

These kinds of complex social behaviours they say need a larger brain, which by retrospective analysis suggests it is the reason it evolved.

So we are encouraged by the evolutionists and their endless TV documentaries telling us what Nature is like, and affirming this idea of animalistic duelling and “the survival of the fittest” that really, our human society is little different.

And it appears in many ways to be so, especially increasingly so in our modern society.

Because, the object we see, of this advanced brain, according to their theory, is not to be “good people”, but only to be clever “social operators” whose goal is to produce the maximum personal advantage for themselves in terms of surviving and reproducing.

Professor Richard Dawkins has documented all this kind of thing in his book “The Selfish Gene.”

So the implication for human society is that being a “goody goody” moral person is really just “a mug’s game” and “nice guys finish last.”

So really, that means doesn't it, as does the principle of "the survival of the fittest" that society is an animalistic, head butting battle for as much territory and as many mates as possible?

And that further means surely also, that all the power, territory and mating rights are given to the toughest, the strongest, and the cleverest social operators.

Which is exactly what we see before our eyes.

In such a society, the weak, the poor, the disabled, the old or unsound of body and mind in some respect are not properly cared for.

Which depending in what country and locality we live is more or less the case all over the world.

Some have said, that the test of a truly moral society is *how it cares for its old people*.

Let's face it – they can't work, they contribute little, their growing incontinence can disgust us, and their infirmity makes us afraid and reminds us we'll go the same way some day, and that's we'll die.

Surely that is the principle reason why some of the young hate the elderly – they see their future, they fear it, and therefore wish the elderly did not exist.

So surely such concern for the weak and the elderly as the "civilised", "humane", "caring" person is supposed to feel, this is all mere sentimentality – like religion and mysticism, surely it's all rubbish – the real fact of the matter is that *the strong will survive* and the rest can just feel themselves lucky to be tolerated and left alive?

So here, we are just pointing out, using our faculty of true (i.e. objective, impartial) intelligence, that the direct consequence of the evolutionist thinking and rejection of religion and mysticism *whether it is true or not*, is this man-against-man, everyone-for-themselves, animalistic "survival of the meanest and toughest" battle for existence and domination.

But unfortunately scientists like Richard Dawkins, cannot see this, for generally speaking they are nice "civilised" chaps, who don't go round molesting other men's women or beating other men to a pulp in the pursuit of their biological needs.

They imagine falsely that we can impose some kind of “ethical” or “moral” ideology on the mass of people, such as communism or “humanism” or god knows (or *doesn't know if he doesn't exist*) what other –ism, which will make people behave themselves in a “civilised way.”

But we have seen for example that communism - though sounding great in theory – never seems to work in practice, because once again, a small but significant number of Darwin's “fittest” (toughest, meanest, most cunning and ruthless) manage to get into the hierarchy of such a system and pervert it to their own ends.

They systematically wipe out anybody who would oppose them, or point out their corruption, such as did Stalin in Russia and Mao Tse Tung in China.

So in the absence of any other plausible alternative, which history has been trying to find for countless millennia, this would appear to suggest that the firmly adhered to religion such as is still found in some Muslim countries, whether it is actually factual or a fantasy, is the only safe way to order a society, in that it protects the rights of all based on moral principles, which would not otherwise exist if society were allowed to be a free-for-all based only on self-interest as it is in the West.

This is *not* however to suggest that all Westerners should become Muslims, or that all Muslims should become Westerners.

But we are just pointing out the *fact* that in such religious dominated countries, if they truly adhere to the principles of their founders such as Christ, Moses or Mohammed or Confucius, we can guarantee that the old and weak would be taken care of, and all people would be respected and given the rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness as they say, in so far as is it possible for each individual to possess those rights and freedoms without impinging on the rights and freedoms of others.

But this does not, we repeat, necessarily mean any set of religious believers has the right to inflict their views on everybody else.

What we are saying, is that even though “morals” and “religious views” are not proven by science, or any kind of visible consequence of Darwin's theories of evolution, if using our intelligence we decide that the safest course in society is the adoption and belief in such principles,

whether in fact they are true or not, we have an interesting problem on our hands.

(note Marx said “Religion is the *opium* of the people” but apparently didn’t count for the fact that if you take the “religious opium” away from the people, that sets the stage to addict them to *the real thing* – or cocaine, marijuana, LSD, “ecstasy”, etc.).

For what we have right now in the West and much of the rest of the world also is the domination over the many by the few.

A fortunate few are kings or billionaires, but most of the population still scabble and toil increasingly hard to make a modest living.

Which means inevitably, as we have seen throughout all history, that the many will eventually join together to overthrow the few, or else, the few will wisely decide to be more equitable in their control over and distribution of the world’s resources, and less personally aggrandising, *in order to not make themselves into targets of revolution or even assassination.*

For example, consider the cold blooded slaughter of the Romanoff dynasty members in Russia, at the time of the 20th Century Russian revolution.

History shows that sooner or later, most dictators are overthrown – those who live in grandeur, while the rest are in poverty – just as are most gangsters – few of them die in their beds of “natural causes.”

So though no scientist can so far prove a scientific basis for religion or morality, the fact is that history has shown that there is little security for *anybody* from the top to the bottom, whilst holding these divisive views of “survival of the fittest”, which in practice in modern human society means domination of the few over the many.

Why are we suggesting that only *religious* beliefs – i.e. those which hold belief in a “higher intelligence” which has a plan and purpose for our existence and a possible “after life” – can persuade people to behave themselves?

Understand we are not suggesting or justifying *blind belief* here, we are being *purely logical based on the psychological reality of the average human as we know him or her.*

The truth is, we are *all* scared of the dark.

We may try to deny, say we don't care, but when it comes to the crunch – e.g. we have a life-threatening accident, or get told we have cancer or whatever - we are *all* scared as hell, and eternally grateful to any doctor or medical staff who can take away our pain, and put us back in one piece, where possible, which unfortunately many times it is not.

It is however easy for the young and inexperienced of all ages to “mock death” because they think it will never happen to them, but as time goes by and they gradually see it happening to everyone around them, or even have a close brush with it themselves, they soon change their tune.

People, for example, like US tycoon Howard Hughes, depicted recently in Martin Scorsese's fine movie, *The Aviator*, can get obsessed with germs or other things they imagine could threaten their health and survival to the extent that their behaviour becomes virtually psychiatric.

Or do you honestly think a man who had no fear of death, and felt himself invulnerable, could possibly behave like that?

Equally, there are those who explore the avenue of cryogenics, leaving instructions they are to be frozen immediately upon death, in the hope that medicine will advance and one day be able to revive them, as depicted quite cleverly in the entertaining movie, *Demolition Man*, starring Sylvester Stallone, although of course the character he played was put into a suspended animation state whilst still alive.

It appears to archaeologists there was some similar sort of “personal immortality plan” being conducted by the Pharaohs, in the elaborate design and grand structure of their famous Pyramids, death chambers and sarcophagi.

So let us not base our philosophy on the lie that people are not scared of death, for everyone but on the one hand perhaps a saint, or fanatical believer in heaven, or on the other hand, an utterly deluded person is very much so.

Of course, there are many other horrors in life possible apart from death, such as being tortured in a prisoner of war facility, or having some tragic accident and ending up in a wheelchair, and so on.

One can very easily lose one's hair, teeth, get facially scarred, become lame, or experience the horror of having a virtual death sentence placed upon one by the announcement that one has cancer or some other awful terminal disease such as is currently presumed of AIDS.

Or we can just live an average life of such misery, endless toil for little reward, traumatic disappointing personal relationships and so on, that there seems little real purpose in existing apart from mere survival itself.

We might add as a likely unique aspect of this *human intelligence* we have, that we are seemingly the only species whose members decide to end their own lives, which seems to be totally against the principle of evolution itself.

Of course, the biologists and scientists can easily think up answers for this kind of behaviour too – calling such members aberrant or genetically defective – but the fact that we have many extremely successful people in worldly terms who do this, such as British comedian Tony Hancock, possibly Marilyn Monroe and Elvis Presley, philosopher Arthur Koestler who wrote *The Act of Creation* and *The Ghost in the Machine*, and many more, suggests to us that a better explanation is needed.

Again, doctors or medical researchers will point to the deficiency of some chemical in the brain, such as serotonin as “the cause”, but can our complex human problems really be reduced to such a simple biological formula?

And if so, what is the point of all this so called “therapy” that millions of Westerners indulge in, when presumably all they need is “a chemical fix”?

The real truth of the matter however, is that brain physiology and chemistry is not yet sufficiently understood to come up with all these kind of facile solutions and consider them reliable explanations.

For example, let us statistically compare the suicide rate in religious and non-religious societies, and see what that says about things. Our guess is it is *many* times higher in the secular societies than the religious, particularly if we leave suicide-bombers out of the equation.

We are not going to try to present statistical data on this matter however, because apart from anything else, the gathering of *reliable* and *accurate* statistical data is not necessarily such an easy thing to do, and in many cases, probably impossible, due to the usual defects in the collection of the data – e.g. how are we going to locate and question a “representative sample” of members of the Muslim, Buddhist or Hindu worlds? – and the formulating of a correct questionnaire.

But with *logic* and fact-based understanding of how the human psyche works, we can say that those who believe in nothing will obviously suffer from a sense of insecurity and fear that those who believe in a God will experience far less so, just as those who have the comfort of a marriage partner *on average* fair better in health and happiness than single people.

Doctors and medical researchers have long been aware of the mind-body connection, in their growing awareness of the apparent equivalence of the mind and the brain.

By experiencing emotional states such as fear, we can induce medical problems in ourselves of various kinds – even a heart attack could be brought on by extreme fear, for example, and some people have had their hair turn white or even fall out completely overnight, following some kind of a serious shock.

So again, this is to imply *logically* that if a belief system (*regardless* of whether the “beliefs” have any reality or not) provides us mental comfort and psychological and emotional security, we are better off with one than without one.

For as “Sufi Saint”, Hazrat Inayat Khan, pointed out: if the beliefs are wrong and there is no afterlife, then the non-believer will be as well off as the believer in the state of non-existence and oblivion – i.e. will simply not have any existence at all of a conscious kind.

But what the scientist and “rationalist” overlooks, is that even if his or her beliefs are not founded on reality, the believer will spend a life which has hope and meaning in it, whereas the non-believer will spend a life of doubt and misery comparatively speaking.

This in itself can be an *evolutionary* negative – the believer is motivated to marry and have children – to “go forth and multiply” – as we see all religiously founded nations all over the world have always done – whereas the typical view of many “rationalists” and “non-believers” is

why have children? Why inflict this misery upon them for no purpose? Why cause them to exist knowing they must age, suffer and die?

And that view is of course, *utterly rational*, given their “beliefs” – i.e. there is no god or “spiritual dimension” or “afterlife.” There is merely the here and now, and a lot of this *here and now* is pretty scary stuff right now, and has been throughout most of history also.

Even in the relatively peaceful and privileged Western Nations, we might catch AIDS or the recently developing “bird flu” and be dead in months or hours respectively, or maybe have our limbs blown off by a terrorist bomb.

As Marlon Brando says at the end of *Apocalypse Now* before he is slaughtered by his military sponsored “terminator”, Martin Sheen:

The horror...the horror...

So note – the scientist and rationalist have actually got themselves a scientific “belief system”, or at the very least we could call it “a non-belief system” which is liable to cause them not to carry out, or at the very least to seriously curtail, their evolutionary mission of reproducing.

In a late 1960s and early 1970s in at least one issue of esteemed British science journal *New Scientist*, an article pointed out this adherence amongst the modern educated intellectual adults to the philosophy of “2.2 children and a Ford Concertina” (a *Ford Cortina* car), and urged the scientific elite to breed more, so that they wouldn’t be swamped further by the plebeian classes, who quite happily rattled out huge families, whether they believe in a god or not.

But history shows it didn’t happen.

“Civilised intellectuals” just don’t want ten or twenty kids in their tidy, ordered, rational lives, and some of them are so “tidy and ordered” there’s no place whatsoever in their lives for smelly, screaming and demanding babies at all.

It is an interesting and currently statistically unanswered question as to how many modern men, who of course all want *sex*, would want *children* also, were it not the more or less inevitable price in most cases for getting their wife or girlfriend’s cooperation in the conjugal bed.

But the fascinating and ironic corollary of this situation, is that we see that those who believe in the Darwinian evolutionary view of human existence, are the very same people who have decided to partially or wholly stop breeding.

Can we be forgiven for almost bursting out laughing about the fact that those who believe most fervently in “the survival of the fittest”, and therefore in the human number one motivation to reproduce and pass on their “selfish genes” at all possible opportunities, are possibly the only sector of human society who are *deliberately* choosing not to do so?

For instance, surely a man of the fame and fairly handsome looks of Professor Richard Dawkins should be using every possible opportunity to pass on his “selfish genes” with every young dewy eyed student and desirable female fan or willing acquaintance that he meets?

Since for example, for a long time now, Mick Jagger, Hugh Hefner of *Playboy*, and suchlike have been following such an *evolutionary, survival of the fittest* agenda, bedding every available and desirable woman in sight; so one might legitimately ask just where did Professor Dawkins and so many other unmarried or “traditionally married” 2.2 children type evolutionist scientists go so wrong?

Without wishing to be any further mocking, we would like to offer them a *theory*, which does not require any “religious belief” as such, as we are quite confident they would coolly reject any such as an “irrational” proposition.

Merely passing on one’s genes randomly and “will-nilly” is not how human evolution proceeds most effectively.

Why?

Because the truth of the human psyche is that regardless of whether we find it in “science”, “art” or “religion”, what we are all pursuing as increasingly intelligent beings is *love, truth and beauty*.

Whether the motivation for these desires can be traced to some kind of instinctive or infantile origin, is not the issue, because the *fact* is that we are *all* seeking those things.

Even Al Capone goes to the opera. He says as is now well known “the show ain’t over till the fat dame sings.” But he still goes to see the show.

He could go instead to an illicit display of “fighting cocks”, like that visited by Ann Margret and Steve McQueen depicted in *The Cincinnati Kid*.

But he doesn’t. He wants fine clothes, fine furniture, the company of beautiful women and even enjoyment of “the fine arts.”

The fact that he has to crack a few skulls, or shoot a few rivals dead over the dinner table to afford those things doesn’t really bother him, so we wouldn’t really call him a *civilised man* by “moral standards” would we, but he is still seeking beauty and a truth and love of a kind.

As he died, did he pray to a God?

We don’t know, and surely we can’t ever now know, as could not even those at his death scene, excepting only what he did and said.

But the fact that *he*, apparently a murderous despot, is still seeking beauty and thinking of himself as some kind of philosopher – i.e. a pursuer of knowledge and meaning - tells us clearly that these impulses are planted deep in us all.

So then the evolutionary question becomes - should we as men fire our sperm like spatter guns at every female in sight, or should we very carefully choose a very small number of females, possibly even only one, with whom when we combine our genetic characteristics with will produce as amazing and startlingly beautiful, intelligent and wonderful children as possible, which as a stable family unit, we are in a position to assure the maximum chance of careful rearing and survival to?

This question clearly applies equally to women, in terms of whom they should choose to make available their eggs and wombs to in terms of a mate.

And clearly, the more *intelligent* in society are choosing this option – they are going for *quality* and not *quantity*. They are breeding *pedigrees*, *champions*, not herds of wild sheep and pigs.

So the implication here is that evolution *may* not be as random as the mainstream evolutionist scientists think.

The actual *behaviour* of the evolutionists themselves, modern intellectuals, and the educated and more highly evolved humans in general demonstrates this fact.

For example, just statistically speaking, to pass on this “selfish gene” effectively would seem to suggest having as large a brood of children as possible, to ensure maximum chance of at least several of our progeny surviving and passing and distributing in turn their genes as far and wide as possible.

But we “educated” and “intelligent” citizens think *small is beautiful*. We don’t seek families of dozens or thousands like farm yard animals and insects do.

We demand *quality* of life, not mere survival.

We like to immerse ourselves in art, music, song, and indeed scientific exploration *for their own intrinsic worth, for their own sake*.

And *regardless of our evolutionary imperative* of “survival” and even “reproduction”, we will if our quality of life is sufficiently lacking decide to “end it all” – we will commit the ultimate anti-evolutionary act of self-destruction and personal extinction.

And we can call it “chemical imbalance” in the brain if we wish, but there is a greater demand for this *quality of life*, the need for wonder, magic, sparkle and happiness in life, and a correspondingly greater capacity for self-destruction amongst the *more evolved*, the “bigger brained” (or more complex brained) than the less intelligent members of our species and race.

What on earth is going on?

Again, we have merely a *theory*, so as we said, we are asking for *consideration*, not *belief*.

Suppose there *is* a supreme intelligence underlying Nature, expressing itself as Nature.

Then nothing in Nature is accidental. All is causal, all is *design*. But not everything is “made perfect” at once. There are trial designs, failed designs, rejected designs, outmoded designs, and so on.

Even *we* may become “outmoded designs” in time, and be replaced by something superior, something which we may even in time evolve into.

This intelligent designer is having “fun” creating things, just as we do when we invent the electric light, the telephone or the motor car, and even having fun destroying things, just as we do when we dynamite and orchestrally demolish a huge old tower block or apartment building. We might even play Tchaikovsky’s *1812 Overture* as it’s coming down.

But this *theoretical* supreme universal intelligence has as *its* kind of fun creating planets, stars, galaxies, and species of life, and sometimes wiping them all out.

We howl when it either does or permits what appear to us *destructive acts, cruelty* and so on, such as endured in the Nazi Death Camps in World War II or the Japanese Prisoner of War camps, or on the other hand, the vast suffering of the Germans in the bombing and molestation of their cities and people at the end of the war, or of those Japanese citizens caught in the fires of the Hiroshima and Nagasaki nuclear attacks.

We cannot understand fully the motivations of such a “God”, such a “supreme intelligence” which seems to have created and allowed these things.

But firstly, its “prophets” tell us how to evade this kind of catastrophic and cruel state of affairs of wars, famines, disasters and social injustice.

Like Moses or Christ they issue laws, commandments, which *if obeyed* will bring us to peace and harmony, and live in a “promised land” of “milk and honey.”

We only get this awful suffering as at present when we get *arrogant* and start to think we know better than this God, and start making up our own laws and ways of life instead of following *Nature’s*.

And secondly, even if we are too stubborn to obey the commandments, the prophets tell us that nobody really dies anyway, that life is in essence eternal, and that however much we are suffering or have suffered, in time we will experience such overpowering joy and happiness, that we will forget and deem insignificant every last throe of it, such will be the reward we will eventually receive.

And this is not merely an empty promise, because the prophets and saints allege repeatedly in all the spiritual literature with which the history of man is littered over the past several thousand years that they *personally* have experienced this state of bliss, known in various traditions as “Valhalla”, “Heaven”, “Satori”, “Nirvana”, “Samadhi”, “Enlightenment” and so on, for which undergoing tortures or even dying on a cross is seen by them in that light, as only a very tiny price to pay.

But with realism, accepting our lowly status in the Universe, we have to also accept that we, as limitedly intelligent humans are simply not in a position to know fully the motives or state of such a God, or of possibly other far more advanced beings in the universe, just as a dog or a tortoise is in no position to understand the mental states we experience and the complex thoughts and ideas which captivate and motivate us.

No dog cares to hear a Beethoven Symphony, no tortoise cares tuppence whether Rembrandt or Vermeer paints a masterpiece or not. There is lettuce, there is a mate, there is a warm tough shell for protection, and that is enough for our little tortoise he declares, thank you very much.

But there seems no limit to our human ambitions in terms of the demand for ever more thrilling, satisfying and broader experience.

If we can't find our joy and adventure anywhere else we obsess upon it in the form of excess use of drugs or sex.

But as we evolve we look for it more and more on a mental level – at the opera, in the music, in the literature, in the “arts.”

As Spartacus says to his love Jean Simmons in the movie:

“I'm free. But what do I know? I want to know where the rain comes from. I want to know why a leaf falls and a star doesn't - where the wind comes from, and where the sun goes at night. I want to *know*.”

We are *homo sapiens*, the man who knows, seeks to know and must know and understand.

This desire and thirst for understanding is as great in the intelligent man or woman as that for food and drink.

Do we not see the frustration of a gorilla, as it examines some branch or leaf or thing it has found?

It looks at it blankly, it seems maybe it wants to know *what it is*, but it is stumped, it has no advanced human brain, its efforts to seek further are doomed to failure.

But in the movie, the godless or near godless Romans don't want Spartacus to be free, and to *know* and *understand*, and when he tries to escape his slavery, they eventually send a huge army against him and kill him.

The wily politician *Gracchus* played by Charles Laughton, has taught Julius Caesar, who hovers in his loyalty been Gracchus, the Republican, and Laurence Olivier's *Crassus*, the Imperialist, and Caesar says to Crassus:

“Well, at least Gracchus has taught me one thing – that Rome is *the mob*(the people).”

But Crassus haughtily answers:

“No, you are wrong, Caesar. Rome is not the mob (the people). Rome is *an eternal thought in the mind of God*. You must serve her. You must worship her. You must abase yourself at her feet.”

So Crassus wins, and the society becomes a dictatorship, with a small ruling elite, and everyone else is enslaved.

He is an *alpha male*, lesser men fight to the death for him for his amusement and that of his courtesan like beautiful but sadistic and bloodthirsty female consorts. Enemies (i.e. opponents) of the state are rounded up and imprisoned or executed. The helpless weak, the old and the disabled, for whom there is no longer anybody to speak up for, die of starvation, poverty or neglect.

Crassus's Roman elitist society is that of the survival of the fittest, it is our modern society in disguise, and is the direct outcome of the Darwinian view of humanity, untempered by any *morality*.

His “morality” is only one of respect for the high and mighty, of the strong and cruel, like himself.

His Roman gods are even more strong and cruel than he is, which is why he respects and worships them.

Christ's "God of love" and "love of the neighbour as oneself" which Spartacus embodies, is an aberration in his society, which stirs up the minds of the masses to *rebellion* (i.e. freedom) and therefore cannot be tolerated, and must be exterminated, just as Spartacus was exterminated, and Christ before him.

Were Emperor Crassus a modern man, he would no doubt have employed some scientists to prove evolutionary theories of survival of the fittest and so on to justify and consolidate the "status quo" - that is of the domination of the strong over the weak - just as did Hitler's eugenicists, who deemed the Aryan race superior to all the others, despite Jesse Owens' triumph at the Berlin Olympics of 1936 in front of his own eyes.

But again, Hitler himself, originally an artist, like Al Capone was *a seeker of order, of beauty*, just as was our Crassus in the Spartacus story.

But if we are to have a harmonious and secure society, such desires must be tempered by a morality lest they turn into elitist and racially intolerant dictatorships and vicious empires, for example by the true following of morals of the Christian kind, or based on fundamental moral principles such as the commandments of Moses.

Failing that, we have an endless and often bloody local, national and international struggle, along the lines of "survival of the fittest" Darwinian evolutionist thinking.

That is to say, if "survival of the fittest" is our principle – if the Germans can wipe out the French or the British. *So be it.*

Or if the Chinese can wipe out the Japanese, or the Arabs can wipe out the Jews, or the Jews the Arabs. Then equally, so be it.

From the *Darwinian* point of view, there's nothing *wrong* with that, is there?

This is merely *evolution* after all, this is a job for which those of a moral persuasion *need not apply*.

It's *survival of the fittest* isn't it? It's the way things have to be.

Thank you Darwin. And for Darwin, if there is a God, let us say thank you God.

But obviously, if there is a God, Darwin – the enlightening element of the information he has provided and the fears he has engendered – is part of that plan.

But surely, it cannot be part of either a God's plan, or an evolutionary plan of a "blind watchmaker" that man should create nuclear and biological weapons, with which not only can he extinct himself, but can likely wipe out all life upon the entire planet?

How does an *intelligent* species, whose goal is above all *survival*, get to such a pass that it can wipe all its members out, as well as likely all the other species on the planet, without which it could not survive anyway, dependent as it is for its own existence on the food they provide?

Our *theory* again says that this god or "supreme power" tries out all the options it can to try to persuade the little critters on this particular planet to adjust their behaviour to its wishes, such that they may earn this fantastic reward provided by evolutionary development.

Nuclear weapons or other "cataclysmic force" only appears *when all else fails*.

After all, this "supreme being" doesn't ask *all that much*. In the *metaphorical* (not *literal*) garden of Eden it only asked – *eat whatever you like, do whatever you like*, but don't eat *that one single apple*.

What would we think of a gardener who said, eat any plant or fruit in my garden without charge, but don't eat that poisoned mushroom over there, because that could kill you?

We would think he was a jolly good and caring guy, wouldn't we?

The prophets don't ask much either. They merely say –

"Have (generally speaking) one man or woman each as partner, guys and girls, and be faithful to them at least until they die, or actually *want* to divorce you.

Don't kill your neighbour, be *nice* to them. Is that so hard? After all, if they are following the rules too, as is the plan, they'll be nice to you too.

Then you can lead a peaceful and secure life, and sleep easy in your bed without fear of burglary, murder, rape or nuclear or chemical attack."

So why has this *intelligent and sensible* theory of “religion” – i.e. treating others fairly and loving one another - got into such disrepute?

Because scientists have used their “intelligence” in the “forbidden way.”

That is, it is not forbidden to *speculate*, but it is “forbidden” to *adjudicate* on matters which science itself accepts are outside of the zone of science, such as “is there a god?”

Science was not wrong for establishing the *mechanism* of evolution, of natural selection, of establishing that man is related to the other species and has evolved from some kind of common ancestor to at least some of the species existing today.

On the contrary, this was an essential form of *enlightenment* for the modern age, which must be accepted eventually by all on our planet.

Science did not make any error by (more or less) proving the evolutionary theory in its general message.

But it is what it did *next* that was the problem. It said:

We are all descended from a primordial one celled bug.

(fine, no problem, we can live with that, we are so much greater than a one celled bug now).

But...

And therefore religion is nonsense, therefore there is no god.

And here, lies the fallen crown.

Of course we know that scientists, atheists and rationalists will howl with anxiety at the term and idea that any activity of a scientist or even human being in general apart from perhaps rape, motiveless violence and paedophilia is *forbidden*.

What we mean is that *nothing is forbidden*, as neither in theory is murder, paedophilia or rape in human society.

But that such “laws” are passed to save humans individually and collectively from horrors.

We *can* and *do* in some cases do these things, but there are *consequences*.

And in the case of the scientists, declaring *no god*, because they are an “authority” and are believed, this first causes people to stop believing in god, and then they say to themselves and each other “no god, why obey morals?”

And thus society deteriorates into an animalistic battle, of “survival of the fittest” in which adultery, crime, violence, prostitution, usury, fraud, abuse, injustice and exploitation of all kinds appear, in which only the strong, violent and ruthless prosper and rule, and abuse and damn the rest.

Politically, we see cruel dictatorships (masquerading in one form or another) instead of benevolent wise monarchies or democracies, and then follow unceasing wars launched by such dictatorships to subjugate and enslave other nations, regardless of the suffering and loss of human life of even their own citizens who are regarded as insignificant pawns in a game, and mean less to them than the pieces on a chess board.

We fully accept that science has the right to *investigate* and explore and *speculate* upon *any* question of human or non-human life.

But we feel scientists must act with *responsibility* in the light of the consequences of what they report to human society.

For example, supposing there were an asteroid discovered hurtling towards the earth and unstoppably going to destroy us.

Unless there was some positive benefit in this being reported to the attention of the public, of what purpose would it be to report the imminence of human extinction, and thus cause all kinds of wild and savage panic behaviour, which would be a million times more productive of suffering than merely a relatively speedy death for *billions* in the face of a global conflagration like thousands of hydrogen bombs going off simultaneously that would likely ensue?

Therefore, much of these words are directed to the atheist scientists, such as the very influential Richard Dawkins, who must eventually realise for the sake of all, that a position of non-belief in religious principles can

bring the entire race only to destruction *whether those religious principles and beliefs have any basis in reality or not.*

Richard Dawkins recent assertion that religious belief is the cause of the global havoc is a total cop-out.

The Muslim is strapping dynamite to him or herself and attacking the “enemy” with it, not because of *religion*, but because of the intolerance of the rest of the world to the Muslim way of life, and the desire of these powerful elite in the world to control their natural resources.

Had the Muslims not been threatened and provoked, they would not be attacking the West, except perhaps for a few extremists and zealots who on their own could not achieve very much, lacking widespread support.

If this seems unproven theory, let us give a fact.

There was for example *not ever* any Muslim attack on England before July 7th 2005 - in other words, after the British had engaged in the second Iraq war, and had been warned by terrorist leaders such as Osama Bin Laden to withdraw their forces repeatedly, long *before* any attack on Britain ever took place.

Note also, that these words of the author are the impartial dispassionate opinion of a man who is neither a Muslim, nor a Jew, and was born and raised as a Christian and has no intention of converting to either faith, and has no desire and nothing to gain from his viewpoints, except the hope that someday there will be a comprehensive and enduring world peace.

Just as Oppenheimer and the other scientists involved in the production of the first atom bomb wrestled with their consciences, let our modern scientists also wrestle with theirs, and cease where possible to allow the use of their high intelligence and extraordinary knowledge for low or destructive purposes, not good for the individual or the global society.

For surely, any other action on the part of the intellectual elite, towards the mass of the people who are the comparatively non-intellectual non-elite, is an act of social destruction, and against any civilised, peaceful and evolutionarily sound organisation of mankind.

Chapter Four – Intelligence, Emotion and Intuition

The free expression of our emotions and the free expression of our intelligence both seem equally desirable goals in theory, but in practice we find many times are opposing and mutually frustrating activities.

That is, the expression and sensation of strong emotions tends to blot out rational thinking, and the practice of clear rational thinking correspondingly seems to demand the suppression or absence of any powerful emotions.

We are all aware that when we are in a mood, for example of fear, passion or anger, our normal thinking processes can be seriously affected, and our normal reasoning faculties may fail to operate.

We regret things we say in the heat of such moments, and at leisure repent the misjudgement of saying them, and decide we would have chosen our words or actions more carefully had only we been “in our right minds.”

The two types of mode of mind operative are somewhat represented by the fictional characters of Mr Spock and Doctor McCoy in the original Star Trek TV series.

Spock is the emotionally controlled rationalist who tries to decide all by cool, clear logical thinking, whereas McCoy is the heated, passionate and emotionally indulgent foil to him, with Captain Kirk standing in the middle of their war of *Reason versus Emotion*, like an unwilling referee.

But both Spock and McCoy irritate us at times. We see they are both incomplete. We tire of Spock’s boring perpetual logical deductions, and we tire also of McCoy’s constant heart-string pulling emotional pleas.

We would like to at times ask Spock to *loosen up, let his hair down*, whereas on the other hand, we would like to tell McCoy to stop ranting and whining, and “pull himself together”, and show a little restraint and military or stoic “stiff upper lip” like Spock does.

This example is not trivial.

For what we are saying is that on the one hand, the ceaseless expression of cold logic, bores and dulls us, yet on the other hand, the overindulgence in emotionality drains and weakens us.

We thus need a balance of emotionality and rationality to keep us in a healthy and positive state.

However, though it is fairly clear just from the image of Mr Spock what the rational mind is about, the emotional nature is far more difficult and amorphous to so easily define.

The trouble with *emotions*, is that like colours, we are talking about a spectrum of feelings, which seem as different to us as the spectrum of colours with all its subtlest shades.

For example, music and art seem to stir in us the widest imaginable range of feelings, each piece of music we hear or picture we view gives us a seemingly unique and different experience of *feeling, emotion*.

Let us consider even the different kinds of emotions stimulated by music, which is surely just one area of feeling, as we get a different range of feelings again for example when contemplating the natural world, such as if we see a tiger in the wild, or we view the starry sky at night.

For example as to music, listening to a Bach fugue is a very different experience than listening to a “heavy metal” piece from a band like Led Zeppelin in their classic track “Whole Lotta Love”, which in turn is very different again from listening to a sensual and hypnotic pop song such as Donna Summer’s “I Feel Love”, which by clever combination of its suggestive singing and warm throbbing synthesizer accompaniment could plausibly even induce an erection in some males.

We do not mean to be vulgar or provocative with our last remark.

We are merely pointing out that the word “music” covers a vast, seemingly infinite array of possible forms, emotions and ideas, and that two different pieces are regarded even by different people as different in “emotional effect.”

There is the issue of *taste*. How can one person “love” a particular piece of music, and another one “hate” it, when surely the music is heard as the same sound vibrations, rhythms, timbres and melodies by everyone?

(note: *timbre* means *tone colour* in music, e.g. that of the *quality* of the drum, the saxophone, the flute, the voice, etc. e.g. a *sombre* drum, a *blaring* trumpet, a *sensual* saxophone, etc.)

The issue is *choice* of emotions.

Different people like to indulge in different kinds of emotions to others, just as some people like to watch a romantic “weepy movie” and others prefer a tough guy “action movie.”

Music evokes diverse emotions within us, in that it stimulates different centres or aspects of our body and/or mind.

For example, heavy metal music’s pounding and aggressive rhythms, vocals and screaming guitar solos are clearly of a “passionate” and “aggressive” nature.

The aforementioned “Whole Lotta Love” is obviously sexual in its “thrusting” rhythms and guitar riff and is almost like a “hot” and “wild” sexual encounter in sound – particularly the middle section, which uses tape loops, screaming vocals, echoing throbbing drums and disorienting phasing effects to stimulate the “mind blowing” nature of a powerful and animalistic sexual encounter and orgasm.

Compare what this is doing to the human body, “emotions” and “mind”, with the effect of listening to a Bach fugue, which is almost wholly a mental or “cerebral” experience which doesn’t really “reach the parts” below the neck, except perhaps the “heart.”

Music, and we can likely say *emotion in general*, is directing itself to broadly speaking four aspects of our being – mind, heart, gut and loins.

We experience *meaning*, or lack of it, in the mind; we experience joy or sadness in the heart; we experience a feeling of strength or weakness in the abdominal area (as in ELP’s song *Pirates* “If you’ve the *stomach* for a broadside, come aboard me pretty boys”), and we experience sexual desire in the loins.

But interestingly, there is a “hotline” to all these zones of feeling via the medium of *words*.

This makes the song the most powerful musical form because it can stimulate us on two levels – adding the descriptive and suggestive power

of words to what Aaron Copland in his classic music educational book “What to Listen For in Music” describes as “the purely musical meaning.”

Incidentally, that of course makes it arguably a greater achievement to express something satisfying purely in music with no words, nor even suggestive title, which explains why only truly great composers like Bach or Mozart can thrill millions with the power of their instrumental music, e.g. Bach’s famous “Tocatta and Fugue in D minor” - made a chart pop hit out of by artists such as “Sky” or the Chinese violinist Vanessa Mae; as can sometimes fine modern musicians like Jeff Beck on his hit track “Dance With the Devil” or Scott Joplin with his famous rag “The Entertainer” used in the Newman/Redford movie “The Sting.”

But the power of words – and of course, the emotions with which they are sung – can render a piece of fairly repetitive and rather incomplete musical backing track, such as in Donna Summer’s “I Feel Love” - which otherwise would have just given a nice warm fuzzy feeling - more or less into an aphrodisiac in sound.

Compare again, the emotions aroused by tracks like the Donna Summer and Led Zeppelin we have mentioned to the listening to one of Bach’s preludes or fugues, or even Keith Emerson’s fine “Fugue” off the Trilogy album, and as one advert said, the feeling is less of sexual arousal and passion, than “live in peace with your pipe”, or to put it differently again, as Tim Rice said in “One Night in Bangkok” from the musical “Chess”:

I get my kicks above the waistline.

So depending upon our “taste”, our “nature” – whether it is really “Nature” or “nurture” we shall discuss elsewhere – we are drawn to desire different bands of the spectrum of emotions, just as people have different favourite colours, which equally have equivalent emotional effects.

In general, obviously “cold” blues and dark colours are relaxing or depressing, and “hot” reds and oranges are warming or exciting. Yellow or gold is obviously neutral – it is balanced and thus balancing. Thus the yellow or golden sun makes us feel healthy and relaxed – neither too hot nor cold, and we have such phrases as “the golden mean” which indicate this state of balance associated with yellow or gold.

However, yellow and gold are found in Nature in short supply. A little of either goes a long way, because like red they are such powerful colours.

Again, just like “emotion”, anyone who has ever tried matching paints will be staggered at how subtle the variations of colour can be – for example, who off hand could definitely identify what was a “vermillion red” or an “ultramarine blue”, a “bottle green” or a “pearl white”?

For example again, depending upon the settings of the red/green/blue colours on our TV or computer monitor, those named colours will appear quite different, as will they be also on the varieties of printed colour materials, as we can clearly observe for example by looking at different copies of the same book, newspaper or magazine.

But we are perhaps not yet defining our terms clearly enough in this analysis. Just what *are* these feelings, and emotions which we so freely discuss and toss around to one another in describing our everyday experiences?

Like sounds or colours, it is in fact not so easy to say what any particular feeling is.

For example, let us try to describe how a piece of music makes us feel, such as Beethoven’s well known slow movement of the “Moonlight Sonata.”

There are all kinds of things in there – we can say, it is *like* the lapping of waves, or gives us an image of a lake at night with the moonlight shimmering on the water, as its title suggests.

Beethoven however did not name it so. This popular title was tagged on only later after his death.

And moreover, if we could say what it meant precisely *in words*, what would be the point of the music at all, why would we need it if words could produce in us the same *emotion*, the same *meaning*?

So we are hinting here that the power of words in expressing our *emotions* is generally speaking somewhat vague and limited.

For example, if we say someone is *sad*, that could in itself mean a whole spectrum of degrees of what we call “sadness.”

So we get “sophisticated”, and try to assign more words to express the intensity and type of sadness. For example, we could say someone is desolate, melancholic, or heartbroken, or we could even use a kind of metaphorical term and describe someone as “devastated” or “shattered”, though of course the latter words normally mean something completely different, not directly related to emotion.

Thus, if someone is asked “how do you feel right now?” there is really no exact way of answering that question.

So people say things like:

“I feel kind of strange” or “I feel good.”

Whereas we could legitimately ask “what do you mean – *strange* like you looked in the mirror and saw two heads, or strange like you feel like you have never been here before?”

Or as to good - “you mean you feel good like you just won the lottery, or good like you’re a well behaved little girl or boy?”

Then we might ask regarding *degrees* of emotion, and the terms for them, who is the most upset - the person who is “desolate”, or the person who is “melancholy”? Or are either of these two as sad or more so than the person who is *depressed*.

The truth is, when we start examining dictionary definitions we tend to go round in circles, and end up finding that most of these terms mean much the same thing, and there is not necessarily a generally agreed understanding of what they mean as to degree.

For example, *melancholy* has medical overtones – that is, it is allegedly a state arising from a medical condition. Which implies it may be a more persistent state than a mere fleeting spell of sadness, for example, which would occur when we discover our lottery numbers did not come up.

But what is the point of this discussion and analysis?

The point is – we are saying that emotional states cannot be discussed in a purely rational or logical way, because *they are not precisely definable, and therefore not agreed*.

As a final example, after all, just what do people mean by the word “love”?

If you say you “love” someone in the context of a one-to-one relationship it is surely meant as the supreme compliment.

But then there is the love of a parent for a child, or of a teacher for a pupil, which will generally not include the sexual overtones of when a man declares his love for a woman, or a woman declares her love for a man.

And then there is the problem that people often address one person with this “supreme compliment”, which the recipient believes to be applying therefore only to them – which it *logically* must, if it really is “the greatest compliment one could ever give another person” – but then the originally complimenter soon offers that self-same compliment to someone totally different.

So of just what value then is such a word at all?

Clearly, it depends upon *who* is saying it.

There could be many people who have said those words a thousand times to one person or another in their lifetime, and some who have said it only a few, or maybe even only once, or maybe even never at all.

Likewise, when someone who is routinely depressed, negative, and despondent, and spends most of their time moping around, if they say they are “sad”, it means something very different than when someone who is a super-optimist, and normally full of joy, love and goodwill reports the same.

In the first case, the declaration of “sadness” will hardly move us at all, and in the second case, it could arouse in us a state of “shock”, just as we would be shocked at seeing a small black cloud in an otherwise blue sky.

When we express our emotions and “feelings” to one another, they are vague approximations. They are not a reliable guide to our expectations of the behaviour of others, except in a very general way.

The feelings we report to one another are not quantifiable like numbers we can add.

One person could say they are sad, but if asked on a scale of 1 to 10 exactly *how* sad, they might say 5. Whereas another person might say 9.9 and be almost ready to kill themselves even though they have reported their feelings using exactly the same word.

So does this suggest we should go around qualifying our emotions with numbers on some kind of a numerical scale, like the famous Richter scale, which is used to measure the intensity of earthquakes?

Even then, the subjective – i.e. opinional – element of personal assessment would come in.

So it is clear to anyone who looks at these issues realistically, there is *no* reliable way of categorising or describing our own emotions, of saying precisely what it is we really feel.

There are only people who are better than others at finding similes and metaphors for their feelings, or describing those which they perceive or imagine to be in others, and understandably at least some of such people become novelists, playwrights or authors.

But the more general point is that we therefore are largely isolated from one another – that is, therefore largely unable to communicate properly with one another *by verbal means*.

Of course this causes massive problems in relationships, because we regard words as our main communicative tool, and it is especially important to most of us that others understand how we feel, which in practice, now as we can see, is quite unlikely, when we can rarely even express it fully or clearly ourselves.

Thus, when we find someone who appears to be an *understanding* person, and seems to know exactly what we feel, it seems to us as if we have discovered a great treasure, and many people can become deeply attached to another such person for that reason.

We say person X or Y *really* understands us, and this is a great comfort to us, we do not then feel so totally isolated and alone in the world, for by pure logic, if no one even *understands* us - what we really *are* and *feel* deep inside - then how can they possibly care about us, or even above all *love* us, which is the thing that most of us want the very most?

So what has all this got to do with *intelligence*?

The point is, we may find someone who scores very highly on a so called “IQ” test, but we may also discover that their understanding of us *emotionally* is poor.

Though they can read and study hard books, and pass tough written exams with flying colours, we don’t put them into the category of an understanding human being.

But guess what? - to become a “teacher”, a “psychologist”, “psychiatrist” or “therapist”, and for that matter, generally speaking even a *politician*, depends almost wholly on the ability to read difficult intellectual books, and pass difficult written exams.

So that means, that those people who *should* be the most understanding of human behaviour and emotions, are appointed generally speaking on quite another basis, which may be wholly unrelated.

Thus we see that this form of *intelligence* they exhibit which enables them to get these jobs of such enormous social and human importance, is *no guarantee whatsoever* they will be truly fitted to carry out these roles they hold effectively.

So what quality or form of intelligence *should* we be looking for in others whom we hope to be understanding of us, and thus able to make *wise* decisions about our lives and know how to relate to us properly?

We have all heard of the term “commonsense”, but we find nowadays, that there is little that is “common” about it, as it is a quality which is rarely to be found, especially in the so called “educated classes” who run the Western world.

What we mean by *commonsense* is somebody who whether tutored in academic thought or not, is able to *see and deal with everyday reality as it really is*.

This person is often found to be *not* the same person as he or she who is exceptionally good at studying textbooks and passing written exams.

In a famous ancient Chinese book, the *Tao Te Ching*, is found the statement:

Those who follow the Tao (i.e. the way of Nature, of wisdom) *are not extensively learned*.

Could this be why that in a world full of vast cut down forests of “learned journals” on every subject from “child psychology” to “comparative religion” we still are governed by not terribly wise people, who have almost equally unwise people from “academia” (i.e. the colleges and universities) advising them?

Please note, we are *not* talking about those who are expert in or work in “hard sciences” such as mathematics, chemistry, engineering, electronics and so on, whose scientific knowledge is proven to either work or not, by the products and machines and technologies they provide.

What we are especially concerned with is the so called “social scientists” – the so called “psychologists”, “sociologists”, “economists”, and so on who govern and organise society using the technology the *real scientists* provide.

What we are saying is that the ability to memorize and assimilate books full of someone else’s ideas and parrot them back in a convincing way to the satisfaction of an examiner, is certainly a sign of a certain degree of *intellectual* achievement, and most definitely an ability to doggedly carry out this form of “hard work”; but it is most definitely *not* any guarantee of this quality of *real intelligence* which we have earlier defined, which would certainly be based upon this quality we have just described as “commonsense.”

To put it differently, there are chess grandmasters in the world who could play and beat any ten of us ordinary mortals simultaneously, whilst even wearing a blindfold, but does this mean we should make them the president or prime minister, because they can turn some very clever intellectual tricks that few others in the world ever could?

Generally speaking, obviously not.

But we feel that this term “commonsense” is too open also to misunderstanding and abuse.

For example, a butcher’s boy who knows how to pack a truck load of chickens efficiently might be regarded by many as having “commonsense”, or a smart girl in a clothes shop who becomes “salesgirl of the month.”

So we are going a step further.

We are going to ask from *where* did all the *genuine, valuable* knowledge that is recorded in the science, mathematics, engineering, biology and even psychology books come from - in so far that they contain any - which our modern “intellectuals” then go to and try to imbibe?

And the answer is that there once was a time when man (as species) knew virtually *nothing*.

He just scabbled in the dirt, and chased and hunted other animals and picked nuts and berries much like any other animal.

So from where did all this knowledge that our modern intellectuals worship and congratulate themselves and each other so proudly upon absorbing come from?

It came from *individual men and women* who could see into reality *with no prior knowledge*, and elicit it for the first time.

And those beings, therefore had no teacher, but for their own “teacher” *within*, which we will describe therefore as their *inner tuition*, or as in its commonly accepted shorter form, their *intuition*.

Clearly, at one moment or another in history, *all* scientific and other knowledge that we have was produced by this *intuition* operating through one human brain or another.

We see that this *fact* – it is obviously *not* a theory, because it is the only *logical* explanation of the origin of knowledge – is quite different that what the average intellectual believes about how human knowledge has been created and developed, i.e. bit by bit, by a long line of contributors, rather than in the “giant leaps” of *intuitive discovery* such as the discovery of fire and the wheel.

For example, Robert M Pirsig in his universally known of (at that time) 1970s book, “Zen and the Art of Motorcycle Maintenance” believed that new ideas came mainly from combining old ones upon a cycle of associative thinking that ran around our minds like the carriages of an enormously long train on a track.

It is for this reason, that “intelligence” is seen as just a “happy chance” combination of already existing ideas or facts that the proponents of so called “artificial intelligence” believe that they may one day duplicate the “intelligence” of the human brain or, rather of the human mind, leaving a

space to question whether those two concepts are *always* wholly equivalent.

For those who have studied a little Eastern philosophy, we should point out that no book of yoga philosophy of course says anything else other than that thoughts are linked by association.

But the unanswered question is *where do the associated thoughts individually speaking arise in the first place?*

The answer is that within us we have a faculty of “tuning in” to what we see, and from this mysterious and unseen inner faculty, which we have labelled *intuition*, or *the real faculty of intelligence*, up pops a new *insight* or an *intuition* (noun, as product of the *faculty* of intuition) such as Newton’s Theory of Gravitation arising from some observation and contemplative process upon Nature, as for example dwelling on the *why* or *how* of the alleged falling apple.

And we earlier asked, where is the faculty of “imagination” located in the brain, and equally now we might ask - where on earth is this *intuition*, and if we cannot find it, how can we actually propose that it exists?

No doubt, with current scientific limited knowledge of the brain, it cannot currently be located, and perhaps never can be.

But such a visual identification is not necessary, because we have defined it as *the equivalent of its function*.

That is, it is the true intelligence of the brain, that can derive *first principles*, and is able to see the depth and *root* of problems, rather than just skim around their superficial and familiar aspects.

Equally, when functioning in a wide rather than narrow way, it is the same faculty which can see into the lives – emotions, thoughts and feelings - of others.

The person who can understand us is more likely the intuitively awake person, than the intellectually driven one.

So the next question we must answer is *why* some people are intuitively awake and others are not.

Chapter Five – Intellect and Intuition

In the preceding chapter we asked the question why so many intellectuals turn out to be not very understanding people, lacking in what we regard as “commonsense.”

As Krishnamurti put it, no doubt based upon long experience of the many scientists and academics whom he took part in discussions with:

There are Ph D's who couldn't put a flower on the table.

We are not here however particularly concerned with such *practical skills*, but with the ability to *solve problems* in the human world, and for that matter, in the material world in general.

But our focus here is going to be on the social and psychological problems of mankind, because we think the rest can be solved easily enough, once the former are.

However, what we are about to say *is* wholly relevant to the scientist who would seek to be a *creative* scientist, perhaps originating new scientific discoveries or even fields of study or technology, because as we are about to explain, his or her ability to do this will depend upon a correct inner perspective and an expanded understanding of the working of the human psyche, such as we now intend to provide.

In science as in all other fields, there are *the leaders* and *the followers*.

Not that there is any shame in being a follower. We can't all be Einsteins discovering *relativity*, or Max Plancks creating a field such as *quantum physics*.

The shame and crime however, is when a new leader emerges, and perhaps overturns the knowledge or theories of the former leaders, but all the *followers* who cannot see the correctness of his new findings stand in his way.

Whilst we accept this process as inevitable in logical terms to some degree – that is, if the leaders were the equal of the followers, they would have come to the same conclusions already *themselves* – we feel that it is necessary to explain the psychology of what is going on in academia and

the human intellect in general, such that those who are able to awaken to this realisation, will either themselves become the new leaders in their field, or else at least not act as such a ball and chain upon those who would become so, thus slowing the overall progress of mankind.

For example, where are the safe new and cost effective equivalents to the dirty and dangerous nuclear energy plants we have, and to the petrol engine and petrochemicals which are so damaging to ourselves and our environment?

These same technologies of the petrol engine and nuclear energy have been around for the last fifty or sixty years with little improvement or change, and no plausible replacements in sight?

What on earth is going on? Are the massed ranks of scientists upon this planet in numbers never before seen of any use at all?

For some people say – “ah, the new formulae and alternative engines and technologies are already there. It is only big business and ‘vested interest’ that is holding them back.”

But this theory of suppression does not quite satisfy.

For surely, if enough of academia could see them for what they are, if they really exist – like “cold fusion” etc. – then *no* greedy conglomerates or unwise governments could stand in their way, were the gossip of the good news to travel round so unstopably.

So here, we are going to also try to wake some scientists up, as well as academics in general.

Not to the awareness of such proven or un-proven “new age technologies” however, but to the processes of their own psyche.

For example, let us take a genuine scientific genius of our age, sadly now gone, British Professor Eric Laithwaite, formerly of Imperial College, London, inventor of the linear motor.

The linear motor he invented provided an alternative to petrol driven engines, in particular, the production of trains that floated above the track and therefore were frictionless and required little or no track maintenance.

But the British government pulled out its initial investment in his “home grown” genius, of which it should surely have been theoretically extravagantly supportive, just on a purely nationalistic basis, and he was shunned by the Royal Institution itself of which he was a member, when he demonstrated to them some of his later developments.

Incidentally, a few trains similar to but likely inferior in technology to what he was developing have now been produced, such as a Chinese “Maglev” (*magnetic levitation*) train, which has been the fastest train in the world, far faster than the Japanese “Bullet” train, and feels to the passengers more like a flight on a plane than a conventional clackety-clack, bumpy train ride.

We can say it is possible the British government may have been influenced by the vested interests coming from the existing and perhaps threatened industries.

But the fact is that if the *awareness* and anger was coming from the scientific community *in general* at this suppression of his work, rather than the vilifying of a *leader* by a group of *followers*, as apparently the “prestigious” British Royal Institution did to Professor Laithwaite, no government or industry could have resisted the public uproar and resentment that would have ensued if there was general awareness of the power of the new, superior, technology.

So why didn't they?

Did they all receive a brown envelope stuffed with cash?

Or on the other hand, perhaps some kind of threatening phone call or whatever, telling them that old technology was best *if you know what's good for you?*

We don't think so. The British media is too quick at catching on to those kind of stories, such widespread bribery and intimidation could not long survive as a secret in a news hungry and shamelessly nose media country like England.

The truth is alas far *more* disturbing.

The majority of scientists and academics in general in the Western world are not only not *leaders*, they are not even worthy *followers*.

Many if not most of them have no business being in academia or science whatsoever, but being a university lecturer or a researcher is a relatively esteemed and well-paid *job* in society, and so too many people study hard those often dreary tedious books stuffed with other people's theories and ideas, and obediently learn them like a parrot to pass their exams and get their academic pips and stripes.

The examiners themselves are part of the same system, and are only interested in many cases in preserving it, and the "status quo", just as the academics in the Royal Institution who insulted and rejected Eric Laithwaite, by refusing even to write up his speech and demonstration they have invited him to give in their journal.

He "rocked the boat", and he was a "self-made man", a plain spoken, and rather blunt Lancashire man, somewhat like a glorified Fred Dibnah, for those who are aware of the nationally famous in the UK British ex-steeplejack and steam train and engineering enthusiast.

But Professor Laithwaite had this genuine genius known on one level as "commonsense", or as we have said, more accurately as *intuition*.

Such men and women start again where the teacher leaves off, and *surpass* the existing teacher. They are *the future*, and it is time for those who cling to an outmoded past to either move on, or step out of the way.

So why do they not?

Because like most of the rest of the current misguided population, they do not understand their own minds.

They do not appreciate that they have been programmed with emotions like pride to hold views and take actions which nobody in their *right* mind ever would.

Furthermore, they have not clearly understood this vital difference between *intellect* and *intuition*.

For example, we have psychologists who are Ph D's and have a list of patients with various personal problems and addictions whom they treat.

One such was once explaining to me how he worked with troubled youth, and how he was using this therapy of *intervention* to "cure" the ills of these young people.

When his wife arrived to collect him, and thus put a finish to our discussion, she groaned visibly when she observed the subject matter of our conversation, of which, she was clearly, thoroughly bored.

It was equally clear to me, that his work had become an obsession to him, which was on the one hand quite likely not effective with regard to his teenage charges, and on the other clearly damaging to his current relationship.

I heard a year or two later that the couple had split up, and he was personally in a bad way.

This guy was a Ph D in psychology.

Another acquaintance who was a trainee doctor undergoing a basic psychiatric training period, reported when he asked a consultant psychiatrist in the hospital to advise on a patient who was worrying him, “please leave me alone, I have problems of my own.”

This is not the exception, this is closer to the general case.

Numerous doctors and psychiatrists have addictions of various kinds, most visibly alcohol and various drugs, despite their psychology Ph D's or whatever, and there is no evidence to suggest that their personal relationships are any more successful than anybody else's.

In fact, the more likely reality is that the ordinary population who live in a simpler, less intellectual way are generally speaking happier and more successful as *human beings*.

And one of the major reasons for this assertion is that the current intellectual training and education that the average “educated intellectual” is getting, is actually contrary to the operation of this *intuition*, this spirit of genius, or in its lesser manifestation of *commonsense*.

Why?

Because as we have said, excepting the “hard sciences” (meaning *purely rational* ones, whose findings are proven as *fact*) academia is largely an *escape into abstraction*.

Let us give an example.

Suppose a man is having a problem with his neighbour, regarding some overhanging tree branches which are blocking his access to sunlight.

He knocks on the neighbour's door, and asks politely if he would mind lopping them off.

The neighbour looks at him coldly, says some rude words to him and slams the door.

Supposing he is an ordinary non-intellectual man with no psychology degrees, what does he do?

He likely either learns to live with it, moves house, or if it means that much to him he might complain to his local authority and see if he can force the man to do so by legal means.

But suppose now that he, or just as or even more likely *she*, is a university trained psychologist.

He decides this man is not quite sane. He clearly has "cognitive problems" or is suffering from some form of paranoid delusional state, schizophrenia, or has a latent psychopathic personality which is about to emerge.

For as a character in a fine young people's novel called "The Pigman" said (approximately) : "I read a book on psychology and when I read the symptoms, decided I had nearly all the conditions mentioned in it."

Which view we would all agree with, were we to do the same, as really the difference between any of us and a so called "clinical case" is only one of *degree*.

For we are all at least *a little* paranoid, *a little* unfeeling (like the "psychopath") and *a little* schizophrenic (two-faced) are we not?

But the wholly unjustified perspective that our imaginary psychologist takes towards his neighbour, is the sort of thing that happens when people who are not very wise, whose own intuition is not properly functioning, take on intellectual knowledge and even worse, get certificates to prove it.

They develop an arrogance in which they start believing they have got this superior view of life to “ordinary mortals” who have not studied in their “elite” and “privileged” classes.

But the proof of any psychological knowledge must surely be if it enables the resolution of - i.e. permanent, sustainable *cure* of - psychological problems, such as addiction, unhappiness, problems of child development, criminal tendencies, and so on.

And to date we have seen little evidence from our own considerable personal experience, research of psychological literature and reports, and long observation of the world in general that such is the case.

Moreover, the *fact* that countless psychologists and “therapists” have been through this academic training, and gained good, or even top degrees, yet still have *their own* unresolved problems of addiction and failed and disharmonious relationships, proves conclusively that these ideas are generally ineffective.

For surely, if it was merely a deficit in the learning of the psychological operative that was the problem, it could be solved with the assistance of a more highly skilled colleague or superior.

But no. We do not see such support working in practise any more than the Christian Church can control or properly support its wayward members, a number of whom have been accused of child molestation, and no doubt some of them have actually carried out the same (most likely *Catholic* priests, who being denied normal sexual relationships *may* develop sexual perversions and unbalance as a consequence).

And the principle reason for this – we do not in fact wish to focus our “attack” on psychologists in particular – is that the way of the intellectual mind in general is to deal with things in a linear, fragmented fashion, whereas the *intuitive* mind deals with things *holistically* – that is, looks at the problem or person before it as a whole, looks to the depth or essence of the person, object or situation.

As the 20th century philosopher Krishnamurti said “the solution is *in* the problem.” The difficulty as mathematicians know is often in precisely defining the question, and then the solution tends to reveal itself easily, once we have properly understood the implications of the problem or question.

The lack of understanding of this “holistic” nature of real human intelligence, i.e. *intuition*, is why as we have said, that many of those who work in artificial intelligence believe it is just a matter of time before we can duplicate human intelligence, or that is, design a computer program with a number of “sequential lines of code” or even a so called “neural net” that will “think independently.”

For example, as we have said earlier, they imagine intelligent discovery or “creative thinking” is merely a happy chance “bisociation” (coined by Arthur Koestler in “the Act of Creation”) of two here-to-fore unconnected ideas floating around in the brain, and equally therefore, that given enough time, this intelligent machine or “mechanical monkey” can type out a Shakespeare play.

But for example, Mozart tried composing by arranging lines of music in sequence using the throw of a dice. All we need report on that exercise, was that these pieces were *not* subsequently found to be his famous or successful works.

The reason is that if we study not some of the hundreds of conflicting and largely inconclusive schools of psychological thought, or focus on the mentally deficient and deranged, but rather instead look at the mentality of the genius – he who invented or *realised* the technology and so on that has *created* this modern world and its libraries and universities – such beings as Newton, Kepler, Einstein, Bach, Beethoven, Mozart, Shakespeare, Edison and so on – we find that these extraordinary beings had a *contemplative mind*, an *intuitive* mind, not one which gorges on masses of information like some kind of demented and hyperactive bookworm.

Most of these great discoveries were also made before the age of mass entertainments and TV sets and hi-fis blaring in our ears.

Life was lived at a gentler, slower pace.

There was a great deal of peace and quiet, and anyone who could be magically transported from the era they lived in such as Newton or Kepler, to experience the modern non-stop lifestyle we insanely accept as *normal*, would be thoroughly traumatised and likely almost die of shock at the contrast.

For example, take one of our modern nightclubs with its ear-splitting rock music, stroboscopic and flashing laser light display, and a pounding

throbbing beat which seems to penetrate our whole body from head to toe.

Likely a sensitive person from a few hundred years ago, accustomed to hearing only gentle music, and rarely at that, and otherwise just the sounds of Nature, suddenly entering such a “den of iniquity” and intolerable noise, would likely believe they had been transported to hell.

For example, even as recently as 1955, a London man was fined three pounds and ten shillings (a huge sum in those days) for creating in public “an abominable noise”, which turned out to be a recording of Bill Haley’s “Shake, Rattle and Roll”, now considered relatively *tame* in comparison to much of our modern pop music.

And when we examine the rhythm and tempo of music as it has developed over the past two hundred years, we see that it has become more and more powerful in the rhythm section, from the first use of kettle drums in the orchestra, for example by Beethoven, through to the pounding “trance” rhythms of today.

Even in the latter half of the last century, we can see how the beat from the gentle Glenn Miller type swing era gathered pace, to the percussive rock and roll of the fifties, and then to the still faster “hard rock” of the 60s, 70s and 80s, until finally it became the hypnotic superpowered “ghetto blaster” type pulsations of today’s disco and “rave” music.

This is obviously paralleling the disharmonious, drug ridden and violent state of society in general, but people in general fail to make or care about this connection, and ask themselves if this over loud ultra-stimulating music is really good for them even *medically* speaking, bearing in mind that listening to a music CD on one’s own hi-fi at 50 or 70 decibels or whatever, is quite a different experience and effect to hearing it at well over 100 decibels in some smoky, alcohol drenched, drug filled nightclub or wherever.

And this is a principle generally speaking - we are *hypnotised*, in a sense *bullied* into accepting all kinds of things in our lives, which again, no *sane* person ever would.

The *leader* scientist or thinker in any genuine field of human enquiry whose aim is to advance the cause of knowledge and understanding is therefore like Professor Laithwaite, not generally speaking a conformist.

This does not mean he is a bad citizen, but the hostility he inevitably receives from the insecure people who fear any kind of change, and cling staunchly for what they believe to be their personal security to the “status quo”, tends to make him *look* like one at times, as he expresses his outrage in unfortunately not sometimes the most diplomatic ways at having his greater truths and advances mocked by lesser beings, and moreover his freedom of thought and action therefore curtailed.

For example, in the case of Professor Laithwaite, he had his funding cut and was even forced to accept financial help from a private citizen who was an amateur inventor, to continue his research in later life.

For just what sort of a nation and society is it that throws its best members on the scrap heap? And so thus, surely such beings are *entitled* to be outraged to at least some degree.

That is, we find that the thinkers and scientists who don't “rock the boat”, don't challenge their professors and teachers, and thus *don't advance knowledge or understanding one iota* are awarded endless degrees and honours, and sit at the top table in the prestigious “Royal Society” dinners, but those who do are “cast out into the wilderness, where there shall be much weeping and gnashing of teeth.”

But how is it that the average academic can still feel good about themselves in the light of the true picture which says they will achieve nothing of any significance throughout their whole academic career?

The answer is, *the escape into abstraction gives the illusion of progress.*

For example, there was a wonderful British TV comedy series which ran in the UK during the 1980s which was called “Yes, Minister”, and developed into an equally if not more successful sequel called “Yes, Prime Minister” starring British character actor Paul Eddington, also now, sadly deceased.

Eddington played this basically good intentioned, but rather flawed and *vain* political character, who first was a minister, and then in the sequel was the prime minister of the UK.

Quotes and script fragments from this series can be found at various places on the Internet, for those who would care to take a look.

The genius of this series however – which surely should be made a standard part of every school or college course on politics, sociology or psychology – was to show how commonsense and progress can be utterly diverted and defeated by the escape into increasingly perverse but plausible abstraction.

The foil to Eddington's character, *Jim Hacker*, was a British “old school tie” snob who headed the civil service, called *Sir Humphrey Appleby*, played by famous “Madness of King George” actor Nigel Hawthorne, whose goal was to always maintain “the status quo.”

The acting is wonderful, and at times a “virtuoso performance”, especially from Hawthorne.

But it is the *educational value* which most concerns us here.

For example, Prime Minister Jim Hacker would decide upon some philanthropic and seemingly commonsense kind of policy such as providing free school milk for children (which incidentally *real* British PM Margaret Thatcher took away in the 1980s, earning herself the title of “Thatcher the milk snatcher”, despite allegedly being a huge fan of this particular TV series) but Sir Humphrey would give him twenty different arguments why it couldn't be done.

He would say in his smooth and smug way – “Yes, this may *seem* like sense Prime Minister, but, this is not *politically sound*. It *will* you see upset the Milk Marketing Board, whose profits will fall, because you see, the anomaly in the subsidies via the Third World extemporization policy will engender intransmutable issues, which will ultimately turn out to be irresolvable, and suggest substantive intransigencies in the economic amelioration of the G8 policy steering committee's policy on social integration in the principle features of its initiatives on social policy modification and consolidation, thus you see, inadvertently producing negative media reports, which will you see, cause *you personally*, Prime Minister, much embarrassment, and ultimately causing an inevitable decline in your ratings in the opinion polls and subsequent performance in the upcoming general election.”

And then after such an unintelligible outpouring of utter gobbledygook, as the above, Sir Humphrey would fix the prime minister with a smug, oily smile, and say “You *do* understand, don't you, Prime Minister?”

And then Paul Eddington as Jim Hacker would give a look of utter blank horror, and mutter “My god?” or “What?” and the audience would roar laughing.

And at the conclusion of each episode of the thirty minute comedy show, the Prime Minister Jim Hacker would usually end up repenting of all his good intentioned plans for change, and do exactly what Sir Humphrey wanted all along, thus preserving “the status quo.”

The *real scripts* are of course much cleverer and more convincing than our rather hastily contrived off the cuff “stab” at simulating one of Sir Humphrey’s speeches, but the point we are making is that just as Sir Humphrey frustrated Jim Hacker’s commonsense ideas and good intentions, so the misuse of the intellect in general, and the escape into abstraction of the intellectual mind, can block all the common sense measures that the *wise* would put into effect throughout society, thus preventing peace, harmony and happiness.

Thus, unwise and badly intentioned and unfair governments keep a bunch of “tame” academic experts handy, to use as “authorities” to blind with science or other specious or *sophisticated* (false, but plausible) arguments and render as insensible as Jim Hacker the population in general, so they can continue to carry out their unjust and ill considered plans with impunity.

For example, if bio-tech industries are breathing down the government’s neck to support the introduction of genetically modified plant foods or even *animals*, the government will wheel out some scientist or other on TV and say “this food is good and safe” even though ten times as many scientists may disagree on this issue.

We are not saying here, that GM food is safe or is not. We honestly confess we *don’t know* for sure.

But what seems clear to everyone, is that Nature in general and “the food chain” which is of such vital concern to the *personal survival* of all of us, is a finely balanced mechanism, and to start creating species or variations on species which never existed in the history of our planet before, surely has to be an unknown and unquantifiable risk, and therefore *should best be avoided*, unless somehow this GM food is *proven* safe, which to the best of our knowledge *it is not*.

For let us forget for a moment the argument over whether there is a God or not. But let us just consider *Nature* which none of us argues over the existence of.

Those who have *sensitivity, intuition*, like musician, philosopher, philanthropist, and medical doctor, Albert Schweitzer, for example, feel a respect for Nature, or as he put it “reverence for all living things.”

Such people – as in fact do *most* of us – apart from the “mad scientists”, industrialists and politicians – feel that for *us* to start playing around with genetic forces and causing mice to be born with human ears growing upon their backs is a living horror movie too far.

It is really, as the psychologists like to term it *psychopathic*.

The same people who are doing these things, would in many cases, happily we would suggest have conducted the savage and inhumane experiments upon the Jews and others, under the Nazi regime, if the stories we have heard are to be believed, as appears.

This is not however, any kind of excuse to persecute those who are currently engaged in this research, for society should be improved by *volunteers* who awaken to a more humane, sensitive and higher realisation, not *conscripts* who will be put before a firing squad if they refuse to obey our “orders” and “demands.”

Rather, we would be better directed in examining the genesis of the intellectual mind, and its consequences.

But if we look for the answer to such an issue in a library full of psychology and sociology books, we will find ourselves getting lost in an increasingly obscure and argued over set of “jargon” and “schools of thought.”

We are not saying there is no value in any of this material, but personal and social change has never, and *will never* be brought about by abstruse and inaccessible intellectual abstraction which are not the common property of or possession of even the non-specialist intellectual elite of the society in general, let alone the masses.

This, we must appreciate, is part of *the vanity of the intellect*, which as we have stated is by feeding on an ever more sophisticated – yet ultimately meaningless and valueless in any practical sense – set of abstractions.

For example, suppose we attempt to discuss “the maternal instinct” with a psychology Ph D.

They may say (according to their particular favoured schools of thought), the maternal instinct is a fiction and has been disproved by “research.”

And we reply – “but hang on, this seems to defy the commonsense everyday observation of how women throughout the ages have behaved. i.e. like animals in every species, with few exceptions, they devote themselves to their offspring, they protect them at risk of their own life in most cases, and we see the same in humans. Try reading a few paragraphs of Richard Dawkins’ book “The Selfish Gene” and you’ll see what the issues are in biological terms. So we *are* animals aren’t we? So how on earth can you have ‘proven’ otherwise?”

And the psychology Ph D will reply (for example):

“Yeah – but what you don’t understand is Heidelborn’s work on substantive transmogrification in subspecies of antipodean fruit flies. That’s *your* problem.”

And what can we say?

We don’t have time to read the millions of crazy research papers on such “hot and relevant” topics as “the statistical and social significance of navel variation in African culture” which come out every year, we don’t even have time to read the summaries, or “abstracts.”

So how can we know that we are not missing something in our education, that they have found tucked away in some obscure piece of research which will change the entire perspective on human life?

I will tell you how. Because if we look at *their lives*, if we look at the current utterly confused and tragic state of society as a result of all this intellectual obscurity and “obfuscation” going on, we see, Q.E.D., as they say, that it has *no practical beneficial effect*.

Because, we have placed the escape into and indulgence in intellectual abstraction into the forefront of decision making, personally, nationally and globally, and put into the background *intuition and commonsense*.

If we have personal problems, no one understands us, we are *unhappy*, we go to a doctor who gives us some “happy pills” to give us a chemical

oblivion or we go to a therapist who listens to us patiently, and says in a soothing voice:

“Yes, I understand you. You are not a bad person as they say. You are a good person who is misunderstood. You are not really an addict, and in any case it’s *a disease*. It’s nothing to be ashamed of, you aren’t responsible, and “they” (i.e. the mad scientists) are researching into it right now, to find out the genetic basis. When they find it and figure out how to cure it we’ll let you know. But in the meantime, let’s get you hypnotised and we’ll recall some traumas from your early childhood, or even from *one of your past lives*, and hopefully we’ll resolve them. It might take a few sessions. But you have to be brave, and stick with it. Rome wasn’t built in a day you know. Just keep saying those affirmations – *every day and in every way I’m getting better*. The thing is you see – *positive thinking*. We are what our minds think we are. So if you can make yourself believe you are not an addict, then the addiction goes. It’s that easy. The problem is people just don’t believe you see. That’s why you’ve got to work on the affirmations. Be sure not to miss a day. And if you are a bit uptight any time during the day, just remember your “happy phrase” that we discussed, and say it to yourself at least ten times. The “spiritual you” is the real you. You just have to believe in your spiritual self and that you are above all material things, and addictions, and when you can master that trick, you’ll be addiction free. I guarantee it. Now – when shall we book you in for your next session? And by the way, leave the cheque for \$100 at the desk please.”

Convinced yet? Sadly, *millions are*. But hopefully not *you*, and definitely not *me*.

As *Ghostbusters* actor Dan Aykroyd said in the amusing movie “The Couch Trip” at his award acceptance speech (he had been impersonating a psychiatrist, and done so well, the psychiatrist’s association gave him an award):

“And people ask me – just *why* does therapy have to take so long? (sombre pause to build up anticipation). And I tell them...there’s nothing that can be done in a short time, that can’t be done just as well in *a long time*.”

But this game of “intellectual sabotage” goes on in more arenas than psychology.

For example, a senior executive in a PLC once told me that at board meetings he attended, quite often *the stupidest idea* would gain precedence over far more intelligent and sensible ideas put forth at the meeting.

To put it politely, he called this phenomenon:

“Balderdash baffles brains.”

But you see, the balderdash wasn't fooling and baffling *him*. But it was taking in the generality of the board, and presumably even the chairman.

So he found his superior understanding, commonsense and intuition residing in a minority of one.

The loudest, or most bootlicking, or “politically cunning” operative such as our “Sir Humphrey” in the aforementioned “Yes, Minister” series, often can and *does* get their own way above more sensible and wise and reticent voices, and thus the madness not only of *King George*, but of our whole society carries on.

So these are the *symptoms*, but as we said, we are going to explain in so far as we can the *genesis* of the intellectual *non-intuitive mind*.

But we are not going to do it with quotes from learned journals or thousands of research paper buried so deep in somebody's attic or basement archives that we couldn't read them anyway for the *dust*.

As a quick aside, is anybody keeping statistics on *the number of people* who ever *read* all this endless stream of research papers on every petty little topic under the sun that our academia is daily producing?

For example, in most countries every Ph D gets a bound copy of their own thesis on their shelf, and the faculty or wherever gets one for its archives.

But does anyone ever read it thereafter?

In likely at least 95% of cases, we don't think so, correct us if we are wrong, though it wouldn't much matter in any case.

The point is – it's all just a game. An information explosion that goes nowhere.

The real research that affects us is carried out by the industrial giants, who alone have the power to finance it properly, or bring its products out into the public arena.

For example, many major papers in mathematics appear each week, and of the thousands that have appeared over even the last few decades, mathematicians admit themselves that there is no guarantee than *any of them* will ever have any *practical* significance to society or even *science in general* whatsoever.

Clearly far less likely is that any social benefit is probable in the field of the so called “social sciences.”

But our *vanity* will not let us see this, or rather will not let these researchers see this, because at the end of the day, they are looking after their salaries and their jobs.

And we do not *blame* them for that. This is not *judgmental*, as such, this is not *personal attack*, as such.

But society as a whole has to wake up to this, for we are being ruled and educated and administrated by a spirit of madness. A blind spirit of intellect which has kicked commonsense and intuition out of the ball park and into the morgue.

And when our wisdom, our intuition, our commonsense forever sleeps as if dead inside the morgue, then we too shall die.

And that’s not a “prophecy”, that’s a *logical consequence* of confused and ill-founded decision making. The evidence before our eyes is the scary, violent, crazy, unhealthy world.

And if we look at which is the scariest, most violent, crazy and unhealthy society in the world, it is probably *big city America*.

They have the most crime, the most murder, the most rape, the most child abuse, and the worst health problems excepting perhaps some currently war torn regions in other places in the world.

And guess what – we also find America has the most “social scientists” in the world, and not only are they dominating America, they are dominating the rest of the world also, except those parts cut off by

politics or language, like most of the Arab world, and some *small* parts of Africa, Asia and South America.

So as we said, we aren't going to seek the answers in one of *their* American Harvard or Yale or wherever psychology texts or research studies.

We are instead going to look at the knowledge that comes from *intuition*, from *common sense*.

And the fact is this – the average little boy or girl in our society grows up not properly cared for, not properly educated (in the true sense), not properly *loved*.

But when we say *loved* we don't mean the sentimental smothering and molly-coddling that the now “social science” reprogrammed parents imagine is correct “parenting.”

We mean, they don't grow to be healthy, self-sufficient, balanced, aware and mentally mature human beings.

The parents destroy them by neglect. Let's be specific what we mean.

Tommy or Jane aged four and a half.

“Mummy, where did I come from?”

Reply

“Darling, don't ask stupid questions. You're too young to understand.”

Wrong answer.

The right answer is e.g.

“You were born from mummy's body. Later when I have a moment I will show you a tape of animals being born on a wildlife program. Or I might even take you to the zoo or a farm and show you.”

That is not to suppose that *every* child will make such an enquiry so young.

But the point is *when a child asks questions* we have to treat *its growing intelligence and curiosity* with the greatest respect.

Example 2:

“Daddy, where does the sun go at night?”

Reply:

“Hey sugar, give me a break. I’ve been working my butt off all day, and I am just trying to rest now and enjoy this ball game.”

Wrong answer.

The right answer is:

“Hey, let’s switch the computer on, and I’ll show you a program that shows the working of the solar system. Or maybe we’ll even visit the planetarium. That will really be fun.”

Example 3:

Child asks *baby sitter* or child minder:

“Why do cats meow?”

Reply: “listen you stupid brat, I’m getting two bucks an hour so your posh folks can go to some swanky party. I ain’t no teacher, just shut up while I watch the movie. I’ll make you a peanut butter sandwich later as long as you shut up and don’t bug me again.”

Wrong answer.

Parents should not have attended swanky party. They should have devoted their lives to their child until it’s old enough to start thinking properly for and taking care of itself.

For if it gets a few more experiences like the above, it will develop a fear of strangers, and a fear of *asking awkward questions* forever.

Which is how most of us are.

We are scared to ask an “awkward question” even if it's something we desperately want to know. We don't want to upset anyone – we don't want them to howl at us, and make our security feel threatened.

So we may even go through a period, as is typical, of being called *stupid* by our parents, teachers, brothers or sisters, or school friends.

Or we just get ignored. Maybe we are a girl, and our parents make an incredible fuss of our younger or older brother, and act like we don't count, and don't really have any right to exist.

So then our little mind warps, and we have got an agenda – we think to ourselves – “*I will show them.*”

Like in “The Birdman of Alcatraz” with Burt Lancaster as a murderer, who eventually becomes an acknowledged expert on birds and gets books published.

But in the early days, when he adopts a little bird with a broken wing, the bullying prison guard says (approximately) “that boyd is just a punk like you, that won't never fly.”

So the bullies (teachers, parents, brothers, sisters, schoolmates, etc.) say we too are a little bird that won't fly. You count for nothing, and are worthy of no praise.

Then with that burning desire to right their wrong judgment on us, that spirit of “I will show them”, we study hard at some subject – it hardly matters what – and study and study and study until we pass those exams, and get that certificate, and then that degree, so they will say:

“Hey – maybe he or she is not such a bad, stupid kid after all. My kid just got a degree. I must be smart too somewhere down there. *I am proud.* He or she is ‘a chip off the old block’ after all. Let's celebrate over a drink and remind each other how great we all are.”

And then we feel proud too, and feel a little grudging love towards us, a little twinkle to us from that judgmental eye that has punished us and ignored us for so long.

But as our reputation grows, and the accolades pile up, we think ourselves far better than our parents ever were, and as we get the approval of the wider world, what our parents think no longer matters much any more.

We start seeing them for the decrepit and sad shell of a burnt out human being that most people over thirty, forty or fifty years old inevitably are.

We wonder how we could ever have considered that their opinion of us mattered much.

And we feel superior not only to them, but to the “unwashed” and “ignorant” masses who dumbly walk the streets and paddle the treadmills of the capitalist machinery which keeps our current consumer society spinning round.

When we support our government in confounding them further, in some way that is not actually in their interest, we don't much care, because we are superior beings after all, we are the elite.

We join academic circles and have our names mentioned in learned journals.

Other “gods” of academia occasionally show us some respect by quoting our work or opinion in their work. If it works well, we do the same for them and “scratch each other's backs.” If it doesn't work well, and they happened to disagree with our findings, theories or opinions, an “unholy war” and vendetta starts, and we do our best to character assassinate them or discredit their words and works at every possible opportunity.

Why?

Because they have *dared* to disagree with us. They have dared to threaten our status as “intellectual gods” far superior to the ordinary man or woman in the street.

If we can, we will have them kicked out of the association or society.

So *now* do we see that when up pops someone who actually has a brain of their own, a powerful spirit of true enquiry and some genius, like Professor Eric Laithwaite, the “Royal Society” is not pleased, but *horrified*, when he gives some demonstration of revolutionary work, which threatens all that they have taught and lectured upon, and therefore *built their reputations upon* for decades.

For if he was shown right, and we *fools*, then even our old despised parents could mock and laugh at us for living a life so proudly that in fact turned out to be an ignorant sham.

So it is clear now we don't need to look deep into some dusty old research paper to find *the truth*.

The truth is in fact *simple*.

Shakespeare – another intuitive genius, who did what hardly any author ever since has, and whom some of the “mad social scientists” now want to discredit and say is “politically incorrect” and thus forbid the teaching of in schools – said it all in simple terms *around four hundred years ago*:

All is vanity.

And because most psychologists and researchers, and intellectuals are vain, damaged people themselves – and let's be fair, as *are we all* to some degree – they won't admit that life is this simple.

They won't accept that their activity is not motivated mainly by reason and logic and the best interest of humanity, but by feelings like “bow down and acknowledge me as a wise, intelligent person, a socially superior and enlightened being.”

And of course, to have a *reasonably* big *private* office – lesser mortals rarely get them now, they get “open plan” offices laid out somewhat like tables in a school room – and a bunch of “patients with problems” coming through one's door every day saying “please help me”, as the average psychologist or therapist does, this assures them that the *illusion* is real.

They have daily or weekly meetings with their colleagues, and they all get together and talk “shop”, and assure each other that *progress* is being made.

But the reality is mostly that the patients don't get “cured”, they get drug treatment programs, or else they just heal naturally over time from say a traumatic event like a car crash or surviving some other disaster, whilst the therapy goes on, thus *giving the illusion* that the therapist actually did something other than listening patiently, which admittedly *is* a genuine service in these days when so many people have only therapists and psychiatrists whom they can trust as confidantes, when at one time they used to have *friends*.

But we see, when we have a society based on *vanity*, rather than *community*, then society is an inevitable man-against-man, woman-

against-woman battle, and therefore it is unlikely that apart from those immediate people who *need us*, any of us actually *can* have true friends.

As great a tragedy in all this, is not only does the activity of the intellectual damage society, by raising irrelevant, confusing or damaging ideas – at the expense of intuition and commonsense coming from the wise and the natural feelings and instincts of the general population – is that they damage *themselves* thereby.

We are not conducting any kind of witch hunt here however.

We are merely seeking to save the present generation – in so far that we can, without self-aggrandizing delusions, not truly knowing how much effect we can have – from any more misery, and hopefully the future generations also, who then may not need to suffer like the present one.

There must be a place for *everyone* in society. So what if we have pricked the conscience and awareness, and *intuition* of any particular current intellectual and academic with our words?

What should they do?

They have their jobs and status to protect?

Can they possibly confess to themselves and the society that their jobs are relatively valueless?

In the case of psychology or psychiatry itself, they might end up in “therapy” themselves, mightn’t they, were they to “blow the whistle”, and “fly from the coop”, being conducted upon them by the ones who refuse to have the status quo challenged and will go to virtually any length to see that it is not, for example, by kicking the renegades out of the club?

Well, we have a few suggestions for them.

Firstly, at the end of the day (or *lifetime*), there is no satisfaction in anything else but being *true to yourself*.

It is from *that mentality* that the intuition flows.

What first will seem as awful fear and pain (we mean *mental pain*, not physical) will later flow into realisation on one level or another.

We shouldn't imagine our old colleagues or associates or even our own family and friends will understand, because usually they *won't*.

If we say – I am quitting the office, and going to be a gold prospector in Borneo, or used to be a handsomely paid psychologist and now we want to make wooden furniture like Harrison Ford, except unlike him, that's all we will have to survive on, likely the wife or friends or colleagues will be condemning us as having lost our senses.

And does that not just prove the trap we are all caught in?

If we dare to be *ourselves*, our social status and security and relationships will quite likely be severely threatened.

That is, if we attempt to use our real *intelligence*, and have our own “innervisions” as per Stevie Wonder's album title, we will be the subject of attack.

In a truly civilised society, we would be *encouraged* to be ourselves, but now, not just the smart and intellectual, but *everybody* is getting crushed.

Let's quote a verse or two of a Randy Newman song to make the point, from “It's Money That Matters”, a nice track, with guitar collaboration from Mark Knopfler of Dire Straits:

Of all of the people that I used to know
Most never adjusted to the great big world

I see them lurking in book stores
Working for the Public Radio
Carrying their babies around in a sack on their back
Moving careful and slow

(Chorus)
It's money that matters
Hear what I say
It's money that matters
In the USA

***All of these people are much brighter than I
In any fair system they would flourish and thrive
But they barely survive
They eke out a living and they barely survive***

When I was a young boy, maybe thirteen
I took a hard look around me and asked what does it mean?

So I talked to my father, and he didn't know
And I talked to my friend and he didn't know
And I talked to my brother and he didn't know
And I talked to everybody that I knew

(they said)

It's money that matters, hear what I say
It's money that matters in the USA
It's money that matters
Now you know that it's true
It's money that matters whatever you do"

Well, we would go a little further than Randy Newman, and say it is *money and status and social acceptability*. Money alone won't necessarily give us the worship and respect we seek, except from the obviously greedy, needy and larcenous.

But there is a guy – Randy Newman – who had nothing much to lose or gain from anything he did by that stage in his career, whose words more or less confirm all that we have been saying.

When we have made *the wrong* choice of way of life, as we grow older, we grow more cynical, we lose the hopes and dreams of our youth which we by then regard as unreal fantasies.

We have a position and identity to protect. We don't rock the boat, and fear and attack anyone who does, like an animal threatening those who would intrude into its territory.

So can we really tell an intellectual who in horror has his or her intuition suddenly awaken what to do?

Not really. They'll have to figure it out for themselves.

Everybody of adult age is ultimately responsible for themselves.

All we can say, is that the only journey really worth the trouble in life, is the journey to becoming a real human being, and when most of the world is against that right now, it is going to be a quite painful journey for most of us.

But there are compensations, mostly on *the inside*, though these can be on the outside too.

For example when we break through the fog of fear and preconceptions which is normally dominating the mind of the average intellectual and academic, and our intuition is freed thereby, we will have increasing access to a facility and faculty of *true understanding* that we never had before.

Let's not imagine for a second that because we are old we are finished, and that we can't grow *mentally* and *creatively* any more.

The current author is well out of his youth, yet makes fresh discoveries that hold personal significance for him, more or less *every day*.

Perhaps *you* could be the one to retake up the work of Professor Laithwaite or one of the other "cranks" who claim to offer the world something that the current society needs but lacks.

The truth *is* most definitely out there, but the authorities aren't necessarily going to help or support us, so *we are going to have to discover it for ourselves*.

Next in our study of what is "true intelligence" we are going to look in more detail at some of what happens to those who would try to use their *natural born intelligence*, and how society is currently trying to stop them, seemingly at all costs.

Chapter Six – How Society is Repressing Your True Intelligence

In a well known and loved British comedy TV series, about a motley group of mainly middle aged men and ex-old soldiers, who were deemed unfit for military service in the second world war, and thus became by default what was known as “the Home Guard”, we have a good illustration of how intelligence is suppressed by society.

Of course Groucho Marx said “military intelligence is a contradiction in terms” long before this TV series, but the exploits of this hotchpotch of pretend soldiers proved the point most conclusively, as well as giving us a good insight into the current human condition.

In particular, the local bigwig, the pompous bank manager, Mr Mainwaring (mysteriously pronounced as “mannering”), though totally unsuited to a position of military command, became the captain of the group, and weekly displayed his incompetence in a whole variety of hilarious ways.

But his *authority* we see, had its compensations.

In each episode, he would find some excuse to tell the only young member of the troop - who somehow had evaded military service likely on the grounds of mental feebleness - that he was “a stupid boy”, in a dismissive manner, which “catchphrase” would bring the house down with laughter from the viewing audience.

But in actuality, to call *anybody* stupid, is really a very great social crime indeed, especially a child.

For as Forrest Gump said “Stupid is, as stupid does.”

Or put differently, if we call someone stupid often enough – which understand, might at the wrong moment only take *once* – they end up feeling like it, and worse, even *acting like it*.

But imagine for a moment that some aliens landed on our planet with huge skulls and brains several times the size and complexity of our own.

They might be able to compute things in their heads which we can only do with the fastest modern computer, they might laugh at our science as

primitive and immature, when they can do interstellar space travel with ease, and so on.

If such test scores were possible, even their dullest children might score one hundred points above even our greatest intellect on an IQ test.

In comparison to *them* we would *all* be seen as “stupid” boys or girls.

And how are we to determine that such vastly superior races of beings do not exist elsewhere in the galaxy or universe, or even in our own solar system who may somehow be hidden from our view, by virtue of their far advanced technology and mental or physical powers?

So the truth is, that *none* of us are so smart, that we should get so vain about it, but unfortunately we still like to mock those whom we believe are not as clever as ourselves, and call them “dummies”, “idiots”, “blockheads”, “half-wits” and so on.

In different countries, quite often whole racial groups are attacked.

For example, in the UK, for generations, it has been the *Irish* who have been labelled as “stupid” by *the English* despite a vast amount of evidence to the contrary, for example, George Bernard Shaw, Sir William Rowan Hamilton (mathematics), James Joyce (author of *Ulysses*), Paul McCartney (who is at least 50% Irish), President Kennedy, and a great many others have shown.

As England however has filled over the last fifty years with so many other more potentially scary races, the racial hatred has been largely diverted elsewhere.

So the repression of intelligence and the human spirit is so systematic at certain times and in certain places, that even *an entire racial group* can be condemned as stupid.

So why does society want to repress *your intelligence*?

Well, let us consider the famous Hans Christian Andersen tale of “The Emperor’s New Clothes.”

The wily salesman sell the emperor his “new clothes”, on the cunning basis that the material is so fine that only the wisest and noblest and most worthy members of his society and kingdom can see them.

So as usual, out of *vanity*, the Emperor insists that *by definition* he can see them, as being the highest, noblest person in the land; and of course all the “nobles” and “courtiers” claim exactly the same, though of course undoubtedly they decide that the stupid common people will not be able to do so.

And is this analogy also not exactly applicable to the “intellectual new clothes” with which the academics clothe themselves as we have pointed out in the preceding chapters?

But the problem is, what happens when the little boy says there are no clothes, the Emperor is “in the altogether”, is naked?

Does the Emperor also say “stupid boy” like our rotund and pompous buffoon, Captain Mainwaring, from the “Dad’s Army” TV series?

Well, we are sure he *would*, but in the story at least, it is too late. For the *common people* see that the Emperor is naked, and they roar with laughter.

And we are not sure quite what happens to the cunning salesmen, when the Emperor finally sees the same is *true*, but we imagine they leave town “just as fast as their legs can carry them.”

And there must certainly be this fear too in those fakers in our modern age, who know in their hearts they are holding positions of power and responsibility in society that they really oughtn’t to, and claiming to know and understand things that they really do not.

And thus they fear “the little boy” who will blow their cover, although we may not realise, they are terrified of outspoken people like maybe *us* who might just say things that will bring out into the open matters they would rather keep well hid.

So they *go on the attack*.

This is why it is often – not the weak, but *the strong* who are the subjects of bullying. Because the weak are no threat to anybody’s “empire”, anybody’s “regime.”

But the strong person who can see into the dark corners of society and the individual heart and mind and bring what he sees out into the light might overthrow the evil empire, and so he or she has *got to be stopped*.

And thus, because *everyone* has got *some* of that ability to see, we are conscripted into this conspiracy of silence by various means, and widespread bullying is one of them, because that makes people scared to be “different”, to be “individual”, that is *to be themselves*

So we have a society of people who in theory all want to be themselves, but in practice can't and don't dare to be.

What a sad and awful state of affairs!

But it's hard to break this “cabal”, this “conspiracy of silence”, because when there are large groups of people all lying to themselves and one another, and only a few “renegades” who are willing to speak or point out the truth, it is rather like the well known psychological experiment, in which nineteen of a line of maybe twenty “plants” are all asked some question, e.g. is this object I am holding green or blue? – and the “plants” are all told to *say* “green” when they know it is really blue, and then the twentieth in the line feels compelled to say *green* also, even though the evidence of their own eyes tells them the total contrary.

Otherwise they fear to be labelled “heretics” and maybe get “burned at the stake” to whatever extent that is allowed in modern society, which though in the end may mean only being kicked out of the association or royal society or whatever, may have the effect of *destroying their life as they know it*.

Thus, is the conspiracy of silence *about the truth* maintained.

Therefore we may have to be very brave in some ways, if we want to try to change this mess.

But the question we would have doubters ask themselves, is – how long can the truth really be suppressed?

For example, the fearsome power of the Roman Church and “Holy Inquisition” eventually crumbled before the astronomical facts which proved the earth was round (i.e. more or less spherical) and that the earth and other planets rotated around the sun, rather than the other way round, and so on.

It may take time, but this wall of concealment of the individual mind from the broader light of truth must inevitably crumble and fall, as has been shown time and time again over history.

But even if all we dare do is whisper the truth, as long as we all keep whispering, eventually the whisper will turn into a *roar* and then the Walls of Jericho or wherever else will come tumbling down, and “set the people free.”

We all want to be free to think, and speak and in so far as is fair to our neighbours, to act and express ourselves and our feelings of love as freely as we can.

But in *this society* few of us can get that freedom, so we escape into abstraction.

Most of us live in some level of fantasy, whether in books, movies or whatever, or if we are more *intellectual* we write books or research theses and try and prove to ourselves and others what clever chaps or chappesses we are, and get a position in society of which we can be *proud*.

We are then a *success*. And then we ask proudly to anyone else we may meet, whilst our degree certificates, caps and gowns hang on the wall: who are *you*?

So we settle for pride, vanity, a nice flat and car and the ability to look down on others who didn't get our degrees, and we feel *superior*.

When we feel a bit of guilt or anxiety about what our lives really mean, or why our relationships never seem to be working out quite as planned, we reach for a bottle, a drug, or a new lover.

The media society doesn't talk about all this, because they are mostly all playing the same game. Anybody who starts speaking like this, i.e. the truth – they shout down, they refuse to publish the books of.

And so not just one little human being, but all we little human beings – because we all *are* little in the grander scheme of things, the Universe, from the king, pope, emperor and prime minister and billionaire downwards – we stay locked in a prison of fear, vanity, ignorance and silence.

The media feeds us endless dumbed-down *sensational* pop music and TV and movie fantasies, which thrill and excite us and keep our minds off the bigger questions, for example, about how we got into this state of fear, suppression of our true selves and slavery in the first place.

Just watch on a TV chat show how when someone starts talking seriously and discussing these big issues *vital to us all*, they get shouted down, mocked, diverted and so on.

People on such shows are constantly monitoring themselves and each other, mentally asking themselves *do I dare say this? Do I dare let the other person say this?*

As in the George Orwell story, *1984*, Big Brother's greatest and ultimate success is that he has got inside our heads.

The hero of the piece, Winston Smith, who is really as much of an anti-hero in his ultimate lack of heroism, just an ordinary human being really, says to himself – “they can torture me, beat me, get me to say anything they wish, but I will still have the possession of what I really think and feel and believe in that so many cubic centimetres of private space within my head.”

But in the novel, he realises he has lost that too, he realises he has been taken over by Big Brother, and he dies loving Big Brother, as he is shot in the back of the head.

The question we have to ask ourselves, now that “Big Brother” and his counterpart “Big Sister” have got into the private space inside our head, leaving us scared to say what we think and feel, or let others say it also, is - *will we die without any real identity or spirit of our own, but only loving these false idols and torturers also?*

Chapter Seven - Intelligence and Hypnosis

In the Sherlock Holmes movie “The Green Lady”, Holmes’ indefatigable, and loyal but somewhat dull assistant, Doctor Watson, played wonderfully by Nigel Bruce, cries “poppycock!” when Holmes takes him to the “Mesmer Society Club” to see a demonstration of *hypnosis*.

Watson claims it can only work on a “feeble, uneducated mind”, but within minutes a club member inveigles him to take part in an experiment, and he rapidly succumbs and wakes up a short time later in horror, to find that he has one shoe and sock missing, but doesn’t remember taking either off.

The point we are making here is, that the so-called intellectual member of our society is inclined to take the same attitude towards hypnosis of any kind, believing that he or she is in total possession of his or her own mind.

Many intellectuals refuse to “believe in” the validity and reality of hypnosis, and of course the movie we have mentioned is certainly no proof whatsoever in itself.

But we are not going to debate here the validity or invalidity of the “formalized” methods of “on the couch” hypnosis, because we are concerned with the much broader and *undeniable* issue of “mind control” in terms of even the simple issues of media advertising.

It is perhaps worth mentioning that as early as 1921, a “Behaviourist” psychologist, J B Watson, whose take on psychology was “controlling human beings via their minds”, after being dismissed from his university post was recruited on the basis of his mind control ideas by J Walter Thompson, which today is a huge international advertising agency with outlets all over the world.

Thus we see already the clear connection between advertising and mind and behaviour control, which was explored in considerable detail in Vance Packard’s famous 1957 work *The Hidden Persuaders*.

But we intellectual people who like the fictional Dr Watson believe we cannot be hypnotised – i.e. have our minds controlled, and our wills perverted to someone else’s plans – are ready for the advertiser’s tactics

we imagine, which can only successfully enslave the masses, but surely, not such highly *sophisticated and educated* people as *we*?

But unfortunately mind control does not depend on someone's intellect. It depends upon *our emotional and psychological vulnerability*.

That is, for example, the intellectual man can be conned just as easily by a pretty face and the charming patter that flows from it as the average man - her "charm" and "sex appeal" bypasses all bands of the IQ spectrum and takes control of him using other means - his *instincts, emotions and desires*.

The reality is that freedom of thought and action does not depend upon how high we score on the Binet or some other test of so called "IQ", but upon our willingness and ability to see life exactly as it is, *however much it hurts, frightens or tempts us*.

High IQ people are no less likely to play national lotteries than low IQ people, unless of course they are so smug and wealthy they don't actually feel they need the money.

It doesn't bother us too much that the chances of winning are infinitesimal, because we are controlled not by logic, but *by fear and desire*.

For example, in this society, which one of us can really say we have got "security"?

Which one of us feels that our job will always certainly be there, that we are "made for life", that we will not one fateful day be supplanted by some younger, smarter person, or if we run a business, that we will never be ousted by some bigger, stronger competitor, or receive some fatal damage to our personal or business reputation and go bust?

Or on the other hand, is any one of us really so *certain* that our lady or man friend will not someday stray or desert us, and rock our world in an equally shocking and traumatic way?

The whole of modern life *in the West* is now structured to threaten our security ever more, right down to our very real fears of not having a pension and how we will be treated generally in our increasingly helpless old age.

And that is also how we are persuaded to go to war after all isn't it? – by threats to *our security*, by playing with our *fears* and *desires*.

First they (like any good advertising team) *paint us a picture* of the monstrous “enemy” and what it will do to us if it isn't stopped.

That is, they put us into a state of *fear*.

Then next, they launch a “glorious” military campaign, in which many “heroes” will be made, and create in us a *desire* for victory.

We cheer and applaud our TV sets as Saddam Hussein's statue is toppled, or whichever other “dictator” the West has sought fit to remove *on our behalf, for our benefit*, so they have told us *repeatedly, hypnotically*.

UK “Respect” party MP, George Galloway is currently under investigation for allegedly profiting from Iraqi oil, though no proper evidence has ever been brought against him on what appears to be an old, dead issue now, and seems merely to be motivated by him being a thorn in the side of the current Blair government, due to his persistent anti-War campaigning, and concern for the fate of the Iraqi and Muslim people.

In his defence he recently said.

“This is all a tissue of lies, *and a lie doesn't become a truth through repetition.*”

But unfortunately, that is *exactly* how propaganda – i.e. hypnosis – works, and the worrying fact is that it *does* work on most of us, the repeated lie *does* start to appear like the truth to most of us, in the absence of any hard facts to the contrary, which in most cases, we are simply not in any position to obtain about national or international matters, let alone the goings on of our neighbours down the road.

All we get is *rumours, gossip*, because we simply *were not there* to witness the events ourselves.

So the technique is that we tell a single lie about our “enemy”, the person or country we wish would either “behave itself”, shut up or disappear, and then we repeat it over and over through different channels, and then others unwittingly start repeating it as well, and when the rumours/gossip seem to be coming from so many *different sources* – even though all the

stories originated from exactly the *same, single source* – we, the public, think there must be truth in it, we think *there's no smoke without fire*.

But if the “liar” in question is a rich and powerful being or a government, it doesn't need a network of rumourmongers, it has the powerful trumpet of the mainstream media to repetitively blast its propaganda at us, and because most of us succumb to the *authority* of the media or the government, we easily believe whatever they want us to believe.

For example, they tell us despite the “terrorist” bombs that the world is now a “safer place”, and if we argue that it doesn't feel that way, they say “ah yes, but you don't see what would have been your fate had dictator X or Y not been removed”, or else “it was our moral duty to give country X or Y ‘democracy’ ”, and so on.

As the dead bodies pile up, the denials and evasions increase, and are dealt with best by showing us as little news of what is actually going on in these war zones as possible, and filling our minds (i.e. *hypnotising* us) with all sorts of other exciting, fun and non-scary things, like the latest antics of the vastly overpaid celebrities whom we are all taught (*hypnotised*) to worship, again by endless *repetition* of the images and actions of them filling our minds.

David Icke calls the technique of the authorities controlling us through fear “problem-reaction-solution”, and it is surely a good way of putting it.

He further points out that, at times a misguided or evil government or other authority will even deliberate *create* the problem, such that when we *react* to it (and typically *overreact*) with fear, horror, judgment and so on, and demand “something must be done”, the authorities are then able to carry out some new policy or introduce some new law which we never otherwise would have accepted, had they not created the “set-up” scenario to make us do so.

Typically the law or policy they introduce centralizes more power in an ever more privileged and powerful few who rule over the many with an ever firmer grip thereby.

The conspiracy theorists then of course capitalize on this idea, and say that virtually every bad thing that happens – e.g. the death of Princess Diana, which also is currently undergoing a fresh investigation – is some kind of cover up which has a “hidden agenda”, and of course, unless we know the facts personally, we cannot say whether they are right or wrong.

So this is all *hypnosis* and we are mostly all “buying it.”

We accept the often baseless “evidence” that makes us afraid – like about non-existent weapons of mass destruction poised to strike us any moment – and equally we accept the glitzy and enticing entertainments and distractions they place before us, to keep our minds off the scary big issues and the global power games.

All the doctors and dentists and most of the university professors have all got their DVD players and look forward to the latest movie releases.

The highbrow types favour opera, Shakespeare remakes and so on, and the lowbrows get Tom Hanks in gritty but photographically stunning movies like “Saving Private Ryan” or else teasing, pleasing movie stars like Rene Zellweger in 21st century neo-musicals like “Chicago.”

The subtlest hypnosis is more by use of fiction than trying to blare facts and “hard sell” pitches at us, which as Doctor Watson rightly said can by this stage of our social evolution only work on a weak, ill informed mind.

The masses have their soap opera dramas by which they can be manipulated into seeing what seems like real life, but isn't, to be real, and representative of how people do, and more importantly *should* behave.

It is high time that soap operas were exposed for the pieces of either deliberate or unwitting *social engineering* that they really are, forever setting bad and unwise examples of behaviour before the masses in a hypnotic fashion, causing them to carry out real life negative behaviours which damages themselves and the whole community.

For example, the bullying scenarios portrayed in series like *Prisoner Cell Block H*, which encourage girls and women to have a tough and mean bullying “gang mentality”, or the promiscuous antics of those in series like *Sex in the City*, *Desperate Housewives* and countless other similar dramas, which if emulated in real life will merely cause untold human misery, and in particular the destruction of families and consequent traumatising and neglect of children.

But though the intellectual may not be conned into significantly changing their lives due to watching soap operas (as most intellectuals simply *don't* watch them), or into buying the *specific* product the glossy advertisement shows him or her, he or she is hypnotically taking in *the background*

props in what he or she sees. He or she is being hypnotised despite any IQ rating into *buying into a lifestyle*.

For underneath the proud intellectual achievements, there is still a fragile emotional creature inside the shell of confidence in one's numerical and verbal reasoning prowess, degree certificates and society memberships.

We all have these awfully difficult and complicated feelings of need for "love" and "acceptance." Above all, we do not want the "opposites" of those things i.e. *hate* and *rejection* directed at us.

So whilst we may not be influenced to buy any *particular* product, we are "educated" on how the "successful member of society" is supposed to live and behave.

The images we have in our heads have been implanted there so consistently and effectively that they spring to mind *immediately*.

We see in our minds the car, the clothes and the homes of the "quality member" of society. They eat in a restaurant, not a burger bar, they wear silk or cashmere, not polyester or nylon, they drink fine wines or spirits, not vulgar pints of beer, and they go skiing, yachting or safairing, not on supervised package tours.

We *know* what a real "success" looks and lives like.

He looks and lives like *Thomas Crown*, in either the Steve McQueen or Pierce Brosnan version of the movie.

In our age of disrespect and informality, he is one of the few beings left whom people might legitimately address as "sir", and of course in our "woman liberated" age he has his female equivalents who drive equally fine cars and wear the most fashionable clothes, and feel it is equally their right to be addressed as "madam."

We are all tricked by these constant suggestions, these "hidden persuaders", into obsessing on our social status, and being made to purchase all the props we need to belong to whatever group we wish to be regarded as members of.

We may have to labour far harder than we would wish to afford these props, because those who seek to "mind control" us not only don't care how hard we must work, and thereby damage ourselves in that process,

but when we finally crack up healthwise, or psychologically under the pressure of stress and depersonalization, they have got an equally huge compendium of “solutions” – some medical, some not – to what happens to us when we have succeeded in destroying ourselves under the hypnotic agenda of their “motivational therapy” (i.e. *purchase and be happy*).

The *real agenda* of government and the power brokers of our society is well demonstrated in the John Carpenter “cult movie” *They Live*, as is also demonstrated the stubborn difficult one has in trying to make the mass of people see their hypnotic state, which by definition is almost impossible, as hypnosis *implies* unawareness, ignorance, mindlessness.

And this hypnosis of us, carried out almost entirely by the media is a never ending process. Every day we are told not only what to buy, but what to think, what to feel, what to be, because we are continually confronted with images of what others feel and think and are doing, and we feel compelled to join in.

If on television tomorrow was announced that the leading members of our society had decided that pogo-sticking, nude yoga or whatever was the most important thing to do in our leisure time, huge numbers of us would join in, no matter how crazy and ridiculous it seemed.

First we would shake our heads, and momentarily think “this is stupid, this is crazy”, but they would first show us images of the “leaders” and “authorities” in celebrity society doing it, you know - Jennifer Anniston, Madonna and the equally feministic Nicole Kidman, or their male counterparts Tom Cruise, Brad Pitt, Guy Ritchie and so on - and think up increasingly sophisticated arguments – just like in the Emperor’s New Clothes story – to persuade us that such is the way to behave.

For example, millions of people go to rock concerts and blaringly loud discos, where one can’t even hear what the person next to you is saying, merely because it is what everybody else is now doing.

We have already mentioned the psychological experiment in which twenty people in a line are told to identify the colour of a blue object, and when the first nineteen (“plants”, told to lie) say it is green, invariably the twentieth (innocent person, unaware of the “conspiracy”) will say green also, despite the evidence of their senses totally to the contrary.

This “peer pressure” now directed to us all via every channel of social activity is absolutely staggering.

As David Icke also points out, we are kept prisoner and thus *policed* principally by our fellow woman and man, who are ready to judge and condemn us, should we *dare* to break with the current whimsical and ephemeral social fashions.

Thus, we are all absolutely *terrified* to be different than the next person *in our group*, yet we laughably say we celebrate our “freedom” and prize our “individuality.”

The few people who are truly successfully and arguably shameless in celebrating their individuality, who deliberately rebel against the general trend, like for example Rasputin in early 20th Century Russia, or David Icke in our present era, are regarded as public menaces and feared by people in general.

Not so many generations ago they burnt witches and persecuted and threatened with torture scientists who dared to defy the Biblical version of creation.

The sanctions are now usually only “social leperhood”, but such ostracization can be nearly as bad as being burnt at the stake for some, who not infrequently decide to kill themselves after enough public mockery and character assassination has made them feel they have socially speaking passed the point of no return, and their “social identity” will never recover.

But the imprisonment in social fashions, such as the kind of holiday one takes, the clothes one must wear and the hobbies one must have to be “socially acceptable” in whatever class one seeks to belong to, pales into insignificance beside the control exerted over us in terms of our beliefs about religious, philosophical, psychological, medical, sexual and scientific issues.

Somebody somewhere decides what you or I are *allowed* to do, say and even *to think* about every issue under the sun. Now if this isn't mind control, please tell us what is?

For example, the average Westerner one hundred or two hundred years or more ago grew up with the indoctrinated belief in a God in the sky, who was his creator and absolute judge, and would decide after his life was over whether he would enter Heaven or Hell, or arguably even worse,

some kind of indefinite “purgatory” where he might undergo any amount of purificatory torture until he was deemed fit to enter “Heaven.”

This theoretical average man however did not make the decision to believe this for himself. He was, as ever, just meekly obeying the status quo, or else he would have accusations levelled at him, and made to feel ashamed and afraid.

And now of course, the pendulum has swung in the totally opposite direction.

Now in much of the West he must *disbelieve* in this same God, or else he is equally going to have shameful accusations and mockery targeted at him, and equally neither now has he made this assessment for himself, but has been persuaded and “programmed” (i.e. hypnotised, mind-controlled) to do so by the current “authorities” – e.g. Professor Richard Dawkins of “The Blind Watchmaker” fame.

Let us define hypnosis therefore in the following way as opposed to the *lie on the couch* or *watch the swinging pendulum* definition.

We are saying, that *hypnotic suggestions* are constantly being fed into the average person’s mind since the time they can understand words, and that - *hypnosis* is the process of getting the mind to accept an idea that it has not come to independently by a process of reasoning, or for that matter, persuading the mind to carry out suggestions which again it would not cooperate in doing, if it were to assess the suggestions with a rational, properly informed and normally aware consciousness.

Hypnosis is in practice generally either a form of mental bullying or seduction.

As we said, the pretty girl or attractive woman who talks us into buying something we would not otherwise have bought, had we just looked at it in cold print and assessed it rationally, is a hypnotist.

Equally is the teacher or the priest who tells us *convincingly* all about God when we are five years old, though he likely has no personal experience of such a being in a direct way.

Because in each case *their suggestions bypass our reason*.

Watching young children express their opinions to some interviewer frequently produces hilarious jumbled and half-formed ideas, which obviously did not ever originate in the child's own mind, but demonstrate to us clearly that he or she is learning already at such a young age that the thing to say is *what you think people want to hear*, in accordance with what you have already been told is the right thing to think and say.

The common factor in all these examples, as we have indicated, is that we have taken on ideas or beliefs or carried out actions that *bypassed our reason*. We never mentally engaged in properly assessing the suggestions and ideas put before us.

As we have been at some pains to point out, the use of *authority* is a major part of this.

After all, even in conventional "lie on the couch" hypnosis we are by implication led to believe the hypnotist is an "expert", and therefore an "authority" who knows what we do not, and therefore we become passive and submissive.

We imagine unrealistically that no idea could be put into our minds without our knowledge or consent, but the reality is that since we were knee high, literally thousands of such ideas have been placed in our mind in exactly such a way.

We accept *the authority of the scientist, the expert*, for example.

We believe for instance that the earth has a crust that averages about 25 miles thick, and a molten iron core, though we have no way of verifying either of these "facts" personally, and that the sun is 93 million miles away, on the scientist's say so, which again, unless we are scientists ourselves we have no way of determining whatsoever.

We believe Mount Everest is the highest mountain in the world, at 29,028 feet (or thereabouts) but again, we only know what we have been told and cannot possibly determine such a figure ourselves.

Many of us *now* believe that fatty meat is bad for us, but green vegetables are good for us, but again, these views were not necessarily believed in the past, and we are just following the views of the "authorities" and "experts", mindlessly accepting these ideas and telling our friends and neighbours they are wrong if they don't see things as we have been programmed to do.

Food issues however tend to affect us more physically than emotionally, but at times this general media and interpersonal hypnosis and bullying becomes so powerful and against our natural instincts that it creates a serious problem in our lives, both individually and as a society.

For example, we are constantly fed the idea from the media that sex is good for us, a major goal in life, if not *the* major goal, whether or not our subsequent life experience teaches this to be true.

But this perspective would we suggest seem to be *very far indeed* from *natural* sex activity, as we perceive it even in other members of the animal kingdom.

For to continually stimulate us with ideas of sex is we would suggest like the experiment that has been done by stimulating the “pleasure centre” in the brain of rats.

Electrodes were attached to a rat’s brain, and a handle was placed in its cage, and each time the rat depressed the handle this would electrically stimulate its brain and give it “pleasure.”

So what do we think the outcome was?

The outcome was that the rat (any one of many) made this connection between the pressing of the handle and the pleasure it received by the scientist’s electrical stimulation of its brain, and continued to press this handle repeatedly until it fell down in exhaustion and was unable to depress the handle any more.

And almost unbelievably, when the rat was revived, it returned to the handle again, and repeated its behaviour pattern of *compulsively* depressing the handle until it again fell down in exhaustion.

So how can we save the poor little rat from such a dubious “death by pleasure”?

Of course we simply take those electrodes out of its “pleasure centre”, take it out of the cage and let it scurry away into its natural environment, in which it will have to wait for an opportunity to mate when the season comes, just like any other rat *in Nature*.

So likewise, it seems only sensible that we should disengage ourselves from this particular aspect of public hypnosis in so much as we

realistically can, and observe only a healthy *moderation* in our sex activity.

This is true of addictions to *sensual pleasures* in general.

As always, we find the *idea* we hold of things we don't actually have experience of turns out to be very different from *the reality*.

So some would say, we are only animals in any case, so what is all the fuss about, we are surely not better than they, what does it matter how we behave as long as it's our "free choice"?

Of course we are all at least fifty percent animal, and those like evolutionist biologist, Professor Dawkins, would no doubt say *one hundred percent* so, and that such an alleged *fact* is nothing to be ashamed of.

Not that we wish to conduct any kind of hate campaign against Professor Dawkins, who appears to us to be a decent, moralistic but misguided man, as indeed seemingly was Charles Darwin himself in many respects.

Yet humans do many other thing apart from having sex, going to the toilet and eating, which animals do not, such as creating beautiful art, music, architecture, science, literature and systems of law and spiritual thought, which surely separate us from the rest of the animal kingdom.

It is in *that* sense, it is suggested we are only perhaps fifty-percent animal, as we do at least fifty-percent *something else* in those activities listed.

So surely the essential factor in distinguishing ourselves – should we desire to – from the rest of the animal kingdom, is in maintaining our own self-respect and respecting others.

This would suggest that we do not unduly exhibit or inflict our private animal nature upon them, whether it be of a heterosexual or homosexual nature, as equally neither should we embarrass others with their unavoidable bodily functions or unnecessarily draw their attention to our own.

Clearly, the mass media bear as much or more responsibility than the individual on this account, yet again, seem to be increasingly ignoring their arguable *duty* in their ceaseless quest for ratings.

But surely none of us can have *absolute* freedom, because if allowed free rein, our desires when put into practice, such as an “inappropriate interest” in our neighbour’s wife or daughter, husband or son, would offend and interfere with the freedom of others, and not infrequently have violent and in some cases even *fatal* consequences for ourselves.

So freedom we find can *logically* only lie in *limiting* our desires, because there is otherwise no possibility of a *peaceful* society, and how can we possibly imagine we are free, if we have no peace?

But we see, that over time, the mass media has *hypnotised* us into believing that “freedom” is to let free rein to all our desires, it is to do whatever we like.

As Aleister Crowley said:

“Do what thou wilt shall be the whole of the law.”

Yet, though they called Aleister Crowley “the Beast” and “the wickedest man in the world”, it is the philosophy that most of us have been persuaded to follow to a greater or lesser extent ever since.

And of course, that *persuasion* is *hypnosis*, in the simple clear and undeniable meaning of the word – that is, it is the continual repetition of images and suggestions coming first from the media and then in consequence reflecting back from our fellow human beings, which *take root in our minds* and tell us to “do whatever turns you on, baby” – and the more that it shocks our parents, teachers or the other “squares” in the pompous smug and utterly hypocritical “straight” society, the better.

And this practice of hypnosis – that is of programming us *by suggestion, persuasion, temptation and shock* with beliefs and desires we have never properly exercised our own minds and thoughts upon – is far more widespread than that practised by big business through its advertising campaigns, and Hollywood through its simulations of reality, which were never reality before they made us make “reality” that way.

For it extends into almost all areas of life, including science, politics, religion, psychology, romantic and sexual relationship, and “spirituality”, as we shall see in later chapters.

Finally, in this relatively brief survey of the hypnotic techniques being used on us all – the point is, once we have started spotting them, we can and *should* therefore, work the rest out for ourselves – we will discuss another form of hypnosis used by advertisers and media people amongst others.

It is *hypnosis by shock*.

That is, defined alternatively, hypnosis is *the enforcement upon the will of one mind by another*.

In this respect, “shock tactics” are often used to gain power over us.

For example, as to the *media* use of shock, the actual revelation of the news of the 9-11 disaster in which America’s modern “Towers of Babel” – the former financial Twin Towers in New York – were brought crashing down by aeroplanes, was a general shock to all our systems, and the endless *repetition* of the images ingrained these events into all our minds in a more or less permanent way.

We were persuaded that something *very big* indeed had happened, such that *a very big* response was to be expected. And thus soon was announced the unending “war on terror.”

But these shock tactics are being used to “get our attention” increasingly in our everyday lives, and rarely we would suggest, for our own good, or in our own interest.

There is as we have just mentioned for example, the increasingly daring and revealing dress of women, to gain attention and shock men, make them catch their breath and fall at women’s feet in adoration and reverence. This is of course not just in regard of attracting mates, it may just as well be done with the goal of making a sale, or getting a job.

Because what is a “state of shock”?

It is one where we lose our senses, not infrequently our *memories* and normal thinking processes, and become *submissive* in the face of what is happening to us. We lose our *power of will*, and isn’t that just what these

manipulators who want to reprogram our “beliefs”, viewpoints and thought processes clearly want?

In terms of advertising, the *scantily clad* lady of the 60s or 70s has become the *naked* lady in the 90s and early 21st century, because shock only works by being *progressive*.

So the advertisers are stuck with the same problem as the TV and movie drama producers are, as their initially clever tricks gradually fail to grab our interest, as we have become more “experienced” and “sophisticated”, we have “been there and done that” – *how to get our attention*.

So for example we are seeing more and more graphic images of naked women in TV, magazine and billboard advertising, and even sometimes naked men, in increasingly risqué scenarios.

Many adverts now also have sadomasochistic elements sneaked in them somehow, e.g. there is one currently showing in the UK in which two ladies with Russian accents dressed in leather and high heels talk suggestively to a naked man in a bath, then drop live lobsters into the bath, and walk away haughtily smirking.

But most Western societies will not generally speaking allow advertising to go into “non-family” viewing, like porn, so the advertising agencies have got another tactic – they use this technique of *hypnosis by shock* by producing images of *ugliness*.

For example, to sell us “oral health” medicine, they may show a girl who suddenly flicks out a sickening looking tongue full of blisters or warts or whatever, like those awful pictures one can see in medical books of various extreme medical conditions.

There is desperation behind all these efforts to hypnotise us of course.

They have to make *sales* or they are going to lose their contracts, and ultimately their jobs, so they have to get our attention in whatever desperate way they are allowed.

If they could sell us a TV set that had a giant hand come out of it and grab us by the scruff of the neck, and blare a speaker in our ear saying “LOOK AT THIS, BUY THIS OR ELSE!”, they surely would, but fortunately for us all, they are not currently allowed to do such things.

But in our current society, chained as we all are to the capitalist machinery, we might well ask, what else on earth are they to do?

The broader point we are making however, is that if our minds are not really our own, and we can be brainwashed, persuaded, seduced, scared or shocked into thinking and doing what others will us to do, how can we call ourselves intelligent?

That is, if we are merely *hypnotised* pawns in somebody else's power game, which alas we *all* are to a lesser or greater degree, but perhaps for true "masters" and "saints", if such exist, how can we think ourselves *truly* intelligent, which surely would imply total freedom of thought and action within the bounds of social responsibility and respect for our fellow human being?

As Krishnamurti explained, a truly intelligent mind is surely free from all conditioning, all prejudice, all preconceived notions that we cannot logically or rationally justify and verify.

In the absence of such mental purity, spontaneity and clarity, emptied of all hypnotic ideas imposed on us either by the educational authorities, religion, science, the media, society at large, or those around us in our everyday lives, just how can any of us call ourselves free-thinking and therefore *intelligent*?

We do not however wish to merely set up a problem without a solution, and those who are interested in ridding themselves of their mental imprisonment – which we are *all* in of course, to some degree – may consider reading the author's earlier work *How to Meditate*.

Chapter Eight – Intelligence, the Media, Kundalini and Sexuality

At this point, we feel we have no choice but to introduce what we regard as the *missing piece* in virtually all modern mainstream scientific, psychological, secular *and* religious thought.

For those who have led such a strictured and manipulated life to have not explored this area of thought, we are briefly going to give a *theory* which should in a general, and in some cases specific way, address most of the human problems that have been bothering them for so long, as so long left unanswered by our modern educational system and “experts” and professors of academia, or even of religion, who have decided they know better than the rest of us about the true significance and origin of life.

In the mid 19th Century Darwin explained how we evolved via the evolutionary process of *natural selection* to become human animals, from some common ancestor which must originally have been the progenitor of all the existing animal life forms we see on our planet today.

How that first presumably single-celled creature itself however came to exist, is a somewhat separate issue, and not one we will trouble over at this point in the discussion.

Why any religious group should have any problem with the generality of Darwin’s theory is a mystery to the present author, because there doesn’t seem to be any reason to fear the fact that human beings may be only unique in *the degree* to which they exhibit intelligence, consciousness and so on.

For surely, anyone who has seen the death throes even of an insect cannot believe it possesses no feeling, as it squirms in agony, much as we would if we were skewered by an enormous needle, or suddenly enveloped in a huge cloud of poison gas.

Nevertheless, we are not trying to organise any animal rights campaign here. We should not of course be cruel to any creature unnecessarily, but we have to draw the line somewhere in that to take this principle too far threatens our own survival.

For example, John the Baptist is said to have lived in the desert on locusts and honey.

Are we to ask, how dare he be so “cannibalistic” to eat “poor insects”, how dare he steal honey from the bees?

If we took that principle far enough, we would surely have to include plants as sentient life forms on some level, and by rejecting eating them, we would all surely die of starvation as no man or woman can live long on water, dust and rocks.

So as we have said, we are at least partly if not wholly *animals*, and therefore, in addressing those who believe that we are nothing else, why should we have any qualms about eating anything, even *each other* as possibly some primitive and remote tribes still do?

So we are suggesting that the difference between humans and other life forms is mainly one of degree. I mean, supposing it is of *kind*, that we can truly say we are “superior” beings, what is the difference really in any case?

Do cats and dogs dream in colour and 3D as we do for example? Who knows, and who cares? It’s interesting, but as likely difficult to ascertain, why trouble with this issue, when there are so many more urgent human problems to solve?

Do dolphins have some kind of superior intelligence to us, do they compose some kind of “dolphin symphonies” in their undersea playground, which if we could understand or translate them might even become top of our hit parade?

Again, who knows, and who cares? It would be fascinating if they could, would it not make life and our world *more* interesting rather than less?

But again, we are human beings, and so let us please stop burying our heads in the sands over human issues, and the very real desperate problems in the human world, such as people in African countries starving to death, who sometimes have to walk across deserts on the rumour of finding an aid agency who will feed them, and in many cases inevitably die of exhaustion and starvation in that process.

While we molycoddle and want to hug the lovely dolphin, which in the wild is more than capable of looking after itself, or angrily protest over those who dare to wear a fur coat, even if the animal had first died a natural death, millions of *humans* starve and die needlessly, but because they are not a pretty sight, unlike the wild life we drool over and embrace,

we ignore their hopeless and tragic fate, and thereby surely are in some ways less human than we would like to believe ourselves to be.

How is it that we can be so obsessed with protecting endangered species, but apparently seem to often care so little about our own, other than our immediate circle of family and friends, and the celebrities who entertain and hypnotise us?

And for once, we are going to lay the blame in a very specific place.

Oh no, we are *not* going to blame the poor struggling little average citizen, lost in his or her own little world of pain and pleasure, working hard to feed and take care of his own little circle of family and friends and fed news of the wider world only by a very selective and often misleading media.

We are going to lay the blame firmly at the door of where it right now in our opinion truly belongs – that of *the mass media*.

Because, as explained in the previous chapter, our average citizen is not really properly in control of his or her own thoughts and feelings, and is not even properly informed.

Our average citizen is rather *hypnotised*, so really not somebody who can truly be held accountable for what is going on in the wider world.

But on the other hand *accountable* he or she is made to be.

It is this average citizen, who does most of the work that *really* counts in society – you know, nursing the sick, milking the cow, driving the delivery truck, extracting a painful tooth, or clearing and maintaining the sewer system – who has a job without which the rest of us would be in a sorry state, who is being made to pay.

Not generally speaking the celebrity, or the privileged classes of media and entertainer who have jobs that the rest of us would *all* like to do, and in most cases don't necessarily have any very special talent that millions of other do not also have which entitles them to deserve such a feted role.

Rather it is he or she – that doctor, teacher, bank clerk, civil servant, taxi driver or building site labourer or even vicar – who generally speaking is going to “cop for it” when the terrorist bomb goes off some place, whilst

the leaders and celebrities are well tucked away behind security doors, body guards and bomb and bullet proof vehicles.

We are saying – the media chooses – under the duress of capitalistic and governmental forces no doubt we accept – what we shall daily be subjected to and made aware or unaware of.

And we are therefore saying to the media – *J'accuse*.

We are saying, stop living in your *very* privileged little world, in which everyone knows your face and name and loves you, whilst the ordinary average person in the street remains anonymous, and in pain, and a pawn and potential sacrificial lamb in the global power games.

For after all, imagine a nuclear war was immanent.

We know already there are nuclear bunkers for the British Royal Family and other “privileged personages”, as no doubt there are tucked away some place for almost all the “big shots” in the world, and if you think about it, quite likely the only reason a nuclear war never happens, is because, without the rest of us, the average people, the effective *slaves*, just who on earth would do all the bloomin’ work?

Who would run the hospitals, teach in the schools, maintain the roads, make the cars, harvest the corn, milk the cows, make the wine, and all the other endless tasks that the poorer people have to do to prop up the extravagant lifestyles of the celebrity and rich classes.

And by clever media manipulation, we are taught, we are *hypnotised*, into loving *them*.

For example, the currently dominant British TV chat show host and film critic, Jonathan Ross, a few years back shocked and offended ex-*X Files* star David Duchovny, by pointing out that he never attended the fan club meetings of those who have been hypnotised to obsess on that particular TV series.

Well known for offending his guests, though usually in a clever less obvious way, Jonathan Ross shouted at him indignantly “Attend those fan club meetings – *give something back!*”

(to those countless nameless nobodies who have made you famous and rich)

But we are not seeking to demonise or attack any *individual*, and certainly not David Duchovny, who seems to us as nice and innocent *or not so* as any other man as far as we can see. We are not in the habit of judging those whom *we do not properly know*.

Many of those in the media are fundamentally decent and kind hearted people, though no doubt with a touch of vanity, which surely most of us would also exhibit if put in a similar privileged position.

Of course, we are addressing not only those who are the *visible façade* of the media world – the news presenters and reporters – but those behind them who are more directorial and controlling in their role.

For example, in theory it is supposedly the view of the media to present an *impartial objective view* of societal and world events.

But in practice we find this is rarely the case, and probably impossible.

Someone, somewhere has got to decide of the thousand or more theoretically newsworthy events that occur every day, which ones should be reported, and how many seconds or column inches they should get.

So where choice exists, we are pointing out that perhaps it is time for more people in *the media*, including the celebrity world, to as Jonathan Ross suggested *give something back*.

The rich king in the palace is after all only as secure as the love of his people. If he is a hated ruler, his subjects and rivals will sooner or later plot to kill him, as all history has proven.

Even seemingly *nice* people like British TV journalist Jill Dando and John Lennon have been murdered for no other apparent reason than their fame, and as long as we continue to live in a world of such glaring inequality and *privilege*, no doubt such occasional terrifying blips on the radar screen of celebrity glory will continue to occur from time to time.

So somewhat in passing, we are just pointing out that *the media* has a power like never before to challenge and *direct* all that is in the news, and steer the thought of the masses to the most desirable destination for the benefit of all.

Surely life has got to change. We observe for example that soap operas are going through phases of struggling for ratings, and forced to make

more and more ludicrous and sexually provocative plotlines – gay kissing etc. – to keep our attention, whereas *reality TV* shows like the worldwide “Big Brother” series are on the up.

Can we infer from that, that eventually, we still stop devoting our lives to the antics and performances of celebrities, but instead choose to devote ourselves to the study and appreciation of the fellow human beings surrounding us in *real life*?

Perhaps such an inference is premature.

But what we are saying is that eventually, TV *must* turn from the emphasis on entertainment and escape to the emphasis on informing us of the most important events in our world.

If the world was peaceful, what would it matter what they showed – that is, in terms of frivolous or stimulating entertainments – as long as it did nothing to encourage breaking of that peace?

But as things stand now, the balance must surely turn to addressing our problems, and confronting the hypnotised sleeping mass of people with that information and investigation before it is too late.

In pursuit of that goal, and of a general understanding in society we would like to place before those readers who may in some way be part of the media, or able to affect its content in some way – if only by posting a comment or writing a letter – what we consider to be the most vital and stimulating segment of information in our possession.

And that is of *the yoga kundalini theory of human evolution*.

As we have discussed it at length in our other works, such as *Kundalini, Preventing the Apocalypse*, we will here try to be as brief and succinct as possible, focusing on its relevance to the present subject matter.

And that relevance, we submit is *total*.

The whole of society has been disturbed *wrongly, needlessly* we feel, by the work of Darwin and others in supposedly unearthing the “origin of species”, and therefore unearthing “the meaning of our human existence.”

But Darwin’s theory is ultimately only a theory of *process*.

It shows the mechanics of the survival of different species, of how adaptation to environment is key to this, such that for example chameleons who can change colour will tend to survive and thrive better in a given environment than will a comparable relative or species who has no such physiological ability to camouflage itself.

We cannot argue against that, that is *common sense*.

But the real argument is surely over *the cause of genetic mutation*.

And *this* we submit is the eternally unanswered question.

They say, the genetic copying equipment somehow “makes a mistake.” It may be a cosmic ray or the background radiation from the earth itself which *somehow* “puts a spanner in the works”, and thus some little alteration in “the genetic code” occurs, and over long aeons of time, the advantageous bits of code survive and are passed on, and the rest diminish or die out, as do the species who carry them.

So it is this *somehow* that we are concerned with.

And according to the yoga kundalini theory, this *somehow*, is not a random factor at all, but a kind of subtle but intelligent energy which permeates every organism without ever being detectable by our scientific equipment.

In yoga philosophy it is called *prana*.

We cannot *see* it, just as we cannot see a magnetic field – we can only see *its consequences, its effects*.

And in humans, the yoga kundalini theory explains, this prana energy functions in particular via what is known as the kundalini force, whose seat and activation area is at the base of the spine.

Before we dismiss this *prana* as nonsense, we would like to ask the scientists in what form “the laws of Nature” which they daily speak of and formulate as undeniable realities exist?

Can we *make* a law of Nature out of something, e.g. as some kind of sophisticated computing circuitry; can we see, hear, smell or weigh it?

Of course not.

Laws of nature are *immanent* to the things in which they exhibit their actions. They are evident only by *their effects*. Otherwise they are, like our theoretical *prana*, totally invisible, and exist only as an abstract idea in our minds, with which we attempt to organise and interpret the reality of our sense experiences and experimental findings made on the basis of those sensory observations.

But what we can observe in those in whom this *kundalini* energy awakens in a dramatic way are *the symptoms* of the functioning of this prana.

And for example, by studying the accounts of currently living or very recently living people whose stories are available on the Internet, we will find there is a common set of phenomena there.

These people are typically not *ill* in any definable way.

Yet what they all have – the *genuine cases*, *that is* – is far above average in intelligence and sensitivity, experiencing a lot of strange mental and physical states, and sometimes receive insights and so called “spiritual” experiences, which accompany their changed bodily symptoms.

In particular, they all – as we have said, the *genuine cases* – report feelings of heat and “stirring” at the base of the spine, just as is reported by ancient yoga texts on this subject, as well as more recent reports by the likes of Ramakrishna, a 19th Century Hindu “saint.”

Above all in modern times, we have the clear first hand detailed accounts in English of the Hindu born Gopi Krishna regarding this phenomenon, and also of Krishnamurti, in the Mary Lutyens biography, in which the often painful and scary activity of major kundalini transformation is described as “the process.”

Equally, we have the example of David Icke, whom whatever we think of his views was previously a fairly meek and insignificant looking TV sports presenter, before becoming *very suddenly* (that is, within a matter of months) transformed to being some kind of a New Age “firebrand preacher”, like a modern John the Baptist, going round trying to set kings and governors aright, at considerable personal risk to himself we might add, though fortunately for him, the public media gaze and modern “civilised laws” are preventing him from gaining the same fate as John the Baptist apparently did, so far.

But let us try to be scientific about this, and steer clear in so far as we can of unneeded jargon and “mystery mongering.”

We are simply saying, that in some smallish percentage of the population there is a possibility that in later life – typically in one’s mid to late thirties – there can be a reawakening of an “energy” in the body, however we wish to name it, which functions in the same manner as did whatever “Natural laws” or energies in the womb that constructed the foetus and baby from a single cell, in particular in developing its mighty and complex human brain.

This kundalini energy apparently seems to gradually fizzle out somewhat in most of us as we mature into our teenage years.

Then the body after passing through adolescence reaches a comparatively stable state, which we regard as “adult”, and we are able to successfully apply ourselves in most cases to living a balanced adult life, and to mating and reproducing to continue the race.

That is to say, if we wish, we could call this *kundalini* (literally *kindling*, as in “fire”) a “growth process”, though far too complex and comprehensive in its actions and effects to be attributable to any single hormone or combination of known biochemical effects.

Or do we really think it is so easy to grow a baby from *one single fertilized cell*, when we are alleging the two transformational phenomena and forces are one and the very same?

And the evidence for this, is as we have seen for example in the cases of David Icke, Krishnamurti and Gopi Krishna, there is generally a *transformation* of the personality, and if the “awakening” of this energy proceeds *rightly*, it is a socially healthy and personally enlightening one.

These beings (and they are all still *human beings* we should point out) also report states of “inner bliss” and “expanded consciousness” that have got nothing whatsoever to do with any drugs they may or may not have ever taken.

To use a slightly misleading but still relevant example, as an adult, having active kundalini can be at times rather like being on an LSD trip that never ends.

It can overpower us, and experts in this field as we presume Gopi Krishna to be (because right now, arguably there *aren't* any others, due to insufficient personal *experience*, take a look at his shorter autobiography *Kundalini the Evolutionary Energy in Man, 1970* for example) report long periods of both “ecstasy” and “horror”, which may equate somewhat with what LSD and other hallucinogenic drug users have referred to as “good” and “bad” trips.

Whether the “kundalini trip” is good or bad depends upon many factors, such as for example the general condition of the body, again, just as in the case of the drugs users, who know from long experience hallucinogenic drugs are *not* recommended in the case of those who are not currently in a healthy physical and psychological state

(not that your *current* author would ever approve *any* kind of stimulating drugs apart from *moderate* use of alcohol, which is not deemed by Gopi Krishna as being of potential damage to the genetic structure, proven he said by the appearance of the geniuses of the Renaissance, who arose despite its long term use in their society).

But further still, when applied to the ongoing kundalini experience, which lasts not a few hours like a drug, but for week, months and years at a time in cases, if the body, behaviour and in particular the *nerves* are not in good order, and pure, the bad trip can actually create *a distorted personality*.

We can either see moderately disturbed people who display sometimes extraordinary talent, yet have mood swings, manic-depression, etc., or we can see seriously disturbed or malignant people, who are having terrifying visions and need to be sedated in some cases for their own sanity and safety.

Many if not all of the mentally ill are according to this theory, as explained in modern times mainly by Gopi Krishna in his numerous talks and books, are suffering from a kundalini awakening gone wrong.

We generally speaking have numerous examples of “wayward geniuses” in our society, who have great talent, but various mental and psychological problems the rest of us don't, which often result in addictions and disturbing out of control episodes of behaviour.

That is, in a sense, in the case of a significantly active kundalini, we could say that we almost have a permanent adolescent on our hands.

Not of course, that we are saying *all* bad behaviour is a result of this, it may simple be bad parenting, but could also due to this same theory be based on some developmental malformation, probably in the womb, rather than of specific genetic origin.

The vital part for our society to understand is that *all* modern people are transforming and evolving to some degree due to this kundalini energy being at least slightly active, and this has implications for us all, in terms of our every day lives and behaviour.

This significance becomes more so for those in the higher intelligence categories, in whom the flow of kundalini is greater, but is surely of import to any one of at least average intelligence, which as we have early explained, is very difficult to assess and quantify in an objective sense in any case.

And the main point here is that this kundalini energy is created in the region of the sex organs around the base of the spine, and is either

- a) sent up the spine along the spinal cord to *the brain* where it has an energising, healing, stimulating or damaging effect (if the energy is *impure*) or
- b) it is converted into gross form as the sexual fluids with which we are familiar, specifically sperm in the man, though it is less clear what happens to this converted energy in the case of women who of course only produce a small number of eggs according to their monthly cycle.

But in both sexes, if the energy is *not* transformed by sexual activity it can enhance, balance or actually *evolve* the brain, either quickly or slowly, depending on the flow.

By *evolve* we mean, that according to this theory as expressed by Gopi Krishna, the prana or kundalini energy when awakened powerfully is said to “irriagate” various parts of the brain, and the consequence will be some form of talent or genius depending upon which parts have been irrigated.

We know that most geniuses have their talent in only one or two areas such as musical or chess geniuses.

It is very rare that we get a “universal genius” such as perhaps *Leonardo Da Vinci* who seems to have possessed not mere cleverness, but actual

genius across several fields such as fine art, and various branches of science.

That is, we don't know of any Einsteins who can also paint like Rembrandt or the converse.

Note that this theory also explains the cases of "idiot savants" who may have generally damaged facility of understanding, excepting this unusual and outstanding talents they display, as for example the well known "Rainman" as depicted in the Dustin Hoffman movie, based on a real life and still living case.

For what we discover is that, this same kundalini or prana energy can also *damage* a brain and nervous system that is unprepared for its powerful flow.

Then we get some peculiar phenomena like schizophrenia, or hallucinations, delusions, voices in the head, strange physical symptoms and so on.

These negative phenomena may turn out to be temporary or permanent, which usually only time will tell, as the fate of the mentally ill shows.

Unfortunately at this point in time, the theory of kundalini does not tell us how to *fix* such problems, though Gopi Krishna says that when this "new science" is properly developed and investigated, it may do so.

But what it does tell us is perhaps how to *prevent* such disasters, and as we have been explaining, one of the main ways of stopping this onset of mental illness caused by a "morbidly" functioning kundalini, is to address one's sexual behaviour.

For as we have explained, the sex centre can produce either evolutionary energy which is sent up to evolve *and* balance the brain, or else can be used up in sexual acts.

That is to say, that excess sexual activity can unbalance a sensitive mind, though neither does the theory recommend any kind of harsh enforced celibacy, but rather *moderation* in sex activity.

According to Gopi Krishna this moderation would typically be sexual activity two to three times a week or a fortnight, depending on the

constitution, but clearly many people in our society are having a lot more sex activity than that.

When we say *sex* of course, we do not mean merely a sexual act with a partner, but any form of stimulation of the sex organs which produces an aroused state, which will begin this process of transformation of the subtler evolutionary and balancing energies to the grosser materials which comprise the sexual fluids and typically for a male at least will culminate in orgasm.

For the sake of completeness, we should point out that in some cases, for example, where the prana is found to be impure, some people will experience a maddening desire for release, caused by impure energy which would otherwise damage their brain or nervous system to some degree if sent up to the brain.

But all this is a subject for long term study and research, and we would not advise anybody to hastily start using this *very limited* knowledge we have placed before you here, apart from the general prescription of *moderation* in most cases, as a basis for any “self-treatment.”

We would just advise, as did Gopi Krishna against *extremes* of sexual behaviour – that is, either total enforced celibacy, or on the other hand, gratuitous sex activity on a daily basis.

The moderation we are advised to apply to sex behaviour applies also to “energy practices” such as some forms of tai chi or Chi Gung or whatever you like to call it.

If these exercise make you feel fit and healthy, that’s all and good. But if they make you feel “bursting with energy”, “supercharged”, we would suggest this is a warning sign, and to “take your foot off the pedal” just as quickly and safely as you possibly can.

Because an important issue here is that because life is so unnatural and hyper-stressful for so many of us, we are seeking ways to make us stronger and more energetic, including probably in many cases punishing sessions in the gym.

On the contrary, we are suggesting, that the mistake here is to push ourselves so far and hard in the first place. We should instead moderate our working lives, take more rest, moderate exercise and so on.

It would be better for many people to work part-time, and have more rest but less money, than to push our minds and bodies to their limits and suffer the many bad consequences of overstress.

As we have pointed out, the powers that be don't currently seem to much care about how much we damage and exhaust ourselves, so we are going to have to complain more about this issue, and *force them* to re-order society so that we can all have an easier life, but without that leading us into poverty.

One measure we can all take is to become less materialistic and reduce our luxuries, trying to focus our energies and finances on what we really need rather than the extravagances and dreams which fire our imaginations but also drain the energies of our bodies and minds due to what we have to endure to get the money to afford them.

This also brings us to the issue of behaviour in general.

And as we have explained in a previous chapter, intelligent and very emotional behaviour do not march well together.

We are not talking *morality* here, we are talking *brain chemistry* or *physiology*.

We know the brain is an organ made of physical tissue, and evidently it tires out in various ways and needs repair just like all our other physical tissues, such as our skin, which is repeatedly replaced completely over time.

And the questions we would have general readers, doctors and psychologists ask themselves and therefore *research* are: what do powerful emotional states like anger, fear, passion and so on do to *our brains, our nerves?*

And equally what does a powerful *orgasm* do to our brains, our nerves?

It can certainly get our heart up to a fearsome rate, causing some people to go into cardiac arrest under the strain for example.

Why is it that it seems we have to get into a condition of "near death" before we can get our bodies to produce the fluid which will create the next generation?

All these questions are currently unanswered by mainstream medical science, but surely they are very obvious ones to ask, for any *serious medical researcher*.

But we see that “traumatic experience” such as rape, molestation, serious assault or attempted murder of us, or even the *fear* generated by undergoing and surviving some event such as a war, car, train or plane crash can remain with us seemingly forever. It appears our brains can be *scarred* by emotional experience, on a very deep level.

So here we are just asking whether it is possible – as seems to us most likely – that these powerful experiences we have of sex, anger, and so on are damaging our *brains*, rather than just our hearts, stomach linings or whatever, which of course would be bad enough in itself?

Is it possible that the punishing *overwork* (particularly *mental* overwork) that so many of us Westerners daily endure, is doing the same?

As we have discussed these questions in our other work, *Kundalini, Preventing the Apocalypse* we will not repeat further that material here.

But we wish to point out that all these issues come into our present subject – that of the nature of *intelligence*.

For can we be properly intelligent if we have a damaged brain, scarred with traumas which pulse around our minds and inhibit and darken our lives?

And doesn't this tell us if true, that therefore we should re-order our society, our pastimes and sexual pursuits to a more gentle and moderate level, that perhaps we should focus more on the emotional satisfactions of love, togetherness and peace, instead of seeking out conflict, gratuitous sex, thrilling, exciting pastimes like jumping out of planes and so on?

But as we have pointed out, the authorities currently have hypnotised us *not to* seek our satisfaction in moderation and peace.

Because unfortunately if we did that, they can't *sell* us all the exciting and stimulating activities which keep us stimulated and smiling to mask the underlying exhaustion and misery and background fears of our live.

Hobbies like art, or playing a musical instrument or rowing a boat not too ferociously on a lake, are in general, *really cheap*.

But the capitalist businesses don't want to us to be quiet and economical.

Like the Romans, they want us to buy our tickets to *the circus, the carnival*.

There's no love in it, there's no peace, no real happiness or security, only thrills and spills.

Whether we want more of the same is up to the individual and collective conscience and choice of each one of us.

Chapter Nine - Intelligence, Psychology and Spirituality

What we now regard as modern psychology, founded by Freud, Skinner, Adler, Jung, Maslow and the rest, has amazingly come about in just the last one hundred years.

But without going into undue detail we are going to present an argument here, which amounts to the fact that modern psychology has mostly had the effect of disregarding commonsense, and therefore condemning our society to a state of confusion it would not otherwise exhibit.

For example, B F Skinner, the founder of *Behaviourism* said that punishment of children doesn't work, using prisoners as an example of how it fails to rehabilitate them.

But like so many arguments of the intellectuals whose ideas have taken dominance in mainstream society, displacing *commonsense*, on closer scrutiny, it misses *simple logical truths*.

For example, in this instance, we are given the *premise* that punishment of children doesn't work, based on the "evidence" that punishment does not work on prisoners incarcerated in correctional facilities.

They don't get to be better people due to a harsh regime, they just come out hating society more than ever.

We accept that in many cases this is true.

But the simple logical flaw is that this fails to distinguish between punishment of *adults* and *children*.

Punishment of children in suitable non-abusive forms may well prevent them from becoming out of control, problem adults, so this is but one simple example of how modern psychology has got gaping holes in its thinking at everybody's expense.

We are making some fuss of this matter, because most of Western society has experienced a breakdown of discipline in general in its youth, and we feel it is high time to lay the blame at the door of those to whom it really belongs – the feeble and erroneous theories on child psychology which have created this situation.

But the *real* psychology with which we should be concerned, is the study of the egotistical nature of children, and adult men and women, and their motivations which clearly expose their behaviour.

This *real* psychology is simple yet subtle.

The practice of it depends as we have said, upon one's ability to resist the hypnotism and lies coming to us from the media, and from the next human being we meet, or see on a public platform.

The real psychology we all need to know as humans as Krishnamurti explains starts with the following principle.

We are all fundamental selfish, fundamentally interested in looking after number one.

If we have to choose if it is *we* who gets the prize, rather than the next person, we always choose ourselves.

Even the so called "saint" is perhaps not necessarily free of this selfish-tendency, because the saint has simply made the decision that the things that the average person wants are not worth having, so for him or her to reject what others hunger for so desperately, is not a true sacrifice, as he or she is seeking a reward on a higher plane, e.g. "heaven", "enlightenment" or whatever we like to call it.

We are all seeking *happiness*, and the only issue is whether we choose a dumb way or a smart way of getting it.

So the saint or "holy man" would say, those who seek golden trinkets and treasure chests, fine clothes and palaces, seek what can be taken away, what will turn to dust, what "does not endure."

Whereas the materialist would reply, "you can keep your mythical and likely delusory heaven in the sky – I will settle for the here and now thank you, and trough as much of it – the wine, women, song and luxury - as I possibly can while time allows."

And that is the agenda that a good proportion of the world is following, perhaps the majority.

Of course, some psychologists try to advise us that real happiness lies not so much in *things*, but in *human relationships*.

But there is a major problem with that. We are almost all so emotionally needy and immature, that our relationships are inevitably catastrophic.

It is this simple.

Everybody wants love, acceptance, kindness.

But the *givers* of love, *the providers* are *few*, that is - those who are so secure in themselves that they don't *demand* the constant attention and ego stroking of other people.

Those who desire love however – the *takers* - are *everywhere*, they count up as the vast majority of people alive.

So we have a situation with few who are truly kind, grown-up, caring and loving, and able to almost selflessly *give*, and many who are selfish, unforgiving, greedy and immature, and are ninety-nine percent intent on selfishly *taking* and giving little in return.

Kind mugs of both genders find themselves easily picking up any number of these *takers*, but to their horror they find that these takers often don't wish to give one percent back of what they so ungratefully take, and then unless the kind people want to stay total mugs, the logical outcome of this situation is that everybody ends up alone.

And that is our society. We now have more single people living alone than ever in recorded history. People are too selfish, self-obsessed and unable to cooperate, care and share to live together peacefully.

A good person could live with another good person, but they are so thin on the ground they find it hard to locate one another, and even when they do, they will normally find any good person of either gender has a substantial number of “hangers on” and “users” surrounding them, who will do their level best to sabotage the relationship of the good people, just as a bunch of vultures feeding on the carcass of a lamb *don't want to share*.

And that really is what much of our modern society is like. One big-hearted mug or another is busy servicing any number of selfish, greedy people emotionally, and sometimes even financially, and anyone else who tries to sidle up to the established group of human scavengers is hissed and booed at and if possible scared away.

But then the givers, the lambs who can be fed upon by the rest are scarce.

So many takers, scavengers, cannot even find a giver, a lamb to feed upon.

So then the modern psychologist or therapist comes along to “service the need.”

He or more likely *she* will listen to our problems, pains and heartaches and offer “empathy” (that means they will pretend to understand our feelings, but not actually *care* about us personally, as the “sympathetic” person would, that is asking too much.).

When we analyze what they are getting paid, and that our life is actually not “getting better every day in every way” despite their “therapies” and “advice”, we realise that they are scavengers too.

Then, when we give up on therapy, we can go to a bar, and sit on a bar stool getting drunk and tell the bartender about our woes.

They listen too, as long as we keep buying drinks. But when we get drunk and troublesome they throw us out.

So in desperation we might even try a vicar or a priest to see if we can get some human understanding, warmth and sympathy.

But all most of them want to do is indoctrinate us with their ideas, tell us that “Jesus Loves Us”, though we haven’t seen much evidence of that in our lives so far, and they aren’t really able to offer us any.

They say he changed the water into wine, but all we can do is the other way round.

They say he was the product of the virgin birth, but nowadays we can’t even *find* a virgin to give birth to our children via the usual method.

So this is what is really going on in society. But modern psychology is not addressing it. It is not addressing the utter chaos, confusion, misery and so on in our everyday lives and communities.

It is not addressing the failed relationships, the delinquent, abusive and disrespectful children, or the neglect and abuse of the unwanted and old.

And that means *all* of us, just a few years or decades down the line, for we know not when that fateful day will come, when we will have some life changing stroke or heart attack, or develop motor neurone disease or something, and be confined to a wheelchair and have to be spoon fed and bottom wiped by people who don't know or care about us, because our children and families quite understandably don't want to know us any more.

And when we realise that psychologists and psychiatrists can't actually help or cure us, we might wonder, just how do they keep their jobs, how do they justify their existence at all?

But ah – they have another trick up their sleeves, and a very good one too.

It is called *drugs*. Nobody with a mental illness ever gets “cured”. They might recover their balance *naturally*, just as a cut heals without any doctor's help.

Of course a doctor might put a few stitches in a cut to help Nature by stopping us bleeding to death from a gaping wound, but *Nature* does the real work and patches up our skin.

What the “unhappy” or “mentally ill” however get is *drugs*. Virtually all treatment of the so called mentally ill or “terminally unhappy” centres on drug treatments of one kind or another.

If we can't fix the pain and misery in someone's mind, we can at least chemically smack their brains with a sledgehammer so they don't actually *feel* the pain and misery anymore.

But where is the alternative the modern psychologists say? We are doing our best. Surely we cannot be blamed for that?

What modern psychology needs to realise is that there is *no* cure for unhappiness other than the establishment of *meaning* and *purpose* in life.

Why?

Because otherwise, how can you ask a being that knows it might die at any moment – even from a terrorist attack – and has relationships that aren't working and all other life's hardships from being depressed and dissatisfied with its lot?

You can't. You can only give it "happy pills" to put it into a somnambulant stupor.

Some people do that for themselves – alcoholics and drug addicts.

But what you *can* do is stop telling the public that you can cure its ailments which are caused not only by spiritual desolation, but by the suffering created by the entire social structure, of undue competition, materialism, greed and overwork.

You can say – let's bring up children to be balanced by applying correct mild discipline and not addicting them to sensual things.

You can say, let's stop running off into complex and unworkable abstract theories but instead just teach them to be honest, decent, thoughtful understanding citizens, instead of aggressive competitors in an unjust capitalist, self-destructive and globally destructive economy.

You can say – we psychologists can do little while you use the media to fill people's minds with unreal fantasies of violence, material glory and limitless opportunities for sexual experience and romance.

You can say – look, we are all scared little creatures on planet earth, struggling for survival in a big nasty world, just doing the best we can.

But you can also do something *new* with your good intellect, as long as it is now accompanied by *an open mind*.

As modern psychology has largely failed to reform the individual and society *in practical terms*, you can explore the thousands of years of "spiritual" and "mystical" literature to see if there is any sense in it.

Forget the Bible and the other major "Holy Books" at least for the moment, and study the works of for example Gopi Krishna, and the philosophy of J Krishnamurti and one or two other similar beings.

And we have in our previous chapters given *the key*, the kundalini theory that suggests we all have this evolutionary mechanism in us, and *some of us* as we have said, are actually *aware* of it functioning in us, and have seen how this can lead to different states of awareness, just as drugs can, but the states we are talking about are without drugs, and can be of a permanent and undistorted nature, as eventually happened in Gopi Krishna's case.

Sufi “saint” Hazrat Inayat Khan wrote that “people will return to religion (in a scientifically acceptable way) because there is nowhere else to go.”

We have a world full of confusion, in which the population is all running round like headless chickens, trying to get as many thrills as they can before they die, and causing a whole lot of trouble in that process of self-interest and self-aggrandizement.

Psychology does not answer it – spirituality alone we would suggest *does*.

But blind belief will not do any more.

As we have explained in our work, *Kundalini, Preventing the Apocalypse*, all capable scientists should investigate this field of research into how *consciousness*, the greatest human mystery, can be developed by evolution of the brain caused by this kundalini mechanism.

This will then explain the origin and purpose of all the true mystical literature – i.e. that produced by or regarding those who transformed to a genuine higher state of consciousness, as we assume Christ and Buddha and others to have done.

In the final chapter we shall look at how modern science has in our view attacked religion and spirituality unreasonably, thus taking away hope and the possibility of the higher development of humanity from not only the average members of society, but from the scientists themselves.

Chapter Ten — The Psychological Flaw in the Modern Scientific and Atheistic Mind

We are told that the philosopher and subsequent evolutionist T.H. Huxley said upon reading Charles Darwin's *The Origin of Species*, published in 1859, "How extremely stupid of me not to have thought of that."

And surely that is true.

Darwin's theory of evolution is extremely obvious to anyone who can think independently who is confronted with the vast array of creatures and a few dinosaur relics freely available in our environment, which almost *all* have some kind of eyes, nose, mouth and limbs.

Of course, with our knowledge of all the different species of apes including the chimpanzees and gorillas, which in some cases, on a dark night might be mistaken for a human being, the proof is virtually conclusive already.

Though the concept of *natural selection* took a little more thought, the idea that it takes a *genius* to come to the general conclusion of the evolutionary theory, of descent from a common ancestor, is surely wrong.

Darwin, admittedly a very intelligent man, was simply in the right place at the right time, and made the right decisions to gain the observational data he needed to prove his case, without perhaps being aware of what he was doing.

The modern Western man or woman who has seen any number of TV Nature programs, from Jacques Cousteau to David Attenborough and so many others however, clearly has a great advantage that no ordinary person or naturalist like Darwin ever had in any previous generation, and that is surely *the real reason* it took so long to figure out.

If we don't have enough pieces of the jigsaw, we obviously can't solve it, and until Darwin undertook his famous journey to the Galapagos islands, neither did he have enough pieces of the puzzle.

Of course, at a time dominated by immature Creationist theories, whose dogma was that God had created the world only a few thousand years ago, to draw the conclusions he did was an extreme act of independent thinking, and for that reason alone we would say he stands out.

He was as we have said, like the man in the line of people who all said the blue object is green, yet he was one of the few amongst the human population who dared to *see for themselves* counter to the views of all his peers, and dared to say the object is *blue*.

He was in a sense, therefore, also like the little boy in *The Emperor's New Clothes* story, who dared to say the king was naked.

But that Darwin's general theory was clearly correct, in no way disproved the concept of a universal intelligence underlying everything, popularly known as God.

All his discovery actually achieved, was to add further mystery to the "mysterious ways" of such a God, who may well have still been assumed to have created the world in six days, but not six literal modern solar days, but rather metaphorical ones of indeterminate length.

This new Creationist "Nature God" was thereby merely found to be a lot more complex in his plans than anyone had theretofore suspected.

But as this unsuspected broader explanation of the modus operandi of such a "Nature God" became clear, Darwin obviously could not correlate this with the dogmatic beliefs of his era.

After several personal tragedies in life, in particular the death of one of his young daughters, he became less certain of any kind of religious belief, and though he did not become an atheist, he clearly expressed the position of an agnostic – one who admits that science does not tell him definitely whether God exists or not.

Surely, this is the correct position for all scientists and humans in general to take, that is, one of *uncertainty*, rather than an atheistic declaration that "there is no God", and that any such idea is "nonsense", which is surely not a rational and logical position, due to lacking *proof*.

And here, we intend to show such, offering a simple theory of why some scientists like Darwin favour belief in God or agnosticism, whereas the mass of modern scientists and scientifically informed members of the population in general favour the atheistic position.

We have in another of our works, asked the question "why does the believer believe, and the non-believer disbelief?"

And now we are going to give a detailed answer, not on a rational level, but on the level of *emotion, of psychology*.

Few or none of us are truly rational beings. To be wholly rational like the fictional Mr Spock was supposed to be, but repeatedly showed he was not, is not likely humanely possible.

We have emotions, instincts, passions, and no known human being has ever demonstrated the lack of these.

Certain beings like Buddha or Christ have apparently had these emotions and passions wholly under control, but they are so long ago in history or so rare, they do not come into this discussion.

The real truth is that if a great enough tragedy happens – for some people it could even be that their share portfolio crashes – we *all* end up in tears.

If an exciting and attractive enough member of the opposite sex shows us their favour, we *all* respond to that with delight and in some cases *passion*.

None of us are so different in these emotional and instinctive responses.

But where we *do* differ is the degree of care, attention and love that is either showered on us or not so in our formative years.

We have already mentioned that there are two principle types of beings in society, the givers, the provider or love, and the takers, the ungrateful stealers of the goodness and generosity of others.

Of course, these are poles, and most of us are somewhere in the middle, but the takers at this point in human existence seem to be swamping mercilessly the diminishing supply of givers remaining.

We could quote (roughly) the New Testament if we wished and say:

“the world will grow smaller and more wicked, and men’s love will grow cold.”

And whether that passage was really spoken by a man who walked on water or not, or whether it was meant to be applied to a future time such as now, we do not particularly care, but it seems to be descriptive of a stage of human development, of a time like *now*.

So the reality is, that many of us, likely the vast majority, did not receive a loving and caring upbringing. Rather it was loaded with trauma of various kinds.

And thus many if not most of us grew up hating our parents, and in particular we find that in the modern era of the last fifty or sixty years, *father hate* in particular has been the prevailing tendency, particularly in this era of “feminism” and “women’s liberation” in which the “sport” seems increasingly to demonize men and blame them for everything.

The parental influence has moved from being *male dominant* – that is, the image of the strict and dominating Victorian or early twentieth century father – to being the *female dominated*, that is – “mum’s are best, dad’s are the beast” type of family structure, that has so easily deteriorated into countless one parent families, with only a mother, and no present father at all.

So of course, you can still hate your father, even if you’ve never seen him, and this is made easier in many cases, by a betrayed or deserted mother’s willingness to “stick the knife in”, and make sure the kids are fully informed on what a beast and so and so their dad really was, and how they are therefore so much better off without him.

But on the whole, the father hate is found to be most intense if he is there, and has done some apparently mean things to you or your mother.

Whether these things were really as mean as they appeared to you as a child however is debatable.

For example, suppose your father ran away because he could not cope with some affair your mother had, he could not cope with the betrayal and disloyalty.

We suggest your mother is not likely going to tell you that *she* was the guilty party, or it was actually *her* who caused him to desert you, rather than whatever story she cooked up to make herself look good to you.

So the result is, you grow up hating him anyway and trusting in mum, whether he deserves that hate or not.

And things can get a lot more complex than that in this simple yet subtle world of human relationships – *simple* in the respect that it is based on the *fact* that we are all looking out for ourselves, number one, but subtle in

the respect that the ways we go about looking after number one can be subtle and devious indeed, and not visible to anything but the most well trained and experienced eye.

For example, a woman may simply be jealous of her child's love for its father. She wants that child to see *her* as the source of love, the centre of things, and so she goes on a one-woman campaign to drive him out, make him the bad guy.

Obviously, few *decent, loving, giving women* behave in such a way, but as we have mentioned, the ones who aren't so decent and loving far outnumber the ones who are *as things stand right now* and have done for the past fifty years or more.

Of course, your father *could* have been a bad person, and your mother a saint, but we are focussing here on what happens to those who have this *belief* about the nature of their father, whatever the truth may really be.

So there you are, a fifteen or twenty-one or fifty year old angry person, and you are (internally) still blaming your "bad dad."

And this is reality.

People carry these childhood resentments throughout their whole lives.

That's why it's so hard to relate to the next person we meet.

Two decent forgiving people get together and it's relatively easy. They already know how to give and take. They don't expect to get their own way all the time.

But two of the damaged ones get together, the ones who won't compromise, back down, give in, and so on, and then you have fireworks 24/7 as they say.

Which for example, we can easily see in the celebrity relationships once the initial excitement and passion had died down, and they discover what one another are *really* like.

Then in the press they say "amicable parting, but *we're still friends.*"

Yes, right – friends who want to live about two hundred miles apart and go to bed and live with someone else who doesn't bully, cajole or needle

them into doing everything they want, and gives them a little space to be their own person, their own human being.

In short, what happened to their “beautiful relationship” was that two “takers” mistook one another for “givers”, and when they finally figured that out, they both ran off and tried to find another “giver” before it was too late.

But many of us have suffered so much in our childhood, bullied by our parents and so on, that we grow up seriously damaged, though because we aren’t much different than those around us, who are also growing up in an uncaring atmosphere, we think it’s *normal* when it’s really not.

And after years of sulks, pain and tears, or even just being neglected and ignored and locked in our own little world, we are thrown out cruelly into the big wider world of the school where we get bullied some more.

Even the teachers bully us, not only the other children, but the teachers have got the gall to say they are “good people” and then they tell us about this “God” whom they go to Church and worship every Sunday or whenever, depending on the particular religious culture we find ourselves trapped in.

So what we have in our society are an awful lot of damaged, unloved people, and naturally when they have grown up in a living hell, how on earth can they be persuaded that there is any kind of loving god?

Clearly therefore it seems to them, there is no justice in the Universe.

There is no benevolent being watching over them who cares (just like their parents, you see) because otherwise it would never have let them undergo all those tortures and trials.

And then we have the minority of people who grew up feeling *loved*.

They hear about this loving God, and even though there seem to be a few logical problems with the theory, they think – “Great, a being that can love me even greater than I am loved already!”

And of course, the fact that they have already been loved, had that feeling of someone kind and powerful and benevolent watching over them (i.e. a good parent), acts as *evidence* that such a being does, and should exist.

So they choose to “believe” in God, as the concept of God reaffirms their psychological state.

They see the world as a place to be enjoyed, a place that they can feel secure in, though they are dimly aware of those other “bad people”, the “malcontents” who just seem to want to wreck everything and mess everything up for the rest.

Why can't those “bad people” be satisfied they ask themselves?

And now we have the answer for them – because unlike you privileged ones who were loved, they grew up without proper care and love.

And if a man or woman *of this kind* becomes a scientist, or in fact aspires to and attains any other kind of esteemed career or job, he or she is generally doing this to create feelings of self-worth and respect from others to compensate for these feelings of being unloved in childhood.

Certificates, medals, badges of honour, and memberships of esteemed societies are very important to this kind of person.

They don't have love, but they get *respect*, they feel they are superior beings due to their hard won achievements which place them *as they see it* over other men and women.

They are “professors”, they are “Ph Ds” – *doctors of philosophy*. What a grand title that really is!

They spend their time busily working hard, beavering away, trying to stack up their own self-importance and rise in worldly fame or position, because that is what unloved people do, seek self-aggrandizement.

Whereas people who are loved, are like the idle boy who sleeps in the hay stack chewing a straw, enjoying life, while all the vain fools toil needlessly to achieve goals that matter only to posterity, but not right now.

Of course, the “fool” one day decides to make his fortune and win the princess's hand in marriage, but he doesn't do this by working his fingers to the bone and being a *slave* like the mugs do, he does it by doing something absolutely remarkable, like solving a riddle no one else in the kingdom can.

He is a rock star like Eric Clapton or he is an artist like Dali, or even an author like Douglas Adams.

But the action of the vain unloved person in society, who becomes an atheist scientist, or merely an atheist without the detailed knowledge of science, is unceasing toil to win and maintain his place in society.

He had no “God” to support him, he achieved all by sheer hard work, by his own merit.

This in itself proves to him there was never any god, because if there was a god, he saw fit to make his life a misery, until he rose by his own efforts to escape his unjust lot.

But if there is no God, no afterlife, surely there is a problem. He might die at any moment, he might have all taken away from him, be “cut down like a flower.”

So what is the solution to such a problem that troubles the conscience of any truly honest, sensitive and rational woman or man?

The answer is *denial*.

Only the “here and now” exists. He says “I am a *success* in the here and now, and there is nothing else.”

He is feeding *emotionally* on plaudits, “honours” and back slapping from his colleagues, and if he is lucky he will even get a woman who will worship him and give him sexual pleasure and make him feel he is a great guy.

And nothing will shock him from this state unless the world becomes so hostile and dangerous that he sees his existence is uncertain on a daily basis.

And as we can see, that is what is happening now.

Gradually the walls in our glamorous and “safe” Western society are beginning to crack. In many parts of our Western towns and villages it is not safe to walk the streets.

There are crazed drug addicts who might burgle you and kill you even if you hide inside your house imagining you are safe.

There are crazy people with serious mental problems who attack people at random for no good reason.

There are animal rights and other extremists who may harass, attack or even murder you if you are doing some scientific research they disapprove of.

And of course, there are the political terrorists who blow people and office buildings up at random for some cause or another that you can never quite fathom.

Then, there are all these awful natural catastrophes and scary diseases which seem to come from nowhere in an ever increasing pace and are like those Hollywood disaster movies come true.

And finally, there are the weapons of mass destruction lying around somewhere, that we don't want, but somehow can't seem to get rid of, that are waiting to be used someday.

What is one to do?

The scientist by destroying the religions faith of the common man over the last one-hundred something years we would suggest has led us to this pass.

We would suggest, that the atheist scientist confesses this error he or she had made in denying the spiritual without any proof to say so.

We would suggest that scientists be humble, confess their ignorance, do not lie to the public about the extent of their knowledge and achievement, do not say there has been conclusive scientific proof of the non-existence of God, as for example Richard Dawkins does, when such a position is obviously not rational, lacking conclusive evidence one way or the other.

For let us look - as a final piece of evidence, at a September 2004 article in the esteemed British science journal *New Scientist*.

The mysteries of life

New Scientist vol 183 issue 2463 - 04 September 2004, page 24

From sex and sleep to ageing and aliens, there's still an awful lot we don't understand about the living world. But what are the biggest unanswered questions, and how close are we to solving them? Here are New Scientist's top 10, plus the experts' choice on page 30

1 How did life begin?

IN 1953 an iconic set of experiments showed that some of the chemical building blocks of life, such as amino acids, could form spontaneously in the atmospheric conditions thought to prevail on the primordial Earth. This gave rise to the idea that the early oceans were a "primordial soup" from which life somehow emerged.

The idea still holds a great deal of water, but 50 years on the details remain sketchy. It is still unclear, for example, how a primordial soup of simple molecules could give rise to today's system of DNA and proteins. It is a classic chicken-and-egg problem: DNA codes for the proteins that catalyse the chemical reactions that replicate DNA. How could one exist before the other?

One theory proposes that the first genomes were actually made of RNA. Like DNA, RNA consists of chains of nucleic acids, but due to its slightly different chemical properties, RNA can catalyse some reactions without the need for proteins. This self-sufficient RNA world could then have been superseded by our present DNA one.

Another idea currently in vogue is "metabolism first", in which the chemical reactions necessary to liberate energy and support life arose before self-replicating molecules did. According to one version of the model this could have started out at deep-sea hydrothermal vents with the formation of pyrite from iron sulphide and hydrogen sulphide.

Another bone of contention among biologists is how the basic chemical building blocks of life could have become sufficiently concentrated to meet, react and form more complex molecules such as proteins and nucleic acids. Researchers have speculated that the chemically "sticky" surfaces of certain minerals - clays are a particular favourite - could have been life's first incubator. Or alternatively it might have been droplets of seawater thrown into the atmosphere, or perhaps small chambers inside rocks.

One of the key issues is to work out when life began - do that and you have a better idea of the conditions under which it formed. Easier said than done. Some researchers think there are chemical signs of life in rocks 3.8 billion years old, a "mere" 0.2 billion years after the Earth became habitable. Others believe that signs of life do not show up until 2.7 billion years ago.

Yet another idea has it that life did not originate on Earth at all, but arrived from space cocooned in asteroids or comets. Experiments have confirmed that the basic chemicals of life, including amino acids, exist in space and that microorganisms could survive an interplanetary trip. But, wherever it came from, this still does not explain how life began in the first place.

Claire Ainsworth

2 How many species are there?

LIFE on Earth remains largely uncharted territory. In the two and a half centuries since Carl Linnaeus devised his system for naming and classifying organisms, scientists have formally described and named about 1.7 million species. (No one knows the exact number, because there is no central clearing house for this type of information.) Everyone agrees that many unknown species remain, but just how many is anyone's guess. Estimates range from 5 million to 100 million.

In the past couple of years, evolutionary biologists have begun to clamour for a Big Science project to provide an answer.

Not because the final count itself makes much difference, but because the real prize lies in understanding who lives where. That knowledge - woefully incomplete so far - forms the bedrock on which much of conservation biology, evolutionary biology and ecology are built.

So is it 5 million or 100 million species? Biologists have tried to get nearer an answer by extrapolating from detailed samples. More than 20 years ago, entomologist Terry Erwin of the Smithsonian Institution in Washington DC fogged 19 trees of one Panamanian rainforest species with insecticide and counted the insects that rained down. If other tree species hosted a similar number of insect species, he estimated the world might hold upwards of 30 million insect species alone. But more recently, researchers in New Guinea have shown that the same insects often feed on several different tree species, leading them to make a lower estimate of around 5 million insect species.

Microbes, though, are the real terra incognita. Just a few thousand species of bacteria have been described, largely because they are so featureless to the eye. But when geneticists compare gene sequences among a collection of microorganisms, they find vastly more diversity hidden there. Two years ago, Thomas Curtis of the University of Newcastle upon Tyne, UK, used this diversity to calculate that a single gram of soil might contain between 6400 and 38,000 species of bacteria, and a tonne of soil might hold as many as 4 million.

A better count of the world's biodiversity might at last be in the offing. Several groups are making plans to collect and classify species, using both molecular and more traditional physical characteristics, on a scale never attempted before. This mass-production approach should reveal the diversity of obscure groups as well as taxonomists' favourites. If the plans are put into practice, the question of how many species inhabit Earth may have a better answer in 20 years' time.

Bob Holmes

3 Are we still evolving?

HUMANS are not like other animals. We have contraceptives to control the number of children we produce, aspirations beyond reproduction, medicines to sustain life and postpone death, and the potential to engineer our own DNA. It is tempting to think that we have moved beyond the clutches of evolution. Tempting, but wrong.

Evolution is built on two cornerstones: heritable variation and selection. Plainly, humans vary. The source of that variation is genetic mutation, which still occurs at around the same rate today as it has throughout our evolution.

But what about selection? In the west we certainly seem to have wriggled free of natural selection. It is no longer just the fittest who survive and reproduce. Modern medicine allows people to overcome diseases and injuries that would once have killed them. Birth control and reproductive technology make reproduction a matter of choice, not adaptive quality. Likewise, the power of sexual selection has been blunted because the mass media has a strong influence on who we find attractive, and because "beautiful" people do not necessarily have the most children.

But that still leaves artificial selection, the force more usually associated with the domestication of animals and plants. Obviously, we do not systematically direct the evolution of our own genome in the way our ancestors did to produce high-yield wheat or miniature poodles, but there is a parallel: many human traits only exist because they have been selected for artificially. The invention of spectacles has allowed myopia to proliferate, dairy farming has given many adults the ability to digest milk sugar, and stone tools allowed our earliest ancestors to extend their physical abilities without evolving bigger muscles. These and countless other innovations have affected our gene pool.

Other forces are at work, too. Humans are changing the environment, altering the climate, filling the world with pollution and creating the conditions for new diseases to emerge - changes that are almost certainly driving human evolution.

And while we may think that genetic technology will give us control over our future, it may actually send human evolution in unexpected directions. It is hubris to think that we can engineer our genome to a particular end. We know so little about how our genes interact that any attempts at engineering sperm or eggs may well have unpredictable results. All we can say for sure is that our gene pool is changing, perhaps faster than ever. But where evolution will take us remains a mystery.

Kate Douglas

4 Why do we sleep?

THE average person spends a third of their life asleep, and going without it kills you quicker than starvation. Sleep seems to be fundamental in biology: all animals do it, and even cultured neurons in a Petri dish spontaneously enter a sleep-like state. Yet we don't know what sleep is for.

There are several ideas, of course, ranging from obvious ones about restoration and recovery to more elaborate theories dealing with memory processing. But none has been confirmed, and the only thing sleep researchers can agree on is that there is no satisfactory answer.

Part of the problem is that sleep comprises two very different states: rapid eye movement sleep (REM), when the eyes flick from side to side, the brain is very active and most dreaming occurs, and non-REM, which is a deeper state of unconsciousness. These are so

unlike one another that they surely cannot have the same purpose. But they are somehow intertwined. In natural sleep, non-REM is always followed by a bout of REM, so their functions are probably linked in some way.

Amid the confusion, one thing is clear - sleep is for the brain. One reason we know this is that animals sleep but plants do not. And other organs, such as muscles and liver, do not sleep. This might seem trivially obvious, but it was only this year that a large region of the brain called the cerebellum was shown to participate in sleep.

Armed with the knowledge that sleep is a whole-brain phenomenon, researchers are starting to unite behind the idea that non-REM sleep, at least, is when the brain makes good the damage done by free radicals, the toxic chemical by-products of metabolism. Other organs repair this damage by sacrificing and replacing injured cells, but this is not an option for the brain. So it switches itself off and, like a highway-repair team working at night, gets on with the job when things are quiet.

Several pieces of evidence have emerged to back this up. One is that animals with a high metabolic rate, and hence a faster rate of free radical damage, sleep more than those with a slow metabolism. Another is that the brains of sleep-deprived rats suffer unusually high levels of oxidative damage. And earlier this year gene-expression studies confirmed that the brain actively switches on genes involved in protein synthesis and membrane repair during sleep.

But what of REM? Some researchers have proposed that this is the brain booting up to test out the repairs it made during non-REM. Others suggest it has something to do with early brain development. But we don't really know. Looks like we'll have to sleep on it some more.

Graham Lawton

5 Is intelligence inevitable?

IT IS comforting to think of human intelligence as the pinnacle of evolution. But cast that anthropocentric snobbery to one side and consider this: intelligence is just another adaptation. It evolved because it is the best way to survive in a particular ecological niche.

Intelligence is evolution's answer to unpredictability. If an organism lives in an environment that is predictable then it can get by on instinct and hard-wired responses. But animals that live in shifting environments need to be flexible, they need to be able to weigh up new situations and act accordingly. That is where intelligence can come in handy.

But hang on, does that mean that once life appears, the evolution of intelligence is inevitable? It's not as simple as that. Natural selection only favours a trait if the benefits outweigh the costs. And there are some serious costs associated with intelligence. For a start, the brain is a gas guzzler. In humans it accounts for 20 per cent of our energy requirement, while making up just 2 per cent of our body mass. There is also the cost of being naive. A newborn animal with hard-wired survival responses will be at an advantage in some situations compared with one that must work out the best way to react. And intelligence seems to carry other as yet unidentified handicaps, as suggested by a study published last year showing that fruit flies bred

for braininess survive less well if food is scarce.

Nevertheless, during the evolution of life on Earth, the benefits of intelligence have undoubtedly outweighed the costs on many occasions. That is why even very simple animals often show behavioural flexibility that denotes a level of intelligence. But our own creative intelligence is qualitatively different. Is this type of intelligence inevitable?

Maybe. As well as being evolution's solution to unpredictability, intelligence creates unpredictability of its own through the complex behaviour it generates. So there is positive feedback. This is particularly strong where one animal's behaviour affects the survival of others - which might explain why intelligence is common in social animals such as bonobos and Caledonian crows.

Humans are the ultimate social animals. We manipulate the world to such an extent that we create our own fast-changing environment. But positive feedback is surely not the whole story. There must also be an element of serendipity involved. So, if you were to rerun the tape of evolution would the world inevitably end up with a creature with our unique blend of mental skills, from complex language and tool use to symbolism and morality? The odds against all of them coming together in one species, in less than 4 billion years of evolution, are extremely long. That is not to say it couldn't happen again, though, given enough time.

Kate Douglas

6 What is consciousness?

IT IS fairly easy to describe what consciousness feels like. Being conscious is all about being awake and aware, having a sense of self and a feeling of embodiment, of knowing the difference between you and the world around you. It is also about having a history or narrative made up of a continuous flow of thoughts, images and sounds - your stream of consciousness. But most importantly it is about how it feels to be you.

But herein lies the problem. Consciousness is a really difficult question for science, because it is entirely subjective. That is why the study of consciousness has long belonged in the realms of philosophy and religion. But now biologists, especially neuroscientists, are getting in on the debate. Some hope that brain imaging and electrical recording will reveal the "neural correlate of consciousness". That is, we should be able to find what is going on in the brain when people are conscious, but not while they are unconscious.

Researchers are making progress with this. But it is still not at all clear what it is about brain activity that makes us conscious. There is certainly no single brain area that is active when we are conscious and quiet when we are not. And there doesn't seem to be a simple threshold of neuronal activity above which we are conscious, nor a type of activity or neurochemistry that always accompanies consciousness.

But even if you accept that consciousness is something that comes from the brain (and not quite everyone does), and you find a pattern of brain activity that correlates with a conscious experience, there is still a problem. Why should the activity of a mass of neurons feel like

anything? Why does pricking your finger feel like pain? Why does a red rose appear red?

This has been dubbed the "hard problem" of consciousness, and some people have tried to explain it away by calling it an emergent property of active networks of neurons - in other words, something that arises from the interactions between these neurons, but which is not found in the neurons by themselves. That, however, seems a bit of a cop-out. What is more, this "explanatory gap" has attracted a number of oddball theories proposing weird quantum states that produce consciousness, mathematical explanations as to why synchronous oscillating brain waves may be the key, and so on.

Some say that the gap will never be bridged because our brains are ill-equipped to understand their own consciousness. And some researchers argue that consciousness is just an illusion anyway.

Helen Phillips

7 What is sex for?

SEX sells, and not just in popular culture. Biologists have been fascinated with it for more than 100 years and there's no danger of them losing interest.

Why sex? Surely there is no mystery there - the reason 99.9 per cent of multicellular species reproduce sexually is because it is the best way of passing on your genes while ensuring there is plenty of variation in the next generation. But this argument has a fundamental flaw, which is the immediate and short-term wastefulness of sexual reproduction.

Imagine a population of fish living in a lake and competing for limited food. The fish reproduce sexually so each new generation contains both females and males, all competing for the same resources. Now imagine that one fish discovers how to reproduce asexually. All her offspring are females, and in time they will all produce their own female offspring, without the wasteful need for males. In just a few generations the descendants of this single fish will outnumber their sexual rivals and drive them to extinction. In the day-to-day battle for survival, sex is a seriously losing strategy.

In the long term, of course, this does not hold true. Without sex to shuffle the genetic pack, species accumulate harmful mutations and quickly go extinct. The majority of asexual species last only a few tens of thousands of years. But this is not a satisfactory explanation for the near-ubiquity of sex. Natural selection doesn't care what happens many generations into the future. To win the day, sex must confer benefits right here, right now. And that's where things get sticky.

How does sex win? There have been dozens of suggestions, most of them focusing on its ability to generate variety. Because the environments in which species live can vary so much in space and time, the argument goes, only those that can adapt rapidly survive. One of the most popular versions of this idea concerns the never-ending arms race between hosts and parasites. Problem solved. Except that no one has been able to prove that this accounts for the overwhelming dominance of sex in nature.

Perhaps there is a way out of this conundrum. Sex may be

everywhere not because it confers short-term advantages, but because it is difficult to give up once it has evolved. Some biologists believe that the type of cell division that gives rise to sperm and eggs evolved very early in the history of life and was only later incorporated into reproduction. They argue that sex is etched so deeply into life's operating system that abandoning it is all but impossible. It is a promising answer, but not a complete one. In some ways all it does is transfer the mystery to another area: how sex evolved in the first place. And that one will keep us guessing for at least another 100 years.

Graham Lawton

8 Can we prevent ageing?

NO ONE seriously believes they can live forever, but most people would gladly forego the tribulations of ageing. The problem is, we don't know enough about why ageing occurs to be able to intervene.

The orthodox view is that ageing is due to an accumulation of random damage. Among the main suspects for inflicting this damage are free radicals, toxic by-products of the chemical reactions that release energy from food.

Some researchers are testing this idea by developing anti-ageing strategies based on fighting free radicals. Vitamins and natural antioxidants in food seem to help, a fact that has led to a buoyant food-supplement industry. Another school of thought is that simply eating less will cut the number of free radicals produced over a lifetime. Semi-starved mice can live up to half as long again as well-fed animals. Some people are trying this out on themselves by permanently cutting their calorie intake by up to a third. A recent small study showed this strategy does seem to improve cardiovascular health, but its long-term effectiveness is unknown, and few people want to feel hungry and tired most of the time.

An alternative view of ageing is that it is a programmed degeneration that evolved to reduce competition with offspring. Supporters of this theory point to recent research showing that knocking out a gene called *daf-2*, or its equivalents, makes worms, flies and even mice live longer. The gene encodes a hormone receptor that controls numerous functions, suggesting this pathway is the "master switch" of programmed ageing. But a gene could affect ageing without having evolved specifically to cause it, so the *daf-2* findings remain compatible with the random-damage theory.

However it is interpreted, *daf-2* is sparking a good deal of excitement in longevity research, as it suggests there may be a relatively simple way of boosting lifespan. Of course, what works for animals will not necessarily work for people. But it's a good sign that the pathway exists in mice.

Steven Austad of the University of Idaho in Moscow certainly thinks so. He famously bet a colleague \$500 million that someone living in 2001 would still be alive and sentient by 2150. "I'm feeling very good about my bet," he says.

Clare Wilson

9 What is life?

IT SEEMS such a simple question. After all, we know life when we see it, don't we? But just try to pin down a precise definition.

We can certainly describe what living things do, but that is not enough. For example, living things take in nutrients and excrete wastes, but so do cars. Living things replicate and participate in evolution, but so do certain computer programs, while some life forms such as mules and post-menopausal women do not. The best minds of biology and philosophy have tried for decades, and failed, to agree on a universal set of criteria for life on Earth, or wherever else we might find it.

If you took a vote today, the most popular definition would probably be the one proposed 10 years ago by Gerald Joyce of the Scripps Research Institute in La Jolla, California. He describes life as a self-sustaining chemical system capable of evolving through Darwinian natural selection. This definition captures the essence of life on Earth, but critics worry that, broad as it is, it may not be broad enough to encompass absolutely everything we would want to call life.

The reason the task is so difficult is that we only have one example to work with. All life on our planet is descended from common ancestry, so no one knows whether its fundamentals - membranes, proteins, carbon-based biochemistry and the like - are necessary, or merely accidents of history. As some experts have noted, it is a bit like trying to generalise about what makes a mammal when you only have a zebra. We need a second, alien life form for comparison.

And we might have one within a few years, not from another planet, but from test tubes here on Earth. Several groups are trying to synthesise life from scratch, and some of their efforts bear little resemblance to our familiar life forms. One under development by Steen Rasmussen at Los Alamos National Laboratory in New Mexico, for example, is based on fat droplets rather than watery, membrane-bound cells. Another, by the Venice-based company ProtoLife, aims to repeatedly select the most "life-like" features from a chemical smorgasbord, essentially letting life reinvent itself. If either of these efforts succeeds, we may suddenly gain a totally new perspective on what it means to be alive.

Bob Holmes

10 Is there life on other planets?

TOUGH one. So let's rephrase the question: do you want there to be? If your view is that there is something special about the Earth, then there is plenty of scientific scope for saying the answer is no, there is no evidence of life on other planets. If, on the other hand, you do not subscribe to the idea that a pale blue dot in a humble corner of an ordinary galaxy should be bestowed with such significance, there is evidence, of a kind, for you too.

But it's not just a matter of taste or opinion. The UK's Astronomer Royal, Martin Rees, considers this the most important question facing science today.

Finding an answer comes down to resolving the issue of how - and how easily - life gets started in the first place. Is it a freak event, or an inevitable consequence of the laws of physics? As yet, we don't know.

Of course, science abhors a vacuum, and so scientists have formed opinions based on whichever set of proofs they like the sound of. Asking for the received wisdom is rather like asking what length a skirt should be. A couple of decades ago, the fashionable opinion was that life is pretty hard to kick off, and thus probably not widespread beyond Earth. These days it is more in vogue to say that life is inevitable, and the universe is probably crawling with living things.

What has changed, scientifically speaking, in those 20 years? Very little. But using the mathematics of probability to reach your conclusions happens to be all the rage. Given the vastness of the universe, the diversity of its environments, and the fact that life has certainly evolved once, you can argue that the chances are pretty small that Earth is the only place life exists.

The fact remains, however, that the search for extraterrestrial intelligence (SETI) operating out of the SETI Institute headquarters in Mountain View, California, has found nothing conclusive in 40 years. And Tau Ceti, a star system that was considered a frontrunner to host life, was recently declared too comet-ridden. Even if we discover life on Mars we cannot draw any conclusions because the Red Planet regularly trades rocks with Earth.

Anyway, what kind of life do we mean? We don't know whether we should be looking for the carbon-based life so familiar on Earth, or some other form. And if we can't agree on a definition of life, and what it might need to evolve and exist, the argument just gets woollier and woollier. So, at the moment, it all seems to boil down to a different question: do you want us to be alone?

Michael Brooks

The experts' choice

Although *New Scientist* came up with the 10 questions presented here, we wanted to know what the experts think. So we canvassed some of the world's leading biologists. Here is a selection of the answers we received:

Chris Stringer

Palaeoanthropologist at the Natural History Museum in London, UK. He is known for his work on the "Out of Africa" theory of human origins

"I think the biggest unanswered question in biology is whether life is unique to Earth. Evidence from Mars may help to answer this question, even in the next few years. As for my own field, I think the biggest question is: what was the last common ancestor of humans and chimpanzees like? Knowing the answer would help solve many questions about our origins. I would also like to discover the key factors that led to the success of our species. Why are we here and not people like the Neanderthals?"

Tom Kirkwood

Gerontologist at the University of Newcastle upon Tyne, UK. He

proposed the "disposable soma" theory of ageing

"Why are people living longer and longer at the moment? What we are seeing is something quite extraordinary. In the 20th century, life expectancy began to climb for all the obvious reasons, such as improved healthcare, vaccines, antibiotics and sanitation. Since most of these measures stop people from dying young, everyone predicted that the rate of increase in life expectancy would plateau as the benefits of keeping young people alive pushed up average lifespan. But the rate has not slowed. What seems to be happening now is that we are beginning to change the nature of old age itself. What is driving this and how far will it go?"

Simon Conway-Morris

Professor of evolutionary palaeobiology at the University of Cambridge. He is known for his work on the early evolution of animals, particularly the fossils of the Burgess shale

"One big question concerns convergent evolution - the finding that life comes up with remarkably similar solutions to the same problem more than once. The camera eye is a good example. What is it that makes life navigate towards particular solutions? Is there a deeper pattern or set of principles at work, some kind of underlying "landscape" across which life is forced to move? If we could discover that landscape, we would have a general theory of evolution."

Frans de Waal

C. H Candler Professor of Primate Behavior at Emory University in Atlanta, Georgia. He studies social intelligence in apes and monkeys

"I want to understand why we empathise with others, and why we do so automatically. A one-day-old baby already cries when it hears another baby cry, and few adults keep a dry eye while watching a sad movie. Our closest relatives, the great apes, show similar emotional sensitivity. It must mean that we are programmed to be highly cooperative. People seem to interact against a background of emotional connectedness, the evolution of which biology has not even begun to explain."

Susan Greenfield

Professor of pharmacology at the University of Oxford and director of the Royal Institution of Great Britain. She is particularly associated with research into neurodegenerative diseases

"I think the biggest unanswered question is how the brain generates consciousness. It is the question I would most like to solve and the one I would tackle if I were starting out again. In my own field, I think the key question is what is the critical mechanism triggering Alzheimer's disease?"

It is clear from reading the above article, that science, despite its great achievements is in no way as “all knowing” as some scientists like Professor Dawkins and to some extent physicists like Stephen Hawking like to make out.

The above confession by the UK’s leading and respected popular science journal *New Scientist* (i.e. the equivalent of the US *Scientific American* magazine) is really staggering in its admission of ignorance upon *the major issues* of all times, though this particular list has not even touched on the “origin of the universe” question, which also is still under debate, with the current thinking favouring “the Big Bang Theory” first suggested by George Gamow.

The trouble with modern science in particular is that its practitioners have the habit of deciding that when they have made some new discovery they have found “the final answer”, or are just a mere step away from discovering the “ultimate.”

But a few years down the line, somebody comes up with some unexpected “finding” which rocks the current theories, which they previously imagined to be the ultimate picture of reality.

Science has indeed made some marvellous advances, but we find that is it often far more flawed and uncertain in its theories than the scientists like to admit.

Throughout the history of science, amongst the advances, have been some nearly shameless efforts to get the facts to fit the favoured theory at all costs.

In particular, a large mass of scientists reject and label “heresy”, what others consider to be proven fact such as Bell’s “action at a distance” quantum physics experiment, in which two particles are apparently proven to be interacting with one another *instantly*, beyond the effect of any force or field science has ever previously encountered, which it has long been assumed since Einstein has the maximum potential of operating at the speed of light.

We were told by Einstein and convinced up until the Bell experiment, that nothing could travel faster than the speed of light, and that such instantaneous “action at a distance” was impossible.

But it seem now even Einstein has been overturned by Bell’s work.

Additionally, the *wave-particle duality* problem – i.e. is light a wave or a particle? – has also not been conclusively solved by science.

The Bell experiment however seems to say something very deep about our universe, our reality, and when we combine it with Heisenberg's Uncertainty Principle, which says we can never know *both* the mass and velocity of any particle in the universe, this all suggests that the dream science once had of predicting the behaviour of reality with a set of equations or formulae is a pure fantasy.

Then Godel's work in mathematics, has cast doubt even upon the certainty of our logical and mathematical processes.

So *rational* science is riddled with uncertainty regarding *the ultimate questions*, and if Godel is right, perhaps always will be.

Another problem we have touched upon, is the mass of information which is coming from all the research department of the colleges and universities all over the world, that is ultimately mostly unusable.

Thousands of new research papers are published every week, that are only known to and understood by a handful of people in the world, and on the whole are destined to make absolutely zero impact on it.

But we have a broader criticism to level at science, especially of the social kind, which as we have mentioned is this *escape into abstraction*.

There are desperately serious world problems all around us, but we can use our intellect to produce endless plausible but ultimately unworkable solutions to them, and then the problems get not better but worse.

For example, we have the growing fascination with ADHD or ADD (Attention Deficit Disorder) which many *children* with "learning difficulties" are being "diagnosed" with.

So they get given a drug or whatever, to deal with a problem that likely simply exists because of the deeply unnatural way that children are being brought up – i.e. not properly supported by the constant presence of a trusted parent, and subjected to stimulations – e.g. being sat in front of 24 hr TV with almost stroboscopically quick changes of scene, like witnessing *from the inside* some kind of mad drug crazed episode.

Or children are strapped in car seats with a dummy shoved in their mouth to keep them happy, and driven hundreds of miles round the road and so on.

When you are a little baby, it's very *scary* and over-stimulating to be rattled round a supermarket in a truck, but you can't complain too much about it when you have a dummy shoved in your mouth, can't speak anyway and in any case are in fear of your life at this strange busy place you have been unwillingly made to circuit round.

Of course mothers in general don't remotely realise that these kind of frantic environments can harm a young child with too much activity going on and too unpredictable an environment.

For have we not noticed for example how babies react to a stranger with great anxiety?

As adults we can feel quite scared being in a strange place with people we don't know, so how do we think a helpless child is going to feel?

Above all of course, the most critical factor in a child's early development is that it must have the security of one *constant, familiar, loving, gentle* presence, i.e. generally speaking *its mother*.

If its usual "carer" - i.e. mother - is suddenly whisked away to work, or a party or wherever, and it has to deal with another far less predictable presence, what is that going to do its psyche over time?

It is going to create insecurity.

If the carer is as good or even better than the mother, that *might* not be a problem, but how does the mother *know* what happens when she isn't there?

There are a thousand ways parents can get it wrong - the raising of children - and it isn't too difficult to see the consequences all around us in the damaged people we daily meet and see.

But instead of giving this vital patient and consistent care to young children up to the age of at least seven, and preferably ten or eleven, we wake up to the fact that something is wrong with our child - it can't cope with school or lessons or whatever.

And because the last thing we want to accept is that it's *our fault*, we go to a doctor or "psychologist" and then they relieve our minds by saying, "Oh, here's another case of ADD. Here are some drugs we believe will increase your child's concentration and improve its behaviour."

The same is true of teenage delinquent behaviour and the treatment of adult criminals is going the same way.

This is a "behavioural problem" they say, so we need *treatment plans*, drugs and "therapies." But they don't work any more than the present ideas are treating the problem of bullying in schools.

The time tested methods of centuries must return.

Parents must devote themselves to their children until they are well-formed fledgling adults, and if they don't wish to do so, then they simply *should not have* children until they do.

Children are *not* a fashion accessory to be bought and put in a safe place and taken out and used only when it's "show time."

They require the greatest hard work that a human being can give, because they are the future.

Michelangelo gets to paint the ceiling of the Sistine Chapel, he goes through "agony and ecstasy" to get it right. That is what we have to do with our children if we too want to produce *a work of art*, rather than just another confused teenager ready to be medicalized, snapped up by the psychiatry industry, and drugged and "therapized."

So why are we making such a fuss about this issue here?

Because the "glory and adventure" and false feeling of empowerment that is coming from the scientific community towards itself and to the general public is happening at the expense of our humanity.

We can build an atom bomb, but we can't make world peace. We can see into the deepest darkest oceans, and far reaches of outer space, but we can't look ourselves in the mirror, and see into one another's hearts.

We can make supercomputers, which we imagine one day will even think creatively – though they likely *won't*, they will just be world chess champions and ever more sophisticated information and process control

systems – but we can't make our personal relationships with our neighbours, spouses and children work.

We feel we are approaching understand of the creation of the universe, but we can't understand and control our own negative and savage emotions, such as envy, anger, inappropriate passions and hate.

The question above all we should surely ask is not enough asked - is science creating a better or worse world?

Thus if we are doing any science that is making the world better, let us continue it. But if we are not, then let us please stop.

For example, modern dentistry is wonderful, and the kind of plastic surgery that can right a major deformity is also a great good; but what of the sort that will presumably end up with all men looking like a slimmed-down square-jawed version of Arnold Schwarzenegger, or have all women looking like a Barbie Doll or Jennifer Anniston clone?

So here, we have presented a new perspective, which is equally really an old one. In fact ancient.

What is the purpose of our lives?

Surely to grow as human beings, to become beautiful people, especially on the inside, rather than just the outer shell.

Because the state of bliss promised by the prophets and saints – which surely due to too many unexplained ancient and modern accounts, science must take seriously and investigate – is part of all our lives to some degree already, but just needs to be nurtured and intensified.

Surely the first task and goal therefore is not to meddle with the fundamental forces in the material world, but to gain mastery over ourselves, rid ourselves of our savage emotions, and establish personal and global peace on that basis.

And this has to be done by looking at the psychological, moral and social issues in our world in a rational but compassionate way.

Surely we have to make certain no one suffers needlessly on our planet, and surely the first step in that is to solve the needless international

disputes and feed those who starve when there is plenty of food to go round.

Let the Muslims and the Jews *share* their Holy Shrines. Surely they both agree there is only one God, so how can they be enemies, how can the differing forms of their rituals and creeds divide people who should all be batting on the same team?

Clearly, it is not religious philosophy at all – whatever the mischief makers may allege – but a power game that is only using religion as the excuse, like the “Christians” in Northern Ireland, who all claim to worship the same Christian God, but somehow are still fighting.

Clearly, they are of course not fighting over *religion* at all – as usual, it is just power – lands, privileges, jobs, territories, vanity of one tribe claiming superiority to another.

Thus let us please drop once and for all this idea that any race is greater than another as the great and good have come from all races in all ages.

So we have to set our course as not to live in abstraction, unconnected to our daily reality, but to understand ourselves, as we have explained in our earlier work *How to Meditate*.

And in that process, we can it appears find solutions *in a general way* to the problems that still baffle science and perhaps always will to some degree.

For we are saying, based on our own limited experience, but moreover on that of countless saints, prophets and so on of many countries and eras, both Western and Eastern, that life is not in essence *material*, but is the expression of *intelligence*, just as the Universe is also not in essence material, but the expression and embodiment of an unlimited *consciousness*.

Thus, we have in this work or others more or less answered all the *fundamental questions* posed by our *New Scientist* journalists – which science here by its own admission has yet failed to do – according to this theory of Universal Intelligence and Consciousness, which as we have said, expresses itself through the human being in the form of the kundalini mechanism and its superintelligent vehicle of *prana* energy.

In conclusion to our work therefore, let us state or restate them and briefly *answer* them in this philosophical, yet *in so far as we may ever be able*, also in a *rational, scientific* way.

1 How did life begin?

Life was created by a Universal Intelligence. In fact, in a sense life was “never” created. It always was and will be, because the only true “living reality” is that universal intelligence, which is a non-material consciousness, awareness, not dependent on any other thing, and therefore popularly known as “God.” The life on this planet and no doubt countless others was and is merely an expression of the infinitely subtle operations of this God, which incidentally is not distinct from us, but clearly because of its all inclusive nature we are *part of*. There was never any “random factor” in genetic mutation. Just a supreme intelligence playing in its own way – creating galaxies, planets, life forms out of nothing, or rather out of an infinite, timeless, formless consciousness.

2 How many species are there?

Well on the one hand, who cares, why not let’s just enjoy them? But on the other hand, the scientists say above they have already catalogued 1.7 million and that it may be as much as 100 million. Does anybody really think that all these different species and more could have evolved on our planet in such a short few millions of years by “random chance”?

3 Are we still evolving?

According to the kundalini theory, we certainly are. It is our brains, the increasing subtlety of which will bring the entire race to “higher states of consciousness” as experienced by saints and enlightened beings like Buddha, Christ, Mohammed, Ramakrishna and so on. Read Gopi Krishna’s autobiography “Kundalini, the Evolutionary Energy in Man” for a modern first hand description of such an evolutionary transformation.

4 Why do we sleep?

In our other works we have explained how sleep acts as a reparative and psychological balancing mechanism, via in the former case the deep dreamless sleep and in the latter case, via the REM dreaming sleep. Sleep is also the principle time that the transformative activity of kundalini is

greatest, and this is reflected in the widespread phenomena of men developing erection during sleep, which is a side effect of the working of the sexual organs in creating the prana that is sent up to the brain. This erection is routinely mistaken for being caused by sexual dreams, but occurs regularly without any sexual dream whatsoever.

5 Is intelligence inevitable?

As the universe itself is the product of an intelligent consciousness, rather than being only a randomly created consequence of “dead lifeless matter” or of even “a blind watchmaker”, of course intelligence is inevitable because it is the Nature of the universe itself. Intelligence is reflected in all the known laws of Nature, and the many yet to be discovered, and we are therefore illogical to imagine it is just a human or animal phenomenon.

6 What is consciousness?

The individual consciousness is merely a spark of the universal consciousness functioning through an individual nervous system. If there were no universal consciousness, there surely could not be any individual consciousness. Either the universe in general is conscious, or else it should surely all be dead and unconscious, whether animate or not. That is to say, that in reality there is only one consciousness which animates the whole universe, but it appears to us to be separate which must therefore be an illusion. Those who have reached a higher state of consciousness, such as Gopi Krishna report that the Universe and world around them is no longer experienced as a material thing, but as a vast, immeasurable consciousness. Thus consciousness is seen to be the *a priori* constituent or “first cause” of the Universe, not matter, which is merely its instrument, and which the universal consciousness apparently creates from a vacuum.

7 What is sex for?

It is clearly a means for the universal consciousness to create life forms which reflect different degrees of its own consciousness. Sexual attraction is based on genetic desirability. Through sex we have created more and more evolved beings and this process is continuing to its ultimate limits, whatever they may be.

8 Can we prevent ageing?

Whether we can prevent it completely is not currently knowable, though would seem to defy what seems to be a natural occurrence in all known species. But by the judicious use of our sex energy, i.e. sexual moderation, we can prolong life and also prolong the quality of life far beyond the current lifespan. The kundalini theory explanation of this, is that some of the sex energy if not used for reproduction goes back into the bloodstream and heals and rejuvenates the body generally. If this process of healing and rejuvenation is starved by excess sex for long periods, then we will experience a premature and debilitated old age.

9 What is life?

Life is an expression of the universal consciousness in any of numberless increasingly complex and sophisticated ways. Life is the universal consciousness “at play.” In that sense, rocks and stars can be said to be alive, in the sense that this universal consciousness must be at work in them all, and not just in the life forms which we categorize as such.

10 Is there life on other planets?

If it is a universal intelligence that is at work in our universe and therefore galaxy, and not merely “dead”, “lifeless”, “unaware” matter that has somehow come together by random chance, then surely the galaxy and universe must be teeming with countless life forms. Any other conclusion is clearly a form of unjustifiable vanity, and rejects the staggering statistical unlikelihood of our planet being unique in that respect.