

DISSERTATION OVERVIEW

FOR 'EPISTEMOLOGY
OF LIES WITHIN THE
PUBLIC SPHERE'



Hans Krauch

2017

Table of Contents

<u>TABLE OF CONTENTS</u>	<u>2.</u>
<u>INTRODUCTION</u>	<u>4.</u>
<u>CHAPTER 1.0 - INTRODUCTION TO THE ROLE OF PHILOSOPHY AND EPISTEMOLOGY</u>	<u>6.</u>
<u>CHAPTER 1.1 - BELIEF</u>	<u>7.</u>
<u>CHAPTER 1.2 - TRUTH</u>	<u>9.</u>
<u>CHAPTER 1.3 - JUSTIFICATION</u>	<u>11.</u>
<u>CHAPTER 1.4 - CONCLUSIONS/ON THE USE OF ETHICS</u>	<u>11.</u>
<u>CHAPTER 2.0 - ON HUMAN NATURE</u>	<u>13.</u>
<u>CHAPTER 2.1 - FREE-WILL</u>	<u>13.</u>
<u>CHAPTER 2.2 - CONCEPTS ON INFINITY</u>	<u>30.</u>
<u>CHAPTER 2.3 - FRACTAL BEHAVIOR IN HUMANS</u>	<u>31.</u>
<u>CHAPTER 2.4 - SUBJECTIVITY/OBJECTIVITY PARADOX</u>	<u>32.</u>
<u>CHAPTER 2.5 - RATIONAL IRRATIONALITY</u>	<u>35.</u>
<u>CHAPTER 3.0 - THE NATURE OF LIES</u>	<u>38.</u>
<u>CHAPTER 3.1 - DEFINITIONS AND GENERAL CONCEPTS</u>	<u>38.</u>

<u>CHAPTER 3.2 - LIE DETECTION – ART OR SCIENCE? PHILOSOPHICAL IMPLICATIONS AND THE APPLICABILITY OF MIND-ALTERING SUBSTANCES</u>	<u>41.</u>
<u>CHAPTER 3.3 - PROPAGANDA</u>	<u>47.</u>
<u>CHAPTER 3.4 - RAISON D'ÊTRE</u>	<u>54.</u>
<u>CHAPTER 4.0 - THE PUBLIC SPHERE</u>	<u>59.</u>
<u>CHAPTER 4.1 - OUTLINING CONCEPTS</u>	<u>59.</u>
<u>CHAPTER 4.2 - CULTURE</u>	<u>69.</u>
<u>CHAPTER 4.3 - ECONOMICS</u>	<u>75.</u>
<u>CONCLUSION</u>	<u>79.</u>
<u>PRINCIPLE CONTRIBUTIONS</u>	<u>80.</u>
<u>CHANGES MADE TO THE ORIGINAL DISSERTATION</u>	<u>82.</u>
<u>LIST OF PUBLICATIONS</u>	<u>82.</u>
<u>BIBLIOGRAPHY</u>	<u>83.</u>

Introduction

What follows ought to be a rather thorough review of the concepts and revelations available in my complete dissertation. Nothing would have been more enjoyable than to focus on a small point of philosophical inquest and expand on it in great detail – but unfortunately for the fine points I wished to make relies on a clear understanding of some very basic philosophical positions, like ideology or culture, that are (and most likely always will be) under fierce debate of what means what.

The positions and comments made were out of necessity to avoid confusion, rather than a deliberate point of covering as much ground as possible. I realize a common trend amongst the history of philosophy, is that one produces a work, then needs to revisit and publish a series of revisions in response to the masses misunderstanding his or her own work. Worse yet, their work is unappreciated and unread until after the original author's death, so that they have no chance to set the record straight (Marx would be the greatest example of this, and the greatest example of what can go wrong if one is not alive to defend the integrity of their work).

I also realize such a thing is unavoidable, and in my very limited experience have had instances of my most clear citations and opinions still being argued against. That being said, it would be nice to walk away from this project with little or no steadfast disagreements, but in the case there are some, I wish it to be in such a manner as to improve the strength of the arguments held instead of destroying it altogether.

To be sure, instead of a feeling of 'getting everything off my chest', as it were, the work of the dissertation has only awarded me a feeling of something being unfinished. To properly and completely cover the topics I wish to discuss in full would require the length of several dissertations and years more work. Instead of it being thought of as a defining piece, all it has done was make so much more work to do apparent. Simply put, it sets the stage to move onward into the world of philosophy.

That being said, these very basic concepts ought to be understood entirely under what constitutes the public sphere, and how lies and the understanding of truth covers them. The overall theme of this thesis is disproving the notion of free-will under a nihilist framework and that illusions are a necessary and vital part of the human condition. Objectivity is narrowly defined and has much less to do with the human experience than we may have otherwise have understood it to be.

I have made an effort to reunite objectivity and subjectivity within the same sphere of truth, but give them clearly marked boundaries within that same sphere. Much effort is put towards defining and explaining these concepts as it relates to human behavior and then we can get to understand how we act en masse to deceive and manipulate others in a group environment.

Through-out the last few years studying at Sofia University, there have been several important revelations that became apparent to me and these I have incorporated them into the finished work. I do not expect anything radical or fundamentally challenging to the status-quo towards Continental Philosophy to be found within the finished work. I do not believe that philosophy is in any danger of disappearing, and also have no fear of being labeled unpopular or a trouble-maker. Philosophers throughout history (like Slavoj Zizek today, Freidrich Nietzsche or Karl Jaspers of yesteryear, or Erasmus of Rotterdam from the Early Modern Period) have given precedent to the pride that comes from being able to proudly state your own opinion no matter how unorthodox or unpopular it may make you. What further ado, what follows is some of the themes found throughout the dissertation itself.

Chapter 1.0 - Introduction to the Role of Philosophy and Epistemology.

We will cover the importance of the senses and the origin of our experiences and knowledge of the world around us. The purposes/definitions of philosophy are covered, including: epistemology, being, ideology, culture, belief, and knowledge. Introduction to the philosophical root of truth and lies is covered here. Why lies are important philosophically, what is the public sphere and introduction to ethics of lying and the morality within lies will be covered. What it means to be a philosopher and to philosophize will be introduced in this chapter. Also, we will go over why epistemology is the proper way to approach why we tell lies.

We will cover the idea that perception is imperfect, yet is all we have, so we may as well accept it as a part of being human. We will also cover at length that justified belief is not the same as knowledge. Introduction to the concept of infinity and finitude is covered as well. Introduction to the aesthetics as it relates to lies along with an explanation of the importance of awareness as it relates to epistemology, desire and knowledge is to be found in the first chapter. The importance of responsibility and an introduction to the concepts of ideology and language are here as well.

I mention at length the role of science in this matter. The truth of the matter is that science is not the only academic branch that searches for the 'what' within objective reality. The solution is not for philosophy to be absorbed into the boundaries of science. To make philosophy a science would mean to turn it into something it cannot be, although people confuse this all the time and we end up with strange religions like Humanism. We do not need to be accepted by science, but we need to accept science as an acceptable method of pursuing truth. What a strange concept we hold onto – on one hand so many of us wish philosophy to become a science, on the other they disdain science for being too limited. We just need to accept the limits of science and use what little evidence it may conjure up to the best of our abilities. Philosophy itself is based within reasoned knowledge and awareness of the world at large, not as a method of social control nor blind faith. We are not that different even though we are a world apart.

Why philosophy is revered as such a dangerous subject is because it threatens the concept that meaning and a complete and happy life are to be found outside our own backyards. The vacation salesman tells us that real experiences are to be found on a faraway beach instead of in the living

room with our families – the priest tells us that real experience is obedience to God. In order to become a complete person we are forced to give up meaning of what it is to be a person to someone else, someone with a vested financial interest in that someone else. We rely on the Other to give us meaning, and therein lies the original problem.

Some of the main sources used here are Hegel, Bonjour, Sartre, Nietzsche, Erasmus, and Audi. This is simply an introductory chapter, but still one that is necessary considering the points I wish to make in later chapters. The sources are well known and trusted and so using them has given me a very solid base to move forward to uncover most intricate aspects of human behavior. Now we move onto some introductory concepts and points covered throughout the first chapter.

Chapter 1.1 Belief

This sub-chapter deals with establishing a foundation of how belief and the formation of lies with the public sphere are made.

Knowing and believing are two worlds apart. Knowing something that may seem incredibly improbable is still infinitely more valuable, epistemologically speaking, than the most probable of justified beliefs. Why? Because we, as philosophers, value truth above all else. Belief is described as an attitude that something is true or false – it has no inherent moral or ethical valuation to it. Belief is more a reflection of culture or ideology than a mental representation of what actually is.

Belief directs us in all ways both true and false. When it drives us towards error, there are no obvious warning signs facing us down that road. Picture choosing a fork in the road – one leading to truth the other to falsehood – how can we tell one from the other? We may choose the well lit and safe looking road over the dark and narrow one – but the easy path isn't always the right one to take. Do we trust instruments? But instruments like the GPS has led more than one motorist to their death. The only sign the lucky few of us might get would be (other than those shouting at us from the wayside) – is that feeling in that pit of your stomach as you go over the

cliff. By then it may already be too late, but luckily not all error is fatal, and we can go back and start again.

When dogmatism and belief face annihilation in the face of objective reality, people tend to abandon objective reality for illusion. This is a core position I take in why I feel people need illusion in their lives. Like underlying language, people frame reality under ideology. Ideology crafts language, and language crafts our ability to understand the world around us. It is my firm conviction that the greatest minds in history were not spouting their religious beliefs through an intention to deceive the masses or themselves.

Their thoughts and reasons were all within the context of said ideologies being within the framework in which they were required to explain their reality as being a part of, thus showing language precedes knowledge. Ideology dictated the rules of the game. What made the greatest minds in history as great as they did was their timelessness – they were able to frame their positions in such a manner that every and all people could relate to it because it could transcend culture and observe the objective. For all their foibles they spoke to a truth shared by all peoples, transcending the particular nuances of the day.

Belief can also be thought of as a necessary filter (or by-product) of living within such a complex and chaotic world. We simply do not have the mental resources to actively think about everything we do. That being said, belief is not the same as desire. I may desire to be rich and powerful, but I have the belief that I do not have the skill-set nor capacity for action to accomplish that feat. Still, all of us act contrary to our beliefs if ideology counters this – for example we know that the odds of winning a lottery is astronomical, but many of us waste money on a ticket anyway. Why do we believe we will live until we are 95, but still buy health insurance? We do it because we have knowledge that people die all the time before they knew such a thing was about to happen. The wise will side on the side of knowledge over belief.

It was cited in the finished work that beliefs were static. This much is true as much as the clothes we are wearing do not shift – a t-shirt does not spontaneously change into a sweater because it gets colder outside. As soon as a belief no longer suits us, it ought to be expelled or replaced. If it is cold, we put on a sweater. Still, we may keep that t-shirt underneath just the same, just as we

still hold onto beliefs that are no longer satisfying our needs. But how is this different from knowledge, when it receives new input, it is modified to suit reality?

The secret lies in the nature of both truths – belief struggles to maintain itself in the wake of reality, while knowledge has no such ambition. Think of beliefs as a functioning system, something that is represented by cycles of birth and death, while knowledge as the more basic forces of the universe like gravity, mass and energy. It just is. We may not know why people die before their preferred time, we just know they do. Knowledge is neither alive nor dead, it exists as a possession, it just is. Belief is either alive or dead – we hold onto it, or it is replaced by another, or one spawns another, or buried below the surface. Now we move onto the sub-chapter regarding truth.

Chapter 1.2 - Truth

This sub-chapter deals with basic concepts as it relates to truth and its connection to using epistemology to understand lies within the public sphere.

Once starting down the road of falsehood, the only conclusion down that path can be false. Truth is not so easy, unfortunately. The road to truth is perilous and fraught with false turns and dead ends along the way. This can also mean that if you start with a true proposition, not everything that follows from it is necessarily truth. This brings us to the epistemic principle, which makes the very important distinction between something that cannot happen versus something that just did not/has not happened yet. Discussing the possible is a very important task of philosophy and one that is greatly unappreciated in contemporary academia.

That crash at the end of the road of error is objective reality correcting your incorrect belief. We expect, or ought to expect, that this cliff will be waiting for us all if we head down the path of false belief long enough. That realization that objective reality proved our belief wrong tells us that the problem began not halfway down the road or near the end – but from the very beginning. Also think of it as a dog you think is friendly. Once it bites your hand, that solves all doubt as to the truth of your belief. Every inch of pavement you took down that road of false belief was

false. Backtracking halfway then going forward again will not help – the only recourse is to choose another belief (road in this analogy) entirely.

One way to look at truth and falsehood is as a structure, like a building or vehicle. Let us take a physical object, an automobile for example, to represent truth. The physical object of the automobile is objectively real and objectively true. Belief, would be a person's drawing of that physical object. If they drew a picture that looked like the physical object, we can say the belief and objective reality correspond, and therefore a belief must be true (unless of course everyone goes to redefine what an automobile is, but let us not discuss this mess right now).

Economically speaking - the truth is a tangible, sell-able asset. In order to be able to tell the truth about something, one ought to be free of the negative consequences of that truth. This is why members of organized crime or other institutions like that do not allow their members to discuss what the leadership of those organizations are thinking or doing. If the truth got out and that truth (more often than not) threatens their credibility or reputation, or exposes weaknesses of that organization – then they may be accountable or liable and vulnerable to losing their positions of power.

It is common in nearly all organizations to sign a non-compete clause and disclosure agreement before entering into a contract of employment. The truth of how something is run is coveted highly. This is why we are only truly free and independent if we can speak our minds as we see fit. Freedom of speech is not a right to all, but a privilege of having no one to rely on and freedom of negative repercussions of saying what is on our minds. Much power rests in the hands of those clinging to illusions. Of course none of that implies freedom of will.

Chapter 1.3 - Justification

In this sub-chapter we will go over basic concepts on how we use forces like belief and our senses to come to conclusions on how we ought to understand the world around us.

We go over the Gettier problem and contemporary issues in epistemology along with an introduction to the concept of time and temporality - in addition to justified belief. We briefly cover types of evidence and the fundamentals of Social philosophy.

There are some beliefs we must hold onto even though we can never truly *know* them. I suppose other than the obvious beliefs about the past may include things we have never participated or witnessed – like we believe world war two ended in the year 1945 – though I was not there to witness it, I believe that was the date it ended. Thinkers like Audi would posit that all memory that is incorrect is considered memory belief. I would agree to that and add that I would put all memory under the category of belief – because it would be equal to the solution put forward in the Gettier problem, of which we will cover further in the dissertation.

Chapter 1.4 - Conclusions/Use of Ethics

In this sub-chapter we discuss why ethics is not a viable point of reference to truly understand lying or lies within the public sphere. I summarize the main points of the first three sub-chapters and set the introduction to further chapters.

Can we find within any relativist or attitudinal positions that will give us any knowledge on morality? Certainly not – because they give no certainty nor value to moral positions. Positions such as 'murder is wrong' and 'people ought to read what they please' are moral positions that have value – because we can back up those positions with reasons that contain things we value, like the sanctity of our own lives and freedom to pursue and expand our opinions of the world.

Where does moral knowledge reside then – in the Bible perhaps? It certainly is explicit on what is permitted and what is not – but that book is wrought with moral contradictions so that disqualifies it. There are no contradictions in knowledge. This will be explored in further detail in the first chapter and one that I will attempt to solve.

I conclude that morals are indeed determined to be, in almost all cases, culturally based, but the effects of those morals are present equally within all humans. I take the utilitarian point of view

that the rightness or wrongness of it should be gauged on its effects on the propensity and growth of the people. If they think taking medication is wrong, and that results in the death of someone, then we can say that moral position of that moral position violates the basic value of human life, and ought to be condemned. This is why I wish to prove a more utilitarian approach to morality a better position to take, and feel the research supports this.

These questions will be a central part to understanding why epistemology is the foundation of philosophy, while ethics (although very important) stems much further down the vine, as it were. Although I do not claim to solve this problem for good, I feel such a position is comfortably explained by adding the necessity of illusion within reality. Thus my meaning by an 'Epistemology of Lies'.

This completes our overview of Epistemology as it relates to belief, justification, truth, and ethics. Do I solve once and for all every position I put forward? Heavens no – because many of them put forward cannot be answered definitively with the information we have at our disposal now. It is time we move onto our chapter on human behavior.

This chapter is important because understanding human nature is fundamental in understanding why we need illusion and lies in our lives, and why in later chapters we can freely discuss larger matters of societies as a whole. I take the approach to this dissertation like the crafting of a pyramid. Epistemology is certainly the base, then we can move upwards to figuring out why we act the way we do, then understanding lies – then finally those lies within the Public Sphere.

Chapter 2.0 - On Human Nature

This is a brief introduction to further sub-chapters in the complete dissertation. I go into discussing the main point of each sub-chapter and explain why each one is relevant to the epistemology of lies within the public sphere.

Chapter 2.1 Free-Will

In chapter two we will go into discussing the fundamentals of Human Behavior. I do not mean for this chapter to be a regurgitation of an entry level psychology or anthropology class. I assume that our readers already have a working grasp of simple concepts like the Needs Pyramid and all that common sense. Philosophy delves deeper than these disciplines, but still I will take the risk of marrying some aspects of those disciplines back into philosophy as it directly relates to the complicated web of behaviors and experiences that go to form deception that lies within the public sphere.

Behavioral science within human beings is, in many ways, not so much a real science in that it can be reproduced in a lab, but relies on very narrow sample rates and ought to never give a direct cause/effect conclusion. Neuroscientists like to pretend that entire civilizations can be isolated and studied like rabbits in a cage – but too bad for them in a global world such a thing is not possible. Still, they do come up with some very interesting bits of information from time to time that we ought to take seriously.

That being said, we can never know for certain how one turns out. For example, one ought never to say that growing up in a poor environment (lacking in love, food or shelter) will result in the child growing up to be a criminal. Also, one who has genes commonly associated with violent or psychopathic criminals does not mean one will end up murdering people or committing violent crimes. I will show that certain genes activate in certain environments, and that what drives our behavior is a chaotic mess of dialectical variables that can never be fully understood or predicted. This is not to show us the end of the philosophical road towards understanding human behavior, only to show that a new road opens before us. A road with no inherent meaning, with no guarantee of certainty – but the only one we have.

I have tried to take inputs from all aspects of what makes up the human-being (because, as philosophers, we are mostly interested in 'the thinking ape', correct?). As philosophers, we cannot ignore the fact of our unique genes and their associated behaviors, that the environment we find ourselves (be it cultural, or economical, etc.) manipulates us, in addition to understanding the nature of consciousness – because all of it is intertwined. Only the ignorant would think they are compartmentalized and isolated from all other behavioral inputs.

By now we should have in our minds a basic concept of what constitutes truth and knowledge so it is safe we move onto how people process these concepts. We need to understand the phenomenology of epistemology, as it were and by covering the fundamentals of human nature we will begin to move further to discussing the specifics of these man made phenomenon of culture and ideology.

In this chapter we will discuss free will and the mental concept of infinity and with it consciousness itself. An overarching theme in the dissertation which is introduced here is discussing why the Enlightenment failed. That fact is taken for granted by myself, and although others have wrote at length about why and how the Enlightenment failed, it is still unfortunately largely unknown today among both academics and lay persons (who have even heard of it).

It is not my intention to expand nor add much of value to these works (their reasons for why the Enlightenment failed have convinced me enough), simply to point where the failure of the Enlightenment has contributed to our public behavior and for Epistemology today. Human beings are known to remember mistakes of the past from time to time and the lessons of the Enlightenment are alive and well in those aware enough to see it. So, when we read the finished dissertation, this is a frame of mind we must have so it is written in the context of a post-Enlightenment world. That being said, not all Enlightenment values are lost on us as of yet, so let us not discount all of the lessons and values put forward by that movement. It is more of a ghost that haunts us, rather than a living thing that guides us.

We will discover in this chapter that we are simple social animals and so many of the traits we exhibit can be understood within this frame. The main question to be answered here is 'Are we

meat robots?' The line from sensory input to actual decision making is discussed at length here. We will look more into Epistemology as it relates directly with human behavior.

The main sources discussed here are the works of Pavlov, Bakunin, Hegel and Nietzsche. Either of these thinkers were far ahead of their time and their inputs put under a contemporary perspective make for a point of view of human nature that proves better at understanding ourselves than what can ever be offered by science.

Still, as I will repeat (as it bears repeating) we ought not to abandon the good works of science, just acknowledge where their limits lie. By embracing science into our folds, science will ask for us. Philosophy will always be relevant to itself, but if we wish for it to return to the glory days of it being the master of the academics then it will need to help it's children when in need. In fact, many areas of science today are begging for Philosophy's help – most notably in the areas of particle physics.

One unique phenomena is how a particle can teleport itself from one part of space to another, exist in two places at once, and what would become of us if we could teleport ourselves from one part of the world to another instantly – would we still be the same person if we exchanged one pile of atoms for another but maintained the same phase and composition as before? That is certainly not a topic to be covered in this paper, but maybe by understanding more about our nature we can begin to start answering these questions posed to us from science.

Anyway, just as there are to those who try to understand the nature of man, those same people are faced with the huge number of variables that force us to be who we are and so we give up the idea of trying to understand it. The truth is too hard to understand so we cling to lies. This 'giving-up' is this concept of free will. It is an appeal to the unknown, just as everything just beyond the capacity of man to know is given to the realm of the supernatural and that is why we need to cover the concept of infinity.

Understanding our need to abandon things we cannot know, we find refuge in illusion and therefore are innately accepting of deception. This is an important revelation in my dissertation because, in my research, most scholars are approaching lying from a moral standpoint and in

doing so fail to understand why people lie, or why such a thing is an inevitable behavior in human beings. We need lies, to lie and to be lied to.

To predict our every reaction to every action would require us to have knowledge of how every variable past and future will affect us – and in this closed chaotic universe such a prediction is, at this moment, something I cannot imagine us as being able to figure out. Maybe we will, some day, but on that I do not know. Neither can we use the scientific method to determine such a thing because we cannot turn back time to reproduce the exact scenario to see if the same thing will happen as before. But determinism will tell us that if we were able to do so and if we turned back the clock to the exact situation and moment a decision is made, we would do that same thing ad infinitum. In every conceivable universe, Napoleon would always have invaded Russia in winter, Michelangelo would have carved his 'David' without a Goliath, and Donald Trump will always have had terrible hair.

My undergraduate degree was in History, and have learned that History solely focuses on the what and the why – never the 'what if'. This 'what-if' is the basis of our concepts of free-will. This is not the same as discussion as the possible – as that discusses the 'what may be.' Perhaps this background has fueled my position that free-will is not important, because the 'what-if' is not important (other than for some idle musings).

Perhaps why person Y believes in free-will because they were taught to cherish the 'what-if' over 'what-is'. Well, some people do focus on the 'what-if', but these 'what-ifs' are not considered important because we do not currently live in the world of 'what-if'. We live in the world of what may be, and Hegel among other philosophers have seen this as the understanding that we can adapt to a changing and chaotic universe to become better persons – better at dealing with the change as it faces us.

This adaptation is (among other things) a matter of our genetic programming. Because I am here today writing about how understanding our ideology and mass deception is to better see the world is a result of my ideology no longer suiting my needs as a human being. We philosophize to suit a lacking of satisfaction of answers of why the world is as it is for ourselves, primarily. As I said, philosophy will always be relevant to itself – and its relevance to itself is based on a unmet

need to know the truth. Something went wrong along the way, it is not delivering what it promised, so it is only natural we must look outward for a solution to a problem. Anything else, we are simply paid propagandists.

We will discuss real and perceived freedom in this chapter. Real freedom versus perceived freedom is the strength to act out your inclinations. Constraints and chains have the same effect as morality and ethics – all weaken the strong for the betterment of the weak. I am not making a moral judgment on this fact - simply stating it as it is, and the works of Nietzsche/Marx and others support this claim.

That experience which wounds us is healed by way of forgetfulness, notwithstanding subconscious damage (like PTSD or recurring nightmares, etc.) and in that case it is arguable that such events are not truly 'forgotten' if they still affect us. There was an excellent film produced by the American Army right after World War Two that documented the use of psychoanalysis to cure soldiers suffering from various mental disorders as a result of their experiences, and one worth watching if interested in watching how trauma that has taken residence into the subconscious exhibits itself as various neuroses.

No matter which position towards freedom you chose, we will find that Free-Will is not there. The more we lie about or hide our true nature, the worse off it is for our long term health. Contemporary people appear to be pacified and sterilized zombies instead of being allowed to exist as we truly are by adhering to illusions of Free-Will. This leads us to another overarching theme of the dissertation – that the lie is a sign of weakness but used to strengthen mass cohesion at the expense of the personal. Like Rousseau, I envision a sole person as superior in quality of mind over a large group. But we do not act as a collective of individuals, we are a global society acting en masse. We make important decisions that change the world together by voting, rebelling, or waging war. We will cover Hegel at length, and where he discusses that via learning we discover that which limits us is of importance here.

What about thinking? For Hegel, the only mode of freedom man has is found is within thinking. Is thinking freedom? Is that freedom of will? What is it and how many of us actually 'think'? I

will continue these questions to a deeper level in the dissertation and believe the sources support my conclusions.

For example - let us briefly consider thinking to be better understood as the processes of the mind that aim to understand and manipulate the world as is for the betterment of themselves and their loved ones. For us, change is impossible without thought. Change is not necessarily freedom, but man is certainly more mobile when thinking is deviating from the subconscious autopilot of the mind. Still, this is not freedom, just an alternate mode of our mind – one of learning.

Opinions and fancies drive us to understand and change the world – they motivate us to risk things we never would have risked otherwise. In of itself that is morally neutral, but we must understand it is who we are – as foolish as we may be. I see the source of this self-deprecating view of humanity has its roots in Christianity, where they constantly are reminded how pathetic and insignificant they are in the face of God.

This leads us to another theme of this dissertation – that concepts involving the vaguely defined or the infinite are merely our own way of describing that which is beyond our limits to understand. There is no proof the infinite exists, but there is plenty of proof that our ability to know is limited. What is more probable – that something actually goes on forever, or we are simply unable to imagine or understand something? The cause is not important, and neither is dwelling on the fact we have limits and boundaries. To those that say the infinite is real I ask for proof of that claim.

The limits of the senses are real – we only see certain wavelengths of light, taste certain flavors, feel certain pressures of touch. When we hand out to the power the State which it has over us, that is just as real. The State does not ask us what we want – it demands from us conformity or it rejects us. “A state, it is true, must grant permission either to enter or leave it; but this permission is not given in deference to the arbitrary choice of the individual, nor is the state founded upon a contract which presupposes this choice.”¹ Even if it had been under signed contract, the State is under no obligation to fulfill it. It may lose credibility if it does not remain true to its word – but still that is a risk it has the privilege of taking.

1 G.W.F Hegel , Trans. S.W. Dyde *Philosophy of Right* (Kitchener: Batoche Books, 2001), 78.

We move now onto the topic of Evolutionary Epistemology, which surmises that: “The architecture of the adult brain is not completely determined by inherited genetic “programs” but reflects modulation due to the ambient environments of the developing individual.”² I agree that not all of our behavior is attributed to our genetic blueprints – the environment has a great deal to do when it comes to why and how we act. It is a combination of all factors – not one, why do so many scholars argue over which pieces of a puzzle is more important is beyond me. They see a blue piece of the puzzle and assume that the whole thing is blue. This is mainly because if one does the same job long enough, every problem can be solved under their specific career's set of tools. Everyone perceives their world in the manner in which they are trained to perceive and function within it.

Yes, it is a pragmatic approach to the subject – and on that we move only Pragmatist Epistemology. This position holds that “...truth is ... the best we human inquiries could do.”³ I admit my imagination and level of knowledge is limited to the degree that I cannot posit an inquiry more valuable than truth. It seems to be the best we can hope to accomplish, and admitting that I find the limits of my own particular self.

Both belief and knowledge are deemed to be separated, of course belief cannot progress knowledge, however it could be possible that knowledge may lead to encourage belief. Therefore “...none of our beliefs provide us with a certain foundation of knowledge; and they are holists in that they take their view of truth a inquiry to encompass all areas of inquiry.”⁴

If we did not regard background beliefs as true, we may as well be chasing our own tails. Yes, beliefs are imperfect, but purging ourselves of them would be equivalent to the medieval bloodletting practice of curing ailments. They clothe our naked bodies, and although may not be perfect at protecting us from the elements it is certainly better than baring it naked.

Judgments stemming from them could be understood as the 'experimental judgment' – or, the educated guess. This will be covered further in the dissertation, but understanding and accepting

2 Sven Bernecker & Duncan Pritchard, Michael P. Lynch, eds., *The Routledge Companion to Epistemology* (New York: Routledge Press, 2011), 850.

3 Bernecker, Pritchard, Cheryl Misak *The Routledge Companion* 861.

4 Bernecker, Pritchard, Cheryl Misak *The Routledge Companion* 862.

our limits is neither a new idea, but is losing popularity in this rather unfortunate post-Enlightenment/Multiculturalist/Globalist world.

Truth is pursued because we need it, just as we need air and water and this is why epistemology exists at all. We desire truth because it is a commodity as valuable as irrationality, not some mythical beast or product of our imagination. “All of our beliefs are fallible but they do not come into doubt all at once.”⁵ Right, one from the other is not possible and yes, beliefs feed amongst themselves, support and reinforce each other. When it comes to these experimental judgments, they are the lone voice when we are looking for any hint at direction.

Some beliefs may not be as deeply ingrained into everyone as we may think. Sometimes waiting until a situation presents itself where one's faith is at an all-time low, then the opportunity to present a more viable answer is present. This is to show that our beliefs and ideologies are malleable and can be changed with outside influence.

On the other hand: “Hence the saying: One may know how to conquer without being able to do it.”⁶ The everlasting plight of the armchair general. I would like to think some people learn lessons from this, but from the experiences in western foreign policy over the last three decades is any indication there is no sign that making mistakes will have any repercussions at home. Learning needs experience of failure, and if every time we fail, we just forget about it and go back to normalcy at home, no change in policy will occur. Failure must inflict pain if it is to be a source of learning.

As the mind now is understood as being part of the body, illnesses are now better understood as linked with one another. Also, I would agree that the mind and body dichotomy have never truly rest – as do the nervous impulses of them. Therefore, this idea is the basis element of our mind is X. Naturally, psychologists will be lured to ideas that promise the secret of condition X.

I discuss the works of Pavlov in detail in this chapter. I conclude that Pavlov, or others like him, are not wrong that conditioning does occur. His experiments are (like so many during the first half of the 20th century) are now deemed morally unacceptable to actually redo, has given us so

5 Bernecker, Pritchard, Cheryl Misak *The Routledge Companion* 863.

much insight into the capability and nature of man. Notice again the overarching theme of the hindering effects of morality. The debatable part here is how far we can go with it to describe the functioning of our mind. Yes, morality can shield the weak from exploitation from the strong so I do not want to discount it totally as valueless.

The debate then goes on how far we can take the accepted fact of conditioned response as it influences our behaviors. The limits to conditioned responses go only as far as the conditions in that we encounter them. We deal with a boss we would like to punch in the face everyday, so when they say something that elicits a desire to inflict violence, a conditioned inhibition is triggered as often as we experience that boss.

Not all scientists agreed with Pavlov (indeed most didn't, I assume because his conclusions were too scary to comprehend), some argued that these conditioned responses told us little about how the brain worked. They may be right, but did anyone criticize Newton for not explaining how gravity worked? No, Newton is lauded as one of the greatest minds in history because his discovery does not threaten that which we value. Like Sartre, Pavlov made his scientific conclusions on the act – so I argue in the completed work that it is the act is what is of central importance. It is a pragmatic point of view that we are interested in Pavlov and the idea that human nature has no free will.

A similar chorus of disagreements stem from psychologists who denounce psychoanalysis. They frame psychoanalysis as something it isn't, then denounce it for not living up to it. Psychoanalysis is the study of the ever changing subjective person - each is unique and cannot be reproduced in everyone all the time. It makes it no less incorrect and all because psychology has no need of it does not mean it is wrong or unusable. People want immovable formulas to understand humanity and when they are shown that such formulas cannot exist, instead of moving ahead and working with what they can we bury their heads further in the sand – cognitive dissonance.

This leads us to understand why lies are so effective in people and why psychologists are paid more and given more official attention than psychoanalysts. Like Scott's line when playing General Patton (I am going off memory here): 'I don't want my men to love me, I want them to

fight for me!' Learning and encouraging the entire individual motivations for a whole army is impractical and he did not care how they were motivated into fighting, just that whatever their job was got done. The powers that be have no cares about what affects your mother's bad onion soup did to your psyche, they simply want you to do your job and to keep quiet about it. Indeed, what difference does it make – if we are witnessing graphs of electrical responses in the brain, or watching an individual flinch or salivate?

The idea stems from the belief that we are uncivilized savages in our natural state. This is not universally true (although some hunter/gatherer tribes are quite peaceful and put us developed nations to shame in their piety), and perhaps the reason why such harsh laws limiting the nature of man in complex societies are self-feeding. What I mean by this is that in complex societies, man is taken out of its natural state, meaning they are animals under constant stress, are brow beat and whipped into submission.

Why is it people visiting isolated African villages are greeted with a horde of smiling and laughing children, but swarmed and robbed by the same age children if one visits a favela in Brazil? If people are controlled and treated like children they will tend to act that way if given a chance. Therefore, treating the ignorant like they are dangerous criminals is then no surprise they would act out like children if given a chance.

I will take a look at what Erasmus of Rotterdam and Wycliffe. Erasmus does not take the question to what motivates the will. It is necessity as Wycliffe says? What is necessity? All these questions I look at further in this chapter. I agree that all these are perfectly explainable given the nature of ourselves – from how the mind and body interacts with itself electrically, to how we function as a whole society, this all leads us to understand the nature of lies and lying in this scheme. Lying is not an expression of Free-Will, it is a self-defence mechanism. 'Compulsive liars' are those mentally-ill persons that are in a constant state of fear and insecurity. Why and how this is I will prove in this chapter by showing how lying is an attempt to make the untrue appear as true.

A good indication that a bad idea exists in your mind is if what makes sense inside of your head comes out as nonsense to everyone else when trying to explain it. Now, there are rare cases of when the people you are talking to are totally ignorant of the topic you are discussing and so anything you say (almost) comes out as gibberish or weird. Other examples of evidence of bad ideas or untruths will be discussed further in this chapter.

One such example is when it comes to a simple definition and understanding of a word, a good practice from since the time of Plato has been to all agree on a definition of that word before carrying on with an argument. Such is a basic method of lies and deceit, to redefine a word to suit their own agendas then push for that agenda under false assumptions.

I say this with rare absolute certainty, most disagreements, arguments and their consequent deadlocks, are all attributed to the point both are arguing over what a word means. No normal person carries a dictionary on them and hardly anyone would bother to look up the meaning of a word when having an argument. Some words are inherently vague and could mean a few things, or better said, are colloquially used to mean several things to different people(s).

The problem, I will argue, stems from failures of early educators, stressing the importance of understanding key words in order to understand a sentence. In fact one of my most trusted sources has a background in early education and his work has been very enlightening as it relates to the training of children to accept blatant untruths. Instead of questioning the meanings of key words (I understand this is time consuming and painful to do – though not impossible), the mind fills the gaps with what it does know (or even worse) thinks it knows. From there it moves outward from a false pretense all because it needs to have an answer. We are never satisfied not knowing a think that constantly asks us for an answer.

This continues onward right until late adulthood, where, after using the wrong terms, or misinterpreting commonly understood terms for so long, are incapable or unwilling to move from their position. The only advice I would offer from this is to begin every debate on a subject with a discussion on the meanings of the key words to be discussed. If a topic never moves beyond this then it is certainly better than a shouting match between people who are never going to

understand each other. The philosophical base of this would be an important point covered in this chapter.

For the secular - the idea that God helped in something that is perfectly explainable considering known variables is abhorrent, as equally as religious persons abhor the idea that God is to blame for unnecessary evil and cruelty. Since God has been placed/invented into the region of the unknown and we are not sure what causes mankind to be evil or cruel, then it only makes sense that God be held responsible for it. If only we could find what comprises God or man, only then would we be in any position to place blame for the shameful sides of ourselves. I do not posit an answer for that in the dissertation, but try to pose this problem in such a way one may decide for themselves what is more probable.

Our senses are simple enough passive receivers, yet our brains to process this information are amongst the largest in the Animal Kingdom. Certainly our brains, compared to our body size, is among the largest to be found. Why is this? Other animals only require the smallest of brains to determine the usefulness of sensory experience, yet not us. The question of why a large brain is important to the success of a species is not one I wish to discuss here, except to show some philosophical reasons for it. I do not go further than supposing the physical reason for this is because of our more vulnerable bodies, or perhaps our design to know more about our environment than other animals is necessary as omnivores. But that is a case of the chicken and the egg – were we weak bodied first then grew a large brain, or had a large brain then eventually shed that strong body? None of that answers why – why are we not both physically and mentally superior to other animals?

Another such question we ask through-out this dissertation is: 'How to become a model citizen? Become a philosopher!': "Contemplatives are not likely to become gamblers, or procurers, or drunkards; they do not as a rule preach intolerance, or make war; do not find it necessary to rob, swindle, or grind the faces of the poor. "⁷A lovely sentiment, albeit naive. Contemplation can rid itself of ethical constraints and indeed become the most dangerous of criminals.

7 Aldous Huxley *The Doors of Perception & Heaven and Hell* (Toronto: Random House of Canada, 2014), 13.

The famous saying: “Steal a ride and you are a “hobo,” liable to be shot. Steal a whole railroad and you are a financier, eligible to the United States Senate.”⁸ Why else are the majority of the CEOs and leaders of countries holders of the highest degrees? This would be covered further in chapter 4, but it shows that what we are told how to act/think by society at large does not add up to evidence to suggest that those who dare to challenge this end up the most successful in said society (within reason – if you challenged the veracity of Mohammad in Saudi Arabia without a very large and well-armed military, I am certain that would not propel you to occupation of the throne).

Another myth linked to free will is that of progress, one which we will discuss later. It is linked to it because those may point to technological improvements over the last couple of centuries as proof that reason shapes the world that we will this supposed triumph over nature and all we enjoy is a product of that will.

It is obvious that Western Civilization has progressed technologically over the years – but that does not prove that the progress was inevitable which has been a continuing theme in contemporary Continental Philosophy, but have been getting enough disagreement with this fact by others over the years that I felt the need to put this in writing myself. Many civilizations have never improved on this earth, and some still cling strongly to medieval and barbaric customs which hamper or reverse scientific growth and development. “But human life as a whole is not a cumulative activity, what is gained in one generation may be lost in the next.”⁹

Take for example the city of Cologne, Germany. After the Roman Empire left it, there was no public plumbing until the mid-19th century - it took about 1500 years to finally get some plumbing back into the city. The entire Middle-East or Afghanistan is an example of this regression: for them, a relatively modern society in the 1960s has turned into the worst place on the planet in only forty short years. Progress is not inevitable, history is not cyclical, and there is no end point or divine purpose of our lives. These are running themes in the dissertation.

One highly contentious point is that of sexuality; mostly because it is subjective in nature yet people keep trying to objectify it. The root of it, of course, comes from a desire to reproduce the

8 Anonymous *The Morning Call* [San Francisco] Wednesday June 06, 1894, 6.

species. Since there is enough of our species to go around as is, sexuality has become quite complex and the most populous societies have expanded out to all kinds of weird and wonderful scenarios.

Where is Free-Will in all of this? The only explanation for myself writing a dissertation on this while sitting in a bombed out bunker surrounded scorpions and rats can only be explained that I was put here as a result of a series of unfortunate events not of my own desire. But not always is the way things work out as bad or good – it just is, all due to an incalculable and intertwined set of variables that manipulated our subconscious to move in directions we have no preconceived ideas of going.

Post-modernist position is based on nothing but lies spurred by an attachment to belief and ideology that has been proven to be incorrect. I have mentioned several times that increasing our self-awareness can grant us a better perspective on our surroundings to spot lies and deceptions as they are presented to us, but this will be covered better in the dissertation.

The downside to this is that we are sometimes powerless to stop or counter such lies and are forced to pay lip service to those who truly believe them. Self-awareness is perhaps one of the most depressing traits of mankind because it comes at the cost of giving up all you may believe in. Coincidentally awareness is the hallmark of consciousness. This brings us to why studying ideology and culture is so important to lies within the public sphere.

I use John Gray's works a lot (and do not agree with him everywhere, but he is mostly right) and he links choice with responsibility since we have no real choices therefore we have no responsibilities for our actions. We have no choice in what we do and of our responsibility over them. Responsibility is never a choice, nor is it born within choice. We wear our responsibility like we wear our own skin. None of that is our choice; responsibility is placed on us like so much else. I will posit in the dissertation that responsibility is forced on us as much as race or religion.

Not all people have had the same spectrum of experiences and were privy to go through the entire spectrum of emotions. To do so would mean to have had a fulfilling life. “At its worst human life is not tragic but unmeaning. The soul is broken, but life lingers on. As the will fails,

the mask of tragedy falls aside. What remains is only suffering. The last sorrow cannot be told.”¹⁰
Suffering in life is unavoidable and is the basest of all emotions. We certainly never enter this world laughing! But, as we will see in the complete work, suffering can be beautiful because it is shared among us all and that binding and feeling that we are not isolated and alone is what makes the human experience so wonderful.

Speech may not be the source of self-hood; I would argue in the dissertation that sight is this source. Speech fills the gaps left by sight. This, I feel, is where I differ markedly from other philosophers (if I dare call myself one now). Much good work has been done in the study and clarity in understanding the power of speech and language and indeed one of the most important philosophers of our time, Noam Chomsky, is a linguist. I respect and used the work of Leonardo Buscaglia in my MA thesis, and his PhD was in language and speech pathology.

Language and speech are certainly important – but secondary to sight. The evidence I use to support this is compounded throughout my dissertation (used in propaganda, television, etc.), and the simple fact that (since the 1950s we have known that) when our vision is activated, 2/3s of brain activity is allocated to this sense.

As soon as we recognize ourselves in a mirror we believe there is a unique and rather strange individual staring back at them. What we should take from this is that illusions are morally neutral – they just are a fundamental aspect of our humanity. Sometimes an illusion or deception is all we have to cling onto when there is no other evidence to make a claim on something we desperately need to know.

Why is this? I attempt to answer all of that, or pose reasons in such a way where one may pursue the right path to answering them upon further reflection. We see that suffering is tied to stress and all of us require stress to maintain a healthy mind and body. Stress is likewise unavoidable; the trick is to have more stress that improves the well-being of body/mind than takes away from it.

Now we move onto the concept of meaning. Is life meaningless? Such a question is silly. Understanding meaning in our lives goes to understanding where we derive meaning. Work? Home? Church? Mosque? Gym? Ourselves? It is certainly more complicated than that, but it all

¹⁰ Gray *Straw Dogs* 101.

requires you to know the other sources first. Would you rather accommodate everyone at the expense of yourself, or yourself at the expense of everybody? Is there a difference and if so does it matter?

The problem with controlling the effect lies in properly controlling the cause. If only we knew the causes, the nature of a chaotic system so when everything feeds back into itself the output is unknown. Where do we look? The nervous system? Unlikely. Perhaps we can find the cause of motivation and behavior within a special kind of person who most outwardly expresses this trait. People spend thousands of dollars to attend motivation seminars and the like – to see people like Tony Robbins or others.

In terms of mental events and the psychic – though real, or felt as real (real enough for us, anyway), I believe they are just unable to measure it yet. Since not everything objectively real is measurable it stands to reason that we cannot reject the existence of something because our instruments cannot pick it up. This is not the same argument as 'there is nothing proving nor disproving an invisible unicorn in the room, so we ought to dismiss it all as an argument' – no, our feelings and such are experienced in the same way as physical sensations. This is some evidence by it being real because it was felt, we just have no metric to measure it by because it is too complex and subjective.

Going back to the argument about this invisible unicorn - if we took this ridiculous scenario seriously there are things we can do to dismiss this. A unicorn is a, supposedly, living thing and living things give off heat. We can observe through the Infra-Red spectrum by using certain instruments to spot such things when our eyes cannot see something. A 500kg mythical horse would show up quite easily within the IR spectrum, even if we couldn't observe it with our bare eyes.

Scientists ought not to dismiss things they cannot measure as a weakness inherent in arguments, but as a weakness in themselves to have theories live up to their own standards. So we see that all behavior is a controlled response. The who/what does the controlling is our bodies in response to the environment. Observable action is down a very long list of unobserved chains of action and

reaction. There is so little we know about how the environment shapes us and certainly much more to learn.

Even with everything we know to be true so far, this only is a drop in the ocean of all possible human behavior. Even if we did know every possible outcome to every possible stimulus, we still would not accurately predict the outcome because the way each person has learned and developed their own responses to their particular situations. “It is neither plausible nor expedient to conceive of the organism as a complicated jack-in-the-box with a long list of tricks, each of which may be evoked by pressing the proper button.”¹¹ Because we can learn and adapt means there are no pre-set buttons of reactions. When an observed need for change in behavior is warranted only then does this box of tricks change its moves.

The 'individual' is not really as we thought it is. We are drones, I will argue not independent entities. “In some departments of our daily life, in which we imagine ourselves free agents, we are ruled by dictators exercising great power.”¹² Imagine rats in a maze, being guided this way and that towards a predetermined goal. Free agency is part of our imagination, but why is this?

We cannot turn off the ability to hate or love – we can, to a degree, modify our actions to those emotions (by way of conditioned responses), but this is limited: “Humans do not have the ability to control physiological response to emotions.”¹³ The rush of emotion and the response all are outside our area of control.

I mentioned previously and in numerous occasions that cooperation and reliance of the work of others is paramount to the functioning of our society. We certainly would not be enjoying the comforts we do if we had to craft everything ourselves: “...people are more naturally social and benefit from cooperation itself.”¹⁴ The reliance is mutually beneficial; this is why we expect others to tell us the truth, and vice-versa. We are naturally inclined to be naive and gullible because such traits are welcome in a close knit social setting.

11 B.F. Skinner *About Behaviorism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1976), 9.

12 Edward L Bernays *Propaganda* (New York: Horace Liveright, 1928), 35.

13 Hassan Ugail, Moi Hoon Yap, Bashar Rajoub *Face Reading Technology for Lie Detection* (University of Bradford).

14 John Christman *Social and Political Philosophy – A Contemporary Introduction* (New York: Routledge, 2002), 38.

Lying isn't always morally bad or harmful – the intent does not really matter here, but the end result of that lie. Neither is lying nor deception isolated to human beings. Indeed: “One could easily point to cases in the animal kingdom where lying is a virtue.”¹⁵ In a world of eat or be eaten, one must use every trick available to stay alive long enough to see the continuation of the species.

During the period of initial programming, children are unable to spot out deception on their own. They can, however, identify what something is and is not, in very simple terms. It is not a binary logic switch but the ability to detect lies is a skill developed over years of experience within an environment. Differentiating truth and imagination are nearly impossible to tell apart for young children, which makes identifying if they are lying or not equally troublesome. It is not their fault because they simply do not know the difference.

Chapter 2.2 – Concepts on Infinity

Beyond measure is a huge distance from infinity, an infinite amount to be precise. We mentioned previously why Free-Will will be discussed as not existing and on that topic we must discuss infinity because where one finds belief in one we find belief in the other.

How does this work with justified belief chains? Is there a prime belief we all encounter? If so, how can we get back to the point of where it is, to see if there are any weak links in that chain. I suppose one cannot. Within a chaotic system, one cannot predict the outcome of a self-feeding loop. If the outcome cannot be predicted, then only the known variables may be known beforehand and this only applies to the application of a single belief. Knowing all variables for one belief may be difficult enough (the variables of variables is impossible to predict the outcome of is therefore impossible to identify the origin of).

Explorers leaving the Old World did not find paradise nor India – but a harsh and unforgiving land, where one could die of exposure quite easily if not for the help of some of the kinder (albeit naive) native humans already occupying that land. The more complex the world is with those with more knowledge, the more complex solutions to problems become.

15 Sarah Gorham *The Art of Lying* (Quarterly West, Spring/Summer 2007 – Issue 64), 20.

Those who only know how to use a hammer will see every problem look like a nail. A good example of this is those people who claim to practice any profession, they frame their world in a likewise manner. Doctors think like doctors, farmers like farmers, etc. Businessmen see all problems as problems of capital, a priest of salvation, of a military commander of discipline, etc.

This chapter is smaller because most of the concepts already present in the previous aid to support the conclusions of these, but it was an important enough topic that I felt it warranted a sub chapter of its own.

Chapter 2.3 - Fractal Behavior in Human Beings

I believe I am one of the first to see human behavior as such and certainly one of the first to try to incorporate it into philosophy. Almost no philosophical works exist to cover this topic, so sources were limited to social scientists and economists. Here we will ask what is fractal and why do we act this way? I use graphs and some mathematics/scientific/economic articles to show the connection between how the universe acts the way it does, then link it with the way we act the way we do.

To do that we will need to discuss complex network theory, memory, time and temporality. It is confusing because on one hand Free-Will and infinity is not based in reality, yet a seemingly endless repetition of patterns can be found within nature – down to the smallest conceivable speck of matter. We will see that neither space nor patterns repeat forever but we can see them enough to guess what happens next by knowing what has happened before. I will try to show that history is not circular but does follow a complex pattern. History maybe not work out as a lifecycle (again, a quasi-circular frame of mind) as Hegel recounts, but I will argue that behaviors have unique patterns associated to them.

We will discuss globalization in this chapter. It will be shown that globalization is not some new phenomena of the 20th and 21st centuries, but another spike in the pattern of human behavior. Globalization as it is known today has gone through many phases of spikes (trending toward unity and Globalization) and a steady deceleration (slow step of de-globalization – where we are

beginning today, like Brexit). The connection between these trends does not weaken as physical distance grows between them because that which binds them is not limited to distance. This is similar to how everyone of a certain social class understands each others situation on a higher level than outsiders, a sort of universal brotherhood.

Without knowledge of the past, we are not just doomed to repeat the same mistakes, but to risk regressing back to points of cave-men or simple hunter/gatherer's. On the other hand, some societies are probably better off forgetting the past (if they are locked in tribal feuds or the like). I suppose if man regresses back to the point of this kind of savagery, where knowledge of the past is in no way helping to progress the society towards a better future, then we can say such a past is not worth looking at.

The fear of change can be used to manipulate our thoughts and acts as that fear is programmed into our very behavior to ensure the future of our children reflects the one we ourselves believed we had. We are, therefore, naturally inclined towards conservative values – even if they be left wing or right wing conversation.

If it is exhibited by collections of humans acting together, of their individual cells acting together or of the composition of the proteins and atoms – then spanning out further in either direction necessitates the need for fractal behavior – right to the limits of the known universe. This is the general framework that reality must be conceived within.

With all this zooming in and out – looking at cells and societies and galaxies, we can easily become confused and baffled. No, I am not suggesting inanimate objects like galaxies or electrons exhibit something akin to human memory (unless you wish to understand memory as the simple transfer and storage of energy, but that might be too simple a generalization).

Since fractal processes define the underlying behaviors and actions of people, and their processes are a result of memory – it only stands to reason that fluctuations of data are the result of adaptations and new inputs we all take in and respond to. Our processes of how we act are all similar, but so too are our methods of coping with a changing world.

That is, the universe as a complete system may not be fractal (beyond that is speculation, but it would not surprise me if this universe is but a self-same component of others), but the way we have been able to thrive and dominate our environment is due to this phenomenon. Why? Because it is adaptive to injury, the loss of one or many will not cause the whole system to crash. From here, we move onto a very important discussion on the differences between objectivity and subjectivity.

Chapter 2.4 Subjectivity/Objectivity

This theme of differentiating the two has been a central concept of my philosophical outlook. In this chapter, we will discuss and define the differences between the two. I will not posit that there is a hard line between subjective and objective, like Descartes mind/body duality. Indeed, they are not inseparable spheres but all falls along the same line.

Like the previous chapter, this ought to be a short one, but still very important if we are to understand the nature of lies and ourselves. I am not aware of many other sources sharing my conclusions, so I suppose a dissertation ought to have some unique insights into things so it is here I invite myself to ridicule by out on a limb and risking telling it as I see it.

Unfortunately for us, truth and falsehood are not obvious manifestations of anything. Where do the differences lie, then, if there is such a difference between the two? For starters, Hegel accurately mentions the following: "...truth is not like stamped coin that is issued ready from the mint and can be taken up and used. Nor again, is there something false, any more than there is something evil. Evil and falsehood are indeed not so bad as the devil, for in the form of the devil they get the length of being particular subjects; qua false and evil they are merely universals, though they have a nature of their own with reference to one another. Falsity (that is what we are dealing with here) would be otherness, the negative aspect of the substance, which [substance] qua content of knowledge, is truth."¹⁶ If truth and falsehoods are not so easily determined, then obviously the lie is not the simple misrepresentation of the false as truth.

¹⁶ G.W.F. Hegel, G.B. Baillie, trans., *The Phenomenology of Mind* (Mineola, New York: Dover Publications, 2003), 18.

The identification of contradictions is key to simple determinations of truth here. Now, Hegel said contradictions exist in some truth, and yes, if we reduce some complex problems to their simplest forms some contradictions may pop up. That does not mean they are necessarily false, but may have done the reduction wrong or our ability to reduce it further is beyond our capability. Let us say we are of a very limited mind and cannot reduce '2 + 1 = 3' any further.

The solution posited there is still true; just that to the limited mind we see two numbers equaling a third and this may appear to be a contradiction when indeed no such thing exists. Multiply the factor of complexity a great many times and there you have many of our beliefs, positions and thoughts on how the world is today - with all of its complexities and unsolved/unsolvable problems.

Though we desire to know all and in the facing of this void of ignorance we do not approach it by prostrating. We throw at it educated guesses, hunches, ideas and theoretical methods to rescue truths from it and loosen its grip over our minds. This is where discovery about us and the Universe itself is made. Indeed, the purely subjective can never be learned by us, but luckily that which is purely subjective is a bit more limited to a certain number of topics and questions.

What are we to do if we get caught within this swirling vortex of subjectivity? Do not limit yourself by what you think falls within the objectively possible. "By reaching for the impossible, man discovers possible, and those who limit themselves to what seems possible will never advance a step."¹⁷ The limits of subjectivity is reached when we move beyond our thoughts on the possible – here we know we are in the realm of what is, not what we think is.

The ability to formulate our own opinions on matters was a ludicrous expectation of all of us at one time, but it was only after countless hours of reading and assignments that such a thing became possible. The same goes for humanity as a general rule. The less effort we put into understanding the world around us, the less capable we are of forming our own opinions of it. We then rely on others solely we will revert to dogmatism or superstition. So, who we become, mentally, is a result of work, not Free-Will. This is where Hegelian philosophy was most useful in formulating my conclusions here.

¹⁷ Paul Aurich, ed., *Bakunin on Anarchy* (New York: Vintage Books, 1971), 6.

The work we do physically shapes our bodies as the mental work we do shapes our minds. Neither the body nor the mind is limitless and the state of rest for both will result in atrophy, uselessness and then finally death. We are born neither with the capacity to walk nor think for ourselves so a habit of critical thinking will reward us with a mind capable of it.

As a child, I remember one story that sums up this point. We were asked to read a book then state whether or not we agree with it. A common initial thought amongst the students were: 'How could we possibly disagree with this? It was physically written down, were we asked to deny the book was ever written?' Disagreeing with the author meant to us young minds with disagreeing with objective reality.

Of course, the point of the exercise was to get us to think critically, before then that sort of thing was never encouraged or even attempted. We were not to disagree with the existence of the words but were dared to judge the message of the words on its merits. That kind of thing requires us to have and build our own set of variables to be able to judge things in the first place.

To do that takes reflection, and so we build upon what we previously have never questioned and use it as a template to judge the previously unknown on its validity. The higher purpose of philosophy, then, is to return to the beginning and challenge those primordial templates we have used to see the world, to judge others in order to become better judges of ourselves and the objective world.

Images of the imagination do not need to be perfect or even understood as real as we can easily tell the difference between certain truths and deception of objects like a picture of someone versus that actual someone. We can escape the current situation temporarily by searching and using imagination to see ourselves somewhere else or doing something else. Basically, I attempt to place all that can be argued or not specifically proven nor disproved as under the realm of the subjective while that which all normally operating human beings must agree on falls under the objective, as troublesome as that sounds. I will have a graph made to illustrate this difference and so I hope that will prove useful.

Chapter 2.5 Rational Irrationality

In this chapter we will find that this is an attempt to show that people are inherently irrational and that it makes economic sense to do so. Brian Caplan's article on the subject is where I was introduced to it and I feel it has not been given the attention it deserves and bares philosophical expansion and growth – even if it was not Caplan's original intent to take his findings into the world of philosophy. In this chapter I introduce the concept of irrationality and later it will tie into the topics covered later in chapters 3 and 4.

Normally, with practice and the right incentives, people will eventually do things according to the expected outcome. If you are unable to switch your biases you will simply avoid situations where those biases cost you. This is why Muslims/Roma congregate into closed ghettos, or others hide their beliefs and avoid situations where if knowledge if you held them were known you would lose your job.

Today, it is a weekly event where someone somewhere posts on a social media site a racist or otherwise unpopular opinion and soon hordes of Social Justice Warriors will find out who you are, where you work, etc. - and complain on the internet until you are out of a job – blacklisted until the mob finds another witch to burn. Holding onto irrational beliefs can be very costly if it is unpopular – so knowing when, where and how to express them is of vital importance to our livelihoods. Such situations and phenomena are discussed in further detail and it will give us an insight into why lies are a self-defence mechanism.

The process of discovering false beliefs and overcoming pride and fear by accepting they are false takes a while. It needs to last long enough for they themselves to realize that their previously held beliefs were obviously false. Like being stuck in quick sand – the initial response by being stuck in a false belief is to struggle and dig yourself down deeper, until you realize just exactly where you are.

Therefore, beliefs are nothing but another mental habit – a 'go to' response to an input. Breaking a belief is no different than breaking a habit. It needs external pressure to a point where the individual genuinely wishes to dismiss it. The external pressure jump starts the internal motivators so that, eventually, a belief is silenced, but not forgotten.

Take for example smokers: Those who quit the habit will still have days where they miss smoking. They miss it after a hard day's work or first thing in the morning. The same can be said for beliefs. I remember fondly when I was a child looking forward to the arrival of Santa Claus or the Easter Bunny, and during Christmas time I still listen for the sound of reindeer on the rooftop.

Those who gave up religion will turn to it when they face a crisis like losing a loved one because they remember that religion once gave them comfort in bearing with the unbearable. Beliefs cannot be cut out, but silenced into submission. Like they can be silenced, they can also be brought back to life. The triggering and suppression of beliefs is, certainly, an integral part of our nature and others who know this can manipulate and direct our thoughts.

That about covers what I plan on discussing in chapter two and from this foundation I feel comfortable with moving forward to discussing exactly what constitutes lies themselves before moving those lies into the public sphere in chapter four.

Chapter 3.0 – The Nature of Lies

Now that I hope we have a philosophical base to explore and understand how we behave and think, we can now go further to understand lies themselves all under the blueprints set earlier. I will look closely at various devices and methods used to detect lies. It was my hope that if technology can read lies from us, then the solution to finding a predictable way of understanding human behavior can be devised as well. Being a true cynic, I was not disappointed to find out the technology that detect lies actually does nothing of the sort, but pleasantly surprised that it proved my ideas about the complexity of human behavior and subjectivity being too complex to map out.

Chapter 3.1 General Definitions and Concepts

Lots of ideas on what constitutes a lie abounds within academia and here I pick and choose among the most common and therefore best ones to come to one where I know fits best into normal human behavior. This is not well covered in contemporary Analytical or even Continental philosophy, albeit on some minor note on the ethics or morality of lying. I could not find anything on what actually what is being done when we lie, or why. This is certainly a good thing for one writing a dissertation, because how is anyone supposed to assess if someone is capable of an independently coherent thought if all they do is cover the same topic covered by a dozen other popular philosophers?

If we are aware enough of our reputations, or if we think our lies are ineffective at instilling belief in others, there are three things we can do. Of course, trust must be established between

ourselves and the other. The second strategy is to say the opposite of what people to believe. This means that if your reputation is beyond repair and nobody will believe a single word you said, and then simply state the opposite of what you want because even if you confess guilt people will take this as a sign you are innocent, but guilty of hiding something else.

The third strategy is to convince people you are completely incapable of delivering the truth, either by feigning mental illness or that you are an ignorant fool. Stupidity and truth are linked, we believe stupid people more because we associate lying with higher mental activity and intelligence. Perhaps this is why we naturally mistrust those with an extremely high intelligence.

What difference does it make if we drink Coke or Pepsi, or if people obey traffic laws because they fear that they will be caught (when in reality that probability is low)? Accurate information may be entirely irrelevant or even detrimental to the morality of a decision. What about the willfully ignorant or the foolish? A police officer telling an armed assailant in a hostage situation that everything will be okay if the person puts the gun down (no it won't be all okay, the assailant will still be going to jail).

They may not be telling the entire truth there, but that manipulation by using lies could have saved lives. Autonomy is, as shown in chapter two, an illusion – so any appeal to it is equally an illusion. Capacity to think for oneself (meaning it is different enough from the majority to be seen as thinking for oneself) is a rarity in its own right so assuming someone has that ability is about as strange as assuming everyone is an expert tap dancer or painter. If a doctor uses deception to convince someone to take lifesaving medication contrary to their religious views – is this morally reprehensible? Those who put emphasis on illusions like autonomy or religion may say so, those who value human life above others may not – no answer is morally superior in this case but the debate is still active.

Indeed, like truth, lies and deception fall within a spectrum of philosophical categories. It is quite messy and unnecessary to compartmentalize them, as, like a complex database, there is much overlap and blending. So this gets us to point the direction now at discovering what is at the core of lying.

I disagree with the notion that lying necessarily involves deception and go into that further in the dissertation. If a person honestly believes something is genuine, and that belief is false – to try to convince me of that falsehood would mean he is trying to convince me of a lie. They might be innocent of malice when spreading lies, but the fact remains they still are spreading lies.

Perhaps if we look back to how those honest people got to spread lies we will find deception – a patient zero, as it were. Doing that would be impossible, because to find that we will have to discover the true origins of our beliefs in whole.

Now let us look at why is it that truths are never born of lies. The degree of falsehood in a proposition is directly proportional to the degree of probability truth is to be discovered from a proposition. Searching for Noah's Ark on the surface of the moon would surely lead us nowhere, though at the same time if Noah's Ark have never existed in the first place such a journey would be an exercise in futility. That being said, in matters of discovery, some of the greatest finds in history were a result of starting off on a wrong premise.

The New World was discovered because the explorers were looking for a faster route to India, and or another example is drugs like Viagra were invented as a heart medication. All started out on entirely different positions, but the nature of the world being as it is we need to start from somewhere. Searching for Noah's Ark on the Moon might not give us what we sought for, but it could teach us a lot about the nature of the Moon just by experiencing it.

The more one complicates and subjectifies the untruth the more the speaker runs the chance of them being proven wrong, the less chance the speaker is right. If, in my opinion, I know someone to be a difficult person to get along with and I tell a co-worker they are a good natured person - I may be telling something that goes against my beliefs, but that may not necessarily be a lie. That person may have a healthy following that would very much agree with my assessment that they were actually easy to get along with. My own subjective opinion does not mean the same as they only valid one.

If we posit something like 'God does not exist' – is that a lie if that goes against our beliefs? This is not necessarily so, because we do not know for certain in every case. If you said 'I believe God does not exist', when in reality you do believe that, then that is a lie. A lie about belief needs the

belief to be true if we are to determine or to qualify it as a lie. A lie about a fact needs no qualifier, like saying my glasses can see through concrete walls – it is simply false and that's that. Whether I believe the glasses see through walls is irrelevant.

People often toy with others emotions to great effect. To do so is most definitely to use lies or deception (whatever is easier), but why is this? Because it is very difficult to spot, and is very convincing. When spotting the politician crying from the podium, no one can use an instrument to measure if they are tears of sadness or of a trained actor pretending to have an emotional investment in whatever they are talking about.

There are no real objective means of determining valid emotions from the feigning of emotions. One either feels something or they do not and emotions themselves are born from the unconscious. If conscious effort is made to exhibit emotions then that is obviously born of deception – a form of acting.

Anyway, truth can be hidden in many forms because the truth is normally quite simple, but the need for interpretation is added in to make everyone happy. Convuluted nonsense is one such form. If someone asked to give me testimony and I replied that the truth in a language nobody understood, I may as well be giving testimony in gibberish or attempting to speak telepathically. The problem with speaking in code is that the message is only good for those who can understand the code. Legalese or insurance documents are only good for likeminded people, and is no basis as a contract between a company and an unlearned individual. They may we well be signing a contract in Egyptian hieroglyphics.

Yes, we can accurately guess if someone is making the distinction between an objective or subjective assertion of truth. This is why the qualifier 'I think' or 'I believe' is so important. The discovery of self-deception, as expressed when we say 'I have been living a lie' tells us that our beliefs about something may be been true (true-belief), but objectively are false. For example, an adult has just found out they were adopted. Their adopted parents omitted a very important part of who their child was and since it is the responsibility of those who raise children to inform them correctly in manners of who they are and where they came from we can safely say that they did lie to the child, if they were led to believe that the adopted parents were the natural.

Above were just a few thoughts posted on the nature of lies themselves and why they are used. It is a tricky concept, especially now that we understand the complex nature of our own subjectivity mixed with acknowledging that of others. As we move from the base of the pyramid upwards the topics become more complex and even more reliant on the stability of the base.

Chapter 3.2 Lie Detection – Art or Science?

We will discover here that what contemporary science has to offer in terms of trying to objectively detect when people are lying. The conclusions are not surprising – they are no more than parlor tricks meant to elicit confessions from an interrogator or whatever other motive they want. Most of the sources here are from scientific journals, research papers on technology and drugs used in contemporary and modern police and government techniques, in their efforts to physically manipulate and control the human mind to suit their own purposes.

I wanted to discover how much the mind can be physically manipulated to say something it normally would not be compelled to, and to see how open our minds were to suggestion. I thought perhaps lies were simply cover-ups of truth, and there might be a drug or technology that could easily unmask those cover-ups. The reality of it was much more complex, unfortunately.

I thought that if I could prove that simply playing with some neuro-chemicals it would get people to forget their families, kill another without remorse or memory, or commit any number of unorthodox acts, then I could show that the entire basis of a universal morality does not exist and that lies were a triggered/switched response within us. I discovered the human mind was much more complex than originally gave I gave it credit for. All of these drugs did nothing more than redirect attention or numb us to our inhibitions (be they natural or socially ingrained) – they do not force anyone to do anything, they simply allow us to do it. Thankfully, that is the most these sorts of people have been able to determine if something is important to the subject.

An important topic I will be discussing is on the popular machine called the 'lie detector'. This is a simple recording machine designed in the early 20th century as a way to monitor overall stresses in the body. Although disproved as an actual method of detecting lies early on, and most regions of the planet reject it as evidence of guilt, the use of this machine is still pervasive in the western world and widely seen as an objective method of determining truth.

We will see that this machine is just measuring a subjectively important impulse, so it really means nothing when determining if someone objectively did anything. This shows that these lie-detection tools are useless without the hand that wields it. They are, like so many others, concerned with the origins of thought and wish to explain past events by knowing the cause of them. Finally, if they are correct that the mind is no different than a complex database, then who or what designed this database? Why is it formed this way instead of any other way? These questions we will look further into in the dissertation.

So, who is better off, meaning whom has the better and more accurate view of the world? The illiterate peasant who has been everywhere and seen everything, or the basement dwelling troglodyte with numerous doctorates in various disciplines? I would side with the troglodyte, barely. The illiterate would only see humanity, culture and ideology as more or less all equal – the illiterate only sees similarities while the educated person can spot differences. Why exactly is not explicitly answered, but I wish to open the door for further discussion there.

A popular side-kick of the 'lie-detecting' machines are mind-altering drugs. Normal people have had at least one example in their lives of taking too much of a drug and feeling some odd symptoms that affect their state of mind. Since mind-altering drugs expose roots of belief and culture and since we are our own culture we can say that truth serums are effective at exposing the basest of our subjective truths. Because things did not end up the way we thought they were in the beginning is no cause for alarm or disappointment, it just tells us we need to continue our search elsewhere. Perhaps we are looking for truth in the wrong places, because we ought to look at the body in the way Pavlov has, as we will discover in the dissertation, in a holistic manner where memory does not just reside in the mind but in the whole body. These possibilities are explored further in the finished work.

To this I should add that our reliance on the gauges and instruments is a Western ideological phenomenon. For example, in the early days of flight, pilots were warned never to trust their instruments and if they got caught in cloud to get themselves into a stable spin until they were clear of it. A very old instructor of mine recalled us with a story that he saw a few ducks fly into a cloud, only to see them tumble out of the sky a few moments later. Nowadays, such a procedure is considered almost suicidal. Pilots are taught to always trust their instruments above all else because of a numerous collection of evidence pointing to how the human body can become disoriented and confused with lack of sensory evidence. I argue that society today has forced mankind to trust machines over themselves and that this is not just pervasive in the aviation industry but in all walks of life.

During a steady turn, the fluid acting on the hairs in our ears eventually stabilize so that we think we are heading straight and level when in fact we are turning, or if we are taking off with reference to the ground during a moonless night, we can have this illusion that we are climbing when we are actually descending – this is called CFIT, or 'controlled flight into terrain' – which has killed, and will continue to kill, both experienced and novice pilots alike.

This is certainly the case outside of aviation – like the use of calculators, the reliance on the internet and search engines like Google to answer questions of fact, all of it points to the notion that the instrument is right and our own opinions and judgments are wrong. This is not terrible per se, it just limits our ability to think outside the realm of what is measurable and that in of itself is not necessarily a good thing.

Why are we bothering to look at lie detection technology in a philosophical paper on lying? The answer is simple, really. Technology and science can give us data-points on the nature of man and philosophy is here to make sense of it holistically. I am using this information as a base for researching new avenues for philosophy.

Yes, I can and do use other philosophical works, but since philosophy is not a closed minded cult it is free to use any and all relevant works at our disposal to do our work – that is, to ask questions and give answers on the most fundamental of human desires. Philosophy goes where it

pleases and uses what information it pleases – as long as in the end the results reflect an accurate assessment of what actually is.

We must briefly describe the notion of ‘what is’. ‘What is’ is a concept to include that which is a part of our reality – be it the subjective opinions of a clueless politician or the weight of a neutron star. As long as we can form a coherent picture of our universe we are free to use it. More specifically here, technology is simply a tool invented by man to aid them in their work – it is created for a purpose.

All living things exist for some purpose and that is procreation and survival of the species. It is the nonsensical yet true situation of life. We exist because we must continue to exist. We procreate because we must continue to exist in some form. Non-existence is the worst fate to befall someone, like the warning line from one of my favorite Hollywood villains, Thulsa Doom: “When I am gone, you will have never been.”¹⁸

Drive for existence is tied to drive for memory, for sense. A 'sense-less' death is seen as something where no lessons can be learned from it – that humanity is simply less one person and we do not know how that can be prevented from happening again. Extracting meaning from life and death is a core component of our desire to self-preserve and procreate. Now, how does this tie into lie-detection technology? Well, a piece of technology, in this case an instrument designed to see if a person is hiding some information or giving false information knowingly, has a purpose to find meaning in people. It is an attempt to see human beings as predictable and determinate robots. A lie hiding within the mind of a person is viewed as a physical thing and as visible as a vein of gold within quartz. So, technology is the attempt to prove the physicality of the mind. Since technology has so far failed to prove the complete physicality of the mind, it still is able to prove that at least some of it is.

Finding meaning in life is a worth-while venture. Like trying to find meaning in someone's death in order to avoid death ourselves (for example – do not exceed the posted speed limit or else you might lose control of our car, run off the road, or hit someone and die. If you do not speed you will live longer). I argue in the dissertation that lie detection technology tries to avoid this

18 *Quotes for Thulsa Doom* <http://www.imdb.com/character/ch0008155/quotes>

problem for police officers, of letting guilty people go free. They are paid to punish criminals and want some objective proof to link a suspect to a crime. Since jail is not a place people go to willingly, the suspect will naturally tell a lie if it means avoiding being sent there. Technology is meant to nullify this self-defence mechanism so how we use technology to do this speaks loudly about the nature of the mind.

In every magic trick, the magician does the best they can to convince the audience that the tools they use are not fake – the swords are real and can cut, there are no broken rings, or the floating girl is not riding up on an invisible platform. The polygraph operator does much the same time, this time they are primarily concerned with getting the suspect to believe the machine does what they say it does, and the operator just reads the results – they have no underlying objectives other than that.

I suppose, if anything, a polygraph test might be used as a way on how you manage under interrogation. Something is not scientifically (or philosophically, in this case) valid unless the academic community accepts it. This should not mean I am endorsing the concept of the academic echo-chamber, this is an argument about the art of interrogation over a science of objective variables in deception.

Granted, in some places they do not allow these tests to be used as evidence - but confessions certainly are. The information I received about polygraphy was readily available on the internet and academic journals, therefore everyone literate has access to it, but at the same time no one seems to neither know nor care about it, sometimes to their own detriment. I suppose nobody reads or bothers to ask for its removal from governmental procedures is a sign of fear of looking like a dissenter – because only someone with something to hide would fear the machine, right?

Another thing we will cover is the idea of confessions and if they actually count as truth or lies. If you answer something contrary to what you know under duress or orders, it is not really practicing deception – though it may be technically an untruth, or lie. It should register no stress to lie in this manner because the source of this stress is not in the utterance of the lie, but to do something we know is wrong because of duress or orders.

For example – it is seen that owning a gigantic truck is considered (in some circles in my own culture) compensation for a small member of population, or that bureaucratic robots compensate for having no education nor power themselves by enjoying it best when they use the small amount of power they have to inflict the maximum damage on others they dislike.

It gives them a certain feeling of validation, that they do wield some power within their location on the organizational chart. If they are a roadblock to what you want, it is a better use of effort to get them to like you rather than to put them in their proper place. Doing that is about as silly as seeing a white collar criminal being hauled off to jail, shouting how he makes more in an hour than the officer makes in a year.

To those languishing in jails for decades because of a polygraph interrogation, the power it holds over their lives is very much real – whether it is scientifically justified as real or not. It is no different than how some sub-Saharan countries hire a witch doctor to read the entrails of a chicken to determine guilt. It has power of determining guilt because the whole community agrees that the Shaman can predict the truth of the matter by interpreting chicken entrails.

The polygraph Shaman of Western civilization interprets squiggly lines on a paper – the only difference between us and Africa is, as I will argue in the dissertation, is in what we place our beliefs. The power here is that the culture agrees on the legitimacy of their respective power of Shamans – be they wearing a loin cloth and feathered crown or a suit/tie and carrying a badge.

We believe in the lies and deceptive techniques of the State because we have given them the power of authority to issue truth to us. The State authorizes the truth – they give licenses to say that someone is capable of safely operating a motor vehicle, practice law or medicine, etc. But we never question the power of the State when someone crashes a car, gets an innocent person is executed, or removes the wrong organ in surgery! That responsibility lies with the individual or company.

Where I plan to move forward with the idea is to say that the mind, then, interprets facts. It may be accurate or not, and determining whether it is, is very difficult. We do know that, without a doubt, drugs can make someone open to suggestion. This does not mean that there is a Free-Will and that is over-thrown by drugs, what it does mean is that it inhibits our normal procedures of

incorporating information and forming a decision to act on them. Normally, it goes through several steps, incorporating various influential factors like experience, culture, ideology, belief, etc. Under drugs, it may bypass cultural or ethical constraints and act only according to others. Drugs do not force you to act in ways you normally do not, it allows you to act in those more basic ways.

Perhaps, and I explore this in greater detail in the finished work, this is why we trust the simplicity of simpletons – though perhaps this term may be inaccurate, perhaps 'neurologically docile' is more fitting. Like others, there is only so much of the mind to go around. We can only juggle so many balls before we start to drop some, and some interrogators find the truth behind their guilt when one of those balls are dropped.

How accurate that is, I believe, not as concrete as we would like it to be. The interrogator really has no control over how good of a juggler the suspect is nor whether or not the truth has been dropped, nor even if the suspect has such a ball to drop in the first place. It is all based on a hope and a prayer.

There are some activities and behaviors commonly associated with liars, of which I will discuss and explore further in the dissertation. Basically, I say they usually speak in simple terms and try to disassociate themselves with the truth by not speaking about themselves as much along with a generally negative tone. An important and often overlooked series of clues here is the actual words the suspect says. Most of the sources dismiss actual words and instead focus on physical reactions like facial expression, voice tones or anything like that. Words do play a key role in active deception and ought to be considered along with other physical signs of it.

Finally, this last part of this chapter will tell us about the psychology behind the belief in this placebo. I will mention how this is included within the series of Epistemology of Testimony and evidence from machines. This about concludes what there is to say about the art of lie-detection. My main objection of this chapter is to prove that 'lie-detection' as a science is, in actuality, an art masqueraded as science, therefore is a pseudoscience. I hope to make it fairly obvious that detecting lies is not possible with the current or foreseeable technology in the future – most likely because it is within the spinning void of subjectivity.

Though the religion of humanism and science has most of us duped into thinking these 14-week long certificate holders have the power to read the darkest secrets of our minds by interpreting tea leaves, or squiggly lines on paper, it is itself an act of clever deception. With that, we move onto a brief description of what I plan on submitting for the chapter on propaganda.

Chapter 3.3 – Propaganda

Now that we have some idea of the complexity of the human mind and that direct and personal attempts at detecting and mechanically fabricating lies do not work – I feel we are ready to look at ways where the mind is subtly coerced into thinking or feeling a certain way on a mass scale. This certainly affects the individual mind, but this is done in a way which affects everyone.

I start by tracing the origins of propaganda and describe how it pervades every aspect of our lives. A brief description will show us that propaganda as we know it today began after the First World War – where it became first obvious that the whims of the populace were important to keep along the party line if ever they were needed to pull together for their government and produce and fight for a war.

During the First World War, the governments had little need for such a thing – their attitude towards the common man was that they were to shut up and do as they were told. This didn't work so well (especially when it came to replenishing their need for more cannon fodder) so the idea that people needed to be convinced that their home governments were right to do as they pleased, and the Other posed a mortal enemy to the common man.

The common man of Medieval Europe had little to gain or lose (except their lives) by fighting in a battle over rival brothers aiming to secure a crown – this eventually evolved to show the importance and what precisely the lowest common denominator had to lose by having their home governments stomped in a global conflict. When perceived power of government was passed to the common people via democracy over the course of Western history, I will argue that it was not as great a revolution as we were taught in history or sociology classes. I will argue that the only

difference is now that the powers that be feel the need to convince their subjects to do their bidding, rather than simply command obedience.

Most sources used here were early books (right after the end of the First World War onward to the beginning of the Second) on the benefit and use of propaganda – before the term became hijacked and associated with Germany's involvement with the NSDAP. I will argue that propaganda is certainly alive and well today, albeit known under other terms, like a 'Ministry of Information' or 'Ministry of Public Affairs'.

I use Chomsky liberally here in this chapter, as he and his like-minded friends have studied and have done an excellent job of exposing and showing us where propaganda is at work with us today. Although I do not share the depths of his hatred of western society, he is speaking of it from a view that all propaganda is bad – though I will argue a more central leaning stance and explain the pros and cons of this very philosophical art.

One of the central questions of this chapter is: 'How do we limit deception within ourselves?' I will try to see if we need to get that if we are right and our mind has been changed to a wrong idea by propaganda, then we can say we have been duped. If we are wrong and refuse to accept the correct position, then we have duped ourselves. The problem is – how can we tell which one has taken place? Is cynicism the only answer? Encouraging thought on this line will be a central part of this chapter.

Within us human beings, I argue that it is the ego that is understood to be the arbiter, the 'inner voice' that defends what we believe against outside forces. The ego is this chattering lawyer that can cite reference after reference of beliefs when faced with opposing views. I don't think we should (or can – despite the very noble goals of the Frankfurt school) completely shut this voice off, but we have to beat him at his own game. If, I will argue, a belief is cited then we must question the validity of that belief by looking for opposing beliefs. If historical precedent is cited then it is wise to look for instances where history has not always shown that a certain set of actions results in a set of reactions.

At least, in the New World, it has been shown very clearly that academia is as much a part of the propaganda machine as the News Corporations of official government statements. This stands in

contrast with popular opinion that academia and other parts of the world where opinions of individuals hold any weight is entirely based on nepotism. Having no reputation is greeted within academia by silence and indignation, reputation for being unfriendly with the status quo is, of course, met with nothing less than every force the alternative power can muster. I take the position that even 'dangerous' minds such as Zizek actually are a voice of *a* majority – though not the majority. Normally, it is my position that, 'they' (the actual majority) will make life as miserable as they possibly can if you dare to challenge popular opinion in academia.

Propaganda, in its contemporary understanding of the word (meaning, 'manipulation of public opinion through mass media') came about sometime before the Second World War. During the interwar period, propaganda still meant something a little less sinister. During this time it was known as a spreading of some kind of truth to the masses. If a person or institution was in possession of the truth, they ought to tell everyone just as if one was in the possession of the cure for cancer – it is understood to be a moral obligation to spread and speak only truth.

I will suggest that propaganda is a need of the people – they desire it. They give power to the state so they look to that state to answer their problems. They want to be told how to think or act in the same way they want state-sponsored education, wellness or health care. Because it is managed and operated like any other institution of society of course it will sometimes be used for nefarious means – that is, against the interest of that society. This is why it has gained such a bad reputation over the last century, because it was shown that propaganda can be used to support the interests of the few to the detriment of the many. Should we disband all police functions of a government because a few were corrupt? No, they still serve society in a positive way – as does propaganda.

Cultists, like third wave feminists or religious figures who actively spread lies – but do so with a clear conscience that they believe what they are saying is true and good for the community. Ignorance, stupidity, laziness or any other myriad of preventable and biologically human factors can go to misuse propaganda. I will agree wholeheartedly that those with the best means to influence mass media can, and will, do so to the detriment of the more modest members of society. For example: if you owned a munitions factory and used some of the profits to influence people to endorse a war that ends up killing half your population.

Obviously, encouraging people to die in order to make money does not seem to be morally acceptable. But that is a very old and tired example – a newer one might be a company taking possession of a lifesaving medication then raising the price on it 7000%, then spending that money to try and convince others that the reason for it is to research newer drugs, when in fact it only helps the shareholders. I will argue that human beings today are a hybrid customer/commodity to be bought and sold.

Of course, when we cross reference differing opinions sometimes the correct answer is somewhere in the middle, sometimes not. I am sure if we cross referenced Islamic State's (ISIS) propaganda with American, the truth wouldn't be somewhere in the middle of that. Some are more correct than others. But let us think for a moment – what if we were on the wrong side – say we were ISIS?

What would we do? The answer is to never stop and to continue indoctrinating youth while fighting those who refuse to disagree with violence – until only one society remains. Simply put – ideology demands that if we are so different from the world and we must continue to spread the seed of society so we must change the world so that they are more willing to accept your message by whatever means necessary.

What Joseph Goebbels (Minister of Propaganda for Nazi Germany) did was incorporate the public mind into the policy of governments. How will a people react to this new tax, or this law being taken into consideration? How can we shape public opinion to be favorable to what we already have decided to do? These topics I will cover at length within the finished work.

Goebbels was among those who set the groundwork for other nations to follow - and he certainly was not unaware of how other nations practiced manipulation of public opinion. His published works were not of personal feelings, but deliberate statements to a targeted audience to evoke a deliberate action. Propaganda, I will argue, as a whole does not really rely on truth to be complete or not, it is only effective if it gets people to act or think in a certain way. All you need is the tiniest of shreds of truth to cling to, and allow the human mind to do its magic.

In order to avoid contradiction, Goebbels recommended a unified source of information. Does Main Stream Media practice this? The 'Associated Press' perhaps – it alone (as of 2007) is

distributed to 1700 newspapers, 5000 TV and radio broadcasters, 10 million images in 120 countries, and is expanding to satellite, all centrally located within New York City. It certainly is a media empire or center of propaganda if there ever was one.

Anyway, what will (hopefully and correctly) conclude that slanted truth makes the best propaganda, as outright lies rarely hold up to external scrutiny. There is also a fundamental shift between Enlightenment doctrine that dictated that those who pursue the truth ought to do it dispassionately. Now, we view truth propagation is seen as something that ought to be pursued with passion as it is a moral and civic duty to make sure everyone is informed.

We will cover the notion that propaganda is like a seed looking for fertile soil, or a virus looking for a receptive host. Today, the best kept secret from us is that we do not actually have free choice. We are given a list of options, but those options are chosen for us and do not necessarily suit us. That has always been the case for everyone, but for some reason that truth has been hidden/forgotten or ignored.

Once propaganda has successfully taken a hold of a person's mind, it morphs into ideology, of which I plan on covering in fuller detail in Chapter 4. Propaganda is no longer necessary to one who is ideologically motivated as they are the converted. When it comes to choosing words that silence dissents – they use our fears and motivations against us. When we say 'bigot' – we understand 'the undesirable other' so when someone calls us that in order to silence dissent, we naturally go on the defensive and grant the field to the accuser.

We will quickly go to express the types of people generally known to tell truths or lies. People normally trust the less educated because, as we covered more completely in chapter two, show those who are naturally of a lower IQ are less capable of lying. Now, education is no indication of intellect or capability – but the majority of people who have little education know this. For them, a 'doctor' or equivalent is someone much smarter than themselves. This means they are a threat because they know they can be so easily manipulated into going against their own self interests. This is another reason why reputation of academics is so important – if we lose the trust of the people then we become their target, plus easy prey for government and other institutions who would love nothing more than shut down or shut up dissenting voices from academia.

I will argue that propaganda does not care about race, sex, or age. I find it cute to see corporate/government bodies staffed with a menagerie of ages, sexes and colors and sell this as a ploy that gets us to think that their message is the result of a collaboration of many points of view and therefore the best of all the possible ones. This form of thinking is the result of 1960s/70s generation of minds who put it into the thoughts of the youngsters that the enemy was of a certain age, sex or race - so the cure for racism, sexism and ageism was more ageism, sexism and racism (this time, reverse it where you thought you saw it before)! That, I will argue, is the world we live in today.

Much of what I cover follows the Frankfurt School's 'Critical Theory' style of philosophy. Being honest with yourself means to accept your failings for what they are. Pretending you, your society or your culture is morally infallible is naive and dangerous. Believing in the inevitable progress and triumph of man over contemporary hardships is equally dangerous. With that mindset excuses for all kinds of atrocities were opened. The Catholic Church, in recent years, ought to be commended for its open and honest policy of accepting the fact that they are not perfect and never have been. Others who claim perfection ought to be scrutinized.

It will be shown that propaganda produces a streamlining effect for society to limit thought and action to a few, manageable and most importantly, predictable sets. The Modern (nor Contemporary) State did not want to be like the Roman Empire, with all its hundreds of religions and political affiliations. What that meant for the Romans was that they were busy every few years stamping out violent rebellions all across their lands when all of that was going on. Only after Christianity settled in were the people docile enough, though by that time, arguably, the Empire was too weak to regain its strength in the West. The Eastern Roman Empire survived quite well under Christianity for over a thousand years, on the other hand – until another religion forced them out.

Yes force can be used against the hard-core fanatics, but for the rest of us a more subtle force is only necessary - one that undermines all core tenements of an ideology. How to do that specifically depends on what ideology you want overthrown or how to infect someone with your propaganda depends on how to your message to what the receiver perceives as important to their current beliefs. Beliefs are never cut out and replaced, but converted and changed from within.

Much writing has taken place here discussing 'elites' or 'the powers that be', as if they were a secret society of overlords. This mysterious cabal has everything we covet – money, power and anonymity. Are they real, or is it an illusion where we pinpoint this source of propaganda? What is more likely to happen?

I will look briefly into the contemporary phenomena of the internet as it related to mass deception. The internet is/was an interesting phenomena – once it was used as a powerful tool for grass roots resistance against corporate and government repression of the poor across the world. It was a source of information outside of Mass Media, given by being posted on the internet via video or written articles. Bureaucratic forces have used their power to block/buy sites that post such content, but I think as long as people have access to the internet they can circumvent such measures of control.

Contemporary national interests are the same as corporate interests and corporate interest serves the shareholders. All that is left is to remove the shareholders from the equation and what we have is a return to a feudal system, or back to a world resembling that strangely awful novel 'Atlas Shrugged' – where masses of poor are worshiping/serving owners of companies like they were Gods. This is happening, I will argue, this very day, when interest rates are near zero, companies can borrow as much money as they want then buy back their own stock, forcing owners out and de facto privatizing the company – but this will be covered further in chapter four.

The point I try to make in this sub-chapter is that propaganda is only necessary to be used on people not already ideologically indoctrinated. Therefore, it only makes sense that it takes root in those already not willing to think or act in a certain way and to use whatever means necessary to do so.

Chapter 3.4 - Raison D'être

In this chapter I will focus my discussion on reason and why the lie exists at all. Some of the sources used here are Nietzsche, Huxley, Erasmus, Gray, Machiavelli, Milton, Voltaire and Kant.

I will take a look at published practical manuals on how to effectively lie. Although we are naturally irrational, I will argue that lies fall within the realm of reason and rationality as well.

A central theme is that we absorb the lie, incorporate it within our minds and then accept it as truth. Afterwards we then use reason to make the lie make sense to us and others. From there the lie may spread to other minds – much like how a virus or bacteria propagates itself. Now, let us explore this subject in greater detail.

Motivational speakers, coaches or even psychologists use the method of encouraging others to imagine their goals, to see themselves as who they want to be or by achieving what they want to achieve. When people do that, it is generally accepted, it becomes easier to actually accomplish that objective. At the moment of imagination, of the point of crafting a story, all the way up to the moment of accomplishment – all this involves the processes of reason, of problem solving and of the rejection of fear because they no longer hold onto the fear of failure.

When reason can no longer justly know something, it turns to justified belief. If justified belief no longer satisfies the quality of knowledge sought, then theory and proposition is summoned. When all else fails, we fall back onto faith – the notion that something is true when that something is perhaps the least likely to have actually happened. Why is such a thing so rampant? Well, we have answered that in chapter two regarding irrational rationality, but in this chapter I hope to have cleared all doubt.

I will briefly go over some propaganda tactics to discuss why such a thing exists. One such tactic is to swarm the debate with subjective words, to see that their victory is determined by whoever has said the most words. Whether those words have any meaning is secondary. Those who tell overt lies will most likely use this because the validity of the content is unimportant – only the volume of the message. Within the realm of the public sphere – talk-shows, television debates, anywhere where time is considered money and money is amount of attention paid then this tactic reigns supreme. Victory is counted by who have had the most air time – because it is generally assumed that the one who has got to speak the most is the one to we ought to listen to, they are the 'authority' in the matter.

Good Erasmus of Rotterdam may have thought that such human bags of hot air meant well, but did so out of ignorance. This may be true, but is equally attributed to those who mean to sow lies for whatever purpose. The avoidance of the horrors of listening to these people I would gladly suggest active avoidance of head-to-head debates. Unfortunately, we cannot avoid all such unpleasantness in our lives, but such a thing is but a side note.

The point I wish to drive home in the dissertation is the fact that we are a part of nature and that there is no mystical spirit/body duality. Additionally, our capacity for knowledge and imagination is not infinite. This leads to the point of this sub chapter in that our use of lies as a part of reason, as a part of nature this is all about procreation and continued existence. This is the chapter where I hope to tie in many aspects of earlier chapters together.

Sexuality will be discussed further under this chapter. In it I will argue that people have a certain set of characteristics they desire in the opposite sex – when the opposite sex sees this, they can feign those characteristics in order to attract that mate. Once deception is practiced enough, they cognitive retrain themselves into acting and becoming what was previously a conscious effort. Is the previous self-transformed into the new, or is it simply hidden under layers of self-deception? Such questions I hope to explore further in the complete work.

I will argue that both are true and ask the reader to think of self-deception as the temperature within the ocean. Near the bottom of the ocean the temperature is the same no matter what time of year it is while the further up there are relatively firm divisions between layers of warmer and colder water, while the near surface and surface temperatures fluctuate on par with the seasons.

The inner self remains the same, but piled on top of it are several other layers acquired over the years, while what we see on the surface, our actions, thoughts and feelings, are the shallow mixing zone between the outside environment and the ocean. Self-deception does not result in the change of the core self, only the observable self. Now, like the ocean, the environment can indeed change the core-self (well, temperature if we are to keep the oceanic analogy), but this is only after enormous changes over a very long time will the core change even remotely.

Looking at human history is a look into the void, but in order to understand it and ourselves today, we need to look into this void. We see evidence of the chaos and irrationality of our nature

within history. It is evidence of Schopenhauer's veracity so one ought to study history not as a symbol of progress, but from a philosophical point of view that is filtered favoring anthropology.

The concept of using mental short-cuts and various other generalizations is a part of the human psyche. I will argue that some situations where actively analyzing a situation, stopping and weighing the various methods available to them are considered, then the best course of action taken – is simply too long a process for us to use all the time. In the aviation industry, if by time a pilot sees another plane coming right at them and they are unsure which way to decide which way to turn, they are dead before such a decision is made – this is why they are trained to immediately turn to the right from the very beginning. The problem is when their training is wrong, or some other snap decision or basis for a decision is based on falsehood then that is what gets people killed.

I will delve into topics surrounding ideology, culture and religion in this sub chapter. Some questions posed will be: How many people claim to be honest followers of every single major religion out there? Who can honestly identify with being Christian, Muslim, Hindu and Buddhist all at the same time? I would posit (in further detail in the complete work) that there are not very many at all. The same can be said for self-professed political positions, be it leftist, conservative, right wing, etc. There is little room for others when you are part of a totalitarian ideology.

I will look at institutionalized lying as a part of corporate culture in further detail. Some of the conclusions suggest that if an institution is so out of touch with reality that they think a certain set of practices can be accomplished then they would not be surprised if their subordinates would report that such a set reported that they were completed successfully. Again, I will stress that the lie must appear plausible to the listener.

In fact, all utterances require some form of justification, or as a minimum the need to sound reasonable is needed if no other justification is readily available. I will, however, posit that within the realm of the public sphere, lying is more of a prevalent percentage wise than in our day to day interactions with other people – simply because the need to lie is there. We are deemed to have no need to know the truth behind what the powers that be tell us what is happening, so we are told what is convenient. It would seem that the majority of us are in fact honest.

What we say might simply be subjective truths (and be totally wrong, by the way), but still we are not a species who is actively trying to be deceiving everyone all the time. This concludes my objectives for this chapter, and now we move onto a brief summary of the final chapter covering the Public Sphere.

Chapter 4.0 – The Public Sphere

This is a very brief introduction into what I hope to discuss on the last chapter. The last chapter is understood to be the one that discusses all the pertinent topics as it relates to the public sphere itself.

Chapter 4.1 – Outlining Concepts

In this chapter I will discuss ideology, culture and economics. Some of my most used sources include Zizek, Habermas and John Gray. Various other important sources reside here, but those mentioned tend to be the ones I build my case around.

The internet and the concepts of multiculturalism/globalism will be discussed here. I will argue that what we will see is that the internet has isolated every single voice in the world, not united them. From this we can conclude that there is no viable difference between the public and private sphere. All are connected globally, making it public, but all are isolated and compartmentalized by IP addresses and physical locations – so we are actually private. We will see that we have moved beyond the modern mass society and into the post-modern global society – unified by technology and a consumerist ideology. This means the line between ideology and culture is a difficult one to differentiate and so we will cover that here.

Those who still hold onto the promises and goals set out by the Enlightenment do so out of fear of the unknown, similar to that of hiding the death of a monarch when there is no clear heir (in order to avoid mass rioting in the streets). The moment of death for the Enlightenment, so it will be argued, coincides with the collapse of the Soviet Union and with it the experiment with Communism. More accurately, the death of the Soviet Union should be seen as a victory for Socialism, not defeat, because, arguably, the Soviet Union was more authoritarian/totalitarian than truly Communist. That being said, it is not my intent to thoroughly discuss the specifics of Communism or Totalitarianism but one worthy of discussing nonetheless.

The argument I put forward in this chapter is that fundamental values in which contemporary western civilization is based is no longer respected. Gray would agree that a return to these values is hopeless – but I will posit that the truth of that is to be seen. To say that things cannot regress back to a previous order is meritless.

What we can all agree on is that the basis of our societies today have its roots in the Enlightenment, but are no longer values that drive western society today. This deception that we are still pursuing goals of reason, justice and moral perfection is the most fundamental to understand if we are to understand the world today.

To see the world through the scope of the Enlightenment would be in error. The Enlightenment and its values are indeed dead; still, I will argue that we should not abandon all of its thinking simply because the living is stupider today than of yesteryear. Like all paths to fresh thinking, it starts in the past then we can begin to formulate ideas for solutions that match the problems of today.

I will cover briefly types of logical fallacies common within the public sphere. To be immune to ad hominem's ourselves I will suggest that it is wise we forget about the importance of the ad hominem. I will recommend using their twisted logic against them and identify as a planet or a fictional character – today the sky is the limit! It is nothing but nonsense, so the use of sense will never register as coherent communication to one who only understands nonsense. Obviously we are all human, an opinion or mental state does not affect our humanity, etc. This is not the focus of the obtainment of truth. We are human no matter what we do, say, or think.

Cult leaders would have our humanity taken away for disagreeing with them – they claim to be the ones who decide who is or is not a person. My argument in this chapter would be to clarify that that no one has that power to take your humanity from you, no matter how harshly they threaten you; nobody can ever turn you into something you cannot not be. From this I happily use Thomas Aquinas' logic that 'God cannot be made to do something that would no longer make him God' – and being a good product of secular-liberal humanist thinking I have simply replaced God with Man.

For the Enlightenment, I will agree that it is true that it is utopianistic. Yes, it was to a degree, like Hegel's idea of the 'end of history' where we achieve perfection and then we can all stop worrying and coast along until the end of the universe in perfect harmony – but to say this is merely an Enlightenment view is incorrect. I will explore and discuss the fact that all ideology holds this view, all dogma would have us believe that we are right and only if everyone were like us then everything would be perfect. Contemporary buffoons like the Islamic or Christian fundamentalists are like mushrooms and thrive in growing within the shadow of large festering corpses – like the Enlightenment. They serve no purpose other than to help putrefy the host body.

I will explore further that this argument can be traced back to the conservative view that uneducated peasants were not supposed to be reading the Bible for themselves – they would all come to the wrong interpretation of it! Ordained priests must be the only ones allowed to read and interpret the Bible. The Old Catholics never won that battle over who decided that, and here we are today, for the better I think.

It is better that the free flow of ideas is necessary for progress, worse that some of those ideas are dangerous and wrong. The freedom to make mistakes is the freedom to be a human being – but is it worth the cost of progress? Who knows, but from standpoint I would rather be a lower class civilian in Canada than a Duke in Medieval France (we have better health care, food, entertainment, etc.). The freedom to explore and make mistakes is what enables progress, and since progress is valuable, we can say that it is in fact worth the cost. This question will be explored a bit further in the dissertation proper.

Today, I will argue, that we rely on the thoughts of enlightenment thinkers just as they relied on the thoughts of the religious, previous. Kant relied on Dons Scotus, Hegel on the classics of Plato and Socrates, etc. Of course you can go back and take those ideas put down by the greats to fashion something greater yourself – but you cannot remove the broken fundamentals of an ideology without rendering the whole system impotent. It would be like if you had a car and determined the source of the problem of it going off the road and killing its occupants is some inherent problem with wheels. So, to solve it, you fashion the same car, but without wheels. The result of that logic is the creation of a safer vehicle, but one that goes nowhere.

Fatal flaws are found within an ideology that worships toleration. Yes it may remain cute, like letting people form cults and worship aliens or let them identify themselves as genderfluid goatkins – if they are in small number this is something we can just point at and laugh, or study as a curiosity. The problem begins when such ideologies become violent, usually when they are no longer a tiny percentage of the minority and move beyond the 10% range. The core of toleration is that we actually endorse what the other is believing and here I will argue is toleration's greatest weakness. So, in the case of complete toleration – we say it is okay to worship aliens, it is okay to think you are a genderfluid goatkin, and it is okay to say it is your right to rape and kill nonbelievers.

I will describe the ongoing clash of ideologies/cultures and economies as an ongoing war of civilization. The war being fought today is not one of bombs, or guns or bullets (though they are a symptom). It is one of ideology – one that we are untrained, unequipped and as the latest series of foreign and domestic boondoggles attest to, one we are losing handily. Can a war of ideology be won with only bullets or bombs? Most certainly. But only if we know who the enemy is and what threat they pose. This is where I found the philosophy of Sun Tsu and Machiavelli so useful. I will argue that our weakness is that our ideology masks the vital concept that others do not share our values and goals.

We are naive enough to believe all are equal, open minded and understanding towards others. Therefore, any of those bullets or bombs fired or dropped will have no lasting effect, no more than plucking the dead leaves from a tree will result in the felling of that tree. When Rome attempted to purge itself of Christianity, what they found was killing them were like the heads of

hydra – when one head was cut off, two more took its place. The wounds need to be cauterized – no more heads were to pop out if the flesh was already dead to life. That did not stop the classical Western Romans from wasting a lot of energy lopping off heads, however.

How we are dealing with various threats to our civilization today is similar to this analogy. A small scale project of removing this local leader of a terrorist cell, or that, as they pop up, is no more effective than plucking leaves from a tree. As long as the tree lives, new leaves will eventually sprout. Current policy would have us hope that we can continue plucking leaves faster than they grow – certainly an exercise in futility, like Hercules and the simple cutting the heads off the Hydra. This is the sort of framework I use to describe ideology and lies within it within this chapter and one I believe the sources support.

If Hercules continued to chop away at the heads, they would continue to have kept coming back, until he became overwhelmed and killed. A new strategy was needed, one that cured the weakness of the previous. The problem was not in the removal of heads, but in the growth of new ones. As is what is needed in counter-terrorism today. Unless of course there is the possibility that Hercules never wanted to kill the beast and simply enjoyed lopping heads off Hydras indefinitely because of his lust for violence. But that is hardly believable and certainly would get boring and tiring quickly.

The trouble for us, as it was for Hercules, was that this is a fight we cannot afford to lose. Continuing the same failing policies, by toying around and provoking an enemy long enough, you will eventually be caught off guard and be defeated. The arrogance and stupidity of the Roman and Byzantine Empires are a testament to this. They certainly had the wealth, capability and manpower to have continued onto this day, but what undid them, as what has undone many Empires in the past and will do so in the future, is a series of catastrophic blunders that continues to escalate to make the situation worse and worse. Empires do not usually go out in a blaze of glory, but rot from the inside out, then simmer into vapor. I do not look at the rise and fall of civilizations as inevitable or natural, but do attribute real philosophical weaknesses to the cause of their demise and death.

Today we seem to be focused on Islam as the primary contender in the ideological struggle of civilizations. Hegel was correct that it has been relegated to the trash-bin of history as a unified and external threat, so how it stands now as a threat is from within. Radical feminism, multiculturalism, and political correctness (RFMPC) will ensure no more resistance presents itself to hostile and violent ideologies remain with Western civilization (in the form of witch hunts, guilt-trips, violence and legislation). Like a person dying of AIDs, all it takes it just one more infection to kill the host. It is not my intent to dehumanize any person or group of persons in this dissertation, but to illustrate the infectious and dangerous nature of ideology.

Is there a chance this auto-immune disease we are suffering from turn itself back to defending the body from ailments? I will explore various possibilities in the dissertation, but ultimate say that such a thing is unlikely, but impossible to say for certain. Cognitive dissonance would have people rewrite or ignore reality if it does not suit their ideology. I will discuss in detail the acronym RFMPC (a term to describe artificial neural networks) We can give a near perfect prediction if we know the proper target of RFMPC – free speech.

Employing various strategies, RFMPC is destroying the capability and willpower for purely orthodox western persons to express their opinions. They have no end goal – only the destruction of the status-quo. Once western civilization is completely destroyed (via the complete abolishment of freedom of speech), then only those who express their will by violence will have any voice. I will argue now that western civilization as we know it is actually quite dead right now – as all endorse some kind of anti-hate speech law. The good news is that ideology lives and propagates inside each and every one of us. The larger scale apparatus that founded the ideology I employ in my daily life may be officially (legally) deceased, but as long as myself and likeminded individuals draw breath there is hope that the apparatus may function once again. It is unlikely though, no more than those who share warm feelings for the deceased Soviet Union will ever see the reinstatement of that particular way of life again.

Where we are heading towards today, I will argue, is a form of despotism. I will explore further the phenomena of the rise of far right politics and the philosophical reasonings for this. I will argue that despotism can be good or bad (usually bad), though that rests on the nature of the despot. Most likely a corporate type of despot, like how society today worships corporate drones

like the late Steve Jobs. Donald Trump seems to be the most likely contemporary candidate of this archetype. It is hard to tell exactly, as usually the transition to this reflects larger series of events.

Since we are going through a period of deglobalization, a good event to see where despotism is near the peak swing of this destabilizing phenomena. This means that when the basics of life are most threatened by chaos we will reach for the most secure form of control we have – that is despotism. The only cure for an extreme situation is the extreme situation in the opposite direction; this is why in times of extreme chaos people desire someone who offers them stability.

From here on we will explore the nature of the public domain so that we can better understand all these bizarre and mysterious changes within our culture, how other cultures react and change to events that threaten them and why this is important to philosophy. The historian enjoys looking at the problems of what has happened and how within a very narrow context of a few series of events (ex: World War One started with the event of the assassination of Arch Duke Ferdinand). Philosophy must ask the difficult question of 'why' – and in order to explain extremely complex topics such as this, we are going to need to grasp some fundamental concepts on the nature of the public domain.

Those who are in the business of promoting and propagating ideology, like journalists, politicians, or marketing personnel are those already proven to be an unquestioning servant to the established approved ideology. Those already selected as worthy are the ones permitted access to the highest echelons of academia, government or corporate institutions. Education, intellect or capabilities are inconsequential to the central powers of ideology.

Only those who have proven themselves to be reliable over decades of observation and indoctrination will be offered positions that result in the propagation of certain ideologies. This is a very lucrative and seductive lure, and for some academics will write anything promoting any subject matter if only given enough money. I will posit that even the most morally robust individual has their breaking point, and that we will discover that morals are, at best, only used when convenient.

What we think we know about people is, in fact our own ideology telling us this. One such question I hope to answer is how are target enemy groups damaged? I, working within the aviation industry, like to use aviation type analogies in my work. I will try to answer the previous question by arguing that it is simply a matter of silencing dissenters and getting the most air-time – like jamming a radar system all you need to do is scream loud enough and long enough no one will be able to pick up anything coherent. If a rival sect writes one publication exposing some embarrassing and harmful statements about the integrity of your institution, write ten times as many articles denouncing them (whether it is truthful or not doesn't matter).

A very important concept to remember in this chapter is that we rely on others for everything – how to dress, what to eat, buy, vacation or vote. With such a grand division of labor we expect there to be experts in everything, when the reality is this expectation is very much overrated. Much of our ideology forces us to look upwards for direction or approval to act. Acting on one's own accord is treated with punishment, disdain, and isolation.

Nothing is supposed to be done without prior permission and approval from those who have the given authority. I believe deep down early in life we are independently minded, but this is unlearned through public education and carries on into adulthood. We must obey or the structure of society falls apart – a silly concept (many structures exist that are not so dependent on as wide a foundation as we think it is, it may not be like a pyramid but could in fact look like a rectangle – with an equal amount of people on the bottom as the top), but we have never questioned this. The idea that equal representation on the bottom and tops of society (numbers wise) is absolutely alien to most of us. We are so used to being dominated by a small cabal of people anything else is unthinkable.

I will argue that ideology demands violence – but carrying out its demands is a dangerous game. Fascist ideology demanded too much of it, and because of that it burnt out very quickly. Christian demand for violence was a strange beast, going from complete pacification resulting in the Arab conquests of the late Classical and Medieval periods, to overt aggression resulting in the Crusades and wars of religions in the Early Modern period. I will argue that Christianity today has totally died out as a political ideology and offers no solutions (and those it does, has no official power to enforce) to contemporary real world problems.

Islam has always been aggressive and expansionist, but, like fascism, because of its aggression it has burnt itself out – by Hegel's time it has ceased to be an organized political force that could've threaten Europe. By contemporary times it is nothing more than millions of confused and angry rabble rousers storming wherever they are able to walk or swim. That form of expansionism is certainly more effective because Europeans have no idea what is going on nor why because they expect invaders to wear uniforms and undermine the will of the government – that is, to behave like European invaders.

Funny that these invaders wear civilian clothing and act with the approval of the government! Still, there are a few pockets organized Islam left in the world – like in countries like Iran or Saudi Arabia, but this is changing quickly and things are certainly not in their favor. Neither progression nor regression is guaranteed, so where this will go is to be seen. All of this I hope to discuss in this chapter. The particular politics of religion I am not too concerned with, only the attributes of it so that we may understand culture and ideology better.

I will argue that ideology lives within each and every one of us. Once ideology has died in all hearts, it cannot come back. Then again, it is not a static part of us – it constantly strives to adapt to new circumstances until it is replaced, like belief. Contemporary global ideology is a direct relative of the Enlightenment movement, which is a unified, borderless realm with the dream of universalities of human rights, democracy and order.

The result of the collapse of ideology is necessarily nihilism, because only in nihilism can we accept that no one outlook can offer us meaning in the world nor utopia but only we can give meaning about our world to ourselves. Worrying about the true nature of a lie is itself deception, because a lie known is not a truth unknown. Exactly why this is I hope to answer in the dissertation proper.

Even in the face of failure or death we cannot imagine our own annihilation. The same is true with ideology – it cannot imagine a world that is different than how it sees it. When it does see others - shock, fear, hatred and resentment are common reactions. All great movers like those who see the flaws and enact change are necessarily considered rebels and usurpers in their own

time. One person can only hold onto one particular ideology and the powers of it to blind to others is total. It controls the emotions and we have no overriding control over that.

A few questions I will pose are 'Can people be so blind and be in a position to have a philosophical discussion with? What is the answer to Erasmus's question?' The simple answer is - of course not. We cannot describe objective opinions to those people no more can we describe the brightness of the sun to a blind person. The blind can feel the heat, but never see the light, so to speak. Slaves to dogmatic ideology, those blind to its deception, are no more capable of freedom of thought than a lamp. Those not slaves to this are equally without freedom of will, but enjoy a larger tether or rope to wander about – and of course the longer the rope, the more of objective reality they are able to explore. How is this?

Just as someone wearing blindfolds will see less than one without, both fields of vision are in one way or another limited, one just happens to be able to observe more and the more you see the more you are aware of. Seeing further out enables you to spot dangers approaching, allowing yourself more time to plan accordingly, in opposition to knee-jerk reactions to events after they have taken place. So, the great deception of ideology, I will argue, is that it confuses your mind into thinking what it sees is objectively real. Think of it as acting in a similar way as a virtual reality mask.

To identify and discard ideology is, then, liberating in the fact that we no longer fear abandonment – this is the true joy of nihilism. So, we need to see that art is one of the more shallow expressions of things as they are, as it repeats the strongest forces of ideology – of imagination and how something is seen through the mind.

Is there a way to reconcile such differences? I will argue that we cannot, but it is better than lapsing into self-deception and looking forward to the release of death. To act in open defiance of God or the government or whatever authority figure you can imagine is no escape from ideology - you are still playing within its rules. What is left once ideology has been removed, once the game is no longer played? Perhaps nothing, because here we are entering uncharted waters.

When an ideology withers and dies it is felt along its population as a collapse in the public psyche. If we start to see large influxes of people suffering from depression or other disorders of

the personality or mental disposition, etc., it is a good sign that the system behind those collapses in mental health has collapsed. I am not saying all cases of mental illness is a sign of the collapse of a society, but, like our fractal behavior, it is certainly a sign of it when observed over instances of the entire population and over a longer period of time. If I were to point to a time where western civilization died as we knew it in the 20th century, it would be with the collapse of the Soviet Union and with it, the Enlightenment.

Obviously, it is not totally dead because it still lives within the hearts of many alive – but this is certainly not so in the younger generations. Once those who lived through the years of the Soviet Union are gone, so too is the foundation of the principles of the Enlightenment. If we must put a date on when the values of the Enlightenment are completely gone, we can only give it a very rough estimate. Considering people are unable to consciously think before the age of 7, and give a rough time of the death of the enlightenment at 1990, then those born in 1983 or earlier would be the ones implanted with Enlightenment ideals. Let us assume everyone lives to the ripe old age of 90, this means that by 2073 we can expect all Enlightenment ideals that form the basis of the public sphere will be de facto eliminated, though it may still exist on paper officially.

A constant theme in the dissertation is that progression and regression are not guaranteed, so where we will be in 2073 is not certain, it may be better or worse – certainly not the same and certainly not within a framework of the Enlightenment. This is just an estimation on what information we have today. So, does this mean that ideology is responsible for the public morality or good?

Of course, moral discipline is one of the foundations of ideology. We ask for it to guide us and we need its commandments to give us meaning in life. When threatened, we beg for its attention. I remember after the World Trade Center attacks, news stations never had more ratings or viewers – no more people ready and willing to listen to talking heads and pundits.

I will argue that the history of ideology is based around the history of religion. First were polytheists – who took the spirit, or nature, of man and put it into the Gods. The Gods were seen as embodiment of human nature, each having a perfect human form to match their perfect human nature, for example Mars, the God of War, was depicted as a muscular, stern and fearsome

hoplite. Monotheists took the nature out of man and cast it into the unknowable – into one God than is not even based on this planet. Monotheism lived well until they time where people started to doubt the divine origin of themselves – with the ideological shock that was the works of Charles Darwin and his ilk. After that, scientific materialism appeared which brought the unknown of human nature away from God, into the faith that our own minds were the source of the secrets of ourselves and the known universe.

If you look for feeling of purpose and meaning from an organization or others, you are giving them control over your life. They will never fully grant you this feeling you desire, or, if they do, it comes at a very steep price: your complete obedience. Spirit, as it was known to Hegel, was understood as this sense of independence and meaning we all have and this was banished from this realm of reality.

The battleground of ideology determines where truth lies. Who is correct - was it within ourselves, or is monotheists correct that it is found within Holy texts? Still, if such a truth was found within them and all of us desire this truth more than anything else, why has so few read the Bible, or why was there such resistance from Church leaders to get people to read it for themselves? Such questions I ask in order to stress the other points made in this chapter, as I do not wish to get too involved in theocracy itself.

What I will argue is that perhaps these books contain no real ultimate truths about ourselves – perhaps what we really want is to be accepted and cared so by our fellow people. People never bother to actually read something that posits to control or own the secret of their lives, and so they trust in the opinions of the few that have. In the 21st century, this seems silly, but knowing our nature it is very understandable. Still, the same problems of yesteryear exist today within the realms of science and humanism. Instead of the priesthood of actual priests, Imams, friars and monks, we have the priesthood of Geneticists, Theoretical Physicists, physicians or bureaucratic leaders. Now we may move onto sub chapter 4.2 – Culture.

Chapter 4.2 – Culture

The main questions I wish to answer are how does this differentiate from ideology or economics? Main topics to be covered here are the 'cultured person', nihilism, religion, insanity, technology, sexuality, the concept of time and finally science.

I do not agree that nothing exists separated from interpretation. Yes, some of the mentally ill or insane are incapable of grasping the simplest of concepts, but they ought not to be considered here. Still, the concept of insanity is indeed cultural in many ways. Take for example those atheists in Nigeria – there to declare oneself as atheist is to admit insanity and you are likely destined for the nearest psychiatric hospital. Other subcultures that I am familiar with consider free-thinking as insane, so when we discuss concepts of insanity we have to take into consideration the culture that defines it.

I will request the reader to think of culture as a type of plant and ideology the soil in which it grows. Certain plants flourish in certain climates and soils. Western democracy, like an Evergreen tree, might survive quite well in the cold and moist climates of the north, but die very quickly when transplanted to a desert or steppe. Everything within that ecosystem does so in reaction to the underlying environment. Ideology sets the environment which spawns other phenomena, like culture, to grow and flourish within it. Still, in terms of Nietzsche, I believe he is quite correct to point out that our own ethics and morality restrict our natural inclinations – for better or worse. There is some truth to the matter that what defines us is how we attribute value to and organize things.

Culture is taught to us, and what can be taught can be forgotten - unlike our base instincts or subconscious drives. This is why culture is placed on a higher functioning level than ideology. We are well aware and conscious of how our culture drives us. What about the sub-categories of culture, like religion? Can we say that religion is also taught, but at its base is a system of negative feelings of guilt, responsibility and cruelty? Could it be cruelty in reaction to other methods of cruelty?

Some subcultures enjoy playing the values of the majority against itself for the betterment of the minority. There are those who guilt us do so by playing the victim, so all of this guilt coercion

comes from this tactic. They convince us why we are wrong and we ought to behave differently. Shame on us! By existing, we are a bane to the existence to all good and innocent people everywhere. Culture sells us the concept of the good, but the goods of slavery. By giving into the demands of those make us feel shame for which we are, we are weakening ourselves down to the point where they will become our masters.

Not causing offense is therefore weakness. Therefore, and this is a flowing theme throughout the dissertation, this 'social justice warrior' culture is only of multiculturalism, is one that is therefore inherently weak. So, western civilization has never been at a weaker point in history and I stand by my prediction that it will cease to exist in Europe within 2-3 generations – perhaps a few more over the Atlantic. I hope to be proven wrong, however!

It is true that cultural forces can get indifferent or decent people to commit acts of barbarity and cruelty that would otherwise be impossible. Tribalism and blood-feuds are such an example, where conflicts can rage on for countless generations because of a perceived slight done since before memory. So, the harsher the laws (the more brutal the government), would mean it would be easier for people to forget the laws of their culture. This was why brutal dictators brought relative peace to the Middle East, or those who brought untold suffering and death to Europe – depending on the underlying culture, its suppression or freedom can be a bane or boon to humanity at large.

I happen to find solace in nihilism and suggest that nihilism seems to be the temporary solution to the public aspect of dealing with deception. As ideology breaks us down in order to build us back up into a functioning participant, nihilism reverses the ideological and cultural building up of an individual. It is the logical next step in the wake of the enlightenment. But what exactly is a nihilist? It seems they are the kind of people that simply allow us to be fully human – be it good/bad/right or wrong. It does not matter because those concepts are irrelevant. To be pessimistic is to reject the human construct of the world. This does not mean they reject reality – they are searching for it and concluded that it does not rest on the other side of a subjective filter.

This morality of the status quo is a hamster wheel – we can go nowhere when using only morality only as a guide. I will take a side close to Nietzsche and say morality just keeps us in

place - that which has lost value in the eyes of a culture is purely a human subjective construction. The basis of value is belief and from there every belief is held to be based in reality. Because without a morality dispensing supernatural being, the atheist simply has transferred their belief into the mystery of human nature rather than the mystery of faith.

I will discuss further the nature of God and morality in this sub chapter. Sin, and what defines sin, is via Christ/God. It is God that tells us what constitutes sin, so if there were no God, then obviously there would be no sins. Now, a 'sin' is not an act against man, but an act against God. So, it is quite right to say that blasphemy and sin is not possible without the rules to say what is or is not allowed. Certain sins may still break other laws, as they may harm nature or other people.

It is similar to speeding limits – if you abolish speeding limits you simply remove the velocity of one's vehicle as a cause for punishment. If, however, you were driving in a manner that endangered yourself or others, then that would be a completely different wrong, even though speed may be a factor in the dangerous method that you are driving in. To kill is certainly a sin, but it is also an affront to universal human morality. To take the Lord's name in vain is certainly a sin, but has absolutely no effect on other people (unless it causes them to lose faith) and is of no concern to universal morality.

Culture has thousands of facets so understanding it within a wide general sense is so difficult to understand. This would be one reason why one cannot give an exhaustive and comprehensive list of what constitutes everything in this paper. What I can do is present as many facets of it as possible, at least what is observable. To expand on what we think we know, rather than offer up a complete and final assessment on the subject listed. I certainly am not capable of describing culture in a short few pages, I doubt anyone can.

The concept of Free-Will has not died with Christian culture, but humanists have taken the torch up (and some philosophers as well) and carried on with it. They really ought not to and labor to understand that philosophy is not under any existential threat if scientific determinism is true. Because science has very clear boundaries of what it can know, there is more than enough room for subjective and chaotic exploration of the unknown and unknowable for philosophy to enjoy.

I will cover some aspects of sexuality in this sub chapter. In it, I will argue that the notions of sex have changed considerably throughout the decades. I do not believe sexual intercourse was ever a truly sanctified act – such a notion was merely an illusion brought about by religious or local cultural customs. 'The world's oldest profession', as it were, has traded sexual contact for other valuables for as long as there were other valuables available. If sex has ever become unholy or whatever it might be a slight twist on all of that due to pornography – those who sell the myth of sex tries to sell it at this attachment to free physical and unrestrained pleasure. It always has been that, to a degree, but not all the time for everyone. The mysteries and tricks surrounding the mating game us humans play are very much a cultural construct – decorating our natural inclinations and framed within ideology.

Pride is an issue discussed here. I take a look at the popular saying goes 'it takes a big man to see just how small he is.' The lesson to be learned here is that the public sphere does not ask its members to have meaning or fulfillment in their lives – only servitude. This links us back to the message regarding low self-esteem – although there is an illusion that government and popular culture are there to help promote such things – the opposite is true. These 'Yes, you can!' and 'You can do it!' slogans really mean, 'Yes, you will!' and 'You better do it!' We put up with as much abuse as we think we deserve and coincidentally, we collectively think we deserve a lot.

We are not permanently doomed to be this way – to hate oneself is taught as is the ability to love oneself. Our states of mind shift with the trends and fads of culture. Where we happen to be standing now is based around scientific materialism, but this is rapidly swinging in the opposite direction favoring feelings over facts. So, if culture is based on belief, what we believe must be cultural in nature. It is not imprinted on our genetic material, so belief in anything is learned, not inherited. Culture, like ideology, is blind to race, sex and age.

All of the cultural idiosyncrasies have set goals for us – goals that offer us a reward for achieving them. Efficiency is equated with less waste and therefore an increase in a quality of life, right? Not always. How is the mass deportation of jobs to the poorest places on earth doing for the host nations that now have massive unemployment? It certainly is more efficient to move where labor is cheaper – so why isn't this resulting in our quality of life going up, how does it explain nearly three decades of stagnant wages?

The answer to that is because the ones profiting from the models of efficiency are not the unemployed factory workers, even though they all cite efficiency as reason enough to commit economic suicide. Such an illusion of the need of efficiency is certainly one of the great lies within the public sphere. It is akin to giving your children to another family because you think the other one can offer your children a bigger bedroom or more toys. The masterpiece film 'Citizen Kane' has shown us that such things only hollow a person to the point of becoming a sociopath. Efficiency has no regard for other important factors like safety, love (the most inefficient emotion of all, next to hatred) or togetherness.

Appeals to popularity and other forms of logical fallacies can be used to scare us into thinking a certain way. It may be used to make a small problem appear large (the latest virus to come out of the Amazon) or a large problem to appear small (like climate change or derivatives). Where does polarization fit into culture? It takes us back to the black/white viewpoints that it tries to get us to see the world as. Part of this is the practice of scapegoating – it is quite easy to place all of our problems onto one easily identifiable group of people.

Culture is aware of its own value-systems and uses that as a benchmark to sell what it desires. Populism is one such thing because in western civilization the demands of the masses simply must be satisfied – regardless of its logic or effect on themselves or others.

Perhaps human beings are not capable of building a truly civil-society – one where they can exist peacefully with nature. Or they could, but would rather not because living in harmony with nature is certainly not a position where man is placed above and beyond nature and everyone else. Civil society does not grant power desired over others, and peace with nature does not give us power over nature.

Also – culture can influence different peoples from the far corners of the earth. One such example I look to in the dissertation is the influence of Greco-Roman culture on African academia. I ask: what can African intellectuals get from the Greeks/Romans? Sure, us westerners today see ourselves as the true heirs to that long dead civilization, but does that give us a closer connection to it than Africans – whose intellectual class is a product of European colonization?

Remember that ideology sets the strategy and culture the tactic – so it makes sense it follows ideologies xenophobia. Xenophobia is not inherently wrong (or any phobia, for that matter), mind you, because it knows there is a very real possibility its cling to power is determined by how well it answers people's three primordial questions. All of these points I look forward to exploring in further detail in the completed work.

I will posit that deep down most of us have anxieties over the notion that all we take for granted is wrong – that all the answers are not there, that there must be a better answer to it somewhere else. This brings us back to third wave feminism. It is an intensifying cultural phenomenon that resembles radical Islam and the Social Justice Warrior/Black Lives Matter movements. Such ideologies born of the 1960s have spawned these sub-cultures and have remained consistently politically active enough to dominate nearly all Western and Central Europe and North America. We can safely say these movements represent the current status quo in the public sphere.

Now, if I were an uneducated, frail older man with a history of rape, theft and murder from a backwards country like Pakistan or Afghanistan where assimilation into conservative European culture would be impossible – to find work in the European Union all I would need to do is simply walk in! Now, that hardly sounds like I am enjoying any privilege here in North America, the opposite, in fact. The reason is, European culture does not want well educated, healthy people from western countries with western values – they want uneducated, violent criminals. If the opposite were true, then there would be little impediment to westerners moving there, and those from Pakistan or other places would have great difficulty in settling. Why is this?

They are best ruled by authoritarian dictators (plus are cheaper to maintain – they desire no education, make below minimum wage, etc.) and therefore will cause no harm if such a dictator comes along. I do not suggest I have some in depth knowledge of the inner workings of law-makers, only come to conclusions I see from the evidence put forward to me. I look at the finer points of these things further in the dissertation and come away with a stronger feeling that lies and deception are prevalent within the public sphere. Anyway, we can safely move now to our final sub-chapter: Economics.

Chapter 4.3 Economics

In this last chapter I wish to look at the basics of economics/cryptocurrencies/importance of money on influence of policy and deception. The idea behind this is that Epistemology covers the basics of what and how we obtain knowledge and truth, behavior is the topic on how we act out on all the inputs we process. Ideology is the framework of thought, culture is the wiring and plumbing. Culture gives us belief and value systems and how we go about dividing categories of value is taken under the wing of economics and finance.

How does this formulate into lies within the public sphere? Well, it is the final layer of deceit in public life. The myth of equality is at the root of economics – so it is here we will give a very brief overview of the subject as it relates to the central issue of mass deception. The concepts of strong/weak or master/slave is at the core of these investigations.

There are some who believe that slaves have a choice – either serve or die. Is this their only recourse? Well, perhaps not anymore in these times. Today we do not need to serve anymore because we are not needed anymore, money can simply be created out of nothing – no taxes are required. On the other hand, power determines what is valuable; therefore life itself is the basic element of all value.

This means that mortal enemies are never going to go away (specific ones maybe, but the idea of having a mortal enemy in general will not), because of the inherent greed to covet what others have. We live on a planet with finite resources and there is only so much to go around, with only so much room for people at the top.

It was mentioned earlier that the weak wish nothing more than to bring the strong down to their level. That is just the first stage – they know that there will always be weak and strong so to overthrow the strong the weak will expect to take their place. This all fits within the law of nature – but economics does not follow natural law.

How can we deviate from these current trends in economics? Critical thinking would be a good starting point – one must question the very tenants of contemporary economic theory. Economic theory should observe human behavior then explain it, not try to interpret human behavior to

match a theory. People who think the market will triumph are delusional – they confuse the triumph of the masters with their own. Sure, some may succeed, but the majority do not. Money does not care who owns it, and it just so happens that the strong are in the best situation to own it.

In terms of crypto currencies – precious metals like gold or silver have value because those resources are finite and coveted by others. What finite resource crypto currencies offer is a valuable number, broke free from the work of computers performing more and more complex algorithms in order to be rewarded with those numbers. The problem is, gold and silver both have practical usage, but what use can we have of a series of numbers on a computer screen? We cannot print them out and cover ourselves with them, or eat them or anything like that. It is all based on faith. Yes, crypto currencies are immune to government control and it is a form of currency used only by people for people. There are only so many of these coins or numbers in existence and this is why I only see them as a commodity rather than a currency – because the only value they have is compared to how many dollars someone is willing to pay for them.

Economics influences ideology as well as vice versa. If an economic system happens to work out then the power of ideology will take advantage of that and its resolve will be strengthened. The great deception is the deception of choice here along with other people's options. Parecon, libertarianism or communism are all a part of the same illusion – and all will be discussed at length within the finished work.

The point is that there only is what is. Therefore, economists are no different than the soothsayers of old and of course people do as they are trained. What philosophy ought to do is observe the world first then afterward form theories and arguments to explain it to fit objective reality. We can expand this out to describe the different from the kinds of people who are the agents of the Master – the one aiming to reinforce ideology and the status quo, and the ones trying to get us to better understand the human experience, instead of hiding ideology, it exposes it.

Conclusion

Those points covered here basically cover the main positions I wish to take on the completed dissertation. It is sincerely my hope that others find the work to be as provocative and interesting to read as it was to create. Even in the relative discomfort of my conditions in researching and creating the dissertation were not ideal, I hope it did not have a negative impact on the quality of the final result. That said, what I take to put forward in the dissertation I fully accept the possibility of being proven incorrect, and in that case I look forward to an opportunity to learn.

Still, what positions I have taken I did so under the comfort that such positions were obtained by taking the best information available to me at the time and at that time of them being written was the best answer I could provide to the questions posed. All in all, this work has given me not a sense of closure that post-graduate work may be nearing an end, but one of dizzying fear that now the world has opened up and there are many more philosophical questions in serious need to research and discussion. I suppose the one regret is not pursuing such a venture earlier, but honestly none of us have the perspective of today to give to our previous selves, so to the future we must look, not the past.

The main contributions to the field of philosophy I wish to add in my dissertation is a greater understanding of the human condition – by understanding why we act the way we act we come closer to securely finding the limits of human perfection. The points put forward are varied and carry across several disciplines – but this is only because the need of philosophy is in need of a general overhaul of some of its points of view. We are living in an interesting time, one where there is a void of philosophical dogma – and this gives us the very rare opportunity to start anew

and help lead humanity further towards the best we can be.

Principle Contributions

1. Attempted to cover a complete overview on the matter of human behavior by incorporating a holistic method covering various disciplines – from mathematics to social science and psychology, all under an umbrella of Continental Philosophy. Nowhere else in philosophy am I aware of an attempt to incorporate all the notions of fractals, infinity and economic theories, like rational irrationality, into the realm of the philosophy of human behavior.

2. By properly understanding human nature, the subjective notions of morality and ethics were disconnected from the nature of lies, and looked into why such an act within the public sphere is as prevalent as it is.

3. Accurately incorporated the realms of subjective truth and objective truth into one realm. By properly defining and classifying both kinds of truth we can better dissect the two in topic matters wherever we find them. In this case, with subjective truth, I am able now to approach a subject matter – determine what is subjective and objective then accept both as they are. I am not placing one kind of truth above another (that, in of itself is an act of attributing a subjective value to something, which would make me guilty of what I was trying to avoid), merely placing each kind where it belongs.

4. Incorporated into philosophy, and make sense of sciences attempts at lie detection. By understanding the science and philosophy of lying I was able to place it exactly where it belongs

– outside the realm of objectivity and within the realm of subjectivity.

5. The concept of free-will was reviewed under a fresh perspective to give us an understanding that we do not enjoy a complete disconnection from agency, but there are strengths and strategies we can use to make the most of the situation we find ourselves in.

6. Lies themselves are now better defined and understood by properly understanding concepts of belief, ideology and culture.

Changes Made to the Original Dissertation

1. Removed and replaced any trace of Wikipedia with more academically credible ones.
2. Made clearer the difference between history and philosophy.
3. Empirically proved and justified why epistemology is a viable resource to discuss lying in philosophy.
4. Clarified the differences between lying and falsehoods.
5. Expanded the introduction to describe the methodology as being holistic in nature.
7. Added on the title page 'Dr.' to Dr. Gungov's title. Indicated '2017' at the bottom of the title page.
8. Changed '2.2. Belief' to '2.1. Belief' in the text. 'Conclusion' was moved to a new page, i.e. 275. This change carried forward to all chapters and sub-chapters.
9. Changed the Intro and ch. 1 in the summary to better reflect the newer dissertation.
10. Bibliography references are now numbered.
11. Metaphors in the introduction are reduced in favor of concepts focusing on a proper attitude to approach philosophy and an explanation of how/why the study of epistemology links with lies.
12. Chapter one was reorganized to cover three most important aspects of epistemology: belief, justification, and truth. The table of contents was changed to reflect this, plus reworded a few awkward paragraphs.
13. Reinforced the comments on behaviorism with some citations and definitions to support the original conclusions.

14. Added a chart on the Hurst exponent as it relates to market price. Added another chart to help understand 'actions per minute' when it comes to how we process information and how that relates to success.

15. The bibliography has been updated to include the new works cited. Summary Bibliography includes all works cited in the complete dissertation.

16. Cleaned up the work's grammar, parts that may be taken as contradictory, and made them clear as to not arouse confusion.

List of Publications

1. Hans Krauch *The Necessary Illusion of Free-Will* Academia.edu

http://www.academia.edu/28356240/The_Necessary_Illusion_of_Free-Will last accessed 15 November 2016.

2. Hans Krauch *The Death of Reason* Academia.edu

http://www.academia.edu/28161154/The_Death_of_Reason Last accessed 15 November 2016.

3. Hans Krauch *Review of 'Hermeneutic Communism: From Heidegger to Marx'* by Gianni Vattimo and Santiago Zabala (New York: Columbia University Press, 2014). *Sofia Philosophical Review*, Vol. IX, No. 1, 2016. Available online at <http://sphr-bg.org/30/80/301.html> last accessed 15 November 2016.

4. Hans Krauch 'A Brief Overview of John of Damascus's Work: "Fount of Knowledge" (The Basilica: Issue #15, November 2016), Pages 10 - 11.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Robert Audi *Epistemology – A Contemporary Introduction to the Theory of Knowledge – Second Edition* (New York: Routledge, 1998)
2. Amber Alert. Uploaded 20 May 2009. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Srsg0T1-6_Y Last accessed 16 October 2016.
3. Anonymous *The Morning Call* [San Francisco] Wednesday June 06, 1894.
4. A Good Question. (Voat: 09 September 2016). <https://voat.co/v/funny/comments/1269032> Last accessed 16 October 2016.
5. Paul Aurich, edr, *Bakunin on Anarchy* (New York: Vintage Books, 1971)
6. James Bamford *The Shadow Factory* (New York: Doubleday, 2008)
7. Morris Berman *The Reenchantment of the World* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1981)
8. Edward L. Bernays *Propaganda* (New York: Horace Liveright, 1928)
9. Sven Bernecker & Duncan Pritchard, Michael P. Lynch, eds. *The Routledge Companion to Epistemology* (New York: Routledge Press, 2011)
10. George Bimmerle “Truth” Drugs in Interrogation – Central Intelligence Agency – Approved for Release (CIA Historical Review Program, Approved for release to Public on 22 Sept. 1993) https://www.cia.gov/library/center-for-the-study-of-intelligence/kent-csi/vol5no2/html/v05i2a09p_0001.htm Last accessed 16 October 2016.
11. Bible Gateway. Proverbs 16:18. <https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Proverbs+16%3A18&version=KJV> Last Accessed 16 October 2016.
12. Bittersweet Justice for Bradley Birkenfeld (Emptywheel: 11 September 2012). Statement by Steven M. Kohn. <https://www.emptywheel.net/2012/09/11/bittersweet-justice-for-bradley-birkenfeld/> Last accessed 16 October 2016.

13. Laurence Bonjour *Classic Problems and Contemporary Responses* (New York: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers Inc, 2009)
14. BPS Working Party (Comprised of Dr. Helen Baron, Prof(s) Gisli Gudjonsson, Sarah Hampson, Gina Rippon, Aldert Vrij & Ray Bull). A review of the current scientific status and fields of application of Polygraphic Deception Detection (British Psychological Society, 6 October, 2004) http://www.bps.org.uk/sites/default/files/documents/polygraphic_deception_detection_-_a_review_of_the_current_scientific_status_and_fields_of_application.pdf Last accessed 16 October 2016.
15. Elizabeth Nolan Brown The Takeaway: 14 Countries Raising Retirement Age <http://blog.aarp.org/2012/07/12/europe-pension-reform-retirement-age-increases/> Last accessed 16 October 2016.
16. The McGill Experience of Robert A. Cleghorn, M.D. Recollections of D. Ewen Cameron (CBMH/BCHM vol. 7 53-76, 1990) Downloaded at www.cbmh.ca/index.php/cbmh/article/download/224/223 Last accessed 16 October 2016.
17. Brian Caplan *Rational Irrationality: A Framework for the Neo-classical Behavioral Debate* (George Mason University “Eastern Economic Journal” Vol.26 No. 2 2000)
18. Brian Caplan. Tacitus, Peace and Desolation. (Library of Economics and Liberty, 21 June 2011). econlog.econlib.org/archives/2011/06/tacitus_peace_a.html Last accessed 16 October 2016.
19. Kenneth C. Catania & Fiona Remple (Hampshire, England: Nature: 3 February 2005, Nature Publishing Inc.) <http://www.nature.com/nature/links/050203/050203-9.html>. Last accessed February 18, 2017.
20. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention: Overweight and Obesity Rates. Last accessed 18 February 2017. <https://www.cdc.gov/obesity/data/adult.html>.
21. John Christman *Social and Political Philosophy – A Contemporary Introduction* (New York: Routledge, 2002)
22. Noam Chomsky & Edward S. Herman *After the Cataclysm: Post War Indochina and the Reconstruction of Imperial Ideology* (Boston: South End Press, 1979)
23. Noam Chomsky & Edward S. Herman *Manufacturing Consent – The Political Economy of the Mass Media* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1984)
24. Cop Sentenced to Two years in Prison for Revealing Defects in Lie Detector Tests. (Countercurrent news: 24 September 2016). <http://countercurrentnews.com/2015/09/cop-sentenced-to-two-years-in-prison-for-revealing-defects-in-lie-detector-tests/> Last accessed 16 October 2016.
25. Brian Davies *An Introduction to the Philosophy of Religion* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993)

26. Jean A. van Dijk *Ideology and Discourse – A Multidisciplinary Introduction* (Pomea Fabra University, Barcelona, 2000)
<http://www.discourses.org/UnpublishedArticles/Ideology%20and%20discourse.pdf> Last accessed 16 October 2016.
27. Russel J. Dalton. *Social Modernization and the End of Ideology Debate: Patterns of Ideological Polarization* (University of California, April 2005)
<http://www.forschungsnetzwerk.at/downloadpub/jjps06.pdf> Last accessed 16 October 2016.
28. Leonard W. Doob *Goebbels Principles of Propaganda* (Oxford University Press – The Public Opinion Quarterly, Vol. 14. No. 3 Autumn 1950)
29. Bella M. DePaulo, Susan E. Kirkendol, Deborah A Kashy, Melissa W. Wyer, Jennifer A. Epstein *Lying in Everyday Life* (Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. 1996 Vol 70, No. 5)
30. Terry Eagleton *Ideology* (New York:: Verso, 1991)
31. Robin S. Edelstein, Tanya L. Luten, Paul Ekman, Gail S. Goodman *Detecting Lies in Children and Adults* (American Psychology-Law Society/Division 41 of the American Psychological Association, 2006)
32. Jaques Ellul, Konrad Kellen & Jean Lerner, trans. *Propaganda – The Formation of Men's Attitudes* (New York: Vintage Books, 1973)
33. Albert Einstein. (Quotation Pages Quotation #9 From Michael Honcur's '(Cynical) Quotations)
<http://www.quotationspage.com/quote/9.html> Last accessed 16 October 2016.
34. Erasmus of Rotterdam & Martin Luther, Ernst F. Winter, trans. *Milestones of Thought – Discourse on Free Will* (New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co.)
35. Erasmus of Rotterdam, Donald B. King, H. David Rix, trans. *On Copia of Words and Ideas* (Miliwaukee, Wisconsin: Marquette University Press, 1999)
36. Paul Ekman, Diane F Halpern & Alexander E. Voiskowsky, eds., *Deception, Lying and Demeanor* (New York: 'States of Mind' – American and Post-Soviet Perspectives on Contemporary Issues in Psychology, 1997)
37. Don Fallis *Lying and Deception* (University of Arizona: School of Information Resources, Philosophers Imprint – Vol. 10. No.11, 2010)
38. Chao Fan, Jin-Ki Guo, Yi-Lang Zha. (University of Shanghai for Science and Technology & Web Services Center, University of Electronic Science and Technology Of China). *Fractal Analysis on Human Behaviors Dynamics*. <https://arxiv.org/ftp/arxiv/papers/1012/1012.4088.pdf> Last accessed 16 October 2016.
39. Lawrence A. Farwell & Emmanuel Donchin *The Truth Will Out: Interrogative Polygraphy “Lie Detection”* (The Society for Psychophysiological Research Inc, Psychophysiology, Vol. 28 No. 5, 1991).

40. Feminist Professor Lindsay Kirkham Says People Who Ask for Proof of Rape Culture Aren't Human (socawledge: 10 September 2015) <http://socawlege.com/feminist-professor-lyndsay-kirkham-says-people-who-ask-for-proof-of-rape-culture-arent-human/> Last accessed 16 October 2016.
41. Jane Flanagan (The Telegraph, 11 November 2011). South African men rape babies as 'cure' for Aids. <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/africaandindianocean/southafrica/1362134/South-African-men-rape-babies-as-cure-for-Aids.html> Last accessed 16 October 2016.
42. Harry Frankfurt, Princeton University. <http://www.stoa.org.uk/topics/bullshit/pdf/on-bullshit.pdf> Last accessed 18 February, 2017.
43. Definition of Free-Will https://www.google.ca/?gfe_rd=cr&ei=aGDeVeuYD4yN8QeOpISoAw#q=free+will Last Assessed 16 October 2016.
44. Rachel Gamson, Jessica Gottesnaw, Nicholas Milan, Sitara Weerasuriya *Cues to Catching Deception in Interviews: A Brief Overview* (College Park, MD: START, November, 2012) <https://www.start.umd.edu/sites/default/files/files/publications/CuesToCatchingDeception.pdf> Last accessed 16 October 2016.
45. John Taylor *Gatto Dumbing us Down - The Hidden Curriculum of Compulsory Schooling* (Gabriola Island, Canada: New Society Publishers, 1992)
46. Emma Graham-Harrison & Angelique Chrisafis, *Greeks Resigned to Bailout Plan Despite Voting Against Austerity* <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/jul/10/greeks-resigned-to-bailout-plan-despite-voting-against-austerity> Last assessed 06 November 2016.
47. John Gray *Straw Dogs: Thoughts on Human and Other Animals* (London: Granta Books, 2002)
48. John Gray *Enlightenment's Wake – Politics and Culture at the close of the Modern Age* (New York: Routledge, 1995)
49. Greeks resigned to bailout plan despite voting against austerity. (The Guardian: 10 July 2015) <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/jul/10/greeks-resigned-to-bailout-plan-despite-voting-against-austerity> Last accessed 16 October 2016.
50. Gordon State University. Quotes by Joseph Stalin. http://ptfaculty.gordonstate.edu/jmallory/index_files/page0494.htm Last accessed 16 October 2016.
51. Alexander Gungov *Real Semblance Flourishing in Post-Consumerist Society* (Sofia Philosophical Review. Vol 3, No. 2.)
52. Alexander Gungov From Virtuality of Gold Coins to Virtual Currencies backed by Gold <https://books.google.ca/books?id=C3duBgAAQBAJ&pg=PA144&lpg=PA144&dq=Alexander+Gungov+From+Virtuality+of+Gold+Coins+to+Virtual+Currencies+backed+by+Gold&source=bl&ots=KyiYQfaxQb&sig=e-FjZBAC9sML0jU2XVtEK-p8ck&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwj-8fz22ODPAhUCCSwKHSC1CfIQ6AEIHjAA#v=onepage&q=Alexander%20Gungov%20From%20>

0Virtuality%20of%20Gold%20Coins%20to%20Virtual%20Currencies%20backed%20by%20Gold&f=false Last accessed 16 October 2016

53. Daniel Greenfeld. 1 in 4 Swedish Women will be Raped as Sexual Assaults Increase 500%. (Frontpage: 29 January 2013). <http://www.frontpagemag.com/point/175434/1-4-swedish-women-will-be-raped-sexual-assaults-daniel-greenfield> Last accessed 16 October 2016.
54. David Hawkes *Ideology* (London: Routledge, 2003)
55. G.W.F. Hegel, S.W. Dyde, trans., *Philosophy of Right* (Kitchener, Batoche Books, 2001)
56. G.W.F. Hegel, J. Siber, trans., *The Philosophy of History* (Kitchener: Batoche Books, 2001)
57. G.W.F. Hegel, J.B. Baillie, trans., *The Phenomenology of Mind* (New York: Dover Publications, Inc, 2003)
58. Edward S Herman. *How Market-Democracy Keeps the Public and 'Populism' at Bay* (coldtype.net 2007) <http://www.coldtype.net/Assets.07/Essays/0907.Ed.market.pdf> Last Accessed 16 October 2016.
59. Edward S. Herman & David Peterson *The Politics of Genocide* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 2010)
60. Edward S. Herman *The Propaganda Model: A Retrospective* (Against All Reason: Propaganda, Politics, Power - Vol. 1 - 14. December 2003) <http://human-nature.com/reason/01/herman.html> Last accessed 16 October 2016.
61. Adolf Hitler, James Murphy, trans, *Mein Kampf* (London/New York/Melbourne: Hurst and Blackett Ltd., 1939)
62. Bible Hub. Exodus 20:17 <http://biblehub.com/exodus/20-17.htm> Last Accessed 16 October 2016.
63. Darnell Huff *How to Lie with Statistics* (London: Penguin Books, 1954)
64. Muchael Huemer, Peter Klein, eds., *Epistemology – Contemporary Readings* (New York: Routledge Press, 2002)
65. Internet Live Stats <http://www.internetlivestats.com/internet-users/> Last accessed 16 October 2016.
66. Is Death of the Paper Gold Market Near? <http://goldstockbull.com/articles/is-the-death-of-the-paper-gold-market-near/> Last accessed 16 October 2016.
67. Islam is the Fastest Dying Religion in the World. <http://defenceforumindia.com/forum/threads/islam-is-the-fastest-dying-religion-in-the-world.65892/> Last accessed 16 October 2016.

68. John Johnson *A Collection of Laws and Canons of The Church of England: From its First Foundation to the Conquest, and From the Conquest to the Reign of King Henry VIII* (Oxford: J. Shimplon, 1850)
69. Garth S. Jowett & Victoria O'Donnel *Propaganda and Persuasion* (Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications, 2012)
70. Rebecca Kanable. *The Truth Surrounding Lie Detection Technology* (Law Enforcement Technology, August 2010). <http://www.cvsa1.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/LEArticle.pdf> Last accessed 16 October 2016.
71. Satoshi Kanazawa *Why Criminals Are Less Intelligent than Non-Criminals - Murder is natural, the police are unnatural* (Psychology Today: 27 June 2010). <https://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/the-scientific-fundamentalist/201006/why-criminals-are-less-intelligent-non-criminals> Last accessed 16 October 2016.
72. Immanuel Kant. *On a Supposed Right to Lie from Altruistic Motives* (France, 1797, part 6. No. I Page 123) <http://www.mc.maricopa.edu/~davpy35701/text/kant-sup-right-to-lie.pdf> Last Accessed 16 October 2016.
73. Robert E. Kraut *Verbal and Nonverbal Cues in the Perception of Lying* (Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1978, Vol. 36 No. 4)
74. Paul Krugman "Fiat Money ...Is backed by Men with Guns" <http://consultingbyrpm.com/blog/2013/12/krugman-fiat-money-is-backed-by-men-with-guns.html> Last accessed 16 October 2016.
75. Bruce Lipton *The Biology of Belief* (San Francisco State University, Fall 2009)
76. Sile Lane, Jamie Horder, eds., *Sense about Lie Detectors* (Sense about Science: July 2012)
77. Daniel D. Langleben, Frank M. Dattilio & Thomas G Guthei *True Lies: Delusions and Lie-Detection Technology* (The Journal of Psychiatry and Law, Fall 2006)
78. Nicholas Langitz. *The Office of Experiments Truth Serum Threat: Notes on the Psychopharmacology of Truthfulness.* http://www.nicolasanglitz.de/nicolasanglitz.de/Texts_files/Langlitz_TRUTH_SERUM_THREAT.pdf Last accessed 16 October 2016.
79. Yannick Lejacq. *How fast is fast? Some pro gamers make 10 moves per second.* (NBC News: 24 October, 2013). <http://www.nbcnews.com/technology/how-fast-fast-some-pro-gamers-make-10-moves-second-8C11422946> Last accessed 16 October 2016.
80. Steven B Loven, Sydney S. Cash, Mu-ming Poo & Malvin C. Teich *Quantal Neurotransmitter Secretion Rate Exhibits Fractal Behavior* (The Journal of Neuroscience, August 1, 1997, 17(15): 5666-5677)
81. Nicolo Machiavelli *The Prince*, W.K. Marriott, trans., (1515) <http://www.constitution.org/mac/prince.pdf> Last accessed 16 October 2016.

82. John C Malone *Theories of Learning – A Historical Approach* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee, Wadsworth Publishing Company)
83. *Man Killed During Home Invasion in Georgia Was Targeted Because of Lottery Win, Girlfriend Says* (KTLA5: 22 January 2016) <http://ktla.com/2016/01/22/recent-lottery-winner-killed-during-ga-home-invasion/> Last accessed 16 October 2016.
84. George W. Maschke & Gimo J. Scalabruni *The Lie Behind the Lie Detector* (anti-polygraph.org, 2005) <https://antipolygraph.org/lie-behind-the-lie-detector.pdf> Last accessed 16 October 2016.
85. Merriam-Webster Dictionary. <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/freedom> Last Accessed 16 October 2016
86. The Daily Mail - Reuters & Daily Mail. *Bottled Air: Chinese multimillionaire sells Eight Million cans of Fresh Air in Ten Days as pollution Levels climb to record highs.* <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2271690/Bottled-AIR-Chinese-multimillionaire-sells-EIGHT-MILLION-cans-fresh-air-TEN-DAYS-pollution-levels-climb-record-high.html> Last Accessed 16 Oct 2016
87. John Milton. *Paradise Lost – 1667* (DjVu Editions E-Books, 2001, Global Language Resources, Inc). <http://triggs.djvu.org/djvu-editions.com/MILTON/LOST/Download.pdf> Last accessed 16 October 2016.
88. Andrew J. Mitchell *The Fourfold: Reading the Late Heidegger* (Evanston, Illionis: Northwestern University Press, 2015)
89. Mark Monmonier *How to Lie with Maps* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991)
90. Micho Morishima *Ideology and Economic Activity* (London: London School of Economics and Political Science, Discussion Paper No. J5/86/142, 1986)
91. Interview by Andrew Mullen, Edward S. Herman and Noam Chomsky. *The Propaganda Model After 20 Years: Interview with Edward S Herman and Noam Chomsky.* (Westminster Papers in Communication and Culture, November 2009). https://chomsky.info/200911__/ Last Accessed 16 October 2016.
92. Napoleon on War http://www.napoleonguide.com/maxim_war.htm Last accessed 16 October 2016.
93. <http://what-when-how.com/biomedical-image-analysis/self-similarity-and-the-fractal-dimension-biomedical-image-analysis/> last accessed 18 January 2017.
94. Angel Nepomuceno-Fernandez, Fernando Soler-Toscano and Fernanda R. Velaquez-Quesada *The Fundamental Problem of Contemporary Epistemology* (<http://personal.us.es/fsoler/papers/teorema14.pdf>) Last accessed 16 October 2016.
95. Matthew L. Newman, James W. Pennebaker, Diane S. Berg & Jane M. Richards. *Lying Words: Predicting Deception From Linguistic Styles* (University of Texas, Washington & Southern Methodist University) <http://www.albany.edu/~zg929648/PDFs/Newman.pdf> Last accessed 16 October 2016.

96. Friedrich Nietzsche Kieth Arnell-Pearson, ed., Carol Diethe, trans., *On the Genealogy of Morality* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007)
97. Friedrich Nietzsche, Bernard Williams, ed., Josefine Nauckhoff, trans., *The Gay Science* (Cambridge University Press, 2008)
98. Friedrich Nietzsche, Rolf-Peter & Horstman, eds, Judith Norman, trans., *Beyond Good and Evil* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002)
99. Friedrich Nietzsche, Walter Kaufmann, ed., Walter Kaufmann & R.J. Hollingdale, trans., *The Will to Power* (New York: Vintage Books, 1967)
100. Kwame Nkrumah *Consciencism – Philosophy and Ideology for De-colonization* (University of Virginia: Monthly Review Press, 1970)
101. Jesse Orlansky. *An Assessment of Lie Detection Capability(Declassified Report)* (Institute for Defense Analytics/Research and Engineering Support Division, July 1964) <https://www.fas.org/sgp/othergov/polygraph/ida1964.pdf> Last accessed 16 October 2016.
102. Victoria Parecon *Parecon An Introduction to Participatory Economics* (Parecon) <http://www.contra-versus.net/uploads/6/7/3/6/6736569/parecon.pdf> Last accessed 16 October 2016.
103. Pawar, S. D., P. Murugavel, and D. M. Lal (2009), *Effect of relative humidity and sea level pressure on electrical conductivity of air over Indian Ocean, J. Geophys. Res., 114, D02205, doi: [10.1029/2007JD009716](https://doi.org/10.1029/2007JD009716).*
104. Sharon Perkins. *Opposite Personalities and Appearances of Twins.* <http://oureverydaylife.com/opposite-personalities-appearances-twins-45505.html> Last Accessed 16 October 2016
105. Richard Pipes. *'Death Solves All Problems,' He Said.* (The New York Times: 10 November, 1991). <http://www.nytimes.com/1991/11/10/books/death-solves-all-problems-he-said.html> Last accessed 16 October 2016.
106. Prisoners of Belief – Individuals Jailed Under Blasphemy Laws (United States Commission on International Religious Freedom, March 2014, Policy Brief) <http://www.uscirf.gov/sites/default/files/Prisoners%20of%20Belief%20Policy%20Brief%203-11-2014%20FINAL.pdf> Last accessed 16 October 2016
107. Philip Rottit *Practical Belief and Philosophical Theory* (Australian Journal of Philosophy. Vol. 76. No.1 March 1998)
108. Jean-Paul Sartre *The Imaginary* (London: Routledge Press, 2004)
109. Jean-Paul Sartre, Hazel E. Barnes, trans., *Being and Nothingness* (New York: Washington Square Press, 1992).

110. Selfie-Soldiers' - VICE News tracks Russian soldier's path from East Ukraine to Buryatiya (Censor.net 16 June 2015).
http://en.censor.net.ua/photo_news/340352/selfie_soldiers_vice_news_tracks_russian_soldiers_path_from_east_ukraine_to_buryatiya_video_photos Last accessed 16 October 2016.
111. Service, etc. value added (% of GDP)
<http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NV.SRV.TETC.ZS> Last accessed 16 October 2016
112. Christopher Simpson. *Science of Coercion – Communication Research and Psychological Warfare 1945 – 1960*
(<https://historicalunderbelly.files.wordpress.com/2012/12/0195102924.pdf>) Last accessed 16 October 2016.
113. Nathaniel Rich. *Bad Things Happen to Bad Children*. (Slate Book Review, 24 October 2011).
http://www.slate.com/articles/arts/books/2011/10/carlo_collodi_s_pinocchio_why_is_the_origin_al_pinocchio_subjecte.html Last accessed 16 October 2016.
114. Karthik Shashidhar *What the Flooding of the Nile says about the Nifty* (LiveMint: 24 June, 2015) http://www.livemint.com/r/LiveMint/Period1/2015/06/24/Photos/w_hurst3.jpg last accessed 15 January 2017.
115. Tana Sanchez *To Catch a Liar: A signal Detection Analysis of Personality and Lie Detection* (Robert Morris University: 39th Annual Western Pennsylvania Undergraduate Psychology Conference, New Wilmington, PA, 2011)
116. Nicolai Sennels. *The Problem of Inbreeding in Islam* (PJ Media, Sept. 19,2010).
<https://pjmedia.com/blog/the-problem-of-inbreeding-in-islam/> Last Accessed 16 October 2016.
117. Kim B. Serota, Timothy R. Levine & Franklin J. Boshier *The Prevalence of Lying in America: Three Studies of Self-Reported Lies* (Human Communication Research: The Department of Communication, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI)
https://msu.edu/~levinet/Serota_etal2010.pdf Last accessed 16 October 2016.
118. Will Shetterly *How to Make A Social Justice Warrior – On Identitarianism, Intersectionality, Mobbing, racefail and Fail Fans 2005 - 2014* (Smashwords: 2014)
119. Kerri Smith "Brain makes decisions before you even know it." *Nature: International Weekly Journal of Science* <http://www.nature.com/news/2008/080411/full/news.2008.751.html>
Last Accessed 16 October 2016
120. Martin Soorjoo. *The Black Book of Lie Detection – Effective Techniques From a Professional Lie Detector* (www.investigationsystems.com 2009)
<http://www.customerepressions.com/cex/cexweb.nsf/Black%20Book%20of%20Lie%20Detection.pdf> Last Accessed 16 October 2016.
121. Ronald B. Standler *Propaganda and How to Recognize It*
(www.rbs0.com/propaganda.pdf 02 September, 2005). Last accessed 16 October 2016.

122. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy: Published Wed. Oct. 8, 2014. Last accessed Feb. 18, 2017. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/set-theory/>
123. Andreas Stokke *Lying, Deceiving and Misleading* (Blackwell Publishing Limited, 2013)
124. Abbey Strauss *The Psychology of Lying* (Association of Certified Fraud Examiners, Dec. 7, 2002).
125. Street Epistemology. <https://streetepistemology.com/> Last accessed 16 October 2016.
126. Damon Tabor. *The Greater the Sinner. A Liberian warlord's unlikely path to forgiveness.* (The New Yorker: 14 March, 2016). <http://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2016/03/14/general-butt-naked-the-repentant-warlord> Last accessed 16 October 2016.
127. The boy accused of blasphemy who cut off his hand (BBC: 19 January 2016) <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-35341256> Last accessed 16 October 2016.
128. The Difference between Falsehood and Lying <http://the-difference-between.com/falsehood/lying> last accessed February 18, 2017.
129. The food chain and the supply chain will merge. <https://media.licdn.com/mpr/mpr/p/8/005/073/161/1384d43.jpg> Last accessed 16 October 2016.
130. *Quotes for Thusla Doom* <http://www.imdb.com/character/ch0008155/quotes> Last accessed 19 February 2017.
131. Edward Tufte. *How to Lie, Cheat, Manipulate and Mislead Using Statistics and Graphical Displays.* (Graphics Press: February 1997). https://cseweb.ucsd.edu/~ricko/CSE3/Lie_with_Statistics.pdf Last accessed 16 October 2016.
132. Mao Tse Tung. *The Red Book.* Chapter 27 - Criticisms and Self-Criticism. <https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/mao/works/red-book/ch27.htm> Last accessed 16 October 2016.
133. Sun Tzu, Lionel Giles, trans. *The Art of War* (The Puppet Press: Department of Oriental Published Books and Manuscripts. British Museum, 1910)
134. Hassan Ugail, Moi Hoon Yap, Bashar Rajoub *Face Reading Technology for Lie Detection* (University of Bradford, October 25, 2011.) <https://www.cl.cam.ac.uk/research/security/seminars/archive/slides/2011-10-25.pdf> Last Accessed 16 October 2016.
135. Anna E. Van't Veer, Marielle Stel & Ija van Beest *Limited Capacity to lie: Cognitive load interferes with being dishonest* (Judgment and Decision Making, Vol. 9, No. 3, May 2014)
136. Yanis Varoufakis *Economic Controversies – The Global Minotaur – America, Europe, and the Future of the Global Economy* (London/NewYork: Zed Books, 2013)

137. Voltaire. *Candide- 1759* (1998, Electronic Scholarly Publishing Project).
<http://www.esp.org/books/voltaire/candide.pdf> Last accessed 16 October 2016.
138. Aldert Vrij, Par Anders Granhag, Steven Porter *Pitfalls and Opportunities in Nonverbal and Verbal Lie Detection* (Psychological Science in the Public Interest, 2010)
139. Oscar Wilde. *The Decay of Lying*. (The Victoria Web. Excerpt from Volume 7 of *The Complete Writings of Oscar Wilde* New York: The Nottingham Society, 1909).
<http://www.victorianweb.org/victorian/authors/wilde/decay.html> Last accessed 16 October 2016.
140. West Virginia Board of Education v. Barnette (no. 591) Decided June 14, 1943.
<https://www.law.cornell.edu/supremecourt/text/319/624>. Last Accessed 18 February 2017.
141. Alasdair Wilkins. *A Brief introduction to Infinity*. (Gizmodo: 06 September 2011).
<http://gizmodo.com/5809689/a-brief-introduction-to-infinity> Last accessed 16 October 2016.
142. Lawrence Wright & Alfred A. Knopf *Going Clear – Scientology, Hollywood & The Prison of Belief* (New York: Random House, 2013)
143. Leonard Wong, Stephen J. Gerras. *Lying to Ourselves: Dishonesty in the Army Profession* (United States Army War College Press, Carlisle Barracks, PA, Feb. 2015).
<http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pdffiles/PUB1250.pdf> Last accessed 16 October 2016.
144. Alexander J. Yee & Shiheru Kondo. *5 Trillion Digits of Pi - New World Record*. (Numberworld.org, Last Updated September 22, 2016).
http://www.numberworld.org/misc_runs/pi-5t/details.html Last accessed 16 October 2016.
145. Wolfgang Ziller *Lie Groups, Representation Theory and Symmetric Spaces* (University of Pennsylvania, Fall 2010)
146. Slavoj Zizek *Mapping Ideology* (London/New York: Verso, 2012)
147. Slavoj Zizek *Cynicism as a form of Ideology – The Sublime Object of Ideology* (London; New York: Verso, 1989)

