

# The Complete Psychological Writings of Mark Pettinelli

**By:**  
Mark Pettinelli



# The Complete Psychological Writings of Mark Pettinelli

**By:**  
Mark Pettinelli

**Online:**  
< <http://cnx.org/content/col10729/1.16/> >

**C O N N E X I O N S**

Rice University, Houston, Texas

This selection and arrangement of content as a collection is copyrighted by Mark Pettinelli. It is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/>).

Collection structure revised: December 17, 2011

PDF generated: December 17, 2011

For copyright and attribution information for the modules contained in this collection, see p. 127.

## Table of Contents

<b>1 What Makes Humans Conscious?</b> .....	1
<b>2 How Emotion is Processed</b> .....	3
<b>3 Problems with Your Life You Might not be Aware of: A Guide for Self Improvement</b> .....	5
<b>4 Happiness, Confidence, Bravery and Courage</b> .....	7
<b>5 Logic Vs. Intellect</b> .....	9
<b>6 The Psychology Of Emotions, Feelings and Thoughts</b> .....	13
<b>7 The Sum of Existence</b> .....	65
<b>8 A Look beyond the 16 Personality Types: Why they aren't Sufficient</b> .....	69
<b>9 What to Do About Negative Emotions</b> .....	73
<b>10 Definition of Spirituality</b> .....	75
<b>11 Definition of Literacy</b> .....	77
<b>12 Consciousness is Thoughts and Emotions: A Whole Brain Approach</b> .....	79
<b>13 How Beauty Can Be Quantified</b> .....	81
<b>14 The definition and meaning of the words "idea", "thought" and "sentence".</b> .....	87
<b>15 Lauren Caitlin Upton Answered Question Intelligently</b> .....	89
<b>16 Dreams Are Fun Because They Are Emotional Not Logical</b> .....	91
<b>17 Dreams Rarely Make Sense Because They Are Usually More Emotional Than Logical</b> .....	93
<b>18 Most Stimulation Is Physical</b> .....	97
<b>19 The Significance of Emotion In Humans/Animals</b> .....	99
<b>20 The Relationship Between Sadness And Depression</b> .....	101
<b>21 Life Is Tragic</b> .....	103
<b>22 Sherlock Holmes: a series devoid of emotional content</b> .....	119
<b>23 Commentary on Descartes' Discourse on Method and Meditations on First Philosophy</b> .....	121
<b>Index</b> .....	126
<b>Attributions</b> .....	127



# Chapter 1

## What Makes Humans Conscious?<sup>1</sup>

Information processing can occur in computers and in life forms less advanced than humans (other animals), so therefore what makes humans conscious is advanced information processing. What consists of advanced information processing is primarily the ability to reflect and from this reflection, experience deep emotions. Dogs seem to experience deep emotions, they are known to be emotionally sensitive, and from that observation comes the conclusion that it takes more than emotion to be conscious. Simply experiencing deep emotions doesn't make someone conscious. If you understand the place each experience you have has relative to your life as a whole then you enrich the emotional and cognitive processing of each experience. A dog will also be able to reflect on each experience and its place in their life as a whole, but it doesn't seem like the dog really understands as well how important it is. The dog will not be able to describe with words different aspects of his experience, how it made the dog feel, why that experience was important to it. However, not all of experience can be defined by your ability to describe it with words, there can be very subtle levels of emotional learning involved, that even if you can't describe it with words can change who you are. When you process an experience, learning is going to be involved. You reflect on the experience on many levels, there is the actual experience, and then there is going to be what you think about it in your mind. You think about it in many ways, and how it relates to many aspects of your life. This reflection is a representation of the actual event in your mind. The nature of the experience becomes changed based on how it relates to your life. For example, you may say, "that event wasn't that serious because I have done that before and don't care", or you could say, "that experience was serious because I learned something new".

Those examples show how you can reflect on an experience on many levels. All those levels are processed unconsciously. If you think about them with words and describe them, it only makes them conscious and might change how you process them a little, but you still would process them and be changed by the experience if you don't reflect on it with words. The point is that high level thinking occurs by any simple experience. This is what makes humans conscious because it shows how we understand a situation and its place in our life. That type of higher level thinking shows that it is also possible that you learn from every situation in life. If you can process it on so many levels, and ask so many questions about it, then part of consciousness is learning. Sometimes people note how they are unconsciously pondering about something or worrying about something. Higher order thinking and conscious processing of events is similar. You unconsciously process events and they have a certain level of clarity and distinctiveness in your mind, or lack thereof. A micro level example of this would be that you might only process a certain event fully and gain a high quality understanding of it after a certain amount of time has passed. After certain periods of time the experience might be subject to different levels of thinking about it. So it might take time before you realize something in specific about an experience. The time processing it without words is a part of a higher order network of thinking and associations relating to each other in your mind that helps make us reflective and conscious.

After pointing out the importance of unconscious learning and knowledge, the next observation to make

---

<sup>1</sup>This content is available online at <<http://cnx.org/content/m26962/1.2/>>.

from that is how much unconscious knowledge influences our conscious understanding without our consciously understanding what it is that lead to your conscious understanding. For instance, real events are going to make you learn something, but you aren't going to necessarily know what exactly caused that learning, or even be aware that you learned something. Also, how is it so certain that people always learn from experiences? Just because you have more experiences does that necessarily mean that you are learning? Is it possible to have such a high order processing system without using words, that is independent and functions by itself and learns progressively?



## Chapter 2

# How Emotion is Processed<sup>1</sup>

The idea that the mind processes positive things better than neutral and negative ones is not new. However, this idea is much more significant, and it applies in many more circumstances than it would be assumed from just this singular idea alone. For instance, this idea could mean that people are simply more open to positive, happier emotions than negative ones. That things which cause pleasure are better and clearer understood than something which is painful. However, something painful may cause you to become more awake, and this in turn would lead you to process information better. This information itself might be pleasurable, even though the original stimulus was painful. If the stimulus is negative, you would still process it better because of the original negative stimulus which “woke” you up. There are examples of negative things which cause people to pay attention, something like spanking, any loud noise (scratching a fingernail on a chalkboard for one), or even a painful emotional experience could cause you to take life more seriously temporarily, and this might cause you to be more awake, active, or intellectual. However, those negative things just make someone better able to receive or understand positive stimulus more so than negative, because someone is still probably going to ignore negative information more than positive information, even though they are in a more alert state. Negative things are ignored because, simply, people tend to believe what they want to believe. It is almost as if for every emotion someone says, “do I want that?” and if the answer is yes, they are much more responsive to it. So someone might ignore someone they don’t like, and pay attention to someone they do. Or, if someone doesn’t like someone, then that person doesn’t cause as much pleasure because the other person has decided to ignore them. It is pre-conceived notions and conceptions of the person, or even an understanding of who that person is, that determines what emotions that person causes. It is like real facts about that person are being stored unconsciously, and then those facts are brought up in the future to determine how much pleasure that person is going to cause. This ties into the idea that positive things are processed better than negative ones because if something is positive, or if you “think” something is positive (which might mean having preconceived notions about someone) then that person is going to generate less pleasure for you because you think they are not positive. What then is the difference between thinking if they are positive and them actually being positive? The difference is at some level (unconsciously) you are thinking that they are positive, you just might not be consciously aware that you are thinking those things. You probably also don’t have control over those thoughts. Conscious awareness of as much of what is going on unconsciously with those thoughts will enable someone to understand what is going on, and possibly change what those thoughts are.

---

<sup>1</sup>This content is available online at <<http://cnx.org/content/m16292/1.4/>>.



## Chapter 3

# Problems with Your Life You Might not be Aware of: A Guide for Self Improvement<sup>1</sup>

These are some questions to ask someone with a psychological problem, or someone looking to improve their life (only it isn't a certain order).

What is the exact extent and scope of your problem?

What is the origin of your problem? Is it from:

1. Social interactions
2. Fear of social interactions
3. Fear of the world
4. If 3) what are all your fears?
5. Could your fears be contributing to a deeper psychological problem?
6. Do those fears cause anxiety only in the presence of the danger, or does it cause long term anxiety?
7. Do you have any conflicts with the world, and are you at peace and confident enough?
8. Being confident alone does not correlate with happiness, especially if your confidence is mis-guided (for instance, if there is a way in which you are being hurt that you are ignorant of, you may be confident, but are still being hurt). If you are in pain or suffering from anxiety, maybe you need to question who you are or what is going on with your life, instead of being confident and continuing with your current behavior.
9. Does your personality have conflicts with other peoples' personalities fundamentally? Although it seems that you may be socially getting along with other people, there may be a fundamental dislike that exists between you and some other people that is being overlooked. A way to look further into this is to ask, if me and such and such a person were to be friends, how would that interaction go? If we were to interact for a very long time (if we just were together not necessarily as friends) how would they feel about me then? Looking at it that way would enhance whatever is going on between the two people, possibly uncovering a potential conflict.
10. Your problem probably is going to originate from some combination of the three following sources A) a social problem with other people, or a deeper issue with who other people are vs. yourself B) a problem with the rest of the world (not social) like work or ordinary things and C) an internal problem resulting from how your process the world, the specific way in which your thinking occurs or how your feelings occur, if they occur as a disruptive process or a helpful one.
11. If your problem doesn't originate from a social source, maybe it is from a logic problem, things in your brain aren't being processed in a clear, logical manner and the resulting confusion (say from a number

---

<sup>1</sup>This content is available online at <<http://cnx.org/content/m16197/1.4/>>.

of problems that you can't resolve, culminating in a lot of frustration) is devastating, yet could be resolved by simple clear thinking.

12. If the anxiety is from something in specific which you can identify, then how is this anxiety being produced exactly (what combination of thoughts, feelings, emotions and real world events lead to this happening) and how can you interrupt that process?
13. Is there a relationship between your individual instances of short term anxiety? Do they all stem from a deeper psychological problem? (Something like, problems with social interactions, deeper issues with other people, issues with the world, issues with yourself)
14. Are you getting what you want out of life? Does your problem come from frustration?
15. Are you letting yourself suffer in your own pain, or is your attitude one which shows you are open to improving your life?
16. Are you confident in yourself, but not being confident in a way that would cause psychological problems (such as hating other people or the world, but still being confident in that)? To live a peaceful, happy life only confidence isn't going to make you be in harmony with the world. Confidence is necessary for happiness, but if there are deep problems you are ignoring, those problems could cause pain. If those problems aren't internal problems with how you process the world, or a dislike of non social aspects of the world (such as work) then you could have an even violent disconnection or tension with other people, which could result from you being confident, only in the wrong way. Your confidence needs to be one which is compatible with the world.
17. If you are not confident with yourself, you would have no reason to be happy or to overcome your problems, because you would have no motivation to do so. Being confident and motivated is necessary to overcome your problems, as long as you are not confident in an aggressive way which might cause problems with you and other people, or even mess up your own internal thought process and emotional processing. Being at peace might lead to more logical thinking, since peace is slower and more thoughtful than violence.

## Chapter 4

# Happiness, Confidence, Bravery and Courage<sup>1</sup>

When people are confident they are happier, so what then is the difference between confidence and happiness?

Confidence is more a matter of how sure you are about yourself. How it is you think about yourself. If you think you are good, then you are going to feel good about yourself. Does this mean that you can be sad if you are confident? That is, when you think about yourself you feel good. That is what confidence is. Happiness is feeling good in general. A way to get to happiness then is to feel good about yourself when you think about yourself, so you associate yourself with being happy. Confidence boosts happiness. Confidence eliminates fear because it is the opposite of fear.

What is the difference between confidence and courage then?

Courage is the continuous state of being brave. Being brave means your emotions don't fluctuate when presented with a danger. Confidence means your emotions don't fluctuate when presented with more of an intellectual threat than with courage. Courage therefore is more of an emotional thing, and confidence is more of an intellectual thing. Confidence is more related to thought and bravery is more related to feeling.

---

<sup>1</sup>This content is available online at <<http://cnx.org/content/m14865/1.4/>>.



## Chapter 5

# Logic Vs. Intellect<sup>1</sup>

What is the difference between logic and intellect? Logic seems to be a way of going about using knowledge so that it is processed correctly. Whereas intellect is more focused on memory or things that don't require as much understanding as logical things. Logic would be the correct way of doing something, but doing something intelligently would just mean doing something with knowledge.

So if you are doing something logically, you are doing it in a correct manner. But if you are doing something intelligently, you are just using a lot of brain-power to do it (that power might come from memory, or skill). So logic seems to be a way to get to an end, the more direct route of doing something, but intellect is more complicated and would involve things other than taking the direct approach to solving a problem. Logic would involve a more scientific reasoning (a leads to b, etc). Science is direct and clear, and logical thinking would be more direct and clear thinking, versus intelligent thinking would just be thinking of a higher order.

So something intelligent would just involve more thought, like a hard math or science problem. But something logical would involve thought that was approached in a scientific, clear, trying to get to the end (right answer) quickly and simply manner. Therefore if a person is logical, they wouldn't need to have a good memory, but, when given lots of facts (as someone with a good memory would know already) are able to sort through them in a logical, scientific manner.

You could still call someone intelligent even if they don't have a good memory, however. If someone is logical you could call him or her intelligent because even though the data isn't already in their head, when presented with the data (or knowledge) they are able to sort through it, and that is using their mind, so they could be called intelligent.

Anything that has a therefore, or a because in it (or a then) (such as A leads to B, therefore... or A exists because B is such and such, or if A leads to B, then...) would be more logical. If I said, I only need to brush my teeth half as much as people with non-electric toothbrushes because those toothbrushes are only half as effective. You are drawing a conclusion through inference, not just stating facts, but drawing conclusions. That is, I took two facts (electric toothbrushes are twice as effective as non electric) and the fact that I need to brush my teeth, and put them together to form the idea, I only need to brush my teeth half as much.

Someone with just knowledge and no logic might know that electric toothbrushes are twice as effective as non electric ones, and might know that they need to brush their teeth, but they wouldn't know that therefore they could brush their teeth half as much as people with non electric toothbrushes. That is an ordinary example based on relatives. That is one person would have more logic relative to the other person, not that either person has no logic at all.

You still have to draw other conclusions in that example, however. If you couldn't understand that brushing teeth is the combination of your hand moving, and holding a brush, then you wouldn't be capable of understanding the concept of brushing teeth, and when someone told you that that was what brushing

---

<sup>1</sup>This content is available online at <<http://cnx.org/content/m14341/1.7/>>.

teeth was, you wouldn't be able to comprehend it, and therefore, wouldn't be able to remember it. Like most animals other than humans (or even a fly) wouldn't be able to understand (have enough logic to understand) brushing teeth.

But then again, dogs are capable of understanding concepts are large as their own name. A dog is a very complicated system, and it is capable of understanding a concept as complicated as itself. They even occasionally know words such as Frisbee, brisket, or food. Dogs can understand when you tell them (some dogs) do you want to play with the Frisbee? So clearly they have a lot of logic. But why then can they only understand a very very few things, if each thing had about equal logic? They would be randomly picking up lots of concepts and words then. Unless it took a certain number of times repeated, with higher emotional emphasis, for them to remember it. The answer is that dogs don't randomly pick up things, for a dog to understand it it has to be easy to comprehend. Like a dog understanding its own name is easy for it to understand, or any large emotional experience. So even dogs have some logic since they are able to pick up on some things. Their level of logic (being able to put two things together) seems to match their memory and intellect (their ability to understand individual facts) however.

What is it about the facts, electric toothbrushes are twice as effective as non-electric, and therefore you only need to brush half as much. And the facts, you have a Frisbee, you can play with it, that the first set of facts requires more logic to figure out than the second? Anyone can see that clearly the first requires more logic, you could even say that the person was logical to figure it out, but you wouldn't say that the person who figured out that they can play with the Frisbee was logical. "I have a Frisbee, I can play with it, therefore I am logical". That just doesn't make any sense.

It is probably because two of the facts (Frisbee and playing with it), go together more easily than the other two facts (toothbrush being good and brushing less). So it is just a matter of how hard it is put facts together which determines logic. When someone thinks about a Frisbee it is easy to see someone playing with it. The two facts are emotionally, logically and physically together. You see the Frisbee and someone playing with it at the same time, so it is easy to remember them that way. However, you don't see "brushing less" that clearly or "being less effective" that clearly. They simply aren't strong images in your head. Playing with the Frisbee doesn't require a person to draw any difficult conclusions, but the toothbrush example does.

So logic is connecting facts that are harder to see, facts that are less present and therefore their connection is going to be less present. Even if a dog loved brushing their teeth and loved electric toothbrushes, it still wouldn't be able to understand that the electric toothbrush worked twice as well as the non-electric one. That is because it is hard to picture one toothbrush working better than the other one. It requires logic, or a scientific process of thought. It is easy to picture (visually) playing with a Frisbee, but (visually) it is harder to picture the electric toothbrush working better. It is more just like a fact than an image.

Therefore logical connections or facts (logic was previously defined as putting two distant or obscure connections together) are strengthened by vision and visual images. That is like different types of learning styles, learning visually or learning by reading. That in fact someone isn't really more "logical" than someone else, they just have a better visual processor. So in the end it really boils down to sensory stimulation, and putting together different types of sensory stimulation. That makes sense since everything is sensory stimulation to begin with, since the world is only real and physical.

This brings us back to the intellect vs. logic discussion. Logic is bringing distant or hard to understand (or see) facts together. But someone with a high intellect might see the brushing very well and be able to remember that electric toothbrushes are more effective, but they might not be able to connect the two facts. So although they can remember individual facts well, and have a large knowledge base, their ability to connect them is less (if they have less logic).

Vision isn't going to be the only thing leading to more logic. You might "visualize" an answer but that just means you can see the answer, but how is that different from knowing the answer? When you say that you see it, you might mean that the answer is so large and complicated that it can exist by itself, so it can be separated in your mind and seen, like it is an object that is separate, versus a part of your understanding. If someone just said, "the pen is on the table" then they wouldn't say that they are visualizing the pen on the table, because they can already see it there. So if the answer or conclusion to a problem is already clearly seen, extra effort doesn't need to be made to visualize it. Thus problems using logic are probably going to



be harder to figure out than problems without using logic, and hence it is going to be harder to visualize them.



## Chapter 6

# The Psychology Of Emotions, Feelings and Thoughts<sup>1</sup>

This book makes the statement that thought, action and feeling can occur in any order. "Action turned into feeling, which caused you to think and therefore turned into thought. Thought, action (your action or external action) and feeling can occur in any order."

You can buy a hardcopy of this book from connexions here [cnx.org/content/col10447](http://cnx.org/content/col10447)<sup>2</sup> This is a link to my connexions book titled "Useful Psychology Information (Reviews of Important Ideas and Research)" [cnx.org/content/col11139/latest](http://cnx.org/content/col11139/latest)<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>This content is available online at <<http://cnx.org/content/m14358/1.89/>>.

<sup>2</sup>*The Psychology Of Emotions, Feelings and Thoughts* <<http://cnx.org/content/col10447/latest/>>

<sup>3</sup>*A Self Help and Improvement Book: Useful Psychology Information (An Integration of Personality, Social, Interaction, Communication and Well-Being Psychology)* <<http://cnx.org/content/col11139/latest/>>



Figure 6.1: Online at [www.zazzle.com/xiornikzazzle](http://www.zazzle.com/xiornikzazzle)<sup>4</sup>

## 6.1 Emotion and Logic

Some things in life cause people to feel, these are called emotional reactions. Some things in life cause people to think, these are sometimes called logical or intellectual reactions. Thus life is divided between things that make you feel and things that make you think. The question is, if someone is feeling, does that mean that they are thinking less? It probably does. If part of your brain is being occupied by feeling, then it makes sense that you have less capacity for thought. That is obvious if you take emotional extremes, such as crying, where people can barely think at all. This does not mean that emotional people are not intelligent; it just means that they might be dumber during the times in which they are emotional. Emotion goes on and off for everyone, sometimes people cry, and sometimes they are completely serious.

Some things in life can identifiably cause more emotion than other things.

1. Color causes more emotion than black and white. So anything with more color in it is going to be more emotional to look at, whether it is the difference between a gold or silver sword, or a gold or silver computer. In both cases the gold is going to be more emotional.

2. Things that are personal are emotional, personal things that people like and that they feel are “close” to them. Things like home or anything someone likes actually. That is a definition of emotion after all, something that causes feeling. So if you like it, it is probably going to cause more feeling. Other things aside from liking something could cause emotions from it, such as curiosity, but usually like is one of the stronger

---

<sup>4</sup><http://www.zazzle.com/xiornikzazzle>\*

emotions. You could say that the two are directly proportional, the more you like something, the more it is going to cause feeling.

But there are things that people like that cause thought. You could like something and it causes you to think, and we previously defined emotion as feeling, not thought. That thoughts are separate from emotions because thought is a period of thinking. What exactly is thinking then? You can think about emotions, “how did I feel then?” etc. So is thought just a period of increased attention? Or is it a sharp spike in attention focused on one particular thing that is clear? It is hard to focus that much if you are feeling a lot, however. This makes me conclude that there is an overlap of feeling and thought, like a Venn diagram. But there are still parts of thought that don’t have feeling or emotion in them, and parts of emotion that don’t have thought in them. That means that thought requires more concentration than feeling does, since we defined thought as a period of increased attention. You can be emotional and have more attention, but usually if you are emotional you are going to be less attentive than you would be if you were thinking more. Then again, if you are emotional you are being attentive to your emotions, whatever they may be, and if your emotions are on something like the sun, then when you see the sun you are going to be attentive to it, but not be thinking about it. So you can pay attention to something and not be thinking about it at the same time. But you aren’t going to be paying attention to anything else. It seems that thought is more attention than emotion, however. If you try to “feel” your computer you still don’t give it as much attention as if you were thinking about your computer. Then again, it depends what you are thinking about your computer, if you are thinking that your computer sucks, you are going to give it less attention than thinking that it is great. It also depends what your feelings are about that computer. If you feel that the computer is good, then you are going to give it more attention than if you feel that it is bad (possibly). The thoughts and the feelings correspond, however. That is, if you are thinking it is bad, then you are going to feel that it is bad. Thus thought and feeling are really one and the same. But thoughts are really clearer than feelings. Thought and feeling may result in the same amount of attention to something, but thought is more precise. It is more precise for you to think that the computer is good, then to feel that the computer is good. Who knows why you feel the computer is good, but if you were thinking the computer is good then you would know why you thought that. Emotions and feelings are more obscure.

So, the more you like something (or hate something, or have any strong emotional reaction to anything), the more emotional it is, but that doesn’t mean that it might not also cause you to think about it. One can’t label everything in life as either emotion or thought however. Life isn’t a scale with emotion on one end and thought on the other. There are other factors involved, things like adrenaline and physical action, which might also cause increased attention that isn’t either emotional or thoughtful. When you’re running you have a lot of attention on the fact that you are running, and you’re not thinking about it or being emotional about it. This means that just because you like something, doesn’t mean that it is emotional. You might like running, but it doesn’t cause emotions in you. What does emotion mean then? Emotions must be thoughts that you can’t identify, when you feel something, it must be that you are thinking about something unconsciously. You just have no idea what it is, usually. Emotions and feelings are thoughts then. By that I mean that they can be broken down into parts and figured out what those parts are. And thoughts are just really parts that you can identify. So the difference between emotions, feelings and thoughts is that you know what thoughts are about, but you don’t have as good an idea of what emotions and feelings are, as they are more obscure and harder to identify.

Thus once you find out what is causing the emotion, it is no longer an emotion, but it is a thought (that is, you now call the emotion a thought, so the thought is still probably generating emotion. In your mind then there is still an emotion, but this emotion is now “part” of a thought, it becomes part of the thought associated with it because you created this link, and hence you would call the emotion/thought just a thought because while thoughts can generate emotions, emotions cannot generate thoughts (by themselves), unless you realize what the emotion is (then you are generating the thought, not the emotion generating it), but you are realizing it is a thought, not an emotion: so this realization takes over and now the emotion is part of that realization (because you consider the emotion a part of you, and you generated the realization), instead of the realization being a part of the emotion (and since it seems like the emotion belongs to the realization (you), instead of vice versa, you call it a thought instead of an emotion, because you generated

the thought (and hence it also seems that you are now consciously also generating the emotion (the emotion coming from the thought))). So that would mean that all emotions have route in real things, and these real things can be explained with thoughts, so all emotions then are really thoughts that you haven't realized; an emotion would just be a thought that you haven't identified yet, so the term "emotion" goes away when you realize it is a thought (because that is what it really was all along, a thought) (though this thought might still be generating a feeling). So, since you perceive the emotion as belonging to you, and you generate thoughts consciously, you consider the emotion to be part of a thought, not vice versa (and hence call identified emotions "thoughts"). So when you identify an emotion, it is a thought because thoughts can generate emotions, so if the emotion is still there after you identified it you would say it falls under the category "thought", because the thought is making it. You might be lazy however and not want to spend time thinking, which are what emotions are for. "Ah that gold sword is pretty" might be the emotion, but to your conscious mind you would have no idea that you like the sword because it is pretty, you might just know that you like the sword and it is making you emotional about it. Therefore, emotional things are really any feelings that cause unconscious or conscious thought. Feeling is also another word for unconscious thought. That then leads to the conclusion that thought can be emotional (because thoughts are going to be about things that can cause emotion). I think that emotions can be more emotional than thought, however, because emotions can contain more than one thought (while thoughts are very slow consciously), therefore causing it to cause more feeling, or be more emotional. While you can only express a few thoughts a minute, your emotions can contain endless numbers of thoughts per minute – they are not as exact and hence don't make as much sense as thoughts do.

So thought is just a lot of attention on one little thing. And emotion is attention on lots of individual things, or possibly one thing. So things that are emotional are things that cause you to think, consciously or unconsciously. And therefore they would cause you to feel, consciously or unconsciously. So the more you like something you can't consciously identify as to why you like it, the more emotional it is, and the more you like something where you can consciously identify what it is, the more conscious thought it is going to cause, and the more logical that thing is going to be. Emotion is just unconscious thought.

How This Chapter shows how Intelligence is intertwined with Emotion:

- "Emotion goes on and off for everyone" – this statement shows how there are degrees to which someone can be focused on and feel thought, and degrees to which someone can be focused on and feel feeling. That then also explains the next statement in the chapter "some things in life can identifiably more emotion than other things".
- Since there are parts of emotion that don't have thought (assuming that emotion and thought overlap – but that is a logical assumption because thoughts generate feelings and are therefore less independent) then emotion (especially emotion without any thought) is going to need less focus or concentration, because emotion is a more pleasurable experience, but thought is one where concentration is usually used.
- Emotions can direct and control thoughts – if you are feeling that your computer is bad, then you might then give it less or more attention, and conscious attention is a function of thought because you need to think to start to focus on something. Or when you notice something you noticing it is a conscious experience because you "notice" it and thoughts are things which you are aware of which would then contribute to consciousness.
- Next mentioned is how emotions and feelings are just harder to identify then thoughts, and that therefore emotions and feelings are really thoughts themselves, or vice versa. If all thought is really emotion, and all emotion really thought, then all intelligence could vary and be dependent on emotions. This is further evidenced by the statement "thus once you find out what is causing the emotion it is no longer an emotion, but it is a thought". That shows how an emotion is a thought that you just aren't identifying. It is just a matter of definition of the terms. Thought is concrete things which are real in the world, and emotion is something that you feel but can't visualize. So therefore intelligence is just the ability to do things which are real, versus feeling something, which isn't as "real" as thoughts are.

An explanation for this chapter:

This chapter basically described the difference between thoughts and feeling (or emotion). Thoughts are things that you are conscious of, when you have a thought, you know you have it because it is your thought. Unless you aren't aware of the thought you are having (which would make it an unconscious thought), then the thought is something that is clear to you, it is usually a sentence, though you might not be thinking of it as a sentence. You might know you want to do something, but you might not express it very clearly to yourself. When someone has a clear thought, they know what it is. You can want to do things and be thinking things all the time, some of the thoughts are going to be more clear than others.

Emotion, on the other hand, isn't clear like clear thoughts. When you experience an emotion, you might not know you are experiencing it at all, and it is certainly a lot more complicated than a sentence, which could be your typical thought. Emotion could be described with a lot of thoughts, and this probably occurs in humans all the time. People have complicated emotions, and these emotions would give rise to thoughts that people are aware of (a conscious, clear thought such as a sentence in your head), and thoughts that people are less aware of, (for instance you are doing something but you didn't fully realize that you were going to or are doing it.

## 6.2 Some Points on Emotion Theory

- There are two types of observations in emotion theory, one type is general common observations (such as sex is good for someones emotional health) and the other type is functional observations (when an emotion stops at one second and another one takes its place, what is happening there, what are the emotions, why do they stop and start, etc (for example, if someone thinks a happy thought it might stop the negative thought completely) also, what are the degrees to which the emotion or thought is felt, is it completely gone etc.
- Emotions stop and start all the time, this stopping and starting might occur as sudden transitions or slow transitions, one emotion gradually fading into the other. That is not a complete explanation for how emotion functions, however. Humans would probably have several emotions occurring at one time, each emotion interacting with one or more other emotions and potentially causing them to stop, start, fade or increase.
- For instance, the emotions hate, love, painful emotions, sexual emotions, hopeful emotions, and humorous emotions are probably all constantly interacting with each other and being felt to some degree all the time. Those are only a few of the emotions/feelings that are probably felt a lot everyday.
- There are going to be observable patterns that occur with those emotions, for instance pleasure might relieve pain and make painful feeling go away.
- Life is intense and ongoing, so therefore intense emotion is probably maintained in humans all the time. These emotions might stop and start, someone could go from brief periods of intensity to periods of low intensity, but the point is there is that intensity that is felt and the continuous flow of emotional processing is ongoing.
- There are different emotional states that can change your outlook on life or how you might respond to a situation. Fear, anger, kindness and admiration are all emotional states that change how you might respond to events. You can also be in a state of readiness for certain emotions, you could be prepared to experience pain or pleasure or be in one of those states.
- Emotions are experienced consciously and unconsciously, the extent to which someone clearly feels an emotion is the extent to which it is conscious. If an emotion is being experienced but isn't under the awareness of the person experiencing it, by definition it is mostly an unconscious emotion because they are not conscious of it. Someone can experience a large emotion but that doesn't necessarily mean that the emotion is going to be completely under the awareness of the person experiencing it. They might describe the emotion as feeling like it is very large, but they might not be in touch with it (making it mostly unconscious). It is in this world of "seemingly larger emotions" that emotional processing takes place. Unconsciously there are many more emotions experienced than you are completely aware of that are being experienced. Therefore it is there, in the unconscious mind, that emotions interact in great depth and complexity, barely being felt consciously at times and with the person possibly only

slightly aware that something emotional might be going on (unconsciously).

- Emotion is experienced differently for each person. An emotion evokes a certain emotional response in a person because that person is who they are, however we all share the same world and there are going to be significant psychological things in it that are generally considered to be significant by most people, such as death or love. Any individual has peculiarities and specifics about what might trigger a large emotional response, it wouldn't necessarily just be something that they "like a lot" but mostly things they consciously or unconsciously find to be significant.
- When emotion can stop and start, and there can be periods of intensity and low-intensity, it makes one wonder just how many different emotional states there are. For every mood in a social situation you could say is an emotional state. If there is a certain mood present, then the people are going to be feeling certain things and responding in a way that is correspondent to that mood. But that is just social moods, there are many other ways people's emotional state can change, if you are working on something you enjoy working on you could be in a certain emotional state for that.
- An emotional state implies a certain set of feelings that come up with a certain activity or under certain circumstances.
- An important observation to note in emotion theory is that pain can stop the current flow of emotion or feeling and alert the person. Pain and anxiety are different from the other emotions because they are unpleasant. How often is an emotion like hope or fun tainted by the emotion of pain? Is fun even an emotion or is it an emotional state? Fun would imply that you are experiencing a set of emotions that makes that circumstance fun, joy is an emotion, "fun" is more of an emotional state.
- The flow of someone's feelings can stop suddenly, for instance, say you are relaxing in bed after waking up, then your alarm clock goes off - you went from feeling happy, relaxed emotions to those suddenly ending. Emotions and feelings stop and start like this all the time. In a conversation, for example, someone could be happy and the other person could show or adopt a negative expression and that could suddenly end the other person's happiness. There are many emotions someone could adopt in a conversation such as shyness, or an emotion expressing a thought or an idea, and these emotions could influence (or start and stop) emotions that the other person is experiencing. It should be clear that the many emotions someone experiences throughout the day changes all the time, stops, starts, transitions, and changes in complicated ways all the time. These changes may or may not be observed, however if you pay attention to these feelings and their behavior you could certainly notice a lot more.

An explanation for this chapter:

An emotional state is a very complicated thing. If someone knew completely their emotional state, they would know everything they were feeling right then. Then they wouldn't really have any "unconscious" emotions, because they would be perfectly conscious of what they were feeling. But then again, it is impossible to feel the full force of all your feelings at once, so it is not possible to be completely conscious of all your feelings. Your unconscious feelings must be dimmed down, or only large in a way that isn't completely conscious. Like you know you have a large emotion, but aren't in touch with it.

Emotional states are complicated, it would be easy to say, "my emotional state right now is really messed up" because that is what emotional states are like, people have several emotions they are experiencing all the time, it is just hard to identify that this is occurring because I would say that people can only identify when they have a large, clear emotion that they can understand.

### 6.3 Thoughts

**Anything that is said or done is possibly followed by a long series of unconscious thoughts and thought processes.**

What is the difference between emotion, feeling, thought, logic, and intelligence? Use of any of them requires a lot of attention. Even when you are feeling something emotional your attention is directed toward that thing. The answer is that everything in life eventually results in a feeling. Even emotion results in a feeling. Emotion is unconscious thoughts about things, and thoughts are conscious thoughts about things.



Thought results in feelings, so unconscious thought (emotion) is also going to result in feelings.

If you think about it that way, thought and emotion are both in part feelings, that is, to some extent you feel them right away, in addition to them resulting in feelings later on. But that still means that feelings are always the end result. Then again, thoughts might be the result of current thoughts. That is like emotion, unconscious emotional thoughts are going to result in unconscious emotional thoughts later on. Even feelings could be called unconscious thoughts, because thought is just focusing on one thing for a brief period of time.

Therefore emotion, thought and feeling are really just periods of focus on certain things. With thought you just recognize what it is that you are focusing on. With emotions you feel deeply about what you are focusing on, and with feelings you are focusing on it less. Physical stimulus also results in feelings, and then you focus on those feelings, you aren't necessarily focused on what caused the feelings (the physical stimulus itself) however.

Thus life is really just different types of feelings; you could categorize all of life as feeling. Even when you think you are in a period when you're not feeling anything, you really are feeling something; you just don't recognize what it is that you are feeling. Remember that feelings are thoughts you can't identify. And since a thought is going to be about something, another way to think about life is just stuff happening. Stuff happening results in feelings in your brain, where more stuff happens. It is all-concrete.

The definition of intellect and thoughts is almost understanding (those concrete things). Emotion is feeling, completely separate from facts or information. All facts and information are going to be about things that cause feeling, however, since all things that happen cause feelings and all facts and information are about things that happen. So facts and information are just feelings organized in a logical manner. Intellect and thought also generates feelings when those thoughts are processed in your mind. Since thought is really only about feelings, it is logical that thought actually has root in feelings. For example, all events are really feelings in the mind, so thoughts are actually just comparing feelings. You take two feelings and can arrive at one thought. Take the feeling of a frog moving and the feeling of a threat of danger. The two feelings combined equal the idea or thought that the frog needs to move when there is danger – the thought is actually just understanding how feelings interact. All thought is is the understanding of how feelings and real events interact with themselves. Feeling is what provides the motivation to arrive at the answer (the thought). If you just had the facts, there is a threat, and the frog can jump, you aren't going to arrive at the conclusion that the frog should jump away. You need to take the feeling that there is a threat and the feeling that the frog can jump and then combine the two sensory images in your head to arrive at the answer.

That shows how all intellect is powered and motivated by emotion. It also shows that frogs have thoughts; the frog has to have the thought to jump away when it sees a threat, as a thought is just the combination of two feelings resulting in the resulting feeling of wanting to move away. That process of feelings is like a thought process. Thoughts are a little different for humans, however, because humans have such a large memory that they are able to compare this experience to all the other experiences in their life while the frog only remembers the current situation and is programmed (brain wiring) to jump away. The frog doesn't have a large enough memory to learn from new information and change its behavior. That shows how humans are very similar to frogs in how they process data (in one way at least), and that one thing that separates a human from a frog is a larger memory which can store lots of useful information and potential behavioral patterns.

Thoughts, especially in humans, are not that independent – they can be much more complicated and it can appear to be that nothing is as it seems. If someone says to you, "I know x". He isn't just saying that he knows x, but there is a chain of other thoughts that also occur in your mind. You analyze the statement he made and it causes you to think automatically, "Do I know x too?" "Why does he think I care that he knows x?" "Is there anything else about x that is significant that I am missing?" "What if this other person is smarter than me?" that doesn't lead to a feeling of being dumb (it might), instead it leads to another concrete thing "maybe I am stupid" or the thought "maybe that person is stupid" interacting with the thought "because that thing he said was wrong". So one simple thought for a human can mean much much more than that one thought. That example shows another way in which humans are different from frogs – they are capable of more simultaneous thoughts. It is also the memory working hand in hand with

that capacity of simultaneous thought as well, if you had no memory then you wouldn't have information to compare and bring up those simultaneous thoughts.

They can all be moving at the same time as well, not only does one thought follow another; but it occurs instantaneously. If the thing the person said was something you didn't know, it might make you feel stupid, thus the thought results in a feeling. But that feeling can be translated to a thought. So it isn't the feeling, "I am stupid" it is the thought "I am stupid". Feeling stupid might make you feel bad, but it isn't just that you are feeling bad, you are also thinking over and over "I am stupid" unconsciously, and that is what is making you feel bad. Or you are paying attention to the fact that you are stupid. Thus thought, feeling, and emotion is just paying attention to different things in your head. Concrete things.

It is a little more complicated than that, however. It is going to be a mix of a lot of concrete thoughts interacting with each other, not just the thought "I am stupid" repeated over and over but maybe also a less intense idea of "well I know x and y that that person doesn't, maybe this was just one event". So anything that is said or done is possibly followed by a long series of unconscious thoughts and thought processes.

There were two examples of thoughts, one was with the frog and the danger of a threat, and the other was a questioning of ones intellect relative to someone else. The example with the frog was an example of a thought process that was simple, while the example with the person showed how some thought processes can be much more complicated than they appear.

How This Chapter shows how Intelligence is intertwined with Emotion:

- It is stated first that use of emotion and thought requires attention, and therefore they both cause feelings, and if they both cause feelings then they are going to be similar in nature. Your intellect (or ability to do things which are real) is going to generate feelings just like emotions do.
- Feelings can result in thoughts – this was shown with the frog example, the frog has the thought "jump" which comes from the feeling of a threat of danger, and the feeling of it's understanding that it can jump. That shows how thoughts can be encouraged by feelings and mixed in with them.
- Thought is also powered by feeling in other ways, as when you are nervous that you didn't understand something, your feelings then cause you to think nervous things like "do I know that too?, does he think I care that he knows that?" Those thoughts are a function of intelligence, because they are causing you to think about real things, which is what intelligence is.

An explanation for this chapter:

This chapter basically outlined that thoughts can cause feelings and real things to happen, and these three things (thought, action, and feeling) can occur in any order. Feelings can cause you to jump, or some other action, and so can thoughts. Thoughts can cause feelings which could cause you to do an action. This means that any feeling, a physical one, a certain emotion, anything, could result in any thought which could cause you to do anything. For frogs, this process seems simple, if it has feelings, they are easy to label such as fear of a person coming near them. For a human, these feelings might be much more complex, involving many more unconscious thoughts and worries or whatnot. A frog isn't going to be worried if its intelligence is insulted, or any number of other possible unconscious thoughts that a person might have. You could still say the frog has thoughts though, since it reaches the conclusion at some point to jump away, and it moves in very complicated patterns. Those patterns of movement for a frog, however, are easy to understand and the same pattern occurs each time you see the frog pretty much. Humans can adapt their behavior with thoughts and make their behavior and thinking much more complex.

I say in this chapter that thought, feeling and emotion is just paying attention to concrete things in your head. If you talk to someone and they make you feel bad, it might be because you are unconsciously thinking they think you are stupid. Or you could say that you are just feeling like they think you are stupid. I guess it doesn't really matter if you say you are thinking they think you are stupid or you are feeling like they think you are stupid. If you are thinking that they are thinking you are stupid it is conscious, you are aware that they might be thinking you are stupid, and this might be making you feel bad. You pay attention to the thought you have of awareness of their thinking about this. You could also pay attention to the emotion of you feeling bad because you are thinking this. Or maybe you could describe what is going on as the other person is thinking you are stupid, and because they are thinking this you feel bad, no matter what you think

or want to feel. They could be influencing your emotions by treating you as stupid. Maybe you're thinking unconsciously back to them, no actually i'm really smart. Maybe that is what you are thinking, but you could still feel bad about it. The point is, the difference between saying you have an unconscious thought and you have an emotion is just how much attention you are paying to each one. You are probably going to be paying more attention to it if it is an unconscious thought because that is what thoughts are, something you think and are aware of. You think you are smart, so unconsciously you are thinking that they shouldn't be thinking you are stupid. Maybe you thinking that unconsciously determines how you feel, so you don't feel bad because they think you're stupid because you know and are thinking that you're actually smart. So when someone treats you as stupid, you could in response a) feel that they are wrong, or b) be thinking that they are wrong. Those are two types of responses to things, you could respond with thoughts, or respond with feelings. If someone is mean to you, and you feel good in response, maybe it is because you are just a happy person, or maybe it is because you are "really" thinking they are stupid and ignoring them. However you want to label what is going on by saying you are feeling something or you are thinking something, you are ultimately just paying attention to your emotions or their emotions or what ever it is you are paying attention to, you don't have to think about it with words necessarily. If you are paying attention to your emotions or what you are thinking or what they are thinking or feeling, you could notice a lot. There could also be a lot going on that you don't know about because you can feel emotions for a lot of reasons you aren't aware of. Emotion is unconscious thought.

So what is the difference between someone thinking something and someone feeling something? You can feel bad, or you could think negative things about yourself that make you feel bad. When someone thinks, they are aware of what they are doing and what they are thinking about. When someone feels an emotion, they might not be aware of it or know how it was generated. What is an unconscious thought then? If thoughts are something you know you are thinking and are paying attention to, then how could you not be aware of them? A thought is something you are thinking, you know you are thinking it. You don't always (or maybe even never) know if you are experiencing an emotion, on the other hand. Emotion is unconscious thought because emotion is just you feeling something about something, so you could express it as a thought. "I feel bad because they treated me like I was stupid", could be the unconscious thought, and the emotion would be, "I feel bad because they treated me like I was stupid". They are exactly the same. If you are aware of what an emotion is, then it is a thought because you think about what the emotion is. It is also an emotion, because you are feeling it, but when you realize what caused the emotion or think about the emotion in your head, it is a thought because you are thinking about it (its still an emotion obviously though).

So if someone makes you feel bad, you might think, "this person made me feel bad". Then you would be experiencing the emotion sadness from them making you feel bad, and you would have verbalized that emotion into a thought, "this person made me feel bad". The emotion sadness turned into the thought in your head, "this person made me feel bad". So someone made you feel bad, this made you sad, then you realized you were sad and thought to yourself, "this person made me feel bad". Action turned into feeling, which caused you to think and therefore turned into thought. Thought, action (your action or external action) and feeling can occur in any order.

## 6.4 Emotions and Feelings and the Difference Between Them

Emotion is more similar to conscious thought than feelings are to conscious thought. Although emotion and feeling can be described as unconscious thought, one of them is going to be more similar to conscious thought. Feelings are more like sensations, when you touch something you get a feeling. Therefore feelings are faster than emotions and thought, because when you touch something there is a slight delay before you can think of something about it (thought), or feel something deeply about it (emotion). Emotion is therefore just unconscious thought. Actually it would better be described as unconscious feeling (so a feeling is like a conscious emotion because you can "feel" it better and easier but emotion is a deeper, more unconscious experience similar to unconscious thought, but emotions are also more similar to conscious thought because thought is a deep experience while feelings are intense or shallow, but not deep).

One definition of emotion can be "any strong feeling". From that description many conclusions can be drawn. Basic (or primary) emotions can be made up of secondary emotions like love can contain feelings or emotions of lust, love and longing. Feelings can be described in more detail than emotions because you can have a specific feeling for anything, each feeling is unique and might not have a name. For instance, if you are upset by one person that might have its own feeling because that person upsets you in a certain way. That feeling doesn't have a defined name because it is your personal feeling. The feeling may also be an emotion, say anger. "Upset" is probably too weak to be an emotion, but that doesn't mean that it isn't strong like emotions are strong in certain ways. Cold is also just a feeling. There is a large overlap between how feelings feel and how emotions feel, they are similar in nature. So there are only a few defined emotions, but there are an infinite number ways of feeling things. You can have a "small" emotion of hate and you could say that you have the feeling hate then, if it is large you could say you are being emotional about hate, or are experiencing the emotion hate. You can have the same emotion of hate in different situations, but each time the feeling is going to be at least slightly different.

You can recognize any feeling, that is what makes it a feeling. If you are sad that is a feeling, but if you are depressed that isn't a feeling it is more like an emotion. You can't identify why you are depressed but you can usually identify why you are sad. Feelings are more immediate, if something happens or is happening, it is going to result in a feeling. However, if something happened a long time ago, you are going to think about it unconsciously and that is going to bring up unconscious feelings (the reason the things that happened previously are going to be more similar to emotion than things that are happening currently is that sensory stimulation (or things happening currently) is a lot closer to feelings than things that are less linked to direct sensory stimulation (such as emotions which are therefore usually going to be about things which require memory to figure out, things like thoughts that are less like feelings and more like emotion)). So emotions are unconscious feelings that are the result of mostly unconscious thoughts (instead of feelings – a feeling can trigger an emotion, but it isn't a part of it). Feeling defined there as something you can identify. Also, you can't identify the unconscious thought that caused the unconscious feeling, but you can identify the unconscious feeling itself (aka emotion).

Another aspect of unconscious thought, emotion, or unconscious feeling (all three are the same) is that it tends to be mixed into the rest of your system because it is unconscious. If it was conscious then it remains as an individual feeling, but in its unconscious form you confuse it with the other emotions and feelings and it affects your entire system. So therefore most of what people are feeling is just a mix of feelings that your mind cannot separate out individually. That is the difference between sadness and a depression, a depression lowers your mood and affects all your feelings and emotions, but sadness is just that individual feeling. So the reason that the depression affects all your other feelings is because you can no longer recognize the individual sad emotions that caused it. The feelings become mixed. If someone can identify the reason they are sad then they become no longer depressed, just sad. Once they forget that that was the reason they are depressed however, they will become depressed again.

That is why an initial event might make someone sad, and then that sadness would later lead into a depression, is because you forget why you originally got sad. You might not consciously forget, but unconsciously you do. That is, it feels like you forget, the desire to get revenge on whatever caused the sadness fades away. When that happens it is like you "forgetting" what caused it. You may also consciously forget but what matters is how much you care about that sadness. It might be that consciously understanding why you are depressed or sad changes how much you care about your sadness, however. That would therefore change the emotion/feeling of sadness. The more you care about the sadness/depression, the more like a feeling it becomes and less like an emotion. That is because the difference between feelings and emotions is that feelings are easier to identify (because you can "feel" them easier).

The following is a good example of the transition from caring about a feeling to not caring about a feeling. Anger as an emotion takes more energy to maintain, so if someone is punched or something, they are only likely to be mad for a brief period of time, but the sadness that it incurred might last for a much longer time. That sadness is only going to be recognizable to the person punched for a brief period of time as attributable to the person who did the punching, after that the sadness would sink into their system like a miniature depression. Affecting the other parts of their system like a depression.

In review, both feelings and emotions are composed of unconscious thoughts, but feelings are easier to identify than emotions. Feelings are faster than emotions in terms of response (the response time of the feeling, how fast it responds to real world stimulation) and it takes someone less time to recognize feelings because they are faster. Feelings are closer to sensory stimulation, if you touch something, you feel it and that is a fast reaction. You care about the feeling so you can separate it out in your head from the other feelings. "You care" in that sentence could be translated into, the feeling is intense, so you feel it and can identify it easily. That is different from consciously understanding why you are depressed or sad. You can consciously understand why you are depressed or sad, but that might or might not affect the intensity of that sadness.

If the intensity of the sadness is brought up enough, then you can feel that sadness and it isn't like a depression anymore, it is more like an individual feeling than something that affects your mood and brings your system down (aka a depression). Also, if you clearly enough understand what the sadness is then it is going to remain a sadness and not affect the rest of your system. That is because the feeling would get mixed in with the other feelings and start affecting them. The period of this more clear understanding of the sadness mostly occurs right after the event that caused the sadness. That is because it is clear to you what it is. Afterwards the sadness might emerge (or translate from a depression, to sadness) occasionally if you think about what caused it or just think about it in general.

The difference between emotion and feeling is that feelings are easier to identify because they are faster, a feeling is something you are feeling right then. An emotion might be a deeper experience because it might affect more of you, but that is only because it is mixed into the rest of your system. That is, a depression affects more of you than just an isolated feeling of sadness. In other words, people can only have a few feelings at a time, but they can have many emotions at the same time. Emotions are mixed in, but to feel something you have to be able to identify what it is, or it is going to be so intense that you would be able to identify what it is. Emotions just feel deeper because it is all your feelings being affected at once.

Since emotion is all your feelings being affected at once, emotions are stronger than feelings. Feelings however are a more directed focus. When you feel something you can always identify what that one thing is. When you have an emotion, the emotion is more distant, but stronger. All your feelings must feel a certain way about whatever is causing the emotion. So that one thing is affecting your entire system. Feelings can then be defined as immediate unconscious thought, and emotions as unconscious thought.

How This Chapter shows how Intelligence is intertwined with Emotion:

- Feelings are more direct than emotions and thought because they are more sensory – when you touch something you get a feeling. That shows further how emotions are really about things in the real world, only it more like you are thinking about them instead of feeling them in real time. Things that come from memory are going to be emotions and/or thoughts, not feelings because feelings are things which are more tangible, those memories might result in new feelings, but the memories themselves are not feelings because they are just thoughts. That shows how you can feel some things more than others, that thought and feeling are indeed separate and intelligence is sometimes driven by feelings and emotions, and sometimes it isn't. You can think about things and not have feelings guiding those thoughts Or your feelings could be assisting your thoughts.
- If you care about a feeling then it becomes easier to identify it – that shows how your feelings can help you to identify other feelings, so your emotions contribute to your emotional intelligence.
- If a certain emotion is larger than others then to your intellect it is going to be easier to recognize, and easier to think about (that is why a depression feels like it does, because you don't know the individual emotions contributing to it so you cannot feel a specific emotion of sadness from it.

An explanation for this chapter:

So feelings are easier to "feel" than emotions, that is probably why they are called feelings, because you "feel" them better. Maybe someone else thinks you can feel emotions easier, I don't know, the point is you can feel emotions and feelings with different levels of intensity and in more than one way, a feeling could be not intense but clear to you. So how conscious you are of the feeling or emotion influences the intensity of it and your conscious experience of it. A feeling could be more intense than an emotion if it is the only thing

you are feeling as well. That makes sense, if an emotion is very complicated, then you probably couldn't feel the entire thing as clearly in a brief period of time. So my theory is that feelings are more simple, and therefore there are more shallow but possibly more intense than emotion because you can focus on a simple thing easier.

If you are having a deep emotional experience (experiencing an emotion) then it makes sense that you aren't as in touch with all of those feelings that are occurring. When you touch something you get the feeling "cold" - that is simple to understand. When you are in a depression you don't understand all the complicated emotions that you are experiencing. You could experience sadness all day. When you can say "oh, I really "felt" that", then you know you feel it and it is a feeling. When you feel something, it is a feeling. When you are emotional about something, those are feelings too, but it is more powerful and deeper, you aren't as in touch with all of it because it is more complex. You could be in touch with something complex and feel that too, I guess. Though I would argue that a feeling is easier to focus on if it is simple and clear to understand and feel to your conscious mind.

## 6.5 Emotions are Dulled Feelings

Feelings are more immediate than emotions, they are easier to identify and are "faster". You can also have only a few feelings at a time but your emotions are possibly composed of many more components. That is, you can have a feeling about a Frisbee, and you can have a feeling about a Frisbee game as well. But if you have emotions about the Frisbee game then in order to get those strong emotions there would have to be many things you are feeling about the Frisbee game.

So one could think of emotions as just more than feelings. Emotions are greater than feelings and therefore they must have more parts in order to cause that greater feeling. Feelings are easy to understand because they are simple, but emotions are harder to understand because they are more complicated. A moody person would be described as emotional because emotion is a component of mood. Emotion is something that affects your entire system like a depression does. A feeling such as sadness is only an individual feeling and can be identified as such.

If something is intense, then it is a feeling, emotions aren't intense they are deep. They aren't as intense as feelings but you could call them intense. Feelings are more intense because that is how we define feelings, if you can feel something then it is a feeling because, well, you "feel" it. Emotion is just something that affects you, your mood, how you are, etc. That is why feelings are easier to identify, because they are more intense. Emotions are deeper, however, when someone becomes emotional you can't just snap out of it instantly, it hangs around in your system. That is why they are probably made up of more parts than feelings are.

The reason feelings are both more intense yet shallower than emotions is probably because your system can only handle so much intensity at a time, so you can only experience shallow things intensely. If you compare it to a river, emotions would have a lot of water and be going slowly, and feelings would have less water, but be going faster. The feeling is therefore going to touch more things in your mind shallowly, and the emotion is going to touch more things in your mind deeply.

Why then do some simple things cause us to become more emotional if emotion is a deeper experience? That is because the feeling must trigger emotions, the simple thing is actually a feeling itself, but it triggers emotions. Like how color can be more emotional than black and white. It is actually that color causes more feeling, and we become emotional then about that feeling. But while you are looking at the color it is a feeling which you are feeling, not an emotion. The feeling made you feel good, however, and that good feeling infects the rest of your feelings and emotions, and then you become emotional.

In fact, all feelings make someone more emotional. The only difference between feeling and emotion is that feeling is the immediate feeling you get from something. It is the thing which you are experiencing currently. Feeling is another word for current stimulation. You can only feel something that you are either thinking about or experiencing. Otherwise you aren't really feeling it, and it is an emotion. That is why the word feeling is the word feeling, because you can feel it intimately, closely.

How is it then that emotions are generally considered to be deeper? That is because with emotions you are actually feeling more, you just aren't as in touch with what it is that you are feeling. So you would

experience the effects of having a lot of feeling, such as heavy breathing, crying, laughing, they would be things that make all your other feelings and emotions feel the same way. However your mind isn't intensifying that experience because it would be too much for you to handle. Therefore emotion is just many feelings (or one strong feeling) that is dulled down, and it would actually be a stronger feeling(s), you just can only experience it fully as an emotion. You can also probably experience parts of that emotion as feelings since parts of it are going to be less intense than the whole, and you can "feel" them then.

So people can basically only "feel" or focus on small amounts of feeling. If it is a feeling that is very large it becomes an emotion with more parts. It isn't that this emotion isn't as deep as the feeling, it is actually deeper, but you simply cannot comprehend the entire emotion at once to "feel" it like you feel feelings. You can bring up feelings from memory (by thinking about sensory stimulation) but those types of feelings are going to be less direct and therefore more like emotions (less intense) than current, direct sensory stimulation that you are feeling in the real world.

Just as feelings can generate emotions, emotions can also generate feelings. For example, something like a fly buzzing might generate the feeling of annoyance, and this feeling might generate the emotion sad. You respond to the feeling first because feelings are faster and more immediate than emotions. An example of an emotion generating a feeling would be being sad that you are depressed. The depression is more of an emotion than the sadness because it is deeper and "slower" but the sadness is more like a feeling because it can be more immediate (it can also be an emotion, but in this example it is a feeling).

How This Chapter shows how Intelligence is intertwined with Emotion:

- If emotions are dulled feelings then your mind is capable of taking feelings and making them into emotions, and vice versa. That means that a part of intelligence is your ability to control your own feelings and emotions and thoughts.

## 6.6 Emotions and Feelings are Broad Thoughts

**Any emotion or feeling can be broken down into the sensations and real events that caused it. And you can think about any of those things (with thoughts).**

A thought is thinking about something in specific. You can have a thought about an entire paragraph, but it is going to be just a thought, it is going to be about one thing, and that one thing might be a summary of the paragraph - but it is still a thought. So what we think of as thought is really just a short period of thinking - one unit of thinking that lasts for a short period of time. An essay is composed of many thoughts, but just one thought would be "I went to the store".

Then again, "I went to the store, and Jason followed me" might be considered one thought as well. So how long exactly is a thought? If it is longer than "I went to the store, and Jason followed me" then it is probably going to be considered multiple thoughts. Thus humans use the word thought as just a short period of time in thinking.

Thoughts are in general talked about as being verbal, people rarely think of emotions and feelings as thoughts. But emotions and feelings are thoughts if you think about that emotion and feeling. The short period of time in which you think about the emotion or feeling is a thought. So thoughts can be about emotions and feelings. They are just harder to identify because they aren't verbal.

The reason that verbal things are easier to identify is because they are distinct sounds (that we have definitions for). Distinct sounds, different sounds, are easy to separate. It is easy to identify one sound from another sound, and that is all words are, different sounds. So it could be that someone is talking and you don't have any thoughts about them talking, or you are not thinking about them talking. In that case you just aren't listening to them, or you are not paying attention to the sounds they are making.

So thought then is really just any short period of high attention. And thinking is long or short periods of high attention. So if you are thinking for more than a few seconds, then you are probably going to be thinking about several thoughts. Since you can think about emotions and feelings too, however, you can think about your emotions or feelings for long periods of time.

Just as thinking is made up of individual components of thought, feeling, or emotion, each of those components is made up of their own further components. In fact, when you think about an emotion or feeling you intensify that feeling or emotion a lot. Each emotion, however, is made up of experiences in the real world. The real world can include thoughts and feelings in your head as well.

So emotions, feelings and thoughts are made up of real experiences. A thought isn't just a thing in your head, but it is something that has components that are real in the world. Those things might be sounds (when you think about someone speaking, you make that sound in your head). A sound in your head is just like a sound in reality, you are mimicking the emotion that the sound in reality is causing in your head by yourself, without having the real sound be there. Just try it and think about any sound, it produces the same emotions as when the sound itself occurred outside your head.

So a thought in the end boils down to you thinking about sensations, any sensation, taste, touch, sound, smell, feeling, or emotion. How can a thought be of emotion? Aren't thoughts supposed to be specific and quantifiable? Well a thought about an emotion is basically a summary of that emotion. If you played Frisbee and you get an emotion from playing Frisbee, then that emotion is a summary of the things in which you remember about playing Frisbee. The same goes with feelings. The feeling you have about something is really all the feelings that that thing causes in you, and when you focus on different aspects of that feeling, you are focusing on different aspects of the real experience which caused the feeling.

So when you think about an emotion you are intensifying the feeling of those real experiences. You have no conscious idea of which parts of the feeling you are thinking about, however. Maybe if you think about directly different parts of the real experience you can link it up to different parts of its emotion.

Thus any emotion or feeling can be broken down into the sensations and real events that caused it. And you can think about any of those things (with thoughts). You can also think about those things as individual thoughts. A thought isn't just a short period of your attention, but it is a short period of your attention during which you are trying to think about something (at least it feels like you are trying, you could not be trying and have a thought). Your natural attention span varies, but if you think about something you can boost that attention, you are trying to boost that attention on something specific or something broad (like an emotion).

Emotions and feelings are so intense, however, that it is like you are trying to focus your attention on them. So emotions, feelings, and thoughts are all periods of focused attention. A thought is just more focused attention than a feeling or emotion (unless it is a thought about a feeling or an emotion, in which case it is going to be even more attention than the feeling or thought or emotion by itself since it is a combination).

So emotions, feelings, and thoughts are all related, they are all things that you pay more attention to. And since emotion and feelings are made up of stuff which occurs in the real world, you could label each one of those things which occurs in the real world a thought, and say that emotions are made up of thoughts, or are broad thoughts. That is, you pay attention to your thoughts, and you pay attention to your emotions, so you could say that emotions are just a bunch of individual thoughts squished into one thing.

What then is the difference between a thought and an emotion? Emotions are usually more intense and therefore last longer in your brain when you think about them, or "bring them up". You usually can only bring them up by thinking about them, however. Other things might bring up an emotion, like other emotions or other feelings, consciously or unconsciously. The same with feelings and thoughts.

People "bring up" emotions, feelings and thoughts in various ways. One way to bring up an emotion would be using thought, such as thinking "I like my dog" would bring up the emotion of the dog. You could also think directly about the emotion of the dog without using the verbal discourse, however. This could also be described as just "feeling", "feeling out" or "being emotional about" your dog. A feeling could also bring up a thought (and all the other combinations of "bringing up" between thoughts, feelings and emotions). They might also be concurrent, that is, when you have one emotion there is an associated feeling with it (and the other combinations of that with feelings, thoughts and emotions). Don't forget that one of those combinations is that thoughts can also bring up or be concurrent with other thoughts (as with feelings and emotions).

How This Chapter shows how Intelligence is intertwined with Emotion:

- Since emotions are made up of many parts which are real, then intelligence is ultimately just your



ability to manipulate real things, and therefore your emotions are going to determine what it is in your mind, and give a larger pool of things for your intellect to explore.

## 6.7 Emotion vs. Logic

What is the difference between logic and emotion? When someone says that they are “emotional” which emotions do they mean? I guess they mean that they experience all emotions more. They could specify further, however, and say which emotions they experience more, which emotions they are more prone to.

If someone is emotional does that mean that they enjoy life more? What if someone was emotional, but only experienced positive emotions more than most people, and didn’t experience negative emotions. Then that person would be happier I guess. Unless they separated out the emotions joy and sadness and just talked about those. Can you be an emotional person and just have excess amounts of the emotion happy? So anyone just “happy” is therefore being emotional. You’d probably be a lot more emotional if you were happy and sad at the same time however (the mix of the two would drive someone mad most likely, however).

Happy and sad seem to be the two strongest emotions. They are stronger than fear, anger, surprise, disgust, acceptance, and curiosity. That would make anyone bipolar (experiencing swings from happy to sad) very emotional. Does the swing mean that someone is more emotional than just experiencing one at a time? The emotional change is hard I think and that is more of an experience than just being very happy all the time, so the change from happy to sad is what adds the emotion in. That is, your body goes through changes as it experiences major emotional changes.

There are two degrees of change in emotion however; one is a major change from depression to mania (which is what bipolar is). Another is just your ordinary change from sad to happy, which can occur many times in a day. So if someone is manic or depressed are they being more emotional than someone who is just happy or just sad?

Symptoms of mania ("The highs"):

- Excessive happiness, hopefulness, and excitement
- Sudden changes from being joyful to being irritable, angry, and hostile
- Restlessness
- Rapid speech and poor concentration
- Increased energy and less need for sleep
- High sex drive
- Tendency to make grand and unattainable plans
- Tendency to show poor judgment, such as deciding to quit a job
- Drug and alcohol abuse
- Increased impulsivity

The symptoms of bipolar depression are the same as those of major depression and include:

- Sadness
- Loss of energy
- Feelings of hopelessness or worthlessness
- Loss of enjoyment from things that were once pleasurable
- Difficulty concentrating
- Uncontrollable crying
- Difficulty making decisions
- Irritability
- Increased need for sleep
- Insomnia or excessive sleep
- A change in appetite causing weight loss or gain
- Thoughts of death or suicide
- Attempting suicide

I don't think that people with the two extremes of mania and depression are any more emotional than people who are just happy or sad. That is because being too happy or too sad shuts off the other emotions people would experience like anger, fear, disgust, surprise, acceptance, and curiosity. Why does it? Because with all the other symptoms of mania and depression, there isn't really any room left for emotions other than happy and sad, a person's system can only handle so much emotion. If you are crying all the time (like you would if you were severely depressed) there isn't any more room for you to experience other emotions. Or if you are as happy as you can be, you're probably too out of it (in your happy land) to think about anything else.

A person could be happy or sad and be less emotional than someone with mania or depression, however. But a person (if they were experiencing the other emotions other than happy and sad) could be just as emotional as someone with mania or depression. Although those people may be crying or have expressions of extreme glee on their faces, happy and sad are not the only emotions someone can experience and therefore they may not be as emotional.

Emotion means that you are feeling something; if you are feeling emotions other than happy and sad, then wouldn't the other emotions (if they were positive) increase the happy emotion and you then have a happy emotion that is larger than the other positive emotions you are experiencing? I guess that would be happy, but it would probably lead to overload. That is why it makes sense that people who are emotional experience a range of emotions from happy to sad ones, so that if they just experienced happy ones it would lead to too much happiness causing overload.

Why would emotions be balanced, why not just have only positive emotions? Because if you are curious, your curiosity is going to backfire when there is a failure (you'd be curious in a failure). Or if you are overly surprised, you would be just as surprised at a bad thing happening as you would as a good thing happening, leading to being happy and sad. Or if you got angry at something, you are then likely to become pleased by the opposite thing happening, so the emotions tend to balance out.

So is it really that the positive and negative emotions balance out? It is probably too hard for your mind to wait to become emotional at things that are only going to lead it to become happy. That is, you would have to consciously say to each thing, ah that is a positive emotion, I can have that emotion now. It seems more natural that when something bad happens, you get more upset, and when something good happens, you get happier. So you don't have to calculate and spend time to assess if you should "feel" in those instances.

That is a good way to size people up, assess how happy they get from what things, and how sad they get from other things. Why is it that happy and sad are the two strongest emotions? It seems that way because all the other emotions follow suit with them. When someone is happier they are likely to be more curious, or more accepting. When someone is sad it also makes him or her less reactive to things (the surprise emotion).

The other emotions don't occur as much as well. You can easily be happy or sad all the time, no matter what you are doing, but the other emotions need to fit into what you are doing. Like the emotion curiosity needs something to be curious in, and the emotion disgust needs something to be disgusted by. When you are doing nothing the emotion you are going to feel most of the time is just plain happy or sad, thus those two emotions are also our "idling" emotions (when we are idle we have them).

If the other emotions don't occur as much, then why would someone be happy or sad in the first place? Are the emotions happy and sad simply the result of other emotions in your body? If that is the case, how is it possible for someone to become manic or depressed? Mania and depression are such extremes of happy and sad that other emotions can't be experienced as well. What then is the source of that extreme happiness or sadness?

Either it seems like life has enough in it to justify being manic or depressed or it doesn't. If it doesn't then the mania and depression would arise from people just being unstable and fragile creatures, easily upset and disturbed. If it does then by a logic process one should be able to figure out the cause of their mania or depression is and solve it.

How This Chapter shows how Intelligence is intertwined with Emotion:

- It could be viewed that emotion is entirely driven by intellect, that everything that you feel you feel because you are who you are, and who you are is determined by your thoughts and your own intelligence.

Or it could be rephrased the opposite way, that intelligence is entirely driven by emotion for the same reasons, those viewpoints are obvious when you take emotional highs where it seems like you are acting out of control - because then you realize why it is you are having those emotions, and you are having them because of something you did (which was driven by your intellect) or something you were feeling (which is driven by your emotions). Your intellect determined how you felt the emotion, because you are your intellect, and that (you) would then determine how you feel about something that happens. Someone's emotional template (who they are, how they respond to the world) could be viewed as being an intellectual template because intellect is understanding real things, and your emotions determine what it is that you process and how you process them.

## 6.8 Life Occurs In Sharp Spikes

**Life occurs during the brief periods of time when people are actually paying attention, in spikes.**

People need to pay attention to things in order to keep their minds alive and active. They need to pay attention to little things all the time. That is why spikes occur, when people refocus their attention on little things over and over it occurs as a spike, because the new object needs to be processed as a whole and this processing takes energy in the form of a "spike".

Humans cannot pay attention to everything, and the things they do pay attention to they need to "spike" their attention initially to get that object into their attention and focus. It is possible to not use spikes of attention, but if you did that then life would be boring. In order for life to be interesting people naturally spike their attention on certain things every so often (once a minute or so) to make life more exciting. Life would be boring if you never paid sharp attention to anything. Spikes of attention keep life "crisp".

If life occurs in sharp spikes, why then doesn't it feel like life occurs in sharp spikes? It seems pretty smooth to me. If it seems this way, then you aren't realizing or paying attention to the complicated emotional and cognitive processes that are going on in your mind, life is not "all smooth" but there are changes in attention going on all the time. Each little thing you pay attention to (actually pay attention to that is, not just "absorb") actually occurs as a spike in attention. This is because most of the time your attention isn't extremely directed, but you need to make it extremely directed sometimes (once a minute or so) in order to properly stay awake. It is also because you don't absorb every little thing, you only absorb a few things once in a while, and these things that you do absorb are the spikes. They are spikes because they are relative to most of your activity which isn't absorbing things intently or deeply. Every minute or so you need to absorb something. That thing is the spike.

When you pay attention to your attention (or what you are paying attention to) how does life feel to you? Does it feel smooth or rough? Life seems rough if you pay attention to it like that, with occasional spikes of interest in things. It is rough because there are many little fluctuations of interest in various things, but intensity is needed somewhere. This intensity comes from the spikes, otherwise life would just be rough and there wouldn't be anything smooth. The top of the spike is smooth, however because it is clear and it lasts a little while (a few seconds or a few dozen seconds). Paying sharp attention to things allows you to have a clear mind for the time you are giving that sharper attention. It separates out all the other things and you focus more on what it is you processed. This clears your mind because you just received a lot of stimulation. In this way spikes can make life be smooth. Without spikes life would always be rough because of all the little things. But if you use a spike then life is smooth afterwards because you are satisfied.

Life is many small variations in attention over time. There are periods of focused attention and periods of non-focused attention. The periods of focused attention are the spikes. This is very complicated if you try to follow your own spikes because there are so many things you are "spiking" and paying sharp attention to all the time. There are three groups of things, things you pay sharp attention to, things you pay attention to, and things you don't pay attention to. You pay sharp attention to things much less often than the other two categories, and that is why the sharp attention is a spike, because it is uncommon and doesn't last as long as the other things, so it looks more like a spike when compared with the other two categories than a leveled plain.

Also, people's emotions change all the time. The change probably occurs both gradually and like a series of steps. There are so many emotions in a person's head that some of them are going to interact with each other suddenly, causing a sudden sharp change in emotion, and others are going to interact more slowly, causing gradual changes in emotion.

It might be that the changes are just sharp, however. You could look at the mind as a system that only changes when it gets a trigger, and that would probably mean that it only has sharp changes of emotion. However those changes wouldn't just be sharp changes. Large, sharp changes of emotion don't just happen by themselves, but deep emotional experiences are often followed by similar emotions that are less intense. That is, if you experience emotion A, emotion A is going to linger in your system.

That excludes the staircase model, but there still could be something like a staircase, only instead of steps at a 90 degree angle they would be something like an 100 degree angle. With 10/360 percent being the emotions that hang around after an initiating event. That would be just emotion changes resulting from large events, however. Either a large event within your own system (something like a thought or a feeling, or a mix of thoughts and feelings), or a large external event (like something happening outside your body). That's because your mind needs to understand, "ok now I am sad". As intellectual, thinking beings all major emotional events that occur in the mind need to be processed intellectually (unless you're sleeping). So in other words if you just get sadder and sadder and are not aware of it you are not going to get nearly as sad as when you realize that you are getting sadder. The points when you realize (at some level) that you are getting sadder are going to be when you start feeling a lot sadder (the steps on the downward staircase of sadness and depression).

There must be other stuff going on in the mind, however. While a clash or mix of two feelings or emotions or thoughts could be figured out, and that would probably result in a noticeable emotional change (the staircase or spike model). There are probably other things going on in your conscious or unconscious mind. That is, some things that happen to people take a long time to recover from. But the main point is, everything, whether or not is a slow, gradual change or a sudden, quick change, resulted from some mix of emotions and feelings and thoughts and external events happening.

Furthermore, any mix of those things, when they interact, is going to be a large change. That is because it is a large change relative to your normal state, which is most of the time feeling nothing, because nothing is going on most of the time. People experience events in life and things in life and they occur in individual units.

Thoughts, emotions, and feelings are the three main components of the brain. "Everything" isn't stimulating enough to cause sharp spikes. There is vision, that is, you see things all the time, but your emotion doesn't go up or down a lot when you close or open your eyes. Unless you are looking at something that is causing a feeling, of course. But even then that feeling is only going to last a few seconds before it dies off. Therefore vision clearly functions with the sharp spikes pattern.

The same with hearing, if you hear something interesting, there is a sharp spike of initial interest, and then it dies down to almost normal. That must mean that feelings and emotions are probably a combination of thoughts, feelings, and emotions. That you almost think about the event that is occurring, and that when you think about it there is a large spike upwards. That the combination of feeling and emotion with thought results in large spikes, which form our best and common regular life experiences.

That is, you can't really tell you are thinking about it because it isn't verbal. But it feels like you are thinking about it during that brief time. That means that your attention is going to be focused on it, basically. Sometimes when someone is in a depression these spikes can be very large because that person is very upset. A large spike would result in emotional damage, furthering the depression, thereby causing the depression to go down like a staircase. It is easy to do emotional damage, but it can't be repaired in a series of spikes, as it would go up gradually (still small compared to the spikes however).

Just think of it as fabric; damage needs to be mended, and mending takes time. It is easy to do damage to the fabric, you can only mend it slowly. No one just "snaps out" of a depression. Furthermore it is easy to stimulate the fabric, just poke it. That poke would be similar to a life experience, the poke has ripples, but the main event was the poking.

The sharp spike occurrences show just how short of attention span humans have. That for brief periods

we are capable of almost perfect attention, and during those periods is the height of the spikes. These spikes actually look more like lumps since they go up gradually and cause a stay in attention for a few seconds, but they are so fast that they are best called spikes. Say looking at an attractive girl/guy causes a feeling. The first few seconds you look at her/him, you are going to have perfect attention, but then it is going to die off. Everything else in life is somewhat like that, whether you are looking at your pencil, or your computer, or whatever. The item you are looking at needs to be initially processed, and your attention needs to be directed to it first off.

Everything in life needs to be processed before it enters your system, and that process is going to be a sharp spike of emotion, feeling, and thought. After you process looking at the computer you can move along to just wandering your eyes throughout the room. If you pause at any one of the things you are wandering your eyes around, you will experience a sharp spike of emotion/thought/feeling. That is, looking at things also causes emotion as well as the thought needed to direct your attention to it, if you are paying more attention to something which causes emotion, then logically you are going to feel more emotion from it.

This doesn't mean that you aren't thinking/feeling when you don't pause or stop. You could say that people are thinking, feeling, and are having emotion all of the time just in amounts so small it is hard for them to detect. That these amounts only go up in sharp spikes when they actually pay attention to something either in their mind or outside it. This "paying attention" doesn't have to be conscious or deliberate. If two feelings interact within your mind it could cause you to pay conscious or unconscious attention to them.

Something like, your girlfriend meeting your ex girlfriend would cause a clash of feelings for your new girlfriend, with feelings for your old girlfriend (possibly). But that clash of feelings wouldn't occur in a thought spike, it would occur in an emotional spike. It would also be a slight rise of tension in the feeling between which one you like more. Also, the rise in that feeling wouldn't be significant compared to if you thought about that feeling at the same time. When you think about the feeling it would result in a sharp spike, and that spike would last a few seconds, then die away. That is because that feeling was a potential explosive one, one that exploded when you thought about it, resulting in a spike. Also, thought about anything else, a feeling, a vision, whatever, results in lesser spikes of thoughts/feelings/emotions. That anything and everything, when thought about, is interesting for the first few seconds, but then that interest dies off. It is the same principal when you pinch yourself. When you pinch yourself the first time, it hurts the most. That is because the first time you are thinking about it a lot more, after that your interest in it dies off. Amazing how much our attention can fluctuate to cause life to occur in short, sharp spikes. The girlfriend example is different than spikes that occur more frequently all the time, when you pay attention to little things. The girlfriend example was an example of when a spike can happen, but that is a spike that you are going to notice a lot more than something like, you just refocusing on what you are typing. It is spikes like that which happen all the time so you stay focused.

Although there are spikes of emotion and feeling, spikes of thought are needed to direct attention. Not thought in the verbal sense, but thought in the sense that it is under your control and feels more similar to thoughts. Thought occurs as basically a bunch of spikes, and since people think all the time and about everything, life occurs in those spikes. They don't feel intense because it is just thought. But basically whenever something new comes into your vision or your attention there is an initial sharp spike of interest. And if you are going to be doing the same thing for a long period of time, then it is going to take additional sharp spikes every couple of seconds or every minute to keep your attention. It is easy to test that, try and read something with the same bland expression as when you start reading it (but after your initial interest at the beginning when you notice the piece) and you just can't do it. To maintain attention your mind needs to snap back to what it is paying attention to. Feelings and emotions are going to follow the thought, however (that is emotions and feelings are imbedded in thoughts). That is why people need to think all the time, to maintain a healthy level of mental activity, it is a part of life. Emotions and feelings can also be described as thoughts, however, so those spikes continue even after you stop thinking, just in the form of emotion-feeling-thoughts (they are still more similar to thoughts however since they are short and spiky).

Basically your attention needs to be initially "grabbed" for anything that you are going to pay attention to. That grabbing is the initial period of paying attention to it. During that first period of paying attention to something is where the spike is because you are processing the item/object. You need a spike to grab your

mind and attention, otherwise you wouldn't be paying attention to anything. You can still process most of life without the spikes, but that is only because spikes had brought you back to reality in the first place in order for that attention to be grabbed. Furthermore it is going to be easier to process new things based on what the spike was about, that is, it is going to be easier to process similar things more related to the spike than to other things in the area. If you focus on a school bus, then you are going to be more attentive to the other school buses you see for the next few seconds or minutes because you were just paying attention to one school bus, and your mind is wired to notice school buses.

Furthermore there is a similar way in which your mind processes each spike. For spikes that are under your control, first the spike would be a period of thought about something, say a school bus or a coffee machine. Then what you just saw or thought about becomes an emotion, or an unconscious series of thoughts. That is you are less focused consciously on what it is you are seeing or whatever but your mind is still processing it. Next, after your mind processes the unconscious thoughts it becomes a feeling, you then feel something about what it is you were focusing on. So it isn't when you look at something you immediately get a feeling, that doesn't make any sense. First you think about it, then you feel it in a general way (an emotion) then after you understand what that feeling is, you feel it (but that basically happens instantaneously so in a way you do feel it right away - also, that same process can happen over a longer period of time). That is because you know what it is, you know where it is, and you know what to focus your attention on. An example of unconsciously processing something you see is when you look at match you then think about fire. Then after you think about the fire you can almost "feel" the fire, following the pattern of thought to emotion to feeling (you think about the match, then something happens unconsciously (this unconscious thought process is emotion (remember emotion is unconscious thought) which then causes you to feel the fire - a feeling).

It could be that a few minutes passes before a conscious spike occurs (that is a spike that is under your control). A spike is basically just anything that you are going to start paying attention to. During those first few seconds of when you are going to pay attention to something there is a sharp spike upwards. Without these periods of attention humans/animals would never pay attention to anything. Basically once every few minutes or so you need to pay attention to something or your brain is going to be too inactive. After you pay attention to one thing, however, your general attention is grabbed and you don't need to have another spike for at least a few minutes.

Everything that is processed, not just spikes, follows the sequence of thought to emotion to feeling. That is because thoughts are clearer than emotions and feelings, and emotions are more similar to thoughts than feelings are (discussed previously) so when you see something or hear something or whatnot for the first time, it is clearer in your mind. Then it becomes less clear and you think about it unconsciously. You think about it unconsciously because it takes further processing in order to isolate the feeling that that things gives you. Some things are just too complicated to feel them right away. Other things, however, can be felt right away, say if you are touching something the feeling arises right away. That is because the physical stimulus is more immediate than emotional stimulus.

Emotional things, however, are simply too complicated to "feel" them right away, they need to be processed first. That is logical, just take looking at anything, say a book. In order to feel the feelings that the book causes in you, you are going to have to at least unconsciously think about it first (that is, after you start paying attention to it, which you do by starting to think about it or just see it and notice it more than you usually notice things in the area). Since you don't need to think about physical stimulus since it is just a physical stimulus, (not something like vision) you don't really unconsciously process it.

Spikes are dramatic rises in attention. They can be assisted by loud noises or something dramatic visually, but they don't need to be. In other words they can be internal or external. You can pay sharp attention to something in the real world or something in your own head. If there is a loud sound in the environment, it is most likely that your spike in attention is going to occur during that period. It doesn't have to, you could pay attention to something else in spike form, but the main point is that you have to have about one sharp spike in attention a minute at least. That is, you have to pay attention to something in your environment or something in your head, sharp attention in the form of a spike (lasting a second or a few seconds) every minute or so.

Otherwise the world would just go by you and you'd be completely out of it. You don't just need to pay

attention to things, you occasionally need to pay sharp attention to things. Furthermore this attention in the form of a spike can't be dissipated and spread out, it is always going to occur in a spike. If, in between the spikes, you are trying to get the highest attention you can in an attempt to spread the spike out, (that is, if you are trying to spread out your attention instead of having spikes) the normal spike would still be a spike relative to even the extra attention you gave to the non spike period, because that attention would still be too low, so you couldn't give it that high of an attention level, as it would be very low compared to the spike still. Spikes of emotion and feeling also need to occur every few minutes or so. The human system needs to be "shocked" into reality because you need to pay attention to life.

Say it is time for another sharp increase in attention (that is you waited too long without focusing on anything) and something occurs like a dog barking. Then you are going to focus on that dog barking intently in the form of a spike. So if the dog continues to bark for the next few seconds or minutes, your attention will be on that more because you paid attention to it initially more so than other things in your environment. This is very important because if someone doesn't use their spikes say to someone they are talking to, they could be talking to that person and not be paying attention at all. You could hear what they are saying but not really be interested in it nearly as much as you would in a normal conversation (if you choose not to think about the person talking to you – remember if you do think about the person talking to you then naturally you are going have a thought spike because that is how thought initiates when thinking about new objects, the new object needs to be grabbed and processed first).

If you direct your attention spikes away from the things you don't want to hear (say if there is a loud noise in the background, just don't pay sharp attention to it) then most of your attention will follow along suit. If attention was uniform then people wouldn't be able to direct their attention easily. In order to ignore the other things in your environment and just focus on one thing, the only way to get just that one thing into your focus would be to use a spike in attention. After that spike the thing you "spiked" would be in your attention at a low level, but the other things around you would be at an even lower level. The spike is necessary to differentiate what you are paying attention to, to differentiate the new thing which you are paying attention to from everything else. You can't just go to a slightly higher rise in attention for one thing (you can pay attention to something new, but you wouldn't be paying more attention to it than other things in the environment already, you'd just be isolating that thing, it wouldn't be a rise in attention, or an insignificant one), because people can only focus on one thing at a time for this reason. Because of the spikes in attention, people can isolate (focus intently on) one or a few things.

That limitation (of only being able to focus intently on a few things) happens because each spike eliminates the other things which they were paying attention to previously. You can spread out one spike to different things, however (if you do it at the same time), that is how your attention can be spread. You can't do a series of smaller spikes because that confuses your mind, it is like saying, pay attention to this, then pay attention to that, and then pay attention to that. It is too confusing. It is easier to say at once, pay attention to this that and that, and then you can do it.

That explanation also explains why spikes occur at all – because it is much easier to pay a lot of attention in a short period of time then to keep jolting yourself over and over at each thing that you want to pay attention to. That way is too jarring and much less smooth. You don't notice the spike when it occurs because it is more like a refocusing than a spike. People basically need to be focused on little things continuously, and this focus is directed by short periods of refocusing labeled here as spikes. One way in which these spikes occur is that when something is first presented it takes more energy and brain power to process it at first because it is new. It is easier to try and comprehend the entire thing at once than to comprehend it in pieces, as the latter just doesn't make any sense. People comprehend things as wholes not as parts added up over time. The other reason these spikes occur is to initially catch your attention and hold it at a high level on something. That is, in order to go from a state of inactivity to a state of activity, you cannot just go up to the level of activity, but you need to motivate yourself to get there by having a spike (this spike is also the initial processing of the new object/event and occurs because of that as well).

In order to get someone's attention they can't just lazily look at you like they are looking at everything else, but they need pay sharp attention to you for the first instant (this is the initial "grabbing" talked about). Otherwise people would be paying attention to anything and everything at the same time. There has to be

a way of separating out what it is that is in someone's attention field. That method of separating is by the use of the spikes.

Spikes work for emotional things and feeling as well as for thought. That is things that are emotional occur in the same spike pattern, as well as things you feel (feelings). Another way to note this would be that your attention is only focused on things that change (things that change, the change usually occurring in spike form). It might be that something grabs your attention a little, and you only put a spike in after it initially grabs your attention a little to then pay full attention to it. Lots of time something happens, like a loud noise, that you only process after it occurred, or slightly after it occurred. So there might be a delay in when you process it, or spike it, or you might not spike it at all. You might also not need to spike something if a similar spike occurred with a similar thing previously.

How This Chapter shows how Intelligence is intertwined with Emotion:

- Someone's attention determines what they see and figure out about the world, if someone is paying more attention then they are probably going to realize more things, or notice more things visually and intellectually. Since attention varies based on emotion, your intellect is going to vary based on your emotions. If you are emotionally interested in things then it might make you pay more attention to them and then you might realize more about those things. If something causes more of an emotional impact (or more of a spike) you might retain understanding it longer (memory is also a part of intellect) or it could increase your emotional intelligence about that thing.
- Everything that is processed follows the sequence of thought to emotion to feeling – that shows how everything in the world is real, and these real things all cause feelings, you recognize what it is (a thought) and then you feel that thought, your emotional processing of your thoughts is part of your thoughts themselves – this is obvious with emotional spikes because when you feel something strongly that strong feeling clearly aids in you understanding things about what it is you are feeling.
- People also only comprehend things in their entirety, because if it isn't completely understood then you cannot verbalize it and make a thought process of it, therefore things that aren't completely understood or verbal are going to be emotional and you are going to "feel" them, not think them.

## 6.9 Angry, Upset, and Depressed?

**Angry and upset feelings often accompany sad feelings, as it is natural to be upset and angry that you are sad (or became sad).**

If someone is sad or depressed, it is natural that they are going to be upset that they are that way. Therefore it is probable that all depression or sadness has feelings of anger and agitation mixed in. In fact it is easy to see a combination of those three feelings as when something bad happens to someone their reaction is an intense feeling of sadness/anger/agitation. Like if you punch someone in the face, or shoot him or her, they aren't going to be just sad, they are going to sad, angry, and upset.

After the event occurs (such as getting punched in the face) the sad/angry/upset feeling only lasts a few seconds on that persons face, to various degrees of visibility to other people. What happens after that is more interesting however. After the first few seconds of sad/upset/angry their mind loses focus on what happened and it no longer is a single emotion. They are focused on the event and that is why it shows up on their face, after they lose focus, however, the emotions become unconscious.

In their unconscious form the emotions are like a depression. A depression is something that affects someone's mood, his or her entire system. When the angry/sad/upset emotions go into the unconscious, they start affecting the other emotions around them, and your entire system becomes sad, angry, and upset. This might not be visible on your face because it isn't as intense, you didn't just get punched, or something bad didn't just happen to you, but it has left a mark.

It seems like the angry and upset emotions are more temporary, and the sad feeling is retained longer. That is because you forget why you are sad, you forget the event that caused the sadness, but your emotions remember the impact of the upset and anger, and that impact was to make you sadder. The emotion sad



is simply easier to remember. It is marked in your mind for vengeance, you associate the sad emotion with being bad for you, but the anger and the agitation are more hormonal, temporary emotions.

That is, it is hard to be angry if you don't know why you should be angry. You need to be able to logically justify your own feelings. It is more common that sadness occurs for a long period of time than anger. There are still elements of anger and agitation remaining mixed in however, just less so than the sadness. So after an initiating event there are the three emotions equally present for a few seconds, and after that mostly the sadness remains, still with elements of the other two emotions.

It is hard to be angry or upset when you don't remember what it is you are angry at. It is easy to be sad because you don't need to remember anything to be sad at something, the sad feeling simply stays in your system because you are used to sad feelings and you don't need to justify them like you would an angry feeling. Or it could be that being angry and upset takes up more energy than being sad does, being sad lowers how energetic you are because it brings you down. When you are angry and upset you are much more energetic and agitated.

So it is like, ok that really pissed me off, but I am too tired to be pissed, I can be sad though. The sadness in your system isn't even an individual emotion after the first few seconds from the initiating event, however. It becomes mixed in with the other emotions and feelings in your body because you no longer remember what caused the sadness. So it is like a depression because it affects your entire system and mood like a depression does.

So there is really a difference between being sad, and being upset. You might even call that period after the few seconds for that person "the person being upset" instead of them being sad. That is how much the upset and agitation emotions are mixed in, that after someone is punched you could say either they are upset, or they are sad, or they are agitated, it depends on the person and the circumstance. That is a lot of proof to show that all three are often mixed in together.

You might say that they are upset, but they are probably going to be more sad, however, because if you are upset and angry then you are going to be sad about that, just like you are going to be upset and angry that you are sad. But I think the sad is going to dominate because no one has enough energy to be upset and angry for very long. When you are upset and angry your tone is louder, you are moving faster and more agitated like, you are more aggressive and looking for retribution. Anger and agitation almost need something to take vengeance on, while sadness you don't attribute to someone else causing it. You do attribute anger and agitation to something external, however.

How This Chapter shows how Intelligence is intertwined with Emotion:

- If it is hard to have emotions if you don't remember something, then that shows how your emotions are based off of your intellect as well. What your memory (which is a function of intellect) remembers is going to bring up emotions, which are then in turn going to determine (to some extent) your emotional intelligence.

## 6.10 Emotion is a Combination of Feeling and Thought

Emotion is such a strong feeling that it must be the combination of thoughts and feelings. If you think about it, if you combine positive thoughts and positive feelings, you're going to have a general overall greater experience, (if the thoughts and feelings are on the same idea or the same thing, you are going to have a greater positive single emotion about that thing). Just take the strongest emotion you can experience, it would have to be a combination of all the positive things in your mind, and people can control their thoughts to a large extent.

By a combination of feeling and thought I mean a combination of what it feels like to have a thought, with the feeling of what it feels like to have a feeling – I don't mean the combination of actual verbal thoughts with feelings, but non-verbal thoughts which are like verbal thoughts in that they are about something, you just can't identify what it is all the time because it is non-verbal.

Since thoughts are conscious and unconscious, emotion could be redefined as the combination of feeling and thought - that you only have emotion when you are thinking about something, and feeling something at

the same time, and the combination of the two results in individual emotions. There is evidence for this from the facts that you can only experience one strong emotion at a time, and you can also only think about one strong emotion at a time. That shows how emotions are pulled up by thoughts, or controlled and generated by them. It might be that this only applies to strong emotions, but it depends on each individual's definition of emotion (it might vary), but I don't think anyone can experience two strong emotions simultaneously. You can feel it for yourself, try and feel any combination of the following emotions (strongly) at the same time - anger, fear, sadness, disgust, surprise, curiosity, acceptance, or joy. You just can't do it. A slight feeling of curiosity is exactly that, a feeling and not an emotion. Emotions are stronger than feelings, and stronger than thoughts, but what are they made of? The only logical conclusion is that they are made up of thoughts and feelings.

The type of thought that makes up emotions isn't just words or sentences or verbal ideas in your head, but basically any period of thinking. It doesn't have to be intense thinking, in fact, if you are intensely thinking there probably isn't enough room left to process a strong emotion, but rather emotion arises from periods of very low intense thinking, and less intense feelings (you still have to be trying to be thinking, that is why negative emotions don't exist, because people just don't try to think about them). During those periods of low intense thinking (from which part of emotion arises) you don't have to even understand what you are thinking about, just understand that to some degree you are more thoughtful than usual. Feelings are generally considered to be shallower than emotions, and thought is considered a deep experience, so in order to have the strong, deep feeling of emotion, it must be made up of the part of your brain that experiences deep things, (the thought part) (remember feelings feel like feelings from sensory stimulation, which isn't "deep" at all).

Furthermore, emotion isn't just a strong feeling, a strong feeling can give rise to an emotion, just like a strong idea can give rise to an emotion, but an emotion is the combination of a lesser feeling and a lesser idea or thought process (this thought process might be unconscious, leading the person having it to just know that they are thoughtful during the experience). You can't have a strong feeling and a strong emotion at the same time because there just isn't enough room or processing power in your mind to do that (it's easy to feel that in your mind just by testing it).

Is a thought sensory input? No it isn't, you can think about sensory input, and that would give rise to a feeling of the sensation itself, but a thought is much faster in the brain. A thought is like a fast firing of neurons while a feeling or a sensation is an experience that actually takes some amount of time longer than it takes for a neuron to fire, which (it feels like anyway) is the length of a short thought. So basically, emotions must be the result of feelings and thoughts in your brain because there isn't anything else left that they could be made up of. All that is in your brain is feelings and thoughts. It is obvious how you can turn off a thought automatically, but you can also do that to some feelings. This is so because feelings are in large part triggered by thoughts. That's because feelings are experiences of sensory stimulation. If you are feeling something that you don't want to feel, however, because that sensory stimulation is present in your environment, there is nothing you can do. But if it results from a memory or something in your mind, you are going to shut it off automatically. This way feelings and thoughts work together; you have your present experience of the sensation, and your mental direction of thinking about that sensation. The latter part you can turn on if you want to make that natural, environmental feeling a strong one. It is hard to experience a strong feeling just by bringing the feeling up in your head, to have a strong feeling you need to have some type of direct sensory input and be thinking about that sensory input at the same time.

So a strong feeling is just like a strong emotion, only you need direct sensory input and thoughts to feel it, while with emotions you just need a feeling (which can result from the memory of a sensation) and some thoughts. So, very simply, everything in the brain is either a feeling or a thought. And emotions are combinations of feelings and thoughts.

Thinking about things generates feeling because you are simulating the emotions of that thing in your head. Although you are not experiencing the stimulation in real life, you still understand what it feels like to be in that situation, and this memory of that stimulation you can feel almost like being in the real situation itself.

If you have emotion about something then you are feeling that thing. Thus you are directing thought

about that object, and directing thought is what thought is. Thought is just directed to something specific, while feeling is more generalized, you have only a few feelings for many many things, and thought is only a way of categorizing those feelings. For example, you can simulate many feelings by thinking, "I am going to go to the store then I am going to come home". Instead of feeling "store" which you feel in the store, you are adding the feeling of traveling to the store and being home. Those feelings are less intense than actually traveling to the store and actually being home, but they are still there and present in the thoughts. So when you have a thought about the store, you feel the store because you are simulating the idea of being in the store in your head.

Emotion always precedes thought; thought is always just going to be an explanation of emotion. Everything in the end turns out to be an emotion in your system, so therefore everything is really an emotion. When you say "I want to leave" the feeling of you wanting to leave is always going to precede the thought. Actually first you quickly understand what it is that you are feeling when you realize what it is you are feeling as an unconscious thought process, then you have a more regular feeling about it, and then you are able to verbalize that feeling into a thought. Unless something is said to you instead of you thinking it, in which case the process is reversed. First it is a thought because it is expressed that way, then it is a feeling, and then it is a quick unconscious thought process to think about what was said.

When the thing is said or thought of verbally it is most clear what the meaning is. In this way words assist understanding. This is probably because the combination of adding the stimulation of sound to the stimulation of the visual (or other sense) of the object/idea enhances understanding and forces you to think deeper about it because sound is an enhancing mechanism for thought.

Feelings are fast, you don't pause and think about them. Emotion you could say, since it is deeper, that you almost "think" about it.

How This Chapter shows how Intelligence is intertwined with Emotion:

- Thoughts also contribute to what it is you are going to feel, and what you feel and how you feel it is then going to determine your emotional intelligence, and over the long run would help determine other aspects of your intelligence as well.

## 6.11 Intentions

When someone has an intention, or does anything such as thinking something or doing something without thought, what is the exact mental process that lies behind that action? What combination of emotions, feelings and thoughts makes that happen? Here is what is at the bottom of the "Emotion is a Combination of Feeling and Thought" chapter:

"Emotion always precedes thought; thought is always just going to be an explanation of emotion. Everything in the end turns out to be an emotion in your system, so therefore everything is really an emotion. When you say "I want to leave" the feeling of you wanting to leave is always going to precede the thought. Actually first you quickly understand what it is that you are feeling when you realize what it is you are feeling as an unconscious thought process, then you have a more regular feeling about it, and then you are able to verbalize that feeling into a thought. Unless something is said to you instead of you thinking it, in which case the process is reversed. First it is a thought because it is expressed that way, then it is a feeling, and then it is a quick unconscious thought process to think about what was said."

So there is an unconscious thought process before everything you think/do, however there are also patterns of feelings which are also there. The feelings described are an important part of it, when you do something there isn't an unconscious thought right before you do it. You first have the unconscious thought when you have the original feeling that caused you to want to do that thing - you first have a feeling that you want to do something, then you understand what that feeling means as an unconscious thought, and then that is translated back into a feeling which remains there until you do the action. So the unconscious thought is not right before you do the thing, the feeling is there before you do it because feelings are faster than thoughts, so your mind has the feeling ready at hand to act on the unconscious thought process. That is because once you realize what it is you are going to do as a thought process, you don't need to spend the

time to think the entire thing through again, but it is stored in the instinctual part of your brain where your feelings are. Remember from the instinctual frog example that feelings are faster than thoughts, and feelings are also unconscious thoughts so they can also store information to do. This is the frog example in the chapter "Thoughts":

"The definition of intellect and thoughts is almost understanding (those concrete things). Emotion is feeling, completely separate from facts or information. All facts and information are going to be about things that cause feeling, however, since all things that happen cause feelings and all facts and information are about things that happen. So facts and information are just feelings organized in a logical manner. Intellect and thought also generates feelings when those thoughts are processed in your mind. Since thought is really only about feelings, it is logical that thought actually has root in feelings. For example, all events are really feelings in the mind, so thoughts are actually just comparing feelings. You take two feelings and can arrive at one thought. Take the feeling of a frog moving and the feeling of a threat of danger. The two feelings combined equal the idea or thought that the frog needs to move when there is danger - the thought is actually just understanding how feelings interact. All thought is is the understanding of how feelings and real events interact with themselves. Feeling is what provides the motivation to arrive at the answer (the thought). If you just had the facts, there is a threat, and the frog can jump, you aren't going to arrive at the conclusion that the frog should jump away. You need to take the feeling that there is a threat and the feeling that the frog can jump and then combine the two sensory images in your head to arrive at the answer.

That shows how all intellect is powered and motivated by emotion. It also shows that frogs have thoughts; the frog has to have the thought to jump away when it sees a threat, as a thought is just the combination of two feelings resulting in the resulting feeling of wanting to move away. That process of feelings is like a thought process. Thoughts are a little different for humans, however, because humans have such a large memory that they are able to compare this experience to all the other experiences in their life while the frog only remembers the current situation and is programmed (brain wiring) to jump away. The frog doesn't have a large enough memory to learn from new information and change its behavior. That shows how humans are very similar to frogs in how they process data (in one way at least), and that one thing that separates a human from a frog is a larger memory which can store lots of useful information and potential behavioral patterns."

It would be too slow for you to just do something based on an unconscious thought process, you would have to wait to have this unconscious thought right before you do the thing, instead of having the thought at one point in time and storing it, and then doing the thing later on. If it is just an instinctual reaction, however, it is just a feeling that you are responding to because it is too fast to have an unconscious thought process. It is just a manner of the definition of what an unconscious thought is - that it is going to be more like a thought than a feeling - which is also an unconscious thought, so it depends how you view it.

If it is an instinctual, immediate reaction, say if you slam a door on your hand then you are going to say "ouch" - that is a thought that resulted from two feelings, the feeling of pain and the feeling that you need to express that pain. The thought is so fast you might consider it unconscious, that is also like in the frog example.

It gets even more complicated than that - this is in the "Life Occurs in Sharp Spikes" chapter of the book:

"Everything that is processed, not just spikes, follows the sequence of thought to emotion to feeling. That is because thoughts are clearer than emotions and feelings, and emotions are more similar to thoughts than feelings are (discussed previously) so when you see something or hear something or whatnot for the first time, it is clearer in your mind. Then it becomes less clear and you think about it unconsciously. You think about it unconsciously because it takes further processing in order to isolate the feeling that that things gives you. Some things are just too complicated to feel them right away. Other things, however, can be felt right away, say if you are touching something the feeling arises right away. That is because the physical stimulus is more immediate than emotional stimulus.

Emotional things, however, are simply to complicated to "feel" them right away, they need to be processed first. That is logical, just take looking at anything, say a book. In order to feel the feelings that the book causes in you, you are going to have to at least unconsciously think about it first (that is, after you start

paying attention to it, which you do by starting to think about it or just see it and notice it more than you usually notice things in the area). Since you don't need to think about physical stimulus since it is just a physical stimulus, (not something like vision) you don't really unconsciously process it."

That shows that it is really all mixed in - thoughts, emotions and feelings - that there isn't just an unconscious thought process but you could also just say that feelings or thoughts are first - this is because when you process something you might think about it first, and it certainly feels this way because when you are processing something it is a very intellectual experience, it is clear in your mind and it feels like you are thinking about the thing so clearly that you must be using thoughts instead of emotions. I say that things are first clear in your mind when you first see it or whatnot, - that would be the "thought" but then it is an emotion, and you do that (make it into an emotion) to isolate the feeling the thing causes in you, so then you feel it (after you isolate the feeling) - thought to emotion to feeling.

So when you have an intention to do something could it be that first it is an unconscious thought and then you just do it? First you are going to have an unconscious thought about it, then you are going to have a conscious thought about it (because it is an intention) and then you are going to do it. Your conscious thought about it may or may not be verbal, you don't have to think about everything verbally in order to do it. You do have a conscious thought about it because that is almost the definition of intention, your intent. If you don't have a conscious thought about it then it is more instinctual, or it could be a mix of the two. Everything someone does is going to be on the spectrum somewhere between complete intention and completely instinctual.

Intentions and instincts (or things you do) aren't just thoughts, but feelings and emotions are often involved as well, where do they fit in? First an emotion could start an intention, and then it would be an unconscious thought process, and then it might become another emotion because you can feel everything (you are going to feel the thought, or have a feeling about it) and feelings are very fast so this feeling can fit into the time after you think about it and before you do the action, or after the initiating event and before the unconscious or conscious thought process. When you do think it is very fast, in fact your thinking might be slow, but there is one point in time where your thinking leads to a conclusion and that is culmination is considered to be when you had the "thought" because it is a conscious thought that your mind understands, but leading up to that conscious thought (which could be verbal or not verbal) was unconscious thoughts (or thinking) because it is hard to reach difficult conclusions instantly. This thought is then held in your mind until you do the action, it prepares your mind for the action, and during that time that thought might generate a certain feeling - maybe fear or a lack of confidence. This feeling is then used when you do the intention, because when you do something you do it so fast that you don't "think" about it right before you do it, but you use the feeling that is "storing" the thought. You might not have feelings about it and your action might not be swayed by feeling, but if it is then your thoughts might be under the influence of your feelings. Your feelings might cause you to stop doing the thing if you are too afraid, for example.

So there is an unconscious thought before every intention, that is what thought is, it is figuring out what you are going to do, and you are going to have to figure out what it is that you are going to do first before you do it. Unless it is like the frog example where you just feel it at the same time that you do it, but in that case the feelings are mixed in with the thoughts, so then it is a matter of how you define "thought". Thought is really a conclusion (not a partial thought, which could be an emotion), so you take two feelings and come at a conclusion, which is the thought, then you do the thing, and that means that you do have an unconscious thought right before the intention, the feeling really is a thought, it is just so fast that it is a feeling and a thought. So right before you do something there can be a feeling - which is also a thought, that causes you to do it finally. So is it a thought or is it a feeling? The feeling is the drive behind the thought (or thinking), which builds up along with the feeling. The feeling is powering the thought (or thinking) because it is so instinctual. So things that are more instinctual are going to be faster and involve more feelings, feelings can speed up thoughts (this is obvious with the instinctual example, where instinct then is really just powerful feelings causing you to think very fast).

So if you do anything there is going to be unconscious thoughts before you do it, because thoughts are just understanding real things. That includes if you have intentions, only intentions (since they are more conscious) are going to involve conscious thoughts as well as unconscious ones, unless it is an intention you

intended to do unconsciously. The reason intentions involve unconscious thoughts as well is because you need to think to arrive at the conclusion, and most thinking isn't completely consciously understood. How many people can think without using words, yet understand what it is that they are thinking? You can understand that you are going to do a certain thing without using words, but you can't think for a long period of time without using words and still follow your thought process. Complicated non-verbal thought processes are unconscious. And almost all thoughts and everything you do is going to be complicated - and therefore they are going to involve long unconscious thinking about them (by long I just mean longer than instantaneous, which would be what you would do if it was instinctual).

So right before you do something there is going to be something in your mind that understands what it is you are going to do, this is a thought because it is real (versus feelings which are things which you just feel). You might even "feel" the thought really. That is what happens right before you do something. However, leading up to that final thought/feeling it is going to be like described before; first you might have a feeling. If humans were computers I would say that first it starts with its programming and then it has the thought, but for humans feelings are their programming - so humans first have feelings and then we have thoughts. Feelings can originate from thoughts however, so it is then a which came first, the chicken or the egg debate. But if the original feeling started because of a thought, the thought was more further away in time from the feeling -by a few seconds at least - that is because conscious thoughts (verbal ones) have space of time around them, if you think, "I am going to shoot" you don't shoot as quickly as you would if you just understood that you were going to shoot, the conscious verbal thought slows you down. So when you have an intention or when you are going to think something (which is what thoughts are - they can be verbal because you can express anything verbally almost, including all intentions) then that follows the process of feeling to unconscious thought to feeling again to store it. I said before "a feeling, then an unconscious thought process, then a more general feeling".

I said that because the first feeling is just the real feeling of the intention you are going to have - which you could say is an unconscious thought because as discussed previously all feelings are unconscious thoughts - and it is clear they are when you realize it is an intention, which is going to be doing something real, and intellect is understanding things that are real. So the first feelings/thoughts are when you first feel that you want to do something, then you need to unconsciously think about it to realize what it is you want to do exactly (this is not a conscious non-verbal thought, but an unconscious one), and then you have a more specific or general feeling about it (by general there I really mean larger or more clear) to store that clear thought, the general feeling then is going to be more clear because you now unconsciously understand what it is that you are going to do, and then it is a real conscious thought and then you could translate that conscious thought to a verbal thought or an action.

So to explain the statement, "first it is a feeling, then it is an unconscious thought process, and then it is a more general feeling and then you are able to make that feeling into a conscious thought (or do an action which would stem from that clear thought)" - that was originally said in the book at the end of the "Emotion is a Combination of Feeling and Thought" chapter in this form - "actually first you quickly understand what it is that you are feeling when you realize what it is you are feeling as an unconscious thought process, then you have a more regular feeling about it, and then you are able to verbalize that feeling into a thought". Whether someone's state before they have that thought is one that started with an emotion or without an emotion, that state must have originated from a previous state, or from some other previous stimulus. In terms of someone's first feelings, their first feelings probably came from physical feelings before the brain was developed in the womb. First people would have just physical feelings, not deep emotional ones because all there is in the beginning is sensory stimulation - mostly feeling your own body and your surroundings.

So the first thoughts/feelings originated from physical stimulus, like, "ouch that hurts". Or "that looks cool". After the human develops they can have thoughts and feelings that can originate from sensory stimulation, physical stimulation, or other thoughts and feelings. But that doesn't explain what happens right before someone thinks something or does something. It explains that originally there are those things which would cause the intention, but not how the intention is formed. Since humans have strong emotions, many intentions are going to be formed from emotion. Intentions are also going to be formed from conscious

/ unconscious thinking. Feelings are also going to have elements of thoughts, however (so it isn't either feeling or thought that originated the intention, it might be both at the same time). Say if you want to switch a switch - it is going to be a progression of feeling/thought. That is, it is going to take time for you to realize what it is you want to do, so it could be feeling and thinking all along, and at some point in that feeling/thinking you are going to realize fully what you want to do, and then you could call it a thought because it is completely formed (this thought might be conscious or it might remain unconscious and only later become conscious). When you realize you want to switch a switch it isn't instantaneous, but it takes time. But when you do switch the switch instantaneously, are you acting off of the thought or the feeling? You are probably acting off of the feeling, the thought was a period in time a while ago, but that thought started the feeling of you wanting to do it, which lead to you switching the switch off of the feeling instead of the thought. Unless you happen to do the thing right after you finally figure out what it is you want to do, then you could say that the thought made you do it.

That reveals that you are always going to have some feeling about what it is you are going to do right before you do it, because then you "think" or "feel" what it is you are going to do. It isn't going to be as strong in terms of thought as when you first thought of what it was you were going to do, because you don't need to think as much to realize what it is you are going to do. You are probably going to be feeling more than thinking right before you do it because you are going to be excited about doing something, you already realized what you were going to do which was the thought part, now it is time for the feeling part. The thought is still there of course otherwise you wouldn't know what to do, however right before you do it feeling is probably going to dominate.

Right before you do something your mind needs to get ready to do it, and you need to remind yourself what it is you need to do and that you need to do it. So that means your mind probably feels something based on what it is you are going to do. This feeling can be simulated if you read a book and then later reflect on how you feel about the book. Reading the book in this instance would be the original thought process, and reflecting on it later would be simulating the feeling right before you do something. You don't need to think about everything in the book to understand the feeling that the book causes you. You don't need to think as hard to understand the same things because it was already understood at one point. The second time it is easier. That is like when you first have an unconscious thought process to understand what you are going to, when you are going to do it later you already understand what you are going to do, you simply then "feel" what it is you are going to do because it is more clearly understood, it is understood emotionally now (more instinctual) so you don't need to "think" as much as you did before. Emotion replaces thought because emotion is easier than thought. Someone isn't going to think unless they have to, you basically have already done the hard part, so the second time you bring it up the thought would be reduced and the emotion would remain. The further excitement of being about to do the thing would raise the emotion even more. But here learned is another thing, if you think about something once the next times you bring it up (especially if you bring it up right after you figure it out) it is going to be much easier to understand so thought is going to be reduced and feeling raised relatively.

So in other words, before the thought or your understanding of what it is you are going to do is complete, you are going or are not going to be having emotions that are encouraging this thought process or affecting this thought process. Emotion and intelligence are intertwined. That is why first comes the emotion, then the complete thought, and then you might have an emotion about that thought itself as well, - in other words the state of the emotion you are feeling is probably going to evolve as the thought does. This reveals that while emotion is unconscious thought, not all unconscious thought is emotion.

Humans don't just say things without thinking about them first, so everything is going to be unconscious first. Speech is much much slower than your thoughts are, and unless you start saying something and don't know the complete sentence before you say it, you are going to have the entire thing thought out first. So technically everything starts with an unconscious thought. However this thought has levels of understanding, there are levels to which you understand the thought, that is why you can't just say everything all at once, you usually have to think about it for a bit first. When people think, it takes time to think, and they don't think unconsciously in sentences. They think unconsciously with emotions, thoughts, visualizations, anything your mind can simulate. When they think unconsciously with emotions you could

be taking large emotional experiences and trying to analyze them, or little ones, you could be combining different experiences, or combining emotion with thought or emotion with visualization (etc.). Your mind doesn't just use sentences to figure out what it wants to do, that would take too long. Sentences are actually just sounds that represent things, you don't need to simulate a sound in your head in order to think. It might be that you simulate tiny sounds, or however it is your neurons fire to organize the thoughts, the point is the thoughts are not fully formed instantly. It isn't the firing of one neuron once that makes a complete sentence. There is a progression of thought. This is obvious because when you are doing a problem, say a math problem, you often can reach the answer without having to say anything. What is happening is that you are thinking about things unconsciously, maybe you are visualizing the number of things you need to visualize to find the answer (say adding 1 to 1 you have to visualize the separate objects, and then visualize the two objects together).

## 6.12 An Overly Optimistic Attitude towards Life Leads to a Dulling of Emotion

When you go into a situation or an event the attitude you have is going to impact your emotional experience. If you think something is going to be fun, when in reality it isn't, and you continue to think that that thing was fun afterwards, it is going to make you feel worse than if you had the right understanding of how much fun the event was. This is because an overly optimistic attitude causes you to consciously focus on things which you enjoy more, but your conscious mind can only recognize a tiny amount of things which you enjoy. So you are amplifying a disproportionate amount of emotion in your own mind. That throws things off balance in your head and you start to wonder (consciously and unconsciously) why you are enjoying some things more than others, and it throws off your responses to natural, ordinary events. In other words, your mind compares the positive things which you are amplifying to the things you aren't amplifying (like how it compares how you work during the day to how you rest at night – that is your mind compares the work during the day to resting at night and therefore you feel more rested because your mind is comparing those things to if you didn't work during the day). Furthermore ordinary events start to become duller because you are amplifying a few events you just think are fun, when in reality all of life is fun if you give it an equal chance.

What those people fail to realize is that basically everything can be viewed as fun, they don't need to grab onto a few things with their overly optimistic attitude. Emotions are fun, and life is so full of emotions that any scene or event in life can be broken down into its many emotional parts. Emotion just means how something makes you feel, and that in turn means what kind of reaction things make you have. In fact, each individual object in life gives an emotion, and makes you react in a certain way.

If you have an optimistic attitude towards life, or an overly optimistic attitude, then most of the emotion that you get is going to be undercut (undermined, etc, because it is going to be outweighed by the few things which you are praising, or have an optimistic attitude for) and therefore overall be leading to a dulling of emotion. That is because this overly optimistic attitude is a conscious thing that only enhances a few of the events in life and doesn't understand that everything in life can be viewed as being fun (if you take the same attitude and just twist it that is).

You're not still being optimistic because you're dismissing the verbal discourse whereby you rate some things in life as higher than other things. You are still being optimistic in a way but now you understand that you shouldn't be over inflating some things more than others. It is like saying, wow that duck tape is really really cool. But then you are missing all the other things in the room which are also cool, maybe a lot less cool than the duck tape but they can still be viewed as being cool. So instead you'd say, hey that duck tape is cool, to keep it more in line with how cool the other things are. This doesn't mean that you are less optimistic towards life, it just means you are more aware and considering of the whole.

Similarly, an overly negative attitude can bring down how cool an object is. You can basically manufacture false emotions about things. While you might feel a temporary sensation of elation (if you're being optimistic) or a temporary down feeling (if you're being pessimistic) afterwards you are going to feel bad because you



basically insulted all the other feelings in your mind as being weak compared to it. Either that or you feel bad because you inserted an emotion that was too hard to deal with in your mind because it was so strong, and you feel bad afterwards because that strong emotion lingers in your mind and takes up room that it shouldn't, in addition to throwing your system off balance.

That is what an overly optimistic attitude does, it takes all the things in your mind that you might verbally over inflate, and inflates them. That creates a tension in your brain because then most of the ordinary things which you should also be enjoying seem dull. The reverse is true with an overly negative attitude, which is also bad.

How This Chapter shows how Intelligence is intertwined with Emotion:

- Your attitude is determined by your thoughts, and your thoughts are going to be determined by your intellect because your intellect is who you are, and you decide what it is that you are going to think. Your attitude is going to lead you to have different emotions, and these emotions are then also going to change how it is you understand the world emotionally, or your emotional intelligence.

### 6.13 Smaller Emotions Follow Brief, Intense Emotions

Extremely deep feelings and emotions, like sadness or anger, usually only last a few seconds. However, those deep feelings often trigger lesser feelings of sadness and anger for the period afterwards. This intense, brief period of emotion can trigger a long array of smaller, similar emotions afterwards. Say if the deep emotion was you being sad, the following emotions that person is going to experience would be lesser sad emotions. These emotions aren't just by themselves, but are often accompanied by thoughts, behaviors, or environmental stimulus.

If you have a brief period of being extremely happy it is more likely to be followed by extremely optimistic thinking, like thinking, I am great, I am amazing, and wow I really did a good job. A brief period of extreme sadness is likely to be followed by pessimistic thinking because that is how your brain is wired. Your brain is programmed to associate sad with failure, and success (or happy) with optimism.

Why do intense emotions only last a few seconds? They do because emotions work in accordance with thoughts. Thoughts only last a few seconds, and therefore it is logical that the most intense emotions you experience are going to be periods of intense thought and intense emotion at the same time. These periods are so intense that they are probably capable of being noticed by the person experiencing them.

Such an intense emotional experience is going to leave a mark, however. That is why those brief periods of intense emotion are going to be followed by lesser, similar emotions. Say if you were extremely happy for a few seconds, then you'd be slightly happy for a while afterwards.

Why does the brief period only last a few seconds? Can't it be longer? If life were great, I guess the positive intense emotional experiences would last longer, and the short negative emotional experiences not even exist. But the attention span of the average human/animal is actually very short, and they can only handle so much intense emotion in a certain period of time.

That leads to another phenomenon called overload. A person or animal can only experience so many intense periods of emotion in a certain amount of time. Say you made someone laugh really hard, and then would tell an equally funny joke right after, that person wouldn't laugh as hard because the laugh brain circuitry is already exhausted. It is like being jaded, only in the short term. This theory is easy to test, just pinch yourself, then pinch yourself again, and you'll realize that it hurts a lot more the first time. That is because pain is an emotional experience as well, and that first pinch is exactly similar to the brief periods of intense emotion mentioned before. Furthermore, the pinch is followed by lesser amounts of pain. When all that residual pain is gone you can pinch yourself again and it will hurt just as much as the first time.

In other words, the brief, intense emotion was so intense that it leaves an aftereffect of lesser amounts of that same emotion. I could also just change the word emotion with thought. If you think something strongly, then similar thoughts are likely to follow, only less intense. The intensity of the emotion/thought goes downhill after the main event solely because your mind is exhausted by the intensity of the intense

experience of emotion or thought. Humans/animals simply don't have the capacity for a more intense experience than an intense emotional or intellectual experience.

People just don't have very, very, very intense emotional or intellectual experiences. The mind just can't handle it. People can have very, very, very intense physical experiences, however. That is only because evolutionarily humans and animals evolved going through very intense physical experiences, but there just isn't any need or purpose to go through intense intellectual/emotional experiences. It would even be boring after the first few seconds. That's because most emotion and intellect is originally from sensory stimulation, which is found in the real world and not in your head.

There are many examples of the intensity of intellectual and emotional experiences dying off. It is simply because something repeated over and over in your head becomes less and less interesting as its newness dies off. You could take any idea and repeat it to yourself over and over and you'll notice how doing that becomes less and less interesting.

In fact, sometimes it is better to not initiate thinking about something that would lead to you to continue to repeat it (or similar ideas or emotions) because it is unhealthy to repeat things (or experience emotions that last too long) because the intensity of the experience dies off and you are stuck in a pattern of thinking about something, or feeling something, that you don't want to be thinking or feeling because it isn't providing enough stimulation. But you are still stuck feeling/thinking it because for whatever reason your mind doesn't let go of it easily.

It is healthier to not be so interested in the thing in the first place so your mind doesn't over inflate it and you wind up going through a period of over-excitement, which you don't really enjoy, followed by a period of under-excitement, which you don't really enjoy. It is like an addiction to emotion that would lead to this behavior. Or an overly optimistic attitude towards life. Someone that is overly aggressively approaching life, trying to grab onto whatever positive emotions or thoughts they can. Or someone overly upset about something and, just being persistent, doesn't realize that it becomes less and less interesting to be upset about that thing, but continues to persist in thinking about it. They just need to move on.

In fact, you could view this two different ways, one is to not experience the more intense thoughts/emotions and try to spread it out over time. The other way to view it is the sharp emotional spike is a good thing. It is probably only a good thing if you like hurting yourself, however. It is a bad thing because it is so out of character with your everyday emotions/thoughts, which are much less intense. Such a drastic change from the ordinary would cause a violent mood swing. Your mind is going to be upset that things around it are changing so fast, and it would lead you to continuously try and figure out what is going on (consciously or unconsciously). Your mind has in it an automatic thing which tries to figure out what is happening to it, and that device is going to short circuit if you put in short, brief periods of intensity. It is like the brief period of intensity jolts your entire system. Like a hot wire.

If you are going to go for the brief period of intensity then that is a way of looking at life, it is a philosophy that you need to grab on to anything that throws its way to you. Or if you are looking for the brief period of negative intensity then that philosophy would be looking to grab onto (really anything, not just anything positive) that comes your way. Someone with those attitudes would think something like, "ok there is a positive experience, lets do it, I mean lets really go and do it that would be really really really fun". They are so upset about life that when they see a positive thing, they cling onto it desperately. What they don't realize is that clinging onto something positive (or negative) or any clinging, causes your mind to stop liking it due to repetition and overload.

How This Chapter shows how Intelligence is intertwined with Emotion:

- When you have a strong emotion it just doesn't disappear, but it disappears gradually. This shows how your emotions are going to determine your thoughts and therefore your intellect. It shows that emotions cannot be completely controlled and therefore are going to change your thoughts and therefore possibly the reliability of your intelligence.

## 6.14 Visual learning

### **Things that are easier to picture are easier to understand.**

Things that are easier to picture are easier to understand. Take the difference between understanding, we are going to play with the Frisbee, and if you throw the Frisbee twice as fast, it will arrive at its destination in half the time. It is clearly easier to understand what playing with the Frisbee is then it is to calculate how soon it will get to the other person. That is because the emotional event of playing with the Frisbee is large and distinct, and involves many things.

One thing was an emotional event; the other thing was a precise calculation. You could also view that backwards, that the calculation is actually an emotional event, and the emotional event is actually a calculation. The emotional event of playing Frisbee is in fact a calculation; you are calculating everything that there is involved with playing Frisbee. When someone says, "let's play Frisbee" you imagine and picture in your head everything that playing Frisbee involves.

Thus for anything that is said you bring up a picture of it in your head. Even if it is a sound or a smell, you always try to picture what is causing it. That is because the vision enhances the experience and makes it more enjoyable to think about and therefore it is also going to be easier to remember. It is like vision is tied in with everything, and that if something can't be visualized, it simply doesn't exist.

Empty space is the absence of vision. But when you think hard about just an empty space, you'd like to imagine something there because you know that you would enjoy looking at that space more that way, that it just isn't right for something to be empty like that. Even blind people visualize things because they can feel in three dimensions with their bodies and hands.

That is also why harder mathematical problems are harder to do, because they are harder to visualize. You have to memorize what 12 times 12 equals, but you can easily visualize what 1 times 2 is. Just one group of 2, that equals 2, you can picture that object in your head easily but when you picture adding up 12 groups of 12 the image gets too large.

Even if you think about a smell that is an invisible gas, you are going to picture something in your head like a gas outlet or a gas tank, or the air being filled with an invisible substance. Vision is in all of our thoughts and emotions, the other senses aren't. Only some things smell, only some objects make noise, but everything can be seen. Everything exists somewhere physically, that is, and if it exists somewhere physically, then even if it is invisible you are going to be trying to imagine the space in which it is in.

In that manner blind people can see. They have an image of the world similar to what we do (even if they have never seen) solely from feeling objects and imagining where everything is. If someone asked you what the properties of an invisible gas were, you'd be thinking about the empty space in which the gas was in. How is it that people can visualize empty space? If there wasn't empty space there, then there wouldn't be anything, just empty space. So when most people visualize empty space they probably think of something like an empty room, or the corner of an empty room and just not focus on the walls, trying to look into the empty space by having an unfocused look to their eye.

It also seems that the easier it is to picture something, the easier it is to understand and remember. That is because things that have a stronger visual presence cause more emotion to be invoked in a person, and it is has a larger presence in that persons mind, and therefore is easier to remember. So the easier the vision is to comprehend, the easier it is also going to be to remember.

Also, the more emotional the event, the easier it is to remember. (and all events and such things in life are visual, as well). That is why dogs remember the words they care the most about like walk, Frisbee, food, and their name. It isn't just easier to remember these larger things, but it is easier to understand them. The smaller and more complicated it gets, the harder it is to understand. So easier physics problems would be something like ball A hitting ball B, but harder ones would involve something like friction, which you can't see as well. For example what is easier to understand, what is the force of friction on the ball, or what is the force of my hand on the ball? Mathematically they would seem to take just as much physical work to write down the mathematical solution, but emotionally it takes more work to do the friction part of the problem. (because it is harder to visualize) That means, however, that it is going to be harder for you to do the mathematical problem, or the friction part of the mathematical problem.

The easier something is to visualize, the less the strain on your mind processing that thing is going to have. Things that are easier to picture are easier to understand as well.

There are also degrees to which you visualize something. Say you are doing a math problem that involves distances. You can focus on those distances when you think about them to varying degrees. That is, when you think of the word distance you have unconscious thoughts about something like, “oh was that a very long trip?” Or you think more or less clearly about how straight the line of the distance is because you are thinking about trips now. Or thinking about the force of friction on an object, you have to try and visualize the tiny particles rubbing against each other. There are degrees of effort you can put into thinking about each visualization. Fields like engineering and physics require a lot of visual intelligence. People who can focus more and visualize things better would probably do better in those fields. Since vision relates to everything, better visual ability could help in countless situations to varying degrees.

Is emotional intelligence visual? How does the statement, “boys are aggressive so they would be more likely to buy a book about aggressivity to encourage their own aggressiveness than if they weren’t aggressive” relate to visual intelligence? You have to be able to imagine boys being aggressive and then you have to think about the response (which is visual) to boys when they are encouraged to be aggressive. Emotional intelligence is then just observing slight visual changes in affect. However to notice these slight changes in affect it is important to point out or lead one to notice better certain visual things by more intellectual observations, which are actually just visual observations themselves.

They are visual observations themselves because almost everything is a visual observation, the only things that aren’t visual observations are observations related to the other senses, but those other senses might play a lesser role than visual since visual is the sense people are most in tune with since it occurs all the time.

Emotional intelligence, however, might also relate to understanding physical senses because you need to understand how people physically feel in order to understand their emotional state, as the physical contributes to emotion. You feel your own body all the time and the senses from your skin and muscles changes all the time as well. Those feelings play an important part in how you feel, and serve as a baseline for emotions. That is you can close your eyes and stop thinking, but you are still going to feel something. That thing you are feeling then must be mostly physical since you aren’t getting any other inputs (other than unconscious emotional ones, but you can do things like focusing on your heart beat or breathing to eliminate more of that focus and focus more on your body).

How This Chapter shows how Intelligence is intertwined with Emotion:

- Emotional intelligence is sensory (or comes originally from sensory data), and your senses are directed by your thoughts and emotions (or you – and you are your intellect). So it becomes clear then that someone is their intellect, and their intellect then must comprise their emotions and their thoughts (since someone is only emotions and thoughts just behaving in a certain pattern).

## 6.15 Consciousness

**Understanding the psychology of your feelings, emotions and thoughts is important because it leads to increased consciousness.**

Consciousness occurs when feeling and understanding meet, this is because consciousness is shown in the ability to reflect on your feelings. In other words, when you understand what it is that you are feeling you are the most conscious. That is because during that time you are most aware of what is going on. This awareness could be described as an understanding of life, not just general understanding. That is you could be doing a math problem, but that math problem isn’t going to increase how conscious you are, because doing it isn’t going to increase your understanding of how it is that you are feeling. It could be that doing the problem makes you more awake, and as a side effect of that you understand how it is that you are feeling better, but that is just a side effect. Understanding how you are feeling makes you more aware of yourself because that increases how much you are thinking about yourself (or your feelings).

Since thoughts and emotions lead to feelings, the more you understand them as well the more conscious you are going to be. So if you are doing a math problem, the more you understand that you are doing a

math problem, and the place the math problem has in your life, then the more conscious you are. That is, it isn't doing the math problem that is making you more conscious, but it is understanding the place of what it is you are doing and feeling (in this case a math problem) and where that fits into your life that determines how conscious you are. It is your inner reflection of how the math problem makes you feel as a whole that separates humans being conscious from other animals. Consciousness basically means aware. This means that the math problem actually does lead to increased consciousness, because you are becoming more aware of the place of that math problem in your entire life as you do the math problem.

So consciousness basically means how aware someone is of themselves (it means other things as well). The more aware of yourself you are the more conscious you are. In order to be aware of yourself you need to understand where everything in your life fits in. It is this awareness, or commonsense, that is more important to understanding who you are. In order to be aware of yourself, or have a concept of self, you have to have a concept of how yourself interacts in the world as a whole, not just as individual parts.

Even though you might be sleeping, you are conscious because you still understand who you are. Then again, during dreams you don't act in as rational a manner as when awake, as dreams tend to not make as much sense as real life. Therefore you wouldn't be as conscious during a dream as you would when you are awake. You are still conscious to some degree, however, since you are functioning in a somewhat reasonable manner. But you still aren't clearly perfectly aware of yourself or your place in the world since in dreams sometimes you do things and see things that don't make sense, but you apparently don't notice them. This indicates further that consciousness is more a matter of commonsense and how well you know yourself than just standard intellect like would be present say when doing a math problem. Your ability to reflect on yourself might not be related to normal IQ, but might more likely be more highly related to emotional IQ.

In other words commonsense can be measured just as standard intellect can be. But what leads to commonsense is emotional intelligence not intelligence that is more related to memory or something built up over time, like skill. The more commonsense someone has the more conscious they are because they know what it is that they are doing. This is a different type of consciousness than the type that makes humans human, this is the practical type of consciousness that makes someone aware of their environment and their ability to function, versus a deeper human consciousness. In dreams people have very little commonsense, for example, in a dream you might try to do the same thing over and over again even though it might be failing, and you just randomly appear in scenes or scenarios with no background knowledge of how you got there or where in the world you are. That suggests that during dreams you are solely emotional. So commonsense isn't just emotional intelligence, but it is a general awareness that would result from understanding your emotions, thoughts, and feelings all at the same time (and their place in the world). In order to understand the proper place of emotions, thoughts and feelings just a large assortment of knowledge isn't going to increase your understanding of who you are. What is going to increase your understanding of who you are however is understanding how your emotions, thoughts and feelings fit into the general assortment of facts and information which makes up the world.

In review, commonsense and a general knowledge of where you are leads to consciousness. Those things both are clear facts separated from a bunch of haziness (the real world). So something like a bee might act like it understands its place in the world, but it doesn't consciously understand it because if you put it in a glass cage it might just bat against the wall trying to get out over and over, not aware that it is ever going to get anywhere. The bee has no commonsense or knowledge. Knowledge in that case would mean understanding that it is in a glass cage, and commonsense would mean understanding that it is never going to get out. So to have commonsense you do need knowledge, but you need to take knowledge and appropriately configure it in order to gain common sense, or consciousness.

You need some knowledge and standard intellect (like memory) to attain commonsense (or consciousness). The more memory you have (random assortment of facts and information) the more information you have to put together in an organized way. It could be that it is easier to put together small amounts of information since it is less to process, leading to more commonsense than just being confused with a lot of memory. However, if you have a lot of data (or memory) and are also capable of putting it together effectively (like you wouldn't be doing in say a dream) then you would have more commonsense than if you had less data and put it together just as effectively, because overall you'd have more data that is properly processed. So

commonsense (or consciousness) is your ability to organize the data in your head. This data is organized relative to yourself, therefore giving you a greater understanding of where you are relative to the data. Disorganized data doesn't count at all. A greater memory might increase your commonsense, but only if you can put that extra data together effectively. The bee didn't understand the data that it was in a glass cage, and it didn't understand that it wasn't getting anywhere by hitting against it over and over. If bees had some commonsense they would fly around a room trying to get out instead of trying to get out in the same place over and over. They just have no idea what they are doing. But that is because it probably doesn't remember what it just did. It might remember to some extent, but that memory might not be clear. So it isn't the bees fault that it has no commonsense, because it didn't have a large enough memory to collect enough facts to potentially use commonsense. A person with no commonsense in that example would be someone constantly running into the door without using the handle. You know the person has a large enough memory to remember that it just did that and it shouldn't do it again, but it is still doing it over and over. That human is not conscious at all.

That human is showing no understanding of its actions. Understanding actions leads to commonsense because it shows that you know your place in the world. That human apparently isn't aware of its current place in the world, which is that it is never going to get out of the room with that strategy. So the more sense someone has, the more likely they are going to understand their place in the world and what they are doing, therefore being more conscious.

The better one understands the statement "I am happy" the more that person understands how they are then relative to their condition at previous times. That would lead to them understanding themselves better. The better someone understands themselves, the more aware of themselves they are, leading to increased consciousness. That is an example of how understanding feelings leads to increased consciousness. That is also different from what makes humans truly conscious, however. It is someone's own deep understanding of who they are and how they are happy at that specific time relative to their life, and the meaning of that which makes someone really aware.

So life is a bunch of data that needs to be sorted in some ways in order for a sense of self to be identified. One way to sort the data would be to identify things similar to yourself. A data point in the center would be you, the points closest to that would be the points most similar to you, and the points further out would be more different. That type of sorting would lead to a long term understanding of sense of self. The other type of sorting where the closest points are what is most relevant to you at the time would be a temporary sense of self. Take the bee example, the bee doesn't understand that hitting the wall over and over isn't getting it anywhere, so for it a temporary data point that it is missing that would increase its sense of self awareness is that it isn't getting anywhere by doing that.

The other type of sense of self is a more long term one. Things like what you like and dislike, and what emotions different things cause in you repeatedly would help you identify "who you are". So consciousness isn't just awareness of your environment, it is an understanding of yourself and who you are relative to your environment. That means a deep psychological understanding of your emotions, thoughts and feelings, an understanding of how you perform both in individual and general instances, and what your ability is to perform in those instances.

Putting together some data points doesn't increase self consciousness as much as if you put together data points that relate to yourself. It is when you relate data point(s) to yourself that even more increased consciousness occurs, because you are relating yourself to more information, increasing your interaction with the world and therefore understanding yourself better relative to the world. So doing a math problem isn't going to increase your understanding of yourself a lot, because those data points don't really relate to you. It is going to increase your understanding of yourself a little because you understand what it is that you are doing, which increases your understanding of yourself, but it doesn't increase how much you are thinking about yourself, which would increase your awareness of yourself even more. If you are trying to leave a room (the bee example) however, you linking your desire to leave the room and the fact that opening the door allows you to do that is linking a point about you and a point about the door together, strengthening your sense of self and how much you are thinking about yourself.

So basically any thought about oneself is going to increase ones sense of self. You have a permanent

understanding of who you are that doesn't change, and that is your long term understanding of self, but when you think about yourself, or you doing something (like trying to leave a room) your sense of self is temporarily increased because you are thinking about yourself more. So consciousness fluctuates greatly based on thought. It also increases greatly if you are having feelings or emotions about yourself as well. It increases when you are thinking, feeling, or being emotional about yourself because during those times you are more aware of yourself.

Commonsense increases someone's ability to put data points (facts) together, but the more those facts (and resulting combinations of facts) relate to yourself the more that your consciousness is going to be increased. This leads to the conclusion that consciousness is just the awareness of the experience of oneself, and that experience includes ones actions, thoughts, feelings, and emotions (both long term and short term). It could be rephrased that consciousness is awareness of someone's life experience, both short term and long term. The more commonsense someone has the more aware of their life they are going to be because they are going to be able to organize their life and their actions in an efficient, clear manner (both short term and long term) by connecting facts to themselves (the more distant the fact, the less consciousness it leads to because it is less related to yourself causing you to think about yourself less). The more someone is thinking about themselves (or experiencing feelings and emotions about themselves) the more they are going to be aware of that life experience because their life is going to be temporarily elevated in their minds.

It is impossible to have a perfect understanding of self, or consciousness because to do that you would have to be aware of the exact effect of each emotion, feeling and thought you have. To do that you'd have to be aware of everything in your environment, and everything that you can remember all at the same time. This means that your consciousness evolves based on your memory, that is if your memory changes, who you are changes because you can't base yourself off the same things anymore. Who you are also changes based on your environment, and how aware you are of your environment.

You are going to be more aware of your environment if you are thinking more about your environment, or processing data about it (again this type of consciousness is more a functional one versus a deeper one). Processing data about your immediate environment leads to a greater sense of self because who you are is dependent on your immediate environment, because you automatically process what is going on in that environment. You get a lot of sensory stimulation from the environment you are in. That can be proved because when you think about your immediate environment your awareness of it increases much more than if you think about an environment you are not in. If you think about being in an environment you are not in your sense of self is going to decrease more than you would be if you weren't thinking about anything, because your minds awareness is going to be divided between two places, so you'd have two senses of self. That links into the idea that processing data that is more relevant to yourself leads to greater consciousness, if the data is physically in your environment it is going to increase your self awareness because that is where you are (so you'd be thinking more about yourself).

While thinking about yourself being in another environment leads to less consciousness then just thinking about nothing, thinking about another environment without yourself in it leads to even less self consciousness then either of the two. That is because you just aren't thinking about yourself at all. If you are processing data in your environment it is like you are thinking about that environment, only less so, so processing data in your environment would increase your sense of self more so than thinking about nothing in your environment, but less so than thinking about your environment directly. By "your environment" I mean the area directly around you, the closer it is to you the more related it is to you, so the more it is going to cause you to think about yourself. If you look at trees in the far distance you aren't going to be as focused as if you were looking at someone right in front of you because your attention is on something less related to yourself.

In summary, when you think about your environment, or you being in an environment, your sense of self changes, (listed from most positive to least positive amounts of change) a) if you think about you being in your environment, b) if you are processing regular data in your environment c) if you are just in your environment not thinking, d) if you think about yourself in another environment, and e) if you just think about another environment (because you are removing you from yourself). This thinking about oneself leads to greater consciousness because that is what consciousness is, awareness of oneself which is going to increase

a lot when you think about yourself (or have feelings and emotions about yourself).

Those rules apply unless the environment has data which is similar to yourself, say if there is a painting of yourself far away that you are looking at, it would cause you to think more about yourself than if you were just focusing on your immediate environment. So if the environment is just environmental, sensory stimulation those rules apply, but if there is something in the environments that causes you to think deeply about something then you are going to be either even more removed from yourself (if you are thinking deeply about something not related to yourself like a math problem or a person who is different from you) or even more related to yourself (greater consciousness) if you are thinking about something deeply which is similar to yourself (say a person similar to yourself, or an experience of yours was a personal experience about you).

That shows that if you think about consciousness as a short term thing, your consciousness changes all the time and drastically. For instance, one might have barely any consciousness at all if they are completely out of it (drunk, really unfocused, laughing really hard). During that time you simply have little or no short term consciousness. There are multiple different time spans of awareness, however, one is of your life in the long term (many years), the other is of your life in the short term (a few years), and another is of your life in its immediate, current phase (days or so) (or any combination of time). People about over 50 might have a consciousness for each 10 year or so span of their life, and they would constantly remember all 5. People are aware of themselves and their lives at different periods. The only thing that is very consistent that people have of themselves is their understanding of who they are, how they interact in the world, and how their emotions, feelings, and thoughts respond in similar instances. Those are things which don't change a lot based on the environment they are in, and that sense of self, or consciousness, is a more long term one. So long term consciousness is based off of how well you understand the psychology of your emotions, feelings, and thoughts, and also how those three interact as a whole to produce your long term psychological state/condition.

So having a larger memory isn't going to necessarily increase your consciousness a lot because it isn't going to lead to a greater understanding of yourself. What you remember of yourself changes your consciousness, but it doesn't increase or decrease it a lot unless it is a dramatic amount of difference in memory, like the difference in memory between a dog and a human. Unless the greater your memory the greater your emotional experience and you'd need to constantly remember all prior experiences in order to maintain the most advanced level of emotional experience you have. In that case a decrease in memory would decrease your emotional experience, and the more advanced ones emotional experience the more likely it is they are going to have a better understanding of themselves.

That leads to the idea that certain emotional experiences lead to a greater sense of self more so than other emotional experiences. If someone was in a war they would have the emotional experience of understanding how they respond in combat, and their sense of self would then forever (or as long as they can remember) be a more action oriented one. So the deeper the emotional experience, the more it contributes to your self consciousness. The more individual the emotional experience, that is, the more related the experience is to yourself, the more the experience is going to increase your self consciousness. That means that there isn't just self consciousness, but people can be conscious about the world around them and other people, and that there is an overlap between self consciousness and world consciousness.

That is, if you have an experience with another person, you then become more aware of that person as well as more aware of yourself. So you'd have more consciousness of that person, and more self consciousness. The same idea goes if you have an emotional experience with an object, or group of objects (in the case of a war it might be something like guns). Going to war might increase someone's consciousness of weapons or danger. Consciousness therefore means awareness in general, not just self awareness. If you are aware of something, then you are conscious of it.

Most dictionary definitions of consciousness just list it as being the things people are most aware of. There are things to be aware of that aren't major things, things which you aren't "most" aware of. Awareness just happens to center around the self. That is a selfish view of the world. Someone could be only most aware of wrongdoing, more aware of wrongdoing than they are of themselves, that is possible. If that were true for most people then consciousness would be defined as wrongdoing, not someone's interest, or awareness in themselves.

So the best definition of consciousness is therefore "everything that someone is aware of". People are



aware of things in both the short term and the long term. A fly is probably only aware of things in the short term, since it has almost no memory compared to a human. A human's consciousness can change drastically, however (their consciousness, or what it is that they are aware of in total). Conscious just means, "Are you aware in general", but consciousness means, "what are you aware of exactly".

The next question is, what are people usually most aware of? Most dictionary definitions have as definitions for consciousness things like awareness of ones surroundings, ones feelings, ones identity, things that people are usually most aware of. Those definitions are people's long term sense of consciousness. Over the long run, most of the things you are going to be aware of are going to be related to yourself somehow; therefore most of consciousness is based on the self. However, you can think about things that aren't related to yourself, and your thought changes drastically, so during periods of thought about things that aren't related to oneself that person is almost completely not focused on themselves. It is impossible to be completely not focused on oneself because you are experiencing physical sensations from your body all the time (which are going to be about yourself), not just mental ones.

So someone can have consciousness about something, the question "what is consciousness" is like asking "what is awareness". Awareness is when you focus on certain things and therefore think about them and/or have more feelings and emotions about them. In review, consciousness means "awareness", "everything that someone is aware of", "everything that someone is aware of currently", or "everything that someone is aware of currently or during a certain period of time (say their life)". So you could ask, "what was your consciousness over the last 5 years". That would mean, over the last 5 years, what have you been aware of. The response could be "wrongdoing", "myself", or a large list of things. A more specific version of that would be to ask, "what are you aware of, and when are you aware of it", or "over the last five years what were you aware of, and when were you aware of it". If someone wants to know someone else's life time consciousness they could ask, "what were you aware of throughout your life". If someone wanted to know if someone was conscious about something (or what their consciousness was of something) they could ask, "what is your awareness of that thing", or "what is your consciousness of that" (for example, "what is your consciousness of war"). You could also say, "what does it truly mean to be human" that could also mean what is consciousness.

How This Chapter shows how Intelligence is intertwined with Emotion:

- Explaining the definition of consciousness shows how intelligence isn't just random thoughts and emotions, but some parts of intelligence are directed thoughts and directed emotions, and that direction is what makes someone conscious.

## 6.16 Curing Depression

**Depression arises from any negative emotion. Therefore, to eliminate depression, negative emotions need to be eliminated.**

Depression arises from wanting things that you can't have. You basically need to be satisfied with your current state/condition. Even thinking that although things are bad now, but there is hope for them to get better means you're satisfied with your current condition. If someone wants something that they can't have, they get depressed. Therefore that is the logical cause of depression.

That works on the small scale too in addition to the large, if you are unhappy with yourself in general, that is probably going to result in a larger depression than if you can't go to the store right away. If you want to go to the store right now, but can't, then it might make you sad, but that isn't as large an issue as if you are dissatisfied with something like your personal life or who you are in general.

What if there is something that will make you happy but you don't know about it? That is ok because thankfully there are only a few general causes of depression. The human condition can be studied and similar things that people want arise in each instance. Just go through everything that you might want but can't have and say in each instance, it's ok that I don't have that, I don't need everything.

Wouldn't ignoring something that you want but can't have be imposing blocks on yourself, that if you want something, you should let your emotions run free and let the desire go? Well if you do that, you're going to be upset. You basically somehow need to justify that your current condition is the best thing.

The best way to do this is to realize that each person is an individual and unique, and that a difference should be viewed as an asset. That if you are different in some way, that that way is positive, not negative. That other people appreciate you for who you are. You need to have confidence in who you are and the state your life is in.

Is having too much confidence in yourself arrogant? Yes it is slightly arrogant, but it also means that you have what you want. If someone has what they want, they are going to be confident. That won't be bad however, because people like people that are confident in themselves because they are easier to be around. Lower self confidence would cause someone to act differently. This is because they would be unsure that each thing they are going to do is going to be ok, so they are going to be hesitant and unsure, causing them to act different and more uncertain. Therefore confidence is the most important thing for someone to have in order to combat depression.

Confidence also eliminates fear. When you aren't confident you are afraid that life is failing you, you are afraid that there is something out there that you want but can't have. It is very important to not be afraid of anything. What if there is something you're afraid of but you don't know what it is? You need to go through everything that you might be afraid of, and eliminate that you are afraid of them.

What if you're afraid of fighting a lion? Something like that would be a test of how fearful you are in general. Once you pull up the fear emotion by doing something fearful, if you are more afraid than you should be then something is wrong. That was just a test. You shouldn't have a lot of fear in life for anything. You should have a lot of self confidence. So you shouldn't be too afraid to do something like fight a lion, you should, however, realize that it is probably going to cause you to die.

How is it possible to not be afraid of death? Surely everyone is afraid to die. Well it is perfectly possible. Think about the situation if you were not afraid of death. What would you be, and how would you be acting, if you weren't afraid to die. If you can imagine that, then you know that it is possible. If you can't imagine that then go up step by step. Take something you are just a little afraid of, and imagine doing that without fear. Then keep going up. Eventually you won't be too afraid of anything, including death.

Fear isn't necessary. Part of logic is the understanding of facts. So if you logically understand that you are going to die, that is ok. If you get a weird feeling when you think about death (aka fear) then you should realize that you don't really need that feeling. The feeling of fear is almost completely unnecessary. You don't need strong feelings of fear to remind yourself that you are going to die if you fight a lion, or to motivate you to run away. Maybe the emotion fear can't be eliminated completely, but the more that is eliminated, the more self-confidence you are going to have.

In fact, logically, eliminating any negative emotions is going to help eliminate depression. That is the definition of negative after all, bad and likely to cause sadness and therefore depression. Just go through the negative emotions of anger, fear, sadness, disgust and surprise. Try to go through anything that might cause those feelings and eliminate them. Also you can do the test like we did with the death test for fear. If you have a larger amount of that emotion than you should for an extreme example, (like death) then that is indicative that there is too much of that emotion in your system, that you are too afraid in general and need to reduce how much of the emotion fear is in your system.

Logically only positive emotions are good, and all negative emotions should be eliminated. They basically don't do any good. The only reason to have minor amounts of them in your system would be to cause a small, healthy amount of anxiety to keep you on edge, but the key word there is still small.

Wanting things that you can't have counts as a negative emotion which is called dissatisfaction. Also a lack of self confidence is a negative emotion because that is more likely to cause fear. If you have 100% confidence when fighting a lion you aren't going to be afraid.

Basically psychology doesn't need to be complicated. If psychology is complicated, then things like depressions can arise easily because there are complicated factors going on. Psychology, however, is actually simpler than it seems. Just imagine a person standing anywhere. This person is not doing anything; there are no inputs in and no outputs. If there are no inputs in and therefore no outputs, then there is no possibility for error (or a depression). Life doesn't get much more complicated than just standing around and doing nothing, so where could a depression arise from?

It is logical then that something like a slight confidence boost (say imaging having enough confidence to

fight a lion) should raise someone out of a depression and into feeling normal, like how they would in the situation where they were just standing around, getting no inputs in and therefore no outputs (output like a depression).

In fact, if you imagine yourself just standing around doing nothing, not only are there no outputs, but you probably feel good about yourself too. There is a simple pleasure in just absorbing the surroundings. That means that humans are like cars, when in idle they are set to go at a minimum speed. They don't stop when you put them in drive but the engine keeps running at a slow pace. From where can a depression arise if our natural state is a happy one?

## 6.17 Concentration and Emotions are Important Factors in Intelligence

People can concentrate in various ways, and one of these ways is imbedded in how a person's brain functions (their emotions, feelings and thoughts all contribute to a certain "brain structure" which would enable some people to concentrate more than others). All things which are harder to do and require a higher intelligence really require more concentration. Concentration is best understood when it is compared to a person's emotional mind; that is, emotion and concentration are contrary to each other because as emotional development and temporary emotion increase, concentration decreases. As adults age their emotional development grows and how emotional they are increases as they learn to separate out the things they enjoy from the things they don't, (as this is a sign of good emotional development) but their intelligence decreases. This must mean that something (probably emotion and emotional development) replaces the decline in intelligence that occurs as adults age. Emotion replaces it because that is the natural thing to happen. As animals use less and less of their conscious mind, they become more and more unconscious. For an animal with as large a brain as a human's being more emotional would mean that they could be very emotional. The larger brain size increases emotional capacity. Since brain size doesn't decrease over age the emotional capacity becomes used more as intellect goes down. When people are less intelligent, they tend to be more emotional because they have a more direct connection (they don't have to "go through" or "think through" their intellect) to their emotions.

A good example of how concentration can have a large impact on intelligence is seen through the example of some people who cannot read and comprehend complicated sentences, but are capable of hearing and comprehending these sentences in real life (Durell, 1969). It may mean they just aren't concentrating enough when they read as when they are listening. Listening leads to them being more interested in what is being said so they can focus on it deeper. The sound and/or social factors "wakes" them up and focuses their attention naturally. That means that solely because they were motivated their intelligence increased; that shows how emotion can influence intelligence.

Concentration is relative to emotion, which is unconscious thinking about something. Concentration is also another word for consciously or unconsciously thinking about something, usually when it is normally hard to think about that thing. That is, you need to concentrate more if you are being emotional or not focused in order to stay in focus, so concentration might then be better defined as thinking under pressure, or thinking in the absence of emotion. That is, someone very emotional would concentrate and that would be thinking under pressure, the pressure coming from the emotion, and someone non-emotional might just concentrate without having to battle wild emotions or distractions.

While concentration means thinking against the perils of disruptions and emotion, you can also concentrate when you're not being disrupted. So any higher-level thinking can be viewed as concentration. This means that when you're not concentrating, you're doing more simple things, since those things wouldn't be higher-level intellect. People can't think about several emotions at once, so therefore emotional things are simpler than intellectual ones (so simple that you can't think about them consciously easily – too simple). That is, as emotion increases, conscious thinking decreases, therefore the number of things you recognize yourself as "doing" also decreases. This happens because people can only think of a few things at a time, and if one of the things you are thinking about is emotion (which you would do just by being emotional) then

you wouldn't be capable of thinking as much consciously (remember emotion is unconscious thought) and that this lower thought capacity would be reflected in a lower intelligence. That is, unconscious emotional processes can replace the higher level functioning used in intelligence as your brain ages and physical factors in your mind decrease your intelligence you might accommodate that change by spending time and energy you'd otherwise spend remembering things and figuring things out by putting your mind into emotion. In the absence of thought you retreat into feelings because they are all your mind can physically handle. As people age their minds physically change to accommodate emotion more than intellect, which decreases. It could be that you understand how your brain is changing, and your emotional mind understands that as well, so you emotionally develop to accommodate your changing mental wiring. That is, as you get dumber (in certain ways) you learn to relax more because you don't have to think as much. You retreat to become more embedded in your feelings and more sensitive to them because the intellect that was covering them up (partially blocking them) is gone. Younger adults might be wilder than older adults, but this does not make them more emotional because emotional means being affected by your emotions, so the younger adults might have a lot of emotion but their intellect isn't affected by it, therefore they are less emotional.

That is, it could be that your emotional development happens to correspond with the physical changes in your brain. That is demonstrated by imagining an adult in a child's mind (say around 3) it simply wouldn't work because the mental wiring is so different. The child is simply too interested in the world and this greater interest is mirrored by faster learning connections in the brain. That is fitting because if you are interested in something, you want to learn about it. As you get older you want to learn less and your ability to learn mirrors your desire to learn. This coincidence is likely a product of good evolution. Learning uses higher level functioning because you need to draw conclusions based on data for the first time, and it is going to be harder to come to conclusions the first time you learn something then when you implement that learning later on. Using what you learned requires much less brain functioning because you aren't getting used to new material which may require a different way to think about that material (it would probably require a new way since by definition you are learning).

Emotion is really any disturbance from concentration, which can be seen as higher-level intellect. So as emotion increases, your conscious concentration goes down, and therefore your conscious intellect goes down (that is when emotion increases a lot such that your willpower cannot overcome it, say during any highly emotional time like crying). But what then is unconscious intellect? It seems that unconscious intellect would be things like emotional intelligence, that is emotional intelligence would be processed unconsciously, since it is emotional. You can think about how "cool" something is but you don't have a conscious thought process about it, you have an unconscious emotional one about it so therefore it is emotional intelligence and having more of that type of intellect might make you more emotional (because you are thinking and processing more things unconsciously, which means you are processing them with emotion). That means that emotional intellect is really just an understanding of things that make you feel, and therefore when you use this intellect you are having feelings so large you can usually identify that you are feeling something, like in the example where you identify how "cool" something is you probably are experiencing an emotion of enjoyment if the object is very cool. If the object is neutral (not cool or uncool) then you would still "feel" your emotions as your mind delves into the emotional part of your brain in order to figure out if you like it or not. You can test that for yourself; just think of a neutral object and ask, "How cool is that" – you become slightly more emotional when you ask the question because you have to think deeply in order to figure out the answer. If you ask the question of "how cool is that" to something cool then it makes you feel good because it is a cool object (this happens because it causes you to think deeply about how cool the object is, and think deeply means thinking more about how cool the object is, and since the object is cool you are going to enjoy thinking about it).

If you think about it emotion is really just things that distract you. Emotion and conscious concentration are completely contrary to each other; they are opposites. If something happens to you that is a disruption (like emotion) then you simply cannot concentrate as well, because you were disrupted. As in the cool example, when you think about how cool something is you start to have feelings about it, and this distracts you from other things that you might be thinking for that time period. That is, it feels like emotion "disrupts" you because it is unconscious, so it disrupts your consciousness because it causes you to feel which disrupts

your conscious mind and you recognize your sense of self fundamentally as being a conscious being, not an unconscious one. In this way it is fitting that emotion would replace higher level intellect (as adults age), because it is clearly separated from it. That is, thinking about how cool the object is thought just like regular thinking is thought, you can feel that in your mind – this indicates that since emotion and thinking take up the same space they cannot exist concurrently.

Emotion feels like it is disruptions and unconscious thought (that is, because it is not logical so it disrupts your sense of logic and the rational continuity of life). When I say “rational continuity of life” I mean that you need to be logical in order to function in a way that would continue your life. You need to have a basic understanding of who you are and where you are and what you are doing (which having higher order brain processes as shown in a good learning ability helps). That understanding is often absent in dreams, where you are mostly emotional and you clearly don’t know what you are doing because if you did, you’d be aware that the dream you are in doesn’t make sense (as most dreams make little sense). Emotion doesn’t just disrupt people in that way (less logical continuity of life) but it would also cause someone’s mind to become more emotionally chaotic. In other words, emotion is unconscious because it cannot be understood. If emotion was understood, then it would be conscious and it wouldn’t be emotion. That is why emotion disrupts consciousness and clear thinking, because it by nature is unclear and not understood. When something not understood such as emotion interacts with things that are understood (such as things in regular thinking and intellect) then the clearer thinking becomes disrupted, because something that is not clear and not understood in nature is only going to add components that don’t make sense, instead of adding logical information which does make sense. That means that when emotion is on, thinking is off. Thinking and emotion cannot exist in the same space, because thinking by definition is something you understand, and emotion is something you don’t (you understand emotion to some degree, that is people can say, “I like that” which shows understanding of their emotions, but emotion is less understood than non-emotion related thoughts such as math, which is much more exact). To deal with this your mind must turn off emotion in order to think, and thinking off in order to feel; thus your brain separates periods of thinking from periods of emotion. The two components of intellect and emotion never exist together, they are by nature they are separate (in terms of time and separate in terms of nature).

If you are disrupted, you think about what happened unconsciously, so emotions and disruptions are the same (that is because disruptions cause people to become more emotional since they get so upset that they got disrupted, which in turn causes them to think about the disruption unconsciously, which is why emotion is unconscious thought - or an unconscious control process of conscious thought that is the mechanism by which the disruption causes you to stop; but what drew your attention to the disruption in the first place, however, was something unconscious because it was so fast - this quick attention to the disruption is emotion, and that is why emotion is thinking unconsciously). That further shows how emotion is different from higher level, conscious intellect.

If you are more emotionally developed does that mean that you think more unconsciously and therefore think less consciously? Emotion or unconscious thinking would replace your decreased intellect, and this is fitting because emotion also takes away from conscious thinking anyway because you only have so much space in your mind (you can only think about so many things at once, and it is harder to think about more things than less). That is, it is fitting that emotion would replace intellect because you are still capable of thinking of the same number of things, so you’d need to replace brain power used for intellect with something in order to maintain the same mental activity overall. That is, your brain still has the same power (which could be thought of as your number of neurons) but they are just used differently. That could also be thought of as when you age the number of activities you do remains the same, so you still need to use just as much brain power. When viewed that way humans can be compared highly with other animals, that is, most of life is really just doing simple, animal like actions. Someone could do something intellectual, but this isn’t going to result in a significant amount of more brain activity than non-human animals. Just because non-human animals don’t think in words doesn’t mean that they don’t feel similar emotions and feelings as humans. If one animal likes another they have a feeling about that. A human’s ability to put that feeling into words doesn’t necessarily add that much emotion or feeling. Most of the feelings people have come from external sensory stimulation, not internal (such as thinking) so therefore most emotions humans have are going to be

similar to other animals (dogs, cats, etc). Therefore it becomes obvious that humans maintain a similar level of activity when they age as when they are younger. And a human's intellect can be seen as just a mental blocking of their emotions; especially when compared with other animals in the world. Most emotions come from real sensory stimulation, not just sensory stimulation that you think of in your head say when reading a book. Doing the actions of the book in real life would generate more emotion than reading about them, for sure. So as people age they still get about the same stimulation, and this stimulation either needs to be felt or blocked out.

A good example of "blocking" emotional stimulation can be seen when certain behaviors of dogs are compared with that of humans. When a submissive (possibly younger) dog meets a more aggressive older dog (say the meeting between an American bull dog and a regular dog) the younger dog can show his/her submission by nipping the dominant dog's snout. That is because the emotional interaction is so intense (due to the dominant dogs aggressivity and potential to harm the younger dog, who it views as annoying) that the submissive dog would be viewed as ignoring the dominant dog if it didn't engage in a very friendly social interaction such as a nipping on the mouth. The nipping relieves the enormous tension between the two dogs, it is a way of saying, "it is ok we are friends". The need for such a nipping comes from too much emotion between the two animals. If humans were in the dogs' skins such an interaction wouldn't occur because the emotional intensity wouldn't occur in the first place. The humans' intellect would block the emotional interaction, they simply wouldn't be aware of it because they aren't as aware of their emotions, the dog is more impulsive and responds directly to his/her emotions. The human might be intellectually aware that one dog is dominant and that this might be a problem, but they ignore it. Ignoring it would cause anxiety for the human in the dog's body and the human wouldn't know why. The human cannot give into their emotions and accept that there is a problem, and that it needs to be resolved.

This problem (the problem is there is a dominant dog and a submissive dog, and the submissive dog would be upset that there is a dog more dominant than it, and the dominant dog would be preoccupied by how annoying the non-dominant dog is, because it is so inferior to it that it is annoying, also there is a need to establish dominance) of dominance can be seen with other animals as well. If there are two roosters and too few hens the roosters are going to fight. If a human was in the rooster's body (but had the rooster's emotions such as a desire for the hens) then it would have to fight it out with the other rooster in order to relieve that anxiety of desire for dominance. The human is simply less in touch with its emotions than the rooster. That is, the rooster is capable of such desire for the hens that it is going to fight over the hens each time, humans on the other hand wouldn't "have" to have a fight over anything that is emotional, they simply don't experience emotions as well because they have too much intellect. Even though the rooster's brain is much smaller than a humans, it is capable of much more emotion because of the lack of intellect. Emotional conflicts that aren't solved then generate anxiety because they aren't solved, so sometimes a lack of emotion leads to people being dumber instead of more intelligent. In fact more emotion means that animals would spend more time dealing with emotional issues, thereby causing less anxiety. It doesn't appear that animals other than humans have the same level of anxiety or depression as a human. How often do you see a dog with a depression or long term anxiety? From those examples it is clear how intellect is a block of emotional stimulation, so if intellect (or memory, which is a part of intellect) is removed the result would be that the animal (including humans) would become more emotional.

Instead of intellect blocking emotions, it could be that intellect is simply changing the emotions to make them go away. That is like with the rooster example, a human might not be aware that there is a problem because he/she isn't as in touch with its emotions (desire for the hens), or with the dog example he/she might not be aware that one dog is different from it and this causes a social issue consciously, but unconsciously he/she would be aware. So the tension still exists, only unconsciously, so the emotions related to the problem still exist. It is only that the human is blocking them out because of his/her conscious mind, which is capable of blocking the unconscious. He/she isn't aware of these unconscious emotions because he/she is thinking too much (and thinking is a conscious process, so humans are conscious because they think, but this leads to a blocking of emotion). That could be viewed as that humans think in a way fundamental to their psychology and consciousness, so fundamental and important that it interferes with their emotions. That means that intellect is intricately tied in with emotions. If something is tied in with something else then as one increases

ones awareness of the increase increases he/she is going to be aware directly proportionally of the larger portion (that is rather obvious). So as intellect decreases, the emotions that were always there from the large amounts of sensory stimulation and social factors become uncovered.

Just as emotion takes away from intellect, intellect also takes away from emotion. That is, if you are thinking about something you can't be feeling as many things, because you can only think about so many things at the same time, and emotion is really just unconscious thought. If you have less conscious thinking then your memory is going to be less because you are thinking less about stuff. That is, emotion uses processes in the brain to think that relate to emotional things, like feelings, not intellectual, concrete things which you would be capable of remembering. Emotional things are complicated things which involve feelings and people have a very hard time thinking about them consciously (for this reason when people feel emotion it is almost all unconscious, that is, you do not associate emotion with a sense of self). Unconscious thinking isn't as clear and defined as conscious thinking, so more unconscious thinking instead of conscious thinking would reflect less of an intellect (because it is less clear and defined, "cloudy"). What it might lead to is a greater emotional understanding, however. That is, it doesn't help with concrete learning, like in school, since its nature is not concrete, but it might help with emotional learning, since its nature is emotional. That is, if you spend more time being emotional it might be that you have more insight into how it is that you are feeling, and have a more direct connection to your feelings.

The reason that less intellect would lead to greater emotion is because emotion is by definition feeling. And people don't "feel" their thoughts. That is, thought doesn't lead instantaneously to feelings. Thoughts can lead to feelings, that is you can direct which feelings you are going to have by thinking about certain things, but the thoughts themselves are not feelings. The thoughts are instantaneous; the feelings take time and linger in your mind. That is why there is an almost endless source of feeling, because you feel them and this feeling is more profound than something you don't feel. It could almost be said that thoughts are just ideas, and feelings are real things. The ideas might generate feelings, but not directly. The reason that feelings are such a source of emotion and feeling is because feelings are more similar to direct feelings which you get from touching things, feeling things, smelling things, tasting things, hearing things and seeing things (the 5 senses). Stimulation of any of the 5 senses leads directly to feeling. It would seem like there would be an overabundance of such sensory stimulation if your intellect was taken away. That is why other animals' minds are smaller than humans, because without the intellect if they had such a large mind to just process sensory information it would lead to an overload of sensory data. That is why most of the human's mind is used for intellectual endeavors, and the feeling part of the brain is very small. In fact, how much people feel compared to how much they think is mirrored in the proportion of the size of the feeling part of the brain to the thinking part. That makes a lot of sense. People think much more than they feel. Animals other than humans tend to feel much more than they think. Just imagine you stopped thinking and just felt the world around you, like if you were a dog. That when you encountered a situation when you needed to think you instead just responded to feelings directly. If you did that then with the submissive/dominant dog example you would respond to the dominant dog (if you were the submissive dog) like the submissive dog does. You would feel the feeling "scared" when you encountered the dominant dog and feel that you would want to suck up, you'd do that by kindly nipping the dominant dog's jaw. Instead people don't respond directly to their feelings but they think about things. When they see the dominant dog they would think about the dog and not realize as well that they are scared. This would cause a tension in the relationship between dominant and submissive dog because it would appear that the submissive dog isn't scared when it should be, and is therefore threatening the dominant dog's dominance. That would cause both dogs anxiety and probably lead to the dominant dog growling at the submissive dog and the submissive dog running away.

In review, intellect disrupts emotion just as much as emotion disrupts intellect. This is because too much feeling or emotion can disturb an intellect because the intelligent mind is very powerful and can magnify the sensations and feelings it receives from the emotional/sensory part of its mind. Intellect also disrupts emotion because it blocks it out or minimizes it. It is capable of doing this because it is so much larger and more powerful than emotion. That is emotion is weak, but is capable of being large if allowed. It is like a river, emotion has a wide stream but it is moving slowly and has a weak current. Intellect has just as wide a stream but is moving much faster. Thus when intellect meets emotion, as it does in the mind, more

“water” from the intellect comes in. If the water from the intellect is reduced, however, there is plenty of water from the emotion to take its place. The lake where the water from the emotion comes from is almost infinitely large, because people can feel anything, anytime. The lake behind the intellect however is more limited, so when you have nothing to think about you resort to feelings. This may make some people feel stagnant, (if they aren’t thinking) because they otherwise wouldn’t be moving around all the time. So for optimum enjoyment/health people either move around all the time, or think all the time, or do one or the other or both all the time. Before modern civilization people were hunter-gatherers and they moved around all the time, and probably thought less. In modern civilization it is more common for people to think all the time, and move around a lot less. That is a significant change. People might be more emotional and in touch with their feelings in pre-civilization time when they were exposed to more sensory and physical stimulation. Physical stimulation is a feeling, you get direct feelings from physical stimulation just as you get direct feelings from external sensory stimulation.

That is, either you are interacting with the world or you are thinking, and if you are interacting with the world you are receiving direct sensory stimulation, which leads directly to feelings. Sometimes intellectual topics lead to feelings, but they rarely lead to deep feelings (things like extremely intense arguments might generate deep feelings, and no one can handle those arguments all the time). Intellect leads to fewer feelings than real sensory input because intellect only leads to thought. How many thoughts can you think of that are more intense than doing the actual thought in real life? I cannot think of any. Real feelings in the brain mostly come from sensory stimulation and emotion, or unconscious thought. If a male sees an attractive female he might feel things and therefore get emotional, but he doesn’t have to think anything consciously to feel those things. So even though there are complicated thought processes (unconsciously) going on about the female, it was still sensory stimulation which triggered the emotion. That is, the sensory stimulation lead to no conscious thought that would be related to having a higher intellect. So that same person could feel all those things even if they had a lower intellect or consciousness (conscious mind) because the thoughts generated from seeing the female in that instance were unconscious. You can only think of a few conscious thoughts when the female is seen because you can only think so fast consciously, but you can think much faster unconsciously, and if it occurs unconsciously it is going to lead to emotion, because that is what emotion is, unconscious thought. Emotion is unconscious thought because if it occurs unconsciously it is something you are going to “feel” instead of “think”.

This emotional nature of emotion (separate from higher order thinking or learning ability) is best demonstrated during dreaming, where a person is entirely unconscious and therefore one can see how emotions (which are unconscious thoughts) function. Dreams are random, chaotic and rarely make sense – that is a reflection of the nature of emotion itself. During a dream you rarely know who you are and things occur which often reflect that you really don’t know where you are. There isn’t a strong sense of self in dreams because you can’t think clearly about yourself. “Thinking” is something which doesn’t really occur in dreams, because if you were thinking you’d realize that you were dreaming, and your mind would switch from its unconscious thinking which consists of making up an elaborate story for a dream to conscious thinking where you wouldn’t do that, or be capable of making up such a complex story and complex visual data that quickly. Emotion can really be defined then just as complicated confusion, such as exists in dreams, which are almost entirely emotional.

Dreams are so out of the ordinary in order to generate more feeling and emotion. The out of the ordinariness in dreams, however, also makes them less logical and make less sense. This means that in order for something to be emotional, it needs to not make sense; if it made sense, then it would be conscious thought not emotion, and that emotion therefore could be defined simply as stuff that doesn’t make sense that you think about, not just as unconscious thought. And “stuff that doesn’t make sense” isn’t going to be remembered because it isn’t stuff that you can think about consciously because it doesn’t make sense. Dreams still make sense to some degree, since there are events in them which are at least somewhat real. So while emotions make some sense, they still make less sense than conscious thought. That is, if you are feeling a lot then are you emotional, and if you are emotional then a lot of stuff is going on in your brain. It could be that emotional development causes people to focus more on things they enjoy as they get older and block out the things which they don’t like (this makes sense as it would be good emotional development) and that



therefore they get to be more emotional and experience emotions better. That is, maybe people can separate themselves from the things they don't enjoy and attach themselves to the things they do. Adults might even seem to be asking the question, "how does that relate to my emotions?" (Since they learn to separate out things they like from things they don't like better, they'd have to relate everything to their emotions more.) This might mean that adults are capable of being both more distant and more "close" than teens/younger adults because of their emotional development, they simply don't treat things as equal anymore and possibly as a result gain more feeling. The down side of getting older on the other hand is that the things you enjoyed before are now older and you potentially don't enjoy them as much because of that (they are less "fresh"). More unconscious thinking (emotion) probably also helps to maintain a more emotionally developed mind, as emotionally developed minds would need to think more about their emotions since they have more of them. This means that as people get older they would get more unconscious, but more intelligent emotionally.

Evidence for the idea that adults learn to separate out emotional events from ordinary ones and emphasize the emotional more comes from studies in autobiographical memory retrieval. In a study done by Dijkstra and Kaup (2005) younger and older adults were tested for autobiographical memory retrieval. Older adults were more likely to selectively retain memories with distinctive characteristics, such as being self-relevant and emotionally intense, particularly when remote memories were involved.

In another study by Charles, Mather and Carstensen (2003) the forgettable nature of negative images for older adults was tested. Young, middle-aged and older adults were shown images on a computer screen and after given a distraction task, were asked first to recall as many as they could and then to identify previously shown images from a set of old and new ones. The relative number of negative images compared with positive and neutral images recalled decreased with each successively older age group. Since it is clear people don't want to remember negative images as much, the study shows how age and emotional development cause people to select what they like more. This would cause people to "relax" more. That is, as adults get older and their intellect decreases, this lack of intellect enables them to be more in touch with their emotions and be more capable of selecting the more positive images.

Memory tests (R.t. Zacks, G Radvasky, and L. Hasher (1996)) show that young adults perform better than older adults when told to remember and forget data. The older adults remembered less than the younger adults when told to remember, and when told to forget data they remembered more than the younger adults.

The results show that younger adults have better control over their minds than older adults. A greater emotional makeup of the older adults is likely a consequence of this. Emotions would lead to less "mental willpower" which would enable younger adults to direct their thinking and to forget when told to forget, and remember when told to remember.

A paper by Einstein and Mcdaniel (1990) investigated the ability of old versus younger people to remember to carry out some action in a future time (known as prospective memory or PM). They suggested that different patterns might emerge between situations in which the PM target is triggered by some event (e.g. "when you meet John, please give him this message"), and those that are time based (e.g., "remember to phone your friend in half an hour"). Their work showed age-related decrements in time-based but not event-based tasks (Einstein, Mcdaniel, Richardson, Guyn & Cunfer, 1995). In my view that would indicate that the event based tasks were more emotional than the time based ones. That is, old people are programmed to work based off of emotional events that occur in real life, not based off something unemotional like time, which occurs all the time and isn't associated with emotional events. Since they forgot more on the time based tasks but not on the event based ones, it suggests that older adults are cued into emotional events more than the younger adults because there wouldn't be a discrepancy between the two. It is clear that the event based task is more emotional than the non-event based task because the non-event based task doesn't occur along with an event. That is, the event is a trigger for the old adult to remember the task. Even if the older adult is more motivated to remember the event in the beginning, they still aren't going to remember it later on unless this motivation is "triggered" again. That is, it is something unconscious (motivation, emotion) which helps them to remember the event. The motivation can be triggered better by the event based task because the motivation comes from the task itself, so they attribute a greater amount of emotion to the recipient(s) of the task. Events are simply more emotional than non-events.

You think of yourself as primarily conscious, therefore anything unconscious would take away from your

consciousness because you can only think about so many things at the same time. If one of those things is unconscious that you are “thinking” about (and thinking about emotion is going to be difficult at best) then it would make you more confused because you would lose more of your conscious, clear, defined sense of self. That is, your sense of self is a clear and focused one (different from emotion, which is not clear). Your sense of self can’t be an emotional one, because emotion doesn’t really make any sense (already shown as in dreams) so you can’t really think about emotion consciously, because it defies conscious thinking or logic. So since your sense of self is what you think about consciously, you are not going to think of yourself as emotional, you are going to think of yourself as more logical than emotional and if you do call yourself emotional that just means emotional relative to other people. That shows that emotion is clearly different in nature from higher order logical processes. And that therefore as intellect goes down as people age as adults it is possible and easy for emotion to go up, because it is clearly separate from intellect. The idea you have of yourself is as a functional being, not an un-functional and chaotic emotional one (that is, if you were solely emotional, not logical, you wouldn’t be able to do anything, you’d just feel and not think – like a frog).

In review, as people age they learn to separate out what they like from what they don’t like, and this ability causes them to gain more emotion, and emotion, being chaotic and unclear in nature, clearly works differently in the brain than intellect does. Emotions are chaotic; they permeate all your thoughts and have an affect on them, like a cloud. When someone is emotional it certainly seems like your entire mind is affected. Some emotions even have physical effects. More evidence that emotion doesn’t use the same brain processes as memory and learning ability can be seen during very emotional times, like during sex or crying, where ones concentration is less. Concentration is needed to maintain intellect, and emotion is clearly different from concentration (as when you are very emotional during sex or crying you cannot concentrate). You can’t memorize multiplication tables (which to do you’d need to concentrate) during sex or crying.

If an adult is intelligent at the same time that he/she is emotional then he/she is relatively less emotional because the intellect balances the emotion. So older adults would be considered to be more emotional because their intellect (or learning ability) is less (if older adults have more emotional intelligence then that wouldn’t make them less emotional because to use emotional intelligence you don’t “think” to figure out the answer but you feel. Emotional intelligence is therefore a sophisticated way of being emotional that animals other than humans might or might not have). That is, younger adults are wild and they are smart. They would still be considered to be less emotional though since a greater portion of their brain is intellect. Animals (other than humans) would be considered to be even more emotional than humans because they have almost no intellect. Emotional is acting instead of thinking, and all animals do is act, not think. Younger adults could then be viewed as acting and thinking at the same time with a higher proportion of intellect than older adults, if you don’t think that older adults have a greater emotional intelligence than younger, that is.

The statement “people and their intellect are based on emotions” is a complicated one. They are based off of their higher emotions and their lower emotions. There is really no such thing as “no emotion” because people they are always thinking, consciously or unconsciously, and that is what emotion is. Sometimes it appears as if they have no emotion, but they are still thinking about things, they still have a memory and they are still using it, processing data and sensory inputs. Those things all cause thought and therefore emotion.

How then could someone be called non-emotional? It must be that they are feeling less, that is if they are concentrating deeply for a very long period of time then they might be a deep thinker that isn’t really wavering in their feelings, just simply thinking about things and not really doing anything interesting that would invoke a lot of emotion, or unconscious thought.

Many older adults complain about being too occupied, both emotionally and physically. That is better seen in very old people whose brains are decaying, for whom even tiny mental tasks can wear out their mind. It isn’t that their mind is being worn out; it is that they already lost most of their intellect but the pauses are filled with emotion. That is what animals are like, the experience you get from animals is an emotional one, not an intellectual one. Therefore animals spend more time being emotional. Emotional in that context means feeling, animals spend more time using unconscious thought and “feeling” the world around them. That is good evidence that as intellect, learning ability and memory decrease it is replaced with emotion.

That is because emotion doesn't need to increase, it simply needs the block of intellect to be removed. People were already thinking about enough things consciously and unconsciously. That is, someone's unconscious mind is really being partly blocked at least as a younger adult, but when intellect is removed the unconscious becomes unveiled (like how animals are unconscious) and the person becomes more emotional as a result.

Evidence for the connection between higher amounts of emotion and a lower intellect can be found in test studies done on people with a depressed mood. In a meta-analysis done by Vreeswijk and De Wilde (2004) a confirmation of the connection between overgenerality and depression was done. The depressed patients were less specific in recalling their memory than the non-depressed.

Since being emotional is rated by how much proportionally larger the emotional part of your mind is than the intellectual part, older people do get more emotional since intelligence decreases over age. However they don't necessarily get more emotion as they age, they simply get more of it relative to their intellect. The lowering of the intellect, however, would make them more in touch with their emotions and capable of greater emotional regulation (as evidenced by the study where successively older age groups remembered more and more of the positive images). They aren't likely to get significantly more emotional, however because the amount of sensory stimulation they are receiving is going to be similar to what they received when they were younger. The only thing that would go down is internal stimulation or thinking which goes down from a lowering of intellect.

As adults age from 20-74 their IQ (Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale) declines steadily (Kaufman, Reynolds and Mclean (1989). The verbal IQ actually stays about the same but it is performance IQ that decreases. From the postulates in this paper the conclusion would therefore be that verbal IQ is somehow related to emotions. Performance IQ is clearly not related to emotions because it tests mostly visual abilities. Verbal isn't likely to go down because the things it tests have to do with emotion and emotional control of attention. You cannot control how effective you are doing visual stuff, however because it requires concentration to visualize objects because there is less motivation to visualize then there is to just think. Thinking is easier than visualizing because people are used to thinking about anything, however they usually only visualize things they want to visualize, not things that are going to be tested on the IQ exam. That is, you can use emotion to control thought but you cannot use emotion to control your basic intelligence as would be reflected in visual ability tests (performance IQ).

The "willpower" of adults won't decrease as adults age. The willpower can direct a mind for under 20 second periods, and under 20 seconds is the time that it takes to do most intellectual tasks. Like a math problem. They could repeat the focus they put in every 20 seconds, "spike" their mind every 20 seconds or so to maintain this intelligence. The things on the performance test don't require that much focus, either you know them or you don't. Note that three of the verbal tests test mention attention or concentration specifically (which relate to willpower which relates to emotion as already stated). And the other parts of the verbal test measure things which are also going to relate to emotion such as information acquired from culture (you are emotionally interested in your culture) and ability to deal with abstract social conventions, rules and expressions (you are emotionally interested in social events) and verbal reasoning (tests things that occur in everyday life which you are emotionally attached to). The performance test on the other hand doesn't test things that are likely to go down because of increased emotion. The performance test tests things that are more intellect related than emotion related, that is visual things require a more intellectual, flexible mind to move objects around in your head. While the verbal subtests just require some motivation to perform (only one component of verbal tests working memory (which isn't that emotional and wouldn't be subject to changes in concentration) - one component wouldn't have a significant impact on the result).

Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale

Verbal Subtests

Information

Degree of general information acquired from culture (e.g. Who is the premier of Victoria?)

Comprehension

Ability to deal with abstract social conventions, rules and expressions (e.g. What does - Kill 2 birds with 1 stone metaphorically mean?)

Arithmetic

Concentration while manipulating mental mathematical problems (e.g. How many 45c. stamps can you buy for a dollar?)

Similarities

Abstract verbal reasoning (e.g. In what way are an apple and a pear alike?)

Vocabulary

The degree to which one has learned, been able to comprehend and verbally express vocabulary (e.g. What is a guitar?)

Digit span

attention/concentration (e.g. Digits forward: 123, Digits backward 321.)

Letter-Number Sequencing

attention and working memory (e.g. Given Q1B3J2, place the numbers in numerical order and then the letters in alphabetical order)

Performance Subtests

Picture Completion

Ability to quickly perceive visual details

Digit Symbol - Coding

Visual-motor coordination, motor and mental speed

Block Design

Spatial perception, visual abstract processing & problem solving

Matrix Reasoning

Nonverbal abstract problem solving, inductive reasoning, spatial reasoning

Picture Arrangement

Logical/sequential reasoning, social insight

Symbol Search

Visual perception, speed

Object Assembly

Visual analysis, synthesis, and construction

Optional post-tests include Digit Symbol - Incidental Learning and Digit Symbol - Free Recall.

There is more evidence that emotion plays a role in intelligence. In a study done by Bartolic et al. (1999) the influence of negative and positive emotion on verbal working memory was tested. Their data showed significantly improved verbal working memory performance for positive emotions and a significant deterioration in verbal working memory during negative emotion. That shows how emotion can manipulate intelligence in the short term, as working memory is a short term ability. Therefore, however, long term intellect (like the rest of the verbal IQ test other than working memory) might be manipulated or under the control of long term emotions. It seems like your ability to learn all the rest of the verbal IQ tests would go up during the period of increased emotion as in this study, only it is hard to test for that. But that ability over the long run would be reflected in no decline in verbal IQ scores, and there isn't. That is, it isn't likely that just verbal working memory would increase due to increased emotion; that was just the only thing that they tested for. The subject probably became motivated overall and this motivation and good mood gave him/her greater mental powers, not just a better verbal working memory.

As adults age their explicit memory goes down Howard (1988) but their implicit memory stays about the same. Howard describes implicit memory as the ability to successfully complete memory tasks that do not require conscious recollection. Since emotion is unconscious, that lack of decline would provide further evidence that emotional process don't decrease with age, but more intellectual ones do. That itself provides evidence that the emotional part of the brain is separated from the intellectual. The emotional part of the brain and the intellectual part still interact, however.

Emotion can enhance or detract from intellect, and intellect can enhance or detract from emotions. In the long run intellect does not disrupt emotion, but in the short term intellect and emotions intermingle and disrupt each other. It was shown how emotions are separate from intellect, and how therefore concentration (which can be defined as thinking under the pressure of emotion [since to give undivided attention you couldn't be disturbed by emotional factors]) is an important part of intelligence (such as memory). When

people's intellect is removed they become more emotional, as this is what is left. The source of emotion (sensory stimulation) is so large that it can never be ignored. Intellect, however can be ignored and emotion would rise up in its place. In the case of adults aging this "ignoring" of intellect happens as the mind physically gets older and some of the intellect is removed. This reveals the idea that humans have the ability to hold off emotion and do intellectual endeavors, or to indulge and bask in emotion if they want to (and switch between the two) sometimes as fast as a split second, and they can switch from one to the other for years.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bartolic et al., 1999 E.I. Bartolic, M.R. Basso, B.K. Schefft, T. Glauer and M. Titanic-Schefft, Effects of experimentally-induced emotional states on frontal lobe cognitive task performance, *Neuropsychologia* 37 (1999) pp. 677-683.

Charles, S.T., Mather, M., & Carstensen, L.L. (2003). Aging and emotional memory: The forgettable nature of negative images for older adults. *Journal of Experimental Psychology General*, 132, 2, 310-24, June.

Dijkstra, K. & Kaup, B. (2005). Mechanisms of autobiographical memory retrieval in younger and older adults. *Memory Cognition*, 33, 5, 811-20, July.

Durrell, D. D. (1969). Listening comprehension versus reading comprehension. *Journal of Reading*, 12, 6, 455-60, March.

Howard, D.V. (1988). Implicit and explicit assessment of cognitive aging. In M. L. Howe and C.J. Brainerd (eds.), *Cognitive Development in Adulthood*. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Kaufman, A.S., Reynolds, C.R., and McLean, J.E. (1989). Age and WAIS-R intelligence in a national sample of adults in the 20 – 74 years age range: A cross-sectional analysis with education level controlled. *Intelligence*, 13, 235-254.

R.t. Zacks, G Radvasky, and L. Hasher (1996), Studies of directed forgetting in older adults, *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 22, pp. 146-148 (experiment 1b).

Van Vreeswijk, M.E., De Wilde, E.J. (2004). Autobiographical memory specificity, psychopathology, depressed mood and the use of the Autobiographical Memory Test: A meta-analysis. *Behavior Research and Therapy*, 42, 2, 731-43, June.



## Chapter 7

# The Sum of Existence<sup>1</sup>

### 7.1 Conscious Reality vs. Unconscious Reality

The world is processed consciously and unconsciously, so reality exists in conscious and unconscious forms. The world is processed unconsciously first, since the unconscious is much faster and more powerful than the conscious mind. This means that all consciousness is an understanding of what it is your unconscious is processing. So there is a reality which is unconscious, however, consciousness is the only reality that really matters because although you can feel things which are unconscious, and although you are currently feeling things which are unconscious all the time you only truly feel things until they come into your conscious understanding. This conscious understanding usually is slower and occurs after the unconscious experience. If you swim in a lake you feel the water and such, however you only actually feel the water when it occurs to you that you were feeling the water. The conscious experience occurs just slightly after you touch the water. The immediate feelings you get from the water are physical ones, when you touch the water with your hand you are going to feel something, but then you think about what you just did, and you feel it deeper. The longer you process what you just did (touch the water) the more the experience sinks into consciousness. Consciousness then is really just awareness that you can identify and play with in your mind. Conscious feelings are feelings that are tangible enough for you to understand. You can have a reality that is solely unconscious, but it is going to be harder to remember this unconscious reality unless you can “grasp” onto it consciously. You feel the water when you touch it, but it only really matters that you touched it until a few split seconds after you touched the water when you realize consciously, almost in a verbal manner (you almost saying to yourself unconsciously “I touched the water”).

### 7.2 Who Am I?

When someone thinks, “who am I, what is the essence of me” they would then think about their feelings, because who someone is is a compilation of what they feel. People are the sum of their emotions. Emotions are longer than thoughts and there are much fewer of them, so when someone thinks “who am I” they think about their consistent emotional response to the world. They might respond to the world in a similar manner throughout life, and the things which are the same about why they originally responded to the world (their earliest memory of how they responded to the world emotionally) and the way they respond to the world now, are going to be the things which composite the core of their being, because there is something about humans that stays the same since birth till their death, and this thing is going to be the core of their being. People obviously change over time, but their original response to the world is going to be the simplest way to understand what emotions that person is trying to evoke from the world. It is also going to be the response they are ultimately trying to achieve throughout their life, only more and more complicated versions of it as

---

<sup>1</sup>This content is available online at <<http://cnx.org/content/m15581/1.4/>>.

they get older. Say someone was trying to get the world to invoke in them a feeling of slight delight. When they are first born they are going to experience this feeling immediately as their primary emotion, there may be other feelings that person is feeling, but this feeling is going to be clearly dominant. As that person gets older more and more feelings are going to appear but the goal of all of these new feelings is going to be to try to understand why their original, primary feeling felt the way it did. It feels like the goal of all those feelings is that your primary intent in the world is to understand your true nature.

How a person responds to the world originally is the core of their nature. This core never changes because you forever remember that response (consciously or unconsciously) who you are is just a building up of more and more responses over that one. You are still the same person you were when you were born, however, because you remember how it was that you first responded to the world and all your new responses are primarily based off of your old ones. This means that you are going to be trying to invoke the same feelings in yourself forever. How you originally felt when you came into the world is how you originally thought about yourself, your original understanding of who you are. This makes it not necessary for understanding of oneself to be completely conscious, because you understand yourself to be who you want to be otherwise you wouldn't have any feelings because you wouldn't agree with who it is you are. Someone can dislike something they did, but when they did that action they purposefully did that action whether or not they did it consciously or unconsciously, because if you do something it is coming from yourself, and you are pleased with who it is you are and who you are is going to determine how you respond to the world. If someone wished they were better at football then it might be a future goal to get better in the future, but they are still pleased with how good they are at football at that moment, because they are pleased with who they are as a person. If someone is not pleased with who they are then they are not in agreement with their existence. That is not possible because then you would cease to exist. Conceptually one has to exist as well as physically, and someone wouldn't exist on a conceptual level unless they were capable of thinking and feeling. If you are capable of doing those things then you would simply (conceptually) feel and think what you wanted to feel and think. You exist, and your existence is a singular point. This point is so simple that it can feel and think what it wants. If reality doesn't correspond with those thoughts and feelings then that fragile point would cease to exist. Therefore for anything to exist in reality all of reality must correspond with the thoughts and feelings of this tiny, tiny singular point.

Someone fundamentally feels what they want to feel and thinks what they want to think. People have control over their own actions and can direct what they do and think, those things then direct what they are going to feel. If someone does things and they don't understand what feelings their action is going to cause then they are not a conscious being. They need to understand the full impact of what their actions are going to do to themselves otherwise they don't fully understand their existence. If someone doesn't fully understand their own existence then it would be possible for things to happen which should cause them to be fundamentally upset with themselves because those things are not in concordance with who it is they really are. Who it is they are is someone that wants to think what they want to think and feel what they want to feel. Reality may not correspond with those desires, however, if you don't understand that reality is not corresponding with those desires. You will not be at odds with your existence if you don't understand that you are actually, truly sad. If someone is at odds with their existence then they would cease to exist because conceptually their existence would no longer make any sense. So therefore the degree to which you understand yourself is also the degree to which you can control reality. If someone is fundamentally upset with something then they aren't going to be getting what they want. This would not work because then there would be no meaning to their existence, and if there is no meaning to their existence then conceptually reality would no longer exist because otherwise they wouldn't have been born in the first place. They wouldn't have if they are capable of thought, which means then that they would conceptually view their existence as positive, and people tend to view themselves as good people otherwise they would have no meaning to their existence.

If someone is capable of clear thought then the conclusion they are going to reach (consciously or unconsciously) about their existence is that it should be positive. If someone actually has a soul (or a clear thinking unconscious) then that would be displeased with the idea of reality not being positive and therefore would get so upset that reality wasn't positive that it would no longer exist. If things don't agree on the



conceptual, perfectly clear level of thinking arena then there isn't an emotional battle or struggle like their might be in real life, either it works or it doesn't work, like how you can't get a partially right answer in math because it is so concrete, there is only one way for things to work because conceptually everything is perfect because it is so real or solid (concrete).

What if someone doesn't know everything that they want? Someone can want things consciously and unconsciously. The ideal would be to get everything that you want unconsciously because the unconscious determines how you feel much better than the conscious. You can think that you want something but you might be consciously wrong. You cannot be unconsciously wrong because the unconscious is just feelings, and if something is going to make you feel better then your unconscious would feel that and "understand". On the other hand you and your unconscious might not know everything that would make it feel better, it might not understand that if it was in a more complicated state (more developed) that it would then want that. The only thing to happen then is that it would have to be developed. But conceptually you might also want this development and that could occur as well as getting what it is that you want currently. Conceptually you are going to want what you want and it wouldn't seem right if reality then didn't take the next step and give you what you really wanted, which is a more complicated existence that would need to be developed. However that means that currently you aren't at your highest point, and therefore aren't getting what you really want. Except you also want development so it would it might be a trade off since you are only capable of wanting so much at one time, so you might sacrifice current pleasure to focus on wanting development. The natural tendency would be to want everything in the world at once, but that is simply not possible because it would overload you. Therefore not getting what you want is part of the human condition. You cannot simply take the "pleasure" factor of human existence and increase it infinitely. There are multiple components to life.

To achieve ultimate pleasure humans don't just experience "pleasure" but there are other factors such as physical pleasure, emotional pleasure, physical stimulus, emotional stimulus, being at peace, being excited, there are other emotions aside from pleasure which all combine to make life (also thoughts). So reality and what you "want" is going to be very complicated. You achieving current satisfaction might not be satisfaction on the conceptual, intellectual level. You might be more satisfied that you are developing, or that some long term goal is going to be achieved then the current pleasure. An example of that would be not overeating and enjoying yourself because you know that in the long term you are going to get fat. Although currently you are going to be experiencing less pleasure by not overeating, you would also feel bad that you are sacrificing your long term health. There thought takes over from pleasure. Thought is one of the other components of life that seemingly defies pleasure because it can override it and leave you feeling less satisfied in the animal, pleasure like way but more satisfied on the conceptual, thought level. It also feels like this long term "problem" of doing things that reality requires is getting the way of current pleasure and that might make someone feel bad that they aren't getting everything that they want right then.

Therefore what someone unconsciously wants fully might not be what it seems you might unconsciously want fully. There might be more advanced concepts involved in what you unconsciously fully want because of the long-term reality factor discussed in the previous paragraph. However if you understand that some things clearly are not going to be good for you then those things aren't going to exist if they really aren't good for you. You might be wrong, but if your conviction of belief that you understand something to be really bad for you and therefore shouldn't exist is strong enough then it probably isn't going to exist because you would be at odds with your existence. You cannot be at odds with your existence because who you are is someone that fundamentally is what they want (conceptually). As someone develops their convictions in what they want might become stronger, thereby causing reality to change to reflect this. But what about the unconscious? What if your fundamental existence, your singular point or even soul isn't advanced enough to want more grand things. Like a rock doesn't seem like its existence is that meaning full. But the soul of the rock might only be capable of comprehending that it wants a sturdy, stable life. And that is what it is then going to receive. If someone's soul was infinite conceptually then they might receive everything that they conceptually want, but what about what they physically want? Or are there even other factors in life other than conceptual or physical? Also what is really conceptual since all of life appears to actually be physical and therefore all concepts are based off of reality. The conceptual then is just a way of intellectualizing

things. If someone was infinitely intelligent then would that mean that they don't exist physically because they are so conceptual? It seems as if conceptual removes one from the physical because when one thinks their thoughts drift away from one singular physical thing that might be in front of them to more complex events in life, involving many more physical things which might be moving and therefore make them more intellectual and complex. Like the idea "I went to the store", involves many physical and even emotional factors (like if you want to go to the store) but the idea of just some object in front of you is just physical and it is there and you can feel it more directly and therefore more intently. It is the same concept as if you were to do or experience the actions in a book it would be more intense then just reading the book. Just reading the book, however would probably be more intellectually intense because you are being less physical and can therefore focus more on the ideas and concepts in the book.

All those ideas and concepts that someone unconsciously wants then ties back into the "reality" factor where some things in the long term might be bad for you that would cause pleasure in the short term. That also ties into the idea that there are many components to life, many ways in which someone can feel that doesn't really reflect what it might be that it seems like what they want. So going to back to the statement "someone fundamentally is just feelings and thoughts that want things and therefore your existence is going to reflect those feelings and thoughts" is actually much more complicated than it seems. You want things unconsciously and consciously. It seems though that if you don't consciously understand everything that you want then your existence is simply going to be less because you cannot comprehend what it would be like to receive that reward (of what you want). If you cannot comprehend what it is that you want (consciously and unconsciously) then you probably aren't going to be able to experience pleasure from it.

## Chapter 8

# A Look beyond the 16 Personality Types: Why they aren't Sufficient<sup>1</sup>

To every person there are going to be basic psychological traits that would say to compose the majority of who that person is, and these traits could be called the fundamentals of their psyche. At first glance it might seem like just a standard personality analysis would show what the fundamentals of their psyche are, but a deeper look into their mind is needed. There are only a few personality types, yet two people with the same personality type could be completely different. Therefore there needs to be more to analyze about someone other than what their personality type is. There needs to be more tests or questions available to lay people that they can use to analyze themselves in a way in which they can understand.

The 16 personality types don't address deeper questions people should asking about themselves that would truly separate out each individual, not just 16 different types. For instance the statement from the descriptions of the personality types "interested in how and why things work" could be made more elaborate. Interested in how and why what things work? That could be broken down into interested in how: politics, mechanics, psychology, cognitive science, math, English, history, foreign language, the sciences, any subject, any aspect of psychology, or any aspects of any of those subjects.

The statement "can be depended on to follow through" is included in a description of the personality types as well. But to follow through in what instances? In social ones? In a work environment? For personal goal setting?

The descriptions of the personality types are broad and could be misinterpreted and people could classify themselves as things that they aren't if they don't look closely enough. For instance, saying "detached and analytical" could be interpreted to mean "logical in all cases, cold and cruel". In reality that person might be slightly detached or slightly analytical, the two don't necessarily go together. And it could mean detached and analytical in only some instances or in some subject matters. Someone can be analytical in one subject area but not in another. Or only analytical when it comes to academics, versus social situations. A psychologist might be analytical when it comes to emotional things, but not analytical with say, science.

"Does not like conflict" could mean personal conflict, group conflict, or wars and even political movements, like say the conflict between being communist or being for democracy.

"Risk takers who live for the moment" could only be applied in certain situations. In fact, the questions "when does this apply exactly?" and "how does this go into effect" could be applied when analyzing everything said about the personality types.

"Loyal and faithful" – someone may only be loyal and faithful to their friends, and put down their enemies - does "loyal and faithful" mean weak?

"Uncomplicated in their desires" – Does this mean that the person doesn't like doing things as much since they have simpler desires? Or does it mean that they are simpler people? That when they want to do something, they aren't picky? What instances does this apply, someone might be picky in some instances,

---

<sup>1</sup>This content is available online at <<http://cnx.org/content/m16178/1.8/>>.

but not in others. If someone is uncomplicated in their desires, does this imply that they are simpler at analyzing things since they might not see as many details, like how they wouldn't see details in what it is that they want? Does it imply a lower emotional intelligence since someone with a high emotional intelligence would probably be more specific about what it is that they want, since they know more about what it is that they want. Or does it mean that they want to live a simpler lifestyle?

“Stable and practical” – those two might not necessarily go together, just because someone is stable doesn't mean that they are also practical. Someone looking at the description of the personality types might not question that if they read the description, they might just then start assuming that if they are stable, they are going to be practical. Analyzing a personality needs to be done critically, with caution and a questioning mind (especially when reading blanket statements about what that type of personality is – one shouldn't take a personality analysis and assume that they are going to be exactly like that). Also, it shouldn't be assumed that that analysis is all that that person is (if it is even accurate) one could go into much more detail, and no one is probably just completely one personality, (even if certain traits are likely to go together) but it is logical that they are mix of many, many different things.

“Well organized and hard working” – again, do the two necessarily go together - someone can be hard working but not be organized. Someone could be well organized in many different things, not just in academics and common life, but in specific fields and at specific tasks, that isn't specified. Also, hard working, but does this mean that they are passionate about their work or that they want to do it? Or just that they do it when they have to? Do they want to be organized as well?

“Extremely thorough, responsible, and dependable” – once again the three might not go together, but it should also be noted that maybe they do work well together in some people. Does the person like having those traits? That question ties into a larger question, what are their main goals with their personality? What are they trying to achieve socially with their personality, or otherwise with their personality? Just describing traits doesn't show the intent or motivation of the person. In fact, if you look at it that way, by asking “what is this person trying to achieve” you get a much closer and “together” or “whole” look at who that person is. All of the descriptions of the personality traits don't address if the person is trying to achieve that. People should take the personality traits and analyze if that is who they want to be. The more they think about who they are, the more answers they will find.

“Well developed powers of concentration” – does that statement mean that the person is also more calm and better at meditating? Does it mean that they are also more detached since they can separate themselves from emotional swings? Does it mean that they can perform certain tasks better because of this concentration? Which tasks?

“Usually interested in supporting and promoting traditions and establishments” – does this mean long standing traditions and establishments more so than new ones? That would make this person more conservative instead of liberal. Or is it just someone who likes things that are ordered and structured, which are likely to be things like traditions and establishments?

“They work steadily towards identified goals” – does this make this person more organized since it is identified goals that they are working towards, instead of more motivated which would mean working towards all goals. The fact that they work towards “identified” goals means that they also might make more goals for themselves? Does that mean that they are more motivated about life as well?

“They can usually accomplish any task once they have set their mind to it” – that statement shouldn't be taken literally, maybe it means that they are very determined, not necessarily that they are very skilled. It might be they can't accomplish any tasks in certain fields at all.

“Loyal to their peers and to their internal value systems” – does this mean that the two go together? That someone is just a better person if they are loyal to their peers, so then they are also therefore going to stand by their values? If you aren't loyal to your friends does that mean that you might not also be loyal to yourself (which might mean being loyal to your internal value system). If you are loyal to your own value system does that mean you respect your own ideas more? Someone could have not decided which values to take on in life but still might have the value of being loyal to their peers and is strongly attached to only that value.

The next statement following the last one - “loyal to their peers and to their internal value systems, but

not overly concerned with respecting laws and rules if they get in the way of getting something done.” So they might only respect their own opinions, but not other peoples opinions or the opinions of a law or a rule? So they respect their own opinions, their peers, but not the people who write the laws. What if they have a value that is also a rule or a law, and it gets in the way of something they want done? Why are they loyal to their friends but not loyal to laws? Does this make them evil or good people? What exactly is going on here?

“Have an exceptional ability to turn theories into solid plans of action” – does that mean that they are reliable people that are practical? Or does it mean that they act on what they say? Does it mean that they are less frivolous since they don't just theorize but also actually plan? Are they less silly then?

References

Quotes are from [personalitypage.com](http://personalitypage.com) (January 3, 2008)



## Chapter 9

# What to Do About Negative Emotions<sup>1</sup>

1. All emotions and feelings (positive and negative) arise from situations and stimuli in the physical world
2. Those emotions and feelings turn into thoughts in one's head that can either be (+) or (-) (negative emotions amplify probability of negative thoughts which are of the same nature as the corresponding emotion)
3. One can track the progression from stimuli to emotion/feeling to thought, and any other changes or developments that may arise from one specific emotion or feeling (i.e. other emotions or feelings, the changes in severity of emotional feeling, such as spikes etc.)
4. In abstracting and analyzing this progression one begins to remove oneself from the (+/-) emotions/thoughts themselves and brings themselves into a state of logical reasoning
5. In an abstracted state of logical reasoning the issues under analyzation become de-personalized, [as in they can even be viewed as emotions not belonging to you but to said subject person A who doesn't really exist].
6. As one attempts to logically analyze these thoughts, as if they belong to another person and not oneself, one becomes calm simply through the process of logical reasoning.
7. In addition to the calming process created through the logical reasoning and the gaining of distance from one's upsetting thoughts/emotions/feelings, one is now in a state from which one can start to understand the causes and reasons for one's negative feelings, emotions and thoughts
8. Once these causes have been identified, and the person is in a calmer state of mind through logical reasoning and abstraction, it becomes more possible to identify possible ways to prevent and/or alleviate the development of harmful negative feelings/emotions/thoughts in the future (as in, through asking oneself, was this stimuli worth the strong negative reaction I experienced from it? Etc).

The Eight-Fold Path; What you can do about it:

1. Recognize that all your emotions/feelings have a source
2. Identify source of negative feelings/emotions
3. Identify source of (a) positive feeling for comparison
4. Try and determine why source (stimuli) caused negative/positive emotion
5. Recognize that your negative emotion/feelings caused specific negative thoughts which may in turn cause further negative emotion
6. Identify the specific negative thought (if you can do this during the strongest part of your negative thought you will be most capable to combat it through creating the highest contrast- as in, become as clear thinking and logical as possible during the moment of high emotion to best remove yourself from the emotional moment) It is important to do this during the strongest parts of the negative thought/emotion/feeling (this can be applied for long term depressions, or short anger tantrums, or short feelings of sadness, or short or

---

<sup>1</sup>This content is available online at <<http://cnx.org/content/m14329/1.4/>>.

long feelings of any negative emotion you don't want) In order to do that that means you have to closely follow your emotions so you can identify which parts are the worst, if you follow them even more closely you will recognize that sometimes there are sharp spikes upwards of negative thought, and if you could use this method during those times it would be best.

(Through this pattern one stops and thinks about ones emotions/feelings in a logical/abstracted manner thereby removing oneself from the feelings themselves. Therefore logical reasoning becomes a therapeutic action by which the person starts to feel calm even in the action of analyzing his/her own emotions. This has the potential to combat depression in two ways:1) by first removing the person from their own emotional torment for the moment of analyzation 2) once in this state the person is in a better position to come to conclusions as to why they have developed negative thoughts/emotions 3) once certain conclusions have been discovered as to why the person has developed negative feelings/emotions/thoughts, in combination with the greater state of calm induced by logical reasoning, the person then has a greater capacity to find ways to prevent and/or lessen current negative thoughts/emotions/feelings.)

7. Try and determine why the emotion caused a positive or negative thought

8. Ask yourself: (are you certain your depression is justified i.e. are you reacting appropriately to the outside world i.e. do you need to be depressed? i.e. can you be responding positively instead of negatively? Do the negative feelings/emotions/thoughts need to be negative? Are you giving too much attention to your negative emotions (or the stimuli that caused them); are they this important? Thinking about positive emotions enhances positive emotions...)



## Chapter 10

# Definition of Spirituality<sup>1</sup>

What is the definition of spirituality? I like this definition: predominantly spiritual character as shown in thought, life, etc.; spiritual tendency or tone. Something needs to be added to that what this "spiritual" character is, however. I would say that it is the same attitude that a religious person would have about being religious, that is, by "spiritual character" they mean someone who is likely to be religious. Spirit is someone's soul, so spirituality would be focused on the self, but focused on the self in a manner in which they can understand it more deeply than just standard cognitive thinking about it, so religion might help you understand yourself in that "higher" manner. That is, it is almost like faith to believe in yourself like that, so it is like religion. The relationship between faith/religion and spirituality then is that both are "higher" methods of understanding the world. Spirituality is just focused on the self, while religion is focused on god. So there is an inner peace that spirituality brings because spirituality is about yourself. You can also say it is about your soul, not just your state of being, because soul is who you really are, the core of yourself, and if you are more connected to the core of yourself you are going to be more at peace, and therefore have more of that spiritual connection, which is one that is a "higher" connection to yourself, like how religion is a "high" connection to god. This "high" connection is higher because it is connected to who you really are, which is the spirit part of spirituality which implies a soul, because when you imagine someone as being a spirit or a ghost you take away their physical form and focus more on who they are mentally, or the core of their being or soul. Also use of the word soul, like that is using energy from your soul, appeals more to your higher morals which you would consider to be more consistent with who you are at the core.

---

<sup>1</sup>This content is available online at <<http://cnx.org/content/m15871/1.4/>>.



## Chapter 11

# Definition of Literacy<sup>1</sup>

If someone can read and write, that means that they would then have to have a large cognitive capacity to understand the communication. The ability to speak conveys meaning, so the same intellect used in speaking would be used in reading and writing. However, words written down are usually going to be longer than normal conversations, so literacy would mean the ability to understand entire books, articles, or even something as short as a paragraph, which isn't used in speech in the same way the same meaning or message would be communicated if it was written. In fact, reading and writing is just speech but doing it for longer periods of time. It could be for the same period of time, but it is usually going to be longer. That means that different mental abilities are going to be used for reading and writing since you are dealing with something that usually has one theme or main idea, but is very long. You could have a conversation about one thing for a long period of time, but this conversation isn't going to be structured to maximize understanding of the topic. When something long is written, it is put down in a certain pattern or way that itself communicates a message from the author, even if the author just meant to put it down in the most logical way possible. So literacy would then include understanding what complicated messages (which can be understanding of any sort – math, fiction, etc) mean, and how they can be understood in different ways, and the best way to structure and order it so understanding is maximized. That is even more important if you are the writer.

At the sentence level that type of understanding might be aided by better understanding how the parts of the sentence relate to each other, or grammar. This is a link to my article titled "The definition and meaning of the words "idea", "thought" and "sentence" [cnx.org/content/m14812/](http://cnx.org/content/m14812/) (Chapter 14). But the rest of the piece relates to itself in other ways as well, and since it is going to be long and written down, each piece might contribute to the same idea. So literacy means understanding long passages, not just being able to read but a higher level of literacy would mean being able to put together a lot of information that is related to varying degrees and link it to a few ideas. So if you are reading a math book, and relate something in the end of the book to something in the beginning, you are a good reader, or more literate. That shows how the definition of literacy can vary greatly because math might be very different from say, reading a story of fiction. Literacy also means understanding the implications and subtle messages a text might convey – that would be a higher degree of literacy anyway. The math book example shows how literacy can cover any mental ability, so then what is the main idea of literacy, it is not just anything someone can understand. It is things that people can understand that is written down, or that they write down, it is the ability to structure large amounts of material in a logical fashion (or if it is a story, structure large amounts of material for emotional appeal, so really any fashion you want, but it is ultimately going to serve an end, or be logical). Unless you are the sentence level, then literacy is the ability to understand a sentence and relate each part of the sentence to other parts of the sentence. In terms of understanding a word (word level) literacy might mean understanding all the possible implications of that one word. The word “store” might mean any type of store. So things at the word level can be very complicated even if it is a simple word, it might be deceiving in context.

---

<sup>1</sup>This content is available online at <http://cnx.org/content/m15760/1.8/>.

How would “literacy” if someone were reading a math book, be different from just the ability to understand math? It would mean how someone is comprehending that book, it would mean the way in which they understand math. How they put together the knowledge of the entire book. Math is just like reading a fiction book, different parts of a math problem relate to other parts in a logical way. If it is explained in that logical way, then someone would use literacy to understand it because literacy is putting together information in a logical manner so that one can read or write what meaning they want to convey.

So literacy isn’t just the ability to read and write, it is the ability to understand what you are reading as well. One cannot read unless they understand what they are reading. So someone might not be literate in math if they cannot do any math textbook. In fact, if you cannot understand something written in specific, then you are not literate for that. In English this might mean that if you are more literate you would be able to get all the hidden meanings that could lie in the text. There is basic literacy and advanced literacy, there are levels to it.

In fact, that is all life is, figuring out how different parts of it relate to each other. This can mean emotional parts as well as physical, simple or complex parts. Unless it is just one part, and you don’t want to know if it relates to anything else. But any one part is going to be made up of its own parts. Unless you are a physicist who thinks that if you break something down far enough at some level it is going to just be one part. But that really is made itself up of different parts that you can see of that one part, you can get infinitesimally small units of that one thing that is somehow bonded to the other parts, it is like an infinitely small number.

## Chapter 12

# Consciousness is Thoughts and Emotions: A Whole Brain Approach<sup>1</sup>

When someone thinks, “What is consciousness?” they might at first associate just thinking to consciousness, or, as Descarte said, “I think, therefore I am”. This, however, is not completely true because people also have emotions and feelings which also contribute to who they are. The statement should really be, “I think and feel therefore I am”. Is consciousness just thoughts and feelings that you can identify, so when you have a thought or when you feel you have a feeling are you then conscious – but not conscious when you don’t have as tangible thoughts and feelings? It certainly seems like one is conscious when they are feeling something they can really feel and think, and by that logic consciousness then is really just you feeling alive. But Descarte said “I think, therefore I am”, so maybe consciousness is more a function of thought and therefore related more to logic and understanding your place in the world then just “feeling alive”. But when you feel alive, or are more energetic, you are also going to be more aware of your place in the world because you are more alert. So it is really, “I think, and therefore I can understand who I am, but this understanding also becomes enhanced when I am feeling a lot too”. That means that your long term consciousness is determined by your understanding of who you are, which comes from your ability to think, and your short term consciousness comes from your ability to feel and think.

---

<sup>1</sup>This content is available online at <<http://cnx.org/content/m15625/1.7/>>.



## Chapter 13

# How Beauty Can Be Quantified<sup>1</sup>

In order to quantify beauty we first need to come up with a scientific measure of attractiveness. Why are some things ugly and other things attractive? Attractive means appealing and why do some things cause pleasure visually while others don't. You can compare attractive objects to find the answer! Some pretty things have an organization to them, a structure to them like a messy room wouldn't be pretty because there isn't any structure. With structure it's easier to separate the objects in your head so it's not confusing and it's easy and pleasurable to "think" about (maybe you see confusion so the emotion is created in your mind, and you become confused). What about a star versus a circle? The star is more complicated than the circle. That is why it is more beautiful (a simple circle is clearly very plain compared to a star, so maybe because there is more think about with the star it is stimulating and therefore beautiful. Just think of your mind as a computer, the star would take more processing power to analyze. So what about a circle versus a square? The circle is one line but the square is 4 lines that's why the circle is more appealing, it isn't as jagged or rough so feel more cozy with the circle. A square looks flat and that's unattractive for similar reasons. Rough things might seem unattractive because when you touch them they feel bad (or you could say they are less wholesome in your mind causing them to generate more pain because people want to feel comforted). So your opinion is biased. A circle is easy to think about because you only have to think about one line. Since the star has more lines than the square and it's more beautiful, so maybe a triangle is prettier than a square (because a triangle looks like a star)? But a triangle is prettier than the circle because it is more complicated. So a square is too complicated, a star is just complicated enough, a triangle is a little less complicated than that, and the circle is too simple. So in order of prettiness there is star, triangle, circle, then square.

You can take that analysis of basic shapes and apply it to all other objects because all objects consist of some pattern of those basic shapes or shapes similar to them. Like the cushions of a couch might be pleasant because they are round and we described the circle as more pleasant than a square because it is round.

More Examples:

A dog would prettier (or cuter, more appealing) than a circle because it's more complicated than the circle, the circle is too easy to think about. A dog is much more interesting because it has many more lines that flow nicely and is cute. The star, however, is more pretty than the dog because it's more complicated, the dog might be cuter but since the triangle is structured it is more perfect and therefore more appealing in a pretty way, instead of a cute way like the dog. The dog is one wandering line but a triangle is more structured and structure is going to generally be considered to be more pretty and appealing. The star/triangles however with its structure is harsher to look at with the sharp edges, a dog doesn't have any sharp edges. Like wrinkles might be considered to be uglier than a plain face because the plain straight face is cleaner and more structured.

There is more than just lines that makes something beautiful and ugly, however like color and brightness and texture. Crystal is usually more pretty than glass, it is because it is shinier and brighter so it catches

---

<sup>1</sup>This content is available online at <<http://cnx.org/content/m14303/1.7/>>.

your eye, you don't have to try hard to focus on it, so it's easier to think about and therefore more beautiful. If you could only see in black and white you would probably think the world is uglier than it is with color because with color you can more easily separate objects because they are more different from each other with all the colors. You could also compare it to seeing in just say green and blue. Black and white are also less bright than the rest of the colors, so it would be harder to see things because they wouldn't stand out as much and it would be harder to see. Therefore it would be harder to think about the objects causing less pleasure and cause you to name them as uglier. That's probably why the color gold is usually prettier because it is very shiny and attractive, it draws the eye and is easy to notice (hence think about). So there are different factors in beauty one is color/brightness the other is its structure and what shape the object takes and how big it is.

Start with what you have there (above) and try to come up with more examples to explore quantitatively figuring out beauty more.

Like when you look at a book, you see a flat plain on one side, and sharp edges. Looking at the edges doesn't cause pleasure because they are sharp, but because they are lines, it further causes pleasure because they are nice, straight, even lines. Looking at the face of the book, (the large flat area) causes a more peaceful type of pleasure that you get when looking at any wide open large flat area/plain, like a peaceful, calm lake. That's because there aren't any lines in the space to distract your mind, so it's peaceful.

Take that idea further, what feeling now do you get when you look at a line that curves? As your eye travels over it, you have to pause mentally to see it curve, your mind stops and pauses at the curve, which means you need to put more mental effort to see it, and since being active causes pleasure, this causes you more pleasure by causing more neurons to fire from the effort. You get that feeling when you look at a curving line too, not just one that curves suddenly, because your mind can't just go from one point to the next, it has to slow down and follow the curve.

Now put everything I said about lines and curves together, and try to get the larger picture of how it all works together, so you can sense the feeling of how beautiful each thing is.

Anything in life is made up of lines and curves. Since you know how much pleasure each line gives you, just add up the pleasure from all the lines in a certain object, (like a person, or a box) and subtract all the annoyance trying to look at that object causes you (sometimes an object has too many lines, unlike a lake, and it would cause head pain if you look at it too closely), so subtract the negative feelings from the positive ones to get the total pleasure looking at the object causes you. Just add up each line, each curve, each time your mind pauses (unconsciously and consciously) how each one of those unconscious pauses causes pleasure or pain and how much pleasure or pain. I showed you what an unconscious pause was when I showed a sharp curve or an angle with two lines meeting at a point, it would be a bigger pause to stop at the point, and a slower pause to see a curve, and slower and slower of a pause until that curve becomes a line, which has no mental pauses (conscious or unconscious) because you just look at the line, your mind doesn't have to consciously or unconsciously follow it around corners or up or down along the curve, it just goes from one point to the next. So when you're stopped and looking at something for a long time, your eye follows its lines, that's what happens when you look at it for a short time as well, only it happens mostly unconsciously and is what causes pleasure or pain to look at the object, and in differing amounts.

We need to relate this to our real experience of seeing things, and the real pleasure and real feelings we experience when we see them. Take looking at a lake. Isolate the pleasure and feelings you get when you look at the lake. If it's a large lake, you probably get a peaceful, calm feeling. Or even looking at nature scenes brings a sense peace and calmness to you, that's why they show pictures of prairies on a plane before it takes off, to calm down the passengers before the scary flight. What is beautiful about a lake or those nature scenes is that they are both large areas with all the lines connecting smoothly, moving about slowly and naturally in a way that is easy for your eye to follow. If something is easy for your eye to follow then it causes some mental stimulation, which is pleasurable, in fact, it causes the right amount of mental stimulation per minute, not too much too fast, (like how sharp edges cause you to pause over them suddenly, which hurts your mind because your eye has to stop (consciously or unconsciously) and go in another direction). That's why lake and nature scenes are pleasurable, because they give the right amount of stimulation per minute. Each line that is easy to look at is a smooth, flowing line that causes pleasure. So add up all the lines and



you are just looking at a bunch of smooth, flowing lines that cause pleasure, yet fit in together so you don't have to repeat looking at each different one. Now analyze why you feel good when you look at a lake or a calming nature scene, it's for the reasons above. Those same principles of lines apply when you look at anything; just apply those principles to anything you look at.

To get the happy, peaceful feeling you get when you look at a lake, that feeling comes from all the lines in the lake. What are those lines? They are each wave or one wave, times one hundred, making up the entire lake, plus each blank space in between each wave. So just looking at one wave, or tiny wave that makes up lakes, I guess you could call them large ripples, won't cause pleasure by itself, but looking at all of them does. People are like lakes, they are made up lots of tiny lines added together. Try to add up all the lines and see what the feeling you get from all the lines added up is, not just one of the lines. To get the feeling a certain type of line causes, you can't just look at that one line to see what the feeling is, you have to take that one line and multiple it by a hundred or more, (like when looking at a lake) to see what the feeling the line causes. Then you can take each line and find out what its feeling is. Then when you have a bunch of different lines, you know the feeling for each little line, just add up the feelings of all the different little lines to get the feeling of the entire thing. People aren't just made up of curvy lines with blank spaces in between like lakes. To get the feeling of one curvy line with blank space around it (as in a lake) look at the entire lake and then divide by how much smaller one little wave is with blank area around it, and you then get the feeling for blank space with wave in it. You can look at that feeling (or feel that feeling) and then get the feeling for little, blank space, or little wave. You can then imagine what the feeling for large wave is (just multiply it by the little wave) or large blank space (just multiply it by the feeling of little small space). Since everything in life (including people) is made up of little wavy lines or little straight lines (straight lines from the book, wavy lines from the waves) or blank empty spaces in between (from looking at the spaces on the lake or the blank space in the center of the book cover). You can get the feeling for anything! Just add up all its individual lines, waves, and spaces. Make sure to cover each spot, until you get the entire space that you are looking at. And you can compare each spot to a wave, line, or space, as that is what everything is made up of.

Also when things form together it results in a different impression as well. Say if you were looking at something jagged, well that's lots of individual things which may look pretty by themselves, but together they look ugly because they don't match with the other thing. Or your eye has to pause from one thing to the next (so it's like pausing over an angle or a sharp curve, your mind has to slow down or your eye has to slow down when it hits the bend or angle because it has to stop). So your mind might have to stop a lot when looking at something jagged, but when looking at a lake it can process all the pretty waves and go smoothly from one wave to the next, instead of being interrupted. So the wave gives the right amount of stimulation, say if each wave was the same as each other wave, it would be boring looking at the entire lake, but since each wave is different it's fun to look at the entire lake, your mind and eye doesn't have to stop suddenly anywhere, and everything is different, new, and interesting. The large dynamic line structure of the lake is both pleasing and interesting and peaceful.

So it was easy to analyze how the lakes make you feel because it is just the combination of many similar lines or units of space. The way each line combines with the space around it is the same for each wave. A person has many different types of lines interacting with each other, so you have to look at how each line combines with the space around it. Say how a circle would interact with a square, instead of (with the lake) a wave interacting with a large blank space around it, than more waves and more blank spaces. We showed in the beginning that a circle was peaceful to look at because your eye never gets interrupted, but it causes pain to look too closely at a square because of the four sharp edges your eye has to stop at. So when you look at a circle that is in a square, or a square in a circle, you get the feeling of the square and the circle. Someone's face is made up of different angles as well, and things that look like squares and circles. Take each individual part, add them up, and you get the feeling for the entire face. Then do that to each arm, leg, major body part, and then see how each fits with each other, to get a look at the whole person, and how they appear. So individual parts of an object each add their own beauty to the whole, you can literally add up the parts to see what the feeling the entire thing causes is.

If you're projecting feelings for something but not actually looking at it, then you just aren't looking

closely enough at the lines and angles. You can actually enhance the feeling of anything you look at by looking at it more closely. If you find that you can't look at something more closely, then unconsciously you don't want to look at it because you're projecting a false image of how that actually looks. So take the lake. If you just look at it for a second, you don't get a sense of peace and calmness, but if you pause and look at it thoughtfully, then you realize that it brings a sense of peace and happiness. If you're projecting that sense will never be there. You need to be in a normal, non-psychotic state of mind to properly appreciate beauty. It requires deep thought (and a calm mind) to appreciate true beauty. Like if you rush looking over the sharp angle (in the book) you wouldn't pause over it and you wouldn't really even see the book at all.

If you're just jumping from a sight to a feeling (you shouldn't get a strong feeling when you look at something because it is just something visual) then you don't have a clear state of mind. Make sure your mind is clear when you look at things in order to get a sense of its true beauty. You won't be able to take any pleasure looking at something if you are associating it with something else, because the fact is you can take pleasure from looking at anything in life, since it is all visual stimulation. You must have a preconceived notion about how someone that looks like what you are looking at should look to get that false feeling. That false feeling could come from anything, some inner fear you have of the world manifesting itself. A lack of self confidence leading you to believe you are a failure and worthless. That would lead to you think you are ugly,

if you think something, then when you look at it all you have to do is associate that thought with the object you are looking at.

So when you look at something and are appreciating it for its beauty, you should get a sensation, not a feeling. That's because everything visual is a sensation, not a feeling you get that would result from something psychological, or something deeply psychological. You know what a sensation is compared to a feeling because sensations are shallower things resulting from a different part of your brain. Sensations like touching, if you touch an object it might result in a feeling, like a feeling of a remembrance of a memory of when you were near that object before, but you can focus on the feeling from the physical sensation of touching it, or the physical sensation of seeing it, not thought or feelings that come up from deep inside your own mind which don't relate to how the thing actually appears or looks. And the feelings those looks or touching it or whatever causes you.

Only if you have an exceptionally strong feeling associated with the object would the feeling override the sensation of looking at it. It's logical to feel a sensation when looking at something because that is what you're doing, looking. You're not thinking about something that might cause a different feeling or any feeling at all, looking at things simply shouldn't result in feelings, just sensations. Looking and touching and smelling aren't deep emotions or feelings at all. Well the sensation of looking might cause a feeling of the sensation, but not a feeling of a thought in your head (say that you are ugly). There shouldn't be any thoughts when you look at something, just your natural, unhindered appreciation of how it looks. I say appreciation because it takes work to look at anything, and that work makes your mind contented by relieving it from boredom.

So it's clear that if the connection between an image and the sensation of that image is broken, you have a problem. Every image should have a sensation, because that's what seeing is, it's a sensation not an emotion. That sensation is just a sensation, and nothing more. The only reason it might be connected (the image) might be connected to an emotion is if the sensation you get when looking at something you have thoughts about, ah that sensation is an ugly sensation, or that sensation is a good sensation, therefore the object must be pretty. You just need to relate the image to a sensation, then the sensation to an emotion or feeling, not the image directly to an emotion. Your intellectual mind is overriding your natural feelings. It is very hard to explain why that is happening.

Why would someone's intellectual mind override their natural feelings about something? There must be some strong fear of the natural feeling. You would know if you have a fear about something if when you pause to think about it, you feel a slight (or large) sense of fear. Even a slight sense of fear about something might cause you to avoid the real feeling, because at a glance that slight fear is tiny, but if you paused over the fear it would become very large. So then it wouldn't be a tiny fear, but a large one. So that person simply isn't confronting their fear over the issue. To avoid the slight amount of fear they get over looking

at something, they simply replace it with a larger emotion (something like, I'm ugly) which is worse than the actual sensation of just the feeling! They need to let that natural pause take place when the slight fear comes in, allowing them to experience the full fear. Then they can logically analyze it and see if that fear is actually rational.

So, basically, you need to confront your fear in order to figure out if you are blocking any sensations. In any event, at least don't associate a wrong sensation or emotion to what you are actually looking at.

We can further analyze how things look and therefore how they make us feel. So we figured out that flat surfaces make us feel good because they are peaceful, like the lake. If you pause and stare intently at any flat surface you get a sense of peace and happiness. The size of the flat surface changes the happy or sad emotions you are experiencing as well, if it was a very very large flat surface, like a plain outside in the wilderness, you would get a sense of awe because your eye can wander in any direction and you wouldn't have to stop your eye, and that would be even more peaceful in a way. Or something like a soda can has a small flat surface that is easy to look at because it is small so it isn't a lot to process, so it's fun to look at because it causes pleasure but doesn't overwhelm your eye by being too much to see. Something like the flat surface of a desk causes a little more pleasure (because of the larger flat surface) but it isn't as fun because your eye doesn't get to jump around as much due to the larger space, it would jump around more slowly. Now you are starting to get an idea of how you can take anything in your environment, or everything in your environment, put it all together, and get a general sense of how vision effects your emotions and how you are feeling at any given time.

So when you're in an office with mostly a desk you feel at peace because of the large flat surface of the desk which is separated by the floor by a large distance that makes the flat surface stand out so you notice it more and get more pleasure by looking at it. A flat surface on a wall causes some pleasure but not as much as the desk because it doesn't stand out as much. The floor of the room causes some pleasure, less than the desk and more than the walls, cause there is probably some pattern on it or it has a more appealing color/shininess than the walls. Like a stone, wood, or carpeted floor would have more shine to it than the ordinarily dull walls, that shine naturally draws in our eye which makes it easier to see, and, therefore, more pleasurable. Objects on the floor also stand out a lot because they are in three dimensions and very much unlike the walls and floor, and even the desk because the objects are small and stick out a lot like little towers. The desk your eye can't isolate because it is too big, and it doesn't have a pattern on it. The carpet on the floor would be more pleasing to look at than the desk because it has a pattern on it. The desk just isn't as much detail, but on the other hand the desk is probably more peaceful, the fact that it stands out more than the wall (because it is more 3d) makes you pay more attention to that flat, peaceful surface so it's a flat, peaceful surface that you are drawn into. The fact that you are drawn into it makes it more pleasing because you don't have to put as much effort into trying to analyze it as deeply. So now we have all the major aspects of the room analyzed and quantified for beauty.

Something like the sun causes peace and wonder because it is a large ball surrounded by a huge emptiness, the sky. The sky causes wonder and is a little daunting because it is so big and intimidating, it seems to even have a depth to it so your eye can wander through it at any level and you'd be wondering what is in there.

Looking at grass is like looking at a pincushion, there are multiple sharp points which your eye clearly focuses on, so it's like jumping around from one thing to another very fast, almost being traumatic to look at that takes so much effort to do. A mirror would be more pleasurable to look at because of its flat surface than a closed curtain, which is very wavy. That flat surface causes peace because your eye can stop and pause, but with the curvy surface you can't pause. It is interesting to see what happens to your feelings when you take your eye and go over objects slowly.



## Chapter 14

# The definition and meaning of the words "idea", "thought" and "sentence".<sup>1</sup>

Why are the definitions of the words "idea" and "thought" important? Their meanings seem simple when first looking at it, an idea or thought is something you think that involves an action, it can be a strong idea and a strong thought that is clear. If the thought is strong and clear it could be considered to have a higher level of consciousness, you are more aware of the thought if it is clear.

When you break a thought or a sentence down into its parts, it is broken down grammatically. There are parts of the sentence that correspond to real things happening in real life, some of the things are people, some are objects, and the various parts of the sentence relate to each other. You are also conscious of either both the entire sentence, thought or idea or conscious of individual parts of it, or both. Each time you think something it is going to be different, each time you think one word such as "go" the meaning is going to be different depending on the context. There is a generic meaning for go that applies each time, but each time the meaning is going to be different because the circumstance is different. Similarly the emotions involved and the consciousness and awareness of the word is going to be different each time. Different parts of the sentence could raise to consciousness in different ways and at different levels.

Also how well you understand the definition of each word in an idea or thought can change the level of consciousness involved. On one level a thought can be simple to understand, or a thought could be extremely complicated with many deep unconscious factors. If you think of a thought as just a simple sentence involving one action that is done, then it seems simple. On the other hand a thought could have many unconscious implications or deeper meaning involved. One word in the thought or sentence could have a deeper meaning or the whole idea could.

How could someone break down a sentence? How do you describe how the parts relate? Can you say, this leads to that, and so forth? Is a sentence just a flow chart with each individual thing involved leading to something else and it is that straightforward? You can break it down into the things in it. The sentence, idea or thought "I am a person" consists of the idea of you, which is described with the words "I am" and the idea that you are a person, described with the words "a person". You could take it to the next level and say that the words "a person" influence the meaning of the words "i am" and say that you are describing yourself as a person, so you are a person. So the two parts of the sentence aren't individual and separate, the meaning of one part greatly impacts the meaning of the other part. In fact, that is the whole point, that is why the words were put together in the first place, so the meaning of one part would influence the meaning of the other part.

There are many types of relationships that can be formed in a sentence or an idea, basically every type of relationship that is possible in life can be described and contained in a sentence. A bad relationship can be described in a sentence, "This happened and it was bad" that is describing a bad relationship. It is saying that what happened was bad, so there is a bad relationship in the sentence. The relationship between what

---

<sup>1</sup>This content is available online at <<http://cnx.org/content/m14812/1.11/>>.

happened and your feelings about it. There is implied there that you feel bad about it. If something bad happened, it makes sense that you are going to feel bad about it. That would be a more subtle level of detail and meaning involved. On one hand it is obvious that if something bad happens you feel bad about it, on the other hand it could be a very complex thing that is hard to figure out the meaning of. That is what sentences, ideas and thoughts are like, they are very simple on the surface sometimes, but could be very complicated in the details frequently.

1. is, are, was, or will be doing\* (this is the relationship between a subject and a verb, the subject is doing the verb) so the relationship between I and run in the sentence "I run" is that you "are doing" the running.

There can be one part of a sentence or idea that is more important than another part, or only one part that has a deeper meaning.

Various parts of each idea relate to other ideas or different parts of that one idea itself in various ways. They are connected or not connected (independent) to various degrees.

In fact, you could spend a lot of time thinking about one idea, sentence or thought and break it down into all its parts, its obvious surface meaning and its more subtle meaning. The more subtle meaning could involve deep unconscious factors.

So if you are reading a sentence, or thinking about an idea and don't understand all of its parts, just isolate the part that you don't understand and think more about it. Another question to ponder is - is it a whole idea if you only don't understand the entire thing? You could read a sentence but does that mean that the sentence becomes a single idea in your head?

If a sentence has multiple parts and is very complicated, do you think about it in your mind as a single simple thing, do you summarize it to yourself to achieve faster recall? Say you had to remember a paragraph, even if you just read the paragraph there are all those parts you have to remember, in your mind you probably automatically summarize it or if not that maybe you automatically remember just a single part of it because that is what you were focusing on.

If you were taking a test and had to answer questions on the paragraph you would probably try to summarize the paragraph in your mind so that you could remember more of it. In fact, in order to understand the gist of what someone is saying you have to put all of the information together to understand the complete message. When someone is saying something there could be a few main things they are saying that you could understand, you don't have to remember every little detail they said most of the time.

It is obvious that sentences and paragraphs have multiple parts and each part their own meaning that might be more or less independent than the other parts. All the parts might contribute to one main idea or several main ideas. One person could have trouble recalling or understanding certain types of ideas. So it might not be that someone has a problem reading complex sentences, it could be that they have a problem understanding complicated ideas. Maybe they understand the ideas if they are spoken to them. What is the exact difference between their verbal learning and their ability to read the same material? That is something to think about that could help decipher someones problem. It could be a way of isolating if the problem has to do with reading the words or a problem with understanding the ideas.

This is a link to my connexions article titled "Emotions and Feelings and the Difference Between them"  
[cnx.org/content/m14334/2](http://cnx.org/content/m14334/2)

---

<sup>2</sup>"Emotions and Feelings and the Difference Between them" <<http://cnx.org/content/m14334/latest/>>

## Chapter 15

# Lauren Caitlin Upton Answered Question Intelligently<sup>1</sup>

This was her question:

Q: Recent polls have shown a fifth of Americans can't locate the U.S. on a world map. Why do you think this is?

Her answer:

During the 2007 pageant: "I personally believe that U.S. Americans are unable to do so because, um, some people out there in our nation don't have maps and, uh, I believe that our, uh, education like such as, uh, South Africa and, uh, the Iraq and everywhere like such as, and I believe that they should, uh, our education over here in the U.S. should help the U.S., uh, should help South Africa and should help Iraq and the Asian countries, so we will be able to build up our future."

She meant that we should raise our priorities on education and foreign awareness, she just said this indirectly. She said in a more complicated and intelligent way that the united states should promote education in other countries. If we did that then our awareness of world countries would rise, which would cause us to place a higher priority on understanding our place in the world, which would then cause people to want to understand where the united states is in the world better. Promoting education itself would raise our awareness of education as well, instead of just promoting something else in another country or going to war with them. That is why she mentioned Iraq specifically because she was saying instead of placing our priorities on war, we should place them on education. It is a matter of priorities. We don't really promote education in other countries now, so if we did then our awareness of education and the world would rise dramatically because it would be showing a lot about the United States if it did such a generous act. It would be so generous it would cause people to become more motivated to learn themselves because it would raise their awareness that learning and education is important. It becomes especially clear that it is important when you see that other foreign countries which are doing very poorly are that way because of their lack of education. So Miss Teen South Carolina answered her question in a philanthropic way not only a brilliant one.

---

<sup>1</sup>This content is available online at <<http://cnx.org/content/m15607/1.5/>>.





## Chapter 16

# Dreams Are Fun Because They Are Emotional Not Logical<sup>1</sup>

We need the escape of dreams from the logical, rational world in which we operate. There is a desire within humans to break everything down and tear everything apart. Why? Because breaking things is fun. No one wants to see everything continue as usual, why? Because things continuing as usual represents nothing out of the ordinary. Things that are out of the ordinary are going to be more emotional, and more stimulating. That's why humans intentionally engineer their dreams, to have something fun to escape into. Take this dream "We're in a hotel. We all have rooms, but we're in Steve's room. There are multiple beds that may be stacked. We are trying to make music. A boy starts playing guitar and it's fantastic. Steve holds up my cell phone, it's recording, he hands it to me. Steve asks me to play it back. There is a lot of music. One song my clarinet is so sharp. Steve says 'if you can't hear that...'" condescending. Steve leaves the room. We are competing for his attention, girls and boys. I am on a bed that is high. I know I'm the favorite and they're asking me about it and I decide to leave. I slide off the bed, then reach up under the rail and grab a black candle (handmade) and a cigarette and something else." It should be obvious that that is a fun event.

If you take all dreams and think about them, you will realize that they are fun, even nightmares are fun because they are emotional. It is fun for a person to have a deeply emotional experience because it is stimulating, people will do anything for stimulation even if that stimulation is a negative emotion. All dreams represent some sort of significant or large emotional event. The event doesn't have to be real it just has to provoke a large emotional reaction in the person. As long as this emotional reaction doesn't incur damage, then all emotional reactions are good. It is the saying, what doesn't hurt you only makes you stronger, only it's more like, what doesn't hurt you only makes you stronger. So if it's emotion, and it doesn't hurt you, then it makes you stronger and you even like it.

People enjoy all their dreams while they are sleeping, because during sleep they are solely emotional beings. As solely an emotional being you aren't engaging the logical part of your brain. So even if you dream about something like the death of your parent, you are still going to enjoy the dream because it is emotional and you're not thinking about the consequences of that. That is why you dream, because dreaming is fun, even if it isn't fun to think about when you wake up. If you were awake and thinking clearly you'd realize that you don't want your parent to die, but during the dream you are solely and emotional being and just interested the thrill of the death of a loved one.

That is, you are interested in the emotional intensity of the death of a loved one because in dreams you are solely emotional. You are not thinking of the logical consequences, and therefore in dreams people are just emotional. There might be a little logic, but the emotional experience would tend to override it resulting in dreams like the death of relatives. The reason you might "enjoy" the death of a loved one is because the death causes you to think more about that person because you are emotionally involved in experiences such as deaths. While awake you are intellectually involved in experiences such as deaths and this intellectual

---

<sup>1</sup>This content is available online at <<http://cnx.org/content/m14302/1.8/>>.

involvement would lead to a realization that they are bad, but in dreams it would lead to no realization, just feeling for the person who is dying, which you might enjoy (not the fact that they are dying).

Why again would the death of a loved one be thrilling? Because it would be a huge emotional experience, and your system is interested in the shock of that experience, that is why you are likely to dream about it. In fact, any nightmare is just really a system shock that causes a healthy amount of anxiety. The person dreaming also “knows” that it is a dream when it is taking place. You know this because in dreams you don’t really worry about consequences, since they are just emotional to begin with. Logic means worrying and such, you can tell that if you had a dream of a death of a loved one, you wouldn’t worry about it in the dream, but you might worry about it while you are consciously awake. Let’s go back to the playing music in the hotel, if you are playing music in the hotel room, you aren’t going to worry about if there are other people near you in the dream that you might wake up (and you can tell that dreams are like that). But you are certainly going to think about it in reality. That’s because in dreams the emotional content is emphasized, and the dreaming mind isn’t aware that the logical one is going to be upset that the dream doesn’t make any sense when it wakes up, or that the logical one is going to be upset you killed a relative for fun.

Just because something is emotional doesn’t mean you worry about it while you are awake. Dreams try to eliminate thinking, the less thinking, the more emotional it is going to be. So dreams might have a lot of sexual content in them as well. You dream about things you want to experience, but only things you want to experience in the dreaming state. The dreaming state is a state in which you don’t have control over your body, and you have a very childish control over your emotions. Your emotions run free in dreams, if you want it, it’s yours (in the dream). So dreams are a reflection of your worse desires and worst fears, because those two things are most emotional. However, in the dream you aren’t really afraid because you aren’t clear thinking. It’s like why people like scary movies, it is something scary that you aren’t directly involved in, so you can safely experience it. You aren’t directly involved with the dream because it is a dream, it is not reality, and your mind responds to that by making dreams that are entertaining to watch, not to experience, so it is very similar to watching a movie, you’re equally distanced from the event.

It would be more real to watch something like a murder in real life then to watch a murder taking place in a dream, in the dream situation the murder might even seem fun. That is also how people can like watching violence in cartoons like Tom and Jerry, where all the characters do is beat each other up, people even find it amusing. Watching something like that of course in real life wouldn’t be amusing however (unless you’re sadistic). Dreams are just like cartoons, you’re not involved in it, it isn’t real, and if you are involved in the dream then it isn’t very physical since you can’t feel your limbs. You can even feel it, imagine a cartoon character in pain, is that fun or sad? It is fun because it is just the right amount of stimulation (it might be sad intellectually, but emotionally, like how dreams are emotional, it is fun). It’s the right amount of stimulation because your mind recognizes it as not real, you recognize logically that it is just a cartoon, or just a movie, and you don’t feel as bad as you would if it were real. That’s why in dreams we need more to properly stimulate us, because simply it isn’t real. That’s why dreams need to be more emotional and entertaining. If you had that much entertainment in real life (like if the dreams you had were actually real), you’d have way too much stimulation and you wouldn’t like it at all. Dreams just reflect the proper amount of stimulation you need to keep you stimulated. That’s probably why people dream at all, for the same reason people think all the time while they are awake, because boredom causes an incredible amount of anxiety. People simply need to think about something all of the time, even while they are asleep. But since it is a dream, they can think about things that aren’t realistic and don’t make sense so they can have fun during those dreams. Doing something like moving some stuff around might be entertaining in real life because you are physically doing it, but in a dream it just wouldn’t suffice, you would need something spicy taking place like death, sex, fear, desire, emotion, or strong emotion.

## Chapter 17

# Dreams Rarely Make Sense Because They Are Usually More Emotional Than Logical<sup>1</sup>

Dreams in general tend to be weird. This would suggest that whatever engine is engineering, or designing the dreams is a weird and/or stupid one. Things in dreams often don't make any sense in reality, but dreams are often incredibly sophisticated at the same time. This would suggest that dreams are emotional, not logical. Emotion is very complicated, but it often doesn't make any logical sense. Dreams convey feelings very well, they amplify feelings, they don't amplify logic.

For example, say you were thinking about a toothbrush that day, or had a lot of thoughts about brushing your teeth, or had some trouble with the dentist and it was bothering you. In your dream that night, you wouldn't think about the events of the day, or logically think about how you could fix your tooth problem. In fact the logical thing would probably never occur in your dream, that would be out of character since dreams are more emotional, you'd probably never dream thinking "ah I should brush my teeth more thoroughly". Instead you'd dream of a really big toothbrush or something immature, childish, and extremely emotional. Or maybe get a large sensation of your teeth being brushed. See how one is more emotional than the other?

Dreams are so emotional that there is little room for anything logical, it's as if all your brain power is being converted into it's emotional essence. This is easy to prove, think of any dream you've ever had, or ever heard of, whatever it was, it didn't make complete sense. The fact that NO dream EVER makes complete sense must mean that the higher, logical part of your brain is shut off during sleep. That makes sense since if you were actually thinking, you'd want to experience real emotions and move your body around to get that experience, not just think about them.

This might make dreams more sexual or Freudian, but more importantly anything that is most strongly emotional to the person having the dream. Take this dream for example "I was at a type of arena-ish thing but it had balconies like a theater would." Notice first off that it doesn't make sense, arena's don't have balconies like a theater would. Clearly if the person was thinking clearly she/he wouldn't have been able to put theater balconies in an arena. Now there sometimes are balconies in an arena, but this person must have been referring to balconies that were pretty like they are in theaters with strong contrast to the arena, say like a stone arena with pretty wooden balconies in pink and stuff in them. That description I gave sounds like a typical dream because it doesn't make sense, and due to the contrast/mix of the arena and the theater, it is very emotional.

The mix of the two things makes it more emotional because it is something which you wouldn't find anywhere in reality. Things that stand out tend to be more emotional, and anything that doesn't make sense, like doesn't make ANY sense, is going to be emotional because it stands out from your everyday

---

<sup>1</sup>This content is available online at <<http://cnx.org/content/m14300/1.6/>>.

experience. Something like a giant gumball rolling over and over in your head, that doesn't make any sense, and its emotional. But why is it emotional? It is because you never find giant gumballs (that are chewed just standing around outside) so if you found one, you'd be in shock, and very emotional.

There are things that are emotional and can be found in real life of course. Take this dream "I was a warrior in a med-evil battle with Mel Gibson and we fought some kind of beasts with our golden swords lol Mel got his head chopped off and I awakened when I was being choked by a med-evil beast. ..." It would probably be more emotional for the dreamer to be doing something with Mel Gibson, since it's not likely he'll ever do something with Mel and therefore would find it rare when he did, so it's a not realistic, out of the ordinary, emotional experience. Furthermore they are using gold swords, how often are gold swords used? Gold is a more emotional color than steel as well. Color is emotional, so color, a dramatic color, or large color contrasts are often found in dreams to further amplify emotion.

Take this dream, see how emotional it is, emotional, not realistic, and amplified for dramatic content.

"I am the best student in a hard science class of some sort. Every day before class I hold study sessions. Everyone fails the first test but me. We are all milling about in the hall after class. The teacher and some other students express interest in the study sessions, but I say I don't really need them. They seem disappointed. Then I tell everyone "Hey, all those study sessions that I've been having... BY MYSELF... will still be there next week" inviting them. The professor asks anyone with a disease to hang around and see her in ten minutes, saying she has the shakes. She's very concerned with her health, which has been strange for some time. I think about staying, but I leave. I see Joe Horvath in the hall and hug him, but I see that he has a finger the looks like it was smashed and healed flattish and deformed. There are flecks of blue paint or nail polish or the nail is flecked blue. When I ask him about it he says he didn't even notice and doesn't know what happened, but it doesn't hurt."

The dreamer thinks he is the best in the class, not just any class, but a hard science class. He is so much better than anyone else, that he has "study sessions" by himself. Of course that doesn't make any sense, the people were asking him about a study session, implying that a study session would involve more than one person, like they usually do. But in his dream he forgets logic and all of a sudden he is the only person needed for a study session, in real life he wouldn't have said that because it just wouldn't be a proper thing to say - he wouldn't say something that silly in real life. To make the dream even more emotional another out of the ordinary event is occurring: the teacher is feeling sick, and her health has been "strange for some time" not bad for sometime, but strange for some time, the word strange would imply something really out of the ordinary going on, like an extraterrestrial disease or something weird, the weirdness and out of the ordinariness being added for extra emotional content, of course. Does this mean that the dreamer is afraid of a strange disease? No it just means he is trying to entertain himself in his sleep by adding extra dramatic content by using the word strange, instead of bad. (it's extremely rare to use the word strange when describing that one is sick, so what I suggested about extraterrestrial implications makes more sense). When you say, "oh I've been feeling strange lately" you are implying that something really weird is going on with you (or in this case your health) which would bring up further rise for concern, or a further rise in emotional, dramatic content!

Take this dream "We're in a hotel. We all have rooms, but we're in Steve's room. There are multiple beds that may be stacked. We are trying to make music. A boy starts playing guitar and it's fantastic. Steve holds up my cell phone, it's recording, he hands it to me. Steve asks me to play it back. There is a lot of music. One song my clarinet is so sharp. Steve says 'if you can't hear that...' condescending. Steve leaves the room. We are competing for his attention, girls and boys. I am on a bed that is high. I know I'm the favorite and they're asking me about it and I decide to leave. I slide off the bed, then reach up under the rail and grab a black candle (handmade) and a cigarette and something else." That is also very out of the ordinary, in fact that would probably never actually happen in real life because everyone in the hotel would hear the music. The dreamer obviously wasn't logically, clearly thinking. If she/he was then the dream would have ended with the people next door complaining about the noise, or there being somewhere in the dream something about checking to see if the hall was clear, but even then someone might walk down it. The point is it is very out of the ordinary, which, since it is rare, is probably more emotional solely because it's a new and exciting experience that you furthermore can't have in real life, so it also has that "I want

it since I can't have it" emotional feel. This is the real kicker, you can sense that the dream wouldn't have made any sense if they actually checked to see if there were other people in the hall. It is only an ordinary, regular dream, if it doesn't make sense. And you can sense that that is true.

Let's see how out of the ordinary this dream is. (All this so far proves that dreams are out of the ordinary, probably just to add emotional content because of the contrast with reality). "We are rehearsing. Instead of a lyrics sheet there is a flat piece of 3D art. It's a series of concentric circles. One of the circles is made to look like a brick wall. That's the verse I am supposed to sing. I get singled out and have to sing the verse alone. It's about life going around and down forever. There's an infinity symbol."

For starters there is no such thing as a flat piece of 3D art, 3D is 3D, but you can see how that would be fun for the dreamer to think about, entertaining for him to think about how it could be 3D, yet not 3D at the same time. This emphasizes the emotional content, but it low on the logical content. Why is the emotional content emphasized? Because dreams are for entertainment, you're trying to have fun in your dream. So he/she mixes the lyrics sheet, 3D art, and flat together. That's a fun thing to do. Dreams in general are going to be more on the fun side, less on the logical, ah this makes sense side. Take the line "one of the circles is made to look like a brick wall". That just doesn't make any sense. Exactly, that's what is fun about it, trying to imagine something that doesn't make any sense. Trying to put together in reality, things that just can't be put together. It's like you're trying and trying to do something that just can't be done. That's behavior typical of an immature child that just won't give up. It's fun to try and break reality and put things together that don't belong together. That way you create something new and different, something you'd want to dream about. People don't want to think clearly in dreams, they want to relax, have fun, and do things that they never could in reality. See things they've never seen, and experience emotions that they aren't going to be able to experience in other places.



## Chapter 18

# Most Stimulation Is Physical<sup>1</sup>

This topic is about the difference between physical feelings and mental feelings (feelings of emotions, of thoughts). My argument in the title argues that most stimulation is physical. If you look at that by the definition of stimulation then that makes sense since stimulation is usually something strong, and physical feelings feel much more real than mental ones. You know you are alive if you are experiencing pain. What happens when someone concentrates on physical feelings? Doing intense physical activity (like playing a sport), feeling pain, going to the bathroom, eating, and having sex are the five strongest physical feelings I can think of. However you also have physical feelings all the time because you are aware of yourself not only in a mental way but in a physical way. You are aware of the physical feelings your body produces all the time and how these feelings are mostly the same as time changes. You are also aware of what it feels like to be you, which is going to be mostly your mental feelings but also your physical ones. So intellectually your mental feelings are stronger if you are doing serious thinking, but if you are doing physical activity then your physical feelings are stronger.

This is related to the difference between emotion and thought because one distracts from the other, and physical feelings are more like emotions than thoughts. This is why pain isn't as much of an emotion than the other emotions because the other emotions are more mental and therefore intellectual. In fact, if you explore the feeling of pain it helps one to understand what a physical feeling is like because pain seems to be the strongest physical feeling. It is also a negative emotion similar to sadness, however, because it might make you feel sad very quickly or simultaneously. If it makes you feel sad simultaneously then it is like pain is an emotion because it is related to the feeling sad. So pain is a physical feeling that overlaps with the emotion sad. If someone is in pain it makes them sad, but that is much different from being sad in the normal way someone gets sad. It is like a physical sadness. Similarly if someone is having sex it might make them happy, but in a physical way much different from the normal emotion happy. So saying pain is an emotion is like saying that sex is an emotion. Sex may provoke emotions but is it an emotion itself? The answer is really that physical feelings are so similar to emotions that the two are tied together. You get a small amount of real emotion from something physical whereby it seems like the emotion is part of the physical feeling because the physical feeling feels so much like a certain mental emotion.

People respond to emotions. They get a feeling or emotion, then they think about it. If a feeling is large enough to be felt consciously, then it is going to be thought about. "thinking" is really processing in a larger context, thus all emotions are processed in the mind. In this way emotions become complicated, that is, life isn't just continuous sensory stimulation. All the sensory stimulation adds up and people have feelings about the total amount of sensory stimulation. Either that or there is a deeper feeling which people get simply from being alive, that isn't related to sensory stimulation. This feeling must come from something, however. The world is real and it exists, this is the only source of potential feeling (since that is the only thing to get feeling from). Pain feels extremely real, it might be that people are happy simply because it is an avoidance of pain, or that happy only exists relative to sad, so you understand how you are happy and

---

<sup>1</sup>This content is available online at <<http://cnx.org/content/m14805/1.7/>>.

can be happy because you know what happy is because you know it isn't extreme pain. It seems like pain is too large to be compared to regular sensory stimulation, like visual stimulation. This means that most emotions (if you consider pain to be an emotion, here I just mean that people are more distracted by the physical than the mental emotions) people have are from just their immediate environment, feeling things and touching things. Feeling their own body and the physical feelings they get from it. Vision doesn't cause that much pleasure compared to physical. However, when someone gets happy from emotions (non physical stimulus) they get very happy. This source of happiness must come from the physical, that is, they get happy because they feel better about their physical emotions (or when they get mentally happy, they can feel their body more because they are more alive and this experience is tied into being happy - the physical experience is also more real so it seems like your mental emotions derive from the physical). If someone is nice to them, then they feel like they are helping them, and this means helping them stay alive, which would prolong their life and the feelings get from their body. In a similar way, all emotions are tied into the physical. Part of what makes people happy is reward which they associate with prolonging their life. They feel deeply about prolonging their life because they get deep physical feelings from their body and from its existence. So emotions actually come from physical sensations, just not directly. That is if they were directly from physical sensations it would just be a physical sensation, but people feel deep emotions if it relates to protecting their physical sensations. In this way people are very animal-like. Seeing things and hearing things makes people feel good but this feeling is very mild. Most feeling comes just from a physical awareness of ones own body. This makes sense considering that physical pain at its height is much much worse than any emotional pain.

In review, emotional pain has its source in physical feelings and pain. This also means that emotions are really physical things. Emotions cause physical feelings. Any "feeling" is really a physical feeling, even if it is from vision or hearing. The sensory feeling triggers a deeper physical feeling because the sensory feeling reminds you that you are alive and have a physical body. In this way all sensations are tied into your physical body.

This all just really means that the physical is much more "real" than emotions are. You could say that emotions are feelings by themselves, but whenever you experience an emotion, you are also experiencing physical sensations. The physical is always there and it is strong because it is real, it is who you are. It is like a baseline for your emotions, it is a reminder that you are alive. If there was no physical world, you couldn't experience emotions because emotions are in root all physical, since everything comes from sensory stimulation initially. Thinking of it that way, all emotions are physical themselves since they remind you of seeing and touching physical things, which brings up a sense of your physical presence in that environment. Also, if the emotion isn't physical, then how is it in any way real? How can someone feel something other than physically? Can you say, "I felt that intellectually?" How much sense does that make?



## Chapter 19

# The Significance of Emotion In Humans/Animals<sup>1</sup>

The negative emotions caused by depression are probably the worst emotions that can occur in humans/animals. This sadness or depression is triggered not by negative, pessimistic thoughts, but by thoughts and feelings that cause you to pause, get angry or upset, and become thoughtful. These brief periods of thoughtfulness (you don't have to be verbally thinking, just be able to recognize yourself as being thoughtful) are the source of a lot of depression and sadness. You know it something is going to be more painful if you "think" about it deeply, and it causes pain. That is like dwelling on the negative. Your mind knows when something in it is going to result in sadness and/or depression, and so it reacts to those things in its environment and in its head (like memories or thoughts) which will make it sad by being upset and thoughtful about it. Those periods of time can be recognized, and if analyzed properly, can lead to that person resolving their inner conflicts and becoming happy.

People hate automatic negative thoughts a lot. These thoughts can be identified easily however, because automatic negative thoughts which are destructive or harmful to people are followed by strong negative emotions. These thoughts are always sometimes followed by a pause, a thoughtful expression, and an upset/angry look. The person having them, however, may be too upset to identify those attributes themselves, the negative thought or feeling upsetting them so much they are no longer clear thinking. So whenever a strong negative emotion appears in your feelings (that emotion is indicative that there was a pause, anger, and thoughtfulness period which caused it), think about what just happened to you before that emotion happened, whether it was a thought, a feeling, or something that happened in real life. Then you can analyze what the problem is and work towards feeling better.

Those periods of negative emotion that followed the pause period can be identified not just by feeling badly, but by experiencing negative emotions and thoughts, similar to the negative emotions and thoughts found in a bad dream. So if for some reason your thoughts turn to thinking about dark things, or thinking pessimistically, or thinking about anything that makes you feel bad in general, remember that you can easily identify the source of that bad thinking. That the bad thinking started with a single initiating event. That event might not be conscious, however. It might simply be an unconscious realization or progression of feelings reaching a certain point.

Another thing that might follow the period of upset/thoughtfulness might be a period of unclear thinking where the person is just "out of it". They may be out of it a little like they are thinking about something sad, or just have a confused look on their face. Or any deviation from a "normal" appearance. Just anything strange looking. In fact, all sadness and depression is marked by an initiating thought or feeling, so whenever someone looks sad that person needs to think to when the sadness started, or whenever there is an escalation in sadness the escalation was probably sudden and abrupt. So the graph of increasing sadness would look more like a staircase than a line or curve. If you think about it, everything begins somewhere, somehow.

---

<sup>1</sup>This content is available online at <<http://cnx.org/content/m14315/1.8/>>.

That's because your mind needs to understand, "ok now I am sad". As intellectual, thinking beings all major emotional events that occur in the mind need to be processed intellectually (unless you're sleeping). So in other words if you just get sadder and sadder and are not aware of it you are not going to get nearly as sad as when you realize that you are getting sadder. The points when you realize (at some level) that you are getting sadder are going to be when you start feeling a lot sadder (the steps on the downward staircase of sadness and depression). That is, if you have a major emotion, it isn't just going to be an emotion, but since it is so large, you are going to think about it and ponder it as well. So it may be that the escalation of sadness is inevitable because of emotional circumstances going on in your brain, however when the escalation occurs it is going to be noticed by your mind. That period of time is the upset/thoughtful period mentioned before.

## Chapter 20

# The Relationship Between Sadness And Depression<sup>1</sup>

What is the relationship between sadness and depression? How long does a sad feeling last in your mind? Is sadness a feeling or an emotion? I guess it doesn't matter what if we call sadness a feeling or an emotion, it only matters how sadness makes us feel. Depression can be viewed as simply a worse form of sadness, one that affects your entire system, whereas sadness is more like an individual emotion or feeling. Depression is usually described as an aspect of mood.

Mood is something noticeable to everyone around you (not always, but it is a lot more noticeable than individual feelings), while an individual feeling like jealousy or hate that people regularly have isn't going to be as much noticed. You can say, oh that person looks happy, or that person looks sad, but you rarely say, that person looks jealous or that person looks angry (only for brief periods of time that is). You can't tell when someone is angry for a long time, you usually can only tell temporary feelings or emotions of anger someone can look angry but the expression on their face is only going to be there for a few seconds. That would mean you can only tell extreme feelings but something like sadness or happiness people often comment on (oh you look happy, or are you ok?) and they don't just last a few seconds.

So sad feelings only last a few seconds, and sad emotions also only last a few seconds. If someone looks sad and it is isn't for a few seconds, then it is a part of their mood, and could be either a temporary depression or a long term depression (temporary being anywhere from a few minutes to a few hours to a few days or whatever). Depression is a system wide thing, it affects someone's mood, and it takes a while to kick in. Sadness (sad feelings or emotions) only last a few seconds, because they are individual and by themselves. If those feelings continue to linger, then it becomes a depression, which affects all the emotions and feelings in your brain. So the process goes, you are upset about thing A (for a few seconds on minutes) then if you are going to continue to be upset about thing A it is going to start affecting your mood, and the rest of your emotions and feelings, and be visible to everyone that you are sad or depressed. The first period of the sad feeling or emotion (which only lasted a few seconds) the person would look thoughtful because the event which caused that sadness had just happened, and that person is going to be thinking about it consciously or unconsciously for the brief period after it occurred. The sadness and depression hasn't sunk in yet, and upset feelings and thoughtful feelings are likely to be mixed in with the sad one. (this is during the first seconds or minutes after the initiating event). The initiating event could be something sad that happens in real life, or it could be just a sad thought that occurs to you which made you upset.

The point is, for the time immediately after the sadness initiates, you are going to have elements of upset/thoughtful in there because that is the natural human (or animal) response to think about what occurred, and to be upset that you are sad. If that sadness continues you aren't going to be as upset about it and thoughtful about it, but it would have invaded your system and made you generally sad (which is what is called a depression) it is not an individual emotion whose source can be identified easily. During the

---

<sup>1</sup>This content is available online at <<http://cnx.org/content/m14305/1.4/>>.

time of the initial sadness the person would be able to recognize what they are feeling because it is obvious at that point what they are thinking or what they just thought, so it is an individual emotion/feeling. After it sinks into their system that sadness might have triggered another sadness they were feeling which resulted from something else initially, so you can't say it is clearly an individual emotion anymore. The new source of the depression may be an individual emotion, but it is your entire system which is suffering from its effects.

# Chapter 21

## Life Is Tragic<sup>1</sup>

### 21.1 Everything in Life Is Boring

Just add, "Well, all you're doing there" before something anyone can do, and you'll realize that what they are doing is actually boring, no matter what it happens to be. Say adding 1 to 1. "Well, all you're doing there" is adding 1 to 1 to get 2. See? You can go through everything in life and eliminate it this way as boring. It's a challenge; you won't be able to find something not boring. That's proof that life is boring, and it sucks. Or say you're walking, just add, well, all you're doing there is walking, and you realize how it's actually boring.

### 21.2 If You're Not Doing Something Intense You're Doing Something Boring

If you're not doing something intense, then you're doing something boring. Everything in this modern life is boring because there is no real intensity. Just ask about any activity you're doing, "is this intense"? And you'll realize that it isn't. The only real intense activities would happen if there was no human civilization, and you were just out in the wild. Typing at a computer is incredibly not interesting and not a very active activity. Watching a game involves you sitting there staring at a small field for an incredibly long period of time. Think harder, really everything you have ever done, no matter how small or how big, wasn't intense at all. To understand how intense something you're doing is, just compare it to how intense your life would be if you were in the wild trying to survive on your own. Everything really is boring now. Your mind really needs to be "woken up" naturally in order for it to have maximum stimulation. When you're out in the wild hunting all your senses are on the alert so you are very energized. When you have that energy you really feel it coursing through your body. You can't have any "relaxing" factors to relax your mind, you have to be trying your hardest, and the only way you are ever going to be trying your hardest is if you're going to die from starvation if you don't succeed. That's a really terrible, slow death that will motivate you to be at your most alert. Conditions like that simply don't exist in modern society anymore. In prehistoric times you'd be doing stuff like that all the time. Your entire life would be like that, all your memories and such, so it would all add up. Even if you could do it now for a short period somehow it wouldn't be the same because your mind would still be sedated by our modern society from its memories of it. You'd be more aware of your surroundings and your physical senses would be absorbing the world around you all the time, you'd feel fresh. People today are feel stale and not alert at all. It's like long term torture by not being in a healthy state, you're basically just sleeping. That causes inner mental pain and trauma in slight amounts that is there all the time. You can feel that that pain from your slowness would go away if you were in

---

<sup>1</sup>This content is available online at <<http://cnx.org/content/m14304/1.10/>>.

a more natural environment, and go away even more if you were there your entire life. That energy just doesn't exist anymore - "emotional intensity" will never equal physical alertness.

## 21.3 God Is Evil

Take all your dreams and aspirations and goals. Unless God gives them to you right away, then he is evil for denying them to you. Unless you are as happy as you could possibly be, then something is being held back. Don't "have faith" that God is doing the right thing if you want something and it is being denied. The only conclusion to come to there is that god is evil. Everything should be yours. Unless that is true, evil exists in the world. There isn't more modesty in a humble life, if you want something, that desire is real. Life sucks because no one will ever get everything they want, and they have a right to get it. There is no reason to deny a person happiness other than to be evil and cruel, and God must be playing the world like his own cosmic joke, with all the enjoyment going to him.

Being "content" all the time isn't enough. Life should be thrilling and adventurous. How exactly is that going to happen when literally nothing in life is thrilling or adventurous? How many things can you list that make you "glow". How many things in life really give you a thrill. I can bet that very very few things do. The only way to be "thrilled" all the time would be if you were under constant pressure to live like humans existed before civilization. Civilization just slowed everything down, took human's out of their natural state, and "domesticated" them. Domesticated animals are tame, not fierce. Without that ferocity there is nothing fun to live for, you're basically just walking around bored. The sad realization is that the only way to really have fun in life is if you are forced to have fun by being under threat. That wakes up your mind like it is supposed to be woken up. Otherwise you're not "awake", you're not "alive" and you're not living. No one in modern society today is alive. They're all dead walking. They're limited by their tame and sophisticated environment, appeased by gadgets and their domination of the natural world. That appeasement leads to complacency, it's a fact that whenever you get happy you are more relaxed, or even emotional in any way you let your guard down. In prehistoric times there wasn't time to be "emotional". If you weren't emotional all the time like we are today, you'd more awake and aware, more interested in things naturally because you wouldn't be content to stay in your own mind. Unless you are under constant threat, your life just isn't worth living. The only way to be happy is to go back to before humans became domesticated animals. It's hard to accept that because your mind is trained into being "content" and its hard to reintroduce domesticated animals into the wild. Imagine being slowly reintroduced into the wild and it is easier to understand then why that would be better. The rest of this article outlines conditions which exist only in modern society, for the domesticated human. And why those conditions are bad.

## 21.4 Life Sucks Big Time

There is nothing fun to do in life. This leaves a feeling of extreme depression. You just have to give in and be a robot/sheep and do something that you're not going to enjoy doing because it will keep you from being depressed. The expression, "busy hands are happy hands" is one out of desperation. If you're not busy then you are desperate. Therefore you get busy so you are no longer desperate, but just because you are busy doesn't mean that you are happy. In fact, no one gets happy in life because although there are some fun things to do, these fun things don't take up enough time to do them all the time. In fact, it's not possible to have too much fun or you'll get anxiety, so we're doomed to little fun. Pick your favorite activity in which you have the most fun, and imagine doing it all day, I find that it would get boring after a while, and I can't find anything else that exciting to replace it, I think this is true for other people as well. If you aren't doing something fun, then you're doing something boring or not fun, and your life sucks. Since you can't do something fun all the time because there just isn't that much fun to be had, life sucks.

## 21.5 Why Life Has No Meaning

Life has no meaning because there is no reason to do anything. No one has an ultimate “purpose” in life. Everything you do you do because you have to. Even when you are trying to have fun you do that only so you can have fun. Why do you even want to be happy? If you think about it you don’t need to be happy, you just want to be happy. There is no ultimate purpose in you being happy. You’re not going to achieve anything other than your own happiness. You’re not going to be contributing anything to the world, or making yourself look better. The sad truth is no one really cares that you’re happy. Why doesn’t anyone care? Because the only reason someone else would want you to be happy is if it made them happy, and since all happiness is irrelevant you making someone else happy is irrelevant. Though I don’t know why anyone would want anyone else to be happy unless it somehow fit their own ends. Everyone is fundamentally selfish so in the world each person is trying to beat everyone else. That is, if they are smart they are going to try to beat everyone else, and if they are stupid then they aren’t going to be contributing anything to the world because they are dumb. So it’s a lose lose situation. Why would someone smart only be looking after himself? Because that’s the best way to get happy, and for some reason everyone wants to get happy. We’re just robots that when we get sad, a chemical is sent to our brain to make us feel bad. None of us wants to feel bad when we get sad, it just happens because we happened to have been programmed that way. If we could program our self we would just make ourselves happy all the time. If we could design a human like robot that’s what we’d do. God must be an evil person for creating sadness. It serves no ultimate purpose. It’s just a reality of life. That’s right, people get sad, and people get happy. In fact, you’re never completely happy or completely sad, it’s always some mixture of the two. So the sadness is always going to be there. Not only does it exist, but it’s there all the time! There is no reason why humans couldn’t be programmed to never have sadness. The only reason we get sad is because god (or evolution) designed us so that we would. It’s just evolutions tool to get us to do stuff we don’t want to do. If you think about if you’re sad, it’s either because you did some things you didn’t want to do, or some things were done to you that you didn’t want to happen to you. So it’s a lose lose situation. Either way you lost out, and there is nothing you or I can do about it. The fact is everything in this world doesn’t happen the way you want it to. You can’t believe in a god because if there was a god he would work for you, and everything would happen the way you wanted it to. Therefore god can’t exist. That is, a good god can’t exist, an evil one surely does. That’s just a fact, unless everything in the world happens the way you want it to, you are losing, and god doesn’t work for you. It just means that god isn’t working for you, but against you. That’s not a big deal since it doesn’t matter that you get sad anyway why? Because when you get sad you just get hurt emotionally, and no one cares that you get hurt emotionally because you weren’t contributing anything to the world to begin with. Even you don’t care that you get hurt emotionally really, you just get an automatic response when you feel bad to want to make yourself feel better, that isn’t “caring”. If you say that people don’t really care about anything, including themselves, since their entire desire to want to care about themselves is based on a preprogrammed emotional response that they don’t want, then they are really just trapped in their own minds. They don’t care that they are trapped in their own minds, because they don’t want to care about anything because then they wouldn’t be sad. If you never got sad you’d never have any desire to do anything, because there would be no motivator, because one level of happy is only relevant relative to another level of happy. That is when you’re “happier” you’re only “happier” relative to a “sadder” state. Therefore you have to feel sad in order to feel happy. In fact by that logic, you’d have to be sad equally as much as you are happy, and that everything that happens in life is a part of that perfect balance. In order to make you happy just as much as you are sad the world would have to be designed so that events fall into place to make that occur, so that is proof that god exists. And that god supports having emotions, both sad and happy ones. God could have designed people to have no emotion, but then we wouldn’t be doing anything or feeling anything. And we wouldn’t be doing anything because we would never feel sad or happy so we’d never have anything to motivate our actions. Once again sad and happy are just emotions relative to each other, you can’t feel sad without once having felt happy because sad is just relative to happy. Happy is something you feel when you are achieving victory over sadness, that is all happiness is. Happiness makes you feel good because it makes you not feel sad. That’s the only reason to be happy, is to not be sad. Because being sad is your only motivator. That’s the only thing that you HAVE to respond to, when you feel sad, you get the feeling that

you have to do something about it, and that feeling is automatic and preprogrammed into your body/mind. When you get happy, the feeling is just that you are a farther away from sadness. Our bodies are entirely programmed. You can't be happy more than you're sad because happy exists only relative to sadness, so if you were happy most of the time you would really just be happy half the time, and sad the other half of the time, get it? And the only way that people would be happy half the time is if god made the world so that events would fall into place that made people happy half the time, otherwise the equation wouldn't work and the fabric of reality would fall apart. Also, what makes emotion real or meaningful? It is just emotion. Whoever said emotion had meaning? It is just a biological response that makes you feel good. Who really cares about feeling good anyway since they are just emotions? You are just an animal, and you only have emotions.

## 21.6 Bad Things Exist

There are lots of bad things in the world which exist that make life worse, and there is no reason that they need to be there. There are bad sights, bad tastes, bad smells, bad feelings, bad attitudes, bad noises, bad emotions, bad situations, bad things, bad objects, bad toys. All those bad things don't have to exist, but they do. That speaks for itself. It may seem like so far there is nothing insightful in this section, however bad things are really the source of all evil. If something is evil then it is bad and harmful. Those words contribute to sad feelings. There wouldn't be a good if there wasn't an evil however. If everything was good you wouldn't know what the word good meant. Everything has to exist on a gradient from bad to good. Nothing is exactly the same. So if everything was good I guess one good thing would be good relative to something else, which is also good, but it would be bad relative to the good thing. But I mean a person is more good than a tree doesn't make the tree bad. Only bad relative to the person. So if we eliminated all things that were actually bad by themselves and left only stuff that could be considered relatively bad, then the world would be good. So the expression, "there can't be good without evil" is actually false. Bad things exist. This refutes my previous happy sad argument and proves that god really is evil, because you can be happy and have sad stuff, the sad stuff would be relative to the happy stuff, but not have any real sad stuff. And it's the fact that real sad stuff exists which proves that god is evil.

## 21.7 No One Is Happy All the Time

No one is happy all the time. In fact, when you realize that you're not happy all the time, you get sad, worried, and stressed. If you're not happy all the time then during the times you aren't happy you're experiencing some negative emotion. The key thing is that being happy the rest of the time doesn't cancel out those periods of negative emotion, you're still going to be sad for certain periods, during those periods you are indeed sad, it doesn't "balance out". During those periods there is nothing you can do about your sadness or discontent. Whenever you have to do something you don't want to do or feel something you don't want to feel, there is nothing you can do to avoid that reality. It's there. You can't say to yourself, "overall I'm happy because I'm happy most of the time". That's not true, overall you're sad because the negatives in life overshadow all the positives. And you have to admit, there is always going to be a negative. Life is always going to be overshadowed and under the cover of evil. There is nothing any of us can do to eliminate that evil. It's there. Whenever you're sad or down, the statement, "it's ok because it is going to get better" is wrong, because its not ok, if you're suffering, then you're suffering, and no amount of hope you have is going to change that. The mere fact that evil exists in the world is indicative that life sucks. It's obvious that all evil is never going to be eliminated, and as long as a shred remains there is still going to be the probability that you are going to run into it, or think about it, or somehow it is going to invade your life. In fact, if there wasn't evil, you wouldn't even be able to comprehend what the word evil meant, because it wouldn't make sense without evidence. So the mere fact that you can comprehend the word is evidence that it exists. Sadness and unhappiness are evils. Pain, fear, rage, remorse, negativity, sorrow, shock, terror, worry, loneliness, hate, horror, guilt, frustration, embarrassment, disappointment, discontentment,



depression, boredom, bitterness, agitation, apathy, alarm all exist in large amounts in our world. In fact, those emotions probably take up at least a significant amount of each person's life. And there is no way to justify their existence. They are there, they are going to stay, and there is nothing you can do about it. There is an evil which exists which will always remain.

## 21.8 Life Sucks because It's Just Feelings

Everything in life boils down to a feeling. Anything you do, anything you say, or anything you think it's just going to wind up making you feel some way about it. That's extremely pathetic, that means you have to worry about emotional/feeling attachments to every single object in the world, how they make you feel, and what they make you do. That's immensely complicated. Life sucks because it is way too complicated. There must be a million different types of feelings, even for the same piece of food you could probably eat it in 50 different ways. And each time the feeling you get when you eat it is going to be different, no single feeling is every exactly the same. That means you can never say, "ah I did that before, that was fun" instead each time something happens you have to spend time and figure out if you actually like it, and if it was actually fun. However, the work involved analyzing each feeling takes away any possible fun the actual feeling could cause, if you know what I mean. Humans are burdened because they have to think about everything. Humans are the only animals I have seen cry. It seems to me that the crying is much much worse than the happiness, and the happiness doesn't "balance it out". I mean when you see someone crying that's a much more intense emotion than any happy feeling they could get. You give someone crying or very sad a more attention than you'd give someone extremely happy. That's proof that the emotion is more intense. Have you ever seen a duck cry? Nope. Ducks are happy all the time, they don't have huge emotional swings like humans do. They don't have to deal with all the trauma and bull shit. I can tell you I would be much happier being a duck. It gets even worse when there are extremely complicated negative feelings, that makes you feel like you're being pressed in by a lot of evil.

## 21.9 Your Feelings Are At Best Robotic

Since most of your brain is neurons feelings don't really exist, and you're just a neurological robot, that thinks. You think you have feelings, but what's really going on is just what condition your physical body is in. If you've done something to make your physical brain happy and content its neurons, then you will think that you are happy. But really all you've done is achieved a healthier state of neurological stimulus. Or a different chemical balance in your brain. So you don't need to say "I'm happy" you can just say "the chemicals and neurons in my brain are in the state that I happen to call happy". I hope you don't seriously think you're happy when really you're just chemically altered. The happiest you ever were was really just a disgusting mess of guck in your brain acting differently than it ever had before. I mean why does one mental condition matter as being better than another? It's all biology. Your body is just a bunch of neurons in your brain which are now not moving around versus moving around. Your neurons don't care if they are "happy". All they do is send off chemical signals in your brain. In fact, your neurons are constantly rearranging themselves, you are never the same person you change all the time. One way you change is you forget most of what happens to you, if your eyes were a video camera they'd be a camera with a 5 second memory that's perfect. You forget 99% of what you see. What's the point of living if you are going to forget 99% of what happened in your environment in 5 seconds? What about 10 seconds? Can you remember everything that was in your vision exactly 10 seconds ago? I doubt it. You can't even process what everything you are seeing is at one time, you can only focus on one or a couple of things. You miss MOST of what is going on. You're just a very limited biological animal, that can't remember in detail anything that was going on near them after 10 seconds. How long does a "happy" feeling stay fresh in your mind? An hour or so, then it becomes just a memory, most of which you forget in a day. If you are happy at 12:00 today you are probably not going to remember you were happy then two days from now. 6 months from now you are going to forget most minor things that made you happy. 1 year from now you're probably going to forget everything but a

few things that made you happy in this month, if you can even identify why you're happy in the first place. What's the point of living if you don't remember almost all of what you live through? And you were never really happy in the first place, just "neurologically satisfied". So most of the "feelings" that you are going to forget, didn't even really exist in the first place. Also, most of the "feelings" you have aren't even happy ones. If you look back to a long time ago you probably only remember good memories, but that's because that's all you remember. That's altering your perspective on how much you go through is actually "fun". Most of the feelings you have are not "happy" ones but mundane and ordinary. Most things in life aren't fun and you can check that by seeing how your "feelings" are doing. You will realize that you're not even "happy" a tiny portion of the time. What's the point of living if you only like living it 1% of the time? Are you even happy 1 minute out of every 100? Can you say that you're happy most of the time? When you typically say you're happy you are just looking at how happy you are relative to how happy you usually are, or to how happy other people are, not how happy you really are, which is determined by looking minute by minute how you feel. If you look at it that way, (in minutes), how many minutes of each day are you happy? Probably less than 60, that's a tiny portion of your time that you happy, that means that you were never actually happy in your entire life, since that one time you said you were happy it only actually lasted 60 minutes. When someone says they are happy they are just really looking at the little time they were happy when they said it, everyone is actually overly optimistic about how happy they are. Assuming you're in the BEST mental state you can be in, then you'd be at best neither happy or sad most of the time, just "going through life mundanely, not really enjoying most of it, not really feeling anything". You're just unfeeling and cold most of the time, since most of the time you're neither happy and sad. Therefore all feeling is at best robotic. When someone says to you, "hi how are you doing" and you reply "good" by good you don't mean happy most of the time, you mean, most of the time you don't feel anything at all! Because that's your best, highest mental state, not feeling most of the time, rarely being happy, and at least being sad as much as you were happy, that's the highest state you can ever achieve. Sorry

## 21.10 Life Sucks because There Aren't Feelings, Just Neurological Stimulus

You should realize that humans don't really feel anything - Any feeling you have is a chemical in your mind sending off "happy" or "sad". That beauty is just how pleasing the things you see are, there isn't a delusional idea that people really "feel" or "love" Love is just a chemical in your brain. Its not a "truly moving, fascinating, deep, wonderful experience". Sorry to break it to you, but there isn't anything magical going on. No need to be delusional. They're just neurons. You're just a practical person, trying to achieve practical goals. One of those practical goals might be happiness, and love might be a way to get there, but you're really just looking after your own neurons. This brings about the point that people are fundamentally selfish, if the only thing that matters is taking care of their own mind, the only thing they care about is themselves. So how is the world exactly supposed to work out if each person only cares about themselves? That's the only thing to care about, how happy your neurons are, love doesn't even exist. Sorry. Nothing is "meaningful" if everyone is entirely selfish, because the only meaning you'd be seeking is for yourself. So when you say, "ah, that was meaningful" add, "aha, that was meaningful to me, and to me only, and I only really care about myself". A delusional view of life might be that the most meaning you can find is from another person/people. The truth is the most meaning people find is from themselves. Since you're most similar to yourself, you are never going to connect with anyone else more than you connect with yourself. So you're always going to be your own best friend. It's easy to prove that people are selfish, because, unlike in movies, in real life no one would actually give their own life for someone else. There we go, proved. That was surprisingly easy to prove. Either I am the first to discover that proof, or everyone else was being delusional in thinking that the world is better and nicer than it actually is, blocking out the fact that people are actually fundamentally selfish, and that it was extremely easy to prove that they are. I mean when you are talking to someone else do you think they actually care more about you than they do about themselves? Nope. Even if it's a loved one they are still going to care more about themselves. Sorry. There just isn't any

real connection. There's an imaginary connection, because everyone is in such denial of the reality of life, but there isn't a real one. Sorry again. This works for objects too. I mean, do you care more about yourself, or your computer. Yourself. I would think that my computer is better than I am because it is so efficient and sophisticated, but even though it doesn't make any sense, I am going to think that I am better than my computer. That's because humans are in denial that life sucks and that they are inferior to computers and stuff like that. When you walk up to the typical person and say, hey does life suck, they are going to say no. It's not that they aren't capable of understanding that life sucks, it's just that they are permanently delusional because they want to think that the world is a better place than it actually is so they can be happy with the world and themselves. That's stupid. You can be wrong, but you are going to be stupid and wrong. Just don't leave out the stupid when admitting that you're wrong. (if you are wrong that is) If you respond "life is good" then you obviously don't care at all about the 155,000 people that die each day in the world. You know why you wouldn't care about them? Because a) people are fundamentally selfish and b) you only run into a few thousand or so people yourself in your lifetime, almost all of which you meet only briefly. You may think your life is exciting and you meet and get to know tons of new people all the time, but it's actually the opposite, by "a lot of people you run into" you do see a ton of people probably in your life, that adds some excitement, but you only talk to much less. However, since you want to think your life is exciting people are just going to delusionally think that they get to know endless numbers of people in short periods of time, that they aren't worthless and, given the number of people that know them individually, are practically famous. That they have had the pleasure of getting to know a lot of people in their life time. See even if you were famous, you still only talk to about the same number of people a non famous person talks to. A lot fewer people actually "get to know" you. It takes years to really get to know someone else. That means you can only have anything resembling a real connection with a very, very, very tiny number of people, only a few or less. Everyone else in the world is really just blank unknowns to you. And you know what I have found, even the people that know me most, barely know me at all. So basically no one is ever going to know someone else. I find that only I know myself, and even there I only know myself a little. It's a cold, empty world. Maybe if I was super smart (way smarter than any existing human) I could know everyone perfectly, but people are extremely stupid (more on stupidity in the next paragraph). That fits in with what I said before, that a delusional view of life is that the most meaning you can find is from another person/people. The truth is you can't find any meaning from life, anywhere. Seriously how many things can you say you've "found meaning" in? Probably none. And I mean finding actual meaning, obviously not found in "little things".

If you can't decide if life sucks or not, that just means that you're not smart enough to ponder the nature of your own existence. Dogs can't decide if life sucks for them or not. Humans should be intelligent and be capable of pondering the nature of their world. But they're stupid. You can't come up with a definitive scale 1-10 of how much life sucks for who and for what reasons. Most people cannot definitively say that life is good, or that they feel good most of the time. I mean, you should be able to rate 1-10 how good you feel at any moment, but you can't. If people really understood life, they'd be able to say, "ah that day was a 9 for me" and you'd be hearing things like that all the time. But you don't, people are stupid. They are not capable of pondering their own existence, since they are not capable of deciding if life sucks or not. Let alone proving it. If they could prove it they'd say something like "oh I'd rate my life a 9 out of ten". They can't do a day by day rating or a lifetime rating, or monthly rating or whatever. They only have general opinions of some individual things or events, they can't rate everything exactly or see how everything works together. So as you can see I can easily prove that human's are too stupid to prove that life sucks or doesn't suck, but since they're that dumb, we'll just go with the life sucks argument :).

## 21.11 Clarification

We need to be clear. Since people have little feelings most of the time, and they aren't happy most of the time, and at best they are happy as much as they are sad, then people really are robots. That would explain why everyone doesn't kill themselves since all their lives suck, it's because they don't feel anything to begin with to want to kill themselves. That makes sense. People not feeling also fits in with people being selfish, if

someone is selfish, they wouldn't have any feelings, because if they did, they would care about other people, which they don't. Love doesn't need to exist if no one is going to feel it anyway. How many times a day do you "get emotional" probably none. If you aren't being emotional then what are you being? The only thing left is logical. If you're logical then you're being selfish, so the right thing to do then would be best look after yourself. To be more clear, we've established now that the best thing to do is look after yourself, which you do because you're selfish and unfeeling, and experience little emotion. If you had emotion you might care about other people, but you don't. How many times a day do you feel a strong hate or anger or love? None times, that's how many. You might feel slight amounts of that emotion, but if you do it would be for only a very short period of time, during which you probably still have to deal with other people that aren't experiencing those emotions at the same time. Sorry. It could be that there's just so little to do that you can only find things to do which produce emotion a tiny amount of the time, and that in spirit you want to be emotional and happy all the time, but can't. That is just evidence that not only does life suck and people aren't emotional, but you want life to not suck, and are just dealing with being unemotional most of the time so you can live for the brief periods of life which exist in equal amounts of sadness and happiness. Hmmm. That means "life" is really just those brief periods in which you're actually "living". That explains why some people think they are happy, because they are just referring to those periods of time, not the null void of nothingness which exists in between (during which they are sad some of the time at best as least as much as they are happy). Or the sadness doesn't occur in the null void but occurs during the emotional periods, in which case they consider being sad a happy experience solely because it is an emotional one! It's ok because this makes sense, you want to have a balance in life, happy on one end and sad on the other, in the middle a large null void during which you are logical, unfeeling, and only looking after yourself. How can you be happy if you are only experiencing emotion a tiny portion of the time? Take a closer look at your life and when you say "I'm happy" or whatnot. You probably say you're happy because there isn't a word for "I'm unemotional". You're really "logical". So when someone asks you if you are happy just reply (if you're in your best condition that is) "I'm logical". So everyone's just logical, and all their feelings are really just neurons? Where is all the warmth and love? It doesn't exist. Sorry. How many "warm" feelings can you remember experiencing this past week? Not many. How many "cold" feelings did you have? Probably a lot more. This is the sad truth to reality.

Life is cold and uncaring, logical and cruel. God must be a mean, ruthless person. We should just go on praying with no hope of salvation. That's what Jehovah did. Even though life sucks, we should continue to hope that it will get better, even though it's never going to, because that's what Jehovah did. Perfect. Brilliant. Very smart thing to do. Life isn't going to get better, it is always going to suck. And if you hope that is going to get better, you're just being delusional.

## 21.12 Why School Sucks

All the subjects suck because they are boring. In math the problems are boring and take too much mental effort, or if they are simple then they are just boring. History is irrelevant because people only care what is going on in the world around them. On that topic the major issues seem to be crime and war, and I don't know why people would want to hear about those bloody subjects. Companies are boring, they are in the news. Politics is just all the boring school subjects wrapped into one, and as they apply in real life. You only have to learn a foreign language because everyone doesn't speak the same one language, so while it might be useful it still sucks that you have to learn it in the first place. I mean what exactly is the point of being able to say the same word two different ways? Studying your own language usually consists of reading endless boring books your teachers consider "intellectual" but you don't. Blowing things up is fun but knowing the chemistry and science behind it is boring. Things moving is also fun but understanding the physics behind it is boring and tedious. Biology is disgusting.

## 21.13 Why Work Sucks

Take any regular job, like working at a sandwich shop, that's just boring making sandwich after sandwich after sandwich, etc. Most jobs are like that, doing the same thing over and over and over, its usual boring and involves, well, work. That's why it's called work, its definition defeats it alone since the words "effort, exertion, labor, and toil" are in it. I don't need to go through each job, because every job if you think about it involves doing something tedious and boring. Unless your job was to do whatever you want, but no one would consider that work, by definition. Work involves a structure and that structure is usually something other than what you'd be doing by yourself. Being a doctor is bad because biology is gross and disgusting. Working at a cash register just involves taking people's money from them, and that too is boring and tedious, doing the same thing over and over. If a job a person has to do is mechanical, boring, machine-like (that is, the person doing the job acting like a machine), repetitious (doing simple things over and over) or doing hard things over and over. Intense intellectual activity is hard, intense physical labor is hard, simple physical labor is boring, and simple intellectual activity is boring. You can't do a medium amount of physical labor without starting and stopping. And you can only do a medium amount of intellectual activity for a short time before that too becomes boring. Hard or simple intellectual activity is boring right away, (pick some examples in your head to check all that). So too much or too little physical or mental activity sucks, and "right amount" gets boring after a short period of time. The only things that are actually fun involve almost no mental activity, like watching TV or just looking around you. (TV is limited itself because its only two dimensional). Just looking around is fun for a second but that gets boring quickly, so you have to find something else boring to do fast before just looking around gets extremely boring. So since we've decided that mental activity in amounts any more than a little sucks, you now realize that there is almost nothing to do that is fun which involves little mental activity. Intense physical activity can be fun but that only lasts a short time. Medium physical activity is boring. And a tiny amount of physical activity (like walking) is boring. So basically anything physical (unless its intense) is boring. So all we have left for fun things to do is mental stuff which requires little effort, but is still fun – good luck finding that. (sarcasm) Don't consider "walking around" fun either that is just really "looking around" which we already decided gets boring fast. Now how many fun, simple mental activities pop up in your head right now. None, that's how many. There is just nothing fun to do in life, it all sucks.

## 21.14 Rating Activity

In the last section we started to rate certain activities we did in order to find out if those activities were boring or hard or whatnot. In life you can either be doing something mental, something physical, or some combination of the two. A mental activity can be hard to a certain degree based on how much effort you're putting into it. You can rate any mental activity you do on a scale of 1-10 for mental hardness, something like putting a towel on a rack would be say a 1, and putting 5 towels on a rack in order of smallest to largest might be a 3. The purpose of rating everything you do is that you will realize that since nothing requires 0 work, everything there is to do in life sucks, because for all of it you have to work. Unless you do so much work that it overloads your body like if you got exhausted physically or mentally you might get some kind of ecstasy or high or something, in that case you've done well, but that feeling usually only lasts a short period of time, and you had to do a lot of work to get there (like exercise hard or something). You can also rate any physical activity or a combination of physical and mental activities. Once again everything in life involves work, or effort. The feelings resulting from the work and effort in life are rarely satisfying, because in order to get a feeling powerful enough to make you feel good you have to do a lot of work making the end result not worth it. Even something like watching TV involves work, just ask yourself (in order to figure out how much work you're doing) what are you thinking about while you're watching the television. Even having feelings counts as work, if you see something violent and get a bad or violent feeling, then how much does that feeling disrupt you and how much work do you have to do to get back to how you were before you had that feeling? For each activity that you do and rated their is a corresponding feeling for, when you do work, it makes you feel bad, so really everything in life makes you feel bad because its going to be a change

from how you normally are, and you have to "work" to get back to feeling normal again. Your mind has to adjust to each new feeling and that feeling of adjustment you can identify in your own mind as work, or effort. If we look closer at putting the towel on the towel rack example, the reason just putting one towel up is easier is because it involves less mental and physical work, when you're only putting up one towel you just have to think "ok put this towel on the towel rack" but when you're organizing them by size you need to say "hmmm which towel is smallest, then you need to do more physical activities to get each towel up on the rack, which have corresponding mental thoughts, put this on the rack this way and that way, slide it right a little or whatnot". So just as everything thought has a corresponding feeling, every feeling has a corresponding thought, you can't really feel anything without being able to put words to it if you try hard enough, and everything you think causes you to feel something as well. Like doing anything physical causes physical feelings, and the words you'd put to those feelings would be to describe what you did physically to cause the feeling. You have to "think" each time you do a physical action even though you don't say the words in your head of what you are doing each time. This proves that all feelings actually take mental effort, and therefore are bad for you. Thankfully most of the time you're just breathing and not thinking or feeling, which requires little effort. It also means you're a robot, however (we've been over that a little). Whenever you get a new feeling your mind does work to make room for that new feeling. Like with the watching violence on TV example, when you see that violence you get a huge feeling of repulsion or interest or whatnot, and you can tell that your body had to work to feel that. That's because you are thinking about the violence, in order to stop that work (of thinking about the violence, that takes work the thinking about the violence) just stop thinking about it. Your unconscious thoughts are what's causing the feelings about violence. You can use that tool to analyze any feeling you get and try to change how it is making you feel, just ask, "what am I thinking about when I get that feeling". Or you could ask "what other feelings does that feeling bring up". And figure out your entire structure of feelings and thoughts. Of course things happen in life that cause feelings that you can't change or do anything about - one more reason life sucks. But you don't want to shut down completely; I mean you could view everything as just work or you could ignore that.

## 21.15 There Are No Happy Feelings

I said before that you can look at any feeling and ask what other feelings it brings up. You can also break down any feeling into its parts. Let's take the feeling you get of giving someone money. You feel bad that you are losing money, that is one feeling. The other person feels bad for taking your money, which causes you to feel worse because now you made them feel bad. See any action in life actually has feelings and emotions attached to it, just look at anything from all its angles to get all the feelings involved. Maybe the other person isn't very nice and feels good that they are taking your money, maybe you have a lot of money and don't care that you are losing a little. Etc. The main point is, for anything that happens in life, you are going to feel somehow about it. However, in order for you to process the action that is happening in life you have to do work to convert that action into a feeling. This work means that there are no happy feelings, because even if the end result is a happy feeling, it took work to get there, and the work outweighs the happy feeling. I found this to be true looking at all feelings, don't just look at the happy feeling, but when you look at the work involved you realize that you're actually sad. Let's look at computers, at first look you might say, sure a computer would cause good feelings, you have buttons you can press and little windows that pop up, that's awesome! But you aren't looking at the fact that you have to press the buttons and you have to think about the windows that pop up when they pop up, so both things which you perceived as happy are actually sad. Everything in life works like that, each and every feeling requires work. That brings about the point that everything is really physical, because when you think about the windows popping up the thinking that you are doing is work that your brain (which is physical) is doing. So everything requires physical work. So there aren't really any feelings anyway, just physical stuff going on. And physical stuff requires work. Since everything is physical, and you are constantly moving and alive, you are constantly doing work. You're never not doing work, you're always moving, unless you're dead. You're always doing mental work as well. What makes it worse is that you can't do "less work" mentally because then you start

feeling bad, (if you just sat there and did nothing without thinking about anything) so you have to do work all the time. Life is work. Life is endless, nonstop work. That's all it is. This work comes in various shapes and sizes. Doing a math problem is just the work of you analyzing numbers. Doing a chemistry problem is you doing the work of analyzing chemicals. Doing a history problem is you doing the work of looking at a certain place in time. You can't do the same thing over and over either or you'll get bored. That's why a lot of jobs suck, because you have to do the same thing over and over, and it's boring. Look harder for repetitions in life and you'll find a lot. Take working at a cash register, although you may talk to people and although the variety of items you're scanning may change, you are still scanning all day and standing in the same spot. What happens to your feeling when you stand in the same place all day? It gets more and more boring as time passes. Similarly doing any type of work (even if its easy) gets more and more boring as time passes. In fact, you can get bored just reading the word more over and over – watch – more and more and more and more and more and more boring. When you think about it most of life is just repeating stuff you've already done, just in very slightly different ways. Nothing is completely new. And when something is new, you have to do work to figure out what it is exactly, which takes away the novelty of finding something new. So since all the time you are doing work, and that work involves feelings and thought, all the time you are feeling something and thinking about something!

## 21.16 Interaction Theory Shows That Although Life Seems Large, It's Actually Rather Small (below)

Life is how everything in your life interacts. Interaction theory is really everything in your life, which are interactions of things within everything. Confused? An example of an interaction of life would be a pot and its handle, each is a thing individually, but the two interact in life, and form a pot and a handle. On a more complicated level, a cave man might interact with a rock, and that interaction could produce a weapon, which could cause another interaction, fighting. (fighting being the interaction between the two people, and interaction between the rock and the man, you get the idea)

You can state how any multiple things in life interact (interaction theory). You can make a relationship between any multiple things in life (relationship theory). You can rate the strength of those relationships or interactions. Everything in life (including ideas) is made up of multiple parts, that sometimes can interact with themselves or other parts in other objects or ideas. Since everything in life interacts and forms relationships (including ideas - an example of a relationship between two ideas would be the idea, let's move to France, and the idea, let's not move to France, the relationship is that they are opposites), you can say that everything in life connects. You can categorize anything in life, including ideas. Words can interact with each other, sentences can interact with each other, paragraphs can interact with other. Any idea can be broken down or translated in words/sentences/paragraphs. Any sensation can interact or form relationships with any other sensation, or any object in the real world, or any idea. Anyone can have practically infinite ideas, about practically infinite objects (or ideas or theories or whatnot).

Surely that last paragraph can be potential for an enormous number of discussion topics. If it isn't then life really does suck. That paragraph should lead you to come up with endless numbers of interactions and relationships. There should be a lot to talk about in life. If I ask someone what are possible discussion topics they should be capable of eloquently responding to me and give a large list of things to talk about. Having things to talk about is very good entertainment if you can find those things. Since people can't find a lot of things to talk about, even after I give them a head start with a potential discussion topic, or say, any discussion topic it doesn't have to be mine, then life sucks. Again, how many topics can you think of to talk about? If you start listing in your head, you will realize that you can't come up with that many. That's miserable. That means any conversation can only be so long and life is really limited to you. Life sucks. If there are a very limited number of fun things to do in life, which there are, then life sucks. How many things can you list of things to do? We've already listed that conversation is very limited itself, and there is little else to do. Sure, you could come up with a list of a few hundred things, but that's IT. It is very limited. All of life can be easily quantified and defined, and you will find the list to be very short indeed. I

mean seriously, what is there to do? Everyone one knows that school sucks. School is only the first 16 or MORE years of your life. Everyone knows that work sucks, which is the rest of your life. You can't play all the time, because, believe it or not, there are only so many things or you can only play for so long. Do a list or start one in your head now, you can only come up with a very limited number of fun things to do. VERY limited. You can't do nothing, if you just stand or sit or lie in place you can only do that for so long without thinking about anything or doing anything. At best you could sit there and think about something, but we've already been over how there are limited conversation topics, (if there are limited conversation topics, there then is limited things to think about). Go on list them in your head, how many fun things are there to think about? I gave one great example that would lead to all potential things to think about in the previous paragraph, and people can't come up with many things to think about from even that. If you can't come up with anything, then that's a lot worse then finding a very tiny limited number of fun things to do.

The conclusion reached thus far reveals that most advanced things in life suck, leaving the simple, natural ones natural and true, things like eating and sleeping, do in fact help people and are in fact the only truly enjoyable things there are to do (the simple things that is, like back before modern civilization. This paper argues that all activities humans do in a post hunter-gatherer culture they don't really enjoy doing, and are deceiving themselves that they like doing it do to societal pressure to conform.

In the cases where modern society brings peace, that peace is good and you like it, but you only like it more than the alternative, war in a modern society. These wars are enormous and involve systematic organized attacks, in a hunter gatherer society there weren't anything around the size of today's nations or even older tribes that formed for organization and cooperation in a war, so there were at most tiny "battles". That is much, much less scary then having to worry about dozens of people or hundreds forming together to kill you. You basically could be alone and have a chance to defend yourself against any band of humans; the packs they traveled in would be so small, deterring them from attacking any other band of humans, because they were all basically the same size. When a war is fought in large numbers the basic humanity and individuality is taken away, a leader can say, let's go to war, he says that because he can just hide behind his men in case things go wrong. If he was in say a 10 man pack, he wouldn't say attack unless it was a life and situation where he HAD to attack, because there wouldn't be any chance of getting away without horses or cars to escape with. One of the greatest fears of modern society is going to war (the dooms day clock, etc) in prehistoric times you wouldn't have to worry about that since there weren't any armies, and the sheer brutality of a human to human fight would deter most individualistic competitions. We sometimes think everything sucks, because, sometimes, everything that is happening to you does!

People didn't evolve for this modern civilization they evolved to live in a hunter-gatherer society. It is very hard to entertain people and get their attention. If you were living under conditions where you had to do stuff, like you had to hunt or you won't get food and you had to do lots of work just in order to survive, you'd be under constant pressure, and your attention would always be there. You'd certainly always have stuff to do, and that stuff would be entertaining because you'd be giving it your full attention, so it would be fulfilling. Most of our lives is spent in buildings which are extremely boring, I mean what is in a building other than a line of sight of 5 feet or less in each direction! A building is also a hard and cold object but nature is much softer. For some reason I get the feeling that I would be happy just walking around outside without modern civilization to "comfort" me. Test it out, try to imagine how that would feel. It feels much better. The threat of your life being on edge gives you a healthy amount of threat that keeps you on edge and healthy. There is also a lot less to think about so your mind is clear. I don't think people were supposed to function having to think about 1000 things each day, it takes an emotional toll that people just weren't designed to handle. If you only dealt with simple things you wouldn't have a toll on your mind. Of course, it would suck to deal with the bugs and not having a bed, so that really isn't a good solution either, I was just pointing out that this is a lose lose situation. That's why life sucks. You have to deal with endless amounts of shit in modern society, and you would have to deal with endless amounts of life threatening shit in pre modern society! But at least the life threatening stuff would be fun and entertaining because your life would be on the line, giving you a healthy amount of anxiety. In today's world everyone is relaxed and not really interested in anything they do. I can prove that because you could see a glow in someone's eyes if their life is threatened, unless we are at that level (that glow) then we're not really entertained. We're not free at all



but burdened by boredom. In pre modern society you'd be free to do what you want, any old time. Now we have the police, government, whatever structure your business or school imposes on you, your family or friends impose on you, etc. If you don't have commitments and attachments, then you don't have your emotions being played with and you don't have anything to lose. The problem with that is that you wouldn't have any commitments or attachments, so that's another lose lose situation. Yoda said, "train yourself to let go of anything you fear to lose" that's good advice, because it's eliminating emotional attachments and clearing your mind, like you would in pre modern society. But you can't do that in modern society, and in pre modern society you'd be worried about losing your life all the time! Life is just endless loss.

## 21.17 Modern Life Is Gay

Domesticated animals are a lot less tuff then non domesticated animals, therefore all domesticated animals are gay, especially relative to a non domesticated equivalent. This relates to life sucks because not only are humans domesticated, but most of the animals they deal with are domesticated by the fact that they interact with humans to some degree. Take wolves and dogs. A dog is a domesticated wolf, it is so domesticated that its entire species evolved from wolf into dog because of its interaction with humans. So in other words, before it was dependent on itself, and then it became dependent on humans. If you're not independent, you're gay. That means you have to rely on something or someone other than yourself for your survival. Modern life is entirely relying on massive amounts of other people and other stuff for your survival. So it's entirely gay. Encyclopedias are gay, they are just massive amounts of collections of information about nothing. Nothing could be more boring and uninteresting then an encyclopedia, except maybe a dictionary. It's gay because it isn't related to your survival, it's an accessory. Why is that gay? Because when you aren't thinking about your survival you're relaxed and doing something relaxing and boring. That's gay because its not intense and interesting. Humans should be dominant over their environment, not succumb to it. The typical view is that humans have dominated nature when the opposite is true, if you put a modern human out in nature they are much less likely to survive then a pre modern one. That makes all current humans gay. They are defeated by nature itself. Gay means non intense. Things that aren't gay are intense. Nothing is more gay than an encyclopedia, which is just massive amounts of the most boring things to think about you could imagine. Things that aren't directly in your environment, and things that you have to think deeply about, are gay because they aren't intense. Even sports are gay, mostly because you aren't trying to kill the other players. You're engaged in this huge battle based on a series of pre agreed upon rules. Rules don't exist in nature, only rules of life. Things that you have to think deeply about are gay because they don't grab your attention naturally, so it just isn't possible to put as much interest in them as you could in something in your immediate environment, say a rock or anything.

## 21.18 Humans are too Simple

The rest of a human can be easily understood and its entire mind figured out as well, as shown by how easily it can be reprogrammed into a robot. (below) The fact that the fundamentals of life can be broken down so easily shows just how simple and pathetic life really is.

Objective: to verbally explain how to create an artificial human. One way to do this is to show all the connections in the human mind and how they work. What is one connection to start. Your physical senses you have physical sense. You have mental senses. But everything begins with a type of physical sense/sensation. So what are all the physical sensations. There are the 5 senses taste, touch, sight, sound and smell. When you walk into a room you experience all of those senses. What if you think about something, that is just thinking about a physical sensation, anything you can think about is really just a physical sensation. Everything is neurological. Including logical thinking structures, which relate in the end to physical sensations as well. Now we need to verbally explain how the human mind works. So when you see things, you get sensations. You get sensations and you get thoughts. Those sensations and thoughts cause feelings. That's it. Why do you get those sensations and thoughts and feelings? Well a physical sensation is just neurological stimulation

from a sense. If you touch something neurological signals are sent to your brain that you are having feeling at that touch, that is a feeling, just touching something causes a feeling. Similarly smelling something causes another feeling. As with the other senses. Thoughts can also cause feelings, you can think about something happy or something sad. Why would one thing cause happiness? Some things stimulate your neurons while other things don't stimulate them, so happiness would be the neurological stimulation.

“Meaning” is just neurological stimulation. How do some things stimulate your neurons and make you happy while others don't? A girl might have a pretty face that when you look at makes you happy. So visually you get pleased. When you think of the girl, you would get happy, and the reason would be it stimulates your visual center of the brain. Why do pretty things stimulate the visual center of your brain? Because they are easier to think about. Why are they easier to think about? Because they stimulate your neurons. Why do ugly things not stimulate your neurons? I think because something pretty puts you in a good mood. Why would something like a pretty lake calm someone down? Its obvious why seeing violence would not calm someone down, because it causes you to think about violence which is threatening to that person, causing them to shut down with worry. In that case the visual leads to thought. Maybe something like water or a large landscape leads to no thought because there is nothing to do in those environments, because they are so peaceful and have nothing in them. And something pretty has fun things to do in it and fun things to feel, like feelings jagged edges wouldn't be fun, but feeling smooth ones would be fun because it doesn't disrupt your senses. So smooth things are prettier and jagged things are usually uglier. So the entire visual sensation isn't really a sensation, it just causes you to think about more real sensations like touch and touching things. Something jagged feels bad when you touch it so it's ugly. Why else would you take pleasure from seeing something? Seriously... The pleasure has to derive from somewhere real. Smell is just stimulating different neurons in your brain. Same with taste. How would I verbally describe smell/taste? Maybe that's wrong and feeling is just what the physical object causes you to think about. Like if you had a mechanic arm it would feel... mechanical. When you have a human arm is feels real and mushy, which is what the arm causes you to think about, mushy stuff like blood and muscles interacting. And if you get shot you think about things getting destroyed, so you feel pain. So if you had a mechanical arm it would feel exactly like that, a mechanical arm, you'd feel like a robot. So we can give our robot a mechanical body and he'd feel it just by thinking about it. And a visual processor to process the lines and smoothness and patterns he sees. Then when sees a pattern that is harmonious, he will think of harmony and that will make him happy. We can tell him what to do “get up and walk around”. How would he understand that. He can learn from his visual processor, getting up would just be his observation of other things and objects getting up, when he sees a human get up they move their legs and torso in a certain way, etc. So he just copies that with his body. Simple. So just give him lots of visual data to process. With descriptions of what everything that is going on is. Then when he hears someone say that, he will understand and respond.

## 21.19 Either Mental or Physical

Life is empty because it is filled with objects not emotions. When you look around you now you see cold, hard objects. When you touch those objects they are all cold and hard. How many soft warm things are there? Skin isn't really soft its more rough and callus. So that leaves out animals. Even if you can come up with a good conversation, then you're just stuck in your head thinking. You're not out and about, moving around. You're really alone in your little head. And you don't move very fast, you're looking at the world from the perspective of your head, and your body can only move so fast. Even if you're in a plane or a car or a bike, your body isn't moving that much. If you're running you're focusing on putting in all that effort moving and can't really look at the scenery. So you can never really feel like you're moving fast yourself.

Where is the fun in life if you can never move around without being jarred. If your body is being moved instead of you moving like running then you're not really feeling anything because all the sensations your body has aren't collecting sensations. Just visual isn't enough because the world is cold and hard like we went over before. And you can't get enough physical sensation to please yourself. Mental sensations (like thinking) are limited because they are just thinking. So all we have left to live in life is physical stuff. But you can only move around so fast. Visual can move quickly but when it does it just becomes too complicated.

And admit it, most of the time you're not running around (which would be dizzying if you did) and exercising (which would involve a lot of sweat) so you're just being cold and unmoving yourself. Humans are just little pathetic creatures that think they are powerful when they are actually weak. All golf players can do with all their strength is put a little tiny ball in a hole. Hockey players can only shoot around a puck smaller than their hand. So clearly all physical activity sucks. And we eliminated mental activity as being bad because it's too boring. That's all there is to do in life, either something mental or something physical.

## 21.20 Rejoicing Too Much In Negativity

People like pain too much. They like watching violence, and they laugh at "funny" violent cartoons where the cartoon characters get hurt then spring right back up as if nothing happened. That is more evidence that people enjoy pain. People also like hurting other people, as that causes pain which they can experience. This all contributes the world being sick and life sucking. People enjoy pain as well as pleasure because both in the end boil down to stimulating your neurons, it's a stimulus, and since there is nothing to do in life, some stimulus is better than nothing, even if it happens to be pain. Pain might even be as fun as happy stuff because there is just as much happy stuff as sad stuff in the world, so for you to be happiest you'd have to get half your stimulation from pain and half from pleasure. If you're watching something and it involves pain and pleasure, and a person that enjoys both pain and pleasure is there he will enjoy it more than someone that just experiences pleasure, so that person wins. Evolutionarily we evolved so that we'd enjoy both for that reason. The reason you feel from both pain and pleasure is because of what the things cause you to think about. When you see someone in action that action is fun, but if they suddenly get shot that is fun too, I can prove it's fun because it happens in movies and stuff that people love to watch, so they must like seeing it. It's fun because it causes you to think more deeply about that person and their life, the fact that they had to get shot for you to think more deeply about them is a minor detail, it just means it causes you to think about that person, and how their life is ending. It's still a lot of stimulation so it's actually a lot of fun. Life is incredibly sick. You may not be smiling as it happens (unless you're sadistic or something) but it's still stimulation, which is a relief from boredom, which you are very happy to have.

## 21.21 Sad Vs Pain

When you're sad it's probably from a lack of stimulus, which would cause your neurons to fire less giving you less pleasure. Pain is fun because it causes you to have a reaction, so it's a stimulus. Too much pain might not be fun however but the right amount could "wake you up" or something, you know what I mean. Sad stuff causes your mind to shut down, and when your mind is shut down it doesn't really have pain from being shut down, so it's possible to be miserable and it not be a good thing like I said how right amounts of pain could be good sometimes, just like right amounts of pleasure can be good as well. This emphasizes the point that sometimes people do have depression, and are in fact actually sad, and their lives miserable. Boredom however isn't going to cause sadness it's going to cause pain, so if an activity is boring you can still do it because you'll still be getting stimulation from it. However that's sick because you are doing something is causing you to feel pain and you enjoy it, so that should be minimized. The more pain you have the more you hate other people and hate life because you're in pain. A healthy amount of pain is ok however because it gives you the right amount of stimulus to give you a healthy edge and keep you alert, but too much will cause you to be a hateful person. Most people are hateful people because of that, they do boring stuff a lot and it causes them to hate the world, and be in pain. In fact, since there isn't enough stuff to do not boring stuff all the time or even a small amount of the time (which we've already concluded) everyone hates the world and is bitter and mean. That makes sense, if most of the stuff you do is boring, it's going to cause you pain which is going to wake you up in terms of stimulus, which would make you not sad and appear to be normal. That is what a normal person is in fact. People aren't smiling all the time. They all have inner pain, which gives them strength. Of course there are some things people enjoy doing, but those things are very few compared to how much gives them pain. This all goes to show just how easily someone can

tolerate the idea of pain, so they can give pain to other people very easily and not feel anything because they are driven by it. They even enjoy watching it like violent shows or movies. Fear causes pain as well, that would be the genre "horror". How do I know it causes pain? You can tell because it causes that sharp, fast reaction that wakes up your mind and gets your neurons firing. That's stimulus which comes from pain, and the sickening feeling you get when you see it is the pain itself. So I guess just intense fear like in horror causes pain, and small amounts of fear only cause small amounts of pain. So people actually like to terrify other people and cause them pain, because it will cause their mind to think about those things, waking them up neurologically and giving them stimulus causing them to be happy. Of course, if that kind of fear like in horror movies happened to you it would be too much fear (if you were the person in the movie) but it's the right amount of fear for you to watch a lot of fear in someone else. Because it causes you to think about what is going on, which causes the right amount of pain and fear. Like I said before the right amount of pain and fear are good for people, but only in the right amount which usually isn't a lot of pain and fear. That small amount of pain and fear keep you on edge and happy and stimulated. So when you watch that violence and see someone else in pain or fear, you get happy because it causes you to have small amounts of pain or fear yourself (because you have to think about what is going on, causing similar neurons to fire in your mind as the person you are watching, aka empathy). So in other words, people like causing, or watching massive amounts of pain and fear in other people!

## Chapter 22

# Sherlock Holmes: a series devoid of emotional content<sup>1</sup>

Sherlock Holmes is a warm and friendly character trying to solve murders and robberies. There is a high contrast between someone warm and friendly trying to solve crimes. If you have a warm and friendly main character in a crime investigation, you can't have a strongly evil villain because there would be too high a contrast and it wouldn't work. Furthermore there was little character development in Sherlock Holmes; it was all investigation and logic. With no character development at all of the person committing the crime, you can't have a strongly evil character. Then again each episode was too short to develop the characters that much, so it was basically a short thriller, a quick in and out of a highly intense crime, no character development, just the facts of the murder. Furthermore the crimes were usually economically motivated not personal, that is because for them to be personal you'd have to back that up with character development which didn't exist. You have to have two opposing personalities for a personal crime, and there weren't really any personalities in Sherlock. The crimes being economically, not personally motivated adds to the logical, non emotional tone of the series. Furthermore, when crimes are committed, the person committing them is less emotional during the action of the crime in order to do the deed. That is because one needs to isolate oneself from the drama of doing something bad. With personal crimes someone has an emotional relationship to the person, and therefore it is harder to be remote from the crime, and therefore that person appears softer. That softer appearance would lessen the intensity of the crime because it is a situation where the two people have an emotional relationship. The emotion makes the crime more emotional and less logical. Something emotional isn't as scary as something logical because you add those fuzzy emotions in. Even if the emotion is hate, it still intensifies the interpersonal relationship. That is because with humans a hate on hate interaction is actually more amusing than scary. That is because humans aren't aggressive, lions hating each other would be scary, but humans hating each other isn't. Sherlock Holmes crimes were of cold calculation, not emotional interest. Take two monkeys that hate each other, it is amusing, that is what a human hating another human is like, funny. That is why there weren't personal hatreds in Sherlock Holmes, it would have appeared amusing. In other crime stories the villain is usually at least looking for a goal of some sort, some greater aspiration of evil like to do more crime (a repeated criminal). But in Sherlock Holmes the criminals were mostly one time committers, not serial criminals. That is because a serial criminal would be too emotionally involved in committing crimes. A serial criminal is something to be emotional about, it is much more intense then someone just doing one crime. The lack of serial criminals also takes away from the emotional content in the series, and adds to the lack of character development of the potential criminals. Furthermore if someone was a serial murderer they would have been more suspected than the other potential criminals, throwing off the intensity of wondering "who done it?". As a TV series, Sherlock Holmes was just something you sat down, watched for a short period of time, and finished, it wasn't something you would get deeply or emotionally involved in, there were only two characters that repeated

---

<sup>1</sup>This content is available online at <<http://cnx.org/content/m14348/1.4/>>.

from each show to the next, most shows have a few more than that. Furthermore the details of Sherlock Holmes life were minimal, we weren't even aware of where the main characters lived. The logical tone to the series, however, added to its suspense. If you made the series emotional then it wouldn't be as scary, there needs to be that emptiness in your head that comes from logic and a lack of emotion, in order to add to the scary feeling. Emotion is comforting and safe, logic and clear thinking is potentially very scary if you put it in the hands of a criminal. So people sit down to watch a short, intense logical, scary, emotionless experience of Sherlock Holmes.

## Chapter 23

# Commentary on Descartes' Discourse on Method and Meditations on First Philosophy<sup>1</sup>

Descartes thought that learning for yourself would be better than learning from someone else, since people tend to have emotional influences. It is probably true that learning from the source when studying human behavior is going to be more efficient than learning from someone's interpretation of the source if you use good judgment yourself. In the case of emotional observations (or observing human behavior) this is especially obvious because the people who preach have a tendency to pretend they know more than they actually do, or try to appear to be better than they are. In this emotional prejudice the truth can be altered from reality, or the source. As Descartes said, "Those who set about giving precepts must esteem themselves more skilful than those to whom they advance them" (pg 7). In other words, someone might alter the truth solely so they could come up with something to say, while the real truth might not be capable of being expressed so easily, it can only be observed. Some things in life are too complicated to express, but however there are going to be people who believe they can express those things, even though they cannot accurately do so. Even knowing your own understanding of the truth might not be completely certain, as you might distort reality or truth so it can be easier to understand, yet possibly not understood at the same time. However, someone's version of the truth might help you to think about the things you have observed and make you better able to interpret reality for yourself – you just should remember that what they say might be wrong and that you need to rely on your own observations and empirical evidence to make certain of its truth. That shows how even something you label false might have elements of truth.

It is hard to assess the truth of many emotional circumstances, however, because emotions are not easily measured. For instance, if you are going to assess how much one person likes someone else, you cannot say, "this person likes that person with 60% passion". You could take various factors of the relationship and analyze them, however for each one of those factors you are going to have an emotional (possibly wrong) opinion as to how much each of those factors weigh in. Dealing with emotional intelligence is basically dealing with an endless number of unknowns, only leading to more unknowns. The only thing to do would be to keep exploring unknowns until you find some minor degree of things you know to a reasonable degree are true. In that manner anyone's idea of what is real could be very uncertain, and that is why it is best to explore reality for yourself. Everyone obviously takes information from reality for themselves, and they are living in the real world just like everyone else, however there can be degrees of separation from an actual experience. A clear example of that would be that you could possibly learn more about the truth better from someone directly than indirectly.

Another question entirely is - are the emotions which are based off of your opinions even real, since they

---

<sup>1</sup>This content is available online at <<http://cnx.org/content/m18416/1.1/>>.

are based off of opinions? For instance, when you judge how cool or interesting something is, that judgment is going to influence how much enjoyment you get from that thing, since your enjoyment of it comes from both how cool it actually is, and how cool you think it is. For instance, if you think that a person is not interesting, you are going to not be as interested in them and therefore not feel good things from them like you would from a person you are interested in. The questions are, how much does your opinion of them differ from the truth, and how much does your opinion of them influence how you feel about them? Those questions can be applied to anything in life. If you think something is interesting, you are going to be more interested in it. It is almost as if your opinions trigger and direct your emotions. If you think something is more valuable then you might be better able to recognize value that is actually there.

How much does your perception of what is going on impact how what you feel is going on? Your perception is going to determine what it is that you feel, that is, your conscious and unconscious perception of what is going on is. If you have a strong false conscious perception of what is going on you are going to feel differently, or think different things from the reality. Your unconscious mind, however, probably isn't going to have a false perception of what is going on by itself since your unconscious mind is your natural mind and many other factors could be being influenced there that trigger real emotions which you don't have conscious control over. For instance, a situation may be very complicated, so your conscious perception can only be so complicated because you can only have so advanced a perception of the situation that you are aware of, so thankfully you can only alter reality so much. The rest of how you feel is going to be determined by lots of complicated unconscious factors, or every factor that is a factor, technically so because that is all going to be processed at least unconsciously. That is also why learning from the source is going to be better than someone's interpretation of it, because the source is going to be much more complicated than a simple verbal explanation. So the statement, "nothing is real, only your perception of it is" is not true because your perception is going to be limited by how much you are capable of consciously perceiving.

That previous quote from Descartes also explains another passage he used:

For it seemed to me that I might meet with much more truth in the reasonings that each man makes on the matters that specially concern him, and the issue of which would very soon punish him if he made a wrong judgment, than in the case of those made by a man of letters in his study touching speculations that lead to no result, and that bring about no other consequences to himself excepting that he will be all the more vain the more they are removed from common sense, since in this case proves to him to have employed so much more ingenuity and skill trying to make them seem probable. (pg 10 the European philosophers)

That passage shows well how everything that someone thinks is going to be true to a certain degree. It is going to be absorbed a certain amount; however your understanding of how much it is absorbed is also going to vary by degree, not necessarily related to the reality. There are also going to be different types of truths, and different ways in which knowledge can be absorbed. It can be understood emotionally. It can be understood emotionally in different ways and in each different way, it could affect a different other sort of knowledge already in your mind. For instance, one piece of knowledge could change your viewpoint on another piece of knowledge or opinion in your mind. This shows how all knowledge is really just opinion, or belief, since it can vary so much based off of new material, or, since we just defined knowledge as belief, new beliefs. By stating "knowledge" or "belief" here, you should understand that both are clearly emotional intelligence. As an example you could use the idea of how much you enjoy going to playgrounds and parks. The idea of that and what you understand about it could be influenced by your understanding of how much you like going to other events. A whole set of experiences could be used and that could be one way your mind compares or processes things. One certain experience, or a few ideas however might be much more significant and relevant to other ideas then all the ideas you have in your mind, however. So it is not as if everything is infinitely complicated, with everything tying into everything else in some infinitely complicated way.

The previous passage is in turn explained by the quote:

More especially did I reflect in each matter that came before me as to anything that could make it subject to suspicion of doubt, and give occasion for mistake, and I rooted out of my mind all the errors that might have formerly crept in. Not that indeed I imitated the skeptics, who only doubt for the sake of doubting, and pretend to be always uncertain; for, on the contrary, my design was only to provide myself with good



ground for assurance, and to reject the quicksand and mud in order to find the rock or clay.” (pg 22 the European philosophers)

Using experiences in life, or anything that is complicated beyond a practical reality is going to involve emotional intelligence. When I talked about how a lot of reality is going to be knowledge of belief I was referring to understanding things that can be manipulated in your mind as to your viewpoint, versus thinking about things that don't have an emotional impact on you and is more like you are just manipulating a certain real reality in different numbers or amounts (like doing math) but not your personal viewpoint. When your viewpoint for a specific thing, or even your overall viewpoint is being manipulated by yourself you are using emotional intelligence. That manipulation might occur when you are thinking about anything that can have various different perspectives, which could be a lot of things. In fact, even something mathematical is going to have different perspectives, for instance, if you get the wrong answer you have a wrong perspective of what you think is the truth. That shows how emotions are going to play a role in even simple things in life, like calculating how many objects there are in a room, or doing other mathematical like calculations. They play a role because for each different perspective you have on the answer, there is going to be a different emotional outlook. For instance, you might be happy if there are a large number of objects in a room, but sad if there are very few. A lot of life is going to consist of observations and behaviors that can be described simply. In that way it is easy to see how a lot of life can be “true”, because when you describe what happens in life in a simple way you also see a certain emotional truth, which would seem to be a more significant aspect of how reality functions.

However, since emotional intelligence is not completely concrete, it can be subject to skeptics, or however as Descartes puts it you should try “to reject the quicksand and mud in order to find the rock or clay”. It is also shown here that since emotional intelligence consists of calculating real things which exist in certain numbers, and can be manipulated in a mathematical like way, that emotional intelligence and non-emotional intelligence - where you manipulate real things in certain numbers – are the same. So you can do math for emotional things and you would be using your emotional intelligence, or you could manipulate non emotional things in your mind (say just calculating different probabilities of something simple) and it wouldn't be using your emotional intelligence as much. Emotional intelligence and non-emotional intelligence are similar in nature because you are manipulating things in both instances; one just affects you to a greater degree.

There is another question Descartes asked that relates to the previous quote of those, and it is basically “how do I know that anything is even real”? He states the following showing how someone could doubt the existence of everything:

Accordingly I shall now suppose, not that a true God, who as such must be supremely good and the fountain of truth, but that some malignant genius exceedingly powerful and cunning has devoted all his powers in the deceiving of me; I shall suppose that the sky, the earth, colors, shapes, sounds and all external things are illusions and impostures of which this evil genius has availed himself for the abuse of my credulity. . .” (pg 32 the European philosophers)

Asking that question is like asking how certain and true anything is, only it is suggesting that there could be a large degree of uncertainly present. It also might mean that the world is either false and simply not there at all. If the latter two things can be identified then the degree of uncertainty involved will also be somewhat resolved.

Saying that the world is false is implying that it is generating emotions in you that are not accurate. The ultimate objective of anything real is to generate emotion, so if something is real but “false” then it must be generating emotions that it shouldn't be generating. It would still have to be real, however, since it is generating emotions (unless you are imagining it, but then in that case what your imagination is creating can be considered real, and that thing is itself based off of something else that was real – or had some real characteristics – at one point). So if everything was false someone wouldn't have any basis to know what truth is at all. If something generates an emotion, then that emotion is real. Your mind might have an emotional bias, however, and be distorting that emotion. For instance, if you have a prejudice against someone they are going to cause you to feel things about them which are false. So how does anyone know that anything they feel is unbiased? The physical world must be real because we can be certain that something physical is there, however it could be shaped in a way that deceives our emotions. A way to figure out how

true something is is to take that thing and compare it in all ways it presents itself in various situations, that way you can take data from where you see it more true in one instance and apply that to see how it might be false in another.

Saying that the world is not there entirely is like saying that the world is false, only it suggests that instead of generating a false or biased feeling, it is not generating any feeling at all. If a feeling is being generated, something must be there, but you might not know how deceiving that thing is. So ultimately it is best to know a combination of all three things, or the certainty of how true and false something is (and those things related to everything else).

Another question altogether is not whether the world exists, but if the person contemplating if the world exists, exists. Descartes seemed to believe that since he was capable of thought, he existed:

I am, I exist. This is certain. How often? As often as I think. For it might indeed be that if I entirely ceased to think, I should thereupon altogether cease to exist. I am not at present admitting anything which is not necessarily true; and, accurately speaking, I am therefore [taking myself to be] only a thinking thing, that is to say, a mind, an understanding or reason—terms the significance of which has hitherto been unknown to me. I am, then a real thing, and really existent. What thing? I have said it, a thinking thing. (pg 35 the European philosophers)

He says he is “a mind, an understanding or reason” which means that all his thoughts together form this understanding and complete mind. He is not just one understanding, people understand lots of things, but all of them would form who he is. Maybe the understanding of who he is occurs in an instant, and in this instant he is only one understanding, reason or mind. He can spend a lot of time contemplating his existence, or glimpse it in an instant. However, this understanding of who he is he carries with him all of the time, only more in the background than when he is thinking about his existence. So it really is thought that makes him who he is, since he is thinking about himself all of the time, in addition to thinking about and in regular life.

Thought determines who someone is because your thoughts are controlled, and all your thoughts over your lifetime caused your emotional development, which causes you to be who you are. There are also feelings, but since someone cannot control their feelings their feelings aren't a part of who they really are. Who you really are is someone that is what they want to be, and what they want to be is going to be something they can think about. If you are emotionally damaged you might act in a way you don't want to, and be presenting yourself to be different from who you really are. That would only cause other people to view you as different from who you are, your thoughts are still intact and you are still who you really are inside (for the most part). Thoughts are controlled and directed; feelings mostly cannot be directed or controlled. Your consciousness is therefore going to be more determined by your thoughts, not your emotions. So it is easy to say that your thoughts understand and/or control who you are, but it is much harder to say that your emotions understand and/or control who you are.

That question, of who someone is, is so large and complicated that it brings up another question that maybe God Himself is deceiving us in this world, for this world (and understand who we are) is so complicated that maybe we are being deceived. Descartes also had his own ideas about the existence of God and his capability of deception:

I recognize it is impossible that He should ever deceive me, since in all fraud and deception there is some element of imperfection. The power of deception may indeed seem to be evidence of subtlety or power; yet unquestionably the will to deceive testifies to malice and febleness, and accordingly cannot be found in God. (pg 54 the European philosophers)

If a human or a God created infinite pain in people, or was infinitely evil and deceptive, then this being would not be considered to be perfect because he or she would irritate everyone. The idea of a successful human is one that achieves personal fulfillment, and it is hard to imagine someone achieving a lot of satisfaction if they alienate everyone extremely. This doesn't mean, however that if someone pleases everyone infinitely their life is going to be infinitely good as well. Also, since a perfect God would do everything perfectly, if He irritated people, He would do it perfectly, and that would mean irritating them infinitely, which doesn't seem like a perfect thing to do. Although it isn't conclusive as to whether or not pleasing other people infinitely is going to be self-beneficial, it could be considered a perfect thing to do since

it is positively contributing to life. Even if someone is cruel to someone else, there is still a human connection that exists between them. This connection would become evident if the cruel person tried to be perfectly cruel, or cruel in such a way that the feelings of the other person became too evident, at which point the cruel person wouldn't be capable of doing harm. For instance, a person couldn't spend all day shooting people lined up, one after another, without it causing them distress. Since God is perfect, he would either do perfect harm or perfect good, but perfect harm isn't possible because it would intensify negative feelings so much that they would become destructive to even the person doing the damage. Perfectly good feelings, however, don't have to be intense - they could just be ordinary feelings and still be considered perfectly good. It is as if the true nature of evil is too vile to even exist. This philosophy is portrayed in a quote by Ralph Emerson - "To laugh often and much; To win the respect of intelligent people and the affection of children; To earn the appreciation of honest critics and endure the betrayal of false friends; To appreciate beauty, to find the best in others; To leave the world a bit better, whether by a healthy child, a garden patch, or a redeemed social condition; To know even one life has breathed easier because you have lived. This is to have succeeded" The quote is a reflection of the ideas behind a good person and that this person is so good that any hint of cruelty wouldn't be tolerated (especially perfect cruelty), and therefore perfect cruelty couldn't exist. So when someone contemplates if they want to be cruel or good, when they realize they can only be so cruel so they also realize how they are good, and this sympathy can be conveyed in grand kind statements (like the Emerson quote).

#### Bibliography

Beardsley, M. C. (ED.) [1992 Modern library Edition Copyright 1960 Random House, Inc Copyright renewed 1988 by Random House, Inc.]. *The European Philosophers from Descartes to Nietzsche*. New York, USA and Toronto, Canada.

## Index of Keywords and Terms

**Keywords** are listed by the section with that keyword (page numbers are in parentheses). Keywords do not necessarily appear in the text of the page. They are merely associated with that section. *Ex.* apples, § 1.1 (1) **Terms** are referenced by the page they appear on. *Ex.* apples, 1

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>A</b> aesthetics, § 13(81)   | <b>H</b> happiness, § 4(7)   |
| <b>B</b> beauty, § 13(81)<br>bravery, § 4(7)  | <b>I</b> intellect, § 5(9)   |
| <b>C</b> confidence, § 4(7)<br>consciousness, § 1(1)<br>conscioiusness, § 12(79)  | <b>L</b> life sucks, § 21(103)<br>logic, § 5(9)                                    |
| <b>D</b> depression, § 20(101)<br>descartes philosophy, § 23(121)<br>dreaming, § 16(91), § 17(93)<br>dreams, § 16(91), § 17(93) | <b>P</b> psychology, § 6(13), § 15(89)   |
| <b>E</b> emotion, § 9(73), § 16(91), § 17(93), § 18(97),<br>§ 19(99), § 20(101)<br>existence, § 7(65)                           | <b>S</b> sadness, § 20(101)<br>sherlock holmes, § 22(119)<br>stimulation, § 18(97) |
|   | <b>T</b> tragedy, § 21(103)  |
|   | <b>V</b> vision, § 13(81)  |

## Attributions

Collection: *The Complete Psychological Writings of Mark Pettinelli*

Edited by: Mark Pettinelli

URL: <http://cnx.org/content/col10729/1.16/>

License: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/>

Module: "What Makes Humans Conscious?"

By: Mark Pettinelli

URL: <http://cnx.org/content/m26962/1.2/>

Pages: 1-2

Copyright: Mark Pettinelli

License: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/>

Module: "How Emotion is Processed"

By: Mark Pettinelli

URL: <http://cnx.org/content/m16292/1.4/>

Page: 3

Copyright: Mark Pettinelli

License: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/2.0/>

Module: "Problems with Your Life You Might not be Aware of: A Guide for Self Improvement"

By: Mark Pettinelli

URL: <http://cnx.org/content/m16197/1.4/>

Pages: 5-6

Copyright: Mark Pettinelli

License: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/2.0/>

Module: "Happiness, Confidence, Bravery and Courage"

By: Mark Pettinelli

URL: <http://cnx.org/content/m14865/1.4/>

Page: 7

Copyright: Mark Pettinelli

License: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/2.0/>

Module: "Logic Vs. Intellect"

By: Mark Pettinelli

URL: <http://cnx.org/content/m14341/1.7/>

Pages: 9-11

Copyright: Mark Pettinelli

License: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/2.0/>

Module: "The Psychology Of Emotions, Feelings and Thoughts"

By: Mark Pettinelli

URL: <http://cnx.org/content/m14358/1.89/>

Pages: 13-63

Copyright: Mark Pettinelli

License: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/>

Module: "The Sum of Existence"

By: Mark Pettinelli

URL: <http://cnx.org/content/m15581/1.4/>

Pages: 65-68

Copyright: Mark Pettinelli

License: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/2.0/>

Module: "A Look beyond the 16 Personality Types: Why they aren't Sufficient"

By: Mark Pettinelli

URL: <http://cnx.org/content/m16178/1.8/>

Pages: 69-71

Copyright: Mark Pettinelli

License: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/2.0/>

Module: "What to Do About Negative Emotions"

By: Mark Pettinelli

URL: <http://cnx.org/content/m14329/1.4/>

Pages: 73-74

Copyright: Mark Pettinelli

License: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/2.0/>

Module: "Definition of Spirituality"

By: Mark Pettinelli

URL: <http://cnx.org/content/m15871/1.4/>

Page: 75

Copyright: Mark Pettinelli

License: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/2.0/>

Module: "Definition of Literacy"

By: Mark Pettinelli

URL: <http://cnx.org/content/m15760/1.8/>

Pages: 77-78

Copyright: Mark Pettinelli

License: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/>

Module: "Consciousness is Thoughts and Emotions: A Whole Brain Approach"

By: Mark Pettinelli

URL: <http://cnx.org/content/m15625/1.7/>

Page: 79

Copyright: Mark Pettinelli

License: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/2.0/>

Module: "How Beauty Can Be Quantified"

By: Mark Pettinelli

URL: <http://cnx.org/content/m14303/1.7/>

Pages: 81-85

Copyright: Mark Pettinelli

License: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/2.0/>

Module: "The definition and meaning of the words "idea", "thought" and "sentence"."

By: Mark Pettinelli

URL: <http://cnx.org/content/m14812/1.11/>

Pages: 87-88

Copyright: Mark Pettinelli

License: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/>

Module: "Lauren Caitlin Upton Answered Question Intelligently"

By: Mark Pettinelli

URL: <http://cnx.org/content/m15607/1.5/>

Page: 89

Copyright: Mark Pettinelli

License: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/2.0/>

Module: "Dreams Are Fun Because They Are Emotional Not Logical"

By: Mark Pettinelli

URL: <http://cnx.org/content/m14302/1.8/>

Pages: 91-92

Copyright: Mark Pettinelli

License: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/2.0/>

Module: "Dreams Rarely Make Sense Because They Are Usually More Emotional Than Logical"

By: Mark Pettinelli

URL: <http://cnx.org/content/m14300/1.6/>

Pages: 93-95

Copyright: Mark Pettinelli

License: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/2.0/>

Module: "Most Stimulation Is Physical"

By: Mark Pettinelli

URL: <http://cnx.org/content/m14805/1.7/>

Pages: 97-98

Copyright: Mark Pettinelli

License: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/2.0/>

Module: "The Significance of Emotion In Humans/Animals"

By: Mark Pettinelli

URL: <http://cnx.org/content/m14315/1.8/>

Pages: 99-100

Copyright: Mark Pettinelli

License: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/2.0/>

Module: "The Relationship Between Sadness And Depression"

By: Mark Pettinelli

URL: <http://cnx.org/content/m14305/1.4/>

Pages: 101-102

Copyright: Mark Pettinelli

License: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/2.0/>

Module: "Life Is Tragic"

By: Mark Pettinelli

URL: <http://cnx.org/content/m14304/1.10/>

Pages: 103-118

Copyright: Mark Pettinelli

License: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/2.0/>

Module: "Sherlock Holmes: a series devoid of emotional content"

By: Mark Pettinelli

URL: <http://cnx.org/content/m14348/1.4/>

Pages: 119-120

Copyright: Mark Pettinelli

License: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/2.0/>

Module: "Commentary on Descartes' Discourse on Method and Meditations on First Philosophy"

By: Mark Pettinelli

URL: <http://cnx.org/content/m18416/1.1/>

Pages: 121-125

Copyright: Mark Pettinelli

License: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/2.0/>



### **The Complete Psychological Writings of Mark Pettinelli**

This book isn't actually all my writing, if you click on the link to my name, that shows all my articles. The external web link goes to this book on amazon.com ISBN-13: 978-0615215600

### **About Connexions**

Since 1999, Connexions has been pioneering a global system where anyone can create course materials and make them fully accessible and easily reusable free of charge. We are a Web-based authoring, teaching and learning environment open to anyone interested in education, including students, teachers, professors and lifelong learners. We connect ideas and facilitate educational communities.

Connexions's modular, interactive courses are in use worldwide by universities, community colleges, K-12 schools, distance learners, and lifelong learners. Connexions materials are in many languages, including English, Spanish, Chinese, Japanese, Italian, Vietnamese, French, Portuguese, and Thai. Connexions is part of an exciting new information distribution system that allows for **Print on Demand Books**. Connexions has partnered with innovative on-demand publisher QOOP to accelerate the delivery of printed course materials and textbooks into classrooms worldwide at lower prices than traditional academic publishers.