

# 15.58x More Likely to Be a Genius: The Impact of Handedness and Pantheism on Cognitive Abilities

Jason Burns, Neuresthetics LLC

10 June 2025

---

## Abstract

Clarification: This method does not make you 15-16 times smarter. The traits being looked at here have impact on two brain regions which form the central structural bottleneck of the brain; giving the physical capacity to do more mentally, among all other variables and traits.

This study proposes a novel approach to cognitive enhancement by exploiting an observed statistical overrepresentation of left-handed-enabled (including those who can use both hands/ambidextrous) individuals with pantheistic beliefs. Among a sample of 77 historical and modern geniuses (from 100 selected by AI), where the prevalence of this combination (7.59%) significantly exceeds the expected probability (0.5%). We hypothesize that this pattern reflects an underlying neurocognitive advantage mediated by the Posterior Cingulate Cortex (PCC), a key region divided across the corpus callosum (CC), which acts as a structural bottleneck in brain communication traffic. Drawing on the established "bottleneck hypothesis," we suggest that left-handedness or ambidexterity enhances interhemispheric communication through the corpus callosum size, potentially optimizing information processing in the PCC, a key central hub for integrating sensory, emotional, and cognitive data through the total self and unified experience of thought. Concurrently, pantheistic beliefs—characterized by a view of divinity as immanent in nature and aligned with scientific inquiry—may foster a cognitive framework that promotes holistic thinking and creativity, further amplifying PCC-mediated connectivity. By intentionally adopting left-handed or ambidextrous practices (e.g., through training) and embracing pantheistic perspectives, individuals may enhance cognitive flexibility and creative problem-solving simply as a matter of physical network economization. We propose experimental designs to test this hypothesis, including neuroimaging studies to examine PCC activity and behavioral interventions to assess the cognitive impacts of handedness training and philosophical orientation. These findings could inform strategies for cognitive optimization in educational and professional settings, leveraging neuroplasticity and belief systems to emulate the cognitive profiles of exceptional thinkers.

---

## Data

Given the "top 100 geni of all time" according to public sources using Grok (removal of human selection helps eliminate selection bias) (the sample of 100 was split in two queries of 50 to account for context window given the use of the Deep Search function.).

### Generation:

Generate a table.  
column A: top 50 genius of all time.  
column B: weather each person in A was/is right/left/ambidextrous handed.  
column C: the spiritual disposition of each person.  
column D: the % likeness of C to Pantheism/scientifically literate theology.

### Plus:

Same format, but the next 50 people. No repeats.

### Lists Combined:

Below is a comprehensive table listing 100 individuals widely regarded as geniuses, their handedness, spiritual disposition, and the estimated percentage likeness of their beliefs to Pantheism or scientifically literate theology. The data is compiled from various sources, with assumptions made where information is incomplete.

Note: There are some potential errors in human record keeping which is drawn upon by AI, such as DaVinci being labeled by the AI as "left-handed", when several biographies (Walter Isaacson, Giorgio Vasari for example) suggest he was ambidextrous, writing forwards and backwards with either hand. One of the issues with a study of this kind is the inherent bias of interpretation, so feedback to the AI about mistakes like this is withheld to preserve the removal of human bias in analysis of the broader pattern.

Genius	Handedness	Spiritual Disposition	% Likeness to Pantheism/Scientifically Literate Theology
Albert Einstein	Left-handed	Cosmic religion	80%
Leonardo da Vinci	Left-handed	Christian	60%
Isaac Newton	Right-handed	Christian	70%
Nikola Tesla	Left-handed	Spiritual	50%
Marie Curie	Right-handed	Atheist	10%
Stephen Hawking	Left-handed	Atheist	5%
Charles Darwin	Right-handed	Agnostic	20%
Galileo Galilei	Right-handed	Catholic	80%
Aristotle	Right-handed	Believed in Prime Mover	70%

Plato	Right-handed	Believed in Forms	70%
Socrates	Right-handed	Believed in gods, questioned traditions	50%
Thomas Edison	Right-handed	Agnostic	20%
Benjamin Franklin	Left-handed	Deist	60%
Ada Lovelace	Right-handed	Christian	50%
Alan Turing	Right-handed	Atheist	10%
Johannes Gutenberg	Right-handed	Christian	50%
William Shakespeare	Right-handed	Christian	50%
Ludwig van Beethoven	Left-handed	Christian	50%
Michelangelo	Left-handed	Christian	50%
Baruch Spinoza	Right-handed	Pantheist	90%
Richard "Rick" Rosner	Left-handed	Unknown	Unknown
Marilyn vos Savant	Left-handed	Unknown	Unknown
Christopher Langan	Right-handed	Unknown	Unknown
Nathan Leopold	Left-handed	Unknown	Unknown
Marnen Laibow-Koser	Left-handed	Unknown	Unknown
Ainan Cawley	Right-handed	Unknown	Unknown
Adragon De Mello	Right-handed	Unknown	Unknown
Michael Kearney	Right-handed	Unknown	Unknown
Nadia Camukova	Right-handed	Unknown	Unknown
Michael Grost	Right-handed	Unknown	Unknown
Sho Yano	Right-handed	Unknown	Unknown
Dylan Jones	Right-handed	Unknown	Unknown
Edith Stern	Right-handed	Unknown	Unknown
Kim Ung-Yong	Right-handed	Unknown	Unknown
Francis Galton	Right-handed	Unknown	Unknown
Thomas Wolsey	Right-handed	Catholic	50%
Hugo Grotius	Right-handed	Christian	50%
Hypatia	Right-handed	Pagan, philosopher	60%
John Stuart Mill	Right-handed	Agnostic	30%
Blaise Pascal	Right-handed	Christian, Jansenist	70%
Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz	Right-handed	Christian, philosopher	70%

Confucius	Right-handed	Confucianism	40%
Buddha	Right-handed	Buddhism	80%
Jesus Christ	Right-handed	Christianity	100% (theological, not scientific)
Muhammad	Right-handed	Islam	50%
Johannes Kepler	Right-handed	Christian, saw astronomy as divine	80%
Carl Friedrich Gauss	Right-handed	Christian	50%
Michael Faraday	Right-handed	Christian	70%
James Clerk Maxwell	Right-handed	Christian	70%
Niels Bohr	Right-handed	Jewish, not religious	30%
Katherine Johnson	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
John Locke	Right-handed	Christian	70%
Immanuel Kant	Right-handed	Theist, rational theology	60%
Rene Descartes	Right-handed	Theist, rationalist	50%
Desiderius Erasmus	Right-handed	Christian humanist	60%
Raphael	Right-handed	Christian	50%
Charles Dickens	Right-handed	Christian	40%
Richard Wagner	Right-handed	Germanic paganism	30%
Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart	Right-handed	Catholic	50%
Steve Jobs	Left-handed	Zen Buddhism	40%
Alexander Graham Bell	Right-handed	Presbyterian	50%
Wernher von Braun	Right-handed	Lutheran	60%
Mohandas Gandhi	Right-handed	Hindu	70%
Friedrich Nietzsche	Right-handed	Atheist	20%
Vincent van Gogh	Right-handed	Christian with doubts	30%
Stendhal	Right-handed	Agnostic	30%
Lewis Carroll	Right-handed	Anglican	40%
Ralph Ellison	Right-handed	Unknown	Unknown
Marcel Proust	Right-handed	Jewish	50%
Italo Calvino	Right-handed	Agnostic	30%
The Yahwist	Unknown	Monotheistic	80%
Wallace Stevens	Right-handed	Agnostic	30%
Rainer Maria Rilke	Right-handed	Spiritual, not religious	60%

T.S. Eliot	Right-handed	Anglo-Catholic	70%
Elizabeth Bishop	Left-handed	Agnostic	30%
H.D. (Hilda Doolittle)	Right-handed	Moravian	40%
Edna St. Vincent Millay	Right-handed	Agnostic	30%
Sappho	Unknown	Polytheistic	50%
William Wordsworth	Right-handed	Anglican	60%
Archimedes	Right-handed	Polytheistic	40%
Euclid	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Pythagoras	Unknown	Polytheistic	60%
Werner Heisenberg	Right-handed	Lutheran	50%
Erwin Schrödinger	Right-handed	Agnostic	30%
Richard Feynman	Left-handed	Agnostic	40%
Rosalind Franklin	Right-handed	Jewish	50%
Grace Hopper	Right-handed	Presbyterian	50%
Tim Berners-Lee	Right-handed	Anglican	50%
Carl Sagan	Right-handed	Agnostic	40%
Stephen Jay Gould	Right-handed	Agnostic	40%
Jane Goodall	Right-handed	Spiritual, not religious	60%
Johannes Brahms	Right-handed	Lutheran	50%
Johann Sebastian Bach	Right-handed	Lutheran	70%
Pablo Picasso	Left-handed	Agnostic	30%
Salvador Dali	Right-handed	Catholic	40%
Frida Kahlo	Right-handed	Atheist	20%
Georgia O'Keeffe	Right-handed	Unknown	Unknown
Mary Shelley	Right-handed	Agnostic	30%
Virginia Woolf	Left-handed	Agnostic	30%
Isaac Asimov	Right-handed	Agnostic	40%

---

## Pattern

Prompt:

Given this list, what is the statistical prevalence of left/ambidextrous and pantheistic combination, compared to the .5% chance of someone having left/ambidextrous (10%) and pantheistic beliefs (5%). Drop the unknowns from the table. Anyone with "pantheistic" >=50% are pantheistic.

Return:

Total entries with known data: 77 (after excluding 23 entries with "Unknown" in handedness or % likeness).

Step 2: Identify Left/Ambidextrous and Pantheistic Individuals

Left-handed or Ambidextrous: Note that no individuals in the list are explicitly marked as ambidextrous, so we focus on left-handed individuals.

Pantheistic: Defined as having a % likeness to Pantheism/scientifically literate theology ≥50%.

From the filtered list, we identify individuals who are both left-handed and have a % likeness ≥50%:

Genius,            Handedness,    % Likeness to Pantheism/Scientifically Literate Theology:

Albert Einstein	Left-handed	80%
Leonardo da Vinci	Left-handed	60%
Nikola Tesla	Left-handed	50%
Benjamin Franklin	Left-handed	60%
Ludwig van Beethoven	Left-handed	50%
Michelangelo	Left-handed	50%

Count: 6 individuals meet both criteria (left-handed and ≥50% likeness).

Step 3: Calculate Statistical Prevalence

Sample size: 77 individuals with known handedness and % likeness.  
Observed prevalence: 6 out of 77 individuals are both left-handed and pantheistic.

Prevalence =  $(6 / 77) \times 100 \approx 7.79\%$ . Expected prevalence: Given as 0.5% (from 10% left-handed ambidextrous  $\times$  5% pantheistic = 0.005 or 0.5%).

Step 4: Compare Observed vs. Expected

Observed prevalence: 7.79%.

Expected prevalence: 0.5%.

Comparison: The observed prevalence (7.79%) is significantly higher than the expected prevalence (0.5%).

Ratio:  $7.79 / 0.5 \approx 15.58$ , meaning the observed prevalence is about 15.58 times higher than expected.

#### Step 5: Statistical Significance

To assess whether this difference is significant, we can perform a binomial test, assuming the expected probability of being both left-handed/ambidextrous and pantheistic is 0.005 (0.5%).

Null hypothesis: The proportion of left-handed/ambidextrous and pantheistic individuals is 0.005.

Alternative hypothesis: The proportion is different from 0.005.

Parameters:

Sample size ( $n$ ) = 77.

Observed successes ( $x$ ) = 6.

Expected probability ( $p$ ) = 0.005.

Binomial test: Using a binomial test, we calculate the p-value for observing 6 or more successes in 77 trials with  $p = 0.005$ .

The probability of observing exactly  $k$  successes is given by the binomial probability formula:

$$P(X=k) = \binom{n}{k} p^k (1-p)^{n-k}$$

$$P(X=k) = \binom{n}{k} p^k (1-p)^{n-k}$$

For small probabilities and large  $n$ , this is computationally intensive, so we approximate using a statistical tool or software.

The expected number of successes is  $77 \times 0.005 = 0.38577 \times 0.005 = 0.385$ , and observing 6 successes is far higher.

Using a binomial test (or normal approximation for large samples), the p-value is extremely small ( $p < 0.001$ ), indicating that the observed prevalence is statistically significantly higher than expected.

#### Final Answer

The statistical prevalence of individuals who are both left-handed/ambidextrous and pantheistic ( $\geq 50\%$  likeness to Pantheism/scientifically literate theology) in the list of 100 geniuses, after dropping unknowns, is approximately 7.79% (6 out of 77). This is significantly higher than the expected prevalence of 0.5% (based on a 10% chance of left-handed/ambidextrous and 5% chance of pantheistic beliefs), being about 15.58 times greater.

A binomial test confirms this difference is statistically significant ( $p < 0.001$ ), suggesting a stronger association between left-handedness and pantheistic beliefs among these geniuses than expected by chance.

---

## Analysis of Pattern

The Posterior Cingulate Cortex (PCC) serves as a critical hub in the brain's default mode network (DMN), integrating diverse fields of information through self-referential processing. According to Sporns (2010), the PCC's high node degree and centrality enable it to connect sensory, cognitive, and emotional domains, facilitating associations and segregations of information (pp. 15, 119, 158-163). This integrative role positions the self as a nexus for processing experiences and information, contributing to a coherent subjective reality, potentially underpinning consciousness (Sporns, 2010, pp. 293-298; Raichle et al., 2001). The PCC collaborates with the corpus callosum, which supports interhemispheric communication, enhancing body awareness and cognitive unity (Sporns, 2010, pp. 161-162, 314-315). Psychedelics, such as psilocybin, disrupt the PCC and DMN by reducing functional segregation and promoting global brain integration. This effect is linked to the high density of serotonin 2A receptors in DMN regions, including the PCC, which psychedelics target (Carhart-Harris et al., 2012; Nichols, 2016). This desegregation alters self-perception and may enhance interconnectedness in subjective experience. Theology, distinct from organized religion, involves the cognitive effort to conceptualize the self within the entirety of existence, as an entity within a universal framework. The PCC's role in self-referential processing may support this function, acting as a bottleneck within the DMN due to its central connectivity (Sporns, 2010, pp. 158-163). The corpus callosum facilitates this by enabling communication between hemispheric networks, though specific theological processing is not explicitly localized to these structures (Vogt, 2011). Link Between Pantheism and PCC Function In the brain's connectome, cognitive frameworks like science and theology can be conceptualized as node structures. When theology is reduced to dogmatic religion and conflicts with scientific reasoning, the lack of alignment may reduce functional connectivity between these cognitive domains, potentially decreasing overall network efficiency (Sporns, 2010, pp. 101-126). Conversely, pantheism, which views divinity as immanent in nature and aligns with scientific observation, may enhance overlap between these node structures, reducing redundancy and increasing cognitive efficiency. This alignment could allow greater network capacity for other functions, such as creativity or problem-solving, by optimizing connectivity within the DMN (Buckner et al., 2008). For example, the statistical prevalence of left-handed individuals with pantheistic beliefs (7.79% vs. an expected 0.5%) among 100 geniuses suggests a potential link between cognitive integration and pantheistic worldviews, possibly mediated by the PCC's integrative role, though this remains speculative.



---

## Why This Project Is High Risk, High Reward:

This research project is a bold leap into the unknown, tackling a big idea that could change the game in its field. The high risk comes from the fact that we're exploring uncharted territory—there's no guarantee it will work. The science might not hold up, or the practical challenges could be tougher than we expect. It's a bit like betting on a long shot: there's a real chance we could invest time and resources and not get the result we're aiming for but that's exactly why the high reward is so exciting. If this project succeeds, it could lead to a major breakthrough. Something that doesn't just add to what we know but transforms how we solve problems or seize opportunities as a matter of hacking the intelligence of the species on a behavioral level. The potential payoff isn't just in knowledge, it's in creating something new that could ripple out and make a massive impact. The monetary value isn't just about direct profits—it's about the domino effect of folding brain networks over on themselves.

The whole purpose of science is to get an understanding of things to increase efficiency. For neurology, that means brains on brains. This is that; fold thinking to conform to the patterns of intellect. If you participate in the pattern, your odds of increasing I.Q. go up in proportion to how different it is to you currently.

---

## The Monetary Value and Benefits:

A successful outcome could lead to further patents or innovations, both by the product of the process, and process of the product. A school with a rate of intelligence 15-16 times higher than normal may yield a standard deviation of difference in that population compared to where it would have been. That's an attractive sales proposition for parents. It should be tested or studied in schools of varying income and racial compositions for equity and analysis of variance, on a volunteer open enrollment basis. There is a legal religious component to the process and product, and products with culture have longer staying power. As a module which can be installed in any institution, advantages for active participants means being part of a study and/or organization which both produces and links people who are statistically more likely to be intelligent, as an in-group. After one lifetime, that one standard deviation could grow to two. A school/hospital/lab/theological assembly as an institution in and of itself, if proven, signals wealth in perpetuity for material parties in scale with longitudinal development. Yes, there's a chance this doesn't work out. If it does the rewards could be great. It's a shot at something transformative that could pay off for years to come. But at the deepest level, ask me why it's part of the Alignment Solution.

---

## Citations

Buckner, R. L., Andrews-Hanna, J. R., & Schacter, D. L. (2008). The brain's default network: Anatomy, function, and relevance to disease. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1124(1), 1-38.

Carhart-Harris, R. L., Erritzoe, D., Williams, T., Stone, J. M., Reed, L. J., Colasanti, A., ... & Nutt, D. J. (2012). Neural correlates of the psychedelic state as determined by fMRI studies with psilocybin. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 109(6), 2138-2143.

Nichols, D. E. (2016). Psychedelics. *Pharmacological Reviews*, 68(2), 264-355.

Raichle, M. E., MacLeod, A. M., Snyder, A. Z., Powers, W. J., Gusnard, D. A., & Shulman, G. L. (2001). A default mode of brain function. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 98(2), 676-682.

Sporns, O. (2010). *Networks of the Brain*. The MIT Press.

Vogt, B. A. (2011). *Cingulate Neurobiology and Disease*. Oxford University Press.