


MARCH 20 2022 4:07 PM ZULFIKAR MOINUDDIN AHMED EXAMINES PATHS IN THE FUTURE OF PSYCHOLOGY

ZULFIKAR MOINUDDIN AHMED
ZULFIKAR.AHMED@GMAIL.COM

1. MY CHESS RATING GOES DOWN TO 1446




I am quite honest about recording failures as well as successes. You see, I woke up today with horrible harm to my eyes that exceed harm done to anyone in history by anybody. This was done by *Bill Gates* who is one of the worst horrific war criminals and lifelong murderers in history of Earth. I woke up and immediately threatened the United States Government with nuclear holocaust unless they destroy Bill Gates and then wrote instructions to Asia to prepare the threat and also produce a coordinated joint defense.

There are all sorts of issues that I deal with. And for this reason, it is quite bad to be dishonest. Dishonesty really damages everyone in all sorts of ways. Now just because *Bill Gates* is a pathological liar who hoodwinked and deceived everyone in the world and still manages to have \$131 billion net worth does not prove that dishonesty is valuable. I hate dishonest people. One should not be honest only about small things like chess ratings but about everything all the time.

Date: March 21, 2022.

2. CHESS RATING AT 1467




At least the rating is robust around 1450. It's a respectable level and gives some hope for future improvements.

What I want to emphasize is that the most important aspects of Universal Human Psychology are *Motivated Habituation* and *Intuition*. I have asked for tenure from HSOC, Harvard-Stanford-Oxford-Cambridge as well as \$80 million for 40% of my company Thyself Inc. for a grand plan for uplifting Life Satisfaction globally. I want to create two private companies in San Francisco Thyself Inc. will be a Quant Positive Psychology company with the goal of uplifting global Life Satisfaction, and there will be a sister Technology company that will deliver Meteor Web-Mobile apps to eight billion people.

I was hoping to hear from HSOC with some decisions, but for various reasons, mostly Bill Gates blockades, have not heard from them. I have asked Asia to prepare to threaten United States of America with *nuclear holocaust* unless they destroy this Bill Gates.

3. A PLAN FOR TWO SAN FRANCISCO COMPANIES



We want to develop some apps for Web-Mobile and deliver services to at least 2 billion people reliably.

If you use cloud services the cost is astronomical.

If you use something other than Meteor it is almost certain that software is to unwieldy.

The companies do not exist yet. Thyself Inc. is registered with EIN available, but Hermes is still hypothetical. The plan is based on the goals of two sister companies being independent but their co-operation is essential to our major goals.

I don't want the psychologists to worry about technology and vice-versa; I do not want the technology professionals to worry about psychology for smooth execution of their respective purposes.

I love the name Hermes for the technology company of our great vision because it is just right, for Hermes is the messenger god from Olympus, and captures deeply the goals of the technology delivery vehicle here. The name will keep the spirits of all the people who will be professionals operating the company buoyant.

4. CAN STRUCTURALISM BE REVIVED?

Edward Bradford Titchener, who obtained his Ph.D. under Wilhelm Wundt in 1892 and joined Cornell University and began promoting structuralism with introspection did not have a great success. It is not very difficult to understand the fundamental reason for his failure. It is because *introspection is itself a high level independent skill that requires years of practice* and he assumed that it was ubiquitous. This is the reason why E. B. Titchener failed.


It is completely obvious that Titchener came from a privileged background and perhaps had the habit of introspection without disruption. But most people around the world not only are not practiced in introspection but indeed, they are abused by their family, friends, and others for too much introspection as *navel-gazing*. The method of introspection is only going to provide valuable insight for a very small group of intellectually involved relatively privileged people and so it is clear why introspection as a universal measurement failed.

5. ACCURATE INTROSPECTION IS A SKILL LIKE CHESS

Psychologists in the late nineteenth century and afterward as well have been confused about issues of introspection. You see, introspection is a sophisticated skill, and it is a positive skill, but it does not develop without practice. Our education, around the world and not just in the United States, has not focused in improving introspection as a skill, not having seen it as a universal human *potential* and therefore not understanding that the cart is put before the horse when instead of focusing on *development of introspection*, they had *assumed that introspection is universal* and then found failure by attempting to measure introspective elements.

Psychologists must instead understand how to develop introspection for healthy human beings and disseminate this knowledge in elementary and secondary education instead for fruitful results.

6. MY CHESS RATING DESCENDS TO 1367



Note that I am a grown man and am not crying home to my mommy just because my chess rating went down to 1367 from a more respectable 1450s range. The important thing is that during learning of complex tasks have various fluctuations with the main tendency being the power law improvement in the long run.

That is extremely important in the more generalised form for *all tasks*. It is so important that we might be able to establish this as a scientific principle of universal human motivated habituation that the main tendency will be a power law in improvement and secondary tendencies will be fluctuations around the mean.

This is a new principle for all motivated habituation tasks that will illuminate universal human behaviour in the future.


7. MY CHESS RATING FALLS TO 1320

From a high point of 1516 my rating has fallen to 1320 after a string of errors in Chess.com puzzles.

MARCH 20 2022 4:07 PM ZULFIKAR MOINUDDIN AHMED EXAMINES PATHS IN THE FUTURE OF PSYCHOLOGY



I made a poster based on hearing Bill Gates in meta confess to Harvard (Psychology) that he has been deliberately attempting to murder me.



He did not confess to trying to kill me as an idiosyncratic event. Rather, he is hard-core murderer from early childhood and murder is his second nature.

I want Harvard to propagate to the entire world that Bill Gates is a dyed-in-the-wool psychopath and has been murdering Americans for the past four decades.

8. I WILL EMBARRASS HARVARD AND OTHERS TILL I GET TENURE AND FUNNDING

So Harvard's President objected to William James admitting Mary Whiton Calkins in 1890 eh? It looks to me like the refusal to offer me tenured professorship right away with *good level funding* smacks of a regression of Harvard (and Stanford and Oxford and Cambridge) doesn't it boys? It looks to me like I have to have a campaign against Harvard boys being *cronies of Bill Gates, now* doesn't it?

Don't mess with Zulfikar Moinuddin Ahmed Harvard. Give me funding and tenure right away. I am so good at propaganda that Goebbels would piss in his pants.

9. ONE OF THE MOST NEFARIOUS BIASES OF PSYCHOLOGY

I am examining this field of Psychology with great interest. One of the things tremendously wrong in psychology is the extremely strong and erroneous idea introduced by Sigmund Freud and others that *we are determined by our parents and childhood experiences*. This general idea is tremendously wrong. I am not the first man to criticise this penchant.

Let me just give a slightly different account. Human beings develop throughout our lives and not only childhood, and this idea is erroneous that says that we have a development period to an equilibrium. This is wrong, and this leads to overweighting the influence of parents and childhood experiences in our development as human beings.

I won't go into the magnitude of the error myself, but refer my dear readers instead to Chapter 3 *Parental Fallacy* of James Hillman's book *The Soul's Code: In Search of Character and Calling*. Note that I am personally responsible for vindication of Aristotle's Virtue-Eudaimonia theory on empirical data from World Values Survey of 2017-2020, and it is a simple deduction that Character theory is also going to be right beyond Personality theory.

I am aware of the anti-Character efforts of an entire school of psychology in America. They are wrong and their claims will be refuted completely eventually. Science will stay with Character I believe.

10. NEITHER SIGMUND FREUD NOR CARL JUNG PRODUCED NATURAL SCIENCE

I was married to an Argentine-American for some years and stayed in Vicente Lopez, a suburb of Buenos Aires for some months in 1996. Buenos Aires is the world's capital of psychoanalysts. I went to a psychoanalyst for many years of my life.

There are many positive benefits for psychoanalysis, but unfortunately both Freud and Jung had deep flaws in their understanding of the human psyche.

For example, Carl Jung's idea of a *Collective Unconscious* I have argued before is a figment of our imagination and does not have any objective existence. The fundamental reasons for some regularity in our dreams are two:


MARCH 20 2022 4:07 PM ZULFIKAR MOINUDDIN AHMED EXAMINES PATHS IN THE FUTURE OF PSYCHOLOGY

- The objective universe has a vast fourth purely electromagnetic spatial dimension which we all share
- Human genetic code for every person contains G_c the genetic code in common accounting for 99.9% of every person's genome


Both of these are important for why there are regularities in elements of dreams of all people everywhere in the world. There is no 'collective unconscious' at all that is separate from these things we share.

11. ZULF MANAGES TO CRAWL BACK To 1403

My chess rating really took a nose-dive and I am most pleased to crawl back to 1403.



He plays chess like a meditation, da da da, I know that the pawns are the swords of a soldier, da da, I know that the knights are weapons of war, da da da.



My losses accumulate. I know that diamonds are money for this art but that's not the shape of my heeeeaaaart. But that's not the shape of my heeeeaaaart.


12. ANALOGY OF PSYCHOLOGY TO CHESS

After you play chess for some time you notice that it's a game where there are many paths, and many of them are bad and many of them good. Psychology is just like this. Unlike physics where the complexity does not drive it, psychology has to deal with both many paths that are wrong and still many paths that have variable goodness.

It's fascinating, really, to deal with something like this subject coming from Mathematics. What is very clear to me is that it is delusional to expect that Neuroscience will lead psychology; rather, quite the opposite will be the case, that Psychology will drive Neuroscience. Those who believe otherwise are extremely lacking in wisdom. It is much more likely that precision psychology with millions in sample size will give us new Neuroscience hypotheses than exhaustive efforts at Neuroscience will give us a Psychology as a deductive science from Neuroscience. The latter sort of idea is dead in the water. It's not possible to succeed.

13. BACK IN DOLDRUMS 1320 RATING

This is too embarrassing for words.



Well, I still have conviction that natural science will win the day and there is a power law *improvement* behind all these horrible slip into menial 1320 territory. The solace is that I am 50 and I have other great achievements proving that I am immortal genius in natural science so I will do the honours and not peg my self-esteem to such a silly pastime as chess.

Having said that, this is quite sad, tragic. I wonder if Bill Gates actually has better rating than 1320. That would lead me to suicidal thoughts. Even the malevolent low type born pathological liar and charlatan *Bill Gates* could be better than me at chess. The thought is unbearable.

14. MY PHILOSOPHY OF TWO COMPANIES RATHER THAN ONE

I proposed two companies, Thyself Inc. and Hermes Inc. to handle psychology and massive web-mobile delivery. Many business school leaders might think 'synergy' means one company.

You see, I am an industry veteran, and that sort of think works for large established institutions. When the effort is small numerically, there will be inevitable conflicts because both software engineers and psychologists have standards of respectability in their fields, and they will both want to have senior roles as managing directors, company strategy, and other corporate honour status symbols.


Rather than actually co-operating, psychologists and software engineers will continuously resent each other and produce a toxic mix within a small company. It is better to let them both float separately with co-operation determined at the business level. This way, both software engineers and psychologists can be masters of their own lives and have direct roles in strategic business without stepping on each other.

The idiots who say 'synergy' is a good reason to put people in situations of resentment where people feel that others are devaluing their illustrious talents and honours and treating them like scrubs will destroy the effort quickly. Those sorts of ideas work when the efforts are entrenched and so there is plenty of growth opportunity for everyone within the company without squeezing others.

This is an extremely good solution to ensure that psychologists and software engineers can be masters of their own ships as friends and allies rather than making them guinea pigs in a reality television show.

15. FLUCTUATIONS PAYING YOUR BILLS

Fine, fine, I am deforming the Led Zeppelin song "Livin' Lovin' Maid".



At least I got back some of the horrible deficit. I refuse to believe that I will be anything less than 1800 in a serious equilibrium. See I am thinking about motivated habituation, and I just know that for Chess.com my Puzzles rating ought to be better than 1800. Today it is in the menial 1300-1400 territory but the day will come and it won't be long when my rating will reach some respectable levels.

16. WHAT IS DIFFERENT FROM BEHAVIOURIST CONDITIONING AND MY MOTIVATED HABITUATION

I am definitely not a *behaviourist* like John B. Watson and B. F. Skinner. Neither am I a *cognitionist* or another stripe of psychologist. I do not believe that the science of psychology deals only with observable behaviour.

Science deals with natural phenomena. Psychology deals with coherent theories that provide explanation and prediction for *all aspects of human beings* observable behaviour, thoughts, feelings, any aspect that has any objective reality.

John B. Watson and B. F. Skinner were fundamentally wrong about what science deals with. The idea that only observable behaviour and theories about them is scientific we know today is bogus. We are deep in the moment neuroscientific development. In fact in the last few weeks, I was able to precisely define emotions as quantitative vectors in state space $E = \mathbf{R}^7$ which are measurable today thanks to neuroimaging and latent quantitative variables provide a vast improvement over behaviourist psychological paradigm exceeding cognition to include affect as well.


What, then, is the difference between behaviourist *conditioning* and my concepts of *motivated habituation*? There are various differences. First my concept not only expects a probabilistic outcome from motivated habituation but provides the fundamental power law rates for development of intuition. The behaviourist concept is not as subtle nor as close to Nature. The conditioning concept is inadequate for Universal Human Psychology.

17. BASIC QUESTIONS OF PSYCHOLOGY ARE ILL-DEFINED

I am reading some of the things from Myers' AP Psychology book and sense that many questions of psychology are ill-defined. For example: "Are our human traits present at birth or do they develop through experience?" While seemingly reasonable, the question is wildly ill-defined. What are 'our human traits'? I can tell you that the general question is worthless. "Two hands and two feet with five fingers on each hand" are some of our human traits; they are present at birth. Some other of our human traits are "An obsession with the films directed by Andrei Tarkovsky". These are not present at birth. The problem of psychology includes changing the questions themselves systematically so they are no longer worthless.

These basic issues have to be addressed by Psychology as a field in a uniform manner. The development of Psychology has continually suffered being a sort of amateur hobby of biologists (Jean Piaget), physicians (Sigmund Freud and William James too), and others who were sort of misfits with Amateur interest in Psychology. As a result the field still has no strong standard foundations in 2022. Don't deny it. Fix it. Now.

18. MY CHESS RATING GOES UP TO 1459



I am rather pleased because this rating of 1459 is a respectable number. It's not actually very good, but it's still respectable, and I think I will reach higher. On my mind in the background are issues of Psychology. I am quite certain that in Psychology, having the tremendous advantage of knowing without doubts that Universal Human Psychology exists as a Science, even though we do not know what are all the elements of that Science, as a logical deduction from G_c , the genetic code in common accounting for 99.9% of every person's genome. Once we know that the Science must have existence, the task of discovering its elements is much easier. It's much easier than being in the situation where there is *controversy surrounding whether Universal Human Psychology exists or does not*.

My argument for this is with work of others, but I am the pioneer in laying Psychology with this foundation, and as far as I know, no one before me had done so. I resolved the question of existence of Universal Human Psychology for the first time in human history. Indeed I have used the same argument for two other important issues of general interest.

First is that "all men are created equal". This was not firmly established and was before the use of this argument considered an ideological position that is open to interpretation. I resolved this as truth. Second is the existence of a nontrivial *Human Nature*. Both of these resolve confusions in *Political Philosophy*. In addition I have established Universal Human Moral Nature with empirical data from World Values Survey.

19. THE PROBLEM WITH EVOLUTIONARY THEORY

Charles Darwin's theory of evolution by natural selection has an extremely serious flaw. The flaw is subtle. It is lack of uniqueness for natural selection. Darwin's principle is that Nature selects traits in order to ensure that the species survives and reproduces.

The appeal of the theory is that we are interested in those organisms such as human beings that did manage to survive over eight million years. This is a good

feature of the theory. It's the tautological part of the theory that holds true without any further argument.

Now suppose in a given moment of time, a large number of possible changes are possible by mating. Nature is not going to be selecting anything specifically at all maximizing anything. The peculiar circumstances of mating will evolve the genetic line without maximizing anything specific.

This is a serious flaw in the principle of natural selection for genetic evolution. The principles of mating are just the principle of mating. Darwin's idea is good to reduce arbitrariness of the features that did survive, but I don't believe that any maximization is being performed by nature at all.

It's *unjustified intellectual vanity* and just plain faith in maximality on this part. I do not believe that the evolution by maximum survivability is operating for mating. Darwin's reasoning is good for the biased sample of those still not extinct. There it is a tautology, that those traits that are extant among living organisms did manage to reproduce and survive.

Darwin's theory is in the contemporary context too weak. He deserves his immortality because on some very broad ways he was a pioneer. People did not know in 1859 that human beings had any non-human ancestors at all, so for those sorts of things, evolution theory has been good. But on details, the theory is not very good.

In particular, any detailed theory of mating in any species is strictly superior to evolution by natural selection generally. Now the straw man of *creationism* is held as the opposite of Darwin's theory. But that's not the only alternative. Evolution can have many different detailed principles. Darwin's principle of a maximality I don't believe will be right.

It so happens that whatever principles *had operated for mating* in the past eight million years going to the last common ancestor between chimpanzees and homo sapiens, had allowed human beings to survive today. The question of whether survival was being maximised or not is total and I would argue wrong speculation of Darwin. I do not believe he's right about that. Human beings mate by laws that do not know the future survival period.

20. DISSECTING CHARLES DARWIN QUICKLY

You see, Charles Darwin *deserves his immortality* because it's clear today still that there was a least common ancestor of both chimpanzees and human beings. This I do not dispute, and the evidence is from molecular genetic analysis. This being true means a *paradigm* is reasonably good, that mating produced evolution, and we now estimate that we have evolved away from the least common ancestor of ours and chimpanzee around eight million years ago.

But after that, the principle of natural selection, that "nature selects traits" based on any maximality principle is a bad scientific theory. This is most definitely not true as natural scientific theory. Things happen. Even eight million years ago, some of our ancestors mated with others of our ancestors following natural laws of mating. That they in addition were doing something else, that the mating was 'ultimately governed by a maximality law' is not good science. It's a religious dogma, not science, these ideas.


In fact this sort of idea is pernicious. It's a paradigm rule of thumb. "We evolved such and such a trait" is now just ordinary language. I don't think that this is best

for natural science, as the explanation of natural selection based on survival is not exactly right. It's a heuristic at best.

Now this may seem like I am splitting hairs. I always run into people who say "evolution theory of Darwin is established". That's not quite true. What is established is that homo sapiens did have non-homo sapien ancestors. All the detailed principles are not all that well established yet and they will differ from Charles Darwin's principles substantially.

21. SOME THOUGHTS ABOUT STEVEN PINKER'S BLANK SLATE

That's right. I have my own copy of Steven Pinker's *The Blank Slate*.



Now as you might have noticed, I have the tendency to mention important books and other works that whets the appetite of the reader to gain some wisdom about the works, but then I am far more enamoured of my own views and disappoint the reader. This is not going to be different. You should find someone else's commentary for wisdom about Pinker's particular innovations. He's a made man with veteran tenure at Harvard, and I don't feel a great deal of guilt about talking more about my own ideas.

You see, the interest in the book is about *human nature*. I am deeply interested in human nature. In fact I have been promoting that the existence of human nature is assured since G_c , the genetic code in common is 99.9% of everyone's genome.

Now Pinker introduces his book with a short quote from Richard Herrnstein and Charles Murray's book *The Bell Curve*. They address 'genetic' and 'environmental' causes of 'IQ race gap'. I better tell you what my view here is. First of all IQ is not a stable measure of intelligence. IQ will substantially change in every person if they continually practice certain problem-solving skills. That's a severe flaw of a large part of the academic world and not just Herrnstein and Murray. In fact this "IQ", like chess will show power law improvement for those who practice. Second, the G_c is the same for black and white people, so I expect that the driving factor of IQ gap is that for whatever reasons black children are not solving IQ type problems from an early age as much as white children in America. So *The Bell Curve* was wrong to make their claims as some genetic defect of black people. I am not sympathetic to Steven Pinker's bland criticism of people who reacted to the book. That book was not simply taking a position on nature versus nurture. I am a bit surprised at the light manner in which he seems to suggest that *simply for intellectual position on nature versus nurture* these academics were attacked. Their proposition was highly racist and had done a lot of harm to black Americans and encouraged some of the most malevolent destructive genocidal racial people in the world. I have no sympathy on this point with the uber-privileged Professor Steven Pinker. It's easy to be glib about it if you are not going to have your life destroyed, as though Nazi racial science were *merely an intellectual position on nature versus nurture*.

I like Steven Pinker, and read his books. I am a bit surprised at his position. Stephen Jay Gould was much more right by retorting with *Mismeasure of Man*.

22. RE-ITERATION OF MY RACIAL VIEWS

I have had lovers who are Argentine-American, Danish, African-American from Louisiana, white from Colorado, and I do not believe in multiple races of people. I believe in a single human race and consider *Purples* to be the Master Race, not any other colour. My view is that the world is divided into two types. The types who believe in multiple races, otherwise known as idiotic morons, like Bill Gates, and the good, gentle, and wonderful, intelligent people, such as myself. That's my racial view.

No Purples are not invisible. I'll show you.



They are the master race, but it's hard to know where they actually live. If you see one take a photograph so I can congratulate them for being Master Race.


23. RETURN TO HUMAN NATURE

One of the things that I am responsible for is to show that for a number of major moral values, as tabulated by World Values Survey, the entire human race has invariant distributions that are immune to mixing from various ethnicities, religions, cultures, languages, continents. This is solid empirical evidence of a Universal Human Moral Nature, and my work shows without any doubt that *human nature exists* and that Human Race is a single race, and further than it is an *Angelic Race*.

I hold that Purples are also part of the Human Race as well, but they are Master Race within humans. You can see that they have slightly larger eyes that look lidless but in fact I assure you they are human. They just look a bit strange with their large roundish hairless heads and their roundish hairless heads. Most of us don't see them often so we don't realise that they're human. I will let the intrepid scientists discover more about the Master Race. Basically the German Nazis were deluded and got confused and thought they were Purple. We know that they are not.

24. SORRY MY FRIEND STEVEN PINKER TO USE YOU

Why don't you write an articulate stylish short article using my Universal Human Moral Nature results with a slightly more delicate dance out of how you were insensitive about *The Bell Curve* and expand Human Nature to ethnicity-independent scale and move out of the way. The avalanche will skip you and ram into Bill Gates and you'll be happier. It's not a joke. The Herrnstein-Murray book was racist but you are not. It's not worth defending that work at least. I have Charles Murray's new book on Human Diversity too. See?



He does not compel me regarding his major thesis that racial difference is substantial. I do not believe there is much one can do with G_c accounting for 99.9% of everyone's genome and exit from the same tribe 75kya when the species evolved together for 8 million years. It's a tough break for Charles Murray. One has to admire the effort but unfortunately he was unaware of dyed-in-the-wool White Master Race types like Bill Gates. You, my friend, have had it rather easy, methinks.

No, I will not take more serious issue with you on "the difference among races and ethnic groups in test scores might be another [example of] ... extreme environmental explanation being correct." (p. xiv) This is a great way out already. This is the substance, for what I hypothesize will resolve this entire debate cold.

- Motivated habituation improves skills by quantitative power law
- Chess is one known example
- IQ is another
- IQ does not measure and static genetic functional

- black-white test scores reflect only that black children are not doing motivated habituation of these types of problems since early childhood as much as white children

Now it's 'environmental' in a broad sense. In reality it is simply a matter of motivated habituation from preschool levels. The resolution is to thoroughly reject *The Bell Curve* and produce nation-wide efforts to ensure that some of these problem-solving skills are routine for all Americans. The IQ race gap will vanish in several decades. I will put my own money and honour behind the result.

In fact I would appreciate it if Harvard, Stanford, Oxford and Cambridge would kindly stop backing IQ as a measure of any 'innate intelligence'. It is nothing of the kind.

25. GREAT CHAIN OF BEING AND MY THEOLOGICAL VIEW

My theological view is not Science, but faith. I hold it to be truth and am devoted to it.

Galileo in 1633 was challenging the Great Chain of Being. I will follow Steven Pinker's *Blank Slate* p. 137–194 since he is a good scholar on the topic and I am rather more interested in articulating my theological views in contrast.

"According to the theory, developed during the medieval times, the sphere of the moon divided the universe into an unchanging perfection in the heavens above and a corrupt degeneration of the Earth below. Surrounding the moon were spheres for inner planets, the sun, the outer planets, and the fixed stars, each cranked by a higher angel.

And surrounding them all were the heaven, home to God. Contained within the sphere of the moon, and thus a little lower than the angels, were human souls, and then, in descending order, human bodies, animals, then plants, minerals, the inanimate elements, nine layers of devils, and finally at the center of the Earth Lucifer in hell." The ordering from high to low is the Great Chain of Being.

My *theological canvas* is a bit different. God is the power that moves all things, eternally inscrutable and silent. The universe is a four-sphere of radius $R = 3075.69 Mpc$, and there is a vast fourth purely electromagnetic macroscopic dimension that is not experienced in the same as the three physical dimensions. The three dimensions are emergent. These are part of Science.

Now for faith. There are many inhabited worlds in the universe. Earth orbits sun and so on are true, but the theological dimension appears as follows. Heaven is an organisation of Angel Souls. I am part of this organisation of trillions. I am an Archangel Soul.

Almost every human soul is an Angelic Soul, not any higher or lower than Angels, but most human beings do not have as high rank in Virtues as Angels. Human Race is a Primitive Angelic Race, a single race. There are literally millions of inhabited Angelic Worlds in the universe, some more primitive than Humans on Earth and some less.

For me, since I am an Archangel, after my death, I will journey to the *center of the Sun* to exit the solar system, and to the center of the Milky Way to exit the galaxy and take ancient paths between galaxies to journey to another galaxy, another world, and be born as a baby there.

The space between Galaxies is known as the Sea Of Fate, and it is the most powerful force in the Universe, as the tide and ebbs and currents in this Sea of Fate affects all worlds including Earth.

In my theology, Human Race is Angelic, and therefore distinguished, for as an Archangel I am naturally benevolent towards Angelic Races.

There are Demonic Races as well in the universe, but they do not live in the center of the Earth. Many have humanoid bodies in physical level as human beings, but their morality is different from human race. They value different things than human beings; their morality is not, for example, constraining on violence against others. In the case of human beings, you can note that the murder rate throughout the world is lower than 0.5% uniformly. In Demonic Worlds, these do not have the same order for peace; they are highly developed, many much more advanced in technology than human beings. But they are Demonic; they value order of a different type than Angelic Races.

There are some similarities with Great Chain of Being to my theology, but the architecture of all of existence is a bit different.

26. MY UNIVERSAL HUMAN MORAL NATURE SUPERCEDES *The Blank Slate*

Steven Pinker's *The Blank Slate* posited some views of morality and meaning with a challenge to the John Lockean tabula rasa view. I want to re-emphasize that my results on universal human moral nature supercedes this 2002 work on the central issue that human nature is regular in morality. My results are breakthrough of more than two millenia of confusion in Western Intellectual Tradition and gives strong evidence that our evolutionary inheritance includes moral values and these are not due to any blank slate either.

The human race is empirically an Angelic Race, and human nature is overwhelmingly, more than 90% moral. The burden is on those who believe otherwise, after my 2021 work on Universal Human Moral Nature, to compel us that human nature is immoral. Japanese neuroscientists showed neural correlates of moral praise and blame in 2008. We are moral and hold moral values because that is human nature.

Steven Pinker often uses a biased sampling of various things to consider the "dark side of human nature" but I doubt that these sorts of things will exceed 5% of human population even. One cannot define human nature by a tiny proportion's behaviour. One can see this theme in Enlightenment Now where he overestimates the violent nature of our ancestors and then concludes that great progress has happened in the centuries. I am not so compelled about the violent nature of our ancestors as he is.

27. HUMAN NATURE IS ANGELIC NOT BAD

I don't know the full history of the prejudice of human nature as bad, but this seems to be a prejudice that even Steven Pinker did not escape. I know that he had turned to this sort of idea in an early teen years from seeing some riots sometime, but he's mostly quite wrong in the prejudice as it is not policing that is responsible for the dominant effect of a moral behaviour among the global population; they have very minor effects. Human beings are 90-95% holding good moral values because that is human nature, and not the darker side and such.

Steven Pinker is not responsible for this prejudice. You can find this in Friedrich Schiller's *On the Aesthetic Education of Man* from 1790s and ubiquitous as well.

These views are based on behaviour of a minority *in every age* and not so much human nature as the failure of human nature.

28. MORALITY IS NOT CONTRA HUMAN NATURE

The Christian Theology, even more than related religions like Islam, explicitly considered the fallen state of Man as part of the central core, so then Human Nature was considered to be bad, and so morality was introduced to counteract bad effects of human nature.

In my theological doctrine, there is no such fall at all. Human Race is an Angelic Race. Indeed, I am classical by Earth standards in the Aristotelian manner, and I have actually extended Aristotle's Moral Virtues to include Virtues of Romantic Love as a spectrum of Virtues that improve probability of high Life Satisfaction. The results are valid empirically, but I offer them to my beloved people the Human Race of any faith at all as a gift of Heaven.

Of course there is no obligation to accept the gift, but the gift is from myself, Archangel, to the Angelic Race. For me the Adam and Eve narrative is curious and interesting, but not part of my faith as I am not Christian. I do not denigrate other faiths. Christians, Muslims, Jewish people, Hindus, Buddhists, and all others are granted the gift of Heaven without prejudice.

29. BILL GATES IS A PEASANT BOY PRETENDER

Bill Gates lives in outrageously tacky gaudy tasteless ostentation and display of wealth while half a million Americans live hobo. I am from an aristocratic lineage of three thousand years and I can assure the world that this is a peasant-born boy, not a real aristocrat. No one in Europe or in Asia, the old world that invented aristocracy would disagree with me. No aristocrat with an iota of honour or virtue and self-respect would do that to themselves. It would be too shameful.

But Bill Gates propagates tales of his deservingness to display ostentatious wealth without education, without cultivation. He is a peasant-lowborn man who has no idea of what aristocracy is. He's not even civilised, let alone aristocratic. He would be ousted from the tribal raiding parties of Genghis Khan, of Atilla the Hun, from Ostrogoth Theodoric's men. No trace of anything but tasteless peasant-matter in the boy.

30. MY CURRENT PHOTOGRAPH

When one attacks someone with money but who is peasant-lowborn like Bill Gates one has to make a decent appearance. I thought it would be wiser to put my photograph here.

**31. I WILL PROCEED TO PATENT QUANT POSITIVE PSYCHOLOGY
WEB-MOBILE APPS FOR MASSIVE DELIVERY**

I am asking for \$80 million for 40% of my company from Harvard-Stanford-Oxford-Cambridge. I have not heard back from them yet. I will not tolerate anyone else doing things based on my ideas at all and will eventually patent up Quantitative Positive Psychology Web-Mobile Apps For Massive Delivery and make a living out of litigation-earnings if anyone does any of this. This is a warning to Harvard-Stanford-Oxford-Cambridge that I do not appreciate robbers and thieves. If you want to do it, you better fund me right now.

32. LECTURES TO HARVARD, STANFORD, OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE ABOUT GETTING THINGS DONE


Look, HSOC, I have worked in the United States Industry between 1995-2008. I am quite familiar with the ethic and the judgments in industry. I have worked in multiple startup companies. Thyself Inc. is my first effort of my own.

No one, and I mean not a single competent person in the industry, forgives institutions when they do not have capability of (a) emailing a notice (in this case it is a decision for tenured full professorship, adjunct), (b) not transferring funds.

Where there is a will, there is a way. You could put \$80 million for cash delivery to my address 915 Meadowgate Drive, Allen TX 75002. You could transfer money to my Wells Fargo Account. I don't really give a damn if your meta is obstructed or whatever. That is a very poor excuse for continuing to delay my livelihood while you enjoy luxury. No one puts up with that.

If you wanted to do it, you would be able to do it a hundred different ways. So don't pretend that you have excuses. No one in the world will give a damn what Bill Gates did or did not do. They will side with me if I tell the world that I put in my blood, sweat, and tears to come up with good ideas that have potential that are all my own personal effort, and HSOC just took my ideas and decided to fuck me up the ass and go ahead and do these things without me even getting out of disability earnings. They will be unimpressed by HSOC. You want to do those things, you better be ready for the consequences, because it won't be secret deals in backrooms and all manner of cloak and dagger. It will be a public affair.

33. MY CHESS RATING CLIMBS UP TO 1506



That's a relief, I made it back to Chess.com Puzzle rating of 1506. I think for several weeks I will be stuck 1400-1600 but 1506 is a very respectable rating for my experience level. It's not FIDE rating but it is still a matter of pride for me because I'm not a die-hard chess fanatic. I believe now that eventually I will exceed 2000 in this measurement, Chess.com Puzzle rating. This is not the same as FIDE but it is still good skill level.

34. HELLO HELLO HSOC WHITE PEOPLE ISSUES

Look, don't pretend you don't know how white people are. Who wiped out the Native Americans? Who dropped atomic bombs in Japan in 1945. Let's do a quick quiz. Was it (a) brown people, (b) red people, (c) yellow people, (d) black people, (e) white people, (f) purple people, (g) cyan people, and (h) pink people. How about Mai Lai massacre? And its aftermath? Who starts wars on false pretenses regularly and bombs the bejeezus out of Asia regularly? If you answered (f) purple people, that's wrong. Also (g) cyan people did not do any of these. Everyone knows how white people are, so why do you pretend you don't know this?

I'm 50 or close to, and I can assure you that you have to be very careful with white people. Some are nice but most are not quite able to make deductions from history and do all manner of gymnastics to pretend that white people didn't do all sorts of horrible things but no one else has problems with seeing, perceiving the scene, and noting down what the issues are in a straightforward manner.