

Why did they die?

In 9 AD, the men and women of the Germanic tribes who died defeating Imperial Rome in the Teutoberg Forest knew why they fought and died.

Today, the west does not know what it stands for. The western free world with the Teutoberg legacy of individual freedom has lost the plot.

This book is about how to get it back if we choose.

Graham Little

Science is our best ideas,
and when applied delivers
the best results.

*Better ideas deliver
better results.*

The principle applies
equally to management of
ourselves.

The historic foundation
understanding of ourselves
is poor, we can improve that
by adopting better science
of ourselves.

Better science results in
better mental health; better
HR/HCM management;
better political/social policy;
and better legislation.

This book begins the
process of change, by
identifying the correct
science of people, and asks
the question are we going to
apply it to better manage
ourselves.

Though much is taken, much abides; and though
We are not now that strength which in old days
Moved earth and heaven, that which we are, we are,
One equal temper of heroic hearts,
Made weak by time and fate, but strong in will
To strive, to seek, to find, and not to yield.

Alfred, Lord Tennyson, Ulysses, 1842

Why did they die?

**Understanding Western identity and values, revitalising them,
protecting them, applying them to build a better society**

Graham Little.

Published by
Institute of Theoretical and Applied Social Science Limited
A reaching for infinity book

Copyright © 2024 Graham Little

First Edition (v5) October 2024

JEL codes A11-14

Free in PDF from www.spiritualmodel.com item 23.

Graham Little asserts the moral right to be identified as the author of this work.

All rights reserved. Except for purpose of fair reviewing, no part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or any information storage or retrieval system, now known or hereafter invented, without permission in writing from the publisher. Catalogue reference in the National Library of New Zealand.

Prologue

In 9 AD, the men and women of the Germanic tribes who died defeating Rome in the Teutoberg Forest, knew why they fought and died. Today, the western free world has lost the plot. This book is how to get it back if we choose.

Nothing emerges from nothing. All we think always has underlying assumptions and intellectual structure. Academics made a crucial decision about that when they denied Rene Descartes proposal on dualism (circa 1640).

Would you build a house on unstable ground? Hardly! First fix the ground. The rule is do first things which must be resolved first, or risk being punished. It applies to all things and is called **reasoned commonsense**. Academics have ignored it since at least 1640.

Would you paint a house with a brush or a wet blanket. Brush, Surely. That is dualism. Denied by academics since circa 1640, due they could not explain it The choice of best idea regardless of any cultural considerations. And there is ample example of such choices in all cultures. We are left with as simple principle about ourselves: **Ideas count, source of ideas does not**.

Our life experience determined by the ideas we adopt and apply. A shift in the underlying paradigm explaining ourselves. Denied by academics, but if dualism is to become the basis of how we understand ourselves, we need elite intellectuals to get it and lead the way forward. Hence the initial distribution list.

We must determine the scientific reasoned commonsense base of understanding ourselves, first, then explore applying it to all conceivable circumstances. Then decide if we are going to adopt the science (determined from within the theory) applying it to ourselves and face the disciplines it imposes, or if we are going to ignore it, and apply unreasoned ideas pandering to our personal preferences resulting in us continuing to wallow as we are, in fractious disarray.

This book will make clear who we were and what we used to stand for. Underlining why science is so important and how we have been let down by academics since inception in 1097. The fundamental of this book is to make clear where science meets living a life one chooses or one of acquiescence. In 9 AD we knew and fought for the right to choose. Today... ?

This is not a long book, complex perhaps. But challenging of all current opinion. It demands reflection. Our future in freedom depends on your willingness and effort to **think**, beginning with commonsense reasoning.

Quality statement

This work exhibits intellectual integrity and was ethically constructed. Refer appendix 1, section quality standards.

Free book

This book, like all my work, is free in PDF download. Some hard copies of books available via Lulu, <https://www.lulu.com/spotlight/grahamlittle>. Society moves forward based on the typical ideas adopted and applied by citizens. Ideas count source of ideas does not. I wanted no obstacle, and price an obstacle, between the ideas and the minds reflecting on the ideas allowing the ideas to influence them and so influencing the life experience of my great grandchildren and beyond.

It is too late for those my age, and my grandchildren as argued by Piaget, largely shaped in terms of their psychic structures. For them, this book may influence the events of their lives, making their journey more enjoyable as a result.

Initial distribution

Academics: VC Oxford; VC Cambridge; President Stanford U; Exec Secretary NSB; CEO SSRN; CEO Universities of NZ; VC Canterbury; Dame Anne Salmond; NZ Ministry of Education; Commissioning Editor OUP; Director Oxford Japan; APA; NZ Royal Society. Editors Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy.

Organization with resources but lack global leadership stature: Emerson Collective; Berggruen Institute; NZME Directors; NZ Herald.

Distributed: NZ Politicians; Most NZ journalists; Hobsons Pledge; NZ Institute of Directors; NZ Supreme Court; Auckland Regional Chamber of Commerce; Personal associates list.

International media: Economist; Time Magazine; The Guardian; The Times; Washington Post; New York Times; LA Times; The Financial Times; Times Literary Supplement.

Request

To understand that freedom is not intrinsic to people or society. Egos, a useful terms referring to self-serving behaviour, wealth and the well understood corruption of power see to that.

Freedom must be fought for and even when achieved must be protected with a passion that will surprise many modern citizens. The enemies of freedom are intrinsic to people and hence to society. To fight for freedom is not a contradiction in terms. The extent our societies are free is directly proportional to our willingness to fight for our freedom.

In 9 AD. Germanic tribes understood and fought Roman imperialism. Since, corrupt academics have all but destroyed that understanding such that today, we are left confused, and our values neutered, because of debilitating over thinking, due entirely academia formed in 1097, who ought to know better, but have abdicated service to humanity in favour of service to themselves (Refer the book THINK, item 66, appendix 1).

We need get back to our core, committed to freedom of the individual, the right of a person to decide their own life within the broadest non-prescriptive legislation with a jurisprudence guiding what citizens should not do, thus ensuring protection of life, limb and property.

Within a depth of understanding of the correct science of people, to face the question do we really seek freedom which demands giving over any assumption anyone knows best, leaving the person once judged they informed and understand, with the decision about their life, and responsibility for its consequences. This leads in surprising directions, and many whom I refer to as the *let us save everyone social do-gooders* will struggle with the notion it is not the responsibility of the governance of free societies to save people who need save themselves.

People committing to freedom must understand what that means, role of education and government in a free society, responsibility for self, and one's life experience. All derived from depth of scientific understanding of who we are, what we are, and how we work. Only science offers security we understand the ideas, and that they work long term when we adopt and apply them, they will enable us to achieve the results we expect.

We and we alone are responsible for the intellectual quality of the ideas we adopt and apply. Each of us, and no-one else, is responsible for the content of our mind.

Consequence

All human action and emotions are determined by ideas adopted and applied now to manage all circumstances. We are responsible or our choices.

An adult is expected to always act with self-disciplined restraint.

There is only mitigation within circumstance. There is no mitigation from any prior personal circumstance, nor any historical circumstance.

For example, a father finding his young daughter being raped is due mitigation if he takes a baseball bat and bashes the rapist 5 times, But there is no mitigation for bashing the rapist 40 times. And none for harming them hours after the event, that is the role of Police.

If subject to distasteful words an adult walks away.

Contents

Using science to revitalize and redeem.....	11
We must begin at the beginning.....	12
Building on the correct science of people makes a difference.....	13
Why they died and what do we build on their legacy	17
The aim of this book.....	23
The research questions written in 1974	24
Facing the challenge of shifting from democracy to a free society	25
Themes 27	
Summary of the scientific explanation of who we are	30
Crucial questions.....	30
Embracing complexity	31
Protecting our way of life	31
Quality ideas are not measured by popularity.....	32
Self-discipline is the B-side of freedom.....	33
Commitment to freedom as personal liberation from tyranny	33
Self-responsibility	33
Scientific defining morality and immorality.....	34
Only two types of society	34
Rediscovering our soul	35
The morality of a free society	37
Formation of academia and the deal of 1097.....	38
Questions academe should address but have not	39
Citizens may hold their own ideas, but professionals may not.....	42
1097: Poor judgement from the start	43
1640: Academic failure to acknowledge dualism	43
1952: Academic failure to adequately recognise Ashby cybernetics....	44
1996: Sokol Affair and collapse of intellectual standards	45
Who is responsible?	46
Explanation of paradigm and normal science	50
What the terms mean in practice.....	50
Paradigm shift	51
Was Kuhn one of our greatest ever psychologists?	52
All we ‘see’ determined by the ideas used to look	53
Reasoned commonsense of doing first things first	54
The poverty of culture.....	54
The definition of culture: Ideas count source of ideas does not.....	55

Definition of culture	56
Strategic science reasoned commonsense plus disruptive ideas	57
Better ideas → better life experience.....	58
The crucial role of assessing intellectual standards	58
Dismissal of peer review as a corrupt assessment process	58
Culture as self-definition	58
We are dominated by our preexisting assumptions	60
Starting again.....	61
<i>The failure of historical comment on people</i>	<i>61</i>
Rejecting the -isms	62
Physical science.....	63
<i>Time does not exist</i>	<i>64</i>
<i>Revision of the standard model of the universe</i>	<i>64</i>
Ideas count culture does not: Building the first global civilization	64
Fundamental philosophical position.....	66
Differentiated perceptual fields	67
The Ganzfeld effect	67
Defining Reality and reality.....	68
Defining sentient species	69
Definition of consciousness a trivial property of sentience.....	69
Conceptualization as the critical property of sentience	70
All things are explicable	70
We need begin with epistemology.....	71
The problem of circularity	72
Definition of a variable.....	73
Relationship of variable to values of a variable.....	73
The extent of academic fail in service to humanity	74
Definition of mechanisms: Systems under study in a box.....	75
Who am I?	76
Events as fundamental of existence	78
Purpose of science	78
Methodology	79
Applying method ensuring balanced point of view	79
Intellectual standards beyond the platform of reasoned commonsense	80
Methodology of SMH.....	81
Identifying the consequences of SMH.....	83
God only exists as a supportive idea in a mind.....	84
God exists, but	84

The definitive epistemological argument defining god as an idea.....	85
<i>God is not the prime mover of the universe</i>	85
<i>God is not a variable offering explanation of the mechanisms.</i> ..	86
God exists and only exists as an idea in some minds.....	86
Conclusion	87
The spiritual model of humanity.....	89
Spiritual model of humanity (SMH) the correct science of people	89
Consequences of the SMH.....	92
The spiritual model of humanity (SMH)	92
What SMH says about us.....	93
Scientific morality.....	93
Enforcing rule of not pursuing of selective morality	93
The global standing of SMH.....	93
Unilateral declaration of validity	93
Should we apply the science?	94
How to live in a free society	95
Be sceptical: But listen to the nominated thinkers of society	96
Being a moral person and avoiding immorality	98
Defining an under-developed society	99
Reasons to implement better ideas.....	102
Major shift in psychological priorities	102
Non-prescriptive legislation.....	103
Systemic bias	104
Free speech	105
Managing inequality	105
DEI (diversity, equity and inclusiveness) policies are a bad idea.....	107
Satisfaction in work	108
The social changes needed	110
<i>A solution</i>	114
Social usefulness and wealth	115
Intellectual methods and standards	117
Some definitions	117
<i>Social operation</i>	117
<i>Social infrastructure</i>	117
<i>Social ideation</i>	117
<i>Education</i>	118
<i>The only solution available</i>	118
<i>Defining personal identity</i>	118
<i>Free speech revisited</i>	119

<i>Jurisprudence</i>	119
<i>Selecting the politicians</i>	120
<i>Use of violence</i>	121
<i>Immigration: Who do we let in?</i>	121
<i>Humanitarian aid</i>	121
<i>Dismissal of activists</i>	121
<i>Beyond democracy</i>	121
<i>Making the most of cooperation (refer appendix 2)</i>	121
The threats to freedom	122
Role of a key groups in society.....	123
<i>Citizens</i>	124
<i>Media</i>	124
<i>Academics</i>	124
<i>Commercial</i>	124
<i>Social service</i>	124
<i>Politicians</i>	125
<i>Immigration</i>	125
<i>Police</i>	125
<i>Armed forces</i>	125
Why freedom?	126
Western values for 21st century and beyond	129
Values, lived not merely expressed	129
Raison d'être	131
Appendix 1: Writing of Graham Little, grouped by category	132
Quality standards	132
Reflexivity	133
First thoughts: Personal web site 1997-2006.....	133
SSRN: since 2016.....	135
Study guide to research the spiritual model of humanity and crucial definitions	135
The revised methodology	136
A scientific general theory of psychology	137
A scientific sociological model	138
Scientific technology to better manage organizations	140
Science based technology of human capital management (HCM)	141
Verisimilitude	142
Appendix 2: Problem solving process for managing free societies	145

Using science to revitalize and redeem

The tragedy of western assertion of individual freedom is the failure to understand other people who think differently and who will accept any laxity and apply it against us. History tells us freedom is only won in conflict. Undeniably killing is wrong. But so is acquiescence and deferring to tyrants.

Two thousand years go, European tribes knew.

From 0 AD to 1970 AD we have overcome Mongols, Inquisition, Crusades, Ottomans. WWII, the cold war. Then English, French and American revolutions freed us. To today ... ?

Do we still value individual liberty, personal choice and freedom as understood by those who fought and died in what could be called the battle cry of the west ... *I will be free*. Today, what exactly does that mean within the framework of understanding ourselves as a species?

For citizens of Western traditions this book (2024) addresses crucial questions: *Who are we? What do we stand for? What are we prepared to fight and die for in 2025?* Seeking scientific answers to modern significant spiritual issues only possible within full and thorough understanding of ourselves as a species. This book underlines the point where science meets life. And within that understanding we each have a crucial choice, do we follow the science or pander to our preferences.

The answer only reached by commonsense reasoned solutions to the pre-existing questions forming the intellectual ground of the question: *What are the values that define a citizen committed to a free society enabling them to live with a broad non-prescriptive legislation, as they choose. We traditionally have called it freedom.* And people have been willing to die for it. We knew in CE 9, Teutoberg; 1200, Crusades; 1935. WWII. Do we know today?

The questions of who we are and what do we stand for today can only be answered by first answering the question *how do we understand humanity*. Only within a thorough scientific explanation of humanity and the social choices possible within that understanding, can we understand the historic choice of western freedom. The fundamental questions remain as it existed when Germanic tribes defeated imperial Rome in the Teutoberg Forest 9 CE. Why did they fight Rome? What did our ancestors seek to achieve? And are the fundamental questions still relevant?

Academics as our designated thinkers, since the deal of 1097, have failed to serve us with clear guidance on good ideas fit for purpose of living, and those not. But worse, they applied and promoted weak processes for establishing intellectual standards.

Worse again, they pretended they were correct when they were not and declined to face the failure of what they offered.

Finally, they ceased all pretence of ethical service to the society providing their comfort, they became self-serving and are so today.

Citizens followed. What else? Academics our designated thinkers. Over several hundred years, they became corrupted by our following, as power corrupts, and sought wealth and influence for themselves ahead of serving society, they sought to determine it in the image best suited them.

Academics in their decline, especially since 1640, have offered social role models of self-serving, manipulation devoid of integrity. We followed. Today, we need dig ourselves out, decline their lead as thinkers, assert reasoned commonsense, build faith in our instincts of right and wrong.

We must begin at the beginning

The steps in understanding ourselves can only be in context of understanding the species humanity. Once we understand and can see western individual freedom as one of the scientific choices for humanity, we must decide if we will apply it.

Philosophy: How can we best understand ourselves? What intellectual assumptions must we make and what conceptual tools do we need?

Epistemology: What exactly is science? And can we depend on it? We need understand the theory we are building before we have built the theory.

System under study: What exactly is the system for which we seek explanation?

Methodology: What methods must we apply to understand ourselves?

Reflexive criteria: We create the methods to create the theory of ourselves from which we must derive the methods ... ?

Reach: Must understanding of ourselves apply to everything we do and all properties we exhibit?

Role of god: What is the role of god in the universe and hence in human affairs? Can we have faith in our judgement?

First things first: How do we improve our judgements?

Following the science: Is western individualism a scientific option for humanity?

Faith in reason: Will people follow reasoned commonsense understanding of ourselves applying it to lift the life experience of all.

Building on the correct science of people makes a difference

All historic science was based on no understanding of ourselves. All justification of all actions was based on the opinion of the person doing the actions, bereft of reasoned commonsense. People did what was best for them and given there has been no reliable science all actions were able to be rationally justified.

Given the correct common science, any actions inconsistent with it can be rationally challenged, then the length of time to change will depend on the extent citizens adopt the science and begin arguing for its adoption.

Realistically, it could take a generation before citizens are acting with self-disciplined regard of what they must do to ensure the society of their children and grandchildren and beyond is based on reliable science and is a much better society than we have today.

Human nature is the ability to build ideas blending them into images such *reality (internal image) ≡ Reality (the external environment)*. Our actions based on us building a reality congruent with the Reality within which we find ourselves *reality ≡ Reality*, the first question of mental stability and sensible action: *Is what we plan to do congruent with our ideas, including our skills and energy, and congruent our grasp of circumstance?*

The Freudian and Marxist legacy, heavily promoted by academics, based on weak to very poor grasp of reasoned commonsense, resulting in priority given our sensitivities/emotions, not our ideas/understanding. Culminating in weak social understanding based on groups, leading to weak ideas like socialism and capitalism, often offered as the reason for and/or the solution to issues of poverty, equitable wealth distribution, and justice.

Then the idea of democracy, unrelated to any insight into a science of people. Ideas we adopt and apply dominate our life experience. Democracy does not enable diversity of ideas.

Majority rule imposes the ideas of one side of any issue on all, including those who do not agree. Then we wonder why society becomes fractious and tense.

A major reason is the processes of democracy are inherently inconsistent with relaxed interpersonal relations. Often forcibly argued by well-intended people. who judge their heart in the right place, and any who argue measures placing greater responsibility on the person themselves as being heatless and uncaring.

All this conflict in absence of understanding of people, as a species, personally, or in collaborative groups, such as societies.

Both sides passionately argue they are right, when both sides argue in ignorance, with neither side having any idea of rationally understanding people such to build forward with certainty knowing the ideas being applied will not be inherently destructive of social cohesion. The current factors applied in assessing social cohesion, such as race, culture, religion, gender, sexual preference, are contentious, conflictual, are completely irrelevant to understanding of social development which requires scientific understanding of ourselves beyond anything gone before.

The spiritual model of humanity places belief in ourselves as the priority for all management of ourselves. Our future is in our hands, based on the fundamental of how we choose to treat each other. The priority of the right to *be*, to exist, and to hold one's own views, and to expect and offer workable compromise in all things. Where negotiated agreement not found, we reserve the right to walk away and not bother again. None, other than Police, may interfere with our daily lawful conduct.

People committed to a free society believe in:

- ***Right of diversity.*** No person has any right to impose their point of view (called selective morality) on any other.
- ***Self-responsibility.*** Citizens are responsible for their own mental state, other than those with neurological failure, judged a minority of current mental health cases. *Free speech:* It follows, a person is responsible for the stability of their mental state, if they are unsettled at what some other person says to them or about them, they have the responsibility to leave.
- ***Demand of balance:*** All media will report on all sides of all issues, using same volume of words and same emotional tone. This is ensuring all ideas get distributed through society in a balanced manner.
- ***Right of respect.*** All citizens committed to a free society will be offered respect for that, and that alone, no matter the extent their ideas diverge from one's own.
- ***Ethic of workable compromise.*** In all exchanges, all people offered workable compromise as the basis of moving forward.

- ***Right of protest.*** Protest expresses dissatisfaction with current legislation/policy but has limits, such no protest may step beyond the line drawn by the dismissal that denying the right of any person to impose their point of view on any other. Pursuit of one's selective morality is against both the law and values of a free society where diversity is a crucial aspect of our spiritual development. Only Police have the right to interfere with any person going about their lawful business.
- ***Right to central services.*** Government manages increased wealth due social cooperation, distributing that wealth in various social services. Government is responsible or the quality of those services but as no responsibility to any person or group to avail itself of those services. In short, if someone does not use the services, it is their problem, not government.
- ***Right to truth.*** Each person can adopt ideas as they choose. There is a social source of truth (defined in terms of verisimilitude) where each idea is assessed by reasoned commonsense and appropriate intellectual standards and offered as a good idea for purpose of living or not. Authorised academic intellectual institutions are designated the *thinkers* of society, having considered an idea and reached a collective decision as to it veracity. This is much more significant than it appears. For example, there is no reasoning that leads to the idea of god as anything more than a personal idea adopted by some people not by others. Hence to be an authorised source of truth, a university can have religious studies as part of anthropology, but never as a stand-alone division.

The list above is derived from the spiritual model of humanity, from which is also derived two types of society, a free society, and a compliant society typically referred to today as a dictatorship. One can transform by degrees to the other, hence the two fundamental types are bookends.

First, we must decide freedom is our path forward. Then we must decide greater understanding of the correct science of people is the foundation of the path. Then we must demand of ourselves and all who share the view, respect for right of others to exist and to hold ideas different from one's own. In their difference lies diversity resulting in relaxed communities.

For example, in a fully free society, citizens are responsible for what they eat, hence all drugs are decriminalized. The government is held responsible for an extensive educational campaign, but the individual is responsible for what they consume.

There are heavily enforced laws on public safety, but if a person consumes drugs and they die, so be it. Government is responsible for providing health services, but if such a service is not immediately available, and they die, their choice. Personal mistakes are the responsibility of the citizen, not the government.

Abortion another example of workable compromise; a foetus is viable beyond the womb at about 25 weeks. Before that, the growth may be removed from the woman's body. If the foetus is declared legally a citizen at say 25 weeks, then beyond that to kill the foetus is murder. Before 25 weeks a growth may be removed from a female body at the behest of the woman. Beyond 25 weeks risks murder. Abortion does not exist.

A free society is one end of the choices¹. Any society which adopts some principles but moderates other principles steps back from being free, toward an authoritarian society where some people impose their wishes on others whether or not those imposed upon agree.

We owe the spirit of Teutoberg an apology for losing our way. We will think, choose, and within the light of our own understanding, denying all mystical existence. With faith in ourselves, we assert individual freedom, the right of all to be different, but accept we need defend that right, and fiercely deny any the right to impose on us.

We were. Confused, we are no more. What is our choice for tomorrow?

¹ Note to be a free society requires a non-prescriptive legislation, the jurisprudence is the legislation be *non-prescriptive* never demanding what citizens must do, only imposing what citizens must not do in order not to threaten life, limb, property and peaceful co-existence. Such a legislation is opposite a *prescriptive* legislation which says what citizens can do/must do and when. For example restraints on woman, education, sexual practice, calls to pray, are all features of a prescriptive legislation. A non-prescriptive legislation contains no values beyond commonsense protection of life, limb and property. A prescriptive legislation carries the values of the central authority.

Why they died and what do we build on their legacy

The western tradition began mainly in Europe, in the Germanic and Celtic tribes with the tradition of individual freedom well established when confronting the imperialism of Rome and consolidated with the defeat of Roman Legions 9 AD in the Teutoberg Forest. Though Rome was not finally plundered by western individualism until 400 years later.

Meanwhile, Britain had been conquered, between the Romans and Normans driving remnants of Celtic traditions into Ireland, Wales and Scotland. The Roman view of the Celts perhaps best expressed by Hadrian's Wall underlining how Rome felt about barbaric and fiercely independent Scottish clans and their resistance to Roman centralised imperialism. This conflict only finally settled with the recent agreement with the IRA.

The internal conflict between centralised authority overseeing a relative passive citizenry versus unfettered individualism is a constant tension throughout western traditions, even overflowing into the eventual splintering of Christianity into Catholic and English Churches.

As the Inquisition raged across Europe, the Crusades burned bright and then lost their fire. Gathering in the background was a new powerful mindset, referred to as intellectual, or scientific, or philosophical, substantially independent of all religion, frequently judged and referred to as secular or atheist. Regarded with suspicion by all religions, and dismissed as lacking the foundation essential for offering moral and spiritual fulfilment. Academics were equally supportive and dismissive of secularization. Again missing the point, demeaning of investment in humanity, only grudgingly recognizing the wisdom of Siddhartha.

The foundation of scientific western tradition is buried deep in western history and even prehistory. But a useful 'stake in the ground' would be Leonardo Da Vinci, circa 1500 BCE, some 400 years after the formation of Oxford U, 1097. And 1500 years after Plato's Republic.

The secular mindset denied our spiritual existence depended on the idea of a god. Instead, it declared our spirituality depended on ourselves, we were in control of our minds, Hence we determine our own spiritual fulfilment, summarised as *Faith in reason: Acceptance of legitimate judgements resulting in peace of mind knowing the best ideas have been adopted and applied, where intellect is in unison with emotions resulting in spiritual fulfilment* {refer Faith in Reason (July 28, 2024). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4908148>}.

As these different and often competing intellectual positions emerged in minds of western citizens, it resulted in a basic question common to all mind-sets: *Who are we? What do we stand for?*

Then with an assertive Islam, strong commitment to their god, an apparent level of social stability based on common religious beliefs beyond western individual freedom. The west was left stranded with lack of clear identity, ruptured spiritual belief questioned by secular reasoning, and resurgence of the historic tension between individualism and centralised control, derived from the capitalism of Adam Smith and socialism of Marx.

Then cancel culture, identity politics, critical race theory, woke liberalism, and the academic abandonment of responsibility of assessing the quality of ideas afoot in society, culminating in levels of social tension between ‘liberals’ and ‘conservatives’ as to give rise to discussion of cultural civil war in such as USA. Many other countries exhibiting ‘flip-flop’ politics as citizens grappled with significant questions of identity, use of force to protect freedom, immigration, excessive influence by politicians, and emergence of levels of inequality judged inappropriate.

Why? In a movement based on reason, with so much intrinsic hope.

This book is grounded on the premise that *why* is due the secular reasoning not being carried to completion. That the academics of the free world have failed humanity, leaving the western citizen bereft of foundation thinking. Since 1097, academics have failed in establishing the scientific basis of what humanity is, as a result failed to offer any rational insight into understanding a person, derived from the yet broader understanding of humanity.

The book faces head-on a simple question: *Do we in the free world seek a stable, relaxed, fair, just, wealthy, diverse society of peaceful co-existence?* Or not?

If so, we need first confront the basic question: *How on earth can we better manage ourselves if everything we understand about ourselves is wrong?*

And yet more undamental question: *Is a correct science of people in fact possible?* Along with the crucial methodological question: *How do we intellectually proceed in solving the question?*

The basis of all fractious, disruptive, disputive, and tense social circumstance is due the failure of academe to confront those questions.

Such failure compounded by academe in the ego-driven, facesaving manipulation to avoid telling the truth it did not know, and promoting to citizens dreadfully poor ideas, asserting authority over citizens by dismissing any and all citizen concerns even coining dismissive phrases such as *common or popular psychology* as an aspect of protecting its self-serving authority.

These are failures beyond serious. The inherently destructive consequences relished by academe as its inept ideas lacking all commonsense, tore society apart, is one the issues making modern academe well passed its use-by date and in need of serious shakeup.

If we do seek a better society, we need better ideas. We need make a free society work. Without friction, reduced social angst, peaceful co-existence, wealthy, creative, visionary, spiritual fulfilment, purpose, and satisfaction for all people beyond anything humanity has yet experienced.

We have exhausted application and refinement of all current ideas. Marxism, capitalism or religious driven society do not work in the manner projected of them. We need better ideas, and those can only be found in better scientific understanding of ourselves.

Returning to basic foundation questions and resolving them from the bottom up is the only thing over the last 1000 years we have not done. I call it ***commonsense reasoning***; doing first things first. Citizens have typically been dominated by commonsense, typically their concerns dismissed by academe who typically pursued what I called ***intellectualization***, dismissive of commonsense. Until now, academic thinking dominated, they were wrong, and commonsense reasoning in line with citizens, must be forcefully asserted. Citizens predilection to commonsense due, perhaps, they have always had to live in a real world, without the luxury of privilege offered academics, who by 1900's had become deeply self-serving, and consolidated such selfish focus in the reality of the Sokol Affair of 1996.

Look about, any care to argue that the quality of our ideas was not placed in the hands of academe 1097. Any care to argue since at least 1640, and rejection of Descartes pluralism, academe has not promoted poor ideas to citizens who listened due the deal of 1097. The credibility of academe has not been justified for hundreds if not 1000 years,

Any care to argue it is ideas of poor quality that have been adopted and applied is not the primary cause of our divisive social state. Ideas such as a man can become a woman by willing it so; god is the prime mover of the universe; any individual who disagrees with the ideas of the mob (peer review legacy) is to be aggressively denied; denying quality standards is acceptable, denying integrity is acceptable, with cheating and lying done by politicians and academics all the time.

These are all values a travesty of values of the men and woman who fought and died in Teutoberg. Does anyone care argue we have not lost the plot. And its correction must begin with elite, and I nominate academics to start our recovery by reasserting they do what they were contracted to do when formed in 10977. Guide free world citizens on the intellectual quality of ideas suited to be adopted and applied in pursuit of better life experience.

To begin getting it back we need a source of truth as defined in the spiritual model of humanity), based on science, which is based on reasoned commonsense, doing first things first. The logical group to serve as our truth bearers are our academics, But they must throw out peer review as deeply corrupt, and adopt standards of intellectual quality far beyond that exhibited to date ... strategic thinking, reach and reflexive criteria, all settled on a platform of reasoned commonsense where first things have been done first, and if any doubt, this declared openly.

To begin the return to our soul of individual freedom and diversity, we must drag academia into line with whatever leverage we can. Control of their budgets, restricted enrolments, dismissal of their points of view. Political disrespect. Media declining to promote their ideas unless justified and validated by the advanced intellectual standards.

Society does not exist as a tree, independent of ourselves. Society is based on the ideas we use to manage ourselves in groups, large and small. In short, we are rational, we manage ourselves based on what we see at the time, selecting the best ideas we have by which we understand ourselves. Many of the ideas we apply to ourselves have been thousands of years in their gestation.

But despite history democracy finally blossomed as the social tool of freedom in the words of Lincoln in the Gettysburg Address 1863: *Governance of the people for the people by the people*

From beginnings lost in the depths of history, marked by notable events like publication of Plato's Republic, circa 500 BC, the understanding of ourselves was wrong in conception.

The ideas drawn from this false understanding instead of drawing forth the best of us, has wrought the worst of us into the modern free world (Modern free world defined from say 1776, the year of the French Revolution, publication of Adam Smith's Wealth of Nations and signing of the American Declaration of Independence).

Today, 2024, both our mental health processes and the social processes we use to manage ourselves as societies, are forged from our understanding of ourselves, are the product of our ignorance. *Poor ideas → poor result.*

Hope is not lost but rekindled in our acceptance of our historic failure. We learn the need to build on better and yet better again understanding of ourselves.

We must adopt the principle of reasoned commonsense of doing first things first. To base all ideas on the secure platform of prior resolved ideas. Before we build the house, we ensure the ground is stable. The 3000 years of history has taught us the rule that first things must be done and resolved first. We ignore it at our peril.

It is crucial to understand a citizen can choose any idea they wish. But, the institution of a university cannot. It must apply with ruthless thoroughness intellectual standards adopted and promoted as true and correct ideas passing all modern standard and fit to be adopted and applied for the pursuit of a fulfilling life. Secondly university governance regards all independent academics as employees and they may not deviate from policy at threat of termination of contract. Finally, the universities are expected to thrash out between themselves the truth of ideas, then it selects the list of policy ideas it presents on its web site.

Finally, any university that promotes an idea later proved wrong, is subject to punishment by the politicians governing the society. In this way, academia offering a strong role model to citizens,

All aspects of what we understand and adopt of ourselves to manage ourselves is knowledge, we create knowledge. To understand the ideas we apply, we must first understand ourselves, beyond religious fervour, to apply clear rational processes to intellectual questions about ourselves.

Finding the depth of confidence in our own judgement. Then confidently draw ideas from our understanding of ourselves to build a free society of which we can be proud, gifting it to our children and grandchildren and beyond. In our older age revelling at squeals of joy as young descendants embark on better lives than our own ever were.

First, we need step beyond closed minded arrogance, applying reasoned commonsense ensuring all ideas we adopt and apply rest on a secure platform of understanding adopting intellectual standards beyond any currently being applied.

This secure ground of reasoned commonsense ensuring rigorous intellectual understanding of ourselves. Then each key group ... academics, media, commerce, courts, and politicians ... must identify its contribution to building a better free society. Finally, once key groups educated themselves, then ensure citizens aware and at peace with the scientific understanding of themselves and the social transition from democracy to a free society.

This book offers definite reasoned identity to all those committed to a diverse, fair, just, wealthy, society of peaceful co-existence. The western way of freedom. Reasoned, offering unrivalled spiritual fulfilment built on our faith in ourselves.

The aim of this book

To shake academia from its 900 years of complacency.

After graduating PhD in, mechanistic organic chemistry from Canterbury University, 1971. I joined Shell Oil NZ as a chemical sales representative serving the bottom half of the North Island. I was disillusioned with academics and their shallowness and lack of what I referred to as 'real world issues'.

I was successful in Shell, but felt incomplete and knew it could never be my life activity. There was more I needed do. In the years 1971 to 1974 I spent hours each weekend researching psychology, social science, consciousness, sociology, history of views and opinions, politics, nature of society. I then realised I was researching myself; I was building my knowledge, but people had created that knowledge therefore any theory of ourselves had to explain its own existence, and to a depth never before acknowledged or understood.

Armed with what I was looking for, a theory of psychology with some coherent view of psychology (remember my PhD is in hard science), that could or did fully account for its own existence. I found no such theory of ourselves. I checked, and looked again, I could not find reference even to a comment that what I had come to call the *reflective criteria* was even mentioned as a major factor in deciding on the verisimilitude (I had read Popper) of the theory.

I devoured Kuhn's The Structure of Scientific Revolutions and came to understand paradigms and normal science and what exactly was a paradigm shift. By 1974, I understood the relationship between a scientific paradigm and the normal science arising from acceptance of the paradigm.

I had defined a variable and understood the difference between a variable and a value of the variable and had analysed the exact nature of the relationship between an abstraction from the environment in mind, a variable, and the environment itself. I researched epistemology and could find no reference remotely dealing with the issues as I had come to understand them.

Shell assigned me to Personnel, and I was the Training and Recruitment Manager, recruiting university graduates and conducting courses up to senior middle management. My research efforts were put to good purpose.

In 1974 I finally decided what I wanted to do with my life and drafted the questions that have dominated my life (refer appendix 1, item 18, page 20).

The research questions written in 1974

1. If we had an apt and thorough general theory of knowledge what would it tell us of knowledge and the relationship between our knowledge and the object of that knowledge?
2. If we had an apt and thorough general theory of psychology what would it tell us of two people having a conversation?
3. If we had an apt and thorough general theory of groups of people (large or small) what would it tell us of a particular group and of the direction of development of that group?
4. There is only one actor, therefore what is the relationship between the solutions to the first three questions?

After about ten years of research and reflection and deeper reading into religion, I added a fifth question:

5. What is the human spirit, can it be conceptualized, located in our psyche and its influence identified?

I decided I had to build my own scientific general theory of psychology, (the term after Einstein general and special theories of relativity). Had I realised then it would take me 50 years to get to the conclusion of writing the book on it, this book, plus the level of personal cost, I may have reconsidered,

There was one dreadful ... *oh no* ... moment late in 1995, after 21 years of effort, I judged I had failed. I Christmas holidayed at a wonderful bay in northland, called Matai Bay. Returned home feeling refreshed but realistic. Mid annuary 1996, the year of Sokol Affair, I remember sitting early morning in the bay window looking out over the neighbouring schools playing fields, I was doodling with my work and had the *ah ha* moment. I had resolved it, I could clearly 'see it'. The needed scientific general theory of psychology built on the epistemological principles I had decided over 20 years earlier were essential if the theory was to stand up to the scrutiny I intended to give it.

I reflected then on acceptance and had fully understood since the beginning of my work, that to get academia to accept it, to break the complacency of near 1000 years, my work had to stand above theirs, I had to resolve issues they could not, had not resolved. To then challenge, I expected and have been intensely subject to dismissive disregard to my work and to the slightest suggestion I had succeeded where they had failed.

These are not people of leadership stature, I had learned that much, I understood leadership and had been subject to quality leadership beginning with my time in Shell. If they were of leadership stature, this book would not be necessary.

I have been actively pursuing this marketing of my work since 2022, the discussion document, item 15 at www.spiritualmodel.com. My work has been dismissed I have been abused, I have been banned from publishing, But I am correct in my base analysis..

The aim of this book: To shake academia from its 900+ years of complacency. I seek the return of academics to deliver on the deal of 1097, return to the reason they were created in the first place, to serve humanity and be the source of truth as in verisimilitude. Guidance of the assessment of which ideas to adopt and apply and which to avoid is more important today than in 1097.

Unless global free world academia heeds this need for a large lift in its professional performance and its adoption of reasoned commonsense as the foundation of assessing the intellectual quality of all approved ideas, then freedom will fail, and humanity will be dominated by imperialistic centralised authority, including Islam. Decline is to throw away western history, they died in Teutobergg for nothing.

Facing the challenge of shifting from democracy to a free society

If we decline to face the challenge raises the question the title of the book: *why did they die?*

Building a fair, just, wealthy, diverse society of acceptable levels of inequality, and stable peaceful co-existence is only possible if all elite find consistency of thinking. The leadership of key groups ... academics, media, politicians, commercial ... accepting themselves as citizens, but crucially also accepting their professional responsibilities and acting consistent with them.

This must involve dumping all historical views of *capitalism and socialism*, dismissing all intellectual history as inadequate in failing the reflective criteria, rejecting peer review and asserting all ideas must rest on a platform of reasoned commonsense. With all ideas promoted as those to be adopted and applied also meeting appropriate tests of intellectual quality. Likely time to achieve these changes a generation from when we manage agreement we need to make such changes.

SMH the correct science of people. To have the spiritual model of humanity accepted by citizens as the correct science of people. Ideas → life experience. Reality ≡ reality. The choice of a free society is established as the choice of citizens by society wide referendum requiring more than say 75% support of citizens. Mere majority vote would leave too many citizens potentially disenfranchised. Once agreed, then legislation is enacted to ensure a central monitoring/controlling complaint political system can never be enacted in the society.

Priority of integrity not sensitivities. To become a free society requires citizens accept integrity as the psychological priority, with respect for all legitimate views on any issue and the right of fellow citizen to hold such views without demeaning comment or disrespect by other citizen. That is banning pursuit of selective morality.

Have a core infrastructure dedicated to truth. Academia assumes the role of social thinkers, source of truth of ideas, citizens may adopt ideas as they choose, but all free world intellectual institutions are united in presenting those ideas appropriate to enable a better life, and those not, so fulfilling the deal of 1097.

Set much higher intellectual standards. All ideas offered must be based on a platform of reasoned commonsense, and intellectual standards of reflexive criteria, reach, and strategic science.

Reasoned commonsense relates to the structure of the idea in relation to other ideas from which it derived and on which it depends for its continuity and conceptual 'substance'. The standard of strategic science describes the detail of an idea within its detailed context. The line between the two is blurred and not precise. For example, (1) the issue of culture demanding a scientific general theory of psychology if it is to be meaningful. Versus (2) culture as a light cloak of uniqueness, which is understanding only available as a detail within the scientific general theory of psychology, .

Demand duty of care exercised by all intellectual institutions. Private intellectual institutions make their own policy decisions, but to hold government derived degree granting rights, to receive government recognition and funds including research grants, the institution must only assert ideas consistent with SMH as a foundation of its intellectual responsibilities to humanity.

Employees policy bound. All free world academia issues definition of the ideas fit for living as institutional policy. All institution employees are expected to defer to policy otherwise to deny policy sufficiently they are terminated. This is consistent with all organization-employee commercial policy.

Media balance. All recognized main media must only present a balanced view on all issues, measured in presenting all sides of any issue with equal volume of words with equal emotional tone.

All legislation to be made non-prescriptive. Legislation must not specify any group, race, or religion. Must only define what citizens are not to do, must avoid any tone of demand of what citizens are to do. This philosophy of jurisprudence leaves living choice to the self-discipline of citizens who must be in no doubt their mental state is their problem.

Quality and responsive social support available, including medical aid, but for example, taking drugs is citizen responsibility, and should they overdose and die, then it is their choice. The state is not responsible for individual choices of citizens, especially if those choices entail significant risk to their own life and limb.

All policy based on SMH. All political policy to be consistent with, derived from and supportive of the SMH, the correct science of people.

Search for workable compromise. Politicians conduct themselves as mediators between groups in conflict seeking workable compromise embedded in plans for resolution of the issue. A social management process consistent with Popper problem solving approach to social development (refer appendix (2))

Limits to protests. The non-prescriptive legislation enables protests, but no citizen other than police, is entitled to disrupt any other citizen from going about their legal daily activity.

Pursuing selective morality is banned. Seeking to impose their selective morality on any other citizens is defined as a moral failure and crime punishable by the full weight of law including police aggressive suppression of demonstrations contrary to the demand for self-disciplined avoidance of imposing ideas on fellow citizens.

Speech is free and uninhibited. Citizens are expected to not react to speech and expected to adopt responsibility for themselves. When any speech is unsettling to their personal sensitivities and is within a law by not inciting violence or treason, the citizen is expected to walk away.

Themes

The main theme of this book is we are each unique examples of the science of ourselves, as such we stand apart from each other only uniting by choice.

Each human being distinct and unique, ultimately responsible for themselves. It is the western way, consolidated in 9 AD when people of disparate disposition united to defend their way in the face of Roman imperialism.

Cooperation enables living comfort unattainable alone, hence workable compromise and cooperative effort the fundamental social ethic of a free society. This again, the western way. Today cooperation enables life experience vastly beyond living alone. It is called social wealth development with distributive fairness the determinant of equality/inequality.

Organizations and *work* the primary means of wealth creation in modern society. To be successful, the organization must have a sound, valid and practical idea, normally arising from the entrepreneur, and cooperative skilled citizens to make the idea a reality.

Current ideas give ownership to the entrepreneur. This policy on ownership needs reviewed, since an idea without cooperative workers is useless, and workers without an idea unproductive.

This book has many themes, intertwined, the main theme clear, but supported by subthemes giving explanation as to why it is a priority for humanity.

The main theme must be derived from the supporting themes: It defines the western way but offers clear scientific reason in the depth of exchange between subjective knowledge and objective knowledge. The priority use of this exchange is why the west developed such depth and breadth of ideas as to emerge with global appeal. As a stake in the ground start point, I use Plato's Republic, published circa 500 BCE, as consolidation of exploring ideas in writing.

After its historic foundation, the western traditions must relinquish such cultural authority for the future in the simple but precise *ideas count the source of ideas does not*.

Humanity must move forward selecting the best ideas, adopted and applied without reference to culture, group, religion, sexuality/gender, or any other personal preference.

In adopting the principal *ideas count source of ideas does not*, as the working foundation of the path forward. We enter a new phase of human development, a global wide civilization based on the best ideas from any source. A civilization holding fast its uniqueness in culture, but adopting the best ideas to apply in building its social infrastructure,

To convince all societies to adopt this path, however, the current free world must show to the remainder of humanity the path works and is the best path to a better future. Currently that is not the case. With this book presenting the actions best to make it so.

Main theme: The scientific proof we are each a unique example of humanity, and the greatest depth of our spiritual fulfilment lies in acceptance of personal responsibility for our choices in all circumstances.

This scientific understanding of people is translated into a society, referred to as a free society, and the consequences explored for people within a society dedicated to freedom.

This intellectual structure is referred to as *the western way*. Hence the main theme is in-depth analytical support of the western way of individual freedom and spiritual fulfilment based upon accurate scientific understanding of ourselves.

Supporting themes:

1. Building a scientific general theory of people, and what it means.
2. Definition of exactly how we are linked to the environment and the consequences of differentiated perceptual fields (refer Ganzfeld Effect).
3. Definition of science from within definition of knowledge from within the scientific general theory of a people.
4. All aspects of the method used to build a scientific general theory of people derived from the theory. Thus, full resolution of all aspects of the reflexive criteria.
5. Application of the theory to all human circumstance and evidence it *fits*. This must include existing science such as quantum theory and relativity.
6. Precise resolution of the role of god in human affairs, establishing we can have confidence in our judgement which can never be replaced by the wishes of any mystical entity. .
7. Details of what individual responsibility means in social circumstance.
8. Definition of exact relationship between central authority, referred to as government, and citizens.
9. Consideration of how we consolidate the choice of freedom in modern society by transitioning from democracy to a free society.
10. Tightened consideration of what government should control and what left to choice if people are to be free.
11. To make clear all aspects of self-responsibility and draw a precise line between enforced discipline and self-discipline.
12. Establish full spiritual development is possible if and only if a person accepts responsibility for their choices and believes in themselves. Accepting their mistakes.

The way forward or humanity is a path of self-discipline and respect for life, beginning with oneself. In the spiritual model of humanity (SMH), referred to as *faith in reason*.

Summary of the scientific explanation of who we are

The brain is a self-correcting feedback loop with ideas as the unit of self-correction. The brain processes sensory input creating the image in mind (reality) of circumstance (Reality); ideas we able to apply are stored in memory; the mind selects an idea to apply. We do it, the outcome determines our experience. We face the next circumstance ...

Crucial questions

Do we in the free world seek a stable, relaxed, fair, just, wealthy, diverse society of peaceful co-existence? Or not?

What if ... and how do we know? *How on earth can we better manage ourselves if everything we understand about ourselves is wrong?* Or at very least, what we are using is (1) not validated, with fragmentation of practical views even in basic psychology; (2) fails the standard of the reflexive criteria; (3) is unable to account for all human outputs (relativity for example); (4) results in fragmented science, where social science is judged different in principle from modern physics. These issues make it fair to state modern social understanding is not science, if by science we mean coherent views resting in a conceptual hierarchy of reasoned commonsense, ensuring at very least initial adherence to the rule of doing first that which needs done first.

This sad state of modern social science, raises a yet more fundamental question: *Is a correct science of people in fact possible?*

Along with the crucial methodological question: *If it is possible, and there is no reason in principle why it is not, then how do we intellectually proceed in solving the question?* No matter how hard it may be, how intellectually demanding, if we establish the best method we can think of, we then follow it, we will build the best theory we are able, and allow future generations of thinkers to take it forward from there. We understand about standing on the shoulders of our forebears,

I remind readers that while we quote Kant, Descartes, Marx, and Freud, in doing so, we adopt a great confusion ... ideas count, source of ideas does not. While these quoted, Popper only proved existence of knowledge without a knowing subject mid last century. And Ashby established the ignored language of ultimate and immediate effects around the same time which resolved concerns about linking changes in variables with different ontology, so made dualism a valid scientific phenomenon, and meant ideas existed and could thus directly be linked to physical things. Mind existed and here I show how it dominates all human existence, as it dominates all sentient species.

I came to that conclusion a decade or so ago, watching a Utube clip of a snake being chased by three lizards over open ground. Smart snake got away, but it was a close thing. It was nearly a meal for the lizards.

Then: *How and why was the actions of that snake in saving its life any diferent from those of a human doing the same thing?* Scan the environment, pick a safe spot, and go for it. How could the snake do that without understanding? How could the snake have undersanding without having ideas? How could the snake have ideas without having a mind? It was all happening fast. How could the snake make choices witout having an image in its mind of the environment, elementary as its mind may be? The snke got away by hurtling into a crevice the lizards could not fit into.

Ideas built on some previous experience of where it was and where to go to be safe. 'Knowing' saved it...? Ideas? Or was I imagining?

If we seek individul freedom, and a *relaxed, fair, just, wealthy, diverse society of peaceful co-existence*, we need implement ideas we know will enable the result we want. Such a society can only be built on scientific insight into ourselves followed through by the disciplined implementation. Please read this book and THINK.

Imagining? No, this book carries on from where Descartes left of circa 1640, and where academics declared him wrong. He was not wrong. Read the arguments offered here. First time reasoned commonsense applied to understanding oruselves, the emergent theory of ourselves explaining all aspects of ourselves, and if we want the sort of society we say we want, we have a lot of ethical and moral changes to make.

Many will not like the changes, but in rejecting them they will be forced to conclude they do not really want the sort of society they previously claimed they wanted, free, diverse, fair, just, peaceful.

Embracing complexity

This discussion is long and complex. Does anyone really wish to argue that as a species we can understand ourselves in a short, simple discussion, and that understanding how to build a better society is even more simple. Please, study, reflect and THINK.

Protecting our way of life

When and how to restrict people pursuing personal views and under what circumstances? Which poses the question: *when is force appropriate to ensure people act with sel-disciplined respect for all fellow citizens no matter the extent the other person does not agree?* When do ideas become illegal? I define ideas that are legal, practical, and resolve the issue, as legitimate ideas.

Thus if facing some circumstance, and you have your ideas, and another person has legitimate ideas opposite to what you judge need happen, and assume you are more persuasive, do you have the right to override their ideas? And is that a free society? Would they think so?

We must choose. Without banning the pursuit of selective morality (personal choice), freedom is self-destructive. We need decide if our (Western) way of freedom in individualism is desirable. We need make it work.

We must face the enemies of freedom: First, our own lack of self-discipline; Second imperialism; Third those, such as Islam who deny freedom is the path to the future and would assert a global caliphate.

If we want diversity gifting life choices to people, we must be willing to face those who would have it otherwise. We must protect our life choice of freedom of the individual, enabling diversity. Build a non-prescriptive legislation which restricts citizens from acts dangerous to life, limb and property.

Freedom cannot be exported by force. It is a choice. We must establish it as the desirable choice by ensuring a free society delivers a better life experience for citizens.

Quality ideas are not measured by popularity

We need better understand ourselves beginning by first demanding academia decide on SMH as the correct science of people.

Then require academe comply with the deal of 1097 and advise on intellectual quality of ideas we adopt and apply. At same time, coordinate appropriate support of media, politicians, while building greater clarity and awareness of the correct understanding of themselves as citizens.

Quality of ideas is not decided by popularity but by ideas resting on a platform of reasoned commonsense and passing appropriate tests of intellectual quality.

We need learn we must never trust popularity. Ideas count source of ideas does not. Opinions do not matter. We must measure quality of ideas by standards and reasoning processes in which we can have long term faith: Reasoned commonsense, strategic thinking, reach and reflexive criteria.

We must deflect international PR supported, at times promoted, by enemies of freedom as implicitly corrupt. We must adopt and apply ideas meeting our own standards and charge academe with that responsibility. Of those who persist with asserting they are right we must gently insist their ideas too inconsistent with freedom.

Self-discipline is the B-side of freedom

We must cement our choice of freedom, dealing firmly with those who would deny the self-discipline needed. Then, avoid aggression toward external enemies of freedom but firmly deny their influence.

Commitment to freedom as personal liberation from tyranny

Getting the thinking right, applying force within our society as needed, this is *our* Teutoberg Forest, Crusades, Alamo, WWII.

We have learned from our history, we know imposing selective morality generates its own resistance.

We demand self-discipline, resist being imposed upon, and draw down the curtain on all outside influence. They are entitled to their choice, as are we. We decline all interference from outside, applying deadly force if needed. In freedom, we insist on workable compromise in all exchanges.

We must not turn our back on our history that forged who we are. We accept our choice of a diverse society, accepting self-discipline as the basis on which to build our communities. We step beyond democracy building a free society with non-prescriptive legislation more successful for people than any other choice.

Self-responsibility

The foundation of a free society is citizens accepting responsibility for self. All other citizens must accept they are not responsible for the life experience of others, only for their own life experience consistent with self-responsibility. This is more difficult than it sounds.

For example: A foetus is viable beyond the womb at about 25 weeks. A free society requires workable compromise between those who demand a woman has the right to terminate pregnancy and those often religious, who demand we protect life. Both are legitimate points of view. If at 25 weeks for example, a foetus is declared a citizen with all legal rights. Then before 25 weeks the growth may be removed from the mother, after 25 weeks, the foetus is a citizen with full legal protection in legislation. To kill the foetus after 25 weeks then is murder. The idea of abortion is dismissed.

Citizens are responsible for all they eat, including drugs. If they take the wrong dose, or if they ingest drugs of unknown source, and become sickened, the state will do its best to get first responders to save them. But in principle, the state is not responsible for careless and foolish conduct by citizens.

The state is responsible for appropriate educational campaign stressing the consumption of drugs is dangerous, and to be avoided. The state is not responsible for citizen immaturity or stupidity.

The consumption of any and all drugs in any form or any dose is fully the responsibility of the person.

Scientific defining morality and immorality

For all issues there is always more than one legitimate side to the debate. Legitimate describes an idea in relation to some issue that is legal, resting on a platform of reasoned commonsense, and passes appropriate test of intellectual quality. In short, there is no reason in principle to reject the idea as a solution to the issues being considered.

Scientific morality is recognition of both sides of the issue. There is no 'right side'.

All citizens are entitled to their preferences, referred to as their *selective morality*. A person may hold the view the state has an obligation to protect citizens from their own stupidity. Such is their selective morality. But their acceptance of the right to hold their views can only exist in a free society, the foundation of such a society is acceptance of the right of other citizens to exist and to hold views different from themselves.

Hence the greatest immoral crime in a free society is to seek to impose one's selective morality on a fellow citizen. The priority of freedom is the right of fellow citizens to exist and hold views contrary to one's own. The ethics of freedom must be workable compromise as regards all things. With the courts the last resort when citizens or groups unable to voluntarily reach a workable compromise.

The first priority of a free society is the right of all to exist. The second priority is rule of law, with particular commitment to the law of contracts in final settlement of disputes.

For a person committed to freedom, these priorities apply to all people, including those internal to western traditions, and dedicated to imperialism and centralised control. For society to be stable, we must come to terms with each other without killing each other.

Given the threats and impasse Russia-Ukraine (2024), we are a long way from acceptance of each other. Priority afforded existence of states, and empires, rather than lives of people.

Only two types of society

Given ideas are the determinant of human mood and conduct, there is the question of *which ideas*. There are only two possible answers, we choose the ideas ourselves, or we have ideas imposed upon us. The first, choosing ideas ourselves gives rise to a free society, dependent on self-discipline with priority of the right of other people to exist and to hold views different to one's own with the demand for workable compromise in all things.

Democracy if not a free society, majority rule imposes ideas on those in minority whether they want/agree or not, refer [Post](#) | [Feed](#) | [LinkedIn](#)

The second, where ideas imposed, often by force, is referred to as a compliant society, all ideas are vetted and approved by the central controlling authority, diversity does not exist, only to the extent it is approved by the central authority.

Individualism is untidy and demands self-discipline. Order from imposed authority is easier, but demands deference, even when one does not agree. Western values, stake in the ground, forged in Teutoberg, AD 9, when Germanic tribes following the defeated Celts challenged and defeated Roman imperialism. If we cannot make individual freedom work, then it will die as an option for humankind.

Rediscovering our soul

I define soul as a depth of peace of mind, hence is a function of ourselves and our mind. Within the spiritual model of humanity several aspects must align and become an integrated *whole* determining our existence.

Accurate understanding of ourselves. I refer to this as the paradigm (after Kuhn) about ourselves, the foundation of our intellectual understanding of ourselves. If this is wrong, I cannot see how we can find any spiritual peace or coherence of existence, since our base understanding of ourselves is wrong. Hence an important aspect of our existence will not *fit* in the sense of being incompatible with other important aspects of ourselves. This would lead to adoption of our spirituality associated with an *outside* circumstances, hence our spiritual existence became integrated with our concepts of god and our spiritual existence claimed by religions.

A sense of existence. Accepting ourselves as part of the universe, not separate, nor special. Seeing all life precious, respecting it, and seeking to live in harmony with it, while accepting human life as priority.

A sense of community. Our sense of belonging.

A sense of meaning/purpose. This is built by ourselves, defining ourselves in relation to all the foregoing, making it meaningful to get out of bed each morning. We can only give ourselves a reason why we personally exist.

A sense of self. A fulfilled existence of one's own choosing determining for oneself the priorities of all the aspects of being 'me'.

Such a fulfilled integration of 'me' only possible in a free society without imposed thinking, only guided by rules of society avoiding damage to life, limb or property.

Rousseau claimed we *born free but everywhere in chains*, His great mistake, which we have hardly moved beyond, is not the existence of the chain but who holds the end of it.

A person sans self-discipline is sans everything.

The morality of a free society

Every person has the right to live as they choose and be respected within broad guidelines afforded by the non-prescriptive legislation of a free society.

The foundation morality is the demand that citizens see and accept all sides of all issues while having the right to hold personal views on the issue, referred to as selective morality.

The ethical foundation is workable compromise recognising that each person is entitled to their selective morality and may act on it provided it is within the law. Ideas as solution to an issue are *legitimate* if practical, legal, and contribute to resolution of the issue.

Other people have equal right to exist, hence in a free society no person has the right to impose their ideas on another citizen, all exchanges in a free society must be based on workable compromise. The Police are to intervene whenever imposition of selective morality was present.

For example, blocking roads in protest, to school children in NZ led by teachers, stopping learning and marching in street protesting climate policies with teachers open to charges of exceeding their authority and undermining the learning of the pupils in their charge. These may not be legal charges, but those teachers condemned by media, and by general ethical and moral standards in society.

Freedom will languish and our free societies will continue to fail to work on behalf of citizens if we do not separate personal views from professional obligations.

If teachers wish to become politicians, then they can do so, but we need come to see it a crime against society where people charged with teaching, abuse that role to make points as private citizens in abdication of their primary social role. It is role model teaching young people inappropriate standards of conduct inconsistent with a free society.

These circumstances remind me of that which teachers ought to know, but their own learning is deficit: *It always looks easy for the person who does not have to do it.*

The fundamental of free society is doing the professional role one chooses and doing it well. Speaking up when others act as NZ teachers acted, abdicating teaching to become politicians and teaching their students that such divisive and demeaning conduct implying they know better than the politicians who have responsibility for doing it. By all means make one's personal views known, but be sure they are presented as only that, personal views.

Formation of academia and the deal of 1097

Oxford University was formed in 1097. It was an idea whose time had come, and Oxford was quickly followed by Intellectual institutions across the free world.

This was a good idea, as the world became more complex the need for clarity and definition of the ideas adopted and applied became crucial. Reviewing the good ideas and distinguishing them from bad, demanded time and elimination of life distractions, like having enough money for groceries, or rent, Academics, employees of universities were given the time and emotional space to think. offer reflective wisdom on the good ideas plus ensure young minds especially, were trained in these good ideas.

Government adopted the oversight on education via degrees. The university itself, via leadership governance was left to provide citizens guidance on good ideas and not good.

In return for providing universities with cash to enable employees to think, citizens from Lords, Presidents and Prime Ministers to peasants would listen and abide by the advice on which ideas to be adopted and applied and which not. I refer to this implicit agreement as the *deal of 1097*.

In short, academe had a duty of care to advise society on the quality of ideas most likely to lead to the best outcomes for society. Note, the institution had the duty of care, not individual employees (the academics).

The formation of universities was and still is a very good idea, to have an infrastructure in society as the nominated thinkers of society, more crucial today than ever before. Employees of universities are paid to think and advise citizens on good ideas and poor ideas. Citizens can choose whatever idea they like, but an institution cannot, it must apply quality standards, and as policy must provide advice to citizens as to which ideas pass the standards and which do not.

I use the term *must*, signifying universities as a consequence of their existence, regardless of funding, have a duty of care to citizens to offer advice on the quality of ideas afoot in society. Governments assumed responsibility for education, but the institution had responsible for the intellectual quality of ideas.

Since 1097, academia has failed to deliver on its side of the deal of 1097, allowing employees to promote ideas of their choosing, with no concern for the quality of the ideas. As a result, today, there are loose in society some dreadful inadequate ideas, without academia offering advice as to the quality of the idea.

Questions academe should address but have not

Global academe has failed to serve citizens with ideas based on suitable quality. NZ academics passively followed. The intellectual institutions delighted to be formed and given licence to think, but from the get-go, the governance as in senior institutional leadership, failed in exercising the duty of care, failed to establish as institutional policy good ideas and not good ideas. Allowed individual employees unfettered latitude in promoting to citizens any idea they judged fit for purpose of living. Whether or not the idea was grounded on reasoned commonsense and passed the tests of intellectual quality.

The cumulative result of the abdication of global academia governance is what we have today.

The list below is merely indicative, the failure to serve free world citizens and avoid the fractious social circumstances we have extends beyond this short list.

The deal of 1097 was between academia as in governance and institutional policy, and citizens. It did not include individual employees of institutions. Hence, the official, reasoned commonsense view could be posted on the web site of every university. It was not, and never has been.

People are entitled to think as they choose. But there is today, in principle, a reasoned commonsense definition of all ideas passing quality test, that could be/should be common policy of all universities, and no employee may promote their own view in contradiction of the policy view. They can, but depending on seriousness of any offence, their employment can be terminated. This is the same for employees of all organizations.

Mental health: People are responsible for their own mental state, the only exception is neurological failure. Hence likely 75% of what is today deemed mental illness is people adopting poor to self-destructive ideas about circumstance for which they are responsible and only they can change.

Years ago, I offered the advice on social management of mental health, *The Science of Mental Health as Applied to Self, Politics and Social Policy* (October 16, 2018). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3267112>, stating unless fundamental change in the underlying scientific understanding then throwing money at mental health is equivalent to throwing oil on an oil fire. Since, my prediction has proved correct as mental health has increased as a percentage of the total health Vote.

I repeat, unless the correct science of people is adopted and citizens guided in the improved understanding of the species and of themselves as an example of the species, then mental health in NZ will escalate as a percentage

of the total health Vote. Further, given the current level is at the bottom of an exponential curve, the rate of increase itself will increase. Such is the impact where the correct science meets life.

Gender multiplicity: There are only two genders determined by DNA XY, and XX. XY bequeaths a male physique, intrinsically stronger, faster, more stamina than XX female physique. It is inappropriate for XY to ever compete in female defined as XX DNA, sports events. Especially any involving speed, strength, stamina. This difference in physique underlined in the gap between world records over 100 meters. There are hundreds of males who can beat the world record time or females. .

Transgender does not exist; a person is born XY or XX and can never change. That includes the 1 in 15000 males (XY) born with a vagina. DNA and DNA alone determines physique. Confused young people need compassionate psychological guidance on understanding themselves. Puberty blockers are a dreadful idea. Sexuality is such a significant aspect of our social existence it is not surprising young people become agitated and confused. But emotional confusion is not corrected by drugs, nor by lies in the form of misinformation.

For instance, a young man with submissive emotions and a preference for being penetrated, needs to be guided to accept and explore themselves and not be advised they are female, nor have their development distorted by drugs. The disrespect for homosexuality in males is almost entirely due the ideas arising from religions. Reasoned commonsense has it such religious based thinking is biased, shallow, and has nothing whatever to do with humanity as part of nature.

We need deal with real causal issues, building the appropriate relationship between mind, body and spirit, and a person can never find their depth of their spiritual existence in lies nor in drugs. It is shallow religious manipulation that must go, and we secure our spiritual existence in accurate understanding of the breadth of humanity, and where in that breadth we 'fit'.

Abortion should not exist: A baby is viable beyond the womb at 25/26 weeks. If the unborn foetus is then legally declared a citizen at 26 weeks, then before 26 weeks, the mother may have the growth removed from her body, after, to kill the foetus legally a citizen at 26 weeks, is murder.

God only exists as an idea in the mind of a person. No god has any existence or influence in human affairs beyond the influence in the mind of a person.

All religion is an expression of human selective morality. All religions are cults and to have restricted social activity.

Time does not exist. Time is a tool of consciousness measuring the period between events.

Two types of knowledge: Stochastic and causal, our modern particle science is limited to stochastic, hence the current standard model of the universe must be viewed as seriously limited and inadequate. It has provided useful technology but try and imagine the escalation in technology if we learn exactly what causes the disintegration of a single radioactive atom.

Lack of reasoning from academia. Academics have not been rational, nor reasoned. They have avoided the brutally simple and obvious question ... ***do people produce knowledge?***

That and that alone should have had academia extremely cautious and deeply wary of what on earth they were talking about. Global technology could have advanced exactly as it has, just without the depth of naivety foisted on unsuspecting citizens.

All human understanding had to arise from in-depth understanding of how we interacted with the universe, if we were part of the universe, if we could have faith in our own insights and reasoning, these are obvious and fundamental issues never fully addressed before academic (employees of intellectual institutions) were sounding off about every conceivable aspect of humna existence. Speculation unrelated to simple, unanswered questions, with citizens following their lead into a depth of ignorance and poor ideas from which we have to extract ourselves.

Indeterminism does not exist. All modern views on the universe are drawn from the arguments of Neils Bohr, who argued if the equations get the right answer, they must be right. Einstein was more circumspect, but neither person had the depth of insight into a science of people to make any valid determination of what knowledge was, or how it was constructed.

The failure was they all ***knew*** people produced knowledge hence all being considered in all physics could only be explicable from within an adequate scientific general theory of psychology. The issue has been totally ignored.

Some hundred or so years ago, was Freud, who never at any stage accounted for the creation of knowledge nor on its role in determining all we do. Yet Freud was promoted by academics, the derivatives yet exist, psychiatry came into being, laws were drafted granting authority to some people, all based on some of the weakest supposed science imaginable.

Continued use of peer review for judging intellectual quality. Peer review always carried the risk of conflict of interest. Second it always was grounded fundamentally on popularity as the main thrust of quality, if enough

people said it was right, then it was right. Third it always restrained innovation in that if the reviewer did not like the idea, or if it threatened the reviewer's status, then the idea was unlikely to be accepted.

A journal could be created by an energetic academic approaching a publisher, who agrees. The editor then recruits academics who share the views, Editorial Board established. Papers solicited, The publisher promotes the journal to institutions, Then the work, no matter any other factor, can be presented to all who will listen as peer reviewed, a status that has come to trump all despite the obvious limitations. But academic egos incapable of acknowledging they did not know, and too many bent on self-serving increase of their wealth and social influence, these factors came to trump all others.

Today, the idea of popularity has filtered into society, so in New Zealand school children march demanding better climate policy. Multi-gender is promoted by activists seeking self-justification as much if not more than intellectual accuracy, aided and abetted by academics who share the view.

It can only be concluded governance of the intellectual institutions have given up on the deal of 1097 and allow unfettered employees to say and do as they please regardless of the quality or potential long-term damage of encouraging ideas in society that fail all thorough test of quality except peer review.

Citizens may hold their own ideas, but professionals may not

Game plans are the systems of ideas a person uses in managing some circumstance.

Our psychic structure develops by adding and refining ideas, for example Piaget explored that in infants and young children. By early adulthood, the person has a jumble of ideas used to manage circumstances they find in life. These sets of ideas are referred to as game plans. We can sharpen these game plans by conceptualizing them and adding and subtracting steps that align better with our desired outcomes.

When we write down a planned game plan it is referred to as a role specification, best thought of conceptualizing the best way of getting the result we desire. Once conceptualized, then we need memorize it, practicing with it until it is habituated, and replaces our previous game plans.

This process describes all human development including management of mental health. In all modern life, if not all life of homo sapiens, there has always been two set of game plans. (1) personal to do with family, friends, relaxation, etc. (2) professional, say 100,000 years ago, collection and preparation of food for the village, cooperative village effort, etc. Today, the

professional game plans involve work, the primary manner in which we describe social cooperation.

The same personal develop processes apply. Refer www.OPDcoach.com for details of the HCM technology derived from SMH. All citizens always have personal circumstances matched by personal game plans. Their choice, and while advice can be offered on how to get better outcomes hence improve life experience, it is always the choice of the person (unless it involves the law).

Delivery of professional game plans, at work, is dictated by the work circumstance. The individual has no choice but to deliver the game plans as required by the work circumstance.

If for example, commitment to deliver the professional game plans is compromised by views on socialism, or views the company is corrupt, or engages in too much CO2 production, etc, etc. In short, where personal game plans conflict or interfere with professional game plan demands, then the person must decide which is the most important to them, and if the conflict is beyond what they wish to bear, they must resign.

Where such conflict exists, the organization employing the person will require the person is restrained in their comments about the company. In short, where personal views are in conflict with professional views, the person is expected to not condemn the organization and if they do the organization has the right to request that they resign. Employees are expected to moderate their public conduct such that their personal views do not demean the organization.

Securing this discipline where employees accepted the need for personal discretion in relation to organization policy was never established in academe.

1097: Poor judgement from the start

Individual employees of intellectual institutions were not required to abide by institutional policy and could promote their own ideas using institutional credibility to support their ideas.

This remains the case today, evidence in USA where several Presidents of universities are challenged and asked to resign due views contrary to broader citizen views, and where the views they hold judged divergent to broader moral and ethical concerns toward humanity, and second, ideas corrupting to the young minds attending the university.

1640: Academic failure to acknowledge dualism

Siddarth Gautama about 500 BCE had declared *we become that we think most of the time*. His philosophy is today referred to as Buddhism. Descartes was much later circa 1640, and declared more to a western audience, *I think*

therefore I am, a philosophy on people referred to as dualism. That is ideas are the driver of life experience.

The idea of dualism was rejected by academe by arguments where they failed to bring to account reasoned commonsense.

This splintering of opinion, in the sense of ideas are important/ideas are not important, uncontrolled by governance or policy was contrary to all commercial experience where it was well understood crucial organizational outputs, like product quality, could not be left to individual employees.

The failure of academe was they did not bring to account there was no scientific general theory of psychology, hence how could they possibly claim dualism false. Their argument of such esoteric design as to be inconsistent with the reality they were discussing people, while ignoring the fact there was only one actor, hence any theory of people had to apply to all people did and could do, including that which they were saying, and nothing academics had or considered was remotely close to explaining their own conduct.

This remains today, with academics yet struggling to explain human behaviour, ignoring people like Popper and Ashby, even moving past Kuhn as to hard to explain.

1952: Academic failure to adequately recognise Ashby cybernetics

Refer Ashby *Design for a Brain*, 1952. The scientific general theory of psychology derived from the work of W Ross Ashby, a global founder of cybernetics: *The brain is a self-correcting feedback loop with ideas the core unit of adaptation.*

Leads to the fundamental equation defining all human life experience *Ideas* → *life experience*. Using the Ashby language of science devoid of ontology, the arrow means *has an effect on*, with immediate and ultimate effects defining the knowledge hierarchy of causality. The ultimate causality defined as truth of any particular thing is a choice and lies in the cost/benefit analysis of going to the next stepdown set of immediate effects in the hierarchy.

For example, understanding free will is a choice of how far we wish to explore the set of immediate effects underlying the operation of ultimate effect ideas → life experience. Such an analysis must include neural operation of memory, neural detail of how we see, and how we visualize ideas and concepts, how we form language, how all perception works, how a neural cell works, and how parts of the brain communicate. I suggest we have decades of dedicated research to unravelling the causality of free will. But now, at least we know how to go about it.

That does not negate our practical understanding, my free will lies in the choice of ideas I adopt and apply in any circumstance. Living a life I choose, based on best ideas on offer, those based on reasoned commonsense ... that is me ... explaining that is their problem, meantime, let us have a drink and laugh at them head down slaving away.

1996: Sokol Affair and collapse of intellectual standards

Alan Sokol was Professor of theoretical physics at New York University with a solid global reputation. In 1996 the science wars in full swing, with claims that the ideas from any cultural source were as good as the claims from any other. Including claims about consciousness, and other significant aspects of science such that peer review was the best quality assessment of articles.

Remember this debate/discussion is occurring in complete absence of a scientific general theory of psychology, the principles of commonsense reason were not being made clear. Falsification was alive and well, but hardly so today. I exchanged with Karl Popper some years earlier. (Falsification is the understanding that the proposition all swans are white can never be proved but can be disproved by sighting one black swan.)

Sokol drafted a paper on the link between quantum variability and consciousness and submitted it to a journal judged prestigious in the field, called Social Text. It was accepted and published. At which point Sokol held a press conference, declaring the paper a hoax. This created a major furore, especially among western academics.

In the aftermath, Nature Magazine held a global survey seeking opinion on peer review. I was beginning to build my spiritual model of humanity, and the status of knowledge, especially science, was of major concern. I drafted a post which argued that peer review had been falsified, but that did not eliminate peer review from consideration but did make it clear the process of peer review had flaws, and when using it one needed to step carefully.

I was approached by a person Maxine, who was Nature moderator of the global survey. They advised my post would be removed, I had nothing useful to say, I was not an academic hence nothing I had to say was relevant. I would be blocked from all future comment. It all unfolded as described.

The result was a reinforcing of peer review, which then resulted in an escalation in journals in turn resulted in an escalation of papers on topics of dubious quality. Summary, since Sokol in 1996, a slide in the intellectual quality of ideas being offered by academics and supported by passive avoidance by governance of universities. Acquiescence is a choice and represents a decision. It does not remove the person from culpability for the choice, citizens of Gaza (July 2024) are finding that out. I hope the world takes the lesson.

Same applies to senior executives of global universities, woke thinking is due poor standards of intellectual quality, puberty blockers for children when we have no idea of how personality is formed, or the contortions a young person may go through in searching for who they are, and their sexuality, or the effect on their life in say 30 years of forcing issues with drugs.

Or a man can become woman by identifying as a woman, this allowed when since 1640 academics have rejected dualism as influential in minds. The depth of abdication of academic senior leadership is ... well, beyond my comprehension. The last thing a senior executive does is abdicate responsibility for crucial issues like product quality, which is exactly what senior executives of universities did, but saving grace it is what they had always done since inception in 1097.

Since then, I have written and can now scientifically prove peer review is intrinsically corrupt process unfit for assessing the quality of any intellectual work and needs dumped in favour of tests of quality intrinsic to the ideas themselves, those suggested and discussed are strategic science², reach and reflexive criteria, all resting on the fundamental intellectual position of reasoned commonsense. Suggestion, refer to the section in the book Modern Methodology at www.ssrn.com/author=2572745. Also, the paper Final and decisive dismissal of peer review (refer appendix 1).

There is much more that could be written, but best if seeking deeper understanding to refer to papers and books. It is complex, but anyone care argue final scientific understanding of people would be simple and understanding society as simpler again. To learn more, refer the appendix 1.

Who is responsible?

Recently a judge upheld the claim by a transgender person there are more than two genders, and a man can become a female by wishing it so.

Biology specifies every person has in every cell in their body either XY or XX chromosomes DNA. There are exceptions, but they are less than 0.5% of human births regarded as 'unnatural' and unfit to be used in any discussions involving 'normal' human circumstances. In short, XY or XX determines the physique of the person, and as such under all circumstances contribute to the

² Reasoned commonsense is an aspect of strategic science. The difference is reasoned commonsense explores the relationship between issues not immediately apparent. Like free will and a scientific general theory of psychology, at least items easily considered separate as academia has done for hundreds of years. Whereas strategic science of a specific ideas deals with the details enabling that specific idea. The first defines where the ideas fit and integrate into the broadest possible human understanding. The second with the specific details of a specific idea.

gender of the person, and it is impossible to ever change from one determining type of DNA to another. In short transgender does not and cannot exist,

Now ask: If every free world university held a policy decision that biology was a variable irrevocably contributing to the definition of gender, and this position was accepted by politicians and majority of social elite. Would the judge have been able to make the ruling they did? I argue they would not, as it flies in the face of all known and accepted foundation science of the human condition.

There are clearly people needing compassionate and considered advice in managing their feelings and conducting themselves in society, Refer to the scientific counselling technology derived or the spiritual model of humanity, Renewal Counselling (December 9, 2023). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4658939>.

The ideas such people apply to themselves needs corrected and is summed in congruence equation reality \equiv Reality, reality (small r) is the image built in mind and Reality (capital R) is the social and physical environment.

The congruence equation ensures the person is thinking clearly about their circumstances and typically when there is a mismatch, then change reality, since seldom is Reality able to be changed, and where the intent is to change Reality, then the person must accept the emotional, social, and economic setbacks and hardships that will occur.

To live successfully it is important that the ideas in the mind of the person as a realistic match with the Reality of their circumstance, especially when the ideas they hold on themselves are inconsistent with the circumstances of their DNA heritage.

Since formation in 1097 academics have had a duty of care to citizens for advising the best ideas to adopt and apply such as to enhance the life experience of all. Until governance of free world universities accept their responsibility for the quality of output of the university then nothing academics say is to be trusted.

Modern society is disputative, and tense. Academia governance is responsible by failing to set policy on definitions of ideas the root cause off disputation.

The spiritual model of humanity asserts *ideas* \rightarrow *life experience*. That is, the ideas adopted and applied determine all life experience. That accepted, then it becomes crucial we have a social infrastructure that sets the common meanings to ideas, asserts their veracity to adequate intellectual standards, and mitigates against manipulation of dictionary meanings and thus protects

what is meant in both verbal and written language. Under the deal of 1097, this was to be the role of academia.

In 1097, the Governance of the newly formed intellectual institutions abdicated the role from the start by failing to determine institutional policy on the intellectual standards of ideas it supported. Education quality was taken over by Governments. But the intellectual quality of ideas was left to the university Governance. And worse, it became standard practice from the beginning to leave intellectual quality of ideas to employees, individual academics.

Be clear, this is equivalent to the CEO of Shell Global leaving the quality of the diesel jet fuel supplied to Emirates or to American Airlines, in the hands of the tank farm employee. With no institutional responsibility or oversight.

There are a lot of poor ideas loose in our free society, I have mentioned abortion, drugs, religion and nature and existence of god, transgender, and multigender, men competing in female sports, confusion between personal morality and professional responsibility. All of which academia ducks and avoids comment.

Citizens have two sets of ideas they apply in managing their lives, one I call *personal game plans*, the other *professional game plans*, with the term game plan describing the set of ideas and their relationships in mind, including the emotions generated by the ideas.

They each serve very different responsibilities, first to oneself, second to the assumed role in society. These issues covered in greater detail later in the book. For now, there is obvious potential conflict which is why most professional bodies have standards of ethical conduct, but there are much more subtle conflicts buried due inadequate conceptualization of who we are and how we work as a species.

Fundamental rule of the world, if one wants to act effectively, first get the thinking sorted.

That is a fundamental aim of this book ... sort the conceptual structure of a successful free society. Currently an intellectual mess due inept intellectual effort in recognition of ideas of Marx, Freud, Neisser, and derivatives in critical race theory, identity politics, cognitive psychology, psychodynamics, psychiatry, separation of social science and physical science, lack of definition of science that can have any real meaning due lack of a theory of psychology, pursuit of culture without the slightest idea of what it is or its standing in determining human conduct, etc. etc.

All current thinking is built and/or derived from historic thinking, and that is largely wrong. It fails the reflexive criteria. There may be odd

comments that got it right, but it is accidental, since the foundation ideas giving rise to all historic comment, all fail tests of intellectual quality.

Our designated thinkers have let us down since their inception near 1000 years ago in two respects. First the lack of governance responsibility. Second, if humanity is part of nature, then our success is in our hands and any deference to any religion based on any deity, no matter what citizens may think, is nonsense, and pandering to the lowest intellectual common denominator.

We are part of the universe and a natural product of it, or we are not. A quite basic question. If we are, all gods and all religions need thrown out as significant actual causal movers. It is the role of academia if it is to lead us as our designated thinkers.

Explanation of paradigm and normal science

After Thomas Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, (1962) the spiritual model of humanity (SMH) consists to two parts. First the **paradigm**, self-published 2014, accepted on SSRN 2016. *The Origin of Consciousness* (July 26, 2016). *Institute of Theoretical and Applied Social Science, New Zealand*. Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2814742>.

It deals with the full range of intellectual issues embedded in scientifically understanding ourselves, such as the intellectual circularity, the exact role of god in human affairs, definition of cause and its application in in humna affairs, the exact nature of the relationship between a person and the environment, definition of knowledge and hence science, scientific explanation of free will and all other features and properties of people.

Second, the **normal science**, which is application of the paradigm to the full range of human circumstances to which the paradigm applies and offers explanation. This is done in the books and papers at the SSRN author site, www.ssrn.com/author=2572745.

From the outset and significantly arising from my own education (PhD in mechanistic organic chemistry. graduated 1971) were concerns about the intellectual quality of research endeavours.

I have been seeking global recognition of SMH or two years, refer www.spiritualmodel.com, item 15. Due closed-minded dismissiveness by most of those to which papers distributed, who have declined to regard this work as a significant contribution to understanding ourselves. But none are willing to declare it right, none willing to declare it wrong. With the American Psychological Association complaining to Elsevier/SSRN about my work, SSRN knee jerked and briefly banned my work from publication (January 2023), but after a few days lifted the ban and have since published all my work without hesitation.

What the terms mean in practice

What we see is dominated by the ideas we use to look. This applies to all things, hence applies to all aspects of science.

We can now define the terms in relation to the reality of living.

Paradigm: The fundamental set of ideas we use to ‘look’. This set of ideas will dominate what we ‘see’, especially when the paradigm is widely shared, and is thus the accepted way of looking at the world.

Normal science: The details of circumstances as seen and understood via the paradigm.

Paradigm shift

A change from one set of ideas used to ‘look’, to another, A paradigm shift is not merely refinement of understanding of circumstance, it is all circumstance understood and seen differently. The new paradigm forces a new set of circumstances referred to as normal science.

If the change is not complete, the new paradigm must be viewed with suspicion and explored carefully before being adopted or promoted.

If the change is complete, those subject to the implications of it will view the new circumstance with deep suspicions and will initially reject it. The effort of enabling people to ‘see’ it, is referred to as ‘marketing’, seeking ways to penetrate through the structure of the existing and typically accepted understanding and have people ‘see’ circumstances using the new set of ideas.

For example, the shift from Newton’s mechanics to quantum physics was *NOT* a paradigm shift under these definitions. The scale of the change was insufficient, being merely manipulation within pre-existing normal science.

The reinterpretation of all modern physics arising from the spiritual model of humanity is a paradigm shift, placing in perspective all prior understanding which can only be done from within a scientific understanding of ourselves.

The spiritual model of humanity is the only understanding of ourselves that presses home to modern physicists it is all the result of human endeavour and can only be accurately understood from within the understanding of people offered by SMH.

This captures all the strength and all the weaknesses of human thought.

To ‘see’ beyond this is hard, and demands not just intellectual skills, but also a personal disposition to stand alone, the object of both ire and disrespect by fellow citizens who will not share the paradigm hence not share the assessment of circumstance.

The spiritual model of humanity is arguably the first true paradigm shift describing humanity to itself. Having intellectual insight, our question now is will we apply it.

The men and women of Teutoberg accepted on faith the right to be free Today we understand it much better than they did. But with academic intellectualized argument and misplaced understanding of what individual freedom means in practice, we appear to have lost the courage.

Was Kuhn one of our greatest ever psychologists?

In *Structure of scientific revolutions*, 1962, Thomas Kuhn described what he thought was how the greatest of our knowledge, science, unfolded. This analysis was vastly beyond any work available at the time, and made seem small and trivial all the work of Freud and derivatives who never considered knowledge a factor in driving human affairs.

Ideas and their development and the consequences of them dominates the Kuhnian perspective on ourselves. The spiritual model of humanity is built on the insights of such people as Kuhn, Ashby, and Popper. Intellectuals from the first half of last century effectively ignored by global academe, who clung to its predilections, promoted bad ideas by applying corrupt peer review, and consolidated its dereliction of duty of care to free world citizens, but enabling the modern fractious, opinionated, self-serving thinking common in society today.

The sad aspect of ourselves today, is those who are charged with being open-minded, of finding and promoting the best ideas offering the best life-experience are not doing that. They are closed minded, protecting current income and status. Such is the consequence of the consolidation of peer review, dominated by the principle *it must be right if the informed majority approves it*.

Denying ideas as determining all life experience ... ideas count source of ideas does not. Therefore, one person may hold the correct/best idea, and one million who deny it, and share a different opinion, are wrong.

The science wars were wrong, we are as we are due our ability to conceptualize, to build increasingly accurate representations of the environment in our mind (reality), and to manage our dealing with the environment (Reality) via management of the image.

All we ‘see’ determined by the ideas used to look

Faith in reason: *Acceptance of legitimate judgements resulting in peace of mind knowing the best ideas have been adopted and applied, where intellect is in unison with emotions resulting in spiritual fulfilment*³.

The idea of dualism is not new.

- **Circa 500 BCE:** What we think, we become. Siddarth Gautama, The Buddha.
- **Circa 1640 CE:** I think therefore I am. Rene Descartes.
- **Circa 1950 CE:** Everything begins with an idea. Earle Nightingale.
- **Circa 1952 CE:** Δ -Ideas \rightarrow Δ -outcomes. W Ross Ashby.

The ideas we adopt and apply to manage circumstance determine the outcomes from that circumstance.

Change our ideas, everything changes⁴.

Our ideas as mediator and interpreter of all circumstances. Humanity cannot change by wishing or by applying self-discipline, willing it to be so, but can change if the fundamental ideas used to understand things are changed. The point is crucial, we can adopt new ideas, but if we do not judge they are correct, they will have limited effect.

Do you then wish to apply the science of people such we build a better society for our descendants. If so, then this paper argues we must start by identifying better ideas, and free world academia is responsible for advising us on quality ideas.

This means the first thing we need do is bring free world academia to heel and have them do as they promised to do when formed in 1097.

³ Quote from the paper *Faith in reason* item 71, in appendix 1.

⁴ Adopting a new idea is vastly more complex than anything I have ever read in any supposed text or academic paper dealing with the issue. The complexity I have not seen grasped especially by likes of say the APA, I sum as interrelatedness, and tone. We have a spirit in touch with all mental sets. The spirit brings a tone to the mental set, like glass half full or half empty. The interrelatedness due the structure of mental sets, and the internal structure of first thing first, nothing comes from nothing, etc. Make a simple change of thinking over there, can profoundly alter changes needed over there. Like a smart IT person knowing that changes to programming over there should not have an affect over here, but sometimes does. Our mind is not simple, and seldom amenable to changes of thinking on one issue without major review of thinking on related issues where there ought not be changes, but maybe. If nothing else, internal tensions within our psyche will limit our level of spiritual peace. Peace of mind understood as influenced by *balanced coherent reasoned commonsense*.

Reasoned commonsense of doing first things first

- Is it a good idea to build a house on unstable ground, thus knowing it will collapse? *Hardly!*
- Is it a good idea to tell someone they are a dickhead and idiot when you want a favour from them? *Hardly!*
- Is it a good idea to offer to help your 19-year-old child doing their varsity study work when you know nothing of the topic they studying? *Hardly!*

The principle is do first things first, called reasoned commonsense. It is a bad idea to break the rule of first things first. If you do you may slip through the cracks, but it is much more likely that you will not, and you will be punished for being stupid.

The poverty of culture

Culture is a term used to describe conduct groups of people exhibit. But what is it? Is it causal in guiding human affairs? How do we understand it?

The rule of first things first applies to all things, including intellectual effort. An example of the application of reasoned commonsense

1. Does society consist of people? *Yes.*
2. Do the causal drivers of a person cease when they enter a group? *No.*
3. Does this mean all understanding of society must begin with a scientific general theory of psychology, then aggregated individual by individual to build any scientific understanding of society? *Yes.*
4. It follows all group-based views of society not built from the foundation of a scientific general theory of psychology (the paradigm in SMH below) must be viewed as mere personal opinion with no intellectual foundation. *Yes.*
5. In the modern world there is inevitably more than one point of view on any issue, and typically each is legal, apt, accurate, referred to as legitimate. Hence there is (almost always) more than one legitimate point of view on any issue. *Yes.*
6. One's personal point of view is referred to as their selective morality, is not science, is not reasoned, it is personal opinion and has no validity beyond that. *Yes.*

7. To build a diverse, fair, just, wealthy society of peaceful co-existence requires people treat each other with respect and acknowledge their right to exist. *Yes*.
8. Pursuing personal preferences, pursuing selective morality, including race, culture, wealth, gang, community, genetic preference, sexual preference, body shape, etc., is intrinsically insulting to those who disagree, destructive of social relations, will raise social tensions, reduce social stability and increase likelihood of violence. *Yes*.
9. Does this line off argument reject Freud, Marx and all derivatives, including all current psychological theory, critical race theory, identity politics, all historic comment on society, all historical comment on psychology, current understanding of mental health, rewrites understanding of jurisprudence, etc. *Yes*.

Conclusion: Global academe does not understand this conceptual discipline of reasoned commonsense, or if it does it declines to abide by the rule.

The definition of culture: Ideas count source of ideas does not

There is no scientific general theory of society, which depends fully on a scientific general theory of psychology, which means there can be no depth of understanding of culture, since a scientific general theory of psychology must explain everything about people including what is culture, and is it important?

It is just as important academics obey first thing first as it is you follow the rule. Academics who claim culture is important in society are lying to you, they do not know, and they are in breach of the rule of reasoned commonsense, do first things first.

If in doubt, do not be suckered by fancy titles, and supposed University prestige. They are conning you pretending they know, and you are uninformed. They do not know.

Reasoned commonsense is addressing first issues first. Exactly as ensuring if building a house, the ground is stable. It applies in all things, shortcut the rule at one's peril.

We see via thoughts we have in mind. What we see depends on the ideas we use to look. Academics looking with the ideas to which they deeply committed and protective, since at least 1640 and where they have aggressively pursued false science like Freud, Skinner, Neisser and Marx, see those issues as per the ideas they have been taught and assumed.

Ideas count, the source of ideas does not.

Culture, all culture is merely a source of ideas, it does not count. Good ideas do. If we assert an idea is desirable because of its source, we are ignoring the rule of reasoned commonsense.

All ideas assessed by the quality of the platform of reasoned commonsense on which it rests, with priority quality standard being within the intellectual base of the idea where there is no unresolved question. When that is so, the idea can be said to have *intellectual integrity* due it created by the process of *ethical construction*, which is to ensure each step in the reasoned commonsense platform left no questions unresolved. Hence in the idea itself, there is no implicit doubt, and the manner of derivation of the idea, the reasoned platform on which it rests is clear and complete. Then and only then, can we be confident of adopting the idea and when adopted and applied it will deliver the result predicted of it.

Where there is doubt, such as there are unresolved questions in the platform of reasoning, then to exhibit personal integrity, we must proclaim the doubt up front ... *we propose ideas ABC, but it does not explain issue DE, which if resolved could alter all we are about to say*. If this had been correctly said of Marx, Freud, Neisser, quantum theory, 100 to 150 years ago, I suggest it would have had an enormous moderating influence on those ideas, and in the case of Marx, perhaps moderated the estimated 50,000.000 murdered last century by their government in the name of building a better society.

I can think of nothing more important than that example for driving home the point of science in forging our existence. With global academics conveniently ignoring and intellectualizing away any responsibility for them promoting Marxian ideas, when applying it resulted in an unprecedented level of government sanctioned murders of innocent citizen who did no more than disagree.

Definition of culture

Culture is a reservoir of ideas accumulated by the group and passed on to children in the group. In itself, culture has no influence on what people do, other than being a source of ideas.

To give any emphasis to culture is to deny understanding of self as primarily driven by the ideas one adopts and applies. Ideas count, the source of ideas does not.

The emphasis given culture a global indicator of the extent global academia has failed its side of the deal of 1097, while underlining the extent citizens have naively deferred to these supposed lead thinkers.

Going forward we have two choices, and I suggest we action both. First reduce the influence of academics on us, and regard them with healthy scepticism. Demand they apply better quality standards to all they do, demand greater transparency of funding, and apply those higher standards to all ideas afoot in society. Second, place pressure on them by more tightly managing their budget and hence reduce incomes to be more in line with the quality of service they provide, which since 1640, has been poor.

Strategic science reasoned commonsense plus disruptive ideas

Reasoned commonsense is an aspect of strategic science in the sense both focus on the quality of the thinking giving rise to any idea. Reasoned commonsense applies to the big issues. Such as it is not possible to have any theory of society without first having an apt scientific general theory of psychology. All group-based views of society are rejected as no more than academic intellectualised nonsense.

Strategic science applied to a specific idea explores the detail underlying that idea. For example, the idea of multigender flies in the face of XX and XY DNA determining male and female physique. And the idea of transgender infers it is possible to change the DNA structure of every cell in the human body, when we have no such technology thus it is not possible. And the idea that a man identifying as a woman is a woman flies in full contradiction of the denial of Descartes dualism circa 1640. Even using Ashby language and promoting the idea *I am a woman* → *I become a woman*. All that happens is the person adopts the gender behavioural stereotypes with no change in physical structure of their physique. This must rate as just one step behind academia's role in facilitating 50,000,000 state sanctioned murders in the 20th century. It is destructive poor thinking as to be a violent abuse of free world citizens, especially woman.

The other intellectual quality standards to be applied are reach, any theory must apply to all appropriate circumstances. If it fails anywhere, it fails. There is no such thing as schools of thought, none meet the standards of reach, they are all wrong.

Finally, the reflexive criteria, if it is a view on people, then it must account for its own existence, or be derived from a theory that does.

In all history of comment on people, and that reaches back a very long way, the start point I adopt is Plato, circa 500 BCE, I know none that bring the reflexive criteria to account. In short, such discussion ignores the question *do people create knowledge?* With the associated question, *are the comments on people knowledge?* I leave the reader to reflect on 3000 years where all supposed thinkers overlooked the most obvious questions one could imagine.

Better ideas → better life experience

Given *ideas adopted and applied* → *outcomes* → *life experience*.

It follows *better ideas* → *better life experience*.

The crucial role of assessing intellectual standards

Better ideas are ideas meeting higher intellectual standards which have been discussed. To be confident of an idea then it must be ethically constructed, thus exhibit intellectual integrity, and meet appropriate standards of intellectual quality against criteria of strategic science, reach, and reflexivity.

Modern social failure for example, lies in application of this understanding on life, with pragmatic democratic government policy risking pandering to the lowest intellectual common denominator in society in order to secure votes. The ideas we are currently applying, beginning with say Plato's Republic as an early attempt to conceptualize society, are in fact self-destructive. Note These arguments lead to ignored aspect in all modern politics, that is the educational role of politicians as priority social role models. Also, or a discussion on applying these principles to democracy, refer [Post](#) | [Feed](#) | [LinkedIn](#).

Dismissal of peer review as a corrupt assessment process

For dismissal of peer review as a corrupt process, refer ...

- *Modern Methodology* (September 24, 2018). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3254017>.
- *The Problem with Peer Review Discussion of a Study on the Impact of Peer Review in Prestigious Academic and Publishing Institutions and the Extent it Limits and Prejudices Innovative Thinking. Offers Recommendations to Improve Intellectual Quality.* (October 3, 2019). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3464045>.
- Final and Decisive Dismissal of Peer Review (April 27, 2023). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4431180>.

There are other discussions, but these carry the thrust of the arguments and specifies the alternatives to continuing with corrupt peer review.

Culture as self-definition

Given the poverty of culture, any person who defines themselves in terms of culture requires psychological assistance in redefining themselves in relation to the ideas they adopt and apply, and guidance on the quality of those ideas. Refer the section above.

In short, defining oneself in terms of culture is an indication of requiring psychological help in an appropriate definition of self, defining oneself in terms of the ideas adopted and applied in forging one's life, and not defining oneself in terms of skin colour, sexuality, gender, religion, etc.

Culture accepted as a cloak of uniqueness, with the underlying ideas drawn from any source, the ideas weighed and measured for their quality, longevity, and certainty of result when adopted and applied.

Culture needs to be understood as occasional useful light weight cloak of uniqueness, It is not the substantial structure of ideas on which to build one's life and society.

A case in point is modern NZ society, where there is demand for acceptance of Maori culture, often at the expense of declining western traditions with much better ideas.

There is a depth of guilt in a cross section of NZ citizens that Maori have been historically mistreated, despite 45 years of Waitangi process and compensation for historic wrongs. The consequence is adoption in NZ society ideas pandering to these issues, and failing to build a fair, just, diverse, wealthy society of peaceful co-existence.

NZ Politicians seeking votes pander to citizens failing to understand, and in doing so, ignoring their educational role of carrying society forward by development of better understanding in citizens. The issues in NZ directly arise from very poor understanding of people and NZ academics have followed global trends,

While I have suggested NZ politicians failing, as they are, the root cause of their failure lies in their poor insight and understanding in the quality of ideas promoted by NZ academics, themselves following global trends. (For example NZ productivity among the lowest in OECD, and NZ is continuing to fail to take advantage of its only source of competitive advantage on a global stage, we grow grass well and are efficient at converting the energy in grass into saleable protein).

The only way forward socially, building on legacy of Teutoberg, is better ideas, and global academics adopting and delivering on their duty of care to free world citizens, the basis on which they were formed in 1097.

We are dominated by our preexisting assumptions

Everything, literally everything we understand, grasp, act upon, apply in managing all circumstances is knowledge. With all knowledge founded on the ideas we adopt and apply to manage all circumstance. SMH is the only scientific understanding of people based on a practical scientific foundation. There is nothing beyond that which we use in our minds to manage our interaction with all circumstance.

W Ross Ashby (a global founder of cybernetics): *The brain is a self-correcting feedback loop with the ideas the unit of self-correction.* Which leads to the following self-management propositions.

Ideas → life experience. All life experience is determined by the ideas we select and apply

Ideas count; source of ideas does not. Source of ideas, specifically culture does not count, it is irrelevant, the idea itself counts as a determinant of life experience. But culture, the source of the idea adopted and applied, is superficial and offers no more than a loose cloak offering some uniqueness if our egos need such, beyond that culture is tossed aside as we mature as people.

Reality ≡ reality. Ensuring the ideas we use reality, (small r) to understand our circumstance are apt in relation to the circumstance Reality, (capital R).

Quality of ideas → quality of life experience. The better the ideas the better the congruence *reality* ≡ *Reality*, the better the outcomes from applying the ideas, the better the life experience.

This results in practical understanding *better science → better results.* With science defined by the quality of the ideas with a proviso science is typically universal. Thus, in NZ it is valid to claim Maori cultural knowledge is science, given it is good ideas that work within the limited domain, but the claim such knowledge is equal to western science has to be dismissed as it lacks reach and depth of integration into broader understanding of who we are, where we came from, and our place in the universe. That does not mean no Maori idea can be extended to be universal but that can only occur after extensive testing and the idea passing such tests of intellectual validity. Ideas count, source of ideas does not.

Opinions do not matter. Whatever one is doing, if we identify better ideas of how to do it, better science, and if we apply those ideas properly, then we will achieve a better result.

That applies to managing ourselves. If better ideas passing all tests of quality are referred to as science, then I repeat ***better science*** → ***better results***, so when applied to ourselves, leads to increased life experience.

The term ***better*** is crucial, it describes how important it is to select processes for assessing intellectual standards that are independent of bias, preference, ideology, and self-serving predilections.

Hence peer review is implicitly corrupt and must be replaced with the platform of reasoned commonsense also referred to as strategic science or ensuring first things done first; reach; and reflective criteria.

Refer appendix 1, multiple items refer to method, the poverty of peer review, and the new standards required to lift the quality of our thinking and so lift our life experience.

Starting again

There is no historic theory of ourselves that accounts for its own existence. This is called the reflexive criteria. Arising from the argument All we understand and know is knowledge. We create knowledge. It follows any description of ourselves must account for all knowledge. But any description of ourselves is knowledge, hence any description of ourselves must account for its own existence.

The failure of historical comment on people

There is no known historical discussion of people or society prior to 2014, when ***Origin of Consciousness*** was published, accepted on SSRN 2016, that could account for its own existence. Hence all known history of people/humanity fails a major test of validity. Further any view of people that does not bring the reflexive criteria to account that was published after 2014, is equally invalid and fails the crucial reflexive test.

If we intend to move forward based on ideas that pass the tests of intellectual validity, then we must begin again, with the spiritual model of humanity (SMH) the only known theory of humanity known to pass all intellectual test of validity, including the reflexive test.

I suggest the future of humanity as a species depends on applying reason and stepping away for our sensitivities encouraged by Freudian view of people promoted by academics. SMH presents ideas as the dominate driver of all humans do. Which places integrity as the priority human ethic, not depth of feeling, regardless of whether one is comfortable with the conduct derived from the ideas.

Colloquially, if the analysis says AB, but we prefer CD then we face a fundamental choice, do we follow our reason, or pander to our preferences.

SMH says if we do not bite the bullet, we will continue to have exactly what we have and bequeath that to our descendants.

The understanding of ethics now extends beyond all previous understanding, consisting of two fundamental steps.

1. The idea itself must have ethical integrity with circumstance.
 - a. Thus, SMH is *ethically constructed* and exhibits *intellectual integrity*. Which means the theory has no underlying question not resolved within the theory, that being the intention behind building the theory.
 - b. All knowledge begins *inputs* → system under study → *outputs*, and if we know $\text{outputs} \neq \text{inputs}$, then we also know there must exist mechanisms within the system under study that processes inputs converting them into outputs, thus all knowledge begins $\text{inputs} \rightarrow \text{mechanisms} \rightarrow \text{outputs}$.
 - c. It follows $\text{SMH} \equiv \text{Mechanisms within people}$, with ‘people’ the system under study.
2. The second step is the common view of ethics, is the person acting consistent with what they say.

To progress from democracy to a free society we must adopt integrity as our priority human quality and become impatient with people who persist in saying one thing and doing something else, usually self-serving.

We must also demand whatever they propose as an idea has intellectual integrity, and able to withstand detailed intellectual scrutiny. Then of course, we must demand they do it.

Immediately many of the social infrastructure elite fail such tests Politicians, senior bureaucrats, academics, directors of businesses, IOD, Royal Societies, in short, any person occupying an ‘elite’ institutional role in society.

It is a major aspect of the price to pay in return for privilege and income. They are expected to fulfil the role of serving citizens, not serving themselves or some system of ideas they may hold dear but do not stand up to detailed intellectual scrutiny.

Rejecting the -isms

Ask *Does society consist of people?* I argue it does. Further any theory of society that does not bring that to account must be dismissed as failing essential tests of reasoned commonsense.

It follows that the work of Marx is intellectually deficit and must be rejected as a system of ideas that if adopted and applied will fail. No matter how appealing the ideas may sound the ideas per ideas are intellectually wrong and will fail. All derivatives of Marxian thinking fail such as critical race theory, identify politics, cancel culture. Many of these are invalid for other reasons as well. They all fail fundamental test of intellectual quality.

There is only one actor. All to do with people must begin with scientific understanding of individual psychology and such a theory must reach to all people have done, do, and could do. This is referred to the criteria of **reach**. SMH is the only theory of people to ever meet the criteria of reach.

Terms capitalism and socialism must be purged from all discourse, as they reflect deficit and damaging understanding of ourselves. Such terms must be replaced by the improved scientific understanding of ourselves in groups, both large and small. There are only two definite types of society, a **free society** based on a **non-prescriptive legislation**, and a **compliant society** based on a **prescription legislation**.

Democracy for example, demands compliance by the majority, imposing their wishes on all others. Hence democracy is not a free society, but a mixed society with significant demands that people comply ... for example drugs and abortion.

Thus, a society moving to control abortion is moving from a free society toward social compliance. Such a move largely driven by religious intolerance of alternative points of view, hence all religions are intrinsically opposed to a free society and prefer a compliant society with the central controlling authority consisting of senior religious leaders or affiliates.

To be a free society religious activity must be curtailed. Our path forward as people must be based on the depth of understanding giving rise to our judgement independent of all external interference.

Then and only then are we free.

If the west does not lead the way forward, in reasoned commonsense then humanity will drift for years under the authoritarian rule of its own fear to reduce god to an idea offering comfort to some but having no social or group validity.

Physical science

All science is a human activity. Any theory of the universe is a human activity, hence quantum physics and all associated science, such as the standard model of the universe, is a human activity.

If any science of people is to be valid, it must reach to all human do, have done or could do. Thus, a scientific general theory of people must apply to physical science as much as apply to mental health. The only science to ever reach to all human effort is the spiritual model of humanity.

Time does not exist

Time exists and only exists exactly as length exists. As length measures distance, so time measures the period between events. Time is a function of sentience which is defined as all species who build an internal image of their environment and use that image to manage their interaction with the environment.

Humanity is the most conceptually advanced sentient species in the known universe. That is the internal images created by humanity offer the greatest congruence ***reality*** \equiv ***Reality***, of all species in the known universe.

The conceptualization skills of humanity are more significant than consciousness which is understood as a trivial self-reflective quality of sentience.

Revision of the standard model of the universe

All understanding of the universe must and can only be via the understanding of knowledge, which can only be via the understanding of how knowledge comes to be and the structure of knowledge, which can only be derived from understanding ourselves and how we relate to the environment via knowledge.

In short it is not possible in principle to have a standard model of the universe prior to having a scientific standard general theory of ourselves. The spiritual model of humanity (SMH) is the only such theory ever created.

Ideas count culture does not: Building the first global civilization

Events, that is a singular unique experience, is considered the fundamental of life for all sentient species. An event able to be described by an idea if and only if the event meets sufficient of the preexisting definitions of the idea. Conceptualization is the management and sharing of ideas, with practical consequence the group learns from the experiences of one. Hence survival shifts from the individual learning to group learning, today typically called culture. Culture is the reservoir of group learning but, ideas count the source of the ideas does not.

Hence, today, with globally shared ideas via this internet technology, humanity has the opportunity, for the first time, to grow beyond the limitations of culture selecting the best ideas from all cultures, apply them and enter a new phase of existence, personally and socially.

We need understand ourselves as having existence via a social infrastructure built from the best ideas for both understanding and managing ourselves. Then in addition, as service to our egos, and our inherent desire to state our uniqueness to others, we can retain aspects of culture, including a belief in god if that assists us live the life we choose. God is a personal idea we can adopt, should we choose, but the term has no more significance than the terms fate, chance or aeroplane.

All missionary activity no matter how well meant, is nothing more than imposition of a preferred point of view held by some people on those who do not hold to that point of view, it is imposition of selective morality, the depth of immorality in a free society.

Given all sentience uses images in mind to manage interaction with the physical and social environment, with ideas as the unit of learning and self-correction. Given ideas determine all life experience, and are the driver of our survival. Then given lack of understanding of ourselves, lack of recognition we are part of the natural world, adoption of some poor and self-destructive ideas on how to best manage ourselves personally and socially; it is a statement to our resilience and determination we have lasted this long.

Fundamental philosophical position

It is difficult to present the spiritual model of humanity in a linear form. Its structure is not linear, nor did it evolve in a linear manner. It is the circularity that made it so difficult, and I suggest the circularity the chief reason why there has never been a scientific general theory of psychology with universal reach, until now.

Below are a series of issues presented as the essentials required to build the paradigm. It did not occur in this linear manner, but these issues emerged as roadblocks I was forced to resolve as I wrestled with the questions (*Origin*, appendix 1, item 18, page 20), reproduced below. These question I arrived at in 1974, having graduated PhD in 1971, and after spending over a year of Saturdays researching social science issues in relation to scientific understanding of why we do what we do (Refer appendix 1, first thoughts, papers 1 & 2, both published 1980s, in the now defunct UNESCO journal, *impact of science on society*. Papers available by download).

1. If we had an apt and accurate general theory of knowledge, what would it tell us about knowledge and the relationship of that knowledge with the object of the knowledge?
2. If we had an apt and accurate general theory of psychology, what would it tell us about two people having a conversation?
3. The fundamental causal drivers of humanity lie within each person. How are those drivers aggregated to enable understanding of groups large and small?
4. There is only one actor, how are the solutions to the first three questions interrelated such as to provide apt and accurate understanding of people as individuals, in groups, and as an example of a sentient species?

Some years after forging these questions, I added a fifth, and in adding it, I decided on the title of the theory, *spiritual model of humanity* (SMH).

5. The search for spiritual meaning has been a major issue throughout human history, what is the human spirit and how is it related to and/or integrated with the human psyche?

The first four questions drafted in 1974, the fifth about 1978. It took until 2010 to build answers meeting the intellectual standards, I judged acceptable. I wrote up the base science 2012-2014 (*Origin*, item 18, appendix 1). Self-published 2014 on Lulu, Accepted on SSRN 2016, Since 2016, I have explored application of the science (SMH) to the widest range of human circumstance I could imagine. The theory has never failed.

This book is the presentation of the theory and its *implications as best I currently understand them*. There is to be no aspect of humanity divorced from this theory, it reaches to everything people do, have done or could do.

To date, review appendix 1, the theory has never failed. The italics above underline that even writing this book, I learned yet more about ourselves and how the theory (SMH) offers insight into ourselves beyond anything gone before.

Please note, for the remainder of the book, issues are presented in brief summary with limited attempt to argue them. They are judged relevant and important if mentioned, with detailed description and argument in work listed in the appendix

Differentiated perceptual fields

A crucial aspect of earth environment. Very difficult to image any circumstance where differentiation of perceptual fields is not intrinsic to the circumstance. In a black hole perhaps.

What is it? Imagine a beach scene, now imagine the multiple streams of photons that arise from it, such one sees the umbrella, and cute blonde in the bikini. The kids running after the large beach ball, the waves lapping the shore, the lone surfer looking for that wave in a dead flat ocean. Unless each gave off different streams of photons, we would not see any of it.

Cybernetics directs that if two systems connected by an information channel, then zero input has the same effect as a non-changing input. In effect, the two systems become disconnected, and the dependent system become null and unchanging.

This description precisely fits the link between the beach scene and our mind. The communications channels being perceptual fields, and neural activation, giving rise to the image in mind.

In circumstances of unchanging perceptual fields our minds become separated from the input, and we see nothing but a flat plane. This description is inadequate we do not merely 'see' a flat place we are 'in' a flat plane. This distinction is crucial when considering clear air white out.

The Ganzfeld effect

The Ganzfeld Effect has been known for decades at least. It entails placing half ping pong ball over the eyes and noting what people 'see'.

People experience a detachment of mind and vision. For a longtime it was described as parapsychology, mystical and beyond scientific explanation.

It is merely proof we are a fundamentally part of nature, and if we subject ourselves to unchanging perceptual fields, as occurs with half ping pong ball covering each eye, then cybernetics takes over and a fixed input between two systems is the same as null input, and the systems become separated.

In the environment this occurs when there are clouds, and a ground covered in snow. It is called *clear air white out*, and a major factor in the crash of the Air NZ plane on Mount Erebus, where over 200 people died.

Evidence has it there must be very large areas of clear sky or of ground not covered in snow if the effect is to be broken. So not all the perceptual field need be uniform, to separate mind and vision, merely most of it.

Canadian ‘bush’ pilots flying in or close to the artic have skills at recognizing clear air white out, and managing the plane by say, distribution of weight on their bum. Of course, today they will also have better instruments given we know about the environmental circumstance.

Defining Reality and reality

The explanation by cybernetics of separation of vision and mind defines the relationship between all humanity and the environment a person finds themselves in.

We do *not* manage circumstance.

We use the image in mind of circumstance to manage circumstance. We manage circumstance based on our judgement of it.

This gives rise to a fundamental of human existence, namely we use images built in mind, referred to as reality (small r), to manage our interaction with the external environment, Reality (capital R).

This leads immediately to the fundamental congruence equation defining the quality of all human life experience *reality* \equiv *Reality*. This says that the greater the match between the ideas we adopt and apply, including our emotional reaction to those ideas, the better we manage our circumstances, and the better the outputs from that management, hence the greater the life experience.

Please note, this did not arise as presented, at the beginning of the analysis, but decades into the analysis. This arose as a result of developing much of the spiritual model of humanity, when I began to understand what the theory (SMH) was, and that the details of the theory were not essential to understand these foundation issues.

Further and even much later, I understood humanity as the supreme sentient species in the known universe.

Defining sentient species

A sentient species is one which builds an image in mind of its environment, using the sensory input from that environment, moderated by previous experience of the circumstances, including what previously worked and what did not, in humanity referred to as learning, experience, memory; then selects what it does from the blend of previous experience, and understanding of its circumstances.

It is difficult to deny that all species utilizing sensory input of any sort in selecting its interaction with circumstance, is not a sentient species.

For all sentient species, the dominant factor in determining action is understanding of what it is doing and the projected outcomes.

Humanity is the supreme sentient species in the known universe.

There is no boundary line of sentience. It merely fades as one reduces the quality of mind. A gorilla is definitely sentient. A single cell is not sentient, thus anything acting merely on chemical responses is not sentient. A tree is not sentient.

Is a blind worm sentient?

Definition of consciousness a trivial property of sentience

Sentience *is* consciousness.

Anything sentient is implicitly conscious and making choices. Assessing all consciousness by human standards fully misses the point. Human ideas of consciousness greatly corrupted by those pursuing religious mystical attributes with which to burden humanity and raise their own social and political influence.

People dominated by ideas, one such idea is god, and shown to be a useful source of energy for some people. But in a free society, embracing diversity, they have no right to pursue their views and impose them on those who do not share their views.

Religion is the term referring to operation of the idea of god in society. Hence god is best understood as personalised, religion is socialised.

All religions are contrary to freedom and diversity and are to be curtailed in a society where people choose to be free.

Diversity exists in a free society, and only in a free society. Only in freedom can people choose their own ideas and live by them bounded only by rules that punish those who threaten life, limb and property of others. A non-prescriptive legislation.

Conceptualization as the critical property of sentience

The quality of sentience parallels the skill of conceptualization, There are by my analysis three levels conceptualization.

Level 1: A dog running up and down a fence barking at it.

Level 2: The dog pausing, looking to left and right, then quietly walking around the end of the fence.

Level 3: Full understanding of what the fence was for, and how it fit within the overall design and operation of the circumstance.

All sentient species have levels 1 and 2.

Only humans in the known universe have level 3.

Only humans in the known universe have university libraries with textbooks on standard models of the universe. I refer to level 3 as the *library line*.

No other species in the known universe has crossed the library line. When/if we ever encounter another species who has crossed the library line, then we know we are dealing with a species with intellectual and conceptualization skills at very least equal to our own.

All things are explicable

External Reality and the image in mind reality, are separate *things*.

This means our reality can be viewed as an *overlay on the external world offering explanation*. reflecting our understanding of Reality.

Hence all things are explicable, at very least due we can make up terms to describe circumstance we cannot otherwise describe. For example, the term photon was adopted to describe the core unit of light as it emerged light was also a particle.

The consequence there is no such thing as ineffable knowledge. To adopt a free society, we need cease being intimidated by notions of god.

There are ideas some may not like to discuss as being contrary to what they believe. But I am committed to increasing our understanding as then and only then can we build a better life experience.

We need begin with epistemology

We need conceptualization tools to build theory that are then able to be derived from the theory we build. In short, we need the solution in order to build the correct solution or we need the answer in order to build the answer.

W Ross Ashby, a global founder of cybernetics, created the concept linking two variables by an arrow meaning *has an effect on*. Thus $a \rightarrow b$, means changes in a has an effect on b.

There exist two and only two types of effects, *immediate effects*, where a directly has an effect on b, and *ultimate effects* where a had an effect on b via c. Hence the immediate effects are $a \rightarrow c \rightarrow b$. the ultimate effect able to be expressed $a \rightarrow b$. This conceptual structure is independent of ontology, and intrinsically creates the knowledge conceptual hierarchy, structured by the relationships of ultimate effects with immediate effects. This structure leads to the only precise definition of cause as the set of immediate effects underlying any system of ultimate effects.

The *universal mechanistic postulate* states *there is always a mechanism*. Namely there is always underlying any system $a \rightarrow b$, a structure c that can be described as the cause of $a \rightarrow b$, such $a \rightarrow c \rightarrow b$. The universal mechanistic postulate means that all variables in all systems are always ultimate effects. This makes cause an infinite regress, there being no final or ultimate cause of $a \rightarrow b$, such there are no underlying c.

Technically the universal mechanistic postulate can be expressed there is no ab that does not have underlying c. This becomes extremely important when considering the current standard model of the universe, and the question of whether the universe is indeterminate, raising the question does probability actually exist or is it due how we think about things. This issue is fully covered in books and papers, refer appendix 1.

In all circumstances final cause is a cost/benefit choice in relation to the step-down set of immediate effects in relation to the ultimate effects for which we are contemplating researching the next level of immediate effects. Hence cause decided by the question, *will investing resources and effort to determine the c underlying the ab we are studying provide understanding of the system in excess of the cost of researching that understanding?* In short, will going to the next level in the conceptual hierarchy be worth it?

This a significant judgement call, as at any time, there will be multiple things we can do with our excess wealth. Within SMH science meets life, an aspect of which is when science meets economics.

In NZ there is the Marsden Fund, a government provided contestable fund for fundamental research, on the basis of my understanding and recent summaries by the Free Speech Union on the effectiveness by which the funds managed, NZ is investing far less than other OECD countries, with the projects of such obscure definition, NZ citizens gaining very little for the investment. All compounded by the Maorification of the Royal Society of NZ which oversees the fund and selects the projects.

Maorification is a term applying to a group converting to and adopting Maori culture, typically associated with increased preference for Maori graduates, and increasingly using Maori language at the expense of English (an estimate, 95% NZ population speak English, while less than 15% speak Maori), Often also directly participating in cancel culture. The Royal Society of NZ is such body, along with NZ universities. The intellectual elite, or at least the extent those bodies represent an intellectual elite, are not aligned with the traditions that gave birth to them. They lack integrity, this is directly opposed to SMH as the correct science of people. Foundation of Royal Society of UK, circa 1662, and foundation of Oxford U, 1097. NZ Royal Society derived from UK Royal Society, and all NZ universities derived from Oxford.

Maori arrived NZ 1250-1300. Western settlement began in earnest circa 1840. First university was formed in NZ in Otago 1869, formation of Royal Society of NZ 1965.

The problem of circularity

Start at any point and the logic drags one back to the start point. This is merely one way of exploring it, there are many other questions that can be asked that do the same, lead one about a circular argument.

1. We need a theory of psychology.
2. To build one we need better conceptualization tools.
3. Tools can only come from better understanding of knowledge.
4. But we create knowledge.
5. We need a theory of psychology.

In short, we need the answer to build the solution to the start question. Plato. Kant. Descartes. Russell. No form of linear logic can resolve this.

The only resolution is cybernetics. Specifically, the tools of W Ross Ashby are the only ones I could find able to advance an analysis and break the circularity.

Ultimate and immediate effects emerge from the analysis (SMH) not merely powerful tools but as a conceptual model of knowledge itself.

Definition of a variable

A variable is an abstraction from circumstance, and of itself, it does not exist. Hence a variable is an idea, but not all ideas are variables.

For example, a chair is an idea, and a term applicable to some object if and only if it meets sufficient of the factors defining chairs. This also defines the crucial role of written language, if any definition becomes too idiosyncratic then written language loses its potency in forging better thinking, since it is dominated by subjective knowledge, and the crucial aspect of the exchange Popper's world II – world III, is lost.

It was the driver of w II-w III exchange utilised by western traditions that lifted western thinking to the breadth and level of quality it achieved. Unfortunately, while much of it grounded on wrong assumptions, it is now being dismissed by other significant groups, dismissing intellectual quality while rebelling against the political often overbearing implications, the movement is cancel-culture, which, as the saying goes, is throwing the baby out with the bathwater.

The term chair becomes a variable when a person sits on a table, which could then be referred to as a chair. The factors defining ideas of chair and table overlap in this instance, without confusion.

Then the term entropy, it is an abstraction with only conceptual existence, and manner of describing events less readily explicable without the term, and with a broad general applicability. Thus, the term enables comparison of events that without the term would not appear comparable.

The same set of issues applies to understanding people, refer Origin item 18, appendix page 143 for a discussion on selection of variables suited to building a theory of people.

Relationship of variable to values of a variable

This is extremely important in SMH. It means that each and every person is a unique example of the theory, with very little in common, beyond the theory itself.

In short, it says that the theory itself is all people have in common, and each person is a unique example of the theory in practice. This highlights the confusion of all historic work on understanding people, the depth of intellectual mainly academic confusion at the impossible task of seeking common principles and shared factors among what was the values of variables not the variables themselves.

It also follows, there are two types of consequence arising from SMH, first that derived from the theory itself, second that derived from shared values of variables applicable to some people/groups not others.

The extent of academic fail in service to humanity

All cultural considerations fall into the latter category, thus are not fundamental drivers of people, merely superficial affectations emphasising uniqueness. But such is human life and experience, people define themselves relative to their daily existence embedded in culture.

The significant and divisive qualities of applying culture to define oneself is totally due academic promotion of weak to very poor understanding of ourselves drawn significantly from likes of Freud, Skinner, Neisser, and other speculations on psychology.

To today, in NZ we are subject to academic promotion of a specific culture (Maori), when there is no coherent scientific general theory of psychology, which means they have no idea of what culture is, or whether it is a significant factor in determining human conduct (which it is not).

I use the term speculations, which is the best that can be said of the little more than the deeply flawed effort of academics who by at least 1640 (Circa when Descartes proposed dualism, and 1100 years after Siddhartha first proposed dualism); academics had little to no interest in serving society, despite that being the reason they were established in 1097.

But worse, academics our supposed designated thinkers, were blithely rushing forward promoting free world citizens to adopt and apply complete intellectual rubbish in face of brutally simple unanswered questions. For instance, how could any set of ideas be promoted as a theory of people when it failed totally to account for science, theories of quantum physics, failed totally any intellectual test of reach; lacked reasoned commonsense, such as speculation about culture when there was no understanding of a science of people, so how could there be any understanding of culture, unless it was assumed culture was not a description of aspects of groups of people, and if that so why were they talking about it.

Then serious limitations to understanding society, unrelated to any understanding of people. Brutally obvious in the questions ... does society consist of people? And are there coherent causal drivers of people, if so, do they cease to be operative when a person becomes part of a group? Then the failure to deal with crucial intellectual questions, for example what is cause, and free will?

Academia was created in 1097, funded quite well, with academic paid well, given credibility and carefully listened to. In return they were to guide citizens in the societies funding them by asserting good ideas suited to be adopted and applied in pursuit of a better life.

In pursuit of their own wealth and influence, modern academics have been successful. In delivery of their side of the deal of 1097, specifically in regard to promoting ideas to citizens most fit to be adopted and applied in building a better life, their performance has been poor, as a score on performance, less than 5 out of 10. And in some instances, such as psychiatry becoming integrated into law, their performance has been less than 3 out of 10, very poor indeed.

While we have made technological progress these last 200 years, our understanding of ourselves, society, knowledge and science as a crucial aspect of knowledge, has been very limited among the elite, and within citizens generally we have gone backwards. All due the poor role models and inept reasoning exhibited by academics.

Definition of mechanisms: Systems under study in a box

Given *reality* \equiv *Reality*. We can legitimately use reality to imagine Reality. Hence any aspect of Reality, we can refer to as the system under study. And we can imagine the system under study in a box, thus system under study.

It does not matter how big, how diverse, how separated the components, we can imagine it in a box. Now, we can write inputs \rightarrow system \rightarrow outputs. Using the language of Ashby, so this says the system under study can have inputs and outputs, and the nature of the inputs has an effect on the nature of the outputs.

We can now take a further step. If outputs \neq inputs, we can reasonable conclude there are processes in the box converting the inputs into outputs. Those processes in the box are referred to as *mechanisms*.

Mecanism are implicit to all system under study. And represent causal understanding of the system. The greater our understanding, the greater our ability to manage the system to enhance our life experience.

A consequence of this analysis is there are two types of knowledge, ***Stochastic knowledge across the box***: This if we know the inputs we can use statistics to predict the output. All quantum theory of modern physics is merely stochastic knowledge.

Causal knowledge of mechanisms: detailed knowledge of variables and their relationships (form a theory) that describes the operation of the mechanisms in the box. Modern physics does not have causal knowledge of the primary causal drivers of the mechanisms. For example, take a single radioactive atoms and describe when it will disintegrate, and why?

This discussion must be understood as resolving crucial insights into ourselves addressing questions like ... what is knowledge, where does it come from, what does it mean, how do we best use it?

Before that, the reasoned commonsense questions of first things first ... what is the structure of the environment that enables us create knowledge; what are the mechanisms in the brain that result in our mental states (defined as that mix of ideas and emotions).

Yet broader, are we unique, or are we part of the natural world, and if so, what does that mean for our spiritual understanding?

To emphasise, the only thing we share with another person is the theory describing the mechanism, we **ONLY** share this fundamental paradigm.

All immediate aspect of ourselves is described by values of variables, we are each a unique example of the theory. Each of us described by unique values of the variables describing the mechanisms. It ought to be now clear the extent social similarities frequently described by culture, as limited understanding of ourselves by placing emphasis on similarities and while we shared ideas, opinions and interests, the reality is we are each different. This confusion between variables and their values is the root cause of our lack of understanding of who we are as individuals.

We can define ourselves and our uniqueness by superficial cultural issues. But it is highly preferable we define ourselves by much more fundamental values of variables drawn from the correct scientific understanding of ourselves. We need to define ourselves by the ideas we adopt and apply, and ensure our actions reflect those ideas and we exhibit integrity.

Who am I?

For a full discussion refer [Post](#) | [Feed](#) | [LinkedIn](#).

We are each a unique example of humanity, the only thing we have in common is the spiritual model of humanity. SMH is an abstraction, consisting of variables and relations between them and describes the causal mechanisms operative in the system under study referred to as a person.

We are not the abstraction. We are each a unique set of values of the variables. Our soul mate is someone with values matching our own such there is an implicit union.

I speak for myself, given human variation, a difficult man who set himself on a path at a young age, resulting in a depth of unwillingness to moderate the goals he set for himself, resulting in an inflexible persona, which only now, in this book, comes to fruition and a spiritual peace of mind enabling a companionship he has sought and wished for, but in his spiritual fulfilment is only now possible.

There are crucial issues derived from the theory, such as the manner in which groups are formed and the causal forces that drive them. Understanding of all groups can only proceed from accurate and apt understanding of a person, all groups consist of people, and the causal drivers of people do not cease as a person enters a group.

This means all modern emphasis on groups as important in society is wrong and has led humanity into thinking of itself in a self-destructive manner. Hence all Marxism and derived ideas are wrong, cancel culture is wrong, and describing oneself by one's associates is wrong, to the point of being self-destructive.

Ideas count, source of ideas does not.

Hence, we and we alone define ourselves by the ideas we adopt and apply. We and we alone are responsible for our mental state as the primary driver of all life as we experience it.

All culture is merely a reservoir of ideas, and we and we alone are responsible for the ideas we select and allow to shape our life and our existence as people.

Today we are able to draw our ideas from many cultures, and we fail ourselves if we do not. If we assume ideas from culture A are correct and ideas from culture B are wrong, we are conducting ourselves in a self-destructive and immature manner. To repeat, ideas count, the source of ideas does not. Culture does not count it is merely a source of ideas.

We need define ourselves with ideas and secure our existence on the bedrock of the best ideas we can find.

In the 3000+ years of western tradition, founded on an intense exchange between internal subjective knowledge (Popper WII) and external written and shared objective knowledge (Popper WIII), giving rise to the greater part of the best ideas to adopt and apply in leading the fullest life one can, Western derived ideas are deservedly dominant.

Today, ego has caught up with human development, and in absence of any scientific understanding of the causal forces that drive us, it has become a dominant factor in defining social interactions.

It is also a factor consistent with the incorrect ideas about ourselves, focusing as it does on one's sensitivities, a corrupting and self-serving view of people, unscientific and incorrect, resulting in social conflict, allowing even encouraging a lack of integrity enabling lies and manipulation as the chief ethical foundation of social conduct.

If we define ourselves based on supposed cultural norms, and not on the best ideas available regardless of source, then we deny diversity, set up a social infrastructure of conflict, and demand compliance, and when people who think different resist, violence is inevitable.

Events as fundamental of existence

Events are perceptual input in relation to mind. Thus, for humanity, an event can be friend's wedding, equally may be a colour of the bride's dress.

An example is the term sunset. The experience of any sunset is the event, it is described by the idea sunset, thus any experienced event must exhibit sufficient of the factors defining the idea before able to be used to describe the event.

This also describes the relation between ideas and the value of any idea. A sunset may be glorious, or ordinary being obscured by clouds. But both are sunsets.

These circumstance are tightened significantly in science, or in any precise thinking consisting of variable, and values of variables.

Purpose of science

To create a theory of the mechanisms operative in any system under study.

The spiritual model of humanity is a theory of the mechanisms operative in people as the system under study.

It has profound consequences driving home the crucial point the only person with access to our mind is ourselves. Hence, we and we alone are responsible for our mental health.

Social cooperation is a crucial issue in the life of anyone seeking a better life experience, especially for descendants. And directing how to build a better free society, emphasising the role of politicians, media, academics and other important social groups.

With how to do it being made clear, we face the choice of doing it, or not. We choose accepting the science and adopting the view that while we may not immediately benefit, the ideas are correct, and in a generation, maybe two, our descendants will be enjoying spiritual development built from belief in themselves.

Methodology

The term methodology is not complicated. It refers to the systematic steps of thinking, ensuring no crucial issue is missed, thus building confidence in the conclusion. In short, methodology is the sure-fire means of avoiding knee jerk reactions. Think first.

Methodology: The steps of mind one will apply to reach a conclusion in which one can have confidence. The methodology ensures foremost that our thinking obeys the rule of reasoned commonsense, that first things are resolved first. It applies to all our thinking not just to complex intellectual issues.

Applying method ensuring balanced point of view

For example, we cannot claim to be a moral person against killing if we condemn Israel (2024) for killing Gaza citizens, and do not equally condemn Hamas for killing Israel citizens on Oct 7 2023. Or condemn Israel for occupying Arab lands without equally condemning Muslims or threatening Israel in the Khartoum Resolution, and promoting it among Muslim citizens, and for aiding and abetting various groups of Muslims fire rockets into Israel with the intent to intimidate and kill Israeli citizens.

One can argue one side or other justified, due this or that. But the morality of free society directs one shall not impose one's personal views on another. Workable compromise the only path forward. If both sides kill and disrupt the life of citizens of the other side, there is no justification for either. Both are immoral people, any person who sides with either is equally immoral.

Reasoned commonsense applies, forcing decisions we stay balanced fair and just. Backing down and admitting we only had one side of it, and we were wrong is a major part of growing up.

The academics claim all sorts of neurological nonsense about the brain and its changes. They may be right, but bluntly I judge they have no idea and stretching far beyond their expertise. But I am willing to argue the teenage years is the time when young people most learn about their mind and lay down the foundation of ideas and processes likely to dominate their lives for the rest of their lives.

Currently we grossly underestimate these formative years, and it is of concern when Freudian failed ideas adopted giving these young people credit for balanced thinking when it is not possible for them to have developed the breadth and depth of understanding necessary in the complex world of today.

For example, voting age of 18 and suggestions of reducing it to 16 raises exactly these questions. Is our understanding of ‘*adult maturity*’, valid, and what is the relationship of our understanding to our scientific understanding of people and their development.

Freud effectively argued *give me the child to 5 and I will give you the adult*. This sort of view has been pursued in various psychological ‘schools’, critical race theory, flowing into Marx to shallow and incorrect social theory, and other mis-judged social movements. In our complex modern world, deeply mutually dependant with academics our nominated thinkers, who have failed to accurately assess and present to us quality ideas about ourselves such to build life experience and reduce social tension (refer to social angst in appendix 1).

Do you really think such empty thinking gets remotely close to comprehension of our modern complex free society, and all done by say 19?

There is extensive discussion of method in papers and books in appendix. 1. The priority point to emerge is the depth of implicit corruption in peer review.

Intellectual standards beyond the platform of reasoned commonsense

Peer review must be dumped as a process of assessing the intellectual quality of an idea. Getting rid of peer review is closely associated with the understanding that popularity does not parallel accuracy.

In fact, given the normal curve of distribution of intelligence, early popularity is a warning sign the idea may not be correct, since it held by a large number of people with below average intelligence and insight. A perfect example, teachers from junior schools in NZ leading school children (under 16) on road marches demanding the government do more on curbing climate change.

Ideas count, source of ideas does not. Which means the idea in a single mind can be the correct idea and the idea in ten million minds can be incorrect.

I define truth as ideas with a solid foundation of reasoned commonsense, reach, and predictive of empirical circumstance. All truth is our current verisimilar resting place, knowing all explanations are ultimate effects, with yet a depth of underlying immediate effects. There is no truth without a theory describing the mechanisms in the system under study, such theory providing accurate predictions matching empirical history, hence offering confidence in predicting the future. It is only the degree of application of rigorous standards that separates science, in the sense of well-ordered thinking, from politics of preference, including corruption for example, due financing.

Note: Much if not all climate predictions fail against these standards.

Methodology of SMH

The discussion below is not meant as a generalization on method and presented as how people ought to think.

Method needs to match circumstance. It is the sensible steps of thinking in relation to dealing with some issue, hence method applies to all life, given we are dominated by the ideas we adopt and apply, sorting out the best idea in any circumstance will depend on the method used. Method is a longer word which means *think*.

It is this argument that leads to the conclusion that all people are inherently scientists. Even those who would disavow science claiming religious priority. I have difficulty imagining anything more foolish as to deny one's nature in favour of supposed divine mysticism.

Below are the steps applied in determining the truth of the spiritual model of humanity. I repeat, it did not occur in this reasoned manner. It is presented this way to assist comprehension and discussion. These steps have all now been completed to a satisfactory standard. This is a complex methodology, as befits arguably the most complex intellectual issue ever attempted.

Deciding the system under study. Inputs \rightarrow system under study \rightarrow outputs. The system under study is to be a person, and we know outputs do not equal inputs. Hence, we can write inputs \rightarrow mechanism operative in a person \rightarrow outputs.

Goal. To create a theory of the mechanisms in the system under study, consisting of variables and relations between variables, using Ashby scientific language, namely an arrow meaning change in a *has an effect on* b, described as $a \rightarrow b$, with all such effects being either ultimate effects or immediate effects.

Immediate effects underlying any set of ultimate effects then the causation of the ultimate effects. This conceptual hierarchy offering the only precise definition of cause, defined as *cause is a relation between classes of relation between classes of events*. That is, cause is the relation immediate effect make with their ultimate effects.

Note: Normal perception is geared to viewing ultimate effects. It is third level conceptualization of homo sapiens sapiens, the subspecies of homo sapiens, that enables crossing the library line and building depth of understanding, enabling better management of circumstance, enabling emergence of species dominance in the eco-system.

Further given the background intellectual position assumed in this method, all relations between variables are classified ultimate effects.

Hence ultimate cause of all circumstance is a matter of economic choice of going to the next step-down of immediate effects and whether the gains offset the cost.

Deciding the variables. This is an act of judgement dependent on the experience of the analyst. For my part, I had PhD in mechanistic organic chemistry, some years as a sales representative, married, with children, a willing learner, with skills in scanning books and scientific papers quickly and determine their relevance to the task I set myself, expressed in the questions I had written. The selection of variables is discussed in depth in Origin, item 18, appendix 1.

Before finally proceeding, I had to determine if the solution were valid, or if it could be overturned by divine intervention. In short, I had to decide if god had any place in the analysis. Without determining on this we could not be fully confident of our judgement of any circumstance. The issue is sufficiently important as to be the topic of the next chapter.

Assess the external environment. Identify those aspects of the environment most influential in shaping the dominant species. In retrospect, the assumption I used was the dominant species would be that species with the most accurate greatest conceptual grasp of the environment enabling the best management of the species in relation to the environment.

This resulted in identifying differentiated perceptual fields, cybernetic effect of null input equal to fixed or unchanging input, Ganzfeld Effect, and clear air white out.

Note, while researching this, the Mount Erebus crash had occurred, and as a consultant I was contracted to work with NZ Police in Auckland on assisting the Officers who had participated in picking up parts of bodies littering the mountain side and trying to establish what belonged to whom. It was a wrenching experience listening to the stories of the Officers and helping them deal with the residual images in their mind.

Use of thought experiment. Having analysed the external environment to my satisfaction, I determined a thought experiment was the only way of exploring how a perturbation would travel through the theory. There being two sources of perturbation, external in the form of sensory input, and internal, as in say imagination triggering emotions.

Thought experiment the only way of seeking understanding of how a change of the variable knowledge influenced other variables, and in what sequence.

The result is in Origin, item 1, appendix 1, in diagrams 6 and diagram 8 nested in diagram 6.

Identifying the consequences of SMH

There quickly emerged two types of consequence. The first type arose from the model itself. The significance of ideas; types of society; definition of cause; derivation of conceptualisation which had been assumed to begin but emerged as a crucial quality; each person a unique example of the theory.

Second type of consequence is when values of variables explored. I found no limit to the values the variables could assume. For example, a single idea is a single value of the variable thought. With that singular value often having multiple emotional values of the variable emotion depending how the person presented the idea to themselves. .

I also concluded humanity had not explored its real potential, and in particular assumed too much as a result failed to grasp the depth of its ignorance.

I came to understand growth of knowledge in terms of reduction of ignorance. And came to understand how all we now and could ever know was via knowledge, hence work of Einstein was subject to understanding arising from our psyche. And the separation of knowledge into stochastic and causal knowledge, and we were deeply ignorant of the causality of ourselves and of the universe generally. Much of this understanding occurred after acceptance of the spiritual model of humanity on SSRN, 2016. as evidenced by the date of papers submitted and accepted by SSRN.

I was fairly clear in 2022, about when I sought to have a global opinion on the validity of SMH as the correct science of people, refer www.spiritualmodel.com, item 15. This was also about the time senior global academics whom I expected to be interested in a correct science of people ceased responding to emails.

The last 2 years have been disappointing in lack of intellectual inquisitiveness exhibited by elite intellectual people. The scope of my contacts expressed in the initial distribution list, to which I have added globally significant media on the hope there is someone within that group willing to adopt a proactive stand and challenge modern elite fixed and closedminded position, interpreted as no more than protection of privilege.

God only exists as a supportive idea in a mind

The question is very important. If god does exist, and is a prime mover in the universe, then we are unable to have full confidence in our own conclusions. It is not enough to have debates on this or that issue seeking to decide the question. I offer a definitive argument based on all we know and all we can ever now.

Further, given that all human knowledge (reality) is an overlay of the environment (Reality), it follows that ineffable knowledge is impossible in principle. While discussing some topics may be uncomfortable for some people, in service to humanity my position is get over it, there are issues of development of human potential vastly larger than the sensitivities of any person, or group of people, no matter how big the group.

I argue we can rationally construct societies that serve all people if and only if we have secure understanding of ourselves. Hence analyse adopt and apply ideas as social infrastructure that we know will deliver the results expected of them.

Before continuing it is worth noting that about 90% of the global population believe in god. Decreasing to about 75% in the free world, outside Muslim countries.

In the free world especially, atheism as the rejection of god has grown steadily and is now accepted as a legitimate point view and people (about 15% of the population) who live fulfilling lives with no reference to god no longer regarded as inferior people, lacking spiritual depth.

God exists, but ...

An important aspect of this book is showing god does not exist in anything other than an idea in mind. The term god no more significant than apple, fate, or aeroplane and deserves no recognition beyond those terms which refer to ideas in mind, two with an external reference and one without.

Humanity will mature when and only when it believes in itself, finds faith in its own reason, beginning with reasoned commonsense as the foundation of thinking resulting in minimum standard intellectual quality ideas to adopt and apply in pursuit of a better life experience.

From this minimum position, recognise all ideas are just that, all subject to quality standards, with god another idea, giving personal comfort and support to some, but not others. With no loss of spiritual depth or fulfilment if a person does not believe in god.

The definitive epistemological argument defining god as an idea

In all circumstances at all times our relationship with the external world can be described *inputs* → **system under study** → *outputs*. In short, there is no circumstance that falls outside our imagination.

This diagram is a paragraph which states: *No matter the circumstance, we can imagine it within a box, with inputs from all else. In the case where the system in the box is the universe all inputs arise from our activities.*

For all circumstances where outputs do not equal inputs, then we know there are processes, called mechanisms, within the system that modify inputs converting them to outputs.

Nothing can exist beyond this equation.

To postulate the existence of god beyond this equation is to deny the equation. Given the whole of human existence since homo sapiens came into being has rested on the evolution of our understanding of this equation, it follows, if god exists, they do so within this equation.

There are only three positions in this equation:

1. Outside it.
2. A variable accounting for the mechanisms.
3. Existence in mind of some people.
 - a. A unique value of the variable knowledge comforting for some people, not for all, and with no universal qualities associated with the value, so for some god meant ABC, and for others god meant XYZ. Which left many groups in conflict/religious wars over which was the correct god.
 - b. As I prove, this is merely an example of imposing selective morality, with the idea being gifted a special place in human affairs it does not deserve, but like the pursuit of all selective morality, destructive of social stability.

God is not the prime mover of the universe

If it looks like a duck, waddles like a duck, sounds like a duck then it is very likely a duck.

Regularities exist and have been so since humanity came into being and encountered them. This means that even if god is the prime mover, humanity can understand the universe by noting and exploring and defining its regularities.

There is no evidence god intervenes, hence to all intents and purposes god is irrelevant.

God is not a variable offering explanation of the mechanisms

Human development lies in building explanation of the mechanisms, including explanation of ourselves, enabling better management of the system, ensuring operation of the system best serves humanity.

I repeatedly explored making god a variable in systems of explanation (theories explaining the operation of a system).

In all cases, god was superfluous and in contradiction of Occam's Razor, and in many cases, god was an impediment to clarity and understanding.

The only conclusion was god was not and never could be a variable existing as an explanatory abstraction of any system, including explanations of ourselves.

God exists and only exists as an idea in some minds

Thought (Th): Thought is knowledge, defined as ideas expressed in language available to attention. Thought is central to understanding people. Page 149, 'Origin', item 18, appendix 1.

All knowledge is expressed by the variable Thought (Th). But not all thought is knowledge. The line between is not precisely defined, it is not a sharp line, but broadly, knowledge refers to something, while a thought may not necessarily refer to anything beyond itself.

It follows ideas are the values of thought in exactly the sense entropy has a value in any defined circumstance. Ideas are the scientific values of the fundamental variable thought (Th).

In management of all circumstance we must apply an idea to manage and interact with the circumstance, which is to determine and apply a value of the scientific variable thought (Th).

Upon any repeat interaction, the value of the scientific variable we adopt and apply will be decided in no small part by our success in applying the ideas from last time. Our brain is self-correcting feedback loop the causal aspect of our brain enabling us to apply ideas, then record what we did and the results. Our mind an aspect of our brain, supervising the development and selection of the ideas to apply in the first case and all subsequent cases.

Free will lies in our choice of what to do in any circumstance. The source of ideas for management of circumstance substantially arising from culture, best understood as a reservoir of ideas. Primary learning is ***ideas count, source of ideas does not.***

The future of humanity is growing beyond culture, relegating it to an unimportant element of personal uniqueness on the understanding that identity is determined by the ideas adopted and applied and not by the source of those ideas.

From the foregoing is concluded god exists as a value of the scientific variable thought (Th) and can be as significant to some as it is insignificant to others.

Given morality is to understand and accept all sides of any issue, and provided the ideas in management of any side are legitimate, defined as clear, legal, and effective, then no person as the right to impose their point of view on any other person.

In freedom of the individual, each person has the right to choose the ideas they will adopt and apply.

Belief in their god is the inalienable right of all citizens of free societies. Religion is the social expression of belief in god. Thus, all religions have the right to exist. But no religion has the right to impose its god on any person.

All religions are to be curtailed in a free society as intrinsically destructive of social stability, and may not seek to recruit members, nor promote its public/social presence. In short, all missionary type activity is banned as destructive of social stability.

Conclusion

God exists only in the mind of the person who believes, offering them strength, but such a belief offers no special spiritual salvation or moral existence beyond that which they exhibit in their dealings with other people who may hold views diametrically opposed to their own.

The idea of god has been a significant idea in human history, but as a substitute for understanding and a comforting escape from the demands of living. The question posed by this book is whether humanity now knows enough to find faith in itself, and step onto the path of reasoned commonsense as the beginning of a future determined by its own reasoning and without the comfort of religious mysticism.

Citizens of the free world need be very wary of Muslims. Islamic views are founded on religion and include religion plus personal and social ideology. Muslims have not dealt with the separation of church and state as did the west during the inquisition.

At stake is a brutally simple question: *Are we as a species part of the natural world or not?*

The west has moved to the point where this book is feasible with sufficient number of people and sufficient depth of knowledge, to at least consider the issue we need build the future based on belief in ourselves and reject all mysticism.

Muslims are not close to that understanding, as evident in their battle cry ... *god is great*. Muslims will pursue imposing their selective morality on society in rejection of the right of any other person to hold an alternative opposing idea.

I understand god but give the idea no significant weight in mind. My own identity secure, including my spiritual existence. [Post](#) | [Feed](#) | [LinkedIn](#).

To now claim god/religion is a major or significant factor in spiritual existence, is to claim I am a lesser person. A suggestion I strenuously reject.

The spiritual model of humanity

The detailed scientific general theory of psychology *The Origin of Consciousness* (July 26, 2016). Institute of Theoretical and Applied Social Science, New Zealand. Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2814742>. See appendix 1 for application of the paradigm to a wide range of human circumstance, thus creating the normal science relevant to the paradigm.

Spiritual model of humanity (SMH) the correct science of people

When cybernetics applied to people, the summary is ... *the brain is a self-correcting feedback loop with ideas the unit of self-correction.*

After Thomas Kuhn (Structure of Scientific Revolutions, 1962) the core science applied to build a general theory of psychology is the **paradigm**, and applying the paradigm to account for all human circumstance is the **normal science from within the paradigm**. This process obeys the rule of first things first, thus ensures our understanding is secure, and cannot be refuted by eventual resolution of any underlying question.

Thus, SMH is a global paradigm shift in how humanity understands itself of such proportions as to make all historic understanding ... prior to 2014, when SMH first published, and since 2014 that does not include SMH ... as sufficiently deficit as to be dismissed as ideas/thinking below a suitable intellectual standard.

SMH profoundly alters global social science. All aspect of understanding people is altered, mental health, spirituality, types of society, free will, causality in human affairs, jurisprudence, education, sociology, social development, politics, building wealth and its distribution, understanding knowledge hence defining science, the exact relationship of humans with the external environment, merely to mention the obvious issues.

But leaves a residual question: *Why has it not been done before?*

SMH was not possible without Ashby conceptualization tools of method. The brutal difficulty understanding people is due any such understanding is knowledge, we produce knowledge, hence, to create accurate understanding of ourselves requires applying the correct methodological tools to get the right answer. But the correct methodological tools must be derived from within the right answer. That is, we need the right answer to derive the tools to build the right answer. It is circular it is not linear.

Academics as the nominated thinkers of the free world failed to grasp the point, and rather than openly admit the limitations of their efforts, they choose to ignore the rule of first things first.

Instead, they opted for the view of ‘competing’ theories of people, typically called schools of thought, none of which could account for all people did, hence all were incorrect as failing the standard of having done first things first. They also failed the intellectual standard of reach.

As with all circumstances, if underlying issues remain unresolved, they are highly likely to come back and bite. In the case of application of our understanding to manage ourselves, academics since inception in 1097, have left vital questions unresolved.

A consequence is wars, social infrastructure, invasions, state sanctioned murders, created what was claimed as Universal Human Rights, rushed headlong into asserting such rights by global PR and force as judged needed, allowed politicians to manipulate, and renege on stated ideas ... all the while in absence of any depth of understanding of people, and how to best achieve the best life experience for them. Academic failure in understanding ourselves did not cause these issues, but certainly the academic promotion of poor ideas in relation to understanding ourselves was a contributory factor.

This is far less significant in a compliant society where all such questions are decided by the central authority, and citizen dissent is forbidden, by Police and often by cultural Police.

The failure of academe in the free world evident in the depth and extent of discussions of restricting of free speech, in absence of any understanding of how we work as a species, and the priority we need give to our sensitivities (emotions) as opposed to our ideas.

If our sensitivities are the priority, as promoted by the legacy of such as Freud, then the free speech debate is inevitable. If, however, as presented by SMH, our integrity is the crucial priority, then the free speech debate is dismissed, people expected to hold stronger views on themselves than projected by their sensitivities, and with the self-management tool ... *sticks and stone may break my bones by word can never hurt me.*

The current free world free speech debate evidence of the extent academics have failed in their historic application of the rule of first things first.

Ashby language of science as in immediate and ultimate effects (discussed above) provided circular conceptualization tools never before offered, hence resolution of the circularity was never before possible. Refer page 15 appendix 1, cover blurb on the book Glossary.

The other crucial principle is social science is not detached from life; academics can no longer discuss say jurisprudence without invoking living circumstance.

If an idea does not fit and reach to all possible jurisprudence circumstance and sit comfortably within SMH the correct science of people, then the discussion is immediately dismissed as rubbish and not worth time bothering with.

The quality-of-life equation below spells it out, science as in the correct manner of thinking about ourselves is no longer an *academic* exercise, it is the very essence of determining the quality of human existence, especially in a free society. It always was but academics ignored the issue in advancing their own wealth and social influence.

Since inception academics have failed in the intellectual quality of their efforts, and worse progressively adopted self-serving ethic actually at the expense of citizen life experience.

They were supposedly the thinkers, but crucial, practical thinking they could not do, and failed to be honest about it. The ideas they then promoted were poor to weak ideas but due their status as humanity's thinkers, their ideas were slavishly adopted by commerce, politicians, and citizens, all of whom thought academics were adhering to the deal of 1097, when they were not.

The living equation: Ideas → life experience. Which means the experience of any circumstance is determined by the outcome arising due to the ideas applied to the circumstance. With the outcomes determining the experience of the person.

The quality-of-life equation: Quality of ideas → quality of life experience. Which means the quality of the ideas adopted and applied has an effect on the quality of the experience. The better the ideas the better the life experience.

The congruence equation: Reality ≡ reality. Which asks the question are the ideas adopted by the person (their reality, small 'r') congruent with the circumstance (the Reality, capital 'R').

Free will. Lies in the human ability to create, store and select ideas, and apply those ideas in management of circumstance, learn from the experience, adjust the ideas and adapt to changing circumstances.

Human dominance: Humanity is a species within the kingdom/phyla of sentient species. Sentient species are defined as those species that use internal images of the environment to guide their interaction with the environment.

Humanity is the supreme sentient species in the known universe with superior evolved intellectual capacities due superior interaction with the crucial aspect of all environments referred to as differentiated perceptual fields.

In uniform perceptual fields all sensory input fails for all sentient species. For full discussion refer appendix 1 and refer earlier discussion.

Consequences of the SMH

Below is a summary list of the impact of the paradigm shift from the disparate views on people currently dominant, to the coherent view based on SMH. There is significant detail within each topic, typically explored in the works listed in appendix 1.

1. The types of society.
2. The crucial acceptance in free societies of the right of people to hold ideas diametrically opposed to one's own with the demand for workable compromise in all exchanges.
3. Importance of ideas prioritizing integrity over sensitivities.
4. Quality assessment of ideas.
5. Selective morality and scientific morality.
6. Creation of knowledge and definition of science.
7. Role of god and priority of personal judgement.
8. The extent cultural history, upbringing and personal experiences are adopted as relevant today, is a choice.
9. Human capital management technology.
10. Mental states, self-management and renewal counselling.
11. Jurisprudence, prescriptive and non-prescriptive legislation.
12. Role of politicians in a free society.
13. The threat to democracy is democracy itself. The shift to a free society.

The spiritual model of humanity (SMH)

There is only one actor, hence the paradigm must apply to all humanity does, has done or could do, including modern physics, and time, managing self, society, and define politics. Refer the list of work at www.ssrn.com/author=2572745, and the overview book Glossary and study guide to the spiritual model of humanity as the correct science of people (November 9, 2021). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3913364>.

The scientific general theory of psychology is the paradigm, application to all humans do is the normal science within the framework of the paradigm (terms after Thomas Kuhn).

SMH: Ideas count source of ideas does not, opinions do not matter. And the congruence equation, Reality \equiv reality. Which states that for our peace of mind, our ideas in mind need match the environmental Reality, and where not, where deliberately chosen divergence, the person is at peace with the choice and its likely social and political implications. .

What SMH says about us

Places ideas as priority, making integrity the critical personal quality.

Defines the personal ideas in relation to any issue as one's selective morality, with almost always alternative points of view in a free society, which leads to the proposition of never pursuing one's selective morality on any issue.

Scientific morality

There are inevitably more than one set of ideas on any issue. Scientific morality is a person recognising and accepting all legitimate ideas on any issue and accepting the right of people to hold views different to one's own. The individual view of any issue is referred to as the selective morality of the person.

Enforcing rule of not pursuing of selective morality

A free society is defined by the strict moral rule than no person may pursue their selective morality seeking to impose it on other people.

In a free society, the Police are expected to enforce this rule with all force necessary. This rule imposes significant limitations on social protest. Imposing conduct consistent with this role is protection of freedom and is not in breach of freedom. All citizens must learn freedom is an act of self-discipline recognizing the right of people to hold differing views and to be respected for those views.

The global standing of SMH

Despite vigorous pressing, which has been the circumstances now for since September 2022, there is no intellectual institution willing to step up and say SMH is the correct science of people, but there is no intellectual institution willing to declare SMH wrong.

Unilateral declaration of validity

Having applied the paradigm to as wide a range of human circumstances within my ability, refer www.ssrn.com/author=2572745, Given no contrary evidence and a global academe who refuse to discuss SMH, and who will not declare it correct and will not declare it wrong I hereby declare SMH the correct science of people.

Should we apply the science?

Society does not exist like a tree. Though at times it may well feel like it is, with circumstances removed from personal ability to influence events.

Democracy has a long history of development in western traditions, beginning at least in ancient Greece, but the thirst for freedom likely predated even Plato who published *The Republic* near 2500 years ago, circa 500 BCE.

The surge in popularity of democracy following the American Civil war and Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, reinforced by WWII, cemented the democracy as proclaimed by Lincoln as the tool of freedom. Unfortunately, as Americans have learned in Viet Nam and most recently in Afghanistan, and Europe has learned in dealing with the Soviet bloc exporting democracy in the view it exports freedom is an immature point of view. The chief reason is failure to come to terms with the rule that first things need to be done first. Build a house on unstable ground ... then do not be surprised when it collapses. Ignore the rule at one's peril.

Until 2014 with publishing of *The Origin of Consciousness* (refer appendix 1) there was no scientific general theory of psychology worthy of the name. In short, all actions aimed at establishing democracy or of even supposedly serving humanity due abuse of women and schooling, etc., was done in absence of any understanding of people.

Freedom is not a social process it is a choice, a state of mind, no amount of effort will change a person's mind unless they choose to change it. And democracy is a corrupt tool, one with a depth of corruption now catching up with us (refer [Post](#) | [Feed](#) | [LinkedIn](#)).

Freedom cannot be imposed by any amount of force, and in fact use of force will always be counterproductive in that the science says the greatest moral crime is to seek to impose one's personal point of view on another, no matter how sincere the intent, a percentage of people will resist, due they reject the idea of being imposed upon.

Freedom imposed no matter the intent, will be substantially resisted. But people can be guided to adopt it as their preferred way of life.

That means freedom must offer better life experience than the life they have. And currently the fractious turmoil across the free world, with deteriorating life experience of most citizens, with confused politics, ineffective and destructive choice being made by academics, and a biased and shallow media, all compounded by the historic success of capitalism in lifting social wealth attracting those from less wealthy societies while free societies swing from one extreme to another in how to deal with the circumstance.

To today, with the inherent corruption of democracy itself, the very moral fabric of freedom corrupted by democracy as majority rules is nothing less than brutal imposition of the ideas of one group on people who disagree, consider abortion or example. For full discussion refer to item 71, appendix 1, Faith in reason page 16.

How to live in a free society

As to potential disenfranchisement, individual sense of powerlessness against the forces in society. SMH the correct science of people specifies:

Self-responsibility: Assume responsibility for one's own mind by selecting a free society as one's social life choice. Expect all other people to equally be responsible for their own mental state. Assert the principle we each must act to take care of ourselves. It is the responsibility of government to provide quality central services in health, education, internal and external security, civic management including road and public transport. It is not the responsibility of government if some person or group does not make use of the services.

Accept people able to have different ideas: Conduct oneself with due quiet acceptance all other people have the inalienable right to exist and in diversity hold ideas different from one's own, and that includes significantly contentious issues such as abortion and gun control. There is always more than one point of view (the definition of diversity), and in a free society no person has the right to impose their point of view on other people. Accept modern complexity and no person can have their own way on any item, hence adopt a social ethic of workable compromise.

Choose friends wisely: Choose who to associate with and who to be polite, but distant. Seek cooperative effort, work, by which you contribute your 'bit' to build social wealth.

Vote: Deny ideology. Capitalism and socialism are wrong, avoid such -isms as inherently poor thinking and destructive. Support and only support politicians who conduct themselves consistent with the practice and principles of a free society such as the principles herein specified. Politicians seeking workable compromise between groups in conflict, who view political parties and their '-ism' based agendas as contrary to a free society.

Retain balance: Decline involvement with all one-sided points of view, for example (2024) Israel is wrong to bomb Gaza, but Gaza citizens were wrong to allow a terrorist group like Hamas to assume political control of the region when it was inevitable they would attack Israel, as they did with Gaza citizens condoning the murders of 1000 Israelis on October 7. State categorically both sides are wrong, both sides must cease killing including rocket attacks, preparation for attacks like tunnels and caches of weapons. Denounce any who condemn one side and not the other as seeking to impose selective morality making them unfit for living in a free society.

Use mysticism, do not be used by it: If one believes in god as a source of strength for you, then follow your beliefs, but recognize others disagree. There is no correct answer, they may not impose their views on you nor vice versa. Be deeply suspicious of aggressive religious stands such as *god is great* as seeking to impose their spiritual point of view. Remain distant from such indoctrination. Be wary of dress codes that convey or infer superior spiritual development, how one dresses has only an indirect impact on one's state of mind unless the dress is intended to convey a selective morality implying it is the correct path forward when it is not, it is merely their chosen path forward which they may pursue. God is a private choice, discussed with friends, but without need for public expression. Dismiss collective/group opinion when it contravenes crucial principles of a free society of enabling people live as they choose. Especially if it hints of one-sided point of view of selective morality. For example (2024), *citizens in support of Palestine*.

Faith in self: Have faith in yourself selecting ideas suited to you managing your mind for you with regard to adopting a life in a free society, enabling you to live as you choose within a nonprescriptive legislation. Learn what that means. Learn the disciplines of mind and support the rejection of any who exhibit ideas and conduct themselves inconsistent with a free society. Accept that a free society must be assertive and firm in rejecting any person unwilling to abide by the principles of a free society, since by allowing them, they will erode and corrupt the way of life you have chosen. The principles of a free society must be codified in legislation, and vigorously enforced in order to protect them, then and only then will the chosen way of life be protected from those who would impose their point of view.

Be sceptical: But listen to the nominated thinkers of society

Society operates based on the ideas we adopt and apply in building it. Where do our ideas come from, and which group in society has the greatest influence on how we think?

Western, largely free world intellectual institutions were begun in 1097, with the formation of Oxford University, accepted by me as the 'stake in the ground'.

It was an idea whose time had come, and Oxford was quickly followed as universities popped up in all countries, including in due course, NZ, much later, with formation of Otago University in 1869, 800 years later, but in the exact same western free society tradition with the exact same obligations to NZ citizens.

Back in 1097 it was accepted people moved forward on the ideas adopted and applied, no confusion by the scientifically bereft legacy of such as Freud, or Marx much more influenced by the thinking of Siddarth Gautama (circa 500 BCE), best known as the Buddha, who argued we become and act as we think. Which meant the better the ideas adopted and applied, the better the life experience of people. Later, 1640, influenced by Rene Descartes and *I think therefore I am*, which was more than philosophy, but a moving toward an understanding of people.

In 1097, it was understood thinking was harder than it looked, and building better ideas tiring, demanded free emotional space, and especially freedom from the demands of living, like having enough money for groceries and living accommodation. Also, well understood thinking was encouraged by living in communities of like minds. Hence the beginning of many intellectual institutions like the Royal Society formed in 1660, or the American Philosophical Society formed in 1743.

I doubt it was written anywhere, but I judge formation of universities offered employees of those first universities time, space and community to *think*, in a manner not enabled by 'typical' demands of living of the day. I do not think it has changed, and to think seriously today demands emotional space and freedom from chores as much or even more than it did in 1097. The ideas are more complex today, and the intellectual/emotional demand to think today, is pushing past everything learned and assumed, to 'see' the world from a new perspective. Which returns us to ideas afoot today, and if university actions have been such as to justify their ongoing credibility.

In return for thinking time, the university advice would be listened to and respected by Lords and commoners alike, with Prime Ministers, poor and wealthy in between. But importantly, it is the institutions charged with guiding citizens of the path of best ideas, it is not the individual academics, who are expected to defer to governance policy. Deference to institutional policy was not insisted on from the get-go and is not policy today.

The institution was formed to offer advice to citizens on the best ideas to adopt and apply, and also charged to educate (especially) young minds in the best ideas. Governments then assumed oversight control of educating citizens by controlling the nature and standards of degrees. This then left the governance of universities alone responsible with the quality of ideas promoted to citizens.

The relationship between an intellectual institution and citizens it serves I refer to as the *deal of 1097*. That is universities will train minds in ideas with oversight by governments and will promote to citizens ideas it judges good ideas to adopt and apply in pursuit of living. In return universities will be funded by the citizens they serve. Citizens will then listen carefully to all the university has to offer on the best ideas for building a better future.

In theory this is a superb deal for both parties. In practice human greed and self-serving corruption have distorted the deal so today, academics are not to be trusted, not without major overhaul of governance/institutional leadership policy and practice. The breakdown of university ethics in service of citizens did not occur overnight but eroded gradually as citizens accepted what academics had to say.

Being a moral person and avoiding immorality

The theory of psychology (SMH) is built from the work of W Ross Ashby: The brain is a self-correcting feedback loop with ideas the fundamental unit of adaptation. This understanding wrongly denied by academics since at least 1640 and ignored by them since the Buddha circa 500 BCE, offers a profoundly different view of people than that popular in academic thinking.

SMH defines types of society, makes integrity the crucial human value, dismisses sensitivities as the priority. Academia was nominated the source of truth, defined as those ideas built upon reasoned commonsense, and passing any intellectual test of quality as appropriate. Not individual academics, the institutional policy defined verisimilar ideas. Hence the precise failure lies with intellectual institutional governance, failing to understand mind as having two fundamental types of ideas, those for personal application the those for professional application.

Self-disciplined commitment to one's professional game plans a measure of one's contribution to communal wealth, based on the simple idea we create more by cooperation than we do alone. Thus, cooperation in modern society generates surplus wealth enabling levels of moral concern for individuals unable to fend for themselves far beyond anything available in history.

There is strong argument over improving how the wealth is distributed, and levels of inequality in modern society. But anger over that must not deflect from the reality of our modern circumstance.

Then the worst possible moral crime as that of pursuing one's own view of any issue and denying the views of fellow citizens, referred to as selective morality. Hence resolution of issues of corporate ownership, and mitigation of inequality, of professional responsibility, and holding to account those assigned significant roles, are major discussions essential to transition from democracy to a free society, but discussions that must occur adhering to the principles and philosophy of freedom.

The fundamental background and science of SMH denies the existence of god other than as an idea in a citizen's mind offers depth of understanding to free will, and role of causality in human affairs, status of science and our understanding of the universe, too mention a few of the changes. The spiritual model of humanity (SMH) presents a profound change in our understanding of people and the idea of a free society.

This change is so profound, with depth of accuracy never before offered nor understood by academe, it is proposed that if not accepted and adopted and promoted by academe, free world societies as currently understood will implode in violence, as a major issue that has caught up with us, is that democracy itself is corrupt and is no more than imposition of immoral selective morality on people who do not agree with the solution.

In short, if we continue as we are then it is highly likely humanity will be driven into compliant societies dominated by a central authority, freedom itself (and diversity as the right to live within law as I choose) will be destroyed, with the major contributor being the governance of our intellectual institutions, allowing their employees unfettered control of crucial product quality, namely the intellectual quality ideas allowed and supported in society.

The deal of 1097 was excellent in theory, but never realistically actioned by academe. Until academe make changes and publishes them acknowledging its failure and determining to fix it, then academia is to be viewed warily. To explore the issues in depth, refer to references in appendix 1.

Defining an under-developed society

Mid-20th century Karl Popper successfully argued that books contained knowledge, his World III of objective knowledge in comparison to his World II of subjective knowledge. The debate roughly from 1950s to 1980s, was called *knowledge without a knowing subject*, and was convincingly asserted by Popper.

Implicit in the debate and not clear at the time was the crucial exchange between ideas in mind and ideas in writing. Brought to the fore within SMH and the Ashby summary of all sentient experience, but particularly human experience *ideas* → *life experience*, scientifically expressing the understanding the human experience depends on the ideas adopted and applied in interaction with any circumstance.

With the crucial implication that self-development, depended on use of written language with clear, apt and precise meanings to language forcing self-discipline whenever one seeks to express one's ideas in writing.

What is crucial in understanding is the precision and fixity of the definition used in writing, thus books, for example, not only forced disciplined thinking within the person, but were able to be shared with all who could read.

This principle of the intense exchange between WII and WIII, understood as the foundation of intellectual development itself a crucial foundation of spiritual development, is being undermined in NZ as NZ academics and supportive disciples rewrite language definitions to suit their own preferences.

This is the exact opposite of the disciplines of the WII-WIII exchange crucial as the foundation of the intellectual development of a society. For example:

- Modification of the term indigenous to include first residents no matter whether they were original in the original place.
- Modification of the definition of knowledge to deny intellectual precision as the key to the definition of science.
- Loose assertions that oral history is as accurate as written, ignoring the human tendency to paint self and historic forebears in the best light making oral history intrinsically untrustworthy.

In short, any society that did not have writing, is judged backward, referred to as under-developed.

It then also follows the intensity of WII-WIII exchange in any group will drive group development, and thus accounts for why western traditions are accepted as the most advanced framework of ideas resulting in advanced social understanding and technology, initially used unscrupulously to impose a way of life on those less advanced societies.

The modern reaction is the cancel culture movement that totally misses the point that ideas count, the source of the ideas does not, which means that instead of rejecting ideas because they are from western traditions, it is time humanity cherry picked the best ideas from anywhere,

Adopted and applied the best ideas (with a large volume of ideas from western traditions) and got on with improving the life experience of people, retaining culture as a light-weight cloak of uniqueness, with social substance in the good ideas selected resting behind the cloak of culture. I refer to it as socially growing up.

The historic wrong imposed on NZ Maori, first residents of NZ have been largely compensated in the Waitangi reparations process, unfortunately taken over by Maori activists enabled by NZ academics bereft of all reason, asserting very poor judgement, lacking any intellectual foundation, such to destroy NZ social infrastructure and social stability by asserting poor ideas of no rational validity.

Much of the rest of the world yet labours in the political conflictual wrestle embedded in the ego demands of people seeking to assert their culture when facing much better ideas derived from western traditions, with academics having fully rejected their part in the deal of 1097.

But academics have a duty of care under the deal of 1097, to promote only ideas resting in reasoned commonsense platform, and passing other tests of quality deemed appropriate. If the professional ideas conflict with their personal ideas, then the academic has the responsibility to promote the professional ideas, not their personal preferences. If the conflict gets more then they wish to bear, they must resign.

It is unacceptable for any academic to pursue their own wealth and social influence regardless of the intellectual quality of the ideas.

For example, fortunes made in the climate debate, gender debate, men participating in female sports, ongoing demeaning of females, excessive promotion of LBTQ as supposed inclusiveness with no definition of the real meaning of diversity, use/development of weak to inept thinking of critical race theory, lack of adherence of the rule of first things need determined first, hence lack of reasoning and rationality in academic discussions adhering to corrupt peer review as the primary process of assessing the intellectual quality of an idea.

All of these issues/conundrums in the modern world resolved by academics adhering to the deal of 1097 and applying the discipline of reasoned commonsense, that is claiming understanding if and only if an idea is able to be justified by it being secured by the ground of the idea, that is first things have been addressed and resolved first.

Where that is not the case rather than blather and promote very poor ideas, improve standards. Foor instance formally declare the theories of Freud and Marx as unscientific rubbish.

Freud and Marx were promoted in their day with their legacy still distorting citizen thinking and remaining a destructive factor across the free world for which the academics have not offered any corrective action.

In the absence of reasoned commonsense foundation, then academics must state ... *in the absence of reasoned commonsense foundation, the ideas cannot be recommended as safe to adopt and apply, and ought to be regarded cautiously until such time the intellectual quality of the ideas is clear.*

Citizens may choose the idea but to do so being fully aware it is suspect and tentative. This at least would moderate much of the effort of activists preying on weakly informed citizens, who resting in the deal of 1097, ought to be able to depend on the thinking quality of people they fund (as is largely the case in NZ).

NZ academics are failing to serve NZ citizens, and do not deserve the percent of Vote Education they receive while they continue to conduct themselves irrationally and immorally, destroying the very foundations of individual freedom that built the west.

Germanic tribes in Teutoberg knew why they fought and died. Modern academics, certainly those in New Zealand, have not the slightest idea of why those men and woman fought and died. Values, the foundation of all human motivation, buried deep under layers and layers of intellectualization devoid of any values, has left the western traditions as considered today in NZ bereft of human qualities, and even to be cooperative.

Reasons to implement better ideas

To achieve better outcomes, hence enjoy better quality of life.

Major shift in psychological priorities

Citizens 1. Improved personal morality. The self-disciplined moral decision to accept all legitimate sides of all issues. To accept the right of all fellow citizens to hold their own ideas, and no person has the right to impose their selective morality on anyone.

Citizen 2. Social cooperation building wealth. Entrepreneurs with ideas without cooperative workers are neutered. Workers without ideas have no future. Distributive fairness built when each group sees it needs the other and the wealth built by social cooperation shared and not controlled by either group. ***Ideas + cooperative workers = social wealth***, accumulating in society based on the simple understanding that we achieve more cooperatively than we can alone. Dump all thinking derived from Marx. Cooperative effort to enhance the life of all is the foundation of social aggregation.

Citizen 3. All motivation is from within. All success is doing the right thing at the right place at the right time and to the right standard. There is only life, and the commitment to it.

Academics. To only promote ideas with a secure platform of reasoned commonsense, that meet appropriate intellectual standards.

Media. To be the exemplary social role model presenting all sides of all issues, thus contributing to the balance in minds of citizens enabling balanced and cooperative conduct based on workable compromise. To not promote opinion.

Politicians. To understand social angst as the primary destructive driver of a free society. To hold no personal opinion on any subject but seek workable compromise to gain agreement between groups in conflict of the issues, their priority and initial action plans to move forward without rancour.

Prescriptive and non-prescriptive legislation

A prescriptive legislation is a system of social laws that directly instructs citizens what to do, when. For example, call to prayer, how females must dress, disallowing of alcohol, disallowing homosexuality, restrictions on who can be educated, etc. The jurisprudence of a prescriptive legislation is to control citizen behaviour and impose on citizens rules determined by the central authority, backed by force of Police, cultural or moral Police, and armed forces.

A proscriptive legislation is directive, requiring citizens to defer to the directions, whether or not a citizen agrees. Citizen behaviour not currently proscribed by the law must be approved by the central authority before being accepted.

A non-prescriptive legislation has the opposite jurisprudence, avoiding direct instruction of what citizens should do, it directs citizens what not to do so to avoid harm to life, limb and property, For example, do not drink alcohol and drive, do not duck school if one seeks education, do not steal, do not harm or kill a fellow citizen.

To build a society of freedom for the individual, a non-prescriptive legislation asserts no citizen has the right to impede another citizen going about their lawful daily routine, hence all behaviors acceptable, provided they do not infringe on the rights of fellow citizens or are destructive of property.

The non-prescriptive legislation aims to prohibit destructive behavior and so to protect people and property. Any and all behavior is implicitly acceptable provided it falls within the rules of society.

Diversity is intrinsic to non-prescriptive legislation and is not intrinsic to prescriptive legislation. The rules-interpretation in the minds of citizens are:

1. For a prescriptive legislation, *do not do anything different without having approval*. Referred to as imposed discipline.
2. For non-prescriptive legislation, *do whatever you like provided it does not run harm other citizens or property*. Referred to as citizen self-discipline.

These two types of legislation must be regarded as *book ends*. There are ample examples of prescriptive legislated societies, citizen conduct imposed by force, for example all Islamic societies, with demands on religion; free speech; female dress, conduct and education; restrictions on private consensual adult sex; etc. Any citizen behavior beyond that prescribed in these societies is subject to significant government formal punishment, and informal social disapproval and even violence.

There is no example of a non-prescriptive legislated society. Democracy is not supportive of freedom of the individual. Democracy does not depend on self-discipline; it imposes majority rule whereby citizens must comply whether they agree or not. Further all democracies impose behavioural demands on issues such as abortion, drug use, gun laws, assisted dying.

The legislation on these types of issues has little to do with protection of life, limb and property, and reflect an overbearing morality of often religious people imposing their selective morality of those who disagree and who hold legitimate views on these issues based on reasoned commonsense but are forced to acquiesce under the current moral climate. All religions are destructive of freedom in they all impose upon people a morality based on god's word, inevitably inconsistent with reasoned commonsense.

Systemic bias

All prescriptive legislation is biased toward the views of the central controlling authority.

A full non-prescriptive legislation applies equally to all, protects all citizens and property from harm. If any law selectively restricts any person or group, then it is to be changed. Academics claiming systemic bias toward say western traditions in non-prescriptive legislation have been guilty of very poor advice resulting in increased social angst and agitation.

Few if any legislature frameworks across the free world are fully non-prescriptive, all contain laws imposing views on citizens even when many those citizens strongly disagree, abortion for example.

Another example would be the right to have homosexuality as a legal activity between consenting adults. Laws demanding a morality, which have little or nothing to do with reasoned commonsense stability and security of society. This is prevalent in western traditions, having been founded on Christianity.

This book raises the question ... *is not it time humanity stood on its own feet, decided its own fate especially since all reasoned commonsense argument proves god no more than a human created idea soothing uncertainty, providing understanding where there is none, and providing an excuse to kill those who defer to a different idea of god.*

Claims of systemic bias arise due collision of several reasons. Poverty of academic understanding with no explanation of who we are or how we work; weak to wrong understanding of the construction of society and the jurisprudence best suited to governing it; failure to grasp ideas count, source of ideas does not, thus failure to grasp how people not subject to western traditions are disadvantaged when those traditions offer better ideas than the culture/traditions in which people may have developed their views.

Cancel culture is the total failure of global academe to understand and provide appropriate guidance on who we are and why we are and how we work as a species.

We must get over ourselves and select the best ideas to adopt and apply.

Free speech

If any person, any time is hearing speech they do not like, and if that speech is not inciting violence nor asserting treason, then the person is fully responsible for their own sensitivities, and they best walk away and get a coffee with friends. Such speech being legal is free speech and is not subject in law to the personal sensitivities of another.

If such speech steps over a social line, and reasonably judged abusive, a legal standard is slander. Beyond slander, which remains verbal, the abuse crosses a line and by bodily advance and intimidation, it becomes physical abuse and intent to do bodily harm. It becomes a matter of Police.

Managing inequality

We are not born equal either in talent or in that bequeathed us.

We have found cooperative effort enables social wealth that enables society to assist and raise/enable the life-experience of those with less talent and capacities. For example, at one time babies judged deformed were placed on a mountain to die. We do not do that anymore.

Ideas adopted and applied determine all life experience and hence shape all conduct. The guiding mind-set of ideas to be applied to circumstance is referred to as the game plan of the person.

All people have two distinct sets of game plans (note *game plans* the term grouping ideas adopted and applied in managing specific circumstances. Thus, personal game plans describe the sets of ideas used in managing personal circumstances).

Personal game plans, the ideas we apply in relating to self, friends, family, etc.

Professional game plans, the ideas we apply in managing our obligations to society, etc.

Much life satisfaction arises from the first set of game plans. Almost all life wealth arises from the second set of game plans.

This is poorly understood by citizens, due entirely it is poorly understood by academics, who preach on about work-life balance, without understanding the relationship between work and life. With work, as it called, the contribution of every person to excess wealth due social cooperation. Wealth vastly beyond anything any person could ever achieve on their own.

It was the shallow ideas of Marx so heavily promoted by academics which destroyed this understanding, and as a result we persist with systems of distribution of wealth unrelated to the crucial inputs to its creation.

Wealth = good ideas well implemented. Without good ideas, the entrepreneur, society stagnates. And as population increases wealth per person diminishes. Without cooperative citizens, good ideas are neutered.

Distributive fairness, a crucial issue of all free societies must reflect the essential inputs of wealth creation. ***Wealth = good ideas well implemented.***

This issue is arguably the most significant issue facing the free world. My first attempts with resolving it:

1. *Why Work* (July 19, 2016). Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2811954>.
2. From Individual Psychology to Macroeconomics (July 26, 2016). Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2814815>.
3. Our Path to Their Future (August 21, 2017). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3023247>.

Currently across the free world, the entrepreneur retains full control of the organization via a legal fiction called shares, as a consequence retains the surplus wealth arising from social cooperation. Applying surplus wealth to assist those less able to assist themselves is the moral obligation of everyone.

It was the shallow foolishness of Marx who destroyed the notion that modern work is the fundamental of developing excess wealth via social cooperation supporting physical social development like household running (water, electricity) and people unable to support themselves vastly beyond anything ever experienced in history. Marx was promoted hard by academics who thought they knew what they were doing, when they did not. The fundamental question, then foundation of all reasoned commonsense in understanding ourselves was ignored and abused by academics, who had never got remotely close to answering this foundation question ... *what are the causal drivers of why people do what they do?* Nor close to understanding society and its scientific drivers ... *society consists of people, therefore, to understand society we first need understand people.*

In our modern world, there are significant structural issues, such as organization ownership and accountability, I foresee significant political resistance to changes to many of these issues despite the fact they are often inconsistent with reasoned commonsense of understanding ourselves in a free society. But these are discussions we need to have resulting in issues we must resolve. It is in these discussions where we discover whether we see a free society or merely seek to pay lip service to it.

Secondly fair pay is decided by governments. It is not decided on organizational effectiveness, despite reasoned commonsense saying the effectiveness of cooperative citizens is essential in deciding organization success and hence development of social wealth. This is a major challenge. Are employees willing to accept losses and a downgrade in income in adverse economic circumstances, or in cases of new disruptive technology, etc. Employees are very likely to want their cake and eat it, that is they want secure regular incomes despite what happens to the organization.

These issues need full and open discussion, best led by academics, but they need to adopt the deal of 1097, in order to do so with appropriate effectiveness. Global academics need to adopt reasoned commonsense as the foundation of all they do, learning to discipline themselves to the circumstances dictated by keeping thinking tight, sequential, and logical.

Let us deal with the real and logical issues vastly beyond opinion. emergent from the correct scientific understanding of people.

DEI (diversity, equity and inclusiveness) policies are a bad idea

Diversity-1: Any CEO who has about them only people who always defers to them gets all they deserve.

Diversity-2: Any board of directors who allows diversity-1 to happen, deserves to lose all their accumulated wealth.

Equity: All success determined by the start point plus effort. Equity demeans effort and encourages sloth. Equity is dismissed as shallow, irresponsible, and deficit thinking.

Inclusiveness: Organization success depends on getting the right thing done in the right place at the right time to the right standard. Any organization who employs people unable to contribute to that, or people with lowered skills in order to meet woke social expectations, should be subject to condemnation of authorities and citizens for accepting people with lowered skills who reduce the quality of operation of the organization.

DEI Policies are no more than academic ‘woke’ thinking devoid of all reasoned commonsense, most notably getting the right person for the right job. If there is to be a social contribution then it needs be identified, made clear and specific, and should not be buried and hidden by having less than fully effective people in role for reasons of being a social do-gooder at the expense of unknown organizational deficit in performance.

The task of the organization is to use social cooperation to deliver wealth to society. It is the role of politicians to decide how that wealth is to be distributed. To appoint less than fully competent people to roles in the organization is to attempt to usurp and second guess government effectiveness. Not to mention the organization failing in its primary role of wealth creation to the best it can.

Satisfaction in work

Work is the act of social cooperation delivering level of wealth beyond anything we could achieve on our own. A fundamental demand on all citizens is if they use social wealth then they are expected to contribute to its development.

We have significant issues in how we distribute wealth, how we manage ourselves personally, socially and politically, based on inadequate ideas on the science of ourselves, even more deeply inadequate ideas on mental health and who is responsible for our mental state.

What do you judge our choices, give up and acquiesce and sink into latitude and despair? Or do we demand people like modern academics stand up and do what they were formed to do in 1097, guide us in applying our minds to identify the issues consider the solutions, make our choices and get on with it.

I am committed to freedom of the individual as the path forward. Reasoned commonsense as the foundation of my thinking. Throwing out religions, and all popular woke thinking.

The people of Teutoberg, 9 AD, were not plagued with inept and incorrect intellectualized ideas. The intervening years have destroyed our values and understanding of them. I suspect, but have not read, that there is belief we are superior to those people who fought and died in Teutoberg forest. We are not, we have lost our way. Do we want it back?

Further we have been guided poorly since 1640 by those charged and rewarded as the priority designated thinkers. The quality of the ideas we adopt and apply have failed, evident today in multigender, men pretending they can become woman despite ample DNA evidence it is impossible, continued assertion of religious argument when by all reasoned commonsense god is not the prime mover of the universe, failure to guide reasoned commonsense that because religious based people claim an embryo is life, people with reasonable argument are suppressed in claiming life only exists when the foetus can survive outside the mother, that the universe is indeterministic, time exists when it does not, incorrect irrational claims and discussion about science and its development and application, when we have no idea on our psychology, how knowledge comes to be and hence have no idea of what science is.

Responsibility for the current intellectual and social fractious confusion we call modern free world society laid at the door of academe, setting destructive role models of over-statement, gross exaggeration, adoption of ideas of low intellectual standard, ignoring reasoning and evidence, adopting self-serving opinions regardless of the marginal validity of the understanding, like climate claims, where we do not really know the causal drivers of the climate, but it is claimed we do.

Academics exhibiting a lack of integrity, urging citizens to listen, listen, ignoring the realistic that people as children, do as done ahead of do as they told.

Those same academics then wide-eyed wonderment as to why there is such exhibited disregard for personal integrity.

We have lost understanding of why they died due we have listened to ideas from self-serving people and unless we demand changes a society built on freedom of the individual will fail as a way of life.

Society does not exist as a tree exists but is determined by the ideas we adopt and apply in its construction.

We must reflect and make our choice and if we chose freedom, we have little option but bite the bullet and make it so.

The social changes needed

A free society will function if and only if each group in society does its job according to the professional game plans considered in previous discussions.

Society does not consist of groups, and cannot be understood scientifically by consideration of groups, hence Marx and Adam Smith are dismissed as poor unscientific thinking. Discussion of a group is merely a convenient manner of considering the thinking focus of a quite large number of people who share a common goal in some operational aspect society.

The crucial issue is not the group, but the extent each person in the group understands the operational function of the group in society. Ideas count, and people in a group adopt the ideas consistent with the goals of the group in delivering its role in managing a free society if it is to become the preferred social structure for all humanity.

All citizens have two sets of game plans, including those in senior roles, such people frequently referred to as the *elite*: Personal, as citizens, professional as contributors to functioning of society, in this instance of a free society, enabling freedom of the individual as priority.

Crucial note: A free society offers the social structure enabling:

- Greatest choice of manner of living.
- Greatest Opportunity to fulfill oneself to the limit of one's potential.
- Greatest spiritual fulfillment.

But, if and only if all people act in self-disciplined commitment to the role they hold in society, fulfilling the professional goals and obligations of the role as their contribution to cooperative social effort in building social wealth beyond what can be achieved on one's own.

First and lowest level of consideration is a citizen having two sets of game plans, personal and professional. Personal refers to the manner the person relates and interacts with family, friends, interests, etc. The second set of game plans describes the citizen's responsibility to contribute to cooperative effort since it is only by such cooperation, they enjoy a life experience far beyond that which they could achieve on their own (to be alone means no running water, no electricity, no roads, no motorised transport, no health care, no security, no cell phones, etc, etc).

While the responsibility to make a cooperative contribution to society is low, it exists and is crucially important. If 10% citizen goof off and ignore it, society will survive, if 60% goof off and ignore it, society is crippled and non-functional. Think!

Why do you judge Islamic based societies, inevitably compliant societies, directed to obey and defer or else, are so adamant on adoption and adherence to the Muslim religion and Sharia Law.

I leave you to consider immature comment on differences between generations, with modern generations adopting different values. They may do in mind, but the social reality has not changed, and much of the rhetoric is nothing more than poor judgement wrought by Marxian type very poor thinking promoted or over 150 years by academics.

Given ideas shape life experience, we face the simple question of painting a house with a brush or wet blanket. It is inconceivable for any person to deny the choice will influence the outcome.

The work of Marx was 1860 or so. It took a few years to gain significant traction by academics, it promised much, especially self-fulfilment, but the ideas as ideas were never science, and were never assessed by reasoned commonsense, and in academic poorly reasoned enthusiasm it was ignored that the ideas of Marx and all derivatives failed all tests of intellectual quality, other than corrupt peer review.

And ignored the most fundamental test ... does society consist of people? That being so how can there be any rational discussion of society without first determining a scientific general theory of people, then aggregated into a scientific general theory of society. These questions so basic and so simple academics ought to cringe in shameful foolishness for ever considering Marx anything but a self-serving charlatan.

There are those that would claim global intellectual social understanding, referred to as academic social science, has moved beyond Marx, but this itself dreadfully misses the point.

Any care to argue Marx and his poor ideas is not alive and well today embedded in ideas surrounding socialism, with its equally corrupt '-isms' of conservatism and capitalism? None based on the slightest understanding of people.

The point being dreadfully missed by these inept arguments is understanding the exact point where science meets life. Social science is not an abstract discussion fit only for esoteric journals read by global academics. It is the exact point where good thinking meets living existence of people. It is the point where 900 years of poor academic thinking failed duty of care toward the citizens meant to be served in the deal of 1097. If a majority of citizens goof off and fail to understand they have social/community cooperative obligations, and if ignored, then they can expect the right to goof off to be removed as centralised authorities take over and require deference.

This deficit social intellectual discussion supported and abetted by the academic adoption of Freud, which translated into a personal emphasis on sensitivities, led to psychiatry, and codification in law of a backward and deeply deficit science of people.

The time gap is crucial to understand. It is the gap between (1) the ideas of the elite filtering into society and being functional in shaping the nature of society; (2) it underlines the irresponsible attitude of academia, such even when academia dismissed most of the ideas of Freud and Marx, they were not out there in LinkedIn and Face Book wrestling with citizen ideas derived from the earliest ideas of Marx and Freud, initially supported by academia. They left the field to activists, who twisted the ideas in order to advance their own wealth and social influence. (3) the deal of 1097 required academics to serve society. They have not.

Then (4) a branch of academia, namely psychiatry, having their version of inadequate thinking on the science of people codified in law, giving legal rights to some in society enabling that group to do as they will with people judged mentally deficit by applying a deficit science of people. Not to mention the lack of science in our ability to define ourselves, leading to simple questions, like, within an apt and accurate theory of people what exactly is mental health, and how can we define mental illness without a clear definition of mental health, and how can we have a well defined definition of mental health unless we have a well-defined scientific general theory of people.

Please note: There is only one actor. People. The brutal simplicity off this assertion has been ignored and ignored. Academic after academic argued their favoured 'school' of thought about people studiously ignoring the brutal simplicity, they were all totally wrong by definition. Since none accounted for all people did, had done or could do. There are **NOT** different types off humans only accountable by different totally unscientific descriptions.

This is the intellectual standard of *reach*. Any theory of psychology must reach to what all people (defined as modern humans, homo sapiens sapiens) have done, do or could do.

Academics since at least 1640 ... rejection of Descartes, and arguably from 500 BCE before academics existed, and the Siddarth Gautama ... have failed to bring the intellectual test of reach to account. They still do it, suggest read the stuff pouring out of such groups as American Psychological association, NZ Psychology, or read the journals in which people like the heads of psychology or psychiatry at Oxford, Cambridge, Yale, or Stanford publish.

Academics today mostly talk to themselves and/or people with the clout to implement their thinking. They are very seldom on Face Book or LinkedIn, etc, guiding/correcting the thinking of people. They leave it to activists. They fail to understand the large time lag between what they may think and read, and the residual ideas in minds of people. Marx wrote 1860 or so, His ideas much alive and well in academe say 1900 to 1960. Given wide distribution by activists and by '*populist*' revolutions and writing 1950 to say 2000. To today, Marx very much alive and well in minds/ideas of the free world citizen and evident in discussions on Face Book and LinkedIn etc, such platforms notable or the lack of academics, who decline all responsibility for the rubbish thinking they have nurtured for some 100 years. Ideas count. Good ideas count especially. Marxian ideas of the lowest level of intellectual standards one can imagine. Academe was founded in 1097 to be our nominated thinkers, to guide people especially free world people, on the good ideas to adopt and those to stay away from.

Marxian idea of a great society: It is estimated in 20th century some 50,000,000 people were murdered by their socialist governments due nothing more than they disagreed with government policy and direction.

I was personally subject to this lingering issue of the status of Marx, when lobbying politicians, about 5 years ago. In one email I referred to deficit Marxian thinking and promptly was replied and told the extent I was an egotistical backward person for even using the name of Marx. And how dare I besmirch his name.

This underlines the success of academia in promoting very poor ideas with such conviction as to induce closed minded attitude in very senior people, well educated, fluent, yet incapable of thought beyond the sphere of mind within which they embedded. A closed-minded sphere created almost entirely by academia.

Although academics may argue they have moved beyond such simple ideas, in fact much of society and senior politicians have not, and even among academics Marx accepted as an historically important scientist, when he was not and as yet there has been no move by our supposed nominated thinkers, academia, to remove his name from all lists of respected scientists.

To have the name Marx, on a list beside Einstein, Bohr, and Rutherford is a disgrace which can only reflect on the inadequacies of academe I am trying to bring to the fore.

Poor thinking promoted for several hundred years by academics pontificating over a scientific general theory of psychology while never getting close to any usable/scientific explanation.

Failing with the most basic understanding: It is circular, not linear. One must estimate the answer, before building tools to cope with the circularity so one can build the theory from which one can deduce the tools.

Academic failure is ***NOT*** they could not do it.

The failure is they could not admit they could not do it, egos got so in the way they lied and manipulated pretended they had answers when they did not.

I claim reasonable intelligence, plus a strong, passionately held belief it had to be possible to explain ourselves to ourselves. And the more I was dismissed and rejected by people I judged ought to be interested but were not, the more I 'dug in'. Given all, it has taken me at least 49 years to get to writing this sentence.

Currently, the people that fought for freedom in the Teutoberg Forest died in vain, as backward and immature ideas continue to be floated across societies with predictably, from within my science (SMH), only a semblance of freedom yet remaining.

I hope with a passion arguments herein accepted by free world citizens demanding academics take note, driving politicians to take note, all combined to have the science applied to better manage ourselves.

A solution

Accept the correct science (SMH): Acceptance ideas adopted and applied drive society.

Patience: We need allow at least a generation between better ideas and their common application in society. We do it for our grandkids and beyond.

We must not rush: Integrity is the psychological priority, not emotions, and sensitivities. Second, we need adopt problem solving process ensuring all agree the steps to moderate the issue.

Social cooperation is the priority of all generations: All citizens have a responsibility to contribute to social wealth, in first instance doing their job. If the conflict between professional responsibilities and personal views is more than the person wishes to bear, they must resign.

Academia only to promote ideas meeting test of quality. All intellectual institutions governed by policy on the correctness and intellectual quality of ideas they promote. All ideas must rest securely on a platform of reasoned commonsense, and as appropriate meet additional intellectual standards of strategic thinking, reach and reflexive criteria. The meaning/quality of all academically approved ideas agreed by all institutions and posted on institution web sites. No manipulation of dictionary meanings to be allowed. Citizens may adopt any idea they choose, but the socially approved meanings set by agreed policy of intellectual institutions.

Today we exhibit personal preference, driven by poor thinking, created and promoted by academia.

We need promotion of better intellectual standards. Dumping peer review. To make a free society the path of humanity, we need self-disciplined restraint, and professionalism.

Social usefulness and wealth

Typically, the level of income and social prestige is in relation to the professional role of the person.

Where New Zealand society has failed, is in allowing people occupying well paid and prestigious positions to act according to personal preferences, and not to act to serve all NZ society in the name of a free society.

And NZ academics are allowing it to happen, and actively supporting it. In the meantime, the greater bulk of NZ society is confused and deceived by very weak ideas on the psychological forces at play, for example, the idea that emotional consequences of actions 200 years ago outweigh the understanding of right and wrong today. It is called historic guilt, and claims of past wrongs, despite 45 years of compensation via the Waitangi process, are still promoted, and promoted, supported by academics, and by many bureaucrats and senior politicians afraid to be frank at risk of losing votes.

NZ plummets deeper and deeper into a mire of very poor thinking led by supposed intelligent people unwilling to face the reality of our existence, we are not dominated by emotions derived from historic events, we are dominated by the ideas we adopt and apply NOW.

We succumb to emotions from historic events if and only if we choose to carry such events forward and allow the ideas arising from such events to be active in mind now, so forge feelings now.

If it happened yesterday, then yes, it will be active in mind.

If it happened 150 years ago, and you personally could not have been involved, then carrying residuals of such events and ignoring reality today, and people today claim to be still subject to the emotions, then it is time they grew up.

Above all, respecting each other now, in a modern diverse society of freedom. At some point in order to move forward without rancour, we need accept what is and build a fair, just, wealthy, society of peaceful co-existence.

In NZ we need cease squabbling over insufficient current wealth, and applying workable compromise, and building wealth distribution generally regarded as fair. And we can *ONLY* increase wealth if we cooperate as a society, knowing what we are doing, and imposing on ourselves our choices today, understanding in freedom we can only impose on ourselves, and if we do not then we will lose the right to do so. Deference to authority beyond ourselves places us on the slippery slope of compliance. We can learn from history: They died for the right to choose.

We need recognise there are always those among us who would burn society to the ground to rule over the ashes (frequently attributed to Sun Zhu).

Freudian ideas of *give me the child and we determine the adult* are nonsense and denies and excludes the idea of self-discipline to do that which is needed, and that while self-discipline feels hard at first, we do get accustomed to it, and it becomes part of what we do.

We do have the capacity to learn! Growing up is learning we are only shaped by events weeks, months, possibly decades ago but if and only if we allow it to be so and allow the ideas arising from such events to shape how we feel now. There is no unconscious, in sense of Freud. There is only our brain an aspect of which is called mind.

Brain offers memories we can access and use mind to select ideas to apply to circumstances we face. Brain also throws up to mind our emotions, sensitivities to this or that. These sensitivities useful to mind as source of our judgement about ideas in memory but if and only if we understand brain as a source of emotions, no more, and they are not the priority, they are to be managed by self-restraint enabling us to select in mind, from the sources in brain, of ideas to adopt and apply to circumstance. If the brain throws up strong sensitivities, then we may need significant self-restraint to resist. In all circumstances and within all events, mitigation is the social allowance granting/allowing the legal loss of self-discipline. (Circumstances beyond which a 'normal' person can be expected to retain personal control.)

This is exactly where academics have let us down, It is exactly where science meets life. Science vastly beyond toys and technology, cell phones and atom bombs.

Intellectual methods and standards

My work is to a much higher intellectual standard than adopted by NZ academics, refer the books:

1. Modern Methodology (September 24, 2018). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3254017>.
2. The Problem with Peer Review Discussion of a Study on the Impact of Peer Review in Prestigious Academic and Publishing Institutions and the Extent it Limits and Prejudices Innovative Thinking. Offers Recommendations to Improve Intellectual Quality. (October 3, 2019). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3464045>.
3. And decisive paper Final and Decisive Dismissal of Peer Review (April 27, 2023). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4431180>.

Some definitions

Society does exist separate from people in as much there are social processes and positions of authority that are the operational structure of society. For example, the Mayor of Auckland has been an important position for a long time far beyond the life of any person.

Following are some brief definitions to assist understand the discussion.

Social operation

Consists of the administration processes managing aspects of the population. The people filling the senior roles of actioning the admin processes of society are typically referred to as the elite of society.

The positions are well paid and prestigious, both justified if and only if the goals are achieved. Frequently, however, in modern supposed free societies, there is very limited effort at monitoring performance and holding people to account or the wealth and privilege they gifted as a result of their position.

Social infrastructure

The goals expected to be achieved by various groups acting in coordination with the coordinated effort resulting in the whole, referred to as society, exhibiting surplus wealth beyond that achievable by individual effort.

Social ideation

The ideas held by citizens enabling acceptance of the elite in actioning social operations and providing the basis of understanding of what each group in society is committed to achieve, and how if each group does its job, then a free society as a whole will functions as desired.

A major scientific issue is understanding the human mind, and the major significance of managing minds via use of subjective knowledge (WII of Popper) in exchange with the disciplines of written knowledge (WIII of Popper).

This is especially significant in understanding socialised formal education, communication of science advances to citizens beyond formal education, communication of demands of legislation, and changes to legislation, communication of social development priorities and actions plans for dealing with the issues.

We need be wary of opinion unsupported by reasoned commonsense.

Education

Citizens will only adopt and apply ideas they understand, what they understand today is derived from failed work of people like Freud, Marx, Schrodinger, Einstein, Bohr, Skinner and Neisser. In the free western world, extended by understanding of Buddhism, Islam, humanism, etc.

None of current popular opinion including all academic thinking, is derived by applying reasoned commonsense in form of first things first, nor does most ideas meet modern intellectual standards of strategic science, reach and reflexivity.

We must begin again with the correct science of people **the spiritual model of humanity**, which must inform all education and communications.

The only solution available

The spiritual model of humanity is the only science of people ever created, discussed fully in books and papers at www.ssrn.com/author2572745, a specific overview book Glossary and study guide to the spiritual model of humanity as the correct science of people (November 9, 2021). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3913364>.

Defining personal identity

We are defined by the ideas we adopt and apply.

Culture does not define us, it offers a shallow cloak of uniqueness, but nothing beyond. We define ourselves by that which we believe in and shapes our behavior. We are the sum of our choices. Ideas count the source of ideas does not.

Imagine a society with a strongly held psychological norm of integrity first and above all else. A society founded on widely held correct science of people.

Free speech revisited

Recently, the Vice Chancellor of Auckland University publicly declared Maori cultural knowledge was equal to western science. Auckland university exhibits a lack of integrity with its foundation derived from formation of Oxford University in 1097. It has participated in the denial of western traditions over the last few years, actively destroying freedom and destabilizing NZ society with emphasis on the demand that Maori culture be given priority in active rejection of the traditions that gave rise to its existence, its funding, and social influence.

Academics at Auckland U are actively seeking a Freudian based view of speech being hateful if a person takes offence.

Circumstance raises the question: Which is the most destructive?

1. A person fully responsible for their own state of mind being offended by that which another person says.
2. Comments by an elite person demeaning of a way of life built over several thousand years,
 - a. Dismissive of a tradition of thinking that gave rise to the institution within which the person is an elite leader,
 - b. dismissive of apt reasoned commonsense promoting a backward cultural tradition lacking fundamental processes enabling development (WII-WIII interaction),
 - c. denial of western science itself as significant in the future of NZ society,
 - d. promotion to NZ citizens of an intellectual confusion that can only result in decreased scientific effort and emphasis on a limited culture the combination of which can only reduce NZ citizens global intellectual standing and reduce wealth per capita,

Does being in an elite role come with professional responsibilities?

Which ought to be defined as hate speech, 1, or 2?

Jurisprudence

Jurisprudence as used here is the philosophy of law relationship with emphasis on the impact off law of the conduct of citizens subject to the law. Academics have failed in this definition due they have never had a scientific general theory of psychology thus could never define philosophy of law coherently in relation to fundamental styles of living such as ideas of freedom, or even compliance.

Derived from the fundamental scientific understanding of people, there are only two fundamental types of society, a free society and a compliant society. Each type of society being bookends with multiple societies between in progressive shift from one to the other.

Each type of society defined by type of legislation, with opposite jurisprudence.

A free society defined by a non-prescriptive legislation, with the philosophy of allowing all possible behavior, only restrictive on citizen behavior to protect life, limb and property (with the addition of guiding contract law and all settlements based on workable compromise).

A compliant society defined by a prescriptive legislation stating approved citizen behavior. What is and is not approved decided by the controlling central authority with approved conduct enforced by Police and cultural police.

With acceptance of the rules, a compliant society is easier to live in, making fewer demands of personal responsibility on citizens.

Beginning at either end ... a step from a prescriptive legislation toward a non-prescriptive legislation is a step toward freedom and a step from a non-prescriptive legislation toward prescriptive is a step away from freedom.

Selecting the politicians

New Zealand has 58 regional councils each with several local boards, plus 120 political regions. This could easily be redistributed to give say, 100 politicians all representing their constituents, none representing political parties.

Voting by citizens is for competent people to represent their interests in their local board. Chair of the regional board then selected from chairs of local boards. Competence being the crucial quality to be elected in the first instance. There are no political parties. The only social preference is a free society.

Should any person exhibit lack of integrity, if challenged, and the complaint held up, then they are immediately replaced on the local board.

It does not matter if they have been elected Prime Minister, who was made a national politician decided as chair of a regional board, who was on the regional board due they decided as chair of a local board. There are no national elections, with all elections at a local board level, and to stay Prime Minister the person must retain their place on the local board. This merely intended as an example it would not be difficult to design much better system or deciding our politicians, and to make them much more accountable to their community.

Use of violence

Violence accepted in protection of a free society, dependent on self-disciplined conduct of citizens. No person may pursue their selective morality and seek to impose their ideas on others.

Immigration: Who do we let in?

Only those willing to swear to accept the views of other citizens and swear to never impose their selective morality of others. Any person accepted into the free society who is found guilty of violating this fundamental rule of freedom can be immediately deported to whatever country they originated.

These rules apply to all immigration including asylum.

Humanitarian aid

Is an act of government, shown clearly in government accounts. .

Dismissal of activists

Are viewed as crossing assertive lines of conduct and aiming to impose their point of view on citizens. Imposing selective morality is banned, and subject to arrest and incarceration.

Beyond democracy

The legislation specifying and defining a free society are to be protected by 100% support in order to be changed. And any proposed change subject to discussion and debate by citizens.

Majority rule declared imposition of selective morality on those who do not accept the solution. For example, abortion. All solutions to be ideas resting on a platform of reasoned commonsense and meeting all appropriate intellectual standards.

These and other issues raised in this book can be seen as the development for the first time of a rational society, with fundamental process emphasising we are a part of the natural world, and we need begin depending on ourselves. And beyond finding our faith in ourselves building our spiritual core.

Making the most of cooperation

Almost all aspects of modern thinking from Marx, through the stupidity of multi-gender and men becoming woman, to democracy itself pushing group against group, lack of understanding of culture, of foregoing work due building a better work-life balance, when all modern living is built on the wealth surplus serving citizens ... when the very foundation processes and thinking of society is divisive, and conflictual, imagine *what if* we get our thinking even half better. Get the thinking right.

- Demand groups adopt their brief and do it, in cooperation with the rest of us.
- Then Popper.
 - Agree the issues, and their priority,
 - Identify the fixable problem, agree solutions to make things better (we seldom fix problems just reduce their influence)
 - Enjoy better communities.
 - Set new priorities.

The threats to freedom

Freedom is not yet secure, with three major enemies:

1. Internal to western traditions:
 - a. Ignorance: Our own ignorance of who we are, how we work, and what that means in relation to our options and choices. We need learn freedom and diversity must be protected, and must exclude all sense of god, other than a personal choice as a source of energy for self, but with no social implications. We must decide we trust and move forward on our own judgement.
 - b. Imperialism: The clash between Individual freedom and imperial centralised control. Implicit to western traditions
2. External to western traditions.
 - a. Muslim ideology IS NOT merely religion, they have not experienced the separation of church and state as has the west, they have not had their inquisition (1250-1500). Muslim religion yet carries Islamic ideology with its deeply confused but dominant *god is great* battle cry.

We must draw down the curtain on all Islam and Muslim religion as fundamentally inconsistent our western core values of individual rights and freedom to be as one chooses. We see a wealthy, just, fair, diverse society of peaceful co-existence which is only possible in society grounded on individual freedom.

We must teach all citizens seeking personal choice in their lives it is only possible in a free society and all to do with Islam is inconsistent with that. We need offer respectful workable compromise, but all to do with Islam must be gently expelled if we are to find our soul resting on the values that forged the west.

Does anyone really think those who died in Teutoberg were in any doubt. When we look back, it is us who need shudder and ask ourselves, have we lost our soul to that extent.

Role of a key groups in society

Please note, game plans define an individual's system of ideas for managing themselves and interacting with circumstance. When game plans are written and thus refined and improved, they are called role specifications.

Personal growth and development are to refine role specifications and replace current game plans with the refined role specifications and practice them until the new, refined and improved game plans become habit.

The notes below are merely brief descriptions of what each significant group in a free society is expected to deliver to make a free society the desirable path for humanity. All people are citizens thus with a set of ideas referred to as personal game plans.

All citizens who make use of social advances, have the simplest professional game plans, to actively make a cooperative contribution to society. Other mentioned groups have a personal set of game plans, plus game plans aimed at achieving the specified goal of the group. In all cases, people expected to conduct themselves in relation to their personal life, which everyone has, and their professional life, with the nominated goal that of the specified group.

Each group is expected to fulfil its role and not seek to operate in other lanes of society.

For example, such as in NZ, NZME (2024) the media company owning a major part of NZ news and advertising setting itself to determine the fundamental nature of NZ society by declining to print newspaper advertising which had passed scrutiny by its legal team, but promoting a style of government fully consistent with freedom involving equal rights for all but promoting politics the directors and Editor off NZ Herald did not like.

These people grossly out of their intellectual depth, reacting to activist comment by pro-Maori elements in society who seek political privilege and wealth more than other citizens due their race, and claim they were here first and hence deserve it.

Then again (2024) children marching on the streets and protesting the government is not doing enough on climate, and other issues, all orchestrated by teachers who think they are helping society when in fact they are teaching children the exact opposite of freedom namely teaching them that if they yell loud enough and march, they can force others to comply with their point of view.

Demanding other do as I dictate, is nothing more than opinionated rhetoric and declining to even consider the data they yell and preach about is not shared by people equally as intelligent as they, and whom they socially brutalise and disrespect in name of progress as they define it.

In say 40 years, those same teachers, now past 60, will look at those same children, now mid-forties, protesting, with group challenging group teetering on violence, and wonder at the fractious nature of it all, and ignore that is exactly what they taught the children to do 40 years earlier.

Failure to think. Failure to get both sides of the data. Failure at workable compromise. Disrespectful of anyone who holds views opposed to their own, Teaching children to be immoral divisive and semi violent adult citizens ... teachers totally failing in every aspect of child development that counts.

Freedom is built and can only be built on recognition and acceptance of the right of people to hold views opposite one's own. Morality in freedom is restraint in not pursuing selective morality, not pursuing one's personal point of view, no matter how passionately held. No data from any source carries a guarantee there is no other data and no other interpretation.

It is the politician's job to forge balanced policy, and they are correct to avoid knee jerk reactions by simplistic activists, including teachers.

Citizens

Personal game plans. This is part of the psychic structure of all people.

Professional: Contribute to the surplus of wealth due group cooperation.

Media

Ensure all issues presented with balance and no preference in volume of word or tone.

Academics

Ensure every idea used by citizens sits on a platform of reasoned commonsense and meets all appropriate intellectual standards.

Commercial

Design systems and recruit and train people to deliver the right result in the right place at the right time to the right standard, sharing accumulated wealth between entrepreneur and staff.

Social service

Design systems and recruit and train people to deliver the right result in the right place at the right time to the right standard, ensuring citizen satisfaction and reduced social angst.

Politicians

Build workable compromise between groups in conflict.

Refer appendix 2, for an example of priority issues or NZ. This philosophy built on Popper's problem-solving approach to social development [Paper 1\) Social models: blueprints or processes?](#)

Immigration

To ensure those entering the free society are committed to a personal morality of seeing and accepting all sides of any issue and committing to never pursue their selective morality. Including buildings, dress, public announcements, protests, etc.

Police

Protect law abiding citizens from internal threats. Using violence against those who decline to learn and decline to exercise restraint.

Armed forces

Protect the choice of a free society from external threats.

Defending our way of life

Freedom, define as being able to choose or oneself within a broad framework of law, is opposed by many who hold the view *they know best*, And they are willing to use manipulation, deceit and force to impose their control.

Freedom is not intrinsic, felt most when it is gone, seemingly paradoxical when defended. Especially when defended with force. External threats are typically easy to understand. But the greatest danger to freedom is our habituated acceptance of it.

This is why the definition of freedom at an interactive, and emotional level is so important. Freedom has gone completely when a person is unable to apply their legitimate selective morality in resolution of an issue important to them. It is very unlikely the right to heard and argue the issue *in my way and in my time* will go in one action. Typically, bit, by bit, by bit ... until there is nothing left; when, then and likely not before then, will the loss off freedom be noticed.

To build a free society and maintain the freedom in face on constant pressure it be reduced, people not allowed to do this or that... to be free, life in a non-prescriptive legislative environment, demands citizen self-discipline and each group operating the social infrastructure does its bit to make the whole a worthwhile place to live.

Why freedom?

For many years I have written extensively on freedom with an emphasis on the simple question, why?

The men and women who fought in the Teutoberg Forest, AD 9, and even before, say 55 BC when Julius Caesar beat Vercingetorix, they fought for their freedom ... but for what exactly did they fight? And is it as relevant today as then?

AD 9 the tribes beat Rome, BC 55 they lost. But in both instances social miracles were wrought by passionate people willing to lead and who successfully united disparate tribes often displaying dislike and violence to each other to unite against what they accepted was a common foe. But exactly what sort of foe? Rome was not a desolate place of random torture and disregard for law and order. Quite the reverse.

In these battles the west was truly born in their commitment to be free. Disparate people often quarrelling with each other, united against a common foe. But why?

In 2016 I wrote *The Psychology of Freedom* (September 1, 2016). Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2833671>.

I opened:

“The truly free man is a slave to hardest taskmaster of all: Himself and his principles. To preserve today’s freedoms, we need rediscover self-discipline.”

I apologize for the sexism...1981, a manner of writing correctly unacceptable today, but I did not want to amend the quote. My first consideration on freedom and its relationship to social models. The thinking continued the theme... ‘A person sans self-discipline is a person sans everything’.

I argued that: ... If I am to comply, then with my background ideology, arising from over 2000 years of cultural development, it is much, much more satisfying to apply restraint to myself than have it applied on me by others. I reserve the right to choose, other than when life and limb at risk generally, like all driving on one side of the road and obeying the road rules.

And the definition of freedom: The right to discipline oneself in pursuit of personal fulfilment and in relation to the greater social good.

With the conclusion:

Given all social causality is via the mind, then freedom must have a positive psychological impact on the minds of those committed to it.

Over the years I have returned to the question ... why did they die? And explored the question in paper after paper.

1. There is No Paradox of Freedom (August 13, 2018). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3230238>
2. The Psychological Foundation of Freedom (June 4, 2020). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3619520>
3. The Future of Freedom (June 29, 2021). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3875980>
4. Future of Freedom Lies in Battle for Minds (April 5, 2023). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4410169>
5. Faith in Reason (July 28, 2024). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4908148>

Why? Today, I place freedom as the spiritual core of reasoned commonsense. It reaches far beyond anything ever offered by any religion, grounded first and foremost on a belief in oneself and one's compatriots.

It is this deep spiritual fulfilment far beyond anything else ever offered, even given such people held religious beliefs, yet they fought and died for the right to choose.

Their willingness to fight and die must be tempered by the reality of the struggle to unite them.

The reality of our modern disparate western world. Quarrelsome, fractious. With much driven by very poor ideas driven significantly by academics failing in their delivery of the deal of 1097.

We could talk of social cooperation, workable compromise, building wealth, living as one chooses, etc. Even the analysis of the role of god and the association of human spirituality with such mystical notions supported by academics at very least never convincingly challenged, never emphasising faith in humanity as the true basis of spirituality.

We need live according to reasoned commonsense, within which there can be no greater faith than faith in ourselves. There can be no greater social consequence than the right to live as one chooses, within the broadest possible legal guidelines. AD 9, Teutoberg, they understood. That is why they fought and died. But it carries a price in having faith in self and being willing to fight to protect it.

Given the failure of governments in modern democracy derived from the failure implicit in democracy itself, now we understand ourselves, lack of integrity, manipulation, failure of all groups to deliver according to the professional game plans in service to community.

We fail to grasp the paradox, the more we fail in our professional lives, the worse the circumstance of our private lives.

The free world began with the correct insight that those in Teutoberg Forest understood, the deepest faith is in ourselves. But today, an insight sadly diminished due very poor guidance by those who were contracted beginning in 1097 as our social thinkers. Then for at least 400 years we have adopted ideas unfit to serve as they claimed they would.

We were given bad advice, but we accepted it. We live in the circumstances of adopting and applying very poor ideas based on historic poor insight into ourselves.

Freedom remains the deepest spiritual fulfilment grounded on finding faith in ourselves. But it must begin with clear and apt insight into ourselves, why we really do what we do.

We need find self-restraint. But before we can do that, we must find ourselves as individuals within deepened understanding of ourselves as a species. And before we can have full confidence in that, we must accept ourselves as part of the natural world.

In *Why did they die?* for the first time in our history is offered scientific insight into ourselves, and how to apply the scientific understanding of ourselves to ourselves making clear the price we must pay to build superior human spirituality beginning with reasoned commonsense faith in ourselves.

Western values for 21st century and beyond

Compliant societies are controlled by the central determining authority, be it imperialism, dictatorships, or religious determined societies. Such societies can be easier living if a person accepts the rules and impositions decided by the controlling authority. All new behaviour is decided by the central authority, and citizens do not get a say in the choice.

The only diversity in a compliant society is that approved by the governing central authority. All ideas held in a compliant society must be consistent with the thinking approved by the central governing authority.

It is harder to live in a free society which places much higher demands on citizens. A free society is the only form of society to intrinsically demand the best from people by having them look into the mirror of their soul and meet the standards they set for themselves in choosing individual freedom and self-responsibility.

The greatest human potential lies in diversity enabling the path to tomorrow best suited for each person. Diversity is only found in a free society. A free society is only found in self-discipline.

Values, lived not merely expressed

The right to be me. I am unique, defined by the ideas I adopt and apply in my life. I am solely responsible for me. In embracing my right to be unique I respect the right of others to be different and offer workable compromise to them wrestling as I to fully assume self-responsibility.

Conduct my life without interference. A non-prescriptive legislation is designed to protect self and others from physical harm and property damage. Within such a legislation, all interactions are respectful, built on workable compromise, and only Police have the right to interfere in my daily life.

Adopt ideas meeting appropriate intellectual standards. Reasoned commonsense the foundation of thinking consistent with freedom. I have the right to be dismissive to those who would deny such reason and accept them as harmless while they stay within the law.

Law applies to all. Any law proved to be restrictive of any person or group is to be changed. Protests against such laws accepted. Protests aiming to impose ideas on others is not accepted and to be met with force as needed. Activism in the sense of one group imposing a point of view on another is unacceptable, and to be forcibly rejected as inconsistent with a free society.

Defence of my rights. I will resist all intrusions on my freedom to choose and expect the Police and Armed Services to apply deadly force as needed to those who would restrict my freedom or attack in any way my right to choose.

**They died for their right to
choose. Lest we forget why they
died.**

Appendix 1: Writing of Graham Little, grouped by category

This writing as accessed via the original personal web site, www.grlphilosophy.co.nz now located within the science web site, www.spiritualmodel.com, with the list of writing at SSRN at the author page www.ssrn.com/author=2572745.

Quality standards

Opinions do not matter. Judgement of ideas is via strategic science and the template of verisimilitude. This work has been ethically created and exhibits intellectual integrity.

Ethically created means it has been created while carefully identifying all underlying questions which if answered will influence the verisimilitude of the theory and any proposition drawn from the theory.

Intellectual integrity means there is no question underlying the theory that remains unanswered by the theory, and no propositions drawn from the theory with underlying questions unanswered by the theory.

Verisimilitude template is the guide to judgement on the veracity and truthfulness of an idea, refer the appendix. Verisimilitude is a process supporting judgement, verification of reasoning, foundation of the priority moral choice of modus operandi of reason. Ideas are the major causal driver of human psychology. Ideas with verisimilitude passing the test of adoption for purposes of living, are referred to as verisimilar ideas.

All ideas are either personal ideas, or scientific ideas. Psychologically there is no difference. Both types of ideas applied to manage circumstance, both supported by emotions associated with the idea. All ideas are subject to assessment as to verisimilitude. Personal or private ideas are not excluded from objective assessment of whether they are fit to be adopted for purposes of living.

The verisimilitude template applies to both personal ideas and scientific ideas. The template in the appendix is phrased toward science, when applied to a personal ide as must be reinterpreted slightly. It is crucial to understand that ideas selected and applied in life circumstances will dictate life experience in that circumstance. The fundamental and typically crucial issue frequently ignored is item 5, called strategic science, but in personal judgement of any proposition called strategic thinking or strategic reasoning, that for any proposition the underlying issues are crucial in judging the veracity of the proposition.

For example, the idea *gender is a function of choice*, fails to integrate DNA in determining body type, fails to integrate birth gender in identity, fails to integrate identity into choice as adult, fails to integrate mental development assessing the difference between child ideation and adult ideation, fails to integrate issues of mind and body establishing how adopting an idea influence or does not influence the body, fails to integrate how changes in hormones alters the body. The idea gender is a function of choice fails item 5 so badly it must be judged unfit for consideration.

Reflexivity

All knowledge is created by people. Any theory of people is knowledge, It follows that any theory of people in the very first instance must account fully for its own existence, SMH fully accounts for its own existence.

First thoughts: Personal web site 1997-2006

Earliest writings published at the personal web site, from circa 1998 to 2005. The first philosophy web page from 1999. <https://www.grlphilosophy.co.nz>

1. [**Paper 1\) Social models: blueprints or processes?**](#) Exploring the philosophy of social planning, comparing the *future blueprint view* of Marx, with the *future problem-solving view* of Popper.
2. [**Paper 2\) Creativity and conflict in psychological science.**](#) Presenting the divergent and failed positions in psychology. That all positions were based on an apt insight into people, but that any truly scientific view of ourselves had to integrate all of these insights into a single theory. I regard this paper published in 1984 as the plan of action of what I intended to do. That is to resolve all underlying intellectual questions and build the first truly scientific general theory of psychology. On publication, I was already 10 years into the plan.

Other papers published at the www.grlphilosophy.co.nz, all written 1998-2005, must be regarded as my preliminary work on exploring the issues implicated in my aim of building the first scientific general theory of psychology.

NB: These papers listed for completeness. These papers are the foundation notes leading to the writing of “Origin”, which was accepted on SSRN mid-2016. All subsequent interests and questions of ground to be resolved are first explored in these notes. Many of these papers I offered to both academics and those who I judged ought to be interested in social policy on the issues. They were all ignored and/or rejected.

- [**Paper 1: A Theory of Perception**](#)
- [**Paper 2: Perception and a General Theory of Knowledge**](#)

- [**Paper 3: A Model of Knowledge and Tools for Theory Creation**](#)
- Paper 4: The Drive to Explain - A discussion of the background issues of a general theory of psychology
- Paper 5: Why We Do What We Do - The outline of a general theory of psychology
- [**Paper 6: How ideas exist**](#)
- Paper 7: The tension between cause and freewill: The fundamental of all human experience
- [**Mapping existing therapy approaches into the process model**](#)
- [**Conceptualization and Ryles regress**](#)
- [**Final Dismissal of homunculus**](#)
- [**Paper 1: Poverty of sociology or why Marx is not a Scientist**](#)
- Definitions of insanity and mental illness and the impossibility of temporary insanity
- [**Nouskills: Skills of the Mind**](#)
- Psychological theory and its impact on mental health practice and policy
- [**A strategy for mental health policy and the process theory of psychology**](#)
- [**Mental health and social policy**](#)
- [**Note on time and the interpretation of quantum electro dynamics**](#)
- [**Note on the easy and hard problems of consciousness**](#)
- [**Note on the emergence and role of language**](#)
- Note clarifying why a photon for example, is understood as being at the limit of knowledge
- [**What moved the pawn? The philosophy of physical dualism**](#)
- [**The difference between physical and social science**](#)
- [**Summary of the general theory of cause**](#)
- [**There is no time**](#)
- [**Note on what is it to be human**](#)
- [**Note on the interpretation of modern physics**](#)
- [**Cause, time, particulars and other notes arising from the AAP conference**](#)
- [**Note on the importance of strategic thinking in philosophical method**](#)
- Prejudice, judgement and purpose in academic editorship: Alan Sokal revisited.
- [**Strategic thinking and its role in academic judgment and editorship**](#)
- [**Toward a better standard of judgement than peer review**](#)

SSRN: since 2016

During the second stage I wrote and self-published the foundation science in *The Origin of Consciousness*. ‘Origin’ as I call it, was accepted on SSRN mid-2016, and SSRN has accepted all subsequent work. www.ssrn.com/author=2572745. All the work on SSRN is exploring the application of the science, clarifying its explanatory power, the notion of consciousness for example, and carefully defining the method whereby the theory created. Latest additions, www.ssrn.com/author=2572745.

Ashby tools enable the following scientific statement: *Brain* → *choices* → *ideas* → *outcomes*.

This statement says the state of the brain has an influence on our choices which have an influence on the ideas we adopt and apply which has an influence on the outcomes we achieve. To deny dualism requires this statement be rejected, I am working toward full acceptance of dualism as the correct understanding of humanity.

Ashby tools **DO NOT** distinguish variables by the ontology of the variable. It is the problem of science to work out how variables such as *brain-choice*, linked as ultimate empirical effects are operationally linked such one transmutes to the other via the underlying immediate effects, with any constant in any equation reflective of the mechanism whereby one variable transmutes to the other.

This is the first and only known proof of dualism.

Note: Books in italic and bold.

Study guide to research the spiritual model of humanity and crucial definitions

www.spiritualmodel.com. Examine the structure of the intellectual position of the spiritual model of humanity, its depth and breadth. Note Item 15, and the attempt to engage with intellectual elite people to explore the advance in science. This attempt failed and people failed to reply and the since politically disparaged behind the scenes and complaints laid over the work. *Glossary and study guide to the spiritual model of humanity as the correct science of people* (November 9, 2021). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3913364>.

[Consolidate understanding key issues of method](https://ssrn.com/abstract=3254017). *Modern Methodology* (September 24, 2018). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3254017>.

Deepen understanding of how a single causal source can produce multiple complexities. The legacy of Thoms Kuhn and paradigm and normal science. *Evolution* (January 22, 2023). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4333700>, plus *Modern Methodology* (September 24, 2018). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3254017>.

There are many papers on application, but one worthy of early consideration is *Future of Freedom Lies in Battle for Minds* (April 5, 2023). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4410169>. The battle for minds includes the use of reason, and the shift away from all forms of mysticism. The integration of science with spiritual depth and with the wonder of just to be.

The text on the foundation science. The Origin of Consciousness (July 26, 2016). Institute of Theoretical and Applied Social Science, New Zealand. Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2814742>

The revised methodology

1. Through the Glass Darkly (July 19, 2016). Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2811861>
2. Strategic Science: An Improved Quality Standard for Intellectual Endeavour and Selection of the Best Ideas to Apply in Improving Life Experience (February 6, 2017). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2912593>.
3. Strategic Science and the Failure of Peer Review: The Universe is a Clock, Not a Cloud (September 6, 2017). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3033398>
4. KISS, Psychology and Quantum Physics (September 13, 2018). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3249269>
5. Modern Methodology (September 24, 2018). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3254017>.
6. The Spiritual Model of Humanity (6) Why Science Rules (July 22, 2019). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3423774>
7. The Problem with Peer Review Discussion of a Study on the Impact of Peer Review in Prestigious Academic and Publishing Institutions and the Extent it Limits and Prejudices Innovative Thinking. Offers Recommendations to Improve Intellectual Quality. (October 3, 2019). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3464045>.
8. Modern Science: Proof Dualism as the Correct Science of People Derived from the Work of Graham Little (August 16, 2020). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3674700>.
9. In Search of Time (November 13, 2020). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3730380>

10. Why Critical Race Theory Fails as Science (January 19, 2022). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4012950>
11. Dismissing critical race theory (CRT) (March 28, 2022). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4069063>
12. Final and Decisive Dismissal of Peer Review (April 27, 2023). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4431180>
13. What is a constant? (June 15, 2023). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4480631>
14. Redefining Peer Review (June 24, 2023). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4490679>
15. Is Indeterminacy Even Possible? (September 6, 2023). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4562807>
16. Thoroughness, quality test and verisimilitude the standard of science (September 18, 2023). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4574543>.
17. Proof of Dualism (January 11, 2024). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4692193>

A scientific general theory of psychology

18. The Origin of Consciousness (July 26, 2016). Institute of Theoretical and Applied Social Science, New Zealand. Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2814742>
19. Mind Over Matter: Presentation to the New Zealand Ministerial Enquiry into Mental Health (April 7, 2018). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3158497>
20. Managing Depression Depends on How We Understand Ourselves (August 26, 2018). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3238966>
21. Who Am I? The Interpretation of the Scientific General Theory of Psychology Explaining 'Me' (September 1, 2018). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3242866>
22. On the Structure and Operation of Mind (September 9, 2018). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3246655>
23. The structure of the human spirit (September 17, 2018). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3250641>.
24. The Science of Mental Health as Applied to Self, Politics and Social Policy (October 16, 2018). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3267112>
25. What is Consciousness? (March 7, 2022). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4051965>
26. Nature Versus Nurture (June 29, 2022). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4149979>

27. Scientific understanding and management of ourselves (August 22, 2022). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4197490>
28. The Correct Science Makes a Big Difference (July 12, 2023). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4508134>
29. Questionnaire Asserting the Spiritual Model of Humanity (Smh) as the Correct Science of People (July 18, 2023). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4513587>
30. Renewal Counselling (December 9, 2023). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4658939>

A scientific sociological model

31. Why Work (July 19, 2016). Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2811954>.
32. From Individual Psychology to Macroeconomics (July 26, 2016). Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2814815>
33. Learning to Live with 'I Want What is Best for Me' (August 23, 2016). Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2828356>
34. The Psychology of Freedom (September 1, 2016). Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2833671>
35. Redefining Science as the Social Extension of Human Nature: A New Intellectual Position Derived from the Proposition that We Can Only Interact with Perceptual Fields (November 27, 2016). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2876338>
36. 'Half-Filled Glass' View of Culture (January 10, 2017). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2897154>
37. On What We Know (March 14, 2017). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2933169>
38. Spiritual Humanism: The Choice of Ideology for a Society Committed to Harmony in Freedom. An Open Letter to the Catholic Diocese of Auckland and Through the Diocese an Open Letter to the Pope (June 30, 2017). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2995716>
39. Definition and Quantified Measure of a Just Society (May 27, 2017). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2975915>
40. Role of Intellectual Institutions Guiding Citizens on Ideas as Fit for Purpose (July 6, 2018) Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3209575>
41. There is No Paradox of Freedom (August 13, 2018). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3230238>

42. A Letter to My Local Member of Parliament: An Open Letter to All Politicians Committed to Building a Fair, Just, Relaxed Society for Their Great Grandchildren (February 12, 2019). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3333377>
43. Putting 'Science' into Social Science: Explanation of High Maori Incarceration in New Zealand (May 11, 2019). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3386804>
44. Media, Money and Trust (November 6, 2019). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3481905>.
45. Social Angst (December 1, 2019). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3496215>.
46. Who Can We Trust? (February 6, 2020). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3533543>
47. Truth (April 19, 2020). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3579829>
48. The Psychological Foundation of Freedom (June 4, 2020). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3619520>
49. Our Path to Their Future (August 21, 2017). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3023247>
50. The Western Way: The Nation-State as the Natural Social Unit of Human Civilization (January 8, 2019). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3312380>
51. Consigning liberal ideology to history (December 13, 2019). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3503721>
52. Spiritual Democracy (September 24, 2020). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3699065>
53. The Future of Freedom (June 29, 2021). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3875980>
54. Purpose of Scientific Politics in a Free Society (August 8, 2021). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3901488>
55. Science and the Constitution of Freedom: A Request to Maori Leadership of New Zealand (December 19, 2020). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3752137>
56. Science, society, and politics (July 19, 2021). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=388963>.
57. The Rhyme of Freedom (August 8, 2021). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3901501>
58. Applying the spiritual model of humanity to identify how to build a better society (April 8, 2022). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4079115>.
59. What Will it Take? (June 6, 2022). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4129536>

60. Scientific Definition of Woke within the Spiritual Model of Humanity, the Correct Science of People (July 24, 2022). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4171316>
61. Building Our Moral Foundation (July 28, 2022). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4175716>
62. Human Nature and Building a Better Society (October 4, 2022). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4238028>
63. Evolution (January 22, 2023). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4333700>
64. Future of Freedom Lies in Battle for Minds (April 5, 2023). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4410169>
65. The Power of Ideas (April 8, 2023). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4413332>
66. Think! (July 6, 2023). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4501882>
67. Where science meets society: Scientific explanation of random mass murders (September 19, 2023). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4576779>
68. Scientific Failure of Academia and the Road to Redemption (September 25, 2023). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4582246>
69. Sad Foolishness of Cancel Culture (December 2, 2023). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4651501>
70. Academia and Media in a Free Society (February 2, 2024). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4714224>
71. Faith in Reason (July 28, 2024). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4908148>

Scientific technology to better manage organizations

72. The Mind of the CEO (September 1, 2016). Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2833571>
 - a. Testimonial: The Mind of the CEO. Graham, very good read ... I enjoyed. Thanks for good brain exercise ... Paul Wilcox, CEO, Auckland Racing Club. July, 2018.
73. Rollout: Improving Rollout of Business Strategy (September 6, 2016). Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2835794>
74. Executive Pocket Guidebook (December 12, 2016). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2883985>

75. Human Capital: The Science of Valuing People on the Balance Sheet (December 28, 2016). Human Capital: The science of valuing people on the balance sheet, published by Institute of Theoretical and Applied Social Sciences Auckland New Zealand, ISBN 978-1-877341-35-9. Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2891129>
76. Time Budgeting: Building Personal Purpose and Motivation (December 29, 2016). Time budgeting Building personal purpose and motivation, ISBN 978-1-877341-37-3, 2011. Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2891384>
77. The Last Leadership Book You Will Ever Need Read: Personal Purpose, Fulfilment and Community Service Through In-Depth Understanding of Who We are, Where We Came from and How We Work (January 1, 2017). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2892340>
78. Modern Team Leadership: What to Do to Ensure the Team Has Greatest Chance of Greatest Success (January 2, 2017). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2892575>
79. The Role of Human Resources Management in the Modern Organization: Applying Scientific Theory to More Effectively Link People to the Organization Making HR the Driver of Strategic Success (January 2, 2017). Published by Institute of Theoretical and Applied Social Science Auckland, New Zealand. Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2892793>
- Science based technology of human capital management (HCM)**
80. The Exciting Promise of Human Resource Management (HRM) (August 7, 2016). Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2819810>
81. Organization Design: Linking Mind to Its Agreed Organization Role as a Foundation of Economics (July 31, 2016). Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2816604>
82. Deloitte Human Capital Trends in Perspective: The Science of Organization Design and Operations (March 22, 2017). Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2937125>
83. People are the Greatest Organization Asset, But If and Only If... (April 11, 2017). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2951430>
84. Trial and Initial Results in Proof that OPD-HCD™ Builds Improved Results and Improved Team Satisfaction (May 1, 2017). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2961555>

85. Do You Need the Science of Vacuums to Put Teat Cups on Cows (July 25, 2017). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3008764>
86. Why Does OPD System Deliver Better Results (December 13, 2017). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3087498>
87. The Spiritual Model of Humanity Defining the Organization in Society (1): Getting the Concept Right (June 10, 2019). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3401575>
88. Spiritual Model of Humanity (2): Innovation and the CEO (June 2019). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3395015>
89. Spiritual model of humanity (3) Improving rollout of strategy (June 3, 2019). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3398039>
90. The Spiritual Model of Humanity Defining the Organization in Society (4): Corporate Social Responsibility (June 10, 2019). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3401576>
91. The Spiritual Model of Humanity (5) Governance, CEO and the Social Quid Pro Quo (July 3, 2019). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3414594>

Verisimilitude

Verisimilitude is a system of judgment rating the key factors that contribute to the accuracy and congruence of a set of ideas as reflecting the mechanism of a system under study.

Purpose: To decide the ideas to adopt and apply for the purpose of living.

Selected factors:

1. Definition.	Definition of the system under study. The conceptualization of the system imagined as a square embracing all events under study, with the aim to conceptualize the mechanism to
2. Congruence.	Selection of variables. Drawn from the system, reflect current understanding of the mechanism within the system. If not directly drawn from the system, then there is an
3. Meets scope of work.	Interpret how the diagram reflecting the mechanisms explains the situation to which it applies.
4. Assess empirical results.	The extent the theory 'gets the right answer'.
5. Meets criteria of strategic science.	Extent all underlying questions that could influence the theory are resolved and accounted for. If there are any underlying questions unresolved, discussion become speculation not science.
6. Historical foundation.	Extent the theory is integrated with, based on, and/or accounts for appropriate historical ideas. See comments in notes on 'scholarship'
7. Meets the reflexive criteria.	Explained from within the scientific general theory of psychology. Must be accounted for in explanation of all human outputs.
8. Passed by peers.	Accepted for publication by peers.
Total	Rating

Crucial factors: The overall verisimilitude rating is the final judgement. But, in the assessment rating of items 2, 4, 5 and 7 are crucial, Any failure against these items means the ideas must be judged as inadequate.

Judgement process: The ideas are rated on a scale of 1-10, 10 high, the eight score then totalled to create the final verisimilitude score of the ideas.

Suggested ratings:

- a. 70-80, judged fit to adopt and apply as our understanding of the mechanisms of the system under study.
- b. 50-70, Fit to apply, but caution required. The thinking limited.
- c. 40-50, Shows some promise. Not fit to be adopted and applied, but worth further investigation.
- d. 0-40. The ideas are totally unsuited to adopt and apply. They need to be rejected in total, and the reasoning process to be applied again to seek ideas of higher verisimilitude. Retaining remnants of these ideas are likely to interfere with further creative development of ideas with higher verisimilitude.

Appendix 2: Problem solving process for managing free societies

Karl Popper is regarded as one the greatest critics of Marx. He opposed and destroyed the chief foundation of Marx in the search for future good as opposed to the practical process of resolving current problems.

Academics have ignored the ideas and arguments of Popper, leaving the legacy of Marx in citizen minds, but failing to balance the illogical and irrational fundamentals of Marxian point of view with the rationality of Popper/Ashby. Under the deal of 1097 academics had a clear responsibility to ensure the very poor thinking of such as Marx did not leave a legacy in the mind of citizens, scarring their perception of social development, leaving a legacy that common state control would resolve issues of inequality, and achieve improved distributive fairness.

What academics fail to promote, and still fail to do so, is to achieve the social control requires all defer to the central authority. This requires force to do so, since all dissension is to be suppressed, resulting in 20th century of an estimated 50,000,000 people murdered by their governments in the name of building citizen life experience.

The contrasting philosophies of political action enabling a better life for citizens was published in 1981, published in the now defunct UNESCO journal *impact of science on society*. [Paper 1\) Social models: blueprints or processes?](#) Exploring the philosophy of social planning, comparing the *future blueprint view* of Marx, with the *future problem-solving view* of Popper.

This distinction has been ignored by academics, when under the deal of 1097 they had a duty of care to citizens to provide a balance to the poor thinking of Marx and disciples. This issue is yet unresolved in citizen minds, and must be regarded as further failure of academics, for not stepping up guiding citizens in where and how science meets life, with science being ideas grounded in reasoned commonsense and meeting standards of intellectual quality beyond peer review.

As something of an aside, published in *impact of science on society* circa 1984 my early work on resolving the question of building a scientific general theory of psychology. [Paper 2\) Creativity and conflict in psychological science](#). Presenting the divergent and failed positions in psychology. That all positions were based on an apt insight into people, but that any truly scientific view of ourselves had to integrate all of these insights into a single theory.

I regard this paper published in 1984 as the plan of action of what I intended to do. That is to resolve all underlying intellectual questions and build the first truly scientific general theory of psychology. On publication, I was already 10 years into the plan.

Today, I have completed the ask, and the overview of the science published in Glossary and study guide to the spiritual model of humanity as the correct science of people (November 9, 2021). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3913364>, applying the methodology inherent in the 1984 paper, but refined as in Modern Methodology (September 24, 2018). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3254017>.

As a practical presentation of the difference, compare the current fractious and combative nature of NZ politics based on current poor thinking the legacy of inept academic efforts and failure to apply commonsense reasoning to determine good ideas from bad. With complete failure to present to NZ citizens the Popperian problem solving view of social development, described in detail in is many books. (Put Karl Popper in Google, there are many sites to choose from and many of his most famous books discussed).

But despite his fame, there is almost no legacy of is work on social development backed into psychological development in the minds of modern citizens, and within the deal of 1097 this is a fundamental failure of academics in NZ and globally. They have not engaged with citizens in ensuring citizens understand the alternatives of how to proceed in developing a better society.

Below I have taken the liberty of listing the top 10 questions facing NZ society right now. The questions/issues are in no priority order. This process proceeds by agreeing these issues, discussing them and determining practical solutions, then doing it. This followed sometime later by a new set of questions... etc.

Improved academic performance. Academia is required to serve taxpayers, guiding identify and applying only those ideas based on reasoned commonsense, and meeting intellectual standards of strategic thinking, reach and reflexive criteria. Within that ensure sufficient trained people in medicine, education, law, etc., to meet social demands. It is the role and responsibility of academia to ensure commonsense reasoned ideas meeting quality standards are promoted to citizens. For example: (1) A male physique is XY DNA, female XX DNA. And includes the 1 in 15000 males born with a vagina. (2) There is no such thing as transgender. (3) A person born XY has XY DNA (male) in every cell in their body, same for XX (female), and that can never be changed. (4) Males should never compete in female sports. (5) A free society makes illegal pursuit of any selective morality. (6) Mental health: People are responsible for their own mental state, the only exception is neurological failure. Hence likely 75% mental illness is people adopting poor to self-destructive ideas about circumstance for which they are responsible and only they can change. Years ago, I offered advice on social management of mental health, *The Science of Mental Health as Applied to Self, Politics and Social Policy* (October 16, 2018). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3267112>, stating unless fundamental change in the underlying scientific understanding then throwing money at mental health is equivalent to throwing oil on an oil fire. (7) Abortion should not exist: A baby is viable beyond the womb at 25/26 weeks. If the unborn foetus is then legally declared a citizen at 26 weeks, then before 26 weeks, the mother may have the growth removed from her body, after, to kill the foetus legally a citizen at 26 weeks, is murder. (8) God only exists as an idea in the mind of a person. No god has any existence or influence in human affairs beyond the influence in the mind of a person. Second religion is an expression of human selective morality. All religions are cults and to have restricted social activity. The list is far from complete but shows the nature of academia performance demands in a modern diverse society.

Distributive fairness. Reducing inequality; reducing poverty and homelessness. Based on principle wealth created by good ideas well implemented. Thus, demands entrepreneur (good ideas) + good implementation (skilled cooperative citizens). Distributive fairness is when the wealth is spread across this formula such all judge the distribution as fair.

Deteriorating national infrastructure. Improve national roads, water and power grid.

Deteriorating civic infrastructure. Councils focus on crucial issues of water, roads, garbage, civic cleanliness, urban quality standards and aesthetic quality, sports fields and civic amenities, service to citizens.

Deteriorating educational standards. Educational curricular focused on ensuring fundamentals of reading writing, math competence, how to live in a modern diverse society, universities provide numbers of doctors needed, appropriate standards for nurse training. Ensuring every person understands they are responsible for their own mental state, hence are responsible for the choices they make.

Improved central services: Adoption of principle all laws apply equally to all people. Adoption of Treaty Principles Legislation. Removal of Maori seats from Parliament. Government responsible for provision of quality central services ... health, education, policing, armed forces ... but each person responsible for availing themselves of those services. It is not the responsibility to pander to any cultural groups, citizens must grow up and assume appropriate responsibility for their own health, education and all-round welfare. Rejection of the idea of the ‘nanny’ state.

Maintaining wealth base: Education of citizens that NZ must export to maintain its wealth base. The farm is 60+ % of NZ export GDP, and farm product quality and farm efficiency must be continuously developed. With improved equality, infrastructure, and social amenities, citizens expected to accept work as part of life with improving productivity. It is the role of central government to guide society beyond self-serving selective morality of culture, religion, sex orientation, specialist focus such as Greens, Greenpeace, etc., climate activists, etc.

Better role models and social self-discipline. Politicians display the social role model, seek reconciliation between groups in conflict by workable compromise. Hold no opinion of their own, No person or group to pursue selective morality, this to be the priority social role model exhibited by all politicians, and by all individuals, groups and religions.

Police enforcement. To assert these principles, pursuing criminals, managing violations of social self-discipline based on right to protest but no citizens have the right to hinder any other citizens in acting out their lawful conduct. No matter the circumstance.

Acceptance of modern complexity. All citizens accept right to exist of all fellow citizens as the self-disciplined foundation of freedom of choice. Then, accept their life structured by two fundamental psychological choices, personal as in one's personal choices of friends, family, social life, location etc., and second that we achieve more when we cooperate than when we live alone, and work is the contribution to NZ social wealth development. Hence the second set of psyche parameters are those demanded to the job one adopts, which is objective commitment to do it well, and not allow personal sensitivities interfere with work performance, and where work demand differs too much from one's personal preferences, one must resign the job.