

Schizophrenia as an Unavoidable Result of Domestication

ir. Emile M. Hobo – 4 August 2022

E-mail: e.m.hobo@hotmail.nl

Contents

The Bleuler-Kraepelin schizoid divide	1
Bleuler's identified causes to schizophrenia and domestication	2
Bleuler's negativism and domestication	4
Bleuler's causes for negative response and domestication	4
The unity of the schizophrenic and the anti-social personality	9
The difference between the anti-social and the psychopath	10
How to handle the anti-social	11
Literature	11

The Bleuler-Kraepelin Schizoid Divide

Researching schizophrenia, available research more readily points to Emil Kraepelin and his term of “dementia præcox” than to Paul Eugen Bleuler. The latter only be referred to, to explain the modern name. The consensus of what schizophrenia is lies with Kraepelin's affective disorder and hereditarianism, neutralizing the out of vogue Nazi term “eugenics.”

When regarding the viability of certain hypotheses, one should also look at the mind of the researcher, not to discard a proper hypothesis sprung forth from a faulty mind, but to understand what generated the hypothesis. In case of a faulty hypothesis, the answer to why the faulty mind came up with it also relates to that mind.

In case of Emil Kraepelin, what most fail to reference is that he was a proponent of genetic purification. He pointed also to the Jews as degenerative, which is ironic, because he phrased his words as if to counter self-domestication. In the resulting conclusions, he furthered self-domestication, while trying to phrase it as preventing it.

He didn't want diverse groups to have intercourse and children and felt so-called bastard children were degenerative, even though in practice, diversification prevents inbreeding and leads to healthier offspring. Of old, supposedly some would note that you don't want to marry a girl of the same village, because they have seen it go wrong.

Kraepelin proposes schizophrenia be a hereditary disease, displaying genetically degenerative effects. He uses it to isolate entire groups of people and label them as degenerative, without going into the individual psychology, without researching the individual case. Essentially he stuck to an all or nothing mentality.

He creates an us and them society, with himself and his peers at the center as what they would label the *Übermensch*. In short, Kraepelin was a Nazi and actively displaying every possible sign of self-domestication one might distinguish by segregating and limiting the interactions between groups of different gene pools of humankind.

Where Kraepelin sought to limit the perception of what schizophrenia was to a limited gene pool of peoples that he would label as degenerative, Bleuler clearly focused on the

psychological aspects, completely disregarding genetics, in describing schizophrenia or the disintegration of the functions of the mind.

Swing back to self-domestication. I say the answer does lie in degenerative genetics, but not as Kraepelin proposed it. Instead it's the result of self-domestication. The negative symptoms and the lack of integration of the functions of the mind are the result of brains that have become too small by inbreeding, to the extent that they can't comprehend reality.

In essence, I want to relate Bleuler's "The Theory of Schizophrenic Negativism" to that of my own on domestication. Bleuler sought to explain what are now labeled as negative symptoms of schizophrenia, or symptoms other people don't display even when they have a disorder. All block quotes in italics cite this work.

My work, the domestication checklist, you can find online. All my work I will reference and possibly amend in regular formatting.

I propose schizophrenia is the result of inbreeding and a resulting lack of an integral view of reality. Due to his self-domesticating practices, I feel safe to say Emil Kraepelin himself was a schizophrenic. He acquired the position of psychiatrist without the necessary mental aptitudes and used it *and* in his own self-interest *and* to further domestication practices.

This dichotomy of mind and actual reality, as you will see, is also what both Bleuler refers to and what I refer to.

The work of Kraepelin, also in terms of eugenics, should be seen as displays of negative symptoms: behaviors others that don't suffer from a kind of schizophrenia don't display. Kraepelin's reference to self-domestication, saying he counters it while in fact encouraging it, is also a very clear example of one of the symptoms Bleuler noted as negative symptoms.

The goal is to establish Bleuler was right and Kraepelin was wrong. The goal is to show that when schizophrenic symptoms aren't the result of any kind of drug abuse, voluntary or forced, they are the result of mental retardation. Drugs can disintegrate the senses and the mind, but this can be fixed. Domesticated people are inherently broken and unfixable.

Bleuler's Identified Causes to Schizophrenia and Domestication

What stands out in Bleuler's writing is his clarity of prose and the fact that he cuts straight to the chase. The only thing that left me wondering at first was that it wasn't immediately clear from the text what he meant by negativism. Bleuler is credited for introducing the notion of negative and positive symptoms: symptoms others don't or do also display.

Bleuler literally notes that *negative* symptoms are simply *incorrect*, implying *positive* symptoms are *correct*. This was perhaps later refined to the use as we have acquainted ourselves with it today, or maybe he just meant differently. What I mean to analyze here are his own words and his own findings by their own merit, to which I restrict myself.

The predisposing causes of negativistic phenomena are:

1. *Ambitendency, which sets free with every tendency a counter tendency.*
2. *Ambivalency, which gives to the same idea two contrary feeling tones and invests the same thought simultaneously with both a positive and a negative character.*
3. *The schizophrenic splitting of the psyche, which hinders the proper balancing of the opposing and cooperating psychisms, with the result that the most*

inappropriate impulse can be transferred into action just as well as the right impulse and that in addition to the right thought, or instead of it, its negative can be thought.

4. *The lack of clearness and imperfect logic of the schizophrenic thoughts in general which makes a theoretical and practical adaptation to reality difficult or impossible.*

The natural healthy brain has two halves that are subconsciously in constant debate with one another. Sever the link by cutting it, I hope you forgive me my lack of reference, and you can ask the left and the right hemisphere individually by covering first one and then the other eye and holding up a question. They will each give their own answer.

Domesticated brains are too small. Like with artificial neural networks that are too small, when you ask them to process complex information, they can't interlink, remember, and as such contain the right pathways sufficiently to determine the right answer. The complexity of the network needs to reflect the complexity of the problems at hand.

The fact that domesticated brains are this small also means that they can't relate the different parts of the brain sufficiently, because the minimally necessary number of pathways are simply missing. This means that both halves of the brain, even though contradicting each other, will be found to be right.

Metaphorically speaking you could say a properly connected brain is a strong balance with a rod connecting two weighing scales, tipping in favor of just one of them. Domesticated brains are connected through a weak connection, metaphorically translating not to a strong steel rod but a wire that bends allowing both scales to sink.

(A1) Both halves of the brain being found to be right even though in contradiction with one another generates the *ambitendency* found in schizophrenics, meaning that they want to do what either brain half wants to do, even though contradictory, at the same time.

The brain halves not being connected properly means that the subconscious link is missing. The two brain halves don't subconsciously decide what answer is best. Instead, what you get, is that there is an open audible discussion between the two brain halves, with voices of the one and the other half contradicting each other in an invisible parliament of the mind.

The left hemisphere as such will have its voices arguing in favor of its own preference and the right hemisphere will also have its own voices arguing in favor of its own preference. Arguing means that they are in favor of their own and against the other. As such both answers of both brain halves are not only considered to be right, but also wrong.

(B1) Both halves not being able to argue subconsciously due to a lack of integration generates the *ambivalency* found in schizophrenics, meaning that both halves of the brain consider themselves to be right and the other to be wrong, without being able to reach an agreement.

(C1) The lack of integration of the brain is reflected in *the schizophrenic splitting of the psyche* by different parts of the brain being represented by consciously present personae (multiple persona) that constantly argue with each other, about each other, about the world, and the person that has these personae in the mind.

Note! People that suffer a similar condition may indicate that one of these voices is actually their own: the other voices respond to it. They suffer a minimal delay over that of their own. This is also what allows them to distinguish these voices as thought voices, so these people aren't actually schizophrenic, but suffered some kind of brain damage.

Not only is the schizophrenic brain thus small that the different parts can't integrate, the parts themselves are too small to form a clear picture of reality. Reality consists of unities of opposites working together, yin and yang, both opposed and contained in each other. This brain can only understand atomic principles that the world will never adhere to.

This lack of integration makes these individuals require everyone and everything to fall in line to keep things neatly organized, repetitive, and as such understandable. Any kind of complexity, even of tone, is inconvenient and leads to great discord in their parliamentary minds. To the unintegrated mind, either things are in absolute order or in absolute disorder.

Yin and yang in the unintegrated mind don't contain each other, but are barred from seeing each other and meeting one another.

(D1) The lack of integration causes the brain to only be able to handle atomic truths and not the simplest of unities of opposites, meaning that the mildest complexity of society will cause great disorder in their minds, which shows as *the lack of clearness and imperfect logic of the schizophrenic thoughts*: they simply can't relate to anything, they can only put in boxes.

Bleuler's Negativism and Domestication

As said, Bleuler literally noted that *negative* symptoms are simply *incorrect*, implying *positive* symptoms are *correct*. People, even schizophrenics, don't do the wrong thing all the time. Sometimes they do right. This leaves the matter of *volition* or *disposition*: is it their active choice or what they are made to do by how they are built?

On the ground of this disposition there may occur direct negativistic phenomena in such a manner that positive and negative psychisms replace one another indiscriminately, only the incorrect reactions standing out as pathological negativism.

As a rule, however, the negativistic reaction does not appear merely as accidental, but as actually preferred to the correct reaction.

This seems to unite the notions of volition and disposition in one construct: people suffering from schizophrenia resulting from a lack of an integral view of reality through domestication prefer to do the wrong thing. Why?

Seen from *intent*, their motivation to me seems simple, as it should be to them: nothing to them makes sense and everything is wrong, so they are going to do wrong. From a point of view of *logic*: when the foundation to your logic is flawed, the logical outcome per definition most of the time will also be flawed. Intent or plausibility? I fear both are correct.

Bleuler's Causes for Negative Response and Domestication

One of the things I've learned in writing is that dialogue is non other than the act of speaking. Dialogue and physical actions stick to the same developmental rules. Bleuler also noted that a negativistic response might be simply to deny what's right or to do wrong.

In ordinary external negativism which consists in the negation of external influences (Ex. Command) and of what one would normally expect the patient to do (Ex. Defaecation in the closet¹ instead of the bed), the following causes are at work:

- (a) The autistic² withdrawing of the patient into his phantasies, which makes every influence acting from without comparatively an intolerable interruption. This appears to be the most important factor. In severe cases it alone is sufficient to produce negativism.*
- (b) The existence of a hurt (negative complex, unfulfilled wish) which must be protected from contacts.*
- (c) The misunderstanding of the surroundings and their purpose.*
- (d) Direct hostile relations to the surroundings.*
- (e) The pathological irritability of the schizophrenic.*
- (f) The pressure of thought and other difficulties of action and of thought, through which every reaction becomes painful.*
- (g) The sexuality with its ambivalent feeling tones is also often one of the roots of negativistic reaction.*

As noted in the section on Bleuler's identified causes, since the world consists of an almost immeasurable plurality of unities of opposites, with the domesticated mind requiring everything to be atomic, simple, one thing and one thing only, this means that they can't make sense of the world nor live in its full entirety: they aren't accommodated to it.

Both with domesticated animals and, within the human population, inmates that in essence have also been domesticated, it's common knowledge to us that they frequently end up preferring the simplicity of their limited surroundings. They prefer to be locked in a cage, because in their cage, life is simple with only one thing at a time happening.

Rule! When multiple things need to be handled in an institution or general society directly affecting the person without an integral view of reality, you always handle them sequentially. Tell them what number of steps or things to do, guide them along per step, don't ever let two things happen at the same time, otherwise they don't get it and they *rightfully* protest. It's not their fault when they do! They are right to! Don't hand them the full sequence: the order hypothetically may change along the way.

¹ Note that *closet* means *water closet* or *loo* or *toilet*. It caught me off guard a bit, because both pooping in your closet for clothes and in your bed are wrong.

² *Autistic* as used by Bleuler bears no reference to the neurological developmental delay or disorder we now know as autism. What he here means to say is that the autistic response equals withdrawing from external reality into the own internal reality of the mind, the thought world of the schizophrenic, because this corroborates itself, whereas the internal reality of the schizophrenic always seeks to contradict external reality.

Rule! If you want to treat them in a humane fashion and you mean to make a joke, keep it simple, as in atomic. For instance, “A cucumber visits the doctor and tells the doctor, *I’m going to be a banana, because they are nice and yellow!*” is a good joke for them.

When in society or in an institution, when overwhelmed with a certain amount of complexity, even if it is just two things happening at the same time, this not only leads to the individual to protest. The protest is also an active display of the individual retreating into what Bleuler noted as the patient’s own fantasies.

(A2) The negation of actual reality in its full complexity by protesting it and requiring everything to be atomic, as in simple, directly causes the so-called *autistic withdrawing of the patient*, meaning that the individual with a lack of an integral view of reality limits the perceived worldview to the own worldview, excluding external reality and its full complexity.

A simple example would be me not sticking to the tactical framework in fencing that these individuals have in their minds and me doing something else. According to the rules I scored a perfectly viable and legal hit. When I don’t score according to their own plans, how they feel I should only be allowed to score, they simply negate the hit ever existed.

These people can’t be a lawful member of any kind of union.

In terms of the schizophrenic mindset, their delusion is that the hit wasn’t a hit, even though reality clearly contradicts their perceptions. They maintain their erroneous predisposition in light of evidence to the contrary, because they can’t comprehend how this could have happened. They then seek to exclude you rather than themselves.

(B2) The fact that reality doesn’t adhere to their perceptive framework causes them to detect a fault, but they are unable to perceive where the fault lies and unable to fully comprehend how it lies with them, which leads to a *hurt which needs to be protected from contacts*, meaning they limit their interactions in order to avoid whatever it is that contradicts their worldview.

People lacking an integral view of reality only see what is right in front of them. I’ve witnessed firsthand both through now repaired brain damage and by interacting with domesticated men that when your senses aren’t integrated, you can’t see in the distance. You physically only see right in front of you and even then not necessarily in focus.

In the words of one man with a lack of an integral view of reality, “These glasses don’t help, but they [doctors] don’t get it.” He isn’t shortsighted due to his eyes not functioning, he’s shortsighted due to his brains not functioning, meaning his eyes can do only one thing and that one thing barely at that.

Only seeing what’s in front of you and not what’s behind it to them is not just a physical reality, it is physical reality and how they perceive it works. There are no mechanisms other than when I stack these items I have a stack and when I break this it’s broken. Everything is atomic and there is no construction: a push and it all comes falling down literally.

One domesticated philosopher seems to have misquoted Heidegger by saying, “The thing things.” This does very clearly illustrate the atomic limits of their perception.

(C2) Not being able to comprehend how the world, artifacts, tools, organisms, and anything else works when you just look at them is the result of not being able to handle any complexity, with the brain only acknowledging atomic principles, invisibles immediately leading to *the misunderstanding of their surroundings and their purpose*.

Examples: “It must be some kind of magic.” - “There must be a critter in there doing this.” - “A higher power is at work.” - “This device, this vacuum cleaner is scary! Aw, I broke it. Nice broom!”

Now imagine being immersed in a world where everything contradicts your natural senses and your natural expectations, while you’re at the same time not able to accept that view and instead seek to make the world into what you mean for it to be. No matter how big or how small the event, every event, anything happening is a nuisance.

You like sleeping. When you’re asleep, nothing happens, all you experience is your mind or nothing at all. It’s best when you experience nothing at all. You’re best off gone and sleeping is how you are gone.

When you see the world, everything does the opposite of what you want it to do. The way to fix it has to be straightforward. You are “good with your hands.” With your hands you can *force* things to go your way, even when they originally didn’t. They offer you control and the ability to make the world and everything and everyone in it into what you want them to be.

You want to be at peace somewhere. Flight is only a last resort when you can’t make the world into what you want it to be. Force means aggression. Aggression is simple, straightforward, and you’ve seen it work with people just letting you have what you want to have, sometimes even just giving it to you, telling others to just let you be, let you have it.

It’s not worthy to them, but you establish your power, so that makes it worthy to you, even when you don’t care about what you acquired. It’s all about gaining power to gain control and make your world view the only correct world view.

(D2) The only *direct* as in *simple* as in *atomic* approach to make the world into what you want it to be is *force*, any kind of mediation isn’t, meaning that an atomic mindset due to a lack of an integral view of reality automatically facilitates *direct hostile relations toward the surroundings*.

The only way people without an integral view of reality know how to do things is by force. They threaten people to get what they want, as much as they pee their pants when they see their force countered, toppling their position of power. This is something they witness and experience from an early age on, only teaching them shame, but not different ways.

Just think how you would feel if you wanted just one thing to happen in the world, your thing, and now there are seven billion people in the world. Every single person of those seven billion people wants to be in full control of their life and discovering their own world view. All of them without fail at least do everything a little different from you.

Even when you have some likeminded people and your personal individual thing turns into our thing, *cosa nostra*, typically who’s in charge is chosen based on seniority, meaning that things still don’t always go your way. You’re mostly agreeable, but you’re always dealing with this old man, or all of these youngsters, and forced into at least some mediation.

That’s not what you want.

You want it to be simple. You want to use force, but now you have a complex organization that always does things slightly differently. When the plan fails, it was a good plan, someone messed up, never you. That's how everyone else sees themselves also. And everyone is always double crossing every one, isn't that what you would do?

Okay, so you didn't get killed and your organization didn't take off. It's best to keep life simple, so you just stick to your apartment or house, but now you have neighbors or birds in the morning. "Tweet, tweet! Tweet, tweet!" It's never quiet, never simple. There's always something little, sometimes something big, that isn't the way you want it to be.

You never get the world to adhere to what you want it to be. Life just isn't as simple as in your jail cell. Good times. The best times probably, when you were in jail. Everything was nice and simple. The rules were clear and simple. Everybody gets you have to fight or you stick to your cell. Simple.

(E2) Everything in actual reality contradicts the worldview of people without an integral view of reality and as such they experience everything as faulty, as wrong, which is a nuisance to them and the root cause of the *pathological irritability of the schizophrenic*.

Considering that for these people both hemispheres of the brain are typically diametrically opposed, both thoughts and actions under consideration seeming right and wrong at the same time, even when they do the right thing, to at least one half of the brain it's wrong. When they do the wrong thing, to one half of the brain, it's also wrong.

They without fail have to suffer that they are faulty and doing it wrong, no matter what they do. Their brain can't tell them when they do it right, it always also tells them they are doing it wrong. This means that to them, any choice of action is both ambiguous and painful, because they are always punished for what they do.

(F2) To people lacking an integral view of reality, both the right and the wrong action according to their brain are both right and wrong, and as such when they do anything, either right or wrong, their brain also punishes them for it, issuing *pressure of thought and other difficulties of action and of thought, through which every reaction becomes painful*.

Due to a lack of integration of the brain, as demonstrated, these people already suffer from a lack of control. The fact that also their prefrontal cortex is bound to be smaller doesn't help either. It makes sure that they are more prone to be driven by the most basic of impulses, which they interpret as food, shelter, power, money, sex, and aggression.

Much like in my writing I have a tendency to say that their self-centered utilitarian views tend to emphasize money, this may very well be an observation limiting the interpretation of their actual motivations too much based on social bias. The way Paul Eugen Bleuler phrased it, he doesn't limit his views, he merely points out his observation.

The people that Paul Eugen Bleuler investigated were most likely also from particular social groups. This means it may have restrained topics for discussion differently: sex rather than money. As is clear from his writing, he indicates that he has witnessed this a lot, but he introduces no social bias himself and leaves room for broader impulses to be triggered.

Sexuality may stand out more than other impulses, because we can crave sex when hungry, thirsty, angry, lacking shelter, basically while suffering any kind of problem. Sex also

offers comfort, which makes it stand out more, but it doesn't always get people into a comfortable position. They also use sex as a weapon, a means to all other ends.

Lack of sexual restraint gets these people into trouble a lot. This leads to their own aversive reactions: them making women cover themselves up with Burkas, women showing their ankles being considered floozies, and so forth. Some people that have problems restraining their sexual impulses resort to self-castration or cutting off the genitals altogether.

Sex is a very strong drive.

(G2) People lacking an integral view of reality also lack impulse control to a far greater degree, meaning they find it difficult, if not impossible to restrain themselves, meaning *the sexuality with its ambivalent feeling tones is also often one of the roots of negativistic reaction.*

The rest of Paul Eugen Bleuler's "The Theory of Schizophrenic Negativism" focuses on elaborating the concepts just elaborated upon, but didn't relate it to domestication or self-domestication. Both kinds of domestication in humans tend to be kept out of scientific literature, with the arts and sciences to the day of today still being under attack.

Bleuler made it clear that they had no conception of what might cause schizophrenia. He discussed a number of to him favorable options and dismissed some that he in a sense considered to be *too far out*. Officially he didn't want to do away with any theory and he wanted to keep his options open, but in practice he didn't practice this perfectly.

He seemed to oppose the notion of it being a physical defect. He may have related that notion to that of motor mechanisms, which he rightfully felt weren't to blame. That it's a physical defect to me now does stand out, so it shouldn't have been ruled out. I think he made a mistake, that I'm sometimes also guilty of, of ruling out too broad a class of notions.

Reading his work and what he cited, I think it's interesting how much closer some were to the truth back then, than we have been for the past couple of decades. The almost full level of moderation pursuing that is a symptom of the scientific communities almost fully having been assimilated by these very same individuals we mean to discuss.

After the second world war and probably before that also, self-domestication was something that scientists felt stood out as leading to Nazism. Although it is superficially referenced in public resources, great effort has been put into eliminating it from scientific survey. As such I seek to reintroduce it, because it is an important concept.

These people are killing us, poisoning us, and administering treatments that have been proven to do the exact opposite of what they should be doing. I recently even heard in the media that they were now trying to do away with the proven theory that white blood cells, specifically the T-cells, be a part of our immune system. This is completely insane.

The Unity of the Schizophrenic and the Anti-Social Personality

Based on my research of domestication and the lack of an integral view of reality, I came to hold a firm estimate that they are in fact the same. On reading "The Theory of Schizophrenic Negativism" the direct relationship between the anti-social personality disorder and schizophrenia, the fact that they are one and the same, stood out to me quite clearly.

By establishing the underlying mechanisms that through domestication cause the anti-social personality disorder and researching Paul Eugen Bleuler's work, as demonstrated above, the evidence at hand shows how they are one and the same.

The anti-social or schizophrenic personality, the first label probably be preferred, isn't the result of a hormonal imbalance, but it's structural. They try to avoid psychiatry as much as possible as soon as they realize that the medication doesn't cure them, but makes it worse. Their mind already continuously punishes them, even when they do right.

Medicating them exacerbates this punishment. Turning them into drooling heaps of man or woman is also further physical punishment. You're not making them better and you prolong their suffering. This isn't the solution and quite possibly the reason they attack psychiatry: to keep themselves out of it, because they feel survival of the fittest should apply.

Hypothesis! The label they get, either schizophrenic or anti-social, is dependent on their history. Do they seek help in their youth? Have they received psychoactive drugs either by self-medicating or through faulty healthcare practices? Have they endured a lot of stress? If the answer to these questions is "no," they get the label anti-social. In all other cases schizophrenic.

I suspect that only when they endure high levels of stress or receive psychoactive drugs of any kind, their voices can turn into hallucinations also. Otherwise they just have voices and they don't know where they are coming from, typically associating them with a higher power.

I fear that when these people attack us, it's like a flock of pigeons marching in front of your car. These people and these animals can make thus little of life and their perceptions and their brain is literally thus divided that they want to die.

Survival of the fittest really means that they want you to kill them. "Dying in a blaze of glory" to them with how their brain works is both *true* (negative a.k.a. incorrect) and *false* (positive a.k.a. correct).

They should be allowed to die peacefully if that's what they wish, considering that (1) their suffering is endless and (2) there is no option to heal them, (3) nor to offer a better perspective of a better future. We can't force them to live, simply because it's inhumane. We only prolong their suffering.

Both the right to live and let live as well as "the right to die," as psychopaths would label it, should apply to all people. If you can't make anything of your life and you without fail suffer paranoia or fear or your own mistakes, you should have the right to die. When you truly love someone, when the time has come to let them go, you have to let them go.

The Difference Between the Anti-Social and the Psychopath

The biological difference between the anti-social and the psychopath is that the anti-social brain is too small due to inbreeding and the psychopathic brain lacks structure in the prefrontal cortex: it's quite mushy. One should note that the two disorders don't exclude each other, but they are mutually different in terms of causes and psychological effects.

Psychologically the anti-social is paranoid and questioning, but also dogmatic, because they can't make anything of anything. If they don't see it right in front of them it doesn't exist. If it's scary they prefer to either shut off their sensations or run away. If they don't understand the mechanisms and feel it's magic, they destroy it.

The anti-social wants to keep things simple and the same, repetitive, without surprises and as such also engages in self-domestication, to keep the family in line.

Psychologically, the psychopath suffers from high anxiety. They aren't questioning, they are just afraid. They don't have many sensations, but their centers for fear work overtime. As such they prefer to portray themselves as predators. They want for you to be afraid of them. By making you scared, they seek control. For control, they further domestication.

For both, the behaviors in court limit themselves to an array of prototypical attitudes, partially based on their backgrounds and surroundings, partially based on whether they are prosecuting, being prosecuted, or in the witness stand. We would do well to study the varying types of scenarios and document them in terms of the kind of reactions you get.

They can also be the victim of crimes, so this should be taken into account. You only pass judgment with physical evidence, otherwise the ruling is innocent.

How To Handle the Anti-Social

When facing someone, to determine whether they act responsibly, you can ask a couple of simple questions. Checking high school and higher degrees before hiring is preferable, but we don't always find ourselves in the position to do so. People without an integral view of reality tend to have vast networks, so they feel they know who they can rely on.

We now face the challenge of determining and showing whether people act responsibly or not. People are entitled to their beliefs, but these shouldn't cloud their judgment. As such you can ask, "Do you hear God?" If the answer is "Yes!" you ask, "Do you base your judgment on what you hear from God or on the democratically elected book of law?"

Those that act responsibly will answer the democratically elected book of law. People without an integral view of reality will answer that they act based on what they hear from God or Allah or one or more other entities, maybe even their mother. When they don't act on reason, but on faith, that's not sufficient for a doctor, police officer, prosecutor, or judge.

These simple kinds of questions they will probably not find threatening, but it will allow the people to see, to question, and to administer the democratically elected laws for themselves. They will help set apart people with and without an integral view of reality. They will allow us to keep society safe and intact. This should be our aim.

Literature

E. Bleuler (1912) "The Theory of Schizophrenic Negativism" : The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease Publishing Company * New York.

E.M. Hobo (2020) "Domestication Checklist" : available through [researchgate.net](https://researchgate.net/publication/358111111) & emilehobo.nl.