

Chapter 19: Will *Cognitive Neuroscience* become the new bureaucratic control tool of the 21st Century?

Give a Cognitive Neuroscientist a brain and a Government Grant to force his or her view of psychology down our throats and he/she'll inch his/her way towards making it impossible for the mind that that brain is a part of to understand the following. (Or, that is, they are your neurons and what you do with them is up to you ¹.)

This Chapter appeared originally in [*Yes, \(Is BiO Spiritualism the answer?\)*](#), 2006, RaIse Books, LLC, Chapter 19, Gary (Dean) Deering

The following is an example of *what* I chose to do with *mine*.

The United States Government has officially endorsed *Cognitive Neuroscience* as the State's Psychology, and along with it has made "A *Call To Action*" for all "scientists" to stitch together an epistemological web *proving themselves correct*. By so doing the Government is in effect saying "... [we the government] will give you all the [grant] money you need to do this". That is, to "prove" that *Cognitive Neuroscience*—**not** *Biocentric Psychology* as guided by *Objectivism* philosophy—is the *explainer* of human psychology.

But what if *Cognitive Neuroscience* as *explainer*—we the people can and do ask—is to real psychology what a TV repair man's "description" of a television's ampere current flows and voltages and inductances and ohmic-resistance values are to "explaining" the "Mary Tyler Moore Show" during which the TV repair guy measured them. If he did this and then also took these *electrical* measurements during "Seinfeld" [or substitute any two of *your* top ten favorite TV shows] and offered us an *ampere* and *voltage* and *ohmic* "explanation" of these TV shows we would ... laugh ... really really loudly.

But the Bureaucratic Government doesn't care. Their goal isn't to explain mental health and mental illness, but rather it is to *control* and *social engineer*

¹ If you doubt the importance of *volition*, look at WHAT the Islamic Fundamentalist Terrorists have *chosen* to do with theirs.

each and every one of us into some god-awful kind of sheepish group wondering the wilderness looking for a shepherd to lead us.

You doubt this?

On p. 57 of its document: "*Mental Health: A Report of the Surgeon General*", the United States Government writes:

Progress in understanding depression and schizophrenia offers exciting examples of how findings from different disciplines of the mental health field have many common threads (Andreasen, N.C., 1997: Linking mind and brain in the study of mental illnesses: A project for a scientific psychopathology, *Science*, 275, 1586-1593).ⁱ Despite the differences in terminology and methodology, the results from different disciplines have converged to paint a vivid picture of the nature of the fundamental defects and the regions of the brain that underlie these defects. Even in the case of depression and schizophrenia, there is much to be uncovered about etiology, yet the mental health field is seen as poised "to use the power of multiple disciplines." The disciplines are urged [by who?] to link together the study of the mind and the brain in the search for understanding mental health and mental illness (Andreasen, 1997. [Oh! Andreasen is who, but why him or her get to urge? And isn't this *Government* report "urging" by citing this reference?]).

This linkage [what linkage?] already has been cemented [by whom?] between cognitive psychology [the psychology of Immanuel Kant's philosophy of Kan't Know], behavioral neurology [that substitutes "behavior of neurons" for "behavior of animals" in Skinnerian, et al. Behaviorism], computer science [which views man as a super-duper Artificially Intelligent Android built by the super-duperist computer scientist in the universe—i.e. god], and neuroscience [which is physiology ... not psychology, but... physiology of the brain]. These disciplines have knit together [a rat's nest? ...] the field of "cognitive neuroscience" (Kosslyn, S. M., & Shin, L. M., 1992, The

status of cognitive neuroscience, *Current Opinions in Neurobiology*, 2, 146-149)ⁱⁱ

On p. 21 this same Government Report states, "...integrative neuroscience and molecular genetics present some of the most exciting basic research opportunities in medical science." This is said on p. 21 under Number 1 of its **Action** Plan for Mental Health in the new millennium; this first course of action is:

Continue to Build the [cognitive neuro]Science Base.

This *explicit* endorsement of "cognitive neuroscience" as the integrator for Mental Health and Mental illness as same relate to The Science of Psychology is precisely that: explicit. One of the few areas in which t.h.e.y are explicit.

One wonders, why?

Why here and not everywhere?

Is it that t.h.e.y have to be explicit somewhere so that their fellow "scientists" can get the message?

Yes, because: if t.h.e.i.r fellows don't get the *message*, t.h.e.y don't get the funds.

If you (you, qua reader, not me qua yu, but you qua you) *still* believe that the linkage between the Bureaucratic Minds within the Government and their flunky scientists from the country's ivoriest ivory towers isn't real, then then then I do not know what to say ... other than ... that which follows.

Prior to the 1970's few people knew that Doctor Burrhus Frederic Skinner—the renowned American *Behaviorist* Psychologist—predicted that he *could* and *would* fill up America first—and the whole world eventually—with human beings who did not need either *freedom* or *dignity* in their everyday lives². He did not say *what* he was going to use as replacement for these two fundamental needs of autonomous human beings, he simply said he was going to do away with them.³

Then in 1971 with the first publication of his book "*Beyond Freedom and Dignity*"—a book *openly* acknowledged to have been bought and paid for by the United States Government via the *National Institute of Mental Health* (NIMH) Grant number K6-MH-21, 775-01—Dr. Skinner told all of us *explicitly* what his plans were for *autonomous* man and how he and *his* cohorts were going to kill him off.ⁱⁱⁱ

² If Dr. Burrhus F. Skinner didn't need dignity why'd he change his name to "B.F."?

³ Actually he did say *what* he was going to replace them with but to spell it *all* out here would be anti-dramatic.

One cannot say, "we" did not believe him, that "we" did not take him seriously because *Beyond Freedom and Dignity* was touted as "...one of the most important happenings in 20th-century psychology..." quoting an excerpt from its own cover. The same cover that reminded us that Dr. Skinner's previous book, *Walden Two*, was a million copy best seller.

The NIMH today—a *Behaviorist [in the anti-volition, anti-freedom, anti-dignity, anti-autonomous man sense of the term] Sympathetic Institution*—is stronger now than it was in Skinner's day and it continues to grow stronger. And the scary *fact* is, it grew stronger in the shadow of one of the strongest intellectual defenses of *freedom* ever presented to the *reasoning* world.

In 1957 with the first publication of *Atlas Shrugged*, Ayn Rand said she was going to stop the *mystic, collectivist, altruistic, machine—that is, the anti-autonomous man machine*—then running the world. She said she'd do this by filling up the world with people who were *so selfish*—so *individually* selfish, so *Objectivismly* selfish—that they would *not* tolerate the likes of those who preached people didn't have *any* kind of needs of consciousness, let alone no fundamental, basic need of *consciousness* such as the *need* for freedom.

If *freedom* isn't a legitimate human need why do we *value* it so deeply?

Are we born valuing it or as we develop and grow older do we learn the *reasons* why we *should* (hence, do) value it?

The answer to this depends on how we interpret the meaning of the philosopher's assertion that human beings are born *tabula rasa*, that is, are born as a blank-slate. Is it as *BiO Spiritualism* interprets it—that is, as the way in which BiO Spiritualism paraphrases Biocentric Psychology: our survival *needs* are innate not learned and our to-be-developed blank slate *capacities to satisfy those needs* are programmed by us in our non-omniscient *volitional* choices as we act and re-act to the world in which we live OR is it as *Behaviorism* and all other non-need-psychology schools of thought interpret it: our blank-slate human *needs* have to be learned and hence they are *not* innate and our innate human capacities to satisfy our helter-skelter needs are programmed by the environment and/or genetics as we flailingly re-act to the world in which we have to propagate our gene pool.

The difference here is critical and it forms one cornerstone of what can be called "psycho-hermeneutics" (as in interpreting your own psychology rather than relying on someone else to do it for you) and the beginnings of a truly New Spiritualism. A *spiritualism* that cares about *precision* and being *right* (*needs* are not learned, they are discovered). A *spiritualism* that *worships* non-contradiction

and cares about *truth* (learning *how to properly* exercise our capacities to satisfy our needs is what is learn-able). A spiritualism that starts by saying that *truth* and *falsehood* are *not* the same thing. That truth—as Aristotle said—*must be preferred*. And by implication, *the false* must be—not de-ferred, but—dis-valued. *How much* preferred and *how much* dis-valued is part of the subject matter of psycho-hermeneutics as already presented in Chapter 17 (e.g., when the skin deep Skinnerians say man has no depth—no soul/no consciousness—they are ... no right, that is, *they are wrong*).

For an example of truth vs. false consider that in Ayn Rand's *Philosophy of Objectivism* freedom is a human need. In *Behaviorism* it is not. Both of these positions cannot be true. In *Behaviorism*—the alleged "science" of psychology as proclaimed by the mainstream American intellectuals of the last century—not only is *freedom* not a human need, but neither is *dignity*. Contrast this with the *psychology* of the early Objectivist, Dr. Nathaniel Branden. As an Objectivist he accepts that *freedom* is a basic human need, and as a (life-centered, Biocentric) psychologist he argues so also is *dignity* [i.e. *authentic* self-esteem] a human need. He "preaches" that *freedom and dignity* are such *basic* human needs that without them we are not human beings. Dr. Branden's first major book on psychology: *The Psychology of Self Esteem*^{iv} is totally and completely dedicated to teaching *developing* man how to become *dignified*—that is, *authentically self-valuing*—man. This book was published the same year an American explorer stepped on the moon and it is an intricate study and blueprint for man—the *explorer*—to follow as he *discovers* how to create and build his *autonomous* self out of nature's *raw* materials.

We all have the *raw* materials. As did all humans before us.

But "we" are *here and now*, so one question for us as *modern* day men and women is: Can we achieve autonomy (be self ruling in the self functions: TFAJ) *in spite* of the culture we live in?⁴ That is to say, *that* is the question for those of us who *value* autonomy. For those "others" who *dis-value* autonomy...for T.H.E.M. the question is: How can I do my part to help the *Behaviorist's* and their friends kill off autonomous man? Is sending them my tax money to support their research good enough or *should* I do more?

⁴ Thinking, Feeling, Acting, Judging. If we accept the BiO Spiritualism view that "culture" as a total, "whole" thing is like a "sum" of fractions and operates on the same principle: namely, before you can "add them all up" you have to *reduce* them to the LOWEST common denominator, then this statement is true for all who aspire to HIGHER in *any* (and all) culture(s).

The second question in the foregoing could very easily be one of the follow up questions that T.H.E.Y. ask themselves. But it isn't the only one *to be* asked. There are many other *better* questions that "they" could ask themselves but do not. Some of these better questions are: *what is freedom? Where does it come from? Is it guaranteed to individuals or does it depend on some kind of action on the individuals part? Is freedom valuable or is the valuing of it merely a conditioned—associationally “learned” in the Skinnerian-Pavlovian dog sense—response and consequently human beings can just as easily “learn” to dis-value it?* For correct answers to these kinds of "better" questions we have to turn to the *Objectivists*, who, as a group of professional intellectuals, have become—not by default, but by *choice*—the intellectual guardians of *freedom* in America (and by default, on the planet).

One such Objectivist is Dr. Peikoff who some thirteen years after Dr. Branden wrote the definitive psychological primer on how to become *dignified* man, Dr. Peikoff published his first book "*The Ominous Parallels. The End of Freedom in America*".^v In this book Dr. Peikoff—the intellectual heir to Ayn Rand's *Objectivism* following her unfortunate, sad death this same year—meticulously traced and identified for the whole world to see, the philosophical roots beneath and hence *the cause* of the German Nazis who *initiated* World War II and killed off *freedom* in a way never seen before. With this book Dr. Peikoff predicted that *freedom* in America was going to *die* by forces *similar* to those inhabiting the inner-conflicted ideologues—the Social Democrats—of Germany's Weimar Republic following World War I. The Social Democrats of that era thought they could integrate the nonintegrable, that is, they thought they were exempt from the *laws of consciousness* and as such that they could do the impossible. They of course didn't come out and say directly, "We think we can do the impossible", rather they "predicted" they could by *implying* they could. They implied they could *integrate* Marxism **and** Capitalism by integrating Capitalism's *methods* **into** Marxism's ideals.^{vi} In essence "they" said: "Let's *promote* Marxism by *using* the Capitalists. Capitalistic man isn't very bright when it comes to [a sheep's view of] *ethics* so he should be pretty easy to control. We'll use *his* productive *superiority* to promote *our* ideology." As a result—of *trying to integrate the nonintegrable*—the (German) Weimarcians *made* themselves and their country *along with them* ineffectual obstacles to the (Nazi) thugs who eventually took over Germany.⁵

⁵ A word of *caution* to all conscientious people who have not yet read *The Ominous Parallels* but are contemplating doing so. If you have ever wondered in your own mind how *you* may or may not have acted had *you* been a young adult living during the time of the Nazi's, this book affords you that opportunity. Dr.

The thugs and their accomplices then, took over Germany by *predicting* that they and *their* social designers could design and produce what nobody else could: a *square circle society*. Then, these Nazi thugs and their sympathizer thugs proceeded to show the world what a *real* "square circle" looks like, and *how* to build one.

If one believed in God, which I no longer do, but if one did, it is *here* that one would stand erect, look up while throwing one's hands skyward and say: "thank god for America".

And Americans.⁶

Today is a day in the first year of the first century following all of last century's dire predictions.

And where do we stand?

In this, the first year of the first century following Dr. Skinner's prediction and efforts to destroy *autonomous* man as well as all the voluminous anti-Skinnerian by-products of numerous Ayn Rand disciple-authors—including the Herculean efforts of the still fighting Dr. Peikoff—we stand *where* freedom stands every day of its life: on the edge of the precipice of *apathy* and mental laziness. In the face of this—that is in the colloquial sense of a "in your face" attitude—the *President of the United States of America* in his year 2000 budget has authorized—unopposed in a *silence* of meekness and moral cowardice that can be heard around the world—the President has authorized Government agencies to dole out *five billion dollars* per year (to start and because of the *nature of the bureaucratic mind* to escalate every year per year thereafter) to Dr. Skinner's *followers* and *sympathizers* for them to use in putting the *final touches* on what Skinner had started—albeit not originated—and envisioned: a *totally* planned, *socially engineered* society completely devoid of *autonomous* men and women.

Peikoff, with this book, has nailed the Nazi mentality to the wall for all to see and it is a puzzlement to me why I have never seen it referred to or heard it mentioned even *once* in all the Public Television "episodes" about Nazi Germany and the Holocaust that I have watched over the past, almost 30 years now. Is it because I don't know everything and it has been mentioned and I just missed it or is there a *bureaucratic mentality* in the *public* sphere that is actively ignoring Dr. Peikoff's accomplishments? Or is this evidence of the desire for the *contradictory* on my part—on my own terms? That is, since I think "culture" is LOWEST common denominator why do I expect it to endorse the HIGHEST? Or is this evidence of me *equivocating* on LOWEST and HIGHEST? For now, I accept that the *best* possible choice here in this multiple choice question is: (a) a *bureaucratic mentality* in the public sphere *actively* ignoring all of *Objectivism's* accomplishments, with Dr. Peikoff's *Ominous Parallels* book simply being included on the "guilty by association" premise.

⁶ Or if you are British, you might want to say: "...thank god for Sir Winston Leonard Spencer Churchill..."; or if you were...and so on... *freedom* lovers and *freedom* fighters know who to thank for the historical victories over tyranny—be they victories over the external kind or the internal kind.

If you think my last sentence is excessively long, wait until you live under the kind of *engineered* society you might have to live under if the "collectivists" achieve their utopian dreams of a ruled, dictated, totally controlled "society".⁷

Along with the *irrefutable fact of the \$5,000,000,000 Government Grant* to Behaviorist sympathizers it appears quite possible that three other things are just as true. One, George Orwell will end up being off by no more than 100 years in his prediction made in the 1940's that "1984" would be the year *totalitarianism* takes over America. Two: if *Objectivism* and *Biocentric Psychology* do not *explicitly* embrace each other and/or if enough of us don't *embrace* both of them—or some very close relatives thereof—for ourselves, then you, me and everybody will be double speaking "doublespeak" well before the occurrence of the Centennial celebration of "1984". A "celebration" that is being planned right now by your *wannabe* social engineers and social designer-controllers. And three: Dr. Peikoff *succeeded* (almost single handedly albeit with a little help from his friends) in warding off a Weimarcian society in America while at the same time *inadvertently* providing the Behaviorists, *Cognitive* Psychologist-Neurologists and all *bureaucratic minds* EVERYWHERE (thanks to the Internet) a *reverse* blueprint to follow as they work to bring to fruition their "utopian" view—updated and "modernized" out of necessity—of an America ruled by a *VOLUNTARY TOTALITARIANISM*.

Voluntary totalitarianism is pure Democracy's ultimate, inevitable, inescapable, "logical" end.

Your success at becoming *autonomous* man is *our* only defense against it.

We can see from our observations of their illusion worship and their TV repair man "explanation" of "psychology" that the *self-contradictory* nature of such a phrase as "voluntary totalitarianism" will not and does not bother "them"—t.h.e.m, the Bureaucratic Minds and Social Engineers—in the least. Quite frankly, *they* simply believe that "people"—that is, *you and me*—are to stupid to get it.⁸

And if the peoples start to get it?

Well...we'll just keep calling it something else.

⁷ To a *true* collectivist, saying "totally controlled" and "society" in the same sentence is redundant.

⁸ You, qua reader, think this overly dramatic? If so, you connect these three dots: ●₁ (p. 410 of the Surgeon General's report [see References: Chapter 15, ii) with ●₂ (HG's anti-reason, only losers use Aristotle based logic of Venn diagrams [see/read Chapter 13 in general and pp. 364, 365 specifically of Reference ii given here under Chapter 16 References]) and ●₃ (Surgeon General's report p. 57 clarion call to action of all ivory tower types to use their "power of multiple disciplines" to *pound* [or, *urged* to link, if you prefer] the square peg 'mind' into the round hole brain [and/or vice—pun intended—versa]). ©s

How 'bout we call it "Behaviorism"?

Can't, they've already gotten that.

How about "Cognitive Psychology" then?

Well they 'kinda got that too because "psychology" has become synonymous with "Behaviorism" so that "Cognitive Behaviorism" is to *easy* to get.

OK. How about "Cognitive Neuroscience"?

Ooooooooooh...Grrrr-ate! That sounds great. If Donna Shalala OK's it we'll go with it and publish it on p. 57 of her first report to the nation on mental health. A report telling those same people *exactly* how she and hers will spend the billions and billions and hopefully *eventually* (in less than 65 years) **trillions** of dollars that they, the democratic peoples, freely, openly and unabashedly gift the *bureaucratic mind* in the form of excessive tax revenue out of every paycheck of every pay period of every year of their productive lives.⁹

"*Mental Health: A Report of the Surgeon General*" published in the last month of the last year of the last century of the last millennium by so many US Government agencies that it's difficult to count them all, explicitly lays it out for all of us to see. And what we can *see* is that the *bureaucratic arms* of the United States Government is pulling out all stops and is going to *enlist* and *embrace* the social engineering minded to *Socially Engineer* each and every one of us—one neuron at a time if that's what it takes—into *submission* and *subservience* to the *anti-autonomous man mentality*, whether we like it or not.

Unfortunately, *some* like it.

This mystic-collectivist-altruistic anti-autonomous man "mentality" is deeply embedded in the American "cultural mind" in a sense analogous to that which is embedded in sheep's "minds". That is, *sheep are sheepish* and if they could think and act from thoughts (which they cannot, but if they could) their "spiritual" quest would be to find a "shepherd". Given the ever growing power of the bureaucratic mind as same is manifest in the NIMH and other Governmental agencies it appears as if our choice is being reduced to its barest essentials: Do you want to be a man (the *autonomous* kind) or a sheep. Here is one area in which religious people or more precisely "Christians" *cannot* escape the hot seat of judgment: Whose image is it that is (and at what age is it embedded), that shows Jesus as the quintessential *shepherd* and *you* as a little sheep in his flock

⁹ 5 billion dollars at a growth rate of 10% per year will—by the rule of 72—double every 7.2 years, therefore, it will exceed 1 trillion dollars in 56 years. Of course if the 10% growth rate is less, it will take longer and if more, shorter.

of sheep? It is *not* Ayn Rand's, this I *know for sure*, that is, *for 100%, absolute sure*.

The foregoing "vice of sheepishness" is the "danger" lurking in the mental pathways of our cultural selves and as you have witnessed here, *BiO Spiritualism* is the first book to *explicitly* advocate that what America *needs* most right now is *individuals* and especially *adult* individuals and *what* adult individuals need most is *The Philosophy of Objectivism PLUS The Psychology of Biocentric Psychology* and a book that shows them how to *embrace and apply* these two intellectual disciplines to help them to identify and then satisfy—with full and complete satiation—their own *true* spiritual needs.

If one believes—as the *Objectivists* do albeit not as I do but—as the (naïve?) *Objectivists* do that *Religion* is a *primitive* Philosophy then one has to believe that so too is it a primitive psychology (*thinking* lustful thoughts is the *same*—morally, psychologically, ethically, actually, practically—as acting them out in reality). Since psychology is to an important degree *applied* philosophy we can see that psychology is intimately connected to and all wrapped up in *philosophy*, which—to repeat, *some* believe—is a form of religion (or if you are an Objectivist, vice versa). Or to be more *precise*, [philosophy (to the naïve? Objectivist)] is a *form* that can *include anything, even* religion.

If this and the idea that the State is not suppose to endorse any *particular* Religion, then why—you may be wondering—the f*!@#&'h is it endorsing AND attempting to Institutionalize *Cognitive Neuroscience*?

Is it because *they* are the T.H.E.Y—the anti-Objective, the anti-reason, the anti-Ayn Rand, the anti-correct philosophy they—that are building a monument out of Kantian clay and calling it, *Cognitive Neuroscience*, the savior of us poor little wretched mentally ill people who don't know which end of the stick is up ... out of the water and hence not bent by slow moving light ... nor that *The Group* is the source of all good on earth and that since we absolutely refuse to get the message that (some) philosophers since Plato have been trying to *ram* down our throat (talk about abuse) T.H.E.Y will protect us from our self and finish building the monument. But, my real fear is, T.H.E.Y know Ayn Rand is correct and they are *afraid of her* and will do *whatever* it takes to maintain control over what they consider to be t.h.e.i.r flock, that is t.h.e.i.r *sheep*, that is *you and me*, that is, *for shearing*.

Is this the *ultimate* achievement for the *Bureaucratic Mind* and the *Social Engineers*: the wool they use to pull over our eyes is the same wool sheared from our own backs?!?!?!?

But as Ayn Rand has told us, this is such a simple game to beat, all you have to do is: not play.

Of course this doesn't say *what* we should do as an alternative.

And do nothing is *not* an alternative.

But to do what you love *is* an alternative and is the *preferred* one.

The second choice is do what you love and can make a living at.

The third one is, do what productive work you must in order to live and set up for that day when you can do what you love.

But the goal, the motivator, the ultimate drive is to end up doing what you love. If you achieve this then you will be happy.

You will that is, if you also *worship* non-contradiction and joy.¹⁰ These are the "given" in the tenet that says, do the productive work you love and you will be happy.

Even as I write the foregoing a part of me feels like a naïve person, forget naïve realist or naïve objectivist or naïve anything, just plain 'ole simple naïve person—says the cynical within—is one who thinks he or she can *actually* live life creatively, passionately, ... happily! Where'd they get such a notion?

Well, I got mine from *Objectivism* and *Biocentric Psychology*, where'd you get yours?

Oh!

You don't have one?

Now I *see*.

¹⁰ Because then when ... you *are* happy because you *should* be happy, you *will know it*. And you will know it in the organismic sense of the term: *I see what I see and I know what I know*. I know that I *am* happy; happiness being a state of noncontradictory joy.

DOWNLOAD Your FREE eBook:

Get your FREE eBook/Starter Kit for helping you solve ALL your psychological problems:

Selfish'ism

Get
up
off
your
deathbed
and
save
yourself
brother.
I
had
to
and
so
do
you.

Gary Dean Deering
(aka the world's first PsychHology Engineer)

- * Not just your early onset bipolar problems.
- * Not just your early onset depression problems.
- * Not just your overarching anxiety problems.
- * Not just low self-esteem problems.
- * Not just your growing unhappiness.

But all of these and more.

Get started NOW on solving ALL
your psychological problems and
get on your happiness PATH today.

Get your FREE Book

Selfish'ism, qua self help book, is critical reading in the battle to keep your mind for yourself and not give it away willy-nilly to those others who want it in order to control you.

Selfish'ism, qua primer on true *Scientific Psychology*, is the foundation for our future investigations into three areas of its sphere of influence in our lives: *Psychology Engineering*, *Theoretical Psych(h)ology* and *Teleometrics* (the mathematics of introspection).

Since Psychology as a science is dead some say it was never born.

So they—those same some—ask: so how could it be dead?

Answer: by virtue of the fact that it refuses to study the proper phenomenon in reality.

As long as psychology—that is, one 'h' psychology—insists on studying the wrong things, it will always lead to a dead end. Always.

Human Beings with human consciousness are the right things to study. Of course, for the broadest science, all living things that possess consciousness (awareness) are the right things to study.

For this reason I am designating real psychology, scientific psychology to be two 'hh' psychology with the capitalized version—i.e., PsychHology—to be a specialty inside the broader two 'hh' psychology field.

That is, PsychHology is all about Human PsychHology.

I use two 'hh' psychology and one capital 'H' PsychHology interchangeably and by these I mean the science as started and defined by the Father of Modern (non-contemporary, non-dead)

Psychology—Dr. Nathaniel Branden. In his seminal work on Theoretical Psychology—*The Psychology of Self Esteem*—first published by Nash Publishing in 1969, Dr. Branden defined psychology as: ... the science that studies the attributes and characteristics that certain living

organisms possess by virtue of being conscious. This definition is tomorrow's psychology today.

Today's psychology is our now salvation.



Selfish'ism

Get up off your deathbed and save yourself brother. I had to and so do you.

Deering

Raise Books, LLC

There's nothing wrong with having psychological problems, it's what **you** do or don't do about them where right and wrong enter in.

--Ayn Rand

REFERENCES

(some with notes and elaborations)

Chapter 19

ⁱ Department of Health and Human Services, *Mental Health: A Report of the Surgeon General* (Washington DC, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1999), 57.

ⁱⁱ *ibid.*

ⁱⁱⁱ Skinner, B.F. *Beyond Freedom and Dignity*. Toronto/New York: Bantam/Vintage Books/Knopf, 1971 pbk., 216/Acknowledgments.

^{iv} Branden, Nathaniel. *The Psychology of Self-Esteem*. Toronto: Bantam Books, Inc., by arrangement with Nash Publishing Corporation, 1969, paperback.

^v Peikoff, Leonard. *The Ominous Parallels. End of Freedom in America*. New York: Stein and Day, 1982.

^{vi} *ibid.*, 148.