

view of human evolution', and **'bonobos display...what might be thought of as our better angels'** ("Hippie chimp" genome may shed light on our dark side', *Science* on NBCNews.com, 13 Jun. 2012; see <www.wtmsources.com/141>). So, according to Hare, chimpanzee-like instincts in humans account for our **'dark side'**, while the instincts allegedly accounted for by the SEM/SDH, as demonstrated by the bonobos, gave rise to our goodness, our unconditionally selfless moral instincts, our **'better angels'**. This argument presents a model for our 'good and evil'-afflicted human condition that is similar to that provided by Wilson's Multilevel Selection theory for eusociality, except that our 'good' instincts are supposedly derived from factors espoused by the SEM/SDH, rather than cooperation forged through warring with other groups, as Wilson suggested. As was emphasised when the Multilevel Selection 'explanation' for the human condition was presented and exposed, we humans *do* have unconditionally selfless, loving, 'good' instincts but they were derived from the nurturing love-indoctrination process that bonobos are developing; and we *do* practise divisive, 'bad' behaviour, but, again, that is derived not from genetic competitiveness but from a psychosis that emerged when our conscious mind was liberated by the love-indoctrination process, and, once liberated, rapidly developed to challenge our *completely* loving (not partially loving and partially selfish) 'good' instincts for the role of managing our lives. So, what Hare, Wobber and Wrangham are doing is precisely what Wilson was doing with his Multilevel Selection theory, which was to bring the human condition to our attention, but only to trivialise it—to subvert the truth about the all-important issue of our psychologically troubled condition!

⁵⁶⁷ There are so many dangers associated with the SEM/SDH that it hardly bears thinking about. With E.O. Wilson's all-out atomic bomb attack on the truth about the human condition, and now Hare, Wobber and Wrangham's no-holds-barred asteroid attack on the best evidence we have for the origins of our moral soul, and also on the truth about the human condition, the honesty and resulting insight needed to save the human race is being buried at the bottom of the deepest, darkest ocean trench that has been filled with reinforced concrete for good measure. It is truth-hating behaviour of the highest order. Basically, mechanistic science has become completely deranged—and since science is the facility charged with delivering us from the human condition, this state of affairs represents end play for the human race!

⁵⁶⁸ Without the exposé being presented in this book all hope for humanity would be lost. But, as will now be described, this exposé is yet to be recognised by the scientific establishment—indeed, for 30 years now all it has received from that corner is obscenely irresponsible, stone-wall resistance.

Chapter 6:12 *The great obscenity*

⁵⁶⁹ Early in this book, in chapter 2:4, a warning was given about the extremely dangerous 'trap' that lay in wait for the human race in its quest to find understanding of the human condition. It was explained that unable to face the truth of our corrupted condition while we couldn't truthfully explain it, humans had no choice but to avoid any truths that brought the unbearable issue into focus and instead live in Plato's dark, **'living tomb'** **'cave'** of alienated denial of it, with science, practised as it is by humans, having to comply with this strategy. Science has necessarily been **'reductionist'** and **'mechanistic'**. It has avoided the overarching

whole view of life that required having to confront the issue of the human condition and instead *reduced* its focus to only looking down at the details of the *mechanisms* of the workings of our world, in the hope that understanding of those mechanisms would eventually make it possible for someone who wasn't afraid of the human condition to come along and synthesise the actual explanation of that condition from those hard-won insights—at which point there would no longer be any need for humanity to live in a dark and horrible state of alienating denial.

⁵⁷⁰ As was pointed out about this strategy, the very dangerous trap inherent in this mechanistic, resigned-to-living-in-denial-of-the-human-condition, fundamentally dishonest approach is that it could become *so* entrenched that those practising it could resist the human-condition-confronting, truthful explanation of the human condition when it *was* finally found and continue to persevere with the dishonest strategy to the point of taking humanity to terminal alienation and extinction. The potential trap is that the established *dishonest* scientific paradigm might not tolerate the arrival of the *truthful* scientific paradigm, even though facilitating its arrival has been science's great objective and fundamental responsibility—and the only means by which the human race can be liberated from its condition, and thus transformed. Yes, despite putting forward an *extremely* dishonest and dangerous 'explanation' of the human condition, E.O. Wilson did truthfully recognise this great objective in the human journey of solving the human condition when he wrote that '**There is no grail more elusive or precious in the life of the mind than the key to understanding the human condition**' (*The Social Conquest of Earth*, 2012, p.1 of 330).

⁵⁷¹ And most alarmingly, the evidence so far is that science *has* fallen into this human-race-destroying trap of becoming *so* habituated to living in denial of the human condition that it is refusing to acknowledge the fully accountable, truthful explanation of the human condition that has been synthesised from the insights it was tasked with finding—in particular, as explained in chapter 3, the insights it discovered into the difference in the way genes and nerves process information.

⁵⁷² For over 30 years now, I and the 50 Founding Members of the World Transformation Movement (the WTM, the organisation I established in 1983 to research and promote understanding of the human condition because mechanistic science wouldn't approach this all-important subject) have been trying to interest the scientific community in the world-saving insights into the human condition that are being presented in this book, but, save for a handful of supportive scientists and some positive responses from other eminent scientists and thinkers, all of our submissions have so far, as I will shortly document, been either ignored or rejected by the scientific establishment. And not just rejected, but allowed to be *brutally* persecuted.

⁵⁷³ In 1995, instead of attracting interest, debate and support, I and the WTM were so ferociously attacked by the two biggest, left-wing (dogmatic, pseudo idealistic, 'let's pretend there's no human condition that has to be solved and the world should just be ideal', dishonest) media organisations in Australia, namely our national public broadcaster, the Australian Broadcasting Corporation (ABC), and Fairfax Media, that I was made a pariah in the Australian community and the WTM was completely marginalised. We endured this situation

until, after 15 long years of emotionally exhausting, and, for such a small group, financially taxing, defamation actions taken by us (which, we've been told by legal experts, involved what was at the time the biggest defamation case in Australia's history), we finally managed to right the extremely serious wrong. This vindication came in 2010 when three judges in the New South Wales Court of Appeal unanimously found that the earlier 2008 lower court ruling—which found my work to be of **'such a poor standard that it has no support at all from the scientific community'**—did **'not adequately consider' 'the nature and scale of its subject matter'**, in particular **'that the work was a grand narrative explanation from a holistic approach, involving teleological elements'**, and that other important submissions **'were not adequately considered by the primary judge'**, including that the work can make **'those who take the trouble to grapple with it uncomfortable'** because it **'involves reflections on subject-matter including the purpose of human existence which may, of its nature, cause an adverse reaction as it touches upon issues which some would regard as threatening to their ideals, values or even world views'**! (A documentation of this attack in the Australian media and the subsequent court cases can be read at <www.humancondition.com/persecution>.)

⁵⁷⁴This situation, where rather than *receiving* support from the scientific establishment for producing the all-important breakthrough synthesis of the human condition that science has been charged with finding, I have been not just ignored and rejected but viciously attacked, was actually fully predicted long, long ago, some 360 years before Christ, by Plato during Greece's Golden Age. Recall in par. 81 how the acclaimed philosopher A.N. Whitehead described the history of philosophy as merely **'a series of footnotes to Plato'**? Well, that greatest of all philosophers was not only sound and secure enough in self to admit humans have metaphorically been hiding deep underground in a cave of denial (as was described in par. 83), he was *also* able to warn of the great danger posed by the cave prisoners' determined opposition to the arrival of the truth that frees them from their horrible existence in that dark 'cave'.

⁵⁷⁵While some of this description was referred to in par. 83, the inclusion here of more of what Plato wrote shows just how prophetic he was in anticipating the persecution that would meet the arrival of understanding of the human condition. Plato wrote: **'I want you to go on to picture the enlightenment or ignorance of our human conditions somewhat as follows. Imagine an underground chamber, like a cave with an entrance open to the daylight and running a long way underground. In this chamber are men who have been prisoners there'** (*The Republic*; tr. H.D.P. Lee, 1955, 514; or see all these quotes in *The Republic* highlighted at <www.wtmsources.com/227>). In this cave allegory Plato went on to describe how the cave's exit is blocked by a fire, such that if one of the prisoners were **'to stand up and turn his head and look and walk towards the fire; all these actions would be painful...and he would [have to] turn back and take refuge'** in the cave of **'shadows'**, which are only an **'illusion'** of the real world outside the cave (515). The allegory makes clear that while **'the light of the fire in the cave prison [corresponds] to the power of the sun'** (517), and **'the sun...makes the things we see visible'** (509), such that without it we can only **'see dimly and appear to be almost blind'** (508), having to hide in the **'cave'** of **'illusion'** and endure **'almost blind'** alienation was infinitely preferable to facing the searing, **'painful' 'light'** of the **'fire'/'sun'** that would make **'visible'** the unbearably depressing issue of **'the imperfections of human life'** (517).

⁵⁷⁶Having described how living in a cave-like state of **'almost blind'** alienated denial has, tragically, been absolutely necessary, Plato wrote that it was ultimately only by being

‘illuminated by truth and reality’ (508) that ‘the enlightenment...of our human conditions’ could be achieved and the cave prisoners be ‘released from their bonds and cured of their delusions’ (515). He then described the initial resistance the cave prisoners would have to being ‘released from their bonds and cured of their delusions’ when someone achieved ‘the enlightenment...of our human conditions’ through being ‘illuminated by truth and reality’. To quote from a summary of the cave allegory that appeared in the *Encarta Encyclopedia*’s entry for ‘Plato’: **‘Breaking free, one of the individuals escapes from the cave into the light of day. With the aid of the sun [necessarily living free of denial of the glaring, burning, searing truth of Integrative Meaning and the issue it raises of our human condition—and assisted by the understandings that science has found of the differences in the way genes and nerves process information], that person sees for the first time the real world and returns to the cave with the message that the only things they have seen heretofore are shadows and appearances and that the real world awaits them if they are willing to struggle free of their bonds. The shadowy environment of the cave symbolizes for Plato the physical world of appearances. Escape into the sun-filled setting outside the cave symbolizes the transition to the real world, the world of full and perfect being, the world of Forms, which is the proper object of knowledge’** (written by Prof. Robert M. Baird; see <www.wtmsources.com/101>). To return to *The Republic* and Plato’s own words: **‘if he [the cave prisoner] were made to look directly at the light of the fire [again the fire represents the searing truth of Integrative Meaning and the issue of our human condition it raises], it would hurt his eyes and he would turn back and take refuge in the things which he could see [take refuge in all the denials and dishonest explanations and arguments that he has become attached and accustomed to], which he would think really far clearer than the things being shown him. And if he were forcibly dragged up the steep and rocky ascent [out of the cave of denial by the person who has broken free of the cave] and not let go till he had been dragged out into the sunlight [shown the truthful all-liberating—but at the same time all-exposing and confronting—explanation of our human condition], the process would be a painful one, to which he would much object, and when he emerged into the light his eyes would be so overwhelmed by the brightness of it that he wouldn’t be able to see a single one of the things he was now told were real [as described in ch. 1:4, this inability to absorb discussion of the human condition because it has been such an unbearable, off-limits subject for so long is what we in the WTM regularly encounter and refer to as the ‘deaf effect’—as one reader of my books admitted, ‘When I first read this material all I saw were a lot of black marks on white paper’]’** (515-516). Plato continued: **‘they would say that his visit to the upper world had ruined his sight [they would treat the person who tries to deliver understanding of our human condition as if he was mad, which is how I have been treated for many years, as I talk more about below], and [they would say] that the ascent [out of the cave] was not worth even attempting [such assertions that it’s not worth attempting have been regularly made against our work, with one of the architects of the mid-1990s public campaign of persecution against myself and the WTM saying, ‘You know you are encroaching on the personal unspeakable inside people and you won’t succeed’ (WTM records, 12 Feb. 1995), and the other architect of the attacks, the church minister who produced the defamatory articles and television program about my work, saying, ‘You realise you are attempting the impossible, you will be fighting to have this material accepted right down to the last person on the planet’ (WTM records, 16 Feb. 1995)]’** (517). Plato didn’t stop there, going on to say, **‘And if anyone tried to release them and lead them up, they would kill him if they could lay hands on him’** (ibid. Again, all these quotes in *The Republic* highlighted can be seen at <www.wtmsources.com/227>). (I might mention here that this idea that humans have been living as prisoners in a mind-controlled state of denial of their

reality, and of attacking the person who tries to liberate them from this state, forms part of our collective subconscious awareness because it periodically crops up in our mythologies. The same essential myth is found in the ancient Native American legend of *The Story of Jumping Mouse*, and, in more contemporary times, in the film *The Truman Show*. The deep resonance of the myth is also evidenced by the various science fiction films that have been based on Plato's cave allegory, such as *Dark City*, *City of Ember* and, most notably, *The Matrix*.)

⁵⁷⁷ So Plato predicted that the cave prisoners would not just resist adopting the human-race-liberating explanation of the human condition '**which is the proper object of knowledge**', they would be murderously angry towards it—hence the brutal campaign of persecution against me and those supporting these understandings of the human condition. What the attackers did that was *so* destructive of myself and the WTM was to base their whole ferocious and malicious media fear campaign against me and our work at the WTM on the accusation that I am a deluded, megalomaniac leader of a dangerous anti-social, mind-controlling cult. But how could I possibly be so unsound as to be a deluded, megalomaniac leader of a dangerous anti-social organisation when I have been sound enough to look into the human condition, as even the statements made by the architects of the attack acknowledged when they said that I was **'encroaching on the personal unspeakable [of the human condition]' and **'attempting the impossible [of confronting people with the human condition]'**?** Quite simply, as Christ pointed out when he was similarly accused of being '**possessed by...the prince of demons**' (Mark 3:22) for his honest, human condition confronting and penetrating words, '**How can Satan drive out Satan?**' (3:23). Christ was making the same point when he said that '**A good tree cannot bear bad fruit, and a bad tree cannot bear good fruit**' (Matt. 7:18). No, the real motivation for the whole vicious media campaign was clearly prejudice against addressing the issue of the human condition. In fact, with regard to the involvement of mind control, as the psychologist Arthur Janov pointed out (in par. 221), the *human-condition-avoiding*, resigned, alienated, neurotic, cave-dwelling, mechanistic mind is the one that is being '**subject[ed] to indoctrination and brainwashing—because neurosis [blocking out] is brainwashing**'. Yes, by *confronting* instead of *avoiding* the human condition the information being presented in this book is the soundest, least neurotic, least brainwashed information that exists! This information is the very opposite of the *mindless* dogma that characterises a mind-controlling sect—it is *mindful* understanding; brain food *not* brain anaesthetic. To accuse those supporting this information of being involved in mindlessness was an absolute reverse-of-the-truth lie. Again, the *real* problem was precisely that we were daring to address the historically forbidden subject of the human condition—that we were daring to think, and think very deeply, not *not* think. With regard to the tactic of using a reverse-of-the-truth lie to counter truth (examples of which are littered throughout this book), Hitler once said that the most convincing lie is the absolute lie, '**because in the big lie there is always a certain force of credibility**' (*Mein Kampf*, 1925; tr. James Murphey, 1939, p.185 of 525). Yes, the reverse-of-the-truth lie is the ultimate unscrupulous and malicious way to attack truth!

⁵⁷⁸ Some idea of the prescience of Plato's anticipation of the *ferocity* of the attack that would be made on the person who '**escapes from the cave into the light of day**' and then '**dragged [humanity] out into the sunlight**' can be gained by the first ruling that the court made *against* my work in the defamation action we took to redress the horror media campaign. As mentioned above, it ruled that my work is of '**such a poor standard that it has no support at all from the**

scientific community’! It was certainly an immense relief then when, in 2010, the three judges in the New South Wales Court of Appeal unanimously recognised the real problem was that the primary judge clearly found my work unbearably confronting, ruling that he did **‘not adequately consider’ ‘the nature and scale of its subject matter’**, in particular **‘that the work was a grand narrative explanation from a holistic approach, involving teleological elements’**, and that other important submissions **‘were not adequately considered by the primary judge’**, including that the work can make **‘those who take the trouble to grapple with it uncomfortable’** because it **‘involves reflections on subject-matter including the purpose of human existence which may, of its nature, cause an adverse reaction as it touches upon issues which some would regard as threatening to their ideals, values or even world views’!** Yes, the problem was *not* that I am a deluded monster, but that I am daring to address the human condition!

⁵⁷⁹ Those scientists who came out to Australia and gave evidence at the initial 2007 trial, specifically that my work is not at all of **‘a poor standard’**, namely Professor Harry Prosen, Professor Scott Churchill, Professor Walter Hartwig and Dr William Casebeer, played an absolutely crucial role in humanity’s great journey to achieve liberation from the human condition. As the philosopher John Stuart Mill wrote in his famous 1859 essay *On Liberty*, **‘the dictum that truth always triumphs over persecution, is one of those pleasant falsehoods which men repeat after one another till they pass into commonplaces, but which all experience refutes. History teems with instances of truth put down by persecution. If not suppressed for ever, it may be thrown back for centuries’** (ch.2). And in the case of these biological explanations of human nature, such **‘persecution’** has already **‘thrown back’** its recognition for 30 years! The science historian Thomas Kuhn similarly warned that the only guarantee truth will survive prejudice is the determination of its advocates, writing that **‘In science...ideas do not change simply because new facts win out over outmoded ones...Since the facts can’t speak for themselves, it is their human advocates who win or lose the day’** (Shirley Strum, *Almost Human*, 1987, p.164 of 297—Strum’s references are to Thomas Kuhn’s *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, 2nd edn, 1970). Interestingly, Kuhn also recognised that in science **‘revolutions are often initiated by an outsider—someone not locked into the current model, which hampers vision almost as much as blinders would’** (ibid). Even Charles Darwin was **‘a lone genius, working from his country home without any official academic position’** (Geoffrey Miller, *The Mating Mind*, 2000, p.33 of 538). While there are certainly advantages to not being **‘hamper[ed]’** by **‘the current model’**, the inherent danger of not being part of the establishment is that the **‘outsider’** is an easy, undefended target for those in the establishment who feel threatened by their new ideas. Thank goodness for those scientists who travelled to Australia to provide expert reports at our trial. (Again, these reports, and documentation detailing the 30 years of terrible persecution that we have been subjected to, can be read at www.humancondition.com/persecution.)

⁵⁸⁰ As I mentioned earlier, the ferocious and malicious fear campaign conducted in Australia in the 1990s and early 2000s against me and our work at the WTM has only been part of the malicious campaign of persecution that has been waged against my work. As I said, I and the WTM have been trying to interest the scientific community in the world-saving insights into the human condition for over 30 years now, but so far all our submissions have been irresponsibly and unjustifiably either ignored or rejected by the scientific establishment. So the question is, how could such a fully accountable and well argued and evidenced explanation have been dismissed?

⁵⁸¹The main method of rejecting the innumerable presentations and submissions that have been made of the explanation (which will be listed shortly) has been to simply ignore them, and—beyond that—to make the most outrageously dishonest and irresponsible claim that my synthesis presents no new data, is an untestable hypothesis, and is therefore not even science! This was the main argument used to claim my work was of **‘a poor standard’** at the 2007 trial, and, as was mentioned in par. 458, it was also used to reject my 2005 submission about the nurturing origins of our moral conscience that I made to the International Primatological Society’s (IPS) Congress in Uganda. Most recently, in 2014, the Executive Editor of *Scientific American* rejected a pitch for a feature story about this book and an excerpt for possible publication on their website. In each case, the rejections were vigorously protested; in the case of the IPS and *Scientific American*, complaints were sent to *every* member of their administrations. Having received virtually no response from the administrators of *Scientific American*, that complaint is now being taken to the highest possible level of appeal in the world. In all these complaints it is pointed out that the same ridiculous accusation was used against Darwin’s Natural Selection synthesis. For instance, Bishop Wilberforce, the opponent of natural selection in the great debate about Darwin’s theory at Oxford in 1860, said it was a **‘theory which cannot be demonstrated to be actually impossible’** (Wilberforce’s review of *Origin of Species* in *Quarterly Review*, 1860, p.249), while the geologist and bishop Adam Sedgwick said it was **‘not a proposition evolved out of the facts’** (‘Objections to Mr Darwin’s Theory of the Origin of Species’, *The Spectator*, 7 Apr. 1860) and that it was **‘based upon assumptions which can neither be proved nor disproved’** (Letter from Sedgwick to Darwin, 24 Dec. 1859; *The Complete Work of Charles Darwin Online*, ed. John van Wyhe, 2002). The palaeontologist Louis Agassiz similarly complained that **‘absolutely no facts...can be referred to as proving evolution’** (William Penman Lyon, *Homo versus Darwin: A judicial examination of statements recently published by Mr Darwin regarding ‘The Descent of Man’*, 1872, p.140), while more recently, the philosopher Karl Popper commented, before later changing his mind, that **‘Darwinism is not a testable scientific theory’** (*Unended Quest*, 1976, p.168). At our 2007 trial, however, Professor Scott Churchill, then Chair of the Psychology Department at the University of Dallas, pointed out—and has since summarised in regard to my work—that **‘Griffith’s ideas have been criticized for not presenting the field of science with “new data” and “testable hypotheses.” But such a complaint is disingenuous since evolutionary processes are not subjectable to the same kind of “hypothesis testing” that one finds in the other sciences. An hypothesis is a “smaller, more compact thesis” that is “deduced” from a larger idea or thesis in such a way that one can test that larger idea piece by piece. Whereas, the kind of synthesis offered in Griffith’s book is presented both conceptually and metaphorically with an aim to tie together existing data, while correcting and expanding upon the more limited existing interpretations of those data... Such a perspective comes to us not as a simple opinion of one man, but rather as an inductive conclusion drawn from sifting through volumes of data representing what scientists have discovered’** (Review of *FREEDOM* submitted to *New York Magazine*, 26 Sep. 2014). In his Introduction to this book, Professor Prosen similarly points out that **‘not only has Jeremy’s work been treated as heretical by mechanistic science because he dares to look at the real “psychological” nature of the human condition, it has also been resisted because of the two reasons referred to in the ruling by the...three judges of the New South Wales Court of Appeal. Firstly, rather than the usual, more mechanistic and less thinking dependent, deduction-derived theories, Jeremy, like Darwin did with his theory of natural selection, puts forward a wide-ranging, induction-derived synthesis, a “grand narrative explanation” for behavior—which, incidentally,**

very wrongly led to both Darwin's and Jeremy's work being criticized by some for not presenting "new data" and a "testable hypothesis"; even for "not being science at all"! Secondly, Jeremy's *enormously* knowledge-advancing (and "science" literally means "knowledge", derived as it is from the Latin word *scientia* which means "knowledge") thinking is based on "a holistic approach involving teleological elements". As Jeremy beautifully explains in chapter 4, the reason that the teleological, holistic purpose or meaning of existence of developing the order or integration of matter into ever larger and more stable wholes...has been denied by human-condition-avoiding mechanistic science, is because it implies humans should behave in an ordered, integrative, cooperative, selfless, loving way.'

⁵⁸² Yes, the reason a more 'thinking dependent' 'wide-ranging, induction-derived synthesis' 'drawn from sifting through volumes of data representing what scientists have discovered' has not been something that human-condition-avoiding, mechanistic scientists have been comfortable with is because, as the cartoon in chapter 2:4 illustrates, it requires being able to confront such historically unbearable truths as 'the teleological, holistic purpose or meaning of existence of developing the order or integration of matter'. Sir Francis Bacon, the father of the scientific method, was one of the first to recognise how hopelessly compromised deductive science can be by the limitations of the practitioner, declaring that 'The subtilty of Nature far surpasses the subtilty of [our current human-condition-afflicted] sense and intellect; so that men's fair meditations, speculations and reasonings are a kind of insanity, only there is no one standing by to notice it...The Logic which is in vogue [deductive reasoning] is rather potent for the confirming and fixing [of] errors [rather] than for the investigation of Truth: so that it is more harmful than useful...And so our only hope is in a true Induction' (*Novum Organum; or A True Guide to the Interpretation of Nature*, 1620; Book 1, Aphorisms 10-14). Essentially, 'true' 'induction-derived' knowledge requires fearless, free, imaginative thinking—as Arthur Koestler has pointed out: 'Max Planck, the father of quantum theory, wrote in his autobiography that the pioneer scientist must have "a vivid intuitive imagination for new ideas not generated by deduction, but by artistically creative imagination"' (*The Act of Creation*, 1964, p.147 of 751). And with regard to the human-condition-confronting fearlessness of such a free 'imagination', Berdyaev said (in par. 237) that 'Knowledge requires great daring. It means victory over ancient, primeval terror. Fear makes the search for truth and the knowledge of it impossible. Knowledge implies fearlessness...Particularly bitter is moral knowledge, the knowledge of good and evil...Moral knowledge is the most bitter and the most fearless of all for in it sin and evil are revealed to us along with the meaning and value of life.' So declaring 'induction-derived' 'new ideas' and 'knowledge' are not science is simply mechanistic science saying it doesn't want to participate in 'the search for truth' and 'knowledge'; basically, it doesn't want to practise science—because "science" literally means "knowledge"!'

⁵⁸³ Another malicious device that has been used to try to dismiss my work is claiming it puts readers in a 'non-falsifiable situation' where if you oppose this information you are said to be suffering from denial, leaving you no way to disprove or falsify the explanation being put forward—but the problem only really exists at the superficial level because the ideas being put forward can be tested as true or otherwise. These are not untestable hypotheses that must be accepted on blind faith. For instance, the existence of denial of the issue of the human condition can easily be established by scientific investigation. In fact, since humans are the subject of this particular study, each person can experience and thus know the truth or otherwise of what is being put forward. Once the explanations are presented and applied

you will discover they are able to make such sense of human behaviour that your own and everyone else's becomes transparent. This new-found transparency confirms that this understanding is the long-sought explanation of the human condition.

⁵⁸⁴ Other equally disingenuous arguments that have been used to try to undermine this synthesis include accusing me of **'overly appealing to authority to try to persuade the reader'**, **'cherry picking evidence to make it fit a preferred theory'**, **'false interpretation of quotes'**, **'faulty generalisation'**, **'repetition designed to indoctrinate'**, **'mind projection fallacy where you project your own false view of the world and declare others irrational if they don't hold that view'**, **'dogmatically asserting ideas to be true'**, being **'full of hyperbole about humans being selfish egomaniacs'**, and **'claiming that humans are fallen and heading for disaster when humans are only getting better, for example, look at how the quality of life has improved in China'**! I would argue, however, that the accountability of the arguments and the quality of the evidence I refer to in support of all my various theses are undeniable—but again, when the need for denial is desperate, any excuse will do.

⁵⁸⁵ The main point is that this *denial*—this ignoring, rejecting and persecuting—has been completely and utterly unjustified; in fact, it has been *totally* irresponsible, *obscenely* irresponsible. *Certainly* all the world-saving insights that appear in this book, insights that I have been putting forward for 30 years, bring the historically unbearably confronting issue of the human condition into stark focus, *but all are presented within the framework of the compassionate explanation of the human condition, which means the need for denial of them has been removed.*

⁵⁸⁶ As emphasised from the beginning of this book, the human race has always lived in hope, faith and trust that one day the redeeming explanation of our psychologically distressed and insecure human condition would be found, and the most fundamental reason for freedom of expression to be maintained in the world is to keep the door open to that possibility. The 2007 court case in Australia about my work was at base a fight to maintain this freedom of expression because what my detractors were doing was using lies and misrepresentation to try to deny me the freedom to express my ideas about the human condition and have them fairly evaluated. Of course, when a person resigned themselves to living in denial of the human condition that in itself was an act of oppression of their own freedom to think about the human condition. The psychological process of denial, which we humans have had to practise on a vast scale while we couldn't truthfully explain and thus safely confront the human condition, has entirely been about denying our minds the freedom to think freely. It has been about oppression. Yes, alienation, which the human race is entering a state of terminal sickness from, is all about repressing the freedom to think. So the truth is when we have spoken about 'freedom of expression' we have only used it in a relative sense, because while we allow people to oppress the freedom within their own mind to think about the human condition, we seek to stop the oppression of free thought everywhere else in society. It is all very contradictory. But despite the existence of this conundrum, the *ultimate* freedom of expression humans have been fighting for is the freedom for all people to not have to resign, to not have to live in Plato's horrible, dark, **'living tomb'** **'cave'** of alienated denial of the human condition, which means we have been fighting to maintain the freedom to express analysis of the human condition—because *only* that freedom could allow the answers about the human condition to emerge and end the need for that cave-dwelling state of denial.

⁵⁸⁷ Yes, the ultimate knowledge that science—that part of our society that was assigned the special task of searching for knowledge—had to find was self-knowledge, understanding of our corrupted human condition. Certainly science, being practised by insecure, human-condition-afraid humans, had to go about that search in a denial-complying, mechanistic way, avoiding any confronting truth about the human condition, but that was always only the first stage of science’s search for understanding of the human condition. It always had to remember that at some point the second stage had to take place, where someone secure enough in self could confront the human condition and synthesise the explanation of it from those hard-won insights into the mechanisms of the workings of our world that its practitioners had found. Science *had* to remain open to the possibility that the human-condition-confronting truthful explanation of the human condition would one day be found. *Yes, science holds the ultimate responsibility to consider, not ignore, or worse, falsely dismiss and even persecute, well-reasoned and evidenced scientific analysis of the human condition!* What has transpired *has been* obscenely irresponsible.

⁵⁸⁸ What now needs to be explained is that there have been two aspects to humans’ resistance to new ideas. Firstly, there is the just described fear we have of encountering ideas that confront us with the historically (but no longer) condemning truth of our corrupted condition. The second aspect of our resistance to new ideas is a consequence of this first aspect. As was explained in chapter 3, being insecure about our fundamental goodness and worth we became egocentric, our minds became centred or focused on trying to prove we are good and not bad, forever searching for reinforcement and validation. The result of this insecure, egocentric existence meant that as we grew up and searched for ways to validate ourselves we each built a world around us that gave us this feeling of worth. We became head of a company, or the parents of a new generation, or the captain of our football team, or a success at making ourselves look pretty, etc, etc, and no matter how superficially meaningful these forms of validation actually were, they were all that kept at bay the underlying insecurity of our condition that arose from wondering whether we were bad, vile creatures for having departed so incredibly far from our species’ original unconditionally selfless, all-loving, Godly, ‘ideal’ way of living and the suicidal depression such thinking could lead to. It follows that we each became extremely attached to the fragile little ego castles we had built and, as a result, we found it difficult accepting any change that might threaten its structure, with the most threatening change being new ideas that required us to fundamentally change our philosophical world view that we had built our ‘castle’ upon. Being thinking creatures, our primary need was to have some philosophy about life, some way of making sense of our existence, because from there we could build a larger meaningful structure, so to have to change those philosophical foundations could be *very* destabilising and thus difficult to accept.

⁵⁸⁹ The point is we humans have resisted new ideas both because of how much they confronted us with the issue of the human condition *and* because of how much we felt they threatened our way of justifying ourselves. Yes, humans have been almost as afraid of change as they have been of being confronted with the issue of the human condition, and since science deals with knowledge—understanding and insights that can affect the philosophical foundations of our ‘ego castle’—advances in science could be very difficult for humans

to accept and adapt to. It is no wonder Thomas Kuhn said that **‘the old scientists who became established within the dominant paradigm have to die off first: they will virtually never accept the new paradigm. Only the younger generation of scientists, who don’t have the emotional attachment to the old paradigm, will be willing to change their minds’** (a reference to the work of Kuhn by Marilyn Ferguson, *New Age* mag. Aug. 1982; see <www.wtmsources.com/174>). The physicist Max Planck put it more succinctly when he said that **‘Science progresses funeral by funeral’** (Marilyn Ferguson’s reference to a comment by Planck in his *Scientific Autobiography*, 1948; *New Age* mag. Aug. 1982; see <www.wtmsources.com/174>). It follows that since the arrival of the truthful explanation of the human condition brings *the* most self-confrontation and the greatest change—in fact, a whole paradigm shift from living in denial to living honestly—it will be resisted the most, which is what Plato predicted.

⁵⁹⁰ So the reality is that any meritorious new idea in science has typically gone through stages of resistance and even persecution before gaining universal acceptance—a process the philosopher Arthur Schopenhauer articulated when he **‘said that the reception of any successful new scientific hypothesis goes through predictable phases before being accepted’**. First, **‘it is ridiculed’** and **‘violently opposed’**. Second, after support begins to accumulate, **‘it is stated that it may be true but it’s not particularly relevant’**. Third, **‘after it has clearly influenced the field [including members of the establishment quickly remodelling/plagiarising the ideas as their own discoveries, something we in the WTM have, unfortunately, also experienced with the ideas in this book] it is admitted to be true and relevant but the same critics assert that the idea is not original’**. Finally, **‘it is accepted as being self-evident’** (compiled from two references to Schopenhauer’s quote—*New Scientist*, 15 Nov. 1984 and *PlanetHood*, B. Ferencz & K. Keyes, 1988). Note how each stage of recognition is achieved in a way that protects the ego of the onlookers. So much for science being a rigorously objective enterprise where the ‘scientific method’ dictates that explanations for phenomena are accepted by proven test; in reality science is *extremely* subjective—scientists will only accept a proven new idea if they see it as reinforcing them somehow. In fact, they have totally ignored ideas that confront them with the issue of the human condition, they have lived **‘a long way underground’** in Plato’s ‘cave’ of denial. I put forward insights that are fully accountable and human race-saving but because they are self-confronting they are rejected!

⁵⁹¹ The famous playwright George Bernard Shaw was another who warned of the true nature of progress when he wrote that **‘All great truths begin as blasphemies’** (*Annajanska*, 1919). It should be explained that the reason great truths so often began as **‘blasphemies’** is because the search for truth was very often not a case of finding it but of uncovering it from epochs of denial—an exposure that seemed highly *blasphemous* to all those who had been practising the denial. We have and will see how finding the great truths presented in this book of the explanation of the human condition, of the meaning of existence, of the origin of our moral soul, and, in chapter 7, the explanation of the origins of our conscious mind, all required the defiance of deeply entrenched denials, which means all these great truths *are* going to **‘begin as blasphemies’**.

⁵⁹² With regard to the greatest of all **‘blasphemies’**, that of the **‘truth’** about the human condition, when Alvin Toffler wrote in his famous 1970 book *Future Shock* of **‘the shattering stress and disorientation that we induce in individuals by subjecting them to too much change in too short a time’** (p.4 of 505), he was actually anticipating the immense shock that the arrival of understanding of the human condition would inevitably bring. Yes, given the arrival of

understanding of the human condition does represent a *massive* paradigm shift for humans, especially a shift from denial to honesty, it was always an inevitability that the initial **‘violently opposed’**, treated-as-**‘blasphemies’** stage would have to be negotiated—*but the fundamental truth remains that science holds the ultimate responsibility to consider, not ignore, or worse, falsely dismiss and even persecute, well-reasoned and evidenced scientific analysis of the human condition.* What has transpired certainly *has been* obscenely irresponsible.

⁵⁹³ Basically, while most, indeed almost all, scientists who have become attached to the old denial-complying mechanistic paradigm will initially **‘violently oppose’** and treat as **‘blasphemies’** these world-saving new understandings about the world of humans (and have done so), there needs to be some who are sufficiently secure and sound to support the new paradigm. As John Stuart Mill said, **‘History teems with instances of truth put down by persecution’**, which means that, as Kuhn said, **‘In science...ideas do not change simply because new facts win out over outmoded ones...Since the facts can’t speak for themselves, it is their human advocates who win or lose the day’**. And indeed, Professor Prosen and the other scientists who defended my work at the trial were just such critically important, secure and courageous **‘advocates’**. Yes, as the three judges in the New South Wales Court of Appeal, led by Justice David Hodgson, recognised as being critically important considerations, my work can make **‘those who take the trouble to grapple with it uncomfortable’** because it **‘involves reflections on subject-matter including the purpose of human existence which may, of its nature, cause an adverse reaction as it touches upon issues which some would regard as threatening to their ideals, values or even world views’!** What an absolutely courageous and precious ruling for the human race! Blessed are the supportive scientists and Appeal Court judges for they are very great heroes in the human journey—especially Justice Hodgson, a Rhodes Scholar who **‘from an early age...had been fascinated by what went on inside the [human] head’** and had written books on **‘consciousness’**, and was said to be **‘blessed with flawless logic’** and to **‘fit the description of Plato’s “philosopher king”’** (Obituary, *The Sydney Morning Herald*, 4 Sep. 2012; see <www.wtmsources.com/184>).

⁵⁹⁴ So, despite the **‘threatening’** and **‘uncomfortable’** effects of the world-saving insights in this book, there *are* people in the world who are capable of supporting their *arrival*. The great prophet Daniel understood that there would be people who could cope with the truth about the human condition when it arrived when he said that **‘the people who know their God [those who are sound and secure] will firmly resist’** **‘those who have violated the covenant [become so unsound that they can’t tolerate any truth]’** (Bible, Dan. 11:32). (More is said about these quotes by Daniel in par. 1123.)

⁵⁹⁵ The reason I put *‘arrival’* in italics above is because once this initial support emerges, others will hear about it and support will grow from there. In fact, as will be described in chapter 9, once this project of bringing understanding to the human condition gets through the very difficult preliminary, *‘arrival’* stage where these insights are **‘violently opposed’** and treated by most as **‘blasphemies’**, the whole human race will discover that *there is not only a way to cope with this massive paradigm shift, there is a completely satisfying and utterly exciting and extremely easy way to now live.* It is only at the *‘arrival’* stage that there is extreme resistance.

⁵⁹⁶ So while support *has* begun for these world-saving understandings, much more is needed because, as described, advances in science of this magnitude have to overcome a *great* deal of resistance. History has taught us that since the beginning of scientific enquiry those who pioneered the demystification and clarification of the human situation have particularly

been persecuted. It is only through the immense courage of the advocates for free thinking that knowledge has been able to replace mysticism, abstract description, delusion and denial.

⁵⁹⁷ At the beginning of the formalisation of the discipline of science, Socrates, Plato's great teacher, and the fearless pioneer in replacing superstition and dogma with logical explanation, faced such hostility he was forced to take his own life by drinking poison!

⁵⁹⁸ The journalist Robert Howard described the backlash the great demystifications of our historical ways of fortifying ourselves against the insecurity of our condition have provoked when he wrote, **'Three major blows have dented humanity's self-esteem: Copernicus showing that the Earth was not the centre of the universe, Darwin showing descent from animals and Freud arguing that the rational, conscious mind is not master'** (*The Bulletin*, 11 Aug. 1992). Yes, each of these ideas was widely rejected and their proponents persecuted by society, with eminent scientists and/or religious leaders of the day leading the charge.

⁵⁹⁹ Copernicus delayed publication of his theory revealing that the Earth is not the centre of the universe until the last days of his life in 1543 because he feared persecution, and indeed, 57 years later Giordano Bruno was burnt at the stake for teaching Copernican theory. Furthermore, 10 years after Bruno's death when Galileo upheld the same belief, **'jealous philosophers joined forces with ignorant fanatics in denouncing Galileo to the Inquisition'** (*Reader's Digest: Great Lives, Great Deeds*, 1966, p.306 of 448). This church court said the beliefs were **'contrary to Scripture'** (*ibid*) and Galileo was forced to recant his support of Copernican theory and live under house arrest for the rest of his life.

⁶⁰⁰ Darwin so feared that his theory showing descent from animals would be seen as offensive that he avoided publishing his ideas for eight years. As mentioned in par. 195, under pressure, he also allowed the evasive, but competition-excusing, 'survival of the fittest' phrase to be introduced into subsequent editions. And yet despite these efforts to comply with the principles of denial, Darwin's concept was **'greeted with violent and malicious criticism'** (*The Origin of Species*, 1968 Penguin edn, title page), so much so that Darwin said, **'I have got fairly sick of hostile reviews...I can pretty plainly see that, if my view is ever to be generally adopted, it will be by young men growing up and replacing the old workers'** (*Charles Darwin*, ed. Francis Darwin, 1902, p.244). In the famous debate at Oxford in 1860, Bishop Wilberforce said that Darwin's concept of natural selection was **'contrary to the revelations of God in the Scriptures'** (*ibid*. p.238) and mockingly asked, **'Is the gentleman [Darwin] related by his grandfather's or grandmother's side to an ape?'** (*Reader's Digest: Great Lives, Great Deeds*, 1966, p.335 of 448).

⁶⁰¹ Freud gave major impetus to the process of de-throning evasive intellectualism and re-emphasising instinctualism by exposing and emphasising the existence within humans of a subconscious, innate self that is not under the control of our rational mind. He was a pioneer in exposing the limited nature of mechanistic ways of thinking and opened the door to the much repressed holistic paradigm and yet for his efforts suffered extreme vilification. As Sir Laurens van der Post observed, **'One could perhaps better have measured the originality of Freud's achievement by reason of the numbers of the highly intelligent, well-informed men who instantly mobilised to attack him'** (*Jung and The Story of Our Time*, 1976, p.108 of 275).

⁶⁰² Each of these giant strides in the journey of demystification of our human situation were met with so much resistance they *were* lucky to survive, so it is clear that with the arrival of actual demystification and exposure of the human condition, human insecurity

and nervousness is going to be extreme—which means that these cautionary words from John Stuart Mill have never been more applicable: **‘We have now recognised the necessity to the mental well-being of mankind (on which all their other well-being depends) of freedom of opinion, and freedom of the expression of opinion’, for ‘the price paid for intellectual pacification, is the sacrifice of the entire moral courage of the human mind’** (*On Liberty*, 1859). Yes, for this ultimate enlightenment to be allowed the human race is going to have to adhere scrupulously to democratic principles which allow freedom of expression, a responsibility the New South Wales Court of Appeal judges respected and practised, but which many others on many fronts have ignored.

⁶⁰³The starkest example of how deeply science has fallen into the trap of being so habituated to living in denial of the issue of the human condition that it refuses to recognise the human-race-saving, truthful explanation of the human condition can be seen in the establishment of all the so-called Brain Initiatives that have been launched recently, the prime examples of which are outlined below:

- in December 2012 it was announced that an American billionaire had pledged \$200 million to Columbia University’s **‘accomplished scholars whose collective mission is both greater understanding of the human condition and the discovery of new cures for human suffering’** (*The Educated Observer*, Winter 2013); and,
- in January 2013 the European Commission **‘announced that it would launch the flagship Human Brain Project with a 2013 budget of €54 million (US\$69 million), and contribute to its projected billion-euro funding over the next ten years’** (‘Neuroscience: Solving the brain’, *Nature*, 2013, Vol.499, No.7458) with the goal of providing **‘a new understanding of the human brain and its diseases’** (Press Release, The Human Brain Project, 28 Jan. 2013; see <www.wtmsources.com/111>) to **‘offer solutions to tackling conditions such as depression’** (‘Scientists to simulate human brain inside a supercomputer’, *CNN International Edition*, 12 Oct. 2012; see <www.wtmsources.com/129>); and,
- in April 2013 the President of the United States, Barack Obama, announced a **‘Brain Initiative’**, giving **‘\$100 million initial funding’** (*The Sydney Morning Herald*, 4 Apr. 2013) to mechanistic science, in **‘a research effort expected to eventually cost perhaps ten times that amount’** (‘Neuroscience: Solving the brain’, *Nature*, 2013, Vol.499, No.7458), to also find **‘the underlying causes of... neurological and psychiatric conditions’** afflicting humans in order to **‘develop effective ways of helping people suffering from these devastating conditions’** (US National Institutes of Health; see <www.wtmsources.com/114>); and,
- in April 2013 *BBC News Business* reported that **‘Lord Rees, the Astronomer Royal and former president of the Royal Society, is backing plans for [Cambridge University to open] a Centre for the Study of Existential Risk [meaning risk to our existence]. “This is the first century in the world’s history when the biggest threat is from humanity,” says Lord Rees’** (‘How are humans going to become extinct?’; see <www.wtmsources.com/120>). The article then referred to Oxford University’s Future of Humanity Institute that was established in 2005, which is **‘looking at big-picture questions for human civilization...[and] change...[that] might transform the human condition’** (Future of Humanity Institute, University of Oxford; see <www.wtmsources.com/118>), quoting its Director and advisor to the Centre for the Study of Existential Risk, Nick Bostrom: **‘There is a bottleneck in human history. The human condition is going to change. It could be that we end in a catastrophe or that we are transformed by taking much greater control over our biology’!**; and,

- in July 2014 the Japanese Brain/MINDS (Brain Mapping by Innovative Neurotechnologies for Disease Studies) was launched at several institutes and universities across Japan. Due to receive funding of \$US300 million over 10 years, it is described as **‘The Paradigm Shift in Brain Science’**, and has the aim of **‘understanding the human brain and for developing knowledge-based strategies for the diagnosis and treatment of psychiatric and neurological disorders’** (see <www.wtmsources.com/244>); and,
- in March 2018, looking to rival the US and European brain initiatives, the China Institute for Brain Research was officially established in Beijing. Reports suggest **‘It would focus on basic research on neural mechanisms underlying cognition, translational studies of neurological diseases with an emphasis on early diagnosis and intervention’** (‘Here’s how China is challenging the U.S. and European brain initiatives’, *Science*, 22 May 2018); and,
- in August 2018, the billionaire Tianqiao Chen dedicated US\$1 billion to brain research globally, because, **‘With a deeper understanding of our brains, we can have a greater impact on the whole of society. We can seize the power to solve problems which affect all of humanity: suicide, terrorism, depression, anxiety’** (‘A Chinese Billionaire Is Using His Fortune to Unlock the Human Brain’, *Bloomberg*, 21 Aug. 2018).

⁶⁰⁴ We can see in these initiatives that the human race has finally been forced to at least attempt to address **‘the human condition’**, because the underlying, core problem involved in *all* of the **‘big-picture questions’** and the **‘Existential Risk’** of **‘catastrophe’** is our **‘neurological and psychiatric’-troubled ‘human brain’**—*that’s* what had to be addressed. The **‘biggest threat is from humanity’** itself, our species’ inability to **‘discover’ ‘the underlying causes of’** our psychologically distressed lives and, by so doing, end this **‘bottleneck in human history’** and achieve the way-overdue **‘cures for human suffering’**, which will **‘transform’ ‘our biology’**. It certainly is a case of self-discovery or self-destruction—understand the human condition or it’s **‘catastrophe’** for the human race! BUT, the mechanistic scientific paradigm, including all of its universities, has proved completely incapable of adopting a denial-free approach and truthfully addressing the human condition, and yet now, when the world is absolutely on its knees and desperate for the neurosis-and-psychosis-addressing-and-healing real insight into the human condition, that same mechanistic paradigm is being given millions and millions and millions and millions of dollars to turn around and do what it has already shown it can’t, but what I and the WTM have already done! And, I might add, we have done this, 40 years of work in all, without *any* outside financial support—from academic institutions or from public or private benefactors. We have funded the whole effort from our own self-sufficient initiatives, efforts, and contributions. Indeed, as has been mentioned, rather than receiving any encouragement or financial support from the world at large, we have been *attacked* by the establishment and had to generate the wherewithal ourselves to fight and defeat that enormously powerful institution-backed attack! For example, the principal media attack against us was carried out by the Australian Broadcasting Corporation, a body which receives well over a billion dollars annually in government funding. We have never been invited to participate in any major scientific or public forums, or been given a wage or grant by an academic institution to investigate any of the subjects that we have so effectively studied; quite the reverse—we’ve been brutally ostracised and forced to sustain and pay our own way to carry on our work and to fight the

massive forces opposing it. Talk about David and Goliath! And it is not as though these huge financial initiatives that are now, in desperation, being made to specifically investigate the human condition can be oblivious to our existence and work because, for one thing, the WTM has the domain name ‘**humancondition.com**’ and any planned attempt, such as these, to supposedly properly address the human condition would, one would assume, have to be aware of our existence. So the mechanistic paradigm is saying it is finally going to bring ‘**greater understanding of the human condition**’, but has not changed tack at all and acknowledged those who have done just that! I should add that in 2014 a special scientist-orientated edition of this book, which was given its own title, *IS IT TO BE Terminal Alienation or Transformation For The Human Race?*, was sent to all the Directors and scientists involved in each of the above initiatives (except the European Commission’s Human Brain Project which wasn’t approached because this book is presently only available in English) to directly inform them of this breakthrough work on the human condition—however, so far (and I’m writing this passage in early 2015) we have had virtually no response from any of them, and certainly no appreciative response. The hypocrisy and obscenity of what is going on is *absolutely astronomical!*

⁶⁰⁵ In regard to how utterly dishonest and completely self-defeating the human-condition-avoiding, reductionist, mechanistic paradigm’s attempt is to solve the mental problems that now threaten to overwhelm humanity, I should re-include the reference Professor Prosen made in this book’s Introduction to an opinion piece by Benjamin Y. Fong of the University of Chicago that was published in *The New York Times* in 2013. Fong wrote that ‘**The real trouble with the Brain Initiative is...the instrumental approach...[such biological reduction is] intent on uncovering the organic “cause”...of mental problems...rather than looking into psychosocial factors...By humbly claiming ignorance about the “causes” of mental problems...neuroscientists unconsciously repress all that we know about the alienating, unequal, and dissatisfying world in which we live and the harmful effects it has on the psyche, thus unwittingly foreclosing’** the ability to ‘**alleviate mental disorder**’ (see <www.wtmsources.com/151>). Fong is right; as he says here and elsewhere in his article, mechanistic science’s ‘**synthetic**’ focus on the ‘**organic**’ rather than the ‘**psychological**’ nature of mental problems can only end in denying humans ‘**the possibility of self-transformation**’. As Professor Prosen recognised in his Introduction, it is *only* the *psychosis-addressing, human-condition-confronting* position that I have taken that could hope to find, and now *has* found, the reconciling and human-race-transforming understanding of the human condition—and yet it is this approach that has been treated as heretical, an anathema and a threat by the mechanistic scientific establishment!!

⁶⁰⁶ In a further horrific example of the obscene ill-treatment of these human-race-saving, breakthrough understandings in this book, the reader can imagine our shock when, in 2012, the WTM learnt that the three leading anthropologists responsible for putting forward the Self-Domestication Hypothesis (SDH), Wrangham, Hare and Wobber—all of whom, as has been mentioned, were informed many years ago of my love-indoctrination explanation for the origins of our and the bonobos’ moral instincts—made no acknowledgment or even mention of my synthesis in their 2012 paper, despite acknowledging the work of many other researchers in a detailed section on ‘**evolutionary explanations for reduced aggressiveness in bonobos relative to that in chimpanzees**’. Worse, it would appear that since they were each made aware

of my synthesis (in the case of Wrangham, on four separate occasions, the earliest being in 1988), what they have done is take virtually all the elements from my synthesis—such as the bonobos’ ability to throw light on our origins, and specifically the origins of our morality; that their social groups are much more stable than those of chimpanzees; the role of females in taming male aggression; the liberation of consciousness; the role of self-selection; the neotenising, juvenilisation process; the use of the domestication of dogs and foxes as an illustration of the neotenising, juvenilisation process; the significance of ideal ecological conditions; the use of sex as a device to reduce tension; the reduced dimorphism between the sexes; the reliance of males on their mothers for social standing; the lack of aggression between groups of bonobos; the lack of routine hunting by bonobos, etc, etc—and, leaving out anything to do with nurturing, presented it as ‘**A new hypothesis**’ (Ed Yong, ‘Tame Theory: Did Bonobos Domesticate Themselves? A new hypothesis holds that natural selection produced the chimpanzee’s nicer cousin in much the same way that humans bred dogs from wolves’, *Scientific American*, 25 Jan. 2012). While it is *extremely* irresponsible to ignore and reject world-saving insights into the human condition, it is so, so much worse to actually take those insights and wantonly subvert or misappropriate the truth they contain. If that is indeed the case, and we believe there is no other plausible interpretation, then that is the very greatest of crimes against humanity.

⁶⁰⁷The following then is the very brief summary of the 30 years’ worth of submissions to the scientific establishment of these world-saving insights into the human condition, into the integrative meaning of existence, and into the origins of our moral nature and conscious mind. Also included are other instances of the 30 years of mistreatment these insights have received. (The full presentation can be accessed at <www.humancondition.com/full-history-of-rejection>. Incidentally, this link provides details of the presentations of the whole synthesis, including the nurturing explanation for our moral soul, that have been made to Wrangham, Hare and Wobber.) These 30 years’ worth of submissions represent an *extraordinarily* long and determined (and yet, so far, futile) effort to have all these fully accountable insights properly considered by the scientific establishment and conveyed to the wider world. As has been emphasised, in the case of the origins of our moral instincts, there has actually been 140 years of dishonest biological thinking on this issue, mountains of books written and oceans of wasted effort since John Fiske first solved the problem with the nurturing explanation—and 30 years now since I presented the nurturing answer to the problem in accompaniment with the explanation of the human condition, which is 30 years of terrible human suffering and acts of atrocity that have occurred on Earth from a lack of self-understanding in humans that should never have happened!!!

- In 1983 I wrote to Sir David Attenborough and Professor Stephen Jay Gould, presenting these insights, but received no real response from either.
- As described in par. 24, in 1983 I personally submitted an 8,000 word summary of this synthesis (<www.humancondition.com/nature>) to the then editor of *Nature* journal, Sir John Maddox, and the then Features Editor of *New Scientist* magazine, Colin Tudge—both of whom rejected it.

- In 1988, 800 copies of my book *Free: The End Of The Human Condition* (<www.humancondition.com/free>) with first-rate publicity packages were sent to every relevant scientist and journal in the world for review, but despite a few significant commendations there was no real response.
- In 1989 Professor John Wren-Lewis personally presented *Free* to 10 science journals including *Nature*, *New Scientist* and *Endeavour*, none of which responded.
- In 1989 a booklet titled *Reconciliation* that contained a summary of the synthesis was circulated to 600 scientists, scientific journals and other relevant parties—to little response.
- In 1991 over 1,000 copies of my book *Beyond The Human Condition* (<www.humancondition.com/beyond>) with first-rate publicity packages were circulated to scientists, journals, universities, and relevant institutions and media—to little response from the scientific establishment overall.
- In 1992 *Beyond* was launched at the National Museum of Kenya and over 70 copies were given and sent to eminent scientists and influential people—however, no lasting support eventuated.
- In 1992 Professor Wren-Lewis published a paper in which he plagiarised my work, claiming the insights were his own! Redress was achieved and Wren-Lewis ceased his involvement (including a directorship) with our project.
- In 1993, 76 first-rate publicity packages with copies of *Beyond* were sent to all the leading literary agents and publishers in the world, but all declined to represent or publish the book.
- In 1995 two highly defamatory publications—an Australian Broadcasting Corporation (ABC) television program, and a full page *The Sydney Morning Herald* newspaper article—were made about me, my work and its supporters (<www.humancondition.com/persecution>).
- In 2002, 70 copies of my book *A Species In Denial* (<www.humancondition.com/asid>) were sent to the leading literary agents in the world, and another 70 copies were sent to the major international publishers, but all declined to represent or publish the book.
- In 2003 a further 800 copies of *A Species In Denial* with first-rate publicity packages were circulated to scientists, journals, universities, and relevant institutions and media. Despite a foreword by Professor Charles Birch, a commendation from Professor John Morton, and becoming a bestseller in Australia and New Zealand where it sold more than 10,000 copies, the scientific community all but failed to respond.
- Between 2004 and 2006, 2,500 copies of a documentary proposal (<www.humancondition.com/doco>) on the human condition (in which I outlined all the main biological explanations that are presented here in *FREEDOM*), were sent to scientists, scientific publications and organisations. While the proposal received over 100 commendations from leading

scientists and thinkers, and engaged Professor Harry Prosen's ongoing support of these explanations, it did not produce any substantial, long-term interest from the scientific community.

- In 2005 my proposal to present 'The Citadel Of The Darwinian Revolution—The Biology Of Our Human Condition—At Last Explained', at the Annual Meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) titled *Grand Challenges, Great Opportunities*, was rejected by the Program Committee.
- In 2005 an abstract of my paper 'Nurturing as the Prime Mover in Primate Development and Human Origins' (<www.humancondition.com/ips-2006-congress>) was submitted for presentation at the International Primatological Society's (IPS) 2006 Congress in Uganda, but, as just mentioned in par. 581, was rejected.
- In 2006 journalist Jo Sandin was unable to include reference to my nurturing explanation for human and bonobo moral behaviour in her 2007 book about the bonobos at the Milwaukee County Zoo, *Bonobos: Encounters in Empathy*.
- In 2006 my book *The Great Exodus: From the horror and darkness of the human condition* (<www.humancondition.com/exodus>) was published online, and sent to many relevant scientists—to no response from the scientific community.
- In 2008 the World Transformation Movement began presenting its online Introductory Videos—however, as yet there has been little response from the scientific community.
- In 2009 my book *Freedom Expanded* (<www.humancondition.com/freedom-expanded>) was published online, but has not yet generated any real response from the scientific community.
- In 2011 my book *The Book of Real Answers to Everything!* (<www.humancondition.com/real-answers>) was published online, but has so far failed to attract significant support from the scientific community.
- In 2012 Wrangham, Hare and Wobber published the paper 'The self-domestication hypothesis: evolution of bonobo psychology is due to selection against aggression', making no acknowledgment or even mention of my love-indoctrination synthesis, despite each being previously informed of it (in the case of Wrangham on four separate occasions)—even appearing to subvert and misappropriate virtually all the elements of my synthesis, while leaving out anything to do with nurturing.
- In 2014, despite the explanation of the human condition that is presented in my books being the fulfilment of the core vision of Geelong Grammar School of cultivating the sensitivity needed to achieve that specific, all-important-if-there-is-to-be-a-future-for-the-human-race task, the school chose *not* to include an essay on my life's work that was commissioned by its publishers for possible inclusion in its Corio anniversary book *100 Exceptional Stories* which 'celebrates the lives of 100 exceptional past students'—see <www.humancondition.com/100-exceptional-stories>.

- From July to September in 2014 a special edition of this book that was orientated to scientists (it was even given its own title that focused on the very serious plight of the world: *IS IT TO BE Terminal Alienation or Transformation For The Human Race?*) was sent to 930 leading science organisations, scientists and science commentators in the English-speaking world, including the scientists involved with the main Brain Initiatives. But despite each copy being accompanied by a personal appeal for support for the book's insights from Professor Harry Prosen, and undertaking two trips to the US and UK to discuss the book with interested scientists and commentators, the situation in early 2016 is that while there has been a few positive responses from individual scientists, our publishers are still waiting for appreciative responses from the scientific establishment.

⁶⁰⁸The reader should now have some idea of the scale of the persecution that my work has had to endure, and also some idea of the immense relief that the final court case ruling brought to those supporting these understandings—in particular to myself; to my partner of 30 years Annie Williams, whose loving support enabled me to cope with all the years of persecution (in particular it was Annie's care that enabled me to recover from 10 years of the debilitating illness of Chronic Fatigue Syndrome [CFS] that I developed in 1999 after endless years of fighting the persecution, which, incidentally, were 10 of what should have been the most productive years of my life); to my brother Simon, who started the base group of people supporting these insights into the human condition; to my very close friend Tim Macartney-Snape, whose high standing in the Australian community (Tim is a twice-honoured Order of Australia recipient) had been jeopardised because of his courageous, unwavering support of my work; and to every one of the other 50 Founding Members of the WTM who have each also had to endure horrible persecution, ostracism and suffering. I might mention that our struggle against persecution has been so monumental that we have had to forgo having children to ensure we have sufficient resources of time, energy and funds to effectively resist the persecution and maintain our efforts to ensure these ideas lead to the transformation of the human race. After all that we have been put through, the fact that our little, but mighty, band of brothers and sisters supporting these human-race-liberating insights is still standing and able to mount, with this book, a further assault on the citadel of denial/lying (mechanistic science) to try to crack it open and free the human race, *is* an absolute miracle. (With regard to my CFS, although the syndrome wasn't officially identified as an illness in Darwin's day, we know it is what he suffered from because of the accurate description he gave of his condition, such as **'I believe to a stranger's eyes, I should look quite a strong man, but I find I am not up to any exertion, and I am constantly tiring myself by very trifling things'** (Letter to Charles Lyell, 1841; *The Correspondence of Charles Darwin*, Vol.2, p.298 of 603). Indeed, there has even been some talk of renaming CFS the 'Charles Darwin Syndrome' (Roger Burns, 'Chronic Fatigue Syndrome Changing the Name', Sep. 1996; see <www.wtmsources.com/123>). Presumably Darwin suffered from CFS because he too was under enormous pressure for, as mentioned earlier, having his revolutionary ideas **'greeted with violent and malicious criticism'**.)

⁶⁰⁹Of course, since the subject of the human condition and its resolution is both a new and confronting issue for humans to have to think about and adjust to, the initial resistance stage that Schopenhauer said new ideas in science are typically subjected to was always

going to be exceptional, and it certainly has been. However, we in the WTM hope that after having successfully fought the terrible public campaign of persecution against us in the law courts, which is the proper, civilised place to seek redress, that the initial **‘violently opposed’**, treated-as-**‘blasphemies’** stage will soon pass and these world-saving understandings will move on to the next stage in the journey to acceptance where they are evaluated by the scientific establishment for their accountability and thus truth—a stage that will naturally involve scepticism, but of a healthy rather than brutal nature. And since these explanations of human behaviour are *so* accountable and thus truthful, this last stage should not take long. As Professor Prosen says in his Introduction, **‘My sincere hope is that with our species’ predicament now so dire, the scientific establishment will finally acknowledge and support these critically important insights.’**

⁶¹⁰History certainly teems with examples of those who have been persecuted for telling the truth, for daring to defy the great denial enshrouding our wonderful world—Christ’s crucifixion being the most famous—but we now have another to match that ultimate example, which is what has been done to me; what’s that rhetorical question in the Bible: **‘was there ever a prophet [a denial-free thinker] your fathers did not persecute’** (Acts 7:52). HOWEVER, when all the truth about human existence is accompanied by the greater, dignifying, compassionate, redeeming and rehabilitating full truth of the explanation of the human condition, *that denial is no longer justified*. And, of course, that denial is *so* habituated—our fear of the truth has soaked into our bones—but, nevertheless, that door to the possibility of understanding the human condition *must be kept open*. There *has* to be sufficient soundness and strength of character left on this planet for the full truth to be supported when it emerges, which (as has been fully evidenced) it now has—because if there isn’t, then the consequences of terminal alienation for the human race that Michelangelo’s and Blake’s paintings at the beginning of chapter 3 horrifically portray are unthinkable.

⁶¹¹Dishonest intellectualism, as opposed to truthful instinctualism, is incredibly dangerous when it becomes overly deluded and carried away with its imagined authority, when it is **‘given...to utter proud words and blasphemies’** (Bible, Rev. 13:5). No wonder Christ angrily called the denial-practising academics of his day, **‘You blind fools!... You blind guides!...you hypocrites!... You snakes! You brood of vipers! How will you escape being condemned’** (Matt. 23:17-33), and said, **‘Woe to you experts in the law, because you [your dishonesty] have taken away the key to knowledge’** (Luke 11:52). Yes, as Einstein recognised, **‘Science [knowledge] without religion [denial-free truthfulness] is lame, religion without science is blind’** (*Out of My Later Years*, 1950, p.26 of 286). To find understanding of human behaviour required both intellectualism *and* instinctualism. As my headmaster at Geelong Grammar School, Sir James Darling, put it, **‘conscience is the executive part of consciousness’** (*The Education of a Civilized Man*, 1962, p.96 of 223); without input and guidance for the intellect from our truthful moral instinctive self or soul, the voice of which is our conscience, then total dishonesty and terminal alienation occurs. Again, as explained in par. 138, intellectual, human-condition-avoiding, dishonest mechanistic science had to find all the details of the workings of the world that make the explanation of the human condition possible, and then instinctual, human-condition-confronting, honest thinking had to use those insights to assemble the actual explanation of the human condition—which is what has occurred, but the problem is science is not acknowledging that explanation. Yes, professors

promenade across their campuses full of conviction of their own importance, the students too are certain they are where it's 'at', but universities have become one big dishonest castle of lies; in fact, rather than centres of learning that seek truth as they are supposed to be, universities have become hideous, human-race-destroying places that indulge and glorify dishonesty! Christ foresaw this danger of the delusion of denial-committed academia when he further cautioned, **'Beware of the teachers of the law. They like to walk round in flowing robes and love to be greeted in the market-places and have the most important seats in the synagogues and the places of honour at banquets'** (Luke 20:46).

⁶¹² Since the great achievement of life on Earth has been the development of consciousness, it follows that for those charged with the responsibility of overseeing its maturity to enlightenment and sanity—namely the scientific establishment—to abuse that responsibility is the greatest of obscenities; worse, it is a spear through the very heart of all of life and meaning on Earth. It is the meanest, most bitter, most selfish, most bloody-minded, most hateful of the truth, most unnecessary behaviour this planet has ever witnessed.

⁶¹³ There is one last comment I would like to make about this awful business of science having had to practise denial. Much of this book has had to be dedicated to dismantling and exposing all the dishonest human-condition-avoiding mechanistic accounts of human behaviour, so it will be an immense relief when, in the future, post-human-condition world, it will not be necessary to have to wade through all that material and just be able to read the true, and, in truth, obvious, explanations of human behaviour it contains. I think that after presenting Plato's truthful account of our condition in chapter 2:6—of how **'our ancestors'** lived in a pre-human-condition-afflicted, **'innocent', 'blessed', 'divine', 'upright', 'cleanly made', 'pure', 'noble', 'good', 'modest', 'honour[able]', 'spirit[ed]', 'simple and calm and happy'** state, and how horrifically that contrasts with our present corrupted, **'fallen', 'evil', 'ignoble', 'bad', 'crooked', 'terrible', 'unlawful', 'insolent', 'pride[ful]', 'lumbering', 'disorder[ly]', 'chaos'-causing,** increasingly **'forget[ful]', 'deaf',** threatening **'universal ruin to the world', 'imprisoned in' a 'living tomb'** lives—it was, from that point on in this book, very obvious how completely committed to evasion, denial and delusion science, and indeed the whole human race, was going to become—which means that all the patient and laborious exposés of all those contrived, implausible, fanciful, ridiculous, blatantly biologically incorrect 'explanations' for human behaviour, really became so predictable that in the end I think it must become tiresome to read. As mentioned in pars 541-542, science certainly has become farcical. It *is* an immense shame that, while the human condition wasn't able to be truthfully explained, scientists had to turn themselves inside out, perform incredible contortions, in order to invent a non-confronting world of supposed explanations of our behaviour for humans to live in. That's what has been so clever about the resigned upset state—how it managed to invent all these lies. *So* much brain power has been spent on that activity; a whole universe of bullshit has been created. So imagine how relieving and peaceful it is going to be to be able to leave all that behind? In fact, one day, a version of this book will be available that has all the now redundant denials printed in grey highlight, so readers can just bypass them and go straight to the truthful insights it contains into our lives. Yes, one day all the lying will stop and go forever from planet Earth, and blessed will be that day—and now, with the truth revealed, it should not be far off! I might say that, given how confronting this new honest

world inevitably is for the current, first generation to encounter, I can envisage that in the not-too-distant future, the truth of the explanations of human behaviour contained in this book, all anyone from this current generation will need to do is read chapters 1 and 3 for the explanation and defence of our horrifically corrupted lives, and the final chapter that explains how every human can be completely transformed from that terrible condition. Not only can the dishonest ‘explanations’ be avoided, but, except for the explanation of the human condition, all the other truthful explanations can also be avoided! Chapter 9 explains how this strategy of supporting the truth, without overly confronting it, works.

⁶¹⁴ Finally, I would be remiss not to observe how amazingly truthful and accurate Plato was in describing in his cave allegory the human condition and the difficulties involved in its eventual resolution. Plato was certainly one of the soundest men in recorded history. Indeed, along with the other two very great denial-free thinking prophets in recorded history, namely Moses and Christ, Plato made the most important contributions to humanity’s great journey to enlightenment; specifically, that through the Ten Commandments Moses gave humanity the most effective form of Imposed Discipline for containing the ever-increasing levels of upset in humans; that Christ gave humanity the soundest and thus most effective corruption-and-denial-countering religion; and that Plato gave philosophy—the actual business of studying **‘the truths underlying all reality’**, in particular studying and finding the all-important understanding of the human condition—the best possible orientation and assistance. So, you could say that ‘the beauty and taste of roses, rice and potato saved the human race’!! And I should add ‘a leg of lamb’—the prophet Abraham—to that world-saving feast because Abraham contributed the precious foundations of real, effective religion with his emphasis on monotheism, the need to revere the fundamental truth about our existence of there being one true ‘God’, which we can now acknowledge is Integrative Meaning. Indeed, in what has to be the most truth-filled and thus greatest poem ever written (extraordinarily insightful extracts from it are referred to throughout this book), *Intimations of Immortality*, the poet William Wordsworth probably best described the critical role denial-free thinking prophets have played in leading humanity by terming them the **‘Eye[s] among the blind’**: **‘Thou best Philosopher, who yet dost keep / Thy heritage, thou Eye among the blind / That, deaf and silent, read’st the eternal deep / Haunted for ever by the eternal mind / Mighty Prophet! Seer blest! / On whom those truths do rest / Which we are toiling all our lives to find / In darkness lost, the darkness of the grave’** (1807). The **‘darkness lost, the darkness of the grave’** where no truth is accessible equates perfectly with Plato’s **‘living tomb’ ‘cave’** of alienating denial where virtually the entire human race has had to live incarcerated against the glaring truth of our condition. Yes, Wordsworth’s reference to prophets being the **‘Eye among the blind’** perfectly describes how denial-free, truthful thinking had to act in partnership with human-condition avoiding, **‘blind’**, **‘toiling’** mechanistic science for the truth about the human condition to be found. In the words of the *Encarta* summary of Plato’s cave allegory, **‘the proper object of knowledge [science]’** has been to achieve **‘the transition to the real world’**—that is, end the alienated state of denial that humans have had to live in, get out of our species’ horrible **‘darkness of the grave’**, **‘cave’** existence. It is only the **‘enlightenment’** of our **‘imperfect’ ‘human condition’** that enables us to be **‘released from’** the **‘bonds’** of our **‘cave’-‘like’ ‘prison’** of **‘almost blind’** alienated denial and, as a result, be **‘cured of’** our **‘illusion’** and

‘delusions’. I should reiterate that Plato also emphasised how relieved the cave prisoner would be to be free of, and transformed from, his old dishonest existence by saying, **‘when he thought of his first home and what passed for wisdom there, and of his fellow-prisoners, don’t you think he would congratulate himself on his good fortune and be sorry for them?’** (*The Republic*, 516).

⁶¹⁵ (I should mention that I have written much more in *Freedom Expanded* (see <www.humancondition.com/freedom-expanded-Abraham-Moses-Plato-Christ>) about Plato’s extraordinary contribution to the human journey to enlightenment of his insightful thinking about the human condition—and about the absolutely incredible contribution Christ made to the human journey; indeed, it is a measure of the precious way of coping with the human condition that Christ gave the human race that he is considered **‘the most famous man in the world’** (*Jesus Revealed*, National Geographic Channel, 2009) and that most of the world dates its existence around his life, as either BC or AD, ‘Before Christ’ or ‘Anno Domini’, which translates as ‘in the year of our Lord’, referring to the year of Christ’s birth. I also explain more about the absolutely incredible contribution Moses made to the human journey with his first five books of the Bible being fundamental teaching in Christianity, Judaism and Islam, and about the absolutely incredible contribution of monotheism that Abraham gave to the human journey.)

⁶¹⁶ The remaining three chapters in this book explain the emergence of consciousness in humans, the story of humanity’s journey from ignorance to enlightenment, and, finally, how the fabulous transformation of the human race takes place. In regard to the next chapter’s explanation of how consciousness emerged, unlike the mysteries of the human condition, of our meaning, and the origin of our moral soul, our ability to understand consciousness depended on recognising so many historically denied truths that mechanistic science can’t be as easily criticised for ignoring its discovery as it can be for ignoring the other key insights—which is why the main damnation of science for its ill-treatment of these world-saving insights appears here in chapter 6.

Chapter 6:13 Nurturing now becomes a priority

⁶¹⁷ Before progressing to those final chapters it needs to be emphasised that having found the compassionate biological understanding of the upsetting battle that humans have had to wage against the ignorance of our instinctive self as to the fundamental goodness of our conscious self, our species’ preoccupation with that battle can at last end and focus return to the nurturing of our children. Further, now that we have found that *very* good reason *why* parents have been unable to nurture their children with anything like the unconditional love children instinctively expect and need, it is no longer necessary to deny the importance of nurturing both in the maturation of our species and in our own lives. Yes, with the arrival of understanding the terrible guilt that parents have felt for not being able to adequately nurture their offspring departs. Parents can now understand that their inability to adequately love their offspring is *not* their fault, but the product of the ever-accumulating levels of upset in the human race as a whole that resulted from our species’ heroic 2-million-year search for knowledge, specifically for self-knowledge, understanding of why we conscious humans are