

<sup>148</sup> (Much more can be read about mechanistic science's strategy of investigating the human condition while avoiding it, including the role the Greek philosopher Aristotle played in developing the strategy, at <[www.humancondition.com/freedom-expanded-science-was-invented](http://www.humancondition.com/freedom-expanded-science-was-invented)>.)

### **Chapter 2:5 The three fundamental truths that have to be admitted for there to be a true analysis of the human condition**

<sup>149</sup> As has been mentioned, what is going to be revealed in the remainder of this chapter is how human-condition-avoiding mechanistic biology—with E.O. Wilson at the helm—has fast been leading humanity to terminal alienation and extinction.

<sup>150</sup> The most effective way to begin this exposé is to identify the three fundamental truths about human behaviour that have to be admitted for there to be a true analysis of our condition, but which mechanistic biology has been determinedly avoiding because they have been unbearably condemning of our present psychologically upset competitive, aggressive and selfish human-condition-afflicted existence. We need to bring into the open what it is that has consistently been avoided by mechanistic biology in order to reveal the field's hidden agenda.

<sup>151</sup> So what are the three fundamental truths about our human condition that have been determinedly denied by mechanistic biology? As explained in chapter 1 when the fully accountable explanation of the human condition was outlined, the human condition emerged when our conscious mind challenged our instincts for the management of our lives, with the resulting psychologically upset competitive, aggressive and selfish condition being greatly exacerbated by the fact that our moral instincts are orientated to living in a way that is the complete opposite of this state, namely cooperatively, lovingly and selflessly. (Note, the biological explanation of the great mystery as to how our distant ape ancestors came to live unconditionally selflessly, cooperatively and peacefully, the instinctive memory of which is our moral conscience, is presented in chapters 5 and 6.) Thus, the three fundamental elements involved in this explanation are that our conscious mind caused our upset state to emerge, that it is a *psychological* psychotic and neurotic state of upset that we are living in, and that our species' original instinctive orientation was to living in a psychosis-free, peaceful and harmonious state of cooperation, love and selflessness. The problem, of course, has been that until this reconciling explanation of the human condition was found that defends our conscious mind's upsetting search for knowledge, relieves our psychosis and neurosis, and explains why we had to depart from an original cooperative, loving, selfless state of innocence, each of these three fundamental truths was unbearably condemning of our present competitive, aggressive and selfish upset, psychotic and neurotic conscious self, and therefore had to be denied. We couldn't face the truth until we could explain it. So these are the three truths that have been denied by human-condition-avoiding mechanistic science—and, as sufferers of the human condition, it is most likely that they are truths that readers of this book will *also* have been living in denial of, and thus unlikely to have been accepting as being 'truths'.

<sup>152</sup> It makes sense, therefore, that the reader will require evidence that these are, in fact, all truths before being presented with an exposé on how mechanistic science has dismissed and

denied them—but in the interim the following paragraph serves as a helpful introduction to how mechanistic biology has gone about denying these truths.

<sup>153</sup> As was mentioned in chapter 1:1, the main way mechanistic science managed to deny these three extremely condemning and confronting truths (that we, in the form of our conscious mind, caused our upset, corrupted condition; and that humans now suffer from a psychosis; and that our species' instinctive heritage is of having lived in an all-loving, cooperative, peaceful state) was to assert that our present behaviour is no different to that seen in the animal kingdom. It was argued that humans are competitive, aggressive and selfish because of our animal heritage; that we have savage animal instincts that make us fight and compete for food, shelter, territory and a mate—basically, for the chance to reproduce our genes. Further, as will be described shortly in chapter 2:9, we said that the task of our conscious mind is to try to *control* these supposed brutal, savage instincts within us. As will be pointed out, this was an absolutely brilliant excuse because instead of our instincts being all-loving and thus unbearably condemning of our present non-loving state, they were made out to be vicious and brutal; *and*, instead of our conscious mind being the cause of our corruption, the insecurity of which made us repress our instinctive self or soul or psyche and become psychotic, it was made out to be the blameless, psychosis-free mediating 'hero' that had to manage those supposed vicious instincts within us! Of course, as was pointed out in chapter 1:1, the whole 'animals are competitive and aggressive and that's why we are' excuse cannot be the *real* cause of our divisive behaviour because descriptions of our behaviour, such as egocentric, arrogant, inspired, depressed, deluded, pessimistic, optimistic, artificial, hateful, cynical, mean, immoral, guilt-ridden, evil, psychotic, neurotic, alienated, all recognise the involvement of our species' unique fully conscious thinking mind—that there *is* a *psychological* dimension to *our* behaviour. We have suffered not from the genetic-opportunism-based, non-psychological *animal* condition, but the conscious-mind-based, *PSYCHOLOGICALLY* troubled *HUMAN CONDITION*. The other reason (which I didn't mention in chapter 1:1 but can now include) for why the savage animal instincts in us excuse doesn't hold water is because of the third fundamental truth about humans, which is that we have unconditionally selfless, cooperative, loving, *moral* instincts, the expression or 'voice' of which within us we call our conscience—as Charles Darwin said, '**The moral sense perhaps affords the best and highest distinction between man and the lower animals**' (*The Descent of Man*, 1871, ch.4). The reason adolescents have become so depressed during Resignation, and why they don't fall for and adopt the savage instincts excuse (although they gladly embrace it *after* resigning and deciding they have to live in denial of the human condition) is because their moral instinctive self or soul lets them know their behaviour should be cooperative and loving, *not* competitive and aggressive. The fundamental reason humans have had a sense of guilt is because we have a moral conscience. Yes, the truth is we do all know that the old 'animals are competitive and aggressive and that's why we are' defence doesn't explain our *psychologically distressed, guilt-ridden human condition*. In fact—as is going to be revealed—'the savage instincts excuse' and 'the conscious mind is the psychosis-free hero' accounts of human behaviour have all just been *terrible* reverse-of-the-truth lies, albeit hugely relieving ones for humans needing to seek relief from the human condition while it wasn't able to be truthfully explained.

<sup>154</sup> Now, to supply evidence for the reader of the three truths that our conscious mind caused our upset, corrupted condition, that we suffer from a psychosis, and that our instinctive heritage is of having lived in an all-loving, cooperative, peaceful state.

### **Chapter 2:6 Evidence of the three fundamental truths, as provided by Moses and Plato**

<sup>155</sup> If we ask ourselves what is the ‘we’ that we are talking about when we refer to the possibility that ‘we’ are a terrible mistake, a worthless blight on this planet, the **‘face of absolute evil’** as Jung said, we can see where the *real* problem about our seemingly horribly flawed condition lies: the ‘we’ is surely our conscious thinking mind or intellect. It is our conscious mind that is uncertain of its worthiness, that suspects that it might be to blame for our species’ present seemingly highly imperfect, even ‘fallen’ or corrupted, competitive, aggressive and selfish condition. And indeed, that most famous mythological account of the origin or genesis of the human condition, the story of Adam and Eve from the book of ‘Genesis’ in the Old Testament in the Bible, which the very great prophet Moses wrote (versions of which also appear in the Torah of Judaism, and the Koran of Islam), recognises that this was the case—that it *was* our conscious mind that led to our ‘good-and-evil’-afflicted condition. Moses said that the first humans, represented in this account by Adam and Eve, lived **‘naked, and they felt no shame’** (Gen. 2:25) in **‘the Garden of Eden’** (3:23) and were **‘created...in the image of God’** (1:27), obviously meaning we once lived in a pre-human-condition-afflicted state of original innocence where we were perfectly instinctively orientated to the cooperative, selfless, loving, ‘Godly’ ideals of life—indeed, the dictionary description for the word **‘Edenic’** is **‘the first home of Adam and Eve...a state of innocence, bliss, or ultimate happiness’** (*The Free Dictionary*). As mentioned in par. 65, Moses then said that Adam and Eve took the **‘fruit’ ‘from the tree of...knowledge’** (3:3, 2:17) because it was **‘desirable for gaining wisdom’** (3:6), obviously meaning we became fully conscious, thinking, knowledge-seeking beings. Then, as a result of developing a conscious mind and a **‘disobedient’** (the term widely used in descriptions of Gen. 3) free will, Moses said we **‘fell from grace’** (derived from the title of Gen. 3, **‘The Fall of Man’**), obviously meaning our original cooperative, selfless and loving (good) state became corrupted and our competitive, selfish and aggressive—indeed, angry, egocentric and alienated—(‘evil’/‘sinful’/guilt-ridden) state emerged. It was at this point that humans **‘realised that they were naked; so they sewed fig leaves together and made coverings for themselves’** (3:7), meaning nudity was no longer a **‘shame[less]’** state, with sex as humans now practise it emerging where, as will be explained in chapter 8:11B, the act of procreation became perverted and used as a way of angrily attacking or ‘fucking’ innocence because of its implied criticism of our lack thereof—at which point it was necessary to clothe ourselves to dampen lust and reduce the **‘shame’** we felt for being so horrifically destructive of innocence. (Note: this explanation of sex as humans practise it now will likely be another concept new to the reader, requiring some thought before it can be accepted as being true, but it really is just a further honest, obvious explanation we couldn’t afford to admit while we couldn’t explain the human condition and defend our immensely corrupted lives.) Moses then said that, as a result of the emergence of all our corrupt angry, egocentric and alienated behaviour, we were **‘banished...from the Garden of Eden’**-like (3:23) state