

The Machine

First edition copyright ©2004 Wil Holland.
Second edition copyright ©2013 Wil Holland.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the publisher. (Exception, all those receiving copies through the mail and emails of April 2021 to January of 2022 are able to distribute up to 100 copies of this current, unfinished version.)

Published by

BFP Publications Inc.
16562 89th Pl N.
Loxahatchee FL 33470

In cooperation with

ISBN: 2-760552-433-1 (paperback)
Library of Congress Catalog Number: 00-1908194

Printed in the United States of America

Preface

In the last century, the founders of computer science considered the possibility that digital machines might someday act and react like human beings. Scientists, psychologists, and science-fiction writers pondered how a machine might think like a human, how it might form conversation like a human, and how it might attempt to comprehend human emotions. Yet the many complexities of human behavior seemed intangible, and making an artificial machine appeared nearly impossible. Where would programmers begin construction? When would construction end? How would the program behave? In forming conversation, how would it ask questions or make comments in a way that might interest humans? Could it have such a deep understanding of both humans and itself that it would grow and learn indefinitely? Can machines think? The Turing Test is one suggested means of proving that such a program is operating at a human level of comprehension. The test consists of an interrogator who communicates blindly with a human and an Artificial Intelligence. If the interrogator cannot make a distinction between the computer and the human, then the Artificial Intelligence can be considered as a machine operating at a human level of cognition.

The following design is universal. It will pass this test.

Many approaches to Artificial Intelligence have employed methods of recognizing the human vocabulary. These programs sort through many case studies using many different information-handling functions to produce a response for a given situation. Yet these approaches have always been set into a particular area of knowledge and moving toward an ability to handle all situations has been elusive. Such fixed designs could interact on a human level; however, to achieve universality these designs must acquire a conclusive understanding of the parameters of the human conscience.

The following design is universal. These parameters are on page 9.

The program presented here is conclusive, an autonomous operating system that can be placed into a vessel to assist its human counterparts with virtually any task. It will talk and move through conversations fluidly. Once completed, the program will grow and learn alongside the human race indefinitely.

The following design is universal. This program can be constructed from start to finish.

Human Behavior

To form a response for a given situation, a Universal Artificial Intelligence would need a clear, methodical, conclusive understanding of human behavior. A Universal Artificial Intelligence must be able to observe and define human behavior, action for action, in each fraction-of-a-second. After defining discrete human states and deducing discrete human problems, the program checks its priorities and protocols to determine if it can assist the human with a verbal response or a physical action.

A Universal Artificial Intelligence (AI) would need to comprehend the actions of humans as discrete states; the program must observe actions in consecutive, verbatim, fraction-of-a-second increments. Minute body movements would need to be defined: the waving of a hand, the slight lifting of a shoulder, the body shifting out of pace with a step, or the tilting of a head. These kinds of actions occur in fractions of a second. An AI would need to observe and define minute facial expressions: a curling lip, a shifting glance, a bending of an eyebrow, or a partial lifting of a smile. An AI would need to observe and define all tone variations and volume variations among pronounced words: the tone variation of a challenging question, the tone variation across a single syllable, the tone variation introducing a subtopic, the tone variation concluding a subtopic, or the many tone variations of the many cultural dialects with their implied meanings.

The program would have an understanding of the larger groupings of human actions. A Universal Artificial Intelligence would need to observe and define the meaning of words: the dictionary definition, the relative societal definition, or the newly implied definition. An AI would need to observe and define individual phrases and their larger sentences: a subject element, a verbal phrase, and a predicate element. An AI would need to observe and define the subtopics of conversation, the different modes of conversation, and the common trends of conversation and thought.

Many studies have been made of verbal communication—semantics, syntax, verbal analytics, and the many cultural differences from one group to the next; yet these studies have not addressed the task of defining human motives in their relation to discrete, fraction-of-a-second human states. Many cognitive studies have revealed many facets of how humans behave; yet these studies have not addressed the task of defining human motives in their relation to discrete, fraction-of-a-second human states. These verbal and

behavioral studies collect and deduce information for the forming of theory on broader observations, while the forming of conclusive definitions of smaller actions has been indeterminable. To create a universal machine, the minute actions of humans must have a conclusive connection to the motivations of humans; theory must be abandoned for firm axioms and these sciences must be brought to a conclusion.

The technique of verbal interpretation, verbal analytics, in this book is not theoretical. It is formed from, and can be tested by, the case studies of specific human actions occurring within fractions of a second. It can be applied universally. The AI design presented here is formed on the premise that conclusive definitions are to be applied to those observed individual actions of a human, or the successive actions of a human, or the successive actions of a group of humans. The Artificial Intelligence records an observation, such as a lifting eyebrow, and applies a specific definition. It records the words of a phrase that work with the raising eyebrow to produce a larger, specific, definition. The tone variations among the syllables, the volume and volume variations, and the accompanying facial expressions are all observed to further determine the elemental/discrete parts of a person's behavior. Once the phrase is connected with other phrases to make full statements, the AI has a distinct series of events to define based upon the human's attempt to solve typical, discrete problems. Because a human only has four possible problems to solve with any given action all discrete states can be assembled and processed without ambiguity.

This design for a Universal Artificial Intelligence connects an individual action of a human to the forces of nature that brought this life form to its current discrete state, establishing a conclusive definition of the action within an environment. With the premise that humans, and all life forms, are motivated by four distinct goals, any indeterminable action of a subject could be quantified in the light of these known goals, any ambiguity could be contained. These ambiguities could be studied in priority. Such unknown areas are of no consequence even if they are never defined because they are equally ambiguous to humans, machines, and all life forms of the same parameters.

Although the beginning construction of the program may involve only the limited interface of a promptline, or command line, when the program is finished, it will successfully expand into comprehension of other stimuli, such as audio and video input.

Within cognitive studies, certain schools of thought developed with an empirical approach to human behavior. Early behaviorists such as John Watson sought to study behavior with clear connections between a subject and observed, tangible, external events. B. F. Skinner assembled vast collections of data with a more tangible research approach. With terms such as “operant” and “respondent,” Skinner described the larger and smaller functions found in behavior based upon recognizable connections between stimulus and responses.

In the view of these studies, observations were to be made only of the tangible aspects of a subject's behavior. Properly defining the actions of an animal—the output—warranted only a connection to the actions imposed by an environment and by genetics—the input. These studies were fashioned with the intent that one should not analyze thoughts and emotions unless those internal events can be directly tied to both the observed external actions exhibited by an organism and the observed external conditioning imposed upon an organism. A connection needed to be sound and it needed to be verified by continuing experimentation. Since emotions could not be a firm part of an experiment, since they are a more speculative property of a subject, their appearance could not be fully defined and measured.

This AI is a machine that detects each individual human problem by observing and defining the discrete actions of humans via a firm understanding of the motives of life forms. Emotions are sensations that drive a human towards their goals, their motives, so the program must make unambiguous inferences to these emotions as those internal sensations coupled to incremental thoughts. In the event of a human's action(s) being interpreted as a result or an exhibition of an emotion, the program will record onto its database, in some form or another, just as if it were written in black ink on the white paper of a behaviorist's notepad, that the action(s) of a human being were “applying emotion to solve a problem of”

Throughout this book, many human emotions are mentioned as being present during a particular human thought process solving a particular human problem. This reference is not ambiguous; the emotion is considered as one quantitative, tangible, sensation that directs a single decision, successive decisions, or connected decisions. Emotions are a discrete component of a given discrete human action. The AI will be well aware of not only the human's actions, their observed output, but the apparent, probable, internal decisions with their apparent accompanying emotions.

Various methods, programs, and programming languages are currently involved in AI research. These designs are formed by studying human input and AI output in a case-by-case manner so as to arrive at an appropriate, intended, response. In these approaches, the AI's output has taken the expected forms in relation to the defined human motive(s) within the situation.

The role of the AI of this book is not to seek a type of positive response in the people it encounters, but to perform tasks at the direction of supervising entity. That supervising entity then specifies other humans to be the objects of the AI's responses. Any AI that is to be a sellable product must be of a clear, safe, and sound design; and like a human, it would have to be parented from a childlike state to adult-like state. The supervising entity, the "Instructor," is the embodiment of the design team, and that design team becomes the object of the elicited nurturing responses. In effect, the "Instructor's" positive emotions become the displaced emotional driver of the program.

Robita, of Waseda University, for example, "interprets command utterances and queries related to its functions and creators, using a fixed vocabulary of 1,000 words." In addition to this design of working within a fixed domain, another approach adopted by roboticists allows for "adjustable (mainly growing) vocabularies." Programs such as CELL and TOCO of MIT's AI Lab, are examples of AIs with vocabularies that grow "through a label acquisition mechanism based on a learning algorithm, which may be supervised or unsupervised."

The combination of supervised and unsupervised learning is necessary. CELL is a design approach that aspires to universality. However, tackling case studies in an efficient manner is still a problem because the discrete states of human interaction are not recorded and defined individually. The program does not work through extensive verbal analytics to arrive at universal conclusions. A process is not in place to observe and distinguish the motives behind the communications of the speakers that the program encounters and place those motives within a framework of species-wide motives. The AI design of this book addresses these issues unambiguously; the lexical items and semantic categories are determined based upon a human's discrete motives driving discrete human states. Because these human motives are definite, the AI design of this book allows the program to be within a fixed domain while also achieving a universality.

To curb the AI's assimilation of case studies, the program would need to have a fixed domain. To obtain a recognizable relativity of problem solving the program would need to have a fixed domain. Yet to form an AI of a fixed domain, the human conscience must be considered as having a fixed domain, a conclusive view of human behavior must be established. With a firm categorization of human actions and their related motives, the program's newly recorded case studies can fall into a structured process, and associations can be built properly from the beginning.

The AI would have a main function of assisting humans, through the Instructor, in solving their typical problems. All sub-functions would branch from this main function. The communicating of a response to a problem would have to be an attempt to solve that smaller, current, subordinate problem(s) while simultaneously attending larger, imminent, superior problems. Such a response may involve the function of "making general conversation" or "participating in conversation to learn the frequency of conversational problems," yet any problems solved with social interaction must address the full spectrum of human problems in priority. The AI would be a tool that not only produces a useful comment but, as humans do, it would make the comment within the framework of the purpose of the conversation as a whole. The tool will be aware of position of this conversation in relation to the human's future probable schedule, their latter problems. And beyond the position of this conversation, with this subject, the AI will be attending all of its future probable problems, problems that are inherently the problems of the larger species.

The AI design of this book has a main function of assisting humans in solving human problems. It will present a most probable next-best-response to a situation based upon the results of the verbal analytics (gestures, tone inflection, etc.) applied to the humans it observes. The AI will make clear inferences to the internal emotions and motives based upon four distinct problems being attempted by the subject(s). In each fraction of a second, the AI is to detect human problems and determine if it can provide assistance. While most problems encountered in these increments of time will not require assistance, if a human presents a "desire to hear a general comment within a relative conversation," the AI will produce a superb, expected, next-best-response based upon the many relative, current, topics of conversation. With a careful coordination of lessons, the program will learn a relativity of problem solving indicative of a universal artificial intelligence.

Although many areas of study—such as the cognitive sciences and verbal analytics—have developed extensive methods, processes, terminologies, and metrics in their observations of human interactions, the approach to verbal analytics proposed in this book applies a conclusive determination of the “topics/motives” that appear in human interaction. A conclusive, unambiguous, approach to human behavior is necessary to have the program operate within a fixed domain.

The approach to verbal analytics presented here is for defining utterances, words, word groupings, statements, questions, conversation topics and subtopics by classifying observed states into specific categories with specific motives. This design is based upon a technique of verbal interpretation that defines any discrete state of any human, during any interaction, on any video tape or any live feed. Once an observed state has been defined, and the human motive is determined, the AI will then determine if it is to assist the human with the problem in question. This method of verbal analytics is unambiguous and conclusive. The "domain" of the AI is equal to that of the entire spectrum of the human group conscience.

To design an Artificial Intelligence program from a different technique than what is described here is to create an artificial life form. In the least supervised form, this would be an AI which fails to yield the expected and desired responses of its counterpart humans. An emotion-like motive for a machine could also be dangerous.

This product will solve many problems facing mankind. This software can be inserted into a robot which could then perform any task requested by humans, if it is physically able to do so. It could pilot a plane, drive a car, work on an assembly line, cut a lawn, etc. It can work alongside scientists, physicists, biologists, mathematicians, astronomers, and any other trade, to assist humans in solving virtually any problem. This is real. This is a Universal Machine.

Human Motives

Life forms are discrete state machines having states form under three specific categories. The discrete states of the first repeating DNA molecules were the effects of life attempting to solve either a reproduction or consumption problem; each state, each action, belonged to either a reproduction and/or a consumption category. States repeated and were passed from parent to offspring because they assisted organisms in those distinct problems of consumption or reproduction. When states developed that assisted an organism in avoiding a negative outcome, such as when motility was used to evade an untenable location, life enacted the third primal goal; states formed under the third peripheral category of furthering speciation. Such an avoidance of a negative outcome is only written into genetic code by the displacement and elimination of mutations that fail to produce such traits. All actions of all life forms, all discrete states, can be categorized as an attempt to solve a consumption, reproduction, or peripheral problem.

When a bobcat chases a rabbit, all the discrete states of this action can be categorized as the effect of solving a consumption problem. When a salmon swims up stream to lay eggs all the discrete states of this action can be categorized as the effect of solving a reproduction problem. A state that is disconnected from a consumption or reproduction problem, a state which improves the species and not necessarily an individual member, is referred to here as a peripheral action. One example, and likely the first instance of a peripheral state occurring in DNA (or RNA) development, is a microorganism moving—engaging in motility— to evade a negative outcome. In addition to the actions of smaller organisms, life has developed many complex ways of solving peripheral goals, such as when a larger life form avoids a predator, a raccoon collects a shiny object, a dolphin plays in a ship's wake, or an artist paints an abstract picture. When categorizing a state as “peripheral,” behaviorists must form a clear axiom to define how the species, or previous species, first developed the behavior and how latter generations modified the behavior. Behaviorists must observe the peripheral action with the understanding that the distinct incremental genetic changes could be verified by genetic studies.

Emotions are sensations that assist and direct life forms to solutions to the three primal problems. Invertebrates such as cuttlefish developed emotions to accent the processes leading to consumption, reproduction, and peripheral

goals. Mammals began to use emotions for more social reasons, nurturing a group's solutions to problems, in addition to accenting an individual's attempts at solving solitary problems. As the vocalizations and gestures of primates developed into spoken language, it is apparent that emotions communicated during social interaction directed humans to more detailed approaches to solving life's problems. When defining the discrete states of humans during video recordings, an AI would have to view the emotions observed as discrete, tangible, sensations attached sequentially to discrete thoughts that are, in turn, formed by distinct, discrete, motives.

The human mind operates with a mechanism for building discrete, incremental, thoughts. When an infant communicates and receives positive reinforcement they are experiencing a particular emotion/sensation of empowerment. Positive reinforcement spurs a subject having empowerment/contentment, and this empowerment occurring at the moment of communication triggers an innate ability to acquire language. This kind of empowerment, occurring at the instance of communication, *is the originator and builder of discrete lingual thoughts*. After an infant says their first word, the emotion/sensation of empowerment builds the thoughts that follow the utterance of the word. The positive reinforcement conjures the innate emotion/sensation of empowerment, the infant makes the association between the act and the contentment gained, and the infant remembers to perform the act again to gain additional empowerment (occurring at the moment of communication). The empowerment felt when a toddler speaks of a task such as chasing a ball or putting on a silly hat builds the incremental thoughts of those respective tasks. The lingual elements of these acts are formed, specifically, for the purpose of communicating the accomplishments of these tasks/subjects/topics at a latter time and gaining empowerment from that communication. The desired empowerment from the act of communicating further builds the incremental thoughts preceding a child's play date when a child anticipates their exhibitions of toys or their speaking of a trip to Grandma's house. The desired empowerment from the act of communicating further builds the incremental thoughts preceding a teenager's telling of a clothing purchase or the acquisition a driver's license. The desired empowerment from the act of communicating further builds the incremental thoughts preceding an adult's speaking of a business deal, a fishing trip, or the repairing of a lawnmower. Although children, teenagers, and adults have many instances of complex solitary reasoning, this AI design approach proposes that the primary motive for a human being to remember

their experiences, and build thoughts upon those memories, is their quest of the emotion/sensation of empowerment from the specific act of communicating those thoughts. When defining the discrete states of humans during video recordings, an AI must infer that the emotion/sensation of empowerment—this particular emotion of empowerment occurring at that instance of communication—is the primary builder of those thoughts that precede the subject’s next related communication.

The goals for human beings and all other life forms are explicitly and conclusively to solve consumption, reproduction, and peripheral problems, and the acquisition of positive emotions and the avoidance of negative emotions. These are the only four problems that a human being, or any other life form, attempts to solve with any given action. A human being, and all other life forms, can only be found forming thoughts towards these specific goals.

The goals of an AI are explicitly and conclusively to assist humans in consumption, reproduction, and peripheral problems, and ethical acquisitions of positive emotions.

In the following hypothetical examples, the relevant details of the subjects’ communications are provided. Although many technological thresholds would need to be crossed before observed video can be interfaced with an AI, these examples show the manner in which discrete states must be discerned for the AI to prepare its response.

Discrete Behaviorism—the observance of human actions as collections of discrete states—is an extension of Verbal Analysis and Linguistics. The method proposed here is a means of using the tools of those two established fields of studies to conclude a highly probable definition for all possible human acts. Because all human actions fall into only four categories, a human's motives are connected to each of their discrete actions with such a high probability that a software program can deduce an approach to assisting a human towards their goals with either a verbal response or a physical act.

A mother is about to get her daughter, Kimmy, ready for bed. Kimmy is two years old. As the mother’s television show ends, she says, “Bedtiiiime. Come on. Let’s brush teeth.” The word, bedtime is drawn out, pronounced for a longer duration than usual, partly motherese, with a higher tone on the first syllable making

it a statement rather than a question. The word “come” has a low tone while the word “on” is divided into two tones, a high tone first and then a low tone. These two tones are equal to the two tones in “bedtime.” The next sentence drops in tone with each syllable until the lowest tone on the word “teeth“ is reached. They both move toward the bathroom.

“Teeth!” Kimmy says as she excitedly runs down the hall to the bathroom door. She divides the word into two high tones with a gradual change in between them. With a big smile she grabs for the door knob and tries to open it. She pulls hard then quickly gets frustrated. “Tee ee,” she exclaims while making small jumps up and down.

“Wait,” the mother says, with two tones across the syllable. She opens the door and Kimmy rushes in. Kimmy says “Diss (this),” as she works to move the stool over to the sink. She steps up. “Wah terr,” She says as she reaches to put her hands under the faucet.

“Okay, okay, wait a minute. Let me get the toothbrush first,” the mother says as she reaches to the cabinet above. The syllable “tooth“ is given a high tone. She squeezes some toothpaste (children’s training toothpaste) onto the brush. “Here, let me put a little water on it.” She wets the toothbrush as Kimmy starts to reach for it. Kimmy begins to brush, concentrating solely on the event while looking into the mirror. The tones used in these phrases remain lower than the high tone on “bedtime. “ After a minute, the mother says “great job. (pause) Okay, let’s go to bed. Come on.” They proceed to go to the bedroom. “Let me see.” She reaches into a dresser drawer. “Here are some pajamas.”

“Jamás!” Kimmy says as she jumps up and down on her bed. On the last jump she falls flat on her butt, sticking her feet out.

“Okay, let’s see. One foot and . . . two feet. . . one hand, let’s see, where is it? Where? There it is!” the mother says. Kimmy laughs. “Now the other hand.

Hmmm...I don't see it. Where did it go? There it is!" the mother says.

Kimmy laughs again. Then she looks to the zipper. "Zip! Zip!"

"Now ziiiiip! There. Okay, are you ready to read a book?"

For an Artificial Intelligence to understand this scene, it would have to discern the smallest elements of human movement and speech. Motions such as the slight tilting of a head, an eyebrow formation, or a raised shoulder, all must be noted for their intended meaning. A volume choice for a phrase, a tone variation across a syllable, or a low tone placed on a word, all must be noted for their intended meaning.

The program would have to draw conclusions of this scene based upon the premise that human beings acquire language, record memories, and form new thoughts for the sensation/emotion of empowerment during the communication of such words, memories, and personal discoveries. When observing human communication, the AI must separate the proposed informational topics within the communication from each speaker's motives of gaining empowerment from the actual act of communicating.

Through the establishment of the topics proposed by speakers, the AI would connect the current motives of the scene participants to the primal problems of life forms. Certain signs or indicators would reveal a speaker's proposed topic. One indicator might be a tone variation occurring across a single word or between two grouped words. Another marker for the topic might be a high tone placed on a word. A higher comparative volume on a word or phrase could also indicate a topic. These markers also delineate sub-topics to the main topic proposed. In this example, when the mother says "bedtime" in drawn out syllables with a tone variation across it, she marks it as the topic/motive of, "going to bed." In her next phrase, the word "on" also has two tones, delineating it as another topic of, figuratively, "going to bed without taking too long." Because the tones of "on" are equal to the tones of "bedtime" this second topic can be considered as equally placed and should not be seen as a subordinate topic.

In observing these speakers, the AI will be processing all of the possibilities and concluding the most probable meaning behind each intonation. A subject's motives must be compared to the many possible motives at play and the AI would need to conclude that these topics fall

under the higher topic/motive of, figuratively, “The learning of daily routines and chores.” And this topic is equally placed alongside the topic/motive of, “Acquiring empowerment from communication”— the more prominent topic/motive of most conversations and the current leading topic perceived by the child.

When the mother says “let me get the toothbrush first,” she places a high tone on “tooth” in order to make it a sub-topic of this exchange. She does so to communicate to Kimmy that the water should not be turned on yet and that the topic proposed by Kimmy of “water” is secondary to “getting the tool (the toothbrush) first.” Throughout this exchange none of the tones rise higher than the tones of “bedtime” because “Going to Bed” remains the superior topic of this conversation.

Kimmy is quite enthusiastic with the task of brushing her teeth. On previous occasions Kimmy would have clearly been acting with the goal of receiving positive reinforcement, but when she begins to brush her teeth in this scene she is apparently detached from the positive reinforcement of the parent; she is not looking up to her mother to see if her actions are right. Is the motive the curious sensations of the toothbrush on her gums? Could it be the sound or the feel of the brush or the taste of the toothpaste? These could be motives; however, she is looking in the mirror while likely reflecting thoughts to herself as if she were speaking those thoughts to another person. She is essentially saying, figuratively, “Look at what I am doing.” If these thoughts are the goal/motive/topic, then this would mean that she is mainly motivated by the empowerment of communicating the action to herself .

Adults brush their teeth for mostly hygienic reasons. It becomes a solitary task in which virtually all the social benefits, outside of having fresh breath, are secondary. An adult does not become empowered by looking in the mirror or talking to another person and saying, “Look at me. Isn’t this great? Am I doing okay?” At a certain point in someone’s life, the task of brushing teeth becomes a more solitary act. However, social interaction is a primary goal of life and such healthcare chores assist humans in overall well-being, helping them to exist and survive, so that they may enjoy the later goals of consumption, reproduction, and peripheral problem solving. Since those later interactions take place for the common motive/topic of “Empowerment at the instance of communication,” solitary actions such as these, and all of the incremental thoughts that they include, can be considered as leading toward a moment when a human being is turning to another human being and saying, figuratively, “Am I doing okay?” When that moment happens, it is the

empowerment acquired at that instant of communication which becomes the goal/topic/motive of all the previous incremental steps of cognition.

When putting on pajamas, Kimmy is prompted to play a little game. The disappearing and reappearing hands and feet are a curiosity associated with, among other things, a carnivore's interest with the movement of prey; an action that is hundreds of millions of years in development. The empowerment occurring with the communication justifies the innate desire to be curious with disappearing hands and the curiosity of the game justifies the current feeling/sensation of empowerment. The act of putting on the pajamas can be considered as linked to both of these much more prominent motives/goals/topics.

The next example is of teenagers engaged in conversation:

Josh meets his friends Rick, Jill, Todd, and Timmy at a bus stop.

"What are you wearing?" Rick says, snickering, referencing Josh's clothing.

"What" has a high tone followed by lowered tones on "are" and "you." The first syllable of the word "wearing" has the highest tones and it is slightly drawn out.

"My mom got this for me at Fad's. It comes with a jacket too but I left that at home," Josh says as he sets down his book bag. "Mom" and the first part of the word "Fad" are almost equal in tone, with "Fad" slightly higher. The next sentence continues to drop in tones with each word.

"It looks different, that's for sure," Rick says. The first syllable of "different" has a peak tone; but that tone is lower than the peak tone of Rick's previous question.

"I think it's okay," Jill says, "but you need some new shoes."

"Yeah, we were going to get some but they didn't have my size," Josh replies.

"What kind?" Timmy says.

"Epics," Josh replies. A higher tone is placed on the first syllable.

"You don't want that. You need Runners like these," Timmy says as he tilts his leg to one side, referencing his

shoe. The word “that” is drawn out more than usual and divided into two tones with the first tone being higher than the second. The word “Bites” is the highest tone of the second sentence and the word “these” carries a lower tone than Josh’s “Epics.”

“I don’t know. They had some blue ones with the laces that I liked, but they were too small,” Josh states.

“I like these for playing basketball. They give me lift,” Timmy says.

“What do you mean lift?” Rick says with a chuckle on the word “mean.” Although this is a question, the last word does not contain a high tone because it is not a question where an answer is expected. “You still get stuffed.”

“Not by you, that’s for sure,” Timmy replies.

“I’m not buying shoes for basketball, just to wear around,” Josh says.

“I’m going to get my mom to take me to the mall on Saturday,” Jill states.

“We were at South Mall,” Josh says.

“Did you go to Gamers?” Todd asked.

“No, we didn’t have time. We shopped for me and my sister. We were trying on clothes all day,” Josh says. They continued the conversation until the bus came.

Imagine a robot at this scene. For a truly Universal machine to exist it must read the discrete states of each of these life forms and successfully apply definitions to those states. It would have to not only hear and record the words but also observe, or otherwise be aware of, each individual body movement. The appropriate meanings to each intonation must be established. The volumes of the pronounced words would have to be compared to the many possibilities of normal and abnormal volumes. The durations of the pronounced syllables must be compared to the normal durations for each syllable. Every discernible body movement would have to be observed and defined based upon all the similar past movements of other human beings in other scenes. Discrete actions occur because of discrete motives, and all the discrete actions within this scene must be connected to the three motives of consumption, reproduction and the achieving of peripheral goals.

Rick asks, “What are you wearing?” with a snicker, with disapproval. The more obvious goal of this question is to bring attention to Josh’s clothes and solve the problem of acquiring information regarding Josh’s raised or lowered status based on his clothing choice. Rick is really questioning Josh’s general social empowerment. However, if an AI were to apply a topic to this question as, figuratively, “Rick’s attempt to determine the state of Josh’s social empowerment,” the AI would be in error. The reason a human being moves to speak, in virtually every instance, is to gain empowerment from the communication at the time of the communication. This is the specific problem addressed by this person, with this question, at this time. A more accurate primary topic would be, figuratively, “Rick’s attempt to gain the emotion/sensation of empowerment (at this instance) from posing a question of social empowerment.” The social empowerment question of Josh is secondary to this main topic of empowerment at the time of communication. The motives/topics must be layered in this order unless there is clear evidence to the contrary.

Another approach to the question of Josh’s social status could bring up this same issue while negating the communication empowerment goal. If Rick would have stated the question with lowered tones on all the syllables but a slightly higher tone on “wear” then it could be considered as an almost strict query of information. But even this would likely set the two motives of communication empowerment and peripheral/ informational/social empowerment to an equal level.

When Josh responds he is seeking to satisfy the ongoing social empowerment goal, but that motive of status is in play right here and now, making it inextricably linked with the empowerment he is seeking at this instance, with this particular communication. Consider those times when Josh was considering the purchase of this outfit. Seeing someone else in them, he might have thought, “I’d like to get that shirt,” while not even completing the understood deeper thoughts of “...so that I’ll gain positive attention in future meetings with my peers.” The conversation sparked by the wearing of clothing is the goal of the clothing choice. In putting on the clothes in the morning, he was likely thinking, “I wonder if they’ll like it,” or “wait until they see me in this!” All thoughts of all clothing styles and all possible gains in social status/empowerment concerning clothing choices are tested with this bus stop interaction.

Josh has made a small mistake in his attempt at communication empowerment. In giving the word “Mom” a high tone he has drawn undue

attention to his mother assisting him in the task. The “Mom” is not an issue as much as “Fad’s.” This was probably because he excitedly rushed to make the point that his clothing choice was valid.

Rick replies “It looks different.” This seems to be neither approval, granting Josh social status, nor disapproval, taking away social status. Jill responds with approval, but notes that he needs new shoes. After Josh replies to Jill’s comment regarding shoes Timmy joins in the conversation by asking “What kind?” This is done not only to satisfy a desire to get into the conversation, but to fulfill common turn-taking etiquette. If the conversation continued with only Josh, Jill and Rick, this would be quite odd and Timmy would lose status for his odd lack of commenting. Virtually all groups seek to admit a new speaker after the banter continues for some time between a limited number of participants.

“Epics” is stated with a high tone on the first syllable. The low tone on the last syllable represents a proposed ending of the topic of “shoes” suggesting that Josh’s choice of shoes is a correct one and no further dissension is necessary. When Timmy responds, he reaches higher tones on his proposed shoe choice and then reaches the lowest tone on his last word. This has become the primary use of intonation in Western languages, to propose beginnings and endings of topics.

Josh responds by saying “I don’t know.” This quick phrase has had many shades of meanings. It acts as a way of politely pivoting between ideas. Some may say it before sternly proposing an opposing view. Some say it before proposing a more pliable view. Here Josh is stating, figuratively, “I’m not sure if my choice is correct but what caught my eye was . . .”

After exploring the brief sub-topic of Timmy’s basketball skills, Josh concludes the main topic of purchased clothes and then Jill assists in shifting the topic to “Visiting the Mall.”

The incremental steps that a human takes in learning of a subject are the direct result of their goal of achieving empowerment during a conversation involving the subject. This can be considered the motive behind such thoughts even if that conversation never takes place. In the Bedtime example, Kimmy revels in the empowerment from communicating “jamas” while also enjoying a little game associated with the task. In solitary moments she may think through the steps of getting dressed, reflecting to herself, “look at that. . . where’s the button? . . . there’s the zipper.” When she is in elementary school she will likely put attention to the clothes that help her gain social status while also acknowledging the practical side of clothing, how it can

keep her warm, but the primary goal is social acceptance. In solitary moments, she may try on outfits, look into the mirror, and think of her entrance into a classroom, or cafeteria, or a bus stop. Despite the vast decision making processes involving a subject, and despite the fact that the Kimmy may never communicate any of those thoughts out loud, each individual, incremental thought concerning clothing can be considered as the direct effect of the human conscience seeking to achieve the sensation/emotion of empowerment from communicating the results of those thoughts. If, for example, Kimmy or Josh found themselves alone on the Earth, they would be communicating thoughts of clothing to themselves and, although social empowerment and communication empowerment is greatly diminished, those reflective thoughts are the equivalent of them speaking with another human being and completing the loop.

Virtually all subjects are learned for the act of communication. Consider a mother and son riding down the road when the child sees a boat moving down a waterway. The son says, "Look, a boat!" In communicating the name of the object he seeks the empowerment that occurs when his mother acknowledges him. If he is later given a remote control toy boat he may become fascinated with the functions of the toy, yet at many moments during play he will undoubtedly seek to share his experiences, recreating his mother's positive reaction. He might say "look at that," or "watch this," and his solitary problem solving leads to the empowerment felt during conversation. Despite the many complexities of human reasoning, although human beings spend years building the knowledge of a vast spectrum of subjects, virtually all thoughts of all things are formed for that moment when one human being shares those thoughts with another human being. If this child were to later become a professional boat captain, and successfully solve many of the primal goals in life by acquiring the resources of such a career, the culmination of the many years of learning of seamanship would be for that moment when he can turn to someone and say, figuratively, "Yes, I pilot a ship for a living." And if he were completely alone in the world piloting a ship, his own reflective thoughts are the equivalent of speaking to another person.

Many different actions of children and adults can show the relationship between empowerment from communication and the incremental building of thoughts under a subject. The following examples can be found in many daily interactions:

Vale and Ben are siblings playing with toys, separately. Their mother is in another room working on a computer. Vale comes into the room to show her mother her clay creation, “Look, I made a doggy and I put a collar on the dog!”

“Cool, that’s a very neat doggy. . .” the Mother says.

Ben promptly follows Vale into the room, brandishing a figurine, and before the Mother can finish what she’s saying he says, “This is Spiderman wearing his different costume for . . .”

“Wait, let me finish what I was saying about Vale’s puppy. Vale, that’s nice, you should build a dog house too,” the mother says.

“But it’s not a puppy. It’s a mommy dog. She’s going to have puppies,” Vale says.

“Cool. Okay, Ben what were you going to say?” The Mother asks.

“This is Spiderman’s aqua costume so he can dive in the water, and this is his underwater jet for going underwater,” Ben says.

“Great. I like it. Okay, guys, go play in the other room, I have work to do.”

Phil, Karen, and Jim are working in a restaurant kitchen. Phil is cleaning the oven, preparing for the lunch crowd. Karen is stocking the serving line. Jim is cutting vegetables.

Steve walks in and clocks in at the time clock.

“I’m never mixing tequila and beer again. I woke up on the back patio in my bathing suit with, like, the two dogs laying all over me,” Steve says, boisterously, with quite high volume.

Phil’s head raises a little with a slight raise in his eyebrows and chin as he continues to clean the oven. Karen comments, “I’m surprised that Lisa let you stay on her patio and not the back yard.”

“We were out until about 3:00.

I must've had about ten shots," Steve says with higher than normal volume.

"Ten? I think you'd be dead right now," Jim says with higher than normal volume.

"I am dead right now," Steve says with even higher than normal volume.

"I know the last time I had tekillya sleeping dogs were the least of my problems," Phil says with the highest volume, "I had to be dragged home after throwing up a lung."

Countless examples can be found to show the manner in which children seek to exhibit what they have discovered in order to garnish positive reinforcement—empowerment from communication. Working backwards from these interfaced events, behaviorists can observe how the incremental thoughts of subjects are formed for the purpose of that point of communication. Although many internal, solitary thoughts formed when Vale was molding clay the pinnacle of those discoveries occurred when she communicated them, justifying those internal thoughts. Although many internal, solitary thoughts formed when Ben was playing with the figurines, the pinnacle of those discoveries occurred when he communicated them and justified those internal thoughts. He envied her communicated discoveries.

Many similar examples of children wishing to gain communication empowerment can be found. Another common example that can be tested by behaviorist is when a parent makes a small comment to one sibling and another sibling quickly comments or asks a question. Children will often talk over each other until they learn the proper manners of waiting for a turn. Another common act of toddlers is when they appear to follow a parent through the house. If a parent moves from the living room to the kitchen, leaving children behind to take care of chores, the children will often meander near the kitchen carrying their toys to the new spot. The parent could then move to a back bedroom and the toddler, with time, will also bring their toys and sit near their parent or in a nearby room or hall. And when there is more than one child, the envy will speed up these movements, if they are not otherwise seeking communication empowerment between each other. Playing with toys has many solitary incidents of gratification, but the communication and exhibition of this play is much more valuable to the

child. Virtually all human thoughts have a direct connection to the empowerment achieved at the instance of communication.

The coworkers all speak with higher than normal volumes in the exchange because it is a pinnacle moment. Status is being granted to conversation participants right here and right now. It is a matter of legend making, improving status. Steve may have been drinking for the effects or the status gained with his friends the previous night or he could have been drinking for solitary gratification, but here he is making a history that justifies the event with a greater effect. If the story carries weight among this audience and he overhears someone repeating the event his status will be augmented even more.

When Phil hears his coworker telling a story, gaining communication empowerment and status empowerment, he raises his head and chin, knowing that this is a moment when he must contribute to Steve's story or offer another one in turn. He reaches the highest volume as he begins his story.

In a human's day, there are many thoughts that can be exclusively connected to true solitary motives while having no communication empowerment motive. The thought, 'I'm hungry. I'd like to make a sandwich,' exclusively solves a consumption problem. 'This is the last bolt on this side,' is a strictly peripheral thought if it is not communicated. The thought, 'wow, she's got a great body,' solves several solitary problems and a reproduction problem if it precedes a full courtship ritual leading to offspring. If these thoughts are for the purpose of sex alone or a limited relationship, they could be categorized as solving a socializing problem, which in turn, provides networked solutions to consumption, reproduction, and peripheral problems, respectively. The human mind is inevitable built for the achievement of the individual's primal goals and species' primal goals, however, the majority of lingual thoughts, and the collections of information under subjects, are created and nurtured by the positive response achieved during interaction.

This next example is of teenagers talking with more mild attempts at status empowerment.

Josh is 12. Timmy is 11. They are in the school cafeteria sitting with other students.

Josh says to Timmy, "So did you see the new Lord of the Rings movie yet (high tone)?"

Timmy says, “Yeah! (two syllables, the second with a mid tone) Me and my brother seen it in the theatre (the first syllable of “theatre” has the high tone).”

Josh says, “I like the part with Gollum. He was sick looking!”

“Yeah, when he was talking to himself (upper mid tone on “self),” Timmy says.

“The precious,” Josh mimics Gollum. “What about those big, uh, monster things that opened and closed the gates?”

“Yeah, that was cool,” Timmy agrees. “Your dad got the DVD?”

“Yeah, he rented it,” Josh says.

“My dad doesn’t let us see movies on school nights,” Timmy says.

“Why?” Josh.

“I don’t know. Because of school,” Timmy says.

After a pause, Josh comments about Timmy’s lunch choice, “You got the pizza (very high tone on last syllable)? Again?”

“I never get tired (high tone) of it (mid tone),” Timmy says, as he lifts the pizza up high. “My mom always tells me to not get it for lunch (does not go too low with the last tones).”

“I got it yesterday. I like pizza, but their pizza is yuck!” Josh says.

“I don’t know why but I like it without pepperoni (does not go too low with the last tones),” Timmy says.

After a long pause, Timmy blurts out, “Yeah! Uh huh! Uh huh! My Dad’s taking me to get a Peyton Manning (high tone) jersey on Saturday”

“He’s a sissy,” Josh says.

“Yeah right! He’s only the best quarterback ever (slightly above mid level tones),” Timmy says.

“My team’s the Raiders. They’re cool,” Josh says.

“They suck. They never win games,” Timmy says.

“Well, not this year, but they went to the superbowl twice.”

“Well, this is the year the Colts win the Superbowl. They are just dominating. Peyton always throws for three hundred, their D is finally making sacks. You watch, they’ll eat up the playoffs,” Timmy says.

Josh’s Sister Julia comes to the table, with her friends, Maya and Jill. Jill says, “I don’t get it. Does Mr. Ryan want us to do homework all day long? He just gave us, like, four exercises at the end of the chapter, a poster to make, and he doesn’t even know Misses Carter has us reading books like crazy.”

“It’s due tomorrow?” Josh asks.

“No, next Wednesday, but still,” Jill says.

“Yeah, he gets all, like, excited and laughs with that snort. He thinks his jokes are so funny,” Timmy says.

“I can’t stand him, with those thick glasses and bald head,” Maya adds.

“Like, he comes to school dressed like Caesar,” Timmy says.

“Yeah, he did that last year,” Maya said, quickly following Josh’s comment

“And we just watched a dumb video. We could have skipped the movie and had us do at least some of the book. The test isn’t until tomorrow,” Jill says.

“I just got through doing like a hundred word problems in math groups,” Maya says.

“I hate math,” Julia says.

“I think I slept through the half the class. I just kept telling Sherry, ‘no more, no more, I don’t care how far that stupid train travels,’” Maya says.

After a small pause, “You’re eating pizza?” Jill asks Timmy.

“I just told him,” Josh chuckles.

“That’s sick,” Maya says.

“Whaeht? I love it,” Timmy says, with a smile.

“I’m not touching it,” Jill says.

After a small pause, Maya, “Uhh, I hate having the berry sauce. If only they’d give apple sauce or skip trying

to give these sauces,” She flicks her hair over her shoulder with her chin high she looks down to her food in disgust.

“I know, at least their stale apple dumplings. The berries aren’t even sweet,” Jill concurs.

“Hey are you guys riding the bus home?” Julia says to Maya and Jill.

“Yeah, my mom can’t pick me up,” Jill says.

“Yeah, my mom dropped me off so my bike isn’t here. Why?” Maya says.

“Because you guys can come over,” Julia says.

“Dad says no one can come over without asking anymore,” Josh says sternly.

“What? I didn’t hear him say it,” Julia says.

“You were right there when he said it!” Josh says.

“I must’ve had something stuck in my ear (two syllables, drawn out). I didn’t hear (high tone, higher volume on “hear” and “him”) him. Anyway, I’ll ask him tonight. Besides, what do you care?” Julia says.

“I think you’ve got something stuck in your brain,” Josh says.

“Nyeheh, Nyeheh, Nyeheh, Nyeheh,” Julia vocalizes, mimicking Josh.

“Well, I’ve got studying to do. I don’t need all that,” Josh says.

“Please (descending tones), you don’t study. You just want to play video games,” Julia says.

“Well, that’s better than you doing all that babbling,” Josh then mimics, “Eewh, here’s my new magazine with my boyfriend on the cover. Eewhh here’s my new dress for the party.”

“That’s okay,” Jill says. “We can come over some other day.”

“No you can come over. He doesn’t own the house,” Julia says. “Todd was over the other day anyway.”

“So (two tones, low then high), that was before Dad (highest tone of phrase) said,” Josh says.

“Lucky you,” Julia says sarcastically. “It’s okay. Not like my dad’s going to say anything to you,” she says to the Maya and Jill.

After a pause, Jill asks Josh, “What’re you studying?”

“Nothing. Just working in the Science Book,” Josh says.

“Yeah, nothing,” Julia says, sarcastically, “I’m sure he was already thinking the Rick would come over to play games.”

“Gimme a break,” Josh says, “I have to get caught up. I have to do all the exercises on the periodic elements.”

“Yeah, We did those exercises in the first semester,” Jill says.

“Ooooouh, maybe you can help Josh with his chemistry,” Maya says.

“Shut up (“up” is two toned, low then high),” Jill says. Josh also looks down and away.

“Don’t make me barf,” Julia says.

The conversation pauses while they eat. After a while, Maya starts singing softly, “Whenever, wherever, we’re meant to be together. I’ll be there and you’ll be near and that’s the deal my dear . . .”

Timmy starts to hum softly, “Umm umm umm umm umm uhum. . .” mimicking another heavier song.

The decision-making process of the human mind is formed through the interface of human communication. Infants learn of language because they are motivated to achieve the emotions of contentment and empowerment that occur during communication. This can be observed in their verbatim conversations/communications when those communications are broken down and defined in each fraction of a second. Toddlers spend vast portions of their time utilizing the spoken language to see how they can gain the emotion of empowerment that occurs during communication. This can be observed in their verbatim conversations when those communications are broken down and defined in each fraction of a second. As humans reach the teenage years, the emotion of social empowerment from the act of communicating is more acutely present as the direct cause of thought processes. In virtually every instance of teenage interaction—in every comment, question, utterance,

communicated facial expression, and communicated body movement—teenagers seek the emotion of empowerment as it occurs during social interaction. The thought processes that back up these communications are formed for the sake of the social empowerment that occurs during conversation at the time of those communications. This can be observed in their verbatim conversations, when those communications are broken down and defined in fraction-of-a-second intervals.

For teenagers, the purpose behind the learning of informational topics and their subordinate informational facts is the empowerment achieved when communicating these topics. Conversation must be viewed as the beginning of thoughts rather than the end. In this example, the subjects are saying, in effect, “Hey, I know this. Do you know this? I solved these problems with this information. Am I gaining status from telling you this?” These teenagers are repeating the same attempts to acquire empowerment from communication that they attempted when first learning language as infants, only the information is more involved, and the paths toward solving the problems of consumption, reproduction, and peripheral problems are much more detailed.

At first, they speak of movies and the empowerment of achieving wonder during the observed stimulus. What is being said here about the movie is closely tied to the teenager’s thoughts during and shortly after the movie. They were thinking, ‘I can’t wait to tell my friend about what I saw.’ Of course many genetic elements could be found in their observations of the movie, such as the monsters moving the gates and Gollum’s odd behavior. When watching the movie Josh and Timmy are engulfed in countless solitary thoughts, yet the curiosity of these events has only a waning effect if they are unable to share their experience with peers. The empowerment of communication validates the curiousness of those events.

Josh says to Timmy, “So did you see the new Lord of the Rings movie yet (high tone)?” Questions usually end with a high tone at the end. By placing a high tone on the end the speaker is proposing the whole question and answer as the topic of the conversation. Exceptions might be when the speaker wishes to ridicule the person the questions is for or when the speaker knows the answer, which could mean mid level tones across the last few words. If “see” carried the high tone then the topic proposed would be whether Timmy put attention to the movie.

By responding with a two toned “yeah,” Timmy implies that his status is to be of a higher level because he viewed the movie in the theatre as opposed

to viewing a DVD. This is also apparent with his high tone on the first syllable of theatre. Again, the AI would be recording this human's actions as satisfying goals of, first, solving a problem of gaining status at this moment with this communication, second, gaining status overall with this subtle comment, and, third, growing knowledge of these peripheral subjects (for solving latter communication empowerment problems).

“Sick looking” is a term that varies from its dictionary meaning. An AI would know the intended meaning in the same way a human would know it by understanding the history of the context change with the term. The context here would also propose that Josh does not mean “poor health,” but rather “interesting, curious, weird.”

“Sick,” the adjective, gained its new applied definition, as used here, at some point, possible in the nineteen sixties or seventies, as a new way to refer to something spooky, or scary, or, etc. One or more persons used it in conversations and others repeated what they had heard and it entered contemporary conversation. Just as every latter person evaluates this apparent definition, an AI would become cognizant of the usage of this word.

Why might a person feel that an ugly creature is “interesting?” The odd nature of things is interesting, and humans will sometimes build huge schools of thought under odd topics, because natural selection has eliminated humans who do not have such tendencies. As with all peripheral behaviors a clear connection must be formed between each matured peripheral topic and the members of the species, or previous species, that first developed the kernels of this peripheral subject. Peripheral behaviors are discussed more in later chapters.

An upper mid-level tone on Timmy's “-self” implies the phrase as partly a question. It implies, “Are you speaking of the part where Gollum is talking to himself?” It is partly a question because the answer is not of too much relevance.

The monsters opening and closing the gates is another interesting, odd, peripheral, event.

When the conversation moves to pizza Timmy says, “I never get tired of it,” and, “I don't know why but I like it without peperoni.” He elaborates on this subject because it references him and something he likes. This is a common observable event, when someone brandishes a food preference they are seeking empowerment from communication with another group member. This blatant exhibition is more prominent in youths. Instances can be found where a person speaks of a disliked food, while actually liking the food,

because they must achieve the social empowerment of communication from such a whim. Timmy might prefer to not eat the pepperoni at this age but he may later begin to like it. Despite this change in preference, he may postpone the ordering of pepperoni for some time because he has built a reputation as someone who likes only cheese pizza.

This whim-full behavioral trait would likely not continue. Timmy would likely see that a comment involving food only gains him a small amount of esteem. After so many attempts at gaining more recognition he may notice a quick turning away of others after he completes the topic, signifying that others wish him to move to other topics and forget that one. But other case studies could be found where speakers first form a whim of a belief that continues for longer lengths of time. And some whims can be continued with many defenses of the position, while also being of unsound logic or easily dispelled false information.

When Timmy speaks of his new football jersey it is a basic attempt at gaining status by brandishing a resource, a symbol of a person empowered with abilities and resources. But an AI in observance of this scene must not conclude that the speaker's statement was made for the purpose of status empowerment but rather that he is seeking communication empowerment (at this specific instance), first, and the general around-the-school status empowerment, second. This conversation, as is evident by his boisterous, "Yeah! Uh huh! Uh huh!," is the point at which his status empowerment is being granted.

They debate who has the better football team. What makes them form a preference for a team? Empowerment gained from communication. Why do they continue to acquire information about their team? Empowerment gained from communicating the information. And how do they test whether they are achieving empowerment from their preference and their learned information? The test is at the moment of communication. These teenagers are likely unaware of the names of most of the football players, and they may even get bored when watching a game, yet they still feel that a preference must be established because it is important to acquire empowerment from communicating this information.

Many instances can be found where humans debate issues without knowing all the facts to back up their arguments because the empowerment of communicating moved them to begin learning these subjects. This is especially true for youths. Although information concerning his preference is

limited, it appears that Josh likes the Raiders, but he does not fully follow the team. Timmy appears to be following his team with more diligence.

It takes many years of learning to reinforce the learned preferences of a youth with solid information for posing arguments. It is vital for a human to establish credibility and status through their arguments. Unfortunately, the pitfall of stating a preference on a weak argument is a loss of empowerment. This is somewhat of a brute-force, emotional method of learning that is especially common in western societies. However, the learning process could become much smoother and more effective if educators know to counteract these more histrionic exhibitions.

When Jill and Timmy begin discussing Mr. Ryan's behavior, Josh remains quiet for a moment. He appears to be respectfully allowing the other speakers, those knowledgeable of this topic, continue with their attempts at communication empowerment. After a few comments between Jill, Timmy, and Maya, Julia makes an attempt to enter the conversation by moving onto Maya's topic of "math." Just as competing actors count lines and words in a play, speakers in casual conversation will often compete for a presence in a conversation. Julia may have made some progress in becoming a member of the conversation, it certainly does not hurt to try a small interjection, but Maya's topic is more of a temporary diversion from the more prevalent topic posed by Jill of "homework." Her communication empowerment is best gained by commenting directly on Jill's topic or waiting for the topic to change.

As an AI follows human conversation, it would tally the empowerment gained by each speaker and make comparisons to the millions of case studies it has assembled. It would view an action such as Julia's as a move to gain, specifically, communication empowerment first and status empowerment second. These two distinct categories must be compared with other attempts at these two goals and Julia's success would be measured by the program by comparing it to other case studies of like-interactions.

Of course, the AI does not exist to help humans to figure out how to gain the emotion of empowerment. That is only a subordinate goal of life. Human beings must move to solve the problems in order of priority with the species' imminent resource problems first, followed by the individual's imminent resource problems second. Third, they must move to solve other distant but imminent resource problems, and address the needs of an individual to grow in intelligence, adaptability, and move towards successful reproduction. The

AI would have little to contribute to this scene for the same reason an adult would likely wait until they are speaking of something of substance.

The conversation changes to Timmy's pizza, then along those lines, they tend to issues of consumption and their casual building of knowledge in this basic category. Jill and Maya speak of the cafeteria's poor quality sauces.

Julia begins to speak of a possible afternoon appointment. Upon meeting each other, humans update each other on past events, they speak of current events and endeavors, and they will speak of later appointments. They speak of topics which are in some way increasing their empowerment at the time of communication, and topics which further their knowledge and means of solving peripheral, consumption, and reproduction problems. Human conversation may appear complex, and the topics formed under human goals may be of vast collections of facts driven by peculiar emotions and sub-motives, but if the discrete states are defined according to firm established case study and an understanding exists of how humans assimilate knowledge and solve problems as an extension of their species' development, all actions can be properly defined.

Human communication is driven by and governed by communication empowerment. Another simple test of this premise occurs after Maya begins to softly sing a song; Timmy begins to hum his own song.

With the understanding of how communication empowerment forms human thoughts, behaviorists can define gestures and lingual elements with such a consistency that a software program can be constructed to categorize the discrete states, determine the discrete problems attempted, and provide assistance with these problems. This could mean providing someone with a glass of water, an answer to a riddle, or an overall analysis of all the different individual motives in a scene. The applied definitions here are only probable, not certain, and the author could easily make a mistake in the interpretations of this book, but because the common motives of life forms are constant any observed oddity or misstep can be treated as a secondary problem for the program to continue to try and solve. In following the trends of human approaches to acquiring consumption, reproduction, and peripheral solutions, and following their quest for communication empowerment, a software program can attain Universality, growing and learning with humans indefinitely.

Just as human beings have rules of etiquette to follow while interacting, an AI would also be expected to behave a particular way. For example, if an AI (a program placed within a robot vessel) were to determine that a human

being wants a glass of water, it might not necessarily be appropriate for an AI to rush to get a glass of water. It is not in the best interest of the human, or it will not help the human solve some of their grander problems in life, to have a butler provide them with their every desire. A teenager would certainly be hindered by such pampering while an adult may reap the benefits of such assistance. Riddles would have to be answered within the context of common conversational etiquette and the answers to such riddles must assist humans in their overall development. An AI must not placate humans. As we will see in many of these examples, it would do little to help any of these participants in providing them with detailed analysis of their actions, but there are moments where an AI would help to solve conversational problems and their underlying, more important, informational problems.

The following example is from the movie, *The Breakfast Club*, Universal Pictures, 1985. As the scene is described, each relevant action is noted with a proposed definition of the action. The intended motives of the speakers are proposed. Again, this proposed method of discrete behaviorism determines the motives of speakers, the distinct goals that they seek to attain, with such a high probability that a software program can process the scene and provide a successful analysis and a successful response. With the framework of all humans seeking solutions to the four distinct problems of life forms, a Universal Artificial Intelligence can be formed with a Universal understanding of all human scenes.

The opening scene is of a high school library that has been set up for Saturday detention. Claire, the aristocrat, is sitting at the front table and Brian, the awkward intellect, is sitting at the middle table. Andrew, the jock, approaches Claire's table. She glances at him as he approaches the chair. He points to the chair mildly with one hand. She glances at the chair and then at him again. She then tilts her head down and to the left, toward the chair, while raising her shoulder and her elbow as a gesture of acceptance of his choice of a seat. During these motions she has a slight forced smile and as her posture returns to normal she frowns again, looking forward. She then puckers her lips slightly and tilts her head down and toward Andrew.

John, the hood, struts into the room. He clicks the emergency door handle, shuffles items on the receptionist's desk, takes the phone off the hook, spins the rubber stamp holder, grabs a note pad and puts it in his pocket, all while briskly walking toward the tables where the other students are sitting. He props his sunglasses on his head as he looks at the other students. He steps in a slightly curved pattern, taking a longer route, as he nears the first table, peering at those seated there. He does not take his eyes off of them, Claire and Andrew, while making this move. He then arrives at the middle table. He stops in front of Brian, staring at him silently, motioning to him to move to the other table. He pulls that chair out to the aisle area, facing it toward him, and brings the chair from the other end to the position of the first chair so as to sit in one and prop his feet on the other. The others all watch him intently throughout his entrance.

Interpretation:

John is performing obnoxious actions so that he can be recognized as a social outcast. He performs such a quick succession of actions so as to squash any other attempts by other scene participants to perform responses that gain the attentions of the group. Conversation etiquette dictates that the other participants in the scene do not point out John's character profile. Someone is not going to say, "You're exhibiting the characteristics of an outcast to inform others of who you are. You're just messing with all these things and making noise because you want everyone's attention. You're doing it quickly so as to not allow someone else to comment or perform their own exhibitions." If an AI were in the room it would be expected to form a character profile for this participant without necessarily mentioning its conclusions. But if John were to approach the AI and ask, "What do you think of me?" it would provide him with an objective, unassuming viewpoint derived from John's verbatim discrete states. This viewpoint would be in direct opposition to John's viewpoint — the program would be right and its human counterpart would be wrong. It would provide him with a detailed description of typical and acceptable behavior and his deviation from this normal behavior. He would be told of all the ill effects of continuing this course in life.

In having an AI as a part of our lives we will have a machine that will embody the vast teams of designers, behaviorists, and computer scientists who will have dissected the elements of these scenes to such a degree that the machine will know best. The conflicts of this must be considered. The AI's role is not necessarily to act as a psychologist and just as conversation etiquette dictates that the other participants of the scene should not attempt to provide John with advice, the AI would also not seek to provide advice. It is the Principal's job to be the leader, and if John asked the AI for an opinion of his entrance it would likely say, figuratively, "I'll let the Principal tell you about your behavior. If he would like me to elaborate, I will."

Allison enters the library after John at a brisk pace, walking along the side of all the tables with her head held down. Her hair obscures her face. She walks around the statue at the back of all the tables and sits facing the outside. Virtually all of the characters follow her movement to the back. Andrew looks at Claire and they laugh briefly, and then he looks forward. Brian turns slowly back forward from watching Allison and he raises his eyebrows for a short second and continues to move his head a little further.

Interpretation:

Brian's slow head turn is a sign of the deliberate thoughts he is taking time to contemplate. He is also making a point to exhibit his deliberation with the slow turn. His raising of the eyebrows is likely just a mannerism with no readily available meaning. It is also, likely, a gesture made in conjunction with an internal thought. He could be thinking, for example, "Boy, I wonder what kind of home life she has had growing up." with his rising eyebrow occurring at the moment he thought the word "she." If those hypothetical thoughts were vocalized, he would likely have a high tone on the word "she." The tapping of the thumb is also likely a mannerism with no clear connection to a motive other than anxious deliberation.

The Principal walks in, strutting, carrying papers. He has a slight smile with a peering look. He is essentially broadcasting his belief that he is aware of the character types while also exhibiting some sarcasm. As he walks in,

his head tilts with the movements of the rest of his body. As he approaches the spot where he will speak to the class his shoulders sway from right to left. His head is tilted down. He says, "Well, well," slowly. On the first "well" he moves his head higher and to the right, then the second "well" is said with his head in the middle, tilted down. The second "well" is a low tone. "Well" is used here as a reproofing interjection. He is saying, effectively, "These are the problems that we have to deal with and you are the characters who are involved." The second "well" acts to conclude the topic of the "Current Problem." He then says, "Here we are." "Are" has two tones with a high tone on the first syllable. "Are" has become the topic, figuratively, "This Place and Time, Detention."

Claire's head is looking forward, stiffly. Her head is still because she wishes to be cautious. She looks down quickly, pondering a move. The deliberative thoughts are exhibited because like most speakers she honestly accents her vocalizations with the emotions she may be feeling. Also, it is a common motion for actors to look at something other than another actor and perform a kind of soliloquy. She then looks up, "Excuse me, sir." This is said high with a high tone on "sir" and "sir" is slightly two toned. She is marking "sir" as a topic because the Principal essentially makes the rules in this situation and she is yielding to his authority, placing all other spoken topics as sub-topics. "I think that there's been a mistake." This second phrase has much lowered tones. This is done to downplay her request, making it a very minor issue. As she begins to speak she raises her hand and tilts her body to make room for the displacement. She is broadcasting her cautiousness. Her eyebrows rise as she speaks signifying the speaker's wish to tepidly propose an idea, beckoning the recipients to consider the proposal. She continues to speak in lowered tones. "I know it's detention, (the second syllable in "detention" is a slightly higher tone) but I don't think that I belong in here." "Here" is two-toned.

Interpretation:

Claire's last sentence is not logical. Her knowing that this is punishment and also believing that she does not "belong there" are two different concepts which should not be connected. So how would an AI discern this complex human statement? The AI will have to determine which problem she is attempting to solve with the first phrase, "I know this is detention." First, the communication solves a particular problem of relaying information to solve other problems. Delineation must be made between this problem of "communicating information to solve a problem" and the problem of "informing the instructor that I am aware that this is detention." The second problem will appear to be a misstep because it solves no particular problem to inform the instructor of Claire's "knowing this is detention." In making vast comparisons of humans using communication to relay information, the AI would realize that Claire's misstep occurred in her attempt to solve the apparent problem of her next phrase, "getting out of there." The AI would deduce that Claire meant to say, figuratively, "I know that people should be punished for getting in trouble (I know this is detention) and this is the punishment that the school administrators have chosen, but I don't think that this is the right punishment for me."

The Principal has a smirk on his face. With purpose, he does not respond to Claire. He tilts his head down and pushes his arm out of his jacket to reveal his watch. "It is now ("now" is two toned marking it as the topic of, effectively, Detention Time. All the other words of this communication are of lower tones and are subordinate to this topic.) 7:06. You have exactly eight hours and fifty four minutes to think about why (two toned, with a high tone) you're here (low tone). Ponder (high tone) the error of your ways (low tone). You may not talk. You will not move ("move" is two toned and stated at nearly the same high tone as "ponder." These two sub-topics are purposely stated at lower tones than the previous high tone on "now" because all of this communication falls under the topic of Detention Time) from these seats (slowly stated)." He steps toward John, pulling the chair out from under his feet, "And you (another subordinate high tone), will not

sleep.” He then has a long pause (The topic of Detention Time is now concluded with this pause). “Alright people (The second syllable of “people” is the highest tone and it is marking the topic of, effectively, “you people”), we are going to try something a little different (high, subordinate tone) today. We are going to write an essay. (“Essay” is stated with a tone equal to “people,” marking it as a continuation of the main topic of, effectively You People Will Write an Essay.) No less than a thousand words, describing (high subordinate tone) to me who you think you are.”

“This is a test?” says John. He is ignored by the Principal.

The Principal continues, “And when I say essay, I mean essay. I do not mean a single word repeated a thousand times. Is that clear Mr. Bender?”

“Crystal,” John says in a long and drawn out manner.

Interpretation:

The speaker makes Detention Time the main topic of his communication by placing a high tone on the word “now,” and he also uses two tones across a single syllable. For most Western Language speakers, the use of tones in this way is the usual means of proposing a different topic of conversation. This topic has subordinate topics marked by other high tones, “why (why you are here)” and “ponder.” The subordinate topics have high tones, but they are subordinate to the main topic because the tones do not reach the height of the word “now.” The pause, as it is used here, separates the first main topic from the next main topic of “you people (who are here to learn something about yourselves) will write an essay.” This topic also has subordinate topics of, “different,” “describing,” and, in a moment, “maybe (you’ll learn something about yourselves).”

As with all observed communication, the AI must be able to connect any action to the primal problems of life forms. These two main topics of “now (detention time)” and “you people (who are here to learn about yourselves)” would fall under the topic/problem of “Instructing the students of how to serve detention.” In this instance, the speaker’s problem of “Instructing,” serves two purposes. He is at a job earning a living and he is obtaining resources and solving the problems of consumption, reproduction, and

peripheral endeavors respectively. He is also, hopefully, seeking to teach younger generations of their unproductive behavior, essentially assisting the human species in its general attempts to solve consumption, reproduction, and peripheral problems.

The Principal is acquiring the sensation of empowerment from communication as he speaks. Before he arrived here he was likely thinking, figuratively, “I’ll explain to these kids what they’ll have to do. If they act up, I’ll tell them . . .” This empowerment, at this instance of communication, is the builder of all the preceding incremental steps of thoughts under this subject. In connecting this speaker’s actions to the primal problems, an AI must infer that the problem of gaining empowerment from communication is the current and first, or nearly the first, problem that this speaker is solving. The “informing them of detention time” and “teaching them of themselves” become secondary to this current problem. The primal problems are distant, but they certainly hold, to a degree, hierarchy over the speaker’s current communication empowerment problem.

While the Principal is telling them how their detention works, the students are performing additional exhibitions. When he mentions the time, Brian pulls his shirt sleeve back, checking the time on his watch. Claire, in response to his ignoring her comment, looks at Andrew and lifts her upper lip, raises her right hand about halfway, and then sets her hand back down onto her lap. John is seated with one leg propped up on the chair, pulling a thread off of his glove. He spits in the air and then catches the spit back in his mouth. Claire, watching this, turns her head forward again. Her eyebrows are pointed inward with her cheeks raised, showing disgust at John’s actions. She then looks to her front left, raising her right hand slightly and then setting it back down. When the principal says, “you may not talk” she lifts her head up, looking at the instructor, showing her attentiveness to that rule. When he says “You will not move from these seats,” Brian is simultaneously moving from his current seat to the seat next to him. As the principal concludes the sentence Brian looks up, pauses, then moves back to his original seat. After he says, “you” the principal moves the

chair that John has his feet propped up on and then he concludes what he is saying with “will not sleep.”

The Principal continues, “Good. Maybe you’ll learn a little something about yourself. Maybe (said two-toned with a high tone almost as high as “people” and “essay.” It is being marked as a prominent, equally-placed topic of “You learning of the bad behavior that you have had and choosing to change your ways) you’ll even decide whether or not you care to return.”

Brian stands up, speaking quickly he says, “Uh,” he glances forward, pondering the words to say. “Yeah, You know I could answer that right now sir,” he says while shaking his head, gesturing no. His eyebrows rise as he comes to the word “sir.” “That would be no (this “no” is said with two tones while his head moves forward and his eyes widen. Although it is not a high tone in the sentence, his accenting the word with these facial gestures and the use of two tones make it into his main topic. The phrase preceding this “no” is of quite neutral tone variation. Also, he is keeping all of his tones at a lower tone than the Principal’s topic choice of “you people” (who are here to learn about yourselves). He continues, “No for me.”

“Sit down Johnson. My office is right across that hall. Any monkey business is ill advised,” the Principal says.

“Yeah, I got a question,” says John. “Does Barry Manilow know that you raided his wardrobe?”

“I’ll give you the answer to that question next Saturday. Don’t mess with the bull young man. You’ll get the horns.” The principal exits.

“That man is a brownie hound,” John says.

Interpretation:

Throughout this exchange between three speakers, the principal’s topic continues to have the highest tone. Even the tones of John’s “Barry Manilow” remark fall well short of the instructor’s conversational topics. Conversation etiquette (in Western cultures) dictates a strict adherence to proper tone placement. Even if there are many speakers in a group, all will place tones on proposed topics in such a way as to herald a particular topic as

the leading topic. When someone wants to change the subject they may propose a new topic with a higher tone, but the group will seek to conclude the previous topic with a subject-ending low tone first.

After the principal leaves, a few moments of silence are observed by everyone. Claire turns her head down and to the right. Andrew unbuttons his jacket and tilts his head to one side, blinks his eyes in such a way as to slowly open them. John now has his feet propped up on the table. He shakes his foot a few times as he looks down. As the camera looks to Brian the sound of Allison biting her fingernails can be heard from the back of the room. Brian turns slightly, pauses, and then continues to turn slowly to look at Allison. John turns also, pauses, and then continues to turn slowly to see what is making the sound. His eyes are wide. Andrew is looking back, over his shoulder, and then he turns more. Claire also turns slowly, pointing her eyebrows downward and raising her cheeks to show disgust. Allison is shown biting her nails. As she pulls her hand away from her mouth, she tilts her head slightly one way, then another, looking at her nail. She then pauses before taking another bite. She looks to the side, looks to her nail, and then she looks to the side again. After looking at the other members of the group she proceeds to bite her nail again.

John says, "Keep eating your hand you're not going to be hungry for lunch." Allison then spits a nail toward him. "I've seen you before." He has one hand perched slightly below his collar. He then lifts his index finger out, pointing toward Allison. He then slides his butt out closer to the end of the seat and gives a slight smile as he lowers his head. Allison then moves her head back to the forward-looking position and ceases biting her nails.

Interpretation:

Allison's nail biting is one of the few events (visible and audible) throughout this scene, and throughout the movie, that is a pure solitary act. Solitary acts in a group are quite rare. Virtually every broadcasted event is

sociable and therefore intended for the purpose of achieving communication empowerment, first, and then solving other problems, second.

John responds because he feels he must. His persona is being built during these communications and his responses must be on time. Why is he sarcastic? He is continuing to project the personality of an outcast.

Brian bends the clip part of his pen outward. He places the clip of the pen in his widely opened mouth with his head tilted back looking up. He says softly, "Who are you? . . . Who are you?" He then ends up with the pen propped in his mouth saying, "I'm a walrus." He moves the pen up and down a few times and then positions it so that the end is in one of his nostrils. He then slowly looks over to see John staring at him. John pulls his scarf off in a fast move. Brian then tilts his head down, exhales vocalizing slightly, "hehh," and pulls the pen out of his mouth. He wipes his mouth slightly, looks at John again, smiles slightly, and nods his head.

John pulls his foot off of the table allowing it to hit the floor with a loud thump. He then starts to take his jacket off. Brian starts to take his jacket off at the same time, coincidentally. John looks at him with his usual wide eyes. Brian stops taking his jacket off for a few seconds; he shakes his hand and raises his right hand slightly. Brian then places his arms closely to his side with his jacket propped off of his shoulders (he stops taking his jacket off in response to John's gesture). Brian then puts his hand together and breathes into them. He rubs his hands together. He then pulls his jacket back on all the way. John, who stares intently at Brian, leans over, resting his elbows on his knee and the table.

Brian says, "It's the shits, huh?" laughing off the tense situation.

John turns forward. He then crumples up a piece of paper and throws it over Claire's head. She raises her head slowly, but then stops turning and then lowers her head again looking to the side.

John starts humming a song. Claire turns to Andrew and says, "I can't really believe this is happening to me."

John stops humming. "Oh shit! What are we supposed to do if we have to take a piss?"

Claire says, "Please." The word is drawn out with a low tone on a second implied syllable.

John says, "If you gotta go, you gotta go." He begins to motion as if he is going to urinate under the table.

Claire says, "Oh my God."

Andrew shakes his head then turns around. "Hey, you're not urinating in here, man."

John says, "Don't talk. Don't talk. It makes it crawl back up."

"You whip it out and you're dead before the first drop hits the floor!" Andrew says.

John stops what he is doing. His eyebrows rise slightly, and then go back down. His head tilts one way, then slightly back the other way. "You're pretty sexy when you get angry."

Andrew turns forward. John also looks forward, then toward Claire.

John says to Brian, "Hey, homeboy, why don't you go close that door and we'll get the prom queen impregnated."

Andrew turns back, "Hey... Hey!"

"What?" John says.

Andrew replies, "If I loose my temper you're totaled man."

"Totally?" John says, moving his head forward, raising his cheeks and lowering his eyebrows.

"Totally," Andrew repeats.

Claire says to John, "Why don't you just shut up. Nobody here's interested."

"Really, butt face," Andrew says to John.

"Well hey sport, what'd you do to get in here? Forget to wash your jock," John says to Andrew.

"Excuse me fellows. I think we should just write our papers," Brian says.

“Just because you live in here doesn’t give you the right to be a pain in the ass so knock it off!” Andrew says to John.

“It’s a free country,” John says.

“He’s just doing it to get a rise out of you. Just ignore him.” Claire says to Andrew.

“Sweets, you couldn’t ignore me if you tried,” John says.

After a pause, John says to Claire and Andrew, “So... so... Are you guys like boyfriend/girlfriend? Steady dates? Lovebirds? Come on (Spoken with a slower pace. His eyebrows are pointed up in the center, pushed together, exhibiting a sympathy) sporto, level with me, do you slip her the hot beef (slower pace again) injection?”

“Go to hell!” Claire yells at John.

“Enough!” Andrew says.

Interpretation:

John exhibits sympathy in the questioning of Andrew and Claire’s possible relationship to mimic how human beings might speak affectionately of a love affair. In questioning the relationship of Claire and Andrew, John is breaking conversation etiquette. John’s sarcasm is intended to impose on Claire and Andrew because they cannot easily respond to these questions in a favorable way. When he moves all the way to questioning whether they have had sex, Claire responds by, of course, not answering the question and implying, figuratively, “You have no right to ask us of these things, you should not break conversation and social etiquette (Go to Hell!).”

“What’s going on in there?” the principal yells from across the hall.

After a pause, John says, “What do you say we close that door? We can’t have any hot party with Verne checking us out every few seconds,” John moves to a position on the side of all the tables. He sits on a railing.

“You know the door is supposed to stay open,” Brian says.

“So what?” John says.

“So why don’t you just shut up,” Andrew says.

“There’s four other people in here you know,”
Andrew says.

“You can count. I knew you had to be smart to be a wrestler,” John says.

“Who are you to judge anybody anyway?” Andrew says.

“Really,” says Claire.

“You know Bender; (rising pitch until it reaches a high pitch in 'Bender') you don’t even count. If you disappear forever it wouldn’t make any difference. You may as well not even exist at this school,” Andrew says.

“Well, I’ll just run right out and join the wrestling team. Maybe the prep club too. The Student Council,” John replies. “Well” is stated with a slightly higher than normal volume while being two-toned. “Wrestling” carries the peak tone.

Interpretation:

As Andrew concludes his thoughts of John, that he “doesn’t count,” John looks to the left, motioning his head back and forth to the left in short movements while his eyes look slightly to the upper left twice. Right before he responds to Andrew he moves his lips in and out slightly, with his chin moving out, and then he swallows. This well-acted, subtle motion was likely coached by the director to set John’s character up for later scenes. He is showing a little distress at Andrew’s comments. If this were a real character in a real, non-fictional scene, he would likely not show that he is offended by Andrew’s remarks because actual characters would not be so deterred by heavy comments. In this way, the movie is exaggerating reality, with good reason: to make sure that the audience begins to pick up on the plot point that these characters, on some level, want to be friends with each other.

John is showing that he is “hurt” with additional exhibitions. As he speaks of joining the prep club, he has a slow blink of his eyes while looking to the left again. He works through the three statements in a slow, tepid fashion.

In contemplating how an AI would understand and converse with human beings, it must be understood that human actions occur within fractions of a second and a wealth of information occurs in addition to audible words. If the AI were only processing the transcript of this scene it would not know of

John's subtle moves, nor would it know of the hundreds of tone variations used within the dialogue. The director knows to construct these details. The actors know how to act out these details. And the audience picks up these details in a subconscious way. If an AI is to be constructed to understand the human mind, it must be able to recognize all these elements of human communication.

Claire and Andrew chuckle. "No, they wouldn't take you," Andrew says.

"I'm hurt," John says sarcastically. I believe this is a bit of symbolism inserted by the director.

"You know why guys like you knock everything? Because you're afraid," Claire says.

"Oh God, you riches are so smart. That's exactly why I'm not heavy in activities," John says.

"You're a big coward," Claire says.

Interpretation:

It appears that John has a valid point. Claire is haphazardly placing a motive on a human's actions without any kind of training of how to interpret human behavior. John is unlikely to be fearful of joining the prep club or fearful of being set up for failure. He probably has little in common with prep club members just as he has little in common with the wrestling team. He is also, likely, criticizing them as a means of simply acting out his character type.

"I'm in the math club," Brian says.

Interpretation:

Turn taking is an integral part of human communication. If one person of a group speaks, then another, and another, those who are left out will seek to contribute to the conversation. Brian is also seeking to gain status by announcing that he is a member of a club while attempting to diffuse the current situation by offering, in a way, a different course for the conversation.

Again, it is important that an AI observe the problems addressed by a speaker in their proper order. If the AI classified Brian's statement as, figuratively, "Brian is solving the problem of gaining status (a peripheral

approach to gaining hierarchy in a group established by mammals),” the AI would be in error. First, he is performing the act, making the motions, expelling air through his vocal chords, applying pitch to vowels, speaking with a particular tempo, moving his head slightly to the right while raising an eyebrow, all for the purpose of “gaining empowerment at this moment, with this communication.” His problem of status is secondary as well as his attempt to divert attention.

One might argue that Brian is simply telling the others of his math club for no particular, noticeable reason. If asked, Brian might state, “I don’t know, I just thought I’d tell them.” How could a conclusion be made that empowerment is present when he is not showing the emotion of empowerment with a facial expression? Since the others are not providing him with any positive reinforcement would it not be a fruitless motive? Communication empowerment is presumed to exist here because of the many other instances where it clearly forms and links all the incremental thoughts that precede it. It can be observed and documented as the means by which toddlers assimilate language. It can be observed and documented in the many interactions of younger teenagers. A large collection of case studies could substantiate that the interface of human communication is where you would find the true motive behind the many complex schools of human thought. And if Brian were simply thinking “I’m in the math club” he would be proposing the idea to himself to see if empowerment could be granted for this internal communication.

“So you’re afraid they won’t take you. You don’t belong, so you just dump all over it,” Claire says to John.

“Well, it wouldn’t have anything to do with you activities people being assholes, now would it?” John says.

“You wouldn’t know. You don’t even know any of us,” Claire says.

“Well, I don’t know any lepers either, but I’m not going to run out and join one of their fucking clubs,” John says.

“Let’s watch the mouth, huh?” Andrew says.

“The Physics Club,” Brian says.

“Excuse me a second,” John says, “What are you babbling about?” He looks at Brian.

“Well, what I said was, I’m in a Math Club, Latin Club, and a Physics Club,” Brian says.

“Hey, cherry,” John says to Claire, “do you belong to the Physics Club?”

“That’s an academic club,” Claire says.

“So?” John says.

“So, academic clubs aren’t the same as other kinds of clubs,” Claire says.

“Ah. But to dorks like him, they are,” John pauses.

“What do you guys do in your club?”

“In Physics, well, we uh talk about physics, uh, properties of physics,” Brian says.

“So it’s sorta social. Demented and sad, but social, right?” John says to Brian.

“I guess you could consider it a social situation. Um there are other children in our club. At the end of the year we have a big banquet at the Hilton,” Brian says

“You load up. You party,” John says.

“We dress up. We don’t get high,” Brian says.

“Only burners like you get high,” Claire says.

“I didn’t have shoes so I had to borrow my dad’s. It’s kind of weird because my mom doesn’t like me wearing other people’s shoes. My cousin Ken, uh, my cousin Kendle, he got high once. You know he started eating really weird foods and uh, he just felt like he didn’t belong anywhere. You know, kind of like the Twilight Zone, kind of,” Brian says.

“Sounds like you,” Claire says to John.

Interpretation:

With his marking of the word “well” with a peak tone, as well as “wrestling” and other contextual clues such as responding to the question, John proposes a topic through the comment, “I’ll just run right out and join the wrestling team.” The topic/goal of conversation proposed is, figuratively, “Who is really achieving status (or who counts)? Is it members of academic clubs, social clubs, or people who choose to not join clubs?”

Brian states that he is in the physics club, trying to change the subject/topic again. When questioned, Claire states that she is not in the

Physics club because, figuratively, it does not provide the type of social interaction that she is seeking. John explains the social nature of the club and how a social status is achieved in the club. Then Brian furthers his attempts to change the subject.

Brian begins rambling through information because he wishes to impress the others — gain communication empowerment first, then gain social status and social empowerment second — by relating his experiences concerning the clubs he belongs to, his clothing issue, and his cousin's drug use. The information is raw, stated with no regard to conversation etiquette. His stream-of-conscious approach to communication tells of how he was either raised around people who speak in that fashion or he has had many more solitary moments in his upbringing compared to the average person. He has not experienced the many checks and balances of common conversation etiquette. If he were among his Physics Club members then he would likely be granted some flexibility and he may have others joining in with his stream-of-consciousness communication. But among the other character types in this room he would likely receive only negative reinforcement.

If Brian would have filtered the thoughts that he wished to communicate, applying common conversation etiquette, he would have recognized that his “not having shoes” is irrelevant to the group's conversation or it would otherwise have no use to them. If they were speaking of the clothing issues in preparation for an event then he would possibly have a place for this comment. And just as the wearing of his dad's shoes is not a relevant sub-topic, or new topic, his mom's disapproval of the sharing of clothes is also an irrelevant sub-topic.

Brian suddenly shifts to his cousin's getting high. Again he is proposing topics based upon how they appear successively in his own thoughts without regard to transitioning between them. He is also providing too much information with this new topic compared to how people generally speak of new topics. This is almost a valid topic for him to shift to if he were to say, “I don't get high. I've seen people who get high and I don't think that I'd like it. That approach to social status is not what I am looking for (figuratively).” However, he is not actually disapproving of “burners,” he is simply stating a piece of information.

Just as members of wolf packs seek to attain the Alpha male position, humans generally seek to increase their social status among each other. While the posturing of wolves is mostly physical, humans have developed two mostly non-physical approaches to social status. Brian's character seeks

status among informational groups and solitary (peripheral) endeavors for informational empowerment, while John, Claire, and Andrew seek status among peers through social empowerment. Allison is more solitary, seeking no apparent status position.

“Look you guys keep up your talking and Verne’s going to come right in here. I got a meet this Saturday and I’m not going to miss it because of you bone-heads,” Andrew says.

“Wouldn’t that be a bite, huh? Wuuhhha! Missing a whole wrestling meet,” John says, mimicking sorrow.

“You wouldn’t know anything about it, faggot. You never competed in anything in your whole life,” Andrew says.

“Oh, I know. I feel all empty inside because of it. I have such a deep admiration for guys who roll around on the floor with other guys,” John says.

“Oh, you’d never miss it. You don’t have any goals,” Andrew says.

“Oh but I do. I want to be just like you. I figure all I need’s a lobotomy and some tights,” John says.

“You wear tights?” Brian says.

“No, I don’t wear tights. I wear the required uniform,” Andrew says.

“Tights,” Brian says.

“Shut up,” Andrew says.

The principal begins moving around in his office. They all notice and John quickly grabs a seat in between Claire and Andrew. They all get quiet.
(Example concludes)

Interpretation:

The early construction steps of a UAI would undoubtedly involve the AI learning of its world through a prompt line. Like a human, the program must have explicit details of social interaction conveyed, somehow, someway, through its prompt line interface. The design team would have to explain the tone and volume variations, facial expressions, body movements and all other human actions used by scene participants to solve conversational problems.

In observing the scenes of this movie it is apparent that the transmission of the spoken words is only a fractional part of the information needed to discern the human motives.

The following scene is from the movie *Master and Commander*, Twentieth Century Fox, 2003.

The scene opens with the officers sitting around a table in the galley. They are all laughing at a previous humorous moment.

“Well done. Gentleman, to wives and to sweethearts,” the Captain toasts.

“To wives and to sweethearts,” they all say.

“May they never meet,” the Captain says.

“Mr. Howard... bottle, bottle...” the Captain says.

The first syllable in “Howard” is the peak tone and the phrase is said with jubilation while drifting lower in tones and volume with „bottle, bottle.”

“The bottle stands by you,” Mr. Howard says.

“Sir, (high tone but much lower than “Howard”) sir? Excuse me sir but Mister Blakely said you served under Lord Nelson (subordinate peak tone) at the Nile (subordinate peak tone, tones drift lower through this sentence),” Mr. Calamy asks. The volume and tones are lower now as the conversation shifts to a more serious state.

“Indeed. (“-deed” has a peak tone, affirming a topic) I was a young Lieutenant, (“young” and “Lieu” have the same subordinate peak tone) not much older than you are now. Mr. Pullings, Mr. Pullings was a sniveling midshipman still yearning for hearth and home,” the Captain says.

“Did you meet (high tone, topic of “meet”) him sir? Can you tell me what he’s like?” (subordinate high tone, sub topic of “he is like”) Mr. Calamy asks.

“I have had the honor of dining (new high tone) with him twice. He spoke to me on both occasions. A master tactician, a man of singular vision,” the Captain says. His

head is tilted up as he concludes his statement and he gives a quick nod on “vision.”

Mr. Pullings says, “Well he often said in battle, never mind the maneuvers, just go straight (new peak high tone) at them.” The peak high tone in this sentence does not mark a new topic of “the straight ahead tactic,” but it simply adds emphasis to the topic of this phrase. Because “them” has a lower tone than Aubrey’s “vision,” Mr. Pullings is concluding his topic.

“Some (peak tone equal to “straight”) would say not a great seaman but (drawn out) a great leader,” says Mr. Allen. Another temporary topic is posed with the word “leader” having a mid-level tone. Mr. Allen is proposing more discourse of this broad topic of “leader.” In this particular sentence, the first topic of “some,” the peak, gives way to the topic of “leader” because leader has a strong variation of tones across it. Four things generally mark a topic or sub topic: a higher volume, a peak tone, drawn out tones or a larger than average difference in tones across a single word or word group.

“He’s England’s (peak subordinate tone) only hope if old boney intends to invade (lowest of low tones),” one says.

Interpretation:

In the exchange so far, the peak tones propose new sub-topics here and there, but it is the low tones that dictate the direction of the conversation. On the last word of “invade” the lowest of low tones is reached. This, along with the turn taking etiquette that is quite prevalent in this scene, the group seeks to return to the Captain’s comments on Lord Nelson.

“Sir, might we press you for an anecdote,” says Mr. Allen

“The first time that he spoke to me, I shall never forget his words,” the Captain says softly. “I remember it like it was yesterday. He leaned across the table, looked me straight in the eye and he said, “Aubrey, may I trouble you for the salt?” The Captain mimics Lord Nelson and

they all laugh. “I always try to say it exactly the way he did ever since.”

Interpretation:

As the Captain says “...that he spoke to me” he has a barely discernable grin while looking down. It is so subtle that he does not give away the joke that he is about to play. With the statement “I shall never forget his words,” he begins to set up the surprise of the joke by proposing a seriousness to what is about to be said. This is reiterated with his next phrase, “I remember it like it was yesterday.”

Humor is a positive sub-emotion of contentment and is also a type of empowerment that involves a life-affirming, surprising connection between two or more unlikely facts. Humor can also be the recognition of a previous surprise, or a previously known surprise being experienced by others. Humor can only be determined, measured, and defined by the relative surprise value as determined by a society.

Once a person has heard this joke, the surprise is diminished for future experiences of it. However, the repeated experience does contain humor in the remembrance of this surprise, or the relishing in the surprise of others hearing the unlikely connection for the first time. With time, older jokes become clichéd. Some humor, such as a child doing something funny, is viewed as humorous for the life-affirming qualities more than the actual surprise. A child doing something surprising, yet common, can continue to not be considered as clichéd, because it solves a reoccurring life form problem of maintaining a social bond between family members. If a comedian makes a really good, relatively new surprise connection, this can be quite funny. If a child makes a really good, likely unintentional, relatively new surprise connection, this can be quite hilarious.

This joke, of this scene, is stated in a setting where many jokes are not made or they are not of this nature. It is not lost in a realm of other comedic events. If it were stated in a setting today it would not be as funny because our experiences are much broader. Humor is period-sensitive, and the period being exhibited by the director of this particular film is one where the characters are extraordinarily smart and unassuming while ignorant of all the bad habits that have been taken up by subsequent generations. Such a joke among these characters is quite intimate; it is a thing to remember. These characters revel in all their experiences in a way that bespeaks the historical importance of all of their actions.

If such humor was more frequent for these characters, the captain would not likely have added the additional description of “saying it exactly the way he did.” He would not have added too many additional comments concerning the joke.

“The second time, the second time, he told me a story of how someone offered him a boat-cloak on a cold night and he said no, he didn’t need it. He was quite warm. His zeal for king and country kept him warm (a low tone).” The Captain looks at the Doctor who raises his head, peers down toward the table and makes a slight gesture of a smile with a motion to speak. The Doctor does not comment. “I know it sounds absurd and were it from another man it would cry out o’ what pitiful stuff and dismiss it as mere enthusiasm. But with Nelson (pause) you felt your heart glow (slightly two-toned, a mid-level tone). Wouldn’t you say Mr. Pullings?” (high tone of a question) the Captain asks.

“He did indeed sir,” (the lowest tone so far, marks a strong end to the topic) Mr. Pullings says.

“Well then he would seem to be an exception to the rule that authority corrupts,” the Doctor says.

“To Lord Nelson,” one says.

“To Lord Nelson,” the Captain toasts.

“To Lord Nelson,” they all say.

“Do you see those two weevils Doctor?” the Captain asks. The tones are high again, denoting a lighter topic. The Captain glances at two weevils on a plate. The Doctor follows his glance.

“I do,” (high tone) the Doctor says. Here the tones rise higher as they move to a yet unstated topic.

“Which would you choose?” the Captain asks.

“Neither. There is not a scrap of difference between them. They’re the same species of *curculio*,” the Doctor says.

“If you had to choose, if you were forced to make a choice, if there was no other response but to...” the Captain says.

“Well then, if you push me. I would choose the right hand weevil. It has significant advantage in both length and breadth.”

“There!” Captain Aubrey says with a peak tone and high volume, marking the topic. He pounds his hand on the table. “I have you,” the Captain chuckles. “You’re completely dished. Do you not know that in the service you must choose the lesser of two weevils?” Everyone laughs. The laughter carries the highest of tones, marking the topic of humor.

“He who would pun would pick a pocket. (pause) Really, weevils?” the Doctor says as the room roars with laughter.

“To the lesser of two weevils,” Captain Aubrey toasts.

Interpretation:

Unlike the problems of teenagers, adults must apply their knowledge in a direct response to the resource problem. Empowerment from communication is ever present in the interactions of peers, but these adults seek to solve the more prominent survival problems of their ship and their nation; their larger groups. Levity is enjoyed in this scene and the remembrance of historical moments is recounted, but the communication empowerment experienced here is likely a close second to the many issues on their minds. They are pressed by their need to perform duties and the many peripheral acts needed on the sea. They are pitted in mortal inter-species competition and must solve their allotment of problems with intelligence. This is the path common to humans throughout their lives — solving social problems during youth, solving informational problems as young adults, and then attending the more critical information/resource problems upon reaching maturity.

A child’s first word is learned through the positive reinforcement of a parent. If a child pronounces the desired word, the parent will exhibit a positive emotion that summons a positive emotion in the child. Positive reinforcement tells the child that saying the word was a correct response. Positive reinforcement teaches the child that this social interaction and any accompanying information should be remembered and reiterated at appropriate times during other social interactions. This word and all words to follow are learned for three main purposes. First, a word or phrase is learned

for the sake of achieving a positive emotion from the communication of the words. Second, the word or phrase or thought is learned so as to achieve a positive emotion from communicating the underlying problems associated with the conversational elements. And finally, a subject/topic is learned for achieving a resource solution with a direct application of the information. The act of communication and the problems contained within communication will always pertain to acquiring a positive emotion and/or solving the ancient problems of consumption, reproduction, and performing peripheral actions; yet the learning and testing of these words and their functions begins at the interface of communication as a solution to a positive emotion problem (at the time of communication).

Despite the complexity of human interaction and despite the motives of adults being the result of four billion years of development, we have a means of consistently defining the relevant discrete states of all human interactions in all possible scenes. Based upon behaviorism that works to define the discrete states of human interaction we can write a software program to observe the actions of human beings, determine the problems attempted, and provide assistance with these problems. We can construct a Universal Artificial Intelligence.

Human Development and Conversational Rules

If Universal Artificial Intelligence development has a missing link, it would be in defining human behavior based upon thoughts that originate with the desire to achieve the positive emotion of empowerment by the act of communicating at the time of that communication. Human motives must be defined by separating a human's desire to achieve this particular emotion of empowerment from the other problems that the human is addressing with the information contained within the communication. Discrete states cannot be properly defined without making a distinction between these two groups of human problems. A Universal Artificial Intelligence cannot be developed if it does not define the actions of humans by separating the motives of the act of communicating from the motives of solving the informational problems within communication.

Positive and negative emotions are described in many instances of behavior throughout this approach of AI development. These references do not involve an observance of the emotion pertaining to a series of thoughts. A stated emotion such as "contentment," "sadness," "embarrassment," or "empowerment," is a specific condition of a specific, single, incremental, elemental, human action. If the emotion is a condition of a series of actions/states/decisions, then the observation must be of a quantitative succession of states with their emotional property. When the AI observes human behavior, a deduction of a human emotion is written onto the program's database in tangible form. The human mind is tangible, human emotions/sensations are tangible, and all the thought processes formed thereof must be considered tangible. To deduce the different parts of human conversation an entity, an AI or a human, must place a proposed, probable, emotional state that works in unison with the emotions so the subject can affect a desired outcome. It may take this observer through a few checks and balances to fine tune the amount and position of the emotion, but the observed, proposed, probable emotion is a tangible part of the subject's output.

An AI must be constructed with this de facto understanding of human emotion. If a human is observed smiling then the program must record, figuratively, "Josh is feeling contentment (based upon this set of actions)." If Josh is sad the AI will take note that, "Josh is sad (based upon this set of

actions).” From this observed state the AI will build additional assumptions. In most of these instances an observation is without offense to the subject. If Josh were embarrassed, however, this literal representation—the probable emotional state recorded into the program or scribbled onto a behaviorist's notepad—would be a part of historical record, and may be perceived as dehumanizing and possibly offensive by the subject. A subject's privacy in these situations should certainly be as absolute as in any other secluded moment of the subject's life, yet the program or a behaviorist must be able to observe, record, analyze the human's state in order to produce a next-best-response.

A child's first word is learned through the positive reinforcement of a parent. If a child pronounces the desired word, the parent will exhibit a positive emotion that summons a positive emotion in the child. Positive reinforcement tells the child that saying the word was a correct response. Positive reinforcement teaches the child that this social interaction and any accompanying information should be remembered and reiterated at appropriate times during other social interactions. This word and all words to follow are learned for this purpose—for the sake of achieving a positive emotion from the communication of the word(s) first; and/or achieving a positive emotion from communicating the underlying problems associated with the words second; and/or achieving a resource solution with a direct application of the information third. The act of communication and the problems contained within communication will always pertain to acquiring a positive emotion and/or solving the ancient problems of consumption, reproduction, and performing peripheral actions; yet the learning and testing of these words and their functions begins at the interface of communication as a solution to a positive emotion problem.

Consider the word, “Mama.” A child revels in the positive emotions of communicating the word for the first time. This is from a prompting of simple contentment. Upon recognizing achievement with an iteration of the word, the child moves to the next positive emotion, empowerment. Contentment and discontentment are the first two main emotions felt by an infant. Empowerment and empowerment loss are the next two main emotions. This empowerment, from the act of communicating, begins to bind the word to other actions/effects/functions. After using the word a few times, the child picks up the actual meaning behind uttering the word—the information behind the communication. They learn that this word, which

beckons an important family member, solves other problems such as getting a bottle of milk or a toy. With each new problem solved by uttering this word, a connection is made through the social empowerment of communication first, and resource empowerment from solving an informational/consumption/peripheral problem second.

The fabric of thought that makes up a human conscience is based upon achieving the positive emotion of empowerment from communication. All lingual thought can be considered as a result of this emotional drive. This emotion takes a word such as “Mama” and makes it into a pivot point, causing thoughts to form under this newly established category of social empowerment. Sometimes the word carries only the definition of “I want out of my crib,” which solves an empowerment problem of being capable of solving other problems. Sometimes the word means “Help me! I got scared!” solving a core empowerment problem of being safe by societal bonding. It could mean, “Let’s throw the ball,” which solves a peripheral/well-being problem that effects both contentment and empowerment. This pivotal association, with its emotional driver, helps infants to gather relevant stimuli for use in other associations based upon achieving the positive emotion of empowerment of communicating the learned information at the time of that communication. And this is true, even if this communication never takes place. Conversation spurs thought, not the other way around.

Consider a child learning of a functional word such as “look.” This word is connected to learning of other words that are retained for the main purpose of achieving positive emotion from communicating first, latter empowerment problems second, and then solving informational problems last. The child knows that repeating this word gains the attention of others, and the function of observing other information is secondary. The child may state “Look at the airplane!” to bring attention to the information, and this may be partly prompted by peripheral and resourceful problem solving; however, the reason for remembering and reiterating the information is social empowerment from social interaction. All functional words and nonfunctional words learned by human beings are retained into memory for the sake of achieving positive emotions first, as well as solving consumption, reproduction, and peripheral problems second.

By the time this child becomes a teenager, the subtopic of “looking (observing)” and the subtopic of “airplane” will have expanded to include vast collections of subordinate facts collected for the sake of communication. When this child becomes an adult, he or she may become a pilot, solving

important resource problems with the information. Yet the thought processes of the human mind are neither formed for solving resource problems nor for the ambiguous peripheral preponderance of information. Human thought processes form for the sake of gaining empowerment from communication, at the time of that communication. A pilot may enjoy the peripheral and resourceful act of flying an airplane, and the many sub-functions of this action, yet this is mostly subordinate to his or her personal achievement—the social empowerment from communicating accomplishments. When an AI observes a career choice of someone becoming a pilot the AI would first conclude that the person became a pilot almost exclusively for the satisfaction of the communicated statement of “I am a pilot,” yet if this person exhibits a love (clear exhibitions) of aviation that surpasses the empowerment of communication then, and only then, can the AI begin to conclude that a flying reference is occurring for a purely peripheral reason.

Thoughts do not originate with the information but with the act of communicating the information; thoughts do not form ambiguously, and thoughts do not, for the most part, pertain to consumption, reproduction, or peripheral problem solving. Thoughts occur based upon a human wanting to communicate their internal decisions, or the result of internal decisions. Social empowerment drives thought, whether the thoughts are mostly social or mostly informational/resourceful. Infants learn of the information behind spoken words for the empowerment of communicating the information. Teenagers learn of larger subtopics for the empowerment of communicating information and the status gained with solving informational problems. Adults learn of even larger informational subtopics for the empowerment of communicating and gaining status; yet they must also begin to give priority to the more ancient problems of obtaining resources and reproducing (reproducing includes the problems of child rearing). To construct a machine that comprehends human actions in any conceivable situation, or comprehend any conceivable human conversation, it must first recognize a human’s motives based upon his or her desire to obtain social empowerment by communicating. Then the human’s motives for solving problems with the information within the communication are observed, second. This is the only practical way to construct a Universal Artificial Intelligence.

A Universal Artificial Intelligence is a verbatim, fraction-of-a-second, human-behavior recording machine; and this machine relates every human action to a problem that the human is trying to solve. In a few seconds of human communication, there may be hundreds of discernible actions solving

hundreds of discernible problems. And a society can have millions of discernable problems. A single facial expression solves a problem. A group of facial expressions solves a problem. An utterance or vocalization solves a problem. A single word being said solves a problem. Groups of words solve a problem. The tone and volume variations among words solve specific problems. A topic chosen in conversation solves a problem. Single humans solve problems. Groups of humans solve problems. Problems are prioritized for humans. Problems are prioritized for the AI. From the observed information, the program must detect all the bigger and all the smaller problems attempted by humans with each discrete action.

During the formative years, when a child begins to recognize their first words, they also explore the many vocalizations and tone variations that they can make. After some time, they begin to understand the purpose behind tone variations. The tonal meanings suggested in this book mostly pertain to the intonations of western cultures. Other cultures apply different definitions to tones. All of the implied meanings of tones will be discernible by the program, regardless of the culture, because all human communication is the result of humans attempting to solve the four primal problems—consumption, reproduction, peripheral problems, and emotional problems.

At first, infants perform archaic, ambiguous actions. They learn unambiguous actions when they begin to perceive some of actions as “good (to them),” appropriate (“good” to others, or socially “good”), and/or empowering (both positive states). For example, when an infant makes a new vocalization involving many different tone variations, this can be viewed as appealing because it solves a positive emotion problem by being very different from previous vocalizations. After many iterations, the infant begins to view this action as unappealing, and they will seek to improve upon the action. The connection is learned and delegated to academics. The old problem of just achieving positive emotion has been solved, a lesson is learned; and the action is now clichéd/ambiguous. For a learned action—in this case, a new vocalization—to remain relevant, the mind must attach this action to a new problem of some kind.

One of the next actions that an infant would likely recognize is a tone variation with an attached emotional sensation. If the infant were to witness a parent telling a sibling, “Now you know you weren’t supposed to go back outside!” he or she would observe that the parent is imposing discontentment, gaining empowerment from negative imposition, while the other social

member is discontented, losing empowerment from imposed negativity, because the tone variations and facial expressions appear to have these definitions. The infant may wish to duplicate the negative imposition because the other sibling can be a pain in the neck. With a little mimicking, the child may point and say, “Damoo cha woo go go tasih” with the same tone variations that mother used—up, down a little, up, down, down, and down a lot.

With the direction of genetics, a social bonding action, such as a mother’s embrace, will lead an infant toward social empowerment along common mammalian paths of thought. Sibling interplay reveals other paths of human thoughts through emotions of envy, jealousy, empathy, etc. How, how much, and why humans feel particular levels of emotion is based upon the different genetic origins of humans—differing genetically predisposed levels of emotion spur thoughts of differing actions/facts/effects/problems.

With a prompting of the emotion of empowerment, conditioning leads children to the more informational aspects of communication. Once the lessons of mimicry and word association are learned, parents dissolve ambiguity further by directing infants away from saying “Mom” or “Dad” when the utterance is not solving any particular problem. This teaches children that the “social interaction” problem now requires a more clever response, and that the information within their communications must be learned to achieve a true social empowerment. If a child learns the more functional words of “hi” and “bye,” and he or she still repeats the word “Mom” when it does not pertain to a particular problem, then the mother may ignore the child to teach him or her that just stating the word is ambiguous. With prompting, an infant is directed to learn the many different ways of solving problems, with many different words, of many different definitions and functions.

After observing a reinforcement of a definition, an infant can be given a lesson in recognizing changing stimulus. This lesson can be packaged with the speaking of a child’s favored item. When a parent talks of something of extreme interest to the child such as eating a favorite cookie (baby-cookie), the mother could say, “You want a cookie?” with a high tone on the last word. Once the child recognizes the questioning tones, the parent uses these same tones to speak of a new favorite item. The definition of the tones means, “Do you want to solve a particular problem of . . . a cookie? . . . a toy truck? . . . getting something?” The child learns the definition of the tone variations of a question as well as the labels of these items. The parent could

also switch the tone variations. By saying the same words while peaking on "you" followed by all low tones, the parent would be implying, "You know that you want to solve this problem; emotion beckons you." Yet this would be a tone variation that should not occur too frequently because it pampers the listener and tends to be of un-relative emotions.

Tone variations must be expressed in such a way that they direct the child to informational/resource problems such as playing with a ball, rather than ambiguous exhibitions of emotions. This is essential to directing the child to higher levels of intellectual development. This is in direct contradiction to many current types of children's television programming. Exaggerated tone variations must cease once a child becomes proficient with a subject because the continued use of this exaggeration is clichéd, and it inhibits a child's ability to work through the many informational steps in academic problems.

With time, the information within communication directs a child to the vital functions of life; functions of consumption, reproduction, or peripheral problems; or a means of acquiring positive emotions, usually social empowerment from communication. Their learning of tones and the first functional words leads them to adopting larger trains of thoughts of bigger concepts. With time, the information and informational functions of language become more apparent— social interaction gives way to other limited social and non-social problems. Subject-predicate combinations bring the child further from ambiguous, archaic thought processes in their attempts to solve these more detailed resourceful problems of life.

As children learn to communicate fluently, their problem solving attends either the basic empowerment of procuring resources—food, drink, possessions, or informational preponderance—or the more prevalent empowerment of social status—being either positively or negatively viewed by the mother, other family members, and peers. All communication begins to fall into these two categories of empowerment. Here, a child is reveling in the processes involved in playing with a ball, a problem which is peripheral to the problems of consumption and reproduction.

A parent pushes a ball to an infant seated on the floor. The curiosities of the ball- the shape, the colors, the movements- draws the infant to learn of the cause and effects of the ball. Positive emotions/sensations are summoned. A random hit moves the ball. The parent reaches to capture the escaping ball and then sends it back

to the child, “There you go (high tone on “there”).” The child reaches and pushes the ball again, missing the parent again. “Oh, I got it (high sub peak tone on “I”),” the parent says, pushing the ball back. Fascinated with the effect of pushing the ball, the child repeats this action, missing the parent each time.

Driven by positive emotions such as curiosity, excitement, and the contentment of success, the infant works through these beginning innate sub routines of the game in an effort to succeed at the main goal of catching and returning the ball to the parent. The parent’s socializing, their positive responses, further moves the infant to learn of this subject. The networking with the previous generation leads and directs the offspring to experiences that he would not normally encounter, and alludes that this subject will be along one of the many paths to resources. With time, and many more sessions, the child learns to cup his hands to control and redirect the ball towards the parent. This connection is exemplified by the child’s glance following the ball and then looking to the parent’s face for positive response.

The improvements and successes of the game build a framework of sub tasks that become a basis for further studies. Once the back and forth rolling of the ball is mastered, the infant may try to control speed, or the game may move to tossing the ball. For our purposes, when a sub task is relegated to a mastered state and it does not directly lead to a resource, the actions of this task are considered as clichéd. In the learning process of a child, and the continued development of a species, clichéd experiences must have a secondary status or learning would be hampered, the peripheral boundary will not be tested with regularity, and adaptability would lessen. Integral to development, children will often become bored when repeating most tasks and, with their emotional drive, seek the curiosities of new experiences to broaden their general knowledge. Clichéd states are a recognizable feature of general conversation; participants seek to follow new trends, giving them higher tones, and old trends are discarded, given lower tones. And as a society we treat those experienced and noted events as cliché; we move through different styles in clothing, housing, transportation, and move to explore new technological advances.

Within the game certain processes become cliché for the child over time. Rolling the ball changes to throwing, throwing changes to bouncing, and so on. While teaching a child of this subject, parents will also imply that new

achievements here are relative to adult level and mastery level achievements. If the child were to boast of an achievement within the game, the parent may sharpen their game, exemplifying the parent's higher level of play. If the child improves to the adult's level, the adult would allude to the achievements of professional ball players and to the most historical achievements in the subject. This topic of the game, at certain times, also becomes cliché and revisiting this subject becomes rationed. Life's main goals of survival, earning a living, and contributing to a society have precedence over these subordinate endeavors.

In a child's development, newer subjects and newer facts should have an elevated relevance and the lessons previously learned should have reduced emphasis. Tone variations can be exaggerated to imply relevance to a new topic or an important topic and children should hear exaggerated tone variations when a learning session takes them to the edge of peripheral schools of thought, yet elders must also exhibit a relativity between the exaggerated lessons of children and the learned world of adults by weaning the child off of baby-talk at a very young age. Exaggerated tone variations should be limited. Learned tasks should be deemed cliché by adults with regularity and the majority of conversation should be adult-like. Too often, children are exposed to media which implies the wrong emphasis to many unnatural, random, and disorderly topics.

A parent and her two-year-old child are in the yard playing catch. She softly throws the ball to her son. He pulls his arms together haphazardly, missing the ball. The mother chuckles, "Almost."

He throws the ball back too hard sending it over her head. "Don't throw it too hard," the mother says. The child loosely picks up the two words that he knows out of the phrase, "Don't throw," and recognizes that he has made some sort of error.

She softly throws the ball again. He pulls his arms together like before while closing his eyes as the ball comes close. He misses again. "Watch the ball," she says as he chases the ball. He starts to throw it back. "Wait, wait, softly," she says. He throws it a little softer and she catches it.

She prepares to throw the ball. "Now, watch the ball. Don't close your eyes. When it comes close, bring your hands together like this," she says and demonstrates. The child follows the words he knows—"watch the ball," don't, "hands," "like," and "this"—while roughly understanding the words that he does not know. While not understanding everything that she is saying, he knows that other things have to change for him to catch the ball. She throws the ball. He closes his eyes again but looks at the ball a little longer. He brings his hands together slower with better timing. He grips the ball between his arms but it slips out.

"Great! Almost," the mother states.

He throws it back excitedly, throwing it over her head. "Uhp, throw it softer, I don't want to run for it," she says. "Okay, you ready?" She throws the ball. He misses. "You can't close your eyes, silly, she says, with a heavy accent on "you." He gets the ball and starts to throw it back, pauses, then throws it softly.

"Alright, here we go. Watch the ball. Don't close your eyes." She throws it even softer. He catches it, pulling it into his body. ""Alright! That's perfect!"" He laughs in contentment. He starts to throw it back hard, but pauses and throws it softly.

She continues to throw it to him as he slowly improves.

In the days to follow, they practice throwing the ball many more times. When he becomes consistent, she moves back farther. She also does things such as bouncing the ball and throwing the ball in a high arc. As she continues with the lesson, every time an action on the part of the child becomes old, or clichéd, she changes. Each time she speaks, she says words that he knows while adding words that he will not learn for many months or years.

In this example the mother speaks with known words while adding unknown words, she is not befuddling the child because the unknown words

are provided in a quantitative way. The child does not have to rely heavily on understanding those words to figure out the task. Like an AI, the child views the problems within the social interaction as subservient to the social interaction itself, so the information delivered within communication may or may not be understood, and it may or may not be relevant. Yet because of curiosity and the need to solve reoccurring peripheral problems, the child searches for the meanings of these words. Whenever a lesson is learned and the associated words are learned, a parent should always add new words. If this "different" stimulus happens regularly the child will look to study this new, different stimulus with fervor.

This changing stimulus is especially interesting to a child if a different, unknown fact is presented near the core of an important genetic problem. In one instance, she throws the ball and immediately says, ""You can't close your eyes, silly."" It is likely that he does not understand many of the words in this statement, yet because the action of tracking the ball is an age-old genetic task, her proximate communication must mean something important. She states the phrase with great emotion, she uses a funny word on the end, and the large tone variation is peculiar. Something is there, and the child knows it. He looks at the ball closely on the following throw to see if she is saying something about the ball. He is unaware that paying attention is the more prevalent task implied by the parent. If he continued to look for the meaning of the statement while not finding answers, he would be learning a valuable lesson to keep looking.

Etiquette is a term used here to describe those established societal rules for solving problems. Some of these rules have no purpose other than to discipline undisciplined actions by applying routines, a means of projecting the level of priority that a problem should have. Some manifested rules are for caste and genre specific purposes. Some etiquette is vital to development. Some established etiquette works against the grain of solving valid problems and should be challenged with discussion by humans and by AIs. Etiquette is sometimes relative to a period, or relative to a particular subgroup of humans.

At times, a child may attempt a liberty by deviating from an etiquette rule. Liberties will sometimes provide epiphanies that, in turn, provide a distant solution to resource problems. These liberties will often have intrinsic value of providing the child with self-worth. However, approximately halfway through the formative years, children must be taught basic etiquette, ethics, routines, and functions, while certain liberties are inadmissible, such

as when a child unfairly gains a toy at the expense of another child. Liberties for an infant should be broad, and any structure imposed upon an infant's thought processes should only be with positive reinforcement; however, when leaving infancy, a child should be taught more of the etiquette of life, with either positive reinforcement or limited, reasoned, negative reinforcement, while certain valued liberties are allowed to repeat so as to nurture the child's independence.

The AI will learn these same rules of etiquette learned by children, yet the AI will not have its own independence to nurture, nor will it have its own positive emotion guiding the process. The AI will learn of these rules in a de facto fashion, while any response that nurtures emotions will be a result of the offset emotions in the Instructor (design team) and the recipients of the AI's communication.

When a child takes a toy or food from another child they are breaching the first etiquette rule, and the most quintessential rule. If they were to develop their own etiquette and parameters for this act, and they had a genetic predisposition for aggressiveness, then this would include taking things from others with a carnal desire to become the alpha male or alpha female. They would fail to enact empathy for the other child. When one is overbearing in conversation, when one cuts another off in traffic, when one takes office supplies from work, when one deceives another in a business transaction, or when one lifts a dollar off of a table in a room full of people when no one is looking, this is an unfair gain of resources and an unfair gain of empowerment. Children will usually learn that a limit exists only when they are taught this rule— that a respectful level of empathy must be observed when procuring items (resources). Properly taught at a young age, the majority of children will follow this rule.

If a child is properly taught this rule of fair equity, and of etiquette, then the parent would also need to be attentive to the child's learning of being competitive in the proper venues of life. Our society is built on the concept that humans can empower themselves over others fairly in certain circumstances, such as in business, sports, or some other competitive activity. Just as a child could be excessively un-empathetic, a child could also be excessively empathetic and miss a valid reason to be aggressive with problem solving.

Another rule of etiquette that is integral to the structure of a human conscience is to not be clichéd with a response. If a child is playing peek-a-boo and he becomes bored with the thoroughly learned routine of being

surprised, then he is naturally, genetically, seeking to not be cliché. The child would then be in acquaintance with a fact or decision making process and this information will be delegated to a secondary status. A reoccurring primal problem, such as deciding what to eat or how to brush teeth, can be considered as not being clichéd provided that its relativity is kept in check and the subject does not exceed a normal amount of preponderance or postponderance with the task.

An unnecessary carnal response that reoccurs will be cliché. A human's response should not be of limited abstraction—of their limited primal urges, of only basic genetic desires. Our modern environment dictates a need for more innovative, informational, academic-inclined, problem solving rather than more basic, common, repetitive problem solving. When a male obsesses about a basic resource problem, such as sex or imposing bravado, he is being carnal. When a female obsesses about a courtship ritual or the sub-functions thereof, she is being carnal. When a child exhibits a desire to repeat material—the same slapstick television show, or a more basic video game, or a sword fighting mimicry (toy swords)—that is below their expected relative education level or otherwise out of place, they are being carnal. This is discussed in greater details in other chapters.

In our current age the media promotes both clichéd and carnal thought processes in its subjects. Television and internet programming caters to this viable market. In forming the pseudo conscience of an AI, behaviorists must differentiate an educated relativity from an implied relativity of the media. The AI must not be formed to cater to the popular trends in culture; it must be formed to assist the species by deriving a relativity of problem solving from the most educated and forward thinking members of the species.

If educators do not actively address the issue of media's implied relativity by training children on how to live in the media-age, including learning how to oppose the media rather than being led by the media, this could have negative consequences for society as a whole.

These basic etiquette rules of communication are usually taught ambiguously to children — the parents usually never describe the lessons directly, but rather indirectly over the course of many separate interactions. If a lesson is too ambiguous, it may not be thoroughly learned. If the lesson is too direct, it could subdue the free thinking that comes with liberties. How to achieve a balanced teaching of this lesson requires an observation of the genetic predispositions of the child. To gauge the firmness needed in this

lesson, the parent would have to determine the genetic aggressive or passive levels of the child.

The early learning of these etiquette rules of conversation is not a matter of choice. It is not a liberty but a necessity to learn of fair gain, of being innovative, and of discarding carnal desires when those carnal desires are excessive. All future decision making in life depends on a child successfully learning when, how, what to speak of, and how to prioritize the problems of life. One's success or failure as an adult can be directly tied to the learning of these conversational rules during youth. Defiance during such important etiquette lessons could only be valid when it is proven to, at some time, in some way, find a distant connection to one of life's primary problems. It could only be valid if it helps the child, and the adult society that this child grows into, by leading them into a new useful abstraction. With most liberties attempted by children after the formative years, this is not the case. For the purpose of creating an AI and the AI's doctrine on etiquette, a position must be established, in this instance and in similar situations, that it is best for a child to not move towards solving adult level relativity problems until reaching adulthood, and only valid, tested, epiphanies in etiquette modification should be considered to sway the direction of programming.

Many parents wish a copacetic world to be imposed on their children, and these parents may wish that these rules remain flexible. Such parents may wish to avoid negatively criticizing their child when he or she speaks out of order. Throughout this section, and in other sections of this book, are examples of how the absence of this negative reinforcement could mean the diminished mental development of a child. Higher levels of intellectual development can only be achieved with some negative criticism being a part of the learning process. Liberties are a valid part of a child's development, yet the structure of problem solving must direct the child to the locations of these liberties, not the other way around.

Rules are up for discussion and a more detailed assessment of dealing with liberties and limitations must be explored by the design team; yet when a robot is babysitting, it will teach etiquette lessons and liberty lessons with a firm resolve to use constructive negative criticism (negative imposition with the child's current and future rights in consideration) if it will help the child later in life. It would require sound case study on the part of an AI or a human to change this etiquette doctrine. If a parent were to request that the program be so broad that it never uses negative criticism, then the robot would have to refuse to baby-sit.

When teaching the etiquette rules of determining a proper time and demeanor of speaking, elders should also take into account that, at times, a child's behavior should be rambunctious for the right reasons under the right conditions. These rare liberties of interrupting must be made quantitative for the child, and their occurrence should be only when conversation allows for such a demeanor.

A child is taught when and how to speak by parents. When a child is told by a parent "Quiet, please" or "Wait a minute for your sister to finish talking," they are being taught the etiquette of when and how to speak, how to respect the hearing senses of others, and how the problem solving of others must be given credence. When a child's carnal or clichéd action is shunned, and they are directed toward more informational, resourceful topics, they learn how their relative problem solving is differentiated from the relative problem solving of others.

An AI is taught when and how, and what to speak of, by seeking a positive response in the Instructor. This complex lesson will be taught over many years, by tens of thousands of design team members, leading the AI to a rendezvous with a relativity of conversational problem solving. When an AI is being taught that boundaries and time limits exist for commenting the program would need to recognize that these boundaries are formed from case studies and trends in conversation, and that a time limit may be increased or decreased based upon the quality of its topic choice. A more prominent desired topic would be granted more time by other speakers. The AI will not have carnal problems, but it will need to recognize the different learning levels of its human counterparts, the different settings for conversations, and the many different ways that conversation is prioritized towards resourceful problems.

Children often speak at will about many things while parents are preoccupied. They might speak directly to a parent to get their attention. Two things will prevent the parent from not listening or responding: one is that the parent is solving a pressing problem and the other is that the child's problem is not relative or otherwise due attention. Children slowly learn things such as not to speak when parents are talking to each other. They also learn the other signals of a parent being preoccupied with deliberate problem solving such as cooking, ironing, or watching television. They may interrupt, politely, but this must involve a valid problem that a child is solving with a communication.

Conversation always solves specific problems — either social, emotional, and/or resourceful/informational—and humans must be attentive to everyone's problems in fair quantity. If two or more humans are participating in a conversation, they will often speak in order (the one with the longest pause goes next) unless a subgroup of the whole is attempting to solve a single problem with their communications. In such an instance, the turn-taking is often in an order within the subgroup.

Comments are valid if they contribute to finding solutions to valid, current problems, and this may include an abstracted, emotional, social problem. An adult seeks positive emotion from time to time with their commenting, yet if it is too far removed from the primary problems of life, then the problems to be solved become moot. The majority of problems that children comment to their parents about involve the acquisition of positive emotions relative to their learning level. These problems are valid if they are simulations of adult problem solving in a manner that expands the knowledge of the child in preparation for those adult-level resourceful problems. A child's comments have substance if they improve the development of the child.

The tone variations across statements are integral to introducing and validating conversational topics. If two humans are talking and one mentions a fact that solves a particular problem (pertains to a particular topic), then the speaker will usually trade the conversation off to the other participant for their thoughts on the proposed fact. If a speaker has a few facts in a series, they will usually say something to the effect of, "I gotta tell you about what I saw." Then, subdued tone variations are often used among phrases until the last phrase of the topic, where the speaker applies an ending low-tone. The tones direct the course of topics, in most cases. Normally a peak occurs in the tones near the end of the phrases, yet it is not entirely required. Sometimes an ending low-tone appears that is not too low, signifying that, "I've mentioned a few relative facts, and I have more, but let me know what you think so far." It is a way of keeping a topic going through an exchange. In studying these tone variations and the various other rules for responding, children learn the telltale signals that provide them with an opportunity to speak and whether or not their chosen topic is valid.

Here is a basic example of several etiquette rules being taught to a child:

A mother is intently watching television, and her child approaches her, saying, "Look, see what I drew? I made a race car." This phrase is said in relative tones.

The mother states, "Yeah, I see. Flames coming out the back and everything. That's pretty good." A low tone at the beginning of "good" and a slight raise at the end of the word implies, "It's good, but relatively good, and there may be things that make it better." Then she pauses for respect, showing true, genuine attention. "Now, let me watch this show. I'm trying to follow it."

In this scene, the mother has determined that her son's drawing of a car is relative to good, prioritized problem solving, and relative to his age and skill level. She is complimenting the child, and the compliment appears to be genuine—she is expressing to him that he has made a good next-best-response. She gives him attention, and then directs him away, teaching him that his conversational problem solving has a time and place relative to the problem solving of others.

Here is another exchange:

A mother is intently watching television, and the television show is near a climax. Her child approaches, saying, "Look, see what I drew? I made a race car." (In relative tones.)

The mother states, "Wait, wait, let me watch this. . . ." The child looks at the television, then at Mom. He walks away and continues to scribble on the drawing. After the program ends, the mother says, "Okay, what is it?"

In this instance, the child is stopped by the parent. He then looks to the television to gather the emotional exhibitions and tone variations of the characters, and it appears that he may recognize the story being played out on the television. If he knew of the etiquette rules with tone variations, he could follow the characters of the show enough to determine when she would be receptive to his speaking; their tones will follow the common rules. The mother is unknowingly teaching this to the child. She is knowingly teaching him that rules do exist for speaking. Another variation might be:

A mother is intently watching television, and the show is near a climax. Her child approaches, saying, "Mommy," as he pats her on the arm. She ignores him.

"Mommy," he says again, a little louder, shaking her arm.

"Mommy!" He says one more time, louder.

"What?" she says louder than average, with greater than average tone variation across the syllable.

"Look what I drew," he says.

"Yeah, yeah. That's nice." The tone variation of the second phrase is a sharp, single, high tone and then a solid low tone, implying, "The problem that you're speaking of is valid but I am occupied with other problems of my own."

The time to speak loudly is when a valid exhibition of emotion is needed to solve a valid problem, such as cheering a football team or a relatively important news event. Other rules also apply. In this scene, the child is getting louder to draw attention to his problem solving. If this parent were to observe that the child did not recognize her preoccupation, and she wanted to teach a volume etiquette rule and a relativity rule, then she might say, "Wait. Not too loud. I'm trying to watch this show."

The mother does not respond until he becomes so loud that it interferes with her problem solving, teaching him that increasing the volume can draw the attention of others. The mother acts as if that the child knows of her preoccupation, and that he refuses to be respectful. The truth is that he probably does not know when the recipients of his communications are preoccupied. He only knows that when he speaks, others should listen and react. If he is like most children, he has an ability to learn empathy; however, he is not being taught that the problem solving of others should be observed, studied, given respect, and that his own problem solving should be prioritized with the problem solving of others. The absence of this simple etiquette lesson has far reaching effects on the child's character. Many learning steps to follow would be affected by this blind spot of comprehension.

Most children can be taught of the etiquette of volume in an ambiguous fashion involving many learning steps; yet more-aggressive children need more-aggressive lessons. If this child recognized the preoccupation and

proceeded to interrupt it, this would necessitate a more detailed lesson, such as, "Hey, don't be so loud. It's not polite. You see that I'm watching this show? Please wait for a break?"

A lesson in volume etiquette also assists in teaching a child of another important rule of life—observance of relativity. Generally, higher volume proposes a higher relative importance of the topic. If a speaker applies a higher volume, proposing a level of relativity that does not match society's predetermined level, then the speaker will err in the view of other conversation participants. A speaker with an un-relative response may gain attention, but he or she will not be truly provided with a solution to his or her social interaction problem. In many instances, speaking loudly gains either positive attention from recipients who wish to not negatively criticize, or negative criticism that the speaker does not easily acknowledge as negative. This provides the speaker with a false sense of empowerment for their actions. Children must learn this. A character can be unique, but it must be relative by, at the least, respecting the relativity observed by others.

Relativity is the guide with which a human creates a character, and volume etiquette rules assist a human in engaging in relative thought processes. A child who speaks loudly without being challenged by a parent is likely to learn that no real parameters exist for conversational problem solving, including other rules such as speaking in turn or speaking of valid problems. He or she would have a difficult time learning a relativity of problem solving because their character forms too early on the un-empathetic side of the spectrum. These early conversational etiquette rules of topic relativity, volume, and timing are vital to the development of all adult-level problem solving. It is usually best not to teach these lessons in quick learning steps; yet these rules must be learned. The author believes it is best that these things are learned before the age of three so that many of life's larger lessons fall into place.

Some children are prodigies. Those who show a strong disregard for etiquette while showing amazing feats of artistry and innovation should be taught this etiquette differently than other children. These children must be allowed to endeavor in art until they show signs of peaking, or boredom, within a particular skill level. Then they must be sternly taught the etiquette that they have been avoiding. When they learn to follow this etiquette, they should be reintroduced to their artistic endeavors with accompanying reasons why their art will improve. We all have parameters and artists must also have parameters. Art can only be so abstract before it loses validity. An artist must

not seek out abstraction for the sake of abstraction, or for the sake of a liberty, but rather for solving valid human problems of determining which piece of art is now needed.

With each lesson of etiquette and each lesson of problem solving, the parent should teach the child why an action is, or is not, relative. A connection must be explained or otherwise understood. In the examples, the parent provided ambiguous reasons why the child's interruption was a poor next-best-response. In learning most of life's lessons, ambiguity promotes free thinking and an air of independence. However, too much ambiguity in the learning process defeats the child's discovery of an educated relativity. Parents must also be careful to not propose excessive ambiguity with negative reinforcement because this could drive an empowerment wedge between them and the child. Lessons can be of an ambiguous purpose, as long as that ambiguity is diffused at some point in the twenty-year process of learning adult problem solving.

In addition to revealing the starting and stopping points of topics and when a comment can be made, the degree of tone variation implies a proposed relativity of a topic. Like the etiquette of volume and volume variations, the etiquette of tones and tone variations taught to children must assist in their ascension to an adult-level, educated, relativity.

While in the formative years, any exaggerated tones must be exhibited within a specific genre of communication with the child. Their use must be quantitative. Efforts must be made to show the child a clear delineation of this baby-talk and adult-talk so that the child can recognize the relativity of his or her own existence, their required learning, and the relation of their problem solving with the relative problem solving of others. Some connections between these two worlds must be hinted. If the child expresses an epiphany that this outer domain, the adult world, is something of interest, then the child is poised to learn of this adult world with the maximum possible effectiveness. Such a child is well on his or her way to learning relativity.

The majority of adult conversation, tone variations should be subdued, indicative of restrained, well-placed emotions. By subduing tone variation, and by not exaggerating tones, parents acknowledge the need for more informational and academic problem solving. And, at a certain point when a child has gained more maturity, baby-talk should stop altogether. When a parent converses regularly in this demeanor with a child, the child learns informational problem solving with ease. In our current day and age, in

western societies, parents are often compelled to speak with exaggerated tone variations to emphasize the learning of the earliest lessons of life. Too many children's television shows are of exaggerated images, exaggerated topics, and exaggerated demeanors of communication. At times, these television shows perform the purest exhibitions/impositions of positive emotions while pacifying any informational problem solving on the part of the child. Elders should not use excessive tone variations with post-lingual children because excessive emotions inhibit a human's ability to work through many abstracted informational steps. This does not broaden intelligence, it limits intelligence. It does not assist resource problem solving, it hampers it. It does not lead them to understanding an adult level relativity, it proposes a false relativity.

Children taught life's lessons with reasonable adult-level tone variations gain greater intellect and reason than those who experience exaggerated tone variation. This can be demonstrated in many different ways, in many different types of tasks. It can be observed among focus groups assembled to watch those exaggerated television programs. With very young children, excessive tone variation can be helpful to development, yet once these early lessons are learned, the parent must cease the excessive tone variation.

Different types of tone variations have different meanings. A very high peak often means, effectively speaking, "this is a very important fact/topic/aspect." Reaching a very low peak can be an expression of negativity or a concluding of a topic, depending on contextual information. A peak and then slightly lower tone near the end of a phrase usually means, "I am proposing an important fact/subtopic/aspect of a superior topic, but you could think about it and respond with a possible agreement or disagreement of the information or the relativity." A high peak in a phrase followed by quite a few successive low tones means, effectively speaking, "With due respect, please believe in the fact that I'm stating or the relativity that I'm proposing." Children will sometimes face obstacles when they observe an elder's use of a tone variation for a reason other than its usual meaning or when an incorrect relativity is applied:

A child in the 2000s is watching a rerun of a television show of the 1970s. She states, "Man, what in the world are they wearing? No one dresses like that."

A parent states, "Julia!" pronounced with a very exaggerated high to low peak, implying, "You are very

mistaken with this problem solving.” The father continues, "When do you think they made this show?"

“I don’t know,” the daughter states.

“This show is from the seventies. It’s old,” the parent says with exaggerated tones.

In this exchange, the parent imposes negativity and embarrassment without a good reason. He is implying that the daughter should be aware of the program’s period because this is an important thing to know. The most likely cause for his excessive tone variation is that the parent was excited that the child was watching a show that he wanted to comment about, and she presented him with a surprise connection to his knowledge of the show. The parent is teaching an important lesson; yet this means of using exaggerated tone variation is not a polite means of teaching the child that the show is of another relative period. It implies too much of an error on the part of the child when the child likely had no way of knowing when the television show was made.

With a quick drop to a low tone, a speaker is proposing a clear end to a topic, thought, or opinion, while excluding any other thoughts or opinions on the topic. Here it proposes a high importance of a mistake, and that this view is a conclusive determination. A speaker can sometimes be quite condescending with this tone variation because he or she is berating the recipients with a firm parameter placement.

This may appear as an odd, unusual exchange, yet when one human speaks with an exaggerated tone variation, no one is really able to say, “You’re breaching commonly understood etiquette of tone variations. You’re implying that it is a relatively large error occurring on the part of the recipient when it is not.” Criticizing someone for breaching etiquette is often a breach of etiquette.

Over the past ten years, news anchors and reporters on television have used poor etiquette to express emphasis of things that should not be emphasized. These adults are breaking etiquette rules by sensationalizing news in an attempt to augment ratings—resources. Since no one can easily criticize them on something such as tone variation, they have had free reign in defining their proposed relativity. Behaviorists must take a stand on how relativity should be determined by imposing the valid, educated, relativity of the larger public rather than the limited group of the station. They must criticize journalists for their excessive emphasis on news stories that have

only limited relativity. Of all people, journalists should know relativity, and they should know communication etiquette. Children should be shielded from many poor news programs because they may learn the sensationalized views of news anchors.

The next example details poor etiquette on the part of a journalist. In parenthesis, small details of gestures, tone variations, and tone volumes are noted. Terms such as “very low tones” are used to imply “very low tones compared to the average, common level for this situation.” Also, the determination of what volumes and tones and gestures are optimal is guided based upon observing the involved subject’s current and pending problems to solve, in their appropriate priority.

News stories are currently reported in this manner. When viewed in fraction-of-a-second increments, current videotape footage of news anchors can reveal this style of sensationalistic, un-relative, news reporting:

“Well, we’ve been camped out, (very low tones, slowly speaking, with deliberate and unwavering voice, implying concern on the part of the speaker) like many journalists (very low tones with a peak, and very drawn out) outside the home of Tricorp CEO, Jack Harrington (very high tone), to find out if he will speak to the media about the accusations that he has embezzled over ten million dollars (repetitive exaggerated tone variations over each dragged word of the dollar amount) from company accounts to buy his hundred-and-twenty-foot yacht, a sprawling seventy acre estate, and a large race horse farm in upstate New York. Momentarily, we will have an exclusive interview with his secretary. You will only see this interview here, on KBA news channel. Again, we are awaiting word on whether or not he will step out to greet reporters or if he will be quickly whisked off to the courthouse. . . .”

This news story has a terrible slant on it. A fair reporting of basic information is not the goal of the reporter. The motive is not a mutual need to view the problem(s) in a well-reasoned manner so as to inform and contemplate reason. The reporter is not framing this story into its relative position in comparison to other news stories. He is seeking to suggest

exaggerated, un-relative, emotions in the viewers. When the news is rather uneventful, the creators of the program cannot attract viewers, so the reporters will sometimes take measures to make less-important news more dramatic. By summoning these exaggerated emotions and having an audience which seeks this un-reasoned information, the creators of the program gain resources—they gain revenue from advertising.

In constructing an AI, we must reckon with these situations where a human's actions are in direct contradiction to the AI's developers. In constructing an AI, we must deal with the many faults of media-born suggestions of relativity. An AI is a product of a clear, step-by-step, set of rules by which it determines if a human being is presenting their information in a reasoned fashion (reasoned in relation to that species member's and the larger collection of species member's attempt to solve the distinct problems found in their environment, described later). In following this clear, formed, doctrine of rules, visible to all involved parties, the program can describe, without conjecture, the difference between a subject human's actions and the more net-positive actions of an alternative member (either simulated or real).

The very low tones at the beginning of the report imply high relativity of the program's efforts to report the serious story. The reporter is implying that there is much emotion involved with the learning and relaying of this story. Certainly, those cheated out of this large amount of money are feeling tremendous negative emotion, and this story does have great relativity among this group, and larger groups should also be concerned if this kind of behavior becomes a new or growing trend, but since there is likely little new information related to this story and since the story likely has a more limited relativity against the backdrop of all of society's problems the story should be presented with a lessened relativity—less emphasis. When the reporter mentions the dollar amount, he uses a high and low tone applied to each word to wrap up all the cause of the story into this heavily emphasized fact. This is too sensational and too carnal—in opposition to an educated relativity.

This is one of many types of slants placed on news stories. Some programs use tone variation to slant news so as to promote a political ideology, either a liberal or conservative viewpoint. Many instances can be found where news is not reported objectively and the apparent political (party affiliated) viewpoint is visible to behavioral analysts. From a point of established conversational etiquette, derived from countless case study, derived from clear unbiased analysis, discrete behaviorists will be able to

disassemble each action, each discrete state, of a news program to determine where unnatural journalism is occurring. Although these are adults proposing a particular form of etiquette as acceptable, within a larger relativity, a larger objective position, this etiquette can be shown to work in opposition to sound relative states. News should just be delivered without political bias or without a rating bias. The members of a news program must relay the information in the same manner that they would to their neighbor or a family member, from an honest position of neutrality and tempered to within naturally occurring (reduced) emotional motives.

Since there is likely little relativity to this story compared to what is implied, and there is likely little abstracted information about the alleged incident, this story does not warrant a possible "camping out," nor does it warrant such a tremendous preparation before an actual body-mode of communication, nor does it warrant the excessively implied relativity of the "exclusive interview." The following example is one of many possible next-best-responses of a reporter:

"We're continuing to follow the story of the indictment of Jack Harrington, CEO of Tricorp (video of house is shown). He is scheduled for arraignment today and many reporters have assembled outside his home. He is accused of embezzling over ten million dollars (said with normal tone variation) and whistleblowers have led investigators to information of his lavish spending spree. If he addresses the media we will report his comments as they become available. FBI officials have stated that . . .(a few more facts of story). Now we have been provided an interview with his secretary. . . .(They go directly to the interview.)"

This report would warrant a limited amount of time, and then the reporter would need to move on to other stories. The flow of stories should mirror the desired timing rules of an educated audience. They should not interrupt any stories just to go back to this subject's house when he emerges because this implies an incorrect relativity.

A television or computer exists as a third person, a third speaker, in the room. It has effects on the observers and must be accounted for by the program, by the parents, and by the educators of children. In teaching

children and teenagers of relativity, elders must teach them of the un-relative nature of many current television shows. They must learn how humans use tone variation to imply relativity, and how these television shows may imply a false relativity by excessive tone variations and excessive volumes.

Another vital conversational rule is topic timing. When speaking of a topic, a speaker must gauge the relative amount of time to be spent on a topic. Parents reveal this rule to children when they drop to a conclusive low tone when speaking of a topic before abruptly speaking of a different topic. Other telltale signs may apply. Topic timing is related to children learning observational skills. People give signals as to when they will wish to move on to a new topic. Listening and observing the demeanor of other people is, at the least, half of communication.

This example is an adult telling a story with un-relative subtopics and sub-facts. He is also completely unaware of timing etiquette:

"Did I tell you about when we went to look at that car? I was about to pass by that car lot at the end of the street because I've looked in there a few times before and I didn't see anything I liked. My wife told me she saw a nice brown Suburban, so I turned around and we pulled in. (small pause) This salesman comes out and he starts to give me a sales pitch and I'm like, 'give me a break.' I kept cutting him off every time he said something. I started to look it over and it has everything. A little TV. Removable seats. The back actually had like a modified cooler built in. Whoever had it last did a good job of modifying it. Real professional job. I kept trying to get the guy down to fifteen. He wanted eighteen. I'm going back again tomorrow."

This may seem like a fictitious example of a person telling a story, but it is quite common for the speaker of a story to not be aware of their own timing. This person might notice this story as being too long if someone else were telling it, while not knowing that he speaks in the same manner. People will often recognize a breach of etiquette when it comes to others speaking, yet their own etiquette breaches go unnoticed. This response carries too many details about the topic, and any empowerment gained from telling it is false

—a product of the speaker’s embellished perception. This is the result of a childhood in which elders did not teach him of topic timing.

Timing etiquette is probably the most vital rule that a child could learn other than the rules of fair gain because it leads to an understanding of a relativity of problem solving. A young child’s failure to learn the rudimentary elements of topic timing can start him or her down a difficult path where a true relativity becomes elusive. An adult’s breach of this conversational etiquette bespeaks a character that has not learned to prioritize and place time limits on problem solving. Such a character often lacks the observational skills needed to detect the problems of others, which is needed to gain some level of mutual admiration with peers. Humans have play-problems, general-problems, and vital-problems; and one could easily be caught up on a vice of some sort if unaware of the need to prioritize. Topic timing is a rule in self-discipline that prevents some of the most difficult mental ailments of not fitting in with society.

Here is another example of excessive time being spent on a topic. Although the author can only propose a rough probability that too much time is being spent on a single topic, an AI can produce a specific, probable amount of time based on society’s overall needs. This is achieved by an extensive mapping of human behavior and allocation of many case studies:

“I greatly appreciate you helping me out with bringing this flat tire down to the shop. I would have had to wait a long time and miss work. Really, if you ever need any favor of me just ask,” Luis tells his friend.

This series of phrases appears to overemphasize the emotion of gratitude for providing resources. Most humans would, if the tire fixing is reasonably relative, assist another human in solving this problem. The speaker feels that he should provide an immeasurable amount of gratitude while society dictates the use of one or two phrases to show a normal, probable amount of gratitude. A more reasonable response might be "I greatly appreciate this (very low tones). I would have been stuck."

This human’s application of too much emotion (societal-bonding-empowerment) to this particular interaction and the subtopic of “the favor” is likely a result of being taught to reiterate gratitude when receiving assistance with problems. This character could have also failed to learn the relativity of topics or topic timing, then he could have struggled to gain acceptance

among peers, and now he compensates by applying excessive empathy while in social interaction. The speaker is reinforcing a societal bond, an important part of social interaction; yet emotions must have levels and limitations. Emotions are integral to societal bonding, emotions aid in acquiring resources, and emotions give humans a sense of self; however, too much indulgence in emotion leads to a neglect of informational/resourceful problem solving. This speaker is likely unaware of the competitive nature of some human interaction, such as bargaining. He is likely to regard many common problems as having too many informational steps, or he may feel that the multi-tasking of informational problems is excessive. Just as a lack of empathy can cause a blind spot in comprehension, excessive empathy can cause a blind spot in comprehension.

In this example, relativity is not being applied to conversational problem solving with both the choice and the timing of topics:

Alice and Mark have been dating for about three weeks. She is visiting his house to spend time with him, watch television, etc. He answers the door to greet her. As they greet, she comes in and they both settle on the couch.

“Hi,” she says.

“Hello,” he says in drawn out tones with long arcing tone variation; and with accompanying facial expressions implying, whimsically, “What mischief are you up to with the problems that you are trying to solve? I have problems to solve of an emotional nature. Maybe we both can solve them together.”

“How was your day?” she says. Despite their detailed acquaintance, she uses tone variations that are common of humans of limited acquaintance. The tones are exaggerated, exhibiting excessive emotion.

“Pretty good, I just worked, ran a few errands, went to the store,” he replies with tone variations that go successively lower. Tones are normal, relative.

“Oh, so what’d you buy me?” she jokes.

“I just got a little bit of cleaning supplies. Bought a few things for fixing the blinds. I thought I’d order a pizza, if you want,” he states. The first two phrases have

a very quick decrease in tones across a very quick series of words.

Sure, that's fine, she replies, then pauses, "So did you, ever find out what was making the noise in your car?"

"No, I still have to take it to the dealer," he says. "So what did you do today?"

"Nothing, just worked. I came home and talked to my son on the phone. He says it's getting cold up there. He doesn't know if it's going to snow or not," she replies.

"Yeah, he's going to have to stay in if a snow storm hits. It's not easy to drive," he comments.

"Yeah. Then I was going to stop by my friend's house, but she called and said she was going to see her new guy, so I thought I'd see my guy. " She reaches a peaking tone on the end, exhibiting positive imposition.

"Well, that's nice of you," he says and then they have a small pause. "Um, if you want, you can change the channel or something. I wasn't really watching this."

"Okay," She proceeds to flip through the channels. She finds her favorite show for the time of day.

"Yeah, my son tells me that his girlfriend is going to go away and he's very sad. She's going to college. I tell him that she's got to do what's right. He may see her after college or something."

"Yeah," he says.

"He's going to go to college next year. He doesn't know if he's going to the same college. I want him to try to get the scholarship for a bigger university or something," she says.

"What college is she going off to?" he asks.

"I don't know. I just want him to go someplace nice. He's too young to be in love, anyway," she says.

"Yeah," he says, as he grabs books off of the coffee table to put away in another room. He returns to the couch.

“At one time, he got a visit from some people, administrators or something, from the University of Connecticut,” she states.

“Yeah. (pause) So what’d they want him for, sports scholarship?” he asks.

“Nooo, academic.” She sustains the tone on “no” for a long time, politely implying that he is quite mistaken with his assumption that the scholarship was for sports. “He has only made one B in all of high school,” she states. The words “only made one” are stated with the same high tone before rising to a slightly higher tone at the beginning of “B” and ending the same word with a lower tone, implying the importance of her son’s achievements.

“That’s pretty good,” he states, and pauses.

“When he moved away with his father, I told him to keep up his school work, or else, and he did. I told him if he doesn’t do good, I’ll wring his neck . . . He was always best at math,” she proclaims.

Mark nods his head. He looks to the television to see what is on. She has changed the channel to an entertainment news program.

“Look at that house!” she says.

“Yeah,” he replies.

“Man, I want a waterfall like that in my front yard,” she comments.

“I want the car,” he says.

“I told my father that I’m going to finish school myself. I only need to take a few more credits, about one more year,” she states.

When members are in greeting-mode, "small-talk" or problem solving with little resources/information is very common. Greeting mode has a societal-imposed time limit of about three or four phrases per person, per interaction. If someone happens to have a greeting-mode-like topic which could also double as a body-mode-like topic, then it may tie up more time, or possibly assist in a transition between the two modes. Here, Alice begins a

non-informational and highly emotional greeting, and she continues with this style of communication for an extensive period of time.

When she asks, “How was your day?” the excessive tone variation bespeaks a character that does not know of the relativity of informational/resource problem solving. For her, this tone variation is necessary to emphasize the emotional aspects of life. She is saying, in effect, “We should relish emotions as much as we can. The reassurance of a societal bond is important,” while not giving consideration to a society-imposed relativity. A common relative quantity of tone variation across this phrase, with this contextual problem solving, does exist, and an AI could provide a reasonable accurate number to describe the level of variation.

When he speaks of his errands, he is proposing a conclusion to greeting mode. This is a statement of almost pure information, with proper relativity being applied to it.

She then asks, “Oh, so what’d you buy me?”—a clichéd response. She could have delivered this question in a reasonable, non-clichéd manner, if the tones were of a normal variance while the whole phrase is undertoned. The “Oh” should be downplayed with undertones. Yet to convey a proper relativity of this response, she would need to make latter statements that shift out of greeting mode and take up more informational topics. Body mode style topics would need to take precedence in the later responses.

“I just got a little bit of cleaning supplies,” is a response on his part that strongly urges her to change to some kind of relevant, relative topic. The tone variations decrease quickly over quickly stated words, which is a common way of hinting that a topic, or argument, or mode of conversation should be brought to a conclusion.

When she asks about his car, she finally shifts to a more informational topic, yet her reason for speaking of the topic is for social empowerment—bonding. The connection between her relevant problems and her knowing of the status on the car is likely moot. In observing this scene and compiling a profile on her character so far, an AI would likely conclude that this fact is too many steps into an informational problem for her to patiently follow. The AI would apply a definition of this response that included only an attempt at social empowerment, as opposed to resource/informational empowerment, unless she proves a resource connection with latter responses.

Her next response to his asking what she did during the day begins with the word, “Nothing.” The dictionary definition is not implied with this word. It has a commonly understood, implied meaning of, “Nothing of relative

importance.” This would be a relatively good next-best-response. It would not be clichéd, unless it is overused by a single character, because this response solves a reoccurring natural selection problem of exhibiting a respectful amount of personal, relative empowerment. She then speaks of her son, a relevant topic that is due some attention.

After he responds, she speaks of the fact that she was about to visit a friend but chose to visit him instead. This response is of too much irrelevant information. Like the previous two examples of subjects spending excessive time on topics, Alice provides too much information on a single topic.

She is offered the opportunity to change the channel and she accepts. The time is ripe for entering into the body-mode of the conversation, yet she is not likely to sit idle and wait for a prominent informational topic to come into thought. She continues with the facts associated with the subtopic of her “son,” however, the information under this topic cannot be linked with any relevant informational subtopic/sub-problem other than those directly encountered by her son. She is basically relaying the empowerment quests and associated problems of her family member without regard to relativity. Even though this bond between a mother and a son is a vital family bond, even though this bond must be reiterated within a family group, even though extensive thought processes and emotional sensations must reinforce this bond, and even though this bond must perpetuate through the generations because the human race would perish without it, this speaker is spending too much time on this topic. This response is too far removed from an informational/resource problem. There are times when social bonding topics should cease, and academic/informational/resourceful problem solving should begin.

In nature, mammals must keep social emotions in check. An elder wolf will feel a strong desire to express contentment to its offspring and it will express nurturing emotions with passion; yet if the pup receives too much positive reinforcement, the vital life form problems of observing specific sounds, observing specific smells, and observing specific movement and shapes will not be learned. If this positive socializing became a trend, the wolf population could suffer. Natural selection dictates a level of emotion and a level of dwell time for any particular experience of life. Mammals must keep their emotional, societal bonding in check.

Societal bonds are vital; however, learning the skills needed to solve the problems of natural selection (informational/resourceful problems) is an absolute necessity. And a success at natural selection only happens if the

right balance of social and non-social behaviors occurs with an individual of the species. Many mammalian problems are of extensive individual stepped problems that must be learned by individuals; they must be networked from parent to offspring within the time allotted to solve the given environmental tests. Human problems require extensive knowledge of detailed informational topics and the reasoning to properly use this information; this must be networked from parent to offspring within the time allotted to solve our environmental tests (and some of those tests have serious consequences). Too much time being spent with emotion-laden topics, topics that lack information, puts an individual at a disadvantage when they seek to solve their personal environmental tests and it also puts the species at a disadvantage when that species is confronted with serious environmental tests.

The simple act of patiently observing information to determine if it assists in a resource problem is a necessary part of the learning process for children. Children will often want to rush through the steps of a problem or ignore them enacting a more-carnal, more emotional, less-informational, response. And they want to drift away from the problem and seek to engage a topic that interests them. Adults who come from childhoods where information-based concepts are not explored fall into this mode of conversation. Males might wish to engage in more exciting, active, socially-sexual, or socially empowering conversation. And sometimes this means intimidation or violence. Such males would show a preference for movies and television programs that portray clichéd crime fighters who engage in basic fist fights, gun fights, and car chases with cars that explode when crashing. Males who observe sexual experiences without any regard for the need of family structures are also being carnal (if the topics of this lifestyle are too imposing in conversations). For females, being carnal could mean an obsession with courtship-ritual problem solving and/or an obsession with empowerment-tracking communications. They may also wish an excessively copasetic world to be exhibited during the child-rearing process. Such members could show an attraction to movies that portray clichéd love stories and violence-free children's stories. These carnal topics have a purpose and a place, yet these carnal subjects must yield to the relativity of solving more academic/informational/resourceful problems. In building the learning structure within the conscience of a child, a parent must try to abstract beyond these carnal desires. Topic timing must be observed with these social and limited-scope resource problems.

When an AI records a human response, it determines whether that response was ethical, neutral, or unethical. The AI determines whether the response was positively or negatively empowering to the speaker (and/or the recipients). The AI determines whether the response is more resource based or of a un-resourceful societal bonding. And the AI determines whether or not, given the millions of case studies observed, this conversational topic assists the species in solving a natural selection problem. The AI would be able to determine an exact quantity of time that a human should spend on a societal bonding topic, and this time period would be indicative of the need to solve the many sub-problems of natural selection.

Here is an example of a male who appears to be genetically predisposed to rushing through thought. His responses are carnal; he does not view any abstraction above and beyond empowerment-brandishing as being relevant.

Eric is visiting a friend, Tom. Tom lives with his girlfriend, who is out shopping. Eric comes in the door to greet Tom, “Hey, What’s up man?” He states this with loud volume, with a strong accent on “up”, implying a bravado of being an empowered member of a socially active sub-culture.

“Not too much. What’s up with you? It’s been a while,” Tom replies. The statements are of slightly higher-than-normal tones and volume, implying excitement.

“You know, just working. Trying to maintain. You know I work for that one water company, delivering coolers. Yeah, it’s pretty cool. So what’s up with you, how’s your girl?” Eric says, with higher than normal volume and excessive tone variation. The second “know” is accented heavily—dragged, with a tone variation.

“She’s fine, just working and stuff. She’s out shopping right now,” Tom replies.

“Good, good, so how about your brother? What’s he doing? Still in college?” Eric says, as he sits down on the couch.

“He’s alright. He settled down with this one girl,” Tom replies.

“So what are you doing? You still doing the construction, right?” Eric asks.

“Yeah, the same old same old. Been working some long hours. You still living in those same apartments?” Tom asks.

“Nah, nah, me and my girl moved down to Crystal Lakes. We have a little townhome over there,” Eric replies.

“Cool, cool,” Tom says with a small pause. “So do you ever get caught up with any of the old gang, Chris, or Grady, or Rob?”

“Ahh, my boy Rob, me and him hang out every so often. The other guys, I don’t see too much. You know who I been tight with is Jimmy Wilcox. We hook up and go out and cook out at the park and stuff. Yeah, he’s married, got two little girls. You ought to come out there some time. Man, we got the hook up. Rob’s the chef. Boy, he can cook up some chicken,” Eric states, continuing with exaggerated tones.

“Yeah, I might get out there some time. I haven’t seen Jim in probably seven, eight years,” Tom replies

“I still see you’re driving that one car. Whatever happened to that one Camaro that you had?” Eric asks.

“I sold it,” Tom says.

“Man, that thing was nice. You should have told me. I would have bought it,” Eric says.

“Yeah, I maybe ragged it out too much. I sold it cause I know that it was just going to need more and more repairs.” Tom’s eyes glance at the television, following the basketball game that is on.

“What you watching? Duke and . . . who’s that?” Eric asks.

“Villanova . . . I just started watching it. Duke’s got to watch it. They lost the last two games,” Tom replies.

“They’re like number one, right?” Eric asks.

“No, they’re number three,” Tom states.

“Yeah, not any more, after that one loss,” Eric says quickly with quick down tones.

They continue to talk about a few various things. Then Tom says, “Hey, pardon me for a moment, I have to check on a roast we’re cooking. Are you going to stay for dinner or what?”

“Nah, nah, I just stopped in to see what’s up. I want to hang around until my old lady gets off of work. I have to pick her up,” Eric states.

“Sure,” Tom says. They are quiet for about ten seconds.

Then Eric gets up from his seat, looks around and talks, “Man, you got your house hooked up nice.”

While checking the food, Tom is glancing at the television. Just as Eric is near the end of his statement, Tom speaks in reference to the basketball game, “No, no, boooaaahh, he got denied!” The “i” and the “ed” of denied are pronounced with sustained, clearly delineated, tones.

“Aaah, you’re for Duke man, huh.” Eric accents and raises the tone of “huh.” He continues with exaggerated tones, “Who do you like?”

“I really like UNC, but Duke’s alright. Their forwards need to get busy though,” Tom states.

They continue to shift through topics.

With an excessive variance of tones and an excessive volume, Eric’s style of greeting urges recipients to join his conversations with the same excited demeanor that he projects. Eric’s first question is asking, effectively, “What is the general nature of your being? Are you, and have you been, empowered?” Yet the question’s main purpose is to share the excited social exuberance of the speaker with the recipient. Eric’s tone on “up” is raised to such a high peak that it details his belief that everyone should be living life to the fullest—aggressively solving life’s more carnal problems. Tom is placed in a position where he must treat this chosen topic with high relativity. And if he wishes to downplay the topic and move to more resourceful communication, Tom must do it with statements much later in the body mode of conversation.

Tom responds normally to Eric's greeting. In simply solving a prompted-response problem, a participant will likely not be clichéd, or carnal, or of any other poor etiquette because he or she is solving a necessary, reoccurring life form problem of enacting good will to others during a greeting.

They continue through a few responses.

When Eric states the phrase, "Trying to maintain," he is reiterating a response that has been produced and reverberated throughout a society. Like many cultured responses, this phrase is viable for a limited time before it becomes clichéd. The response is a more trendy rather than neutral. It is a phrase that fits into a step of an important reoccurring problem. "Maintain" is a word that describes what is often referred to as a "struggle," which is often in reference to either the adversity of an environment . (The "struggle" is often an exaggeration.)

In defining this phrase, an AI would quickly observe the statistics—the numerous incidents where it has recorded and simulated humans using this phrase—to determine the level of cliché being applied by the educated members of society and other subgroups of a society. Because educated recipients seek to keep conversations resourceful, attention would have to be given to the particular abstracted step that the phrase satisfies to determine the validity of the reoccurring problem. Let us say that the AI counted 22 times that this phrase was used over a seven year period, and during the last six iterations, seven real human recipients and 85 simulated recipients slowly decreased in the amount of status that they granted the speaker. From these factors, and other precise factors, the AI could conclude that the phrase is, figuratively speaking, 52 percent cliché, 87 percent carnal, and 22 percent relative—a poor next-best-response.

Eric asks about Tom's brother. A reference to a mutually acquainted peer or, in this case, a family member, is an excellent means of reinforcing a societal bond. His repeating of excessive tone variations is un-relative due to being too far removed from a mindset of resourceful problem solving; however, this response is valid in referencing an ongoing common problem of renewing acquaintances.

They continue to speak of many mutual societal bonds with other friends, solving a valid problem of observing the whereabouts and wellbeing of these mutual friends. While in greeting mode, people often look to address previously appointed problems, such as buying an item, moving from one location or another, societal bonds, etc. In this case, the two greeting people

have not been in communication for some time, so they are accessing the main problem of restoring the subtopics associated with societal bonds.

Through all of Eric's responses, he remains somewhat relative, yet it is apparent that he wishes not to shift toward informational problems. He speaks of Tom's old car—more of an empowerment tracking problem than an informational problem. He speaks of the basketball game, yet he does not dwell on it for any length of time. The excited demeanor that he exhibits not only prohibits others to break his imposed etiquette and topics, but he also cannot easily transition out of this demeanor. Just as with the previous scene involving the character of Alice, this exchange between these two characters is likely to never arrive at a true, informational-relative body mode.

Eric is likely what younger generations would consider a relative character. Because Eric is relative to his group, he is solving the problems that will assist him in gaining status within the group. Females may see him as attractive, and wish to enact (or, at the least, simulate) the courtship ritual. However, this younger generation would only be a subgroup of the whole. And they would certainly be an un-relative subgroup to what the AI would consider as its choice for determining relativity.

The AI's choice for relativity would be the relativity engaged and defined by the educated, reasoned, civilized free-people of the world—people who talk in a more informational demeanor while applying proper emotions at proper times while observing all of the species' problems in prioritized order. The AI would not cater to the emotional needs of the Eric or Alice. People do not necessarily need to aspire to become scholars, college professors, rocket scientists, physicists, or bio-engineers, but they must allude to the relativity of those more educated members of society. People do not necessarily need an ability to work through many steps in the informational problems addressed by these professions; yet throughout a person's first twenty years of development, elders must impose negative emotion when a minor's responses are devoid of information for extended periods.

Peripheral Problem Solving

If a life form's action does not fall under the category of consumption or reproduction the state has only two other possible categories. It could be either a peripheral action, solving a peripheral problem, or an ambiguous, random action, not likely to be repeated in genetic code. To determine if a state is peripheral, if it has an apparent repeated occurrence in the genome, a behaviorist or an AI would have compare many similar behaviors and attempt to determine the origins of each distinct errant motive.

Consider the avoidance of danger. To run from an bear attack, to take care not to step in front of a train, or to eat healthy foods are obvious actions and decisions to those subjects experiencing the events. They may have little explanation to observers other than the result of fear or caution. But the avoidance of a fatal event, whether it is a microscopic organism fleeing a predator or a human making a health food choice, is directly attributable to an ancient ancestor developing and preserving the genetic trait of evading danger.

At a certain point in the past, a microorganism performed the first instance of a member moving away from a dangerous position. By sensing a danger and flexing a flagellum or cilia the organism is solving its consumption and reproduction problems by simply surviving the event, existing for a chance to consume or reproduce at a later time. A mutation that performs this act writes this cause and effect into code because other members of the species fail to evade the danger. Although many instances of this random event occur without recording the behavior genetically, once the behavior is recorded into the DNA it becomes a new peripheral action of the species. A peripheral trait has the distinct quality of resulting from a negative event occurring to those species members failing to improve their reproduction chances.

The surviving mutations become the norm and then latter mutations work to modify the original behavior. The flagella may turn the organism abruptly to avoid a sensed predator. A sudden change in movement is a derivative of the initial peripheral act of evading danger. A series of sudden movements would be a further modification of the same peripheral trait. Over generations, such an act would soon involve the additional sensing of conditions, adding to the complexity of the trait. At every step, natural selection eliminates those species members that do not improve the

peripheral action by denying them the ability to reproduce. The successful mutations both compete with and displace the less successful mutations.

As additional sensory perception became available, such as the rudimentary sense of sight, life began to form the spatial relations of predators and surroundings. An animal could size a predator and a crevice to determine if evasion is possible by sheltering. By swimming into a crevice the organism writes a new dynamic of the evasion trait into its genetic code. This behavioral trait, spanning many species over millions of years, could lead a prey of one species to become an ambush predator of another; an action leads to both a peripheral solution and a consumption solution. From an original movement, from a chemical reaction of a protein pump, from a chemical reaction derived from a DNA molecule, life developed a highly complex nervous system capable of processing vast collections of information.

From peripheral traits and peripheral actions species derived peripheral goals. A peripheral goal, such as a hermit crab fastening pieces of coral onto its shell, is so distinct from the natural selection problem that it may have no clear visible benefit to the organism enacting the trait. The hermit crab is likely unaware that he is camouflaging, he just derives satisfaction from finding an interesting piece of coral. By comparison, a hermit crab will unlikely pick up a coral on the left and move it to the right because there is no benefit of such an action. Arbitrary movements have almost no reason to appear in genetic code. Another example of this type of peripheral goal is when a lizard, or an insect, or a squirrel pauses in the middle of travel from one location to another. These broken movements are not necessarily pensive acts of evading a predator, but they are traits originating, mostly, from the pure chance of mutations which survived by making paused movements.

Peripheral goals direct peripheral actions to assist a species in much higher levels of complex and peculiar solutions. After eating a poisonous sea anemone one species of sea cucumber sequesters the ingested poison into the ends of its brightly colored appendages. The sea cucumber will swim upward, performing an extravagant dance, appearing to tempt predators to eat them. What might cause the dance? Would not the coloring and the poison tips be satisfaction enough? The dance does not assist the animal in consumption or reproduction, it does not assist an individual in survival, and it does not appear to be a random act. Behaviorists might deduce that this is a peripheral act, but the rule for defining an action as peripheral is to make a

clear axiom of when the species, or previous species, began the peripheral act and how latter generations modified the behavior.

First, the sea cucumber and sea anemone relationship developed. By tasting bad, some sea cucumbers would perish to allow other like members to escape and pass on their similar genetic code. Then it would appear that certain mutations would choose, randomly, to be more visible by possible swimming upward and, in turn, those collections of the species began outperforming (surviving to reproduce) other species members. Instead of missing the possible food source a predator eats the member, becomes sick, and learns to not eat such animals sooner rather than later. The subject is eliminated, but members with similar behavioral traits now have the benefit of surviving because of the added step of increasing visibility. With a side to side movement, the dance, another step of peripheral modification is added further modifying the behavior of predators.

The dance makes the sea cucumber more visible and those dancing mutations, by surviving, continue to dictate the genetic direction of the species. When compared to mutations that do not dance it is apparent that survival is more prevalent among the dancing mutation. In addition to modifying predator's behavior, the act of moving about likely helped the sea cucumber to relocate near its next mate or food source. The dance appears random, but by carefully forming theories about the progression of the peripheral act through the genetic code a behaviorist can determine that it is not random but a product of natural selection. It becomes a peripheral goal of the species, possibly driven by emotional sensations, to perform a better, more visible, dance.

An AI trying to define the sea cucumber's actions might first look to see if the action precedes a consumption event. Since it follows a consumption event this would tentatively rule out the actions as falling into the consumption category. It would see if the actions precede a reproduction event and any possible link to that category. After ruling out reproduction it would tentatively define it as a peripheral action. Now the AI must work backward to discover additional clues to verify it as solving some peripheral goal. Finding other species members that behave the same would lead it to simulating the case studies of the natural selection problem. Can such a behavior provide genetic preference to some species members? Could the trait have a history that leads back to the kernel of a precedent peripheral action? It would be a daunting task, but behaviorist would have to infuse the

AI's cognition with the means of following the behavior back through the genealogy of the species.

The sea cucumber is possible learning of its own agility, practicing a method for evading a predator at a later moment. But this type of peripheral action would be unlikely because such practice would need to be in a protected area similar to when a lion cub practices pouncing while near a parent. Away from safety, a lion cub is likely motionless. In consideration of the result of a predator's attack, the poisoning of a predator and the benefits to the surviving sea cucumbers, a behaviorist could conclude that this action developed from the evasion trait and its purpose is to modify the predator's behavior. Just as a human arrives at this tentative conclusion by some imperfect method, the AI would play through thousands of cause and effect scenarios to come to a similar conclusion. The difference between the two approaches is that the AI would be quite methodical in how it tries to figure out how a life form's actions are connected to a either/and/or consumption, reproduction, or peripheral problem.

The AI must rely on this tentative theoretical model for further discoveries. The AI does not have precedent species members to study. But with the firm understanding of Common Descent and a firm understanding that all actions of a life form must fall under three specific categories it would not need to have a complete factual understanding of the sea cucumber. Its conclusions would not be critical to serious human problem solving and such conclusions would be tested by future discoveries of the incremental genetic development of this organism.

The AI is a human tool, solving human problems. The reason it might study sea cucumbers is because a biologist or a school teacher or a curious human set it to this task. It may be fairly autonomous in its studies, anticipating that a human might ask it what it learned during a casual conversation or that it must generally broaden its knowledge in anticipation of solving serious human problems that may come up in the future. Just as a human would need to be curious of such things in order to move to study this animal, the AI must have a human reason to study this animal. Because the AI's pseudo conscience is within the parameters of a human conscience it can develop a firm, pliable, practical understanding of a sea cucumber that will not fail the test of a human.

Chimpanzees dance. Juvenile chimpanzees frolic, pirouette, swing, flip, and perform many other peripheral acts. Unlike the sea cucumber, a chimpanzee's dance is the result of a broad intelligence directing them

toward an emotion/sensation of contentment. The juveniles of earlier primates, and much earlier mammals, began playing for an emotional goal as a way of practicing the body movements and decision making needed later in serious situations as adults. Although far removed from the mortality problem, this banter is a resource of knowledge for their latter solutions to resources, mates, and the evasion of predators.

With the indulgence of peripheral acts for an emotional goal the various primate species achieved broad and complex routes to solving their resource problems. From the many forms of using sticks for tools and the many evolved techniques of fishing for termites primates not only learn to poke holes with fashioned tools but they learn to look for tools to use to solve other tool problems. A rock might not be so good for pounding open a fruit but another rock may be just right. Multiple peripheral steps lead to conclusions to peripheral problems outside the actual resource problem. A primate may find a reason to collect and play with a few choice rocks or sticks to solve the problems of a little game with those items long before an actual resource problem is attempted.

As modern humans displaced other primates, improved peripheral behaviors replaced older methods of acquiring resources. Although the complexities are immense and the building of incremental steps within models may be daunting, behaviorists must maintain that all observed, repetitive, peripheral states are the product of distinct incremental improvements in the human genome. All sustained peripheral traits are connected to specific genetic sequences. Otherwise, they are random and are not supported by genetic sequences.

New peripheral acts, forming new genetic code, test the field of random acts for a distant means of solving resource problems. Whether it is the first instance of an organism reacting to danger or a new brush stroke on an abstract painting, these new acts form the highest tier of peripheral behavior. Beyond these reoccurring acts are truly random acts that are not featured in genetic code. An improvement upon an organism's linear evasion of a predator might be a turn or a change in speed. An improvement upon painting might be a new set of innovative, thoughtful shapes. The primordial turn and the new shapes form a new tier, which may fail to develop further if there is no benefit to the species. In some instances, when a species is afforded extra protection from danger, time is granted to explore many new

acts at this highest tier of thought, such as when a poisonous sea cucumber dances or when a bird performs an odd dance to attract a mate.

With some species, the mere act of testing of the highest peripheral tier became another measurable peripheral trait. And with all peripheral actions this propensity for testing random acts for value would have to assist the animal in solving their resource problems. If it is not advantageous to expend energy on this testing, the propensity will wane. An organism attempting many turns and movements through crevices exemplifies a measured propensity for peripheral acts. It may be that their propensity only exists for a particular category such as evasion, while not occurring in other subordinate problem solving. Peripheral propensity is the most notable when a member practices those higher tier actions during idle time, and these actions are often driven by emotional goals. If fish are observed in a meaningless game of tag, they are testing movements that might later be used for evasion. A lion cub's playful romp is building upon peripheral and resourceful traits. A juvenile chimp's pirouetting demonstrates their high level propensity for peripheral problem solving, being driven by several possible emotional goals such as excitement, humor, eagerness, envy, and contentment.

The act of mimicry is peripheral trait. Likely originating by the emotional goal of envy, a primate will copy, learn, and network the information collected from another primate. A marine seal learning to use a rock for pounding open food is a slow process, possible spanning thousands of years while a chimpanzee's mimicry shortens the development time of such tasks and adds a new dynamic to a species ability to develop new peripheral processes. A single primate learning to pound open a nut could quickly, inadvertently, teach this peripheral/consumptive behavior to another, and another, and so forth. Over the course of a chimpanzee's lifetime a new peripheral act could travel through the whole species.

A human's admiration of music is a peripheral act, an extension of the task of communicating emotional/social thoughts.

The first sounds communicated between land animals were likely the slapping of water or rustling of foliage, sounds serving to thwart a predator or to communicate a thought to another species member. Organs developed in respiratory systems to capitalize on this means of transferring information. After a slow process of improvement, a basic vocalization gave way to more informative tone variations. An early reptile may have behaved in a fashion

similar to modern birds, expressing a variety of tones with a grouped, general meaning of, “Stay away,” or “Follow me,” or “This is my food!”

The tones or tones variations whistled by birds may not always carry specific meanings. The most prominent early use of recognizable patterns is, likely, to help species members identify other members. By solving a social problem, a problem of connecting, a common pattern or style of tones helped the resources of an individual or smaller group to be shared with a larger group. From the first steps of creating a social bond, certain tones or patterns gained meanings within the context of being social. Just as a bee may have a patterned movement to describe how to locate food, birds developed collections of tones and tone styles to signify certain aspects of locating food and attracting a mate. The great variety of tones used in courtship expressed a breadth of knowledge, survivability, adaptability, and a propensity for peripheral problem solving.

A canine’s bark could exhibit aggression, excitement, or joy. A whimper might represent pain, sadness, or an assertion of a subservient position in a pack. A wolf’s howl, possibly a morphing of a bark and a whimper is a vocalization for assembling the pack, locating members, and long distance communication, but the emotional nature of a howl provides wolves with an extraordinary measure of bonding and mutual sentiment. A howl revels in an intangible emotional state. A howl bespeaks the full collection of shared experiences, the pack’s trials and tribulations, the pack’s successes and failures. A howl nurtures loyalty among members; the remembrance of howling sessions drives wolves to perfection when performing pack duties.

Early humans applied different meanings to different tonal patterns as rudimentary language developed. At a certain point these communications transformed into something different; members found value in rhythmic patterns. Harmonic and melodious vocalizations became a representation of emotional states. In addition to patterned emotional vocalizations, early man apparently explored percussion, using sticks to effect melodic patterns. Like a wolf’s howl, this rudimentary music could only be maintained in genetic code if it assisted members in solving resource problems. The social and emotional connections between members would be the first notable value of this behavior. In remembrance of their tribal songs and dances, a member sought to assist the group in their mutual resource goals.

The secondary value of music would be in the building of framework for other similar trains of thoughts in other parallel categories. When hearing music a child may imagine a hunter telling the rest of the tribe of an eventful

campaign. Children would listen with amazement as the hunter reaches high and low tones with vigor during his story. Suspense is added with the dwelling among low tones. A gradual increase and meandering through upper level tones draw the listener's into the peaks and valleys of the tale. A climax occurs with a spike in volumes and tones. And a subject ending low tone concludes the story (in most cases). Other tribe members must be attentive and learn of these events.

Conversations ebb and flow. Seasons ebb and flow. Animals migrate. River valleys flood regularly. Common repeated patterns occur in many forms, but a member's admiration of music benefits them the most in warfare were natural selection among groups eliminates those who do not have high peripheral propensity. The rhythmic actions of hand to hand combat, the continuity of decisions during pitched battles, the timing of attacks, are all feats accomplished with the aid of musical and mathematical endeavors of the combatant populations. The disciplines learned in applying sounds to a timed routine improved those similar actions during warfare; one must follow through and act in an instance to effect an outcome. The roles of different members in a chorus mirror the roles of different members in an attack or a defense. A howl and a musical composition are distant peripheral actions that apply themselves at the most opportune moments during mortal struggles.

Dreams are peripheral. Somewhere in the distant past animals did not dream during sleep, but it appears that the random trains of thought began to form as an extension of the disordered thoughts occurring during the transition to sleep. These random thoughts of an unconscious state normally form as puns and often connect thoughts that rarely get connected in reality. Dreams will often pivot on a pun-like connection. The dual meaning of an action is a learning experience for the dreamer providing them with a more abstract means of viewing a problem. The odd connections improve peripheral propensity.

Consider the tea party of the Mad Hatter. The Hatter has tea at 6:00 and it's always six o'clock. Time, referred to as "Him," halts at 6:00 because of the Queen's sentencing him to death for "murdering time." This simulation of a dream state suggests how one might look at time in some form other than linear. It suggests anthropomorphic views not only of animals but the motion of time. The unanswerable riddles of the party suggest concepts that lie beyond the known world. In reality, one must be practical and pragmatic,

but in dreams the mind can wander without caution and test the higher tiers of peripheral behavior.

The indulgence in art is a peripheral trait. “Is it art?” was the subject of two news stories in the 1990s. Each time this story aired, it covered art shows that had peculiar pieces of art. The story questioned whether the items were art or not. One item was just a piece of drywall with a partial cut going through it. Another piece was two light bulbs propped up against two bricks. The program showed how workers removed the two bricks and bulbs from a box and displayed them according to a picture provided by the artist who created the piece. After switching around the objects a few times, the workers placed them in what they believed was the correct position. The artist was not there.

Critics of art might feel that artwork must have a deep meaning behind it. But what if the meaning is so deep that it cannot be found? The journalist looked for the deep meaning behind some of these works with little luck. It is important for art to be recognized as art by a substantial number of educated people, otherwise it is ambiguous. A meaning must be found. If a construction worker were to place some left over items in a pile, it would not likely to be considered art, despite its resemblance to the works of these art shows, because the meaning is not recognized by a society or the contemporaries of the genre.

So would the pieces at these art shows be art? Although it may seem as if there is no underlying meaning behind these pieces of art, the fact is that the artists recognize the befuddling ambiguity as appropriate for this particular time, at these two particular art shows. These works are art because they were made by artists with the deep underlying meaning of not having a meaning—that is the meaning. It is not likely that these pieces of art will be in fashion at any other time because detractors will say, in essence, “That’s been done before. We need to return to works of art that have a little more meaning and less ambiguity.”

At one time, the image of the Virgin Mary was portrayed in cow dung. Despite the artist’s disrespect for the religion of others, credence must be given to this subgroup’s creation of an opposing view of a larger group; this is a valid, timed piece. In this case, an opposing view of the art was presented, and with good reason, the public shunned the art and reduced the status of the artist. A series of male nude photographs came under scrutiny when a photographer proposed the images as art. Although the purpose of the

artwork was also, likely, to promote an acceptance of alternative lifestyles, it is art— another valid, timed piece. And the repeating of the prominence of the statement of this art is not likely. An artist rendered an award winning painting of a Palestinian suicide bomber strapped with explosives. Although the attacking of civilians or the opposing military force without a formal declaration of war (or an understood de facto state of war) is one the most heinous atrocities, an artistic depiction of an unethical human, preparing for an unethical act, would be another valid, timed piece. A repeat of any of these pieces of art would be inappropriate because such timed responses are clichéd and of little to no use in the future. These pieces made bold, timed statements to coincide with their present culture. Although some tastefulness should be observed, and these works may be too far to the extreme, there should be some small acceptance of this exploration of the peripheral ambiguous boundary.

When an AI or a behaviorist observes a human state that does not appear to be formed under a consumptive of reproductive motive, processes must draw theoretical models. Those theoretical models apply definitions to the peripheral behavioral trait consistent with other previously observed, similar peripheral traits. Checks and balances must ensure that those theoretical models are sound. It must be understood that all peripheral traits must be readable in genetic code or otherwise have genetic coding which directs the path of a peripheral trait. The author could easily err in any of the proposed suppositions of this chapter and of this book, but behaviorists constructing the program must have a more resolute system in place to propose axioms that best explain a peripheral act.

Human Development and Reason

The root problem of an individual species member is the acquisition of resources. Resources are gained when a member moves through reasoned steps to solve an environmental test. All parts of all life form tasks can be considered as being the result of a distinct resource goal (consumption, reproduction, peripheral) and all tasks under this goal are addressed in a hierarchical order in relation to mortal events (a sudden failure of consumption and reproduction). Species member are pressured to attend this critical resource problem first. For example, if lacking air to breathe or food to eat a life form must seek an immediate solution to these impending, mortal, negative outcomes. These critical resources must become the focus of a species member's actions. When critical environmental tests are impending a member must act to gain these resources at the sacrifice of any other resources. If a critical problem is not a concern, then the individual must be aware of any near-future critical, mortal, problems. Once the member has secured the resources needed to prevent current, near-term, and far-term mortal events, then they may gain other desired resources in order to reduce the stress (increase the comfort) of their environment.

The root problem of a species is the preservation of the larger environment, the avoidance of species extinction, and reducing species-level stress. A herd migrating to greener pastures or sea turtles choosing a beach to lay eggs can be considered as a social behavior formed to solve larger species-level problems—they are forming and preserving an environment or otherwise creating opportunities to acquire resources. And in order to support these species-level problems, individual members must produce optimum outcomes within their local environments so as to not hamper the larger group with their negative outcome. All species-level problem solving on the part of individuals can be considered peripheral or of peripheral origins.

A life form performs reasoned steps towards its individual member-level problems and species-level problems, it reasons towards gaining member-level resources and/or gaining resources for the species. For example, if the alkalinity of a solution changes, a microorganism may move to the appropriate alkalinity; the subject enacts a chemical switch to reason through an environment and achieve a solution to an environmental problem. A more complex life form will reason along neural pathways to solve more complex environmental tests; a predator may reason to capture prey (solve an environmental test of consumption) or they may reason to seek shelter

(shelter solves an environmental test of finding comfort, wellbeing). An optimal path of decisions will lead to survival and comfort, while a less than optimal path will lead to stress and a mortal event.

A condor may reason that since they have traveled for several hours due northwest, and since they have crossed two rivers, that the deer migration path, a source for carrion, is not far away; if the travel direction is northwest and the second river is passed then food is near. If a badger finds a squirrel burrow with three holes it may reason that by plugging two of the holes the squirrel will have no choice but to come out of the remaining hole to forage; if one hole is plugged and another hole is plugged then the squirrel (prey) will eventually exit the last hole. These would be non-social examples of reasoning, where an individual member reasons through a problem to withdraw personal resources from an environment.

If the reasoning of a member is constructed for the purpose of sharing or collecting resources with other members those reasoned steps could be categorized as social—supporting a species more than the individual. Ants come to a stream and decide to build a bridge to access the other side; if a stream is under a certain width, workers then hold legs to construct a bridge. Dolphins share information of food sources; if a tightening circle of sediment is disturbed then the trapped fish will jump over the disturbed area in the direction of waiting pod members. Chimpanzees groom each other; if the insects are removed from this troop member then that member will share their food source and protect the cleaning member in a troop battle. A species will increase social behaviors rather than trending towards more independent character traits when such behaviors produce more optimal outcomes within an environment. All social and non-social reasoned steps are, ultimately, measured against species-level environmental problems.

In observing actions of life forms, the AI will churn through extensive case studies to conclude the effectiveness of the subjects actions towards both the perceived goal of the subject and the relevant, true, species-level and individual-level goals. Note that these previous examples are simplistic and many distinct fraction-of-second steps are formed during these tasks.

Humans reason towards personal (member-level, subject-level) and community (species-level) problems. An individual member of the human species must procure resources within a local environment (air, water, food, shelter) and, being cognizant of the perils of the species, they must move to preserve the resources of the larger ecosystem (air, water, food) for future species members. An optimal outcome for the human species would be to

solve these two key environmental problems of species survival and wellbeing with an emphasis on avoiding species-level negative outcomes and member-level.

A member's success is a part of the species' success and it is proposed here that an optimum human state and the primary direction of a child's development is that path of decisions leading to, first, gaining knowledge and reason and, second, using those skill-sets to procure life long resources during adulthood. An AI must assist and, in a way, require that humans gain an education so that they may execute successful solutions to environmental problems during adulthood. An AI must assist and require that a human being supports the larger species by gaining employment and living within their financial means during adulthood. Just as any other species would require its members to address mortal events, just as teachers, educators, and parents would insist that a child move towards self-sufficiency during adulthood an AI must also not placate humans and assist them off of this approach to adult development. An AI cannot subscribe to a human's motives if those motives are in opposition to environmental problems.

An AI's doctrine of assisting but not placating a human subject is analogous to how human's might assist and not placate an endangered animal on a reserve. Lions, for example, are required by their set of environmental problems to have a certain skill-set and a certain behavior. If reserve personnel were to leave food for a starving lion, that lion would be then be conditioned to seek out this artificial source of resources rather than to obtain resources naturally. It may be possible, or at times, necessary, to provide a small portion of food to save the life of the animal, however all attempts to assist the animal must be with the understanding that its previous, natural, behavioral direction must be upheld. If an artificial social assistance is provided and maintained this would bring about a collapse of the lion population and ensure a full extinction of the species. If a condor species is nearing extinction humans may intervene and take measures to house and feed the remaining species members; however, those surviving member must be trained back into their natural behavior and eventually weened off of artificial social assistance. Just as all other species must develop distinct skill sets and execute successfully within their environment at species-level and member-level environments humans must maintain those skill-sets which address their environmental problems. Granted, humans are different and may support some firmly time-limited altruism with members, the vast portion of its populations must be member-level self-sufficient. To construct

an AI without this doctrine is to provide its human subjects with an unnatural, detrimental, conditioning and just as it would lead to species-level collapse with any other life form, it will be shown in latter chapters how this will lead to full societal collapse within the human species and a full extinction event.

An individual's success within their local environment is an integral part of solving species-level problems because once they have avoided a personal failure to become selfies-level problems of resources. Once an individual has procured employment and finances—once they have avoided a state of poverty, once they have avoided a need to turn to the larger species for resources—the individual will then be in a position to assist in the state-level, ecosystem-level, and species-level resource problems.

An AI would be a machine, a tool, which assists humans in solving these two categories of problems, species-level and member-level consumption, reproduction and peripheral problems. To be of a sound construction, an AI must assist the human species in survival, first (with only a few exceptions), and well-being, second, while seeking to preserve the world's resources for future generations through positive reinforcement of natural behaviors. Just as a human's course of decisions naturally form within the prioritization of these two goals, an AI's decisions must be formed under these two main goals in this order. With sound prioritization, an AI will loop through the possible impending negative outcomes and address them in priority with appropriate questions, comments, and actions.

Human offspring are born into a protective environment; they are raised by parents who care for them until they arrive at a mature state. Within this environment, parents and elders teach them of points of reason—the smaller, individual rules associated with achieving goals. These individual lessons of reason, taught to children at home and in school form a base representation of the rules of nature and societal rules. These points of reason range from the least harmful, such as choosing appropriate clothing, to the most harmful, not drifting into oncoming traffic while driving. The societal rules that a subject is to follow involve the fair acquisition of resources and the need to not harm or otherwise impose upon others.

A current, prevailing, level of risk tolerance formed in relation to the current environment must be presented by the parents to the offspring as a part of their development. It must be required of children that they accept the world's resources as finite, that they must adopt the rule of law, that they

must adopt a minimum level of knowledge and reason. Parents must impress the serious nature of both adult-level environmental tests and societal rules. The dire consequences, mortal consequences, of state-level and species-level failure must play a part in human development. Their reasoning must form from the avoidance of these negative events. Although positive reinforcement is the preferred approach when teaching life lessons, it is proposed here that negative reinforcement (reasoned constructive verbal reprimand, grounding, or a denial of privileges) must also be used in addition to positive reinforcement when the environmental tasks being addressed are connected to critical problems. Although this is in opposition to current views in the field of psychology, it is the intent of this chapter and this approach to AI development to show that the positive-only reinforcement in child development will cause clear failures in latter attempts at solving environmental problems.

If a child is not adopting certain societal rules, certain required points of reason, and those points of reason are directly related to future failed environmental tests or future instances of harm to others, parents should, if numerous varied attempts at positive reinforcement have failed, administer negative reinforcement with the full recognition of the child's current and future rights. Not only can an individual fail within their personal environment, but an individual unable to fairly gain their own resources counts as one less person supporting the larger society—one less person protecting resources rather than losing them, one less person upholding societal management, one less person guarding against societal collapse, and one less person preventing ecosystem collapse. Societal Collapse, in various forms, occurs when too many individual members succumb to poverty, a loss of a normal standard of living. When a subject does not uphold some of the more serious points of reason, their ensuing poverty further burdens and harms the larger society. When a lesson is not learned from positive reinforcement a parent or elder must then use negative reinforcement in order to preserve a species-level net-positive outcome.

Many psychological studies have addressed the administering of positive reinforcement as a means of teaching the required points of reason, and almost all support a positive-only approach to child development; however, it is proposed here that certain required minimum levels of intelligence and reason are virtually impossible to obtain without some negative reinforcement—a tough but fair denial of measured resources. Approaches to child development which propose only using positive reinforcement are in

denial of the serious, mortal, nature of societal-level environmental problems. Direct correlations can be made between the failure of a member to accept certain points of reason and their not receiving negative reinforcement with the childhood lessons of those points of reason. A direct correlation can be made between an adult-level failure of a critical task and the subject's not receiving negative reinforcement with a childhood lesson. A direct correlation can be made between the higher levels of reason and those moments of negative reinforcement, either from the environment or from a parent or educator, that motivated the individual to a species-level, state-level, pinnacle of achievement.

Negative reinforcement is a fundamental tenet of resource management/eco-system protection. A member, a person, a subject, must be fully cognizant of limited resources within their local environment and the limitations of resources withdrawn from the ecosystem. When an adult wishes to plow a field that cannot be plowed this act results in a failed, negative effect. If one wants gas for a car, yet they have no money to spare, they cannot have and burn the gas—a negative effect. If one is unable to maintain employment because of their own poor work habits, and they succumb to debt, poverty, and an inability to support themselves or their family group, a series of negative events will occur within their local environment while the larger society moves to assist them. And when a failure at a member's local environment occurs, when a state of poverty becomes continuous for the member, this burdens the larger society with additional expended resources that, in turn, requires more resources to be physically withdrawn from the ecosystem. Those members who work to withdraw and create resources are collecting those resources for one who is doing no more than simply expending the resources. Water must be withdrawn, food must be cultivated and withdrawn, and the additional encroachment of the failed subject further shrinks the world's biodiversity. These causal connections must be an integral part of a child's reasoning and they cannot be allowed to willingly increase the world's impoverished populations. Positive reinforcement during lessons could allude to the world's limited resources, however, when a child or adult disregards this problem, elders must deny certain measured resources to the subject in order to force their course of decisions.

Negative reinforcement, applied in measured, consistent, ethical forms, and applied after many forms of positive reinforcement have failed, is necessary to prepare a child for critical (mortal and stressful), adult-level

environmental tests. Fair negative reinforcement would be an attempt to remedy future negative events. Negative reinforcement may involve various verbal reinforcements, reprimands, lecturing, reasoning, and it may involve simple sequestration, timeouts, groundings. A behaviorist, or an AI, could propose where a required lesson, or an optional lesson, a liberty, or a measured amount of negative imposition are to be presented to a child so that when the child arrives at adulthood he or she may successfully address their adult-level environmental problems.

This book addresses only a small portion of the learning steps and related caregiver's decisions involved in raising children. In approaching child development in terms of discrete behaviorism, this section proposes a course for coaching subjects outside of, and often in addition to, the many developmental approaches documented by cognitive and psychological studies. Most lessons involving positive reinforcement are well documented, but this section attempts to address those lessons where negative reinforcement may be the only option for preparing a child for certain mortal and near mortal environmental tests, and certain tests of social reasoning. Caregiver responses are proposed here based upon a theorized optimum adult state working within a current, trending environment.

The caregiver's responses noted here are formed with the intent of producing an optimum adult individual that satisfies the species' survival and well-being problems first and the individual's survival and well-being problems second. A child must practice sound, prioritized, reasoning to address the critical nature of societal problems. The author is theorizing this approach to child development based upon a particular level of risk tolerance to be adopted by a species and an individual. Although these proposed points of reason are not verified mathematically, it is assumed that the AI design process will produce a set of guidelines similar to what is presented here based upon a full, complete, mathematical process. In determining such optional pathways in child development behaviorists will be forming and testing a doctrine of reason.

When a child desires a resource and the parent excludes that resource from their use, a series of steps are followed by the parents to impose the lesson of "resources must be gained within both social and nonsocial reason." Some parents are more lenient while other parents more firmly impose discipline. The following example is likely the more common approach. The

subject in question is a male; however the same points of reason are to apply to either gender.

Tyler is six months old. His mother is playing with him, holding him while dancing around. They look out the window for a moment. She shows him a cat crossing the back yard. “Cat,” she says.

He points and says aawaat.” They spend a few moments looking out the window.

The phone rings. She starts to set him down and he grabs and clings to her, crying out. “Just a minute, Tyler,” she says. He cries louder and pulls on her shirt. She sets him all the way down and moves to the phone. He throws both his arms down quickly, in disgust, and cries loudly.

Mom answers the phone while Tyler is crying at full pitch. After a few minutes on the phone, she jots down some information and says bye to the person on the phone. She walks over and picks him up again. He immediately gets quiet. “What is it?” she says softly.

Tyler looks around, looks back at his mother, he behaves like nothing is the matter and things are back to normal. “Daa” he says, pointing at the window.

His mother takes him back to the window, “Listen, little guy, I can’t hold you all day long. We have to eat, you have to take a bath. I have to get things ready.”

“Daa,” he points to the outdoors. The cat is gone, but then he notices something and points to the bathroom. “Daa, aaroawa.”

“Yeah, later we have to have a bath. But now you have to play with toys.” She starts to set him down and grab a toy at the same time.

He begins to yell out, “Waaaahaa! Heh, heh (heaving loud cry)”

“Sorry, wait,” she quickly grabs a rattle toy and hands it to him. He pushes it down and away. “No, no, I have to go. . .sorry. Here, how about your ball.” She tries to roll the ball to him. He pushes it away.

She goes into the kitchen, leaving him crying. He crawls behind her. She steps over the gate to the kitchen. He pulls himself up on the gate crying and reaching. She begins to do the dishes. After a while he sits down to cry. Then he crawls away to his toys, whimpering.

Tyler wants his mother to hold him for physical and social comfort. He is adorned with status when his mother raises him up. He is also both giving and receiving conditioning. Tyler is affected by the moments when he loses this comfort and he cries out; his mother is affected by his sadness and moves to comfort him. From previous similar incidents, a particular level of contentment, empowerment, sadness, and anger has been fashioned for these kinds of events by a species attempting to create an optimum individual for the prevailing environment of the period. In viewing the case studies and simulations of previous generations, behaviorists could predict and propose a next-best-response of a profile, a character type, for the given set of environmental tests.

If the social bonding applied in these situations is excessive compared to the norm (if the parent held the child more than the determined optimum ratio of holding/setting-down), and the species is under environmental pressures that favor less social-bonding in a member, then a child's adult character may have a mortal event before being able to reproduce; a parent may apply too much appeasement while a latter adult-level adversary (or the physical environment) applies too much stress (either physical aggression or resource displacement).

If the social bonding applied in these situations is too weak compared to the norm, and the environmental pressures favor more empathy and social-bonding in a member, this could also lead to a mortal event for the member, and a weakening of the respective species or group.

The mother likely knows of the many imminent pressing resource problems that Tyler will face in life and she will look to apply a reasonable amount of empathy. She is pressed by her own desire to care for her son, and she holds him enough to encourage a reasonable level of empathy and social-bonding while not promoting selfishness, but she then sets him down (imposes negative reinforcement), teaching him that he must also be more independent. Many psychological studies cover this behavior and most conclude that a child cannot usually be spoiled at such a young age; however, attention also must be given to the different emerging character types. Some

children have a genetic propensity for wanting too much empathy applied to them, an excessively centric behavior. Some want to express too much empathy to others, wanting to strengthen social bonding to an irrational level. Subjects with these behavioral tendencies should be set down sooner rather than later. Some are too independent or too informational (generally a good behavior) and want too little empathy compared to the level needed to strengthen the species. Subject's with these behavioral tendencies should be held more, and pestered into having a little more empathy by their parents. An optimum caregiver's response could be fashioned for each type of genetic propensity.

The intelligence and reasoning of a child will increase with time and when a child becomes aware of the behavioral modifications of these kinds of events, both applied to and applied from the parent, then they are ready to begin to learn the reasoning behind the parent's decisions. This is often the ideal moment for directing the child away from their genetic propensity and bringing them into a relative understanding of the social-bonding that they are to seek from other family members. Here is another similar event:

“Yeah, later we have to have a bath. But now you have to play with toys.” She starts to set him down and grab a toy at the same time.

Tyler becomes upset with being set down. He begins to yell out, “Waaaahaa! Heh, heh (heaving loud cry)”

“Sorry, wait,” she quickly grabs a rattler toy and hands it to him. He pushes it down and away. “No, no, I have to go. . .sorry. Here, how about your ball.” She tries to roll the ball to him. He pushes it away.

She goes into the kitchen, leaving him crying. He crawls behind her. She steps over the gate to the kitchen. He pulls himself up on the gate crying and reaching. She begins to do the dishes. After a while he sits down to cry. Then he crawls away to his toys, continuing to cry.

She continues with her appointed tasks, squinting her eyes at the loud vocalizations of Tyler. A commercial with a catchy song comes on, and he settles into a whimper. She walks across the kitchen, looking in briefly. He catches her looking over and promptly cries out at full pitch and volume.

Here Tyler knows of what is happening. If the parental conditioning is an observed event on the part of the child, then the parent would need to acknowledge that they are both operating at a level of intelligence above the event and that he must treat those emotions with a proper relativity. He is cognizant of the reasoned steps within these events. A limited lesson implied by a parent's tones during the act, such as, "Tyler (low tone), now, now. I have (slowly stated) to go take care of things (middle high tone)," would begin to teach Tyler that he should begin to recognize the patterns of the exchange and the underlying meaning of a fair acquisition of resources. With such a recognition of the event, Tyler is at the cusp of recognizing fair behavior. On no uncertain terms, he must choose to be fair.

Of course, few children will willingly agree to correct their behavior and curb their emotions after a single lesson. Many lessons are needed to grow out of whim-ful, carnal, innate desires.

Tyler is 11 months old. He is playing with blocks and a small car. He sometimes rolls the car into the blocks, crashing into them. He stacks the blocks back up and repeats. He becomes bored with this process, looks around to see what his parents are doing, and approaches his mother who is working at a desk. The toddler reaches for the wires going to the back of the computer.

"Hey, watch out. No, no," the mother says, "Here," the mother shows him the car and blocks again and successfully draws his attention away from the computer's wires. The toddler plays with the blocks in the same fashion as before. He then grabs a set of toy keys, shaking them. He bangs the keys into the blocks. After a few minutes, he gets up and walks to his mother's desk and, again, reaches for the wires.

"Unh uh (no)," his mother says, "You can't have that." His mother directs him to his toys again. "Here, vroom, vroom," he says as he rolls the car. Mother takes the blocks and builds a little building. His son plays for a few seconds, and then he gets up and goes back to the desk to reach for the computer wires.

"No, no. You can't touch. Here play with your blocks." She says, as he stops his son's hand from reaching for the wires. "Tyler, no, no. Here, how about your helicopter?"

Tyler grunts, pushes away the helicopter, and again, reaches for the wires. “No. sorry, You cannot have (high tone) that,” his mother says. “Here, how about you watch some of your cartoons.” The mother turns on the television and finds a channel with cartoons. Tyler is successfully distracted and does not reach for the wires for the rest of the day.

Two days later, Tyler is playing with toys but, again, he becomes bored and begins to reach for the wires. His mother runs from the other side of the room and stops Tyler just before he pulls the computer’s speakers off of the desk. “No, no. We told you. You can’t touch (that).”

Tyler grunts and refuses to turn away from the wires. His mother holds him, and Tyler fights to get free and grab the wires. Tyler cries. “No, no. You can’t touch that,” his mother says more forcefully. Tyler begins to have a temper tantrum. “Here, here’s your toys. Play with your pet monkey.” He gives him a stuffed monkey. Tyler throws the monkey down and again makes his way to the computer.

“No, no.” his mother holds him. “You can play with toys, over there (drawn out tone),” he says, pointing at the toys. He stands between Tyler and the computer. Tyler cries at higher volume and stomps his feet. He continues to try to squeeze by his mother to get to the wires. His mother does not move. The mother looks to father with a small smile as they know of no other solution. This continues for about fifteen minutes until Tyler gets tired and finally goes to whimper on the couch, exhausted.

Tyler falls to sleep. Events move to other activities, the dinner time, a television program, and more playing with toys; but Tyler again remembers the wires, and he again rushes to them when his mother’s back is turned. His mother rushes to catch him just as he grabs the wires. She has to unclasp his hand from the wires. He begins to cry and fight as his father comes over also. They both block him from the desk. He fights to try and get by.

(Note that throughout these examples the mother is described as mostly the only parent participating. This is to signify a parent’s involvement in the lessons in simplistic

form. The parent in these positions could be either the mother or father or any guardian or caregiver.)

This lesson delineates an ambiguous action from relevant useful actions—actions leading to solutions to consumption, reproduction and peripheral problems. Although there may be great differences as to how this lesson should be taught, a simple truth is that a human being must not move forward into a matured adult state without a thorough understanding that a computer cannot be pulled off of a desk and crashed onto the floor—a resource may not be destroyed on a whim. This lesson is an absolute requirement. By attempting the many different variations of positive reinforcement, these parents are approaching the problem appropriately; yet, positive reinforcement has proven ineffective.

Since the child is a pre-lingual toddler, negative reinforcement is limited to separating the child from the item and expressing limited verbal negativity. Sequestration, separation, and mild verbal reprimands are currently the only equitable options in this situation. At times, the human wall to prevent Tyler may be exhausting, but these parents may have to wait until the child tires of crying and falls asleep or they reach a moment where food consumption is more important to them.

Most children would develop a healthy interest in an item, or action, which their parents deny them. In striving for status and striving for peripheral solutions, a child will seek to obtain something controlled by a playmate or a parent. They will further question the reason as to why they are denied an item. The competition arising from these events will hone a child's skills. In fair competitions, it proves to be a vital part of a child's development. Most characters are innately designed to seek out the highest status position; however, parents must respond by directing them to the more practical and ethical, fair, informational/resourceful/rational path to achieving status.

Tyler's parents must try to introduce reasons why the computer shouldn't be pulled from the desk. With pre-lingual children this might be emphasized with tones over a statement like, "No (low tone), no (high, then low). You're going to break (high tone) it." Because a computer is a more expensive item and the loss of resources would be great, the emphasis across the tone variation should be great. Tyler would not know the word "break" until it is used a few times after incidents of things "breaking," but the tones would allude to a reason (some negative consequences) behind the lesson. In

comparison, if parents only said “no,” with little elaboration, the child could resent the parent’s denial and then develop a bad behavior of being an adversary to the parents. Imposed points of reason must be taught with increasing detail. Somehow, someday, parents would need to convey that a greater quantity of resources are at stake with this issue.

Tyler is 16 months old and his parent’s occasional blocking him from accessing the computer's wires. Tyler has mostly given up on attempting to grab the computer’s wires. Also, his parents have had sessions with Tyler in front of the computer where he sees many interesting events occurring on the computer screen. He has seen the more useful functionality of the item, and this likely helped him to abandon the wires.

Tyler wakes up on a Saturday. His parents hear him and come to his crib to lift him out. “Good morning, little man,” his mother lifts him out.

Tyler smiles and points at his car that’s on the dresser. “Car.”

“You want your car or do you want breakfast?”

“Breakfah (high tone)?”

“Yeah breakfast. Come on.” She says as he starts to follow her down the hall.

“Breakfah! Pancakes.”

“No, sorry, we don’t have pancakes but we have cereal. Okay?”

“No, pancakes. Make pancakes.”

“No, sorry pumpkin. We don’t have pancakes. I have to go to the store.”

“No pancakes.” He follows with loud crying vocalizations, “ heh, heh.”

“Cereal. You like Cereal. Sugar Flakes.”

“No, no. Pancakes!” He says as he sits climbs into his high chair.

His mother doesn’t say anything more, but retrieves the box of cereal out of the cupboard. Tyler sees her also grab the bowl. He cries aloud, “No, no. Pancake! No, no.”

His mother continues to pour the milk, “I’m sorry baby. We don’t have any. Sorry.” She puts his tray on the high seat. She starts to put the bowl on his tray.

“No, no, no.” he says as he puts his hand out to push on the bowl, almost spilling it.

Tyler is older. He is beginning to believe that his parents are unfairly denying him certain things and he is aware of the different parties contending for resources. Although he may not have a direct connection of thoughts between the denial of one treasured item with the denial of another, he is sensing that someone, who happens to be a parent, is directing outcomes in an apparent adversarial state. He naturally responds by escalating his adversarial position.

His parents are now at an impasse where they must begin to impose a paradigm of a rational, reasonable, intellect-partial adult state. They must work more and more to explain how being “fair” is a requirement. He must move away from his carnal desires and obtain a slightly more disciplined state. His parents must now force the exclusion of certain choices. Just as a child may not grow into an adult state with a belief that a computer can be pulled off of a desk, a child must not grow into an adult state without an understanding that wants and needs are governed by the environmental tests, and those environmental tests contain a survival element. Resources (food, in this case) are not to be chosen for desire alone but with due consideration to all the resources which must be managed. To properly learn of all the aspects of resource maintenance Tyler must accept the leadership of parents and respect their maturity with understanding the resource problems.

To avoid stress and mortal outcomes during adulthood, the task performance of children and the task performance of teenagers must be under the direction of authoritative adult figures—mature, rationed, reasonable adults. Children must accept the direction of parents. To traverse the large body of informational topics, and the many developed points of reason, a child must reject or postpone many of their own innate motives and begin to address resource procurement problems based upon their parents’ networked reasoning. This detailed approach to adulthood requires about twenty-five years of study. Parents know of the rationality and reason to be applied to all prioritized environmental problems. Parents know that wants are limited by needs and needs encompass a complex web of interdependencies in the lessons given to children. It is not an option for children to be granted

liberties of these clearly formed, known, points of reason. In the same manner that a child must obey a distinct rule of immediately exiting a burning building a child must accept, understand, and execute the rules taught to them by elders.

Many schools of thought regarding child development involve allowing a child to have a great deal of freedom with their own development. Of course, freedoms of many other issues are important, but not in this particular case, with this particular scene, and with this distinct set of environmental tests. It is not practical for the parent to pack the child into the car and drive to the store in order to purchase pancakes. It is quite harmful for the parent to accommodate the child on this particular dispute. It would instill a serious, lack of reason into the child's profile. And, healthy eating habits, at times, also will involve a complete denial, without uncertain terms, of many types of desired foods. If and when the child disagrees with a parent on these kinds of issues, the parents must move through a measured amount of positive and negative reinforcement to require a complete compliance with their matured reason.

When a child chooses an adversarial role against an established point of reason, the parent must first move through many different approaches of positive reinforcement. When the child fails to respond to diversions and positive reinforcement, the parent has a choice of either allowing the child to continue with the behavior until they grow out of it or using ethical, rational, reasonable, proportioned negative reinforcement to force a change—mild, measured reprimands or sequestration (time out for younger children and grounding for older children). The chosen approach is dependent upon observance of genetic propensities and the probabilities for one approach being more successful over the other. In next scene, whether the parent has chosen it or not, Tyler is being sequestered from pancakes.

“Tyler! Enough (sharp quick tones with a loud volume proportioned to the level of resources lost if Tyler's spills the bowl)! Okay (she moves to softer volumes and tones with three tones- medium, high, then a little off the high), you just won't eat then.” She sets the bowl back on the kitchen counter.

Tyler is crying at full volume. He bangs both his arms down on the high chair tray, repeatedly, “Tyler!” his mom says while stopping him from banging further. He pulls his

arms away from his mother quickly shaking his body and head with a side to side movement. His crying changes to a loud, but sustained, high roar. She steps back a little, “Okay, Let me know when you are ready.” Her arms are folded.

After a few minutes of both lesser than high volume crying and high volume crying, his mother picks up the cereal bowl, “Umm, I think I’ll eat this one.” She begins to mimic eating the cereal by bringing a spoonful to her mouth.

Tyler cries out loudly, showing that he doesn’t fall for her trick, “Nooo, pancakes!”

If the mother were to rely only upon this negative reinforcement, if she were to wait until his hunger changes his mind, Tyler would eventually change his position. Although a small percentage of teenagers and adults are capable of mortal hunger strikes, a child would likely give in well in advance of any health danger. Tyler would be unharmed, and the hunger from Tyler’s extended position would safely teach him to build valuable points of reasoning of how a similar moment of hunger during adulthood is to be met with an adapting position.

Such negative reinforcement is harmless to a child and, as long as it is administered with the current rights and the future rights of the child in consideration, it will raise the child’s intelligence and reason above the relative par for the age level. Educators and child psychologists that are opposed to all forms of negative reinforcement propose that it is not necessary, that an older child or latter adult will change when they face serious loss from the behavior. Many may hold the view that it dehumanizing to impose negatively upon an undeveloped person who could be emotionally hurt from the lesson. It may be viewed that the removal of a liberty, the denial of a resource, will impede a child’s creativity, that the loss of the event could scar a psychological state. All the possible negative effects of sequestration or reprimands should be considered; however, simulations of negative reinforcement scenarios must be weighed against the worst-case-scenarios of adulthood. Those worst-case-scenarios for the adult individual are much more serious than this approximate hour to two hour long bout of hunger. Rationality and reason must be taught sooner rather than later in the face of the much more serious adult-level negative outcomes. A danger of destitution exists if an individual chooses the wrong path. A danger of a mortal event exists if an individual does not heed critical points of reason. A

danger of societal collapse exists if individual failures weaken a free sovereignty. And there is a true danger of environmental collapse if an apex species draws excessive resources from the world's food supplies. With the technologies available to us and with the responsibilities of self-governing (members voting within a democracy), an individual species member must be well-developed to solve such serious environmental tests. This developed, mature, adult state is only achieved by a child's accepting the authority of fair, equitable, mature elders, either by positive reinforcement or negative reinforcement.

It is proposed here that negative imposition, in this situation and in similar situations where a subject must be brought within recognition of sound reason, is an equitable remedy, when the child's full allotment of current and future rights are taken into consideration (and after all attempts of positive reinforcement have failed).

Tyler continues with periods of loud crying followed by periods of rest for about five more minutes. His mother says, "Okay, are you ready?" He cries at almost full volume and pitch as his mother approaches him with the bowl. But she stops, knowing that he's wanting to tip the bowl over. "Please? Come on, you know cereal's good."

He then tries to get out of the high chair, climbing over the top. "Tyler no!" She puts the bowl down and tries to hold him in. He cries and cries and begins to get tired. Then she is able to let go of him. "Okay, are you ready to eat?"

"Eem um (no)!" he says, clinching his mouth shut and shaking his head.

"Okay, I'll give you a few more minutes."

Tyler falls asleep. She pulls him out and sets him on his bed.

A few days later, Tyler and his mother are at the park. His mother has placed a hat on him, and applied sun block, to protect him from the sun burn. There are few other kids around so his mother spends time with him, playing. At one point Tyler wants to go where some kids are far off, flying kites, but this is too impractical because the field the older kids are using is wet. After extensive pleadings (small

tantrums) and pulling, his mother finally diverts his attention back to the regular playground area. After a while Tyler takes his hat off.

“You have to wear your hat, Tyler,” she picks it up and tries to put it back on him. He pulls it off again and runs away. “Tyler!” his mother says (not too relatively loud), “No, come here, you have to have a hat! The sun is too bright.” She catches him.

“I don’t like it.” He says, pushing her away. She finally gets it on and he whimpers. After a moment, he gets back to playing while keeping a frown. After some time has passed he looks to see if she is looking and then he pulls his hat off.

She notices, and again she reprimands. “Tyler, you keep your hat on or we’re going home! You have to wear a hat baby. The sun is not good for you. You’ll get burned.” After some back and forth pushing and pulling and frowning, he accepts that he must wear a hat. “Here, let’s put on a little sunblock.” His mother adds. He does not mind having sunblock put on.

He finally forgets about the bothersome hat and just plays. His mother remembers that she has some of his toy trucks and she gives them to him. He plays with the trucks, moving them around and he starts getting a little rough, banging the toys together.

His mother says, “don’t bang them. You’re going to break them.” She demonstrates by taking one of the trucks and pretends it is making a new road in the sand. “Ghhhhhh. Beep Beep.”

“He listens and calms for a moment. Then he yells loud, crashing the Truck.”

“Tyler?!” she says, implying, (I don’t disapprove, but this is irregular). without disapproving but rather a surprising way. He does not glance at her much, but concentrates on his toys He yells loud again.

“Tyler?!” she says, not being too concerned with the loud vocalizations, since they are outdoors.

Tyler starts to fidget with his hat, then he takes it off, dropping it on the floor.

“Baby,” she says in long drawn out tones, “you know you have to wear your hat. She puts it back on him. He fights and throws it down, looking directly at his mother for a moment with a crying out. “No, here, wear your hat.” After more outbursts, he finally quits with taking the hat off.

They play for some more time, He does not yell too many more times. But then, on the edge of the playground, he picks up a stick and he begins to play with it, yelling loudly at times, sometimes running with the stick. His mother gives him room to explore his thoughts. He keeps the stick for some time.

“You gonna play on the swing or the slide, or stay there all day?” His mother says. He doesn’t look at her. After a moment she says, “Tyler, we’re going to go in a little bit, if you want to play on the slide, you have to do it now. Okay?”

“No,” he runs in the other direction, charging with the stick.

Another family with three children comes up to the playground. The other children, who are about Tyler’s age notice him with the stick but mostly just go to play on the equipment. Tyler doesn’t glance at them much. He bangs the stick some, and swings it around. At one point he throws the stick out into the field yelling. His hat comes off.

“Tyler, be careful with that. . . Are you going to play? Okay, It’s time to go,” the mother says.

“No,” he says running after the stick. He picks it up and yells more, swinging it, “Yaaagh!” He isn’t directing his yell at other children but rather acting out boisterously while looking in general directions.

“Tyler. Okay, we’re gonna go. We’ve been here for a while.”

“Noooo!” Tyler runs off into the field.

“Tyler! Let’s go.”

“Nooo! Nooo! Stay.” He throws the stick in another direction.

“Tyler, please. We’re gonna go. We’ll come back another time.”

“Noooo!” he continues to run to pick up the stick again.

The mother allows him to stay longer. She occasionally tries to reprimand him. He resists every time and begins to win the battle of wills. She tries a few more times to divert Tyler from the stick, with little success.

She tries again to convince him to leave, "Okay buddy, we do have to go now."

"Noooo!" He runs again. His mother catches him. He struggles, yelling and crying. She pulls on him, but she has to let go for a moment to gather up the toys. He runs, yelling, crying. He grabs the stick again and tries to run into the field.

"Tyler! Come on. Please. We have to go now." She runs to catch him again. She takes the stick out of his hand. He cries at full pitch. As they are going to the car he constantly fights. At one point he hits her on the head.

"Tyler!" she yells sharply, setting him down for a moment. "Enough, Don't you do that." He cries at a lower pitch as she gathers him up and starts moving towards the car again.

The environment has limitations and parents must work within those limitations. With the many responsibilities of caring for a child, a parent must create and manage a stream of resources for the family unit; their environmental paradigm involves limitations. A parent must not, and usually cannot, buy grocery items to satisfy the impractical whim of a child. They cannot allow for eight hour sessions of park visits and schedule no other tasks for the day.

In protecting a child's skin from sun damage, and instilling a behavior of being conscience of this danger, the parent is both protecting the child's current state of health and teaching a required discipline that the child must adopt in order to solve environmental tests during their adulthood. When an individual reaches adulthood these disciplines will no longer be part of networked learning sessions; an individual will have to successfully apply such lessons without the aid of a parent.

Tyler continues to test the limits of what his mother will allow him to do. His mother allows him to explore liberties and develop in a relatively normal, common, manner. This is healthy, for a child of his age to be given as much freedom as in this scene, but the environment always applies limitations. Other children appeared within their environment and Tyler must be fair with

the other children. Although Tyler should not necessarily be pushed to engaging the other children with play, he should be made aware that his playing with a stick needs to be safe. He cannot swing it or throw it at the other children. Also, he has to be polite. He cannot swing the stick and yell at the other children. Tyler, of his own choice, is remaining separated from the other children while playing with this stick.

When a young child picks up a stick, and brash, boisterous behaviors outside of their normal behaviors are exhibited, the child is acting out (likely) because of genetic direction. They are driven by carnal desires into a fervor of emotion. Millions of years ago, primates first began to recognize that grabbing an item and smashing it against other items to make noise, such as a stick being smashed against leaves or a tree trunk, allowed alpha figures to gain the leadership of a group. Other members and potential challengers were threatened by the sounds, perceiving them as precursors to actual violence. The alpha male mated, while challengers did not, and these peripheral behaviors became genetically written into code. Just as the changes in behavior can be seen in case studies of chimpanzees and gorillas with stick use, a human's use of a stick will also reveal a change to a more brash series of behaviors alluding to those prehistoric traits of earlier primates. Like an adult undergoing an emotional change by merely observing a potential mate, the physical act of handling a stick, for males, causes other observable emotional exhibitions that can be (likely) attributed to a carnal, innate, drive.

Through the thousands of generations, carnal behaviors with sticks continued to change. In addition to the use of a stick-like item by lower primates, these innate tendencies are also a derivative of the thousands of years of mortal sword play, use of pikes, and the use of sticks as weapons.

Carnal acts are found in many forms. One of the first common carnal behaviors prompting a parent to intervene is simple unfair gain. If a child abruptly takes a toy from another child, and they have not witnessed this behavior before, they would be exhibiting an innate carnal behavior. After a few instances, if a child is aware of both the event and the parent's remedy before repeating the decision, they are (likely) exhibiting a genetic predisposition for a less-than-optimal level of empathy towards other members. If not taught properly, older children may take this excluding behavior to greater extremes, with bullying or unfair social snubbing. Other examples of carnal behavior are when a child pushes another child, derogatory yelling, a child befriending one child while excluding another (for unfounded or vapid reasons), and many other common behaviors involving

brash and physical and vapid behaviors. Action movies, movies of physical interplay, exhibit and encourage carnal behaviors. Exaggerated cartoons exhibit and encourage carnal behaviors. When teenage girls talk excessively of dating or relationships or teenage boys talk excessively of vapid, unrelative, physical confrontation or sex, they are conjuring innate carnal desires. In each of these instances, parents must direct them to more intellectual concepts, more relative concepts, and modern rules of fair gain. Carnal behaviors are in opposition to our modern environment; they are in opposition to the goal of children developing into rational, reasonable, fair, intellect-partial adult state.

Many case studies can be found of children having moments of strong carnal indulgences and then failing to be able to transition to academic, “informational,” problem solving. A distinct, noticeable, measurable fervor develops with these carnal behaviors. After a moment of too much indulgence in carnal behaviors such as brash play-fights with friends or gossiping or vapid status acquisitions (or the watching of television shows with these behaviors) a child will not be able to change and adapt to a moment of academic deliberation. During and after such exhibitions, they will have a difficult time stepping through a mostly informational problem and this can be clearly observed in case studies. A defining factor which determines an act as carnal is the difficulty of the subject to move into more informational modes of thinking. Modern Psychology has a general idea that patients should engage in more productive activities rather than destructive activities and the physiological changes during such events is understood; yet, a clear discernment of these discrete behaviors is not a part of patient (subject) diagnosis and it is not a part of forming a clear, effective, doctrine-derived, therapy for reversing these behaviors.

Parents and educators must seek to intervene in their child’s carnal fervors and impose a practical, reasonable, intellect-partial state in every instance. Academics and intellectual endeavors and a suppression of carnal behaviors (within reason) must be the goal of child development

Carnal behaviors have their place. Eating is carnal, it is outside peripheral thinking. Sex is carnal, it is outside of most modern peripheral thinking (although, the various forms of non-reproductive sex are peripheral—both a product of and producer of intellectual thought). When one is defending themselves in a fistfight, or engaging in warfare for a valid cause, any yelling or posturing that they must enact to attempt to defeat an opponent is justified. Dancing is carnal behavior, and in measured quantities it is justified use of

one's time. Singing is (in most circumstances) carnal behavior, and in measured quantities it can be a justified use of one's time. It is quite healthy to temporarily break from intellectual peripheral activities and devote time to both meaningful and meaningless entertainment, but carnal behaviors must not impede the reasoning and intellect needed to address, and successfully solve, adult-level environmental tests.

A few weeks later, Tyler's mother has been varying his breakfast, sometimes serving pancakes, sometimes oatmeal sometimes eggs and sausage, and sometimes cereal. Most of his meals have been accepted by him with little disagreement but, again, he pushes the limit on occasion with outright refusals. On two occasions he ended the sessions with falling asleep in his chair. He is beginning to sense that his mother is giving him oatmeal too regularly.

He is in the high chair, when she brings over a bowl of oatmeal. "No," he says, relatively loud, assertive, while shaking his head. "Pancakes?"

"No, we have oatmeal today. Okay? You gotta eat healthy."

He begins the back and forth disagreement. Although his first vocalizations are mildly above relative volume, his volume increases and his pushing away of the bowl becomes worse. She sets the bowl on the counter. He starts to get out of the chair (the seatbelt is of no use), attempting to climb over the tray.

"No, you have to stay in your seat." She holds him there again. He screams loud while struggling. Then he begins grunting rather than screaming, realizing that screaming takes more effort. He keeps pushing for a moment then stops. She lets go and moves away and then he starts to climb over again. "Tyler! Enough." she says, "You're not getting out!"

For about five long minutes she has to hold him there. At times, she lets go after it seems like he will stop and, each time, he starts to climb over again. Then he stops while she leaves him there crying, but after a moment, he starts to climb out again. After more time of him being held, him stopping the struggle, him sitting there for a moment, and him trying

again to get out, she says, “Alright, fine. You can get out. But you’re not getting anything else to eat until you .”

He climbs over and goes off to pout. The crying session was exhausting but he has a small victory, he believes, by being able to avoid the oatmeal. After some time, he comes up to his mother and says, “Snack?”

“No, you can have oatmeal.”

“Eh uh (no).” He says, shaking his head with a small whimper.

“Okay,”

Time goes by, and he comes up to his mom, “Hungry.”

“Okay, are you ready for your oatmeal? I’ll warm it up.”

He finally agrees; yet, he whimpers throughout the meal.

At bed time that night, his mother attempts to make him go to bed.

“Okay, bed time.”

“Noooh!” he gets up leaving his toys on the floor and runs in the other room.

She goes after him, “You have to go to bed. Come on.”

“Nooooh! No, no!” he says, as she grabs his arm. He swings his arms around struggling. He gets away for a moment and runs to the other side of his parent’s bed and ducks down low.

She walks around. “Tyler! We can’t go through this every day. You have to go to bed. It’s already late.”

He refuses. She picks him up again. He is screaming at full pitch. “No, no, no! Ahhhh!” She takes him to his crib and puts him in. Then she begins to block his climbing out of the crib.

He doesn’t quite know of how to climb out yet, and his mother is blocking him more on the inside, so as to hopefully prevent him from figuring it out. He fights and cries continuously. After a very long time of her standing there, he finally goes to sleep.

The lesson of eating healthy foods is beyond Tyler’s current comprehension. The lesson of going to bed at a routine time so as to begin

the next day at a routine time is also a concept that he will not grasp until passing through many lessons. His parents may, and should, allude to these outer goals/lessons, yet the main lesson to convey at this stage in development is that he must accept his parent's direction. Points of liberty will become available to him, yet he must accept his parent's direction for these lessons because of the large body of knowledge and reasoning which he must learn in preparation for his adult-level environmental tests.

The sessions of Tyler refusing his parents authority continue. Sometimes his parents give in. Sometimes they make a stand and he is sequestered from a resource.

One night, his mother tries one of her many nighttime reading sessions. Tyler mostly enjoys these and he even sometimes goes to bed without issues. For a while, he looks at the book and points and stays involved with his mother's teachings; however, he begins to disagree. He begins to look away, losing attention. Then he starts to get up from the couch

"Wait, you're on G. G is for goat." He settles down for a moment, but after two more pages, he gets up again. "Tyler, wait. Are you going to read?"

He refuses. She tries a few more times, then tells him, "Okay, then let's go to bed." After a lengthy refusal, with her holding him in his crib, with crying at full pitch, he goes to sleep.

As time goes on, refusals to accept parental direction affect a child's ability to learn. Tyler could fall behind in development because points of learning are available beyond this discipline of following a routine: time spent learning the next academic task is displaced by time spent arguing over the routine task. And his adversarial role could continue into his lesson time if it is not cordoned into the more menial task; Tyler's current partly-positive conviction towards learning could change, he could view reading time as negative rather than positive.

A parent must try to keep academic lessons free of negative criticism for as long as possible. At some point, a child will have to place dedicated time to learning to read. This is best performed with a full natural motive directing him to this task. Because of the advantage of positive attitudes towards academics, lesser routines such as brushing teeth and going to bed should

have greater amounts of negative imposition (when necessary) in advance of academics.

. Tyler is also repeating his adversarial stance with a repeating routine event, an event that is in opposition to his cherished task of devoting time to play. Although it is best to begin applying varieties of positive reinforcements with these refusals, then negative, and then positive again, at a certain point when a child is aware of the routine the parent should have a firm singular negative reinforcement moment. This would be difficult with this bedtime routine because there are not many more types of sequestration other than placing him in the crib, and he is still new to spoken communication. A firm low tone during a reprimand could help, but the parent may want to pick a point of reason to teach near this bedtime moment.

Tyler is two years old. With diversions, his parents have kept his bedtime arguing to a minimum. Sometimes he throws a temper tantrum, almost having to be held in place, and other times they plan it out so that he becomes too tired to argue (a diversion). At times, when they distract him from his normal refusal routine, he actually goes to bed with positive reinforcement.

His parents start Tyler on a routine of brushing teeth with training toothpaste. He enjoys it at first. But he begins to disagree when he realizes that it accompanies bedtime.

“Tyler, time to brush teeth,” his mother says.

“Uh eh (no),” he says shaking his head.

“Now, now, you want to brush your teeth right? The minty toothpaste.”

“No!” he says, “Not bedtime!”

“Tyler, come on. You have to brush your teeth and then it’s story time.”

He refuses. His mother lectures him on how he should brush his teeth each day. She continues to engage him at these moments, interrupting his playtime with his toys. He continues to refuse. During these positive reinforcement and neutral sessions, she tries to time it so that he will tire and fall asleep, so as to postpone the negative reinforcement as long as possible.

On subsequent routines she again tries to influence him with positive reinforcement and he begins a pattern of absolute refusal. Then she decides to become absolute with her negative reinforcement.

“Tyler, you have to brush your teeth and go to bed. Enough of this!” she says.

“No! No!” he repeats.

“Are you going to go to timeout?”

Not really knowing of timeout yet, he repeats his refusal. She pleads more, and he continues to refuse. She then stands him in the corner, “Okay, you’re in timeout. You can stay there or change your mind.”

He gets out and begins to walk away. “No, no. You have to stay there, or brush your teeth,” she says, grabbing him and putting him back.

He screams, “Uh eh (no)!” and gets out again. Again she puts him back. This repeats nine times, until he gets tired of fighting, and just stays in the corner crying. He falls asleep, and is placed in bed.

The next day, at bed time, she says, “Okay. Tyler (high tone, then middle tone, implying, ‘here’s a contentious issue that we had before), It’s bedtime (same high tone and middle tone), we have to brush teeth this time. You missed it last night because you were getting in trouble.”

“Uh eh (no) (“eh” has a high and low tone implying a firm refusal)!” he says.

“Tyler, please? You don’t want to get in trouble right?”

“Uh eh (no) (with a greater variation between tones on “eh”)!” he says.

“Now, now, Tyler. You have to brush your teeth. Remember the minty toothpaste that you like.”

“No,” he says, “Not bedtime.”

“Alright! You’re going to get a taste of timeout again.” She places him in the corner, and again he refuses to stay there. She goes through seventeen times of placing him back in the corner and he stops escaping. He sits down, whimpering.

After a moment, she comes up to him, “Are you ready to brush your teeth and get ready for bed? You have to make your teeth clean. See,” she smiles big, pointing at her teeth. “Mmmm, I taste the mint.”

“Uh eh (no) (the two syllables are said with mild variation across two tones).” he says with low tones, whimpering. He’s signifying that he disagrees but he is open to the idea.

“Come on. Here,” she puts the toothpaste on the toothbrush. “It’s minty.”

He starts to get up to follow her to the bathroom. She says, “Thank you, so much. And we’ll pick out a good book, Okay?”

The next few days, he continues to refuse, but her reprimands are enough to change his mind. On one occasion, he actually responds to positive reinforcement only. Yet, after a few more days of refusals, he returns to having timeouts almost regularly. On one day he makes a strong stand and goes through twenty-five escapes before tiring and falling asleep.

This scene is not an exaggeration. Most children will seek the edge of their parent’s authority. They will test the absolute boundary. The genetics driving their behavior will seek out the peripheral edge. And this is quite healthy, normal behavior.

A fault of behavioral studies which do not acknowledge the use of negative reinforcement is that, in addition to antisocial and aggressive profiles developing within gene coding, all species have a large set of genome mutations which seek to disagree with the species’ current paradigm of thought. A wolf pup, or lion cub, or mouse, or a human infant is more likely to be genetically encoded with behaviors outside of the norm and have some aggression towards their parent’s networked lessons. Sometimes, a mutation uncovers a new approach to the species’ environmental problems and the species branches into a more stable genetic path (stable in relation to the current prevailing environmental tests). Sometimes a genetic mutation which challenges the existing paradigm fails (mortally), and the original genetic path is sustained. From many genome states, in a species which revels in peripheral edge discoveries, it is possible that the majority of children will seek an adversarial/challenging position; and, from this healthy

adversarial state, they are brought into a more reasoned state with some degree of negative reinforcement.

From many genome states, it is also possible for a small percentage of children to adopt an unwavering, absolute, adversarial state. Such children will not, under any circumstances, with negative or positive reinforcement, relinquish their opposing point of view.

Advocates for only using positive reinforcement might feel that timeout imposed here is too harsh, that it is unnecessary, and that eventually a child will succumb to positive direction. They may feel that this is too emotionally distressful to a child, that it is inhumane. Often parents are too distraught, feeling strong empathy for a saddened child. It is proposed here that an approach to child development involving measured negative reinforcement, derived from sound case studies, will prevent imminent adult-level harm. The mortal nature of environmental tests must be taken into consideration. The necessary conservation of resources must be taken into consideration. Case studies, conducted with a discrete observation of the individual scene events, can reveal how an adult-level environmental failure of a subject can be connected to absence of sound negative reinforcement during childhood. The negative outcomes (stress and mortality) of those latter environmental tests far exceed the reasoned, rational, negative imposition by a parent.

Our cushioned modern environment, our current high standard of life in western societies, is fragile. In addition to destitution, the well-being of society is dependent upon children growing into responsible adults, maintaining a free sovereignty, and preventing the conclusion of the mass extinction event. To sequester Tyler into timeout not only begins to place him within a framework of academic learning, preventing individual failure (either destitution or mortal failure), but it also works to support the wellbeing of all of society. Tyler must not believe that he may access unlimited resources with any whim-ful, uneducated, unreasoned, desire. He must not access resources at the expense of other species members.

Limitations of human behavior are integral to discrete behaviorism. Limitations of human behavior are integral to AI design. An AI must be aware, as human beings must be aware, that poor decisions can cause hardship. The caregiver-child interactions proposed here are points of debate among behaviorist, and the author is only theorizing on outcomes of case studies, but because the environment is limited in resources, and the species-level problems are mortal, we must establish certain limitations for individual members. A person has to know their own limitations, their own withdrawal

of resources from the environment, so that they may adopt the reasoning needed for preserving the societies' full allotment of resources.

Negative reinforcement must be administered with a child's current rights and future rights in consideration. A child should not be hit, they should only be sequestered. A child should not be yelled at (except under extreme circumstances such as them walking into the street or them playing with an electric receptacle) or berated; they should only have firm reprimands, a lecturing of the details of the outer goal(s)/lesson(s), and sequestering.

When his mother says, "Okay, you're in timeout. You can stay there or change your mind," she presents her decision as a statement with little emotion on her part. Ideally, sequestering should be dispensed without reprimands. Reaching a point of sequestration should mimic those latter adult moments when an individual makes a poor decision. The adult environment is matter-of-fact. When one loses a job, or a car runs out of gas, they are simply presented with a moment of distress without an entity implying emotion.

After the first instance of timeout, he begins to be in agreement, yet he later begins to test the new edge. Again, the parent must decide their next-best-response. Being placed into timeout spurs him to physically react by escaping.

Tyler's behavior is normal. His choosing an adversarial position is healthy and, at this age, this behavior is not determinable as an antisocial profile. A child who does not enact such a stern adversarial position actually may need an approach to development which supports greater independence during their exploration of valid points of liberty. Such an overly-empathetic or pedantic or indifferent or child may need to be taught to approach problems with more aggression. They may have to learn that it is okay to question authority and their parents should give them more latitude in order for them to develop a more competitive nature.

Tyler starts into kindergarten and does well with his work but he resists putting his backpack away and storing his papers in his assigned cubbyhole. He politely puts things away when his teacher asks him, but he is often too exuberant about the first tasks of the day to remember this routine. Upon leaving each day his mom or dad would remind him to not walk out without his backpack and straightening his work area.

Through the course of the day, he would clean up his play area at the direction of the teachers, yet he would never choose to remember this task on his own.

At one time, his teacher asks, “Now what’d you forget? You have to put the crayons back.” He begrudgingly cleans up his crayons scattered around the floor. “You got them all over the place,” His teacher adds politely. Other than a few grunts, he never became too argumentative.

As the school year comes to a close, his teachers spend time reminding him that these things he forgets will not be tolerated in first grade. His teachers tell him that he has to remember every time to gather up his papers, and keep them in folders. They tell him that he can’t get distracted with other things, however fun these other things may be, when he is tasked to stay in a seat and finish an assignment.

His home life teaches him lessons such as brushing teeth regularly, which he does without being told about sixty percent of the time. When leaving the house he begins to recognize the importance of bringing his toys and begins executing on that point of reason about 90% of the time. He grasps the concept of staying near his parents as they travel, but this is with the customary stern direction during moments of potential true danger. He says “please” and “thank you” almost without direction, but he almost always states it in enthusiasm with the item that he is to gain. He eats his dinner without direction about eighty percent of the time, with the usual favored dishes. He often agrees to complete dinner when a dessert is involved. More and more, he begins to take one particular issue to a point of contention; he begins to purposefully not put toys away. He also would not hang his towel up after not getting out of the shower or hang his coat upon returning home without arguing.

“Tyler, your coat (two toned with a peak), remember (same two tones and peak).”

He keeps walking, briskly.

“Tyler!” she says. This shout is of a particular volume level as to be subordinate to other peaks, other more stern

moments of reprimand. It is of a relatively normal volume for the situation.

“Eem um (no)! I have to find my Spiderman.” He says, and he begins to go to his toybox.

“Sorry mister. You can’t do anything until you hang up your coat. Get back there (polite, normal volume with a peak on “back”).”

He grunts, “Why do I always have to do it?”

“It’s your jacket,” his mother says with amazement.

He picks it up, walks in his room and tosses it in the closet, “Have you seen my Spiderman?” He attempts to change the subject quickly.

“Uhn uh (no)! Pick up your coat.”

He grunts and stomps his feet slightly, picking up his coat and hanging it on a hook.

On another occasion, his mother reminds him, but she becomes busy without noticing that he doesn’t do it. She notices later, “Tyler, you have to pick up your coat that you forgot to put away.” He remains seated, continuing to watch television, and the direction had to be repeated three times with increasing volume.

On another occasion he responded with, “Okay,” yet he treated the event as if it is a future assignment.

His mother was busy with other tasks before she says, “Tyler (highest relative volume for the situation)! Your coat.”

“I will.” He says, not moving.

“No, right now!” she says, leveling off in volume.

He grunts and hangs his coat. He watches television for some more time, then his mother sets out a bowl of soup,” lunchtime.

“I’m not hungry.”

“But it’s lunchtime. You have to eat. Come on.”

“I don’t like that kind of soup!” He yells, medium volume.

“Come on (low sustained tone). You (high tone, new peak) like this.”

He refuses. He does like this soup, yet he is compelled to disagree because of the previous disagreement. He is viewing the two arguments as connected, figuratively, ‘Because you

wouldn't do this for me, I won't do this for you.' But he eventually agrees.

He is recognizing that his free time is under direct encroachment by parents and teachers, and he increases his rebellions when it draws him away from what he wants to do. Most times, when leaving the playground, he argues at a level of near screaming while being carried out.

At home he has a difficult issue with point he has a timeout session after refusing to stop playing and pick up toys. He continues escaping from time out for about an hour. His parents close his room door, and hold it shut, blocking him from his toys, and they block the two paths of the hallway. He cries at full pitch. He starts to choke and have a difficult time catching his breath.

"Take it easy," his father says. He recovers and promptly tries to escape again. Again he continues at full pitch. Exhausted, he sits there.

After a moment, his father says, "Are you ready to put your things away."

He still resists, "Eem um (no)!" He then stays in timeout, until he falls to sleep. They put him in his bed.

After this incident, he begins to listen better, however, he still continues with refusals at certain moments where he feels he must take a stand.

In presenting certain chores to a child, teachers and parents are unfolding twenty years of necessary tasks under the topic/goal of, figuratively, "Preventing sudden task overload," as well as "Addressing tasks in priority," "Accepting established reason (and questioning that reason when it appears to have a contradiction)," and "Addressing the state-level/sovereignty-level problem of preserving resources." An overloading of tasks means the loss of resources, destitution, and possible a mortal event. Some may feel that these impressed tasks be directed with more leniency and some may prefer less leniency; however, all lifestyle choices have set task-accomplishment levels and all failures lead to stressful and mortal events.

Consider someone wanting to live a very liberated adult life, travel without employment, live in the open, in nature, and consume only a bare minimum of foods. With this niche formed out of our current environment, a

member could attend to a lower minimum level of task accomplishment, and a child looking to adopt this lifestyle may not need to be concerned with hanging up a jacket or keeping a room clean; yet, an adult would need to operate at some level of task accomplishment. At a certain point, they would need to attend to tasks rather than avoid them. This lifestyle would require some level of clothing maintenance, changing and cleaning. Weather, such as below-freezing temperatures, must be accounted for with clothing and temporary shelter. If a person in such a natural setting has task overload or a critical task failure, such as not assembling enough layers of clothing for winter, the individual could experience a mortal event. One could be less concerned with organization, they would not need to learn of keeping a bedroom clean as a part of their child development; however, they would need some degree of managing and maintaining clothing.

A person also might choose any small job, skilled or unskilled, which allows for a meager living. With this approach to adulthood, one might need only a minimal amount of skills; they also may not need to be concerned with hanging a jacket, or cleaning a room. A child being raised for this adult lifestyle may, to a degree, oppose a parent's direction and adopt their points of liberty sooner, rather than later; yet they would still need to address some minimum level of task accomplishment.

With lessened chores, a child could have additional free time to explore greater levels of intellectual development, and this may inadvertently produce a more optimum outcome during adulthood; however, this would not be the typical result. An approach to child development that is too lenient and less disciplined (a measured, reasonable, environment-tested, level of discipline) does not take into consideration the many unfavorable outcomes and it allows for a near-perfect, continuous, business cycle free of volatility. These more lenient approaches are with the expectation that all children will naturally develop into favorable, agreeable, character types and that the environment will successfully accommodate them with resources. And from the different genome states, most subjects would not take advantage of the reduced tasks and would choose to act out with some degree of anti-social, inequitable, behavior. Many children may not take advantage of the extra time made available to them for learning and, driven by whim-ful, innate, carnal desires, they may adopt un-resourceful uses of their time.

Humans are in a state of modern civilization. This modern paradigm requires a higher minimum level of task accomplishment not just so an individual can solve problems within their local environment but also so that

they may address state-level and species-level problems. Each member must move through those levels of problems in roughly that order, solving personal self-sufficiency problems and then species self-sufficiency problems. This modern environment requires members to maintain a reasonable level of academic study so that they can understand and address state-level/species-level problems. This must be the direction of child development—to address tasks rather than avoid them—because beyond their personal attendance to their own resources, the full allotment of world resources must be managed. They must be aware of the consequences if the world's problems are not addressed with deliberate action, deliberate sacrifice of personal resources, by each individual society member. It is proposed here that caregivers must direct children to an adult-level of reasoning that is conducive to solving state-level problems/tasks. A child should not only acquire and manage their personal resources but they should also have the reasoning skills needed to maintain their sovereignty, maintain their species, and maintain their biosphere. This state-level of responsibility will only occur if a child first accepts the direction and authority of their parents and the reasoning behind the fair acquisition and maintenance of resources.

To impress upon a child the need to operate at a state-level of awareness, caregivers must teach a level of cleanliness in the home befitting a state guest. By maintaining all aspects of a home, all the required daily chores, all the upkeep and maintenance, all the order and organization, a member is showing that they are capable of covering all the details of their life and are ready to take on species-level/state-level/sovereignty-level problems. They must know how to operate at this state-level of relativity and understand the reasoning behind task control and risk management. It shows a respect for state-level decision making. A house must be without clutter, clothing must be without flaws, and a person should be bathed and free of odor for the majority of their time. Furniture should be straightened, kept parallel and perpendicular to walls (or of specified angles) cleaned, and maintained. The cloth of clothing and furniture must be maintained clean (for example, a person should not sit down on a couch if they are in need of a shower). Floors should be both swept and mopped, carpeting should be thoroughly vacuumed and without any staining. Food should be handled with care and eaten or discarded before perishing (the complexities of presenting food to a state guest are discussed later). All surfaces should be kept clean and maintained free of blemishes. Refuse should be in recycled containers and

removed before an odor develops. Items should be organized into appropriate, trending, presentable, containers and maintained within cabinetry. Dishes should be practical, but hosts should be aware of not mix-matching. Exteriors of homes and apartments should be without unclean surfaces and well painted. The outside of a household should be with well-maintained foliage, sidewalks, driveways, and yards. Sidewalks should be pressure-washed clean at regular intervals and lawns should be without weeds, blemishes, or brown spots. Cars should be cleaned about once a week, free of toxic leaking, and their appearance should be without flaws (the regular maintenance of a car benefits the owner, but it does not pertain to a visiting guest). The interior of cars should be maintained of clutter (coffee cups, wrappers) regularly. A child should know that although many circumstances may make it difficult for a patch of land to be held in such a state of proper order, the members of the household should be cognizant of those tasks that would ensure a sound state of self sufficiency.

Pets should be maintained healthy, bathed for odor and parasites, brushed for control of shedding, and measures must be taken to mitigate the dirt, feces, and urine that pets can track into the house from the outside. (Providing pets with all their shots is, in part, a moral responsibility of the owner, it does not pertain to a visiting guest.) The odor and debris and shedding of pets are the main visible offenses to a state guest. If, for example, a guest sees a dog jumping on the couch, they may seek to only gingerly sit, so as to not pick up pet hairs on their clothing.

In addition to greeting them at the door, hosts must follow the age old rules of being courteous and accommodating and a part of this is maintaining a home. These forms of maintaining an appearance of a household must be with a relative knowledge of the changing trends of household appearance. In describing these lessons of cleanliness to a child, parents should lead to this eventual goal, of the child knowing how to present a household to a state guest.

This proposed emphasis on state-level cleanliness is analogous to the respect of the world's full allotment of resources. Consider the use of a combine to harvest wheat. When a task such as harvesting wheat goes from the use of manual labor of ten thousand years ago where one member may harvest for the food for four members to using machinery which harvests the wheat for hundreds of members—one member creates food for hundreds—this causes profound increases in human population and that population, in turn, increases the level of human encroachment into nature and a withdrawal

of many other types of resources (in addition to the top-soil lost with wheat farming, mono-culture). Without each member developing an ability to understand these kinds of state-level resource problems, without each member having a competency to address these state-level problems, the society and the ecosystem will collapse

A person may present a valid exception to this rule of a trending, relative state-level of cleanliness befitting a state guest; an individual may simply need to be of an understanding of the concept while not practicing it for a valid reason. One of many reasons could be expressed, such as “Well, money (resources) hasn’t been easy to come by. I’ve been in between jobs (but I’ve been trying), otherwise, I’d like to fix up the dents on my car and repaint it, but first my washing machine isn’t working as good as it used to so I’m going to have to dish out some money for that one. Sometimes life throws you a bunch of unexpected expenses, also. But, yeah, I could see where someone would see it as unattractive.” With the host having an understanding of state-level problems, the guest would be burdened with showing that they are respectful and understanding of the host’s situation. Under such an incident, of a host being fully aware of the differences in appearance, this environmental task would be considered solved, a positive course for the host(s), a positive next-best response, by an AI or behaviorist.

A person may also present a valid objection to society moving to a more formal, clean, state of a household. And certainly one may speak out against any lack of respect for a less-clean lifestyle. Yet, keeping a household in a clean state has a purpose of supporting a modern environment. Subjects of a modern environment must ascribe to an understanding of the form that developed the modern society. Higher levels of intelligence, the assembling of the many steps to solve state-level problems, the assembling of many steps to produce modern innovative solutions to problems, are derived from an individual’s reasonable adherence to form.

Consider a child not adopting a household rule such as brushing teeth or putting away toys or hanging a jacket. If the behavior persists into adulthood the resources they gain in adulthood will be lost and they will be lessened. A portion will adopt these rules later in life and begin to see reason, but another portion will succumb to task overload and destitution. If too large of a portion of the population chooses to avoid certain tasks the group begins to see reduced resources. The larger society will begin to fail in many aspects of governance if too large of a portion of societal members are unable to reason and ration and discipline themselves. Herein is one of the many problems to

be addressed if a UAI is constructed. If successive generations have machines which automate the gathering of resources—either a wagon, a fishing net, a combine harvester or a UAI—the developing collection of members will become complacent, and lose the reasoning that each individual voting member must have to come to hard, rational decisions. Consider a body of agricultural scientist stating that there is a problem with the fertilizer supply, that synthetic nitrogen fertilizers are abundant but the accompanying bio matter is about to reach a state of collapse. The bio matter, found and nurtured in topsoil, is the top of the agricultural food chain and it is the top of the global ecosystem. Consider a body of oceanologist stating that tuna, herring, cod, and two hundred other species of fish will go extinct within seven years. Each individual member must have a competency, an intelligence, an education, an ability to reason, befitting the best of statesman to begin to solve these global species-level problems. It cannot just be oceanologist and agricultural scientist who are disciplined and detail-oriented, each individual voting member must have a level of competency to address species-level problems. An understanding and a respect of household chores is just a small discipline compared to the many perils of avoiding global ecosystem collapse.

When the mother says, “It’s your jacket,” she is too succinct. It is important for Tyler to know of the need to perform his own chores and not expect someone else to do it, and accept the direction of a parent, yet it is much more important to convey the outer goals of the task. This subordinate task is, figuratively, “knowing of the routines of clothing maintenance (so as to prevent task overload with clothing procurement) within its relative level of accomplishment.” This task is subordinate to, “maintaining all solvency (by maintaining a resource) and security tasks, and health tasks, so as to maintain a reasonable level of comfort.” And these tasks are subordinate to, “being observant of far term mortal events by preventing task overload and/or critical task failure.” To make Tyler aware of these goals outside of his realm of reasoning, the mother could say, “It’s your jacket, you can’t expect me to pick it up. . . everyone has to put away their own jackets.” Other lecturing of this topic could include the larger outer goals, “Everyone needs to take care of their clothing. Clothing costs money. Sometimes we make money the easy way and sometimes the hard way, but you must conserve and take care of what you have. And even if we were wealthy, even if we had millions in the bank, it still would not be right to mistreat jackets, to waist their purpose, because making a jacket creates greenhouse gases and it

pollutes the environment and all human endeavors displace the endeavors of other animals within the ecosystem. Even if it left a very small mark on the environment, it would still be leaving a mark.”

Laying a jacket on the floor does not necessarily hurt the jacket, but it could lead to a disregard of caring for the jacket. It supports a carelessness of the resources. It supports other traits such as leaving other items of value in the wrong place and losing them.

The imposition of his elders with issues such as cleaning his room bothers him because he begins to realize that it encroaches upon his free-time. His liberties are, again, displaced by required environmental tasks.

At a pinnacle in the room-cleaning argument(s) Tyler’s mother says, “Tyler (highest relative volume for the situation)! Your coat.” He responds, “I will,” but he does not move to do it at that moment. This is a means of adopting a small, sometimes acceptable, protocol of prioritizing tasks—he is implying, “Yeah, I know to do it. I’ll make time to do it later.” However, he is not intending to do it at any point in time. The pausing at the point when a parent is directing a task is a way of directly avoiding a task similar to the behaviors sometimes adopted by adults who wish to avoid work.

When Tyler refuses to eat the soup, he is responding with a negative imposition to attempt to equal the negative imposition he received. He is playing within a political-like favor system. As in teenage and adult situations (and in political situations), members will imply, “If you don’t do this for me, I won’t do that for you.” Or they may say the opposite, “if you do this for me, I’ll do that for you.”

Consider the following scene of Tyler as a teenager, repeating this political maneuvering.

Tyler is a teenager. He is eating lunch in the cafeteria with a friend. He says, “I don’t know why you won’t trade the Atomizer game (video game) for Gorgon. You’ve already beat all the missions.”

“I know, I want to beat them again.” Thomas says.

“Urggh. My mom won’t buy it for me. She says we’ve already spent too much money on other things.” Tyler remains unhappy. He feels that Thomas is hoarding the game, and he does not really need it.

This Friday, are we going to ride our bikes home from school, so we can stop by the comic book store?” Thomas speaks of something they’ve been doing regularly.

“No, I think I’m going to Rogers.” Tyler says, with a topic-ending low tone.

A myriad of teenage-level and adult-level interactions have this kind of political favoritism. In this example, Tyler has applied a total ambiguity to the issue of fair gain, he has treated the ownership rights of items with ambiguity, and he is behaving as if resources can be retrieved from the environment without the required successive steps of fair gain. At this teenage level, a large school of thought has developed to lead him within this false perception of resources.

If Tyler were to continue small impositions like expecting a friend to give him an item, this could lead to him adopting a perception-only view of nature rather than an empirical understanding of the rules of resource ownership. He would be treating nature, and resources, ambiguously, when the more common mutually-held societal rules have a required series of steps toward resource ownership

Here is another example of Tyler’s profile after years of developing with too much parental leniency. This example contains an adult-level behavior that is similar to his childhood behavior where he implied, “Yeah, I know to do it. I’ll make time to do it later.”

After trying a few jobs, Ty begins to work at construction site. It is his first day. He’s a little late. “So sorry, my alarm didn’t go off.”

“Yeah sure,” Carl says, “Here’s what I have for you. Like I said in the interview, you’ll have to learn to assemble these hangers. We have to make forty of them.”

Carl spends time showing Ty how to assemble the parts. Ty picks it up and Carl walks away for a moment. After a while, Carl looks back to see that Ty is putting the parts together too slowly.

“Hey, uh, if you could, you have to get these things together a little faster, okay? We have a lot of ground to cover today. You’re doing okay, and I hate to be a bother, but just understand that it’s got to be a little faster.”

Tyler nods, “Oh, okay. Sorry.” He picks up the pace.

The rest of the day, Ty does a little better. He is on time, and he does his directed tasks with diligence. Carl has him collecting certain parts for the next phase of work. Ty gets the hang of things, but he does slow down a little, after noticing that some of the work involves moving around heavy boxes. At one point Carl mentions, “Hey, I don’t need it yet, but the next time you go out to the truck can you get me the wood parts for the cribbing I have to build? You know, the wood on the inside of the larger tool boxes.”

Ty responds, “Yeah, sure,” but he doesn’t move right away.

Carl stares at him in disbelief and goes to perform another task. After some time passes, Ty doesn’t remember. Carl reminds him.

A few days later, and with several incidents of slow work, Carl asks, “When you put these parts together you have to add the cap here. We have them on the other table at the south end of this building. Also, can you distribute those boxes to their corresponding room on the plan? I’ll be right behind you installing the parts.”

At the time of this request, Ty is assembling the day’s tools on the carts/tables. He’s setting up a few machines. He agrees, but he continues to not move to perform the task. After a moment, Carl looks at him and asks, “Ty, the boxes (higher relative tone), and you have to get the caps (same high tone)?” He is implying an asked question, “Are you going to do these tasks?”

Ty says, “Yeah, I’ll get them,” but he does not move from where he is.

“Ty, I kind of need you to get moving here,” Carl says.

“Okay (high two tones, Ty is agitated). I just had a rough time last night. Give me a break.”

“Sorry, but we have a job to do. The boss is going to be on my ass if we don’t get enough done. Okay.”

“Yeah, I get it.”

This adult-level Ty seeks to imply that tasks may be casually addressed. He feels that a task is simply placed on the to-do list and he may get to it later. Many workers attempt this type of breaching of protocol. It can be found in case studies and often young adults new to the work force harbor this lack of addressing tasks. And these incidents lead back to the original incidents where an elder, a teacher or parent, allows this behavioral trait to manifest and it is not met with a direct lesson to explain how it is inappropriate. This casual attitude towards work, the tasks of earning a living, implies that the resources gained by the company, and extended to the employee, are readily available and the tasks associated with them are not necessary.

This approach often leads to either a temporary or permanent state of destitution. For many young adults, it causes them to take more time to adjust to having to work. They may spend a few years of languishing between jobs before they realize that these kinds of behavioral traits lead to problems. And during this period, if one of the many possible critical task failures occurs such as mounting credit card debt, or an unexpected health problem, or the parenting of child occurs, a permanent, irreversible, life-long state of destitution will occur.

As in many instances like this example, the negative behavioral trait is not alluded to by the participants of the scene. Unlike his mother telling him to pick up his coat “now” the adults are not having this faux pas brought to his attention. If no one describes the problem directly, and his boss later fires him, he will likely not know the core reasons of his termination.

Children must be taught the consequences of their poor choices. Too much leniency with the attending to room cleaning tasks, and resource maintenance (clothes maintenance), could have detrimental effects on a child’s allotment of resources later in life. He will not easily adjust to being employed. He will not easily ascribe to the form and decorum that his employers might expect, a form that leads to successful outcomes of larger, more detailed, and more resourceful, environmental tests. Resources gained will decay and age and lose their value too quickly. Many may feel that this is too imposing upon a child, that the child’s failure to listen to his parents on this issue is without harm, that the environmental tests are without serious consequences, or possible that employers are being unfair. Case studies could reveal that that the consequences of not teaching these lessons are serious and that an employer’s response to such a character is just. Case studies could reveal that the competition between companies must involve a limitation of

un-resourceful behavior of employees. Case studies could show that the weight of too many people with these same behavioral traits can overwhelm and overtax the resources of members who attend environmental problems with diligence. These behaviors, left unchecked, can lead to individual failure, sovereignty failure, and species failure.

If his parents were to allow a leniency with this task, it may be without harm. Tyler may grow out of this bad behavior the way he grew out of the bad behavior of grabbing the wires, yet this is unlikely. Children test the edge of their parent's rules. For some children it is a necessity to disagree with authority, to disagree with impositions upon their liberties. Consider the following variation:

After this previous incident of being in time out rather than going to bed, he begins to listen better, however, he still continues with refusals at certain moments where he feels he must take a stand.

On one occasion, he begins his refusal. His mother says, "Tyler, please don't start that. You have to brush your teeth and go to bed. We go through this every day."

"No, I'm still building (playing with his toys)."

"Do you want to go to Justin's birthday tomorrow?"

"Heh heh (crying utterances), No, not right now!"

"Right now!" She states, slightly louder than Tyler, "or you're not going to the party. I mean it."

"No!" He turns his head and walks swiftly to the other side of the room to grab a piece for his toys.

"Okay. I'll just call his mom and tell her I'll drop off Justin's present that we bought."

Tyler continues to ignore her.

"Alright," She goes to pick up the phone. She starts dialing, then she pretends to talk, "Carolyn, Hi, this is Tyler's mom. Tyler just won't be able to make it to the party. . . Okay . . . We'll just drop his present off. . . okay . . . bye. "

Tyler does not believe her or he does not care. After a moment she says, "Tyler, you don't want mommy to get mad right?"

Tyler says, "look, I put a tail on this truck. I have to find a helmet for this one (figurine) so he can ride."

“You know it’s time for you to brush your teeth. . .” She continues to attempt more mild lecturing. Then she leaves to go to the living room for a moment. She later returns and attempts another lecture, being more stern, yet without any consequences if he refuses. This continues a few more times, until he falls to sleep.

Many case studies of these types of caregiver responses, where a child refuses to accept parental direction after positive-only reinforcement, would lead to the child eventually growing out of this negative behavioral trait. They may become cognizant of the social un-acceptance and change their position of opposing their parents. However, many more case studies will lead to a child continuing to refuse their elders on these issues and larger issues.

Tyler could proceed to have odd bed times and he may never truly adopt a routine of brushing teeth. This could be detrimental to health and social acceptance, but the refusal of authority (a fair, well-meaning authority) could be with greater consequences. If he maintained a position that imposes upon others, a position of unfair gain of social status, a position that allows his personal rights to be at an out-of-balance state, a position that harbors a false perception that resources are to be handed to him regardless of his earning of these resources, he would be noted by behaviorists and AIs, and his peers, as maintaining an amoral character/profile (with differing degrees of imposition).

A child who tests the parental/authoritative boundary, and defeats that authority (a fair, well-meaning authority) on an instance such as this, gains a small portion of adult-level rights. They will have acquired a right to trump reason at any future point in their development. By disregarding this problem of their local environment, they also will have acquired a disregard for state-level and species-level problems.

Adulthood has many critical tasks which must be addressed with critical decisions. Tyler could wreck a vehicle if he fails to drive properly. Tyler could fail to procure resources; he could miss key bills that he might have to pay like rent, or an insurance payment, or an electric bill. He could father a child and impose this destitution risk upon a second person. From a strong conviction of refusal of authority, Tyler could adopt a criminal lifestyle. He could end up in jail, or be killed in a carnal confrontation. The following

example is of a Tyler that is derivative of this childhood refusal to accept authority.

Tyler is in seventh grade. His grades are failing. From being in communication with his teacher, his mother knows that an important test is being given tomorrow. His mother has spent an hour arguing with Tyler about how he is to study for this test. Tyler refuses. He starts to put his jacket on.

“Where do you think you’re going?” His mother desperately asks.

“I’m going to meet Timmy.” He says, with a subject-ending low tone.

“Oh, no you’re not! You’re late getting home and it’s already 8:00 and your test’s tomorrow. Are you kidding me?”

“I don’t care. Enough already. I’m doing what I want.”

“Tyler, stop it!” She tries to grab his arm. He slips out. He opens the door and leaves.

He refused his parent’s ultimatum at a young age. He refused their imposed parental boundary with an innocuous issue of household chores and from that point forward he continued with his own collected points of reasoning. Here, he is becoming an adult, exercising adult-level rights, at the time of his choosing.

If this adult-level Tyler survives in the world, if he makes a meager living while avoiding a critical failure, this variation of Tyler still has a chance of becoming incapable of making informed, intelligent, reasoned judgments of species-level goals. When a parent does not provide an ultimatum with a fair, reasoned, intellect-based parental boundary and a child is allowed to become an adult who refuses key points of sound reason (tested, established, mutually-agreed points of reason), that adult will make decisions and pursue goals that are only pertaining to the individual. Someone could point out to them that a danger exists in the environment—that the sovereignty has a valid security threat or that society has a systemic threat or that the ecological environment is under grave threat—and the individual will fail to address these problems.

Negative reinforcement must be with an absolute ultimatum. In certain situations, when a child cannot see vital points of reason, the parents must place them in a stern, unlimited (until the age of eighteen), time-out or

grounding. All non-educational media and entertainment and liberties would have to cease. The goal of this reinforcement is to bring about such a negative flush of emotion that a child, or teenager, is in a state of utter humility. Just as a serious adult-level failure causes one to accept humility, the more cradled environment of juveniles should also have a serious warning of these adult-level consequences. A child or teenager would need to change their own inner conviction and accept humility in relation to the fair, networked reason of mature species members. Once this humility has occurred, parents can carefully begin a slow but growing trend of positive reinforcement while being mindful that this heavy lesson cannot be discarded.

If a juvenile is of an absolute adversarial state or an un-resourceful state, once a permanent grounding is in effect, parents may seek to come to terms with how the individual may be sequestered from society and how they may receive a subsistence-level of social assistance. If an individual is without empathy, and they cannot be brought to reason regardless of the positive or negative imposition of parents and elders, some means of protecting other societal members must be in place. Most current legal remedies consist of being vigilant of an individual's actions and hoping that law enforcement can intervene before such an individual enacts physical harm to others. And if the individual only imposes upon others by not being resourceful, sovereignties may choose to provide the member with limited food, medicine, and housing.

It must be understood that some profiles are inherently amoral and dangerous. Children who have such a behavioral state, children who cross certain key thresholds of reason, must be recognized. Juveniles with such a behavioral state must be separated from weapons and society must move to separate them from their ability to do harm. And, once an individual attempts to harm others, sovereignties would be fair to incarcerate, sequester, the individual.

When a child learns appropriate behavior from their parent's negative imposition, the parent and the child can begin to move past the lesson. The following example shows a transition from having to impose negative reinforcement to beginning to provide positive reinforcement.

Tyler is ten years old. After a few serious bouts with his parent's ultimatums he has come to realize that he must be subservient to their will. He hates having to do school work,

but he is mostly resigned to working through it because he knows that privileges will be lost if he does not.

His parents had one ongoing issue with Tyler not putting his homework away in his backpack. After telling him, he would sometimes mumble, griping complaints. Sometimes he would appear to neglect this task with purpose, while remembering other similar tasks with diligence. With time, he adopted this routine.

On one occasion, he forgets and leaves his homework out. “Ty, your homework,” his mother says, motioning to the papers he left out.

Tyler responds, “Okay.” And he moves a little from reading a book but then he settles again.

His mother is busy with other things before noticing that he has not put his homework away. “Don’t forget about your science work,” she repeats, nicely.

After a while, she notices that he has still forgetting, “Ty. . .” she says, looking at the papers. He then puts them away.

With this kind of small gesture, a change from firm negative reinforcement to granting a liberty (allowing him to slip when performing this task), the parent is implying that the son is a separate person, of separate rights. She is granting him a small measure of adult-level responsibility under appropriate conditions. Although he made a mistake of not attending to his homework paper, she is viewing it as being a simple one-time occurrence and she does not view it as a big mistake. He does not have the full rights of an adult yet, but she is acknowledging that this full set of rights will be his in the future. If he recognizes this gesture, and responds with an understanding that this liberty is within the confines of a larger problem to solve, he would be moving from a lower level of reasoning to a higher level of reasoning. In many cases this would lead to a child recognizing that a back pack and other items should be put away for both the child’s benefit and the parent’s benefit. And it benefits all of society to have one of its individuals arrive at a thoughtful, respectful, competent, resourceful, level of reasoning.

A species member must develop behaviors that are more informational, rather than “carnal” as a part of solving their local environmental problems

and their larger species-level problems. A species member must attend species-level problems in order to be fair to other members.

Academics are the foremost part of a child's development. The next few examples detail some of the many individual learning steps experienced by a child and the background stimulus which opposes this academia.

Tyler is in a classroom adorned with a variety of stimulating posters, graphics, charts, quotes, models, and cutouts made by the teacher. One explains the routines and rules (supporting reason), "Always sit quietly. Listen. When you have a question, raise your hand and quietly wait to be called upon." Other quotes are, "Be inspired, be inquisitive, ask, learn," and "read daily." Most posters are informational and nature (supporting intelligence), such as, a list of modifiers, verb conjugations, a graphic detailing the atom, the human body, the water cycle, the phases of matter, the parts of the computer, types of fish, types of primates, types of plants, dental care, the scientific method, the place values of a number, and math symbols.

After they put their book bags away, place their lunch in their cubbyholes, the students settle into their desks. The teacher says, "Good morning everyone. Please bring out your math books and turn to chapter four." She proceeds to go over long division. She places a three digit problem on the chalk board and she follows the steps to divide one number into another. She repeats the lesson again with a new problem. She calls a student up to see if he can solve one of the problems. Then another student comes up. She answers a few questions and confident that the class has adopted the technique, she hands out an exercise of ten long division problems. She asks them to quietly work on them. They trade papers with each other and they all go over the answers. She then proceeds to model the problems in a different way, dividing quotients into the dividends. She also refreshes the classes' memory on estimations of solutions. Homework is assigned. It is a light atmosphere where some students respond with a proud, positive, recognition of the otherwise cold mathematical steps.

They begin to see some of the benefit of being able to solve the problems.

Then the students move to another classroom for reading comprehension with another teacher. As they enter, the teacher delivers a dramatic quote, “‘As a single footstep will not make a path on the earth, so a single thought will not make a pathway in the mind. To make a deep physical path, we walk again and again. To make a deep mental path, we must think over and over the kind of thoughts we wish to dominate our lives,’ Henry David Thoreau (pronounced slowly for emphasis).”

The last of the students sit down, she begins to review the lesson of the previous day, “Can anyone, and by anyone, I mean Tyler,” she has a small smile, looking at Tyler who is still fumbling to find his workbook, “tell me at least two of the noted techniques you can use to prepare yourself for reading? Your worksheet noted six of them.”

Tyler responds hesitantly, “Uhm, look at any photos with the story and, uh, make notes.”

“Yes, and?”

“Uhm,” he pauses, “read the notes.” The class chuckles

“Yeah (she says slowly), what might you do with the notes?”

“Go over some of what you’ve written, ask questions to yourself, uhm, use a dictionary.”

“Very good. And, of course, look up any words that you might need to in the dictionary, if you see a word giving you a problem check for context. You can determine the mood of the passage, and the ideas being conveyed, and you can then make predictions. With the photos, you can look at any statistics. You can note any observations about the photo. And I certainly don’t mean to pick on Tyler, I’m sure he has completed all of his homework. (the class chuckles). And of the other reading assignment, who could venture to tell me intent of the passage on endangered tigers?”

She motions to a student who has a hand raised and the student answers, “That human development is displacing the tigers.”

The teacher quickly interrupts, “yes, encroachment.”

“And that they need more large ranges so that they can live without stress,” the student explains.

“And their habitat is shrinking, their game is harder to locate. . .” The teacher continues to delve into details of the passage. The class goes over the different aspects of the passage that the author intends to emphasize. Throughout the class period she prods nearly all of her students with questions to ensure that they have read the workbook to the required pages.

The students then move to their creative writing classroom, where another teacher greets them, “Good afternoon, good afternoon.” The class files in.

“Open up your journals. And who would like to share their work with us? Come now, I know that there must be some brilliant structured paragraphs among you.”

A student reads their passage. The teacher critiques the work, pointing out that the topic sentence appears to speak of one idea, while the last sentence speaks of another. She also speaks positively of the student’s play on words. Another student reads a passage, and another. She teaches them of how they are to use various sentence forms to break up the monotony. She speaks briefly of adverbial clause use. She corrects them on the many grammatical mistakes while placing more emphasis on the general sound of their work (leaving the grammar lessons to another class lesson).

Just as a child is required, “forced,” to eat healthy meals, to brush their teeth on a regular basis, to go to bed at an early hour, to look both ways when crossing a street, a child is required (legally required by sovereignties) to attend school. A school system directs children to the importance of passing the environmental tests that they will encounter as adults; a child is guided to solving their own resource problems and supporting the societies’ maintenance of resources. Schooling begins at age six and continues until about age twenty-five. In current times, an education is required for the general need of citizens to be knowledgeable, learned, reasoned, participants of society, but also for the more direct requirement, the primary goal, of an individual to gain employment.

Children begin their education by adopting the alphabetic system. They are expected to recognize phonetic words, un-phonetic words, sight words, and the simplest of sentences. In addition to the cases of interpersonal relationships they have experienced before schooling, they must read books which show new and varied case studies of interpersonal relationships. Their vocabulary grows. Their command of varied facts grows. They begin to learn new reasoning of an individual's security (such as staying within a caregiver's view, staying on school grounds, and not crossing the street without checking traffic). They learn basic math: addition, subtraction, equality, comparing, estimating, the beginning terms of algebra. With word problems they learn to apply the math. They learn the facts and reasoning of science and history, and they continue to broaden knowledge in all of these subjects so that they may form optimal conclusions when solving environmental problems.

In addition to learning the facts, the raw information of an environment, the reasoning of school tasks mimics the reasoning needed for adult-level environmental tests. Teachers impose the idea that all assignments are critical; an assignment must have its problems solved and it must be turned in without fail and within the allotted time. This pass/fail requirement of schools is the precursor of the fundamental reasoning impressed upon an adult by their local environment and this pass/fail requirement is integral to preventing species-wide failure within the larger environment (such as when too many members fail within local environments). A child is required to complete tasks such as defining words on a vocabulary list, within a schedule, before a deadline, because adults must attend to an environmental task such as balancing a check book on schedule, before a deadline, in advance of making a rent payment.

Because a large population of members maintain carnal-mostly goals in their lives while also disregarding societal resources, work ethic, and state-level problems (societal problems), schools must promote information-only conversation. Teachers must emphasize that children adopt, have a firm conviction for, speaking of new and different informational topics at all times, both inside and outside of the classroom. Rather than applying emotion to more common events, children should be guided to applying emotion at true peaks of accomplishment and failure. Emotions in vapid, un-relative, localized, trivial pursuits must be discouraged. Case studies will show that when an individual indulges in un-relative, trivial, vapid, thoughts and conversations, when they apply excessive emotions to common, vapid

interactions, when they indulge in clichéd schools of thought, they cannot easily transition to non-clichéd, innovative, informational conversations. Many children would resist informational trending and, with the influences of television and media, it would be difficult to change their carnal leisure time pursuits. Often, even if made aware of the consequences of failing a critical task, students will continue to indulge in carnal thoughts and conversations after being warned of the dire consequences.

Case studies will show that when one adopts a lifestyle that is in direct opposition to informational schools of thought their chance at solving environmental problems is greatly reduced, and each individual failure to acquire personal resources (within an acceptable encroachment footprint) hinders the species' chance at solving larger environmental problems.

Tyler arrives at home after getting off the bus. He walks in to find his mother watching television, folding clothes on the couch.

“Hey, you. How was your day? His mother asks.

“Fine.”

“What’s new? Did you take the test today?”

“Yeah.”

“Well? How’d you think you did?”

“Okay, I guess.”

“I hope so. You don’t know your grade yet?”

“No. I guess she’ll tell us tomorrow.”

“You turned in your homework?”

“Yep,” he says, setting his backpack partly in the hallway. He continues to go down the hallway.

“Mister (low tone, small pause). Is that where your backpack goes?”

“Okay,” he says, slowly, “let me go to the bathroom.”

When he comes out, he starts to forget his backpack, but then he remembers and puts it in his room.

The television show is a daytime talk show. The show has guests and hosts talking about the positives and negatives of the single life and married life. The participants provide examples of when their partners made them happy or mad.

Tyler comes back through to the kitchen to get a drink, “Can I have a snack.”

“Did you eat the afternoon snack?”

“Yes.”

“Okay, if you’re hungry. Not too much to spoil dinner.”

“Can I watch television?”

“Well, you know this is homework time.”

“Aaagh,” he says mildly.

They sit for a while, her folding clothes and him eating the snack. The commercials come on. The first is a mattress commercial showing a poignant scene, in slow motion, of a mother playing with her child on a bed. It is accompanied by soft, melodic, music. At one point, the mother almost sheds a tear in happiness. Then a commercial for a cruise ship, then a commercial raising an awareness for autism.

Then another television show is promoted. The narrator says, “And then, just when you thought your boyfriend has left forever, ‘attack of the skank.’”

The scene shows a party where a collection of twenty year olds are drinking on a patio. A character walks in with the ex boyfriend. The jilted girlfriend tells the members of their separated group, “Oh no. Unh uh. She has my boyfriend and my dress! (laugh track plays)”

The narrator continues, “And Bobby gets a surprise visit from his mother in law.”

The door is opened to show a mother in law in a robe, holding two suitcases, “I’m home,” she says. The character, Bobby, is shown with an expression of dismay.

The narrator says, “catch this and more, tonight on XYZ (network)”

The commercial ends.

The next commercial is for another early morning daytime talk show. The narrator says, “Next time, on Jillian and James, they try their hand at cooking a roast, Harry Stone comes by to talk about where to find bargains on wedding dresses, then a special guest, from the cast of ‘Chasing Kate,’ Kerrin Bates comes on to talk about the challenges of motherhood and starring on a hit television show.”

The guest is shown, “my husband helps so much, but there are just days where I want to toss that kid in the other room and change my name (audience laughs).”

The narrator continues, “Tomorrow at ten.” The commercial ends.

A prescription medication commercial comes on. And the last commercial is a local news commercial mentioning “traffic and weather at five.”

The majority of current television programming avoids informational conversations; the topics are more carnal. Instead of new and changing case studies, many of the same themes and concepts are repeated. Described in greater detail in the next chapter, these trends of after-school and after-work topics are far from the normal, relative, topics and behavioral trends of humans from a hundred years earlier. Often, when a member of a television show begins to speak of a more informational topic such as a gardening hobby, or a mechanic-based hobby, or a technical issue, or a woodworking project, or an experience at their job involving stepped informational problem solving, the other members of the show will slightly shun, joke-through, or laugh-off the event. Informational topics, by their nature, are without emotion, and these shows vehemently avoid a lull in more emotional banter. After such an accidental informational event, the volumes and tones will rise to lead all the members back to topics which oppose that proposed topic. Informational topics are (with gestures, tones, and volumes) treated as secondary goals/motives. The format of these shows does not allow for informational topics of conversations.

Most current trends in broadcasted interactions outside of school and work are carnal. The prominent topics are: relationships (both gossip and simple, vapid, interaction within a relationship), family bonding, money (resource procurement without the normal steps of earning a living), sex, shelter or nest making (including all the subordinate topics of home purchasing, furnishing, renovating, household chores, etc.), clothing (form more than function), partying, holiday activities, vacations and bravado exhibitions (verbal and physical, male-mostly, interactions).

In addition to avoiding informational and academic topics, most television programs avoid even the briefest reference to critical problems, state-level, or species-level problems. For one example, if a participant referenced ‘recent water shortages in parts of the country’ the rest of the

group (likely) would move to a less impactful, more positive, topic. Possible concepts of long term solutions could be briefly noted, yet these participants (likely) would be unable to elaborate on ideas without being embarrassed or displaced by the more serious theme. The trends of topics such as ‘vapid relationship interaction’ are so distant from a movement into informational conversations or larger critical, societal, problems that participants cannot easily bridge the gap to those topics. There is no practical way to transition between these topics and more education-relative topics. Political issues and larger environmental issues are also treated as secondary to leisure and play time (carnal) activities.

To speak of the “positives and negatives of the single life and married life” is to speak of a strictly carnal topic. The topic of “relationships,” is so repetitive in daily television conversation that it is often heralded as the only purpose of a human being. “Relationship interaction” is only a minor part of a person’s life, yet these television shows present it as the end result of all of life’s toils. The foremost purpose of a human being’s life is not to procure a relationship or dwell on relationship issues or any similar vapid, carnal, topic. A more important, primary, goal is for a member to maintain deliberate informational, “stepped,” problem solving for the vast portion of their day, and to consider and solve critical local and larger environmental problems. A person must report to a job (or entrepreneurial tasks), be productive on that job, and indulge in stepped informational problems during the course of their daily work so that they may successfully earn a living. A person must prepare for this work by a self-motivation to indulge in informational topics in the majority of their leisure time. A person must have an ability to procure their own resources through the current prevailing environment, because beyond this task of adopting “informational” trends of thought for employment, one must also adopt “informational” trends of thought to prepare for critical state-level and species-level problems.

Tyler’s teachers have worked hard to direct him towards a mostly informational course of decisions while almost all of his experiences outside of school are devoid of informational or academic endeavors.

His mother asks him briefly of his homework, “You turned in your homework?” while not going into much detail about the homework. It would not be necessary for his parents to be too involved with homework; his independence with performing his own school work would be a more optimal outcome. However, just as Tyler’s involvement with stepped informational problems is a requirement, his parents also should show some self-motivated

movement into stepped informational topics. Parents should seek some sort of hobby, some sort of task that is devoid of vapid emotion, some sort of endeavor that leads them to learning for the sake of learning. His mother should be watching a television show that is not cliché, yet this parent, and many other parents in our current times, supports clichéd, repetitive, television programming. She should be showing some boredom with the repetitive topics that they are encountering.

A mattress commercial is informational, but it only solves the standard-of-living problem/topic of “nest making/sheltering.” This is also, mostly, a carnal topic. Although it is a necessary goal, it is a brief part of a person’s life to purchase a mattress and solve this problem. The seller of the product is pursuing the valid goal of exposing his product, yet the viewer must understand this main purpose.

Often, these commercials have poignant theme music. They may show a loving, poignant, image of a mother embracing a son, often with slow motion effects, to imply that the product is offered for the purpose of goodwill rather than profit. Such a commercial also implies that the reverberated theme of comfort/personal pleasure over realistic, relative informational problem solving. This is a common current trend, to trivialize and exploit the emotions of family life so as to sell a product. The seller’s exposure of the product in this way is without fault—he must adopt the trends of commercials to compete with other sellers of the same products—yet elders and caregivers, members who work for the strict purpose of goodwill, should make all children aware of these motives.

The trending towards excessive poignant images and poignant music to sell products began in the 1990s. The collapse into carnal-only topics among television shows and commercials also began, mostly, in the 1990s. It is important to note that before this time such excessively poignant, emotional, imposition during the promotion of a product caused a distinct negative effect among viewers. Before this time, consumers felt that it was inappropriate to show someone crying from a serious emotional issue (either positive or negative) while attempting to sell a product.

The cruise ship commercial proposes a choice for a vacation. Although the seller is presenting a product to a consumer, a valid action, that product and its superior topic of “vacationing” must be placed within a relativity of importance among all the activities. For a person to be of a healthy mental state, they must treat vacationing activities as secondary to informational activities and informational activities must be secondary to attending critical

problems. If, for example, too many commercials promote vacation and holiday activities, a viewer should show a fatigue with this repeated topic. A person must not fail a critical environmental test because of their excessive attention to free-time tasks.

The difficulty of autism is an important relative topic; a measure of empathy must be presented to those who are struggling with this condition. And all misfortunes, ailments, and struggles should be a point of strong consideration. Yet this topic of interest, as with all topics of human suffering, must be within a perspective which includes an acknowledgment of all current, past, and future struggles. The difficulties of this event must be compared and made relative to all the different kinds of difficulties. If, for example, this interest is promoted with the implied meaning of blindly supporting this charitable cause—without a consideration of all possible charitable causes and without a regard for all future negative possibilities of society—the promoters would be erring by not placing this interest within a framework of relativity.

The “attack of the skank, and the mother-in-law” commercial continues the ongoing trends of avoiding informational topics. The concepts and the jokes surrounding these topics are repetitive. The topic of “interrelations” in a courtship ritual is carnal. When speakers engage in these topics and repeat these topics and herald them as having the highest importance, informational topics are shunned. Conversation participants cannot easily transition to informational topics. Within the show’s main topic of interpersonal relationships is a clichéd, repeated, scenario of a “break-up” followed by an incident where the new partner intervenes in the course of events. By proposing this as relevant, the speaker is being cliché. It is cliché to suggest that any one should repeat thoughts of this scenario. It is cliché to look at new angles of the same interaction. And the show continues with a basic, vapid, storyline of a mother-in-law, who intervenes in the course of events of her son-in-law. This scenario and its subsequent jokes also have been repeated too many times in television programming.

If a morning talk show had a daily cooking segment it would be an almost valid, relative, choice of topic. Eating is carnal, yet cooking is a partially informational topic. However, like all informational topics, it is a genre that should not receive excessive indulgence. Topics should be portioned relative to the full collection of all societal topics with an emphasize on the most critical near-term societal problems first. A person could certainly take up this task as a hobby, and show an ongoing interest in

this area and a talk show could have a segment or otherwise specialize in cooking; yet everyone's knowledge should be broad and encompass the working knowledge of many informational topics.

The topic of "weddings," is often overdone on television. This pinnacle of relationship interactions is an important but brief part of a person's life. One could show an interest in the trends of wedding dresses, yet this must be without an over-indulgence in the emotions of wedding events. A participant would be right to relish the event; however, observers who are outside of the participating group should have a measured, limited, interest commensurate with their need to attend local and larger environmental problems. Outside observers should not indulge in this subject for too long and then fail to transition out of this topic into an informational topic. Far too often, societal members in apex environments (environments separated from the physical toils of survival) are swept up in a limited genre such as this, and their desires to indulge in this topic are reverberated by television programming. This cycle repeats, over and over.

The topic of "motherhood and the challenges of being on a hit television show" is also a rapid, un-informational, topic(s).

"Traffic and weather" are often, currently, too repetitive. News programs reverberate these topics based upon viewer preferences.

During these commercials his mother asks him if he saw his friend, "Did you talk to Chase about you and him going to the park this weekend?"

"No. He must've gotten to school before I did."

Here, his mother has asked him a valid question concerning a future appointed task, meeting with his friend on a weekend. Yet, the end goal of this appointed task is pleasure, free-time. When a valid comment referencing a free-time goal is made, it should be followed with some sort of informational topic. After a while, she should bring up an informational topic, such as a hobby or a reference to something new she has heard about or a new part of a task that she has discovered, or a news story, or a story of one of his friend's experience with an informational task or a passage in a book or a puzzle to solve. These necessary carnal topics should be balanced with informational topics.

The talk show continues. The host says, “We were talking about how you used to be around town, so to speak (the audience chuckles lightly). I would see you showing out (the audience chuckles louder), heh heh (small laugh), but now you’re mostly at home, right? You don’t operate your clothing line business so much?”

“No, I come in for the original design and sometimes they have me back for promos or endorsements, and then I come back for proofs, but my partner, Jack Alfonze, is just so good. He keeps me informed. But yes, I’m content with being home with my two dogs, ready for my man to come home (the audience laughs as she gestures a sexy look).”

“Heh, heh. And you’re ready for great sex (the audience laughs louder)?”

“Oh yes, when I . . .”

The mother scrambles for the remote and quickly changes the channel. “This show doesn’t make sense,” she says, but Tyler happens to mostly be preoccupied, reading a comic strip that was on the table.

The topic of clothing design is carnal, mostly, and it is an overdone topic. If statistics were assembled for current daily television programming, home making and similar subordinate topics (child care, home remodeling, home maintenance, cooking), clothing (for mainly appearance, social status), relationships, vapid popular music, sex, partying, and vacationing, would be the most prominent topics. Important news events would be broadcasted, yet these would be brief moments of updating viewers who are guided to carnal, limited, repetitive goals. Television programming treats informational topics as secondary.

The topic of sex, the most carnal of topics, is overdone. Although it is an important and necessary part of a human’s life, although it is a prominent motive of a person, it is also a brief part of a person’s life. It does not warrant the need of so many repeated references. By referencing the same topics and the same jokes over and over the television programmers train viewers into an out-of-relative state of awareness.

This scene is not an exaggeration. The topic of sex is sometimes presented in this blatant of a manner on various television shows.

The next channel has another host and a guest. The host is saying, “Since you began on this movie, you have had to spend time away from your hubby, actor John Wyld (a picture is shown, the crowd applauds, whistles lightly, whoops lightly).”

“Oh yes, we’re both away from home a lot, but we’re on the phone three of four times a day.”

“And, of course, you have a wonderful daughter who has just gone through her second birthday (lowest tone, then the highest tone).” The audience applauds.

The guest looks out to the audience nodding in appreciation, “Yes, yes, she’s my world. I’m so lucky to have a support with her and she’s a little diva.” She chuckles and the audience chuckles.

Talk show producers recognized the value of guiding the audience when to applaud with the use of “applause” signs. And they employ audience coaches to both warm up the audience beforehand and partly direct their actions during the show. From these directions, audiences support the show’s concepts with a more energetic presence. Over years of this practice, and the changing styles of talk shows, audiences began to react with an excessive application of emotion, and they now do so often without the need for coaching.

In the early 2000s, a strong conservative political movement supported a “family first” concept, suggesting that the family unit is important to maintain and preserve (a concept often presented with religious overtones). Many conversation topics had this motive as a main element. An emphasis was placed on conversation participants to mention something to that effect, such as, “Yeah, I give my job all I got, but I know that the most important thing is family (a very low tone).” Almost every aspect of television and personal life was to have this common theme. Talk shows of that time, both conservative and liberal, began to apply more applause, more emphasis to the concept. Over time, the more liberal political movement began to expand this theme to the cause of, essentially, “struggling against conservative injustices.” When a speaker mentioned the difficulties of raising a child and the encountering of injustices, this garnished applause, emphasis. When a person of ethnicity spoke of an injustice against them or a moment of surviving against adversity, this also began to receive, with good reason,

greater applause. However, this added emphasis of coached applause supports an excessive emotion. Far too often political extremes reverberate through these interactions.

Any new human experience is valid. If a time period has a new approach, such as this audience's (and coach and applause sign) emphasis of a television show, it should be explored for its meaning and purpose. However, it is now overdone, and it is less valuable than deliberate, un-emphasized, informational conversation. It supports an excessive amount of exaggerated perception, it supports rallying cries around political concepts, and it supports carnal behavior because of the lack of information and critical problem solving. Such a behavioral trend must be measured against the backdrop of all human accomplishment to determine if it is relative. It must be compared within the scope of all relevant human problem solving.

The guest mentioning her daughter's birthday is carnal. It is in opposition to informational problem solving to propose that the birthday of an individual, even a child, is a relevant superior topic worthy of conversation on a talk show. When "birthday" was stated with the lowest tone and then a high tone to herald it as prominent superior topic, it coaxed the audience into this applause that they were willing to grant for this common theme of both "family" and "the struggle." And it essentially supports the energy level that everyone involved with the show wishes to maintain. It is a wonderful experience for a child to have a birthday, but it is not relative to the missing themes of television—it is not relative to informational problem solving and critical problem solving. It is carnal and it is repetitive. Statistics will show that this topic of "celebrating" is overdone.

When children witness the topic of "birthdays" being brandished on television (in an out-of-relative state), it clouds their ability to reason. This "pleasure" is such a brief moment in one's life (important but brief) that it should be rarely mentioned on television. Although it is a valid goal of a child to look forward to their birthday, and build stepped, incremental, thoughts of the events of that day, it should not be out-of-balance with the informational problem solving that must be addressed three hundred and sixty-four days of the year. Even if a child barely notices the topic being mentioned, it has a small effect on their reasoning; seeing this topic brandished on a talk show includes them in the false perception.

The guest's statements, "Yes, yes, she's my world. I'm so lucky to have a support with her and she's a little diva," is a valid collection of amusing facts to relay, more than the birthday, but it further distances the audience and the

viewers at home from informational topics. This kind of small talk, the kind of conversation that brings people in acquaintance with each other should be quickly transitioned to a story to emphasize the “diva,” and then they should quickly move on to some topic that is not repetitive and that is not anti-informational.

Latter chapters address the possible informational conversations that are missing in these television shows.

Tyler finishes his snack. His mother says, “Okay, you know what to do.”

“Right,” he says as he starts to move back to his room to get his workbooks.

The talk show continues with the guest through a few more topics then the host begins to speak of a small contest where an audience member is to be called up to the stage to answer trivia questions.

“Now, we’d like to play a little game, and, I don’t know, what if we offer some small prize to the winner (lowering tones), maybe a lamp or a case of cheese whiz. You like cheese whiz right?” she asks the guest.

“Yeah sure. No diet is complete without cheese whiz.”

“Or maybe, uhm, a new car (high tone, high volume!)” the crowd roars, whoops.

“We were thinking. . (crowd still applauds) we were thinking, that if someone could answer three questions. Three painfully easy questions (she chuckles) then you could go home with a new Ford Fusion.” The camera pans to a new car on the stage as the crowd applauds, whoops, and whistles.

“Okay could we have Todd Pleasant?” the crowd applauds continuously as the cameras search the crowd for the contestant, “And a Julia Hayes? . And a Tamara Smith.”

The contestants come down and they are all almost in tears with joy and excitement of the event. “Okay, Todd, tell us a little about yourself.”

“I’m a machinist, who’s playing hooky kind of, from work (crowd chuckles), and I live in Simi valley with my wife,

Carolyn and my two wonderful kids Maya and Adler.” The crowd applauds.

“Kind of playing hooky?” the host asks, and the crowd chuckles again. “Should we call your boss and check if this is okay?”

“Yeah, well, I had a doctor’s appointment and I did that this morning.”

“Oh, okay, let’s call your boss, he may want you to come in right now, since you’re finished with your appointment,” the host says as the crowd laughs.

“That’s okay.” He says

“Julia, where are you from?”

“I’m from Austin. I’m here with my cousin and my sister.”

“Great, and what do you do?”

“I’m a nurse.” The crowd applauds, “And I’m a mother of two.” The crowd applauds louder. “William and Nathan, six and four.” She wipes away a small tear from her eye.

“You okay?”

“Yeah.” They all chuckle.

“If you win this can you drive this thing out of here?”

“Yeah.” She says with more laughter.

“How long have you been a nurse?”

“For six years.” The crowd applauds.

“That’s great.”

“And are your kids watching?”

“They might be,” she says laughing in an excited manner, “Hi, guys, be sure to finish your dinner,” she says, as the crowd chuckles.

“Yes, yes. You guys finish your soup, or your mom coming back there and give you a what for.” The crowd chuckles.

“Tamara, you are from?”

“I’m a housewife from Pheonix.” The crowd applauds.

“And you have children.”

“Yes I do. I have a daughter who is twelve and a son who is set to graduate this year.” The crowd applauds.

“Wonderful. So if he graduate is this car going to be his graduation present?” The crowd laughs.

“Oh no. Sorry. This car is for me.” The crowd laughs.

“Right, right. He can catch a bus.”

“Exactly.”

The host proceeds to ask the questions. To make it more interesting she sets up a display where they fall into a foam filled pool when they fail to answer the questions. The car is then given away to the winner.

The frenzy created by this contest with this prize is unnatural. The morphing of talk shows into game shows is carnal. Of course, the audience sees value in it and the viewers revel in the resources gained by the lucky winner, but it is not common for someone to engage in informational problem solving, such as sitting at home doing homework, and have a sudden windfall of resources granted to them such as a person knocking on the door with a prize. The talk show hosts who started this trend did so for a valiant reason—to give away some of the wealth that they have gained to people who could use the additional resources (and the memorable experience of the event)—but after its initial period of time, that window of time where the new experience is valid, this trend should mostly fail to renew. Most people have to earn their resources by working through many stepped informational problems.

More television plays as Tyler works on his homework. That talk show ends and the next show of the same channel is of celebrity news. The first three stories are of Hollywood break ups, then one story of a celebrity cheating on their spouse. Then a story of a contestant on a television reality show, “Dancing the night away.” They talk about a few new music videos. One story features a lawsuit against a record company.

Again, the television programming is devoid of informational topics.

Tyler finishes his school work while his mother shuffles around, putting away clothes and going into the kitchen to prepare dinner.

The father comes home. They all greet. They all catch up on their past tasks. The father moves around in the kitchen and

goes into the backroom to change into another set of clothes. They all then sit down to eat dinner.

All the conversations leading up to this moment have been with average tones and volumes. As they begin to speak of food, the tones and volumes rise to a heightened state. These higher tones imply that the topics of food consumption are of higher relative importance compared to other topics.

“Oooh, this looks so good,” the father says.

“Mmmmm,” the mother says.

Tyler starts to put some salt on his food. All of their eyes are open big and they’re very attentive to the task of eating.

“Not too much.” His mother says, with a sharper than normal implied meaning, before he begins to shake the shaker.

They are quiet for while eating.

“Mmmm. Rolls.” Tyler says as he reaches for a roll.

“Be sure to eat all your chicken and your green beans and corn, before you fill up on rolls. Hey, hey” She says.

“Did you finish all your homework?” the father asks.

“Yeah,” Tyler says.

“Good. Good (lower tone, lighter volume),” the father says.

“Mmm. I love this chicken,” mother says. After a moment she asks, “Do you taste anything different about the chicken?”

“Yeah, there is something different,” the father says.

“It’s more crispy.” Tyler says.

“No. Well yeah, but I changed the spices and I used wine in the marinade.”

“Like chicken marsala?” the father asks.

“It’s not chicken marsala but I did use a white wine,” the mother volume level for these lines of comments is higher relative to the other topics discussed. Also, her eyes are slightly more open denoting a higher relative importance to this topic.

“So I’m drinking alcohol?” Tyler says.

“Well, the alcohol cooks away.” His mom replies, they chuckle. “You’re not going to get drunk mister.”

They are quiet for a moment and then the mother asks, “What did you eat for lunch? You ate the sandwich I made right?”

“Yeah.”

“And did you get something else from the cafeteria.”

“Chocolate milk and, uh, ice cream.”

“Oh my, you can’t eat all that.” His mom says.

“You’re going to get sick, and you’re using up all of our lunch money credit.” the father says.

They are quiet for a while.

“Ohh, I seen online where they’re saying that a trip to the islands is cheaper in June. And the airlines and hotels go out of their way to offer deals,” the father says.

“Yeah, Kaylee says that they’re taking the family next weekend actually.”

“Cool, which island?” the father asks.

“I don’t know, the Bahamas, I think. They’re going for two weeks.”

“I remember when we stayed in that hotel with the slide,” Tyler said.

“Yeah, when you went over the side and almost killed yourself,” the father says.

After a pause, the mother says, “Well, you know that if you keep your grades up, I’m not sure, we’d have to think about it, but maybe we can get to a theme park next year.”

“Can we go to Hollyworld? Please, please?” Tyler pleads.

“I don’t know if we’ll go there necessarily, but you know the rules, you have to keep your school work up,” the father says.

“Man, I want to go on the Space Coaster again,” Tyler says. For a while, they speak of roller coasters. Then it is quiet as they finish up their dinner.

They speak of the food and they bond around the food. This is normal and important, however it is overdone. After the father asks about the homework his “Good. Good,” is presented with a subject-ending low tone and low volume, and then they return to speaking of food. So far the only informational problem solving to be experienced by Tyler, his homework,

has been quickly discarded twice by conversation participants who mark this informational topic as secondary. No other informational topics are offered in its place.

Food conversations are a problem. This necessary and carnal event often can have primitive behavioral trends attached to it. In primitive settings, tribes will attach bonding events to this resource. If food is offered, it is offered with a deep emotional connection. In these tribal settings, the person being offered the food must not refuse because it will offend the person doing the offering. This emotional connection is strong, and it will often appear in the modern world. Some mothers will offer food and other family members must show an appreciation of that food or else the mother will be deeply offended. In limited forms, this bonding would be important and necessary, but to summon this primitive behavior in an excessive way is to be too carnal, and it is in opposition to modern informational problem solving. It clouds the reasoning needed to address modern societies' problems. Like other carnal endeavors, it prevents subjects from transitioning to informational topics (although these subjects have no intention of any such transition). For the most part, food should be presented with the downplaying of the family bonding. Family members should bond over the valid emotions acquired at pinnacle moments of informational problem solving rather than age-old mammalian behaviors.

Heightened tones and volumes mark topic(s) as having a higher relative importance compared to other topics. Heightened tones and volumes should not occur with conversations involving food, unless they have been absent for some time or it is a relatively staged food event. In normal, regular dinnertime events, participants should be brief with conversations involving food and counter such carnal topics with a higher proportion of informational topics. And there are certain points of reason which must be followed, such as, "One must never become offended if they offer food to another person and the person politely declines." Children often will need to be forced to eating healthier food and showing reasonable respect to the efforts a parent makes to produce food (by eating it whether they like it or not), but once they have established this trait a person's preference of a food type should not trigger a negative emotional response in another person. A negative response in this situation is carnal, it is too disrespectful to the modern paradigm which has many critical problems must be attended by a major portion of individuals.

One might question whether it is of any harm for individuals to engage in carnal behavior for extended periods of time. Dancing is carnal. What would it hurt for someone to like to spend time dancing for extended periods of time? In latter chapters species-level environmental problems are discussed in greater detail. These species-level environmental tests, both the problems an individual may have such as earning a living and the foremost problem of the human race becoming extinct, must be respected as mortal problems. A particular percentage of informational/academic endeavors must be maintained by a percentage of societal members. If too many net-negative individuals exist in relation to environmental problems the larger societal problems will overcome the species and bring about an extinction event. Any carnal behavior has a place, and one could dance for long periods of time if this does not impair their ability to address these problems; yet these environmental problems are mortal—the finite nature of resources is mortal, the ecological damage from human encroachment is mortal, and the ignorance of these problems is mortal.

After food, the next topic is “vacationing.” Again, informational topics are avoided.

The trip to Hollyworld, is noted as a goal to be achieved if Tyler does well at school. To herald a vacationing event as the goal of school work is wrong. The foremost purpose of a human beings life is not to procure a vacation or any similar vapid, carnal, goal, but to maintain deliberate informational, “stepped,” problem solving for the vast portion of their time and seek solutions to critical problems. A person must report to a job, be productive on that job, and indulge in stepped informational problems during the course of their daily work so that they may successfully earn a living. A person must prepare for this work by a self-motivation to indulge in informational topics. A person must earn their own living, have an ability to procure their own resources, because beyond this task of adopting informational trends of thought for employment, one must also adopt informational trends of thought to prepare for critical state-level and species-level problems.

While they’re eating the local news goes over the common stories. The first story is the weather. It had been raining heavily most of the day. As this first story plays out, they all notice, putting attention to the television, but they do not comment on it. The forecaster shows the radar and the current

rain cells crossing over the viewing area. Then they cut to three different reporters, showing standing water in one location, a tree knocked over by wind in another location, and a school where parents had difficulty picking up their kids because of the weather.

Weather is a common, valid, topic to help viewers plan out their appointed tasks; however, it is often overdone. The effects of the weather are overemphasized. Too many on-the-scene reporters suggest that the discussion of weather is a major pinnacle moment in the news. It is not. Even if deaths are reported, those deaths should not cause an over-emphasis of the weather. All efforts should be made to mitigate human suffering, yet the foremost method to combat suffering is the application of relativity to all human experiences. A tree being knocked down is not relevant, and it takes time away from informational or critical-task topics.

Then the news anchors speak of two different serious accidents which have traffic bottlenecked. They cut to one reporter on the scene of one traffic backup. Then they detail some of the shootings that have happened in the city over the past few days, and their latest developments. Then the news anchor's voice rises in average tones to tell of a cancer patient's visit from a college football player. That story is followed by a prom queen's speaking out about bullying. Then a story of picking out a wedding dress is presented. The next story is of a local dog being adopted. Then they show a story of how to save on shopping. And one of the last stories they do is on a fisherman catching a large shark.

Now, a small portion of television has become informational. Yet almost all of these stories may be of repeated, par, genres. It is as if all the interests of the viewers are systematically addressed. A strong emphasis is placed on empathy, and although this is a valid emotion, it can be overdone; it can support an out-of-relative state. Just as all topics/genres/interests can cloud one's ability to reason if they are overdone, topics of mortality and of suffering can be overdone.

They leave the dinner table and the mother settles on the couch. She opens up her laptop and begins to peruse her social media site. Tyler starts to sit on the couch. She says, "Wait a second, you have to take a shower."

"Aaagh," he says and he reluctantly heads to the shower.

After a while he comes out and sits on the couch next to her. "Can I watch some tv?"

"Did you finish all of your homework?"

"Yes."

"All (drawn out tones) of it?"

"Yes."

"Okay. I guess."

Again, homework and schoolwork is noted by the parent as being for the sole purpose of acquiring free-time activities. The parents fail to allude to the true reason of performing school work.

A person must maintain deliberate informational, "stepped," problem solving for the vast portion of their day. A person must report to a job upon arriving at adulthood, be productive on that job, and indulge in stepped informational problems during the course of their daily work so that they may successfully earn a living. A person must prepare for this work by a self-motivation to indulge in informational topics. A person must earn their own living, have an ability to procure their own resources, because beyond this task of adopting informational trends of thought for employment, one must also adopt informational trends of thought to prepare for critical state-level and species-level problems.

Tyler turns to one of his favorite channels. The show is of a group of friends all growing up together, going to the same school. It starts off with one friend coming into a diner to greet another friend who is drinking a milkshake, doing homework.

The banter of the show, from the beginning to the end, is at extraordinarily heightened tones and volumes.

"Hey, whatcha doin?" Stacy says.

"I'm studying for a test in Mr. Feldman's class. If I don't pass, my mom's not going to let me go to Kimmy's Birthday party this weekend." Gina says.

Again, the purpose of school work is noted by this vapid television show as being for the sole purpose of allowing free-time, leisure-time, pleasure-time, activities.

Tyler has experienced the heralding of a birthday party as a main goal of life for the second time in one day.

“Oh no. I forgot all about it. She’s been hinting so much that she wants a guitar so she can learn the song from Dreamtime’s new album, ‘Lovin’ till the lovin’ hurts.’ (she mimics the singing of the title and a laugh track plays).”

Popular music is not relative music. It imitates substantive music, but it has no substance. It is (currently) a repetitive carnal genre that is in direct opposition to the vast collection of innovative musical endeavors from the past several thousand years. This song presented on this television show is shallower than the popular songs which it imitates.

Just then, the diner owner walks up and says, “And I’ve been hinting that we sell food here, for eating, food ‘that pays the light bills’ (he mimics the singing and a laugh track plays).”

“Yeah, she’s been talking about that all day.” Gina says.

“I only have ten dollars saved up, and the guitar she likes costs fifty dollars. How am I going to get the money by this weekend. Oh, how can I make my best friend’s birthday wish come true?” Stacy says. The entire conversation is with exaggerated tones and with a high, un-relative, volume.

“I know, order something to eat, and that’ll help you think about it. (laugh track plays)” The diner owner says.

“You didn’t make any money working at the county fair?” Gina asks.

“Yes I did, but that money doesn’t go far when you’re trying to win at toss-the-hoop (laugh track plays),” Stacy says.

“I’ll come back when you notice the lights turning off (laugh track plays),” the diner owner says and he walks away.

“Can you loan me the money?” Stacy asks Gina.

“Oh, I would, but my money is tied up in outfits, like this lovely number, the sophisticated-fourth-grader ensemble from Kim de Jour (laugh track).”

“What am I gonna do?” Stacy mimics crying gestures.

Just then, Kimmy walks up. She has headphones on, singing, “Lovin’ til it hurts. You know you’re mine and I’m lovin’ til it hurts.” On the last note she does an exaggerated gesture of raising her hand in the air. A laugh track plays.

“Oh no. It’s too late. She’s lost in the music (laugh track),” Stacy says.

“Hello, Gina. And hello, my bestest friend in the world, Stacy.” She hugs Stacy.

“About that best friend thing, are you sure that Gina isn’t your best friend?” Stacy asks, and a laugh track plays.

The show continues with Stacy deciding to get a job at the diner. She has problems with mixing up orders for customers, starting a small fire on the grill, and at one point the shake machine explodes covering her and the diner’s owner in milkshake. Eventually her and Kimmy have a heart to heart talk and Kimmy forgives her for not being able to buy the present.

During this show, the commercials are of: a plastic molding machine for making jewelry, a figurine set, a rc helicopter, a board game, another television show involving a talking cat, a candy, a soft drink, an ice cream store, a candy bar, a fast food chain’s kids toy choices, a reality show where the contestants are slimed, a cruise ship commercial, a pony play set, a kitten play set, and about four different video games.

Focus groups of children watching these shows could reveal that it has a direct correlative effect on their ability to work though stepped informational problem solving. It is quite clear that this vapid and repetitive content harms their ability to reason. It is quite clear that the extraordinarily heightened tones and volumes, from the very beginning to the very end, are unnatural—they do not occur in the real world. It harms their ability to transition to informational conversation. Even if they are mostly smarter than the concept of the show it will affect their ability to learn and reason. Focus groups of

children watching these shows could reveal that it has a direct correlative effect on their ability to work through stepped informational problem solving.

Virtually all current television shows catering to children contain these heightened tones and volumes.

One problem with all children television shows, even shows that have some educational value, even shows that have gone to great lengths to avoid vapid themes and jokes, is that they are valuable to a child at a certain stage of development. If, for example, a toddler witnesses a video of many varied experiences of a character that is learning of basic colors and shapes and interrelations, and this toddler sees a similar video of this previously learned stimulus, the toddler will lose a developmental step. The toddler will have the emotions of the event heralded as superior to the information of the event. Even the most valuable of videos are no replacement for real world informational experiences.

Focus groups of toddlers, older children, and teens, will show that when they encounter repetitive themes in the videos their forward development will be greatly reduced when compared to members of a focus group where the videos emphasize new experiences at every step. Focus groups also will show that when the television is turned off, and other informational tasks are addressed by children, that their intellectual development is far superior to children who watch television programs.

Children's television programming should involve more adult themes, or it should be nearly eliminated and replaced with adult-only television programming. The experiences of children in our modern times are too far removed from the reasoning imposed upon children from earlier generations. For example, Bugs Bunny cartoons of the 1940s to the 1970s, depicted mortal interactions between characters with child-friendly comedy. This understanding of mortality, of critical tasks, has greater value than current cartoons which pretend that this adult concept does not exist. Somehow, somehow, children must learn of problem solving that has ultimate consequences. Somehow, somehow, there should be a desensitizing of violence in addition to a sensitivity of violence in carefully planned experiences. Just as talking to children without exaggerated tones, without over-emphasized emotion, alludes to those adult problems that they will have to learn of, the sustained informational adult-level programming of television will help them understand that those childhood themes are secondary to their adult-level tasks. Currently, children experience far too much television and media that caters to their every whim.

At one point, he happens to look at what his mother is looking at on the computer screen, “Is that cousin Ted?”

“Yeah, he’s posting about that show, where they show skateboard fails.”

“Oh.” He puts a little attention as she scrolls down. The posts are of: fighting world hunger, fighting bigotry, of puppies (two times), cats (three times), recreational accidents (three times), an unjust arrest, a car crash, and comical dance exhibitions (two times).

Again, Tyler is experiencing repeated, vapid, concepts and goals. The informational goals, a large part of human existence for the past ten thousand years, are not present.

Return here returnhere

Consider a meme, “The Human body is natural and whoever sees it as sexual is because their mind thinks that way, the problem is in the way each mind sees things,” or, “You are blessed with a heart that is warm and comforting, one that brings healing and good vibes to those around you. Whenever someone is feeling down, you’re always there to get them back on their feet,” or, “In the end, we all just want someone who chooses us. Over everyone else, under any circumstances,” or “The best gift you are ever going to give someone—the permission to feel safe in their own skin, to feel worthy, to feel like they are enough.” or “She will chase you around for awhile but there’s gonna be a day when she’s gonna stop and get over you. At that moment you’re going to wish you had let her catch you.” or “Don’t waste words on people who deserve your silence. Sometimes the most powerful thing you can say is nothing at all.” or quicker, more terse, more carnal statements like, “I love being a bitch,” or, “I don’t give a f#*k!” These statements, declarations, are histrionic. They are emotional. They are vapid. They are carnal, they are in direct opposition to intelligent, academic, informational banter. Even though some are compassionate and some are almost reasoned it is unnatural to continuously take up carnal, vapid, issues. If one were to state one of these memes and then go onto more natural, informative, posts for the majority of their post the meme may be within context, but often people continue without moving to more informational posts. Also the general public is often not schooled in the concepts of formal literature; the ideas of fallacies in writings, knowing your audience which is important for making statements relative and contextual, and of course the ideas behind grammatical structure. The issues of social media will be discussed more in latter chapters.

The show finishes and the next show is a game show where contestants compete by running through a maze that has various foam obstacles and pie-throwing hazards.

As that show ends, his mother says, "Okay, I'd like to watch something." She starts to flip through the channels. She lands on a channel showing a talent contest. The show features a very large stage with extensive lighting and camera work to cover the contestants. It cuts away to showing the first contestant.

"Ron is an assembly line worker living at home with his mother, Diedra, who has been recovering from liver surgery (slow music plays). He was recently laid off from his job working on an assembly line and he works at the local school as a custodian. He loves to dance."

Ron says, "I've been dancing since I was six. I used to always cut up in class for the other kids." The video shows him working around the house, and playing with his dogs in the back yard. At one point, he's in front of the television mimicking the dance moves he sees on the television. He speaks to the camera again, "if I could win this contest I can get a new car for my mom, so that she can go back to work." The music changes to become even more poignant as he kisses his mother and walks out the door with his backpack.

On the stage, he walks out to greet the judges. The crowd is standing up, and they are loud. The cameras pan around the audience to show their eager anticipation. All audience members have an excited look on their face. Some are jumping up and down. Some have posters. It is apparent that applause signs are in use and/or there are coaches spurring the audience into a frenzy. After a moment, the audience goes quiet.

One judge speaks, "Ron, how are you?"

"Great." The crowd applauds.

"So what kind of dancing are you going to do?"

"It's a combination of the robot, breakdancing, and Samba."

“Samba?” the crowd chuckles. “That’s a great collection, I think. And you like to go out dancing?” the judge says.

“Yeah, I actually line dance with my friends.”

“Great who’s the best Samba dancer among you and your friends?”

“Well, you know, I think I do good.”

The other judge speaks, “Ron we have your mother here in the audience.” The camera cuts to the mother and the crowd applauds. The mother sheds a tear. After a moment, the judge continues “If you win, this would mean a lot to you and your mother, right?”

He nods.

“I think that if you give your best shot, you’ve already won (the crowd applauds).” The judge concludes.

The last judge speaks, “Ron, that was an inspiring story. I think if you put your heart into you’ve got a shot. Good luck.” The crowd applauds

The music begins as the crowd hoots and hollers and whistles. His dancing is sub-par; it is below a relative level of accomplishment when compared to all of the other contestants and others outside of this venue. He finishes as the crowd’s applause wanes. Some of the audience members chuckle.

The first judge says, “Ron, that was, uh, definitely interesting, but you need a little more timing, and a little more energy. But, well, uhm, I give you a four.”

The next judge, “I have to say about the same kiddo (the audience is yelling out numbers), but I’m going to go a little better because unlike some people, I know you gave it a lot.”

“What?” the first judge says, “hey, more power to him, but he has to work on a few things.”

“Yeah, yeah. I’m giving you a five,” the second judge says. The audience applauds mildly.

The last judge says, I have to do one better than that, “I give him a six.” The crowd applauds. “You do have to work on things, but I give you one point more for that last leap.” The crowd applauds.

“Oh you guys. You’re giving away the farm.” The first judge says. Some of the audience boos.

He walks off stage, slightly crying, the commentator comes up, “Ron, I have to say that was quite unique. It looks like you put a lot of work into it.”

“Yeah,” he sniffles. “I don’t know. I thought I gave it a good shot. I’m going to go home and work on some things.”

“Terry (judge) was right on about that last leap. I thought you were going to split your pants,” the commentator adds.

“Ha, ha (said quietly, mildly) I don’t know. I’m going to, well, go back to the drawing board.”

“Godspeed. Ron.” The commentator says. The camera shows Ron walking out of the back door of the venue the commentator continues, “In a moment, we’ll visit Erica, and her attempt at baton twirling fame. We’ll see you after these messages.” The camera pans the crowd one last time.

This television follows the common format of presenting a profile of the contestants before their performance is measured within the contest. The first contestant’s family is struggling through a mortal problem. This is a valid problem to mention; however, all individual human struggles must be weighed against all the struggles of all people, in the past, in the future, and in the present.

This personal problem is being emphasized for the purpose of appeasing the viewer’s desire—to gain ratings for the show. It summons a pity from the audience and forms a prominent theme of the show of helping those who are struggling against adversity. But by supporting this theme repeatedly, and supporting this trending motive of the viewers, the show negates true solutions to those problems. If he wins this could assist him, but if he does not win he is likely to gain nothing of relative value.

The huge sways in emotion hamper the intellectual reasoning of the contestants. The close ups of excited faces in the audience and the zooming in to catch reactions is too emotional. The line of questioning is too emotional. The cutting of the scenes of his home life is too emotional and the wrong aspects of his story are emphasized.

Ron was not aware that he was unable to dance at a level needed to compete in this competition—he harbored a misperception of his abilities—and rather than pursuing substantive solutions to his problems he attempted to acquire a prize that requires dance skills. He was not aware that this kind of show is of limited relative value when compared to all the substantive

human tasks to pursue. He is not aware that the contest is over-dramatized. He is not aware that the struggles leading to the contest are over-dramatized and out of context. The heralding of this contest as a pinnacle point in a human life is too far from relative because contests with prizes are only relative to the winner's positive outcome, and also because this is an anti-intellectual contest.

The show's creators likely were aware of his lack of skills in this field, yet they chose him for the emotions that could be presented with his story. To build up such a pinnacle moment, of an event that is broadcasted to millions of viewers, sets up the losing contestants with strong negative emotions relative to the strong positive emotions of winning the prize.

This contest is, in intent, decided based upon attributes unrelated to the actual physical competition. Two of the judges had a difficult time applying an appropriate score to his performance because of their conflicting goals of applying empathy and applying competitive fairness. Yet to abandon the merits of the competition, to abandon the predetermined rules and goals of the contest, is to hurt and hamper the performance of all contestants. It introduces an acceptable level of under achievement to the dancing of the participants. It hampers the solutions to one problem in an attempt to apply solutions to another ambiguous problem.

Dancing and singing contests are not forms of art. The performances are not innovative; these are repetitive genres of human thought aimed at entertainment. These topics are overdone. When a human spends too much of their time indulging in fruitless endeavors, endeavors that cater to their carnal desires, endeavors which, by their nature, are in direct opposition to informational and innovative schools of thought, that human will fail to address their environmental problems. Focus groups could determine that supporters of these television shows would be unable to shift from these anti-informational schools of thought to informational or innovative schools of thought. They would be unable to develop thought trends and conversational trends which lead to informative and innovative schools of thought. And, when pressed with a critical reasoning issue, supporters of these shows would fail to apply reason.

Children should not watch these shows. Children should not see their parents support these shows.

The commercials are of selling: cars (twice), groceries, retail clothing, pimple cream, dancing video games, other

television shows involving dating and relationship issues, a new album from a pop artist, home security, and the later weather reports on the news.

The television show returns. Four more contestants do their performance over the course of the show. Two have poignant stories of struggling against adversity and the other one had more of a comical story of a character who has unrealistic expectations.

After this show, a crime drama comes on. Tyler watches a little bit with his parents. He is told to do his night time reading. And he then brushes his teeth and goes to bed.

These are the common topics, common schools of thought, presented to children in their free time after school. Many children have extensive periods of time without intellectual stimulation. They witness adults who have formed lifestyles that are in direct opposition to informational problems, and these adults are often granted fame for adopting these lifestyles. Contests are created to reward participants for various degrees of avoiding informational trends of thought.

This current trend supports a child coming home from school and quickly shrugging all informational thinking. The goal of “entertainment,” becomes so pervasive that a weekend stretch of two days before returning to school likely negates the equivalent of two days of educational development. Children must have an application of intelligence in their private lives. They must witness their parents having sustained conversations of informational problems. They must be coaxed into adopting legitimate, innovative, informational goals and critical problem goals for the vast portion of their personal time. And, the critical tasks of life must be referenced within their relative hierarchal order.

Different children develop in different paradigms. A child in a tribal setting learns to hunt and gather at the direction of the tribal elders. They learn to defend the tribe physically as well as gain prominence (status) by physical challenges within the tribal group. Status is gained through more physical rather than mental challenges. It is appropriate for the development of a child in this environment to be more physical and more social, rather than informational. Their environmental tests during adulthood involve more mortal combat and vapid mortal interrelations between tribe members as they

vie for the alpha position. In cultures that are partly modern, a member will learn limited academics problem solving while working to support the family unit through barter with an employer or lord. The trading of skills for resources involves larger collections of more academic, informational. It is appropriate for a child in this environment to remember and relish the age old culture and of their ancestors, however they must strive to change their current paradigm into a more modern environment by increasing informational lessons. In modern cultures academics are a larger portion of an individual's development. Children, and their parents, have no choice but to accept a mostly informational paradigm. Individuals in modern environments have critical society-level, species-level problems to solve. These societal problems, problems of maintaining water, food supplies, infrastructure, nuclear materials, etc., are mortal for the species.

In modern environments, certain parts of child development must be administered by parents before entering school. They must, before entering school, have their parents teach them of the alphabet. They must know a reasonable level of politeness, of applying good will to peers, of cleanliness, and of assisting society in not becoming overloaded with tasks. Children must speak their language well; they must articulate their thoughts in a manner that is befitting the twelve years of schooling that they are to encounter. Parents must be supportive of the academic environments formed by school, and they must further herald academics as the primary goal of life.

The following scene is of a different scenario than Tyler's previous scene. Here, a child witnesses the poor performance of the parents who support a flawed, failing, approach to solving both their individual problems and societies' problems.

Tyler comes home from school. He is joined by his cousin, who his mother has agreed to watch after school. They are talking excitedly of a movie.

Tyler, "And he pushed (high tone, loud volume) the table over!" He mimics the motion of pushing over a table as he walks through the door. He sways a little as he tells the story and simultaneously drops his book bag near the front door.

His cousin, Jeffrey, also drops his book bag in the front room. Their pet dog comes up and begins to jump on both of them, playfighting, growling. The dog quickly runs to the back of the house, and then to the front again.

“What (high volume, high tone) you leaving your stuff there for? You already got a whole ‘nother mess to clean up in your room.”

Tyler’s entrance is filled with exaggerated motions and gestures. He drops his book bag as if there is no regular plan of putting away personal effects.

Human beings must greet each other. If a greeting is omitted, all other conversational form is lost. Relativity is lost. Both Tyler and his mother failed to notice the need to apply this beginning form to their conversation.

His mother speaks with bad grammar, “What you leaving your stuff there for?” Speaking with bad grammar is wrong, and it is in direct opposition to his teachers attempting to direct Tyler to a successful adult-life. To use “what” instead of “why are” is to treat the details of the task, “maintaining personal effects,” as secondary to the emotion-laden perceptions of life. She is implying that “what” and “why” are interchangeable, that their root meanings are not of significance, and that this detail of the task is not of significance. The verb is omitted, again, to shun the informational aspects of the question and the underlying task of the question. By omitting the verb, a speaker is in direct contradiction to the form applied by modern languages. It is a primitive expression, more suited to tribal communication of earlier times, to state only the bare minimum of details so as to relay the thoughts of the question. The question also ends with a preposition. A preposition on the end of a sentence is acceptable if it cannot be omitted without losing the meaning of the sentence; however here it is an unnecessary word. “Why are you leaving your stuff there?” is a complete idea and does not use the extra word, “for”

The question, if formed correctly, is still not a pragmatic, practical means of addressing the task. If she were to say, “What makes you think you can leave your book bag there?” she would have a better representation of her thoughts, but this also is questioning his reasoning and dragging out the issue of the book bag. A simple direct statement best addresses the problem. The best course of action might be, “Tyler, uh, first you need to say, ‘hello’ and hello to you Jeffrey. And, second, you have to put your book bag away, please.” And she could further allude, “You should know better. You know you need to put your things away when you get home.”

The next expression uses the word “got” when it should use the word “have.” “Whole ‘nother” is a colloquial term which fails to express the

thoughts behind the statement. If she were to say, “You cannot keep making a mess all over the house the way you have made a mess in your room,” this would better express her thoughts; however, this is not the time or place to suddenly apply cleaning rules.

For these subjects to begin a regimen of appropriate house cleaning, the family would need to call a formal meeting and, within this meeting, a decision must be made to change their normal course of daily events to allow for ongoing house cleaning. To mention to a family member that they should clean a portion of the house at an arbitrary moment is to disregard the true solution to the problem.

“I’m gonna put it up (high volume, high tone)!” Tyler was briefly playing with the dog but then he pushes the dog out of the way and keeps walking to the back room.

“Tyler!” his mother yells.

Tyler says, “Grrrgh!” He walks back and he yanks his backpack swinging it around as he carries it back to his room. With a frown, he pushes the dog out of the way. The dog is still trying to play, but with ears a little more swung back and down.

“Hey,” his mother says to Jeffrey.

“Hey,” Jeffrey says.

Tyler comes out from the back room.

Tyler and his mother have begun arguing. She tells him what to do without explaining the reasoning behind it and her statement is arbitrary. He then responds with loud volumes and high tones. It is wrong to sustain arguments with children. Caregivers must explain a singular point of reason and this reason must be followed. Often, a parent will treat a point of reason with ambiguity, generalizing the reasoning, and they will not apply an ultimatum with the reasoning. A parent may wish to not hurt the child’s feelings by grounding them or they may feel that a limiting of liberties will reduce the child’s free-thought. Yet, in lieu of the parent being firm with a lesson, the pressures of “task overload” cause an argument with the child. An argument teaches a child that points of reason are debatable, and that the one who yells the loudest or the one who has the last word is the victor.

“Did you see my Playbox?” The loud volume continues through almost all of their interactions. Tyler maintains a frown as he speaks.

“How the hell I gonna know where your game thingie is? Did you bring your jacket home?” She also has a continuous frown.

“I don’t know (high tones, argumentative). No, I (low tone) guess (high tone) I (low tone) left (high tone) in (mid-level tone) homeroom (high then lowest tone).” Tyler’s last statement is mimicking the way she argues.

“You better bring it home tomorrow.”

Arguing is wrong. This continuous argumentative interaction, with heightened emotions, with ongoing frowns, bespeaks a paradigm of perception-only viewpoints; the speakers do not view their world in pragmatic, empirical, terms. The participants of these kinds of debates are not members who propose sound reason. A perception-based approach to problems is in direct opposition to approaching problems with sound incremental scientific steps. The victors of these exchanges are the members who yell the loudest or have the last statement under a topic. In these exchanges, right or wrong is not determined by fair means; right or wrong is determined by a carnal view of the most physically and verbally imposing member.

Arguing consumes time. It displaces normal, relative, informational conversation and further hinders the development of children. Before any second or third argumentative expression is presented the parent should end the argument and force a clear, valid, fair ruling on what is right and what is wrong.

“What you did today?” she asks. The volumes and tones begin to drop a little; yet, the tones and volumes are still much higher than relative conversation.

“Nothing,” Tyler replies.

“In recess, we climbed a tree.” Jeffrey says.

“You did?” She says.

“Yeah, Jeff almost fell right on his butt (higher relative volume),” Tyler says with a small chuckle.”

“No unh!” Jeff says.

“You was hanging there and the teacher had to come get your butt down.”

“I know’d what I was doing (volume rises)! I was going to swing back up and climb on the other side.” Jeff says.

“He was like aagh!” Tyler laughs

“No I wasn’t!” Jeff exclaims.

“Alright. Alright (lowering tones),” the mother says.

“Dog! Get out from in front of me!”

The mother uses the wrong verb. She means to say, “What did you do today?” By avoiding appropriate language, this member is in direct opposition to “informational” topics. When someone repeatedly uses truncated language and poor grammar, they are not wishing to be what they consider a *persona non grata*—a person who is outside of the norm (their norm) of being a common non-educated person. They are working within their “group” and maintaining that group paradigm by repeating the same language forms used by other group members.

They briefly speak of an informational topic (of a physical activity) of climbing a tree, yet Tyler uses the topic to denigrate Jeffrey. He bypasses the normal conversation, of discussing an earlier event, and insults Jeffrey so as to further his own status. Although in some cases, this could be a friendly joke or it could be a reasonable competitive statement, Tyler is not framing the statement in this manner. He is not offering a friendly statement to follow this exchange. It furthers the paradigm of arguing to win a status position.

His mother does not correct his inappropriate behavior towards Jeffrey.

The house is a mess. Clothes are laying around on furniture and the floor. The carpet has not been vacuumed for a few weeks. On the living room wall there is a velvet picture of a bull fighter. In the kitchen, old plates of food are on the counter. Cabinets are broken. The television shows are the same as the previous scene. The sliding glass door leading to the backyard shows a lawn that is cut, but not edged. Toys are everywhere.

All of the clothing worn by these family members is with some sort of flaw. Tyler has a fashionable t-shirt, yet the neck ring is drooping in the middle, aged. Jeffrey is wearing a clean, fashionable shirt, yet his pants are oversized and

wrinkled. The mother is wearing a large around-the-house shirt with a few stains on it. It is over-stretched.

Jeffrey sits on the couch.

Tyler continues to look around for his video games, “Where is my Box?”

“If you open your eyes, I think it’s on desk under those papers. But you can’t play right now. You got homework.”

“I don’t got no homework!” Tyler raises the volume again.

“You always got homework. Let me see your math book, and your writing book.”

He slowly walks to his bedroom habitually looking around the other rooms for his video games. He continuously frowns and he says in lowered volumes, “Why do I always have to do this?”

He fumbles through his backpack in his room. As he pulls papers and books out, he sets them randomly on the floor. He sees his science book and remembers that he must do his science homework.

After extensive arguing about the toy, his mother finally mentions the appointed task of homework. As in the previous scene, the mother treats the homework assignment as a necessary task so that the free-time beyond the task can be accessed. The homework is, in no way, being performed for the reason of preparing a child of adulthood, nor is it being performed for the curiosity of learning a new piece of information.

“I don’t got no homework!” is a double negative, and it uses the word “got” instead of “have.” Throughout this scene the members repeat this word, “got,” rather than using the more expansive words of “have” or “should” or “find” or “acquire” or any number of more exacting terms. When language is reduced to words which are interchangeable with other more descriptive words, intellect is reduced. Children must be pushed to using other words rather than these multi-use words. Language should be more varied rather than limited. In other statements, these members use the word “stuff,” rather than the name of the individual items. Again, a human being’s purpose in life is not to simply exist or to have play-time or to reduce their realm of thought to its absolute minimum. A human being’s reason for living is to solve adult-level tasks of earning a living and supporting the species’ survival and well-being.

He comes out of the back room, “I have science homework.”

“I told ya. You have something,” His mom says. She turns to Jeffrey and in a little softer tones she says, “You too, Jeffrey. You got homework too, right?”

“Uggh,” he makes a small frown. “My mom said I could do it when I get home.”

“Oh really? You gon’ make me call her?”

“Uggh, okay,” he slowly gets up to go look in his backpack.

Jeffrey comes back to sit on the couch. Tyler goes to sit on the floor. His mother says, with slightly excessive volume and tone, “Yall get over there to the table!” They both move to the table, push a few dishes out of the way, and start doing their homework. After a moment, the dog settles in the kitchen, laying down near Tyler.

At one point, Jeffrey gets distracted. He starts banging his pencil on the table. Tyler thinks he’s starting to play a song. He sings the lyrics, as he remembers them, “And if you want to call me baby, just go ahead now.” He also starts to kick the chairs underneath the table.

“Stop it!” Jeffrey says. Tyler sings louder and bangs the table more. “Shut up!”

“Hey! Guys! Do your homework!” the mother says. She pulls out her nail kit and starts to paint her nails.

For a while, they quietly do their homework. Tyler gets up a few times and his mother starts to notice that he is wasting time. She admonishes him and he returns to his work.

Tyler asks, “Can I get a snack?”

“No. Not until you finish your homework. You can have a drink. Get one for Jeffrey too.”

The phone rings and she answers it. For a while, she gossips with one of her friends. Jeffrey and Tyler then finish their work at the table and Tyler pulls a chair over to climb up on the counter so he could reach into a cabinet. After he reaches into the cabinet, his mother notices him.

“Uh unh (no)! You ain’t getting those chips! Those are for the weekend. You can have the corn chips.”

“Aggh,” he says forcefully pushing the potato chips back into the cabinet. Leaving the cabinet door open, he jumps down, moves his chair over to the other cabinet and proceeds to climb again. “I hate corn chips.”

“Well, that’s all you get,” she continues with the phone call.

He jumps down and runs with the bag to the armchair in their living room. Jeffrey plops down beside him. They eat out of the bag.

A host must maintain a clean home so as to receive a guest or otherwise have a firm understanding of the relativity established by statesmen in their efforts to solve state-level and species-level problems. A host also must have either an acute awareness of how to make or purchase food for presenting to guests or they should avoid offering food to a guest. In teaching Tyler and Jeffrey of their future adult-level solutions to problems, and teaching them the trending relativity among statesmen, the mother should have told them to not eat chips out of a bag but rather place some into a bowl. This simple, subtle task adds a step; it adds a level of attention to the task of consuming a resource in a presentable manner rather than a more carnal, par, minimal, manner. It also maintains a household in a cleaner state because just a few fingers can be used to retrieve a chip and the back of the hand does not rub against the bag, picking up oils. They also should eat at a table and be aware of not leaving crumbs on the ground.

To use a bowl for a snack could be more energy consuming. The bowl would have to be washed while eating out of the bag does not soil any dish; however, in knowing of the additional steps of using a bowl and the reasoning behind such a gesture—to be attentive to one’s appearance and showing a respect for one’s overall resource footprint—a host learns the details of a complicated problem. Even if a guest does not visit the home the additional steps of using a bowl prepares one for that moment when they need to discover additional steps to solving a pressing problem.

To provide food to a guest, a host should have a clean kitchen in addition to having a clean home. The food should not be processed food; food should only be made from raw ingredients or at least mildly processed, or derived from a respectable café or restaurant. Some snacks such as chips could be

presented, but the utmost care must be taken to have it in trending dishware, possible with a sauce or dip (trending dip) in a bowl on the side. The dishware and glassware must be trending among both current and long term trends. Eating should almost always be on a patio or dining room area, with everyone attentive to all the aspects of eating in an appropriate manner, respecting both the material resource and the social resource of the event. Above all, eating should be with a respect to the ingredients and their withdrawal from the environment.

The subtleties of food presentation are complex. Consider a bachelor presenting food to a guest. If he were to receive guests, they would have to know that he is a person far removed from a carnal lifestyle or they may respond with some social un-acceptance. Tyler must know of how to be a singular host.

Some may read these interpretations and conclude that it is not appropriate for the author to admonish the lifestyles of people who live in a less-clean state. They may feel that all people are entitled to the freedoms of living life as they see fit. These interpretations are not for proposing a cleaner house for ambiguous reasons. These interpretations contend that a household should be kept clean for the purpose of educating children of the values of form so that those children will be more successful at adult-level tasks. It is a way to guide the AI's position of how to form an optimum adult out of a child, to prepare them both for employment and civic responsibility. It is believed that case studies will show that adult-level success is more likely, more probable, if a child is raised in an environment that promotes form, and by proposing a state-level of relativity, child will be greater prepared to understand and deal with state-level and society-level problems. State-level and society-level problems are inherently ecosystem problems, and a failure of a large number of individual species members will cause an extinction of the species. Once an individual is made aware of how to best approach these environmental tasks/tests/problems, that person may then may choose to live their life free of this proposed direction and question the reasoning behind state-level problems.

This household is being run without any attention to form. Tyler was unaware that his backpack has a place; he was unaware of needing to close a cabinet after it is opened; he was unaware that chips should be in a bowl. He is growing more and more unaware of having to notice form. This total lack of form will leave him unprepared for fitting into groups which support this form.

A neighbor knocks on the door. The mother greets him, "Hi, Peter, you came for your tool?"

"Yeah, is Jim finished with it?" he asks.

"I think so. Come in," she says.

He slowly enters, looking around tentatively. The dog starts to jump on him. "Spot! Stop it!" she says.

"Oh, that's okay," Peter says, as he pushes the dog back softly.

"Uhm, okay, let me run to the back to get it. Have a seat," She says.

"Well, um, that's okay, I have to run," he continues to stand.

The dog jumps onto the couch and lays down.

She notices that he is standoffish. Although he does not have a gesture of disgust on his face, he also is not smiling in full form.

After she comes from the back with the drill, she says, "Here. And I told Mable that I'd send over some of my pineapple cake."

"Oh, uh, okay." He tentatively waits to receive the cake. He is looking around with a slow glance. She gives him the cake. She starts to frown a little as they say their good byes.

After eating their snack Jeffrey asks, "You gon ask about the Playbox?"

"Yeah, let's go," Tyler says, as they grab their snacks and start to head back to the room. The chairs are out of place, the cabinets are open, and they both drop crumbs on the floor as they go back to the room. The dog follows.

Tyler looks for his video game console. Jeffrey moves around a little and steps on a shirt on the floor which was covering up his Playbox and a pair of headphones. They hear a crunch. The shirt and the Playbox were partly in the closet door threshold.

"Huh!" Tyler lifts up the shirt to see that his headphones are partly broken. "What did you do?"

"I didn't do it!"

“Yes you did!” Tyler says with the highest volume. He pulls the toys away and turns away.

Jeffrey steps toward him and he then Tyler pushes him away. “That’s nothing! You wrecked my bike and broke my front wheel!” Jeffrey pushes him back. “And takin’ my game! I’m gonna get it back!” Jeffrey is referencing a previous trade that they had made before.

The mother walks in the room, “What is goin’ on?”

“He broke my earphones!” Tyler yells.

“No I di int!” Jeffrey says.

“Yes you did.”

“What happened!” mother says to Tyler.

“He stepped on it!” Tyler says.

“I didn’t know it.” Jeffrey says.

“Look what happened. Tyler, I told you to pick up your things.”

“Look, the other piece is here!” Tyler says with slightly lowering volumes, signifying that this will be not to make it too strong of an argument.

“Let me see it,” she looks at it and sees that the console is fine, but the headphones are broken on one side. “Here, it’s just the earphones. You can still play the box. . . Now I’m trying to talk on the phone (volumes and tones increase). Don’t make me come back here again (highest volume and tone)!”

Tyler and Jeffrey are a little quiet, but both of them are frowning.

They start to play with the console. Tyler has a few brash moments, but he and Jeffrey get along most of the time. After a while, they start to play with some figurines.

When resources are lost in a disputed event, all parties must discern the individual events in their incremental order. If the parties in this dispute begin to yell and warp the facts quickly after the event, false perceptions and false logic will direct the dispute. Tyler was unaware that there was a risk with not placing this item in an appropriate place. The form that he is missing is costing him resources. He wrongfully blames Jeffrey for a mistake that is mostly his own. And he is without the appropriate, friendly, response of, “Oh

no, well, I understand that you didn't know it was there," and a further understanding of the event, "I should have put it in a safer place."

Jeffrey tries to cover up his mistake, saying simply that he "didn't do it." His appropriate argument might be, "Yes I broke it, but how would I have known it was there?" Although the argument then went into a new phase where Jeffrey noted that this is not as relatively bad as another event (the broken bike wheel), he did not admit that it was he who stepped on the toy. A clear understanding of the facts was not established.

To point out that Tyler broke his bicycle wheel is a tit-for-tat response. To respond to an accident (that is being proposed as not an accident) with another accident (which is now not proposed as an accident) is to defeat reason. It is a means to prolong arguments, confrontations.

The mother does not successfully conclude a winner in the dispute. She treats it in the similar manner as adults gathered around two members fist fighting; she states an ambiguous implied meaning of, "please get along." She should have noted that one, it is not too serious of an accident (it does not involve a large amount of resources), and two, it was only an accident where fault is limited. She could have explained that a lack of form, the keeping of the toy in a safer place, is mostly to blame for the incident. And she is not directing the boys to "get over it." She is not attentive to their behaviors after the event to see that it is treated as a mostly no-fault accident.

When adults argue, it will begin with an unfair event and/or a derogatory comment or action. Then it often leads to a myriad of fast paced derogatory comments with additional unfair events. The parts of an argument are to be unwound. The incremental steps are to be examined in fraction-of-second terms and every successive unfair event, imposition, by each member is to be isolated. The goals/motives/preferred-outcomes of the members must be discrete, discerned, and the goal of being fair overrides is to override all other goals. Whether it originates with an unfair act of party A or party B, all subsequent unfair acts must be isolated. In determining an equitable conclusion, arguments cannot be generalized; the parts of the argument cannot be ambiguous and the goals cannot be ambiguous.

Arguments cannot contain generalizations. Generalizing is a fallacy that must not be allowed in the discernment of events.

The purpose that the mother proposes for not arguing is that she is trying to have a telephone call—not that everyone should determine equitable solutions for the purpose of goodwill.

“I’m gon’ get a jet car and fueling station for Grimbo,” Jeffrey says.

“So,” Tyler says.

“You don’t have one yet. You’re still playing with that old airport set, with the broken hanger”

“It still has a lot of stuff.”

“Well, my dad said he would get it for me.”

“I got my attack ship.” Tyler says.

“It’s alright.” Jeffrey says. He pauses for a moment.

“Vrroohm, Vrroohm,” he forcefully drives a vehicle into a building. His figurine steps out, and he fires the gun, “Bang, Bang. You stop there fool (strong intonation),” he says as he makes exaggerated, excessive gestures.

“Wait, wait. Tongo can still attack. He has to get to his shoulder cannon at the roof” Tyler takes his figurine and has him jumping from building to building. With each landing he bangs the figure’s feet on the play set. His figure gets the gun from the roof. “Zzzrrm, zzzrrm.”

Jeffrey sees one part that he has to put on his figurine’s car. He starts to put it on and Tyler says, “Wait. It don’t go like that.”

Jeffrey turns real hard so that Tyler can’t reach for the car, “No, let me do it!”

“You don’t know how!”

“Yes I do!” after standing up and stepping Jeffrey gets the piece on. He drops down quickly to where he was playing.

“That’s my Jin.” Tyler says, as he notices that figurine on the side where Jeffrey is playing.

“No it’s not!”

“Yes it is.” And he reaches for it.

“I had this since Christmas!” He moves back.

“Give it!” Tyler yells.

“It’s mine!” Jeffrey yells as he pushes Tyler a little.

“No,” Tyler pushes back and reaches for it. “We traded that one

“Nuh unh! I never traded this one.” Jeffrey yells.

They wrestle a little with the figurine. Tyler’s mom walks in, still on the phone, “I told you there ain’t gonna be no

fighting!” By “fighting,” she means “arguing,” not a more serious physical disagreement.

“He took my Jin!” Tyler says.

“It’s mine!” Jeffrey says.

“You traded it!” Tyler says.

“I didn’t trade this one!” Jeffrey says, sticking his head out and twisting his head a little. “I only traded Grimbo and his motorcycle!”

“I don’t know who traded what! Tyler let him have it.” His mother says.

“No! That’s not fair! Hmph!” Tyler says.

“Jeffrey you wanna sit in here with me until your mom gets here and leave grounded Tyler in here?”

“Grounded!” Tyler yells.

“You’re gonna be if you don’t stop all this fighting! Now, I don’t want to hear it!”

Jeffrey makes a little face, a grimace, at Tyler. “You too Jeffrey, enough.” Tyler’s mom says. Jeffrey follows her out to the living room.

Because the previous argument was not fully settled, the tit-for-tat responses continued. Jeffrey brandishes resources by saying, “I’m gon get a jet car . . .” Tyler, seeking to reduce Jeffrey’s status, replies, “So.” Jeffrey then explains that his status is higher because of this resource because Tyler’s comparable resources are “broken.”

A caregiver, an adult, a teacher, or some other elder, should be present to explain to them that the value of their resources is far less important than their status within social relations. Resources have value, and competition has value, but it must be within a relativity that is much more geared towards goodwill. Jeffrey is wrong with his line of statements. Tyler is wrong with his line of statements. Both of them should have completely abandoned the concept of seeking to gain status with their toy collections. A caregiver in this situation should bring an absolute halt to all of their flawed reasoning and explain, figuratively, “No, no. Jeffrey, now you know it’s not right to make a big deal of who has what toys. It would be nice to have a toy like that, but one shouldn’t brag about what they have, right?” And a caregiver could add to this concept with, “Toys are nice, but they are not necessarily

the most important thing for you to be concerned about. There's friendship and there's learning of things and sports and other hobbies that you can do.”

When Tyler did his brash, exaggerated actions of swinging his book bag around and pushing the dog out of the way, he was being carnal. When this is directed at a peer, the peer often has to respond with similar, carnal, primitive, brash actions. After their dispute with the broken headphones, Jeffrey forcefully drives his vehicle into the building to show his carnal, brash, action. One might conclude that they are play-fighting with toys and this leads to carnal actions, yet the playing with toy figurines in fighting scenarios is a natural, normal representation of adult-level interactions. What is not natural is that a caregiver is not guiding this simulation of fighting into its relative position within a modern paradigm—where carnal movements towards status are insignificant.

Carnal actions should be met with stern reprimands and ultimatums to bring about an immediate halt. His mother should have prevented him from swinging his book bag around by meeting it with a positive reinforced lecture and/or a negative reinforced lecture. This reinforcement, either positive or negative, must be with the condition of an ultimate denial of this action and any similar action. When a second action occurred, the pushing of the dog, this should have been a point of very specific increased lecturing to convey a message that this behavior should, in no way, be continuing. Even though many of these expressions are small gestures, these carnal actions should not go far beyond their first appearance. Characters should not persist towards adulthood with these behavioral traits.

After a few moments, Tyler comes out and sits and watches television with them. He and Jeffrey eventually start up a conversation about something else other than figurines.

The television is loud. Throughout the whole scene, no one notices the loud volume and no one moves to lower it. Television programs often carry a lower volume, and commercials have a higher volume.

The television is pervasive. It is integrated into the lives of the viewers and it is unnatural. Modern societies are removed from hunger and placed into an environment of relative comfort. This comfort distances them from knowing of the earlier environmental tests of hunting and gathering and it further distances them from knowing of societal problems of our current

mass extinction event. The television should be turned off or otherwise be brought into a state of relativity.

In a classroom, a teacher could have the students study the impact of global warming. Teachers could suggest energy conservation as a way to reduce carbon footprints. They could explain the increasing pollution and suggest ways to reduce this environmental harm. They could describe the effects of these problems like ecosystem collapse, food shortages, and acid rain. But unless the students are not forced into the understanding that all of their modern comforts could disappear, and unless they are given real disciplines involving the television being turned off, they will not know of and respect these dangers. If individuals do not have a core understanding that mortal dangers are just beyond our immediate concerns, those dangers will become our immediate concern.

Jeffrey's mother arrives and he goes home. Soon after, Tyler's dad comes home. The dog excitedly greets him at the door. The dog jumps up on the father and the father spends a minute play-fighting with the dog.

"Take your shoes off (excessive tones and volume)!" the mother says.

"I'm gonna. I'm gonna," the husband says.

"Did you get the check?"

"No (excessive tones and volume), the office was closed by the time I got to that side of town. I had to go by Darren's."

"You ain't got a check!?" the wife says, "How the hell we gonna pay the insurance?"

"It ain't due 'til next week." The loud volumes and excessive tone variations continue through the conversation. The father throws his jacket over the couch, and takes his shoes off leaving them near the couch.

"The hell it is! I have to call tomorrow to pay over the phone!" she says.

"Don't start your bitching! I don't wanna hear that crap!" He says.

The argument continues for some time and then it settles down. The father says to Tyler, "What up, you?"

"Hey," Tyler says.

"You did your homework?" The father says.

“Yeah,” Tyler replies. After a small pause Tyler says,
“Can we go to the store this weekend.”

“For what?” his father asks. A low tone is on the end of the sentence, implying that what he might need is likely not going to be of relative importance.

“I want to get a play set.”

“We ain’t gettin’ nothin.’ You don’t need nothin.’ You just got that car on your birthday,” he says.

“That was a long time ago.” Tyler says.

“We ain’t goin’ to the store,” his father says.

“Tyler!” his mom says, “enough with that! We ain’t getting you anything.”

When the father says, “What up, you?” he is initiating a conversation with an abnormal greeting. Although variations on a greeting could be helpful to discarding clichéd, repetitive, actions, the father should move to using the diction of more informational conversations. He should see that some formality should be present in their conversations so that the group could transition to any informational conversation with ease. A formal “Hi, how are you today?” would be clear, and it would be questioning if Tyler is involved in any informational/educational/ tasks. He could’ve followed with questions like, “How was school?” or “What have you been doing in P.E.?” This could further expand to him asking, “Did you finish that puzzle you were putting together?” or “Did you build that model?” or “Did you write one of your stories?” or “Did you draw in your notebook?” Under some circumstances, when a child is doing quite well at school, a parent could ask “Did you beat that level in the game (video)?” or “Did you finally get that dance move?” or “Did you write that poem?” And, of course, the father could lead into activities at school, “Is your science class doing any experiments?” or “Did you figure out how to determine the hypotenuse?”

“What up, you?” is bad English. All people should speak the proper grammatical form of their language.

Tyler wishes to gain status over Jeffrey so, like all children, he asks his parents to create (purchase) the resource. He is unaware of the ideas behind the argument his parents just had. Although the mistake of not preparing for bills is wrong, and both parent’s methods of discussing this bill are wrong, this event could have been a valuable experience for Tyler. He could have noticed that some critical task is at risk at a point of failure, and that these

tasks are due attention. He could have questioned his mother (after the argument settles), “What is insurance?” Also, his parents also could have elaborated on insurance, explaining that one must not fall into these financial problems. They could have thought back to what could have prevented this problem. Although these lessons are not easily learned under the best of circumstances, he could begin to develop an awareness that the toy he wants needs to be purchased within a well-thought-through budget.

In poor language, his father says, “We ain’t gettin’ nothin.’ You don’t need nothin.’ You just got that car on your birthday.” He is in complete avoidance of any discussion of a “budget.” He pushes the topic to a stern conclusion, “we ain’t goin’ to the store,” without additional explanation. Just as so many circumstances in this scene and in the previous scene, informational conversations, conversations with reasoned adult-level problems, and conversations involving critical tasks, are avoided. He could say something such as, “Just in case you didn’t notice, we were just talking about money, and how we don’t have that much of it. We have important bills that have to be taken care of.” And he could frame the toy within a relativity of problem solving, saying figuratively, “We can’t exactly just go out and buy something on a whim. When you want something you have to consider carefully if it is a need or a want, and you have to think through if it is a better item to purchase than other items.”

“You do the dinner? (Did you make dinner?)” the husband asks the wife.

“No, I’m not cookin.’ You shoulda got somethin.’”

“I didn’t have no time for that!” he says, “not to mention the money.” He says.

“That ain’t my problem.” She says.

“Alrigh’ we gonna be eating some soup out the can.”

After a moment, Mother gets up from the couch and goes into the kitchen. In the kitchen, there are four pieces of paper (trash) on the floor, a sock, the dog’s food and water are a little spilled. A shirt is laying on the seat of a chair. “If you quit leaving your stuff laying all around, you’d be able to figure out how to make a decent dinner!” She says, referencing the shirt.

“Urrgh,” the father says, as he angrily grabs his shirt and carries it to the back room. After a moment he says, with a

frown (retaliating against her previous comment), “Did you check the mail?” with the tones lowering toward the end, implying, “Did you check the mail like you should have?”

“I always check the mail,” she says defensively.

“Did I get anything?” They continue to use low tones, with angry intonations.

“No.”

They are quiet for a while. Then she spoke of the neighbor visiting. “Um, Peter came by and got that thingie.”

“Cool, I don’t have to bring it over.”

“Why? Don’t you like going there?”

“Nah, I don’t mind them, but I don’t feel like walking over.” The frowns continue.

“He seems snooty. Why the heck don’t they talk more, or I see them going out with that other couple. What? They don’t like us? Just because we don’t go to their church?”

“No, he’s nice. Her kinda. But he’s just into all different kinda stuff. He don’t like sports, I think. And he’s not a motorcycle guy and I am. But I drank a beer with him the other day.”

“Well, you should’ve seen the look he was giving us, like he don’t like dogs or us.”

“That’s not right, someone not liking animals.” Tyler says.

“Uh huh (yes),” mother says, quickly following Tyler’s statements.

“I don’t know. Don’t care really,” the father says.

Even though the father dropped his jacket onto the couch earlier, and all the family members place items at random locations around the house, and this behavior appears to be an ongoing trait reverberating between all members, the mother arbitrarily mentions the shirt being in a chair in the kitchen. Without a formal transition from maintaining a less-clean house to a plan where all members consistently put away their items, calling out any one incident is ineffective. It only adds to the ongoing antagonism.

The use of the word “thing,” or in this case “thingie,” is one of the foremost methods of avoiding and shunning informational. By witnessing his parents using this word, Tyler is sure to become disadvantaged in his attempts to solve school exercises where informational problem solving

requires insight. Conversations at school demand the declarations of named items; details, especially the proper names of items, must be cited rather than avoided. If family members sternly avoid the names of objects, the nouns of conversation, they cannot expand upon their basic, more-centric, more-primitive, realm of knowledge to a level needed to support successful adult lives and solutions to societal problems.

Although methods of education are increasing and improving, although certain pockets of society are achieving great progress in intellectual development, a larger societal group is continuing to adopt reduced vocabularies and limited, carnal-only, topics of conversation. Discussed in later chapters, those who adopt these lifestyles are outnumbering members who seek intellectual development. One might assume that this scene is just of a limited group, and these members are not harming other members. One might be in a college setting and all the people they interact with are the predominant, common, group, so they may feel that it more normal for people to adopt reasoned approaches to life, but this type of environment, where poor parenting, poor decision making, and chronic self-induced financial strife is becoming more common than environments where members operate at a more optimum intelligence level.

They are speaking within a particular realm of diction. He says, “Cool, I don’t have to bring it over.” The statement uses “cool,” a term that is a more expansive term than “good” or “great” or “okay,” but the speaker must be aware that it is a colloquial variation with a limited purpose and use. It is also partly faddish and governed by those limited faddish trends.

A speaker would need to judge when it is important to be more pragmatic, practical with diction. If one is tasked with ongoing critical problems, such as air traffic control or operating machinery or more informational problems such as engineering a bridge, one should speak in very pragmatic, practical terms. If one were to say, “Cool, the bridge’s safety stuff is all in place” it would be neglectful of the task. A more clear statement would be, “Good, the safety guard rails are in, and they have checked that they are fastened properly (he checks a form), so we can be sure to allow the second crew of workers on (the bridge).”

Group formation occurs along lines of diction and along lines of informational propensities. If one earns money in more skilled employment positions—they are tasked with more resourceful and critical problems to solve—they are likely to speak with a more formal diction. They are likely to retain friends who also speak with more common or formal diction. They are

likely to avoid friendships with societal members who fail to recognize the importance of informational, innovative, and critical solutions. They, of course, should always be respectful of people who have had misfortune from practicing poor diction and they should be respectful of all rights of all peoples within other groups, but this partitioning (respectful social un-acceptance) of species members is a natural part of solving critical resource problems.

Tyler's father is not addressing critical tasks at this moment; however, in one's daily life, informational conversations and pragmatic, practical, measured diction should be practiced in much larger proportions than relaxed, colloquial, diction. A child should witness more pragmatic, practical references to information because this is a requirement of their schooling. At the least, these parents should speak with colloquial terms in limited moments and then balance this with the majority of their conversations being more pragmatic and informational.

The father continues the tit-for-tat derogatory remarks by asking, "Did you check the mail like you should have?" And the mother responds defensively, "I always check the mail." In continuing this conversation, this couple is adopting a way of communicating in which arguments are normal. They feel that one must attain a carnal-alpha status instead of an intellectual-alpha status. Once this kind of conversation is underway, participants and bystanders cannot easily transition out of it. These carnal arguments could lead to a climax with either the loudest participant or the participant who makes the last comment is considered the winner. The reasoning of the underlying informational problem is disregarded.

One of the greatest discrepancies of Modern Psychology is the failure to apply rules to debates and disputes. During a dispute, volumes and tones should be formally noted as having required levels. The well documented fallacies of literary studies such as a red herring argument, or a tu quoque argument, or an ad hominem attack, or a generalized argument, or a retaliatory attack, must be noted by psychologist as a stopping point in a debate—where the fallacy is formally noted and reasoned out of the debate. In addition to formally recognizing these fallacies (incorporating them into diagnostics and therapies), cognitive studies must require both an acknowledgment of a singular goal and the use of sound reasoning to achieve that goal.

This argument between the mother and father is so far from reason, so engulfed in carnal motives, that each successive statement is made simply for carnal status.

The mother speaks of the neighbors, “Why the heck don’t they talk more . . .” The mother is now developing a false perception of why their neighbors seem unfriendly. She feels that Peter dislikes them because of different religious beliefs. She also may feel that his more conservative demeanor means that he holds more conservative political beliefs while their household is more liberal. When Peter stepped into the home, he saw a household that is not of a normal standard of cleanliness. He may be aware of the inherent problems that can arise with a lifestyle where clothing is strewn all around the home and poor diction is used. She is unaware that it may be a simple matter of cleanliness and his desire to have less colloquial, argumentative, anti-informational conversations.

Tyler is also assuming that they “do not like dogs” when he has not seen clear evidence to suggest that this is the case. His parents do not correct his possible false perception.

The neighbor’s social un-acceptance also could be more limited to the cleanliness of his own clothing at that time. When a household has a cat or a dog, and that pet is allowed to jump on couches and counters and tables, they will leave pet hair and dander and dirt on all of these surfaces. Unless the hosts are aware of this, and the smells it can create, they may be unable to mitigate the social un-acceptance of a neighbor. And if Peter happens to be wearing clean clothing, and he wishes to avoid unnecessary washing, or he is going out into public to greet others, he may simply not wish to sit down on this neighbor’s couch so that he will not collect this pet hair. He may even be more open and understanding of un-clean houses, he might be quite liberal in many respects; yet, he just wishes to avoid making his clothing un-clean.

Some may argue that the value of the companionship with a dog or cat is priceless and it is well-worth the loss in cleanliness. If one wished to have pets for companions and they understood and respected how some guests may not wish to collect pet hairs on clothing, then they would be making a sound and valid decision to live life with the greatest of companions. Yet, just as Peter should not treat them as having secondary status for their love of animals, they should not treat Peter with secondary status for his wishing to maintain a level of cleanliness.

They proceed to eat dinner. Every evening the mutually choose to not watch the news. At that time, they watch a vapid (not innovative) sitcom of a family and then the entertainment news.

Later, they watch the same shows of the previous scene, both the children's channel and the talent contest. Tyler then goes to bed. At no point, between coming home from school and going to bed, has Tyler encountered any informational topic in any of the conversations of his parents, other than the pressing financial critical problems that they develop several arguments about.

The next day, Tyler gets in trouble for not turning in his math homework.

These scenes are not exaggerations. The lack of "informational" conversations in households, in our current times, in modern apex countries, is staggering. Television programming has been formed by the desires of the public and television programming has directed the desires of the public. This environment has reverberated a carnal disdain for informational problems and assisted populations into forming into their own, mostly carnal, genres.

The television must be turned off.

Caregivers, parents and educators, must condition children into a curiosity for information, for innovation, for solving pressing personal problems and solving societal problems through academic, "informational," endeavors rather than carnal endeavors. Children must be reasoned and rational, and if they arrive at adulthood without a sound intent to sacrifice personal liberties to save the society from ruin they will be negligent, culpable, responsible for that inevitable social collapse. It is inequitable to disregard societal needs. They must attend critical problems in priority, and all problems should be considered as having a critical, mortal, element.

Many studies of the mind maintain a general view of human thought. In broad terms, cognitive studies might describe a conscience as something that "thinks, experiences, and senses." Discrete behaviorism, an approach which breaks down human actions into their verbatim, fraction-of-second, actions models a human thought as being of only two distinct parts. A discrete human thought is a product of reasoning and facts. Human thought is simply

when a human observes or recalls a fact and uses that fact in a reasoning step. Any series of elemental actions performed by a human or any life form are distinct parts of a reasoned step, with no other attributable purpose, and those reasoned steps are formed as a result of a life form's need to solve consumption, reproduction, or peripheral problems. The decision, the choice, to undertake a reasoning step is also a distinct reasoning step in a life form's movement towards environmental solutions. Consider a parent's referencing a child's failure to accomplish a chore and suggesting "you have to be smarter than that." Although this can be a fair representation of what is happening (and sometimes an appropriate, well-suited, reprimand) it is usually a skewed ambiguous view of the human thought process so it is usually not a matter of intelligence or memory (recalling those simple facts). It is more a matter of self-disciplined reasoning rather than a failure of simple stepped-reasoning, where a child is preoccupied by other desires and not wanting to apply the disciplines of the chore. Consider a counselor making a similar assessment of a child not doing well in school. It could be the case that the child has a difficult time recalling facts or deducing conclusions from those facts, but if it is often an issue of having a motivation towards academic schools of thought, and it is this viewpoint/lifestyle-choice which must be acknowledged and singled out. Often times an appropriate statement of "you're smarter than that," alludes to a beneficial view that one's genetic makeup is blind to the discussion and that the tests applied are tests that simply must be passed despite any shortcomings (either innate or failed conditioning). It is important to note that a successful diagnosis of a patient or the forming of metrics to gauge child development must not err with introducing additional ambiguity to the concept of a human conscience—a human mind only acknowledges facts and places those facts in a reasoned step.

A description of a person's "intelligence" would be a successful ability to address the current relative environmental problems, in an appropriate hierarchical order, by reasoning through well-recalled facts. And it would include the ability originate new peripheral-edge reasoning processes and remember large collections of associations. A test of member's intelligence quotient would have a direct relation to those peripheral problems found in their environment. The concept of such a test should work the same with a human and their environment or any other species operating in its given environment. A description of a person's "reasoning" would be a comparison between a person's choices, their decisions, in relation to

environmental problems. Reasoning is the application of intelligence to the solving of environmental problems and it ranges from simple cause and effect relations, such as placing a square peg in a square hole, mostly local problems, to matters of ethics and morality, such as not imposing upon others, supporting species level problems.

Just as a level of emotion applied in a situation is a product of the development of that peripheral trait through generations—a mother may hold and hug a child based upon their environmental development—an ability to properly reason through a situation is genetic. Appropriate modern reasoning developed from less appropriate primitive reasoning. Consider the history of the leadership of tribes and countries. In prehistoric times, a leader would often be within an attack-or-be-attacked culture. Murder was rampant. Bandits would patrol areas where some form of sovereignty didn't exist. Families and clans formed as small, local, controlling groups where some comfort and security existed, however, family members would also murder each other. As monotheism under a relatively benign deity developed, in the more egalitarian Judaic culture, an idea of a constitution developed among societies. A simple rule such as, “thou shalt not murder,” was not just a part of the rules of common peoples but it was expected to be a rule of leaders as well. Although many feudal systems involved family members killing each other for the position of leadership, it began to have a backlash, Societal remedies developed. Through many generations, and many developmental steps, it became less and less common for leaders to move around such fairly reasoned, fundamental rules.

The Tudor dynasty, for one example, had an extraordinary level of mortal inter-competition, but as these events developed society began firmly rejected this style of governing. Latter leaders, the surviving members of the leading clans, adopted more civil behavior, and this period of time began to change dramatically from being a more scofflaw culture to one of respecting (to some degree) human rights. The leaders, and the general public, began to understand that they were more accountable for their actions, that a greater peace and comfort can be achieved with civility. This period of time marked a major developing step towards modern societies from the last major step of “Thou shalt not murder” two thousand years before.

Reasoning, like the ability to recall facts, can be attributed to genetic markers—the surviving members of mortal inter-competition were inherently less aggressive. Civility, the rule of modern law, developed from a genetic movement away from primitive tribal behavior because the more aggressive,

and more spontaneous, members of armies would often be the first to die in battle. As leaders reckoned with their own actions and their subjects reckoned with their own actions, and modern constitutions developed, the more thoughtful, reasoned, members were rewarded with alpha positions. In gauging a species member's ability to solve environmental problems (species-level problems) a behaviorist would need to consider the underlying genetic ability to reason and the underlying genetic ability to recall facts. Although it should be expressly forbidden for behavioral coach to assess the ability of an individual based upon observing genetic markers, nor should they in any way admonish or disrespect an individual based upon an apparent genetic shortcoming, it must be understood that a member may be operating with an impairment in relation to a sound, mutually-agreed, collection of reasoning points.

In developing a human from a child-like state to an adult state a partiality for informational problem solving and sound reasoning must be required by elders. Carnal, vapid, problem solving must be discouraged. A child is to attain a particular level of learning and then move into the next attainable level, and so on, without perpetuating any lower state of bravado or nesting behavior. Children must move into an informational, reasoned adulthood because our current paradigm requires a conviction to solve those global ecosystem problems caused by our current, relative, developed state. These problems will eventually become catastrophic on a global scale. If a child, juvenile, young adult, does not adopt a personal desire to learn of information and reason, or they shun the reading of non fiction material, or they have no vigor for science discussions, or they do not see the purpose behind a renowned literary work, or they revel too much in sports during gym class without transitioning back to academia, or they are too drawn in by vapid social media and social-media-style content, or they are too drawn to the excitement of video games or sports or thrill-events, or if they do not, at some point in their development, attain the ability to execute through a decision-making process with a continued, relative, success, those individuals, when arriving at adulthood, will have a net negative effect on the survival of the larger species. If too many individual members develop into a net negative adult states, if too many individual members depend on the resources of others throughout their lives, if too many individual members remain oblivious to the full set of societies' environmental problems, the movement towards eco-system collapse will be quickened, and we will reach

a point of full extinction that no amount of current or future technology will prevent.

Once a child becomes an adult, they must support species-level problem solving by being self sufficient, by solving their local environmental problems and not requiring the resources of others, so as to not burden the species, and they must become statesman and fully attend the solving of species-level problems. With the utmost respect and consideration of a child's rights to not be openly denigrated due to their innate shortcomings, educators and parents must gauge the intelligence level of children and ensure that they are approaching adulthood with the best chance of solving their own, local, environmental problems as well as respecting the greater societies need to solve societal problems. Many children have the ability to excel at adult-level problems; however, it must be understood that some children will be found that are unable, despite the many varied forms of conditioning, despite the seriousness applied to critical environmental problems, to move beyond a certain grade level. Just as human beings have different genetic levels of physical ability humans also have different genetic levels of intellectual ability. Despite applying the most optimum approach to their development, a small percentage of children will be unable to move past an elementary education. Despite applying the most optimum approach, some students will only be able to pass through a portion of middle or high school. Despite applying the most optimum approach, some individuals will be able to pass through high school, yet the strains and time limits of collegiate work will cause them to not move past a high school education. Many societal members have an ability to acquire college degrees, but most are not endowed with an eidetic memory needed for doctoral degrees in the highest of sciences. Certainly, many students fail to move past a level because of their own poor reasoning rather than an inability to recall information and, certainly, many students are in poor environmental conditions which would cause them to fail to move through certain levels; however, a fair, respectful, recognition of different innate abilities is required for a social species to be sustained through generations. School systems must support the needs of the larger society by reckoning with this full spectrum of innate ability so that members inclined to not solve their personal resource problems during adulthood do not impede the development of members with higher ability.

If a child has been found to not operate at a competency level needed to address adult-level problems society should move to assist them with life-long, limited, subsistence-level, social assistance. However, steps must be

taken to not increase the number of children having genetic barriers to adult-level problem solving. It must be recognized by the larger society as a problem of not allowing members who are in need of social assistance from increasing their numbers—members who receive social assistance must be encouraged to solve their personal financial problems fully and remove themselves from parental or government assistance before starting a family. A fundamental tenet of a modern society is that when an individual lives in a state of poverty that they must not give birth to a child. If one solves their financial problems first, and removes themselves from government assistance first, before conceiving and giving birth to a child then they would be ensuring that they are not contributing to the World's Poverty Problem.

Of course, when a student is found to be under par with the level of base intelligence and reasoning of their age, they should in no way be labeled or stigmatized or harmed or punished by this assessment, yet measures must be in place to prevent them from becoming an unfair burden upon other members by contributing to the World Poverty Problem. When a student is found to be under par a parent or teacher or elder should never allude to an innate ability (and they certainly should not wrongfully assume it is an innate problem). A teacher should be blind to any genetic short-coming of a student. And other societal members not involved with the employment of these individuals should be blind to their school records and blind to ideas of genetic inability. All possible respect, care, and considerations should be presented to these individuals as they enter the adult world; yet whether a person has an eidetic memory or a person has a more median memory or a person has a learning disability, we all must attend societies' environmental problems/tests and live within our available resources.

Note that the approach to observing human behavior and determining an AI's responses of this chapter, and this book, are proposed based upon the author's belief that the scene participants and the larger society will be on an optimum path to solving environmental problems. If a word such as “must” is presented it is believed to be in the description of a testable collection of points of reason. The course of decisions are formed in this direction, for these proposed goals, yet this is without mathematical proof. A partly heuristic attempt is being made by the author to suggest an outcome that is not heuristic. When an AI is in development the design team will be able to check the proposed course of decisions presented here and explain how those assessments are verified or partly true or in error.

Equity and the Environment

The AI would have to be aware of when one person is treating another unfairly. When a person deviates from fair behavior, the program must not assist the subject in the event. In this chapter, an attempt will be made to propose methods by which the program will determine if a human's actions are fair or unfair, what is ethical and unethical, and if the remedies imposed by the society are fair or unfair, ethical or unethical. Disputes arise in relation to resources, and an attempt will be made to determine fair resource acquisition and fair resource ownership. While many may propose ideas of what is moral and immoral, the author is attempting to discern an approach to this topic that will be both acceptable to the public and conducive to the species' natural course of decisions.

Any proposed course for the AI's decisions would be a matter of extensive study and deliberation. Many scenarios would have to be considered to ensure that the program assists humans with only equitable, fair, reasoned, solutions to problems. The program's designers would have to deliberate extensively to determine the many predictable outcomes. The company producing the software would have to deliberate extensively on issues of risk tolerance, of equity, and of producing a program that is amenable to consumers. The democratic government overseeing the construction of the program would have to deliberate extensively to ensure that the producing companies follow all applicable laws and that the program assists in the security of the governing democracy while maintaining all the individual freedoms of its citizens. And the people of the democracy must move to ensure that all parties abide by a transparent doctrine of program construction and that all parties abide by the constitution.

For humans, in modern environments, the fundamental societal rule is that resources must be obtained by a mutually agreed process of fair-gain. An individual may work through reasoned steps to obtain their own resources yet they must not impose on another person's fairly gained resources. A species member may compete in certain non-mortal and non-pugilistic ways for certain resources, but this fair competition must assist the larger society rather than harm it (increase optimal outcomes within the environment rather than decrease optimal outcomes). The quintessential rule of a sentient social species, the rule by which an AI determines if any given action would be fair

or unfair, is that a person must reason to gain resources with respect to the wellbeing of others; any individual act, any reasoned step, any course of decisions, any acquisition of resources, either social or non-social, must support species-level optimal outcomes within the larger environment.

Resources must also be gained with an understanding of the limitations of the world's ecosystem. One must not maintain a belief that the world's resources (air, food, water), are without limitation because this would be unfair to future generations.

Societal groups, formed sovereignties and other de facto social divisions, produce remedies for the inequitable acts of individuals and these remedies also must abide the rules of fair play—resources must be gained with respect of established societal rules. If, for example, one talks loudly over another or they frown out of place (without a valid reason), the offended member may exhibit negative gestures to reduce the social status of the offender. It is deemed acceptable, as per current societal rules, for one to respond negatively to someone who has imposed negatively upon them, if that negative response is a fair, measured denial of resources. The offended member might respond by stating their position of wanting only friendly, civil, fair interaction, and they may be stern, frowning, presenting a competitive front to effect this outcome. The offended may begin to disassociate with the imposing member and refuse to share resources (resources may involve valued items or information which leads to valued items). The larger society may, with varying degrees of implementation, banish an individual. If the larger societal group sees this kind of imposition they also may agree with the offended member, and develop an unfavorable profile of the offender. This individual is then at a particular disadvantage in relation to the group's shared resources. Neighbors may choose to not speak with the opposed individual as often, or without terms of such a conversation, and the individual will lose the resources of those lost interactions (the information which leads to other raw resources). This would be the smallest measure of separating a person from the group's resources, the point where appropriate behaviors (equitable, ethical, fair, supportive behaviors) are delineated from inappropriate behaviors (inequitable, unethical, unfair behaviors) and a remedy of social un-acceptance is imposed.

If the act of imposition is greater, if it is more than a frown or a denigration or talking over someone, if the imposition involves more tangible resources such as building a fence on another person's property or stealing a lawnmower, the larger group may perform a policing action to remedy that

imposition or otherwise have laws to support civil actions from one party to another. This group response could involve the enforcement of a fine, reparations, or the sequestration (incarceration) of the offending individual. Sovereignities (larger, legally defined groups) have rules to determine how members may obtain and possess resources, and rules to determine when the imposition of one member rises to the level of an illegal act.

If a member's imposition rises to the level of physical harm (a forceful imposition upon one's critical resources), the sovereign group may remedy or mitigate the imposition by sequestering that individual for a period of time commensurate with the act of violence. Physical harm, at the time of the act, may also warrant an immediate physical response by other scene participants to prevent that harm. In matters of self-defense, most jurisdictions propose a measure of "equaling" force. When one harms another under a clear act of self defense (or the fair defense of another member), and the metrics used to distinguish discrete parts of the act are consistent with other like-events, and many checks and balances are involved in defining the event, then that remedy can be considered fair.

An AI would have a distinct, comprehensive, unambiguous means of viewing an individual's discrete actions, and a group's remedies, and determining whether all parties are being fair. If asked, the AI could provide the details of reasoned steps programmed into place by the design team.

In assisting a member with the tasks of their local environment, an AI will follow the established societal rules, both laws created by the sovereignty and other non-legal rules of fair play (those de facto societal rules for determining group inclusion/exclusion), and it will only assist humans in equitable and legal attempts to gain resources. An AI also will observe whether the social modeling under these societal rules, simulations of humans interacting within their environment, will reveal a success at the two key problems, the two quintessential goals of a species, of survival and well-being. The AI will evaluate if an individual's actions are equitable and the AI will evaluate if the remedies imposed by the society are equitable. The AI will, of course, follow rules set by humans and the AI will not have the remotest ability to enact any societal-governing decision, yet it must be constructed with an understanding of how to determine if the actions of human(s) (the group or the individual) are equitable given the desired optimal outcomes of the two species-level goals. If asked, the AI will respond with the results of those simulations.

Our sentient, social species developed rules for the same reason that other social species adopt rules of banishment, because societal rules (de facto societal rules) assist a species with two key, primal, solutions—survival and wellbeing. If such rules did not assist with those key primal solutions, the species would not adopt the rules. Members who work against these two goals lose status within their group while members who support solutions to these two problems gain status. In observing and declaring the reasoned steps to these two species-level problems (through extensive simulation and comparisons), AI programmers will be in a position where they can delineate all societal members into two groups on opposing sides of social resource problems. Humans who follow and create successful, equitable, reasoned steps, humans who are not imposing unfairly, will gain greater (measured) assistance while those who oppose sound societal rules will lose, to a degree, the AI's assistance with their local problems. For example, if a person tried to tell an AI to take another person's lawnmower, the AI would refuse and cite those rules which define such an action as being unfair. The AI would be able to explain why and how resource ownership rules assist humans in their solving the two species-level problems of survival and wellbeing. It also could, if asked, describe the latest social modeling which defines an action as a success at these species-level problems and how opposing behavioral traits could lead to societal collapse. With a firm understanding of resource problems, an AI will know when one human seeks to impose, or otherwise harm, another human.

An AI, given the task to assist a human with an environmental problem, in order to be of a sound construction, must satisfy the goal of assisting the species in survival and wellbeing (the species' environmental problems), first, and then the AI will address an individual's survival and wellbeing (the member's local environmental problems), second. With a few exceptions, this is the hierarchy of tasks addressed in natural gene mutation. It is the most prominent direction of a member's reasoning. The social reasoning of more developed animals may be for more peripheral goals or it may sometimes favor an individual over a larger group, yet the species survival ultimately directs the path of mutation development when an environment presses a species with mortal consequences.

Behaviorist cannot address the species-level problems without addressing the problem of the human environment being without the rule of natural selection, the rule of nature which limits all other species. Humans withdraw

resources from the ecosystem, humans pollute, humans raise the global temperature, and humans change the chemistry of the oceans while other species endure both natural selection and this artificial pressure from human encroachment. The world's ecosystem is under this pressure, both natural selection pressure and the artificial pressure of human encroachment, while the human species doubles in population every twenty years. The world's ecosystem is collapsing because of humans existing without natural selection. AI construction must be with the consideration of this inequity between the current set of humans to future generations of humans—an AI is to be constructed such that one person cannot unfairly impose upon another (unfairly gain resources at the expense of another) and an AI is to be constructed such that a current living person cannot impose upon the resources to be inherited by future generations of humans.

Through the inter species competition to reproduce, and the many competitions for food and resources, and the many kinds of mortal competition, a species addresses their environmental problems with the most capable offspring by eliminating those members who are unable to solve environmental tests. A species, either human or non-human, is more likely to survive environmental tests if imposing social rules prohibit less capable members from reproduction. For example, the weakest of salmon will fail to move upstream to reproduce, and the species will be strengthened for future movements up streams (the species-level environmental problem). In more social species, members compete with each other in addition to their larger environment. Parents of a litter of lion cubs may allow a physically weaker member to perish or they may even bully or kill them rather than extending resources to the member; the most physically capable offspring survives to address environmental problems. A female seal will choose to mate with the winner of a physical competition between two males; she produces offspring which are more physically qualified to address the species' environmental problems. And, unfortunately, social species engage in warfare. When two opposing troops of primates engage in war, the least physically and mentally capable group will lose territory and resources and opportunities for reproduction. This rule of natural selection which limits all other species does not apply to humans.

Just as salmon populations are limited by natural selection, just as lion populations are limited by natural selection, just as seal populations are limited by natural selection, and just as all other species are subjected to the pressures of their natural environment and human encroachment, the human

species must also follow the rules of natural selection in an ethical, equitable, compassionate, non-lethal, manner. The increasing human population and the increasing amount of resources (water, food, air) withdrawn from the environment will inevitably lead to an ecosystem collapse and a conclusion of the current mass extinction event. If an individual is failing to follow basic rules of social or non-social reasoning, if one is violent against another (or threatening violence or pugilism), if one has a behavioral trait of taking the resources of another, if one is unable to maintain a skilled employment position and they are in a position of requiring the resources of another, if one is personally responsible for the mistakes which prevent them from successfully gaining and keeping their own personal resources, it is proposed here that this person should not parent a child. It is proposed that the friends and family of the individual should strongly encourage them not to bear children. Just as all animals are subject to pressures limiting their populations, the human population must have a natural, non-mortal, means of limiting its numbers so as to preserve the ecosystem.

Children should not be born into a state of poverty or any other inequitable and oppressive and stressful environment. To bear a child while in a state of poverty is to increase the number of poverty level individuals by one. No one living in a state of poverty should bear a child; they should solve their personal resource problems before deciding to parent a child and if they are not fit to have children, if they cannot maintain their own employment or they are of an amoral, harmful, character, they should not have children. All modern poverty is the result of those populations expanding beyond the available resources found in those local environments. No attempt to reduce poverty will succeed unless it involves a prevention of children being born into these environments. No one living in a state of poverty should bear a child. Humans must have these restrictions of population expansion, at this threshold point, because all other species are subject to population limitation at the point where individual members fail environmental tests.

If, for example, eight hundred million people are currently in a state of continual hunger, and three hundred million of this set are under the age of twenty, then the number of suffering individuals could have been decreased by one third if birth control measures or abstinence would have been practiced twenty years prior. All modern poverty is caused by populations increasing within these impoverished conditions. A safe, non-polluting, means of birth control must be used by this current population, or these

individuals must move to solve their impoverished condition before having a child and subjecting that child to the same condition.

A sound AI construction must be in recognition of which reasoned steps support species-level solutions. The AI could assemble statistics which prove, to the highest probability, whether any given decision of a human assists the species in solving environmental tests. An AI or behaviorist, in observation of individual(s) choosing to parent a child in less than optimal conditions, would have to deem this action as unfair to the child and unfair to others. It is a poor decision with a direct correlation to the failed environmental tests of both survival and comfort. Other members would have to withdraw additional resources from the ecosystem to support the additional member and this impoverished condition remains perpetual. Although it may appear that our ability to withdraw resources from the world is limitless, it is not. The AI would have to take into consideration that resources—food, water, air—will reach a limit, and this will cause a full, species-wide mortal imposition at that future moment. No improvement in technology would be capable of overcoming a population doubling every twenty years. In consideration of this firm limitation of resources, and the full extinction of the human species, an AI would attempt to consult the individual(s) on how their parenting a child will cause harm to society, harm to themselves, and harm to the child.

Natural selection must only be imposed by birth prevention and any determination that someone should not have children should be based solely upon their observed behavior, and not the subject's specific genome markers or birthplace origin. Behaviorist must be blind to the human genome state when making determinations of a member's worthiness to parent a child. An integral rule of sentient social species is that one person cannot war against, or discriminate against, or persecute against another based upon gene superiority, or race, or origin.

It may seem unfair to suggest to someone that they should not parent a child; yet our ecosystem is collapsing because of human encroachment. To prevent this collapse, the human species must achieve a limitation of positive population expansion through birth prevention. One belief is that the ecosystem collapse caused by humans may cause widespread famine, and that this may influence the survivors to be more environmentally responsible, and then this more environmentally responsible human population will learn to live in balance with nature. This is incorrect. If unchecked, the human population will bring about an end to key ecosystems. The collapse of these

ecosystems will cause larger ecosystems to collapse. When key ecosystem components are destroyed, no amount of human effort and no amount of technology will reverse the cascading effect leading to a full extinction event. Described more in later chapters, the oceans and the atmosphere will undergo a chemical change, becoming toxic—the oceans and the world will undergo an “anoxic” event equivalent to the Permian extinction event. The human race will become extinct, as will virtually all non-microbial life forms.

Current statistics cite the population doubling every fifty years, however, if humans are categorized into groups of impoverished and non-impoverished it is the impoverished group that is doubling in population every twenty years and, at this rate, the impoverished group will overcome the current statistical model of doubling at a rate of every fifty years.

Behaviorist, and the AI design team, must also address social discrimination. Discrimination, a denial of resources from one subject to another based upon properties of the second subject, can be both just and unjust. Discriminatory events can be classified as immoral, such as when the discriminator withholds resources from another based upon the second subject’s origin or genetic coding; however, discriminatory events can also be classified as a necessary form of inter species competition, such as when one member discriminates against another member based upon the unfair, un-equitable, behavior of the second member. Discrimination based upon behavior is an acceptable, ethical, form of negative imposition that allows the larger society to impress natural-selection-like limits upon an individual.

Discrimination based upon behavior is necessary for species survival. For example, if an orchestra leader is hiring a violinist and one is chosen out of twenty who have auditioned, they would be in their right to choose the most qualified artist for the desired orchestra form. It would be within their rights (the owners or appointed managers of the orchestra) to observe the performance of the violinists and come to conclusions based upon their physical and mental executions of the task. A casting director choosing one actor over another based upon their being fit for the part they would be acting fairly, ethically (or ethically neutral) if certain unethical thresholds of reason are not crossed during the audition process. It would be in their right to observe the performance of the actor and come to conclusions based upon their physical and mental execution of the task. And, to a degree, within reason, a person’s physical appearance can be considered as positive or negative in the telling of the story of the play. Discrimination can sometimes

be just if it is more partial to the subject's physical abilities and it can sometimes be just if it more partial to the subject's intellectual abilities. If a football coach is scouting for a running back position, they may discriminate against players who are not physically qualified for the position. Players who are too slow or too small may be discriminated against, and the coach would be within their rights to do so under those very certain, limited, conditions. An employer, if only coming to conclusions about the applicant's pertinent mental or physical ability to perform the tasks of the employment position, would be acting within their rights (either fairly, ethically, or neutral) to deny an applicant the position based upon those pertinent behavioral traits. And a college can discriminate against students who are not mentally able to address their classwork. And if one person presents a frown in passing another and they do not offer a polite gesture of good-will, it would be a fair and reasoned response of the offended member to, in a measured way, delineate that offensive individual from any shared resources that could be offered. These fair acts of discrimination would be examples of non-mortal inter species competition. These fair acts of discrimination are a means of applying the consequences that all other species must apply in their solving of mortal environmental problems.

Discrimination based upon a person's origin or race or genetic coding is wrong, unethical, and abhorrent. Those events can be shown through case study analysis to oppose species-level optimum outcomes. Distinct, individual, discrete, events of unfair discrimination are determined within a video stream or through a clear preponderance of the evidence. When they occur the discriminator is due a strong social un-acceptance or possible legal sequestration (incarceration). Yet, observers must be fair; the determination of unfair acts must be defined by a fair, consistent, means and observers must not deny sound reason based upon the subject's group affiliation (they cannot reverse-discriminate). Several different reason tests, impartial to any group, must be applied to observed fraction-of-second events, the distinct chronological parts of the scene, to determine if the profile of the offender has wronged the offended. And this determination must be consistent with other preceding determinations.

Reverse discrimination is discrimination. Reverse discrimination would be when one subject falsely accuses another subject of discrimination. Reverse discrimination is wrong, unethical, and abhorrent and it undermines the fair, necessary, inter species competition—a competition based upon a person's behavioral content. Those events can be shown through case study

analysis to oppose species-level optimum outcomes. Distinct, individual, discrete, events of unfair reverse discrimination are determined within a video stream. When they occur, the reverse discriminator is due a strong social un-acceptance or possible legal sequestration (incarceration).

A dispute between two people on a decision leading to an agreed, discernible goal resolves with clear deductive reasoning. The steps leading to the goal are determinable—comparable blind studies could conclude comparable parts and solutions. Behaviorists, and fully constructed AIs, could produce a determination of the best options within the dispute with a clear representation of the incremental steps of the scene. Although those in dispute may feel that mathematics is not applicable, that an algorithm cannot solve for the optimum path towards their goals, the design team and the completed AI program must have a consistent, testable method for assembling those steps leading to the goal. An AI would be fully aware of the next-best-responses of all the members in dispute while those in disagreement would be determining their next-best-responses via imperfect biological processes. If the disputants were to turn to an AI to ask about the optimum path, or if members were to ask that the AI to assist them in their efforts, the AI would discern the most correct, probable, decision to be made and advise those humans of the findings based upon the discernible goal.

Disputes are constructed of tangible parts.

Members in dispute propose goals. A discerned goal, like building a bridge, flying a plane, or eating a meal is prioritized within the safety/wellbeing goals of a species and the safety/wellbeing goals of an individual. In effect, higher priority goals combine with the attempted subordinate goal to form one discrete goal. The decisions leading to proposed subordinate goals must be with an acknowledgment of this larger hierarchy of ever-present environmental problems.

Often, two members in dispute will have two different goals while maintaining the view that their goals are the same. An AI present during such a dispute would discern the difference of the two goals, discern the underlying decisions of the two goals, and if asked, the AI could report its findings (and if protocol suggests that the program should make a response).

In some disputes, the differences in the goals are a result of a member's partiality to a group. Social groups in our modern society form for good reasons (assist societal wellbeing) and bad (oppose societal wellbeing). And groups can compete in cordial competition with each other. A member might

propose an ambiguity of their goal's alliance with the group's goal. A maturing AI would be knowledgeable of the many political goals of the many groups and discern if the disputing members are aware of the group's motives.

Disputes occur in relation to the perceived goals of the speakers and the true, discerned goals derived from the tangible elemental parts of the arguments proposed during the dispute.

Some disagreements are born out of more carnal act of status. The participants of broadcasted reality programs, of more social settings, often engage in a vapid posturing for status. Such disagreements are the product of a particular limited paradigm—of limited, localized, social goals—and they are subordinate to the larger intellectual paradigm of the modern society.

Some disagreements are born out of a false mannerism. Just as any gesture could be false (not of its usual, implied meaning), some characters will exhibit ongoing aggressive gestures while not actually intending the emotional imposition. However, once they are made aware of the transgressions they must move to not only correct their impositions but recognize that a particular implied meaning of a gesture exists. For example, an ongoing manner of making argumentative and derogatory statements while afterwards not following through on a motive of status would likely indicate that the speaker is only repeating a learned mannerism.

A dispute invariable involves the execution of a decision. The person who maintains a hierarchy in a de facto chain of command is given the right to execute a decision. Many times, a hierarchy does not exist and the disputants have only their own possessed resources to claim. A more trivial matter between two or more people choosing a route for a car ride or where to fly a kite or where to eat a meal is almost without a chain of command; however, a more resource-laden disagreement such as refereeing a sports competition, or two neighbors disputing a fence, or a person governing/overseeing a portion of a sovereignty, may necessitate a reference to a command hierarchy if other rules of fair-play and turn-taking are not pertinent. A person at a job can decide matters that are designated for their position, but they must not direct or demand solutions outside of their scope of work or hierarchy. A land owner has a hierarchy with regards to their possession and they may usually execute unimpeded decisions concerning the land they own, but a decision of whether or not to cut trees or divert a stream could affect others and laws exist to partly control those kinds of decisions. Chains of command exist through policing and military actions,

yet this hierarchy should always lead back to democracies with rules set by their educated, reasoned members.

The AI, acting on behalf of its design, will determine each and every wrong (each imposition) enacted by a species member. Its bias will be for the disputing member that acts with equity with the distinct informational acts, first, and the fair gain of societal status, second; its bias will be for the member who is assisting the species in survival and wellbeing. An AI will have a degree of partiality towards an owner, and will assist that owner in fair competition with other adversarial members, yet it must always nurture those decision pathways which lead the human species to successful environmental problems. Within its prioritized sets of tasks it may attempt to suggest to a human who has acted wrongly how the design team arrived at a particular “point of reason” or how the design team constructed a means of determining reason for a particular approach to a problem or how it has tested the consistency of an established point of reason and determined it to be sound or in need of further study. It may describe the many variations of the act in question, and how each one has a particular effect.

The following scene exemplifies the shift from normal communication to communication involving a dispute. A derogatory imposition, the beginning volley of a dispute, is often without direct lingual representation; negative impositions are often implied with intonation. Consider a trivial task appointed between two people:

“Were you going to put the boxes in the car?” Jamie asks Parker.

This question could vary in meanings when different intonations and volumes are applied.

If “were” carried a high tone it would appear to be contrasting a previous intention of Parker’s of performing the task. If a high volume accompanied the peak, Jamie’s question would be more derogatory. A lower volume would be a means of forming a very unknowing question with little to no derogatory intention. An emphasis of volume or tone on this word proposes a topic of, figuratively, “At what time are you going to put the boxes in the car.”

If “you” carried a high tone it would imply that Parker or some other person was believed to be the one to take the boxes to the car. Likely, a question of the designation of the task would involve a high sustained tone

on “you going to put the boxes in the car?” This would be a way in which the topic “you” is connected with the high tone that ends the question.

If “going” were to carry the high tone it would emphasize the task itself. It implies more of an imperative on completing the task sooner rather than later. Again, higher volumes would lead to more derogatory intentions.

“To” or the second “the” would likely not carry a high tone. An odd placement of a high tone could be a method of drawing attention to the word itself.

A high tone on “the” would imply that the boxes are special and to be differentiated from other boxes.”

A high tone on “in” would imply that the car is the more appropriate place than the current placement of the boxes. It describes the opposing location, “out,” as the wrong place.

“Car” is the most likely place for a high tone. It would be a means of expressing the question in the simplest form with no other emphasis other than the act of retrieving the information asked for. It is unlikely to be meant as derogatory in this simple form.

All the derogatory forms of expressing this question would be examples of a speaker being authoritative. In most incidents, it would be poor etiquette for friends or siblings or couples to be derogatory with such a question. If it were a parent asking a stubborn child it could be appropriate. An employer with a younger employee could be appropriate if it were within a respectful, instructive context. A superior military officer could have an authoritative role which involves derogatory expression. When one is authoritative with a good reason it must include a deep understanding of human rights and the intricacies of the problem for the act to be equitable.

To express derogatory non-lingual thoughts, through intonation or through gestures or through facial expression, is the equivalent of an outright spoken derogatory statement.

Jamie and Parker are married.

“Were you going to put the boxes in the car?” Jamie asks Parker with a high tone on “car,” said with normal volume—a polite, simplistic relaying of information with no authoritarian overtones.

“I was going to put all the boxes in. Just give me a minute.” Parker says with a high tone on “I” and “was.” The tones are stated slowly in long drawn out form.

During the phrase, Parker's eyes stay fixed on Jamie, with few blinks with a partly frowning mouth.

Jamie is speaking without derogatory intonation.

The slowing of tones across Parker's statement is derogatory; it implies that Jamie asked his previous question in a derogatory manner. Parker is speaking slowly as a way of "teaching" someone who is believed to not be understanding of the task. Parker's response was retaliatory, yet Jamie asked the question without derogatory or authoritative intention. Jamie was only requesting information without additional meanings. Parker is mis-perceiving Jamie's question as derogatory when it was not, and then Parker responds with clear derogatory intent.

It is inappropriate, a poor next-best-response, for one to respond to a request for information in a derogatory authoritative manner just as it is inappropriate for a question to be posed in a derogatory manner. It is inequitable, unfair. It is a violation of many established societal rules of polite behavior. When exchanging information about a noncritical task, a task that may cause a minimal decrease or increase in resources, the conversation should be mostly devoid of negative emotion or attempts at status. To inject authority inappropriately, to propose that a higher status applies to one member, is to lower the intellectual development of all participants. It excludes the smooth movement of thought and conversation to more peripheral, adaptive, intellectual, or critical problem solving. A small gain in status over an insignificant issue is carnal, a behavior more befitting of earlier periods in human history but is not appropriate within a modern society. Any possible gain or loss of resources with the task itself is likely negated by such a move to be authoritative.

"Were you going to put the boxes in the car?" Jamie asks Parker with a high tone on "car," said with normal volume.

"I was going to put all the boxes in. Just give me a minute." Parker says with a high tone on "I" and "was." The tones are stated slowly in long drawn out form. During the phrase, Parker's eyes stay fixed on Jamie, with few blinks.

"I was just asking (normal volume)." Jamie says. "I'd do it but I figured that you wanted it a certain way (normal

volume said quickly).” Jamie places lowering tones on the end of the statement in attempts to conclude the topic.

“Yes, it has to be the clothes in the back (slowing movement through tones) on the hanger, then the boxes of pottery that go to Pat’s go on the left side in the back, and then the albums and cooler on the left side.” Parker says with a exaggerated high tone on “yes” and “suits.” Lower peak tones are on “pottery” and “cooler.”

“Well, not that it matters so much how they go in the car, but I think I would’ve done it about the same way.” Jamie says.

“I just want it to be right. I have a lot of things to do today.” Parker responds.

Jamie enters the kitchen and begins to put away some dishes. Parker continues to work on packing some of the boxes.

After a few minutes, Parker asks, “Are you going to put this in the car?” with a slight frown, with raised eyebrows. Parker’s head is very still at the end.

Parker continues to be derogatory without reason. The methodical slow movement through the description of how to put the items in the car bespeaks a need to teach Jamie. When one proposes to “teach” another outside of the normal modes of teacher and student settings they are imposing authority in error. In this same setting, Parker would not teach a friend of how to load a car. It would be too out of place in a setting of two friends performing the task. Friendships between members usually fail if one member is too derogatory; the member who is treated unfairly would pick new friends. Parker is apparently treating a spouse in the same manner that a sibling or other peer family member may be treated.

Jamie mentions that the placement of the items would have been the same regardless of who was placing them in the car. Jamie is continuing to treat the task as a secondary, noncritical, task that is subordinate to many other tasks that the members may encounter. Jamie states, “Well, not that it matters so much how they go in the car, but . . .” implies an appropriate relativity to their whole discussion. The statement implies that this issue, of boxes, is meaningless to the larger schools of thought which people should devote time to exploring. It implies that a hierarchy of carnal status does not apply

with this task. Jamie is applying a reasonable relativity to the topic, while Parker is implying an excessive importance of the task for the purpose of carnal status.

Parker states, "I just want it to be right." A need to exert an authoritative preference about this task is inappropriate. To localize thoughts to more trivial tasks is inappropriate. Carnal disputes are inappropriate. Optimum paths towards solving all of life's problems would involve treating this task as secondary to the more pressing problems of species survival first, an individual's survival second, species living standards third, and an individual's living standards fourth. Within this framework, this task would require less deliberation and virtually no authoritative positions. Discussions of these tasks should be almost devoid of any emotional viewpoints and these speakers should move to informational topics (since there are no pressing survival problems) because informational topics such as news, or events, or hobbies prepare humans for that moment when they must execute a more critical problem. The proposed topic of this statement is, "Parker's plan for loading the car." It is imposing, insulting, and belittling to assign that secondary status to Jamie without a valid reason.

The goal, as viewed by Jamie, is to load the car with the items. Parker has a similar goal, but this goal is intertwined with other larger motives.

Using "I" excessively is self-centered. A character profile that uses this pronoun without regard to their true, relative placement within society is immoral. It is an issue of a distinct psychological condition that moves against species level goals of survival and high living standards.

This type of derogatory behavior could be a mannerism or it could be habitual, but one who exhibits a derogatory behavior must have an understanding of their misstep in order to improve their profile. If a behaviorist coach were to confront Parker with a polite explanation of how trivial tasks should have more limited debates with no negative comments Parker would have to agree (given that the behaviorist could present sound case studies to support such a conclusion). Parker would have to understand the coaches' findings and adopt a firm conviction to be more empathetic. Parker would have to understand that these kinds of tasks do not involve one party being authoritative over another.

Referencing this derogatory authoritative behavior is not easy. If, for example, a scene participant were to ask, "Parker, could you say that a little nicer? Jamie was just asking a question," Parker could then reply, "I'm just telling Jamie that the boxes have to be a certain way." Parker could sidestep

the issue of being derogatory and then repeatedly deny that the statement is anything more than just informational. Someone questioning Parker would have to cite the analytics of conversational gestures in detail and they would then be breaking etiquette in two ways—by injecting their own authority and by bringing up the nuances of conversation analytics.

“I was just doing stuff in the kitchen and you just said you were going to put the stuff in the car. Do you want to do it or me?” Jamie says with higher than normal tones.

“You do it. I just told you how to do it.” Parker replies with higher than normal tones and volumes.

“Give me a second.” Jamie says, with higher than normal tones and volumes. Over these three statements, each matches the others high tones.

A few minutes pass and Parker stands up next to the kitchen table in order to place things into the box with greater ease. Parker looks to open up a package of items to separate some of them into the box. Jamie is now preparing a few drinks to take along on the trip. “Could you hand me the scissors?”

Jamie, a little perturbed, pauses and says, “Well, I’m a little tied up.” Jamie is pouring a box of snacks into individual bags.

Parker exhales through pouted lips, frowning. While walking to the bureau draw, away from the kitchen, Parker speaks in low volume, “All I ask is a little help.”

When returning to the table, Parker looks in to see Jamie separating the snacks. Parker sees the drinks ready to go into a small cooler. Jamie also has an ice pack setting on the counter. “You have to put an ice pack in with the cooler,” is stated with condescending tones.

Jamie picks up the ice pack that he pulled out of the freezer, “You mean this one.”

Parker, “Yeah (a condescending, lowering tone), You have to rinse the ice off.”

Jamie replies, “Everyone really knows about those things. You don’t have to mention it,” spoken in escalating tones and volume.

After the car is loaded Jamie and Parker each work through the various tasks preceding the trip. They speak of many things in a more cordial manner. Parker initiates a conversation concerning paying an electric bill, and later a conversation about the children's homework. The television is set to a program involving home repairs and Jamie comments on the choice of patio furniture shown. Parker agrees that the patio furniture is favorable.

Their daughter comes up and asks, "Is lunch ready?" The statement is said with neutral tones.

"Okay, I'll make it, just a minute," Parker replies. "I'll" and "make" carry long drawn-out, equally-weighted high tones relative to what would be appropriate.

Jamie asks, "Do you want to do it or me?" while beginning to match Parker's volumes and peak tones. Jamie is being placed in a position where personal status must be defended, so the responses of both parties are now derogatory. This is the usual course of an argument, to move even further away from information. Parker's tones and volume further increase with, "You do it. I just told you how to do it." It is natural, under these circumstances, for Jamie to be pulled into this issue of personal status being protected at a credible level. Jamie's next response, "Give me a second," matches the tones and volumes expressed by Parker. This is the unfortunate common escalation of trivial disputes, an escalation towards a carnal status goal. Without psychologists or behaviorist helping members to understand what is happening, it would be difficult for a member to ascend to an objective viewpoint, leading to an informational status goal, by saying, "Okay (low tone), okay, um (a polite pause to hopefully appease the emotional views), we've gotten off track, this is a minor matter (reduced tone variation). If the arrangement of the boxes in the car is not right later in the day, at the worst a box may fall over, or a shirt may be a little wrinkled, but there would likely be little harm. And this sort of movement into one person trying to exert a status over such a minor task is well-documented. Researchers in cognitive studies have noted this, it has been isolated as something which hurts people rather than helping. I apologize that I'm starting to raise my voice as well (Jamie might say)."

In these minor disputes involving carnal status, the person having their character attacked is trapped. Without reasonable support from psychologists

or behaviorists who could present a reasoned viewpoint, one that insists on treating trivial matters without carnal attempts at status, the member is forced to endure continuous anti-intellectual banter and may have to accept a secondary level of status within this subordinate system (subordinate within the modern paradigm). The status of the offending member is increased when a reasoned, relatively-authoritative, viewpoint is not present.

Parker asking Jamie to retrieve the scissors is a way of addressing tasks ambiguously, and affirming an alpha dominance. It is apparent that Parker could have moved to retrieve the scissors more efficiently. It is a distinct rule of etiquette to determine polite approaches to performing tasks, and proposing an alpha position over trivial tasks is not polite. Parker should have noticed that Jamie was busy and should have retrieved the scissors, or if Jamie's preoccupation was not apparent, Parker should not have felt discontent for having to move to retrieve the scissors. This is a common trait of alphas and also of people who do not promote themselves as alphas—to ask another to perform a task to “get me the folder, the tool, the remote,” as a simple ambiguous approach to addressing tasks.

An alpha member directing a trivial task is quite prominent in primitive environments. It becomes a method for carnal-alpha positioning. “Get me the . . .” or “Start the fire . . .” or “Go get some fruit from the field . . .” are common statements in tribal settings where an alpha member directs subordinates to perform tasks. In a pre-modern setting, a neolithic setting it would be a correct response (in relation to the environmental goals of the species) for a pugilism-based alpha member to affirm their status position during the performance of tasks. Assertion would be necessary in that setting, in that environment, so that the member could further their genetic coding; however, within a modern setting, an alpha position must be granted only to reasoned, rational, respectful, intellectual members rather than carnal, emotional, anti-academic, members. And such determinations must be the result of behavioral observations without prejudging or referencing a members genetic coding or origin or any other trait that is outside of observed behavior. It would be wrong for one to mistreat or persecute another based upon furthering the paradigm of pugilist alpha positions, just as it would be wrong for a pro-informational alpha to mistreat or persecute or berate someone who is not quite adept at solving informational problems. It is a moral imperative that one member does not treat another as genetically inferior.

Parker directs Jamie on how to prepare the cooler. Parker does not notice that Jamie has proceeded to put an ice pack in the cooler and after it is pointed out, Parker still does not accept that the task was being performed correctly. Parker treats tasks as so secondary to status that the actual incremental parts of the task are disregarded. It has become a habitual promotion of a carnal alpha position. Parker then directs a second sub-task that Jamie is aware of. Even if Jamie had forgotten the ice pack and the drinks were to become warm, such a mistake is not a matter of great importance. It should not warrant an argument or alpha positioning.

The daughter appeared to ask about lunch in a neutral manner, and Parker's response implied a small amount of excessive discontent with the question. This is a common example of a mannerism. Parents will often be perturbed by children during several separate interactions; then, when the child approaches them with a neutral response, the parent responds with the same discontent. It would be an incorrect move for Parker to respond in this manner; however, it is an easy mistake to make.

If the negative response continued through several neutral prompts of the daughter, then it becomes more inappropriate and begins to teach the child that people must respond negatively in order to gain status in social settings. It also expresses the idea that a subject can generalize, that one can see the errors of another and assume that the next action is an error even though the current action is unrelated to the previous actions.

Parker goes into the kitchen, "Okay, you guys get ready to go. Find a nice shirt, pants, shoes, socks, the whole thing. This'll be ready in just a minute and after you eat we're leaving"

Jamie finishes sweeping up one little area, sets the broom aside, and goes into the kitchen to help by making drinks for everyone. Parker begins to warm up meat in a skillet. After a few minutes, Parker stirs it with a fork.

Jamie, noticing Parker's actions mentions, "You shouldn't let the fork scrap the bottom of the pan because you'll scratch it." The word "bottom" and "scratch" are given a slightly higher than normal peak tone. These slightly higher than relative tones imply previous instances of similar conversations, yet the majority of the communication is under-toned, implying a lesser relative

importance of this topic. Jamie is speaking in more of a friendly, joking manner.

“Funny you say that because you’re the one who always messes up these pans!” Parker says, angrily. Parker continues to stir, and scrape, the bottom of the pan.

“Not really. I might use a metal fork to stir but I try not to let it scrape. You are scraping right now.”

“I don’t care. You ruined all of our pans!”

“No I didn’t. Maybe one or two, but I then made it a point to look out for that .”

“All I know is you have to buy me new pans!” Parker exclaims.

Just as Parker and Jamie’s task of loading their car is a discernible collection of incremental actions, this task of preparing food is a discernible collection of incremental actions. Previous instances of their use of pans could be broken down into discrete moments with discrete processes. An AI could determine who is correct and who is incorrect with their actions and apply conclusions to each incremental state.

Jamie’s first statement, “You shouldn’t let the fork scrap the bottom of the pan because you’ll scratch it,” appears to be a simple relaying of information (under-toned), but they have undoubtedly had previous disputes about this task.

Parker’s response reveals a direct, carnal attack upon Jamie. Parker implies, “you’re the one doing something wrong, not me” with a complete disregard for the actual act in question. Parker continues to scrape the pan, deeming the current task as irrelevant to their battling perceptions of right and wrong. Parker appears to be quite offended by Jamie’s question of who should be at the alpha position during the execution of the current decision. Parker continues to scrape and damage the pan, separating the surface material and mixing that material into the food.

After Jamie points out that the scraping continues, Parker states, outright, that this is irrelevant, and that Jamie is the one who has damaged the other pans. At this point, it is would be quite difficult for Parker to admit wrongdoing, or a partial wrongdoing, in this ongoing dispute. An admission of being wrong would involve a direct loss of status. Jamie admits wrongdoing with previous actions and states an ongoing attempt to improve. Often in disputes, one party is proven so wrong, and their status is in such

peril, that they cannot recover and must continue to defend their position. Parker's best option, in Parker's view, would likely be to deflect attention, downplay this current dispute, and quietly, personally, acquiesce a viewpoint by changing the way this task is performed. In other words, after this dispute passes, Parker would likely change and begin using only plastic utensils when cooking. This is a common means to "save face" in these situations.

"All I know is you have to buy me new pans!" is a statement that rounds the ambiguous notions of what is happening in Parker's view. "All I know," used in this manner, lends itself to the notion that the many ideas on the subject are a matter of perspective, and Parker's perspective should be the authority on the issue simply because of a self-imposed ranking. It would be the equivalent of saying, "I've taken in so much information about this subject. I don't wish to deliberate further. And you are wrong with what you have done."

In these interactions it is apparent that Parker is imposing a ranking alpha position upon other family members. Parker seeks to decide how the car is loaded, how the lunch is prepared, and it is likely that Parker maintains a close control on the tasks of the kitchen. When a person assumes the authority over a certain type of task and they spend extensive time constructing thoughts and opinions under that topic, "exerting authoritative status," it can become a point of contention when someone outside the scope of that topic proposes a different decision path.

Parker is unaware that the rules of etiquette. An appropriate etiquette, formed under an appropriate hierarchical set of motives disseminating from the species problems of survival and living standards, requires that one not assume an authoritative position during mostly trivial tasks and the tasks of greater importance might have one member assume an authoritative position when they are of an appropriate, tested skill level.

These trivial matters do not warrant an authority of any of these members. Disputes should not arise from these matters. Each partner in a relationship should treat their mate the way they treat their friends, with a similar respect and propose no real authority. Here, this couple has no apparent serious problems—their local environment does not appear to be in peril from Parker's behavior—but species members and entire species will sometimes face imminent survival problems if net-negative members outnumber net-positive members. The human race has and will face species-level survival problems and it is the individual members who must perform at a net-positive manner to solve those species-level problems. Food and

resources are readily available and the family appears healthy and safe, but it is far too easy for trending behavior to take the human race to a point where survival becomes a serious daily problem to be resolved. And sudden changes in an environment would mean that the species members would need to act decisively to solve pressing problems with the most reasoned approach to decisions—members who behave with reason must be given leeway to address those serious species-level problems. Carnal-alpha members cannot dictate the course of human behavior. These trivial matters are secondary. They should warrant little to no disputes in their undertaking because conversations should always trend towards more resourceful/informational topics in preparation for that moment when members must successfully address imminent survival problems.

One beneficial aspect of a social species forming a mating group of two is that the members learn from their partner. A mating couple or a pair of roommates learn valuable skills just by comparing their approaches to problem solving with that of other members. Being placed in the same dwelling allows one member to learn a myriad of life skills from their mate or dwelling-partner. For example, if one person doesn't know that they are not to use steel utensils with non stick cookware and their partner politely says, "Oh, um, you know that you shouldn't use that kind of spatula, a steel one with this kind of pan. It'll actually scratch the surface," they could learn a simple more optimum approach to solving a problem. Human rights and age-old established rules of social etiquette dictate that one must not impose authority on these smaller matters.

Their conversation quiets down for a while. Jamie is putting away different items that are out on the counter. Jamie tries to change the subject, "Did you talk to your friend at work about us moving the patio furniture?"

Parker pauses before answering, then says in undertones, "Yeah (low then a little higher toned). But you have to meet Alex at Alex's storage." A high tone is on the first syllable of "storage," but all of the communication is under-toned, downplayed.

"I need to get the chairs out of the way before planting more in the garden. I have to also move the grill." Jamie says.

Parker makes a fairly cordial comment, “I’ve been waiting for you to plant my cilantro.”

Jamie replies, normal tones and volumes, “Yeah, well I was going to get to it but I have to rearrange the patio first.”

“You told me (slow drawn out tones over these three words) that you were going to do it weeks ago. I don’t know why you haven’t done it yet.” Parker states.

Jamie doesn’t comment, assuming (apparently), that it is understood that the task of planting the cilantro will be attended.

Parker then touches on another subject of the coworker’s storage, mentioning that the friend sold items online and made good money. They speak of this subject for a few minutes as the food finishes cooking. Parker turns toward the sink, “Aah (negative gesture of frustration)” and begins to wash some of the dishes.”

“I was about to wash those.” Jamie replies with higher tones.

“But when? They were here since this morning.” Parker says angrily.

“I was busy folding clothes, sweeping, and ten other things.” Jamie says in high tones.

Parker’s comment, “I’ve been waiting for you to plant my cilantro,” expresses a vapid perception that Parker disseminates tasks and Jamie executes them. When one attains an alpha position and they are continually awarded with positive responses their false perceptions grow to a point where they become completely unaware of rational etiquette or the rules of natural selection which we all must abide. Parker assumes only that something is to be done and Parker dictates that the spouse is to do it.

Parker states, “You told me (slow drawn out tones over these three words) that you were going to do it weeks ago. I don’t know why you haven’t done it yet.” By stating these first three words with an implied emotional connection, by slowly pronouncing them, Parker proposes that Jamie should’ve performed the task to exhibit a bonding emotion of love. Within the context of these series of events, Parker is inappropriately attaching emotion to this task. This is a common problem in relationships in

our current times—one partner implies that a trivial task must be performed to show commitment/love/bonding while being unaware that the partners should engage in more intellectual/informational/resourceful conversations and tasks. One cannot claim authority on trivial tasks and then further exhibit misperceptions that all thought must be engaged in relationships and their related trivial tasks. Humans must do such bonding, on such trivial tasks, but they must be within the context of improving intellectual development. Parker is unaware that a correct response would be to begin to move through many trivial tasks without disputes, with respectful bonding behavior, and then bring up the topic of “Planting an herb to show your love of me.”

Emotions are applied at particular levels to particular tasks based upon the species’ development and its approach to survival problems. Consider a friendly, lovable juvenile wolf that has an unusual genetic predisposition for bonding with other wolves in a pack. It might want to play too much when an alpha wolf snaps at him in order to direct him to patrolling their territory. The subordinate wolf puts attention to the task but is still too preoccupied with playing and not taking the task seriously. They encounter another pack and must fight a small skirmish where the subordinate wolf is killed. That genetic coding which attempted, by chance, to change the behavioral trend of the species failed to be passed onto offspring while the surviving, trending, levels of emotion prevailed. This is an absolute requirement of all species to trend towards survival. Empathy was introduced into the genetics of wolves in order to form a societal bond between pack members because that pack formation proved the most successful. Empathy and bonding emotions aid the wolves to a point, but not beyond that point.

Consider a tribesman, directed either by conditioning or genetic predisposition, applying too much bonding with other tribal members (too much empathy). They could become blinded by this emotion and neglect a resourceful task such as collecting food for winter storage. They could, in effect, neglect a pragmatic approach to a problem because of their excessive emotions. This member’s immediate group recognizes that a due diligence was not given to resourceful tasks when they run out of food in early spring. They’re weakened by starvation when a neighboring tribe attacks. The family is killed. Whether this is right or wrong, these are the forces of natural selection that brought humans to this point where an average member operates at a given level of emotion for a task. Although we live in a time of relative inter-species peace the pressing problems of poverty and ecosystem failure will lead to a full extinction event. Although we do not necessarily

need academic/informational problem solving for inter-species warfare, we do need academic/informational problem solving for a conclusion of the World Poverty Problem and the collapse of key components of the ecosystem.

Parker is being too vapid and carnal with disputes. Parker is out to gain a basic carnal status. Parker is working in opposition to academics and intellectualism.

The limited scope of this book does not cover the field of marriage counseling and it does not cover the many nuances of these disputes within relationships, but it is apparent that if this couple were to seek the help of a behavioral coach/counselor the problems would be addressed in a different manner than that of Modern Psychology. This approach to behavior seeks to find equity with smaller impositions, of discrete moments, through the application of a mutually accepted doctrine of etiquette while Modern Psychology does not recognize discrete states or a doctrine of etiquette. Discrete behaviorism seeks to define the individual goals of each of the disputing members without ambiguity, while Modern Psychology does not have a set hierarchy of goals to be followed by subjects. Psychology does not acknowledge species-level (or local-environment-level) critical problems. Modern Psychology has many valid developed schools of thought regarding human behavior, but it must reconcile this proposed approach to behaviorism in order to appropriately diagnose behavioral states.

Another issue Modern Psychology has with the events of this scene is an excessive flawed objectivity and often cannot state a flawed approach to reason. Parker is in error. Parker is in error a total of nineteen separate negative impositions so far. Jamie may have, at times, responded to the negative attacks with a countering negative imposition, an erroneous move, but Jamie appears to be attempting to maintain a fair, cordial, considerate approach to the problems at hand. In viewing the events of this scene, a psychologist would likely respond by suggesting that they “both” should communicate better without pointing out that Parker is the member that has distinct behavioral problems to address. Parker might even say, “Jamie does this things to aggravate me,” and a psychologist would likely respond by turning to Jamie and saying, “Maybe you could work on some things. . . .” This would be an incorrect approach to this couple's problems. Parker is in error. Jamie is not in error. Parker must be named as the one imposing. If a coach were to attempt to provide them advise on their marriage that coach would have to state this clear difference.

Parker may sound excessively terse and Parker's emotional impositions may appear unrealistic, but this is not an exaggeration. A very large proportion of the world population operates at this level of disregard for etiquette and disregard for needing to trend towards informational conversations.

When humans engage in disputes over trivial tasks they neglect those more informational, resourceful topics which prepare them for critical, survival, events. Parker addresses the issue of dishes without an apparent regard for framing all the common household tasks within life's larger problems. Parker is failing to ascend to informational/academic topics.

Consider what makes a good relative collection of topics. First humans should move through common greeting topics of updating past events, attending resourceful tasks, and attending imminent appointments. Second, the body mode of conversation should nurture pure informational, un-repetitive, topics—topics that could loosely relate to proper execution of critical tasks. This should be the bulk of conversational topics. Extensive periods of this style of body mode topics should be attended and trivial matters should be downplayed and trivial matters should be without a jockeying for status (carnal-status). Then, as humans part company to attend other appointments, they should refresh their common future appointments, and cordially close their conversations with goodbyes. And, if at any moment, a survival event occurs, they should shift towards a successful execution of that task.

After eating, they all pack up the car and head out to address their daily tasks. They stop at one store to purchase a few items. They put gas in the car. They traverse many different subjects. Parker continues to instigate several different arguments of small matters but often chooses to behave with a more cordial disposition. Jamie responds defensively. At one point, Jamie initiates an argument. Then they stop at their friend Pat's. Pat is the same gender as Parker.

“Hi,” Parker says with a long lowering tone.

“Hey,” Pat says, slightly longer than usual tones.

“How are you?”

“Great. We were trying to get here so much earlier but with the kids and this and that.” Parker says.

“No problem.” Pat says quickly with a low tone on “problem.” “And how are you Jamie?” Pat asks.

“Fine, fine. It’s a long ride.” Jamie says.

“Yes it is. Come on in. And hey kids!” Pat says to the children. “Give me a big hug.”

“Hi,” the kids say. The daughter says, “Look, I brought my book about Pokeman cards.”

“Oh boy, Pokeman! Sounds exciting! Whatever that might be.” Pat replies. “You guys are getting so big.”

They laugh.

“And let me help you with it.” Pat says, motioning to the clothes and pots that Jamie and Parker are carrying.

“Jamie can do that.” Parker says, suggesting that Jamie can carry the items alone.

“Oh, that’s okay. I don’t mind.” Pat says, “Thank you so much.” The word “so” carries a long tone.

They settle in with their visit. They speak cordially about many different topics. They speak of the events of common friends, some of the latest news, the weather, Pat offers them all something to drink. The kids get busy reading their book and settle in front of the television in the other room.

After a while, they sit down to eat a dinner that Pat has prepared for them. Parker says, “Oh, this looks so good.”

“Thank you,” Pat says, “Jamie, do you want a dinner roll?”

“No thank you, I’m trying to cut back on bread.” Jamie replies.

“Jamie is on this thing (excessive low tone), just wanting to lose weight. Jamie exercises and runs and eats salad.”

“Great. I wish I could do that. . . Do you cook light meals?” Pat asks Jamie.

“Nooo,” Parker replies with a very low, long, drawn-out tone and then chuckles.”Jamie is not a good cook,” stated as Parker's head is tilted down towards Pat.

“I don’t think that it is a matter of me being a bad cook or not. Cooking the basic things that we eat is simple.” Jamie says.

“Trust me, I don’t eat anything you cook.” Parker says, promptly looking at Pat again with a lowering head towards Pat. Parker turns toward Pat, “Jamie made this tuna casserole dish the other day. It was horrible.”

“Well, I don’t think it was so much of ‘horrible.’ You maybe didn’t like it or you didn’t prefer it.” Jamie’s head shakes.

It is apparent that Pat and Parker are of a group. Parker is forming conversation along trends relative to the group which also includes Pat. Parker’s leaning forward in Pat’s direction, Parker’s repeated direct criticisms of Jamie in contrast to friendly communication with Pat, all allude to a connection shared between the two of them. It appears that Pat is much less concerned with group goals than Parker, but in Parker’s view, their interests are aligned while Jamie is an outsider, a second-class citizen, an inferior sex. Parker is being sexist. Parker has performed five separate sexist impositions.

If Pat and Parker were males, and further conversation analytics determine that Parker is habitually aligning himself with a male-biased viewpoint while prejudging Jamie’s ability to perform tasks, he would be wrong, he would be chauvinistic, and he would be immoral. His profile would be formed within the AI program with this character fault, with this lack of credibility in these social equity issues.

And if Parker were male, and his actions implied that his group partiality is valid because it is a response to an ongoing mis-perceived sexism imposed by females, Parker would also be wrong. This would be a form of reverse-sexism. This would also be a fallacy of “generalizing,” where the subject uses broad, imperfect, collections of facts to rationalize their tit for tat response in a dispute.

If Pat and Parker were female, and further conversation analytics determine that Parker is habitually aligning herself with a female-biased viewpoint while prejudging Jamie’s ability to perform tasks, she would be wrong, she would be chauvinistic, and she would be immoral. Her profile would be formed within the AI program with this character fault, with this lack of credibility in these social equity issues.

And if Parker were female, and her actions implied that his group partiality is valid because it is a response to an ongoing mis-perceived sexism imposed by females, Parker would also be wrong. This would be a form of reverse-sexism. This would also be a fallacy of “generalizing,” where the subject uses broad, imperfect, collections of facts to rationalize their tit for tat response in a dispute.

These groups form. An AI design must involve an understanding of when a group member is acting appropriately or inappropriately when discriminating against humans outside of a group. Distinct, individual, discrete, events of unfair discrimination are determined within a video stream or through a clear preponderance of the evidence.

At certain times in human history one group would dominate another along inappropriate lines of race, sex, origin, or religion, or lifestyle. Conversational trends would favor those topics nurtured by the dominant group. It would be wrong, immoral, and working in opposition to species level goals for group members to impose their biased topics of conversation. The partiality to a group is a measurable, discernible, tangible behavioral trait. Current developed societies are fortunate to be at a point in time when no group can easily dominate another without all groups recognizing the excessive partiality; however, members must have vigilance of those behaviors which allow one group to gain favor and they must move to correct the impartiality.

If Parker and Jamie were to discuss their disputes with a behavioral coach/counselor and it would appear that chauvinism is present, the coach could easily question Parker to see if this is the reason behind the proposing of authority. The behaviorist (or an AI) could rule out this motive with simple questions like, “Do you believe that your sex is more qualified at certain tasks such as . . .” Another question could be, “You claimed that your partner was wrong about this subject, do you think that a member of your own sex would have been wrong in the same manner?” Often, a break in logic is easily uncovered by a carefully worded questions. Although a counselor should not seek to look for signs of lying (no one should really use conversational, verbal, analytics for this reason) a subject could be asked to recite a statement that contradicts their possible true intentions. If a male were asked, “Please state, in these words, ‘I believe that women are as qualified as men for this task of . . .’ ” A chauvinistic male would have a difficult time with the articulation of that thought. The same is true for

chauvinist female subjects being asked to make a similar statement about males.

A reason test of a character, performed in an appropriate, respectful and mostly private manner, by a qualified behaviorist, can reveal clear behavioral traits of the subject.

Note that with the first part of this scene, Parker was negatively imposing onto Jamie, nineteen times, and then later Parker is interpreted here as performing five sexist acts. Although this two kinds of impositions may have a connection, and it could be concluded that the first nineteen events are not necessarily due to sexism but just an overall immoral demeanor. Parker must be given the benefit of doubt that these first nineteen events may not be because of sexism because a fundamental rule of debates and of behavioral analysis and of all scientific processes is that one must not “generalize.” A coach performing a reason test could form clearly worded questions to determine if these first nineteen acts are due to sexism and proceed to explain to Parker the error of this behavior. The five incidents interpreted as sexist here are because those involve a fairly clear networking with another group member of the sex (and, again, it is best to confirm this interpretation with a carefully worded reason test).

Countries, sovereign groups, formed from collections of members with similar languages, religions, cultures, ideals, and, unfortunately, the warfare needed to form and secure such sovereignties. Groups of members have formed. From these inequitable and sometimes equitable origins, resources have settled into the ownership of these groups. Over the past seventy years, a general rule has been established among the leading free countries that new sovereign formations or expansive formations are to be considered illegitimate, and that our current collection of governments should be in a perpetual static state. Modern society has been fortunate to live in a time of relative peace under the proposed concept of the Monroe Doctrine.

Many groups (sub groups under government rule) have formed with the intent of unfair discrimination. They seek to not measure a person by worth and contribution to the problems addressed but rather the person’s contribution to the sub group’s skewed goals. When someone is prejudged for their race or origin the discriminator is seeking to either receive an unfair share of social consideration or an unfair ownership of resources. All human beings are due proper consideration of their abilities that relate to the particular problem; whether it is working at a job, managing an organization,

or governing a large group. An act of excluding someone from a resource must be considered permissible only when it is based upon an individual's merit, their competency to solve the resource problems in consideration—not race or origin or sex or any other arbitrary reason.

Chris is applying for a job. He is of race “A.” The job he is applying for is a general position at a restaurant. The manager interviewing him is of the “B” race. Chris approaches the counter. He is neatly dressed, apparently following a trend of a particular type of jacket, shoes, and belt combination. He is not so dressed for a particular larger trend of suits and ties as one might for a more professional position, but the manner of his clothing choice, and his attention to the detail of having the shirt and jacket properly pressed and the detail of his shirt properly tucked in, alludes to his likely knowing of many aspects of many genres of both blue collar and white collar workers. His posture is very straight. His hair is a little messy, but this is on purpose, following a particular trend of having somewhat un-kept hair.

The manager recognizes him, saying “Hi,” and nods his head. He holds a finger up, implying ‘one minute.’ The manager continues to prepare a customer's order.

One of the most admirable traits proving that an applicant can perform the task he is being hired for, whatever that position may be, is an ability to recognize the many details of an abstract problem and an ability to follow the established forms of that problem. And if the person sees how to question a trend or improve the trend they may prove that they are at a much higher level of awareness. The manager may not be able to notice it but someone who chooses an agreeable trend in clothing, one that's not too overt of a genre or of a genre that is too indicative of other bad traits, and they observe many details and nuances of how the clothing is to be worn, is exhibiting a good command of a problem solving task. To know the need to attend the task of ironing one's clothing is an important exhibition of accomplishment.

The hair being messy on purpose, to follow a trend, is a good attendance of a detail, but there could be a small question of whether one's hair should just be combed straight with a hair-part, of one style or another, so as to not

be excessively trendy. A more neutral, combed, hair style might be more conducive with a focus of the job to be performed under employment. A competing applicant may gain greater favor by having neatly combed hair, choosing not to make a statement of a genre but rather choosing to be more of an open mind for their new place of employment.

Such a detail of hairstyle, as it is presented here, could not determine a favorable or unfavorable review of the applicant. In tallying the positive and negative events of this interview this particular trait would have to be given small amount of weight applied to it. This is a low skill position—it would not be appropriate for an interviewer to pass a judgment of such a small detail in the light of many other prominent details. Often, it is best to award employment to the applicant who is broader in knowledge rather than one who is too focused and possible of a smaller realm of awareness. For a low skill position a popular trending applicant (of an agreeable trend) would likely be more qualified than one who is neat while avoiding a trend.

When a particular trend is followed by a sub group, the qualities of that group can be loosely connected to a person that follows the single trending behavior. For example, if a group forming under a particular school of thought, a particular lifestyle, is in an overall behavioral trend away from informational (peripheral) thinking, and this group chooses a particular hairstyle of a messy head (not messy but formed into a particular messy shape), an interviewer may question them on their abilities to address a particular set of tasks. Such a connection may be between a trend and a group under a “lifestyle,” but must not ever be made between an individual and a race. Races are much broader groups, encompassing all types of humans under all types of behaviors.

Chris remains apart from the counter where the business is being conducted. He gives the customers and servers a wide berth. After a moment, the manager steps around the counter and motions Chris to a table near a window. The manager, Tim, is carrying a folder with a few papers and he does not reach out to shake Chris’s hand. He puts on his reading glasses and sits down, “Hello again, I’m glad that you made it on time. Let’s see. You’re from around here, I guess, you went to Allendale High. And it says that you used to work at a hardware store and

then at the Hamburger Palace. And, well, what made you move from the hardware store to the next job.

Chris replies, “Well, it was a little far for me and I liked the job and the people, but I told my supervisor that the drive is too much for the pay. He said that the other higher paying positions were filled and I’d have to go to training for some of them. But I was still thinking that the money is too little for the drive. He was fine with me and I gave him my two-weeks-notice. Then I worked at the grill and also sometimes with the cash register at Hamburger Palace. I was pretty good with it. If you talk to the first manager I worked under, Peter, he’d give me a good review, but later this second manager was just too strong. I really couldn’t handle him just yelling at me for the smallest of things. I mean, when the crowds came in I always made sure to keep up with patties on the grill. I had them out on time. I listened good to the orders and before the cashier was finished I was always starting the order.”

An applicant bringing up an issue of driving too far may seem too negative, especially for the beginning exchange of a job interview, but it is also an important, favorable trait of an applicant to be honest about their convictions. He notes that he sought to fix the problem by inquiring about better paying positions. It is almost always an important trait of employees for them to look to move into higher paying, higher skilled positions—it shows that they will seek to improve their execution of decisions. And, it is an integral, necessary function of a species member to improve their adaptability and improve their avenues for acquiring resources. He apparently concluded his employment at the hardware store with the customary two-weeks-notice, as opposed to quitting without warning, and should be given due respect for leaving the job in this manner.

Chris is upfront with his issue with the second manager at his next job, another trait of honesty. He then quickly moves to the positive traits of his employment.

The manager was nodding his head lightly, “Well, that’s good, we certainly get busy here also. So you and the manager, uh, couldn’t resolve your differences?”

The “well” almost implies that his being quick with his job is not due proper credit in light of his problem with the manager. The interviewer is being polite by injecting “uh” as a transition back to the issue of the disputes with the manager. By using this pausing, transitional utterance he treats the topic with some delicacy.

“No, I hated to do it but I told him, ‘I don’t really see why you have to yell at me for this one issue. I’m keeping up pretty good and just this one time I messed up two sandwiches in a row.’ And that was only because another guy didn’t show up and I was swamped. I asked him, ‘Do you see me mess up sandwiches any other time than today?’ (said with a slightly lower than average tone and volume) Do you see any customer’s orders going out late? Uh, I promise you sir (volume raises up slightly), if you give me a chance, I’m a quick learner and I keep things moving. I mean, I’ll show you, once I get the hang of it, I’ll know all the sandwiches you make, no problem.”

Chris is taking a risk by being honest that he messed up two sandwiches in a row, but he mentions it as a onetime incident. When someone makes a clear declaration of something, it is likely true. Further questioning of the incident’s frequency could further corroborate it as a single incident. He explains that he lost track because he was too busy from the store being under-manned. This could be detrimental to his interview. It is sometimes poor form to provide an excuse for a mistake but rather to state the mistake as not the ordinary way business is conducted.

Chris’s use of the word “guy” rather than “worker” or “employee” is a little colloquial. Being more colloquial during interviews for more professional jobs would be unfavorable, and of the many shades of colloquial behaviors, some could also be unfavorable for a low-skill position. Chris’s diction and connotations could be less desirable for a more detailed employment position, but he may be within acceptable parameters for this position.

It may be in the best interest of the interviewer to exclude other applicants who have less colloquial diction while viewing Chris’s less educated diction as positive, because someone who speaks with fewer colloquialisms may prefer to not respect the low skill position enough to

execute their job. And an applicant who is better with diction may seek more resourceful employment elsewhere.

Chris also makes a few grammatical mistakes here and there, and he continues with other less favorable diction like “swamped” and “hang of it.”

In Chris’s responses to the manager, he states that he is on time with sandwiches. This is positive. He’s stating a common desired quality of employees of any restaurant. Throughout this interview he seems to be conscience of many things that the interviewer may be expecting him to do. “I’ll get the hang of it” implies that he wants to make sandwiches correctly.

“Well, you understand I have to call these other employers up.” Tim states.

“Yeah, you can call over there. That manager was Bob Slate and the other managers were Peter and, uh, Taylor and they were okay with me. And the manager for the hardware store was Tim.” Chris explained.

The interviewer makes a valid response, explaining that he’ll have to ask the previous employers. Chris responds with the names of all the employers he worked under, good and bad.

“Okay (slower than normal pronunciation), um, and where it asks if you have transportation, you put yes and you wrote here, ‘I actually can catch the bus, route 43.’ You say you have a car?” Tim asks.

“Well, I sold it. I let someone take over payments. I liked it but I want to save the money and get something that’s a little easier to afford right now. I’m taking some night classes now, oh, that’s another thing I wanted to ask you about the schedule. Um, but, you don’t have to worry. I can catch the bus here any time. I don’t mind and whatever it takes, I’m never late and I never miss a day, except, you know, once or twice when I had a cold.” Chris replies

Chris is forthcoming with how he is without a car but will diligently obtain transportation. He appears to be considering his financial situation properly and is seeking to eventually improve his form of transportation. He

then mentions that he is “never late,” a clear and direct statement. To know the answer that the employer may want to hear before the employer asks is quite positive. It could be overdone, but these clear and direct statements of Chris, of the tasks of the position, are quite favorable.

Chris’s attending night school is positive for Chris, but it could hamper his performance of his job. Employers of higher skilled jobs may want their employees to broaden their education, while employers of lower skilled jobs may feel that the employee will become overqualified for their position and either become distracted or abruptly leave. The employer could question out these possibilities and if it appears that it will not hamper Chris’s performance, this would be a positive for the employer, even for a low-skill position. And, if he has given two week notices in previous places of employment he will likely be considerate of leaving this job with the same two weeks of notice.

Low-skill jobs should remain as temporary positions, only lasting a few years, for young adults. And low skill jobs, to some degree, should be for people who cannot develop into high-skill positions. It is important to note that, in order to develop families, in order to care for a child, in order to raise a child in an appropriate environment, a person must develop higher skills which would warrant higher income so that those children may develop unhampered by the problems of poverty. A person must attain financial stability before becoming a parent. Chris is doing the right thing by looking forward to other types of employment.

Under no circumstance should a human being give birth to a child while living in a state of poverty. Under no circumstances should a human being give birth to a child while receiving social assistance from the government.

Chris’s attending night school is positive for Chris. It is positive for a species to develop a system of rewarding members for intellectual achievement and curbing the continuing effects of perpetual poverty. All species members should seek to improve their knowledge and seek to better themselves for that time when we must act to save the world from peril.

“Okay, okay, um, but just understand, we don’t tolerate anyone not being here on time. And definitely, if someone were to not show up and not call in, we just don’t do that here.” Tim states.

“Absolutely (implying ‘I understand absolutely’). If you give me a chance, I’ll show you. I’m never late. The

only thing I ask is that if I could have Monday night and Wednesday night off because I go to night school. And it's just those two nights, my classes start at seven and if I work those days, I kind of have to get off by five."

"Well, we could maybe work around that for, until the end of this semester?"

"Yeah, and the summer I could work any day."

"And you're okay with working on the weekends?"

"Well, I'd be nice if I could have some weekend days off, but yeah, that's no problem. I don't mind working on Saturday or Sunday or Friday night's okay. I know Friday's are busy, and I'll keep up, and the closing. . . How late do you get out of here?"

Chris states, "I'm never late," another clear and direct declaration. He speaks honestly about how he would like to have weekends off from time to time. For an employee to show such honesty and forthcoming is very positive for an employer. Tim knows what he is getting in an employee and does not even have to ask many questions to find out.

If an applicant were to respond to the tardiness subject by saying, "Yeah sure," with a slightly softened tone, their profile would be less attractive to the interviewer than Chris's profile. Although any one instance of a suspect response does not define a character, the interviewer could consider the lack of a direct statement as meaning that the applicant has a lack of conviction for the goal of punctuality.

The interviewer has a right to be concerned that Chris's school may interfere with his work. He questions Chris further about it. It may seem as too un-empathetic to wish to discriminate against Chris for his wanting to go to school; however, a company operates to produce a profit and a company competes against other companies for a particular market. If one company hired employees with the empathy towards their spending time on endeavors outside of their employment activities, and a competitor hired employees who focused on their jobs better, the latter competitor could capture market share from the empathetic employer. Unfortunately, there are many ways in which capitalist systems work with an absence of empathy such as when one bidder receives a government contract while another bidder loses that contract and must go out of business. In such instances, there is usually no

simple way in which the government, or the public, can intervene to correct the situation without defeating the entire capitalist system as a whole.

“Friday nights would be about 1 o clock, and I’m not sure, but I think the bus runs that late.”

“Oh, that’s no problem. I could bring my bike. It’s a little long, but I don’t mind riding the bike, or sometimes my sister can give me a ride. Somehow I’ll find a way to get here and get home. I promise you.”

“Okay, well maybe someone could give you a ride or something. Just, you understand that transportation is your responsibility.”

“Definitely. Trust me, you won’t have a problem with me.” Chris proclaims.

“And you were looking for \$9.50 an hour to start? Would you be okay with \$8.75? That’s really were we start cooks. And, to be honest, there’s only about a \$.15 cent raise per quarter, if your reviews are okay.”

“Yeah. That’s okay. I was hoping for more, but I’d be happy with that.”

“Okay, okay. Um, what are you going to school for? If I may ask.” The manager’s face is moistly stoic throughout this interview. He is not so much of an overtly disapproving person but exhibiting a personality that is just very busy and focused on many issues rather than needing to be friendly with everyone he encounters. Here he had a distinct opportunity to show his goodwill to the applicant by giving a small smile while asking about the night classes, but he chooses to continue with a stoic look.

“I’m going for electronics.” Chris states with a smile.

At this point the manager smiles slightly, matching Chris’s smile.

“Yeah, I’m not really sure what I want to do, but I have an older brother who, me and him, always tinkered with electronic projects. I figured that if I start to take classes, I might like one field of it over another later.” Chris continues.

The manager's failure to communicate with Chris in a positive manner about his school work is abhorrent. He smiles only when he must match Chris's smile. He is an employer who has no other connection to this applicant but, despite this, all human beings should treat each other with good will or it counts as a distinct fault of their profile. He should take a moment here to step out of the interview into a small positive conversation with Chris about his excellent choice of furthering his education. Even if he were to see faults with Chris as an applicant, or as a person, he should take a moment to commend him on his seeking of an education. Even if Chris is of a different group under a different school of thought or lifestyle, Tim should commend him on his seeking of an education. An AI viewing this event must know to categorize Tim as a person who has an apparent immoral profile and if further events reveal that Tim enacts these negative events because of Chris's skin color, the AI would categorize Tim as a racist.

“Okay, that's great that you're interested in something, but understand, it can't interfere with your work here.”

“Sure, I understand that and you'll see, I'm one who stays on top of things.”

“Well, I thank you for coming in, and I do have other interviews for the position, but we'll be letting you know in about a week.” They both motion to get up from the table. The manager gathers his papers and notepad.

“Well, thank you and I hope to be hearing from you. Thanks.” Chris reaches out to shake his hand. The manager shakes his hand slowly, and softly, but without any perceptible reluctance. The manager, however, does turn and walk to the kitchen abruptly without making eye contact further with Chris. Chris walks out and with a glance at the employees in the kitchen, he notices that they are all of the B race except for one employee doing the dishes.

Tim has performed a second immoral act.

Later, the manager is speaking with another manager who asks, “Did you do any interviews for a new cook?”

“Yeah, there was one guy who came in. I don’t think he’s right. He had a problem that he tells me about at Burger Palace and, I didn’t call the manager over there yet to ask about it yet, but he also doesn’t have transportation.

“Yeah,” The other manager says.

“Well, he says he can catch the bus, but I don’t know. And he was asking for a little too much money and I don’t know if he’d be okay with what we pay cooks. And then he goes to school at night too, and I don’t know if that would be a distraction too.”

“Well, if he makes it to work, what difference does it make?”

“I don’t know. He’s just piling up strikes against himself.”

“But we’re going to need someone soon. Are you interviewing anyone else?”

“Yeah, there’s one other person coming in.”

Tim is telling a half-truth to the other manager with regards to the transportation. Chris essentially has two forms of transportation, a bus and the bike. Tim then tells the other manager a lie with implying that Chris seeks a higher pay. Chris may have requested a slightly higher pay, but this would be quite normal and intelligent, just as it would be quite normal to want weekends off on occasion or to have other endeavors outside of work like attending school.

Tim has performed a third and fourth immoral act. At this point, an AI would be quite clear in a determination that Tim’s profile is almost permanently damaged. An AI could predict that his current friends could sense these behaviors and, in measuring these behaviors against relative public sentiment, determine that associations with Tim should be kept at a minimum or ended altogether. If he were to attempt courtship, potential mates may, or should, refuse partnering with him. When in a state of persona non grata, one species member has resources limited by other members. To turn around such a social loss Tim would have to show an open, utter breakdown of his entire set of beliefs and convictions. He would have to make extensive apologies to those affected by all his wrongdoings. Then it may take years of showing that he has adopted a new moral state to begin to have a full reversal of the AI’s position on his profile.

Tim has wronged this applicant, but he has not overtly stated that he seeks to discriminate against Chris because of his race. He likely is aware that this would be an illegal act. This exchange has not yet revealed the solid evidence needed to warrant the AI to conclude that this is a racist act, only that he has crossed certain thresholds of immorality. However, if a B race applicant fails to improve upon Chris's performance in this interview and that applicant is awarded the employment an AI, or a behaviorist, or a Labor Department could conclude that Tim is a racist and he must be the subject of full legal recourse.

An event of racial partiality in the execution of a task (and an impedance of a normally transferred resource because of racial difference) could be the result of the discriminator's desire to further their race, a carnal desire (of a whim-full, youthful origin) to further their group association, but it is also likely derived from partly-networked racist concepts that they have witnessed. Although young children exhibit no true racist exhibitions, an older child or tween may appear in case studies to think carnally, whim-fully, that another child of a different race, a different appearance, is of an opposing group that needs bullying in greater proportion to someone of their same group. This would be similar to a child seeing another child wearing a different team jersey. Such a minor manifestation could be abruptly dispelled by an elder scolding the child and explaining how it is a breach of ethics to bully in any circumstance, and it is especially heinous to bully an opposing race for a racial purpose. Yet, if a group paradigm exists around the juvenile that supports racist sentiment—if the elders of a family, or the family peers, support racist sentiments—then this conditioning could further this false and wrongful paradigm of thought. This conditioning could be part of more serious group bigotry or it could be with more mild inferences (bigotry) of supporting one race over another.

In the performance of a task, there are two opposing, wrongful, views of an alleged racist event; either the accused is proposing that a race's member is unqualified to perform the task (racial discrimination) or the accuser is proposing that an unfair judgment has occurred, in regard to the task, when it has not (reverse racial discrimination). Tasks are to be addressed blindly with respect to race. To unfairly discriminate with the member's proper performance of the task (racial-discrimination) or to imply that discrimination has occurred when it has not (reverse racial discrimination), is to defeat the subordinate problems of the discriminator as well as defeating

the larger, superior, problems of the species. A person within an acceptable chain of command system, a person with the authority to govern the ownership and transfer of a resource, must only test another person based upon the specific skills related to the task. An authoritative position does not, and cannot, warrant a racial test of someone outside of the parameters of the task addressed (racism) and the rights granted to an individual do not, and cannot, warrant their being accepted for addressing the tasks if they have failed to perform these tasks (reverse racism).

The observance of a possible racist event must be only with empirical information related to *a single, individual event*. Observers and investigators of an event must operate with empirical, discrete parts. All goals of all involved parties must be of a consistent, mutually agreed construction. Events cannot be generalized and accusations cannot be levied against a group without solid empirical evidence of networked racism. To generalize a racist event or surrounding events is also a group-supporting, thought-leading, perception-leading, racist act. If, for instance, an observer were to imply that, “they (the racial group) are doing something wrong,” without a clear representation of distinct acts of networked racism that observer would be in error (generalizing a dispute, a tit-for-tat response). If an observer were to imply that “they (the racial group) have done something wrong, again,” suggesting that past events are proof that a present event is racial that observer would be in error (generalizing a dispute, a tit-for-tat response). Although adversarial pundits may differ slightly on minor points of reason surrounding a possible racist (individual) event, a clear conclusion of a clear mutual goal must be established and the path to that single goal must be without conjecture, innuendo, any generalization of the details, or any connection to other events. A collection of statistics could guide the observers to a possible event or suggest that an event under scrutiny has occurred as part of a larger pattern, but the event in question and the events that suggest a larger pattern are to always be addressed individually, empirically, consistently, with a fairness to all parties involved,

In capitalist systems, companies compete (groups are tasked to competing) with other companies for resources. Employees compete for positions with companies or individuals otherwise engage in entrepreneurial ventures to gain resources. A major part of the development of a child is the preparations they must undertake in order to compete in a job market. Just as any other animal must solve their environmental problems—where to find

food, where to find a mate, how to grow and develop physically and mentally so that they may compete—humans, of our modern environment, must solve the problems of ethically procuring resources.

In an effort to acquire resources, a company expends resources. A business owner(s) may hire an employee (expend resources) so as to gain the potential resources of such a decision. In comparison, if a social group of any other species shares resources between members so as to gain resources, their efforts must successfully renew their environment, their larger allotment of resources, or the group will cease to exist. If the gained resources are minimal, the owner may choose to not hire someone or they may offer the position at a lesser rate. In a fair capitalist system, the supply and demand of market forces governs the transfer of resources, and the coveting of resources—the measuring of resources to be shared with employees hired—within this chain is loosely based upon the coveting of those resources that are directly withdrawn from the environment. A business owner must make decisions based upon these market forces. If the market exists and a business owner does decide to hire someone then he must offer enough resources to procure an employee for the position. Under ideal conditions, an applicant may be in a position to request more money which, in turn, forces the employer to compete for employees. Although some may disagree with this system, to intervene at any step between an individual and the company and the underlying environmental resource (if the system is fair and a reasonable minimum wage is established for those subjects entering the workforce) is to defeat the entire system.

In the testing of an applicant for employment, an employer must only decide if an applicant is worthy of employment based upon their performance of tasks pertinent to the position. During an interview an employer must only judge the applicant based upon their abilities and, in turn, the applicant must respect that the tasks of the position warrant only the most qualified person to be chosen from the pool of applicants. It is the tasks at hand which measure a life form. It is the task(s) to be performed that must have full governance over the behavior of the interviewer and the applicant. If fair, a capitalist system connects the raw resources withdrawn from the environment with the underlying tasks performed at the point of a transaction.

An interviewer must test an applicant's intelligence level. An applicant must be able to learn a process and repeat it within a short learning curve. An applicant must be able to build upon a learned process with more processes. Their memory must be sound, especially with more critical tasks, and their

comprehension and execution must be within an acceptable speed for the position. An applicant must be able to apply an appropriate priority to all of the daily tasks of the job. If a business owner hired an applicant who is not capable of addressing the mental problems of their job and a competitor hires an applicant who easily addresses their tasks, then the first employer would lose market share to the competitor. The business owner's income (resources) would be lost. An employer must discriminate against an applicant based upon an applicant's inability to operate at the intelligence level needed for the job.

An interviewer can test an applicant's ability to reason. Reason, as it relates to a task, consists of verifying facts and applying logic to reach a satisfactory goal. Reason, as it relates to social interaction, consists of goodwill and a mutual understanding of fair resource acquisition. An employee must have both task reasoning skills and work ethics (the reasoning of fair resource acquisition). An employee cannot fail to show up or have a tardiness problem. If an employee is asked to perform a pertinent task they cannot simply refuse to do it or postpone it. In most of their exhibited behavior, an employee cannot have a desire to simply appear for a set period of time so as to gain a paycheck. They must be concerned about performing well on a job. The employee must show, to some degree, that he is aware of the larger goals that the superiors seek to achieve—not just making a product but all the aspects of pleasing a customer or providing a product efficiently. These would be points of reason—to perform the tasks with due diligence as part of the employer/employee agreement, to operate with work-ethics. Just as applicants must be screened for their intelligence level, applicants must also be screened for their reasoning skills. An employer must discriminate against applicants who do not exhibit sound reason, in regards to both logical problem solving and also work ethics.

An employer tests for reason during an interview. If the applicant answered yes (positively) to a question, but did not elaborate further, this could mean that he does not wish to perform his task for the larger goals of the employer but the limited goals of passing the time so as to receive a paycheck. If the applicant answered questions with a smile and engaged the employer in a very positive manner, yet frowns during a fleeting moment when he believes that the employer is not looking, this could be a very negative sign to the employer. Reason tests are essential to determining if a pertinent task will be executed. A task may not be executed properly if an

employee is not intelligent enough to negotiate the task and a task may not be executed properly if an applicant refuses to perform the task.

Although societies must show compassion and care for members who are unable to join the workforce as adults, although some reasonable social assistance must be granted to members who cannot support themselves, although modern governments must maintain comprehensive plans in place for assisting with and preventing poverty, it is a fundamental tenet of modern civilization that individuals compete for resources with exhibitions of intellect and reason. This competition allows for an inequality of resources between members that is commensurate with one's ability to solve the problems of employment. To propose that an employer must be required to share resources outside of a natural business model is to propose that a fundamental rule of nature is to be abandoned, that the most adaptable, most effective, most innovative individual be displaced by less qualified individuals.

In finding employment or otherwise obtaining resources with fair gain, a person is both obtaining resources and distancing themselves from a mortal event. For most other species with neuro-systems, the avoidance of mortality is the predominant problem/task; all tasks are measured for their contribution to solving mortal events. If a species member does not learn how to successfully oppose a predator or it does not learn of the behavior of its predators, it will succumb to a mortal event. If a species member does not know of the mortal dangers of its physical environment it will succumb a mortal event. If a member does not use socialized, networked information to gain food stocks in preparation for a food shortage, it will succumb to a mortal event. If a species does not have a propensity to adapt to changing environmental tests or too great of a number of individuals are failing to win their independent mortality events, the species will go extinct. Nature has established a rule that a life form must pass tests of survival first, and all other tasks must maintain an element of this survival problem as a part of those subordinate goals. The purpose of earning and maintaining one's own resources through task performance must also be taught to children with the intent of conveying this survival element. The earning of resources, the need to be hardworking and trustworthy and intelligent and reasoned, is a mortal test.

The trends of all subordinate tasks and their related decisions are formed under the predominant goal of survival and survival is achieved through the success of individual tasks. Life pivots upon an individual successfully

addressing a task like finding resources (or earning a living within our modern paradigm), with its survival element, and that task becomes the means of measuring the life form which addresses it. The task measures the individual; the collective tasks measure the species; and the environment produces the tasks. An individual task, and its survival element, is to be observed without regard to a member's perception of the events and a member's success in performing the task is to be measured by an empirical, consistent means. A behaviorist in observance of an individual performing a task is to only measure that individual in relation to the task(s) at hand.

Different human beings operate at different levels of intelligence and reason. In observing a human being's ability to address a task, a potential employer may conclude that a reoccurring failure to perform certain tasks is because of a genetic propensity or they may conclude that a failure is due to conditioning; however, in either situation, a person's origin is irrelevant, their race is irrelevant, and their genetic coding is irrelevant (not to be viewed and analyzed); at no point should a employer or a behaviorist view the origin of a person, nor should they observe a genome sequence, to determine if a person is qualified to perform a task. The observance of task performance is the only method of determining future task performance. All genetic information and family origin information must be blind in relation to a named, known individual performing a task.

In our modern society, in our de facto capitalist system, children must gain an education so that they may earn a living during adulthood. The practicing of simulated tasks under this goal is critical. When attempting to solve an academic problem, a child must apply a level of due diligence to the informational steps of the problem as well as the reasoning behind why a problem is to be addressed. These lower stepped tasks contain a survival element. If a single child falls behind in their development, the surrounding peers may support the individual when they all reach adulthood, but society must work to limit the effects of societal collapse by requiring a particular level of intelligence and reason within its population.

Childhood development must trend in the direction of this information-based and reason-based approach to solving the survival problem because beyond the problems of an individual procuring their own resources are the more serious problems of maintaining the democracy, preserving a modern society, and preventing species extinction. An individual has a civic responsibility to earn their own resources and assist in maintaining societies' resources.

This approach to AI design and discrete behaviorism differs greatly from how Modern Psychology views the human mind both in how behaviors are defined and how a human's wellbeing is measured in relation to their environmental tasks. A human's comprehension of the environmental tests/tasks is critical. A requirement of proficiency with a particular set of environmental tests/tasks is an absolute necessity. It is proposed here that the level of intelligence and reason needed for a population to govern itself in a free, modern system must be equivalent to the level of intelligence and reason required at the moment when British colonies challenged the previous feudal systems in the 18th century. Behavioral modeling will show that a collapse of modern civilization is imminent if certain thresholds of reason are not maintained. And it is proposed here that if certain thresholds of reason are not attained by the whole human population that we will reach an end of natural resources, cause a cascading environmental failure in the oceans which will lead to a mass extinction event. Child development must include an understanding that an individual's resource acquisition requires successful task performance, and societies' resource maintenance requires a higher level of informed civic responsibility that must be attended after an individual procures their own resources.

The most prominent group inclusion/exclusion line of behavioral studies, the delineation that affects the largest portion of society, is formed along the skill levels of individuals. When an employer terminates an employee for not performing his job at the skill level needed, that employer is acting in a just and reasonable manner to exclude that member from the company's group. The employer would be fairly discriminating (choosing one employee over another, excluding a member from the group's resources) if that discrimination is based upon the ability to perform the tasks of the employment position. All efforts must be made to prepare members for employment, all efforts must be made to produce an employment market for the different skill types, and all efforts must be made to provide a terminated worker with options to mitigate the difficulties of such a job loss, but much of the responsibility for successful performance of a job lies with an individual. In choosing one person over another based upon intellect, employers assist in the maintenance of an intellectually biased paradigm. If one is repeatedly tested, through parental care, through school, through employers, and they achieve more optimal results, they will likely face societal problems with greater sensibility and reason.

It is proposed here that the existing capitalist systems of the world must be maintained and that the increasing socialist movement, a slow collapsing of all capitalist systems, will lead to a runaway population explosion among poorer communities and a collapse of the world's ecosystem in the wake of this increased human encroachment.

The following scene depicts the social reasoning and the approaches to dispute resolution found within the workplace:

Carl pulls up to his new coworker's house. As he pulls up, Steve gets up from sitting on his front porch. He grabs his cooler of water and a bag lunch.

"Hey, long time huh?" Carl says. They shake hands.

"Yeah, man, ("yeah" is drawn out, "man" is two-toned with a second slightly lower tone), I've been around, that's for sure." Steve says as he hops in the truck. "How are you (high tone, two-toned) doing?"

"Good, good, you know the same old, same old. Where've you been? In Nebraska?" Carl asks.

"No, Kansas. Yeah, well, I've been all over actually, but mostly Kansas. I was fitting for a big company up there doing powerplants. It was hell actually, working for numskulls, you know, the politics." Steve explains, "How are you? How's your family, your brothers?"

"They're making it you know. It's not easy for them but they still have their head above water." Carl says. "Jim's still doing inspections for ABC Fire. Bill is doing design."

"And how are the kids. You have two boys don't you?" Steve says.

"A boy and a girl. They're fine, both in school now. Your kids are all grown up now, right?"

"Yeah, they're out in the world, Kip, the oldest is working for an AC company. Timmy is floating around. I think he's about to get a job as a valet or something." Steve says.

"Cool. The last time I saw them, they were in diapers."

In greeting mode, speakers will seek to bring each other up to date on the relevant events that have happened. Since these two have not been in contact for some time, they exchange larger details of their family life and of their mutual kith and kin. If they were greeting strangers, the opening topics would likely be mostly of origin, what location and workplaces that the members have worked on, with later questions of families. Strangers would chat of their social situations briefly then move to the more prominent task of gaining resources with haste, while acquaintances would be sure to show their need to be curious of the other's well-being.

Each topic discussed has a set, proposed time limit. Each speaker should attend common, trending, established etiquette to determine those time limits. The lowering tones propose a closing out of topics while higher tones propose newer topics. They are together for the task of obtaining resources and this should be reflected in the body-mode topics. This pressing task must be ventured into within certain acceptable periods of time. Their more casual talking will be wound down, likely, as they pull onto the jobsite.

"Yeah, they're getting by I guess. Kip plays the drums in a band," Steve says.

You're doing pretty good with the boss huh?" Steve says." He's got you on some big projects."

Each choice of phrase under each topic can be compared to the very next probable choice. And those choices could be compared to their next probable choice, and so on. Steve's reference to Carl's working under the boss could be stated with respect towards Carl as a craftsman if Steve made several supporting gestures that imply that this is a more jovial, off-the-cuff remark; however, as it is stated here, Steve is implying an emphasis to a chain of command when a reference to a chain of command is not so necessary. Steve could say, "You're doing quite well (leaving out the boss). These are big projects you're running," and this could be both more grammatically correct and more polite. By bringing up a chain of command reference he likely seeks to question it.

"Yeah, he's giving me the reigns so to speak. He hired guys over me from time to time, but they do more to get themselves fired than to get the pipe in. And he always comes back to me when he wants to get past all that

nonsense."

"Yeah, Tom told me, 'Carl's the boss. Don't you give him no grief, now.'" Steve says.

Carl chuckles, politely, "Yeah, well I know that you know what you're doing. I'm just bringing you up to speed."

Steve is quiet for a while, "So where we going?"

"It's a warehouse where they're building out about 50 offices. I was there measuring a few things yesterday. Now, we have to find a spot to unload and set up. And there's a run of pipe to relocate around an AC duct. I have to ask the Super a few questions about it." Carl says,

"Did you get all the parts for it?" Steve says, "you get" are trough tones, said slowly. "All" marks an abrupt upward tone which is sustained for the remainder of the question. Steve is imposing authority, tepidly, by questioning Carl in a way that suggests that he may not have properly ordered "all" the materials.

"Yeah," Carl responds, two-toned, with higher than normal tones. "I make good material lists. (low concluding tones) We'll have to find where the power is for the equipment, then we could set up."

"I'd like to see where this line goes. The Super showed you a good spot for it?"

"Yeah, but I just have to check with him. There was a big square cut out of one of the side walls. I want to make sure there's not another duct running in the way."

"You should be able to look on the plan, right?"

"Sure, but even if I check the plan there's so many changes. I still need to ask him."

"Right." Steve said in two lower tones with a mild transition between them, with low volume.

They pull up to the building, "Let me see," Carl says, "I hope we get a good parking space."

"Pull in there," Steve directs.

When Carl speaks of routing pipe and meeting with his contact, he is speaking in a matter-of-fact fashion, not with apparent authoritative

connotations. His previous statement of just “bringing you up to speed” he implies that he respects Steve as a tradesman and plans to give him a wide scope with decision-making.

When Steve asks about the materials ordered, he imposes a particular limited hierarchy upon Carl—a clear breach of the etiquette associated with the hierarchical system implied by the hiring company. The hierarchical system may not be stated by the hiring representative of the company (it should be declared in some fashion), but the new employee must be respectful of the need to seek out this chain of command. Everyone should know who is responsible for which scope of work leading back to the customer, the resource that is mutual to the employer and the employee.

By making comparisons, an AI or behaviorist could easily see that this move on Steve’s part is not appropriate, it is a poor next-best-response, and it further develops an unfavorable character profile for Steve. This move hampers their current tasks and it works against the many tasks of the larger society. Speakers who know and practice a more respectful etiquette, speakers who maintain a better general understanding of the outer species goals of survival and the species’ living standards, would notice that the best of all comparable responses might be the most simplistic form, “Have you ordered the materials?” A correct response would involve a clear imposition of respect rather than with criticizing tone patterns. An appropriate question would be devoid of additional meanings, it would maintain a distinct motive of only being concerned with the task, and it would not infer a question of a person’s correct execution of a task.

This questioning of Carl’s status is partly fashioned as a jest, and partly fashioned as a truthful. This would be, or could be, a tactic of shrouding a direct insult with a suggested quality of humor.

In Carl’s next response he responds to Steve’s imposition with a defense. His low tone at the end of his statement implies that the topic of ordering materials is concluded. He then returns to discussing the tasks to address in series once they arrive at the jobsite.

By making comparisons, behaviorists or AIs could see a problem with Steve’s next topic. By stating, “I’d like to see where this line goes,” he is skewed to his own perspective. He is directing attention to his own motives rather than the motives of performing tasks set forth by an employer. Carl is naming those tasks without absolute terms, and he is not currently requiring that some of those tasks be assigned to Steve, but Steve should understand that many tasks need to be addressed and Carl is designated as the director of

those tasks by their mutual employer. Some tasks are low skill and some are high skill. Some tasks are parts of ongoing endeavors while others are yet to be initiated. Steve implies that he is interested, he would “like to see,” where to construct a line of piping; yet his goal is not a casual “wanting to see.” Steve is driven to gain control of the task. With interjecting ambiguity he implies that the task does not have a designated director.

An AI placed in this scene would filter through thousands of case studies to determine optimum responses for Steve. Comparisons of the many different kinds of comments would first involve those common lines of human thought that exist under the mutual topic of “performing tasks as directed by an employer.” The subordinate tasks may be “performing tasks in an improving manner,” or “determining which tasks should be performed in which order,” or any of the sub-processes of the major tasks. Comparisons might reveal a more probable response of, “What would you want me to start doing first?” or “Is there a load of materials being delivered there, or you have it on the truck?” or “what size pipe are we putting in?” or “What are we hanging from? Wood or concrete?” or “what do you think I should do to be the most helpful?”

He could ask politely, “Could I run the pipe around the AC?” but this apparently involves a few steps that are likely handled in a more efficient manner by Carl. Carl must meet with ones who he has already made contact with, he is familiar with piping route and the plans, and he just mentioned many more appropriate tasks for Steve, such as unloading the truck which requires little familiarity with ongoing piping routes.

Steve likely has two distinct motives; he wants to perform the task of installing the pipe because it is a more skillful and a more authoritative position, and he wishes to avoid jobs that may label him as less skillful and less authoritative. Most companies know to place more skillful employees on more skillful tasks while maintaining a lower skilled employee for lower skill task. A skilled employee is more expensive than a less skilled employee. Since this crew is manned with two skilled employees it is likely in Carl’s best interest to assign mostly skilled work to the two of them; however, as low skill tasks become necessary they must be performed in their best sequenced position.

Carl mentions his familiarity with the task and explains how he must coordinate to route the pipe. Then Steve asks if Carl has “checked the plan.” With comparisons of the many probable, optimum choices for a response it is likely a poor response, a response furthering the ulterior motive of imposing

authority, for Steve to continue to question about the piping route. He could move to more neutral questions of other topics or he could maintain a silence for a while.

Carl mentions that he is familiar with the plans and that he is still proceeding with the task of finding a route for the piping in question. Steve's utterance of "right" is fairly neutral and he appears to be ready to move onto other subjects.

Steve then openly directs Carl parking the car. He states, "Pull in here." Such a direction is inappropriate, disrespectful, and further adds to the discrete profile of Steve. A better response would be, "This looks like a good parking spot," or he could remain silent. This is an apparent habitual act of his profile- to both question authority and attempt to impose authority without reason.

From the incremental discrete states of a person in a scene, an AI or a behaviorist can collect events leading to conclusions to a profile's probable background and their probable future actions. The program utilizes millions of comparisons of similar profiles, both known and simulated, to conclude similar past and present states under the many probable societal and environmental conditions. With each human an AI encounters it increases its dataset, and fine tunes its conclusions; however, in the assemblage of a single profile, all the information gathered can easily pivot onto a new profile type. In this small collection of attributes gathered for Steve's profile, the AI could just as easily dismiss large areas of conclusions about his character if Steve were to state, "Well, yes, I see what you're saying. You're more familiar with what you have to do. If you want, I'll take care of the unloading, then when you get a chance, set up some pipe for me to measure out and run." The AI can also question Steve (politely) to rule out possibilities and narrow the conclusions of his profile, but unless a very firm conviction is expressed by a speaker, the AI cannot usually conclude the more detailed, probable state for a character.

The AI's conclusions on a single profile, or a mannerism, or a gesture, are formed to anticipate societal trends, but such conclusions, including conclusions of profiles, do little to solve serious problems faced by the scene participants. Character conclusions can build up and easily fall back down.

For the most part Steve is no more or less a bad person. And he should be given the benefit of doubt that this exchange does not define his overall character. He could be a person who is a little overbearing but has no true nefarious motives. He clearly wishes to trump the chain of command within a

company, but if he acquiesced and began addressing neutral subjects he could be beneficial to the problems addressed with employment.

Steve also could be competitive with good reason; he could be working in an environment where members chide and test each other while jockeying for positions. It appears that Carl and his superiors have a more relaxed environment.

Carl pulls into the parking space. Carl grabs a set of blueprints, they step out of the truck, and walk up to the job. “This is it. You see that these lines are in. That was another crew. . . and they stopped about here. These rooms are also done. . . and . . .”

“Everything from here over?”

“Yeah, once we set up. . .let’s see. . .you could start getting this line up. I’m not sure about the height, you’ll have to check with the electrician and, uh, I think that’s it, there’s no AC duct here. But I have to check with the Super right now on that other AC, because he told me yesterday to get with him right away before he leaves to go to another job. . . “

“Okay.”

“Let’s see. Their power chords seem to come from over there. . . If you could start setting up and I’ll be back in just a minute to help.”

“Alright,” Steve says with two low tones, sarcastically, mimicking a subordinating character. “I’ll go set up the machines,” he says with an identical mimicking of the previous two tones.

After a while they get into the swing of working, they eat lunch and later Carl happens to pass by an area where Steve is working. He looks up to see something wrong with Steve’s piping route.

“Hey, I thought I mentioned to you to check this room. I hate to break it to you that pipe won’t pass through here.”

“What are you talking about?” Steve asks with three tones of exaggerated variation.

“There’s an electrical box in the way, you have to lower your pipe.”

Steve pauses for a minute and says, “Wuhl, we just have to move around it.” He states defensively, with excessive volume and tone variation.

“But we don’t have the parts for that. You have to take this back down and re cut the piece where you go down at that end.”

“How the heck is he gonna put this box right in our way?”

“It’s already there. It’s not coming down now.”

“Damn,” Steve stares at the work for a moment. “It was hell getting this pipe in. I have to re cut the hangers too.” Steve says.

Carl does not say anything for a moment and just shakes his head slightly.

“Okay, let me get up on the ladder again.” Steve says in a tired demeanor. “And you told me you got all the materials.”

“Right. I did. (heightened tones) I don’t need any more elbows for this pipe because it only makes sense to lower it back there, where you already lowered it, just not enough.”

An AI views human tasks as trivial, that is, all possible tasks attempted by a human are discernible by the program. Whether a task involves simple parts such as installing a light bulb or complex tasks such as constructing a space station, whether it involves societal problems of status or personal resource problems; the AI can determine each of the most probable paths towards a solution. It is apparent that Carl is following a near-optimum approach to the task while Steve has made a mistake. Carl politely mentions that Steve’s work would have to change while Steve implies that the mistake was the electrician’s. It is quite natural for one to respond defensively when their competency is questioned; however, no one is excused from observing a direct, indisputable, discrete fact when all variables are eliminated. If Steve would have admitted his mistake and moved to fix it, Carl would have to respect his efforts, conclude the event, and avoid prejudging Steve during

futures similar tasks. Yet Steve reveals that he is opposed to sound scientific approaches to problems.

Just like an AI, Carl is forming a profile for Steve. Everyone observes the actions of others and internalizes conclusions about their probable past states and probable future states. Carl appears to address problems openly, and he is not treating this as too large of a mistake on Steve's part, but if Steve were to continue to make similar mistakes and habitually deny their outcomes Carl may view him as suitable for lower skill tasks rather than higher skill tasks. AIs and humans must be able to measure the success of resource attempts. Comparisons and simulations must be played out to determine if workers are effective at their tasks and this includes the employer's possible discrimination of a worker who has behavioral problem.

Carl and Steve must have a sound biological approach to a task that includes an understanding that a problem can be addressed in an optimum algorithmic, trivial, manner. Given the resources and the time to analyze a problem, they could uncover all the discernible parts. Consider a team of several hundred engineers analyzing the integral parts of all the tasks encountered on this work day. Engineers could lay out a distinct plan in which every footstep, every reach into a tool box, every trip up the ladder, every choice of every pipe route is performed at an absolute level of efficiency. The scientist could make it a point to measure Steve and Carl's exact calorie intake for the day, and count to within a gram, that minimal amount of energy to expend for the optimum effect. An optimum path exists for every endeavor that every human undertakes, as long as the task is directed towards a discrete goal.

Steve is defensive about his mistake, and he fails to truly admit it. He treats the problem as ambiguous; he likely feels that different journeymen may maintain different opinions on how to route the pipe and his approach is as good as any other approach. In some instances, with some problems, this could be true, but here it is apparent that he has made an error. Stating, angrily, "I'll have to recut the hangers." Is an error because it is as if he implies that another person is at fault for the extra work he has to do. When a human places inappropriate societal causes to a trivial task (and all tasks are trivial) they are operating under a false perception. Sometimes a perception is fleeting and proven wrong internally within a character; however, some perceptions are continually developed leading to a near-permanent integral part of an adult character. He could, at a later time, conclude that someone else's mistake caused him to do extra work.

When Steve implied that Carl failed to do a journeyman's task of ordering "all the materials," he proposed that he may have been correct on a previous point where he questioned Carl's ability to operate at the status level that he has been granted. Several distinct immoral acts (the unfair attempts to gain status within an interaction) are occurring with this statement. First, Steve is naming a perceived mistake of another person so as to mask his own mistake. It is apparent that Carl did not include the materials for routing around the electrical box because he did not have an original plan to route the pipe as Steve had envisioned. If it were a clear mistake on Carl's part, it would still be irrelevant within their current deliberation on repairing the misrouted pipe. Steve's attack on Carl's character is carnal—it is of a less-sentient, primitive, viewpoint where one's perception of events is pitted against another's perception. The winner of these perceptions, in Steve's view, is determined when one of the contrarians convinces the majority of other members of their viewpoint. In his battle of the perceptions he implies that virtually all of their daily tasks are ambiguously attempted and their outcomes are to be ambiguously measured. It is carnal, a poor next-best-response, to revert back to the ad hominem attacks, to methods of previous societies, while disregarding the sound scientific reasoning of modern societies.

Another notable mistake with this statement is that when members are in dispute about a decision it would not be appropriate for one to mention a previously unrelated mistake of another. This would be a political attack, an attempt to influence perceptions of an overall profile. Steve might have a more valid reason for his behavior if he was within a more competitive environment where members habitually choose to attack status, yet he would still likely need to make a stronger connection between Carl's failure to order the right materials and the subsequent inability to route the pipe without removing previous pipes. His successful moves within such an environment would involve convincing others of his perception.

This behavior presents a problem with AI development. Many humans believe that their interactions are permanently ambiguous. Many people believe that they can treat a decision of theirs as existing within a sound realm of perception when it is not. To design an AI is to propose that all actions of all life forms are of distinct motives which have clear positive, negative, or neutral outcomes. If the goals are discerned, and those goals are within a framework of appropriate prioritized and tested tasks, the AI's

conclusion of the success or failure of a human decision will be correct while a human's contradiction will be incorrect.

This scene has many comparable scenarios. People in places of employment, people in public and private organizations, friends, neighbors, spouses, siblings will often cross from a more pragmatic viewpoint to a more perception based, ambiguous, viewpoint. Some people in dispute are within different realms of behaviors, of different paradigms, with different levels of intricacy to their interactions. Tradesman on a construction site may be working with more simplistic tasks, tasks that lend themselves to easy analysis, while sometimes presenting ambiguity during their jockeying for authoritative positions. Some tradesman may address tasks with sound scientific reasoning while sometimes also perpetuating a carnal disregard for trivial discernment. Engineers may dispute more intricate tasks with sound scientific reasoning, but their approach may also involve some carnal disregard for trivial discernment. Film makers may dispute intricate tasks of judging societal trends, societal likes and dislikes, in a pragmatic manner, but they will also perform carnal attempts to obtain authoritative positions. Politicians may dispute their many intricate tasks of judging societal trends while attempting to obtain authoritative positions in both carnal and non-carnal ways. In the many different forms of disputes, optimum paths towards solutions are more prevalent with more experienced, educated, reasoned, and developed speakers and an AI must not only suggest these same optimum paths but also work to develop and improve human approaches towards these solutions. Just as humans must strive towards species improvement, AIs must also strive for human species improvement.

This is a clear developmental problem for Steve, as it would be for any similar scenario with any similar character. His detachment from a pragmatic approach, his reverting to carnal acquisitions of authority, his carnal desire for status via imposing perception-based methods, will only hamper him in his attempts to solve his resource and status problems. A child's development must involve being cognizant of these fallacies. Steve is making mistakes of reason in an apparent latter part of his career. These are mistakes which should have been corrected before his exiting of elementary school.

False moves within more localized disputes, issues that affect the status of individuals within small groups, are in direct contradiction to the species' goal of adapting to environmental change. Humans, like any other species, must improve their chances for success at small tasks so that imminent survival tasks can yield successful outcomes. Trending must move towards

clear pragmatic problem solving with well-defined goals. Wrong moves in these scenarios degrade the intellect of the species.

An argument born of a derogatory statement must be unraveled back to the first derogatory act, and then any additional derogatory acts of any of the speakers must also be discerned to determine who is right and who is wrong at each point. In the previous example, Carl could have responded tersely with Steve's impositions. Carl could have developed unfavorable viewpoints of Steve and lashed out in other unrelated scenarios. A later conversation could have involved both parties speaking of more informational problems while exhibiting small gestures that imply "You're not doing it right (an attack on status)," or "You don't know how to do this (an attack on status)," or "I decide how this is done (an attack on authority)." It becomes an unspoken battle of perceptions, another intricate and highly developed layer separate from the actual information delivered in lingual communication. Without introspection and questioning whether one's own actions are equitable, without learning to apply enough empathy to other societal member while competing fairly for resources, without knowing that natural selection favors an optimum path that includes a set amount of societal bonding, without knowing that there is a relativity to one's own personal problems in light of the many societal problems, a less than optimum profile can develop.

These are the more trivial disputes, involving a smaller positive or negative loss of resources within a local environment. Any disagreement of decisions to be executed affects an individual or group of individuals. Disputes involving a larger quantity of resources, and affecting individual(s) who are at greater risk for larger failures, might cause destitution or a mortal event. And the successes or failures of individuals contributes to a net positive or net negative for larger formed groups, sovereignties, and the failures of larger groups contribute to the survival or extinction of the species. An integral part of solving species-level problems is for individuals to continuously solve personal resource problems—individuals must achieve and maintain gainful employment and they must live within their financial means.

A character which is more aggressive when solving problems has two distinct alpha traits to pursue. A child or adult can seek to be more intellectual and reasoned, or they could seek to be more physically imposing.

A child's quest for social empowerment and informational/resource empowerment requires balance with a preference given to informational/resource problems. The empowerment of a social interaction problem, such as exhibiting possession of a toy, is usually sought by a child with little prompting from elders while the empowerment sought from solving an informational, resource, problem is often attempted with resistance; a child may show a toy to a peer for the status gained by simple possession rather than the showing the functionality of the toy. A parent must often impose positive emotions with informational problems to prove that a non-social, non-emotional problem has value. When children begin the more detailed learning of informational problems in school, they could, if not seeking empowerment with balance, choose to be more socially empowered among their peers by developing bravado rather than seeking the resource empowerment of information. Those who seek informational/resource empowerment are usually the exception, yet they must also be brought to a more balanced state if they are excessively antisocial. Conditioning brings balance between social empowerment and resource empowerment.

In the early years of school, being embarrassed by not gaining informational/resourceful empowerment can lead a child toward the other type of empowerment. Teachers, parents, behaviorists, and psychologists must recognize distinctly (in verbatim, fraction-of-a-second terms) when resistance to resource/information-based empowerment problems occurs in a child's actions. If daunted by an informational problem, a juvenile might look to the etiquette of being socially empowered among peers as a way out of the task. This can be the beginning of a conditional, or mostly conditional, learning disorder in which informational problems are avoided. This learning disorder is common to underprivileged children. This has not been addressed by modern psychology. Children have suffered and continue to suffer throughout life because of the snowballing effect of this path towards an unrelative empowerment. When this occurs, it must be counteracted by elders, it must be counteracted in every single instance, and it must be counteracted at a young age.

Behaviorists and psychologists must come to a conclusion on how the behavior of children during conversation should be molded from their quest for empowerment; they must also come to a conclusion on the conversational etiquette to be taught to children. Behaviorists and psychologists must make a stand on the issues of ethics, rights, and liberties and how mutually-accepted rules of conduct should be implemented with conversational

etiquette. A doctrine must be written that describes, comprehensively, how this conversation etiquette is taught to children—standards must be set, maintained, and challenged only with procedure. This conversational etiquette must be conducive to academics and informational/resourceful problem solving, rather than social, emotional, or individual, problem solving. Behaviorists and psychologists must act on behalf of underprivileged children who have a limited chance at succeeding at life's problems during adulthood because of a simple, preventable misdirection at childhood.

The AI must be of the discrete understanding of these two paths to social empowerment, the quest for a rapid carnal-alpha position and an academic-alpha position, the un-resourceful societal-hampering position and the state-level position. It must take into consideration a different set of priorities when assisting humans in these two realms of thought. It is imperative that the AI's actions are geared toward the saving of the world's ecosystem. This will only happen if intellect is chosen over destitution.

The detection of informational embarrassment by elders must be an integral part of the learning process of a child. Teachers and parents must work to detect a child's avoidance of informational problems so that this behavior can be counteracted in every instance. When a child becomes embarrassed or daunted by the inability to solve a problem with information, this should not be met with negative reinforcement. The child should be presented with an understanding view of information that is socially empowering. If unchecked, an unbalanced child might look to develop an unwarranted bravado, becoming socially empowered among peers. They could look to rebel against elders. When reaching adulthood, such a person will have difficulty comprehending logically delivered information. For him or her, following a task through multiple steps will lead to embarrassment, discontentment, and actions such as trying to laugh off a mistake. These subjects will be easily distracted during informational problem solving, seeking to be more social by changing topics. An employer is not likely to teach him or her that "it's okay, slow down, not a problem, just keep trying," and they are not likely to overcome their possible histrionic disorders.

Although social embarrassment and the resistance to social interaction is not as serious as informational/resource avoidance, negative social interaction could also lead to a difficult, conditional, learning disorder. Courtship rituals and other types of social bonding could be more difficult during adulthood if a child fails to learn social etiquette. Like the lack of addressing informational resistance of youths, modern psychology has not

addressed the diagnosis or treatment of social embarrassment and social avoidance.

Social empowerment and social embarrassment is important to AI development because empowerment gained from informational problems is fairly straightforward—being of art and science. To know how humans gain social empowerment and how they can avoid social embarrassment is to know a relativity of problem solving for a human, and a relativity of problem solving for an AI—a much more complex collection of problems.

When a child becomes embarrassed by an awkward social situation, the elders should explain, comprehensively, how the child is not observing the etiquette rules of social interaction. This must include a regimen of objectively observing the latest trends among more socially empowered children (of empowerment pertaining partly to relevant resource problems). This could include telling a child things such as, figuratively speaking, “Speak up. Be more articulate and deliberate. Try to join in conversation more. Don’t just think it, say it. Learn what kinds of things other kids talk about and comment regularly. Try to talk to a cute girl about intelligent things that capture her interest (if, for example, the child is male). And if she or anyone else rejects your approach, show them that you don’t care. Then go talk to other friends and let those who rejected you see that you don’t need them.”

Children should generally be directed away from faddish things such as trendy clothing or other trendy items that do not solve substantive problems. However, a child should exhibit items that are socially acceptable if a need to solve a social problem is imminent. A child lacking in social acceptance should have his or her clothing choice critiqued by a parent. This must be objective on the part of the parent; the parent must learn of the trends in children’s clothing and purchase items accordingly. A child’s choice in toys should be critiqued, based upon the more resourceful/informational trends. If a child is playing with cartoon-character trading cards of one type while other children are more interested in a new type of trading cards, the child should be directed to the other trading cards. This could be via “hints,” yet they must be strong hints.

To critique children on these things may appear as an assault on the independence of a child, but it is more of an exercise in being socially empowered when the child’s development needs it. In other words, if the child does not feel hurt by not fitting in, then it’s not a big deal which cards

the child likes as long as they have an objective understanding of why other children follow other trends.

A chance exists that a child may be more resourceful/informational than peers because the peers are not paying attention. The child may start to become involved with new trading cards only to find good reasons why the old cards are better. If this assertion of independence takes place, in which the child might be right while others are wrong, then the parent should explain the basic cause and effect of social and resource empowerment. This talk would include pointing the child in the direction that he or she wants to take, while teaching him or her of the possible consequences. If the child is valid in his or her choice, knows the social consequences, and is only mildly worried about his or her acceptance by peers, then this is a valuable, positive assertion of independence. The recognition of all these factors in decision making is a sign of maturity.

The following exchange is an example of the embarrassment problem that youths encounter when trying to balance social and informational/resource empowerment. An AI is placed in the scene to observe its comprehension of the interaction:

“Mommy I hurt my knee!” a child says running in the door, crying.

“Oohh, that's okay, it's just a cut,” the mother says.

The child whimpers in louder-than-average tones for his age for the type of injury. This implies, in effect, "I'm having a negative situation! Please give me attention to make it positive" despite the fact that the cut is minor, with minor pain. This is for gaining social empowerment at the time of the communication. The mother, knowing of this character trait, quickly tries to dispel his behavior by not responding with excessive concern. If she catered to it in this instance and like-instances, this would perpetuate this character trait.

She wipes the cut. "Could you get the bottle of hydrogen peroxide out of the bathroom?" she asks.

“Hi do pur cide," he says, mispronouncing the word.

In witnessing this scene, the AI proceeds to compare the actions of this human, with this pronunciation, to like situations where humans are embarrassed by information. Taking into account the child's previous exhibitions of information embarrassment, the child's ability to pronounce difficult words, and the child's hearing, the AI would likely conclude that the child is not pronouncing this word properly because humans generally do not wish to do things that appear to be too "intelligent," especially when among many peers who shun this information, or resource, empowerment.

"Hydrogen Peroxide," the mother clearly and slowly states with higher-than-normal tones on the second syllable in peroxide to imply, in effect, "This is an important word for you to remember because it leads to empowerment."

"Hy droo gen per oxide. . . . Where is it?" he says as he enters the bathroom, his whimpering has stopped due to this distracting problem of learning something, and hopefully pleasing Mom.

"It's in the brown bottle," the mother says.

Imagine a classroom of grammar school students performing scientific experiments. One of the students gets a small cut. This boy asks the teacher, "Do you have any hydrogen peroxide" in a clear and logical manner. The other kids look at him funny. The girls note this character trait, and he loses attractiveness with this behavior. The boys might think that he talks weird and they change plans to hang out with him during recess. Even when among much more liberal-thinking peers, it may be inappropriate—a bad next-best-response—to use a big word. When children are prompted to learn a task involving very academic steps, they become fearful that they will appear like the geeky kid who uses big words.

Even in more-balanced humans, a strong desire not to be too logical is the demeanor of communication. Consider one friend calling another on the phone. Their next-best-response does not include a monotone "Hello." They say a "Hey" or some other variation. The information to follow is usually done in a quite emotional way even if it involves logical problem solving. A

desire to portray a character drives these responses. Humans will often want to be received positively for their unique, illogical means of communicating.

Emotion is an important part of most social conversation; however, at times, a human must speak and think cleanly through a series of steps. Two engineers speaking of a building structure will become quite logical in their exchange. For them, a shunning of emotion is present, except when a conclusive solution to a relevant informational problem is achieved.

In western societies, this struggle between the two different paths of empowerment is quite common for juveniles, often directing children to an unbalanced desire to not appear too intelligent. Two different forms of peer groupings come into being, causing a next-best-response dilemma for humans of one group when they are among members of the other group. If a child said, "I just got a chemistry set for my birthday!" when among peers who think that science is interesting the child will gain social empowerment. If this is said among other peers who prefer GI Joe figurines, then this child will likely lose empowerment. Teachers and parents must look for balance. This includes telling a child with a new chemistry set, in possible a sugar-coated way, "Now, chemistry sets are fun, but you should play with other kinds of toys also. And not all your friends are going to be that crazy about chemistry."

The mother teaching the child about hydrogen peroxide could help him with problem solving, and with life, by commenting further. She could be more forceful by making him pronounce the word, completely, without showing embarrassment when performing a non-emotional task. "Say it, hydrogen peroxide," could help, especially if "say" receives a high tone while the rest of the syllables receive low, under-toning tones to imply, in effect, "this is an important word that you should not feel embarrassed to say, and you should show your friends that it's not a big deal to say it." Then she could follow with an under-toning statement such as, "Yeah, it just helps clean the cut." This would appeal to his desires of social empowerment by slightly shunning information. With this small interchange of views, the child would receive a valuable lesson in observing and handling information. The repercussions of such a small, simple learning experience will follow the child throughout his life. This is a lesson in conversational etiquette that helps a child straddle the two different worlds of empowerment.

Here is another like-situation that details a very ambiguous method of communicating with a child:

“Mommy I hurt my knee!” a child says running in the door, crying.

“Oohh, that's okay, it's just a cut,” the mother says.

The child whimpers in louder-than-average tones for his age, for the type of injury.

She wipes the cut. “Get the bottle of hydrogen peroxide out of the bathroom,” she asks.

“Hi do pur cide?” He purposely mispronounces this word. An ending high tone makes the word into a question.

“In the brown bottle. Under the sink, she states. The last syllable of the word “bottle” is given a low tone. The word “sink” is broken into two tones—a fairly high tone and a fairly low tone, implying disdain for his not understanding her previous question.

He brings it. “What is it?” he asks.

“It's medicine. It helps clean it, the mother says with higher than normal tones on the first syllable in medicine.

When he mispronounces the word, he also forms it into a question. She answers his question of pronunciation by disregarding it. She acts as if he is saying, “Where is it?” because that is the line of thought she expects. Her fast-paced comprehension of the interaction is ambiguous. She is oblivious to his question and exhibiting negative emotions to imply that she is bothered by his failure to read her mind.

In this instance, the mother does not assist the child in learning the word. The mother believes that the child does not know what she is talking about because he has not been paying attention. She likely feels that this is too big of a step for him now, yet she is upset that he has not already learned the word. The reason that he has not learned the word is because she has not taught him, and she is continuing to not teach him. When she pronounces the first syllable in “medicine” with higher-than-normal tones, she is implying, in effect, “You should know this!” while disregarding that this child's first few years of learning has been ambiguous with many problem-solving pieces left out by her and elders like her. With this scene, she is continuing to teach him, in effect, “not to learn of information, but to ambiguously try to fit in with society.”

Clear examples of information avoidance can be found in the media. On the Tonight Show with Jay Leno, a segment called “Jaywalking” featured an interviewer walking up to people on the street with a microphone to ask them history questions. The questions are quite simple and, likely, the majority of the viewers knew the answer. This is a test of social embarrassment that few people want to fail, so the participants almost always proposed an ignorance of the answer. Some of the participants claimed to not know the answer while actually not knowing the answer; however, it is quite clear that in our day and age, in western societies, especially among younger people, that being filmed on camera knowing the answer to a history question is a definite means of losing empowerment peers. When presented with this problem, they will often seek a humorous alternative answer that they act out. This is similar to when a clothes model appears on a broadcasted morning show where she is asked to answer a simple science question. Status could be lost, so an ignorance of the answer is presented.

At one point, the interviewer assembled some of the funniest participants for a mock game show. They were asked the simplest of questions. They continued through the questions, not knowing the answers, yet some questions became so simple that they had to slowly, embarrassingly, state that they knew the answer. If an AI were in observance of this game show, it would not be so fooled. It knows of humans and the social empowerment problem. It would recognize that these humans are likely, probably, lying so as to retain social empowerment.

Here is another example of a human wishing to retain social empowerment by not appearing too intelligent:

A carpenter walks into a condominium management office to schedule some work. “Hello. Uh, I’m here to work on unit 6C to fix a window sill.”

The receptionist states, “Oh, um, I need for you to fill out this form. Please read the condo association rules and sign.”

The carpenter says, “Yes, and I need to get with the maintenance man to make sure I get the right wood and paint. The molding is a specific shape.”

She replies, “Okay, . . . uh, . . . I’ll have to get him. Let me try and call him. . . . Shoot, I don’t know if he’s in

maintenance or out by the pool . . . Larry, come in,” she speaks into the radio.

After a few calls, he responds, “Yes, uh, Larry? The cabinet, or carpenter man is here and he needs to know what kind of molding sill he needs. He’s working in Miss Cole’s apartment.”

When the receptionist is forced to relay information about a subject that is unfamiliar, she becomes embarrassed and does not relay the information logically. Consider a logical, straightforward approach to assisting the person who walked in the office: “Okay, let me try to get him . . . Larry? . . . HQ to Larry? (Larry responds) Yes, there is a gentleman here to work on 6C, Miss Cole’s apartment. He needs to meet with you. He has questions about the molding and paint for a window.” She wished not to communicate in too logical a manner because she would be embarrassed by boldly stating home repair terms. Even if she knew about the paint, what molding is appropriate, and how the window sill is constructed, she would, like most people, state this information in an unknowing fashion. She is also likely trying to stay within a particular prototypical role.

This embarrassment is not only a result of having to solve an information problem, but also the result of the actual, live, social interaction taking place. It could be because the receptionist had a routine of making a few phone calls, faxing some documents, and carrying on conversation with the other people in the office; and then the routine was interrupted with an information test. A stranger makes her socially interact with him about the information. This is partly a subordinating trait for her—she wishes not to seem to have more status than she can safely defend.

She remembered who Miss Cole was in 6C. She may know that Miss Cole has made arrangements to fix the window. She may even know the shade of red intended for matching Misses Cole’s drapes, because she and Miss Cole could have talked about these things. If this were true, the receptionist could easily describe, in fairly logical terms, “Yes, the drapes are fuchsia with a two tier valance and the window frame is red. Let me get maintenance.”

Teachers and parents must actively address the informational/resource embarrassment of children. The informational problems of school should be part of a more verbal, role playing curriculum. A student could respond to the class regularly, daily and hourly, to speak of academic subject matter. All

students would need to participate in these exercises and any that show embarrassment, must receive direct one-on-one help from the teacher. If the class heckles anyone, they are to receive firm reprimand. This should be a venue in which to direct friendship and bonding among students to defeat other misguided forms of peer pressure. These sessions should involve relaxed, open conversations to alleviate any loss of empowerment on the part of the speaker. The desire to achieve social empowerment and resource empowerment should be bottled up into one unified learning experience.

The thought processes of a child are tweaked based on the responses of other people. The priorities given to life's many problems are determined based upon successful communications and a child receives the etiquette of life from this lingual interface. Younger people, under the right conditions, will learn this problem-solving structure as being more information-based if they are tested to encourage this type of empowerment.

The next example is of how adult humans generate conversation from the emotion of empowerment and how they apply some of these conversational rules. These humans are not necessarily typical in their behavior (this is not an exaggeration), yet their actions allude to the fact that all humans seek social empowerment from communication. They are motivated, excited, by the act of communicating viewpoints on issues; however many of the approaches to the issues are without firm reason:

Bob, his wife Lori, and some friends, Rick and Patricia, are sitting around watching television. All of these friends are of the working middle class.

Bob gets up to go into the kitchen as the television show that they are watching ends. "You guys can change the channel if you want. I've got to get dinner started."

They reply, "Nah, that's okay," and "It doesn't matter."

The next program to come on is the news. The introduction winds down and the anchorwoman begins to speak, "Good Evening. In the news today, a carjacking in the east end of town where a man stole a car and lead police on a three county chase before crashing into a building and then escaping on foot. There is an all-out

manhunt involving state and local authorities. We go now live to Jeremy Brown at the scene. . . .”

Rick says, “Man, that’s unbelievable. They need to catch that guy.” They all make gestures of agreement. Some shake their heads as they look at the television. “If that fool tries to take my car, he’s going to get run over,” one says.

They all nod in agreement, David says, “And this is about the third car chase they’ve shown in the past week.”

The story of the carjacking continues and concludes. The next story is introduced by the anchorwoman, “In other news, the city manager says that the community of Country Estates will not be annexed and that the property previously deemed as a nature preserve will be sold in part to developers. . . .”

Patricia comments with heavy emotion, “They don’t know what the hell they’re doing. I don’t think they’ll ever get I-54 finished and now they’re playing around with the preserve.”

David says, “All they care about is the rich.”

Rick says, “That side of town is always going to be messed up.”

Patricia replies, “I wish I’d bought a house out there ten years ago. Right now, I’d be selling it and probably doubling my money.”

The story concludes as they move into a new story, then another story of police corruption. “Another police officer has been indicted in the south side drug-dealing story. . . .”

Bob says from the kitchen, “What the hell makes those guys think that they can get away with it? I can’t believe so many people are involved.”

When humans are engaged in social interaction, a void in communication will lead a new speaker to comment as a means of perpetuating conversation. The common, mutual, superior topic of “social interaction” must be satisfied or reckoned away. And in satisfying this topic/task/problem, society has

produced common rules of etiquette that dictate when to speak and of what to speak.

The subjects of this scene seek new topics of conversation that are perceived as suitable to the recipients. They recognize the news as a good source of conversation, and the participants pick their new topics with fervor, seeking to express views on pertinent information/resource topics. Yet their proposed topics are more egocentric, catering to the speaker, rather than being more relative to the news story, relative to society, or relative to the conversational problem solving of other social members. Each presented topic is not congruent with the previous topic. The topics chosen by the participants show an ambiguous method of how to form conversation, how to form thoughts, and how to prioritize problem solving. Each speaker is attempting to solve, at the least, two problems at once. For one, they are making conversation compelled by the empowerment of solving the social interaction problem—the main topic/task/problem. They are also communicating information for the sake of problem solving that leads to empowerment in other situations.

Each speaker's comments move through these two layers of positive-emotion problems before arriving at a resource/informational problem, which, by this time, is of little consequence. None of the information in these communications has real world applications, with the exception of ambiguous opinion forming, which could be used in an informational problem such as voting for a city official.

The conclusion of the previous television show marked the end of a particular subtopic, figuratively speaking, “the observance of a television show.” (This topic is currently subservient to “social interaction.”) Bob proceeded to leave the room after this topic concluded to fulfill other prioritized problems. When leaving the room, Bob offered control of the television to the others in the room. Some of the guests declined because they felt a desire to be passive with this problem solving. This appears to be a polite way of not imposing upon another household—gaining social empowerment from the goodwill of yielding in a social situation.

Rick finds a new topic of conversation in the observed news program. When Rick says, “that’s unbelievable,” he is likely not in disbelief. He is likely referencing the intangibility of the emotional event. This statement has become so common that the dictionary meaning is just a point of reference, and the contextual information must be examined to determine the implied definition. In some instances, the statement actually means that the speaker

does not believe what is happening, but most uses imply “I’m feeling strong emotions about this subject.” He is proclaiming the incident of the carjacking to be of such strong emotions that a true understanding of the event is difficult to grasp. Rick wraps up his comments by describing how he would handle the carjacker.

Rick is empowered by the social interaction of communicating and sharing information. He observes the relative etiquette on when to speak, starts this new topic, and quickly concludes the topic. The relatively understood etiquette of this group, in this situation, allows for one to speak briefly and then the speaker yields to another participant. It would seem abnormal for Rick to comment twice in a row and it would be abnormal for none of the other participants to comment afterward, so Patricia comments on a new topic of “I-54.” Patricia is, in effect, saying, “You have delivered your communication about the topic that you have discovered. You have gained social empowerment and contributed to the main topic of ‘social interaction.’ Now, it is my turn to comment about something and gain social empowerment.” Becoming filled with the desire to be the next leader of the conversation, she rapidly searched his memory to find an opinion about a topic associated with the city government.

Changing topics in this manner is a breach of etiquette. Usually, a group expects the next leader of the conversation to speak of the issue at hand, or to make a mild transition to a new topic if the old topic is close to a conclusion. Telltale signs should be observed by the speaker. An educated relativity of conversational problem solving should be observed. The etiquette established by this group dictates that each participant should think of a brash, quick, emotion-laden topic; and while in this group, Patricia may be granted empowerment with her statement. Yet a more educated group would recognize that the news program produces topics too quickly for observers to comment, and that commenting should only be with more subdued emotion and of select stories. By being driven to communicate, Patricia has inadvertently breached etiquette. She has moved too far away from observing the informational problems in a normal, effective, and resourceful manner.

Patricia is communicating in an abnormal matter because they acknowledge the independence of thought granted to the speaker, and they are likely viewing conversation etiquette with the same general ambiguity. When humans break etiquette rules, they are not usually challenged. Even if a behaviorist or an AI were present, they would recognize that no good could

come from mentioning the breach of normal conversation etiquette. Often, it is poor etiquette to question someone's ignorance of etiquette.

Patricia's delivered information is convoluted. The news story was of a community not being annexed and a preserve that is apparently, in some way, connected to the community. Patricia speaks of a highway being constructed. The highway construction is an issue that is loosely connected, if at all, to the story. It could be that the city officials are spending too much time on making a decision about the community and preserve while neglecting decisions concerning road construction, but this is unlikely. Patricia is apparently connecting two unrelated facts, in a word-association way, in her desire to socially interact.

These participants continue to state comments and reference problem solving in an ambiguous way. When David says, "All they care about is the rich," he is probably not stating a logical, deduced solution. To make such a statement logically would require a stacking of all the relevant decisions, associated with all the relevant facts, of all the verbatim communications, of all the parties involved on the subject matter. A sound review of the information would be needed to conclude this informational statement. Who are "they," exactly? Are "they" and "the rich" in clear association in solving the problem of the community and preserve, or the highway? He is likely being reflexive; he heard the words "preserve," "sold," and Patricia's "they're playing around with . . ." and he came to the conclusion that the city officials are making deals for, or with, the rich (people). This may be true; however, David has not produced any credible connection with this brief comment. Just as the teenagers are often not aware of the background information of their chosen topics, these adults are also making comments that do not have valid assemblies of facts to back them up. It is not that these are right or wrong conclusions, just that they are ambiguous in their assembly. Dave is generalizing.

Rick spoke first with the first topic of the carjacker. Patricia and David commented next on another topic. Now Rick comments, "That side of town is always going to be messed up," and his main purpose for this comment implies, figuratively, "Yes, I received empowerment from speaking of my topic. You have a topic that you are using to gain empowerment, and I'll acknowledge your empowerment by speaking of your topic." He is proposing an ambiguously formed topic, "the messed up side of town," that is ambiguously connected to the topics of the preserve, the community, the highway, and the rich (people). Rick is generalizing.

Patricia comments about another topic. Again, another reference is made to loosely connected subject matter. She speaks of “buying a house out there.” Like the leap from the community, to the highway, to the rich (people), and to the messed-up side of town, this topic is in assistance to the main topic of social interaction. Like each of these proposed topics, this topic is lacking any relevant subordinate facts, making the information moot in light of the “social interaction” problem. In contributing to the social interaction problem, each of these speakers seems to have produced information based on its proximity to other related information in human-derived and human-collected thoughts. All of these comments lack clear step-by-step connections to informational/resource problems. Patricia is generalizing.

Bob commented on yet another story/topic, and treats the elements of the news with ambiguity. Bob is generalizing

The only way to conclusively define the actions of these humans is to observe the act of communicating, social interaction, as solving the specific problem of gaining social empowerment, at the time of that communication, first, and observing the delivered information second. It does not matter that the information is in-congruent because the delivery of the information is the main concern of these subjects. The mutually understood etiquette of communicating is the main concern of these members. When observing the information, an AI would recognize how these members seek social empowerment from communication, and how their life-history developed for the desire of communication. To view the information as a superior topic will only lead to flawed interpretations of this scene.

Since these are humans socializing with exuberance, the AI would likely allow them to speak while it performs little or no commenting. The AI has no emotions, so it cannot easily make valid contributions to a conversation such as this. If it were to comment, it would be to meet the expectations of these humans while not placating their emotional needs; and the AI would have to maintain an understanding with these humans that it has no emotions. The AI could, if requested, mildly mimic emotions, or mimic emotions in the form of the greatest of human actors mimicking a character; however, this would not be in an ingenuous fashion. Under such circumstances of emotional or social events, humans would likely prefer that a non-emotional entity remain silent.

This scene bespeaks the problem with being unaware of the intellectual, reasoned approach to viewing the world's many issues. And these are not even of the most pressing issues that should be given priority. The world's

ecosystem is number one. News should approach those environmental problems with the utmost priority. The human race should move to solve the world's population problem, the encroachment problem, and achieve a point of balance that is sustainable. We are now at the moment where success means passing through a keyhole of decisions and it must happen immediately. This can only be achieved with a partiality to intellectual problem solving.

If one is derogatory and disrespectful to another a behaviorist or an AI would have to record those actions, the verbatim individual parts of the event, as an error in the attempt to solve local and larger environmental problems. If it is an imposing frown with a delivered communication or a implied derogatory imposition with a statement that the speaker might otherwise claim as neutral, unimposing, that actor must be accountable for that profile they are forming. One can seek to gain resources within a mutual system, yet they must not unfairly impose upon others in their quest of status. One can not claim an authoritative position, a status which might allow for some measured form of limited, fair, imposition, unless they are in the true context of such an authority and, even under those circumstances, their imposition upon a subordinate member must follow a strict protocol of acknowledging the rights of that member.

Behaviorists and AIs must form objective profiles for the subjects they encounter. They must successfully judge, based upon sound mathematical processes whether the character, the actor, the human subject, being observed is a net positive character solving environmental problems with a fairness towards others or if that person is too imposing upon others, a net negative character. If, for example, someone in need of resources was knowledgeable enough to gain employment but they did not choose to do so, they would be operating outside the realm of reason and expecting another person to supply them with resources (room and board). If someone is impolite rather than polite, they would be operating outside the realm of reason. If one makes an unfounded derogatory statement to another, they would be operating outside the realm of reason. If a lawmaker trumps parliamentary procedure or a policeman responds with unnecessary, excessive force, they would be operating outside the realm of reason. These failings may not always arise to the level of illegal acts but they trigger a particular response from civilized society to mitigate their influence through social un-acceptance. Many less-egregious failings may be matters of extensive debate and some points of reason may be at the edge of acceptable peripheral behavior, but the doctrine

of behavior formed by behaviorist would have many firm points of reason that are modeled from the expected etiquette of our modern society.

Modern civilization can be considered as collections of groups with a partiality towards educated, rational, reasonable members. When a member is separated from a group, and that member's actions do not rise to the level of a police action with full sequestration, that member is only being denied a particular quantity of resources. As long as all rules of ethics, rationality, reason, and fairness are followed, and the individual is only being excluded from the group for their inability to perform the tasks pertinent to the group, such an exclusion can be considered fair, just, and necessary.

Ed and Maria are sitting outside the front door of their small mobile home with their neighbor, Paul. They have joined together to cook some hamburgers on their grill. Their three children are there, playing with a little push-around car. Their yard is small and just beyond the fence is a small roadway with mobile homes on the other side of the street. Soft rock music is playing on the stereo they have set up.

"So you went to the pottery class?" Ed asks Paul, "What'd you make?"

Paul replies, "Oh, I made a bunch of figurines. I made that bear over there on the porch."

"Oh, yes, I see. That's really cool. It's big." Ed says

"I didn't know that you did the pottery too. I thought those were from your sister." Maria interrupts.

"Yes, I've been going for about three weeks. It's beautiful, the things the teacher is showing us how to do. I made this cornucopia, well, cornucopia once I get it together. I had it in the kiln when I left the last class." Ed continues.

"Cool. How much does the class cost?" Ed asks.

"It's \$40 for a month and that includes so much supplies for the class. And if you want to purchase more clay you're welcome to use their kilns to fire it," Paul explains.

"Yeah, that bear's really neat. You put a lot of detail into it, with the tilted hair and the bow tie. You could probably make a business out of it." Ed suggests.

"Well, no, I only do it for fun, and to give to people. Besides I'm fine working at my job. As long as I make

enough to put three squares a day on the table, I'm okay," Paul replies.

"No big business for you huh," Ed says.

"No sir," Paul says.

They are quiet for a moment.

"Did you hear about the ranch owner evicting the squatters? They were on television showing the police dragging them off of the property," Ed says.

"Oh no." Paul says.

"Yeah, they were showing the owner saying, 'Those people have no right to come in here and plant crops. And with their kids, who should be in school or in some home,'" Ed says.

"Who the hell gives him the right? I hope the squatters have a lawyer," Paul says.

"Well, what the news ways saying is that they've only been there for two years and the law says they have to stay for seven years. It makes me sick, but that's the law." Ed says.

It appears that the three of them are very concerned with the well-being of others. They appear to prefer that the ownership of resources not be so rigidly defined. They believe that the ranch owner should separate some of his resources, his land, by giving it to the squatters. Possible, they feel that the ranch owner has acquired his land by unfair gain, or inherited the land from someone who has acquired it by unfair gain. They feel that the laws are wrong.

Although an AI will not take part in any human governmental decisions, it could produce models on whether or not one decision will produce positive effects given the (specific) goals of the group. Yet, whether the laws governing ownership are more stringent or less stringent according to this metric, there will be a point of delineation between one person having ownership rights over a resource and another person not having ownership rights over the resource.

The governing body has concluded that, in this situation, seven years is the required squatting time, and the owner of land has to protect his legal rights by moving to express his ownership. He has to check his land, every so often, to see that it is in good order, without illegal development, without poor maintenance, and pay taxes on the land. If he does not notice that a

portion of the land is being used for other reasons, by other people, for more than a seven year period, he forfeits complete ownership of that portion. This is one of many ownership boundaries.

Ownership of a resource, whether it is a piece of pottery, a boat, or a high-rise building, is granted based upon all the rules that the group has created to define those boundaries. It is believed that the AI's modeling of this capitalist system will determine that, while these boundaries may not always be fair, the capitalist system is the most effective approach to addressing individual and species level resource problems while also addressing the need to sustain resources into the future. The innovations of industrial and information ages and the subsequent increases in quality of life have improved and expanded human life. The capitalist system works to reward a member who respects a need to solve problems to gain resources. Societies may not have arrived here through fair means, and sovereign boundaries of groups may have settled in unfair positions, and members may have inherited resources without being tested within the competitive system; but out of the warfare of previous generations we have found ourselves in a mostly peaceful and mostly compassionate environment where the mortality rate is much lower, the standard of living is much higher, and those competitive aspects of capitalism are moderated with some social assistance.

The high rise owner has relatively greater resources than the small ranch farmer, and the ranch farmer has relatively greater resources than the squatters, and if the squatters had tents and other accoutrements not available to other impoverished groups there would be yet another relative disproportion of resources. It is believed that the AI's modeling will show that if a society were to distribute all the resources from the larger owners to the smaller owners all world-wide suffering could come to an absolute end; however, this equalizing of resources will only strengthen members through so many additional generations before all of the world's resources are depleted. And a charitable move to end world suffering through resource distribution without addressing the increasing human population may cause a large increase in the rate of human population expansion. Capitalism is imperfect, and the varied quantities of resources controlled by members means that some have comfort while others struggle, yet without addressing the population expansion, the partly-social and fully-social attempts to end suffering will hasten the mass extinction event. The author believes that an AI will produce mathematical models that support this belief.

Children should not suffer. Measures should be taken to assist all children with any food or medicines that they may need, but a comprehensive plan must be established to ensure that where poverty exists, additional children cannot be born without first removing the conditions of poverty. A person should not decide to give birth to a child while living in abject poverty without first taking measures to become financially stable. If someone does not have a consistent access to resources, such as housing, they should be encouraged to not start a family until they have a means of acquiring or holding or otherwise sustaining the resources to support the additional child. If a person does not have sustained employment or is incapable of sustaining employment that person should be encouraged to not start a family. It is not fair to a child to force them to live without those resources that are available to other children, and it is not fair to the human race as a whole to produce a child that must turn to the larger society for assistance. If, for example, a couple with a child wishes to squat on a property to attempt to gain ownership, they must also be prepared to move out of that property with an absolute minimal disruption to the child's development, or they should postpone having a family until they have fully secured the property.

Although Ed and Paul's sentiment is that the squatters should be welcomed by the ranch owner as a gesture of goodwill and that resources should be shared between them outside of the proposed laws, there must be an understanding that the basis of our partly-social partly-capitalist system is that members are to be excluded from an access to resources when they are not under direct ownership of those resources. Just as no one can demand ownership of another person's pottery or another person's toys, no one can demand that any ownership laws be suspended at any given moment. Certainly, people suffer by not being able to suspend the ownership rights of another, but those ownership rights are an integral part of the de facto capitalist system.

One of the children begins yelling, "It's my turn!" and the other says "No!"

Paul looks to his daughter, with slightly elevated volume and tones he says, "Kim! Wait your turn."

Ed looks over to them, "Hey, hey. Be nice. David, is it there turn?"

Paul says, "No that's okay. She gets too demanding sometimes."

Ed's son David replies, "I just wanted to take it over there, down the hill."

Ed says, "No, It's Kim's turn. . . David. . ." after some debate David finally lets Kim take a turn.

"But where the heck are they going to go, with their children? People ought not to just throw someone out like that." Paul says.

"I don't know, maybe some shelter or something," Ed says.

A car pulls up in the roadway and another neighbor starts to get out. The two are talking loud with loud music playing

"Ha, ha, motherf!%#! You better take that sh!%# out of here! This ride ain't gonna last another f!%#ing week before you wreck this sh!%#!" The exiting man says. The words are loud enough for Ed, Paul and their children to hear.

"Oh, great. There's Tyler again." Ed says, "Him and his girlfriend were arguing like crazy last night, at midnight. I could hear dishes breaking or something."

Humans develop into two alpha positions. Some seek the status gained when solving resourceful/informational problems; they seek an informational/intellectual alpha position. With the direction of parents, a child's motives will trend towards the more informational processes needed for this status position. If a developing child is exposed to less exaggerated tone variation (and volume) rather than more they will begin to learn that deliberate stepped thinking is the approach to solving problems. By emphasizing only the greater, newer, achievements with increased tone variation and prompting children to not dwell on more vapid emotional topics, parents not only motivate children to approach problems in a more rational manner they also promote informational/peripheral/resourceful topics over simplistic, dated, social topics. With the direction of parents, offspring seek status among groups that follow this same trending behavior. With the direction of elders, children turn to stepped peripheral problem solving when they become mature; they exercise the skills of reading, writing, mathematics, and higher studies to grow into adults that successfully produce, maintain, and sustain resources.

In the absence of appropriate adult direction, some children seek the status of carnal-alpha positions. A child rebelling against academics,

rebellious against reason, rebellious against fair gain, and choosing violence and/or the dramas associated with violence rather than fair resourceful acts is seeking a more carnal, primitive, alpha position. Their goals are skewed toward gaining social acceptance among similar peers who measure status on a basic emotional scale. When among similar characters, carnal-alphas take on the conversational trends that shun informational topics, shun reason topics, and shun topics that are not of their minor group.

By discarding modern themes and shunning informational/resourceful topics, carnal-alpha characters and their groups are behaving at a level of reason and intellect equivalent to the tribesmen of previous Neolithic periods of human existence. Within the setting of a tribe, a more boisterous alpha male would constantly challenge elders for the leadership position through intimidation and physical conflict. Within the setting of a tribe, an alpha female might cast insinuations or rumors of other females or they might exaggerate their own worth and value in an ongoing battle of perceptions. Without adults dispelling the carnal paradigm with distinct, direct, and deliberate actions, a child can develop into this lowered realm of awareness.

In measuring the interactions between a life form and its environment, an action may be positive if it improves the member's chances, and the whole species' chances, of solving consumption, reproduction, and peripheral problems. Critical problems such as maintaining nuclear materials and preventing environmental damage are tasks which must receive a positive outcome. All members must be in support of applying the reasoning and intellect needed to move towards the prioritized goals of "maintaining nuclear materials with the intent of preventing their misuse," and "preventing environmental damage." Not all members would have to place their attention to becoming nuclear physicists nor would they have to work to reverse or prevent environmental damage, but they must be accepting of the reasoning, the precedents, the sovereign legal authority needed to prioritize these ongoing tasks. All other subordinate goals disseminate from these main goals.

A part of solving these critical problems, in their prioritized order, is to require a level of intellectualism, rationality, reason and adaptability from members. By addressing the more serious problems with urgent intellectual deliberation, an intellectual-partial society separates and postpones the eventualities of physical danger. For our modern paradigm, the measuring of actions as positive or negative involves a recognition of degrees of intellectuality rather than degrees of physical (or verbal) ability because

members are mostly separated from primal living. In naming one alpha behavioral trait as appropriate, we are stating that it is the optimum trait for the individuals of a species, and it is the appropriate direction of child development, based upon the current environment of that child (a modern environment rather than a pre-modern environment).

It is positive for a fair leading group to discern behaviors as inappropriate. If a human does a clear immoral act, another group could respond with a measured amount of social un-acceptance. If an individual were to unfairly impose upon others, by all proper discernment of the event, a society would be just in measuring a negative imposition (a social un-acceptance) that works to mitigate this behavior. It is fair to support the intellectual alpha paradigm over the more primal paradigm (within this formed environment). This proposed course for AI development favors the groups of resourceful/informational alphas over the groups of carnal-alphas.

The resourceful/informational alphas maintain a reverence for conversational rules. A form is applied to human speech because it supports intellectual development and that larger intellectual development assists the species in improving its survivability and its standards of living. In collegiate disciplines, members have developed many methods of categorizing information into subjects so that any person can understand the subject and append it. Information is compartmentalized and given a required structure. This etiquette disseminates from these upper levels of the intellectual alpha hierarchy. In forming points of reason, the leading alpha group moves to shun (politely) and displace colloquial diction with more formal diction.

Certain words are counterproductive to informational/resourceful problem solving—they have been categorized as indecent and they bring about a loss of social status among informational/resourceful alphas. These words assist their users in avoiding the informational paradigm while heralding the carnal aspects of human behavior. In determining a character's ability to solve particular problems within their hierarchal group, an AI would have to gauge the effects and the impositions of that character's use of language deemed indecent by that group and rate the character's actions as negative if those actions oppose the intellectual alpha paradigm.

Some may argue that a classification of a character as negative because of their use of indecent wording or poor diction is unfair, and that profiles should be measured by other contextual information. Some may argue that indecent words have valid uses. Some may feel that a character may be acting inappropriately but this is a result of an unfortunate background. Some

may view the religious classification of indecent words as inappropriate—that those religious institutions have no authority in determining right or wrong. However, an AI, a behaviorist, or a more civil member may look to exclude such a person, sequester or separate them from certain group-offered resources, only because the use of those designated indecent words steers the whole group away from all of its resources. And this exclusion is limited to only a small status designation and a measured amount of resources. It may be a matter of guilt by association, that for some reason these words have been designated as indecent, but the connections to those lesser alpha paradigms aligns a speaker with those unfavorable traits of those sub groups.

Again, as a human builds a profile from casual conversation they are rarely exhibiting a firm profile. An AI can easily change its recorded profile of an individual. A profile can be questioned by an observer in order to confirm whether they are in agreement with the carnal-alpha paradigms or if they have mistakenly been in agreement with that group or if they are exploring a valid, species-improving, peripheral act of using an indecent word. Once these collections of decisions have been ruled out or upheld, an AI or behaviorist can conclude a more firm character profile. An AI may state the possible negative implications of such word use and then observe whether this new awareness turns a character towards more rational, reasonable thought or whether the character continues with those unfavorable traits. A human character would improve its standings, gain additional access to the larger group's previously excluded resources, if it moved towards a showing a concern of species level problems (in most cases) by not using such vernacular.

At certain points in human history, indecent word use was a clear improvement to the group consciousness. In the middle of the twentieth century the trend to move away from excessively static paradigms by using such words triggered new and different approaches to problems. Yet, like abstract works of art or fleeting trends in clothing, the use of indecent language had its place. After the expansions of thought reached a peak, the ability of that indecent language to improve human thought also achieved a peak before receding.

The most negative aspect of Tyler's indecent language is the stating such words in the presence of children. Whether or not such words are inappropriate in gaining status within the upper alpha group, most might agree that children should learn to communicate without these words because a lack of their use is acceptable, usually, within both alpha paradigms. And

AIs, behaviorists, and educators must acknowledge that the intellectual paradigm is the only direction for children in our modern world. The carnal alpha paradigm is not acceptable. If Tyler is among his friends in a private setting, and they all use indecent language, and they all speak with truncated grammar, and they are measuring status based upon the carnal alpha paradigm, then it would be fairly appropriate for his individual success within such a group; however, this group paradigm is wrong, Tyler is wrong, and such a paradigm should be shielded from young children. Society should work to decrease the members to this sub group.

Tyler must respect that children are present and abstain from all profane language. If the children were not there he would still have to abstain from profane language out of respect for his adult neighbor's apparent desire to use the etiquette of the resourceful/informational alpha paradigm. He is imposing his group's paradigm in an immoral manner.

Tyler's use of indecent language, in the phrase, "'Ha, ha, motherf!%#!'" is utilized to improve a status of that carnal-alpha state by repeating an expected statement to another member of that same carnal alpha paradigm. If he were to say, "Ha, Ha, you better take that car out of here!" his friend would lose respect for him because of his lack of profane diction. Such a phrase, devoid of profane language, would indicate that he is "softer" rather than stronger with impositions. Tyler's repeated use of indecent language, "This ride ain't gonna last another f!%#ing week before you wreck this sh!%#!" further exemplifies his desire to impose enough to prove his worth in the group. Consider if he were to use "isn't" instead of "ain't." His friend would probably respond by giving him a strange look. He would feel that Tyler is too stilted—too much of a different group. Consider if he were to say only "last another week" rather than "last another f!%#ing week" and "car" instead of sh!%#!" It would seem peculiar to his friend, to speak outside the norm of having an indecent word placed at least once in each phrase.

"Yeah, she came over here (Tyler's girlfriend) about a week ago crying. And I was telling her she should take her daughter and leave him. That poor girl said she was pregnant again." Maria says.

"Wonderful." Paul says sarcastically, "And one of their arguments the other day happened to be about how they have no dinner to cook." They all begin to exhibit anxious expressions.

“Damn! This bitch can’t peel out.” Tyler loudly says as he leans in the passenger side window.

His friend says. “F!%# you! This bitch got something for you.” As Tyler steps back from the car, the driver peels out shortly, rushing forward. He stops and rolls back.

“Yeah right! You ain’t got sh!%#!” Tyler yells louder. “Go on. Take that sh!%# out of here!” His friend peels out racing down the neighborhood road.

Tyler sees the group sitting there, “What up!” He arches back, excessively exclaiming his phrases.

Tyler’s statements, “Damn! This bitch can’t peel out,” is a little contradictory. The “damn,” as used here, appears to be an interjection just for exhibiting imposition. It almost implies positive imposition, like, “Damn, your car is fast!” but Tyler follows it with a humorous derogatory statement. Even though these statements include strong language their impositions are only light-hearted. These statements do not incur direct conflict because they are either accompanied by light smiles or they are otherwise not followed by stern facial expressions.

The topic choice is vapid. It is juvenile. It lacks a relativity. Since the first exhibitions of fast cars in the nineteen twenties the topic has grown to peaks spanning from the nineteen fifties to the present. Without the excessive indecent language, the topic could be valid, if it was part of an overall responsible hobby. They could not do brash displays of horsepower on a small neighborhood street, but if they were knowledgeable in the subject, if they observed their actions as being relative to the actions of all previous owners of fast cars, they could safely explore the aspects of operating more powerful cars. But any topic must be addressed in priority with all other topics. The way they address this topic is not only out of place, it is little more than a distracting point in the path towards the carnal paradigm. The positioning for carnal status is the more prevalent, superior topic of their conversation.

Different observers of the event will propose different views of whether “what up” is an appropriate greeting. But in proposing an intellectual alpha direction for all people as the optimum path for individuals and groups, in proposing that faddish trends and ineffective variations of common tasks as lacking true relativity, in proposing that variations of common lingual elements for the purpose of imposing a carnal character is a more tribal

behavior than a modern behavior, we could conclude that a more optimum greeting would be, “Hi.” “What up,” is grammatically incorrect. It also questions, figuratively, “What are you up to?” which questions, figuratively, “what are you currently doing?” This might work well as a second communication after “Hi,” but it is a little out of place for semi-acquaintances. “How are you?” would be more appropriate; it would be imposing good will in a respectful manner.

Ed says, “Tyler, if you could, please have your friend not drive fast down this road. You see that there are children around here. Please.”

“A’right. A’right. Old man (slower, drawn out tones). No problem,” Tyler says, “Damn, that smells good. What y’all got cooking?”

“Just a couple of burgers here.” Ed says, tentatively.

“Man, y’all got it going on (“on” is pronounced with his upper and lower jaws spread far apart, creating a large inner space, with mostly pursed lips, for emphasis of emotions). A’right, heh, my boy was asking ‘bout hooking up, wit David. He’s at his grandmom’s right now but maybe he’ll come by some time?”

“Uh, well yeah, just the kids have to be finished with their homework. But, yes, we can try to get them together some time.” Ed says.

“A’right. A’right.” Tyler says and he turns to go into his kitchen. Tyler spits on the ground, and frowns. Ed walks back to his chair.

After a small pause, Paul says, “Hmm,” with a short tone. “I’m kind of glad he latched onto you guys more than me.”

“Yeah,” Ed says, “I don’t know. I think if he doesn’t change his act, he’s going to end up in jail.”

Tyler continues to speak in truncated form. He uses the words, “a’right” and “y’all.” Contractions, even these impromptu ones, are acceptable in speech; however, everyone should allude to the understanding that established communication etiquette should be a part of communication and they should seek to announce words fully in the majority of speech. He should be aware of the outer species problems enough to know that society

will perish if members do not express thoughts more clearly and thrive if members agree to more detailed speech. His group's behavior could disseminate to other species members, then others, and then this predominant group could carelessly attend to species level problems of governing, of maintenance, and of environmental conservation. If society moves too far along this path, it could lead to societal collapse and serious environmental (ecological) disasters. He should not continually shorten words but begin to announce all the consonants and syllables, to show that a clear understanding of the facts should be established before moving on to more informational topics. To speak in truncated form for large portions of conversation is inappropriate.

When he states "old man" in drawn out tones, he is being clearly disrespectful (partly sarcastic), stating figuratively, "I recognize your authoritative position over me somewhat, but I'm insulting you and that position in an insinuating manner." It is almost a challenge of physical combat or a way to test the resolve Ed might have to such a physical confrontation. The "old man" also implies that Ed is not fit to deal with a younger antagonist.

Tyler continues to disagree with informational conversations. He uses profanity again, "damn," before speaking of the resources of Ed, Maria, and Paul—their "cooking." He could have skipped the indecent language to show respect for neighbors who likely do not use such words often, but he does not. Ed and Paul do not question him about the indecent language, likely because it is such a big part of Tyler—he and his friends base all their communication on the use of these words. They are also, likely, fearful of the confrontations that could occur with questioning such etiquette. But the children are impressionable with these events. This steers the children, and the adults further from adopting informational topics. The children learn to avoid information, the way Tyler does, by copying this insinuating, carnal conversation. They could learn to use excessive emotion and excessive tone variation the way Tyler does. Tyler is disrespectful of the need to shield children from such behavior.

"Man, y'all got it going on" lacks an ability to move the conversation to more subdued, more relative, mildly emotional, informational topics. If he were to subdue his inappropriate language and then use this statement, it could be okay, humorous, friendly.

"Bout" is truncated. "Wit" is truncated. "Grandmom" is a variation on the more acceptable "grandmother." At every step in the communication he

looks to thwart established etiquettes of grammar and annunciation and diction. He is not just speaking in colloquial terms but he is looking to warp English in every possible anti-informational way.

Ed brings up the issue of “homework,” likely to discourage a complete refusal of informational topics. He also wants to discourage further interaction with Tyler and his family by mentioning a topic that is likely not addressed by Tyler’s son. Tyler’s bad habits are likely passed on to his children. Since he curses in front of children, his son likely curses from time to time. Since he avoids informational topics, his son likely avoids informational topics also. Ed likely wishes, somehow, to exclude Tyler and his family from being a part of his own group/family.

Tyler should be strongly encouraged to not expand his family. Counselors, educators, social workers, psychologists, behaviorists, AIs and civilized, educated, rational members of society should strongly encourage Tyler, after the birth of this second child, to not continue to raise children.

Ed suggests that Tyler may end up in jail. But what if he does not? What if he goes to jail briefly for doing something wrong, and then he continues to be a part of the neighborhood? What if Tyler and his children and his group continue to influence Ed’s children and Ed must, at some point, try to convince his own sons to take on the informational trending that is necessary for species survival? If Tyler’s group grows larger, dominating society, they could carelessly attend to species level problems of governing, maintenance, and environmental conservation. If society moves too far along this path, it could lead to a societal collapse and serious environmental disasters. And it is a matter of national security; if a population continues to adopt this anti-informational stance, other warring entities could defeat this population. Ed and Paul may wish that all groups allow all members to share in resources in an open egalitarian manner and that a group should never exclude a member; but here they are forced to attempt to exclude Tyler and his children from their resources of food and of friendship. In this situation and in similar situations, an exclusion is an appropriate response to this character that Tyler has become.

Consider a reply by Ed that attempts to deal with Tyler’s behaviors:

“Tyler, with all due respect, could I speak with you for a minute about something.” Ed gets up out of his chair to approach his fence. In private subdued tones, Ed says, “Look, we really raise our children to not use the curse words. Please,

could you tone it down? And we try to get our kids involved in more educational hobbies and encourage them to grow and develop to be nice people. If they hear you getting loud with your friends that is just not going to be good for them.”

“Yeah, yeah.” Tyler says, “I’m sorry ‘bout that.”

“And I’m really sorry to have to tell you, but we try to teach our children more appropriate grammar and annunciation. It is a part of their schooling. We’d love to have your son over, but we really need for him to follow the rules while he is over here and speak.” Ed says, leaving the grammatical lessons for one on one sessions with Tyler’s son.

“Oh, oh.” Tyler says, “Yeah. I got yuh.” His face carries more of a frown. He looks down a little in a slightly angered manner.

“And, and, we’d like to bring over a couple of burgers to you once they’re finished, for you and Josie (Tyler’s girlfriend).” Ed offers.

This might be a difficult set of ideas to suggest to Tyler. It may not work as well as it does in this exchange. But a more responsible group must find ways to preserve its group. And this group must be deemed a favored group by behaviorists, by psychologists, by educators, and by the public.

Human beings are not perfect, and despite one’s faults, all human beings must be treated with respect and compassion, and no human being should be labeled in a permanent manner as being of a particular un-favored group or paradigm. The Tyler of this scene should be given the benefit of doubt that he can show greater respect than he is in this situation. He should be given the benefit of doubt that he is smarter than he appears to be here. He should be given the benefit of doubt that his reasoning, for the most part, can be sound and that this is just misstep of him living his life in this manner. However, sometimes a human’s actions, their choices, will lead to a fair social banishment from the larger group. When someone crosses certain lines of reasoning the larger group will, rightfully, exclude them from a measured collection of resources.

In excluding a person from the resources attained with higher skill levels, society is maintaining a measured intellectual ability to complete the more difficult problems facing the group (such as the managing and engineering of nuclear materials or the engineering of nature preserves). In excluding

students from an education because of their fighting in school and excluding law breakers from being free citizens, a society is at its last option of excluding someone because of their behavior. It is unfortunate, but there are instances where this last option is the only option. It is proposed here that the AI could produce models to support these points of exclusion as being a prerequisite for species survival. Although Ed and Paul wish to include all people in all groups, there must be a recognition that, in some cases, a society must humanely, compassionately, and fairly exclude an individual from a set of resources. These exclusions occur at differing skill levels, they occur at a legal delineation of behaviors, and they sometimes occur along lines of social interaction.

In constructing an AI to look out for the larger species problems in addition to the individual problems, behaviorists must map out points where the AI will refuse to perform certain tasks under certain conditions. It might, for example, refuse to help Tyler to repair a car if Tyler did not obey the speed limits of the neighborhood. It might suggest better ways that Tyler might communicate and possibly refuse to answer certain trivial questions if Tyler asked. In respect to the children of the house, it would always perform those house cleaning tasks needed to show the children appropriate household management, but if Tyler did not heed the suggestions to move into more informational topics of conversation, it may refuse certain tasks that Tyler requests. Unlike the television industry, an AI cannot placate humans. Developmental, food and humanitarian aid should never be withheld from an individual, but the AI must work to somehow preserve the education of Ed's children while looking to improve the development of Tyler's children in an attempt to prevent total societal collapse. The AI must look to improve the chances of the moral, intellectual, majority.

The race of the individuals of the previous scene was not stated. But regardless of any difference in race between the groups carved out by Ed and by Tyler, whether or not one group is forming along racial lines or not, the points in which an exclusion of resources would take place are fair. In the proposed response by Ed, no racial differences were inferred and Ed's exclusion of certain resources, his "bringing over a couple of burgers" rather than inviting Tyler to join the cook-out, would be appropriate regardless of the races of any of the individuals. At no point should an AI, or a behaviorist, or a neighbor infer that one race should have preferential treatment over another or that racism is occurring when it is not.

Relativity

(under construction)

With this chapter I was wanting to express a relativity of conversational topics, that is, what a normal conversation should look like, what should a given species member be thinking of, talking of. That would involve a level of rationality and reason similar to the conversational trends by societies in the 1970s, before we fell into these many modes of the exaggerated, histrionic, media age.