

ACE (A 'Civilized' Evil)

GVB 2765

Abstract: ACE is a visual art originated and a somewhat sensible speculation furthered attempt to link an unimportant if ubiquitous behavior in Civilization (the complex, largely urban, technologically advanced societies) with an equally unimportant (and much even excessively despised) human need which spawn an evil (anti survival oriented) unaware and hence unmanaged (by those possessed of it) behavior, that in turn links to a diverse, numerous, and important array of objectless (apparently causeless) ills much identified with Civilization and its huge concentrations of population. This attempt, less abstract as it pertains to the unaware evil above, results in a notion of a disease, of a covert imitative behavior ubiquitously though variably (in intensity) distributed in Civilization. This notion of a disease I call FUII (Functionless Unaware Indifference Imitation). If FUII were not unaware, it would directly and convincingly manifest itself thusly: FUII afflicted individuals would observe in themselves a simultaneously occurring persistent difficulty in making what they would wish at any one moment to be important to them as important as they would wish it to be and keeping at any one instant that which they would wish to be unimportant to them from being more unimportant than they would wish. Such difficulties could be said to be evidence of interference with reality formation (its intensity and flexibility) and be a massive source of threat as adequacy of reality formation is extremely survival oriented.

The prime function of ACE is to transform this notion of FUII into an empiricism assault inviting hypothesis on the existence and importance of this putative disease FUII. This Hypothesis is called

## ACE

The FUII Disease Hypothesis. Should this hypothesis ever be made sufficiently a probability by replicable empirical means and in so doing become a theory; the secondary but actually more important purpose of ACE would be facilitated. This function is the development of superior ways to limit and or manage FUII (several possible now existing unaware ways to limit FUII are presented in ACE together with much other also somewhat FUII supporting evidence of an objectless ill's character).

Copyright 2004 by Thomas C. Custer

ACE will do its work in three parts thusly: The first part will deal not with whether FUII exists or is a disease, but with somewhat sensible speculations on how and why implicitly intangible Functionless Unaware Indifference Imitation, FUII, could exist and be defined to be a disease. The middle part of ACE will deal with material that possibly limits FUII and with how the subject matter of ACE came to be important to me. Both of these topics will somewhat support the existence of FUII and its importance (its putative disease status). The final part of ACE will attempt to link FUII causally to a diverse, numerous, and important array of existing objectless ill's, whose existence will thus add somewhat more credibility to FUII's existence and malignant status. Hopefully, reader consideration of all three parts will lead towards a meeting of ACE's goals.

To begin: In the area of our life processes concerned with reality formation and maintenance I assert (imagine) the presence, the discernable presence (to external observers) of two perceptual behaviors, though they are most usually observed together as a hybrid behavior (a combining of the two). A behavior is defined in

## ACE

the confines of ACE to be any phenomenon that can unawarably motivate imitation (not necessarily successful imitation) of it by those exposed to the phenomenon. The first of these observable perceptual behaviors is Ground Perceptual Behavior, GPB, which makes that which it is directed at unimportant/unreal/unvalued/etc. to various degrees as required by that (unspecified here) which motivates it. The second observable perceptual behavior is Figural Perceptual Behavior, FPB, which makes that which it is directed at important/real/valued/etc. to various degrees by that (also unspecified here) which motivates it.

I speculate that the two behaviors are almost exclusively used in tandem resulting in an observable hybrid perceptual behavior that efficiently obtains the degree of importance or unimportance desired at any instant. For example: Using the seminal notion of Figure-Ground of Gestalt Psychology, what an individual might be concentration<sup>NG</sup> on (making figure of) at any one instant would utilize a hybrid consisting of a dominant FPB and a recessive GPB (how dominant and how recessive would be up to whatever motivates this reality formation) which would work together to obtain the degree of importance desired. That which surrounds the area of concentration would exhibit an opposite organization with GPB being dominant and FPB recessive. This opposing hybrid would greatly facilitate the work of the hybrid behavior dealing with the area of concentration.

I speculate that when an observer notices that individuals are paying attention to something (directing their attention at a potential stimulus) the observer is being exposed to hybrid behavior where FPB is dominant. Similarly and significantly for the purposes of ACE, I speculate that when an observer notices that indi-

## ACE

viduals are not paying attention to potential stimuli though they direct enough FPB at them to be cognizant of the potential stimuli; the observer is being exposed to hybrid perceptual behavior where GPB is dominant.

If the reader of ACE keeps the above in mind; it will be extremely easy to segue into the next level of this somewhat sensible speculation. It is my assertion that in the context of Civilization (defined above) this GPB dominant hybrid perceptual behavior (in all the various social environments to be commonly encountered in Civilization such as homes, work places, public spaces etc.) on balance is the dominant behavior (though it, this hybrid behavior, does not exist in solitary splendour as will be shown below) to be observed in its category. This category is observable valuing and or devaluing behavior and includes FPB, GPB, hybrids composed of both, and other behaviors not of a perceptual or reality forming nature to be touched on later in ACE.

It is further asserted/speculated that this putative dominant hybrid is also the dominant part of what I call Indifference Behavior, IB. I assert that IB has three other imitable (they are behaviors as ACE defined) characteristics. The first of these is that IB is multi directional. This means that an observer can determine where IB is being directed. For example: An observer of IB can notice if other's IB is directed at themselves, at others and which others, or at the physical environment etc.. Secondly, IB to observers of it must appear functionless in the sense that the specific purpose or purposes behind IB is/are simply not available for observation however useful or not such purposes might be. Indifference or Indifference Behavior, IB, is most remarked on anecdotally by new

## ACE

comers to Civilization who note the lack of interest the urban so notably exhibit with respect to an overwhelming percentage of the potential stimuli they, the urbanites, are immersed in. The long urbanized/civilized, I assert, exhibit much IB with regard to the IB of others. In general, the IB of others is unimportant to observers of it. I assert that this unimportance, this IB directed at other's IB constitutes the fourth imitable characteristic of IB in that it is so closely and continuously associated with exposure to other's IB. This last makes IB quadrupartite. It consists of GPB dominant hybrid perceptual behavior, directionality behavior, functionlessness behavior, and unimportance behavior. I assert (really speculate) that thus defined IB superceeds GPB dominant hybrid perceptual behavior as the dominant observable behavior in its category (see above) in the context of Civilization.

With the addition of one more ingredient, the above leads to a notion of a covert imitative behavior. The ingredient is imitateness, which has already introduced itself in the definition of behavior used in ACE. I speculate that we are possessed of a 'genetic' predisposition and hence variable need (herein called IMN) to imitate others and in particular to imitate the dominant behaviors in their various categories to be observed in the social environments of Civilization. I understand that a great many readers of ACE will be more than uncomfortable with even the idea of IMN. Coming partially from an 'artistic' background myself, a milieu that champions individuality, creativity, all things un or anti imitative, and as I am also in great need of nourishing my sense of self esteem; I should share this implicit loathing of imitateness, but perhaps because I seem to need whatever I do to be functional, I instead embrace low

ACE

ly, of the herd, etc. imitativensness if it will but help make what I enjoy doing and being exposed to in painting and other endeavours purposeful in some valued way. Hopefully, some significant percentage of readers are also willing to overlook a great deal of unpleasantness if it yields the unfashionable in the arts reward of functionality. For them I present this partial listing of reasons to promote IMN:

1. We share so much genetic material (DNA) with other primates, often observably imitative creatures (the term ape comes to mind).
2. Imitativensness is so highly repugnant to us (consider the word copycat) that I feel there is something to imitativensness, perhaps of a deeply repressed nature (It is perhaps something managed with difficulty by the Ego).
3. This is redundant, but an embrace of ~~awful~~ imitativensness will shortly be shown to make FUII a possibility (imitativensness will deliver utility, rationality, hope). IMN works.
4. Imitativensness is so wonderfully ~~utterly~~ mindlessly simple (instantly understandable), a precious quality that should never be dismissed however incongruous it must appear when associated with Civilization's complex and difficult affairs.
5. Any serious consideration of how we learn and how we acquire our norms and values cannot easily dispense with the role that IMN would 'naturally' play in such processes.

Indifference behavior and imitativensness, IB and IMN, a dominant behavior in its category and a 'primitive' need attracted to such dominance, what forms would imitation of IB take? As IB exhibits much directionality one could reasonably speculate that imitative IB would at different instants be directed at the physical environ-

ACE

ment, at others, and at observers of IB directed at themselves. I am fast approaching the notion of FUII. As a preliminary, note that would be observers of imitative IB would not be able to distinguish it from 'functional' IB which makes it impossible to be aware of imitative IB 'externally'. A relative irrelevance that must be inserted here is that imitative IB must be as imitable as 'functional' IB. The implications of this are not pleasant, but at this juncture are not relevant to the task at hand. <sup>T</sup>What task is this: It seems obvious that this so far purely speculative imitative IB would be functionless (see definition of IB) which could change its name to functionless indifference imitation, but where is the unawareness, the U, in FUII going to come from? Admittedly, (see above) one cannot be aware of functionless indifference imitation when searched for externally, but what would prohibit such awareness if individuals re-viewed their own behavior?

Let me answer these questions in this way: Assuming that those who imitate IB to do so must direct functionless unimportant (see IB definition above) IB in various directions including themselves (see above) and assuming/speculating further that ~~these~~ <sup>the</sup> latter directions must include the IB imitators sense of self; then this sense of self (self reality) must be diminished (made unimportant/less real). Assuming even further that imitation of IB is something, a behavior, that is part of this self; then must not this particular imitation be subject to being made unimportant as is the whole of what constitutes the self in question? I'd say yes. Why should what I said yes to matter?

It matters because as the reader will recall, one of the putative imitable characteristics of IB is its unimportance. This being

## ACE

the case; then there exists the situation where that (IB imitation) which is already necessarily unimportant is made even more unimportant because it is a part of the IB imitators self being made unimportant because of imitative IB directed at it (see above) by the individual possessed of the self referred to here. Perhaps all this is so, but again, what does it possibly signify? It possibly signifies that a condition of a redundancy, of an excessivity of unimportance is an integral part of IB imitation. It is the contention of ACE that this, if you will, exponential richness of unimportance makes it quite impossible for those doing IB imitation to be in the least aware of doing so however much such awareness might be of benefit to them (the implicitly inimical nature of IB imitation is only increased by unawareness of it). Provisional acceptance of the meaning of this sentence allows IB imitation previously articulated as being functionless unimportant indifference to instead become Functionless Unaware Indifference Imitation, FUII.

Before leaving the first part of ACE and its perhaps unposterous speculations, the reader should consider this: If one is unaware of doing FUII; then how could one be expected to even begin to manage it, be in some sort of control of it, etc.? Why such management would be a very good thing will become apparent in what follows. I believe it would make sense to invite the readers themselves to speculate on how FUII could possibly interfere with functional reality formation. As stated above this notion of a behavior, FUII, avoids any possible management by being unaware to those engaged in doing FUII and FUII's functionlessness almost demands that it conflict with functional purposeful perceptual behavior and resultant reality formation. I will touch more specifically on what forms such inter-

## ACE

ference might take further on in ACE, but the reader should consider that any interference in any form with oh so survival oriented reality formation would be a threat to those so interfered with. This threat being without apparent cause as FUII is an unaware behavior, must be aggrandized. It is this objectless situation that renders FUII a behavior that can be defined to be a disease, should FUII ever attain the exalted state of probably existing. This concludes part one of ACE.

In more than seeming contradiction of the unpleasantness sketched above, there is the indisputable reality that most of us seem to adequately cope with the vicissitudes of Civilization. This reality it would seem must fatally weaken ACE's still absurd ambitions for FUII. However, part two will ease this nascent attack on vulnerable FUII (it is so totally intangible and only a mere notion) by indicating how we may have unawares developed ways to limit FUII and in so doing limit its ill effects or symptoms if you will. ACE now begins part two thusly:

1. Limiting motivation to imitate IB (do FUII) by means of using perceptual behavior (GPB and FPB respectively) to make IB that individuals encounter (are exposed to) unimportant (perhaps but not necessarily the same unimportance that is so insisted upon in part one of ACE) and these same individuals make FPB dominant hybrid perceptual behavior<sup>s</sup> where encountered important whether they have any 'functional' importance or not to these individuals. The result of both these perceptual actions taken together arguably should lessen motivation to do FUII by reducing the dominance in its category that I assert/speculate IB has in Civilization.

## ACE

However, the potential weakness of all this 'distorting' behavior, though it is much within our capabilities (delusions etc. are a commonplace of our existences), is that for my notion of FUII and my hopes of making an hypothesis of it (The FUII Disease Hypothesis) and ultimately so much more (FUII Theory) there must exist countervailing forces or needs within us that will seek to limit or indeed end such distortions. Otherwise, the basis of FUII's existence would cease to be. What could some such forces/needs be?

Does it not seem reasonable that there should exist an exceedingly survival oriented need within us that motivates reality formation that exhibits a certain objectiveness, a certain absence of or relative absence of distortions that serve other purposes than those served by rational ego managed reality formation? Also, would not the IMN (putative need to imitate) need to have an undistorted knowledge of the dominance status of various behaviors in their various categories in order to best be able to perform the apparently species survival oriented (however inglorious) function of IMN? It should also be noted (uncomfortably for ACE) that this proposed way to limit motivation to do FUII by making unimportance an integral part of IB which may lead to the deadly U of FUII which certainly would thwart the purpose of such distortions. This form of limiting FUII then remains controversial in the extreme but perhaps some individuals have no other means open to them.

2. Limiting motivation to imitate IB (do FUII) by means of exposing those desirous of or even those unaware of any need to limit FUII ~~of~~ to Ground Valuing Behavior, GVB. What is this GVB? Let me enter upon an explanation which will also serve the purpose of making it somewhat clear just how the notion of FUII most reluctantly and ir-

## ACE

regularly materialized. To begin: Nothing else having worked, I was unawaresly reduced to using what I drew or otherwise visualized in both architectural design and in painting to try and find something/anything about our existence that might be of lasting value to myself and others. What happened then? This happened: I very grudgingly concluded that the result of what I did visually itself constituted a behavior (ACE definition). The particular thus defined behavior that this visual material/art/~~did~~ is what I called Ground Valuing Behavior, GVB. GVB is behavior that values the unimportant (itself defined along an open ended range of definitions such as, for but one example, from simple physical entities such as a single blade of grass in a park to deeply made unimportant matters such as those that are commonly repressed or denied such as fear etc.).

A major characteristic of GVB is that that unimportance which is being valued must not reach the state of being figure (being directly recognizable). If this happens the ground being valued ceases to exist as a ground and so does GVB. GVB is the art that I believe I and many others do (and are much rewarded by exposure to it in the process of doing it and afterward) for the most part unawaresly.

A less than fully rational allegiance to both functionality and imitativeness led me to the position that GVB would have a possibly important function if those adequately exposed to it would then in some sense 'experience' a lessening of motivation to imitate some as yet unknown devaluing behavior. A very messy and exceedingly extended searching for such a behavior finally resulted in the emergence of <sup>I</sup>indifference <sup>B</sup>behavior, IB, as defined and articulated in the highly speculative opening section of ACE.

GVB, a non perceptual behavior, joins the category of valuing/

## ACE

devaluing behaviors so necessary to making sense of FUII. I originally 'reasoned' that GVB could be effective in countering/weakening putative IB dominance in the valuing/devaluing category of behavior because it must use some non perceptual 'equivalent' of a great deal of FPB if the unimportant is to be valued and if those exposed to GVB are exposed to this equivalent. If this is so; then the dominance of IB would be compromised and there would be less motivation to do FUII in those exposed to this less dominant IB.

This might well be the case, but now at a much later date, I speculate that viewer exposure to that (GVB) which values the unimportant or rather that which perhaps values unimportance itself could act to counter and so weaken the imitability of the unimportance aspect of IB. If this is so; then possibly the 'U', the unawareness dimension of FUII, could be compromised to varying extents (the variation caused by several obvious factors unspecified here). A weakening of IB's unimportance would in turn weaken the 'exponential' effect of the doubling (so to speak) of imitative IB unimportance as speculated upon in the opening 'theoretical' section of ACE, a weakening that would possibly lessen the unawareness of doing FUII by those doing it. This lessening might take the form of those afflicted with FUII being more dissatisfied with the reality of much of their environments (self, social, physical, etc.) and even to question, if only casually, why so much is insufficiently important/valued. It also might be the case that even a slight increase in awareness of doing FUII might motivate some slight attempts to manage FUII.

The more probable perceived effect of exposure to GVB is sim-

## ACE

ply that it is pleasurable and the more effectual the GVB and the deeper and more 'concentrated' the ground being valued is, the more pleasurable exposure to GVB is and this is because this exposure putatively weakens motivation to do FUII whose putatively threatening nature must again putatively be deeply if unawaresly unpleasurable to those doing FUII.

If limiting FUII mitigates that which comprises the eventually approaching final part of ACE; then I feel that viewer exposure to the GVB work advertised in [www.SPRYSKY.com](http://www.SPRYSKY.com); can be said to have therapeutic value. If this is so; then I feel reasonably comfortable in calling GVB products (they're fine art prints) a means of delivering an as yet undefined form of therapy, GVB Therapy or GVBT, Ground Valuing Behavior Therapy (an experimental, work in progress type of therapy).

The reader has possibly noticed that the last part of the full title of ACE is GVB 2765. This means that ACE as a whole is also in the GVBT business (reader exposure to ACE putatively results in therapeutic effects in the reader). As is the case with visual GVB, making figure of the ground being valued cancels GVB and so too GVBT. Verbalizations about the specific grounds (unimportances) being valued is also such GVB/GVBT fatal making of figure. The same restraints obtain in my lone verbal GVB, ACE. With great difficulty I discerned at least one candidate GVB hidden though dispersed in the mass of ACE, but I cannot divulge it for the reasons given above. Those of you experiencing any pleasure reading distinctly nasty ACE can possibly ascribe it more to their exposure to this/these possibly valued possible unimportances, than to any merit ACE might prove to have. This possible pleasure might enable readers to be more toler-

ACE

ant of awful ACE. This concludes my remarks about GVB.

3. Consider the common phenomenon of individuals associating with others of relatively like minds such as religions, political organizations, single issue groups, ethnic groupings, etc.. In such associations is one not much less likely to be exposed to a category dominance of IB (perhaps fraudulantly<sup>6P</sup> augmented by FUII)? Should this not limit motivation to do FUII? That such associations seem to persist despite periodical (see human history) high survival costs to their members might say something about the value and existence of the possible FUII limiting function of these groupings and of FUII itself.

4. Consider the unremarked on huge agglomerations of privacy arrangements (homes etc.) in Civilization and in particular those arrangements where there are the funds available to elaborately articulate and expand such arrangements far beyond any need for shelter from the elements. Firstly, these arrangements serve status interests to various degrees. Think how self directed devaluing behavior which is an aspect of FUII must strengthen status strivings which makes these arrangements somewhat supportive of FUII. Secondly, note that such arrangements must radically limit their inhabitants exposure to IB occurring both externally and internally. Thirdly, note how the often suburban and exurban location of prosperous privacy arrangements further limits exposure to IB (fewer others to be exposed to and those few more likely to be relatively like minded (see above)). Fourthly and perhaps prematurely, it should come as no surprise to knowledgeable readers of ACE that the occupants of dwellings least effectual in limiting exposure to IB or in increasing self esteem/status, exhibit distinctly more of the objectless afflictions that

ACE

I attempt to link to FUII in part three of ACE. Fifthly, it is conceivable that the more pricey privacy arrangements allow their occupants a great deal of exposure to supposedly FUII limiting GVB in the form of architectural matters such as spatial relationships and other matters of an aesthetic nature.

5. Another unaware way FUII might be limited is by this contemplation of the entertainment media, a not inconsiderable industry in Civilization. If the products of this industry ranging as they do from violent sporting events to sensitive domestic dramas can be considered to be social environments where FPB dominant hybrid perceptual behavior is the dominant behavior in its category (valuing/devaluing behavior) and I think these products can be so considered; then the incredible number of people who consume (are exposed to) such products, the incredible irreplaceable amount of time they are willing to spend in such consumption, the appreciable pecuniary expense involved in such in such consumption, and not least the scale of the industry itself all should act to support the existence of FUII as such FPB dominant products or rather exposure to them possibly limits motivation to do FUII.

These five possibly FUII limiting phenomena I believe <sup>are</sup> ~~is~~ a very far from complete accounting of ways that we might unknowingly seek to limit FUII. I hope they push forward the purpose of ACE as that which limits FUII must also somewhat support both FUII's existence and importance. Now ACE turns to much darker material that possibly supports FUII. Of course, this dark stuff is the diverse, numerous, and important array of objectless (apparently causeless) ills referred to in the abstract of ACE. FUII is not yet even an hypothesis, let alone anything more (a theory), yet I feel that it

ACE

can be related to this array. Why this feeling? Simply, consider how a behavior, an implicitly inimical behavior, and above all an unaware and so unmanageable behavior elegantly or at least easily 'fits' with objectlessness linked to various ills. If one is suffering from the ill effects of a behavior one is unaware of; of course these ill effects must be objectless (apparently causeless). Perhaps these various ill effects have other sources. They all, I believe, have other explanations. Please go over this doubtless incomplete listing of objectless ills and consider whether or not FUII would have the most potential for efficiently illuminating them all.

What follows often presupposes the existence of variably strong arrays of here unspecified needs<sup>v</sup> (genetic predispositions) within individuals as well as the existence of much varying social environments these individuals inhabit. It is asserted here that frustration <sup>OR</sup> ~~(of all the needs involved)~~ <sup>AND</sup> ~~causing~~ conflict between some of these needs and the need internally responsible for FUII (IMN) is unavoidable (particularly so if no or inadequate management/limitation of FUII is available) and that all the variability of all these needs and of the social environments they 'inhabit' makes for a situation in which easy direct detection of FUII is most unlikely. This difficult situation is worsened by the putative inability (see first section) of individuals to detect FUII internally or externally. With the above in mind consider the following objectless phenomena:

1. Would not depression/anxiety be much if not completely accounted for by the unaware unmanaged presence of survival threatening FUII and also by the survival threatening presence of <sup>VITAMINA</sup> ~~conflict with other~~ <sup>CAUSED BY</sup> needs frustrated by FUII, a frustration and conflict that must include IMN as FUII itself is likely to be limited by such conflict? Also

ACE

see no. 11 this section.

2. Could not free floating (objectless) hostility/aggression be similiarly explained in violence predisposed individuals?
3. Could not many individual's objectless difficulties in managing their lives (ego weakness) be accounted for by exhausting need conflict initiated by motivation to do FUII?
4. Could not commonplace intransigent boredom (inability to become adequately interested even in that with survival value) be accounted for by FUII interfering with and weakening FPB dominant hybrid perceptual behavior?
5. Could not social alienation where a 'distance' is sensed from others and where the norms and values of these others are felt to be valueless, be the result of FUII directed at these others?
6. Could not environmental neglect and despoilation be partially accounted for by FUII directed at the physical environment (built or natural)?
7. Could not inexplicable (objectless) difficulties with self esteem and identity (self reality) be accounted for by so afflicted individuals directing FUII at themselves?
8. Could not many much more serious mental problems/conditions that share inadequacies of reality formation be at least somewhat accounted for by FUII?
9. Could not increasingly commonplace endless objectless 'difficulties' in interpersonal relationships be they sexual, familial, educational (involving both students and teachers), economic, etc. be a 'product' of FUII as well? FUII caused reality inadequacy of others and self would readily lead to such difficulties, particularly in situations further aggravated by a number of the ills glanced at elsewhere

ACE

in this section.

10. Could not the also endless reportage of accidents caused by inexplicable pilot/driver/mechanic error and inattention have much to do with the presence of FUII?

11. Could not the all too common sense of meaninglessness (possibly inadequacy of meaning) that is perhaps a component of depression be FUII related? Consider just how easily that which one would wish to ← but somehow cannot make important enough/valued enough/real enough/interesting enough/ etc. could leave one with a sense of the meaninglessness of one's reality. Could not a sense of meaninglessness then be a consequence of FUII, of FUII not only unawaresly diminishing the FPB dominant hybrid perceptual behavior that helps keep an individual's typical areas of specialization (significant others, family, occupation, etc.) functioning, but also FUII necessarily unawaresly deepening the unimportance/unreality/devaluing/etc. of the vast areas of an individual's nonspecializations, which in making such areas less perceptually accessible to individuals perhaps trying to flee meaninglessness 'infused' areas of specialization, leaves them in some sense trapped in meaninglessness which must act to intensify these individual's sense of meaninglessness. The above ridiculous verbiage could be rephrased thusly: If I (the reader) could but make what I'm interested in much more important to me (achieve possible reality adequacy); would not any sense of meaninglessness that I might have simply vanish? If one could easily think this way; then a sense of meaninglessness could possibly support the value (evil) and existence of FUII.

12. Typically, in my 'prehuman' version of Gestalt Psychology the deeper the unimportance of ground, the more this aids and improves

ACE

the importance/the reality/the value of that which one would wish to be figure. If this way of 'seeing' reality is accepted; then a situation where a deepening of ground unimportance is not accompanied by an increase in figure importance possibly indicates in general that something is amiss and threatening both the individual involved and his reality formation. In particular, this something could possibly be the unaware intrusion of FUII into this individual's reality formation processes. See abstract of ACE.

13. If there exists any evidence that those with least access to possible ways to limit FUII (see middle section of ACE, page eight), primarily the economically disadvantaged, exhibit higher levels of the objectless ills mentioned in this section than other groups and in particular if they exhibit objectless distinctly higher levels of short term thinking, of a need for immediate gratification (this includes substance abuse), and in general errors of judgement (AKA stupidity) than those with more opportunity to limit FUII; then would not this tend to support FUII?

14. As our quantitatively measured species success soars (more and more of us and so much more IB to be exposed to), is there any evidence of an increase in objectless 'AKA stupidity' phenomena (see above) usually attributed to the economically disadvantaged to be detected in Civilization as a whole? If this is so and it is my impression that it is, could this not be seen as evidence of FUII and its importance (stupidity <sup>AND THE BEST</sup> is not survival oriented for <sup>either</sup> individuals or <sup>THEIR</sup> societies)? <sup>ARC</sup>

15. The rise of the information society (semi ubiquitous use of computers) seems to indicate that 'AKA' stupidity is not increasing. This development seems to have an aura of intelligence etc. firmly and legitimately attached to it. However, I believe communication

ACE

via computer allows<sup>those</sup> doing so to much avoid exposure to IB and in so doing enjoy another way to limit FUII, a way also less accessible to the disadvantaged. This possible unaware function (FUII limitation) of computer use might then indicate the existence of FUII too.

16. Objectless overspecialization and obsessiveness: Could it be possible in view of my model (see eleven above) of how FUII negatively affects reality formation, that since the putative presence of FUII requires that more effort (use of FPB) is required to make potential stimuli figure at the desired level of importance etc. than if FUII is not present or limited or even somehow managed, while simultaneously FUII drives that which is desired to be ground to a deeper (more unimportant etc.) level than is desired, thus requiring more effort (use of FPB) to acquire the desired level or alternatively make that which is ground figure; then an energy crisis of sorts is created in the area of reality formation behavior which reasonably leads to a radical perhaps even anti survival oriented prioritization of energy allocations in favor of an inadequate number of those parts of a FUII afflicted individual's life that are most important to that individual and or to society? If such areas are dominated by the different specializations we pursue that taken together are much the source of the efflorescence of species success we call Civilization (a success much facilitated by use of GPB dominant hybrid perceptual behavior, the main component of IB, to help individuals avoid information overload and to concentrate their FPB dominant attentions on their specializations); then is it not possible that the result will be competence in specializations but incompetence (poor reality formation) in dealing with the whole of their lives? Evidence of this would then possibly support FUII.

Obsessive behavior can be similiarly 'analyzed'. Much effort  
(20)

## ACE

directed at a narrow topic that is important to the obsessed and reality starvation of everything else and this too could support FUII.

17. Could not not uncommon obscure objectless distinctly unhappy feelings of loneliness be provisionally laid at FUII's door? After all, if FUII unwaresly devalues both self and others; does this not make individuals feel more vulnerable around others while at the same time making others less real etc.? Taken together these putative effects of FUII would seem to demand some painful frustration of our variable but not controversial need to interact with our social environments. The result could well be objectless loneliness and this in turn would possibly support FUII.

18. Could not the all too common counter productive, Civilization threatening and hence deeply stupid and evil objectless hostile relationships between individuals exhibiting inimitable differences such as gender, age, racial characteristics, ethnic, class, and economic differences etc.; reveal the existence and importance (disease status) of FUII indirectly in the form of an IMN (in the individuals involved) frustrated by other needs opposed to the doing of FUII? Such hostility and the aggression often resulting from it would also possibly reveal the presence of FUII in that FUII would arguably facilitate the dehumanization of inimitable others through radical lessening of their reality and value. Such dehumanization facilitates aggression. If this is so acts of terrorism might have something to do with FUII too.

19. In this dark part of ACE let those readers who are left activate both their capabilities to 'enjoy' black humor and to accept the seeming inevitability of tragedy in human affairs. If they could speculate about how number three of the central section of ACE (individuals

## ACE

possibly limiting FUII by joining in like minded groups) might well increase the potential for the evils touched on in number 18 above.

20. Consider love in its most preferred form from a FUII perspective. Romantic love in ACE terms is but an intense level of FPB dominant hybrid perceptual behavior directed at the love object. If individual's attention to any type of FPB dominant hybrid perceptual behavior is ACE speculated to lessen the dominance within its category of IB and so lessen motivation to imitate IB (do FUII); then could not the vast interest in being exposed to expressions of love (not exclusively linked to the female) be to some extent supportive of FUII?

## ✓ ALZHEIMERS

21. If there exists any evidence that Alzhiemers Disease correlates with density of population; then could it not be that lifelong FUII caused interference with reality formation becomes more apparent as we age (weaken) and if so then this disease supports FUII?

22. Consider the universally accepted and furthered notion in Civilization that infants and children need a great deal of love and attention. Could this not be yet another unaware way to limit FUII by exposing the most vulnerable of us to concentrations of FPB dominant behavior and if so this supports FUII?

23. It is not terribly difficult to see the possible role and so possible existence of IMN in the objectless fads and fashions that clutter Civilization, but what of FUII? If one could say that areas of less intense Civilization (rural areas) exhibit less volatility of fad and fashion than urban environments (higher intensities of IB than rural environments); then the ephemeral nature of fads and fashions perhaps reveals the presence of FUII in that FUII makes it difficult to sustain interest (FPB dominant hybrid perceptual behav-

ACE

ior) in whatever the fad or fashion might happen to be.

24. Think of the huge consumption in Civilization of coffee and other stimulants with regard to the possible existence of FUII.

Would not such stimulants help both intensify and 'flexify' FUII interfered with reality formation? If so; then would not such intakes possibly somewhat support FUII?

25. Finally, think of how interference with reality formation might have much to do with ADD (Attention Deficit Disorder) <sup>A</sup> ~~which if substantiated could make ADD supportive of FUII.~~

This casual and incomplete listing of possibilities that somewhat support FUII and its importance (disease status) concludes the evidentiary dimension of ACE's struggle to complete the discovering of FUII, which is to say to complete the 'construction' of The FUII Disease Hypothesis. Now to the conclusion of ACE.

Does the reader now have a sufficient sense that the reasonings, <sup>(SPECULATIONS)</sup> ~~(inferences)~~ and evidence presented in ACE do adequately link an unimportant, ubiquitous (also dominant in its category of behavior), and very necessary behavior in Civilization, namely <sup>I</sup> indifference <sup>B</sup> behavior, IB, (as ACE defined) can when exposed to also 'unimportant' <sup>AN</sup> IMN, yield <sup>COVERT BEHAVIOR</sup> only apparently nonexistent FUII, which <sup>SENTENCES: UNWASER INDICATED IMITATION</sup> in turn can be more or less ~~provisionally~~ adequately linked to the diverse, numerous, and important objectless (apparently causeless) ills and other evidentiary material presented above that are all much associated with Civilization? If so; then is the reader motivated to treat the notion of FUII as an hypothesis, The FUII Disease Hypothesis? If this is indeed the case;

ACE

then perhaps the chances that FUII should be murderously empirically assaulted (few new notions survive the untender mercies of science) are wonderfully improved. Then should FUII both still be breathing and a theory (The FUII Theory) following such ~~an attack~~<sup>NUCLEAR AGGRESSION</sup>; the work of ultimately developing hopefully exponentially better ways to limit/<sub>(SUCH WORK AIDING)</sub> manage FUII will begin to have a proper<sup>v</sup> foundation. The achieving of such ways is the ultimate goal of ACE.

Thank you for your patience. This concludes A 'Civilized' Evil, ACE.

~~YES~~  
YES FUNCTIONLESS UNWARRANTED INDIFFERENCE  
IMAGINATION IS AN INTANGIBLE, ~~IT~~ (MOST UNPLEASANT  
BUT REMEMBER THE VALUE THAT BEEN CREATED TO THE FUII  
IN THE BIOLOGICAL, PHYSICAL SCIENCE, APPLICATION IN  
AND CIVILIZATION BY THE DISCOVERIES OF CERTAIN <sup>STAGE</sup> NEWLY RECEIVED INTANGIBLES  
EACH HAVE