

# Secret Intelligence Service

Room No. 15

## Notes - Extract Diary

### Useful Considerations of an Interpersonal Nature

(C-I)

There are certain interpersonal dynamics bound with the discovery that a person one has a relationship with is a spy. This relationship covers a vast array of types of relationship and degrees thereof and so on, but what are these dynamics and how are they dealt with? This is awkward if considered from the point of view of being a spy, but it is interesting to consider how relationships are affected by the other party or parties. There is a degree of trust that is central to a relationship (arguably), but what does this mean if the other is a spy? Does it mean that nothing is ignored, that every nuance is noted and certain facets fed elsewhere, that by implication the spy is an accomplished actor/actress and there is little if anything discrete? What of the allure that the spy holds? Can this ever override the feelings directed at the great surveillance capacity that indeed does watch and note everyone's behavior? If the spy is close at hand and shares thoughts and feelings, might these thoughts and feelings carry the very character and intention of the 'big brother'/'big sister' thus adding to the allure?

Notes on personal space

What might it feel like to be a 'person of interest'?

Each person displays their own unique characteristics associated with knowing that surveillance of them is indeed the case. In addition, a person of interest to one agency is very likely to be a person of interest to associated agencies

and also those foreign, thereby very much of interest and to an extent that every living breath belongs to 'others'.

What does it feel like to suspect, but not know for certain that one is being watched? The secret intelligence machine that is now in operation and emerging at great speed has vastly transformed society and societies on a world scale, such that it is not possible to hide oneself from its view no matter how one might try.

### Notes on personal space

I am seated in a café and the person I have arranged to meet has arrived. "Good morning," I tell him, with a warm smile. "I am so pleased that you have endeavored to meet me and I realize your time is important. I have to say it is so good to see you at last."

I know fully what he is going to say in response to the questions I ask.

Why am I doing this? It is not always possible because meetings are awkward to arrange, thus very often out of the question. When they are, it's a wonderful opportunity to dwell in my feelings and flit between these and what I have previously built up and studied in depth

So, this is a situation where I am allowed to both practice my skills as an actress and be a party to their prescient and very manipulative character and intention.

What does a wander into a person's personal space tell?

The deeper fabric of personhood is often not accessible, even via warrantless surveillance in its relentless curiosity and multiplicity of probing facets. One could say that often certain important components are set aside for deeper review because the resultant analysis is not as penetrating as it would ideally be.

One dwells in a personal space where a great deal of the personality finds outward expression, much of which isn't revealed elsewhere. Therefore it is a richer picture profile that includes a wander into this personal space. What does this reveal? What does the person's choice of possessions, style, color and condition tell of? What idiosyncratic elements find their way into drawers, bookshelves and armoires? Not to forget the bathroom's 'state of being.' Who else is the space shared with and what is the extent of this other contribution, is it greater, is it possible to separate them, who is

dominant, how, to what extent? Is there a garage, basement or loft area and if so what is in it.

Remember much is known prior to this 'visit' with regard to what income is allocated to whatever and this obviously providing hints as to what might be or is concealed, thus needing to be found.

What is written on the walls so to speak was written in the subconscious and this is very interesting to the intelligence operative. This in the 'things' coveted and wherein fascinations reside.

Obviously it is a surreptitious entrance is the ideal \*\*\*\*\*

Who is defining the book of life as it pertains to the destiny of humanity? The mutual adjustment whereby the most influential

Where does the conception of the future reside, in its form and continual modification?

In continual modification, that which both conceives the form of the future and the collective destinies of people who constitute that future resides in the minds of certain individuals. These individuals are few and exist in a framework whereby the freedoms of the past and present time are in danger of capitulation, thus the future cannot be left to chance.

PSYOP

Dwell with what has power to overwhelm and to dominate by exploiting fractures in the human psyche, literally to paralyze the will to resist.

Our particular focus in this, is upon emotion, though not confined therein.

Can use any weapon? Yes, but we are focusing on one weapon in particular.

Who is our target audience?

What effect are we intending?

Post script to the above. We are working from the premise that human emotion, this innate capacity to feel, is multifaceted and in this, an array of targets suit our purpose well. Consider that emotions are bound together, in varying intensities with regard to circumstance. And I have to say what is outwardly stated is not the inner condition. There is, invariably, a hypocrite lurking therein,

one that fears, one that desires. Yes, the will to resist is not as strong as one might be led to assume, if strong at all.

Do spies now coexist peacefully in society? - a good question.

I shall be brief. I think this is interesting and due certain consideration.

I am thinking of the unquestioned beliefs regarding spies; that such exist behind a veil, are somehow a negative of polarity.

We have all lived together, irrespective of who, what . . . within a societal hierarchy that is turbulent, violent.

However, the present is not the past and the present can be the engineer of the future.

How and in what respect and who is the engineer?

I say that society has 'been moved on', such that new concepts are merging.

The opposition becomes something else. What does it become?

I say it becomes nonhierarchical, non-violent toward the 'new order' that includes \*\*\*\*\* and all else.

We are deconstructing the opposition. We are disorganizing the inherited order. We are invading the entire field. >> We are being included in the individuals lived experience, in this 'new and quickly emerging order'. << We are moving quickly from the veil.

I say consider this in view of the 'whistleblower' - traitor and no other interpretation - who is actually helping to achieve this condition.

I am observing in a group setting, which could be on a street, at a party, at a concert, gazing through the doors of a supermarket, or wherever. There is on the face of it nothing remarkable and there is nothing to indicate anything out of the predictable. What am I looking for?

Street cred intelligence, collection to direction.

We can say anything we want here and show a compulsion to display uniqueness, rather than recite the material of others, so here goes (this was before computers and cell phones);

I can remember years ago (not too many) there was JD. Now, JD was a life insurance salesman. What was remarkable about him, I thought and still do was his skill in collecting, processing and analyzing

information. There was also his uncanny knack, most highly developed, in conversing with people. When I say people, I mean literally everyone and in this, he was fearless. He would walk along a street and engage anyone and everyone whether hostile or not, young or old, likewise in a store, club, bar, sports game, dog show or restaurant. He also kept an Intellipedia. He would take a random sample of people (before moving on to the next), his mission being to discover all that there was to discover about the people in his sample. He became acquainted with strangers such that they would, by virtue of his skills in applying this discovery, welcome him into their midst. They invariably did welcome him and he was successful.

What is the point here? Well, he had no access to anything at all that the current era, multifaceted and massive military intelligence machine provides, certainly not the internet/social media. He would troll up and down streets, note the houses, vehicles, scan the local newspapers in depth for information on who was doing what, where, when. Who had died, who had been born, who wed and so on. He spent hours in the local library and council offices, gleaning information. He used all of this to plan what his direction would be and when I say direction, I mean the type of approach he thought most appropriate to employ.

He once told me, "You wouldn't believe who there is in a group of people. You think they're like us, but let me tell you a lot of them aren't and they do best to keep 'it' hidden."

Not so many of his colleagues liked him much, if I remember correctly. He was overly tall and always wore an ice blue color suit. Actually some would take to running full tilt away if they knew he was likely to appear.

Perhaps the current era in its inextricable linking with electronic state of the art and computerization would scoff at doing this, although I know something akin is used by law enforcement.

There was a great deal he knew about those under his scrutiny and most of these he manipulated into his confidence. If there had been a terrorist or someone leaning in this direction lurking somewhere on his patch, it is not certain he would have become aware, but he would have engaged the person/s and this interpersonal approach just has to aid analysis. If he'd been given the remit so to do, he would have known, I do believe simply because he would have spoken to him/her.

JD was free, he didn't cost anything and his hard work approach more comparable to that of Roman society than the present.

## *Anatomy of a terrorist*

*The question; what are the constituent precursors to attitude, is one we have to consider.*

Who and what are we dealing with?? It appears to me that it is not what is the case that we often contend, but what really is not the case: A DELUSION is a belief held with strong conviction despite superior evidence to the contrary. Unlike hallucinations, delusions are always pathological (the result of an illness or illness process). As pathology, it is distinct from a belief based on false or incomplete information, confabulation, dogma, illusion, or other effects of perception.

DELUSIONS typically occur in the context of neurological or mental illness, although they are not tied to any particular disease and have been found to occur in the context of many pathological states (both physical and mental). However, they are of particular diagnostic importance in psychotic disorders including schizophrenia, manic episodes of bipolar disorder, and psychotic depression.

One's 'life world' consists of varying intensities of personal associations and which could be described as 'journeys that beckon' some of which if taken to the extreme might to some cause major disruption, but even this is not abnormal, rather a condition the apparatus we have allows. A consideration here though; who is to say when and if pathology is the case? What would be 'injurious' and at what point? I think this is important because 'escapism' and 'infatuation' are not the same conditions, though they do overlap.

I would say infatuation is often carefully manipulated and a reinforced state that certain (many) people and organizations engage in because they recognize its benefits. . .to them. I think much of the movie industry's affair with violence and its perpetrators (certain individuals who, in my opinion, are mentors in the extreme negative degree) is a good example.

Some would say that fantasy is a willingness to indulge and freely express novel thoughts thereby it is a creative process because something is created, even if it stays in the mind. Perhaps 'escaping' into this condition might at times apply.

A further consideration might be whether some are actually aware of the status of their thoughts. What began as deliberate attempts to deceive become normal associations. Even at the outset this could be the case, an unconscious drive that fuels a living lie. I tend to think in this situation, most are aware that the persona they present is not theirs at all and they revel in the response they encourage.

Infatuation can involve the process of 'idealizing the other' which is a

taking into oneself facets of someone else living or dead and making these facets what one wants them to be. This might appear unhealthy but when you consider how many actually do this, one starts asking what unhealthy actually is. There are myriad who imagine lovers conferring all of the things denied them, even to the extent of enjoying a dialogue in the mind and/or assuming a role this imaginary other has in one's (or collective) affairs. Is this an injury of sorts, a 'disease' or what is attributable to the infinitely complex, neuronal circuitry, thus a byproduct of it and one we who recognize it have to deal with.

If you consider that all biological life presents infinite complexity. We infer much regarding the human capacity to cognize, it is the genus that subsumes us yet we dwell with descriptions of attributes which do little to encompass what is to us the infinity of its construction. So one might ask what are you doing when internalizing. Well it's much easier to examine the affect, that is, the manifestation of the process though there are lots of theories on what happens within and certain of these utilize sophisticated imaging technology, yet the capacity to dwell in four-dimensional thought with its requisite emotionality remains a very literal 'miracle' if you want to use that word. Nothing new in that but to say there is much that becomes possible in this realm of thought, this personal mental status of the person dwelling among others similar. What is termed 'fantasy', well, anything becomes possible because it's not just a silent moving portrait, but one containing facets which can be very deeply felt, in fact in ways that can become 'overbearing'.

When you say 're-engineered', might not the entire content of memory as it presents, as well as the newly felt and which becomes memory be a 're engineering'? The process of which is an amalgam of many different processes, some not in awareness (unconscious) some symbolic (as in dream states) some containing varying emotions often but not always linked to concomitant experience and these, of intensities in flux? Might an engineering model inculcate a design under our control? I ask because many would not posit control to cognition.

Fulfilling of desire is interesting because it displays the capacity to bring all of these complexities into play but also to bring others too, such as the felt desire to hurt and to kill.

However one chooses to define states of being therefore has to appeal to what is happening with the person and who else and what in the outside world is defining it.

The human biological system which has evolved into its current form in adaptation over eons upon eons >is capable of destroying and loving and degrees of both at the same time.< Even to love who has been killed and vice versa. Human beings are instinctually driven to procreate and to drive the species into non-existence. What be the attributed worth of ornithology as opposed to missile technology? We use our ingenuity most often to design in accordance with instinct.

An interesting question in this context; given the awesome design we carry, it's equally awesome potential to imagine, to utilize language's descriptive picturing . . . how many actually do?

I am in a nostalgic mood. I sit and hanker for the rainy dark evenings, silent except for the sound of the key.

Morse code is simple method and versatile in that the alphabet and the numerals can become a code in themselves, very awkward to encode. This can be changed successively, though doing this made for very slow and amateurish transmissions, colloquially, a 'bad fist'. However, this was not as important and was the integrity of the message.

In its pristine form (unadulterated), experienced Morse operators could send and receive at very fast speed. In addition, individual operators could also differ slightly in their using slightly longer or shorter dashes or gaps. This was what was referred to as a 'good fist'.

Interesting, no!

Making it one of the simplest and most versatile methods of telecommunication changed nearly half of the alphabet and all of the numerals resulting substantially in the modern form of the code

Morse messages are generally transmitted by a hand-operated device such as a telegraph key, so there are variations introduced by the skill of the sender and receiver – more experienced operators can send and receive at faster speeds. In addition, individual operators differ slightly, for example using slightly longer or shorter dashes or gaps, perhaps only for particular characters. good fist, quickly

**INTENTION, INTENT, PURPOSE, DESIGN, AIM, END, OBJECT, OBJECTIVE, GOAL - mean what one intends to accomplish or attain.**

Intention implies little more than what one has in mind to do or bring about <announced his *intention* to marry>.

Intent suggests clearer formulation or greater deliberateness <the clear *intent* of the statute>.

Purpose suggests a more settled determination <being successful was her *purpose* in life>.

Design implies a more carefully calculated plan <the order of events came by accident, not *design*>.

Aim adds to these implications of effort directed toward attaining or accomplishing <her *aim* was to raise film to an art form>.

End stresses the intended effect of action often in distinction or contrast to the action or means as such <willing to use any means to achieve his *end*>.

Object may equal end but more often applies to a more individually determined wish or need <his constant *object* was the achievement of pleasure>.

Objective implies something tangible and immediately attainable <their *objective* is to seize the oil fields>.

Goal suggests something attained only by prolonged effort and hardship <worked years to reach her *goals*>.

In current artificial intelligence and philosophy of mind intentionality is a controversial subject and sometimes claimed to be something that a machine will never achieve. John Searle argued for this position with the Chinese room thought experiment, according to which no syntactic operations that occurred in a computer would provide it with semantic content.<sup>[15]</sup> Others are more sceptical of the human ability to make such an assertion, arguing that the kind of intentionality that emerges from self-organizing networks of automata will always be undecidable because it will never be possible to make our subjective introspective experience of intentionality and decision making coincide with our objective observation of the behaviour of a self-organizing machine.

Superintelligence is defined as an "intellect that is much smarter than the best human brains in practically every field, including scientific creativity, general wisdom and social skills." The definition does not specify the means by which superintelligence could be achieved: whether biological, technological, or some combination. Neither does it specify whether or not superintelligence requires self-consciousness or experience-driven perception.

The transhumanist movement distinguishes between "weak" and "strong" superintelligence. Weak superintelligence operates on the level of human brains, but much faster. Strong superintelligence operates on a superior level, as a human brain is considered qualitatively superior to a dog's.

In plain language, profoundly gifted people or savants are called super-intelligent. Clever search algorithms or the Semantic Web are sometimes considered to be super-intelligent. While these outstanding people or machines have an advantage over average human brains, they don't qualify as superintelligence, as they don't have superior abilities in cognition or creativity. The scientific community is heterogeneous, not a singular entity, and cannot be called a superintelligence.

Suppose that, by some mutation, a human being is born that does not have Searle's "causal properties" but nevertheless acts exactly like a human being. (This sort of animal is called a "zombie" in thought experiments in the philosophy of mind). This new animal would reproduce just as any other human and eventually there would be more of these zombies. Natural selection would favour the zombies, since their design is (we could suppose) a bit simpler. Eventually the humans would die out. So therefore, if Searle is right, it is most likely that human beings (as we see them today) are actually "zombies," who nevertheless insist they are conscious. However, this assumes that such a mutation is possible.

#### Notes

A KGB document, dated October 1975, noted that the Sterns spent 1963-70 in Cuba, during the 1970s, apparently disappointed with their lives in the Soviet Union, they tried without success to have their American attorney negotiate their return to the U.S. The KGB monitored the negotiations and had no objections, since their knowledge of espionage activities was outdated or had been revealed by Morros.

Boris Morros, a Soviet spy turned FBI informant, implicated Dodd and Stern in 1957 as Soviet agents as part of his exposure of the Soble spy network. The Soviets then allowed them to immigrate to Moscow just as they were convicted of espionage by a U.S. court

**Martha Eccles Dodd (October 8, 1908 - August 10, 1990) and her husband spied for the Soviet Union against her native United States from before World War II until the height of the Cold War. She had lived in Berlin early in the Third Reich (1933-1937) with her father William Edward Dodd, then United States Ambassador to Germany. She became involved in left-wing politics after she witnessed first-hand the violence of the Nazi state.**

#### Notes

Can a spy be out of date?

In a certain sense the answer is yes, a spy can be 'out of date' and so, in considering the spy of old (for example of the WW2 era,) but

the interesting aspect here is why the answer could be no. In fact a spy could not be out of date ever.

For example, Martha Dodd Stern (1908-1990) together with her husband spied for the Soviets against the United States and so, from before WW2 to the height of the Cold War. She had resided in Berlin during the early years of the Third Reich (1933-1937) with her father William Edward Dodd, then United States Ambassador to Germany. She became involved in left-wing politics, upon experiencing at first-hand the violence and atrocities of the Nazi regime

In 1957, a Soviet spy named Boris Morros, while turning informant for the FBI implicated Martha Dodd Stern and her husband as being Soviet agents, as part of his unveiling of the 'Soble' spy network. Subsequently the Soviets allowed them to immigrate to Moscow, while being convicted of espionage by the United States.

Apparently disenchanted with their lives in the Soviet Union, they made unsuccessful attempts to have their US attorney negotiate their return. The KGB observed the negotiations and had no difficulties with them, since their knowledge of espionage activities was out of date.

The point being; that their intentions could not be out of date but the relationship between their intentions and their context was.

What are intentions, once felt become and remain the conviction for which spying (espionage) is the vehicle? This same status of the person applies during the present day, though the present day context owns a vast array of what certainly would invite that accusation. I refer to geopolitical trends, current geo-spatial and concomitant intelligence gathering that exists as an intelligence cycle within this frame.

However, the person who intends to commit espionage is not wholly confined to an era's context.

Let's look at intention to commit espionage and see how it overrides the moved on context and could be applied to anywhere within any era. In Martha Dodd Stern's case, the changing framework of Soviet foreign policy that she was informed effectively made her out of date/redundant (according to the KGB:

Intention, intent, purpose, design, aim, end, object, objective, goal; refer to what one intends to accomplish or attain. Intention implies little more than what one has in mind to do or bring about Intent suggests clearer formulation or greater deliberateness. Purpose suggests a more settled determination Design implies a more carefully calculated plan. Aim adds to these implications of effort directed toward attaining or accomplishing. End stresses the intended effect of action often in distinction or contrast to the

action or means as such. Object may equal end but more often applies to a more individually determined wish or need. Objective implies something tangible and immediately attainable. Goal suggests something attained only by prolonged effort and hardship.

## INTERPERSONAL / LINGUISTIC APPEALS, FALLACIES . . .

An **appeal to fear** (also called *argumentum ad metum* or *argumentum in terrorem*) is a fallacy in which a person attempts to create support for an idea by using deception and propaganda in attempts to increase fear and prejudice toward a competitor. The appeal to fear is common in marketing and politics.

**Appeal to emotion** or *argumentum ad passiones* is a logical fallacy which uses the manipulation of the recipient's emotions, rather than valid logic, to win an argument. The appeal to emotion fallacy uses emotions as the basis of an argument's position without factual evidence that logically supports the major ideas endorsed by the elicitor of the argument. Also, this kind of thinking may be evident in one who lets emotions and/or other subjective considerations influence one's reasoning process. This kind of appeal to emotion is a type of red herring and encompasses several logical fallacies, including;

Appeal to consequences

Appeal to fear

Appeal to flattery

Appeal to pity

Appeal to ridicule

Appeal to spite

Wishful thinking

**Appeal to consequences**, also known as *argumentum ad consequentiam* (Latin for "argument to the consequences"), is an argument that concludes a hypothesis (typically a belief) to be either true or false based on whether the premise leads

to desirable or undesirable consequences. This is based on an appeal to emotion and is a type of informal fallacy, since the desirability of a consequence does not make it true. Moreover, in categorizing consequences as either desirable or undesirable, such arguments inherently contain subjective points of view.

In logic, appeal to consequences refers only to arguments that assert a conclusion's truth value (*true or false*) without regard to the formal preservation of the truth from the premises; appeal to consequences does not refer to arguments that address a premise's consequential desirability (*good or bad, or right or wrong*) instead of its truth value. Therefore, an argument based on appeal to consequences is valid in long-term decision making (which discusses possibilities that do not exist yet in the present) and abstract ethics, and in fact such arguments are the cornerstones of many moral theories, particularly related to consequentialism.

An **appeal to fear** (also called ***argumentum ad metum*** or ***argumentum in terrorem***) is a fallacy in which a person attempts to create support for an idea by using deception and propaganda in attempts to increase fear and prejudice toward a competitor. The appeal to fear is common in marketing and politics.

**Appeal to flattery** (also **apple polishing** or **wheel greasing**) is a fallacy in which a person uses flattery, excessive compliments, in an attempt to win support for their side.

Flattery is often used to hide the true intent of an idea or proposal. Praise offers a momentary personal distraction that can often weaken judgment. Moreover, it is usually a cunning form of appeal to consequences, since the audience is subject to be flattered *as long as they comply* with the flatterer.

An **appeal to pity** (also called ***argumentum ad misericordiam*** or **the Galileo argument**) is a fallacy in which someone tries to win support for an argument or idea by exploiting his or her opponent's feelings of pity or guilt. It is a specific kind of appeal to emotion

**Appeal to ridicule** (also called **appeal to mockery** or the **horse laugh**<sup>[1]</sup>), is an informal fallacy which presents an opponent's argument as absurd, ridiculous, or in any way humorous, to the specific end of a foregone conclusion that the argument lacks any substance which would merit consideration.

An **appeal to spite** (also called ***argumentum ad odium***)<sup>[1]</sup> is a fallacy in which someone attempts to win favour for an argument by exploiting existing feelings of bitterness, spite,

or schadenfreude in the opposing party. It is an attempt to sway the audience emotionally by associating a hate-figure with opposition to the speaker's argument.

Fallacious ad hominem arguments which attack villains holding the opposing view are often confused with appeals to spite. The ad hominem can be a similar appeal to a negative emotion, but differs from it in *directly criticizing* the villain —that is unnecessary in an appeal to spite, where hatred for the villain is assumed.

*Why should benefits for certain students be reinstated, when I got nothing from the state and had to sacrifice to pay for my studies?*

**Wishful thinking** is the formation of beliefs and making decisions according to what might be pleasing to imagine instead of by appealing to evidence, rationality, or reality. Studies have consistently shown that holding all else equal, subjects will predict positive outcomes to be more likely than negative outcomes (see valence effect).

On the other hand, some psychologists believe that positive thinking is able to positively influence behaviour and so bring about better results. It is referred to as the Pygmalion Effect.

Can describe wishful thinking in terms of;

the fantasy cycle - a pattern that recurs in personal lives, in politics, in history - and in storytelling. When we embark on a course of action which is unconsciously driven by wishful thinking, all may seem to go well for a time, in what may be called the dream stage. But because this make-believe can never be reconciled with reality, it leads to a "frustration stage" as things start to go wrong, prompting a more determined effort to keep the fantasy in being. As reality presses in, it leads to a nightmare stage as everything goes wrong, culminating in an explosion into reality, when the fantasy finally falls apart.

An **ad hominem** (Latin for to the man or to the person), short for **argumentum ad hominem**, is an argument made personally against an opponent instead of against their argument. *Ad hominem* reasoning is normally described as an informal fallacy, more precisely an irrelevance.

**Informal fallacies**

## Informal fallacy

Informal fallacies - arguments that are **deceptive** for reasons other than structural (formal) flaws and which usually require examination of the argument's content.

Argument from ignorance (appeal to ignorance, *argumentum ad ignorantiam*) - assuming that a claim is true (or false) because it has not been proven false (true) or cannot be proven false (true).<sup>[13]</sup>

Argument from (personal) incredulity (divine fallacy, appeal to common sense) - I cannot imagine how this could be true, therefore it must be false.<sup>[14]</sup>

Argument from repetition (*argumentum ad nauseam*) - signifies that it has been discussed extensively until nobody cares to discuss it anymore.

Argument from silence (*argumentum e silentio*) - where the conclusion is based on the absence of evidence, rather than the existence of evidence.

Argumentum verbosium - See Proof by verbosity, below.

Begging the question (*petitio principii*) - providing what is essentially the conclusion of the argument as a premise.

(Shifting the) Burden of proof (see - *onus probandi*) - I need not prove my claim, you must prove it is false.

Circular reasoning - when the reasoner begins with what he or she is trying to end up with; sometimes called *assuming the conclusion*.

Circular cause and consequence - where the consequence of the phenomenon is claimed to be its root cause.

Continuum fallacy (fallacy of the beard, line-drawing fallacy, sorites fallacy, fallacy of the heap, bald man fallacy) - improperly rejecting a claim for being imprecise.

## Correlative-based fallacies

Correlation proves causation (*cum hoc ergo propter hoc*) - a faulty assumption that correlation between two variables implies that one causes the other.

Suppressed correlative - where a correlative is redefined so that one alternative is made impossible.

Equivocation - the misleading use of a term with more than one meaning (by glossing over which meaning is intended at a particular time).

Ambiguous middle term - a common ambiguity in syllogisms in which the middle term is equivocated.

Ecological fallacy - inferences about the nature of specific individuals are based solely upon aggregate statistics collected for the group to which those individuals belong.

Etymological fallacy - which reasons that the original or historical meaning of a word or phrase is necessarily similar to its actual present-day meaning.

Fallacy of composition - assuming that something true of part of a whole must also be true of the whole.

Fallacy of division - assuming that something true of a thing must also be true of all or some of its parts.

False dilemma (false dichotomy, fallacy of bifurcation, black-or-white fallacy) - two alternative statements are held to be the only possible options, when in reality there are more.

If-by-whiskey - an argument that supports both sides of an issue by using terms that are selectively emotionally sensitive.

Fallacy of many questions (complex question, fallacy of presupposition, loaded question, *plurium interrogationum*) - someone asks a question that presupposes something that has not been proven or accepted by all the people involved. This fallacy is often used rhetorically, so that the question limits direct replies to those that serve the questioner's agenda.

Ludic fallacy - the belief that the outcomes of non-regulated random occurrences can be encapsulated by a statistic; a failure to take into account unknown unknowns in determining the probability of events taking place.

Fallacy of the single cause (causal oversimplification<sup>[26]</sup>) - it is assumed that there is one, simple cause of an outcome when in reality it may have been caused by a number of only jointly sufficient causes.

False attribution - an advocate appeals to an irrelevant, unqualified, unidentified, biased or fabricated source in support of an argument.

Fallacy of quoting out of context (contextomy) - refers to the selective excerpting of words from their original context in a way that distorts the source's intended meaning.

False authority (single authority) - using an expert of dubious credentials and/or using only one opinion to sell a product or idea. Related to the appeal to authority

Argument to moderation (false compromise, middle ground, fallacy of the mean) - assuming that the compromise between two positions is always correct.

Gambler's fallacy - the incorrect belief that separate, independent events can affect the likelihood of another random event. If a coin flip lands on heads 10 times in a row, the belief that it is "due to land on tails" is incorrect.

Hedging - using words with ambiguous meanings, then changing the meaning of them later.

Historian's fallacy - occurs when one assumes that decision makers of the past viewed events from the same perspective and having the same information as those subsequently analysing the decision. (Not to be confused with presentism, which is a mode of historical analysis in which present-day ideas, such as moral standards, are projected into the past.)

Homunculus fallacy - where a "middle-man" is used for explanation, this sometimes leads to regressive middle-men. Explains without actually explaining the real nature of a function or a process. Instead, it explains the concept in terms of the concept itself, without first defining or explaining the original concept. Explaining thought as something produced by a little thinker, a sort of homunculus inside the head, merely explains it as another kind of thinking (as different but the same).

Inflation of conflict - The experts of a field of knowledge disagree on a certain point, so the scholars must know nothing, and therefore the legitimacy of their entire field is put to question.

Incomplete comparison - in which insufficient information is provided to make a complete comparison.

Inconsistent comparison - where different methods of comparison are used, leaving one with a false impression of the whole comparison.

*Ignoratio elenchi* (irrelevant conclusion, missing the point) - an argument that may in itself be valid, but does not address the issue in question.

Kettle logic - using multiple inconsistent arguments to defend a position.

Mind projection fallacy - when one considers the way one sees the world as the way the world really is.

Moral high ground fallacy - in which a person assumes a "holier-than-thou" attitude in an attempt to make himself look good to win an argument.

Moralistic fallacy - inferring factual conclusions from purely evaluative premises in violation of fact-value distinction. For instance, inferring *is* from *ought* is an instance of moralistic fallacy. Moralistic fallacy is the inverse of naturalistic fallacy defined below.

Moving the goalposts (raising the bar) - argument in which evidence presented in response to a specific claim is dismissed and some other (often greater) evidence is demanded.

Naturalistic fallacy - inferring evaluative conclusions from purely factual premises in violation of fact-value distinction. For instance, inferring *ought* from *is* (sometimes referred to as the *is-ought fallacy*) is an instance of naturalistic fallacy. Also naturalistic fallacy in a stricter sense as defined in the section "Conditional or questionable fallacies" below is an instance of naturalistic fallacy. Naturalistic fallacy is the inverse of moralistic fallacy.

Naturalistic fallacy fallacy (anti-naturalistic fallacy) - inferring impossibility to infer any instance of *ought* from *is* from the general invalidity of *is-ought fallacy* mentioned above. For instance, *is* does imply *ought* for any proposition, although the naturalistic fallacy fallacy would falsely declare such an inference invalid. Naturalistic fallacy fallacy is an instance of argument from fallacy.

Nirvana fallacy (perfect solution fallacy) - when solutions to problems are rejected because they are not perfect.

*Onus probandi* - from Latin "onus probandi incumbit ei qui dicit, non ei qui negat" the burden of proof is on the person who makes the claim, not on the person who denies (or

questions the claim). It is a particular case of the "argumentum ad ignorantiam" fallacy, here the burden is shifted on the person defending against the assertion.

### **Petitio principii**

*Post hoc ergo propter hoc* Latin for "after this, therefore because of this" (faulty cause/effect, coincidental correlation, correlation without causation) - X happened then Y happened; therefore X caused Y. The Loch Ness Monster has been seen in this loch. Something tipped our boat over; it's obviously the Loch Ness Monster.

Proof by verbosity (*argumentum verbosium*, proof by intimidation) - submission of others to an argument too complex and verbose to reasonably deal with in all its intimate details.

Prosecutor's fallacy - a low probability of false matches does not mean a low probability of some false match being found.

Psychologist's fallacy - an observer presupposes the objectivity of his own perspective when analysing a behavioural event.

Red herring - a speaker attempts to distract an audience by deviating from the topic at hand by introducing a separate argument which the speaker believes will be easier to speak to.

Referential fallacy - assuming all words refer to existing things and that the meaning of words reside within the things they refer to, as opposed to words possibly referring no real object or that the meaning of words often comes from how we use them.

Regression fallacy - ascribes cause where none exists. The flaw is failing to account for natural fluctuations. It is frequently a special kind of the *post hoc*

Reification (hypostatization) - a fallacy of ambiguity, when an abstraction (abstract belief or hypothetical construct) is treated as if it were a concrete, real event or physical entity. In other words, it is the error of treating as a "real thing" something which is not a real thing, but merely an idea.

Retrospective determinism - the argument that because some event has occurred, its occurrence must have been inevitable beforehand.

Shotgun argumentation - the arguer offers such a large number of arguments for their position that the opponent can't possibly respond to all of them.

Special pleading - where a proponent of a position attempts to cite something as an exemption to a generally accepted rule or principle without justifying the exemption.

Wrong direction - cause and effect are reversed. The cause is said to be the effect and vice versa.<sup>[40]</sup>

Personal attacks (Argumentum ad hominem) - the evasion of the actual topic by directing the attack at your opponent.

Faulty generalizations

Faulty generalizations - reach a conclusion from weak premises. Unlike fallacies of relevance, in fallacies of defective induction, the premises are related to the conclusions yet only weakly buttress the conclusions. A faulty generalization is thus produced

Notes on interpersonal space

So here I am, sitting and waiting for \*\*\*\*\* to appear, such is his pattern along with the group of three who sit together. \*\*\*\*\*. However, I am a half hour early so the polystyrene bucket of coffee in front of me is a welcome friend, though not too welcome as coffee makes me pee quite profusely.

Because I am here I can flit between the conversations taking place around me, and do so while making notes on my laptop and seeming occupied in the process.

I always think that conversations are interesting in the amount of faulty generalizations made and semantic nonsense spoken as though it was meaningful. To me, a person attune to the where's and wherefores of people with a particular reason for being so, I feel like making a few notes regarding why much of what is being said is, and I shall quote Mr. Spock, "It's not logical." Though to us, it is very useful because in a psychological sense we do it to aid our objectives.

Also while here and in my analysis to offer the proposal, 'know yourself in the process of doing so". I mean, what applies to others

can also apply to me. I am not immune to doing the same things and as long as I understand their use, can employ them to advantage, just as I said we do.

I shall say again as I enjoy repeating myself that when I listen (and watch), it's good to understand (or try to understand) the *appeals* that people make. I am in the people industry after all. This is why I am here.

By 'appeals' I shall say do reside certain logical 'fallacies' (delusions) which use the recipient's emotions (could call them suckers if you like) to score points/win an argument. I shall focus on emotions though emotions are not the only appeal, though there are quite a number and I have time so will list some of them.

Obviously with using emotion there is an appeal to subjectivity and in this, influencing subsequent reasoning.

#### **IMPORTANT CONSIDERATIONS**

Fear (*argumentum terrorem*) is where a person attempts to create support for an idea by using deception and propaganda in attempts to increase fear and prejudice toward a competitor.

Flattery (not flatulence) is where which a person uses excessive compliments in an attempt to win support for his/her side. Flattery often hides the true intent of a proposal. It is a cunning form of appeal to consequences, since the audience is subject to be flattered as long as they comply with the flatterer. This is why we use it, yes!

Consequence (*argumentum ad consequentiam*) is where the desirability of a consequence does not make it true. Premises (statements) often presented lead to desirable or undesirable consequences, thus emotion is the appeal.

Pity (*argumentum ad misericordiam*) is where a person tries to win support for an argument or idea by exploiting his or her opponent's feelings of pity or guilt, thus a very specific and powerful appeal to emotion.

Spite (***argumentum ad odium***) is where a person attempts to win favor for an argument by exploiting existing feelings of bitterness/spite, in the opposing party. It is an attempt to sway the other/s emotionally by associating a hate figure/s with opposition to the speaker's argument

The 'ad hominem' can be a similar appeal to a negative emotion, but different in that it criticizes the villain in an appeal to spite, where hatred for the villain is assumed.

**Ridicule (appeal to mockery)** is where a person presents an opponent's argument as being absurd, stupid, or in any way comical, to the specific end of a foregone conclusion that the argument lacks any substance which would merit consideration.

Wishful thinking is the establishing of beliefs and making decisions according to what might be pleasing to imagine instead of by appealing to evidence or to reality.

I can continue this later because there is a great deal more to say and think of with regard to \*\*\*\*\* is in the parking lot. I shall focus on her now.

In logic, appeal to consequences refers only to arguments that assert a conclusion's truth value (*true or false*) without regard to the formal preservation of the truth from the premises; appeal to consequences does not refer to arguments that address a premise's consequential desirability (*good or bad, or right or wrong*) instead of its truth value. Therefore, an argument based on appeal to consequences is valid in long-term decision making (which discusses possibilities that do not exist yet in the present) and abstract ethics, and in fact such arguments are the cornerstones of many moral theories, particularly related to consequentialism.

An **appeal to pity** (also called *argumentum ad misericordiam* or **the Galileo argument**) is a fallacy in which someone tries to win support for an argument or idea by exploiting his or her opponent's feelings of pity or guilt. It is a specific kind of appeal to emotion

**Appeal to ridicule** (also called **appeal to mockery** or the **horse laugh**<sup>[1]</sup>), is an informal fallacy which presents an opponent's argument as absurd, ridiculous, or in any way humorous, to the specific end of a foregone conclusion that the argument lacks any substance which would merit consideration.

An **appeal to spite** (also called *argumentum ad odium*)<sup>[1]</sup> is a fallacy in which someone attempts to win favour for an argument by exploiting existing feelings of bitterness, spite, or schadenfreude in the opposing party. It is an attempt to sway the audience emotionally by associating a hate-figure with opposition to the speaker's argument.

Fallacious ad hominem arguments which attack villains holding the opposing view are often confused with appeals to spite. The ad hominem can be a similar appeal to a negative emotion,

but differs from it in *directly criticizing* the villain —that is unnecessary in an appeal to spite, where hatred for the villain is assumed.

Wishful thinking is the formation of beliefs and making decisions according to what might be pleasing to imagine instead of by appealing to evidence, rationality, or reality. Studies have consistently shown that holding all else equal, subjects will predict positive outcomes to be more likely than negative outcomes (see valence effect).

On the other hand, some psychologists believe that positive thinking is able to positively influence behaviour and so bring about better results. They call it Pygmalion Effect.

Christopher Booker described wishful thinking in terms of

the fantasy cycle - a pattern that recurs in personal lives, in politics, in history - and in storytelling. When we embark on a course of action which is unconsciously driven by wishful thinking, all may seem to go well for a time, in what may be called the "dream stage". But because this make-believe can never be reconciled with reality, it leads to a "frustration stage" as things start to go wrong, prompting a more determined effort to keep the fantasy in being. As reality presses in, it leads to a "nightmare stage" as everything goes wrong, culminating in an "explosion into reality", when the fantasy finally falls apart.

An ***ad hominem*** (Latin for "to the man" or "to the person" short for ***argumentum ad hominem***, is an argument made personally against an opponent instead of against their argument. *Ad hominem* reasoning is normally described as an informal fallacy, more precisely an irrelevance.

### **Informal fallacies**

Informal fallacies - arguments that are deceptive for reasons other than structural (formal) flaws and which usually require examination of the argument's content.

Argument from ignorance (appeal to ignorance, *argumentum ad ignorantiam*) - assuming that a claim is true (or false) because it has not been proven false (true) or cannot be proven false (true).

Argument from (personal) incredulity (divine fallacy, appeal to common sense) - I cannot imagine how this could be true, therefore it must be false.

Argument from repetition (*argumentum ad nauseam*) - signifies that it has been discussed extensively until nobody cares to discuss it anymore.

Argument from silence (*argumentum e silentio*) - where the conclusion is based on the absence of evidence, rather than the existence of evidence.

Argumentum verbosium - See Proof by verbosity, below.

Begging the question (*petitio principii*) - providing what is essentially the conclusion of the argument as a premise.

(Shifting the) - Burden of proof (see - *onus probandi*) - I need not prove my claim, you must prove it is false.

Circular reasoning - when the reasoner begins with what he or she is trying to end up with; sometimes called *assuming the conclusion*.

Circular cause and consequence - where the consequence of the phenomenon is claimed to be its root cause.

Continuum fallacy (fallacy of the beard, line-drawing fallacy, sorites fallacy, fallacy of the heap, bald man fallacy) - improperly rejecting a claim for being imprecise.

### **Correlative-based fallacies**

Correlation proves causation (*cum hoc ergo propter hoc*) - a faulty assumption that correlation between two variables implies that one causes the other.

Suppressed correlative - where a correlative is redefined so that one alternative is made impossible.

Equivocation - the misleading use of a term with more than one meaning (by glossing over which meaning is intended at a particular time).

Ambiguous middle term - a common ambiguity in syllogisms in which the middle term is equivocated.

Ecological fallacy - inferences about the nature of specific individuals are based solely upon aggregate statistics collected for the group to which those individuals belong.

Etymological fallacy - which reasons that the original or historical meaning of a word or phrase is necessarily similar to its actual present-day meaning.

Fallacy of composition - assuming that something true of part of a whole must also be true of the whole.

Fallacy of division - assuming that something true of a thing must also be true of all or some of its parts.

False dilemma (false dichotomy, fallacy of bifurcation, black-or-white fallacy) - two alternative statements are held to be the only possible options, when in reality there are more.

If-by-whiskey - an argument that supports both sides of an issue by using terms that are selectively emotionally sensitive.

Fallacy of many questions (complex question, fallacy of presupposition, loaded question, *plurium interrogatorum*) - someone asks a question that presupposes something that has not been proven or accepted by all the people involved. This fallacy is often used rhetorically, so that the question limits direct replies to those that serve the questioner's agenda.

Ludic fallacy - the belief that the outcomes of non-regulated random occurrences can be encapsulated by a statistic; a failure to take into account unknown unknowns in determining the probability of events taking place.

Fallacy of the single cause (causal oversimplification) - it is assumed that there is one, simple cause of an outcome when in reality it may have been caused by a number of only jointly sufficient causes.

False attribution - an advocate appeals to an irrelevant, unqualified, unidentified, biased or fabricated source in support of an argument.

Fallacy of quoting out of context (contextomy) - refers to the selective excerpting of words from their original context in a way that distorts the source's intended meaning.

False authority (single authority) - using an expert of dubious credentials and/or using only one opinion to sell a product or idea. Related to the appeal to authority

Argument to moderation (false compromise, middle ground, fallacy of the mean) - assuming that the compromise between two positions is always correct.

Gambler's fallacy - the incorrect belief that separate, independent events can affect the likelihood of another random event. If a coin flip lands on heads 10 times in a row, the belief that it is "due to land on tails" is incorrect.

Hedging - using words with ambiguous meanings, then changing the meaning of them later.

Historian's fallacy - occurs when one assumes that decision makers of the past viewed events from the same perspective and having the same information as those subsequently analysing the decision. (Not to be confused with presentism, which is a mode of historical analysis in which present-day ideas, such as moral standards, are projected into the past.)

Homunculus fallacy - where a "middle-man" is used for explanation, this sometimes leads to regressive middle-men. Explains without actually explaining the real nature of a function or a process. Instead, it explains the concept in terms of the concept itself, without first defining or explaining the original concept. Explaining thought as something produced by a little thinker, a sort of homunculus inside the head, merely explains it as another kind of thinking (as different but the same).<sup>[31]</sup>

Inflation of conflict - The experts of a field of knowledge disagree on a certain point, so the scholars must know nothing, and therefore the legitimacy of their entire field is put to question.

Incomplete comparison - in which insufficient information is provided to make a complete comparison.

Inconsistent comparison - where different methods of comparison are used, leaving one with a false impression of the whole comparison.

*Ignoratio elenchi* (irrelevant conclusion, missing the point) - an argument that may in itself be valid, but does not address the issue in question.

Kettle logic - using multiple inconsistent arguments to defend a position.

Mind projection fallacy - when one considers the way one sees the world as the way the world really is.

Moral high ground fallacy - in which a person assumes a "holier-than-thou" attitude in an attempt to make himself look good to win an argument.

Moralistic fallacy - inferring factual conclusions from purely evaluative premises in violation of fact-value distinction. For instance, inferring *is* from *ought* is an instance of moralistic fallacy. Moralistic fallacy is the inverse of naturalistic fallacy defined below.

Moving the goalposts (raising the bar) - argument in which evidence presented in response to a specific claim is dismissed and some other (often greater) evidence is demanded.

Naturalistic fallacy - inferring evaluative conclusions from purely factual premises in violation of fact-value distinction. For instance, inferring *ought* from *is* (sometimes referred to as the *is-ought fallacy*) is an instance of naturalistic fallacy. Also naturalistic fallacy in a stricter sense as defined in the section "Conditional or questionable fallacies" below is an instance of naturalistic fallacy. Naturalistic fallacy is the inverse of moralistic fallacy.

Naturalistic fallacy fallacy (anti-naturalistic fallacy) - inferring impossibility to infer any instance of *ought* from *is* from the general invalidity of *is-ought fallacy* mentioned above. For instance, *is* does imply *ought* for any proposition, although the naturalistic fallacy fallacy would falsely declare such an inference invalid. Naturalistic fallacy fallacy is an instance of argument from fallacy.

Nirvana fallacy (perfect solution fallacy) - when solutions to problems are rejected because they are not perfect.

*Onus probandi* - from Latin "onus probandi incumbit ei qui dicit, non ei qui negat" the burden of proof is on the person who makes the claim, not on the person who denies (or questions the claim). It is a particular case of the "argumentum ad ignorantiam" fallacy, here the burden is shifted on the person defending against the assertion.

\*\*\*Repeated but expanded

Petitio principii

*Post hoc ergo propter hoc* Latin for "after this, therefore because of this" (faulty cause/effect, coincidental correlation, correlation without causation) - X happened then

Y happened; therefore X caused Y. The Loch Ness Monster has been seen in this loch. Something tipped our boat over; it's obviously the Loch Ness Monster.

Proof by verbosity (*argumentum verbosium*, proof by intimidation) - submission of others to an argument too complex and verbose to reasonably deal with in all its intimate details. (See also Gish Gallop and argument from authority.)

Prosecutor's fallacy - a low probability of false matches does not mean a low probability of *some* false match being found.

Psychologist's fallacy - an observer presupposes the objectivity of his own perspective when analysing a behavioural event.

Red herring - a speaker attempts to distract an audience by deviating from the topic at hand by introducing a separate argument which the speaker believes will be easier to speak to.

Referential fallacy - assuming all words refer to existing things and that the meaning of words reside within the things they refer to, as opposed to words possibly referring no real object or that the meaning of words often comes from how we use them.

Regression fallacy - ascribes cause where none exists. The flaw is failing to account for natural fluctuations. It is frequently a special kind of the *post hoc*

Reification (hypostatization) - a fallacy of ambiguity, when an abstraction (abstract belief or hypothetical construct) is treated as if it were a concrete, real event or physical entity. In other words, it is the error of treating as a "real thing" something which is not a real thing, but merely an idea.

Retrospective determinism - the argument that because some event has occurred, its occurrence must have been inevitable beforehand.

Shotgun argumentation - the arguer offers such a large number of arguments for their position that the opponent can't possibly respond to all of them. (re - Argument by Verbosity and Gish Gallop.)

Special pleading - where a proponent of a position attempts to cite something as an exemption to a generally accepted rule or principle without justifying the exemption.

Wrong direction - cause and effect are reversed. The cause is said to be the effect and vice versa.<sup>[40]</sup>

Personal attacks (Argumentum ad hominem) - the evasion of the actual topic by directing the attack at your opponent.

Faulty generalizations

Faulty generalizations - reach a conclusion from weak premises. Unlike fallacies of relevance, in fallacies of defective induction, the premises are related to the conclusions yet only weakly buttress the conclusions. A faulty generalization is thus produced.

Secret Intelligence Service

Room No. 15

03012013r15Civtyr

Notes (extract diary) - Useful Considerations of an Interpersonal Nature

(C-I)

Adversitate. Custodi. Per Verum