

About the Architecture of Knowledge

The architecture of knowledge is highly unique and one must add— even durable while in the concurrence with the following: the template is given by the raising up, which is similar and almost equates with the only therapy known nowadays, where the sociopath is being learned to behave more usefully that only follows the principle of usefulness due to the fact that the long-run and a more effort demanding process (action) will ultimately bring a bigger product; the second coincidence is the scale of sociopathy which is a maximum according to the psychological sociopathy scale of 40, where 40 is the maximum. This diminishes the flaw of the architecture remarkably, in order to afterwards build a 'real life' carcass/seemingness... as a methaphory be it as flesh on bones or in the scenario of building, the stages that come after the foundation, be it decor or facade.

In its completion, the sociopath living in their delusion, has the potential and a probability with certainty to dwell in the society.

At the same time the factor that lies the foundation which it has been built upon, work and continue to do so, gives ground to comfort and ease, giving rise to loosely use the same (anti)methods or paths again. Now there occurs an effect of transparency, out of which the other is the illusive carcass. In that process, the recognition of the mirage should become obvious, but the problem might persist in the manner of thirst for something, surrounding the mentioned, and the ones unaware of the sociopath, not to mention the 'willing victims'. The very comfort zone, which the sociopath uses for channelling, though ordinary people use it for other purposes.

As non of us is livin' in a cave, or according to the rules of the jungle, neither be let carried by the phenomenas of nature, but rather more or less use the comfort factors, the whole illusion should be viewed as a sequence of metaphores, kind of like a riddle from zen buddishm: for starters a human looks healthy, vital, successful, functioning in their all manners. The small slight faults accur in the clearest and in the easiest key in linguistics: for example, their uses of a wrong case, a mandatory changing of the meaning in misspelling or a missing of a letter, there is not a mistake for granted / for a falsehood, but a mandatory deforming of a word, up to a point of referring to asemantical elements, which can be self invented (by the sociopath). Asemantics should directly carry the perceiver to the non-existance of the carcasse (not to mention the fascade). In other words, which is very important, at the level of common sense (mundane reason) there has to be a distinguish between axidentally made or due to the lack of education made mistakes and between that of the conscious and willing ones. At this very point, the psychological marking of 40 is controversially helpful, because it is the more perceivable by others/accessible/comprehensible. To refer to the determination of comprehensibility, 'epistemology' has to be taken into account (as a method). Whereas psychologists with a doctorate degree can get insight from the term 'cognitive'. For we are now dealing with exact sciences.

People who do not comprehend or have no acquaintance with linguistics, must be seen through the paradigm of a methaphorical sequence, accordingly: firstly, imagine a glass, in order to see the plaster(ness) of the facade, which is loose, to then reach to the architectural

eclectic dimension, which is out of stylistics / having no one style, having no compatibility whatsoever, which is but a loan, a made up, iconographic random set, for to finally see the carcass or a structural error factors and of course their abundance. Additionally (secondarily) there can occur extremely expanded references between the signifier and the signified, be them metaphores or metonymes, during where the structure is not defective but tortuous/expansional. But in that very case, syntax is incomprehensible to a no – speaking – semiotics *mundane reason* following human. (Presumably, but not by definition, there might occur references, which accidentally, for example due to good parenting, have developed completely logical and acceptable structures—presumably only because I did not dig into it).

In the sphere of mind archetronics, in accordance to the recently discovered brain scans, there will be shown (in the 22nd c.) the faultly entangled ganglions, which come to being after their somewhat long usage. In addition to linguistics they can be seen in motorics as well. In body language, in behaviour(ism).

And what emerges, is the difference of language-biased cultural ethics in a broader perspective, that lies in the common memory of the beings of socium (or in a clearer scale: in the common ground of the united plane of the communication model).

The last is the most elaborate one, but thanks to that, the easiest model to grasp to see the faults of the atomaric elements. That does not mean that the described ethical model is not a dynamical one. But it cannot be grasped in terms of the semiosphere methodical approach. Nor does not it work that way, when speaking of dynamics.

In this case, a computer generated hologram or a virtual helmet (and all the other technologies etc) would be most comprehensible... But the one who writes it, has no knowledge of such things.

In essence, the mentioned model does not have a core in itself, nor a periphery (the ethical model), which means that non of any other elements are more important than the other. Surely they locate in different places, but they do not form a hierarchy. Them being like a floating stock of rules... it's like a slowly, as if a statically floating model, which unexpectedly completely switches the places of its elements, in order to maintain, and again stresses maintaining the equality of the elements. When necessary.

About the Architecture of Knowledge, Part II

Though when detected and they (the sociopath) becomes aware of it or they see that somehow the given signs are not working anymore, they start modifying or modelling the whatever hierarchy they currently use, Or subordination. They use the same defected tropes (of their own, so in essence they can't be called tropes as such), which are the afore mentioned structural error factors. The layout is the same. But in order to remain hidden, they have to alter the model. Ultimately there are limited number of structural errors which they can use, for some are e.g. subconsciously undetectable, and others too obvious even for only *mundane reason*.

They rely on their tools: usually the 'willing victims', using projection to externalise the detected fragment or nature, which surely is momentarily internalised, and presented as a sign of its own with new connotations (connotational coatings.).

At the moment, what is seen, is an even more clearer fleshly bonestructure.

Suppose they are already (re)constructing a new sign or model.

The new becoming, form-taking symbols fade away into a friendly shout. A never-before seen sign, that is forming to become symbolic, but instead gathering connotations and forming one, it would be quite impossible without synthesis, and then disintegrating as if it never was. Due to the instability or passiveness of the indexes.

The fading passing symbol, that actually was a drawn to cluster of connotations from surrounding cultural environment, thus giving it justification and legitimating it in the social construction of reality. In actual sign world, it was a connotations drawing index, which became passive, making it a non-legal entity in the world of symbols.

One of the hierarchy types requires the existence of a child of a willing victim or a sociopath, or be it both. In either way, the raising, parenting, and all the knowledge that is part of having a child, is necessary for this model to work.

As was presumed, the next attempt to disguise the facade was a sign designed to be a chameleon-like, symbolic in its origin, trying to activate an iconic one on the host. Continuously aggressive one, with an aim to cover up the architecture.

In order for this or any other sign to be activated in a host, the carrier (willing victim or a sociopath) needs to have at least somewhat knowledge intrinsic to the host. This requires some unethical surveillance, observation and analysing of the hosts' doings or in the simplest: direct communication. The defence mechanisms against such parasitic doings are: being totally idle and numb, not answering to any questions subjectively and intrinsically in case of direct contact, their own weapon, machiavellism, can be used against them, though there is no 100% guarantee, as one judges by ethical paradigms of a normal conduct and not by parasitic leeching of the succubus.

So the questions still remains: how to shake off the parasites, who without their hosts would drop dead or remain upside down weakly shaking, begging for difference, or drop to the ground with only a skeleton and skin remaining?

Analysis: whereas the structure is more comparable to a semiospheric layout with the core being in its place (as spoken in terms of architecture), the framework is similar to that of the ethical model, as no ethics can be spoke of in case of sociopaths. (ASPD-s have their own twisted ethics, with a model so shaky and tilted compared to that of the normal people, but not arbitrary, as to that of the sociopaths). The framework is semiotically completely arbitrary. To the common sense, the *mundane reason*.

That is the layers talked about. They have worked out, lets say 10 layers, between which to choose from and use as fit.

What a *mundane reason* does not see, is that none of them fit to any structural and dynamic hierarchical sphere, but tries to overlap it, for the purpose to make the dynamic semiosphere immobile (not static).

So the framework/ethical model has to be completely extracted from a (cultural) semiosphere to see them separately, and the framework/ethical model as a matrix after which the semiosphere of an individual, collective or a whole culture follows its dynamics.

The abstraction is fundamentally necessary.

The language-biased cultural ethics model has to be seen as wider, and at the same time piercing the semiosphere, going beyond the sphere, due to the simple construct of it by being historical; (without abstraction it has been the whole of lets say, biosphere, or cultural semiosphere, by definition).

It, too, has its periphery in the essence, where the further elements are archetypical, or as if passive genomes, with a non-seen effect. That seeming invisibility is a cultural and ethical layering, which in its factual immobility is stronger than the narrowminded (and narrower) non-fitting model/layers of the sociopaths, or any model by them, which are additionally wholly seen, not having a single mute character.

Making one mute, makes the whole layer mute.

The abstraction was made thanks to my visit to Finland, Helsinki, where I saw it. In Estonia, one cannot yet speak of this in a manner of objective neutral layout ground. Estonia has numerable tendencies, chaotic even, in cultural, political! and societal sense. Some of which are drastic. The aim of these discourses have to be re-analysed, recalculated, overviewed. The semiosphere is so closed (as mentioned in my published book "572. sketši neljas võte") that it still has no meaning in the western European sense. Politically speaking. These are the non-vectors. And as it is a closed semiosphere (suffocating), there is no meaning to push it forward nor backward, but rather to first become dynamic in itself. Exterior indexes cannot open it. As I stated in the mentioned book, ... one has to read it...

I am so arrogant that I can say I know the answer, but humanities are not supported, the Tartu-Moscow school of semiotics is not supported, so why should I give a solution to a country that cares of a singular vision towards nothingness? In a paradigm shift-speaking. (One simple example is the Cellulose factory argument on the bank of river Emajõgi, which is proven falsely, being not even an argument but keeps rolling and redirected over and over. Another is the chaos in the forest industry-- another closed circle).

Beyond the Semiosphere

By definition, semiosphere has its core, periphery, and that what is pushed out from the semiosphere, as said in other words, is not culturally active, but exists in the memory of culture. Usually the dynamics is seen between the core and the periphery. But seldomly the elements beyond activate and take place somewhere inside. It is rather unlikely, that they momentarily take place in the core, more unlikely that they switch places with the elements of those. By definition of Juri Lotmans' Cultural Explosion, this case would be a major and massive one.

The abstracted model of ethics, when not abstracted, is part of the dynamics and hierarchy; it was necessary to see the elements from the neutral ground in the previous chapter. As a whole, it seems that the most peripheral elements are those which are muted, untranslated, uninterpreted, or even erased. For some cultural scientists are able to restore the erased particles/elements/artefacts. And additionally: what is mute in the common ground, is seeable for a humanitarian magistrate/Phd degree having person, especially to those who profoundly investigate and study a (highly) specific field. Those specialised, are the other of the methodological scientists, who are able to see further and/or restore the deleted elements (burnt books, changed history, see the whole out of a piece of pottery or a tool like Sherlock Holmes, restore forgotten music...)

That is where those people come in need, taking into consideration the two previous chapters (The Architecture of Knowledge), with methodological investigators being more creative and hence having a thicker entwinement of tropes / rethorical constructs as such in an expanding dimension; and with the specialists, who can channel long strings (even to the core) of knowledge/artefact in the lengthening dimension.

The two can have positions and do as well, of enrichening the culture, not only in the context of sociopathic field, as spoken in the „Kuidas mõõta humanitaarteaduste ühiskondlikku mõju?“ (Sirp, 24.11.2017), where scientists, populists, interpreters, cultural critics and journalists should collaborate in order for the wide audience to present what the scientists are doing.

So here lies the answer to the mentioned article, the struggle. First a strong communicating pattern/string has to be established, which is in the article already, a communication model that starts with the scientist and ends with a common ground speaker. When that functions, one (the scientist) can enrich the core, or any other parts and elements, therefore strengthening and enriching the entire culture. Nowadays cultural phenomena are more interconnected and interdisciplinary than ever before. So therefore it is not so much as that despicable economic model that has no ground in the field, but the interlinks: PR, communication studies which is infused with semiotics anyway.

In classical terms there is no 'beyond' or 'beyond' is the foreign semiotical and the mentioned above 'beyond' goes under the diachronic dimension.

Unregarded Factor of Environmentalism

Passive Sociopaths

Whereas Martha Stout, the researcher of sociopaths, prognoses the amount of sociopaths in population to be 4%, the amount of passive sociopaths can be at least 20%. Those are the people who have entirely embraced the utopian fiction of a sociopath; behavioral aspects and a picture painted by a sociopath has become primary, if not the sole. (They are their willing victims: „Sirp“ 26.06.2016 „*Sotsiopaadid ja nende abivalmis ohvrid*“). In this article the definition of passive sociopaths does not exclude passive victims in general, like passive smokers or alcoholics, those who have to withstand domestic violence or are oppressed by a sociopathic boss, but in order to specify the term to suit the article, these cases are not disserted here. In addition, those reading this article and have not heard of or become acquainted with the term „sociopath“, should first familiarise with the topic in a wider or narrower sense, due to the fact that internet provides such information and would require a separate introductory article.

The difference between a sociopath and that of the passive is the level of awareness. A perfect passive sociopath has accepted the whole web of lies, and behavioral and verbal automatisms. The occurrence of natural automatisms is culturally acceptable, but in this case they are replaced with artificial ones, becoming part of humans' manner, even part of ones' personality. In the latter case they are acknowledged and consciously used, a justification and a place in the pattern is found for them. *At this point conscious automatisms and cultural clots are equated as synonyms, and all manners having this meaning are defined as acultural.*

How is it possible that sociopaths exist the way they do in society?

Taking into account that they have no empathy, they are not capable to love, their sense of danger is unrealistic (varying individually, a dangerous or naturally frightening situation brings them excitement, instead of avoiding it or taking measures), their robotlike copying (which is the source of artificial automatisms) is never spontaneous, it has to be recognized that they are severely ill persons. From the medical, mental illness, and neurological aspect: to add here the rather recent brain scans (showing that their frontal lobe is not functioning).

Indeed, the main argument is that it is very difficult to recognize a sociopath. Because of their masks. But what is lacking—cultural non-acceptance: Their so to speak natural, allowed and uncured presence and position, be it leaders in military, in huge corporations or point persons in smaller scale, seems to be accepted and taken for granted collectively. And precisely that is the largest part of the mask behind which they are able to hide.

After dismantling simpler connotations that form their narcissistic charisma, what remain are stereotypes, glimmering empty cultural icons and cliches. And proceeding to the level of feelings and psychology, untangling their world of sensibilities we see, that the entire gamma of feelings is a learned and elaborated acting, that has been acquired through repetitions and mimic. One natural emotion/feeling remains—anger, or simply an intellectual case (as there are several types of sociopaths). What remains, is an observing, exploiting monster, brain mutant, or more widely used term Social Predator.

Sociopaths vs the Environment

They are completely apathetic of the death or tortures of any animal. In addition to human animal. Rather, they enjoy the torture of animals and others. The apathy spreads to environment altogether. That is how some corporate leaders pour poison into rivers with ease, and so on. Not invariably, it is simply their favourite place to be: play with hundreds of chessboard figures and billions of non-real euros. Staying at the top means the endlessness of the game. And here we see another clear sign of a deep mental illness: to destroy their own environment. More important is the game and winning, than rational calculation of facts. Therefore it can't be said, like the definition states, that in the eyes of others they seem huge rationalists.

The forming of automatised behavior patterns for possible passive sociopaths is also irrational: the most important is the final goal; slight sensory experiences or even aspects of slightly emotional internal monologue are marginalised step-by-step up to the point of illegalising them (stating them pointless), because seemingly they inhibit productivity (in the world of a sociopath they do not exist at all). After the product (object, passive sociopath, willing victim) has been finished, they accept the world view after which a sociopath can rather easily place whatever they want there: from the perspective of the current short narrative, mutated sense nuances and sense perceptions. The outcome is a cultural clot that is capable to reproduce itself, due to the occurrence that in essence the positioned sign is a symbol, but with a continuously active referring-indexical rhizome.

Whatever the approach, it is important to state that sociopaths are an important factor in environmentalism. And should be added to the already known list: CO2 emissions, eating animal meat due to methane, by-catching and combing of oceans, the overall polluting of ecosystems (plastic being the first to mention), the balance of ecosystems (for example the well being of bees), instead of continuing the list I just mention the movie „Before the Flood“.

Be it the factors brought out here will evoke a neurological therapy, a cultural systemization or nowadays witchhunt.

The Desert

Sociopaths tend to produce desert. All they are able to cultivate, is mental desert in the context of thought. With a tendency to have the potential to form a (non-)cultural one, having a vacuum of non-existence. Also the single signs convey nothing.

When it invades to reality plane of existence, by the cultivation through their misconduct, the reality becomes that of the void. Simply a destruction. With no perspective.

They just pawn around and try to delete, through the internalisation, followed by externalisation; or through attacking atomic symbolic elements to be deleted by presenting them as false. (Can be a good? job for a lawyer.)

There is no purpose for these kind of supposedly decultivational misconducts, approaches. Their deluded cause is to insert misinterpreted matter into or onto the planned desert, which usually is alive. But that is out of their comprehension.

The supposed outcome would be to lift whatever substance up and reinsert it into their plane of desert, which would then flourish, which already does so. No logical conduct prevails, only a game. To come to conclusion, it (their thought and behavior) can be watched through game theories to the utmost.

Defects of the Willing Victims

Will there occur similar defects in case of „the sociopath’s willing victims“ („Sirp“, 26.08.2016, „Sotsiopaadid ja nende abivalmis ohvrid“) in the long run? By using somewhat the same motional and thinking patterns, their marginalized perception perspective still remains, but the more will it be pushed to the subconscious. This will be replaced by cultural cluts, mutated behavior, speech and thinking discords.

Therefore, I have a reason to assume that those mutations take place in the general cortex, in the holistic system, where humane remains (empathy), but passes through the whole system of ganglions in the cortex (being the first characteristic of a human in terms of brain construction).

When comparing the „victims“ brains with the sociopath’s brain, who’s frontal lobe mainly does not function, the keeping of their subordinates (or pets) can cause barriers. Which they actively express, as in their semiosphere these are the norms. For example too strict correctness up to the specific tricks of works in the manner of specialist’s work. Or for example established normative, which for them is insurmountable, where pseudo-morality draws lines to wrong places, be it sexuality (pseudopedofilia supposedly in the example of K.Kender, up to erroneous misceptions, where marriage is the only norm – for example total denial of homosexuals living together; eating habits, pseudo tricks of works which they falsely want to pass over to other fields.

In turn, from the previous segment it can be concluded that the malfunctioning part of the sociopath’s empathy carrying brain part passes over to „the willing victim’s“ holistic cortex, inhibiting and rather displacing the natural transfers of the neurotransmitters. From that can be deduced, that there is also a reason to speak of anatomical / neurological phenomenon.

Additionally there is a reason to argue, that relocated dominants (signifiers, or taken from Gottlob Frege’s „Über Sinn und Bedeutung“ the term ’Bedeutung’) produce or rather feed the lacking neurotransmitters of the sociopaths, transforming them. Not compensating the activity of the frontal lobe. In other words, creating a situation, where the willing victims do all the work for them. „Thinking is working“ or „thought is an action“ – M.Foucault (the quote is imprecise, but the meaning remains the same. From the book „Ethics“). Different kinds of work can be referred to. Or even to all kinds. It depends on the willingness of the willing victims. Which depends on cultural context and acceptance and tolerance, or in other words being open to or dead to an impulse.

The Fluctuating Mind

What about the random elements that don't fit into any cultural context, floating around in the semiosphere? The attached atomic elements that consume the whole human being. Take its role. When defined, they are not atomic, but anti-symbols which have no origin.

Derived that they could overwhelm a whole, they are bigger than a person. So they are psychological signs. Being as entwined mollusks. Plasms, that leave a person in a state of constant non-fluctuation.

The people who become signs themselves, just are. The surrounding plasm excludes dwelling, character (which assumably was not present in the first place), choice, a selective brain intrinsic to homo sapiens, making way to a corridor of non-selection; forsaken thinking, which is misplaced with justifications of baudrillardistic curtains of a disattached map; misplaced habits, replaced by pseudo needs of non-cultural environment and have a creational aspect, and needs of a non-human.

The wasteland of human trash is floating, statistically being marginal, but according to influence, are significant. The two percent of this makes up a 30% of insatisfaction, despair, anxiety, depression, fear. The pile of s#%t. These are.

Come they will be leeches inside the sociographical landscape, simply addressing fragmented messages. The rise of that is given by the intratextual essence of the nowadays culture, the internet, the instant messaging... That is, a development too rapid for a certain mind to grasp and become a fluctuation.

...A fluctuation inside a plasm. Oh, what a freedom...

...And give rise to the contextual environment to be treated the same way...

A Hypothetical Cure

As according to National Geographic's TV show „Mindgames“ (and possibly in Discovery Science as well), new neuro paths, or new entwined ganglions (neuro cells) can be developed by giving people/subjects tasks, which they have never before performed in their life (e.g. a person has never before ridden a bike); using the same method can gain access to sociopaths' passive parts of the brain. Be it psychotherapy or other kind of action suggested by an acquaintance, referring to proximity of action-based or thought-based and emotion-based ganglions, due to that different parts of brain carry out several functions. ... The whole „Mindgame“ series can be referred to as helpful.

One example: he used to be bad at creative assignments, such as poetry, acting, drawing, dancing, and so he closed that gate. And by doing that, slowly started switching off some emotions that come with creativity. His treatment would be to overcome the awkwardness or shyness that comes with stage fright and failed or bad performance and just continue to perform, until finding at least one field, which he has a bit talent or finds some interest in. The results are not important.

Another example: it is hard to overcome ones' narcissism and admit that he wants to be a simple craftsman or a manual laborer. All that is left from performing and showing shallow skills on the stage, are some poses, which feed his narcissism and continue with the sociopathic manouvering. They have hidden their actual wishes deep inside the subconscious. It is not known why.

These examples have a neurobiological reference: ventromedial prefrontal cortex deals with decision making as well as emotions. In handcraft for example, a person has to make miniature decisions all the time. By that reactivating that part of the brain. FMRI scans has shown lack of activity in that area (as well as in amygdala and orbitofrontal cortex).

THE WHOLE CURE PERSPECTIVE AND MORE ANALYSIS IN ARRANGED MANNER IS IN THE ABSTRACT. This has not been yet published, but is accessible by asking me.

Genesis

Conclaves, models, structures left behind by the real predators the sociopaths, who have co-existed since somewhat, lets say, industrial revolution – which concludes normal, because of a huge reorganisation of social, economical, productional, class hierarchical and therefore psychological global macronarrative – can be or have been picked up by ordinary people, because they are legal, where legalised and have been left to stay idle, and in addition have become obsolete to the true sociopaths. (There should not be a name for these kind of ordinary people, I call them stupid. Maybe they have to be slightly sociopathic as well).

This section departs from the original subject and turns toward cultural analysis. But the more need these conclaves be derived back to their origins. Not all corporate organisations are leaded by sociopaths, who sell sugar, plastic or whatever other garbage there is to sell, in a completely acceptable way. It can be, that Mac Donalds was originated by a sociopath, but does it not anymore. A widespread legalisation followed—that is, a new normative of a new socio-economic model, which exploits the workers, cows and through them, earth itself. Now the exploitation has become to a mutational form, where cows cannot even stand anymore and they are fed corn, which is not natural to them; not to speak of chicken who are taken from their instinctive-habitual behaviors and mutated under our eyes.

Cultural approach continues with a negative assumption towards industrial revolution: the machinery originally invented by, or a factory system, had exploitation innate. A new feudal and noblemen uprising, who are in no manner as such any more by title, but by state of affairs, who can grasp the macrostructures more easily, leaving an ordinary man to be located somewhere in or between the macrostructures. In itself it is not negative, but easily gives way to exploitative manner. Additionally leaves and shows the microstructures before the revolution as marginal (as they are smaller in themselves in simplicity).

Most of the people cannot grasp the macrostructures nor are they willing to. So the revolution took a leap or had a hastening space to which not only humankind could not catch up but also (subconsciously) would not want to.

To demarginalise and equate the microstructures is a logical answer. Here can be concluded another symptom of sociopaths: Megalomania. Which is the product of the rapid reorganisation of all socio-economic phenomena, and can be added to symptomatology as the third symptom, or as a subcategory of delusions.

B-vitamins and support to the myelin theory. (Only in the manuscript)

Do they have a constant B-vitamin deficiency or need it way much more than other people daily and during their growing period.?

It accords to the abovementioned myelin deficiency theory, in which generation B4, B6 and B12 vitamins play an extremely important role.

But also, B1 is for processing nerve impulses, B3 for the development of the nerve system, **B6** for synthesis of neurotransmitters and for myelin generation, B12 for the synthesis of myelin, (B15 is under question but assumptions have been made that it stimulates the nervous system).

An argument was, that this is the reason, why sociopathy has to be taken under consideration and into perspective earlier in a developmental phase than 18, so as to feed the deficiency.

Emotions

They have anger. Yet they have laughter also. That emotion is called joy. But their laughter differs a lot from those of human. It is their egomaniac response to gain, which they can't control. And their gain is usually to twist the opponent, the pray, the victim.

Had a glance thought about cannibalism now...

In case a musician is reading this, he'd understand, or a one with absolute hearing; quite easily, the difference of the tones. Both are spontaneous, but have different sources (different brain locations), different meanings, usually laughter is not deciphered at all, but there are exceptions to any ordinary vision, and has been mentioned just. The tonal degrade is flatter and has a narrower path when seen in octaves and notes, quite monotonous and yet bursting, which can be confusing. They do not have falsettos in their laughter, nor a 100% chaotic rhythm; rather is it more predictable, though not having any rhythm, but being more close to one. The falsettos or whatever do not bring them to gradation. They no not of it. (It has to be

mentioned that laughter shouldn't be deconstructed at all, but it bothered me, that they have one and yet do not have the emotion. Now I know).

Oh, and then there is also the made-up, the fake laughter. Imitational. That needs awareness, attention, differentiation.

Narcissists as Thieves. Faulty psychiatry. Explained Dark Triangle.

Their ID or Self is almost absent, being replaced by a mirror effect of the Ego. As the Ego is almost never neutral, but always influenced by desires, emotions, shaped by these or reshaped to a Superego according to Lacan, but let's discard it here. And leave as if this analysis had two levels. And does.

ID has the more dark area, the unseen, than Ego. It is strange, the comparison, that in eastern religions, the ego, or I, is something negative, and should be overcome, ultimately having only It; or in buddism where I and ID are synchronized and in addition with the allness of spirituality (Brahman?). In western cultures, ego is important and positive: with honour, self-respect, needs to worship, identification through possessions, prestige with the possessions, pride of the afore (exegi monumentum) and the kin, worshipped emotions— in short quite the contrary to that of the east.

In the shortcoming of the ID, which is vastly in the subconscious, the narcissists enlarge their egos, or in some terms of physics, the proportions are carried over (cannot be less or more), because the mirror has to fit somewhere. Their Egos expand and due to the shortage of the fundamental, psychologists see and explain them through a weakness in some core habit of life, and see self admiration acts as disguising it, and not knowing what the f... why or no explanation about it, not justification, if not pointed out.

As the foundation is damaged but they do not see it, nor the cause of their suffering, they draw evil wills from the dark triangle, sociopathy and machiavellistic, as some emotions are suffocated to any mirror (any mirror will do)—rather an abstract and tropic (related to tropes) concept, it has to be a synecdoche. And therefore it is a macro concept, not a micro which is more suitable for metaphoric elements.

Sociopaths only use narcissism as a tool, having more often a stronger foundation but not always, as in case of people who fall in to the hands of drugs and alcohol; though having the impulsiveness of a child, it can be only explained through the way they have been directed by their parents, with no fault but not knowing of the tendencies. As this one weak therapy concept at the moment only prevails. Already mentioned several times.

Narcissists have a tendency to take what is suggested or referred to, as their own ideas. Their image of Self takes too much a space for part of the others to fit in to the perception. And vice versa—while taking for granted what is referred to or be it an idea, taking it as their own, they re-reflect it back to the idea giver and simply remaking the topic, e.g. rephrasing it, try to feed it to the others as their own. So they are thieves.

They have a constant need to make themselves aware to others by any means. Imagine a twisted world of an introvert narcissist, who has a subconscious urge to express themselves. It would draw more and more communication to their subconscious, becoming like matingtime male birds.

To put it into human world, it would be a constant flaunting in a quite primitive level, constant because of the active human sexuality. Yet they would retain their commonsense communication and behaviour, which in psychiatric terms leads narcissism to be a proper disorder.

It can be magnified that males (genus *homo sapiens*) start to behave like females and the other way around. The elements collide, creating an androgynic bridge. Here people with a sense of fashion can more easily see the discord, in ones' appearance.

The vanity can be insulting, because they take their owned objects as part of themselves and flaunt with these. That is their built up characteristic extension, they become protective of that world of things. They might additionally more paranoid, if the object is in the same or similar, when possessed by another. When possessed by a stranger, they simply become irritated. Or in the world of vanity, in the hierarchical perspective, a more glamorous a possession (or an artificial? feature) is, the more at unease and unstable it makes them. A child can be wanting and crying, but they might be wanting and acting in a different way, up to a physical attack. Not to speak of a mental—while very commonly the crying of a child is a manipulation as well, in a shop where there a plenty of things for example.

... they become frustrated and fall to the antisocial part in the Dark Triangle, the sociopathic.

About the Dark Triangle can be concluded, that being one makes the other two a tool: a machiavelli uses narcissistic and sociopathic tools, and two more...

More about narcissists: one target can be cocaine. Cocaine gives one a megalomaniac tendency, a grandiose feeling, elevating ones' self esteem. And when used more often or that is: abused, vanity can turn into narcissism; or in case when a set of weak characteristics are present; or in case of low self esteem.

When reading this, one must understand to be discreet in this separation right now, even though stylistically being a good continuation of thought: to be separately discreet, that a sociopath can turn a person with low self esteem, or by suppressing other weak characteristics, into a narcissist, via cocaine. Because administering cocaine is COOL. According to this writings' theory, the narcissists here are fabricated, tools, 'willing victims', not pure self admirers. Some points can be taken and seen as features of pure narcissists, but mostly it has a sociopathic tendency.

Separately About Antisocial (Dissocial) Personality Disorder

According to „Theories regarding the life circumstances that increase the risk for developing antisocial personality disorder include a history of childhood physical, sexual, or emotional abuse; neglect, deprivation, or abandonment; associating with peers who engage in antisocial behavior; or having a parent who is either antisocial or alcoholic.“

(http://www.medicinenet.com/antisocial_personali.../article.htm),

they should be treated with psychoanalysis in addition to the ongoing behavior therapy and programming.

The sickness of the ASPD, distorted reality.

All behavior is illogical. Now they only work in The Social Construct of Reality. In the inductive case, they have ripped the social construct completely from reality, though that is an exception. In the very reality they are simply tilted.

Taken into grasp the Dark Triangle, they belong to that of the sociopathic, and narcissistic. But not to machiavellistic. That is their misconduct, at least when perceiving leadership, a politican quest or marketing.

Narcissism comes from the superego, taken from Lacan's triad as a normal phenomena to any grownup. But, as taken from the definition of the ASPD, with their own rules, distorted world view, when being accepted to society, they bring forth an almost 100% rationality, comparativistic to the sociopaths, trying to eliminate the irrational in the human being; with, the rational, being a theoretical one in actuality, not to care that there is the empirical actuation of it. These merge and entangle, being one in their head. So therefore, they cannot see the world neither theoretically, nor empirically, but as a flow of constant reinterpretation to always faulty. And the justifications they have, or rather, they cannot extract, abstract, layer.

(A hypothesis: at some point, their ganglions of interaction, usually in the left part of the brain, have entangled up to a point of relocation).

This gives way to access the mind of the sociopath—for startes, the gamma of emotions is not understandable and taken as irrational and therefore, in their world, to be marginalised. For the irrational can't be controlled. As well. But the main problem is, that they turn these two around in their head: the empirical becomes the the theoretical and vice versa. That's the difference between the ASPD and the sociopath.

About APD cure

Antisocial personality disorder does not fall to the Dark trianlge nor has it any connection to it. It does not have any connection with sociopathy in whatsoever. Because it is a singular symptomatology, and not a diagnostical approach.

Being a singular entity, it can be extracted more easily. And analysed. What can be used, is a methaphorical approach. As a cure. Because of a shift between the signifier and the signified abnormality. An ideal would be a reasoning non-shift between those two; but in this case, methaphor comes handy.

An example is one instead of another. That is the definition rather.

So the shift tends towards a further signified, which in case of the antisocial personality disorder personality does grasp. ... And which is faulty. A methaphorical shift between the signifier and the signified (according to Saussure) is not an ideally normal conduct of speech. Therefore it should be used in accordance with the linguistic paradigms for the antisocial... to be learned. ... Be it yet a continuing methaphorical language use or a shift to a normal conduct, or both.

The two: the signifier and the signified do not have to equate, they just have to be in grasp of

one-another. ... There should be a shortening, Between the two.

A practice can be found in a cultural context in general, or in poetry, which conveys more information and is harder to grasp.

Either way, the goal should be a feeling of equation between the two at some points.

For should it stay at only a metaphorical level, then the grasp/approach/cure is not met.

Philosophical Reasoning

So why do people have to work in the context of post industrial revolutions, not have eased up in comparison to any other era?

Are the machines pointless or what is the meaning of all the exploitation?

The point should have come some time ago already, the ease; or then again rather concentrating to some higher purposes, for any abundantly excessive leisure time leads to degradation.

A somewhat form of degrading has taken place, as all see, but do not do; the falling of nature, the parasitic overpopulation of humanoids, the exploitation of any given resource—human, natural, historical.

That is completely contradictory. And it is not the comparativistic to the intrinsic contradiction to the human situation. The situation: that most people ought to kind of work and do so as well, but the degradation continues in a fastening space. So one has to derive that some of the work forms are obsolete. And here is where a selection need be made. To take the common ground, the mundane reason, there is responsibility, functionality, (reactive reasonable sense of) purpose, but it is all in the context of Social Construction of Reality. Now reality is a social construct, about to rip apart from all the rest: cosmos, nature, religion, self identification. One of the matters that help, is philosophical reasoning.

Philosophy—isn't it the oldest science? In excellency, a socratic approach. And maybe the computer-addicted youth need to be bothered by an old bearded man, ruining their conquests in the bubble wars or whatever games there are in the computer phones.

Analysis. Culture (versus aculture)

The gradualism would be High culture, common mundane culture (or in Estonian or other still-having-roots culture, an ethnoculture, which in turn is not excluded from high culture, but on the contrary, brings high culture closer to people), slacker culture-- usually global, consumer culture, aculture (anticulture). Though it must be mentioned that in case of lower cultural strata the acultural aspects start to attack the afore ones. And so the layeristic layout would then rather be: high culture, common mundane culture, consumer culture, a mix of consumer culture and aculture, aculture.

And it gets more complicated: the local differences, ways of doing things, rural working and tool differences, dialects which actually still exist in an evolved and faded manner (in Estonia, in UK e.g. it is clearly obvious and not fadingly vague).

The more differs there are, the harder it is for the acultural elements to attack it. The interwoven rhizomes of cultural phenomena give a stiff and impenetrable protection.

At least in the case of Estonia, the common layout and ground has a very high potential. The question remains, why are people and groups of people not only intolerant towards outsiders, but intolerant towards different groups inside the society. It is not lack of vitamin D! The

semiospherical elements constantly repel each other, taking a lot of energy and having no conclusive result. It is a meaningless struggle, especially in case of Russian vs Estonian culture. There is no versus. The Russian speaking community has accepted, acclimated, accommodated their spot in the Estonian cultural perspective, having somewhat of their own micronarrative. Supposedly half of them watch Russian channels and musicians from YouTube, but Russia is next to us. Isn't it. Enough about Estonia, that boondocks. So the more entwined a culture is, the harder it is to the acultural elements and sociopaths with their acultural narratives to penetrate, or even get access, to it. And additionally, the more entwined (harmonic) culture is able to constitute a macronarrative. This is the most powerful tool. Why is English culture so high? Because they have it.

A Metaphor

the sociopath inserts the spawn, as if small eggs, to the carriers' brain and after acclimatisation they pop up to be fully grown symbols, which instantly start to manifest themselves. They are taken as their own, and even protected if necessary, because it seems to belong to the 'willing victims' world view.

In a bio-metaphorical explanation, they attach to a ganglion as a transparent egg and slowly start to merge with the ganglion. At the instant of full merging, they get one with the neuro flow and travel with the stream.

It might be, that this process is caused by the lack of myelin in their own ganglions (of the mirror neurons).

The activated symbol is a construct, a frame. It is not a mere index-symbol as suggested before. It is a holistic system, which starts to remodel the thought of the carrier ('willing victim'), and their world view. A metaphor to a singular momentum AI, which at the moment of self-awareness, starts to reorganise itself, only not that rapidly. But the loan from artificial intelligence studies is appropriate indeed.

That index-symbol is used by the 'willing victims', the construct, framework, is intrinsic to sociopaths. But I must derive from it, that many of the sociopath's treatment is to put them do some handicraft. (as referred to in segment seven "hypothetical treatment").

That index-symbol of the 'willing victims' is always ambivalent (though symbols usually are), but their two or several signified do not have the expected (not following mundane reason) denotations. The denotation is chaotic and random, the sign being aggressive in its indexing, referring to a quite arbitrary icon or a more personal meaning (as in 'Sinn' by Gottlob Frege), and therefore having no reference at all ('Bedeutung' as termed by Gottlob Frege).

Semiotically speaking Bedeutung in the signified has been moved to the signifier and turned into an index.

About Semantics

(An example of a syntactic misuse: at first it seems that they have a gap in their sentences, as if some kind of a pause. But in closer inspection, linguistically, the artificial gap renders the sentences non-semantic. They do not have any meaning. A syntactic example: part of the sentence __ a behavioristic pause __ the sentence continues. Some real examples: At the shop „check out these discounted prices.“, It would be „check out __ a nonverbal gesture __ prices.“;

"Oh wow, how beautiful the sky is today", "oh wow, how beautiful__an antisemantic gesture__today". It would be se“an,,ically charged, if the words were to be accompanied with a gesture. Even common.)

Asemantic signified are usual to the willing victims. The sociopaths e.g. use both the linguistic and behavioristic component separately, giving way to layers, separating the structural symbolic whole and hence, also collapsing the meaning. It is different, but they both use asemanic components.

In some cases, the willing victims use only a behavioral component, which is supposed to be accompanied with a sentence. Making them kind of like sign-language-understanding monkeys.

That is the ideal view—asemanic. In actuality, sociopaths' meaning convey is twisted to that of what is expected of a normal cultural conduct, plus their meaning has so many connotations in order for the victim to drown in them, rethink and keep thinking. A kind of a spiderweb. Their meaning is never what a signifier could possibly denote. In further exploration the actual signified is very weak in the matter of reality and knowledge.

Utopia

Sociopaths do not use no empirical knowledge when transferring the described indexical symbol to the minds of the 'willing victims'.

They have none.

Not simply emotions, but under discussion here are all possible functions. Empirical knowledge should be generated in the inner brain, which is inherent to animals as well. Additionally dynamical processes are evoked by cerebellum.

There can be no analysis nor synthesis in knowledge, any kind of interaction is excluded. That is why they create utopias out of real emotions. Holistic system does also not stand ground here—exception certifies the rule...

When constructing an ideal theoretical plan, they cannot accept nor perceive the unexpected, which result from empirical knowledge/level. That is the reason why they loose self control when the plan does not run on its course or in case they have put more effort to generate plan B-s, they use one of them, usually a violent one. (Their string of thought ends as if with a wall, where empirical knowledge starts. Even when acquiring such knowledge, it is used in an untraditional way by other brain functions, and is translated automatically without any awareness. ? this could be the very reason of cultural and behavioral clots).

Dialogues and life events have the innate unexpected nature. This does not fit for them. Their weakness seems to be static barriers, all dynamical processes have to be channeled to a single theoretical language, which is essentially digital. Therefore they have polarity, which is one of the few neutral characteristic.

Both Introduction and Epilogue

There might be confusing words, terms or thought derivations in the afore text. And assumably most people would not recognize, do not know or if they do, cannot

know/recognise a sociopath next to them. That is why it is considered best to give examples from popular culture.

The best example is „ Fargo “ series. A classic sociopath with an ability to act out as an innocent person and as well having a „willing victim“ whom he turns into a monster after many encounters. A weak will which he breaks and manipulates with ease.

A favourite example is „The Matrix“, especially the final duel at the end of part three, where the antagonist being an AI, but acting out just like a sociopath, just does not understand some aspects of humans. It is as if a sociopath’s brain is drawn on the screen.

Some other AI references can be brought out: Ex Machina, which is more complex in a sense that the builder himself seems sociopathic, manipulating the young man who is testing the robot prototype, who in the end walks freely as a sociopath amongst humans. That's what it seems and that's what it seemed to me. But like taking a chess game and reorganizing the pieces it appears that the ultimate victims are the two women and the young fella represents a bystander's position-- to at least try to see, what those women had to live through.

These examples leave a question that the only way to defeat a sociopath is to kill them? Of course the most extreme are shown. This reference has already been mentioned as somewhat faulty, even though it would otherwise ruin the screenworks—that in culture they are accepted, but not handled as seriously ill persons. So therefore other endings would in future be adequate as well.

In case of „The Wolf of the Wall Street“ it is hard to tell, who is a sociopath, who is a victim or is there any. It seems as if the character played by Matthew McConaughey might be one, but the movie does not emphasise this topic in essence. Still there are lots of sociopaths in this context, which it does emphasise.

For usually there are serial killers, maniacs, e.g. „Silence of the Lambs“, easier references, who are simply ruthless killers haunted down by the police, a special force, FBI. Mostly sociopaths do not kill but manipulate, except maybe only in America, where guns are handed out too loosely. That does not mean they are less ruthless.

In any way, people with no contact to, no knowledge of them, and previous seeming only a theoretical hypothesis about something vague, should take knowledge from these quite plain character build-ups, or other works similar and known to them, that is from cultural reference and not start constructing one from the discussion of this writing.

One extraordinary example is „Edge of Tomorrow“. Amongst themselves, the aliens are like alphas and betas (could be people only with ASPD or sociopaths in lower in measurement scale of 40), the ‘willing victims’ are omegas—it has to be mentioned, that this is one of the sociopaths’ utopias, not to be taken literally, though in their eyes it as well is... The omegas make it difficult to work as the omegas do not fit to the construct/framework 100%. ... This movie supports the aforementioned ganglion (mirror-neuron) theory. – The mimics like single cells of an organism.

The repetition theme in general seems to be one theme of a sociopathic cycle. And to put all those movies together as a puzzle. After that there’ll come new and better ones. And those will become part of a cinematographic history.

There are lots of movies with sociopath as an antagonist is there, e.g. „Okja“ (even said out loud in the movie), „No Country for Old Men“, „One Flew Over the Cuckoo’s Nest“; in „Sin City 2“ there are both male and female sociopaths represented: Ava as the manipulating deadly woman and senator Roark who thirsts for ultimate power and wipes out anything and anyone threatening it.

A sad end by the hand of a sociopath is "The Maze Runner". It clearly states, what the world will become when led by sociopaths and when THIS proceeds. (do not please watch the other sequels but rather read books of them).

The aim of the outtakes is to show that sociopaths do not have a sociopathic personality trait, or a disorder simply, but suffer from a serious mental illness.