

An Argument Against People's Perceptions

By Ethan L. Roth

Introduction

In the collective consciousness today, man spends much time worrying about the “morals” of others. Look no farther than the book *Metamorphosis* by Franz Kafka. The book highlights the perception change in neurocognition between his family and himself, the insect, after he “pulls back the curtain” by not lying to himself anymore. Another great example of this is *Crime and Punishment* by Fyodor Dostoevsky. In the book, Raskolnikov is only labeled as a murderer, whereas he was allowed to drink beer and hangout with everyone for multiple weeks on end before he actually admitted to his deed. However, there is one more piece of information on this text to where my argument begins: Raskolnikov himself was delirious after his murder. Oftentimes, “morals” labeled by society are irrelevant. *How could they be relevant?!* Raskolnikov felt worse lying to people about his murder than when he actually admitted to it. The fundamental principle of Christian religion is to admit your bad deeds. The argument is two-fold: if you are not pure, then admitting a lack of purity will therefore lead you to better peace of mind where you can then strive towards an apocalyptic bliss. This paper does not argue for the benefit of Christian religion, rather, it takes a more energetic approach. This paper argues that energy and self-intropection are more impactful for a person's psyche in terms of value compared to the labels put on people by society which are now termed in modern society as “morals”.

Jeffrey Dahmer made me Depressed

Jeffrey Dahmer is best known as a serial killer in the midwest. I think there are two interesting facts about Jeffrey Dahmer. 1. Jeffrey Dahmer's demeanor changed significantly after he underwent double hernia surgery around age four or six. 2. Jeffrey Dahmer was not antagonized on the streets of Milwaukee until people actually found out about his murder.

Another piece of evidence for my case: Ted Bundy was known by many as “charming” before he was persecuted.

In modern society, we value the way other people think of us all of the time. If someone is good at their job and respects others, they are labeled as good. However, Ted Bundy was good at his job and “respected” others, yet he murdered in his freetime. Perhaps, having a smile at small talk is like a cherry on top of a shit sandwich. In that case, *why value public perception at all? why value a system inherently only values the surface level?* If a being only focuses on the surface level, then they can achieve high-standards of moralityfw while legitimately being cold-blooded.

Going back to number one of Jeffrey Dahmer's case study, the man's neurochemical balance was fundamentally changed after surgery. However, I do not want to jump the gun, so this is rather an observation than us assuming the surgery is to do for him being a killer.

The Case of Morality being Fluid

It has already been identified in this paper that extrinsic reward based moral labels are practically irrelevant if a being wants to legitimately flourish in life. Perhaps, I should make an argument for what is important if it is not societal based morality. If societal based morality is only superficial, then I would advocate and support Carl Jung's fundamental ideology of one facing their "shadow" being.

In Carl Jung's work, he makes the argument that empathetic people will reach a high level of sanctity, peace, and intellectual power if they "transcend" these exact labels I have been talking about in my paper.

By "transcend"-- if a naturally empathetic person begins to believe the initial argument of my paper, and they begin to devalue extrinsic rewards based on morality, then they will reach a higher point of self-actualization, stillness, which will give them more peace. This paper makes the argument that stillness and peace are more important than societal morality. This paper makes this argument because it has been observed in modern history: Jeffrey Dahmer before he was arrested and Ted Bundy before he was arrested, that morality is more-so a manipulation ritual more than anything else. Due to the increased amount of societal superficiality due to technology (which this paper doesn't attempt to flesh out but is rather an assumption based upon the author's opinion), morality becomes more and more of a poster and less and less of an energetic ideology.

A pivotal and exemplary case of morality being fluid is the guitarist John Frusciante. Within a 20 year span, his viewpoint changed from being directly quoted to hating this realm of existence to then becoming a grateful person with a loving wife who appreciates the sound of music. In his dark phase of hating this realm of existence, it is documented that he was doing drugs with a friend of his who died under his watch, and was quoted saying, "I think it's more of a shame that he was born, than he died. Because he didn't like this life, this place, and he's in a better place now," while this does not compare to evil of the serial killers listed above, John Frusciante serves as a case study of a being in fluent motion of morality.

In modern American terms, doing drugs and locking yourself in a room and being glad a person is dead is an immoral thing to do. However, in a 20 year difference the man is completely sober with deep gratitude for existence. However, as a society, the extrinsic labels of society are slower to fade away or change, as if someone is put in prison or labeled with a crime that is stuck on them forever. That leads me to ask the daring question: *is fluidity more important than labels?* This paper argues that fluidity is indeed more important than labels, as it sees labels as insignificant (see "Jeffrey Dahmer made me Depressed").

A Side Note on Neurocognition

Human beings are slaves to their neurocognition to some degree. However, there are two large aspects of human life that many young beings have out of their control: neuroscience and family upbringing. It is fundamental knowledge in modern psychology, especially within studies of psychopathic behavior, that many "evil" psychopaths have two key things: a chaotic family upbringing and a less than active amygdala. For those of you who don't know, the amygdala is

responsible for the activation of both anxiety-based chemicals and others. Psychopaths tend to have less anxiety based chemicals, on average. All of these random brain chemistry reports and childhood trauma observations give light to one key detail: all of this is out of the little kids control.

Why Bother?

If many psychopathic killers became psychopathic killers because their little kid brain was traumatized before they even received a large amount of free will. And, if cold-blooded killers and rapists such as Ted Bundy and Jeffrey Epstein were easily able to maintain a good “label” of morality for years on end, don’t bother with the approval of others at all to begin with. This paper proves the fundamental action of serving others serves as nothing other than a superficial label that does not compare to the absurdity of character evolution as seen in the John Frusciante example. Now that this argument is laid here, I make the argument which aligns with Carl Jung’s work studying empaths and transcending shadows.

If psychopathic and malice behavior practices are largely due to psychological trauma and brain damage, then sitting with oneself, transcending shadows, and stillness are proved to be more important than the approval of others. I identify “transcending shadows” to be the fundamental ideology of one coping with their own trauma long enough to where they no longer want to seek validation for others or manipulate others. Perhaps, morality is an entire mental illusion, and instead, if one truly does not want to cause damage, then stillness is the answer. I would much rather be accused of a false rape charge as I am still alone in my room than be in the reverse where I am a rapist but the coffee shop lady and my Moms best friend think I am a golden boy. In the grand scheme of things, the mental dining room conversation of morality is nothing but small talk.

Bringing this back to Raskolnikov in the introduction paragraph, the man felt worse about himself after he did the deed than when his family liked him. Therefore, self-introspection is more valuable than the perception of others, as Raskolnikov knew himself of his own savior and his own morality, as once he submitted to Christ he was given peace even though he was labeled by society as a murderer. Now, mind you, this piece is a fictional work, but I still see it as a good example for my argument. There are countless examples and psychological case studies of people feeling worse about their own actions than how the public perceives them. Look at Anthony Bourdain, the famous show host who did an episode in South America where he confessed to feeling guilty about not being there for his daughters and prioritizing monetary success. However, CNN reporters and the collective consciousness loved him. This is the same example as Raskolnikov in real life: as self introspection is proved to be more powerful than extrinsic morality. Why is this? Anthony Bourdain had great status in terms of extrinsic morality, as many articles and publishers saw him as a worldwide hero exposing the underbelly soul of the world. However, he himself hated his greedy personality, he thought he was a wimp, and he hated that he could not self-soothe and looked back negatively on his drug addiction in his early 20s. If Anthony followed the argument both in this paper and in Carl Jung’s work, then stillness

and self-introspection would have helped him from his moderate to severe depression and him ultimately deciding to take his own life. Now, this is only a hypothetical assumption. However, one thing is true, Anthony Bourdain was not a still person, as was reported by him many times, yet he was viewed as a positive American protagonist. Therefore, if one is not self-actualizing themselves to a holistically balanced point where they feel content and still, what is the point of extrinsic-based morality?