



**Mike Lydon\***

\* Graduado em Filosofia e Psicologia.  
Voluntário da ASSINVÉXIS e da IAC.  
mlydon@usa.net

### Keywords

Intentionality  
Incorruptibility  
Organization  
Self-corruption  
Self-criticism  
Will

### Palavras-chave

Autocorrupção  
Autocrítica  
Intencionalidade  
Incorruptibilidade  
Organização  
Vontade

### Palabras-clave

Autocorrupción  
Autocrítica  
Incorruptibilidad  
Intencionalidad  
Organización  
Voluntad

## Logical Approaches to Self-corruptions

Abordagens Lógicas à Autocorrupção  
Abordajes Lógicas de la Autocorrupción

### Abstract:

Self-corruptions are problematic for every individual, as they present the core intraconsciential challenge that is at the crux of each consciousness' self-overcoming and fulfillment of purpose (complexis). The present paper offers an explanation of what self-corruption is, how it occurs, and how it affects the intra- and extraconsciential reality of the consciousness. It proposes that self-corruption is problematic, but it is not as problematic as its *rationalized* justification, a mental process which makes self-corruption *seem* like it is good, cosmoethical, coherent, in line with one's true goals and purposes, even when intimately the self-corrupting individual knows that it is not. Once the consciousness can dissect, analyze, and criticize the justification of its self-corruptions, it can see them as practices which go against the goals that define its purpose (i.e. Cosmoethics), and thus more easily overcome them by applying logic.

### Resumo:

Autocorrupções são problemáticas para todo indivíduo, pois apresentam a essência do desafio intraconsciential existente na auto-superação e cumprimento dos propósitos (complexis) centrais de cada consciência. Este artigo oferece uma explicação sobre o que é a autocorrupção, como ocorre e de que modo afeta a realidade intra e extraconsciential. Propõe que autocorrupção é problemática, porém não tanto quanto sua justificativa racionalizada, um processo mental que faz a autocorrupção parecer boa, cosmoética, coerente, alinhada aos verdadeiros propósitos e metas, mesmo quanto intimamente o indivíduo autocorrupto sabe que não é. Uma vez que a consciência pode dissecar, analisar e criticar a justificativa de suas autocorrupções, pode vê-las como práticas que vão contra os objetivos que definem seu propósito, isto é, a Cosmoética e, desse modo superá-las mais facilmente aplicando a lógica.

### Resumen:

Autocorrupciones son problemáticas para todo individuo, pues presentan la esencia del desafío intraconsciential existente en la auto-superación y cumplimiento de los propósitos (complexis) centrales de cada conciencia. Este artículo ofrece una explicación sobre lo que es la autocorrupción, como ocurre y afecta la realidad intra y extraconsciential. Propone que autocorrupción es problemática, pero no tanto cuanto la justificativa racionalizada, un proceso mental que hace la autocorrupción parecer buena, cosmoética, coherente, alineada a los verdaderos propósitos y metas, aunque íntimamente el individuo autocorrupto sabe que no lo es. Una vez que la conciencia puede disecar, analizar y criticar la justificativa de sus autocorrupciones, puede ver-las como prácticas que van contra los objetivos que definen su propósito, es decir, la Cosmoética y, por tanto, las supera mas fácilmente aplicando la lógica.

## INTRODUCTION

The consciousness exhibits 3 primary functional attributes, which it must harmonize in order to evolve: 1. **will**, 2. **intentionality**, and 3. **form** (i.e. **discipline** and/or **organization**).

**Will** is the drive of the consciousness to *become something greater*, thus comprising its sense of *purpose*. One example of such a purpose could be “I want to know myself.” Another could be “I want to help others.” Yet another could be “I want to understand the cosmos.” All of these are purposes that are coherent with a multidimensional world view, as well as the *megapurpose* of consciential evolution. A purpose tends to be more abstract and less defined in that it may take many intraphysical lifetimes to achieve completely, and may take different forms and iterations throughout the lifetime of the consciousness.

**Intentionality** is the more immediate direction of the will. It consists in the *goals* that the consciousness sets for itself in moment-to-moment manifestations. When the consciousness sees itself as having good intentionality, its goals are such that they are coherent with its overall purpose. For the person who wants to help others, some goals might include going to college, getting a degree in psychology, going to graduate school for a PhD, mastering energy, volunteering and/or teaching at a conscientiocentric organization, practicing Penta, among others.

**Discipline, organization, and/or form** refer to *actions* that are manifestations of the goals which define the purpose of the consciousness. A refined degree of discipline and organization entails the practical orchestration of one’s goals such that they are harmonious with one’s purposes and do not interfere with other goals. For example, the organized person would be able to balance a relationship, a job, and volunteer commitments, in addition to parapsychic development, within the context of a maxifraternal life-purpose (existential program). A refined degree of organization also entails using the most effective tools possible to reach one’s purpose-driven goals.

For the sincere consciousness that sees itself as a multidimensional being, it will inevitably have a set of multidimensional, multi-existential, and multi-millenary goals that define its purpose. Self-corruption occurs when the consciousness knowingly goes against these goals.

**Self-corruption** is the consciousness’ denial of its purpose and the goals that define it through its *thosenes*, and *actions* in moment-to-moment manifestations. It happens when a consciousness engages in the achievement of *sub-purposes* in ways that act *against* its primary driving purpose. Self-corruption occurs when the consciousness deceives itself, thereby failing to accurately measure the achievement of the goals which define its purpose. In common parlance, self-corruption means doing the things that we know we should not be doing, as they do not bring us closer to self-fulfillment in accordance with our core purpose (completism). However, sometimes we do know that certain goals and actions are not in line with our purpose (ignorance), and sometimes we trick ourselves into thinking that they are (self-deception).

Most self-corruptions involve the consciousness acting in predominantly egokarmic ways (selfishness) when it has the potential to be more fraternal and universalistic in its manifestation (assistentiality). In locking the consciousness in egokarma, self-corruptions present the main obstacle in evolution, as they keep people closer to their own ignorance, misguided intentions, and deferral of power and responsibility. When self-corruptions are given reasons to occur, they hinder people from manifesting in a more sincere and fraternal manner.

The present paper rests on three premises:

1. That self-corruptions are repeated because they are:

- a. Compatible with one's evolution.
- b. If not compatible, then permissible.
- c. *If not permissible, then at least not overtly corrupt enough to discard (self-corruption is justified completely ad hoc<sup>1</sup>).*

This first premise, that self-corruptions are allowed because they are rationally justified to be not truly incompatible with our evolution, leads to a second premise:

2. That if we commit self-corruptions because we have mentally constructed them to see them as something good, we reverse-engineer the process of rationalization to see every self-corruption for what it really is, in relation to our cosmoethical intentions and purposes.

Logically following from 2), we can then make the transition to

3. That, once we intimately see a given self-corruption as something that is completely incompatible with our core purposes, we can then make a more complete commitment to overcome it with our will.

In this paper, the author hopes to offer several techniques that can help any receptive person use self-criticism and discernment to identify and undo self-corruptions when they occur within one's intimate consciential reality. In doing this, the author has hope that he may allow the sincere reader the opportunity to live with more clarity, integrity and to live in harmony with his or her defining existential goals and purposes as a multidimensional being.

## I. THE SPECTRUM OF SELF-CORRUPTION

It is commonly said that the only acceptable mistakes are new mistakes. In other words, an old mistake (i.e., conscious mistake), has no excuse. A self-corruption is essentially this: a conscious mistake, or an error in that one does not correct. There are three conditions or orders of self-corruption ranging from mild to severe. The categories include: 1. Self-corruptions of *neglectful, selfish, or poor intentionality*, justified as being compatible with one's purposes; 2. Self-corruptions of *deferral of power*, which one permits because they feel they are helpless to do anything about them; and 3. Self-corruptions of *deferral of responsibility*, in which one simply refuses to discard the self-corruption for the sake of their core purpose.

1. **Intentionality.** These self-corruptions include those which result from neglectful, selfish, or overtly poor intentionality (goals). They consist in the *ad hoc* justification of one's actions, placing a veil of rationalization over one's true intentions. Example:

- a. "I want to be a spiritual person (purpose).
- b. Spiritual means loving everyone (when really, 'love' is convoluted to include sexual impulses) (goals).
- c. Loving everyone can mean sleeping with a lot of people (actions)."

In this case, the person's seductive intentions are masked by an appeal to doing something that is "loving" and thus "spiritual," but falsely so.

This type of self-corrupt reasoning masks the intentionality (goals) as being **compatible** with good will (more noble purposes).

**Summary: Self-corrupts due to poor, selfish, or neglectful intentionality masked as something benevolent.**

2. **Power.** If people have self-corruptions in which they intimately know that they have poor, selfish, or neglectful intentionality, and they still do not take action to change these, they can rationalize by saying or implying that they do not have the power to change their conditions, and thus are not obligated to. Usually this takes the form of deferring to external circumstances as the cause of one's self-corrupt condition. Example:

- a. "I know deep down I am a good person (purpose), and
- b. I would like to stop seducing women (goals).
- c. It's just that so many beautiful women throw themselves at me, and I can't say 'No' (action)".

In this case, the individual defers power to others. In so doing, they deem their self-corruptions as being **permissible**, in that they give themselves permission to repeat the self-corruption. This demonstrates corrupt reasoning in that the person tells him or herself that they do not have conscious control of their actions, or more simply, they are not the cause of what they do – something else is, whether it is their emotions, impulses, or other people.

**Summary: Rationally and emotionally denies power to change. Defers power to unfavorable conditions, whether internal or external, denies conscious control over actions. Unfavorable conditions have power over the self-corrupt individual's actions and he or she does not.**

3. **Responsibility.** These self-corruptions are characterized by knowledge of one's poor intentions, and knowledge of one's power to correct the condition, met with consequent inaction, and the displacement of responsibility. In these cases, the individual decides not to put forth requisite effort to discard the self-corruption, and disowns his or her responsibility entirely. In these cases the person is fixed in their ways, and refuses to claim personal and moral responsibility for their position. Example:

- a. "I know I should help others more (purpose).
- b. I know that I could do this through volunteering (goals).
- c. I know that I should volunteer today, but I don't feel like it (action)."

In self-corruptions of this nature, the person will usually in some way defer responsibility to someone else. For example, the lazy person may call into the office and have the following conversation with the director:

Volunteer: "Hi, I was wondering if you still wanted me to come in today".

Office director: "Well, you are on the calendar for today and we need some graphic design work finished so we can get the fliers out on time, so yes".

If the director says yes, the person will say to him or self, "Why is that director so demanding, making me come to the office? That director is so unfair."

The following is another plausible outcome of the above conversation:

Volunteer: "Hi, I was wondering if you still wanted me to come in today".

Office director: "Well, you are on the calendar for today, but I don't have a problem if you just come in on Monday instead".

Volunteer: "OK, great, thanks, see you Monday".

In both instances, the volunteer deferred responsibility onto the director for making the final call on whether he should come to the office or not. At this point, the volunteer already decided that he did not want to go. If the director held the volunteer to his or her commitment, the volunteer would have had resentment

toward the director as “making” him do something that he did not want to do. The volunteer can blame the director for being “too demanding” or “unfair” or otherwise misusing his or her authority. Since the director is being so “demanding”, this can give the volunteer reasons why he should not want to come in to volunteer. From the volunteer’s perspective, it is obviously a problem with the director.

However, if the director told the volunteer that he could come in on Monday instead, the volunteer would find the director to be agreeable. However, the volunteer’s perception of the director is less consequential in this case than the volunteer’s perception of himself. The volunteer was lazy and did not want to go to the office, even when he knew he had work to do. Instead of applying effort to go to the office, he gave in to his laziness and decided he did not want to go. The volunteer was not sincerely inquiring whether he was needed when he called the director. He was asking someone else to dismiss him from his internal obligations, and was simply asking for a confirmation of his self-corruption from an authority figure. This entire process illustrates an intentional deferral of responsibility to someone else.

**Summary: Rationally and emotionally denies responsibility to change due to fear, laziness, or other aversions towards applying personal effort, as well as attachment to old habits. To justify this, the person defers responsibility to unfavorable conditions, whether internal or external, as the cause of his or her self-corruptions. The individual assumes that others should be the ones correcting the problems instead, and that anyone who disagrees is an oppressor of the ever-vigilant self-corrupt victim.**

As illustrated above, the first order of self-corruption is one which is categorized by poor intentionality. When a person is informed of his or her poor intentionality, and the self-corruption repeats, it becomes one characterized by deferral of power to unfavorable conditions as the cause of the problem. For repeating self-corruptions which defer power to external conditions as the cause of the problem, the person must defer moral responsibility, and in so doing, he or she fabricates a false view of reality which denies his or her core experience of purpose, and instead always justifies self-corruptions.

## II. INTER- AND INTRA CONSCIENTIAL ASPECTS OF SELF-CORRUPTION

The following is a more detailed analysis of the characteristics of self-corruption. Here, we will explore how self-corruption begins within a given individual, and how it affects the individual’s interactions with others and perception of the world.

### 1. Intraconsciential aspects: qualities of the self-corrupt actions of the individual

In any instance of self-corruption, the individual has some cosmoethical principle that they have acknowledged to be true and good, and they engage in actions that deny this principle.

Take for example the person who sees him or herself as someone who is highly assistential, yet who does not volunteer to help his or her romantic partner in chores or other responsibilities around the house. Their main or self-defining purpose is assisting others, yet they engage in the sub-purposes or sub-goals of leisure time or other activities in ways that go against the principle of assistance, during a time in which particular acts of assistance have priority.

### 2. Intraconsciential aspects: motives behind self-corruption

There are two motives for self-corruption. One consists in the emotional aspect of stress, and the other is strategic inaction in relation to stress.

The emotional dimension of self-corruption consists of feeling the stress that comes with moral responsibility (positive stress), or the feeling that one should do something that is personally demanding (i.e., entails effort, change, growth). Upon feeling stress, the consciousness is confronted with a decision: it must confront its positive stress or avoid it. When a consciousness is confronted with positive stress, it is easier to avoid. The more challenging posture is one which applies cosmoethical effort.

In the case of one partner not wanting to help another clean the house, s/he knows that s/he should clean up. However, if the house is really messy, it requires a level of effort that s/he sees as too demanding to commit to. Since it is so demanding, s/he finds a way to justify to him or herself that it is not really that important.

### **3. Interconsciential aspects: perception of self in relation to others**

If a person does not acknowledge an error in hindsight and try to remedy it in the future, they will instead make up some sort of excuse so as to justify what they did. In order to justify him or herself, the individual begins to see themselves as a diligent person who in that scenario was for whatever reason not really responsible for their actions (or inaction).

To carry on with the previous example, the person who does not want to clean up around the house will start to think of themselves as hard-working and diligent. Perhaps they say that, since they work so hard so often, they do not have to exert effort in this instance. Internally, however, they still know that they have unfinished work. Instead of seeing the work as something constructive, they see it as a burden, and they are the victim of this burden.

In sum, the self-corrupting person in this instance sees him or herself as the diligent victim of circumstance.

### **4. Social dimensions: perception of others / world**

In addition to having a distorted view of him or herself, the self-corrupting person also adopts a distorted view of others and the world. For the person who does not confront themselves, they see themselves in an unfair world populated by unfair people.

When a person does not do household chores, they may externalize the responsibility and simply delegate it to their romantic partner. Even if they do not delegate the task directly, they still do it indirectly by not cleaning up after themselves and leaving a mess for the person that they live with. When they neglect to do the task, yet initially felt responsible for it, they have to tell themselves how hard-working they are, and how their partner is just being unfair by making too many demands, and that the chore is too difficult. Even if the self-corrupt person does not say this out loud, they still adopt this posture internally. To cover themselves. If they did not adopt the posture of “this chore is too difficult, I’m so hard working, my partner makes too many demands,” they would have had no trouble doing the task.

In social contexts, the self-corrupt person sees him or herself as a diligent person existing in an unfair world, surrounded by unfair people.

### **5. Moral Contingencies in relation to others / world**

Lastly, the self-corrupt person can justify his or her actions by saying that, since other people and the world are not fair anyway, they are not worthy of receiving any sort of help. This point is the point that is most critical, as it constitutes the point of radical distortion in one’s initial code of cosmoethics as a result of justifying an anticosmoethical action. For example, at the juncture of the initial decision, the person knew



what they should have done according to their intimate cosmoethics, and they knew this to be true regardless of what other people did or did not do. However, after neglecting to act upon their internal commitments, inflating their own diligence, deflating the diligence of others, and seeing the world as an unfair place, they set up the contingency of “if other people and the world are not fair, then I don’t have to be.”

When a person decides not to do a chore around the house, he sees himself as a diligent person existing in an unfair world, surrounded by unfair people. Since the world and people are unfair, he resents them and constructs a reality in which they are undeserving of help, and does not feel obligated to do anything for them.

The social dimensions of self-corruption may be summed up as follows: “In neglecting to keep our commitments to help others and the world, we justify our actions by distorting our views of ourselves and others. We see ourselves as diligent victims of circumstance, and we see others as for whatever reason undeserving of help. However, prior to making a self-corrupt decision, whether other people were or were not entitled to our help had not entered into the equation. We had made a commitment to do what was right because it was the right thing to do”.

The following is the flawed logic of self-corruption:

1. Decide to do something that one knows to be uncosmoethical.
2. See self as justified in self-corrupting, as a consequence of having done so much good in the past. See self as essentially a good person who needs a break.
3. See others and world as unjust and unfair, making too many demands, essentially being corrupt.
4. See the world and others unworthy of our help, due to the fact that it is so corrupt and makes so many demands. The world is thus at fault for one’s inability to act with diligence and cosmoethics.
5. Because of the state of others or the world, one is justified in self-corrupting in the future.

The essential problem with continued self-corruption is that the individual will begin to justify his or her actions as coherent with a distorted set of facts, based on a distorted, self-reinforcing view of the world. Instead of cohering to his or her original set of values (cosmoethics), which were based in facts, the individual, mired in self-deception, instead distorts the facts to make them more compatible with its self-corrupted values. When the consciousness intimately realizes its poor intentions, it must defer power or responsibility to external circumstances to justify what it did. In deferring responsibility, it disowns its original sense of purpose.

### III. CAUSALITY AND THE LANGUAGE OF SELF-JUSTIFICATION

As it has been discussed above, the worst kinds of self-corruptions are those that people allow themselves to repeat. People repeat their self-corruptions because they *fabricate* and *imagine* reasons that seem cosmoethical that they use to justify themselves. The reasons that people use to justify their self-corruptions are based in what they deem to be the causes of their self-corrupt actions. Thus, the first step to remedying self-corruptions is to stop making reasons for them, i.e., attributing causes and responsibility to external conditions. To stop attributing causes to external conditions, it is first necessary to understand the nature of corruptible logic as well as its consequences.

**Definition.** In common language, a **cause** refers to a given condition *A* that is sufficient to give rise to another condition *B* whenever it occurs.<sup>2</sup> If *A* happens, *B* will always follow.

Examples of causal statements:

1. To have an Out-of-body Experience (OBE), induce a strong vibrational state (VS) – a strong VS is sufficient to cause a projection, OR, given that a strong enough VS is present a projection will always occur as a consequence.

2. To become incorruptible, apply cosmoethics to all situations (applying cosmoethics to all situations is sufficient to cause incorruptibility, OR, given that cosmoethics are applied to all situations, one will assuredly become incorruptible as a consequence).

When people explain why they do something, the first word in their explanation is the word “because,” “I did (or didn’t) do *x* because...” Of course, the key word in the word “because” is the word cause. A person’s explanation of their action is thus an explanation about its cause.

There are 2 types of postures regarding the causes of one’s actions:

1. *Corruptible*. Postures which are always conducive of self-corruptions, or
2. *Incorruptible*. Postures which will inevitably eliminate self-corruption completely and entirely throughout the lifetime of the consciousness.

A corruptible posture can include two subcategories of corruptible rationalizations (or excuses) regarding the causes of one’s actions:

1. *Causal*. With regard to the causal power one has to overcome his or her self-corruptions through the force of will.
2. *Moral*. With regard to the moral responsibility that one has to overcome his or her self-corruptions.

A rationalization having to do with the actual causes of one’s actions is the following:

“I can’t do a VS (*B*) because of counterflow (*A*).”

**Implicit Premises.** To say that one cannot do something (*B*) under a given condition (*A*) simply means “it is impossible to do *B* under *A* conditions.” The use of language in this way has the following consequences in terms of its implicit premises, which include the following:

1. If an adverse condition is present, then it is impossible to do a VS.
2. An adverse condition *causes* a VS not to occur.
3. Adverse conditions actually cause inaction, lack of will power, and helplessness.

Recall that a cause is the condition such that if it happens, a certain result is inevitable. So, when the person says: “I cannot do a VS because of (x adverse condition),” they are actually saying that it is impossible to cleanse one’s own energies under unfavorable circumstances.

For conscientiologists, evolution is the megapurpose around which they orient their lives. To evolve entails progressing from a more egocentric condition to a more fraternal and universalistic condition. One major milestone in the achievement of a more fraternal and universalistic manifestation is that of becoming intrusion-free.

The intrusion-free being exhibits no intimate emotional disturbances in his or her personal holothosene. Through the force of his or her will and incorruptible moral posture, the intrusion free being keeps all negative influences from affecting his or her intraconsciential reality. Thus, one defining characteristic of the intrusion-free being is the ability to do a vibrational state anytime, anywhere, under any condition, as a vibrational state is the functional homeostasis of one’s emotions and energies.

To offer a summary of the above:

1. Evolution is everyone’s *megapurpose*.



2. To truly prioritize evolution entails becoming intrusion-free in one lifetime (goal).
3. Becoming intrusion-free involves doing a VS anytime, anywhere, under any conditions (action).

One action that defines the goal of becoming intrusionless is being able to do a VS under any condition whatsoever. However, when people use corruptible reasoning, they attribute the reason (or cause) of their not doing a vibrational state to external conditions. However, if the cause lies in external conditions, this would mean that every time external conditions are unfavorable, a vibrational state would be impossible.

For the person who understands intrusion-freeness as a major lifetime goal which is: 1. Possible; and 2. Desirable, the above posture is completely incompatible, as it can always be used to blame one's internal conditions on external circumstances and not make any strides in personal effort to overcome them. The above reasoning, when it is applied to life situations, demonstrates a desire to be intrusion-free only: 1. Theoretically; 2. Whenever conditions are favorable; or 3. Not at all.

Every time you disagree with applying effort towards your evolution in the moment, you disagree with intrusion-freeness as a goal that defines your purpose.

**Moral reasoning.** A variation of the above is the following: "...But whenever I try to do a VS (*B*), there is all this pressure and I get overwhelmed (*A*). It's just *so* difficult (*B* is absurdly or unreasonably difficult in the presence of *A*)."

This variation has less to do with the actual causes of doing or not doing a VS, and more with the moral permissibility of not doing one. In this case, the condition of adverse circumstances (*A*), though it may not actually cause a person not to do a VS (*B*), is such a condition in which the person sees it as morally permissible to sidestep his or her internal commitments.

The instance above has more to do with justifying one's position to others, in the context of moral and social obligations. In the above example, the individual's implicit logic is as follows: "It's so difficult to do a VS, I shouldn't feel morally obligated to by others." And, "Since others shouldn't make me feel like I should do a VS in demanding situations, I shouldn't feel like I have to." And finally, "Since I shouldn't feel like I have to, I don't feel like I have to."

A clearer way of looking at this posture is the following, "It's so difficult to do VSs that others should agree with me that I don't have to take responsibility for my energy." Or, "Other people should agree with my perception of helplessness."

If the person believes that they are morally permitted to not do a VS under unfavorable circumstances, then they have morally agreed to not be intrusion-free in the moments that they allow their circumstances to overcome them.

This posture sidesteps the issue of one's core personal commitments, and defers to others who *should* or *should not* be telling a person what to do. This posture can be remedied by internally connecting the idea of one's principles with small, consistent, concrete acts of effort.

Intrusion-freeness means demonstrating incorruptibility in conditions that are less favorable as the days go by.

#### IV. INCORRUPTABLE REASONING, SELF-CRITICISM, AND LOGIC

When we are able to apply self-criticism, we can then apply cosmoethics and discernment to eliminate self-corruptions.

Cosmoethics is not based in rules, but principles, which are the logical and intuitive basis for rules, oriented around one's greater sense of purpose. Principles are universal, in that they apply all the time. For example, is there ever an instance where you would not commit the lesser of two evils? Is there ever an instance where you would feel justified in consciously and intentionally acting in a way that was against your evolution or the evolution of others? If so, there is a problem.

Much of what makes self-corruption more manageable is the fact that the human ego is very clever at justifying it as something that is essentially good for us (*ad hoc* self-justification, corruptible reasoning), or that it is in line with universalistic principles, or at least not against them. The following technique of incorruptible reasoning can be used to clarify oneself when one is self-corrupting by bringing the nature of the self-corruption to the forefront of one's awareness, juxtaposing it to the goals which define one's principles.

The process of undoing self-corruption is organized below in 6 logical steps, applied to the example of doing vibrational states (a practice which is one particular manifestation of having cosmoethical goals, and consequentially one which people tend to be lax about).

1. *What is your excuse?* Example: I do not want to do a vibrational state because I feel annoyed.
2. *What is your ultimate goal (principle)?* Example: I want to become self-incorruptible and intrusion-free. This means I would need to be able to do a VS anytime, anywhere, under any conditions.
3. *What is the logical conclusion of your excuse?* Example: I am declaring that being annoyed can keep me from doing vibrational states. I will most likely be annoyed many other times in my life. If this is the case, then I am telling myself one of two things:
  - a. *Causal.* Being annoyed actually prevents me from doing a vibrational state (i.e. being annoyed causes me not to do one). If this is the case, I am waiting for external conditions to change such that I do my part. If the excuse appeals to a condition as a cause, it means that being annoyed is a condition such that it is impossible to do vibrational states if that condition of annoyance is present, much in the same way that it is impossible to fly by flapping one's arms under the conditions of gravity.
  - b. *Moral.* If the excuse is not causal, then it is one of moral permissibility. If I agree that it is possible to do a VS when I am annoyed, but I do not, then I am saying that being annoyed is a condition in which it is at least morally self-permissible that I do not do a VS (perhaps because the VS is so difficult under these conditions). I am declaring that, when my emotional state is poor, I can relieve myself from my agreement to my evolutionary duties, which are in fact universal, unconditional, and non-negotiable. This is incoherent and defies evolutionary logic.
4. *What is the logical conclusion of your goal?* Example: Wanting to become intrusion-free means being able to do a vibrational state at any time, under *any* conditions, including the times that we are annoyed and especially when we do not feel like doing it.
5. *Universalize your options.* Thus, given your initial evolutionary goal (which is more permanent than your moment-to-moment emotionality), you can make one of two logical moves in this situation: 1. Give up your principle; or 2. Give up your excuse. In other words, you consciously acknowledge that you have two choices:
  - a. You give up on your evolutionary intentions and allow yourself to always make smart-sounding excuses.
  - b. You move forward, demand a VS, and do not allow yourself to make excuses.
6. *Make an honest move.* If you self-corrupt, mentally declare in a frank and honest way that you are self-corrupting, and before you do, ask yourself if this is how you truly and sincerely wish to manifest as

a consciousness. Also, be frank and acknowledge whether your choice is actually coherent with your goals. If it is not, how does this feel to you energetically? At this point do you still self-corrupt? Here is a technique to use if you still feel that you do not have the mental power to overcome your self-corruption in the moment: once you acknowledge you are self-corrupting, say out loud to yourself: “I do not care about my energy, and I do not care about my evolution, and I am not willing in this moment to put forth the mental effort to overcome my present conditions.” How does this feel? Do you accept it to be true? If you decide to push through and do a vibrational state, or any other demanding task that requires your cosmoethical effort, congratulations: you have succeeded in diligently applying logic to your evolution.

## V. INCORRUPTIBILITY AND ITS BENEFITS

If this paper has made the reader question him or herself with regard to his or her self-corruptions, this is good.

We can only correct a problem once we see it for what it is.

For the readers who feel aversion or fear towards the ideas proposed in this paper, know that suffering at *our* evolutionary level is caused by perpetually justifying ourselves in relation to our conditions, and not *correcting* ourselves in the name of our principles.

For the individual who sees evolution as his or her end objective, it is necessary to discard all of the habits, fascinations, and aspects which no longer serve oneself.

Self-Corrupt Posture	Incorruptable Posture
Responsibility is an unfair burden	Responsibility is empowering challenge
Other people are too demanding	Other people are evolving with me and have the right to ask of me
Life is so difficult	Life is a challenge that presents many evolutionary opportunities
Demand that others see value of oneself through emotions and energies	Present to others the value of principles through action
Others are responsible for the condition I am in	I am completely responsible for the condition I am in
I am helpless to remedy my condition	I will actively do whatever it takes to remedy my condition
Makes smart-sounding assumptions that personal change is not possible (I can't help but be the way I am because the world is the way it is)	Knows that personal change happens all the time, and that our <i>proexis</i> can either <i>lead</i> us or it can <i>drag</i> us
Asks more from others	Asks more for others
Tries to make self stronger by making others weaker	Makes self stronger by overcoming personal weaknesses
Life is painful	Pain is temporary, morals are permanent
Always wants to do tasks later, thereby never doing them	Does things when they come up; acknowledges that, “If I haven't done it now, I already haven't done it later”
Tries to bring others down	Will gladly help to raise others up
Assumes that responsibilities will be taken care of with time	Knows that conditions will only improve with personal effort
Waits for friends, colleagues, helpers, or the cosmos to intervene to offer the impetus to change	Is internally driven, and sees self-overcoming as its own reward, and motivation in and of itself for change
Values are the unconscious consequence of one's actions	Actions are the conscious consequence of one's values

Incorruptibility begins with an incorruptible posture and an incorruptible way of thinking. The following is a useful chart that distinguishes the differences in thinking between the self-corrupting individual, and the diligent individual who aims to be incorruptible.

There may be readers who are silently thinking to themselves as they read this. “Yes, but...” and come up with some excuse for not hearing the words said here.

The author cautions the reader that, from the position of self-corruption one can never assume that personal effort will not work towards overcoming one’s problems, especially if one has not really tried. Even if one has tried for some time and has been disappointed with the results, remember that long-lasting change is gradual and takes sustained concentration and effort, and that every small victory counts. If it were true that profound, deep-rooted change happened overnight, then Hitler could have become a serenissimus as soon as he realized the nature of his errors. This is quite unrealistic.

In having self-corruptions, we lose part of ourselves. In locking our minds in a position that justifies our self-corruptions and refuses to take responsibility for them, we lose ourselves completely, as we defer all responsibility to something – anything – that is not us.

Neither this article, nor the person who wrote it purports to be perfect.

But for *you* reader, what would you like to become? What goals do you have in place for yourself? I ask that the reader sincerely reflect upon this, and sincerely question all of his or her self-justifying excuses in daily life. Does the reasoning in this case agree with the reader’s internal principles?

The more an individual makes excuses, the more he or she puts the breaks on his or her evolution.

In applying discernment and incorruptible reasoning, any willful individual can overcome his or her present conditions with sustained effort. This posture is best to adopt as soon as possible, as what we do not accomplish now, we already have left undone for tomorrow.

## NOTES

1. Latin: “For this purpose only.”
2. In philosophy, there is much literature on the nature of causality, and it is generally considered that there are 3 categories of causes: necessary (if A does not happen, then B cannot happen; A is necessary for B to occur); sufficient (if A happens, then B will always follow; A is sufficient for B to occur); and contributory (A is one of a number of factors causing B, but may not be sufficient to cause B in and of itself). For the intents and purposes of this paper, it is only necessary to focus on sufficient causes.

## REFERENCES

1. Allen, David; *Ready for Anything: 52 Productivity Principles for Work and Life*; Penguin Group; New York, NY; 2003.
2. Arbinger Institute, The; *Leadership and Self-Deception: Getting Out of the Box*; Berrett-Koehler Publishers; San Francisco; 2002.
3. Dorrell, Philip; *The Singularity: Purpose and Transition*; Available at: <<http://www.1729.com/blog/SingularityPurposeTransition.html>>; Accessed on: 25 April, 2006.
4. Ecker, Bruce & Hulley, Laurel; *Depth-Oriented Brief Therapy*; Jossey-Bass; San Francisco, CA; 2006.
5. Vieira, Waldo; *700 Experimentos da Conscienciologia*; Instituto Internacional de Projeciologia; Rio de Janeiro, RJ; 1994.