



Abstract

## Anti-intelligence and human complexes

*This is a synthesis on the results obtained from the research that was conducted by Peter Belohlavek on the functioning of intelligence in human dysfunctional behaviors.*

### Intelligence vs. anti-intelligence

From a conceptual point of view, human intelligence is defined as the individual's capacity to produce information to develop strategies to adapt to the environment within which he lives.

Anti-intelligence is the functional intelligence for destruction. Its main objective is to destroy the capacity to adapt to the environment or to provoke the destruction of an element or of other individual in order to maintain the individual's own marginalization as a superior entity in his environment.

Anti-intelligence potentiates at its highest level when someone acts using his anti-intelligence and who has been endowed with a high IQ. The underlying purpose - not conscious - of anti-intelligence is to destroy that which is threatening - real or fallacious- and/or to feed complexes.

For this reason, the person using his anti-intelligence has no frustrations to elaborate (there is no need to adapt to the environment) and the emotional intelligence is never threatened. This is why the creativity for destruction surpasses the creativity for construction. Anti-intelligence is anti-moral.

An individual that works in his anti-intelligence with a certain IQ is "much more intelligent" than another with the same IQ who uses his intelligence.

An anti-concept is a structure whose aim is to destroy a concept. For this purpose it uses compulsive automatisms that make the individual "survive" at the expense of the environment.

The compulsions to lie, to attack, reject responsibilities, envy, greed and hubris/pride are some examples of compulsive automatisms.

Anti-concepts function because they are not recognized as such; instead they are considered the natural complement to the purpose of a concept.

Anti-concepts function as viruses. They are admitted in a concept because they are recognized as they were part of the concept itself.

When anti-concepts get in touch with the concept, the concept disappears.



For example:

- 1) Justifying works as the anti-concept of laying foundations.
- 2) Affirming as the anti-concept of sharing.
- 3) Dominating as the anti-concept of leading.
- 4) Indoctrinating as the anti-concept of learning.

Many people think that justifying means laying foundations or groundings. Objectivity disappears when using justifications, and a “parallel reality” - which seems to be objective –appears. This parallel reality is a subjective construction.

The one constructing a justification needs to have others to share it with, so as to “feel” it is real. This is the way fallacious cultural myths are constructed.

The benefit of this functioning is to satisfy the necessities of both complexes as well as that of the individual and collective unconscious.

## Complexes

Complexes are rigid functional structures that are used by our intelligence to construct parallel realities in which the individual takes pleasure in or experiences a dominating sensation that encourages him to stay there.

Complexes are homologous to “cancer”. They develop at the expense of the body and eventually kill it; the paradox lies in that in doing so they die as well.

Complexes make individuals or cultures act in the environment in such a way, that it transforms outer reality into inner reality.

In this way, individuals or cultures lose the capacity to adapt to the environment and confirm the “parallel reality” constructed by the complexes until they reach the point of being completely marginalized from the environment and become extinct or “die” in social terms.

Complexes are fed by fallacies and fallacious utopias that are constructed by man to avoid responsibilities and to satisfy his own beliefs or needs.

## The benefit of complexes

They build a world in which they generate their own transcendence. They construct a parallel reality where they feel free and suffer no demands. It is a comfortable situation of pleasure and domination that the individual does not want to give up. Although it feels like being in the womb, it is, in fact, a “cancer” itself.



## The antidote – Consciousness and action

The only possible antidote for compulsive actions is the planning of social added value actions and the control on the results of such actions.

This process can only be carried out if one has the ethical intelligence to do *so*. *In that case it* generates a positive functional feedback that makes the complex remit.

If the complex is already installed in a group or culture, the possibility of remitting it has the cost of marginalizing the individual. Paradoxically, the cure has a similar effect to the one generated by the disease.

Socially shared complexes act as such degrading the culture, but are perceived as a characteristic of the culture itself. Hence they can remain in that environment and expand.

Complexes are installed in uncertainty, despair, powerlessness and atopia contexts. We define atopia as the incapacity of an individual, group or culture to find a functional place in the world.

All processes that break the vicious circle begin by being at peace with the place that one has in the world. This means giving a sense to life, which implies finding a way where one can transcend, assume responsibilities and exercise inner freedom.

The Unicist Research Institute