

# Domestication Checklist

*ir. Emile M. Hobo – 18 June 2020*

*E-mail: e.m.hobo@hotmail.nl*

## Abstract

One of the main problems we see in society today is caused by inbreeding. This essay proposes a new disorder, the domestication disorder. It focuses on the mental aspects that result from inbreeding through domestication practices. It also relates to some of the physiological disturbances caused by inbreeding, but doesn't include them in the proposed checklist. The checklist describes the interpersonal, affective, lifestyle, and antisocial traits as found in inbred individuals, using the same four factor structure as the Psychopathy Checklist. It adds a fifth category, the lack of an integral view of reality, and goes into detail how to establish whether individuals suffer thereof. It suggests the checklist as it is now may be a bit repetitive and suggest how it might be made more efficient. It also identifies how people often remain within the same group for too many generations in a row and where that may happen. It introduces suggestions for laws to prevent domestication, by making sure that individuals are at least ten generations apart if they want to have children, and how to handle domesticated individuals. Furthermore it distinguishes between psychopathy as a trait and domestication, while recognizing that they often are but don't have to be mutually exclusive.

## About the Author

Emile Michel Hobo, born July 5th, 1980 in The Hague, The Netherlands. Creative Director. Studied Computer Science at the University of Twente with as a main interest Artificial Intelligence and Consciousness, starting in 1998, because he had not other choice. Practical training at the Artificial Intelligence Lab in Zürich in 2003. Completed his studies in 2004. Found the teachers were not qualified to work and had no understanding of working with analytical individuals. Suspects that many of them, much like former classmates that never finished high school but made pretend they did and continued anyway, don't have high school degrees. Former member of Mensa, ranking in the top 1%. Currently not affiliated with any organization.

## Contents

Introduction .....	2
On domestication .....	3
The Domestication Checklist .....	4
I.    Interpersonal .....	5
II.   Affective .....	7
III.  Lifestyle.....	8
IV.   Antisocial .....	9
V.    Lack of an integral view of reality .....	10
Efficiency of the checklist .....	14

High risk groups.....	15
Domestication disorder and the system of law .....	15
Preventing domestication .....	16
Biological differences with psychopaths.....	16
Onward.....	17
Literature .....	18

## Introduction

It's strange to see lawyers, prosecutors, nurses, and doctors, people that I went to high school with, of whom I know they never finished high school, whereas I graduated preparatory scientific education youngest of my class. I remember the graduation ceremony and some of my former classmates that now say they graduated were there to see us out, but I didn't suspect they would go on to make pretend they did graduate.

Of those that did graduate, I remember one other person other than me crying. The small group that I still didn't feel a part of due to the people that never graduated socially isolating me, told her that there was no reason to.

I think most of the people that initially went to preparatory scientific education never graduated. They were the people that craved a position of power, which they felt they needed this kind of high school education for. They were also the kind of people that were nice to you, when you do as you're told.

If you don't do as you're told, because you stick to the law and have your own mind, they become threatening, gathering as a pack, surrounding you, trying to intimidate you.

Their faces were different. It isn't that they grow a beard or that they have a bigger or a smaller forehead, but you can tell when they get frustrated or angry sometimes, that their skulls are mildly deformed, giving them the face of a dog. When they don't want to get caught, they sometimes put on a puppy dog face, hoping to be judged to be innocent.

In animals that have been domesticated, we are allowed to be clear that this leads to physical deformations. Some deformations of the jaw are known in humans to have been caused by inbreeding also. If you tap such a jaw slightly with your fist, these people immediately enter shock, yet they liken themselves to be bulldogs, with a good nose, even though their smell most likely also is impaired.

As you may imagine, this particular physical trait was thought by the Dutch police to be a desirable trait until recently. It was only eliminated as such when it was described in the newspaper as being the result of inbreeding.

Not all criminals are criminals due to inbreeding and not all those that have been inbred will enter a life of crime. Yet, inbreeding is a really important problem that we face today throughout the world.

Inbreeding and its practices can easily be identified in humans, and need be countered to prevent it from ever happening again, as well as should be identified by our systems of law to require special treatment and care to handle criminals that have become such due to inbreeding being the foundation to them being a problem.

The reason I have come to know more about inbreeding in humans is largely because people constantly push me to accept my situation without discord. They expect me not to

press charges, even though I face murderers, rapists, child molesters, criminal organizations, radicalism, and extremism on a daily basis.

Due to me facing such problems and seeing those that made high school into a pack oriented institution not unlike a maximum security prison, but then without any real security measures in place, continue on and on in everyday society with these very same practices, I've come to realize the importance of studying domestication practices.

Reading about "Animal domestication and behavior" in the book with the same name by Edward O. Price, the most important aspect that we can safely study in relation to anti-social behavior, is the lack of an integral view of reality. Many other traits are associated with domestication and as such inbreeding, but the psychological construct is what we must judge in order to determine what the proper punishment or treatment should be.

It's not strange to note that criminals can have specific physical features when it's due to inbreeding, but physical features don't determine who did it or whether someone will really end up in a life of crime. People with and without these physical features can both be not guilty and guilty and the only thing that serves to prove which is which is the democratically elected system of law with science to back it.

## On Domestication

The Dutch have meant to incapacitate their people including me ever since I was young. This in Dutch gets the translation *uitschakelen*, which means 'turn off' or 'eliminate,' which from a strategical point of view is a correct denominator, but from a humane perspective it should say that they took away opportunities for our people to act, react, and solve problems.

We've seen our share of politicians, of which many that crave power. We've also seen those that meant for the democratically elected system of law of The Netherlands, for as far as such a thing can exist here, to be upheld.

Under the guidance of Wim Kok and Hans van Mierlo, since the 1960s we've seen a steady increase in the amounts of charges the police would allow us to press. In 1948 they registered less than 5% of all crime. During the 1960s they reached past the virtual threshold of 10%. Since then the number of registered charges rose to approximately 39%, until they left parliament. This led to a steady decline, with now around 20% being registered.

They mean to immobilize us physically, socially, and psychologically, which is exactly what happens with animals when they become domesticated through generations of inbreeding (Price, 2002). They become incapacitated. They lack an integral view of reality, meaning they can't cope with freedom by adapting, which is something you also see in humans.

These people more often than not mean to be rebellious and infiltrate the system. They upset the order of society, install an autocratic power structure, and try to get you to accept reality as it is, rather than taking care of problems and fix mistakes.

I sat and wrote down the psychological construct associated with domesticated behavior.

It's typically people with particular disorders that mean to domesticate us. They tend to be anti-socials and psychopaths. People with other disorders facilitate and enable them.

Pathological narcissists only see what's right in front of them and assume that's the problem, because their world view is limited to what they see. The way they see it, it only relates to them, not even to those they see. Autistic people stick to the structure handed to them and assume everything is okay, as long as they do. And so forth and so forth...

In short, disorders are a problem. Due to domestication attempts and inbreeding happening everywhere, it was possible for me to identify yet another : the *domestication disorder*. Since it's the result of anti-social people and psychopaths incapacitating people and making sure people want to live their life in the same way, the construct shares features with the psychopathic construct in terms of anti-social and interpersonal behavior.

At the same time it's a distinct entity, which is largely based on a moderate to extreme lacking of mental and more specifically language faculties. They can't understand higher forms of language, even when explained to them properly and in not too complicated a way.

Making use of eloquent language doesn't mean that it's complicated to understand, it just means you use *all* proper words, not limiting them to a subset but varying them to illustrate the *nuanced* bounds of all perspectives, and using refined conjugations, like the subjunctive to illustrate for instance uncertainty principles.

Eloquent language is a natural response and form of proper rebellion against oppressors. It's important you come up with your own ideas and phrases. It's perfectly okay sometimes when circumstance beg for you to do so, to be less eloquent and for instance just say, "You need to come up with your own shit." It's also okay to swear when it makes sense, just not because you feel you should get away with it.

Eloquence isn't the same thing as citing other people that were eloquent to merely illustrate you're a person of learning whereas in reality you are not. You need to come up with your own shit and it had better make sense.

Language faculties are important, because if you can't sufficiently grasp *what's being said* — you don't have to be eloquent yourself — you lack the foundation for an integral view of reality, meaning you have none. That's a problem and as such I have now come up with the Domestication Checklist (DCL).

The DCL looks a lot like the Psychopathy Checklist Revised (PCL-R) developed by Hervey Cleckley, Robert Hare, and quite possibly a number of lesser known researchers and PhD students that do deserve mentioning here.

Mind you, you don't have to be eloquent yourself. You should just (1) *be willing to* and (2) *able to* interpret it, possibly with the help of someone that is eloquent or has a bit more experience in interpreting it. This also means you might be able to learn to appreciate it, provided what it's about falls within the realm of your interests.

## The Domestication Checklist

How a crime happened has certain factors to it. When it comes to the character construct of the perpetrator, what you would see in a finished screenplay or scenario is essentially action, interaction, and thought (possibly through voice overs). These are the three *top down principles* to the psychological construct with identifiers as in symptoms to analyze them, but they *don't show the underlying construct*.

On a side note, dialogue is the act of speaking, that as said can be analyzed also as a part of action and interaction, directly or indirectly reflecting thought. It isn't just about what's being said, but it's also why. What does the actual evidence show in terms of truth? Without evidence, to the law there justly is no truth or falsehood.

Back to the three principles, the four factor structure as introduced by the PCL-R proves a ready interpretation in terms of broad categories associated with these three principles. It

eliminates overlapping functionality, separating categories in distinct functional entities and as such is efficient and most probably conclusive in analyzing *psychopathy*.

Again on a side note, we should never cease to question, and as such may conclude but may never conclude that the result is conclusive as in an end to our search.

The PCL-R identifies the four following categories: interpersonal, affective, lifestyle, and antisocial. They aren't closing categories in that two symptoms of psychopathy haven't been assigned a category, (1) promiscuous sexual behavior and (2) many short-term marital relationships.

There are a couple of differences with domestication due to the fact that psychopathy tends to be an accidental disorder whereas domestication is forced. For instance, psychopaths lack not just empathy, but largely any kind of feeling. They probably aren't completely devoid of feelings, sometimes something gets through, but it's a feint shimmer.

Domesticated people lack empathy due to a lack of imagination, part of a lack of an integral view of reality, that leads to them misinterpreting what's good and what's bad, assuming a utilitarian stance. They focus on gain rather than merit.

As such psychopaths don't suffer from anxiety and domesticated people do. Domesticated people, once in jail, sometimes even favor being locked up, because life is simple and easy to understand in jail. It's probably also easier to understand to them, because most in jail stick to what they consider to be *the game*.

Since lack of an integral view of reality causes specific behaviors and views, it functions as a fifth category for this newly adapted construct. The list can be fairly specific, so some components may have to be reorganized as being a subset of another symptom. This means they help determine how many points someone gets, rather than being a separate symptom.

## I. Interpersonal

- i. *Incapacitate* : make sure people can't make use of their basic rights to an education, safety, healthcare, and infrastructure. "You shouldn't complain and be happy" – or even – "thankful." This links to their utilitarian views, as illustrated by category V. *Lack of an integral view of reality*.
- ii. *Blame the victims* : avoid responsibility to catch the actual perpetrators, e.g., by identifying shell shock as schizophrenia. They try to domesticate victims as well, by realigning them with their perceived power structure, probably realizing that these aren't aggressors and they feel they can get away with it.
- iii. *Enforce desired physical traits while reducing mental faculties* : they favor big people with what look like strong jaws, even though these are really the result of inbreeding and when tapped will immediately result in shock.
 

Force feeding victims or witnesses drugs after saying they have delusions also makes sure that their reproductive faculties are repressed, furthering the greater cause to domesticate all people.

Victims or witnesses that think for themselves be all analytical people and a threat to the "good cause," because they expose it.
- iv. *Self-serving / self-centered* : care only for others when this might lead to future benefits for themselves. When caring for others typically do so even though the receiving party doesn't want to be cared for, for instance by bestowing gifts they don't want.

- v. *Superficial code of conduct* : they have their own largely undefined code they say they adhere to, which in practice they rarely do. The problem they face is that in order to get away with it, they feel no one should tell what they did and instead keep their mouths shut, but if you get away with everything by telling what you and others did, then they consider that a good way out. The highest code they stick to, isn't preservation of the pack, but self-preservation : self before all others.
- vi. *Unrelenting pack mentality* : when caught take associates down with them when it concerns the larger organization. When it's for a petty crime, not budging and doing a little time doesn't have to be a problem, but they don't take the fall for the entire organization if they see ways to take them down also.
- vii. *Aim for sympathy* : make an estimate of what crimes people should get away with and which ones are sensitive matter.
- They adhere to values like, "Murder happens. When it isn't the murder of a child, it's a part of life. Rape can happen, but did she have it coming, the way she dressed, acted, was she asking for it or shouldn't she have denied any advances? Would I want to have sex with her, regardless of her desires? And when you're a man that got raped, man up, why didn't you kill the bastard?" They might say, "I would've cut off his dick and then killed him."
- Child abuse, as they put it, sits badly with the people, so that's something they don't say they condone. And if you're the poor bastard being accused of child abuse, you have it coming, and you're a coldhearted bastard denying it. The way they see it, if you don't die, you need to get out of town after they serve you what you deserve.
- Unless the evidence is closing, the 'guy' or 'broad' that did do it, they don't get it that he or she did it. It's a decent guy or one freak of a broad that will do anything you want.
- viii. *Manipulative* : they feint law and order but allow everything as part of a larger manipulation scheme to get what they want. This links to impulsivity as found in their lifestyle, because they need to manipulate to find themselves in a position where their impulses are met.
- It isn't the same as planning, because they even in their emotional displays constantly have to read you without a plan. They respond directly to your unexpected responses, with as a goal to obtain the position they mean to find themselves in.
- They mean to bend your will to the extent that you accept that they do as they do.
- ix. *Oppressive* : feel they have innate (were born with) "authority." Authority to them isn't knowledgeable conduct and responsibility, it represents a position of power. They will explain to you how it's all about attitude.
- They tend to physically find open space where they can be seen, where they feel they can take up the position of the dominant male, like a gorilla that watches over its family as they cross the road on their search for food or safety. The difference being that they don't provide safety or food.

- x. *Only attack perceived threats* : when you're friendly, don't consider you a threat, but when you go against the established pack order or they feel you undermine their "authority" will manipulate, attack, and undermine your position without legal cause. The main problem being that they are easily convinced *that you are a threat*, without proper cause. In practice they come off as friendly, but quickly become intimidating and/or aggressive when you don't do as told.
- xi. *Believe in a greater good* : state we're good people or good friends as long as you do what you're told and you accept your reality as it is without expecting problems to get solved. This good that they hope to find and feel relates also to the fact that they perceive life as a game, but to them in the end a high being, like "God," judges and they feel they did the right thing — they wrongly consider it to be *an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth*. It was "God" that made them do it : it's like they didn't act themselves.
- xii. *Lack a sense of humor* : they mistake crude and rude for wit, disregarding that jokes need to stay within or even reinstate ethical boundaries. If there's a clear winner-loser situation, it's unexpected, and what they say or hear contains an incongruity, that's sufficient for them to find it humorous, whereas humor that reinstates ethical boundaries (*unless it shows love to them!*) is considered to be an active threat to their cause and game. Sometimes they do find it funny, but attack anyway.
- xiii. *Bluff as a lifestyle* : they lie in accordance with what people want to believe and what they want to be a part of. They observe what (1) they would expect you to want to be or (2) they expect you to be like "if life were fair," their assumption being it isn't. They will tell you this is how life works.
- Honest people like myself at first assume life is fair, because they are, but unfortunately fighting is a part of life. People that bluff as a lifestyle witness you don't have to be a billionaire to live like one, you just have to say you are one and you get mostly everything for free. Mortgages aren't that expensive and tend to be self-supporting for them.
- Check references to counter bluffing.
- xiv. *Favor secrecy, but speak openly* : in order to set up any kind of secret organization, you need to be able to talk about it.
- Maybe you need to earn their trust by doing or saying you did what they want you to, but even being friendly might lead to them to believe you're one of the gang as long as you don't judge.
- The irony is that it's impossible to set up any organization without discussing it, so you need to be able to discuss it in order to set it up, meaning that secret organizations aren't really secret.
- When you speak the truth, people often dismiss it and don't believe it. That's what they also thrive on. Don't dismiss anything, check everything.

## II. Affective

- i. *Lack of empathy* : they strive to accept and for others to accept reality as it is. It's impossible for these people to fathom anything be wrong when it isn't in

front of them. When it is they favor to try and neutralize the situation and if that's not possible run away. They convince themselves nothing's wrong.

They do have feelings and crave for others to be empathetic and have a sense of what it is, but they simply don't know how to maybe even summon it, use it, and show it.

This means that they quite literally need to learn to think about how people feel by getting them to think for themselves without giving them the answers, but self-reference instead. You constantly need to ask them how they themselves would feel about that.

This requires due diligence and vast knowledge of how to avoid being manipulated into believing that they have empathy.

- ii. *High emotional quotient* : they learn exactly what to say in every specific situation, giving the right answers all the time. They never act by actually solving the problem. Instead they just confirm the resulting damage and pain. They need to learn to see and act without us giving away what it is that should make them act or how they should act. They need to learn to fix the problem as a matter of habit.

### III. Lifestyle

- i. *Impulsive* : they dream of making a big score, but in practice usually fail to conjure up a scheme or a plan, largely due to not considering the consequences. Their impulses mostly focus on (1) lots of food, meaning they tend to get overweight because they feel that's a sign of affluence, and (2) trying to get with what they perceive to be the alpha male or female.
- ii. *Focus on appearances* : aim for money, indulging in food, brandname clothes and apparel, big houses, many carpets, fancy cars, etc. Commercials and glamour trigger their impulses.

It's part of understanding what the good life is. They fancy anything fancy you have. Their impulses are triggered by the fact that they feel they should have it and you shouldn't. They damage your property, impulsively, but later in life often learn to do it in inconspicuous ways.

They mean to display they have it, get bored with it quickly, and get rid of it tossing it in the trash even though it's a high quality product, that they just so happen not to understand because it has invisible or complex components doing things or they simply don't recognize the quality.

- iii. *Uncaring* : when they own fancy things themselves they don't know what to do with them, find they complicate life, and are done with them relatively quickly because either care is a nuisance, like regularly cleaning an apparatus for it to function, or it just doesn't hold their interest.

They prefer things that just work and if they don't this means they are broken and should be thrown away. Also, when it comes to fashion, as soon as the perception of having has confirmed the stature of those that have, to domesticated people the having loses its meaning, because they could have it, have had it, and other than that they don't value it.

- iv. *Position oriented* : they abhor studying and work and fake degrees and resumes to obtain the position they feel is respectable. When checked they don't finish high school, yet infiltrate school, colleges, and universities, undermining the whole system, because they have no sense of responsibility.  
They feel when they have the position, you're not allowed to argue with them, you're not allowed to utter criticism, and they don't have to prove anything and as such you're not allowed to ask them for their degrees.
- v. *Irresponsible* : feel no responsibility for one's own actions *and* inactions. They get that they don't get it, but as such also don't feel any responsibility, because the way they see it, they couldn't have known. They don't know how to figure things out. A higher power, "God," acts through them.  
As police officers for instance, when they make a mistake, they don't feel it's their mistake when they get it wrong, because how could they have known? This also means that they do get it, but they always mean to get away with it and are afraid to get caught.
- vi. *Openly corrupt* : they need to be able to discuss what they do and reach an agreement with others that have taken up socially responsible positions in order to be able to get away with it, which means everybody in the end knows. To those that do have an integral view of reality it's only a matter of growing older to figure the world out. Those with an integral view of reality always mean to assume that those in charge of socially responsible positions are responsible, which in the end they aren't. (And it hurts.)
- vii. *Unfaithful / Wily*; cheats, lies, steals in all respects life : love, health, employment. They feel being deceitful equals being smart, smart also equaling getting away with it. They favor a deceitful scheme that works over making something out of your life legally.  
To them if a *scheme* works, *works equals good* and *doesn't work equals bad*. It isn't about emotion, motivation, and morals, it's all about the execution of the plan. Good only means that they achieve their goal at any expense to others and bad means that they get caught and have to suffer the consequences.

#### IV. **Antisocial**

- i. *Habitual offenders* : break the law habitually, assuming everyone be born guilty and break the law anyway. If they are a little less aggressive, they favor smaller crimes, but they can feel they have scores to settle and that's just the way it works.  
They don't care that smaller crimes lead up to and create opportunity for bigger crimes. If they can get into bigger crimes, meaning that they feel they shook hands with the right people to get away with it, they do.
- ii. *Incorrigible* : refuse to learn and mend their ways.  
They feel that when you go to jail, you have to do your time, that's part of the game — it isn't something they learn from. They try to force people to get

in line with their rebellious unlawful behavior, which they consider to be cool, and not breaking the law uncool.

This means they continuously harass the people around them, which is readily observable in daily society, school, and the workplace, which places a lot of pressure on those they harass. They may see it as incidental, but individuals that feel themselves excluded thanks to these harassments tend to be harassed by all groups of offenders habitually.

- iii. *Learn to conceal* : they feint they learn to mend their mistakes. Instead of fixing their mistakes, they learn to understand that healthy individuals consider it to be wrong to break with the law, even though they consider wrong to be the same as “not getting away with it.”

They learn to cover it up in hindsight, without planning up ahead. They don't do planning, they do situation management. You have to have your plastic in your trunk and your hammer and saw ready at all times, because otherwise you find yourself without them.

This means they may also have workshops to help get rid of evidence. They know who to turn to or where to go.

- iv. *Favor shortcuts* : prefer to steal and fence illegal materials. They consider stealing to be smart, because you shouldn't have to work for it. These people that did work for it supposedly haven't earned it. You have to be from a “respectable” family or the likes, or they simply don't want you to have it.

- v. *Fake credentials* : put a high school degree and typically also higher education that either of them they never completed on their resume.

When the educational system has been corrupted, without a high school degree they may get a higher education degree they haven't in any way earned, because the government, companies, or parents of pupils pay these institutions based on the number of graduate degrees they hand out.

These degrees are commonly referred to with terms like “a fuck-off degree.” This means that they mean for you to leave the institution once and for all. You get a degree because you were thus bad at everything, that they don't ever want to see you again.

## V. Lack of an integral view of reality

- i. *Lack imagination* : it's highly important for them to see and be able to grasp how it works. If they don't see it, they don't get it.

In case of technological advancement, this means they favor a broom over a vacuum cleaner and a hand drill over an electronic drill, because otherwise they can't see on the outside how it functions. With too many parts it also becomes too complicated, the tools need to be straightforward and simple.

When they get caught due to security cameras filming them, they more likely blame it on people that couldn't even have known than on the cameras. Typically they blame the usual scapegoats that tell them to stick to the law. They don't see how these cameras work, not even with plenty of

monitors at the, say, school reception desk, therefore “they musta squealed.”

This also provides problems when these people get a job as police officers or care professionals. For instance when dealing with someone without a prefrontal cortex, that’s something that’s inside the head, which they don’t see, and as such they can’t grasp the concept of a missing prefrontal cortex and the person functioning.

Quite frankly, the principle of brains may be largely or completely foreign to them. I’ve never had the opportunity to ask.

They don’t know how to figure out how to solve problems and as such choose a brute force approach. They have difficulty relating things and need constant guidance in order to do so, but consider it too big an effort to want to do this all the time. They are unable to come up with a plan to figure out the truth and may quickly resort to violence and torture to extract what they think will be the truth.

This also leads to them easily being manipulated to do things that, when handed the truth, in hindsight they would’ve preferred not to have done. They mean to get away with them anyway, until they can’t handle the stress anymore if they feel this.

- ii. *High anxiety* : due to lacking imagination they can’t tell what the truth is which constantly clouds their judgment and their perception of reality, which deprives them of any kind of certainty in life, leading to high anxiety.

Complex environments further contribute to this anxiety, yet due to their pack mentality, they are drawn to those circumstances, i.e. cities, where they fall prey to high anxiety, because they feel opportunity calls them there.

It might be beneficial for them to learn to realize that when they are in simple menial surroundings out in the countryside where life is simple, that this makes sure they oversee reality, because there’s nothing more to it than what they see and they really have everything they need, without anyone telling them they need all of these superfluous products.

- iii. *Strong sense of tribe* : form in-crowds.

Create groups they call the elite based on a handshake without anything to show for it. Part of this particular extremist tribal attitude is a constant confirmation bias in the way the members strengthen each other’s elitist views without a need to actually do it right.

It’s not about actually making it, it’s about being around and suffering some kind of mandatory torture to submit yourself to the group and they use the ideas of strength and withstanding torture as a mask for submission.

They eliminate what make the elite : sincerity and being the best anyone can be at your trade.

- iv. *Easily manipulated* : act on conspiracy theories and accusations.

A part of their game, they don’t put their trust in noble people — those that strive to love, care, and protect, those that die for you rather than that ask you to die for them — but instead choose to trust no one. They feel that

that's how the game is played, so as much as they are easily manipulated, they themselves manipulate.

It isn't *quid pro quo*. Call it, *sine morale quid pro nichilo*.

- v. *Ineffectual* : don't consider consequences. They feel it's fair when their launched attack works and if you manage to defend yourself that's not fair. Fair equals them being in charge, unfair equals you being free. If they attack you by jumping on your back and they win, they feel that's fair, because their attack was smart. If you ram them into the wall when they do that, they feel that's unfair, because their scheme didn't work.
- vi. *Judgmental* : play their own judge, accusing others without foundation of going to do what they do themselves, which is meant as preemptive retaliation. For instance, when they feel you'd give them the death penalty for what they do to you, they try to kill you to preempt that death penalty from being sentenced, even though hadn't they attempted to kill you and just leave you be, there could be no just cause for a death penalty as a sentence to begin with.
- vii. *Mask justice* : to them it's not about locking up or punishing the right person in general, but it's sufficient someone be punished. When the people see someone punished, the people also want that party to be the actual guilty party and be able to put their faith in authorities.

They forge evidence and reinterpret words as what they mean to hear, contradicting the original actual words and meaning, presenting a disintegrated structure.

Quite frequently they get away with blaming the innocent, because of the faith that people put in the system of law. This persists until they are in full control, when the people realize that none of it makes sense, ever. Out of fear most people now dare not revolt and opportunity to do so has also been made ineffectual.

Opportunities for people that mean to initiate counteraction, also to meet up and stand together, are thwarted by neutralizing communication channels as well as infiltrating their ranks. They block formal procedures for complaints and allow those that have seen complaints issued about them to handle the "situation" themselves.

- viii. *Acknowledge truth* : do state you need to stick to the democratically elected system of law, but brush it aside in practice.

It isn't like you're wrong, but they will tell you that if you were to engage in for instance the procedures you mean to initiate, it will lead to nothing and it will be broken off prematurely, *dismissed* by someone else due to a lack of foundation to that procedure. Therefore you shouldn't even try to start the procedure.

It's the law you have the right to and you can go to the proper agencies (that you're officially now already speaking to) to start the procedures, but the case will be dismissed. And no, they aren't arguing with you, they are just "explaining." See next point.

- ix. *Block truthful action* : feel written law is incorrect (“bullshit”) and it’s the law you feel. As such they complicate procedures, which leads to what you might label “the counter marathon.” An illustration of this can be found in the comic book, part of the series “Asterix” by Uderzo, where Asterix and Obelix get caught up in the bureaucratic paper mill, being sent from counter to counter, having to get form on form to be allowed to post a form, which typically leads to people going insane.
- x. *Oppressive* : when responsible, feel to know better than the democratically elected system of law. They feel they determine what the law is all by themselves. Although they do appreciate confirmation like anyone else, which they sometimes get when exposed to inbred peers, some mentally ill, and psychopaths, they don’t value any kind of democratic process. They are in charge, not you, not anyone else, not even one of their peers.
- xi. *Mild but forcible grandiose delusions* : they may say they have special insights, feelings, skills, heightened senses, like a guard dog, bulldog, or an eagle or a lion. They also feel all of their peers that see things the same way, when they have a different idea about what is true, they all see it wrong, it’s only them that see it right, no one else does.

It isn’t like they do know, but you can’t really know, and that means that all other people really can’t know either, therefore when they feel they are right, their right is a higher right than yours and you just have to listen to them and do as you’re told and accept reality as they say it is.

- xii. *Rebels without a cause* : when free — meaning one get to love when loved, get to do the job one love to do in full, be cared for socially through full healthcare and safety regulations — and enjoying all rights, feel confined and act rebelliously. They keep attacking the foundation of society, disallowing people to find their place and enjoy their rights, by upsetting society through aggressive and manipulative counter-democratic action.
- xiii. *Wealth oriented utilitarians* : state it’s all about the game even though there is plenty for everyone.

Wealth to them equals power, meaning that they can also use it to get people to do them favors. It isn’t so much about them having opportunity, it’s about them depriving you of any opportunity, meaning that you should be outspokenly thankful for the favors they grant you, rather than just be allowed to live your life and make an honest living.

Moral human beings don’t expect anything in return when they see you’re in need and when they can, they do you a favor.

When we can pay taxes, we do so, but that’s a collective kind of insurance. Taxes make sure that even when you can’t pay taxes and as such don’t have to, you still get safety, healthcare, a basic infrastructure, and an education to allow you (provide you with) the opportunity to live your life.

- xiv. *Lacking language skill* : they prefer and force the use of simplified language with only an intended indicative, no functional subjunctive, and a smaller vocabulary due to underdeveloped language faculties that are necessary for an integral view of reality.

- xv. *Uncultured*: they don't see the difference between properly engineered high end products and their own cheap low quality counterfeit clones.

It isn't about quality, it's about what you say it represents. The brand name itself is sufficient for it to be respectable, because that's what people recognize. They don't get that the brand name has a good name, because they made it and make it.

Moral human beings consider making a table "making it." Domesticated human beings consider the howling acknowledgements of their peers without anything to show for it a sign that they've made it.

## Efficiency of the Checklist

A lot of the issues within different categories of the checklist are interrelated and as such serve to substantiate specific issues. As part of a formal checklist they should possibly be combined with one being the symptom-category or argument and the other the constituents or foundation that allow you to score that denominator a.k.a. show that the argument holds.

The best way of doing this is by sticking to the criteria that were used in computer science to come up with a network model that was as efficient and small as possible, while covering all the bases. These criteria warrant further research on the domestication checklist that doesn't have to take too long to perform.

These criteria can be found in "Computer Networks" by Tanenbaum (2000) and led to the conception of the Open System Interconnection Reference Model (or OSI RM in short). The five criteria to make the model we need as efficient as possible are:

- i. Where a different level of abstraction is needed, a new layer has to be created.
- ii. Every layer must have a well-defined function.
- iii. The function of every layer must be chosen keeping in mind the definition of internationally standardized protocols.
- iv. The boundaries between each of the layers must be chosen thus that the amount of information that has to be transferred using interfaces is as small as possible.
- v. The number of layers must be thus large that the different functions don't have to be put together in the same layer, and yet so small that the architecture doesn't become awkwardly big.

The layers as I identify them are the five categories that are marked by Roman capital numerals. They each represent a different level of either action, interaction, or motivation. They are interrelated, but as interrelated as they be, this is due to them being a part of the same disorder, not the fact that they are unnecessary.

You need to examine to see whether points should be separate points you can score or whether they motivate the scoring of other points. I'm open to criticism, so if the five main categories as I identify them need to be restructured, so be it. I may be wrong. Either way the five criteria need to hold.

Although the DCL can be made more efficient, none of the points it covers can be eliminated, because they all contribute. Individuals suffering from a domestication disorder may display different ranges of symptoms, but they all show a large amount of these traits per individual. What the minimum is must be determined based on experiment and practice.

## High Risk Groups

All people with a heightened sense of tribe run the risk of inbreeding. They may call it differently, but it's all about them focusing too much on their own group of people.

Sometimes they focus on people having to be of their neighborhood or town, which also means they are racist. It will also occur when parents, grandparents, and so forth joined the same club, say a specific institution for “higher” education and associated fraternities and sororities with specific fraternities and sororities also being closely linked to each other.

It may also be doing the same job, generation after generation, like being a police officer.

It doesn't matter what you call it, if you expect your children to become members of the same tribe, clan, club, or gang : it leads to inbreeding. They need to be sent out into the world to be with other people they previously had no association with.

One of the key indicators of it having gone too far, because they do sense their children aren't all that healthy anymore at some point, is that they go looking for “fresh blood.” Those words are a very strong indicator that it has gone too far.

An elite-mode of thinking, with that being based on family and inheritance also causes it. It has been shown to happen throughout the ages : Cleopatra, the van Habsburgers also had strands of family that were unable to dress themselves anymore.

The true elite stick to the criteria as offered by your French dictionary : to be *honnête* and *le (la) meilleur(e)*, or ‘sincere’ and ‘the best.’

Good families don't exist, we all have our troubles. The only good family is the family that (1) also applies the letter of the law to its own family members according to the system of law and (2) branches out always, staying away from “old blood.” The difference being with searching for “new blood,” that they go out into the world instead of limiting the world to their own, luring people in occasionally.

Another risk factor or perhaps result you might witness, is fathers and mothers expecting their sons and daughters to follow in their footsteps and just do as they're told. Normal people love their children for who they are and let them be as they be.

## Domestication Disorder and the System of Law

One of the most prevalent forms of fraud that I witness that sustains domestication, that can easily be countered, is faking high school degrees. In The Netherlands, universities get paid based on the number of graduates they produce, which stimulates them to accept anyone and hand out degrees to the worst of the worst.

High school degrees are lacking in case of a lot of high ranked officials : politicians, lawyers, judges, prosecutors, doctors, the police, university professors, and so forth.

This doesn't differ in other countries, where it's fairly well known that in private schools, your admission can be bought, with those that get a scholarship helping out those that were of older stock and didn't need such a thing. Yet, when these of older stock give the right answer and with guidance know what to look for, does this make them qualified?

The honest ones that would've done great with other kinds of jobs will probably find themselves to be smart enough to trust their spouses, the very same that helped them in college make it to the end. They will probably tell their children that it isn't really all that and you should stick to what you're good at.

Or maybe it's me craving to find the best in humanity, in every human, even though there is none to be found in some people. If you get that you don't get it, why don't you quit? I

want to think they don't because they function for their spouses, fulfilling the position as well as they can, because otherwise it would be completely lost.

Those that call themselves the elite without honesty, without sincerity, without anything to show for it, they will continue to be a problem. Checking their high school degrees and making sure in fact that all degrees are monitored by the state, whose function it is also to provide an education and security, should provide us with proper means to counter inbred fraudulent behavior.

## Preventing Domestication

To prevent these kinds of problems, we don't have to take inhumane action. Castrating isn't the answer. What we here witness is that although you should have a population of 1000 people or over for a healthy population, we get subgroups of people of less than 1000 people that stick to that group, limiting genetic diversification and causing inbreeding to happen.

Plainly put, these people do like to get laid and do want healthy offspring. When aided instead of subdued, they enjoy when their offspring are healthy and smart. As such we could try to help them get together, by introducing different groups to each other and showing that no matter how different they are, they are also the same.

Essentially we need to further the love between the Montagues and the Capulets. Much like you can get healthy animals, like police dogs, by mixing different breeds of dogs that have been limited to their own family in terms of offspring to produce healthy little bastards, you can do this with humans too. You shouldn't be an asshole, but being a biological bastard is a good thing.

When you explain to these people that it increases the chance of strong and healthy offspring, there won't be anything holding them back from making lots of healthy babies. Why, you may ask? If you ask them, they'll agree: everybody wants to get laid. Ironically, for a large part, that's how your counter organized crime: "Make love not war... Or —" in their language "— *fuck*."

In terms of law that means that people will probably have to be at least ten generations apart if they want to be allowed to have children. The minimal number may be larger than ten, but not smaller.

They need to procreate outside of their group of 1000 related individuals. Two to the power of ten equals one-thousand-and-twenty-four, so with two children per couple that equals ten generations, that's my first estimate. On top of that you need social dating services based on mutual views and interests.

## Biological Differences With Psychopaths

The main difference with psychopathy is that domesticated people have been incapacitated mentally, physically, and sociologically to adhere to the democratic system of law as soon as they actively partake in society, which they shouldn't have to do. They have a tendency to behave like domesticated pack animals rather than feral social beings with an integral view of reality. The cells in the body structurally *solidify* this kind of behavioristic construct and sometimes appearance.

As testified by Price, their brains are also smaller, leading to a decrease of mental abilities. I note that in humans it leads to a lack of imagination and decrease of the language faculties.

With psychopaths, if I'm not mistaken, after they die you can see they are psychopaths because during forensic analysis of their body by the pathological anatomist, you witness a speedier disintegration of the brain than with other human beings. I don't currently have references, but if I recollect this correctly, their brain structure simply is *mushier*, meaning that it's virtually impossible to instill any structure in their brain because of that.

This warrants further research, since I don't have access to the kinds of research that go into this right now.

Analyzing mental disorders, there seem to be a number of causes. They can be accidental, like with psychopathy. They can also be the result of the environment not offering enough room to develop, as seen by the fact that in the countryside autism is less prevalent than in the cities. They can be the cause of external stressors. Hormonal unbalance also leads to mental disorders. Drugs can generate symptoms that mimic mental disorders and make mental disorders worse.

In case of domestication, the aberrations are the result of forced inbreeding, that has become a part of the local culture. These aberrations can as such be thwarted and countered by opening up the local culture and making sure that people see beyond the bounds previously offered to them.

Although I do conclude that the causes are different for psychopathy and domestication, there's no reason to assume that a person can't be both a psychopath and domesticated. There will be those that are highly aggressive and/or highly manipulative. This may be due to inbreeding, but also due to coincident psychopathy.

There will also be domesticated people that are perfectly happy enjoying their house, lawn, flowers, the food provided to them, the spouses we can introduce to them.

I do suspect that inbred psychopaths tend to be more openly violent and manipulative, meaning that even within a system of law that's relatively corrupted, they still get caught, because they completely disregard the implied structure of criminal organizations and can't remotely fathom a way of getting away with it.

Either way, in order to counter all problems we need to identify all root causes of all of these problems and weed them out.

## Onward

So far, what's been established is that we need to counter domestication and problems caused by domesticated people. To do so, (1) we need to make sure that all people need to be at least and possibly even more than ten generations apart be they allowed to have children, and (2) quite simply check all high school and higher education degrees.

The emphasis should actually be on high school degrees. Higher education degrees tend to be bought. Wealthy individuals, companies, and even the government sustain the corruption of the system of law by doing so. To break through this self-enforcing cycle of corruption we need to place emphasis on monitoring the education and work requirements of the people.

From the point of view of criminal law, we also need to take action to halt the corruption. Here we need to distinguish between non-aggressive non-manipulative individuals and aggressive or manipulative ones. Domesticated people that are happy to live their lives when provided with safety, healthcare, a house, lawn, flowers, plenty of food, and dating services can live out their lives in peace, with some support.

We still face domesticated individuals that physically or through manipulation keep attacking our people and our democratic system of law. When they can't be taught, because they remain manipulative, or because they keep responding aggressively like aggressive dogs that need to be put down do also, we should sentence them to death.

Habitual criminals thrown in jail continue to break the law in jail. If we want to be safe and keep the crime rates down, we need to put them to death. We have no other option. They keep murdering and raping our wives, husbands, children, grandchildren, grandparents, and so forth. They never stop, unless you stop them. We need to end it. Those guilty that can't be taught all need to be put to death.

They keep murdering and raping us, safety of the innocent comes first. It's self-defense and it's warranted.

## **Literature**

Paul Babiak, PhD & Robert D. Hare, PhD (2006) "Snakes In Suits – When Psychopaths Go To Work" : Harper.

Carl B. Gacono (ed., 2016) "The Clinical and Forensic Assessment of Psychopathy – A practitioner's guide" : Routledge, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition.

Robert D. Hare, PhD (1993) "Without Conscience – The Disturbing World of the Psychopaths Among Us" : The Guilford Press.

Edward O. Price (2002) "Animal domestication and behavior" : CABI Publishing, CAB International.

A.S. Tanenbaum (2000) "Computernetwerken" : Academic Service, Schoonhoven, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, March 2000. ISBN 90 395 0557 8. Original title: "Computer Networks" Third Edition.