

# Who's In My Seat?: On What We Can Learn from God's Complaint about Morons Who Don't Understand Asymmetries in Sociobehavioral Patterns, Neuroscience, and Our Inherently Physical Universe

**D. Tony Sun**

Analytic Jurisprudence, Inc., 475 Wall Street, Princeton, N.J. 08540

## **Abstract**

Societal life has impressed upon us that our human activities and products are various, but not uniformly monotonic. However, the social movements, explicitly or informally driven by an overly politically correct lifestyle and sociopolitical outlook, add excruciating pressure as well as encourage people amorphously to be balanced and in particular “be in the middle” most of the time. In this article the author argues that when we stay, or even force ourselves, in the middle of something, even if the arrogant assumption was made that centrality or “middle-ness” seems to imply importance, we are missing points on the fact that the so-called “centers” of human civilization as well as the physical universe may not be us, but rather something higher than us and bigger than our own existence and where God is potentially positioned either constantly or occasionally.

**Keywords:** centrism, political spectrum, ethics, asymmetry

Social norms and critical dialogues shall anticipate no mere negatives, for otherwise when we spot something positive, we would suffer from the oblivion of pain and mistakenly conclude that the situation is not as bad as it actually was, which could be exemplified by controversies in drug overdose—when a positive piece of evidence comes to our attention, we falsely feel that they were of less harm. If the positive were abnormally “precious” so that we delusionalize ourselves because of it, then it would be the triumph of evil. Almost calculatingly, we might, instead, want to become more authentic, unbiased and determined about ourselves with our own arguments. In the following sections the author sketches an outline for the appeal that would demonstrate that centrism as an absolute philosophical or political stance is problematic, and pure centrists were almost practically either delaying chronicity or becoming part of the problem.

## **INTRODUCTION**

Modern societies are becoming more and more hesitant of and uncertain about taking their stances, politically and socially, in the course of this third decade of the twentieth century, and this has even happened in a Congressional testimony. Just like God does not play dice, nor does justice discriminate

across occupations, any lines of work, ethnicities, economic statuses, academic disciplines and beyond; being in the middle, if without a reasonable and ethical cause, is both a folly and a foolishness that will probably cost us dearly. Moral frailty shall not excuse us into pure centrism either; to take strong, ethical stances is the struggles of this new era for human societies, the constraints of which are what we are forced to strive against amid all ambiguities. Supposedly at dawn of the twenty-first century, even in the present-day American society we observe more and more individuals taking neutral stances either politically or even morally, yielding at a convergence of a significant part of the population “being stuck” in a potentially unprecedented state of imposed moral indifference. Such a trend, arguably, can be dangerous in an era when people around the globe are constantly subject to being compromised by abusive technologies, disruptive innovations, as well as excruciating, torturing political powers and regimes. Besides, scholars often lack, or barely have clarified, any underlying *geometric* measures, say the Euclidean metric, which governs distances and provide a much less ambiguous definition of what it means to be left, right, or else. Following through, a healthier perspective is recommended philosophically and at the individual level, which includes leaving space for each-other, paying radical respect, hospitality and beyond.

Leaving aside democracy by any conception, the freedom we have tasted in modern days in the past few generations seems to have pushed people farther from each-other on many occasions—which nonetheless has nothing wrong by itself, arguably—in a way such that it has been complicated changes the world of democracies has seen through since the last decade of the twentieth century, since about which time the author was born and gradually grew my scientific and social awarenesses. After all, whence we are in a state of being “masked” by multiple external factors for which their associated intentions cannot be fathomed out easily with the exception of a democratic and well-spoken society and media culture, sometimes it is challenging for people to find directions for lives and clearly see their positionalities respectively in each of their lives.

In his early teenagerhood, the author unexpectedly and strangely developed a mild, yet-not-serious compulsive disorder of its unique kind: it felt like a compulsive wanting to manually touch by hand or finger the exact middle part of an ordinary object (e.g., a pencil, a textbook) as if some virtual, auditory voices were encouraging me so, which drew the attention from the author’s parents and friends who tried to give me health advice. With years gone by, such “compulsion to occupy the center” dissolved and, due to its passive progression, I developed a corresponding, anecdotal immunity akin a shield against traps or tendency towards it, or simply put I do not tend to keep daily objects symmetrically positioned consequentially after reallocating them.

Geometrically defined, middle-ness or centrality can refer to the type of positionalities which, with respect to the point/object of interest, render the collective whole as either circularly symmetric, linearly symmetric, spherically symmetric, and so on, such that its remaining constituents are, by pairs, within equal distance to the interest point. In mathematical analysis, this normally implies an underlying “natural” Euclidean metric or distance function that precisely defines the distance between two objects which are part of the collective whole of a particular context. Similarly, in political philosophy, the term centrism is normally reserved for describing a conservatively-based “middle-of-the-roadness” positionality that “left unclear as to why the middle is more desirable,” and that “centrists” are quite commonly discussed relatively next to liberals and the political left (Elhefnawy, 2021) in the United States in particular. In the following sections, I discuss and argue for strong stances as opposed to centrism on societal, political issues.

## LITERATURE REVIEW AND PREPARATION

### **Preparation of History: Eighteenth-Century Origin of the Political Spectrum**

The known left-right political spectrum as terminology dates back to the end of the Eighteenth century during the French Revolution, when constituents sitting on the right of the divisions in the French Constituent Assembly were in favor of preserving the monarchy with a “more moderate course of change,” whereas those on the left wanted otherwise (Carlisle, R. P., 2005, pp. vii). Along the spectrum, toward the extreme left we have witnessed the “Greens” and liberals while on the right there have been conservatives, reactionaries and even fascists, and in between these two warring ends the “moderate legislators” sit the “center seats” (Woshinsky, 2008, pp.109) which is how centrists were naturally understood and defined.

### **Preparation of Biology: Asymmetric Neuroscientific Dualities**

More than ninety years ago in Europe, zoologist Wilhelm Ludwig already defined “small, random deviations from perfect symmetry in bilateral traits” into what he called fluctuating asymmetry (1932) which sprung from organisms’ “inability to develop in precisely determined paths” (Van Valen, 1962). Normally, mammals have two eyes as visual devices, as well as left and right hemispheres that correspond to their opposite-side limbs. We also have pairs of upper- and lower-limbs, ears, lungs, and even two sides of the heart.

Why is this the case in nature, for which when two parts are located as given, literally nothing is in between or in the middle? Obviously, what makes the number two special is that it is the minimum plural quantity which counts for a multiplicity; and arguably we can also ask the question why not three, four, or more parts of the same organ—possibly, some choice of efficiency drove the process of creation such that nature stopped at the quantity two for these examples. With dualities in biology, for example in neuroscience and the human nervous system, human beings grew a solid structure of vision with the optic chiasm, also known as chiasma, where optic nerves connects the left eye to the right occipital lobe and vice versa through the retinogeniculostriate pathway (Noback & Demarest, 1981, pp. 410). Albeit dualities exist, they do not induce symmetry necessarily; often times conversely, the dual constituents are almost always not identical nor exact copies of each-other, with differences from minute to significant measures, such as the well-known structural and cognitive differences between our two brain hemispheres (Duboc et al., 2015).

## **METHODOLOGY: A BENCHMARK FOR ETHICAL IMPORTANCE**

In human history and futuristically, whenever we decide to build new factories, explore a different continent, to go to the Moon, the ethical ground we take, provided in consideration, should always be for people and not bacteria. This defines what it means to be “important” in a human society, an entity situated in nature. Whenever we want to evaluate and judge any human activities and social behaviors, we do it as people and would naturally want to base such judgment upon ethics, or ethical grounds, generally speaking in our arguments. For example, if NASA wants to go to Mars, it would be a valid grant proposal to advocate for human development of extra space, natural resources, etc., as opposed to protecting the lifeless eco-environment of the present-day Mars. Why bother exploring and cultivating Mars as a planetary resource, when there is little to none proof of living things there? Same thing for excruciating, but controversially, purely clean energy emission.

## COUNTEREXAMPLES

To begin, a disclaimer would be congenial if discussions on harmful types of centrism were to come about. The following provides a collection of counterexamples that are irrelevant to, and independent from, centrism. Conceptually, counterexamples may include people-pleasing personalities and behaviours, excessive kindness, or even self-hurting behaviours. At the same time, the universe or natural environment we live in is nevertheless *physical* as opposed to mathematical or even “social” or “political,” for otherwise the word “physics” would just become an expression. Sadly, often we have neglected the fact that we are situated in nature, the universe, one that does not depend upon our very human existence.

### Counterexample One: References to Geographic Locations

In the upper country of the State of South Carolina there is a small city named Central that is adjacent to Clemson University’s college town, where the author got his first postgraduate degree nearly a decade ago. I chose to live there the second year at Clemson because the rent was descent and it was quieter with bus access to campus, while I did not understand how it got its name in the beginning; the geographic centrality of Central, South Carolina is situated within being the approximate halfway point between Atlanta, Georgia and Charlotte, North Carolina, plus there used to be a railway line there. Even though such a name sounds too ordinary, it actually is embedded with such location information about the neighboring states and major cities.

Geographic locations are down to territory and are a concept that is not meant to be overexploited nor politicized by nature. When it refers to a center part of a city, a continent, a nation, or even a time zone, it means what it means; as North America as a continent is usually treated with three or four different time zones, we will find the Central Time is associated to first portion of the eastern half of the continent including Chicago and Minneapolis, adjacent to the mountainous states (Colorado, Wyoming, etc.) which are actually in the Wild West. Center City of Philadelphia, the Central Park of Manhattan, and Mid-Atlantic coastal area are also examples.

### Counterexample Two: Net Neutrality

Telecommunication at the civilians’ level is more or less about trust, or the absence of it. Telephones can cross the Pacific Ocean because devices and gateways were installed, regulated, and implemented by people. Ironically, especially since three decades ago, some of these technologies rejected what their inventors envisioned since over a century ago and panaceas are dimly visible with centrism. Internet used nowadays is usually provided indirectly through some Internet Service Providers (abbr. ISPs) that remain dependent on the Domain Name System (abbr. DNS) which, at a global scale, associates our website addresses to numerically-based Internet Protocol (IP) addresses. Then the question of trust, along with security, would arise: why would a subnet or regional, local network “trust” a remote, unknown provider’s connection requests, allowing such requests to route arbitrarily, and neutrally, into their local network’s machines?

The latest net neutrality rules were approved by the Federal Communications Commission in 2015, aimed to preserve the open internet and ensure that it could not be divided into pay-to-play fast lanes for web and media companies that can afford it and slow lanes for everyone else. There is security, and there is also access. The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) addresses the term net neutrality as policies instead, defining it as “a national standard” which characterizes the (normally broadband) Internet service as “an essential service” (Federal Communications Commission, 2024), namely an necessity for modern life perhaps just like water and electricity.

### **Counterexample Three: Median and the Orderness in a Comparison-Based Model**

No matter what kinds of data, qualitative, quantitative, mixed, object-oriented or auxiliary, they can either be compared, or not. It follows a dichotomous distinction from the definition of the “comparison-based” computational model: if a pair of objects within a given dataset can be compared, it is of such type, otherwise not. Further, if all elements of such dataset can be compared in groups of two, which means pairwise, then the entire dataset is said to be sortable, and it follows that a sortable dataset can be sorted, which induces a sorted order or orderness, then the single object in the very middle of this sorted order is named, in statistical sciences, the *median* of the dataset. Obviously, with an even number of total elements, two elements would end up being the candidates of median, for which we may choose either a “virtual median” which is the average (i.e., arithmetic, geometric, or conceptual, by any benchmark metric of choice) between the two, or the lower candidate, or the higher candidate.

### **EXAMPLES**

#### **American Collegiate Leaderships’ Indifference on Domestic Verbal, Physical Violences**

The Israel-Hamas war and conflict since last October had become a global concern, which subsequently induced, in a free country like the United States, “free expressions” all over the places and even in private, Ivy-League higher education institutions’ campuses. The author attended such an institution for a postgraduate degree and graduated before the war broke out, and I was shocked by how quickly, since my departure from Philadelphia, my own campus, which had already been lack of security responsibilities, was further compromised by protesters and harassers to certain ethnic group(s) of constituent students on campus.

Consider a public or state university scenario: when an ordinary student walks across campus and is approached by any harassers, such incident takes place on a public ground that is supposedly land-owned by the state government, which consistently provides financial support for this institution. The associated law enforcements of the city, county and state are expected to be in charge of these cases and stopping the violence, upon the earliest moments they could be identified. What about private schools—say Harvard University or Columbia, most of the buildings, campus areas (which are partially fenced) or possibly some streets are owned by them, so it sounds like a private courtyard/property; then if someone malicious and assaulting comes in, and the University does not stop them, sometimes even while seeing the scenes, it can only be deduced that it is their decisions to let the violence happen, continue, and fester.

By now the author has studied completely and partially (matriculated) in nine higher-education institutions, among which eight were in the United States; while I was walking on the famous Locus Walk on University of Pennsylvania’s main campus, about the time I graduated from Penn, and was somehow approached by a random harasser who asked me for money and something else. I refused, and he uttered out the words that he was going to physically injure my body and my face, so immediately I, realizing that we were standing in the middle of an Ivy-League campus, told him seriously to “watch your language,” as a responsible, verbal action for defending my own campus’ safety and serenity. However, what is more shocking is the fact that two campus security people, at that time, were standing about ten feet away from me in front of Wharton business school’s other building; seeing it, one of them told me to just do no bother or just ignore it.

#### **“It Depends”: University Leaderships’ Abusing (Unethical) Neutrality on Assaults**

Higher levels of precision in our language usage “strengthens the social contract of trust” (Peterson, 20-

18, pp.260). When a professor answers questions during an office hour with a context-dependent and generative tone, students would like to listen and respect them, but it is no longer the case when it comes to right and wrong. The top leaderships of three elite universities in the United States were taking hours of time during a Congressional Committee testimony last December while their words were unsatisfactory, in that a relatively just-to-confirm type of question could end up receiving an “again, it depends on the context” answer (NBC News, 2024) which drew certain outrage, and we can clearly interpret such responses as an unethical, neutral stance upon judging and regulating on-campus violence and assaults, may it be verbal, physical, or psychological. What makes it even more controversial is the fact that these three are all private institutions.

It is arguably true that sometimes a certain expression can be abused in the first place, long before it confuses people in a dialogue or questioning scenario; free speech in general has been addressed and “protected” by the First Amendment of the Constitution of the United States as a cherished value that entails both direct words and symbolic actions (U.S. Courts, n.d.) such as burning the flag in protest (Brennan & Supreme Court of the United States, 1988).

### **Border and Its Induced Fentanyl Crises: Hesitance and Vulnerabilities**

The fentanyl poisoning crisis is only one among the derivatives induced by the border control failure [(murder case in June 2024 in Maryland by four-time border-crosser)] in the United States. Since the preceding winter many more migrants were coming into the southern American borders in various forms, oftentimes illegal and secretive, entering the states of Texas, Arizona and others via traffics. Geography did not become a barrier for the pouring and spreading of unknown migrants for which certain states managed to kick a “muddy ball” away to other states, such as from Florida to Vermont, by financially funding these people to travel by air or by buses using tax-payers money. When many migrants arrived in New York in Manhattan when the author just moved here as a transfer graduate student, on the news I occasionally overheard that the City Government was catering them, on occasions evening handing out pre-paid debit cards with small funds (e.g., actual money in hundreds of dollars) for these individuals to do grocery shopping; on one weekday in the spring, the city decided to close one public, secondary school for a day to shelter additional migrants at their athletic stadium, pushing its students to study online for at least one day.

It had been addressed that illegal and potentially threatening influxes of border-crossers had been “released from all over the world, from mental institutions and jails and terrorists,” and “pouring into our country,” for which the Republican nominee clarified himself as “not a conservative thing” but rather common sense (Dr. Phil Primetime, 2024). As far as “other peoples” coming into North America with the United States included is concerned, it is a continuing topic since settlers arrived, long after which since the Cold War for example it became a national security issue *domestic* to America; this problem is chronic, has been debated democratically, and has drawn humanistic considerations, but any corresponding contemporary agendas seem unsatisfactory. Because of the reluctance as well as ambiguities in border control, such criminal problems got worse, especially when we confirmed that murderers no longer crossed over to pursue American Dreams but simply to damage.

### **CONCLUSIONS: GOD’S “COMPLAINT” AND WHAT CAN BE LEARNED**

While observing and sensing the nature, may it be living creatures, forestation, mountains and creeks, or clouds and the sky, it is very hard for men not to feel appreciative and to ponder about the existence of a creator of all these. We are very much entitled to our ideologies and it is sometimes hard for us to be

aware of even nature. Appreciation would grant us values, or a benchmark for goodness, that we appreciate and pay attention to certain things as opposed to the rest, henceforth people would not just believe in anything. If we believe in nothing, we might fall for anything. Politically, if there exists a “political barometer” that can allow us to measure up things like air pressure for weather observation purposes, political scholars would use to analogize it, alongside with the “political compass” (O’Connell, 2023) which can tilt and forecast. Amongst all standards and rationales, America was founded on Judeo-Christian principles of the Bible; only if we stand in the truth can greater things be achieved. Reminders like “take care of ourselves first” ought not even to be mentioned: before we can help others, stand in with oneself. At least help everybody simultaneously and fairly.

Consider a remote resemblance with a streak of comets across the sky; when we listen to any perceived or so-called conservative senior professionals putting together a dialogue to address contemporary public affairs in a seemingly pseudo-reversed-generational American society in an attempt to send reminders to ordinary and young people, including policy-makers and prosecutors, in the hopes of bringing certain things back to a “norm,” they were not necessarily thinking about the own benefits, political interests, nor even their own legacies sometimes, but rather just following their own natural reactions to whichever gut-inertia feelings they were honing onto at those very moments. When a media journalist, a public figure, and a political leader sit together, what we can look in retrospect years from now might only be, at its minimum, some ordinary professionals who were doing their jobs and paying their necessary social responsibilities to voice for their own time in civilization’s history, although such effort still matters because they collectively thread our history. Such efforts might contribute to the balancing out of the left and the right, dragging along age-old stereotypes that can still teach us something about history and traditions, and finally leaving us a little bit of room to wait for God’s settling down into His seat, one that is not meant to be taken even if it were in the middle by any measure. This article hereby makes an appeal for strong stances on things in general, namely societal issues, and in particular on collective decisions for common sense, the public good, and ultimately social welfare. Who discard morality as “pure centrists” are akin to a toxic cancer to healthy, democratic sociopolitical progresses. In addition and slightly aside, neither do pure competitions have any inherent benefits nor an ethical ground for progress at either the individual nor the societal level, in a way such that wasting time getting trapped by a “short circuit” of competitions, often times unhealthy, toxic and even mutually-vindictive, can be a common mistake that many youths and organizations run into nowadays, when people and entities ought to have better things to do.

Generations have reversed. What we observe in the general public includes but is not limited to a tendency away from the limelight so as to minimize public attention. Fast forwarding to the present, as part of the remaining active candidates of the 2024 United States Presidential Election the contemporary American politician Robert F. Kennedy Jr., while preparing his rationale and introducing his running mate, reflects their philosophical stances relatively from opinions of the two parties, in that Kennedy was referred to as either right-wing extremists, by the Democrats, or “a left-wing lunatic” according to the Republican side; he nonetheless leveraged them to establish himself as “neither right nor left, nor in the center” but rather “with common sense” in order to “stand for peace and against war,” to “end chronic disease epidemic,” and to address tribalism, demonization, rancor (Kennedy, 2024) and so on, in a way that he confessed that he did not even know were these above priorities left or right, or else. Cliche as it might sound, we can hardly deny how obvious it is that the heat generated by left-right dynamics is confusing our ethics to tell right from wrong and maintain our sanity. Despite the multiple

American contexts mentioned, the author in this article aims at addressing a generality so that the argument and conclusions can also be adapted or even applied on other occasions.

## REFERENCES

1. Brancucci, A., Lucci, G., Mazzatenta, A. & Tommasi, L. (2008). Asymmetries of the Human Social Brain in the Visual, Auditory and Chemical Modalities. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B*. <http://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2008.0279>
2. Brennan, W. J. & Supreme Court of the United States. (1988). *U.S. Reports: Texas v. Johnson*, 491 U.S. 397 [Periodical].
3. Carlisle, R. P. (2005). *Encyclopedia of Politics: The Left and The Right (Volume 1: The Left)*. SAGE Publications.
4. Duboc, V., Dufourcq, P., Blader, P., & Roussigné, M. (2015). Asymmetry of the Brain: Development and Implications. *Annual Review of Genetics*, 49, 647–672.
5. Kennedy Jr., R. F. (2024). RFK Jr.: Are We Left Or Right? *YouTube*. Retrieved April 16, 2024, from <https://youtu.be/EPLyp0K5vR0?si=kwzbGfKJq6S6LZKl>
6. Dr. Phil Primetime. (2024). Dr. Phil's One on One Interview with Donald Trump. *YouTube*. Retrieved June 6, 2024, from <https://youtu.be/TfPS4a-K3bI?si=9dbZ3wDCt-zcWbN8>
7. Elhefnawy, N. (2021). 'What is Centrism?': An Examination of Centrism as a Conservative Political Philosophy. *An Examination of Centrism as a Conservative Political Philosophy* (June 15, 2021).
8. Federal Communications Commission. (2015). Open Internet Report and Order on Remand, Declaratory Ruling, and Order. *FCC-15-24*.
9. Federal Communications Commission. (2024). Net Neutrality. *Federal Communications Commission*. Retrieved from <https://www.fcc.gov/net-neutrality>
10. Garry, P. M. (2017). *The False Promise of Big Government: How Washington Helps the Rich and Hurts the Poor*. ISI Books.
11. Gill, E. (1988). *An Essay on Typography*. David R. Godine Publisher.
12. Jamison, M. (2018). Net Neutrality Policies and Regulation in the United States. *Review of Network Economics*, 17(3), 151-173. <https://doi.org/10.1515/rne-2018-0041>
13. Lowi, T. J. et al. (2022). *American Government: A Brief Introduction* (Brief Seventeenth Edition). W. W. Norton & Company.
14. Ludwig, W. (1932). *Das Rechts-Links Problem im Tierreich und beim Menschen*. Berlin: Springer-Verlag.
15. Noback, C. R. & Demarest, R. J. (1981). *The Human Nervous System: Basic Principles of Neurobiology* (Third Edition). McGraw-Hill Book Company.
16. Maia TV, Cooney RE, Peterson BS. The Neural Bases of Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder in Children and Adults. *Developmental Psychopathology*. 2008 Fall; 20(4):1251-83.
17. O'Connell, P. L. (Dec. 4, 2003). "Online Diary." *The New York Times*. Retrieved 17 June 2023 from <https://www.nytimes.com/2003/12/04/technology/online-diary.html>
18. Robinson, C. E. (1932). Maine—Political Barometer. *Political Science Quarterly*, 47(2), 161–184. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2143085>
19. Taylor, C. (1967). Neutrality in Political Science. *Philosophy, Politics and Society*, 3, 25-75.
20. Peterson, J. B. (2018). *12 Rules for Life: An Antidote to Chaos*. Penguin Books.



21. U.S. Courts. (n.d.). What Does Free Speech Mean? About Federal Courts. Retrieved from <https://www.uscourts.gov/about-federal-courts/educational-resources/about-educational-outreach/activity-resources/what-does>
22. Van Valen, L. (1962). A Study of Fluctuating Asymmetry. *Evolution*, 125-142.
23. Walton, K. (2018). Lon L. Fuller on Political Obligation. *The American Journal of Jurisprudence* (Volume 63, Issue 2, pp. 175-188).
24. Woshinsky, O. H. (2008). *Explaining Politics: Culture, Institutions, and Political Behavior*. Routledge.