

# Follow the Animal?

Marcia R. Pinheiro

IICSE University, USA

---

**Abstract** It seems that we have all inverted in our heads because of the investment society makes in subliminal, sometimes without even noticing it in a conscious manner. Because we have all inverted in our heads, we start having it all inverted in our spirits. For having it all inverted in our spirits, we end up having a completely unfair and biased world, where everyone who should be on top is oppressed to highest possible levels and everyone who should even be exterminated by the State is praised and rewarded to highest levels. To stop such a phenomenon, we must pay attention to the really small things, such as the colony of bees. In this paper, I will show you why.

**Keywords** Sociology, Politics, Oppressed, Oppressor, Subliminal

---

## 1. Introduction

We suffer crime for fantastic sixteen years plus in First World Democracy, and we certainly blame the own authority for law and order for absolutely all of it, as you can see, for instance, in sources like (Pinheiro, 2017). That made us think quite a lot about the systems in place.

One of the things that we observed is how much value we put in things that, if seen from another perspective, perhaps the right one, would actually be worthless.

Another thing that we observed is that love is about sublimation and sacrifice. It was never about pleasure, so that we can only love God if we go through Jesus Christ, that is, through immense sacrifices and sublimation. We can only love another human being if we accept going through several sacrifices and immense sublimation. Even love for a profession implies that.

Yet another thing we observed is that the most compliant subject may be compliant because they hope to get the friendship of the own authority, like perhaps they see themselves in their place naturally, as it certainly was our case. Perhaps they simply think their declared thoughts and apparent intents coincide with theirs. If that is their reason to comply, then, instead of being the most intelligent members in social terms, they are the most stupid, since authority is, per se, an abstraction, something that refers to nobody in particular and to no human being: It refers to a concept we created, therefore to something that fits in a piece of paper. We should seek love of actual human beings, not of entities, since those, just like most of the animals, are simply incapable of loving: We may love them, but they cannot, for reasons that are very logical, love us back.

The authority themselves may have everything inverted in their heads, and be, for instance, like Léa Ricci Pinheiro<sup>1</sup>, who declared she was going to become a Taxation Officer because of the power and influence involved, that that would make people like her. This inversion may come from the smallest things that are passed from generation to generation but remain unexamined, either properly or in totality, things such as the bees story.

Logic may frequently work both ways: marginal's and God's People's. It is a matter of studying both sides and finding ways to sustain the choice for being good or socially kind.

If you go for the side of the marginal, you can say, for instance, that having sex is getting another person to know you, so that the more promiscuous you are, the more people will know you. In this case, if someone said you had died, but you had not died, you would have more chances of being told to still be alive, and therefore of having people looking for you even after years of you having disappeared in the bush.

If you go for the side of God's People, you can say that only one person really knows you, and that is your sexual partner, and you have only one. They know your psyche, your actual persona (Pinheiro, 2017b), since you chose to dedicate yourself to having a true relationship. In this way, if you are kidnapped and the cops are studying ways to save you, your partner can

---

\* Corresponding author:

drmarciapinheiro@gmail.com (Marcia R. Pinheiro)

Published online at <http://journal.sapub.org/ap>

Copyright © 2017 Scientific & Academic Publishing. All Rights Reserved

---

<sup>1</sup> Face to face interaction with her

come and help them in terms of what you would naturally be doing if they approached the place in this or that way, what could then save your life.

They could also instruct the cops in terms of what to say to get you to comply and do what they need you to do, once they are in the place, inside of the time they need you to do it.

In one case, we talk about knowledge of your body, of your physicality, and, even so, only of what is apparent, not allergies, diseases, issues, fragilities, etc. In the other case, we talk about knowledge of your soul, of your essence, and therefore knowledge that may last forever.

One point is that the body changes every fraction of second, but our essence is rarely changed. In this way, only continuous sexual relationship could return knowledge of the body that be appropriate to judge things in the just-described situation, since the situation could occur five years after you had sex with the person and they could then be much fatter, even of another skin colour due to some disease, another nose shape due to plastic surgery, etc.

Another point is that this life is transitory, evidence of the existence of the human soul is historic and abundant (Pinheiro, 2015), this life, compared to eternal life, is nothing, is like a second in a year. In this way, knowing the physical body of the person, even if that knowledge could be regarded as absolute, is nothing, for the body shape will change in each new incarnation. You can then tell that the corpse the cops found is not the corpse of your lover, but you cannot tell that the person in the next body is the same person you had intimacy with. On the other hand, if you have a true relationship, you will never be mistaken: You will recognize that partner in each one of their incarnations.

With this, our labour, of investing in that relationship, is never wasted: It will pay dividends for eternity.

If we know only the body of the person, however, and therefore if we choose not to cognize the person in the quality of a human persona (Pinheiro, 2017a), we are wasting our resources instead of investing: Another person will come into our lives, and we will repeat the same processes without ever evolving. That means that our human incarnation is definitely not being used to progress to maximum that we can, and we may take millennia to reincarnate.

It seems that human kind has always chosen optimization as the best investment, so that we tend to think that people who plan their lives do much better than those who don't. In this case, the choice for knowing the body, but not the spirit, is nonsensical.

In the same way, the cop can choose to use his gun and entitlements in general to get whatever he wants from human life in a selfish manner, but the virtue will help society and keep this world fair, so that there will be police in the future, for instance, and their public respect or standing will still be the same.

Arguments exist in favour of hell and in favour of heavens. It is all about how much weight we give to each item, and how much we get as our own overall in this way. As The Bible seems to tell us everywhere: God set us free to choose even between Him and the devil.

We should try to produce theories and spread things, also in a subliminal manner, in a way not to injure what we call God's People. Those would be the people who have good intentions with this world, fellows at work, society in general, and so on.

This paper will perhaps tell us what shouldn't be done.

## 2. Development

We observed the story fellow humans, such as our teachers, told us from closer, and decided that the bees, instead of being the most developed beings, with a dimension of organizational power that is impressive and natural, the most hardworking animals, and also the most productive, are actually a bunch of idiots: They all serve one Lord, which would be the queen bee, and that Lord is fat, much fatter than them, idle, and lives to vomit and procreate. All they do in life is eating, depositing their vomit in their cubicles, which obviously then compare to our toilet bowls, and segregating what may as well be sexual material, perhaps comparable to menstruation in humans.

You can read a bit more about that in (Pinheiro, 2013).

The thing is that this piece of information makes what was super clean, organized, and seen as a super intelligent creation, become a dirty toilet bowl... Also makes what used to be a super intelligent set of beings become the most stupid of all.

Now, this seems compatible with the designation insect: They would have to be inferior to human beings. So far, however, given the way Biologists and other professionals refer to this animal, most of us have the impression that we are actually inferior to the bees.

Perhaps this perspective finally puts this class of animals in the right place.

Also the Egyptians are told to be extremely intelligent people, who produced a few of the greatest wonders of human kind, such as the pyramids. In reality, however, most of the Egyptians, from the time that is usually seen as a time when their intelligence was most prominent, would spend their lives digging or moving stones [(Salam, 2002), (Jamille, 2014)], so that their leaders could have their own pyramid. They would work for even way more than eight hours per day, digging in a really stupid way, completely unhealthy and irrational, and, in the end, what they would get from that is that their leaders would have a home. Sometimes it would be a death chamber or something like that.

If rationality were ever there, they would form a little group and take off in order to enjoy their own lives, their own bodies, and existence, is it not? They could build much simpler houses for themselves, say igloos, and spend most of their lives having fun instead, so say observing nature, creating and nurturing their own family, writing books or whatever.

We haven't found any special reason to separate their organs from their bodies, and then put those inside of containers. It looks like we could embalm people with way less effort, and their corpses would last for even longer in a good state. Cryogenics (Smith, 2016) could be mentioned here.

Yet, some people theorize that The Gods told the Egyptians how to embalm, and The Gods are obviously seen as supreme beings, beings of infinite intelligence. From what we have read, embalming in Egypt involved even spices and/or wine (The Trustees, 1999).

That sounds like food, quite sincerely.

Cryogenics sounds way more intelligent, and therefore either The Gods became more intelligent, changed, and we now get better inspiration from them or this all comes from ourselves somehow.

The Egyptians, in general, were quite stupid, and that is why they spent their lives in what we could easily call voluntary slavery. Their lives would serve the purpose of giving comfort and luxury to leaders that would, for instance, randomly select a few of them to be thrown over the precipice in a deep dive that would lead to the early termination of their human bodies.

That is another perspective, and perhaps the only right way to see it.

The bees also seem to engage in the practice of voluntary slavery and serve the purpose of a fat, ugly, and idle bee, that being why we call it queen.

They are therefore quite stupid, just like the Egyptians from the past: Either they are super dependent beings, who need that queen to do things they cannot do themselves or they are super underdeveloped in terms of intelligence and cannot see what else they could be doing with their lives.

As said in our introduction, Logic can be used in all ways, including defending hell.

In a recent paper, Chibuikem (2017) says the following:

Plato (Plato, 1991) is convinced that social justice is directly related to individual justice such that an understanding of justice in the social dimension simply entails understanding it in the individual sense. In (Plato, 1991), Glaucon challenges Socrates to define justice and to show why acting justly should be thought to be in anyone's self-interest. They offer a threefold classification of goods viz; (i) intrinsic good (e.g. harmless good); (ii) intrinsic and instrumental good (e.g. health and knowledge); and (iii) instrumental good (e.g. medicine and exercise). Glaucon and Adeimantus (Plato, 1991) claim that most people rightly regard justice as a type iii good and they want Socrates to show that it is type ii good. They argue thus:

1. Justice arises as a sort of social contract
2. Hence, people have a reason to seem just, but no reason to be just.
3. Moreover, if justice is type ii good, then, the just person must always be happier than the unjust person – even when the just person is *on a rack* and the unjust person is at liberty.

The simplest way to play Socrates is then saying that item 3 has an obvious flaw: The just person would have to be happier than the unjust person only if they were in the same situation, so that you would have to consider the just and the unjust on a rack to tell whether justice is intrinsic and instrumental or not. The just could be happier than any other person in the same situation, proving that justice is a good that is intrinsic. If the other is at liberty and they are in jail, they can be upset with the fact that the other is at liberty, and the other can be happy because of the same fact. But it is then the fact that justice is not happening that is causing the unhappiness and the happiness that became intrinsic. Moreover, there is also material justice, which is something different from intrinsic and instrumental, since instrumental is compared to health and knowledge. You may have material justice, so say your name remains the same, and that might not be instrumental, so say you are simply insisting that you want that name even though it is blacklisted everywhere, like it is your name or something.

Justice is not a contract: Justice is a feeling, a feeling of balance, of being even, a feeling of respect for the rules, which should reflect the local morality when there is democracy and capitalism.

This is a perfect example of manipulative argument, unsound and unreasonable, but associated somehow to respected names and people, so arguments likely to remain in the Collective Unconscious (Pinheiro, 2014) as something sound despite their real nature, which is precisely what we talked about before: Logic can be used to defend hell and Logic can be used to defend heavens.

In 2001, end of the year, Doctor Pinheiro told Trevor Skinner that perhaps if men learned how to respect the animals, they would learn how to respect women, since they frequently called women bitches, dogs, and so on.

Human beings are used to do whatever they please to the animals. Only sometimes will the animals be able to react in a way that is compatible with Logic or closer to what is compatible with it. A man got eaten by his dogs when he came back from somewhere. He had left all his dogs without food for all that time, the time he was away, weeks. See (Pinheiro, 2016).

Human beings force dogs to themselves and they invent they like them. Thanks God we have at least (Pinheiro, 2016) to tell us that dogs and human beings are different things: It is very unlikely that a human being would eat the other upon being

left to starvation. In fact, nothing has been said that makes us think this is possible, even though several cases of animals eating even their babies have been reported.

Dogs should not love human beings: Dogs should at most not have a choice and then learn how to display behaviour that seems to be compatible with the human definition of love, so that they would actually be behaving just like what we seem to see described in the argument above (seem to love for instrumental gain).

Several men say that the dog is a better investment than a female partner because the dog will always return unconditional love. Unconditional love, however, is not a rational choice: The own man will stop loving or will love in a different way, which is equivalent to stopping to love, if the woman betrays them.

Several things, if said over and over, so, in particular if they are part of popular dicta, will influence social behaviour and therefore social investment, laws, and all else.

That is one of the things (Pinheiro, 2017c) talks about.

It seems that we are advertising the figure of the queen bee as something really good: A static figure who lives to be served by others and whose sole social function is procreating (MAAREC, 2017).

We are also advertising the figure of the Egyptian leaders: Moving figures who had despotic power.

We are also advertising the figure of a good female partner: A dog.

This has to stop.

Still in Chibuikem (2017), we see the following paragraph:

In other words, the principles of psychology and political science are the same. The soul of the individual person is a miniature version of the structure of society and society could be viewed as the individual person projected on a large screen. However, the relationship between the two is deeper than that of simply having a parallel structure. The relation between the individual and the State now becomes plain, for the three classes in the State is an extension of the three parts of the soul.

If the soul of the individual person is a miniature version of the structure of society, a woman should be worth less than a dog in the social structure, and, quite sincerely, that is exactly what we see.

Dogs are spotted without food, locked, without proper care, and human beings will call the dogs' organ, which will come, fine the owner, collect the dog, and so on. Women all over the world are seen locked inside of their homes on a permanent basis when every human being needs air, regular exercise, which does include long walks, and all else.

To make it all worse, the dogs' organ will happily find this dog another owner, who will then hopefully, and according to their expectations, finally provide proper care to the dog. Women all over the world are even institutionally and governmentally forced to the men who oppress them instead.

Were a dog an independent being or a more independent being, such as the wild animals, say koalas, human beings would even be forbidden from keeping them inside of their homes.

Women are obviously more than the koalas. Even so, instead of forbidding men from keeping them at home, most of the time clearly against their will, the law or The State forces them to be kept at home by the husband who enslaved them in Islam.

Time to make these popular dicta become forbidden: In Brazil, Chiquinho Scarpa, a multimillionaire, called a black woman monkey and got arrested. His arrest was advertised in the entire nation. Well, why not locking anyone who says such things? That does create impact, and very negative societal impact, to the side of women.

Nelson Ricci Pinheiro had a dog called Poti. When Poti became old, Nelson decided for abandoning him in a park, so that the dog would die on his own. Nelson refused to pay for euthanasia and did not want to watch Poti die.

Nelson told that to many people, including Doctor Pinheiro.

Why is it that the rules some places on earth apply to human beings who become old would not be applied to dogs? Isn't that top cruelty?

Poti was spotted eating rats that were bigger than his size several times because Nelson left Poti amongst them: His house was infested with rats and so was his back yard, where Poti was kept. Would you think that the law or The State could allow a baby to be left where the rats were? Poti was spotted by Doctor Pinheiro with the rat's tail still hanging from his mouth. Why? The dog tried not to chew the really bad meat of the rat. It just wanted to get rid of the possibility of being eaten by it.

Would that not be top cruelty?

And that is the animal Nelson would say was better than his wife, for he had unconditional love for him. Like Nelson is every male on earth...

To the being who is the best he can think of, death away from home, from his carer, from his supposed partner, and living amongst rats that he is obliged to eat for matters of survival (Survivor is just a TV Show...).

Oblige the Nelsons to take care of their Potis as expected and they will perhaps never repeat that the dog has more love for him than his chosen sexual partner.

Besides, Nelson claimed not to have money to buy food for himself, and therefore being obliged to subject Poti to a vegetarian diet. We would think everyone thinks that dogs need meat. If Nelson was unable to provide the basic elements to the dog, shouldn't we oblige the government to give Poti to a more suitable owner? Like the dog are the women indeed...

How many women do not have sex every day with their husbands, complain about that, and end up told to visit psychologists instead of getting help of those they complain with, especially when those are government, to find more suitable partners and not be bothered by the bad one again?

Sex should be a basic need in a marriage between two human beings...

It is even biblical...

If the man cannot provide, the woman should have not only a legal excuse that is very plausible to abandon that marriage and home, but she should be helped by The State in terms of finding a more suitable partner and being protected against any form of violence as well as contact with the bad one. That is like eating for human beings in terms of marriage, definitely is.

### 3. Conclusions

We are what we advertise, so that we become our dicta, our imported words, and our history books, basically.

We can advertise Logic and its use, but we then have to teach people the ways Logic can be used to trick us, the ways they can fight against their opponents and their deceitful actions, and so on.

Perhaps we can keep on saying that The Egyptians were the most intelligent people ever alive, but we then have to say that the way of living of the vast majority of the Egyptians was really stupid or something like that: Once we refer to someone or something by means of the designation intelligent, we should also refer to whatever is about that someone or something that is not intelligent to create choices, ways to keep those who are listening thinking in an active manner, and absorbing mostly what they really want to absorb.

We cannot keep on saying that the bees are highly organized beings, with really impressive amount of intelligence: That causes losses to human kind as a whole. One of those losses is that human beings start believing a Centrelink person is OK. A Centrelink person is not OK: Either the government is not doing their job, of reintegrating the person to society after a short period of support, or the person is a parasite by choice. In both cases, a horrible mistake has happened, and we are not fixing it, so that the Centrelink person is not only not-OK, they are the proof of our failure as a race. They are our queen bee, and therefore it is not OK saying that the bees are super OK.

The bees have at least one big problem, which is precisely the queen. Call that their load in life...

We cannot keep on saying that the animals love us: They don't. Animals learn how to simulate the aspect of human love at most, and they do that for a very good reason: They cannot eat otherwise.

There may be oddities, such as the dog that missed the owner so much they found their tomb and visited it every day as if mourning. Yet, we cannot tell if that is the same as human love or not, and it probably isn't. One of the biggest differences is that human beings choose to love each other, and choose from a position of equality. Choosing means knowing all that is involved, having options, and even so saying yes. For as long as the animals do not have a choice, we cannot ever tell if they love us or not.

A dog does not have unconditional love for a human: Their love lasts for as long as their needs are being satisfied. In this way, nobody has unconditional love for anyone else. Love in normal humans has to be a rational occurrence, for humans are rational. In this way, love is always conditional. It is precisely those who most defend unconditional love in their partners that will stop feeling love upon the silliest things on earth, so say having their partners falling into temptation and going to bed with someone else.

Equating women to animals and treating animals in a humane way means that the government should not only accept denial of provision of the good sex as enough reason to stop a marriage between a man and a woman, legally do that, but also that the government should help the woman get a better partner, one that can provide sex, and still protect her from any contact with the bad partner, the previous one.

Equating women to animals and treating animals in a humane way also means never allowing women to be badly treated if they are kept at home, so that even in Islam women should look happy and have their basic needs satisfied.

## REFERENCES

Pinheiro, M. R. (2017). *Rio: The Chains of Slavery and Abuse* (1st ed.). CreateSpace. Retrieved from [https://www.amazon.com/RIO-Slavery-Dr-Marcia-Pinheiro/dp/1548246271/ref=asap\\_bc?ie=UTF8](https://www.amazon.com/RIO-Slavery-Dr-Marcia-Pinheiro/dp/1548246271/ref=asap_bc?ie=UTF8)

Pinheiro, M. R. (2015). *Anima Est*. IICSE University. Retrieved from <http://journals.abc.us.org/index.php/abcra/article/view/589>

- Pinheiro, M. R. (2017a). Human Persona. *International Journal of Advances in Philosophy*, 1(2), 21–24. <http://doi.org/10.5923/j.ap.20170102.01>
- Pinheiro, M. R. (2017b). Human Persona (preprint). *International Journal of Advances in Philosophy*. Retrieved from [http://www.academia.edu/29803023/Human\\_Persona](http://www.academia.edu/29803023/Human_Persona)
- Pinheiro, M. R. (2013). Super Hot Topics for Your PhD: Oh, It Is Burning! Retrieved June 24, 2017, from <http://onscienceingeneral.blogspot.com.au/2013/05/super-hot-topics-for-your-phd-oh-it-is.html>
- Salam, M. E. A. El. (2002). Construction of Underground Works and Tunnels in Ancient Egypt. *Elsevier*, 17(3), 295–304. Retrieved from <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0886779802000251>
- Jamille, M. (2014). Piramides na National Geographic (2001). Retrieved July 12, 2017, from <http://arqueologiaegipcia.com.br/2014/05/27/piramides-na-national-geographic-2001/>
- Smith, R. (2016). What is Cryogenics and How Does Freezing Bodies Work? *Express*. Retrieved from <http://www.express.co.uk/news/science/733717/What-is-cryogenics-how-does-freezing-dead-body-work>
- The Trustees of the British Museum. (1999). Embalming the Body. Retrieved June 24, 2017, from <http://www.ancientegypt.co.uk/mummies/story/page2.html>
- Ogam Nicholas Chibuikem, An Insight into the Notion of Social Justice Following Plato and Rawls, *International Journal of Advances in Philosophy*, Vol. 1 No. 2, 2017, pp. 25-30. doi: 10.5923/j.ap.20170102.02
- Pinheiro, M. R. (2014). A New Model for the Human Psyche. *Quest Journals Journal of Research in Humanities and Social Science*, 2(5), 61–65. Retrieved from [www.questjournals.org/pub/marcia-pinheiro/70/941/6a0/](http://www.questjournals.org/pub/marcia-pinheiro/70/941/6a0/)
- Pinheiro, M. R. (2016). Pets that Ate Their Owners. Retrieved June 24, 2017, from <http://academicstogetherforever.blogspot.com.au/2016/11/pets-that-ate-their-owners.html>
- Pinheiro, M. R. (2017c). The Words from the Gap II: De-characterizing or Enriching? Retrieved June 24, 2017, from <http://www.proz.com/translation-articles/articles/4438/1/%3Cfont-color%3Dred%3EThe-Words-from-the-Gap-II%3A-De-characterizing-or-Enriching%3F-%3C%7B47%7Dfont%3E>
- MAAREC. (2017). Honey Bee Biology. Retrieved June 24, 2017, from <https://agdev.anr.udel.edu/maarec/honey-bee-biology/>