



Cognitive Stupidity

James F Welles*

P.O. Box 17, East Marion, New York, USA

*Corresponding author: James F Welles, P O Box 17, East Marion, NY 11939 New York, USA;
Tel: +954-531-5392; 631-323-8153; E-mail: [jwelles103 \[at\] aol \[dot\] com](mailto:jwelles103@aol.com)

Abstract

The brain of an infant may be the blank tablet envisaged by Locke [1], but as it is shaped by both experience and language it develops into the mind of an adult. As the character of the maturing individual becomes defined, the mind shapes experiences decreasingly according to immediate stimuli themselves and increasingly according to linguistic interpretations of and emotional reactions to perceptions. Thus, the environment does not dictate human behavior but provides but provides a context for its expression.

Keywords: Brain; Mental health

Introduction

The basis for interpreting environmental stimuli is the schema-the cognitive program (Ger: Weltanschauung) which acts as a template for perceptual experience and provides expectations and explanations about objects and their relations to and interactions with each other [2]. It is populated by or constructed of memes [3], which are subjected to selection pressure by the psychocultural environment and thus are not necessarily as true as they are gratifying and popular. Just as a reigning intellectual paradigm defines each of our modern sciences (e.g., atoms in chemistry) [4], aschema defines the mental life of an individual by providing an intellectual frame of reference for information, ideas and behavior. Traceable back to Edmund Husserl's phenomenological observation of the mind's tendency to organize experiences [5], like Piaget's mental structure [6], it comprises the "Cognitive map" of the individual's reality and determines his 1. world-view, 2. self-concept, 3. self-ideal and 4. ethical convictions. While providing basic notions about principles of nature and theories about how the world works, the schema both fosters and inhibits further learning. It is particularly good at promoting learning of refinement, whereby established expectations are confirmed and reinforced and responses made more subtle. However, learning of novelty is made less probable and more difficult by preset patterns of thought which limit an individual's range of cognitive adjustment. Thus, the schema

encourages self-corrective, fine tuning of itself even in cases in which it remains a maladaptive behavioral program. The learning process can be broken down into two interrelated steps: assimilation and accommodation [7]. Assimilation is the perception of stimuli and the incorporation of experience into an existing schema; it is accomplished by assigning the percept of an object or phenomenon to an established cognitive category as defined by the individual's vocabulary. An Accommodation is the change or modification of the schema due to the assimilation of new information. Minor adjustments, refinements and modifications of the schema are very common and occur with little or no awareness or emotion. The resulting schema is the individual's reorganization of his experience into a system which provides both predictability of events and a sound basic strategy for successful behavior.

Attitudes: However, as an individual matures, the presence of the schema tends to dominate the process of assimilation by defining perception in progressively restrictive terms and by the formation a There are, of course, nonverbal schemas - e.g., those which permit us to interpret physical forms, body language, music, etc. However, as our prime concern here is with interpersonal stupidity, we will concentrate our attention on verbal/behavioral schemas of attitudes which evaluate perceived data. Attitudes determine whether a given fact is construed favorably or not. This point is easily demonstrated by a play on a standard form of

Received date: 28 July 2020; **Accepted date:** 08 August 2020; **Published date:** 13 August 2020

Citation: Welles JF (2020) Cognitive Stupidity. SunText Rev Neurosci Psychol 1(1): 107.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.51737/2766-4503.2020.007>

Copyright: © 2020 Welles JF. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.



humor: "I have some good news and some bad news: the Yankees won last night". This is good news to Yankee fans and bad news to Yankee haters.

Laugh or not, there are three factors which may contribute to the formation of attitudes. First of all, attitudes may be rooted in a person's need to know about the environment. Such attitudes are data based and provide a verbal knowledge system to which incoming bits of information are compared or contrasted. Attitudes may also be adopted because of externally applied social rewards and pressures of normative group influence. Finally, attitudes may be expressions of the value system of the individual and provide him with the self-satisfaction of self-sustaining internal rewards [8]. Along with their function of evaluating information, attitudes also act to promote the achievement of goals deemed to be worthy, to maintain self-esteem and to express views. Most important of all to students of stupidity, attitudes determine what a person considers to be his "Best interest". This is crucial if stupidity is deliberate, informed, maladaptive behavior that is, behavior counter to one's own best interest. The determination of "Best interest" thus turns out to be quite an arbitrary process. The basic problem with such an evaluation is that judgment is so "Attitudinal". For example, the extreme case of homicide may variously be considered a crime (murder), necessity (self-defense), heroic (combat) or simply negligent if not accidental: the evaluation of the act depends very much upon the circumstances and the attitude of the judge.

It is by interacting with the environment that people reveal their attitudes—the beliefs, values and ideas which the reference group's language and norms have molded into a schema. Socialization internalizes this system so that it defines who and what a member is and does. As a young person matures or an initiate conforms, external rewards and punishments become anticipated and behavior adjusts to preconceived expectations.

It is important to note that the creed of a group functions as a unifying force [9]. Political and economic systems (e.g., democracy, capitalism, etc.) are often misconstrued as descriptive of how societies interact with their environments. Actually, along with behavioral rituals which are also binding, such systems are concrete expressions of ideological creeds which promote group unity. When the system's values are internalized, the individual feels himself to be part of a homogeneous group of people comfortable with themselves regardless of what they are doing.

One of the inherent drawbacks of intense group loyalty, however, is that it can interfere with logical analysis of problems [10] and corrupt the super-ego values of the group. The unacknowledged goal of most groups is maintenance of the schema. Reason is used to rationalize, and value-based perception is skewed to favor the schematic/social quo. Conformity is the standard and intellectual integrity a threat to short-term, immediate complacency. Unfortunately, the long-term consequences can be disastrous, as

happened in the Penn State scandal centered on convicted child molester Jerry Sandusky [11].

To achieve and maintain a healthy balance, there must be a dynamic tradeoff between the short-term social needs of the group and the long-term intellectual imperative of information. This inherent compromise is typical of the human condition and displays itself as emotional conflict, suppressed or expressed, in all but the total conformist. One of the saving graces of a schema is that, consistent with the theory of cognitive dissonance, it can easily make minor adjustments changes which reduce rather than arouse emotional tension. Accumulated minor adjustments can add up to a significant schematic alteration which would be traumatic if forced in one step. This process is comparable to the gradual evolution of one species into another by the accumulation of genetic mutations.

Minor adjustment makes it possible to retain the schema while behavior adapts to novel circumstances. This is ideal for a stupid society, as it permits vague and ambiguous leaders to do somewhat more or less than they should while their followers can believe their cause to be sacred. As new behavioral norms emerge, so too may an identity crisis or conflict gradually evolve as traditional values are deemphasized for the sake of group cooperation in new circumstances. The mechanism of successful schematic adaptation to novelty is, usually, largely language dependent, as it is language that provides the basis for our cognitive life, including the expanded mental capacity to be both very intelligent and very stupid.

References

1. Locke J. An essay concerning human understanding. Bk. II, Chap. I, Sec 2. Locke's psychology provided the basis for the American environmentalist learning side of the Nature. Nurture controversy. The European genetic intrinsic side was first broached by Immanuel Kant, who attributed inherent structure to the human mind (leading to such traits as aggression, curiosity and morality). The Hegelian synthesis offered here is that language and social values in one's cultural environment structure the mind and make us human/stupid. 1690.
2. Hamilton D, Ericsson K, Simon H. A cognitive-attributional analysis of stereotyping. In advances in experimental social psychology edited by L. Berkowitz. Academic Press; New York. 1979; 12: 53-84.
3. Dawkins R. The blind watchmaker. Longman, London. 1986; 158.
4. Kuhn T. The structure of scientific revolutions. 3rd edition. University of Chicago Press. Chicago. 1996.
5. Husserl E. 1900-1901. Logische Untersuchungen. Piaget, J. Structurism. 1971.
6. Piaget J. The moral judgement of the child. Macmillan, New



SUNTEXT REVIEWS

York. 1932.

7. Proshansky H, Seidenberg B. Basic studies in social psychology. 1965.
8. Rinehart H. Winston, New York. 104.
9. Arnold T. The folklore of capitalism. Yale University Press. New Haven, CT. 1937.
10. Proshansky, Seidenberg. op. cit. 616.
11. TMZ Staff. Report finds paterno aided sandusky cover-up. AOL. 2012.