

# ToM / KoF

“Theory of Mind” oder “Knowledge of Falsity”

Probleme mit der “Theory of Mind” werden mit Autismus in Zusammenhang gebracht. Unumstritten ist dieser Zusammenhang aber nicht. Und auch die evtl. resultierenden Konsequenzen sind unklar.

Was sicher häufig gilt ist, dass Asperger-Autisten Schwierigkeiten haben das Verhalten ihrer Mitmenschen zu verstehen und vorherzusagen ... weil es häufig irrational ist!

Wer also die Probleme verstehen möchte, der sollte nicht nur schauen, was den Aspies mangelt, sondern auch, wie komisch NT´s handeln, im Denken aber auch im Irrationalen.

Hier das “Knowledge of Falsity”, das Wissen um häufige Denk-Fehler:

## **Beware of**

### **- mistreating the logic**

One often occurring error is to mistake an implication ( $\Rightarrow$ ) for an equivalence ( $\Leftrightarrow$ ).  
"Auties are often good in systemizing" is an implication and it's NOT an equivalence!  
You are NOT allowed to conclude, that all people, who are good in systemizing are auties!

Other errors are e.g. mistaking coincidence for causality (like the pigeon in the skinner-box).  
Today with the abilities of our culture we are in the same moment the pigeon as well as the builder of the box.

### **- mistaking the tools**

There are two kinds of mistaking the tools.

The one derives from [Kants] Formula of Humanity, [that] commands that “you use humanity, whether in your own persona or in the person of any other, always at the same time as an end, never merely as a means.”

from [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Groundwork\\_of\\_the\\_Metaphysics\\_of\\_Morals](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Groundwork_of_the_Metaphysics_of_Morals)

Using the tools is quite the opposite: use the tool always only as means and never as an end!  
So systemizing is a tool which has to be used for an end, not for speculation.

The other mistake is to take the wrong tool for a task.

Systemizing is a very powerfull tool e.g. for problem-solving.

But systemizing is the wrong tool for answering moral questions.

If reasoning will help at all, I prefere the French moralists as Montaigne and Pascal.

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/French\\_moralists](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/French_moralists)

Another wrong use of a tool is to take the law as a tool for moral.

But law is based on a minimum consensus that is thought to enable a relative peacefull living together.

Moral in the opposite is a maximal postulation, which often is (or has to be) in opposition to law.

Here I like the most the

"cardinal virtues are a set of four virtues recognized in the writings of Classical Antiquity and, along with the theological virtues, also in Christian tradition. They consist of:

- Prudence (phronesis): also called "wisdom," the ability to judge between actions with regard to appropriate actions at a given time.
- Justice (dikaiosyne): also called "fairness," the perpetual and constant will of rendering to each one his right.

- Temperance (sophrosyne): also called "restraint," the practice of self-control, abstinence, and moderation; tempering the appetite.  
- Courage (andreia): also called "fortitude," forbearance, strength, endurance, and the ability to confront fear, uncertainty, and intimidation."  
from [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cardinal\\_virtues](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cardinal_virtues)

**- disregarding the borders of rationality**

From [David Dunning's](#) book "[Self-insight](#)" is the discrimination of

- a) the known knowns
- b) the known unknowns
- c) the unknown unknowns

and I believe that the "unknown unknowns" are the biggest part.

To cite Sokrates "I know that I don't know"

**- being poor-spirited**

So don't hide behind "objectivity" or statistics.