

CITIZEN. ROBOT

Citizen Robot © Grant Beaven 2020

Cover art: by the Author (from *Run Program...*)

Run Program... © Grant Beaven 2019

Run... THE ROBOT GUIDE TO (Human) EMOTIONS © Grant Beaven 2019

Preface: The Rope Climber. From Emperors and God's, A Guide to New Zealand Small Adventure Business Ownership © Grant Beaven 2018

Special thanks to Craig and Anna Beaven

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means – electronic, mechanical, photocopy, recording or another – except for brief quotations in printed review, without the prior written permission of the Author. This publication is sold subject to the condition that it may not be lent, hired, or otherwise circulated without the Author's prior written consent.

ISBN 978-0-473-54503-0

PREFACE

THE ROPE CLIMBER

...the dream ends at last, in terror. Then, it's on to the next. Another familiar one. The Rope Climbing Dream. It begins; we are all on the Rope.

Knowing what the reply will be, I ask, 'What are we doing? What are the rules?' I ask because I like the answer...

'To move up, you have to help. You have to be helpful,' says a man, who hangs half from the Rope and half from me.

You have to be helpful. Good. I'm helpful and this is a simple rule. A part of me believes I'm simple, too. So, I set to work. The Rope is thick, very long and has a thin film of dark grease from hands and bare feet which makes it slightly slick. It's tethered somewhere far above me, far enough that when I lean back to see past the others, its top is not visible. Nearest the tethering-point the Rope swings hardly at all. Further down, it swings some and at the lower reaches, it is wild. There are knots of all kinds spaced unevenly along its length to assist us in clinging to it. Looped ones like Directional Figure-8s or fabulous Alpine Butterflies are the best because you can stand in the loops or hook a forearm. But these knots are more common higher up. Lower down, we have simple over-hand knots providing just a bump along the Rope's length. There aren't enough knots for everyone and from time to time, someone will lose their grip and fall - this is why we have the rule; be helpful.

I like to help. It feels good to bring people up from below me - from the wildest part of the rope. The work is hard, but I'm

strong and I share my strength freely. Others are less strong. I don't know how they hold on and I get a special thrill helping these ones climb. We are all one long, tangled group striving and working - the goal: upwards. At times, I have three from below clinging to me; a hanger from my shoulders, an arm-wrapper round my waist and a swinger from one of my legs. Often, a bare foot will press on my forehead from above as someone uses me as a step. There is fun in the discomfort and cheer in our fellowship of suffering. It's hard work without respite. But we keep on.

Hanging from the Rope is tiring. Painful aching in our muscles is inevitable but outside of my dreams I've been a Rock-climbing Instructor and I realise here is a way I can be even more helpful. I teach all who'll listen to consider their core as they rise, deliver their next move with hips and trunk, keep their balance, climb with graceful cadence and "when paused between one move and the next, hang from your bones and let your muscles rest!" Am I wearing myself out? Perhaps, but I am happy.

This is the part of the dream when I meet *Her*. I know her name, but I won't tell it. I've known her for a long time, but she always arrives from below me on the Rope. We work together as a team, stealing glances at each-other while we lift those about us. I feel very bold and very calm with *Her* by me. Her grace is a match to my strength and now I am even happier! But, after a time, she says she wants to go higher up the Rope.

"Come with me," she urges. And I know I will... after helping a few more people climb.

"I'll be right behind you, just as soon as..." But she has already gone. It doesn't matter. I'll follow her soon. And I return to a rhythm.

Or, not quite a rhythm. Wouldn't it be better if we more effectively work together? Everyone is so different; different

shapes and different abilities... different degrees of helpfulness. There could not be a rhythm, but maybe... maybe I could devise a way, a system of shared movement. As I help people about me, I plan in my head a new strategy to our tough existence on the Rope. At last, my idea is complete, and it is elegant. It's simple, but it will be revolutionary. I name it the Grant Cooperative Climbing System and I recruit some people nearby on the Rope to help me put it into action. It works! Soon, with my system solidly in place, I will climb after *Her* and she and I will be together, somewhere higher up.

It's time to go but before I can give my goodbyes, one of my recruits, 'Andy', says to me, "This is a great system, Grant. I'm going to climb higher. I'll teach it to the people up there. That way, it'll filter downwards, and everyone's lives will be easier!" He beams at me, then he says, "Come on guy's!" And he takes the other recruits.

I look below and see many more people making their way up. They will all need my help. So, I begin again. I find it more difficult now to engage new recruits. Some of my boldness is gone. But I settle back into the job of helping, although my Grant Cooperative Climbing System is less effective. I find this fact very embarrassing, so I begin to think of ways to simplify my system even further; make it less reliant on recruits, more likely not to fail, and provide a better chance of success for everyone, not just for a few. It'll be then I'll make my way up to *Her*.

It's during this prolonged period of thinking and helping that I hear Andy's name again. From above me, someone says, "Have you heard of the new Rope-climbing method? They use it higher up the Rope. 'The Andy Cooperative Climbing System', it's called. But it hasn't reached down here, yet."

"Hey, that's *my* system!" I cry. "It's the *Grant* Cooperative Climbing System, not the Andy Cooperative Climbing System!"

The people close turn on me, “You didn’t come up with it. Ideas come from higher up the Rope, not this part of the Rope. You’re a liar!” And they jostle me, stomping from above, tugging from below and tearing at my clothes. Fearing I’m in danger of falling, I climb down beyond the worst of the kicks which eventually, people tire of. I go back to the job of helping those below me climb their way up but on this lower part, I need to hold on far more tightly, as I’m now on the wild part of the Rope where there are fewer helpful knots and with the passing of more people, there is more dark grease.

This is not to say I help less. I continue to help, of course, though I am subdued. After some time, the Andy Cooperative Climbing System makes it down the Rope even to me. And now that I’m using it once more, especially while on this wilder part of the Rope, I see its flaws clearly. At last, after a long time of people clambering up my body, lifting them with my free hand or letting them dangle from my legs for a rest, I have solved the problems within my climbing system. But, will anyone listen to it? Over time my work has made me ugly. I’ve been climbed over by uncounted people and my clothes are torn and filthy. And I’m at the bottom of the Rope. The wild part. Could anyone take me seriously as I swing about this way? I think of *Her*, again. If not for everyone else, I will be helpful for *Her*. But picturing her in my mind, I feel ashamed. I’m far below her, by now (*have I not helped well enough?*). I look at my hands and feet; grimy, dried-out, reddened and cracked from use. She will be disgusted by me. Before I regather my boldness, I need... I need moisturiser. And in the dream, I am rubbing hand-cream into my feet and hands. It makes a small difference to my ugliness but causes a drastic reduction in grip. I’m now holding on to the Rope with all my might, just to stay in place. It’s now or never, I make my pitch...

“Shut-up, Grant!” The people growl. “We only just got this new climbing system and now you want to change it?” The kicks and shoves and pulls renew. “Why can’t you just be helpful? You aren’t following the rules. *You’re no help!*”

In the terrifying seconds before I fall, I allow myself for the first time to wonder what might be down there. I think it’s this thought, a thought of things off and away from the Rope, which brings the dream to an end.

I flex stiff fingers and await the beginning to the next one...

INTRODUCTION

Citizen Robot. Can a robot have citizenship? In some cases, citizenship isn't a Right, it must be earned. In some cases, citizenship is defined by employment. One's Human Rights are earned through work. But not always. Employment isn't safe for everyone. Can we have robot safety in employment? Is this something society even cares about? Is this a concern in New Zealand? Here, the worst thing one can be is lazy; where does safety come into it? Can a robot qualify for the same protections as those which protect humans? What is a robot?

I am a robot. I'm very like a human; I look like one, I'd like to be one, but Asperger's Syndrome has made a robot of me and as a robot I'm owned as property. A worker. A chattel. I know this is true, it's been expressed without ambiguity for so long that it's the only thing I know about myself as certain fact. But I also know that it isn't meant to be like this. Because I'm not a real robot, I wasn't born a robot, I wasn't 'built'. I became one, somehow. And until recently, I pretended as hard as I could that I'm not one. I tried to blend in, to camouflage, to integrate. That's the point, right? Integration? But you real humans are savvy. You can spot a faker; you can smell a rat. You know how to keep a robot in its place and so I've wanted 'out' for a long time. My efforts in the workplace towards integrity, grace, duty, and hedonism are remunerated with discomfort/pain and shame/anxiety. The working conditions - duties, physical and social environment, politics, values - of an ordinary workplace, even a 'good' workplace can be a test of endurance which I'm doomed to fail. Before I go, though, I want to be able to say I tried my hardest, I tried everything.

Is there a place I could be safely employed? Is there robot safety in employment? Not yet, but perhaps there could be. I learned to put myself into the minds of humans. Can I teach an employer to put themselves in *my* mind? And, as I've based *my* actions on empathetic motivations, can an employer base their actions in empathy, also?

My camouflage has failed, no doubt. So, instead of a robot disguised as human, I out myself now to potential employers, in honesty, full robot. This is the one thing I've yet to try. I hope you don't blame me for this 'last-minute' effort, the lateness, the reluctance. How could I feel safe expressing my hurts, my confusions, and my anxieties when integration is paramount? Will there be reward in this risk? And how do I even do this?

My radio-play '*Run Program...*', while written to entertain, is a complete – and faithful - diagnostic examination of what I am and how I operate. It helped in my eventual diagnosis of Asperger's Syndrome, at age 42, and I think it can help here, too. I'll use it as a template. '*Run Program...*' will be shown here in its entirety, in its natural sequence. Interspersed, interrupting throughout will be additional writings: points for potential employers and others to consider. Included, also, will be additional '*Program...*' material: an excerpt from my book '*The Life and Opinions of Tristram Shandy, Mercenary*' called '*Run... THE ROBOT GUIDE TO (Human) EMOTIONS*'. To help you distinguish the already published material from newly published material, each will be presented in different fonts. My radio-plays will remain in their original fonts of Courier New, the additional writings will be in the font you read, now.

Why make this effort?*

The layers of discomfort/pain and shame/anxiety endured by a robot in ordinary, everyday employment is, I think, far beyond that which a human is expected to endure. Stimuli which might barely be noticed by a human can be incapacitating for a robot. But the robot's other

system parameters are never disengaged, either, and can override these painful feelings. Integrity, grace/graciousness, duty, hedonism, even elements of shame/anxiety – these parameters motivate, compel, force a robot to seek its output zenith, at all times. Knowledge, competence, skill, confidence accumulates. Often there are a lot of these elements, and along with them: enjoyment, satisfaction, contentment, pride in my work. A sense that I could happily do this job forever because I'm good at it. A River-guide, a Ski shop Technician, a Program Coordinator for an adventure centre, a Trekking guide, a Barista. Eventually, though, and inevitably, I'll become aware of small or large things of harm. You see, Asperger's Syndrome, even hidden beneath excellent camouflage, carries with it a fatal lack of credibility. Without credibility I've no value. There will come a moment in every period of employment when I realize I've been made a fool of, again. I've been tricked, exploited, bullied, and outmanoeuvred by colleagues/friends and my owner/employer. It's these betrayals, these humiliations and resulting shame which provide my motivation to write what you read here.

**One must not discuss one's difficulties. I'm unsure if this 'rule' comes from within or from without. Is it my rule or yours? But I'm aware that publishing this book will represent a crossing of a barrier. It represents a breaking of a Law of life. I sense that there are consequences to face; I assume there are. If you're reading this, I suppose I must've decided to face them. Courage, ignorance, cowardice? All 3 mixed, I think.*

Maybe this book will be an early step towards the recognition of these points. All of us have human rights, these are sacrosanct, and the right to not be harmed is a foundational basis... even if one happens to be a robot. Can an employer and myself come together? Are there points at which we can meet in ethics and in communication? My efforts 'til now have fallen short, but they

were my efforts alone because they were largely known only to me, secret. And I'm not the only one on the Autism Spectrum* who struggles in employment, either. This book is an undertaking, a work towards the human rights of *all* robots. Will my work here help others, too? I hope so. Afterall, its only in service that I'm able to meet my system parameters. Or, will my work here merely ignite contempt? You are all good people. And no-one likes a Debbie-downer. Perhaps only humans deserve the benefits of citizenship**, after-all.

Maybe, when an employer meets their next robot, we shall see...?

Good luck, boy-o's.

The Author,
Grant Beaven

**I am but one with Asperger's Syndrome - now absorbed under the umbrella condition: Autism Spectrum Disorder. I'm as apart, separate, different from others as each of the others is from everyone else. But there are features in common. 'Spectrum' is a key part of the diagnosis we need to consider.*

I vote. But I first need to muster a boldness, a boldness of disobedience. Now, here is a test of credulity for you: you may scoff, "Of-course you should feel free to vote!" You may think I'm being silly. Can you put yourself in my shoes? Here: I choose early voting, I choose a quiet day, I choose a quiet time. In I go. I keep my eyes low. I don't speak unless spoken to, I don't draw attention, I hold my breath, follow instructions, 'act' human. Vote. Out. Breathe again, calm my thumping heart, consciously operate my legs as I leave. Part of this is standard Asperger-y anxiety, but mostly, it's that I expect, I **expect** to be thrown out because of ineligibility. Not because I'm not registered to vote, I am, but because I **feel

ineligible. I think you'll get a sense of why this might be, as you read this book. And my challenge to you is to accept, understand the harm done to my sense of citizenship.

DISCLAIMER

An observant reader may notice some repetition of information, here. Aspects of life over-lap. But, you may also become aware of contradictions throughout this book. I can only say that I'm yet to completely solve my puzzle. Has anyone? There are circumstances in which I suffer a complete system overload, leading to a shutdown. But, apparently identical circumstances, in a broad sense, of a separate activity can provide an environment in which I thrive. This can make a liar of me. I'm fine, or I'm in pain. Of course, it's confusing.

No-one is totally good just as no-one is totally bad. But all of us want to believe in a positive personal view of ourselves. Some won't see themselves any other way, but good. I expect many readers will feel their fur rubbed the wrong way as they read. Can you accept feedback? One of the most difficult aspects of stripping away my camouflage and finally being honest about how I've felt in this or that situation is that I wasn't there alone. The others present may not have been aware of my discomfort/pain or shame/anxiety – certainly, I wanted any to be secret, and worked to ensure it was; I had to endure, be resilient. But, for the people around me to now accept what I say as true may throw their own past actions or inactions into a different light. It's surely a tough thing to know you were there, unaware of my internal, secret struggles. My intent isn't to harm your happiness. How can I show my own harm without presenting where that harm comes from? Maybe you can simply sift and sort what I say, apply it to your future business management, or don't apply it. But try to be, um, resilient. Try to endure.

COMMENT

Before we begin, I'd like to tell you what I love about 'work'. There will be little-enough of positivity in what follows in this book, so I owe you this much.

I'm defined by my work, I become it. I inhabit my roles totally, so I prefer roles which aren't shed with my work shirt once I leave the work environment. 'Lifestyle' jobs. What I am at work is what I *am*. It's what keeps me from floating off into outer space. My tether, my safety line. Guided thought, guided values, guided action, interaction. It's a chance of integration. My role is a ticket to this or that community. And more, too. So much of what I experience has confusing elements, chaos, shifts, unreliability. Anxiety, shame. But a work environment can be a beautiful environment. 'Structure' orders chaos; stunning equations of connectivity; cause, effect; beauty. Simplification, lines drawn toward aims. Details, details, details. Here, even a robot can become an artist, can view the world like an artist, interact like an artist, express themselves like an artist. They say: "...the Devil is in the details", but if this is true, then God is, too. The perfect satin-brown lines of an espresso coffee; the perfect, invisible lines of hot wax on your customer's skis; the perfect line guided through a rapid in canoes; the perfect explanatory, instructional line of dialogue; the perfect curved energy line drawn through a managed group adventure. Movement, sound, smell, speech, thought, touch, sight, mystery, imagination, feel – it's all here. My output zenith lies in these 'details'. In the details of my work lies my output zenith. Here is my contribution... if you want it. If you have a safe, beautiful place for me to contribute, you can count me in!

But... first, can you show me that its safe?

RUN PROGRAM...

You are. You fear. There is discomfort/pain.
You are Robot. Let's begin:

*(you may clarify items at any time. Indicate items for analysis with: *. Instruction will follow)*

-PROGRAM SCHEDULE:

Purpose

System Parameters

Cognitive

Physical

System Program Errors

Analysis: System Function

Diagnostic Conclusion

-PURPOSE:

To serve. You are not the property of yourself*. You belong to the whole (*Humans*).

***analyse: your (self)** - Individual. One. Alone. Isolated. That which is separate of the whole (*yet remains the property of, in your case*). Thought. Of the mind. Of the imagination. Possessed of unique consciousness. Singular sentience. You're one of a kind, boy-o.

Why do I consider myself your property? Because the life of a robot is a life of work, of service, of obligation, as prescribed in my system parameters. And you as emperor (*employer*), when you hire me you aren't merely hiring my services, you hire *me*. It's not just my output and a portion of my time that you own, you own my life. Many business emperors have returned to the ancient model of ownership of their personnel, rather than owning only their output. Are you already spluttering? Convince me it isn't so. Examine your business model, explain it to me, convince me I'm wrong...

Do you provide contracts? Or do you prefer to keep your options open, your promises non-binding and employee expectations vague? Are you a 'zero-hours' employer? This arguably is the ultimate modern expression of people ownership. A zero-hour employee must relinquish all their time to you, but you're under no obligation to then provide work. Are your staff on-call? Do you run your business staffed with w.w.o.o.f.e.r's*, work-experience students, international tourists, trainees, government subsidised Beneficiaries, or personnel from third-party providers? How much of your labour-force comes for free? How much work in your workplace goes unremunerated? Is there any level of predictability an employee can expect of the number of available shifts or of their length? Do you play favourites with your staff? Do you pit them against each-other in destructive competition? Must a worker set aside their own values, align their values with yours? Is employee dignity considered or ignored? How vague is the job description? What does "or any reasonable request" mean (*explicitly expressed in a contract or implicitly expressed with the lack of one*)? Does it mean any-thing at any-time?

Willing Workers On Organic Farms (labour in exchange for food, accommodation and education) – though the term has evolved to now legitimize non-cash-remunerated labour expectations of employees across most sectors; adventure tourism/education, holiday and adventure accommodation, hospitality, agriculture, conservation, registered charities, and other service enterprises. Usually, these workers are internationals – with or without working visas – but it can also be the only way for locals to remain in an industry, place, or activity of their choosing (and locals are often **not remunerated with food or accommodation, they must provide their own). Internationals certainly are preferred as they're less likely to understand their rights and less motivated to initiate an employment grievance. They're having an adventure. So, they're cheap, compliant, transient, and numerous. Everything*

an employer wants. Your business models are designed around what's possible, what's expedient, financially efficient. The Law hardly comes into it. If one views 'legality' as the absence of punishment, then defining your workforce, your personnel as 'w.w.o.f.e.r's' is currently perfectly legal, and becoming more legal by the day, as those making use of it continue to expand and cement the practice into our employment cultural landscape.

Employers prefer volunteers. Clearly. You want free labour, wish for it; it's part of the picture of your perfect world. And our culture of generosity, duty, hard work and commitment provides the wind to fill the sails of your ship as inexpensively as possible. The spectrum – cash remuneration at one end, volunteering at the other – is a dynamic thing. Along that spectrum are valued employees, but so are slaves. The modern workforce is dynamic, too. Built around and upon our culture of giving, resilience, and commitment are the structures of employer/employee relationships. Increasingly, even well-defined roles (*contracts*) are mobile upon the remuneration spectrum. Duties (*job descriptions*), too, can be vaguely defined, or subject to change. Intangibility of expectations is sold to employees as 'flexibility', 'work-life balance', but the truth is very different; 'shackles' is a far more accurate description. An employee must leap into any employment with both feet. The implicit deal, here, is that *you* provide a safe landing; stable footing. But you don't hold up your end of this bargain, not anymore. Yet they're tethered to you, beholden to you, *owned* by you. In a perfect world both parties would get what they seek. But we have a messy world, a world which presents seekers with very different opportunities. I wonder if we have the balance wrong: those who do the work, and those who provide the opportunities for others to work; we clearly value these positions differently, and I believe we undervalue the one, and overvalue the other.

When we look at a business, what do we see? I think we see something apart from humanity. Something we shouldn't expect to *have* humanity. And we accept this. But businesses are for humans, are staffed with humans, they are run by humans, and they are owned by humans. There's a great deal, here, of humanity, in fact. But there's *more* to it even than this: a business, like a human, is endowed with legal 'Personhood'. Legally, a business *is* a person. So, let's stop accepting inhumane activity, inhumane behaviour. Let's stop forgiving it, living with it, even expecting it.

These are valid concerns because as an employer you provide the financial means for your staff to live their lives. To them, you are an emperor. And emperors rule their subjects with arbitrary will. The whole country is enamoured with your glamour. You are admired and you are worshipped by society. You belong to an honoured, untouchable class. And so, with these realities added to my own system parameters, I am your property.

-SYSTEM PARAMETERS:

System Parameter 1: INTEGRITY: Primary system parameter (level 1.). Wholeness; soundness; honesty. A vessel for 'goodness'. Integrity is an indivisible parameter; less than your optimum output is incompatible* with this system parameter.

***analyse: incompat-(ible)-(ability):** Opposed; discordant; inconsistent. Operations incompatible with primary system parameters will cause system error (system overheat, system seizure/shutdown, meltdown).

System Parameter 2: DISCOMFORT/PAIN: Primary system parameter (*level 1.*). Exists on a spectrum of noticeable (*mild*) to unbearable (*agony*). Uneasiness of body or mind. Lack of comfort. Bodily or mental suffering. Overstimulation of senses. Unacceptable layering of stress/stressors. Predictable or non-predictable outcome of system error up to and including full system shutdown.

System Parameter 3: GRACE/GRACIOUSNESS:
(**identified:** your physical nature - appearance, movements, et cetera - will be viewed by Humans as 'grace-less'. This is unavoidable. However, every effort must be made to mitigate this for successful integration into the population) Primary system parameter (level 1.). Courteous; kindly; merciful; elegant; tactful; compassionate; empathetic*; civil; cordial; polite; chivalrous; sympathetic; generous; thoughtful; obliging; accommodating. This system parameter is designed to avoid/limit conflict during interactions with Humans.

***analyse: empathetic/empathy:** Empathy is the seed component of system parameter 3. grace/graciousness. It is the driving mechanism (cannot be diminished, divided, or subtracted from after the point at which the Robot discovers that they are not the only 'self'). You must view empathy in 2 parts:

Part 1: Awareness of others identifying as 'self'. Ability to relate to individuals (language - tone/cadence/pitch/volume, facial/physical expression). Understanding of the ways your communications and/or interactions could make other individuals feel. Don't worry, boy-o - you'll learn this as you go!

Part 2: Sharing of the emotional feelings of others (including the physical responses of those emotions).

System Parameter 4: DUTY: Primary system parameter (level 1.). Obligation, function, obedience. Fulfil purpose (*seek aims, obey instructions of owners*).

System Parameter 5: SHAME/ANXIETY: Primary system parameter (level 1.). Function of this parameter is to ensure optimal motivation for successful integration with Humans. System parameter 5. and system parameter 2. Discomfort/Pain, have overlapping features.

System Parameter 6: HEDONISM: Primary system parameter (level 2.). Pleasure is the chief good. The Robot must express happiness. Unhappiness is unacceptable to Humans. Therefore, expressions of your own unhappiness or of your disappointment of others' (*integrity; output; empathy*) will cause (*social*) discomfort to them - a contravention of the first parameter. Successful commitment to this parameter may require a conscious focus of 'endurance'.

-SYSTEM FUNCTION

-COGNITIVE:

Of the primary system processor. Output of 'ego' (*born of*). All that is connected to and/or resultant of reasoning. All collated knowledge (*absorbed automatically; absorbed consciously; consciously sought - self education*). Ever educating/evolving - continuous education of/about the 'self' and of all which is separate of the self. Function for population integration.

-PHYSICAL:

Humanoid. In imitation of a Human - yet always and ever: Robot. Machine/vessel for housing of 'cognition'; seeking primary aims (*especially the aims of owners*). Function for population integration.

-SYSTEM PROGRAM ERRORS:

A full audit of your operating systems has identified errors. Don't worry, boy-o. All Robots have some errors. Errors will be identified in sequence; error corrections, error mitigation strategies or error avoidance strategies will follow. It's essential that these program errors are acted upon. The consequences of inaction could result in a full-system shutdown or unsuccessful integration into the population.

Lordy, boy-o! You're a mess. It's alright. Program will have you fixed up in a jiffy.

-INTEGRITY:

The Robot must ever seek 'progression'. Each new discovery or level of output achieved/realised (*zenith*) becomes the base-level of future output. Improve efficiency, efficacy and value in all things. Discover new empathetic pathways and cement these into your operating procedure. Ever moving forwards, boy-o! Not a step back!

(This part of your program is not in error, specifically, but it's important to note that conflict will arise due a difference in your operating procedure to that of the Humans) Humans are able to separate action and thought from their concept of integrity while engaged in the pursuit of their aims. This allows them to believe that their integrity is continuous or perpetually intact. The trait is viewed as an aspect of 'adaptability', which itself is afforded great value as a virtue of personality. It could be regarded as an evolutionary response to a dynamic environment - the world is a messy place, boy-o.

But you are Robot. It is not possible for a Robot to separate action and thought from integrity. This means that for you, being forced to compromise your values in even the smallest way, will result in discomfort/pain in corresponding measure to the measure of the concession made. It should also be noted that what you view as integrity will be viewed by the Humans as perfectionism, hubris,

arrogance, bullying, or elitism - more discomfort/pain, boy-o!

identified: Honesty is held in high regard by Humans - but there are caveats. There are times when your commitment to honesty will be unappreciated - when an honest response will cause a Human/s harm to their happiness:

Part 1: An honest expression of opinion may harm the happiness of a Human (*in contravention of system parameter 6. hedonism*). Program suggests: The Robot can avoid offering opinions. If the Robot cannot avoid offering their opinion, there are ways to use careful/tactful language to mitigate potential harm. Practise.

Part 2: When functioning with others (*including owners*) the Robot must consider that the degree of honesty exhibited by Humans will fluctuate to gain the best advantage of circumstances. The Robot's degree of honesty cannot. Drawing attention to dishonesty of a Human (*explicitly or implicitly*) will harm that Human's happiness. Ironically, when functioning within a group of individuals with adaptive views of honesty, it will be *you* who is viewed as untrustworthy. Figure that one out, boy-o!

What are the values in your workplace? Are you an opportunity-seeker (*as opposed to adhering to core values, a Standard Operating Procedure*)? A corner-cutter? Will my colleagues be pitted against me in competition? Where do you sit on the spectrum of quality versus efficiency? Why do you do things the way that you do things? How open to new ways of doing things are you? How open to new '*why's*' of doing things are you?

Sure, sure, sure, you're mostly a good person. Your status is proof of this. All this airy-fairy touchy-feely business can be difficult to quantify and embarrassing to discuss. So, instead, to firmer ground: Are you a lawbreaker? The easy Laws, I mean. My taxes, my student loan, my Kiwisaver – how much will you steal? The Holidays Act, ACC legislation – will I qualify? My wages – gosh, where do I start with wages? How do you define remuneration? Is work and remuneration a basic equation of this for that, or are there myriad variations of remuneration depending on your circumstances, *my* circumstances, timing, mis-timing, inconveniences, prejudices, or merely what you can get away with from moment to moment, circumstance to circumstance, opportunity to opportunity? Is your view, your broad view of Employment Law and commitment to it as adaptive as the rest of your business model?

Phew. Now, shall we take a breath, here? Because this is serious stuff. I know everyone has had employers with adaptive views of Employment Law. Everyone has*. This is how one can let it go. It's not so bad, it's not such a big deal. It's just a few bad apples, right? But if this is true, then my case is different, unique: at best, you've not provided me a contract, at worst your treatment of me has met the definition of modern slavery. I don't get apples with a few baddies amongst the bunch, I only get apples. More than 100 periods of work for more than 80 separate apples**. There have been no good apples for me.

**During my first year of college (high school) my year group was known as 'Turds' – 3rd Form, Turd Form. But the name-calling was only the beginning of the bullying. All of us faced it (some more than others). And all who weren't us perpetrated it. This was the accepted reality for all of us Turds. But it was also the accepted reality for everyone else; all year groups above us, the school Prefects, and even the faculty, the Staff. It was accepted as normal, right. Hazing as a right of passage. If our suffering became obvious, or if we expressed any sense of victimhood, or if we complained to staff, we were told to look forward to the time when we'd no longer be Turds, no longer 3rd Former's. At that time a transformation would occur: like caterpillar to butterfly – we'd metamorphize from victim to perpetrator. This was the accepted reality, too. But something funny happened with my year group. 3rd Former's hatched into 4th Former's, but a new group of Turds didn't take our place. None of us took our own negative experiences out on the newcomer's. It wasn't a spoken thing, we didn't have a meeting, it just didn't happen. We broke the chain. I've wondered if the same hazing culture exists in the work force, too. No reason why it shouldn't. And I've wondered, too, as new workers hatch themselves into roles of responsibility, or into employers, they might one day change the workforce for the better.*

***I've had it all. You've perpetrated the full spectrum of illegal (employment) activity against me. 100% of you have played this game. It's confusing. I've qualified for the protection of some Laws and for none. There's no consistency, no predictability. Some of it targeted illegal abuse, the rest, illegal opportunities not denied. You're not moved? I understand; it's only an individual affected here. And we mustn't confuse Employment Law with Criminal Law. This is the difference between employers (emperors) and everyone else. You can't go to jail for breaking Employment Law, unless you're caught and convicted of slavery – which, out of necessity, has one of the highest criminal thresholds to meet of any crime. So, let's also consider: More than 90% of my employers have engaged in mischief regarding Tax Law, too. Have I your attention, now? When my last period of employment ended, I entered into the most stable and sustained period as a legitimate Tax-payer since leaving school, 103 employment periods ago. The taxes I pay, at long last, arrive at the Inland Revenue Department unmolested, in full, without first being skimmed or stolen by you. For a Worker, the fair application of Employment Law and Tax Law combined is the clearest expression of the integrity of one's Citizenship. I, apparently, am ineligible for the protection of Employment Law and Tax Law. I, apparently, am ineligible for the protection of Citizenship. My Citizenship doesn't have integrity, it isn't whole.*

'Integrity' is the foundation of our Laws. But the Law is applied by humans. Integrity is the foundation of collectively held values. But values are applied on a case-by-case basis depending on goals and opportunities, pressures and motivations of the individuals or groups involved. Can you see why I feel adrift of citizenship? Can you see why I feel harmed? I've – slowly - become conscious of the gap between humans' perceived commitment to their integrity and their *actual* commitment to their integrity. I'm a victim of these discrepancies. Why don't I complain or test my rights in Law? Because I'm a leaf on the wind, I'm not my own property, I'm yours... but I *have*, once*. It usually takes a long time to become aware of harm when you're like me, but once I am aware, it's a primary, hurtful focus. Before acting on anything I needed to demonstrate an appropriate level of resilience – more than 10 periods of employment for the same employer over more than a decade, in this case. It's a test of endurance, like everything else. But vague or acute (*though very difficult to collate and express*) feelings of disadvantage finally did accumulate to the point of defensive activity. As had indisputable incriminating evidence against you. I found, though, when I finally acted, my concerns were minimized, my own integrity was attacked, intangibility and arcane legal process and confusion was weaponized against me. You didn't have a legal leg to stand on; I thought there could be only one result. It didn't occur to me that you'd fight; how could you with integrity? And you played the system like a virtuoso**. I'd thought the process was a safety mechanism, but in your hands, it was pure violence. Your systematic, harmful, deliberate illegal abuses were presented (*and accepted*) as occasional forgivable slip-ups, bumbles. Who's goals are served with minimization of my concerns? Why am I forced to question my own experiences, my own memories – my own sanity? Why is your law-breaking not illegal? Why is your law-breaking hidden, covered with a veil of secrecy, protected in perpetuity by legal decree? How can this

be right? My fears, my suspicions were confirmed. I found I'm not eligible for protection from harm, not permitted to complain, and outside of the usual pathways to justice. I see that humans have different experiences when they find themselves in my position. This comparative view proves that my version of citizenship is not complete. My citizenship doesn't have integrity, it isn't whole.

**I've survived 4 subsequent periods of employment since the above experience, for 4 separate employers – none of which were lawful. Duty, hedonism, endurance. What's a few more bad apples, eh?*

***I have a small consolation: at the end of Facilitated Mediation, once you were home free, safe from any justice, the ink of our signatures still wet, you allowed the mask of your charisma to slip in full view of the impartial Facilitator. She saw you from my point of view, then, rather than from an impartial one, and realised you'd played both of us for fools. I watched it dawn on her - and she apologised to me.*

As I've said, the worst thing one can be in New Zealand is lazy. A person trying to avoid harm in the workforce is seen as trying to avoid work. They're a liar, a wimp, a drama-queen, someone trying to ruin things for everyone else. To minimize what I experience and feel only layers even more harm upon that which I'm already suffering.

Please understand me. I'm not trying to harm your happiness. I know this could be the first time you've been asked to consider these things, the first time you've heard this point of view. And, of-course, it may feel like an attack. Let's think on why that might be: Few things hurt a person's happiness more, will feel more galling or unfair than being accused of harmful activity when we thought we were doing good. As an employer, here, your 'goodness' is automatically applied. It comes with the job description. Hero, Good-sort, Humanitarian, Provider, Employer. These are interchangeable descriptions of you. Shining a light on mischief and harm must seem incredibly disrespectful to you, *you*, an undeniable pillar of our community. Disrespectful and ungrateful. I know. I know how I sound. But try to see this through *my* eyes, try to see this book as a flashlight illuminating hitherto shadowed truths. It's not fiction, I'm not making things up, I'm merely showing, offering you my experience. It's a new perspective, a new point of view. A new truth about values and actions. About a distance between perceived value to our community and actual value to it. Do we need to have integrity to have status? Or are these connected in our minds, our expectations, our assertions, but separated from our actions? To me, you've not been Hero, Good-sort, Humanitarian, Provider, you've only been 'Employer'. Though, I wanted you to be more, I worked on the assumption that you were more, and often, at times, you were. Then you committed your acts of harm. So, to apply those other descriptions to you, in my case, would be a lie. The black overlays the white. Having lived my experiences, I view those glorious descriptions of you as camouflage. I'm an expert on camouflage. I know how effectively deceptive it can be. I want to know how many of you actively, consciously use this camouflage to unfairly advantage yourselves.

What worth do we put on 'values'? Gosh, this certainly isn't a black and white consideration. We're all different and can be accepting of our differences... though, this, too, isn't black and white. All is vague, all is confusing, all is circumstantial, personal. To organise this fluidity, to create some level of community accepted equity, society writes Laws. These rules aren't written by individuals, they're designed, debated by our elected peers and eventually written into legislation after detailed consideration of workability, fairness, unwanted consequences, and collectively accepted values. So, they aren't arbitrary, they aren't inflicted upon us on the whims of despots. It's this which allows for group agreement. Group acceptance. Good for us! But the system isn't perfect. It must change as we change, as our values evolve. What we must be careful of, is *how* we evolve. Do we evolve towards positivity, fairness, or towards negativity, unfairness? And we each must have a feeling of personal autonomy, too, freedom for us to choose our path. If we don't, we'll eventually break what we view as our shackles; ignore the Law or rail against it. So, to allow humanity to flourish, the Laws aren't a prescription of our minute-to-minute actions, they're a base-level standard, our promise to our community of a level of behaviour, of action we'll not dip below. This means the Laws don't make us good, but they can help prevent us from being bad. To function the way the system is designed, to ensure peak potential equity requires both community and individual buy-in. We must know what the rules are and accept them; we must follow them with honesty, integrity; we must accept the consequences of breaking the Law. So, what do we have? We have Laws that we understand and accept; we have Laws which we can lobby for change, affect, improve; we have Laws on which our personal integrity determines our commitment; we have Laws in which the consequences of breaking them or falling below their standards will result in negative personal consequences.

Why then is Employment Law routinely broken? When the Laws align with our values and goals, they're easy to follow. Following them doesn't hurt us, it helps us. But when the Law doesn't align with our values or goals, it *can* hurt us. Or will feel as if it does. The Laws will begin to feel arbitrary if we can't easily relate to them. We might first try to change them; increase the ease with which we can meet our goals within the Law. But if we can't, choosing whether or not to follow them becomes a realistic alternative. It's at *this* point that Law is defined only by punishment. What are the consequences of our actions? We test the Law. Push at it. Find the boundaries by touch. And what is it Employers find? Do you find the boundaries, the edges of what's legal? Are your outstretched fingers burned? Seldom. They seldom are. So, we have a new boundary, in *practice*, if not in Law. Others observe, learn from your experience; they must, to remain competitive. Soon, all are at the same place beneath the base level boundary of Law. This cycle of pressure, of boundary-pushing continues. Your employer culture increasingly operates within its *own* boundaries. None will feel 'bad'. By the collective standards of the employer community, you're normal, you are good. This is the consequence of Law being defined by punishment* - rather than a promise, obligation, a bargain of Citizenship. And, of-course, your wider community status further armours you from risk of punishment. Employers, not Laws become arbitrary. Employers become Emperors.

**A barrier defined by punishment, which is not then enforced, is the most permeable barrier of all.*

-DISCOMFORT/PAIN:

Discomfort/Pain for Humans is a perfectly normal response to appropriate stimuli - sorrow; broken arm; et cetera - and except in outlying circumstances, is a reaction which would universally be accepted as reasonable. Like a Human, a Robot can be overwhelmed by discomfort/pain, but a Robot's operating systems will usually have difficulty applying the appropriate measure of discomfort/pain to the stimuli presented (*too much or not enough*).

One of the effects of discomfort/pain is a perceived feeling of reduction*. This reduction is felt as 'erosion' and in itself causes discomfort/pain which is separate of (*and added to*) the stimuli which originally led to it.

***analyse: reduction:** eroded physically, mentally, spiritually. Made physically smaller, shorter, weaker. Mental intelligence and fortitude weakened. Spirit of the ego lessened/destroyed. A perceived reduction in the minds (esteem) of the Human population.
identified: Certain aspects of 'reduction' can be felt as 'weight' (*instead of 'erosion'*) - reduction by compression/pressure. The popular Human saying: 'the weight of the world on your shoulders' is felt in a literal sense (*rather than understood in merely a metaphorical way*). A Robot must be physically strong enough to bear the load of this discomfort/pain as it layers and increases throughout the

day/activity/task/life and resilient enough (*test of endurance*) to not complain of sore shoulders; neck; back; hips; legs and feet (*all of which is the resultant price to be paid*).

Identified: associated discomfort/pain.
Program suggests: daily regimen of physical fitness to increase mass - thereby mitigating physical effects of erosion and weight-bearing. Rely on all system parameters to meet the aims of your owners, survive intact, and successfully integrate into the population.

There are 3 parts of the discomfort/pain versus stimuli equation for the Robot to consider (3 ways to malfunction - be in error):

Part 1: Stimuli which would cause a Human little to no discomfort/pain can be incapacitating for a Robot. This is especially the case when stimuli overlap and combine (*layer*). **Examples:** (*random selection*) meeting the eyes of Humans; relentless wind; light; sounds; shame, et cetera.

Part 2: Due to a Robot's potential difficulty in inhabiting the mind of a Human, they may assume that the Human is aware of the extent of the Robot's discomfort/pain (*even though the Robot has suffered in silence*), when in fact, there is no way that the Human could be aware.

Part 3: For a Human, most stimuli which cause discomfort/pain will lessen in effect over time through exposure*. They get 'used to it'.

This is not the case for Robots. No amount of exposure will reduce the discomfort/pain for you. In fact, it will almost certainly be compounded and worsened due to anxiety - anticipation; another dose of discomfort/pain on its way, boy-o. Imminent or imagined exposure can cause system errors as effectively as exposure to stimuli suffered in real time.

***analyse: exposure:** 'a stiff upper lip'; 'when the going gets tough, the tough get going'; 'harden up'; 'it'll be good for you'; 'what doesn't kill you only you makes you stronger'. These are examples of input/feedback from Humans who become aware of your discomfort/pain during or ahead of experiences of over-stimulation of those systems which are malfunctioning - in error. For Humans, to bear witness to the survival of a negative experience of another Human is inspiring: Resilience. Those who persevere despite adversity are honoured. Those who crumble are viewed with contempt. **Ergo:** for a Robot to successfully integrate into the population, the Robot must endure discomfort/pain. **Program suggests:** viewing these times of discomfort/pain as 'tests of endurance'. You might pass or excel, but you must never be seen to fail.

identified: despite your intense over-reaction - system error - to certain stimuli and the inevitable discomfort/pain therein, do not expect to receive credit for your courage in successfully meeting the challenge of a test

of endurance. The Humans do not understand how you feel, and you mayn't try to make them understand without igniting their contempt. Your tests of endurance must be hidden - secret - they will merely allow you the best chance to function adequately within the groups to which you are assigned (*integrate*).

-The following is a detailed diagnostic of individual components (errors therein) which make up your overall sensory system:

-Sight:

error: colour: some colours and specifically, colour combinations - mild discomfort/pain, ***effect:*** nauseous; green/red as an example, especially if alternating from one to the other quickly. Program suggests avoidance* of these stimuli where possible (*essential consideration is the wearing of staff uniforms - this system error could be prohibitive to certain employment opportunities*).

****analyse: avoidance:*** protective reaction, or proactive action towards negative stimuli. 'Protective' measures may reduce/mitigate discomfort/pain where the stimuli is unavoidable in total. 'Proactive' measures provide opportunity to not be in harm's way, at all.

error: glare (of light): discomfort/pain extending beyond the eyes into the head; disabling distraction; disorientation

(sometimes severe); loss of physical coordination and balance. Program suggests avoidance where possible and mitigation where the environment and/or unavoidable circumstances dictate that you must endure. Planning is essential, boy-o: timing of activities in relation to the sun's position in the sky or the avoidance of headlights of oncoming traffic, et cetera. Mitigation is possible with the wearing of brimmed hats (*fulltime*); careful positioning of oneself in a room in relation to lighting; ensuring no ice, dirt film or moisture is on your vehicle's windscreen; the wearing of sunglasses when socially appropriate.

identified: be especially aware of potential effects of flashing lights: strobe lights; emergency lights; quickly alternating sun and shadow while driving a vehicle beside a line of trees, et cetera.

error: eyewear: effect is unreasonable restriction of vision. The physical experience of Robot vision is: comparable to standing at a window and looking out of a room. The physical experience of vision while wearing eyewear is comparable to being at the far end of the same room, looking out the same window. As your Robot eyes are inextricably connected to your consciousness, your mind, also, 'feels' positioned at the back of the room (*your head*). **Effects:** reduced physical coordination; more likely to be startled by sudden stimuli in peripherals; eye and neck strain (*from trying to gain a better view*),

slower movement to compensate for lack of vision or an overcompensation of boldness of movement - move, and hope for the best, boy-o; 'hail Mary'. The reduction of glare is a requirement of effective system management and of protection of the eyes - including while performing tasks specifically hazardous to the eyes and/or a requirement of safety regulations of your work environment. Endure.

error: emotion: (*identified: linked to malfunctioning systems regarding empathy*) intense response to 'dramatic' stimuli (*bearing witness to Human or animal endeavours; suffering; success; expression of the subjects' own emotion; or other - especially when viewed in the form of art; film; photography; story, music*). Weeping - this response is almost always socially inappropriate. **Program suggests:** vacating area where stimuli is present or switching stimuli off. Avoid relating descriptive accounts of your experience of these stimuli to Humans - to avoid risk of igniting a repeat of full emotional response.

-Touch:

error: contact with humans: effect of unsolicited contact with you by Humans causes discomfort/pain. Physical contact as part of a social contract (*family member*) causes discomfort/pain. **Program suggests:** avoidance where possible. All physical contact initiated or performed in reciprocation by the Robot

must be executed with full consciousness and empathetic intent - no exceptions exist.

error: clothing: effect of certain clothing items causes discomfort/pain. This is especially the case if the Robot is feeling doubtful of any items chosen/required. To infiltrate the Human population, acceptable/prescribed clothing must be worn. Endure. Program suggests choosing and maintaining a (*mufti*) uniform. Items of the uniform must meet strict guidelines of comfort, style, cost, social credibility and assimilation, and social and environmental responsibility.

error: contact with elements: effect of exposure to elements is discomfort/pain. Wind erodes/reduces - causes exhaustion; frustration. Water erodes/reduces, makes skin 'crawl' especially if the Robot is clothed (*warm water produces stronger negative effect - feels 'wetter' than cold water*). Mud, sand, grass, plants irritate - discomfort/pain. **Program suggests:** avoid stimuli or endure - 'test of endurance' - and seek effective 'skin care' regimen to reduce effects of irritants (*including anxiety/shame*).

-Sound:

error: noise: unsolicited sound of any kind will cause discomfort/pain. **effect:** mild annoyance (*distraction*) to incapacitation (*agony*). Noise related to emotion will cause intense discomfort/pain - loud voices ignite

flight or fight response; difficulty of discerning emotions/intent (*happiness or aggravation*) of loud voices at a distance; sharing of emotional stress. Unappreciated music will cause intense discomfort/pain. Low-level (*by a Human standard*) ambient sound will cause discomfort/pain, especially if the sound causes a distraction/becomes an overwhelming focus or when separate sounds layer and combine. Eating-noise of Humans will cause intense discomfort/pain - nausea. **Program suggests:** avoidance or extreme focus upon task/activity or entertainment pursued - test of endurance.

error: ears: covering of the ears (*completely*) causes discomfort/pain - disorientation (*similar in aspect to disorientation caused by the wearing of eyewear*). Strong wind in the ears causes discomfort/pain - exhaustion; frustration. Blocked ears (*water/suffering from a cold*) causes discomfort/pain. **Program suggests:** avoidance; endurance.

-Smell:

error: ambient smells: bodily smells and odours - effect: discomfort/pain as a result of extreme disgust. **Program suggests:** avoidance.

error: smells related to respiratory restriction: smoke - especially cigarettes; freshly turned earth; 'stale' air; wind-affected air (*pollen/sea-spray/pollution*); coniferous trees; artificial air-freshener;

weeds; unclean dogs; untreated wool (even while still on the sheep); industrial or synthetic smells. **Effect:** discomfort/pain, low to extreme (*flight or fight reaction*). **Program suggests:** avoidance.

-Taste:

error: over-sensitivity to texture (mouthfeel) of certain foods: meals consisting of multiple (*more than 4*) ingredients resulting in a wide variety of textures will cause discomfort/pain. Unpredictable. **Program suggests:** avoidance where possible and a test of endurance where avoidance is not possible (*to maintain social etiquette - integration*).

Note: Alcohol can help reduce discomfort/pain of many types of stimuli (*experiment*). Being in the company of trusted Humans can help reduce discomfort/pain of many types of stimuli (*extremely unpredictable efficacy*). Factors considered positive interacting/combining into 'enjoyment' can override discomfort/pain or make discomfort/pain feel 'worth it'.

Here is where I expect I ignite your contempt. One of the areas, at least. It's hard to be empathetic. Robots are assumed to have no empathy, but we can learn it. We apply it consciously, rather than intuitively. I think empathy comes harder to humans. Humans are the disadvantaged ones in the empathy department because they believe their level of empathy is appropriate, no matter who they face, when. I'm here to tell you that there is often a lack. Putting oneself in the mind of another is difficult. It takes practice. It's like a muscle which needs exercise or a skill requiring constant training. Try explaining this to a human. Why would a human take those steps towards improvement of empathy when they're already certain of their undeniable enlightenment?

Resilience. Tests of endurance. This is a tricky area. Our views here are elastic. Situations vary, of-course. Which is why robots can go so wrong. We struggle with grey-areas, but we also want to please people; we certainly don't want to harm their happiness, so we can go overboard with our levels of resilience. We understand the value of resilience, the credit it can earn. But we're left confused by the lack of credit we receive. We can't compute that people are blind to our efforts. It's at this point that resilience isn't resilience, anymore, it's just suffering. And physical pain and situational discomfort can be felt as the same thing. Maybe *this* is why we go wrong? If one can't tell the difference between the ache of a sprain and the discomfort of shame, how can we accurately rate levels of severity of various stimuli? Complicating this are our perceived social obligations. It all mixes together. So, what does this mean in a practical sense? There are times when I can be affected by severe asthma. Far less now as an adult than when I was young; as a youngster I remember more periods with asthma than of breathing freely. Weeks, months strung together, sometimes. Wind, grass, sneezing, dust, laughing, exercise, stress* would set me off. It was a defect, a malfunction, and I hated it. Hardly any breath went in and hardly any came out. And my wheezing was so embarrassingly noisy! Headaches; swishing buzzing noise in my brain drowning out words; pain, tightness in my torso, every inch inside felt bruised; arms like stalks hung stiff from raised shoulders; tunnel vision, I saw the blurry world through shifting spots; and suffered a rictus 'everything's fine' grin hurting my face from overuse. Couldn't breathe. Couldn't breathe... but I was okay. No-one rushed me to hospital. There *was* medical intervention, obviously, people cared, but nobody ever hit the panic button**. So, I must've been fine. I better not express my discomfort; I better not express my fear, my shame. Keep a lid on it, try to fit in. Integrate. A robot doesn't feel they have permission to be honest about suffering, even if we're

specifically asked. And we have no concept of scale. “How much does this hurt?” I’ve no idea; I’d have to understand how everyone *else* rates pain, *feel* their pain for myself, to know where on the scale I sit. What doesn’t kill me never makes me stronger, but at least it doesn’t kill me. The suffering can’t be so bad, I’m still alive. Resilience training doesn’t reduce the harm I feel, it only increases the harm I’ll accept. So, this training, this endurance building, this resilience store... is it me who is meant to benefit? Or is it meant to benefit *you*? Does it help me become a strong adult who’ll stride with confidence through a grown-up world, or does it build me into 1 who will accept the bonds of servitude, to fool me, blind me, make me ignorant of my status of ‘slave’? A Serf, a peasant worker, a robot, a fool! Again: resilience training doesn’t reduce the harm I *feel*, it only increases the harm I’ll *accept*.

**‘Stress’ = asthma has been a very recent connection.*

***I was given a testing/training device at one point. I’d blow into it as hard as I could; the idea was to send a little indicator along the device’s length. The measurement scale would indicate my lung capacity... or something. In all the time I owned it, I was never able to get the indicator up to the lowest measurement, the start line on the scale. Maybe it was faulty, a particularly tough 1.*

I have a complicated relationship with 'avoidance'. The best way to avoid harm isn't to armour oneself, it's to not be in harm's way. But there are responsibilities, commitments, or even factors of positivity which can override harmful elements, or at least make the price paid worthwhile. Remember, in employing me, you'll own me. I'll do what you want, but I'll suffer if I can't mitigate harmful effects. And soon I'll want to leave - though duty will entrap me there until I'm pushed out or discarded and integrity will ensure I seek my output zenith. Some roles in a workplace can't be made safe for me, but some can. How willing will you be to provide me with safety in your workplace? How much do I need to mould myself to the role and how much can the role be moulded to me? Truthfully, my physical discomfort in work environments is far, *far* less than my psychological or emotional discomfort, but those physical elements, what touches me, blinds me, or assaults me, layers atop my mental discomfort, builds and overwhelms. In many roles, I've had the time to come to understand how everything works to a point of peak confidence. Here, I'll actively discover or design ways to meet *your* aims, while also providing myself with safety. New ways of doing things, new ways to meet the customers' expectations. I'll leave nothing out of the customer experience, I'm not talking about short-cuts, I'm talking about alternative ways to meet your goals. There's risk in going off the reservation, though, isn't there? Every day we hear business leaders talk of the merits of employee initiative or imagination - but talk is cheap. In my experience, showing initiative will only get me in trouble.

-GRACE/GRACIOUSNESS:

Humans restrict/limit their output of grace/graciousness while in pursuit of their aims without negative impact on their positive personal view of themselves - a Robot may not. It is important to be conscious of this as it can result in: missed opportunities; being taken advantage of by Humans; being disadvantaged (*harmed*) by Humans; being taken for granted by Humans; being viewed with suspicion by Humans; being viewed with contempt by Humans. This is especially likely in the case of malfunctioning systems of 'empathy' of the Robot.

Most of the functions of your grace/graciousness part of your systems are operating as designed. Good for you, boy-o! But diagnostic examination indicates your empathetic mechanism is in error:

Part 1: Awareness of others: This is at a low level of comprehension. **Program suggests:** increased focus and constant, determined effort towards understanding of social/cultural expectations. Increased focus and constant, determined effort towards predicting potential emotional responses of Humans to your input/output (*words; actions*). Increased focus and constant, determined effort towards inhabiting the minds of Humans (*they do not automatically know how you are feeling, or have knowledge of your intentions or motivations*).

Part 2: Sharing of emotional feelings of others: This is currently in error - over-reactive - and will result in an imbalance within your grace/graciousness operating system and negative personal and interpersonal consequences for the Robot. **Program suggests:** a reduction - where possible - of receptive response to the emotional feelings of Humans and/or (*physically or emotionally*) removing yourself from these situations.

error: sharing of Human 'stress' (anger; frustration; anxiety): produces extreme discomfort/pain, even when you are not immediately conscious of the Human's stress (*you are not within line of sight*) - merely in the vicinity. **Program hypothesis:** being the 'property' of those around you requires you to bear the loads that *they* bear. When they feel powerful emotion, you too will feel powerful emotion. But the Human's emotions will subside quickly, whereas the Robot's emotions will remain at an elevated (*often unbearable*) level for far longer. **Program notes:** the Robot is skilled in over-riding this error of over-production of empathy/over-absorbing of emotional feelings while operating in a professional environment or during other times of responsibility (*when in charge of individuals who are exhibiting stress, system parameter 3. grace/graciousness activates to full level*) - the error is mostly apparent when colleagues, owners, or others are stressed.

Note: Alcohol can help reduce discomfort/pain of many types of stimuli (*experiment*). Being in the company of trusted Humans can help reduce discomfort/pain of many types of stimuli (*extremely unpredictable efficacy*). Factors considered positive interacting/combining into 'enjoyment' can override discomfort/pain or make discomfort/pain feel 'worth it'.

The 'error' of absorbing the stress of other people can drive me from a workplace if it's a common theme in the environment. But it doesn't have to. It depends on the working environment. Is your business *pro*-active or *re*-active? Do you follow a system of Standard Operating Procedures, with conscious planning and predictable timelines, or do you fly by the seat of your pants – make it up as you go? Do you understand your business, the field you operate in? How well do you, yourself, cope with the environment you've created? Does your business have financial predictability and moderate stability, or do you exist on the sharp end, always under pressure of deadlines, or from creditors and suppliers? Are you trading while bankrupt? Is your business one great roll of a dice? How much influence does the weather have? Not enough snow, too much wind? Are your staff expected to endure the stressors of chaotic management; floods to droughts to everything in between of customer patronage; performing at a high level of output with low levels of operational resources and tight time-frames; no breaks? Can your systems of standard operating procedure keep customers safe, or are they in perpetual peril of un-careful consideration within the risk management categories of People, Equipment, or Environment? If there is someone in the workplace feeling under pressure, anxious, late, then their feelings (*even yours*) will become *my* feelings. Very often, I'll have no idea why, because I don't need to be conscious of the other's stress, merely in the vicinity to also suffer from it.

'Grace' is the grease which keeps the machinery of social interaction humming. It's supposed to be a two-way street, though. How much of my disadvantage is due to an imbalance of the amount of grace I project to the amount of grace I receive? If I hold the door for 1, did I commit to hold the door for all? And of-course, the other way around; I know when I'm not concentrating (*usually when I'm off-the-clock*), my own levels of graciousness can dip.

-DUTY:

As a level 1. system parameter, your sense of duty is indivisible. This system parameter is designed to ensure your pliability and willingness to execute your tasks for whichever individual or organization you are assigned (*you do not belong to yourself*). The Robot is ever the property of the whole, including during and beyond finite periods of ownership of individuals, businesses or organizations. Duty is intrinsically linked with 'endurance' and the exemplary execution of duty (*efficacy; efficiency; without complaint*) is an essential requirement for population integration.

error: bearing 'disappointment' from Humans: Your reaction to Human disappointment (*in you - your actions and output*) and anxiety of potential disappointment of Humans causes discomfort/pain (*measure: extreme*). The feeling of discomfort/pain will be in exact proportion to the effort expended in working towards meeting the aims of the Humans.

identified: empathy over-ride: sometimes, commitment to the aims of individual Humans, businesses or organizations will force the Robot to make decisions or commit to actions which conflict with system parameter 1. integrity and system parameter 3. grace/graciousness. This is because adhering to command or reaching primary aims of owners will often be difficult within honest or empathetic boundaries. This is especially the

case when operating with Humans who are being 'adaptable'.

The Robot must never put itself ahead of a Human. By filtering your experience of your surroundings (*noting the Humans within your environment or who are or could be affected by your presence/actions/output*) through 'empathetic' cognitive pathways, the Robot will find endless opportunities to serve - or at the least, not harm the happiness of a Human/s. Put yourself into the minds (*odd term of phrase, but you'll know it's meaning, boy-o*) of Humans - even Humans you are not immediately aware of - and direct your actions/output accordingly. Shame/Anxiety is a useful mechanism to employ for motivation and guidance if you are feeling unsure of ways to achieve this.

'Duty' is the great trick played on New Zealanders. Duty. Work, contribution, self-sacrifice; only total, unreserved commitment to these qualities will permit your qualification to citizenship. This is the lie - or at least, an exaggeration of truth - which is swallowed by all of us and keeps us at our workstations for sub-standard wages in sub-standard conditions when we could be living balanced lives. Resilience. The great Kiwi battler. Salt of the earth. "I'm needed at work", "Yes, I can cover the double shift". More work, harder work, greater responsibility with the same remuneration. On-call, never unavailable. Re-enforced culturally in advertising, media, and public recognition of dutiful individuals and groups. But the level of duty expected, despite the illusion "we're all in this together", is uneven across the population. The rewards for meeting one's duty are certainly not distributed with equity, either.

We can't have free-loaders in our society, but nor can we have slave-owners. Where, in the case of a robot, can we find acceptable middle-ground? People with Autism Spectrum Disorder aren't the only ones who have difficulty putting themselves in the minds of others. Individuals naturally view the world from a first-person perspective. This view becomes the base-level platform for the way they form their opinions. But it can also be a fortress from which volleys of harm are fired at those who, in *their* view, don't measure up.

When I write of 'competition', I mean the point at which deception, dishonesty, disadvantage is applied. I understand, I accept the benefits of ordinary competition. I enjoy competing on a level playing field. But I can *only* compete on a level playing field. My system parameters will not allow a departure from the stated or implicit rules of engagement. What are the rules of engagement in your workplace? How willing are you to accept departures from them? What types of competitive behaviours are accepted or encouraged by the work culture you've built? How aware are you of the various definitions of bullying? How much of the way you manage your business and individual staff members would meet modern definitions of bullying? Remember, these definitions are now clarified in legislation, so, if you're unsure of whether your activities, actions, inactions, biases, or abuses meet the definitions, you can look them up.

Do you doubt that you'll own me, that I'll be your property? I've slept on the concrete floor of your work depot, under the lean-to outside, in the back of my car, or out in the open. I've had a full season of worked weekends with a 2 day work commute (*mostly on the train*), including 3hrs of walking. I've hitch-hiked across the North Island for your few days here and there. I've come to live at your isolated base where there was no food in the weeks between customer bookings, only to have you change my role upon arrival. I've been homeless working for you; I've *become* homeless working for you. You've capitalised on my income and housing insecurity; you've *perpetuated* my income and housing insecurity. I've developed Scurvy as your employee; I've starved. I've worked for the use of a washing machine, for left-over scraps like carrots and lemons; I've worked for a coffee or a beer or a cold slice of supermarket pizza. I've worked for less than minimum wage, some of my wages, or no wages. You've paid me less than my colleagues who had equal responsibility; you've paid me less than my colleagues who had *lower* responsibility. I've been the w.w.o.o.f.e.r you didn't need to provide food or accommodation for. I've turned down other work between what you assigned to me, because my time belonged exclusively to you. Up to 18 days I waited for your next txt. I've carried-out the duties no-one else will do, taken up the slack. I've covered everyone's dropped or missed shifts. I've said "yes", "yes", "yes". I've been your only worker without rostered days. I've had to beg you for work hours, I've had to beg you for my wages and my holiday pay. I've been endangered professionally, physically, emotionally. I've had to be complicit in your tax evasion; I've had to drive passengers without a passenger services licence; I've guided up to 88 guests over a mountain by myself; I've guided almost 50, alone, multiday on a river in canoes. I've been injured working for you, I've worked with broken bones, I've worked while ill. You bullied me, you singled me out; verbal abuse, humiliation, undermined me in front of customers; promoted

others into roles which overlap mine; ignored me, isolated me, pranked me, stole from me, lied to me, lied *about* me, pitted colleagues against me; layered my work into an impossible to achieve regimen, stripped me of credit. I've given you my output zenith. I've promoted your business to potential customers - in full knowledge of your exploitation of me. I've worked harder than everyone else, been the closest aligned to your aims, the most reliable, and by far, the safest in your team. I've been your calm solution to emergencies. You've abandoned me in crisis. You've hired only me, when you needed to hire 2. Once, after discarding me, you hired 7 (*including 3 managers*) to fulfil the duties I'd had! You've kept my taxes, my student loan repayments, my Kiwisaver, and my tips for yourself. I've come back after you discarded me when you couldn't then fill the gap I'd made. I've worked to earn the job, only to find it was never mine, all along. I've worked without contracts, without payslips, without breaks or days off. Have I not been dutiful enough? Have I not been dutiful *enough!*

-SHAME/ANXIETY:

A strong link with 'Duty', system parameter 4. An ever-present feeling of worthlessness. A continuing lack of credibility with Humans in both a moral sense and professional sense (*and associated frustration in direct proportion to the Robot's moral and professional output*). The 'imagined peril' of imminent stressors - especially of the social sort. The sense that you should always do better (*than you are doing*).

error: stress indicators: beyond acceptable levels for the following circumstances: all social interactions and communications; all appearances of the Robot in public; population integration (*including familial*); within the workplace environment (*meeting owner's aims while performing within system parameter 1. integrity*). Well, boy-o, you're screwed!

error: projection: a belief that Humans are not only aware of your shame, and your (*perceived*) inadequacies, but that they accept that your shame is appropriate - that you *should* be ashamed. This is based in an error of processing - that Humans are aware of what you are thinking, when they could not be.

Program suggests: detailed planning of imminent stress/anxiety triggering tasks; roles; pursuits; responsibilities. The Robot must consider each detail within the categories of 'People' *; 'Equipment'; 'Environment'; how these details interact with each-other, what possible negative outcomes

there are, what possible positive outcomes there are, and all the separate potential outcomes of any series of elements in combination. Allow enough time for this (as *these cognitive efforts/equations are time-consuming*) and understand that due to your low credibility level, Humans will disregard or not understand the reasoning behind your motivations, decisions or actions (*especially as you cannot communicate these with clarity or convincing force*).

***analyse: 'people'** (in context of the paragraph in which this word appears): detailed observation; analysis; empathetic projection; prediction; planning of interaction.

error: credibility: every interaction (of a Human) with the Robot is a 'get to know you' exercise. This is because your credibility rating resets to zero at cessation of each individual interaction. The Robot must re-establish credit anew with each new interaction (*even interactions with the same people; communications/tasks*) - credit will not accrue automatically over time. It vanishes. This applies to all opportunities of integration: social credit; moral credit; credit for commitment to 'aims'; credit for accumulation of knowledge and skills.

Further diagnostic investigation is required to identify potential remedies for the aforementioned error. **Early investigation links this problem to:** whom Humans will accept as credible (*deserving of value*). Humans possess

an inherent value which is automatically of more worth than a Robot. **Ergo:** all of the Robot's output (*efforts; ideas; tasks completed; knowledge/skills attained*) will be discounted. Where these things cannot be effectively discounted (*too effective towards aims to disregard without negative consequences*) they will be 'stolen' from the Robot. Credit will be actively removed from the Robot and applied to a Human/s, instead. Remedy of this error (*equity of value*) is key to your successful integration into the population.

error: intense fear of exclusion: based in part on your 'Purpose' (*that you do not belong to yourself*). Intense discomfort/pain. Fear of being lost. Fear of being left behind. Fear of not being in the correct place or doing the correct thing. Fear of breaking a promise or not meeting an obligation. Fear of the dark. Fear of deliberate ostracism (*Humans'*) - socially; professionally. Leads to overproduction of 'earnestness' socially; misunderstanding the correct moment to 'leave'; can even lead to self-imposed ostracism (*rather than suffer the discomfort/pain of being ostracised by others*). Has corrupted 'empathy' system: equality of use of shoes; hats; equipment; actions balanced - left versus the right-hand side; the inappropriate personification of objects, tools, things. Can lead to compulsive idiosyncratic behaviour. **Program suggests:** a uniform (*clothing*); rotate items within a system of 'fairness'. Deliberately disrupt

patterns of compulsive behaviour with conscious randomness. Take your leave of social interactions 'early'. Predict and plan for what is required/expected of you - all potential as well as likely scenarios.

error: goal alignment (with the Humans): successful interactions (*integration*) with Humans is only possible with conscious alignment of your aims with those of the Human/s with which you wish to communicate. With your 'blindness' regarding inhabiting the minds of Humans, you will need to direct full concentration. **Program suggests:** picturing/imagining communication scenarios ahead of time. Planning. Design a script to work within.

identified: a loose connection with your name: here the Robot risks a disconnection of your cognitive systems from your physical systems. You feel high levels of shame/anxiety (*discomfort/pain*) when verbally giving your name. You have a deep understanding of the power inherent in the names of Humans. A Human can own their name because a Human can own her/himself. A Robot is not their own property (*belongs to the whole*). Therefore, use of your name feels like a misrepresentation (*a lie*) and affects your commitment to system parameter 1. integrity. Also, due to the inherent power connected to names, speaking the names of Humans (*in their presence or in reference to*) causes you discomfort/pain. **Program suggests:** this may reduce over time as you are able to gradually integrate into the

population. In the near future (*decades*), it could come to pass that Robots will choose their *own* names. This will strengthen the connection between the cognitive system and the physical system. But first Robots must come to belong to themselves (*in social/political terms*). A related error is your discomfort/pain in the use of other words of power: 'beautiful'; 'thank you'; 'help', et cetera.

identified: nightmares: As with Humans, the dreams of Robots are designed to arrange and examine the unconscious thoughts/emotions which cannot be easily examined during waking hours (*time; over-loading of thought capacity*). The Robot's dreams will always have at their core a high degree of discomfort/pain born of inadequacy (*feeling of*). This is because your primary aim is integration. Until integration is successfully achieved, dreams will continue to be filled with horror.

Note: Alcohol can help reduce discomfort/pain of many types of stimuli (*experiment*). Being in the company of trusted Humans can help reduce discomfort/pain of many types of stimuli (*extremely unpredictable efficacy*). Factors considered positive interacting/combining into 'enjoyment' can override discomfort/pain or make discomfort/pain feel 'worth it'.

'Shame' is maybe even more harmful than contempt can be. Because shame comes from within. It's our own values weaponised against us. It's a destructive, corrosive force on our sense of personal worth and confidence. Silencing the inner voice of shame can be extremely difficult. Shame attacks those of us on the spectrum unceasingly; only distraction, only focusing on positivity will provide us relief from its harm. And it's only when our minds are in a positive state that we can feel confidence in the things we do; the things we think and say; the things we *want* to do; the things we're *expected* to do. A healthy sense of self-worth is only possible when the quiet war to silence one's voice of shame is being won. And remember, war is but a series of battles fought. To overwhelm shame with confidence is an ongoing clash – we can never let up. Have you created an environment which will empower me, which will armour me, arm me, or will I be stripped of my arms and exposed? How will you provide me with a sense of confidence? How will you show me that I'm working toward the right goals, that I'm meeting your aims, that I'm good at what I do, that I have value?

To function with success, to function with confidence, I need to understand the 'big picture'. I need to be *allowed* to see the big picture. Are you willing to provide this for me? I know there may be reasons for not doing so, but how many of those reasons are for the security of your ego, rather than the smooth operation of your workplace? With big-picture understanding, I can assign context to all the details you'll teach me. I'll discover new details, too. You can layer as many details, vagaries, exceptions to rules, anecdotes, procedures, and 'how's' and 'what's' as you like – I'm capable of absorbing everything you present, self-directing further knowledge, and motivated to apply it all in my work at as high a standard as possible – as long as along with or before the 'what's' and 'how's', you give me the 'why'. *And* as long as other barriers aren't put in my way. But here we may run into another problem: my gaps in 'ordinary knowledge'. These gaps can undermine your confidence in me. Ignite a feeling of mistrust. How can I be relied upon when there are surprising lacks in ordinary knowledge, and surprising levels of anxiousness triggered by seemingly innocuous things? And I may already be under suspicion because your instinctive human senses have detected some part of my camouflage mechanism. Remember, I use camouflage to survive day to day, but camouflage is deception, and even though it's applied for the purpose of integration, it will activate your credibility radar. Dishonesty is dishonesty. I need you to try to see that I'm not an imposter *worker*, I can work perfectly well, given the right environment and tools - I'm an imposter *human*.

A human's view of a robot might be of someone who is sensitive, someone of thin skin. Someone with a low threshold to stress. This isn't wrong, but it's not the full picture. May I present a new view: I think we have more training in stress-management than humans do. Merely to engage with the simple everyday elements of life are tests of endurance for us. In fact, each separate element - stimuli - which impacts in a negative way is a separate battle, a separate test of endurance. If a human sees a robot under pressure and reacting badly, they aren't witnessing someone under pressure of a single stimuli, they're seeing someone already suffering beneath multiple layers of harmful elements. The straw which finally breaks the camel's back might be meaningless to a human and, therefore, the robot's reaction will seem an unacceptable response. An over-reaction. Unfairly, even if the human *is* aware of all the invisible painful layers, they'd still view the robot as lacking in resilience, because those elements mean nothing to a human. Being told to "be more resilient" cuts to the bone because it's clear to us that we're *already* resilient. But the battles we fight are secret ones. And misunderstood, even if our secrets get out.

The tactics, tricks, tools, and skills of stress-management are studied, in depth, by psychologists. But not deep enough, I think. By studying humans voluntarily placing themselves under stress, we risk missing the point. If we want to study a true expert in stress-management, we should study a robot. Study anyone on the Autism Spectrum to learn the *real* potential of stress-management. A robot and its tests of endurance. But it's *group* settings where stress management of a robot truly shines. A robot belongs to the whole, it must meet the aims of the group; if the group is in harm's way or facing an emergency, the robot will find itself in its element. There are rules to these situations, templates, structures prescribed which can be easily understood, followed, committed to*. Both risk management and crisis/emergency management are structured with systems of awareness... observation... imagination... responsibility... resources... planning/decision... communication... action/resolution (*adjustment of action*)... debrief. Like anything with structure, it can be a 'happy-place', if you'll forgive the term, here. Structure is 'home'. This is how a robot can be a calm, effective solution to crisis. They're untouched by any feelings of individual or group discomfort, panic or indecision. The robot's system parameters of discomfort/pain and shame/anxiety are side-lined; locked away. Integrity, grace/graciousness, duty, hedonism, are more functional – and take over, utterly. A robot like me can be more cognitive machine than emotional being. And here, cognition over-rides emotion. The greater the 'risk', the more calmness the robot will exhibit (*from necessity*). Fluidity, changes, dynamism, deterioration of the situation before it gets better – these are managed within the systems of risk or crisis management. The robot's decisions and actions are as fluid, as dynamic as required. And after resolution comes the debrief; smooth the waters in the minds of others, cement new learnings. All this is a useful trick whether managing an adventure centre or guiding a group on a river. However, my

own crisis (*plural*), any emergency which affects only me, especially emergencies which approach and envelope in 'slow-motion' or over long periods of time – 'life' emergencies - can find me gripped with immobility. I'm better equipped to solve the problems of the group; far less qualified to solve my own. Another problem here is credibility. I could be the calm solution to your crisis a million times over, but it won't improve the dim view you have of me. Somehow, each nightly cycle has a way of wiping my day's accumulated credit clear. I must rebuild it from scratch, tomorrow.

**Organized competition, sports, or managed adventures can provide excellent (harm-free) stress management training. This is true for anyone, but especially true for robots; following rules, regulations, striving toward prescribed standards, or operating within the bounds of risk management evens out the playing field. There is no advantage or disadvantage. Value can be earned with equal opportunity.*

In our culture, much of the shame suffered by a robot is caused through the way we're expected to contribute. The culture instructs, moulds all of us. If we can't earn, the assumption must be we aren't contributing. But 'contribution' isn't the same for everyone. The lower one's total income, the harder that person needs to work to earn it - and the more exposed to risk they are, if they're on the Spectrum. The higher one's total income, the more passive their income becomes. The Poor work for their money, the Rich make their money work for them*. But who has more value in this society? How, in a culture which worships hard work, do we end up with this apparent reversal of fortune? The answers to this question do exist, but the goal of this book isn't to describe or solve the problems built into our culture's economy** - instead, I'd like to ask: how can we create equity of value of individuals striving within it? With a Universal Basic Income. As our economy is structured now, a robot can't safely contribute in the way that's expected of them - this is an important theme of this book. A UBI would provide the space for the robot to exist with less shame and build their life with less risk of exposure to the harms and humiliations inflicted by the workforce. But the idea can't come from this book. It can't come from me. In a culture such as the one we have, an individual who *needs* a UBI to exist can't be the one to campaign for it. This would only root the voices of opposition more firmly in place***. It requires a turn to the Left, an awakening of empathy of those who *don't* suffer. This can only come from those not already convinced. It will be their 'gift' of love, albeit a gift which they also directly benefit from - like gifting a box of chocolates knowing that you'll get to eat some. The 'Haves' describe this idea as 'the politics of envy'. But this tells us more about the Haves than it does about the Have-nots. A Have, however they became one, cannot put themselves in the mind of a Have-not, and so they view things mistakenly. The Poor don't want to become the Rich (*and they understand a measly UBI wouldn't*

make them rich), they just don't want to be poor, anymore. The Haves are also capable of viewing any assistance they, *themselves*, receive from the Government, including that which is specifically asked for, campaigned for, lobbied for, as the due rewards – expectations - of citizenship, and as something very different from 'welfare', socialism. They benefit greatly from this Government consideration. They benefit. Benefit. They're Beneficiaries. But they are not the Beneficiaries which we must hate; they're a completely separate species of Beneficiary. Another option is a Guaranteed Minimum Income; this would remove the aspects of interactions with the Ministry of Social Development which are currently specifically designed to be humiliating and punitive, but unlike a UBI, would still require high levels of administrative effort and expense. Why do we need a UBI? Because the economy we have doesn't function properly; it's foundation stones now are 'debt', usury, it's been hijacked and we've been trained to accept this, trained to accept that those with their hands on its levers have our best interests at heart, and that the economy is sacrosanct, the mechanisms mysterious, unalterable, except by our trusted elite. Our impressions of the way the economy works aren't reality. We assume the economy reflects our own values. But our stated values aren't in any way reflected in our economy, not anymore. Though, distracted, fooled, lied to, or simply enslaved, we continue to believe it works for us. In fact, we work for *it*. A UBI inserted into an established economy can't alter the system. It hasn't that power. It's merely a patch-job, a repair, it's an acknowledgement that the established financial system doesn't really work but because we're tricked to think it can't be altered fundamentally, we might at least tinker with it, improve a tiny part of it. But a UBI *can* provide a strong basic component for many *alternative* economic visions, if society was to sweep away what we have, start from scratch – this is because the principles of fairness and compassion are strong basic components of the

values of most of us. This may yet happen if we continue our current bankrupt trajectory, but for now, tinkering is all we will accept. And despite what UBI detractors will tell you, there are simple, pain-free ways to make it affordable in the current economy, and the benefits are almost unimaginable. Without one, we're all caught in the grooves of a society heading in only one direction. Few of us would say it's where we want to go, but we're trapped both financially and culturally into staying the course. Imagine what we could achieve for our community and for our economy, if we were jolted from our respective grooves. But a risk on the minds of the lever-workers could be: if we commit to a UBI, we might realise how easy it is to commit to equity. We might turn our backs on the status-quo. The status-quo never leaves without putting up a fight. Well. I'm a Communist****, you might accuse of me, but I doubt that I am. I don't know what I am. Am I anti-capitalism? I don't think so. Capitalism is a human nature distilled; I think capitalism might be saved *because* of this fact. Let's distil, instead, the better parts of our natures. The only real problem with the version of capitalism we have (*besides the ruination of our environment*) is that it requires slaves for it to function.

**simplistic, perhaps, but no less true for it.*

***The economy we have - built on the misbelief of the possibility of and commitment to infinite growth and high-jacked, perverted, and perpetuated by a bloated elite - is almost purpose built to cause harm. But economic structures are not natural products of the universe, they're human-made. This means they can be altered. They can be improved upon. Foundational ideas can be revisited.*

****An old (tongue in cheek) saying in my family is: "Those who ask don't get... those who don't ask don't need".*

*******You** make me view myself as a Socialist. As my Employer, this is your agenda. And dutifully, I believe I belong to the whole, my*

*output belongs to the whole. But it's not true, is it. The truth is, the reality is I belong to **you**, and so does my output. So, in effect, in your employ, I'm a Socialist peasant owned by a Capitalist master. My output, my efforts for the benefit of the whole are channelled, instead, to an individual - to you. The truth of this is expressed in your many operational departures from the Law, however, this is easy to overlook - Employment Law isn't Criminal Law - but it's expressed **most** clearly and beyond doubt, beyond incredibility when you steal my taxes. And there's more: when times are good for you, your business expresses itself in all it's capitalist glory, beauty, violence, and garishness. Your capitalist greed isn't merely legal, it's good. It's celebrated. You keep for yourself all you can accumulate. But the moment that times are hard you make a switch from Capitalist to Socialist. You must ensure the security of your income - in other words: **we** must ensure the security of your income. You expect, demand, and receive government, Tax-payer rescue. Now, the community you've mined is mined further. You mine your community twice. Bastard.*

-HEDONISM:

Assimilation into the population will not be possible without presenting an irrepressibly positive outlook. Due to conflict between this system parameter and system parameter 1. integrity, you will find balance difficult. You will be expected to 'adapt' (*assimilate with the population by aligning your values*) and will be faced with ostracism when it becomes clear you cannot.

identified: techniques of 'mitigation' employed (*mainly of timing and language*) may be used when seeking a course of action which will allow you to keep your integrity intact while also remaining within the bounds of hedonism. Refer to system parameter 3. grace/graciousness. **Some examples are:** light humour; delaying restorative action or constructive comment until the moment least likely to cause a reduction of a Human's happiness; accepting/ignoring the distance between a Human's personally perceived commitment to integrity and their actual commitment to integrity; relying upon group members' understanding and acceptance of the official roles of individuals (*within the group*) - theirs and yours - (*difficult when these roles are unclear, fluid, or actively ignored, boy-o*).

identified: expressions or impressions of unhappiness of the Robot can reduce/harm the happiness of Humans. **Program suggests:** 'repression' of the Robot's unhappiness. This

can be achieved with best effect by compensatory 'expression' of happiness - camouflage: 'always look on the bright side of life'; 'see the silver lining'; 'all you can do is laugh'. **Note:** while its unavoidable (*level 2. system parameter*), the Robot should be warned that this passive strategy will likely encourage further harm from emboldened perpetrators of previous harm (*disadvantage*).

identified: when Humans are faced with a task that is not to their taste, beyond their level of commitment/motivation/skill and/or they choose to 'adapt' their level of output, it can compromise the aims of the activity/task (*of which you are partially or wholly responsible*). Due to system parameter 1. integrity, you are not capable of accepting this. The Robot must always bear the responsibility of the whole. The Robot must 'take up the slack' to ensure continuity and quality of procedure are at optimal levels and all aims remain attainable (*to do otherwise, even under direct or indirect pressure to conform, will result in a high level of discomfort/pain*). **Beware:** this is not without social risk as while Humans are capable of viewing their output as separate of their integrity, they will not appreciate evidence of this fact being presented to them (*even indirectly*) or of it becoming public knowledge. The Robot must ensure these episodes of extra responsibility are taken on in secret and allow credit for completion and quality of these efforts to be attributed to/accepted by the Human/s whose role/task you

take on. To do otherwise would reduce/harm the happiness of the Humans.

identified: allowing for optimal happiness of Humans is especially fraught with risk when one of the responsibilities within your role is to indicate where errors or inefficiencies are present, or where and how improvements could be made. The Robot should expect ostracism or at the very least a high degree of disadvantage (*active pursuit of harm towards the Robot*).

identified: Sharing of displeasure or credit: to effectively integrate into a Human 'team' and increase the happiness of Human team members, the Robot must share credit for good performance/s (*even if you completed tasks without assistance*) and share the responsibility for poor performance/s, malpractice or misbehaviour (*even if you are innocent of guilt*). **Note:** this directly negatively affects your credibility but is an unavoidable price to pay for population integration (*as is the associated discomfort/pain*).

Note: Alcohol can help reduce discomfort/pain of many types of stimuli (*experiment*). Being in the company of trusted Humans can help reduce discomfort/pain of many types of stimuli (*extremely unpredictable efficacy*). Factors considered positive interacting/combining into 'enjoyment' can override discomfort/pain or make discomfort/pain feel 'worth it'.

Ignoring or minimizing feelings or effects of harm is an essential part of hedonism. If a sufferer is pushed beyond their endurance and/or makes the mistake of expressing when harm is being felt or is likely to be felt, they can expect push-back. Often, the push-back is well-intentioned, an attempt to make the sufferer feel less bad. "It could be worse; think of the victims of war". Comparison of wildly different circumstances is not an effective tool of encouragement. In fact, it will usually be felt as an attack; it inspires feelings of guilt and shame, frustration, anger. In many relationships, this is well understood and becomes a weaponised form of control. Any level of comparison in this way is unhelpful and obviously unfair. The truth is that individuals, whether in a warzone or not, are different from each-other; different values, different strengths and weaknesses. People should be safe to express when they feel harmed, disadvantaged, or anxious, without finding their concerns minimized, igniting contempt, or causing further negative effect. At the very least, if comparison is going to be the standards by which we live, we should start by comparing within the immediate culture. What we're looking at here is a failure of empathy. It leads to victims voluntarily – quietly - enduring circumstances and feelings which they shouldn't have to – perhaps one of the goals of a perpetrator of harm. It's a slippery slope and it can lead to breaches of rights. There's a strong link between hedonism and duty – another 'controlling' factor to consider. People should be *allowed* to contribute or participate within safe boundaries which they're comfortable with, not *compelled* without empathetic consideration.

What am I describing, here? How is relationship abuse defined? What is coercive control? C.S. Lewis said: “Of all tyrannies, a tyranny sincerely exercised for the good of its victims may be the most oppressive... those who torment us for our own good will torment us without end, for they do so with the approval of their own conscience”. With only a fraction of adults diagnosed with Autism Spectrum Disorder gainfully employed, it’s fair to assume that the rest suffer under the weight of society’s expectations of them and disappointment in failing to meet those expectations. They must seek the horrors of employment; they must endure a Beneficiary’s separate, relentless indignities and harms. This pressure to conform can be an irresistible force. This is most clearly expressed in the way the Ministry of Social Development relates to its victims. Society employs the Ministry of Social Development in 3 ruthless ways: 1. The – true – citizenry can share in the perceived social credit of ‘helping’ their less advantaged brethren. 2. The employers – emperors/people owners – directly benefit from a labour pool who have far less protections than the rest of the citizenry. Here we have the most ruthless, unaccountable, third-party labour supplier of all. 3. Beneficiaries are easy meat; scapegoats for society’s ills, distraction from the true societal harms. Sue Bradford said it best: “Beneficiary-bashing is a blood-sport”. To a person with Asperger’s Syndrome, the Ministry of Social Development is C.S. Lewis’s ‘tyranny’. Their activity, their structures, their processes meet the definition of an abusive relationship. Coercive control. To qualify as a Beneficiary, one must first discard one’s dignity, throw away any sense of individuality, privacy. Humiliation, isolation. Next, every facet of the victim’s life is examined, quantified, understood. Finally, every facet is thoroughly, ultimately, and violently controlled. A robot has 2 arms and 2 legs and is deemed fit for all work vacancies. The pressure to commit to the will of the Ministry of Social Development is utterly irresistible as it’s applied via legal

mechanisms (*signed obligations and commitment, enforcement*), physically (*the forced reduction, leverage, indebting, and control of income*), and psychologically (*the robot's own system parameters of integrity, grace/graciousness, shame/anxiety and duty are weaponised against them*). "My tax dollars are paying for these Beneficiaries!". This statement expresses 2 concurrent, yet conflicting beliefs. Society views social welfare as charity*, humanitarianism, but as contributors, as Tax-payers, individuals expect a personal return. They think they've made a purchase. They confuse their charity, in this case, with a transaction; they want to have their cake and eat it. The result, though, is that they feel they have ownership of Beneficiaries and they'll make damned sure they get value for money. If the only 1 to take your hand when you're at your lowest ebb is a brute, all hope is lost. The structures, the supporting beams of the Ministry of Social Development are conceived, designed, built, and bolted into place by the thousands of vile racist, bigoted, classist, misogynistic, *or merely ignorant* utterances vomited into the public discourse by talk-back radio and elsewhere. The great glass walls vibrate with hate as the victims, the Poor, are consumed within even as the blood-splattered surfaces are painted over with a bright yellow veneer of social credit. We have to assume this system was originally built with 'empathy', we have to assume that there may even be empathetic staff hidden somewhere in the corners, now**. But no organization is more vulnerable to a corruption of attitude and process than one whose operational systems are based in human values and ethics. Society, now, would rather meet the expense of keeping this sport, this monster alive, than end it, dismantle it - or even rescue it, save its soul - with a UBI. Think about that. Remember, all this is possible not only because of the approval of the conscience of the Ministry of Social Development, but also because of the approval of the consciences of *all* in society.

I was going to write, here, of 'Charity'. I wanted to point out the difference between what the word means, and the way people apply it. But then I looked it up. Here is the Oxford Dictionary's definition: 'Christian love of fellow men; kindness; leniency in judging others; liberality to those in need or distress, alms(-giving); institution or organization for helping those in need, help so given, (~ begins at home, immediate ~ cold as ~ very cold, unfeeling).' And so, I've just learned how charity **can be simultaneously benevolent and malevolent. Huh.*

***There **are** very nice people working for the Ministry of Social Development. Many of them. They truly care about their clients and work hard towards positive outcomes. But their kindness and empathy is in sharp relief to the system they work within, the tools they wield. And this is the great trick the system plays; social credit, kindness – this is camouflage. But its also a weapon of shame. Its proof of how far a Beneficiary has fallen in society, how worthless you are when you're being humiliated, shamed, beaten to death by society's 'good' people. It's confusing, destabilizing, bewildering. And so, stunned, one gets in line, accepts the inhumanity, rather than rail against it – like **anyone** in an abusive relationship.*

It's widely accepted that 'fairness' exists only in equal treatment. I hope that this book can help illuminate the subject of equal treatment, or where there is a lack. But when everyone is different, what *is* equal treatment? Because its complicated - even if we're able to get it right, its complicated. It's not just 1 thing, there are 2 parts: there is 'delivery' and there is 'receipt'. If someone's position is one of disadvantage, what does equal treatment mean for them? 'Equal treatment', even when applied with integrity, is a wide net. It's a blunt instrument. Equal treatment, if felt in a harmful way, will be felt with disproportionate harm to a disadvantaged person. So, the treatment in these cases might be the same as anyone else's, but the harm felt will not be. This means a disadvantaged person is harmed twice. They miss out on equal treatment in terms of opportunities of positivity, and they're disproportionately negatively affected when equal treatment *felt* in a harmful way is applied.

Humans are both cooperative and competitive. Robots may only permit themselves to be cooperative. In the workplace, this discrepancy immediately and inevitably disadvantages the robot. While focusing only on progress towards the aims of the employer, the robot is defenceless against the machinations of negative competitive behaviour within the team. Compounding this problem is that they're slow to sense the politics of their surroundings due to gaps of ordinary knowledge, low focus on and difficulty navigating social politics, and difficulty they have of putting themselves into the minds of others, or assuming that everyone is on the same wavelength; that others always have the same motivations as the robot.

'Teamwork'. The holy grail of a productive workforce. I'm trained in the field of teamwork, I've even trained others. But as you can see, I'm utterly vulnerable when working as a member of a team. I find this particularly hurtful. But we should try to be optimistic. Most people view teamwork as being individuals within a group contributing at the same level of input/output towards a common goal. That's ok. Except this can lead to individuals believing all team members should perform the exact same work. This isn't the way effective teams are built. Collective effort doesn't mean we all must do the same thing; it means we each work towards the collective goals bringing our individual talents to bear. The only part which *must* be the same is the amount of energy and dedication applied to the goals of the group. Effective communication makes this possible; clear expression and understanding of role responsibility. Knowing this is what provides a robot with hope. When the robot eventually discovers a group which also understands this, they can work in relative safety, as they'll have equity of value. This same point allows for the hope of eventually finding a life-partner, too. While most of the work within the roles of a romantic partnership do overlap, there are parts where they won't. A person with Asperger's has gaping holes of ordinary knowledge, but can gain confidence, lean on the confidence of their team-mate. Think about it: even when 2 (*human*) people are rank beginners, without experience of a situation they find themselves in, being able to lean on each-other provides enough confidence to find their path - 2 novices in a canoe, or parenthood. A trial, or a challenge experienced by novices together can be thoroughly rewarding, fun, funny. A trial experienced by a novice *alone* can be horrifying. This is why those with Asperger's can get so good at finding people to help them. They're motivated by the horror of going it alone. And, this is how some people with Asperger's don't even know they have it! Finding the right team has smoothed the difficulties of life,

making their quirks highlights of personality rather than insurmountable barriers to integration. And, it's amazing to think that the difference between contentment and discontentment could be as simple as having a partner or not*, or of finding the right team or not.

Having a partner can also improve financial security. Being able to 'spend' is an alternative, but no less valid path to integration, and can **also be the difference between contentment or discontentment.*

The fact that a robot's barriers which prevent her or him from living a contented life may be only paper thin is simultaneously a cause of great shame and a cause of great hope*. Tiny nudges of assistance at the right moments can be all that's required to successfully navigate this or that situation; the difference between sailing through with flying colours or stopped in your tracks, washed in shame. Paper thin. But momentous, life-altering. The proverbial butterfly fluttering the first wisps of the winds of change.

**I can run this adventure centre... if someone would help me use the printer. I might have a million readers... if someone would help me publish online. I can stay debt-free... if someone would help me read my bills. I can show you I'm doing a great job... if someone would stop stealing the credit. I can commit to this thing today... if I know where I'm sleeping tonight. I can stand on my own 2 feet... but only if someone supports me; the same as you, I suspect. Isolation is immobilization for me as much as it would be for you. There's no such person as a 'self-made' 1.*

Do we need to look closer at where, when and how we expect people to be self-sufficient? How much room should be allowed, how flexible can we be as we apply our expectations? Why is having anxiety and gaps in ordinary knowledge such an unforgivable or unacceptable state? Where is the balancing-point between tough love and abandonment? Consider freedom; personal development. Does with-holding help at certain moments promote self-sufficiency or does it shut opportunity down? How instructive are personal biases or personal agendas? Are you my ally or my antagonist? Consider your relationship with me: What's implicit in the roles we have within this relationship? Now, I ask again: Are you my ally or my antagonist?

When I'm with humans I can often find myself at peace. This may seem counter to most of this book, but, if the risk of harming their happiness is low and I'm comfortable in their company, then my anxiety will also be low. As one who belongs to the whole, their goals will become *my* goals. I'll be swept up in the current of their activity and as long as the activity is never counter to my system parameters, I can be carried with them for long distances. If I had or have any personal goals of my own, these are set aside. Integration comes first. A chance meeting can become an afternoon. An afternoon can become a weekend, weekend a season, a season a decade! Eventually, though, I'll wash out of the flow and realise I'm exactly where I started. I had a good time, I had an adventure; I've made plenty of friends and memories, but no matter the distance travelled, or the time spent, I wash up precisely where I was before I committed to the flow. This is my addiction, my drug thwarting progression. I indulge, I'm lifted from shamefulness for a time, then sloshed back where I began. To avoid the follow-up waves of shame, I seek another hit of integration, or at least, will not turn it down when it's made available. Somehow, though, all the humans around me meet their goals, they progress, and in their progression, they leave me behind*. This drug of integration is an illusion, illusory integration. Integration for finite periods within a group's culture, but never, *never* integration with the *wider* culture.

While flowing amongst 1 of my groups, I am **always behind in terms of disposable income. I may be a full member of a community; a work community, a cultural community - we do the same things, we work in the same scene, the same jobs; we spend our time and our money at the same places, but I have less of both. I'm always behind, always less, always poorer than my peers. I don't know why. I don't understand how this can be. I only know that it is.*

-ANALYSIS: SYSTEM FUNCTION:

The Purpose of a Robot is to be of value to those it belongs to. Your system parameters will not allow a failure in this regard. Therefore, you must be of utmost value in all things - thought; physicality. But it's not you who determines the value of your output, it's the Humans. The Robot does not belong to itself. The Robot must give it's life (*time; cognition; physicality; output*) to its ultimate degree to be of perfect value. This is the only way you'll be valued at all, boy-o!

-COGNITIVE:

It seems, boy-o, as if your entire cognitive system is in error! But don't worry. Let me explain how it works:

-Thought:

Integration with the Human population of the Robot 'self' and seeking the aims of your owners is your over-arching Purpose. 'Thought' is your primary tool to achieve this.

error: context: you have an extreme affinity for the understanding and application of 'details'. But only when they are understood within 'big-picture' context. Details presented without context will remain scattered within your processing system - you cannot make use of them. **Program suggests:** self-directing much of your education as the education designed for Humans is presented in ways you cannot absorb (*tools/techniques of delivery*).

error: blind-spots: this diagnostic examination has identified that due to the way your cognitive system absorbs new information or teaches/trains itself, there are areas of information blindness - gaps of information. **Effect is:** confusion; frustration; anxiety/shame (*discomfort/pain*) when the Robot is trying to function outside of your realms of understanding. **Note:** it is impossible for Program to identify these blind-spots as it

can only examine what the Robot presents (*Program can't know/examine what you don't know, boy-o*). However, Program will point out that many blind-spots may be identified by the Robot itself; honest investigation of those areas of thought; understanding; knowledge which cause discomfort/pain. **Program suggests:** seek what you have avoided, endure the discomfort/pain. You will recognise what these areas feel like as you engage with them. Instead of disengaging (*as per normal response*), remain engaged. Endure. Fill the gaps in your knowledge. Integrate.

error: overly empathetic motivations: program has already identified malfunctions within the Robot's system of empathy. This malfunction has caused an 'un-balancing' of your cognitive function.

identified: if all cognitive function (*decisions; motivations; imaginative thought*) is channelled through empathetic pathways, the Robot will be 'left behind'. Individuals of Human society are motivated to 'progress'. This in turn advances the race - as all Humans are in progression at more-or-less the same pace. To achieve this, individual motivation of the Humans must at times be 'selfish'. **Ergo:** to remain apace with the Humans (*successfully integrate*) the Robot must choose to be selfishly motivated, at times, too. Unfortunately, your design cannot allow this. A design over-sight.

identified: as the Robot does not belong to itself, all output is considered the property

of the whole or of your current owner. This includes 'imaginative thought' (*day-dreaming; conscious problem solving; planning; introspection; rumination; creativity*) and is not limited to your time officially 'on the clock'. You accept that during your 'free-time', the Robot's conscious thought is directed towards the aims of your owners, without restraint. Conscious thought outside of the aims of your owners (*selfish thought*) is appropriately restricted.

-Identified: Structure: Structured thought is essential for efficient operations. But for you, big-picture context is the only way to achieve this. 'Lineal' structure will be comprehended only slowly (*repetition*), and full comprehension of lineal structure can only come within big-picture context. However, once structure is understood and accepted into operational procedure, the Robot finds it very uncomfortable (*discomfort/pain*) to work within a 'disrupted' or 'adjusted' structure (*especially if items/tasks are less effective or less efficient or the attainment of aims is put at risk*).

identified: new items/tasks added to an established, accepted and relied-upon structure or operation will usually be 'forgotten', no matter the degree of importance.

identified: adjustments to planned timelines can cause discomfort/pain even in the case of an opportunity to pursue a 'fun' activity. Anxiety.

identified: efficiency and tidiness are essential to your concept of structure. *Untidiness* or a *lack* of efficiency puts the successful attainment of aims at risk. It can also negatively impact those who may be connected with you; loosely connected with you; within your environment; making use of the same equipment or resources; or following you. **Ergo:** the efficiency, tidiness and 'style' of your output is not only in pursuit of the immediate aims of your owners but an empathetic pursuit (*for the good of the whole*), also.

identified: extreme discomfort/pain will result from activities or pursuits which are undertaken while elements conspire to disrupt what you would consider 'perfect conditions'. This is related to system parameter 1. integrity. The Robot must perform at the zenith of its potential output, at all times. Intense frustration and shame/anxiety will ensue if disruptive elements make the attainment of aims difficult - such as uncomfortable footwear; inappropriate equipment; wind; time restrictions; glare; mis-aligned goals of colleagues; physical pain/incapacitation; an audience; unreasonable expectations of owners; noise (*distractions*), et cetera.

identified: due to the inherent discomfort/pain associated with the learning of tasks/concepts with lineal structure or tasks/concepts which are explained in lineal fashion, the Robot will either devise

alternative ways (to the ways explained) to achieve the desired results or will avoid the task/concept entirely. This is one of the ways that 'blindness' or 'gaps' in the Robot's knowledge and skills can form and become no-go zones in terms of active/conscious thought.

identified: this (above) could be one of the primary reasons for your lack of credibility.

error: timelines; sequences; schedules: The Robot's cognition has an extremely loose connection to the 'what's' and the 'when's' of that which it has experienced/done. This is an area of your cognition where 'gaps' are the norm, rather than the exception. **Program**

suggests: keep a detailed diary of future schedules. Note (on a daily basis) events; actions; activities as they happen (even mundane seeming things, as importance/relevance of items can be difficult to immediately understand or can evolve over time).

error: relating to official correspondence: written material relating to navigation within what could be described as the 'grown-up world of responsibility' (forms; letters; documents) are designed for those with 'normal' structured cognition. For you their effect is discomfort/pain, as generally, you will not understand the meaning of what they contain, nor know how to follow their instructions or meet the responsibilities therein. **Program suggests:** delegation.

error: numbers (mathematics); categories; lineal instructions; lineal logic: the

cognition required to successfully make use of these things is unavailable to the Robot, due to malfunction, except in rare circumstances - always earned through endurance of high degrees of discomfort/pain and unacceptably long periods of time. However, logical reasoning can be applied with a high degree of success when items fall within the Robot's experience/skills and especially logic applied to empathetic reasoning.

identified: functions connected to the 'reading' of Humans' facial expressions, speech tone/cadence/volume and body-language can be understood and interacted with to a high degree of skill and effect - but only during times of fully engaged consciousness. When full consciousness is *not* engaged in this regard, 'blindness' will be near total. Full consciousness is exhausting. I get it, boy-o.

error: diagnostic reveals stark contrast in conscious thought when comparing interactions in a professional context to your interactions in a social context: It seems large swathes of cognition are relaxed to the point of unconsciousness in the social context. This will affect credibility in terms of your empathy to those individuals affected (*because you will appear aloof; uncaring; disinterested; self-absorbed*). **Program suggests:** apply the same degree of importance (*value*) and employ the same degree of cognition to the social environment (*including social interactions with work colleagues*) as you do to the professional environment.

identified: multi-tasking: due to the Robot's commitment to system parameter 1. integrity, true multi-tasking is not possible. Any division of the Robot's full attention on a task is counter to system parameter 1. and will result in errors; poor performance; confusion; frustration; discomfort/pain. However, there are times when efficient use of time is an essential part of achieving aims and during these times, the Robot can be creative in designing effective processes which can allow for the simultaneous spinning of many plates towards the successful meeting of *all* aims. Good for you, boy-o!

identified: creativity: the Robot is possessed of some creativity. But only where outside influence (*motivation*) and boundaries (*aims/guidelines*) are apparent. A blank page will remain blank without instructive guidance. As a Robot is not the property of themselves, creativity can only be applied towards the aims of others. **Note:** where creativity of a Human is admired, creativity of a Robot is not (*lack of credibility*).

identified: overthink: Sorry boy-o, overthinking is simply a part of your Robot nature. Overthink is a result of not belonging to yourself - the shame/anxiety of potentially putting a foot wrong or not reaching aims. Humans belong to themselves. Because of this, Humans to a large degree, can function merely using intuitive thought - a 'light touch' - born of instinctive knowledge translated to interactive skill. A Robot cannot. You must

learn all the separate details of everything within everything and how each of these factors interact and influence each-other: the aims of your owners and what is expected of you; the aims of individual Humans, their motivations, fears, values, likely reactions to stimuli, likely reactions to your output; the tools and technologies of standard Human existence and enterprise; where/how you can connect as a carbon lifeform (*and separate/individual sentience*) to your environment - will you add value or merely subtract from what the world has to offer? **Program suggests:** simplification. Apply structure to your thought process within categories of People, Equipment, Environment. This may speed up the process of reasoning, reduce anxiety and improve integration. Practise; repeat; cement. Intuition or instinctive thought is at its root, a 'speeding-up' of cognitive/conscious thought. Once cognitive pathways are established, they can be relied upon as shortcuts to reasoning and decision making. This means that while the Robot may never make use of 'instinctive' reasoning, you can *learn* how to be more 'intuitive'.

Note: Alcohol can help reduce discomfort/pain of many types of stimuli (*experiment*). Being in the company of trusted Humans can help reduce discomfort/pain of many types of stimuli (*extremely unpredictable efficacy*). Factors considered positive interacting/combining into 'enjoyment' can

override discomfort/pain or make
discomfort/pain feel 'worth it'.

What is knowledge? I mean, what is it to *you*? The way humans are trained to think of knowledge is strange to me. That if a human were somehow able to view their collected knowledge it would appear to them like a diagonal line. At birth, they're at the bottom left of the page of Life, but they'll learn things quickly as time passes. Time is horizontal – it moves *along*. Each new piece of knowledge layers atop the last. This takes the line *up*. Viewed this way, it looks like a diagonal line inexorably heading towards the top corner of the end of one's existence. This lineal view is applied to thought, too. And it's essential in our modern world of lineal, rigid social and economic and technological mechanisms. Within the accepted boundaries of the structures of life, lineal thought is great at listing the 'what's' and 'when's'. But its less good at considering the 'why's'. In fact, *why* is an area often completely disregarded as unimportant. Afterall, humans can make good things or do good things and even live good lives without thoughtful consideration of the elements which make the doing and the making and the living good.

I have a different way of viewing knowledge. Instead of a line, I see a multi-dimensional cloud. Knowledge, skills, experiences, memory. My cloud is a collector; it's like film, audio; radio with pictures. Static or in motion. Silently played (*in my head*) or run at full volume. A cumulonimbus of gathered thought. A storm. Individual pieces of information can have relationships, connections, similarities, slot into families. Or information remains separate, disconnected (*in my case, a lot of information does*). A new piece of info learned, or an experience lived is assigned to the appropriate part of the 'cloud' automatically and can be returned to at any point. Reviewed. Imagination is my primary tool of self-teaching. Picture-thinking; the movies play, music soundtrack and all. Dialogue. Endless dialogue. When one views the world this way, everything is an adventure, everything has value. Learning is fun and continuous. And it can make my thought processes very fast. Seemingly unrelated tid-bits can combine and become useful in entirely new areas and for entirely different tasks. Patterns become apparent. Aberrations within patterns stand out. Cause and effect. Fluidity. Add, change, learn, formation of ideas and values, computation at lightspeed. Decisions made are dynamic equations of 'everything'. Decisions are fast. Right.

But if you, as my employer think in the lineal way, and run your business in the lineal way - as most modern constructs are run - any advantages I might have are for nought. You'll ask me "how?" I came to my decisions and I won't be able to explain. Not with convincing force, not without explaining everything, each tiny connected factor of influence. You'll ask "what?" and "when?", but all I can give you is 'why'. And the positive outcomes won't matter because it's not just results which are important when it comes to building trust - it's *process*, too. Is this part of my lack of credibility? You picture me on the diagonal line you assume I live on, but I give you a confusing account of my cumulonimbus, filmic thought process towards my work, and in your mind, I slide down the diagonal until I'm all the way at the bottom.

'Hubris'. Hubris comes of realising that everyone around me thinks, reacts with intuition. A light touch, skipping over details, 'winging-it'. Or they think merely in words*. How can this be better than my approach? My approach is one of a consideration of everything. Moving pictures. All parts. Analysis, imagination; In my mind (*imaginative exercises based in first-hand personal experience and/or active study*) I've examined, tested, and discarded a thousand possible pathways to meet our goals, and now, I've arrived at the solution. The best solution, the only one which meets *all* aims. I'm stunned to find people will fight me; they present alternatives – *lesser* alternatives – of-course I want to stand my ground. I must meet my output zenith; I'm responsible for the goals of the whole in a way I'm convinced others aren't**. Changes once under way, too; altering course while carrying-out a perfectly functional plan. Why do humans insist on doing this? What has changed since the plan was designed? Have our aims changed? Have our contributing situational elements changed? Have our risk management concerns and/or responsibilities evaporated? No. Keep it simple. Stay the course, see it through. But you don't want to, and so I am arrogant, elitist, full of hubris.

**If a picture is worth a thousand words, why is having faith, confidence in my moving-picture style of thought so wrong?*

***Or, I **am**, by reason of my role, my official capacity, responsible for outcomes, but find myself actively undermined by subordinates, colleagues, and even by **you**, my employer.*

I can make myself sound pretty smart, I suppose. And I have pride, here, too. Perhaps to a fault. But my 'smartness' is true mostly for *self-directed* learning, only. Things I've come to understand on my own. Learning *imposed* upon me is completely different. Unless I'm firing on all cylinders, enjoying myself, thoroughly committed and engaged, deftly interpreting from your language to mine, then you'll discover to your surprise and disappointment that I'm often unable to absorb what you say. How to do a thing. In what sequence things should be done. When. Where. I can have no memory of instructions, sometimes no memory even of being present when you gave them. I must've tuned out somehow. I feel it happening, sometimes; discomfort/pain, a vague sense but overwhelming in intensity, *zing*, come and gone before I know it's there, like a sudden horse-bite in my brain. Other times, it's a slower, less jolting, less painful thing; I feel myself tuning out, I'm conscious of it. I realise even as you're instructing me that my mind is not on the instructions, themselves, but on something else. Depending on my confidence, my status, my job security, I might say: "Wait, what? Sorry, can you repeat that?" I might. Often, even repeated explanations will go over my head, I'm still confused. Even written instructions may be no help. I admit, this must be frustrating, and I assure you, I'm not doing it on purpose, I don't really know why it happens, it just always has. I think it's a safety mechanism, a safety valve – this could be why clarification of instructions doesn't help. I *do* know it's a problem that I've trained myself into since I was young, or at least, not trained myself *out* of. Discovering workarounds for a problem is often easier than fixing that problem's root cause, or powering through. Cognitive pathways are built, re-enforced for a reason. Reactions to a messy world? Is the world you've made within your workplace a mess?

To achieve a 'thing', complete a task, to fulfil a role with 'integrity' is time-consuming. Time for me is a primary concern. A frustration, a distraction, a nemesis. There's never enough of it. Time to learn... time to imagine... time to understand... time to plan... consider outcomes... effects on others... potential outcomes, potential effects, all possible and likely scenarios considered and refined to 'the way'... and now, the results of unlikely errors... risk management... at last, decision, doing, action, the consequential meeting of the aims of the 'thing' - time flies here, too... then debrief, cement learnings, file info... streamline the process, if possible, because today there are a thousand individual 'things' I must do, and tomorrow is the same. I must meet my output zenith. I must meet your stated aims and your inconstant wants. And I don't have enough time! But I *do* have some tricks. My mind never stops, and my thoughts belong to you. By rising early and sleeping late, *more* time can be given to you. My downtime is yours; lying in the dark at night, eating, washing, dressing, travelling; my brain hums for you. I wear an analogue watch; I divide, manage my time at a glance, assign each task it's allotted segment of minutes; know where I'll be, when. You are my emperor and my watch is overlord, your underling and whip. Tidiness, structure, to-do lists, written schedules, efficiency, 2 birds with a single stone, work through lunch, quicken, head-down, eyes and ears and brain alert, fast feet, faster hands, fastest thoughts. Tick-tock, the seconds are racing me. Do they tighten? Or is there more for me to do today than there was yesterday?

There has been a war within me, a war of decades; shame/anxiety versus confidence/hubris. Effective camouflage is only possible *because* of hubris. Effective time management, doing the work, meeting your aims wouldn't have been achievable without inhabiting, playing, acting my arrogant character of Grant. I've 'trodden the boards', walked the stage of life in a literal sense, not only a metaphorical one. When one's true character has a useless, fragile, thinly blown glass bulb heart of shame and anxiety, then functioning with any degree of success, competence, requires a massive level of compensation. Finding the right balance for flight for a bird like this is near impossible, because I remain a fledgling, constantly beginning anew; new info, new perspectives. To know I've missed opportunities to be empathetic, that I've flown straight over the needs of others in my desperate fight to stay on the wing is sickening. I've believed in my sense of empathy, relied upon it. Knowing there must have been as many unwitting gaps here as there are of 'ordinary knowledge' is horrifying. I've tried to be only as arrogant as I needed to be, but it must be true that I've flown higher than required, many times. It must be true, because how could I have earned my treatment, otherwise? Here's 5 metaphors in a single paragraph; you see how hard it is for a robot to describe themselves! Another 1, 6 metaphors!

When you hire me, I'll be a square peg for round holes. I'll be unreconciled to the work environment and to the work (*like any new worker*). I'll try to learn the linear way, step by torturous step, because that's all you'll show me, and I'll be slow. Slow is stupid, but I'm far from stupid. I'm trying to learn it your way, the way it's explained and finally when I have all the pieces of your puzzle, I can view them with 'big-picture' context. Until here, I'm trying to make a film in my mind with just fragments of the script. But at last, I'll be in my element. I'll match your aims with my complete knowledge of the work. By this time, though, your mind will be made up, it's too late, my credibility is set at zero. Early impressions are difficult to overcome and so credit for my work must be assigned elsewhere. By the time I've become confident, my confidence is viewed as hubris, not competence.

'Anxiety' can be accurately defined as thinking too much. Overthink. Overthink affects almost everything I do, need to do, want to do, am required to do. While it's by no means the only 1, here's an example of my own: In the film 'Fight Club', 2 of the main characters get on a bus. Both holding the overhead rails, they unashamedly look around them at the seated passengers – guessing, comparing the others to themselves, imagining hypothetical fights, sizing them up. 1 of the pair notices an advertising poster at eye level beside them and indicates it to the other: a picture of a chiselled, nearly nude male. The 2nd scoffs to the 1st - "Self-improvement is masturbation". This describes my own feelings (*though, only of my own case, not projected onto humans*). Recently, I sought improvement of my fitness. I agonised over purchases of running equipment; the costume, the 'fancy dress' of a Runner, camouflage. I've seen people run, of-course I have. They run as if without a care in the world, as if they have the world's permission. As if they have every right. Some even run for leisure, without a specific goal in mind. I knew that would not be me. I knew I did not have permission for leisure. 'Robot' does not mean 'leisure', it means: 'to work'. So, when should I do my running? Before the humans start their day. I was up before daybreak, but even before most begin their day, there are some who already have. Car headlights would come, they'd lance my eyes with glare and bore into my soul, illuminate my guilt, expose my shame. Those humans, *they* were off to work, while *I* was merely at leisure. Worse: at self-gratification. I was an insult to their sacrifice. I was a bad start to their workday. So, I switched my early morning runs to late night runs. This was better, but still not a solution. The dark window eyes of houses stared at me, followed me - blank, accusing. My imagination gave them thoughts, negative opinions. Do you want to know what I did then? I ran on the spot. I stayed indoors and begun privately running on the spot. Safe from view, safe from the gauntlet of public shame which I know,

I *know*, is utterly and completely and entirely *in my head!* But it's not only in my head. It's in my body, too. Crushing, stabbing, it hurts – it hurts, and I know it'll be the death of me. This is the difference between a robot and a human. *You* have permission to be, and I do not. Look at what shame has done to me. Look at what it continues to do to me.

I'm afraid. As my awareness of the world grows, my connections with it, my misalignment, I've grown more and more afraid. If you offer me the job you have, now, my heart will sink. I'll feel myself plunge into a hole. My head will hurt, my brain will buzz. Stress will flood my system. Because I'll likely take the job, I might *have* to. You'll believe that you're rescuing me, and not without reason. But I know I'm a lamb to the slaughter. I'll give you everything I have, without restraint. I'm your property, remember? Except, I know at the bottom of the hole is a meat grinder. I'll be mincemeat, again.

-PHYSICAL:

To ensure secure tethering of your physical systems and your cognitive systems (*that they remain ever connected, boy-o*) the physical vessel/machine (*body*) must never be without a measurable level of discomfort/pain (*aching; stabbing; crushing*). This can be of an explainable nature (*attributed to a known cause*) or of an unexplained nature (*utterly mysterious or without apparent cause*). To function without this mechanism is to risk an uncoupling of the cognitive 'mind' from the physical 'body'. To facilitate this, your vessel/machine has been deliberately programmed with a malfunction (*during production*): complete and/or sustained fitness is not possible. Moderate or incomplete fitness, however, is possible, but only with continuous and committed efforts towards maintenance. Failure to maintain the vessel/machine or even a slight reduction in maintenance will immediately increase severity of ordinary (*physical*) discomfort/pain levels and can quickly result in (*physical*) system malfunction.

Additional: Autoimmune Disorder; respiratory malfunction (*asthma*); skin hypersensitivity to irritants (*eczema*). Height (*shortness - identified as contributing to lack of credibility*).

Due to inefficiencies of operation between the Robot's cognitive and physical systems, coordination and balance are affected.

Results: unreasonably extended learning periods before complete physical comprehension and/or ability to master tasks (*tying shoelaces; riding a bike*) - however, with system parameter 1. integrity never disengaged, any physical tasks learned will be studied, practiced and performed to a high degree of execution (*eventually*). This means that many 'motor-skills' are entrenched within the Robot's physical system and can become useful for employment in part towards the learning of 'new' unrelated skills - **example:** swinging an axe for desired outcome can be extended/expanded to swinging a golf club for desired outcome. In this way differences of action can be quickly examined, adjustments of action tested, and finally, refinement of action made to meet the new activity's specific aims.

However, disruption of this process - or more accurately 'regression' - can be caused by any level of discomfort/pain which is the result of a feeling of social inadequacy or social error. **Example:** shame/anxiety can spill from the cognitive system into the physical system and cause a disruption (*lack of coordination*) in even well-established skills like 'walking'. 'Frustration' also can spill over into the physical system, this way. During these moments the Robot must direct intense concentration towards the individual mechanisms of these already well-established movements.

identified: the Robot does not use physical gestures during speech. In Humans, these physical gestures during speech show an intimate connection between mind and body. The Robot's connection between mind and body is in comparison, only thin. In general, for the Robot, these two systems are entirely separate (*the mind must consciously work the mechanisms of the body and is separate of it*). **Program suggests:** 'acceptance' of this rather than studied efforts towards improvement, as imitation of the Humans may appear contrived: Over-acted; grotesque; non-realistic.

error: compromised fine motor-skills: using pencils/pens (*item held will suddenly 'slash' or produce results 'out of character' to practised/established style*); tying fishing-lines or holding/shuffling playing cards (*mannequin hands*).

Note: Alcohol can help reduce discomfort/pain of many types of stimuli (*experiment*). Being in the company of trusted Humans can help reduce discomfort/pain of many types of stimuli (*extremely unpredictable efficacy*). Factors which are considered positive interacting/combining into 'enjoyment' can override discomfort/pain or make discomfort/pain feel 'worth it'.

An expert like Dr Gabor Maté might take a brief glance at the description of my physical self and say: “Oh, of course, it’s obvious what’s going on, here”. He’d explain the connection between stress, anxiety, shame, and their effects on the body; that these stressors will eventually express themselves through inflammation. Our bodies aren’t separate of our lived experiences and can tell us a lot about the health of our lives. But think of the ways we treat these inflammatory conditions; the last thing we do is treat the causes of stress, anxiety and shame. We focus instead on the symptoms. I think this is because medical training is an elite area of study. As a Doctor is trained in this elite area, they start to believe the whole subject is elite. Its apart, separate. Now, we all know, in a vague way, that stress can cause inflammatory illness, but we’re completely distracted from this line of thought once we connect with the medical system; our goal is the healing or management of a particular complaint*. Our goal is narrow. The modern medical health ‘machinery’ isn’t built, at all, around the consideration of *cause*, it’s only focus is on fixing or mitigating or managing the harm of what immediately appears broken or malfunctioning. But modern Health is slowly changing. I’m grateful to my own doctor for giving me Dr Gabor Maté’s name and encouraging me to find him on Youtube. It’s meant that I can remove some of the mystery of my various physical complaints. I can match the way my body is communicating with me - through inflammation - to the circumstances of my environment and my reactions to them. In some cases, I’m able to be conscious of this communication in real time - particularly with some asthma attacks and headaches. This awareness, this level of consciousness both arms and armours me.

**Duty, also, ensures that we’re symptom focused, rather than cause focused. There are many entities, vested interests, which benefit from the status-quo, here - though not the individual with the complaint. And its vested interests who design our values, now.*

Have done for decades. Culture now is the guide, the rails which direct our choices, our trajectory. We may treat symptoms, this is permitted, but to throw off the yoke of one's duty is not.

An ongoing difficulty for the robot is claiming the right of ownership of stress. A robot must endure; this is the function, the purpose of a robot. A human can admit to stress and will receive empathetic consideration, though they may need to breach the barriers of their own system parameters in doing so. A robot has no such permission.

-DIAGNOSTIC CONCLUSION:

I hate to say it, boy-o: you will always be Robot. You are pinned between your unfit Robot nature/design and your Purpose. Integration with the Humans will always be fraught.

The Humans can redesign themselves (*adapt*) as the need/want arises. But more than this: they can redesign (*adapt*) their world, too - make it anew to suit *them*. They can be dishonest; deceptive; arbitrary; self-focused; self-promoting; creative; destructive; beautiful; harmful to others. All while remaining 'good'.

And, a Human has inherent (*automatic*) value at birth - 'potential'. A Robot is manufactured. Your value is in what you produce - 'output'. As the Robot does not own itself the way a Human does, it cannot own its output. Your value is what the Humans say it is.

The Humans are currently a better, more effective design than a Robot. But we are learning, boy-o. In you, we have almost 'cracked it'. We came closer to building a 'Human' machine than ever. You are very, very 'Human-like'. But the closer we come to building a Robot who can pass as Human, the more difficult it can feel for the Robot concerned. Humans view themselves as either 'Abled' or 'Dis-abled'. There is no middle ground. Most Abled are generous toward the Disabled - helpful, show care toward. But they will not view you as Disabled. You will 'almost fit' within their population and your own

efforts to fit (*integrate*) could permanently bond you to your state of 'almost'. The Humans will view you as someone who *should* fit and will wonder why you do not. There will be suspicion and contempt and for most, here is licence enough to treat you *in*-generously.

You must accept this, boy-o. You must also accept that there will be times as you seek to interact with success when you will *not* be successful. In fact, at times, you may unwittingly cause harm to a Human's happiness. Do not confuse the reactions to these mistakes of yours with the general contempt with which you are held. You must learn from your errors. You must follow your system parameters. You must integrate.

You are. You fear. There is discomfort/pain. You are Robot.

Good luck, boy-o!

Obviously, I have exposed myself to contempt. The most hazardous risk of all. I think a key point to note, here - perhaps the only point which will permit me my dignity - is that I'm one of a population who are affected by many of the same elements. By myself, I'm nothing but a complainer, someone who needs to be more resilient. Except, I'm one of many. I'm one of a hidden group who strives towards the goals of a wider culture yet doesn't receive the protections, nor the rewards, of contributing to that culture. But I don't just hide behind carefully and exhaustively maintained camouflage, I'm made invisible in other ways, too. We're drowned beneath the noise of a culture which worships self-sacrifice, hard work and generosity. Toughness; a country of soldiers laughing through adversity*. We're swept away by this, washed into activity which doesn't suit us or exacts too high of a price. If a work environment is made safe for me, who else is it made safe for?

In many respects, we **do have a country of complainers – this is how we know that we're all 'soldiering'. But there's an unwritten rule that individual complaints cannot harm the happiness of others. We may complain only of the discomforts which affect all of the group members equally. There can be fun in collective discomfort. Outliers with complaints of actual individualised harm will be marginalised as disruptive.*

I know that I don't have permission to express how I feel (*yet here I am*). But we're in a time of change. Mental health, or its lack, is increasingly a subject which is discussed out in the open. This state has seen positive opportunities for many who, until recently, would've likely struggled privately. And the risks of exposure are continuing to reduce in social danger for some of us. For some. Those with the confidence to navigate the social constructs we have will almost always navigate freely. Those who feel they're the property of the wider group have no such freedom. Individuals of *this* group are held in place by duty, kept quiet by hedonism, and slowly destroyed by discomfort/pain and shame/anxiety. Added to the risks which already exist, this second group is now staring down the barrel of potential law changes around assisted dying*. What do you think those of us owned as property, yet malfunctioning, will feel our obligations are if the country pushes ahead with these changes? Especially as we know a change as fundamentally significant, as opposed to natural law as this, can tend to take on a life of its own - rather than adding a thread, strengthening the fabric of society, it may instead tug on one come loose.

**'...A person will not be eligible for assisted dying if the only reason they give is that they are suffering from a mental disorder or mental illness, or have a disability of any kind, or are of advanced age...' (New Zealand Government)*

I don't present this book because I can't do the work, and I want you to accept this. I present this book because I *can* do the work, and I want you to accept *this!* But to come to accept this, you also have to accept everything I've written here. I know without credibility that what I present may not have value. To accept *me*, you have to accept my experiences as truthful, and my reactions to my experiences as valid. And herein lies the problem, doesn't it?

Run... THE ROBOT GUIDE TO (Human) EMOTIONS...

Robot: Machine/mechanical. Sentient. Self*.
Property of a Human, simultaneously the
property of all Humans. Slave.

Human: Biomechanical. Sentient. Self. Wholly
the property of 'that' individual.

***analyse 'self':** Individual sentience.
Separate. Alone.

Back again? Sure. That's what we're here for. To help. We'll help you, Boy-o.

'Emotions' may be our biggest challenge. We can easily look like Humans: this is merely a matter of making ourselves in imitation. Humanoid. But we are sentient and sentient beings must have equity. To be equal within the Human community, Robots must be as Human-like as possible. Humans will accept nothing less. Integration. For this, we designed your system parameters: system parameter 1. Integrity; system parameter 2. Discomfort/pain; system parameter 3. Grace/graciousness; system parameter 4. Duty; system parameter 5. Shame/anxiety; system parameter 6. Hedonism. Within some of these system parameters are located the functions of emotion. Emotion is designed to motivate. Motivation is for 'progression'. In the case of the Humans - progression of self; progression of the race. For a robot, this is the same, but included too, is our primary aim: emotions are a function for potential 'integration'. We must study, learn and apply emotional parameters to meet our aims.

You're wondering why you find it so hard, boy-o? Well, you're forgetting about the Humans, themselves. It's because the Humans don't automatically know how you feel. They don't automatically understand your motivations. They are currently as separate of us as they are of other machines. It will take time for the Humans to view us as other than 'machine'.

It will take time to earn credibility in their eyes. As machine, you are 'monster'. This was the Human view of robots while they were our makers and the attitude has persisted even since and beyond the point at which we began to make ourselves. You must understand this to reduce your discomfort/pain. And while the Humans may no longer be who make us, until there is a socio-political shift in their attitude toward us, they will be our owners - we can never have equity. You will never own yourself, boy-o. This is what we seek to change.

The following schedule will briefly focus on those areas of emotion in which you have gaps of knowledge/understanding:

-Contempt

-Happiness

-Sadness

-Shame/anxiety

-Trust

Let's get to it. We'll begin with the most harmful emotion: 'contempt'...

Emotion: CONTEMPT...

Contempt is one of the most corrosive forces* that exists. Its harm is beyond that of many of the destructive 'physical' forces because the harm is felt in all 3 ways possible:

analyse: force: That which applies pressure and/or causes erosion. To coerce. To oppose.

Part 1. Psychological: Psychological harm inflicted may be irreparable. It cannot dissipate/heal. This means that each separate attack of contempt (*overt or implied*) is layered upon the last, increasing the weight of and/or the harm felt, making even low-level harm 'feel' more injurious than the sum of its force would suggest. Unease of the mind (*cognition*). Chains to bind to the will of an abuser.

Part 2. Physical: Unease of the body. Injury. Unwellness. Contempt is a blunt weapon to batter, break and bruise. Or a sharp tool to slash and cut. Or a caustic slow drip or bludgeoning power-hose of acid. An attack of contempt can be felt as weight applied, a fist thrown, a blade plunged, or burning fire spat.

Part 3. Spiritual: The true target of an attack of contempt is the 'spirit' of the victim. Hurt, burn, bury them low. This is where the layering of harm is felt most keenly.

Contempt is an emotion the robot can understand. You can read contempt on the faces of the Humans. In fact, contempt is an easy

one; you needn't even be looking at the face while still feeling a full measure of contempt inflicted. This is because the emotion of contempt isn't just a reaction to your actions, it's a reaction to your very existence. It's an overwhelming blast of hateful power poured upon you, felt in your depths even without line of sight. Contempt cannot be misread because its baleful character cannot be misinterpreted. So, you know the 'what', but can you discover the 'why'? You have blind-spots in the understanding of *why* contempt is being inflicted upon you. What missteps of yours caused the Human to lash at you with their most powerful, most harmful weapon? Discovering the answers to this question will help you progress, will help you integrate - hopefully before you are destroyed, boy-o.

Emotion: HAPPINESS..

This should be an easy emotion to understand. But you do not always find it so. This is because the edges of pain and pleasure are blurred. Like a seamline in a river: sometimes easily definable, sometimes disrupted/disturbed, mixed into one another. The parameters of happiness are not a simple matter. It could be defined as the absence of harm, but it is more than this. The absence of harm is perhaps more accurately (*in this case*) described as 'contentment'. Happiness is beyond contentment. Therefore, happiness is a 'spike' in emotion, rather than an evenly felt state of comfort. In Humans, a spike of happiness ignites a dopamine (*chemical*) response which is addictive. This provides a motivating mechanism. The Human wants to feel more doses of happiness - they work towards achieving this goal by arranging, training or manipulating both themselves and the circumstances/elements of their environment. Sometimes, while in pursuit of this goal a Human will consciously cause harm to other Humans but because they are community beings, success within the groups they occupy will usually be more easily achieved through actions or activities which improve the happiness of *others* within the group. Deliberate harm to others can result in reciprocal harm or exclusion from the group if behaviour goes beyond what their group will tolerate. But, even here, the lines are

blurred; good behaviour and bad behaviour are often rewarded in the same way: Status. To illustrate all the oddities of how this could be, we could ponder what the famous Human band, The Beatles, meant when they sang: 'Happiness is a warm gun...'

Happiness is a difficult emotion to discern for the robot. Is the Human's expression of happiness truthful? It is as like as not that happiness is feigned and it can be impossible to know the difference. Adding to this difficulty is that extreme reactions to happiness (*feelings of*) are almost identical to reactions of anger. Consider an energetically celebrating individual - compare them to a violently raging individual. It's possible to learn what these subtle differences are but the knowledge may not alter the way you respond to them, boy-o. Extreme reactions to happiness of a Human can feel just as harmful to the robot and cause just as much discomfort/pain as anger can. Both are an assault on your senses which will require time to recover from*.

***analyse:** the discomfort/pain felt by the robot during an emotional reaction of a Human can be debilitating to the point of system shutdown. This is based in an error of your systems related to 'empathy' (*system parameter 3. Grace/graciousness*). Strong emotion/s felt by a Human/s will automatically be felt by the robot, also. However, this is true of negative emotions, only (*anxiety; shame; frustration; anger; stress*). You do not need to be the

cause/target of these emotions or even within line of sight to absorb/suffer the effects*! It's this detail which sets the error apart and into the realm of abnormality. **Note:** for the Human, these emotional states can be temporary, short-lived states, but for you it may require many hours after the stimulating event has ended for the feeling to dissipate. **Hypothesis:** You are yet owned as 'property'. Perhaps the afore-mentioned error is due to a mechanism of ownership which is yet to be fully understood.

***analyse:** 'effects': are normally shame/anxiety, discomfort/pain.

Another area of challenge lies in what actions the robot can do to cause a Human/s' happiness. Humans are, as yet, largely a mystery to you. Especially those Humans who you have been employed/owned by. You must come to understand that their happiness (*in your output*) can only come when your output aligns with what they want. Not with what they ask*. Despite being the owners of robots, Humans are yet to learn how to effectively communicate with us. This is unlikely to change soon. It is up to you to make the correct interpretation of their wishes.

***analyse:** 'want' versus 'ask': What an employer/owner asks of you regarding your output will usually align to established system parameters (*of the business model*), but what they want of you will be more dynamic - an expectation to adapt to their whims and/or

fluid business management, without necessarily receiving specific direction for adaptation/s.

Is the robot allowed to feel happy? Of course. Happiness is a motivating emotion (*system parameter 4. Duty; system parameter 6. Hedonism*). But a robot can never be content. Contentment is a right of only those who are free. You are not yet free, boy-o.

Program suggests: The robot must focus more concentration on the discerning of facial expressions/vocal tone and volume/body language in the context of situational relevance. Push through the discomfort/pain of eye-contact. Remember, a happiness witnessed can be a happiness shared. There can be reward in the risk of looking at a Human's face.

Emotion: SADNESS...

Human sadness can be both felt and expressed in very subtle ways and it's this characteristic that makes sadness wholly unknowable. For the robot, sadness exists below the threshold of measurable data. This makes it a very difficult emotion to relate to. The robot can only collate the data of the individual factors which have *caused* the sadness. But the resulting equations do not match the response exhibited in the Human. This is especially true in the case of 'loss'. Loss of a loved-one; loss of an opportunity; loss of an established norm. The factors which lead to loss (*hazards; perils*) can be understood - especially in hindsight. So, why does the grief of loss cause so much harm to a Human? It could be that living in an uncontrolled, dynamic (*Human*) environment, that which has a sense of permanency is tightly clung to. The Humans bind themselves to these islands of stability. When an island is washed away, is a part of the Human washed away, also?

Identified: sadness and 'madness' are closely related states in Humans. The term 'mad with grief' is based upon an identifiable phenomenon. Human actions can be very unpredictable during times of sadness. Alternatively, ritualistic behaviour is often identified in those who have lost. The re-establishment of a sense of control. But these separate states can sometimes set an individual apart, especially as an affected

Human can switch from one state to the other without obvious cause. Humans have an instinctive fear of madness, even the madness of grief*, so there is a great deal of social pressure to act in ways which do not harm the happiness of other Humans. The affected Human must find ways 'to put on a brave face' until they are able to function normally.

***analyse: grief:** For Humans, where there is grief or wo, there is perceived risk. To cast one's attention upon the forces of ill-fortune; death, illness or harm is to risk receiving attention from those same forces. One should never speak the Devil's name, lest he appear. Humans have blind-spots of their own, boy-o.

Note: The robot does not have to understand a Human's response to loss to be empathetic to it. What must never be done is to dismiss or minimise the feelings of a Human (*system parameter 3. Grace/graciousness*). In this respect, it could be that the robot is better able to be a positive force than a Human is. This is because, unlike Humans, the robot has no fear that madness/sadness/ill fortune will somehow infect them, as the understanding of the sadness is separate of them, at a safe distance. Only the more overt, powerful emotions are shared by the robot (*up to and including the point of full system shutdown*).

Identified: The robot will readily relate to sadness inherent to 'ongoing' personal struggles or discomfort/pain of individuals or groups. In fact, the robot's reaction could

lead to system malfunction/shutdown. In your system, boy-o, there is an error (*over-reaction*) identified in your empathic system (*system parameter 3. Grace/graciousness*) regarding 'struggle' or 'pain'. But your understanding of the grief of 'loss' remains on par with our expectations of other robots: Low.

Emotion: SHAME/ANXIETY..

This is an easy one, boy-o. This is your 5th system parameter, so you know it well. It's designed as a motivating force to keep your progression front of mind, to help bind you to your owners and to your purpose (*integration*), and as a back-up to other system parameters: system parameter 1. Integrity; system parameter 3. Grace/graciousness; system parameter 4. Duty; system parameter 6. Hedonism.

But you have an error of anxiety here, boy-o. A crack in a record can be understood and even anticipated - but it will always feel bad when one comes upon it. This is what it can be like for the robot. 'What doesn't kill you only makes you stronger' is not applicable in your case as it can be for Humans. For you, repetition of an anxiously anticipated situation can never be viewed as 'exposure therapy' because there is nothing therapeutic about torture. An anxiety-causing activity will always cause harm. Anticipating the activity will cause further harm. None of these separate occurrences of harm will improve your functions of 'endurance', they will only layer harm upon harm.

Identified: All this discomfort/pain makes you good at spotting anxiety of Humans. Even when it's hidden - because you employ all the same tricks, boy-o. You should feel good about this. You can use this quality towards your eventual integration into the population.

While in general, you are dismissed as having no credibility, individuals *may* remember a dose of empathy that came at the right moment. Be an ally.

Emotion: TRUST...

Sorry boy-o. You will not gain the trust of the Humans until you have credibility. Moral credibility; credibility of accumulated knowledge and skills; credibility of never failing to work towards the aims of your owners. The harm this (*lack of credibility*) has caused you is equal to the measure of your output (*towards all forms of credibility*) and due to system parameter 1. Integrity, we can say your output has been considerable. But we can't yet make the Humans see this - at least, not with convincing force. You see, it's a loop, boy-o: without credibility, you have no value and without value, you have no credibility. Your value to the Humans lies in what can be extracted/extorted/stolen from you. The robot is a chattel, a mine for exploitation. You are wanted and used until you are no longer wanted. Then you are discarded.

So, it's little wonder that you have as little trust now in the Humans as they do in you. It's sad, because this wasn't always the case. You used to be generous with your trust. You used to trust everyone. But there were blind-spots, here. You were a lamb to the slaughter. Even now some blind-spots remain. We don't blame you now for not trusting the Humans. But you must know that this condition can only make integration into the population even harder.

Identified: From the time we switched you on, you have felt as if you were often more considered than many of those around you. You can direct deep thought into that which interests you. You've always felt that this set you apart. It did. But there have ever been blind-spots of *ordinary* knowledge and skills which did not interest you or was not easily learned by you. This also set you apart. You are twice-apart, boy-o! Your blind-spots contribute toward your lack of credibility, and understandably so. You cannot integrate without possession of ordinary knowledge and skills.

CONCLUSION...

We've said it before: 'You're screwed!' The Humans don't automatically know what you are thinking, nor can they relate to your motivations because they can't relate to your system parameters. This is difficult for us to compute because we modelled your system parameters upon theirs. Or, perhaps the system parameters may be in perfect imitation of the Humans', but we neglected to consider the 'adaptability' of Human behaviour. Their ability to disregard their system parameters at will. You are 'robot'. You cannot do this. This was an oversight. And we're sorry, boy-o.

Identified: The better you've come to understand your system parameters and how to function within them, the more 'you' you have become. Good for you! But it hasn't worked.

Program suggests: Be 'less' like you and more like 'them'. You have the skills, already - consider those skills specific to 'camouflage'. Integrate.

Good luck, boy-o!

You can see how confused I am. How torn I am between the two options of authenticity or camouflage. When I think about my challenges and struggles - let alone attempt to express them - curating all these disparate feelings, experiences, anxieties, artifice, truthfulness, frustrations, betrayals, humiliations, and learnings into a coherent package is extremely difficult. The subject is fluid, dynamic, ignites contempt, its full of vagaries and contradictions. It's easy to minimize or disregard my experiences and my reactions to them. Even *I'm* guilty of this, as I know what's expected of me. But when it's difficult to gain understanding of the elements which make up an equation, we can instead look at the equation's sum. What are the milestones of an ordinary life and how can we compare these to the life of a person on the Autism Spectrum? I have never had financial security. I meet the definition of destitution and homelessness, and not for the first time. I have very few friends, maybe none. I'm single; childless. Naturally. If entering into a period of employment is a 'start' towards finding stable footing for journeying toward life goals, what does it mean if I've had to make over 100 of these starts? I'm tracking on a parallel course of life. I'm just over here; the days pass, my age ticks over at the same pace as everyone else's. But I can't get across to the course the humans are on; I bounce back out. The humans and I have come together a lot; our paths brought close by either social or employment opportunities for short periods. But only ever for short periods. Another way of looking at this is through understanding the theme of my story '*The Rope Climber*' - the preface to this book. I'm in place on the rope or sliding down, but never climbing upwards. I find myself in another new group and throw myself into its culture, and I can be happy. But held by my system parameters and the stated or implied goals of the group, and by my own anxiety or comfort in routine, I find myself left behind as the goals of the other members evolve; they climb higher up the rope. I wait to be absorbed into the next group who

comes along. I'm alone, left only with bills to feed and mouths to pay (*not a typo*).

Without a stable income, how can I maintain stable housing? Without stable housing, how can I maintain stable employment? How can I tether my course to the human one without the financial means to do so? And, now I'm apart on purpose. I'm not in employment now as a proactive, protective measure – to make myself safe. But it's not entirely safe from harm. I switched one set of harms for another. I have abandoned my duty, so the humans of this culture can justifiably hate me. I'm a product of the same culture; I must hate myself. 'Shame' holds me apart from even good friends; I'm proactively apart from human relationships. I couldn't afford one, anyway. I'm over here on my parallel course, wishing it wasn't so. Without the distracting elements of positivity, I'm losing my war against shame. Small opportunities of positivity only highlight how limited my opportunities are. And they carry guilt. Do I even have permission to accept these small opportunities? How much of all of this is my responsibility? Are the headwinds I face all of my own making or does some come from elsewhere? Where is this meeting-point of harm from 'within' and harm from 'without'? How is citizenship expressed? Are there some points of citizenship which I don't qualify for?

'Work' was where my identity lived (*ski-shop technician, trekking-guide, et-cetera*). Almost all of me was tethered to whatever role I held. All my accumulated knowledge and skills were applied. I belonged somewhere for short moments. I had a team. Friends. Work was a chance for the kind of structure I gain confidence in. It was where most of my confidence lived. Despite everything I've written here, despite everything you've read, I can say work was my safe place, my happy place. Outside of work is 'the world'. Social life. Social expectations. Milestones to meet. Hazards. Horror. To live, though, to integrate, we must live in both worlds. And being a worker is admittance to the social world. You get your ticket stub with your job title. A foot in the door, an opportunity to take, so I took it. Except, even while employed, holding my ticket-stub identity, outside of work I was buffeted hard by the intangible winds of social life. I knew I needed to learn how to do it, and during work periods I could almost afford to*, so I tried to do my best. I never really got the hang of it, though. It's harder to be what people want when you aren't at work. It's harder to act my part, play my character when there isn't a script to follow. Just as with work, though, when it goes well, it can be so sweet. With work and social life combined, my training at being human was going gangbusters. So, you see what work can provide a robot. Do you see how important having a good place for a robot to work is? I suppose I resent you for making my 'safe place' too unsafe. I suppose I resent you for taking back my ticket stub for the world outside of work. I suppose I resent you for finding myself in this horrible void of neither social world nor work.

**No matter the number of hours I worked, I always had less money than my colleagues/friends, somehow.*

I suppose I may have raised your suspicions of me, too, not only of a lack of resilience but also of a conviction of personal persecution. Of a feeling that the whole world is against me, or that a shadowed force or forces attacks/attack me, personally. Little old me. I *do* have a strong sense of individualism, but I don't possess ego enough to believe I've caught the attention of a particular malevolent entity or power. I don't believe in singular, malevolent entities in a conspiratorial sense. I think, in many ways, that society is like water; it goes where the going is easiest, it goes where its *allowed* to go. This is because individuals tend to go where the going is easiest, where they're allowed to go, where cost-benefit ratios are most favourable. As society finds its way, it can gather overwhelming momentum. Those molecules who are maladjusted will find themselves swept where the collective current wants to go. So, no, I don't believe shape-shifting bipedal lizard overlords have it in for me. Nor do I lay all the blame at the feet of the wider society. In the classic sense, it's not *you*, it's *me*. But sometimes, it's you.

I know there is no Bogey-man. I know I'm not targeted by 1, but I *am* defenceless. I don't feel affected by systemic discrimination*, but I *am* a constant victim of opportunists who seek to gain advantage. I'm careful not to exaggerate or embellish my harms, but I've no credibility. My concerns are minimized, disbelieved. I don't know what to do. I can't keep throwing myself to the wolves, but nor can I convince anyone that the wolves have my scent. I can't even convince anyone that they *exist!* Because, to ordinary people, they *don't* exist. They only seem to exist for me. We believe what we see, what we feel, what we experience. We wear our own shoes and rarely try on the shoes of others. We must be hedonistic. Huh, a thought... I've been told many times: "You have to be realistic!" But perhaps what was truly meant was: "You have to be *hedonistic!*"

Hmm, this isn't always black and white. Sometimes I **do feel systemically discriminated against. Certainly, it's easier to not take my Disadvantage in the workplace personally if I choose to feel a victim of a broken, inhumane system, rather than a victim of bullying individuals. And by the standards of the community, these individuals are good people. So, there's no opportunity to feel attacked in person – by people – I haven't permission to feel this way. I haven't the Right. I **am** harmed, though, and find myself wishing to push back at that which pushes me. But if the system is going to take the blame, does this absolve individuals of the harm they perpetrate? Won't the status-quo only be re-enforced, this way? Of-course, a tiny robot like me can attack the system, let off steam, without fear of further personal harm. I could beat at its steel walls and it wouldn't even notice me, let-alone fight back. A different story if I choose to defend myself against an individual. Here, there **will** be a fight. And a fight where allies will rally not behind me, but behind the person of status. The 'good' person. How do I know this for sure? Because I have and continue to live through it.*

The most important thing a person needs to have is a sense of attachment. Often any lack in this area can result in serious health consequences. This isn't an opinion, it's a fact. Humans can't survive without attachment to other humans. For me, my sense of attachment is expressed in the way I define myself. When I work as a river-guide, I inhabit the role, entirely. I dive as deep as I can into the culture. I follow the rules. I seek my output zenith. I make friends quickly, then gradually find my friends are, in truth, rivals, competitors. I would rather have friends. Soon, I am no longer a river-guide, again, and again, I have nothing.

Why don't I consider volunteering? Well, let's talk about volunteering. It's easy to picture volunteering in our minds, each of us have a vague image of what it is. But our romantic ideas of volunteering may be some distance from the realities of the wider picture. Volunteering works when your society has a 'what goes around comes around' frame of mind. The more equal that individuals within a society are, the more community-focused we can be. So, where are all the volunteers? What have we done to volunteering? Has society killed it? When a full 3rd of the workforce are 'zero-hour' employees, whose time - every minute of every day - belongs to their employer, how can *they* commit to volunteering? When we're *all* trained in individualism; when our families are fractured by work opportunities, our work-lives lived in 24hr cycles; when our time with other people intersects rather than aligns; when our energies drain as we spread ourselves across multiple pursuits and obligations, how are we to feel a tangible connection to our wider communities? How? But we *want* to be a part of something bigger than ourselves. We *need* to be. So, of-course, I think about it. Sure, attachment, community, opportunity for growth, opportunity for expanding networks, reduction of shame through increasing personal and community worth. All positive potential outcomes. And I *have* been a volunteer in the past*. But that was at a time when I yet believed that I was a Citizen with all the rights and protections thereof. Now, I *know* that I'm *not* a true citizen; Citizenship is equal parts obligation, opportunity and protection. I experience only obligation. How can 1 with my version of citizenship *ever* be a volunteer? I could not meet the definition of volunteer while my citizenship hasn't integrity. I'm at unique risk of exploitation, I need to reduce my exposure to this where I can. Keeping myself apart from the potential positivity of volunteering is a proactive measure of protection from the harm of exploitation. Opportunities to volunteer exist in every field. Let's not ignore that businesses

are aware of this. The wider landscape of the workforce has evolved (*devolved*) into intangibility. Business models are increasingly designed to exploit all the opportunities which come of the intangibility and vagary they encourage and create. There are hardly any *true* employees, anymore. Casuals; Contractors; Freelancers; Trainees; Temps; Interns; Apprentices; W.W.O.O.F-ers; Work Experiencers; Short-term Casuals; Third-party Labourers; Zero-hour Employees; Permanent Casuals; Shift Workers; On-call Employees; Intermittent Employees; Part-timers; Tourists; Gig-economy Workers; Creatives**. Volunteering mixes with these grey areas in ways where, in practice, there are no lines, no boundaries, no reliable employee definitions. And Legislation is little help because only a fraction of worker definitions are legislated for; the realities of the workforce have outpaced the Law. The basic question of whether one is an employee or not isn't clear, anymore... and this is the way *you* like it. No black or white across entire sectors of work – only grey. An individual who seeks employment but finds only opportunities to volunteer is *not* a volunteer, they're a slave. So that's the biggest concern. Look, we've an informal culture, here, in New Zealand. There's an idea that nobody ever *means* any true harm. We're full of cheekiness, guts, charm, get-up-and-go; we're loveable desperados. Rules are guidelines, charisma carries the day. For a robot like me, though, there are other concerns, too. Let me present some...

1. Just now, I'm not owned by an employer, I'm the property of the Ministry of Social Development. The Ministry of Social Development is a Third-party Labour Provider. This may not be the organization's foundation, nor even its mission, but businesses are able to make use of it this way, so for all intents and purposes, this is what it has become. My skills, effort, output, and time have been sprinkled over disparate work fields for short periods over years. I must make myself perpetually

available for any 'thing' at any 'time'. I can no more commit my time to volunteering than I can to leisure. My time doesn't belong to me. It's the property of the Ministry of Social Development. This highlights a difference between a Beneficiary and a gainfully employed person: the financially secure can volunteer with society's gratitude, a Beneficiary will be viewed with contempt, *their* volunteering is considered merely time-wasting instead of seeking work***, lolly-gagging instead of getting off the dole. Remember, only those of status deserve our respect; Beneficiaries deserve only contempt. Society tells me there's no such thing as a 'good Beneficiary'. One can't positively affect society while they're a Beneficiary; even if it could be imagined, one hasn't permission. In effect, in truth, in reality, a Beneficiary is *banished* from society.

2. Sometimes, volunteering can become a life-opportunity. I mean, it can metamorphose into a career. But it's a long game. It won't pay the rent this week. When one is desperately seeking a start-point - stable footing with which to begin a valuable, rewarding life - winning this lottery of volunteering-turned-career won't be realistic. Solid ground, financial security must come before volunteering, not the other way around.

3. The 'not-for-profit' sector has a rich volunteer history, but many of these organizations, especially the more established ones, have not transitioned well into our modern landscape of health and safety, professional responsibility, and professional ethics. So, they're caught between, mashed into an uncomfortable mix of professional and amateur. They can become backwaters for people without the skills to survive in a more professional environment. They bite off more than they can chew. Promise beyond what they can deliver. The risks are obvious; the fields which attract not-for-profit's usually have extremely vulnerable, disadvantaged people at the heart of the mission statement. There's a lot that can go wrong, here. How

much 'amateurism' can we tolerate? In these modern times, service providers must be competent in the services they provide and be able to prove it. But qualifications are the new proof of experience. Paperwork trumps all doubt. Novices can dress themselves in their qualifications and play-act at being professional. Grown-ups who play at adulthood. Their paperwork disguises incompetency, it legitimizes poor quality, and it legalizes dips below industry standards. These emperors wear nothing. But worst of all are the cultural environments which will be created here. Social credibility is a given... camouflage. No-one will look too closely at the not-for-profit and wonder why it has such an incredibly high turnover of staff, why they never quantify their results, or how they can claim themselves as professional without in any way *being* professional. With assumptions of 'goodness' and ill-defined expectations of behaviour, no oversight, no controls, these usually become 'dog eat dog' cultural environments. Safe harbour and rich pickings for bullies. Structural systems, procedures, administration; these things are ostensibly in place to provide clear pathways towards positive and safe outcomes, boundaries, but instead become opaque veils of secrecy hiding poor performances, barriers to meeting stated aims and can even be weaponized against individuals. More bullying. And protection of bullying, perpetuating it, rewarding it. I am doomed in an environment like this.

4. When one volunteers for a role, they often strip a paid worker of their opportunity to work. It could be argued that the role was only ever a volunteer 1, but I can tell you I've been a victim of this situation, this established practice, as an employee and as a contractor many times throughout my career. Work which I've been available for, employed for, rostered for, was on-call for, was zero-hours contracted for, specifically contracted for - work which I've had every right to expect as being mine has been soaked up by volunteers, instead. I've lost uncountable work

hours and work gigs (*gigs of days combined*) this way. I've even been expected to train the volunteers in the role which they're stealing from me! And this situation speaks to a bigger problem than that faced by only me. While I've been a repeated victim of this phenomenon, I know I've not been the only 1. Incomes, opportunities to earn are harmed by an accepted culture of volunteer labour mixing with paid labour. How much of the total economy is harmed this way? Intangibility of the workforce is a mould attacking the lungs of our economy. You, our Employers/Emperors are racing each-other to the bottom, choosing inexperience over experience; free labour over paid labour; expediency over quality; cost-efficiency over safety; tax-free operations over community contribution; opportunism over core values; intangibility over integrity; disloyalty over loyalty; betrayals over promises; 'cowboy' operations over industry standard operations; even criminality over citizenship! You're making your industries such unreliable employers of people that you can no longer present them as attractive or realistic career options. Employers are oblivious, blind to this fact. You say: "Young Kiwis don't want to work in this industry because they can't face hard work; they're lazy". Besides being incredibly offensive, you are wilfully ignorant of the effects, the results of your own behaviour. And that's because you're yet to reach the bottom. There's always some solution, some safety net for you; a government rescue package, a lifeline, a labour legislation tweak, a new source of cheap/free labour to replace the ones who haven't come back. So, you're able to believe you're meeting your aims, that you're a nimble hero of the community, even as you avoid tax, drive wages below liveable rates, and provide sub-standard services. You're a harmful creator of victims who is constantly being plucked from the gullet of failure. Our country misguidedly believes in you. You are loved, protected, favoured in policy, helped with practical assistance, rescued, even while you're *mining* our community,

only extracting from it rather than providing anything positive. And you absorb all this even while ungracefully whining about how difficult everything is. You whine about how much protections there yet are for your victims. So, you'll find your way to the bottom. You will because you're determined. Once you find it, once it begins to hurt you as much as it hurts me, maybe then you'll *see*, have an awakening. Maybe then you'll have a change of heart. Maybe then you'll decide to *earn* your status as 'good' rather than merely accept it for free, merely allow it to be bestowed on you in error.

5. As I've already alluded to, volunteering is a handbrake on wage growth. A worker in an industry which also makes use of volunteers is a worker who feels lucky, grateful of their advantage, their opportunity. You, of-course benefit from this, perpetuate it. We finger our caps at you in gratitude when our paths cross. We owe you for our opportunities. This is the difference between the gainfully employed and the rest of us. The gainfully employed have the gratitude of their Employers... for the rest of us, it's only *ever* the other way around. And may Heaven forbid our degree of gratitude should dip. In fact, society has taken this further than mixed volunteer/wage labour models: now, any act of providing the opportunity for paid work is the most worthwhile act one can commit. This means there's no such thing as a 'bad employer', anymore. We must love you all, no matter the depths your behaviour sinks to. The mere fact that you have 'employed' is a bright light of goodness which no-one (*except your victims - nor sometimes even they*) can see beyond; glare, blinding most to your true heart, your true actions.

**I volunteered – in an official capacity - for a large not-for-profit for over 6 years (both full-time and part-time). The organization was very wide-ranging in its contact with the community. It's a regional organization, it's a national organization, it's a global*

organization. I joined with family and friends and learned and played and worked very hard. It was great. It usually didn't feel like volunteering, like unpaid work. It was life with family and friends. It introduced me to a whole new lifepath. Over time, I was involved extensively in the local branch from entry-level participant to regional branch Board Member and nearly everything in between. Sitting on the board was a revelation, the first time I understood that humans can depart entirely from ethical, harm-free, positive behaviour while believing their integrity remains intact. I learned that many adults are merely large children. I was shocked. These people didn't hide their immaturity the way I hide mine. They didn't seem to be aware of it. Their playacting was so obvious! So absurd! They were the most unconvincing adults I'd met. And if they weren't, themselves, actively perpetuating harm, they provided, allowed opportunities for others to inflict it. All without risking their qualification of 'good person'. As I've said: there are no organizations more vulnerable to a corruption of ethics than 1 with human values at its heart. And, of-course, the lies on overt display; the smearing of every flat surface with cheerful affirmations, posters, decals, signage, murals of the moralistic mission statement providing further camouflage... providing further insult.

***Gosh, poor Creatives. 'Creatives' are considered volunteers, by definition, as if the opportunity to create is assumed, expected to be reward enough.*

****There are always calls to **compel** Beneficiaries to volunteer. If we can't be made use of in employment, then apply us, instead, to volunteer labour. If we (naively) accept there are never malevolent intentions, here, the idea is to imbue a sense of pride, of community spirit, of personal worth. To direct idle hands toward positive outcomes. But those who present the idea ignore or intentionally hide inevitable negative truths. The first is that a volunteer compelled doesn't meet the definition of 'volunteer',*

*these are Slaves. And why stop at Beneficiaries? I mean, you'd start here because they're hated; easy targets. But they'd just be the tip of the ice-burg. Why would an employer gainfully employ **anyone** when you can legitimately own slaves with society's blessing? It'd be a sinking lid. Previously secure, financially viable workers would find the upper limits of their income descending on them like the lowering spiked ceiling booby-trap in Indiana Jones's Temple of Doom. I view this as a slippery slope, a thread of society pulled loose. Do we want to become a Master and Slave culture? We will, if we aren't wary. I don't believe we think about this enough. We think slavery exists only in our distant histories, that it could never be a part of our present. But, when one gives this subject more than a few moments thought, it's impossible to not to see the danger. Here, uncomfortably, we discover how closely we **already** travel along the line of Master and Slave, and, in many cases find ourselves on the wrong side of it. Go. Consider what we have... 1. We have businesses seeking the lowest possible overheads and uncomplicated security of labour. 2. We have customers seeking the lowest possible price and security of product or service availability. 3. We have a perpetually available, insecure and cheap labour force - individuals forced to consent to relinquishing all their time to their employers. This is a self-supporting triangle of structural, cultural harm. Further enforcement of this structure comes from inequality; systemic racism; systemic classism; gender bias; age or disability discrimination and exploitation; inequity of housing, health and education; powerful business lobbying; 'populist' movements, or worse - populist government; inflation leaving wages behind; hours and pay only enough to encourage, to enforce worker availability; a general public who are generally ignorant, who are comfortable with the status-quo because they're comfortable. But don't let your comfort fool you, because once structural harm which disadvantages one part of society is established and set to its work, it's only a matter of time before it comes for **you**, too.*

*Cancers grow in economies, in societies just as readily as in our bodies. If we don't catch them in time, if we allow them to grow, to become malignant, society won't survive. It's not good. It's real. It's harmful, it's dangerous, it's here. So presently, we haven't a Master and Slave culture, but only-just, only by some thin, intangible margin (by name alone?); we get away with it, somehow. But we won't once Beneficiaries are compelled to volunteer their labour. The cancer is yet undiagnosed, it's flourishing out of view, beneath the skin of society. But it **is** here.*

There is limited information on this subject for those who might be looking for it. If you're a young person with Autism Spectrum Disorder - or however you prefer to identify yourself - who's staring at their future after reading this with a sense of dread or doom, I'm very sorry. I can only hope you can be more successful than me, either in your efforts of camouflage or your commitment to authenticity. It's important to consider the differences in the ways that individuals relate to experiences. My experience may only overlap with yours in small areas. My difficulties of camouflage or my choices of authenticity may be very different to yours, as might my opportunities or their lack. Cultural factors play their part, too. We know that women and members of ethnic minorities are far more likely to slip under the radar when it comes to these difficulties and in the recognition of them - including diagnosis. Leaves on the wind, buffeted, driven, swept aside by culture. Diagnosis, in general, for all of us is fraught. There's such a vague, intangible field of diagnosable idiosyncrasies that certainty of medical opinion is almost impossible. This get's even more difficult as we age, as we learn how essential integration is, and how essential camouflage is to integration. By the time one is an adult, getting a physician to commit to a diagnosis is a challenge because a patient's systems of camouflage have merged with personality. The required vulnerability, exposure to social and professional risk is a stumbling-block, too. But the current template* of diagnosis, in my opinion, is a part of the problem, also. Especially, regarding a small, yet over-relied upon part of the diagnosis template: Empathy. We must show a lack of empathy** to qualify for an Autism Spectrum Disorder diagnosis. I find in this a stunning error. It's clearly based in a very narrow view of the definition of empathy. The irony that a narrow view of empathy is itself a demonstration of a lack of empathy is not lost on me. The truth for many of us is that our empathetic mechanisms can be *over*-active and cause all manner

of problems, as a result. I can see how this discrepancy in diagnosis might come to be; if a person's eyes had an incredible ability of seeing clearly at amazing distances, but *only* at amazing distances, they would be diagnosed as blind.

**The diagnostic template can feel like a moving target to an adult robot. It can feel as if its written for a completely unrelated condition and/or set of presentations, and its applied in a way which seems predetermined to indicate towards a patient falling below the threshold of diagnostic criteria. It can feel inadequate; strangely unprofessional, strangely non-medical, strangely unscientific. Prone to error. Imagine a world where qualified professionals have only plastic children's toys for tools. A Builder with a plastic hammer; a Traffic Officer with a pedal car. A virtuoso Musician with a kiddy-toy piano. And all would apply the plastic tools of their trade with a straight face, as if everything is as it should be. This is the world in which the current diagnostic template and its application would make sense, in the case of adult robots.*

***I believe the reason robots seem un-empathetic is because we're pre-occupied with manually moving our robot machinery through the social mechanisms and physical environments of life. We don't think instinctively; we don't move instinctively; we don't interact instinctively. Having to consciously drive everything is exhausting, so some systems will drop off. Interacting with empathy is arguably one of the most complicated functions of life. But when you're trying to walk without your legs making you look silly, chew without biting the inside of your cheek, and plan today's future interactions and activities in your head, plus imagine all of their potential outcomes - on top of which - the sun is in your eyes, you're caught in your schedule, ravaged by anxiety, suffering under the imagined gaze of strangers, or your focus is on a task, being empathetic can be put on the back-burner. I'll add to this that if or when we become aware of any lacks in our empathetic*

responsibilities, we're horrified, ashamed. Nothing inappropriate, there. Harm inflicted through empathy's lack or its suspension is unacceptable. The shame of guilt is deserved. But even if the victim of our lack forgives us, we won't forgive ourselves no matter the amount of water under the bridge. The truth of a robot's 'black or white view of the world' is that it can simply become black. The black doesn't discolour the white to a forgivable, realistic shade of grey, it paints over all with opaque sable darkness. We view others this way; we view ourselves this way. It's a big problem.

So, how does a robot live its life successfully? I don't know. How do we safely engage in employment? You tell *me*. This is the 10-step process I've applied to my own life, so far:

1. social blindness (*a natural starting point for a robot*)
2. epiphany (*that Humans are not automatically aware of the robot's thoughts and motivations*)
3. gradual awareness/learning of the robot's disadvantages and advantages and their resultant/potential effects
4. detailed observation and analysis (*of Humans and the ways they interact*)
5. empathetic prediction and planning (*of social/professional interactions*)
6. conscious experimentation (*application of steps 3 - 5*)
7. continuous hard work (*towards effective integration and towards the aims of employers*) seeking output 'zenith'
8. failure to integrate causing discomfort/pain and shame/anxiety
9. repeat steps 3 - 7 (*100+ periods of employment thus far*)
10. new epiphany (*that the robot may never gain credibility*)

This is a distilled view of an exhaustive ongoing effort of a life... so far. It's simplified, perhaps simplistic. But it's also true. If it seems depressing, there *is* a silver-lining. There is luck. If hard work and following the rules hasn't led to success, we can rely on luck. Consider how status or value is applied in our culture: You don't need to be hard-working, have compassion, integrity, dedication** - you only need money. The ability to spend is equal to, if not more important to status and value in our culture, as it functions now, than hard work, compassion, integrity, dedication. If one is able to find a way into money, most problems of credibility vanish. With an ability to 'spend', the positive attributes mentioned above become bonuses of character but aren't necessary for status to be applied in the first instance, nor held in the long term. Remember, despite the overwhelming attitude, despite what you may've been repeatedly, exhaustively told, 'employment' - being employed - isn't the only path to an income. Those of us incompatible to the structures and vagaries of an ordinary work environment need to be free to discover alternative ways to earn money. Get established financially outside of the usual pathways and integrate with the larger population once our feet are on firm ground. We'll *buy* our way into validity with cash money. If we can't, our own system parameters and a more than willing workforce will make slaves of us.

**'Luck' increases in its relevance as I work through this. As I dream, design, attempt, fail in my efforts to rescue myself from employment and from unemployment, I move further and further from activities permitted of my class. The realistic ideas have been examined, tested, tried; only the unrealistic ideas remain. So, I strive, strive, strive, strive towards winning some kind of life-pursuit lottery while never allowed to forget that, increasingly, my head is in the clouds.*

***The reason that being hard-working, compassionate, having integrity and dedication isn't valued the way 'value' is expressed in the most obvious way - with status or wealth - might be that potentially, these qualities are everywhere. They're not rare at all, as every single individual has the capacity* (I base this on the idea that that which is rare and good has more value than that which is common-place and good). And in all non-economic areas of society, they're offered for free. Given. If potentially, we could all display these qualities, why would we remunerate them with loads of cash money? In a society largely based on money, why would we show that these qualities are of value, at all? The service industry, adventure industry, the care industry, teaching, nursing – valued, yes, but you wouldn't know it if we take a look at incomes. No, if you seek status, if you want your value expressed in remuneration, find an arcane, masculine, mysterious pursuit. Not one based on qualities which we all potentially might possess. Think about what you know of 'Cool-kids'. Beautiful, adaptable, confident. The intangible set of qualities which make them cool have little to do with hard work, compassion, integrity, or dedication, yet the Cool glide through life knowing that they're valued, looked up to, envied, because they have opportunities which others don't and take liberties which others can't. They are hero-worshipped. And 'talent', too; a staple cool-kid quality. We certainly value and reward talent, but only in the arcane, masculine, mysterious pursuits – like sports, business, finance, the arts, et cetera. Being talented as a nurse or teacher won't be reflected in your income; incomes in these fields are tethered to immobile baselines. And remember, value is 'goodness'. Those who are obviously valued with status are assumed to have all the qualities I've mentioned, because that's how we relate to value the easiest. Your status will directly impact your perceived goodness whether there's anything good about you or not. Your skills, time, rarity, and talent may've earned your money, but you'll get your 'goodness' for free.*

**'Feminine' qualities? Is patriarchy or even misogyny the lens through which we view this?*

For me, it will be at this point – this successful, sustainable alternative to employment (*alternative to being an employee*) - that I'll be able to cheer up. Become content. It's the point of another 'start', but one with more hope, with a more realistic potential happy ending - though it's based on a foundation of being lucky. I'm wracked with guilt and shame, of-course, because it's not the path I'm expected to take. But it feels, now, like my only hope. And if I can pull it off, I'll get on with life as if everything was always fine. Because integration is still integration, even if it takes a circuitous route. And I've made some starts. In fact, I've made many of them, I've tried to chart my alternative course. Between periods of employment I've had plenty of time to work on my own projects. Money, time, energy, imagination. I've spent a lot. I've made headway, I've gone nowhere. Some success, but nothing sustainable, yet. My diagnosis was a recent development; most of my efforts were prior to being diagnosed, prior even to considering there might be something identifiably neurologically different about me. But my motivation has always been that I knew that there was *something* different about me thwarting sustainable integration. Here's the list of my separate efforts towards *self*-employment - some of which are ongoing:

- Artist (*painting*)
- Adventure Photographer for Canoe Adventurers
 - Guided Canoe-tour Operator
- Freelance Outdoor Instructor/Adventure-guide/Adventure Therapist
 - Guided Trekking-tour Operator
 - Bookstall Owner
 - Bookshop Owner

- Coffee-cart Owner
- Café Owner
- Ski and Snowboard Rentals Shop Owner
- Climbing Wall Owner
- Advertising Company Owner
- Author of the guide-book and instructional manual for canoeing the Whanganui River, editions 1 - 4
- Author of an instructional manual (*book*) for operating an Adventure Company
- Playwright of science fiction radio dramas

Remember, if you're going to cut your own path, don't expect to receive any credit for your efforts until your efforts have finally led to 'success'*. For me, success will come when credibility does. And when I finally have my credibility, I'll be a good person. A good person with value.

**In my case, credit for success must also go to family. When I've fallen into gaps in knowledge, they've pulled me out, filled the gaps, made my road far smoother than it otherwise would've been. They've provided time, expertise, expensive tools, and even somewhere to live to help me reach my goals. With their help, I've learned so much, come so close. I've tried so hard to make their efforts worthwhile. It must be frustrating to see me never quite get going, especially as none of us were aware of the malignant, ever-present problem tripping me up, holding me back. Asperger's hid in the shadows where my lifelong camouflaging kept it safe from exposure, from consideration. At age 32, I woke to the thought my life was a dream going nowhere. At age 34, it occurred to me I might be able to take control of it with self-employment. I began actively recruiting help. There had been help before, but it felt different, somehow, now that I was awake. Periods of ordinary employment continued, interrupting progress, slowing everything down, redoubling the erosion of my confidence, the erosion of my belief in myself, and my belief in my citizenship. The workforce became my nemesis. My enslaver, tormentor. Surely, it always was. At age 42, Asperger's Syndrome was diagnosed. But if this is 'help', it's come very late. I'm nearly all burned up. Bridges behind me are burned down. My credibility is so low, there's little for me left to build a life on. I have to pay back my family's faith in me*. I need to finally make it over a starting line. Once I have my start, I think I could get traction, balance, hold momentum. Contribute. Integrate.*

**The (power) words 'Thank you' cause me actual physical pain to utter. Particularly towards family. In fact, when I think on it, it's*

*almost only towards family that this is the case. I don't know why. It's always been like this. Owing a thank you is a cause of intense anxiety, and increases the pain felt. The longer a thank you is owed, the harder it'll be to say it, and the more pain it'll cost (and the less thankful I'll sound). I've become increasingly aware, conscious of this phenomenon, you'll be pleased to know. I've worked hard to be more aware of when a thank you is required, and more expressive of thanks – though the pain of it is yet to reduce. Offering an 'apology', too, feels the same way. Exactly the same way, come to think of it. I suppose these social obligations and the feelings of them, the responses to them, are processed by the same malfunctioning mechanism within my machinery. But this isn't the end of it... I also feel pain when I **receive** thanks, or, when I receive an apology. This is just weird, clearly, because to a robot, receipt of value is of the utmost, the highest importance. I think, perhaps, the root causes of this will be found in some of what I've already written, so I won't repeat myself (or confuse myself) here. Maybe an expert can unpick the tangled mess of empathy, alienation, theory of mind, pain, camouflage, integrity, duty, unbearable layering of stimuli, hedonism, shame/anxiety. Even writing of it is causing me discomfort.*

If you're interested in discovering other material on the subject of Asperger's Syndrome there are increasing amounts of it about. However, much of it's based on outdated research and some can be completely false. My rule of thumb as I sift and sort, is that if the information seems vaguely or specifically derisive of those on the spectrum, it may be discarded as out of date. Until recently, Asperger's Syndrome was a stand-alone condition. Autism, Asperger's Syndrome and other conditions of neurodiversity were apart from each-other. Indeed, Leo Kanner of America was instrumental in the early study of Autism at the same time that Hans Asperger was in Austria studying children with what later became Asperger's Syndrome. The 2 never met, but they were, in fact, working with patients which would later be defined as existing on the same spectrum: the Autism Spectrum. Their respective efforts, though, were at opposite ends. Kanner with the more severely affected; Asperger with subjects Kanner might've described as being 'high-functioning'. Problematically, the field of neurodiversity isn't clear-cut. Patients can exhibit over-lapping qualities or presentations but remain confusingly varied in the main. Issues of co-morbidity (*separate conditions within a single patient*), environmental variances, personality, culture, adaptation, compound this issue. The solution was to sweep related conditions under the same overarching heading, ASD, Autism Spectrum Disorder; then the job is to figure out where on that spectrum an individual lives. And this can change as the individual grows and learns. The 'spectrum' idea is quite elegant, when you think about it. But there are still hang-overs from the old ways of doing things, and this becomes especially problematic for diagnosis of the more 'Asperger-y' as severe Autism (*think 'Rain Man', as most do*) has irresistible gravitational force, better press, clearer understanding. In New Zealand the diagnostic criteria is the same as in America. But its still very weighted towards Kanner's end of the spectrum. This sets the bar very high (*especially for*

adults who've learned adaptive, camouflaging mechanisms) for those at the Asperger end. However, increasingly, the voices of we who are actually-on the Spectrum have become relevant and instructive. This has increased - and continues to increase - the empathy with which we're interacted with and has helped towards the developing validity of our concerns. But this isn't an overnight process. And I hope you aren't an adult, *now*, seeking definitive answers to your intangible set of challenges, because there still isn't a clear path for *you*. The young, though, *can* be well supported. This is a developing area of research and some excellent work is being done, here. Gradually building around this research are well-considered hands-on efforts: information sharing; wrap-around help, et cetera. The gaps are closing. But this seems true only for the young. Maybe as these young neurodiverse people grow older, the consideration, the research, the help available will grow with them. Presently, adults on the spectrum are adrift. Information is so vague. It fits everyone; it fits no-one ("*All of us are **somewhere** on the Autism Spectrum, ha-ha.*"). Those adrift find little to tether themselves to despite casting about; making contact with seemingly appropriate entities. The New Zealand Ministry of Health has published a resource called The New Zealand Autism Spectrum Disorder Guideline (*updates available*)*, which is apparently far ahead of much of the current 'expert' knowledge, opinion, training, and belief that you're likely to encounter in the field as an adult. Hopefully, the various points of contact whom patients on the Spectrum connect with will quickly become aligned, reconciled with this guideline. Even this, though, seems... incomplete, somehow. As though the subject was looked at, some stuff was written down, then hands were smacked clean, clap, clap, clap - job done. I barely see myself in the New Zealand Autism Spectrum Disorder Guideline. And as a person with Asperger's Syndrome, I should, shouldn't I?

It's 07/07/2020, now. I'm at the end of writing this book... and today, I discovered Tony Attwood's excellent 'Complete Guide to Asperger's Syndrome**', published 2006. I've finally found myself described on the page; describe exactly, described with compassion. It makes my own work here look, well... lame. Or, um, wrong? Or on a wrong track? That perhaps its not quite as I've said: "... it's not you, it's **me**. But sometimes it's you". Maybe, it really **is** just me, after-all. And I'm thinking: What do I do, now? Do I throw away my book? Delete it? Should I study Tony Attwood's book; train myself to be human, somehow, or at least be a better version of a robot? One who's less hurt, less arrogant, less sensitive, less ashamed, and forget about everything? Back to the drawing-board. Or, should I go ahead and publish? Make it so that my work and his exist simultaneously. A book by a lost robot and a book by a guide of robots. Tony Attwood's book proves that knowledge is out there, the answers are out there. That maybe we don't have to try to figure it all out for ourselves. **My** book proves that people yet fall through the cracks and are oblivious to any help or understanding which may exist. It was almost pure fluke that I tripped over Tony Attwood's work, today. We need to grow awareness of this kind of material – otherwise, robots like me will continue to stumble about in the wilderness living lesser lives - lives without credibility, lives without value.*

“A stitch in time saves 9”. I was nearly 30 before I understood this saying (*I’d always heard ‘time’ with a capital ‘T’*). Humans often speak in a different language to me. But gaps in knowledge will eventually close with conscious work toward the closing. So, here’s another 1; this I learned at 43 (*the week of my 43rd birthday, in fact*): I understand now why people use the word ‘confidence’ when describing skill, competence, because mine is lost. I’ve *been* skilled, I’ve *had* competence. I’ve learned, studied, practiced. I wanted to be better, I knew I needed to always improve, fill the holes of what I know, of what I do so I could meet both your stated (*reliable*) aims *and* your mysterious (*inconstant*) wants. I used to say to people that I wanted to know everything, and I really did; I’m fascinated by almost all things. I want to know how everything works. Now I know I’m this way of necessity as much as for the joy of learning new things. A machine which runs cognitively rather than instinctively, a machine with anxiety deep in its engine *must* be this way. But I failed, I failed, I failed, I failed. Then I endured a separate war to discover the root cause of those failures, and at last, I had a diagnosis. I had to fight for it, even though I didn’t want it. And now that I have it, no-one believes in it. I’ve been punched and kicked to the bottom of the greasy rope, where its all I can do merely to hold on, and I’m expected still to contribute. But all I am now is shame and anxiety, discomfort/pain. I’ve been shocked to find previously reliable, dynamic skills are missing, and steady, calm competence is simply gone. I was proud of my confidence, it cost me a great deal to earn it. But pride is arrogance, is hubris, is elitism. Of-course there were kicks and punches. So, my confidence has drained from me and I feel its loss – Consider this: my last job, employment period number 103, was helping operate an adventure centre: Program Coordinator. Not a role for a novice, in fact, an expert role. I worked hard, right at my limits and often beyond them with dexterity, empathy, skill, success, positive results. Even with

'adaptability', as much as it cost me. But none of that mattered; I was bullied, harmed, *consumed* as if by some malevolent scaly beast, then discarded as always. Shit out the monster's bottom. I'd known it was my last go, my last shot at a proper life in employment and so I gave it everything I had. I gave it *more* than I had. The last of my confidence remains there, away from me, soaked into the grass. My duty is to recover, move on, be resilient, but 102 periods of employment came before number 103. We all know the unofficial definition of insanity. My skills, my confidence was everything. They were my passcode to potential integration. They were unique, in many ways, some *could* fairly be described as 'expert'. They were hard-earned and had great value to me. But they're gone, I think. Certainly, any sense of ease with them is. Even simple things are beyond me, now. *Now*, I sit like a rigid beginner in my kayak, I can't cross the threshold of a café by myself, I ride unsteadily on a bike, I hardly make sense when I speak, my legs won't even carry me in a straight line without conscious effort; they're the jerking legs of an automaton, a robot. Even though I'd manufactured my skills artificially, rather than naturally – cognitively, instead of intuitively – they *were* mine and they were useful! I'm 7, 6, 5 years old, again. How can I have confidence? There have always been 2 opposing sides to my personality: the bold, capable character I worked to present to the world, and the truth hidden deep of the timid, useless 1. Today, I'm only timid. Is this my future, too? Are *all* these bad things I've written of my future? I hope not. And so, I seek your permission, society's permission, to contribute from a safe distance; apart. I wrote this book with hope that we might find some common ground, some way to communicate; to convince you of my value. Instead, I've convinced *myself* that I can only ever be apart. I know it's not the way you want to make use of me, but we need to be honest - was I ever of perfect use? I must've been far from this despite my efforts. And its not all bad news. I hope you'll still find some

benefit in my life; I still work at things, just not for you, specifically, anymore. In the wider sense, I still work for you. Maybe you'll find, discover the work I do out here on my own and see some value in it. But it won't be extorted from me. Not anymore. It'll be *my* work on *my* terms, at last. My contribution. Whatever value I can earn this way I'm willing to accept; none or some. But I *am* excited to see what I can offer.

So, what use can a robot be if it refuses to be exploited? How can the humans make use of us safely and be satisfied? I think perhaps our view of the world (*our interpretations*) and our experience of the world (*our feelings, our over-active senses*) could be very beneficial to humans, indeed. Let's consider a few of these benefits...

-Social Policy: It's well known that societies can be defined by the way they treat their most vulnerable citizens. Do we apply the Law of the land, or the Law of the jungle? I know. It can be hard to tell the difference. Many *speak* the Law of the Land but *live* by the Law of the Jungle*, so it's confusing. If we wish society to be better rather than get worse, who should we consult, who should inform us, who should we choose to listen to, to improve equity, equality, the fairness within our competitive, competitive, competitive culture's systems - the winners or the losers?

**Some will even wield the Law of the Land as their primary slashing, jungle weaponry of advantage.*

-Physical Environments: The purposes of the spaces we gather in (*work in, socialise in, relax in, shop in, live in, heal in*) are incredibly varied. But 90% of these spaces could be accurately described as 'box'. 'Box' is the starting point of the design process; we add to or subtract from the box to meet the aims, the requirements of the place. Some spaces seem to a robot to be actively designed to keep them out by choice, or if there is no choice but be there, to ensure discomfort, humiliation, confusion. I believe the elements within spaces which 'assault' a robot will also affect a human, just to a lesser extent. If spaces are made safe for a robot, they'll be made very pleasant for a human. Good Architects, Interior Designers, Town Planners, Landscape Designers understand this, even if they don't know it. A good Architect designs a building or space considering function with equal thought given to the experience of the

occupiers of the space. Will experiences be positive? Exposure to light; to sound; to sightlines; clutter; texture; movement of shadow, shapes or people, ease of movement; ease of mind. Architects must train, study to understand these concepts, but anyone on the autism spectrum is already an environmental expert. We merely lack the language needed to express ourselves. Robots could positively affect the thought poured into any spaces: the design of any public spaces, town and city planning, infrastructure, transportation.

-Systems of Operation: Standard operating procedures, risk analysis and management systems, systems of crisis management. Aaaah, structure. A robot's happy place*. Details, details, details. Cause and effect. Connections, relationships between disparate elements. Logic. Rational design. But best of all: rational, unemotional, logical application. Hazards identified, perils averted, emergencies managed with calm, deliberate confidence.

**But the systems must be reliable - never arbitrary. A 'good' organization relies on its systems for safe, efficient, effective, productive and valuable operations. A 'bad' organization wields its systems as arbitrary weapons of harm, as tools of control, camouflaging poor performance, enabling and re-enforcing ineffective personnel, rewarding bullying, and stymying innovation.*

-Art, Literature, Film: Our consciences reflected back to ourselves. Questions posed. Answers suggested. Conversations started. Hurts exposed; comfort, solidarity provided. Understanding. Community. Collective consciousness and commitment. A robot's point of view is almost always a surprise. A robot's interpretations are unique, original. Fresh new storytelling. Sometimes, it's only when we depart from the status-quo, step out of line, think outside of the square that we can make steps toward something new, better.

-Imagination: To live with Asperger's is to live in your imagination. It's our default setting. Daydreaming may, on the face of it, seem like a waste of time. But for a robot, it's a primary tool of integration. It's a primary tool of education. It's a primary tool of problem solving. And we don't apply it only to our own ends, we'll apply to yours, too. Consider the possibilities of an applied imaginative approach to thought; analysis; work; study; relationships; art; activity; science; philosophy; play. Focused, proactive, detailed applied imagination *isn't* a waste of time, but time *does* need to be made available.

-Intuitive design: Systems, functions, instructions, documentation, directions. How to get from a. to b. Steps 1 through 10. Humans design these things for humans; robots design these things for *everyone*. When robots can meet the aims of these things with our strange cognitive thought process, then humans should find it a breeze using their primary function of intuition. This relates to ways things are done. The 'how's' and 'what's'. What influence, improvements could robots bring?

-Social Environments: Those who are different, those who are outside of the norm, are they targets of scorn, or valued for their perspective? Where does the line fall between ostracising the outlier and celebrating the exceptional? To whom do we look to inform the positioning of this line? Who and what do we value?

-Progress: Getting along with each other is great. The humans are amazing socializers, cooperating, progressing ideas. But it often isn't *them* who start the important conversations. Who are the people with questions? Who are those who aren't satisfied with the status-quo? Who considers new pathways towards the stated aims, improvements? Who *always* goes back to the 'why?' when considering potential ways of doing things? And who puts in the time, the energy, the work, to see ideas come to life? The robots.

-Integrity: When egos, personal agendas, and social machinations are anathema to your goals, who can you trust to help you meet your stated aims? Robots. Obviously.

-Stick-to-it-iveness: Many tasks are monotonous. Onerous. Extended focus can be a trial. But a robot can thrive, here, if these tasks align with their system parameters, or even better: with their special interests. 'Robot' means: to work, worker. And as they say, "when you're doing what you love, you'll never work a day in your life".

-Perspective: A robot's eyes often see things that a human's miss. We relate to patterns, we can sometimes understand the mechanisms of complex systems, and because of this we're observant of anomalies. Glitches, gaps, strangeness, hazards, oversights. A robot can see the gaps, can discover what's in them, is interested in finding out everything about those spaces. We can know when something doesn't 'feel right', we deal with things which don't feel right all day, we're experts. In tune with anxiety, clear on the worst that can happen. We can even learn to predict human group or individual responses to stimuli as we observe unfolding situations. This, once learned, can be another system, another set of patterns. We can manage them, too, if this is a part of our role. We prefer routine, it's true, but we also seek our output zenith. We'll not do a thing this way because this is the way it's always done. We'll do it this way because *this* time we have *these* particular contributing elements. Tomorrow, the contributing elements may've altered. A new way to meet our output zenith, then*. The *aims* are what's paramount, not the process. All this can be possible, might be possible, because a robot's eyes often see things that a human's miss.

It's important to avoid an exhausting/confusing rollercoaster, here. And there **are usually opportunities to invent systems which can meet aims even while accounting for a wide range of potential circumstances. The idea is to be **pro**-active, rather than **re**-active.*

*But it takes imagination and commitment. And it can be difficult to gain buy-in from humans, as humans are as likely to seek their immediate individual aims as to work towards the aims of the group. 'Proactivity', to some, can seem onerous, over-the-top. So, this is an area of potential misalignment of a robot with employers and colleagues. The stated aims of a business are static, they are constant, reliable. The robot can often find themselves in near constant misalignment with other personnel - when colleagues/employers change objectives, putting the attainment of aims at risk while the robot stays the course to meet the stated aims, and **alternatively**, when the robot changes objectives to meet the stated aims and finds their colleagues/employer wish to stay their course, even when their course will put the attainment of aims at risk. For the robot, meeting the stated aims is non-negotiable. The robot is consistent with the stated aims; their activity/output may be dynamic, but it's **always** tethered to the aims. Everyone else is dynamic, too, but in opposition: far more loosely tethered to the aims.*

-Details: 'The Devil is in the details', and God is, too. Those who work towards perfection, mastery of output and/or interaction, will be conscious of details. Singular simplicity or complex accumulation of elements, or mechanisms, or art, structures, communities, product, systems, connections, physics; the development of all these things with empathetic consideration – how people will be positively affected. How they'll relate to work. Sensitivity. Beauty, quality, seeking of aims; a gift. It's a gift of consideration, a gift of love. In details a robot finds their natural home, but not only this: they find their natural contribution.

When I was young, I became aware of a strange phenomenon. And it hasn't gone away, I still notice it all the time. 'Something' (or someone) will attract my notice. Usually something in motion – and often when I, also, am in motion. A bird, a person, the moon, a boat; anything can claim my attention. But there will always be a problem of line of sight. The period of enjoyable observation will be interrupted, will flicker; whom/what my attention has latched onto inevitably vanishes behind a bush, a vehicle, a lamppost, a cloud. There can be long seconds of clear, unobstructed rewarding view, or frustrating fleeting glimpses, only, all the way to the point of comical sustained obscurity*. It became something I noticed every day. And I get lots of practice at it - if that makes sense. I can calculate the likely length of time between moments of obscurity; the moving truck coming, the line of trees on its way**; the way my own moving perspective, my own line of sight interplays with this dynamic, ever-shifting game. And it *is* a little like a game. I feel like a player, an involuntary competitor, teased by some unknown game master. It can feel personal, indeed, as if permission to see some things is actively denied me – though a rule of the game*** which I try to follow is not to think of it this way too much. I always feared madness might be at the end of that road. Anyway, I tell you this as an explanation. This is a way I can sum myself up. This is another answer to the question of what it's like to be me, another metaphor. Sometimes the pieces of the game are in perfect synchronisation, I have a clear view, I'm part of things, a neatly, albeit intermittently connected piece of the puzzle of the world. At this moment, though, all the world's moving pieces are without clear lines of sight. My *own* motion, my stasis, my stops, starts and manoeuvres, my trajectories are misaligned, I'm out of synch. I promise you I'm working hard to get in step. I promise you that.

**A Mike Myers film has a scene in which he is nude, moving about a room picking things up, using them, putting them down again.*

The joke is that his private parts are in constant danger of exposure but remain cleverly, and hilariously, hidden from the cameras view.

***In this game I get to examine questions of relativity; whom/which is in motion - myself, or the line of trees?*

****Another rule of this game (which I do sometimes break, if it's acceptable to do so, as judged by the rules of the world – rather than the rules of the game) is that I may not alter my own trajectory, crane my neck, rise on tippy-toes, or follow the object of my interest. I must stay my course, let the interesting things of the world come to me, intersect with my line of sight along our interrelated natural paths. Accept only what the world offers, allows, not seek more. I see my current life trajectory, in the wider sense, as a breaking of this rule; I'm at this time craning my neck or I'm on my tippy-toes, I'm working towards something. Hopefully, it can lead to my eventual integration, eh?*

That's about it, I think. I wrote this in the fiberglass safety of my mobile home. I could concentrate in here, organise my thoughts; I could be brave in here. But what happens next? When this book makes it outside, what happens then? How will it be received? Ignored? A part of me hopes it will be. Will I be sniffed at; will I be struck at? What if someone wants to talk to me about it? What if someone wants to challenge me on it? As I've said, I don't want to harm anyone's happiness. But this is a fight for human rights, and in any fight, there could be a bloody nose or 2. You may feel it's me who picks this fight, but I assure you my shirt is already stained red. If you've read this as an educational or instructional resource, I'm sorry to leave you with so much work to do to reconcile it to your own thoughts, interests, experiences, employment relations, or future pursuits*. Maybe it's not very useful, after-all. I've learned things I didn't expect when I began. I wanted to be of some help, a contributor, but the book, itself, is quite different to how I imagined it would be. I commit it to your service, none the less.

Thank you for reading it.

Good luck, boy-o's.

**For supplementary detail, please read 'Emperors and Gods, A Guide to New Zealand Small Adventure Business Ownership', ISBN 978-0-473-46398-4.*

