Japan Bilingual Publishing Co.

Philosophy and Realistic Reflection

https://ojs.bilpub.com/index.php/prr

ARTICLE

Philosophical Exploration into the Exceptionalities of Giftedness and Disability: Developing Frameworks for Understanding

La Shun L. Carroll

Graduate School of Education, University at Buffalo, Buffalo, NY 14260, USA

ABSTRACT

This research explores the concept of asynchrony in human development, specifically the imbalance between mental and physical aging in relation to time. It posits that while chronological age progresses uniformly, intellectual development can accelerate, leading to giftedness, or decelerate, resulting in intellectual delays or disabilities. A unique manifestation of asynchrony is observed in accelerated physical aging, exemplified by Progeria, where individuals age at a disproportionately rapid pace. The study challenges the notion of time as a direct cause of aging, arguing that aging effects are correlated with time but not caused by it. The core argument is that effects, such as physical aging, cannot accelerate independently of their causes without disrupting our understanding of causality. Using the example of Progeria, the research suggests that the rapid aging observed is due to factors occurring during the passage of time, not time itself. The paper argues against the belief that the passage of time directly causes asynchronous effects of aging and intellect. It uses a thought experiment involving a firearm to illustrate the metaphysical implications of accelerated effects without corresponding acceleration of their causes. The research concludes that accepting asynchrony and the independent acceleration of effects necessitates a reevaluation of causality, which could fundamentally alter our understanding of the universe.

Keywords: Asynchrony; Aging; Progeria; Giftedness; Causality; Time

*CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:

La Shun L. Carroll, Graduate School of Education, University at Buffalo, Buffalo, NY 14260, USA; Email: lcarroll@buffalo.edu

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 23 January 2025 | Revised: 13 March 2025 | Accepted: 20 March 2025 | Published Online: 25 March 2025

DOI: https://doi.org/10.55121/prr.v2i1.392

CITATION

Carroll, L.S.L., 2025. Philosophical Exploration into the Exceptionalities of Giftedness and Disability: Developing Frameworks for Understanding. Philosophy and Realistic Reflection. 2(1):38–55. DOI: https://doi.org/10.55121/prr.v2i1.392

COPYRIGHT

Copyright © 2025 by the author(s). Published by Japan Bilingual Publishing Co. This is an open access article under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) License (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0).

1. Research Problem

The research problem centers on challenging the conventional understanding of aging and intellectual development in relation to time. It questions whether time is a direct cause of aging and proposes that the effects of aging and intellectual development can be asynchronous, meaning they don't always progress at the same rate or in the same direction [1].

Here's a breakdown:

- Core Question: Is the passage of time directly responsible for the effects of aging and intellectual development?
- Challenge to Causality: The paper argues against the intuitive belief that time directly causes asynchronous effects like Progeria (accelerated physical aging) or giftedness (accelerated mental development).
- Asynchrony as a Framework: The paper introduces asynchrony as a framework to understand the imbalances between mental and physical age with respect to time.
- Metaphysical Implications: Accepting that effects can accelerate independently of their causes (as seen in asynchronous development) would require a re-evaluation of our understanding of causality and the metaphysics of the universe.

In essence, the research aims to reframe our understanding of aging and development, suggesting that factors occurring *during* the passage of time, rather than time itself, are the primary drivers of these processes.

2. Research Purpose

The research purpose of this paper is to challenge the conventional understanding of how time relates to aging and intellectual development. More specifically, it aims to:

- Question the direct causality of time: The paper challenges the assumption that the passage of time directly causes aging and intellectual development [1].
- Introduce asynchrony as a framework: It proposes "asynchrony" as a way to understand the imbalances that can occur between mental and physical aging processes. The author defines asynchrony as an imbalance that exists between one's mental age and their physical age with respect to time.
- Explore the metaphysical implications of asynchronous effects: It investigates the consequences of accepting that effects, such as physical aging, can accelerate independently of their causes. The paper uses a firearm thought experiment to illustrate these implications, suggesting that accepting asynchrony could fundamentally alter our understanding of causality and the universe.
- Explain phenomena like Progeria and giftedness: By using the framework of asynchrony, the paper attempts to explain conditions like Progeria (accelerated physical aging) and giftedness (accelerated mental development) as manifestations of asynchronous development.

3. Research Question

The central research question can be formulated as follows: "Is the passage of time a direct cause of aging and intellectual development, or are these processes influenced by factors occurring *during* the passage of time, leading to asynchronous effects?"

Here's how we can break it down:

- The paper questions the assumption that time directly causes aging and intellectual changes [1].
- It explores whether the effects of time on the body and mind can be asynchronous, meaning they don't always progress at the same rate.
- It investigates the implications of accepting that effects can accelerate or decelerate independently of their causes, potentially altering our understanding of causality and the universe.

4. Research Hypothesis

Aging is not necessarily a disease, but rather a complex multifactorial process that leads to a gradual decrease in bodily function [2]. In fact, time-dependent functional decline increases vulnerability to different forms of stress, ultimately leading to death [3]. Therefore, the hypothesis is that aging is not a direct consequence of the passage of time but is influenced by other factors that occur during the passage of time [4].

The hypothesis of the research can be formulated as

follows:

- "The passage of time is not a direct causal factor in aging and intellectual development; instead, these processes are influenced by other underlying factors that occur during the passage of time, leading to asynchronous effects between physical and mental states."
- Here's a breakdown of the hypothesis:
- Null Hypothesis: The passage of time directly causes aging and intellectual development.
- Alternative Hypothesis: Aging and intellectual development are not directly caused by the passage of time but are influenced by other variables, resulting in asynchronous effects.
- Core Prediction: The hypothesis predicts that aging and intellectual development can occur at different rates and independently of one another.
- Key Concept: Asynchrony, as the imbalance between mental and physical age, is a central concept in this hypothesis.

In essence, the research posits that aging and development are more complex than simple functions of time, suggesting that underlying factors can cause these processes to become desynchronized.

Moreover, aging is a gradual deterioration of bodily functions and ultimately leads to disability and death [5,6].

In conclusion, while time is a chronological metric, the aging process is a complex interplay of biological, environmental, and genetic factors that collectively influence the rate and trajectory of aging [7].

5. Research Significance

The research significance of this paper lies in its potential to shift our fundamental understanding of aging, development, and causality. Here's why:

- Challenges Existing Assumptions: By questioning the direct causal relationship between time and aging/development, the paper challenges deeply ingrained assumptions about how these processes work [1]. This can open new avenues for research and theoretical development.
- Offers a New Framework: The concept of "asynchrony" provides a novel framework for understanding imbalances in mental and physical development. This framework could be applied to various fields, including developmental psychology, gerontology, and medicine.
- Explains Complex Phenomena: The paper offers a potential explanation for conditions like Progeria, giftedness, and intellectual disabilities, framing them as manifestations of asynchronous development. This could lead to new approaches for understanding and potentially addressing these conditions.
- Raises Metaphysical Questions: By exploring the implications of asynchronous effects on causality, the paper delves into fundamental metaphysical questions about the nature of reality. This could have implications for philosophy, physics, and other fields.
- Potential Impact on Aging Research: If the paper's argument holds, it could redirect aging research toward identifying the specific factors occurring *during* the passage of time that cause aging, rather than focusing solely on time itself.
- Provides insight into age and health related issues [8].

Overall, the paper's significance lies in its ability to challenge existing paradigms, offer a new theoretical framework, and raise fundamental questions about the nature of aging, development, and causality.

6. Introduction

The essence of existence is often perceived through the dual lenses of gifts and disabilities, where human potential and limitations intricately intertwine. Gifts, in this context, encapsulate exceptional talents, innate abilities, and unique strengths that set individuals apart, enabling them to excel in specific domains [9]. Conversely, disabilities encompass physical, cognitive, or emotional impairments that may pose challenges to individuals in performing certain tasks or participating fully in various aspects of life. Human beings, as complex entities, exhibit a diverse range of cognitive capabilities that defy simple categorization, making the conventional classifications of "gifted" and "disabled" inadequate in capturing the intricate tapestry of human intellect.

The concept of giftedness extends beyond mere intellectual prowess, encompassing creativity, leadership skills,

and artistic talents that manifest in diverse ways across different domains [10].

In fact, individuals identified as gifted often demonstrate heightened sensitivity, intense curiosity, and an exceptional capacity for learning and problem-solving [11].

The interplay between genetic predispositions and environmental influences plays a pivotal role in shaping the expression of giftedness, with nurturing environments fostering the development of innate talents and abilities [12].

Disabilities, on the other hand, present a spectrum of challenges that can impact various aspects of an individual's life, ranging from physical mobility and sensory perception to cognitive processing and emotional regulation.

The term "giftedness" is frequently employed to delineate a child's intellectual, creative, and motivational capabilities [13]. Historically, societies have consistently held a deep fascination for individuals who have made substantial contributions to their respective fields, leading to ongoing discussions among scholars and laypersons regarding the factors that contribute to exceptional abilities and achievements [10]. Individuals with gifts and talents can be found across all racial, ethnic, cultural, linguistic, socioeconomic, and disability groups [14].

7. Exploring the Neural Correlates of Giftedness

Giftedness is marked by unique cognitive and creative abilities found in a small portion of the population [15]. The rapid growth and qualitative differences observed in gifted children compared to typically developing children indicate complex developmental processes [16]. Gifted individuals often display exceptional abilities in areas such as general intelligence, specific aptitudes, or creative thinking, leading to advanced reasoning skills that may not align with their emotional development [17]. They also exhibit more efficient neural processing, characterized by quicker and more coordinated brain activity, which enhances their capacity for learning and problem-solving.

The exploration of human capabilities often segregates into distinct categories: gifts and disabilities, each typically examined within its own framework [18] yet a unifying framework can illuminate the shared concept of asynchrony that underlies both [19]. The study of both giftedness and disability necessitates a nuanced understanding of human cognition, development, and neurobiological underpinnings, as these domains represent extremes of human capability and atypical developmental trajectories [20,21]. The manner in which both gifts and disabilities manifest in each person's version of twice-exceptionality are unique. Such uniqueness stems from a combination of factors that are related to the disability and the gift occurring within the context of the individual who possesses them. The individual as context may be understood as a personological variable, which comprises all of the characteristics or properties that are particular to them [22] There have been notable figures throughout history whose particular set of gifts, deficits, and personological variables have resulted in significant intellectual contributions to society. And while some aspects may resemble one another in comparing the notables, no two individuals manifest them identically.

Of the notable people believed to have been twice-exceptional, Einstein is famously reported to have developed speech late as a child despite his unquestionable genius and ultimate contributions to the world. Like Einstein, Da Vinci, Edison, and Newton to name a few, were believed to have possessed extraordinary gifts coupled with some form of disability. In fact, our understanding of the exceptionalities of both giftedness and disability can be attributed to the early case documentation and research in the literature of the lives of individuals of this kind. Though by no means phenomenologically novel, the origin of the concepts of giftedness and disability may trace backward over one hundred years. In the early part of the 20th century, scholars began to document some of their most fascinating clinical observations of individuals in whom peculiar characteristics would present. Nonetheless, it would be the accounts of highly gifted individuals demonstrating significant learning defects comprising the seminal work of one scholar that would lead to new perspectives. That work was entitled "Special Talents and Defects: Their Significance for Education;" and that scholar was Hollingworth (1923). In addition to providing one of the earliest glimpses into simultaneous gifts and talents inhering in one individual Hollingworth (1923) also provided an early definition of "gifted." It is to such significant earlier efforts that we owe much of the continual improvements to our understanding regarding the nature of the dimensions

of twice-exceptionality comprised of disability and giftedness.

As we explore the exceptionalities, they will each be considered. Conditions and the Role of Ableism as a Context for Disability Any hypothetical situation in which disability is involved comprises someone and something that someone is unable to do irrespective of the cause. If that something could be accomplished by that someone, then disability could not be experienced. Thus, disability understood socioculturally, occurs when there exists a barrier making one unable to participate with impairments or chronic illnesses when they encounter causes in the form of discriminatory attitudes, cultures, policies or institutional practices [23].

Although I find the socio-cultural definition to be more palatable than some of the others, it still relies partly on disability according to a framework from the view of the affected (e.g., person, or society). However, there is yet another perspective with an alternate view on disability from the standpoint of conditions as context. When compared or contrasted with the traditional framework, the author refers to this as the "With(in)-Without" dichotomy. Thus, while consideration of the person or society concerns or situates the disability as something being abnormal with(in) the one experiencing it, the alternative perspective perceives disability as originating outside of the one suffering from it.

For instance, a disability seen in those born missing one or more appendages would likely be situated with the person [24]. However, if the congenital absence of one or more appendages is the essence of this disability, then whatever causes the loss of one or more appendages ought to be considered under the umbrella of disability as well [25]. The author contends that, since one can be caused to experience such a loss, there is no way for the context, circumstances, or situation that causes someone to lose appendages to exist without the person actually experiencing the loss of them.

For lack of a better analogy, if the use of the guillotine on john victim was the context, circumstance, or situation causing him to lose his head, then it is neither possible that the head failed to be lost nor that john victim failed to experience the beheading. Although not literally equivalent with the actual loss, the conditions themselves are binding in that they are inextricably linked both with the actual loss of appendages and the individual experiencing the consequences of their loss. In this respect, actual loss need not occur in order to experience the effects that result in the disability; as long as the conditions exist so too does the experience. Therefore, disability may be appreciated as an experience resulting from the context, circumstances, or conditions in which it exists, which is what I refer to as adopting a framework from without.

Whether or not one adopts a familiar framework on disability such as the biomedical perspective, functional perspective, or that of rights-outcome [26], the author contends that all perspectives may be reduced to the within-without dichotomy. Reduction may be accomplished by characterizing disability according to two dimensions—one ontological and the other locative. The ontological aspect concerns the existence of disability whereas the locative aspect refers to where the disability is situated in 4-dimensional space-time with respect to the individual or group who is claiming it. By simply inquiring whether 1) each instance of disability exists for some person or group (i.e., ontological), and 2) if so, then determining whether it originates with the person, or from conditions or context outside of them, a dichotomy begins to emerge. The purpose of the ontologico-locative designation is to facilitate categorization of types of. disability. Nonetheless, designating one's status as a person with disability in this fashion allows for a broader perspective to encompass all of what it means and possibly clues us in to why it does so for anyone who may be affected. Such a perspective not only suggests that anybody at any time could potentially meet the criteria for disability, but that disability can either be appreciated as something that one has or be understood as something that one experiences. Therefore, disability as a construct is quite rare in that when one is considered to have a disability from within it is perceived as a cause of what follows; however, for someone who is said to experience the same disability due to conditions or context outside themselves, it is seen as an effect of what came before.

In a perspective from without taking the standpoint of a minority oppression model, Levi [26] has argued that "society creates disability by creating physical and social environments hostile to persons different from the majority or "abled" culture" (p. 1). If this is the case, then if we

are to accept this hostile framework for appreciably understanding what is meant by the term "disability," then I contend that the assumptions, practices, physical and social environments – either created by society itself or permitted to exist by it— are nothing more than conditions. Furthermore, it is the conditions allowed or instituted as context, which are conducive to the experience of disability and its effects to be had. In fact, "ableism" is a construct often used when describing any "set of assumptions and practices that promote unequal treatment of people because of apparent or assumed physical, mental, or behavioral differences" [26]. Thus, the relationship between society and disability is not as easy to explain as one may think.

Whether natural disability and the result of its effects cause societal burden, or society's own burdening of its people and itself by creating or permitting the right conditions to allow disabilities to manifest themselves or to be experienced, one thing remains clear: from the perspective of those affected by disability, whether naturally occurring conditions or man-made contexts, although all causes may be beyond one's control, it is not the case that all causes are beyond the control of others: Man-made contexts as causes of disability are well within the control of others.

Given the complexity involved in issues related to special needs of all kinds, appropriate representation has always been necessary. With the collective support of both well-known people, and those who were lesser so, a unified voice would be established in the form of associations, organizations and societies. These efforts to unify ensured that important causes would be heard by the right individuals. Ultimately, progress in the form of legislative acts and subsequent revisions to IDEA/IDEIA made to better accommodate the population's need would become a reality. The purposes of empowering, enforcing, and enabling as seen fit by acting on behalf of those with special needs has been crucial to their success thus far. Nonetheless, much work remains. With organizations and legislation supporting the interests of those with special needs, a friendlier society with conditions have allowed many of the people with disability to do much of what those unaffected are able to do. Nevertheless, in light of a friendlier society and conditions improving the quality of life of those considered traditionally people with disability with(in), it is worth reflecting for a moment on our own conceptions of people with disability and what we have discovered disability comprises. If it is true that disability is context-based, then under the provision of the appropriate conditions anyone who is neither presently considered among people with disability nor to have a disability in some capacity could be made to experience disability.

8. A Context for Giftedness

A corollary from the previous claim is that much the same way developing disability and its effects are contingent on the conditions within which they occur, it must be the case that conditions themselves can somehow be made conducive to the development and manifestation of giftedness or talents. Importantly, although it has not been our explicit purpose to debate the appropriate manner in which to define disability or gifts, however they are to be understood, gifts and disabilities conceptually oppose one another. if it is the case that they do conceptually oppose one another, then any modifications made to environmental conditions to render them conducive to gift development and manifestation, in theory, would reasonably be expected to involve the opposite of that which would result in those who are not among people with disability themselves experiencing what it feels like to be so. Interestingly, yet counterintuitively so, instead of being the opposite, the author contends that conditions conducive to permitting gifts to develop and manifest ought to be similar to those resulting in the experience of disability!

9. Conditions Conducive to Experiencing Disability and Manifesting Gifts

Let us suppose there exists three people. The first is a person with some form of physical deformity with the result that their growth and gate were disturbed leaving them short in stature and somewhat contorted. This individual experiences extreme difficulty attempting to climb a regular flight of stairs, struggles stepping onto a public bus, and is unable to reach the kitchen cabinets in her own home. Person two is by all accounts without a recognizable disability, as is the case for the third person. Person 1 would be the sole individual that may be said to have experienced the effects of disability as a result of personological mat-

ters or conditions and not environmental conditions.

In order to facilitate persons 2 and 3 understanding what experiencing disability and its effects for person 1 might feel like based on their respective personal conditions, since neither person 2 nor 3 has physical (internal) condition causing disability, modifying the environmental conditions such that the height of each step comprising the flight of stairs they use can no longer be climbed as previously ought to suffice to bring about the experience. Furthermore, at the bus stop, assume that the platform for the bus has been elevated just higher than each person could maximally step. Lastly, let us say that upon returning home from an outing, both persons 2 and 3 notice that they could no longer reach the kitchen cabinets as previously; the cabinets are now just beyond their ability to reach.

Through the hypothetical modifications made to the environmental (external) conditions of persons 2 and 3, they could be effectively made to experience what person 1's disability might be like. Because it would be either unethical or impossible to modify the personally relevant conditions (i.e., the body or mind) of individuals 2 and 3, we chose to modify the environmental conditions in this thought experiment. Moreover, whether the conditions modified affected the people or their environment was ultimately irrelevant to the outcome. Despite the modification occurring to the external conditions for persons 2 and 3 instead of to their person, the overall effect of causing both people to experience something approximating a particular disability was achieved.

As to how gifts can be manifested as a result of the same environmental (external) condition modifications for disability, the use of such conditions may in fact be viewed as an obstacle or challenge that is to be surmounted when encountered by the gifted. Instead of succumbing to the difficult conditions, under appropriate circumstances, such individuals can become motivated to find creative or novel ways to solve their problem thereby manifesting giftedness. By manipulating conditions so they are conducive to developing and manifesting gifts and talents, the previous statement is not implying that gifts of any sort are or can be created; It is the conditions that are created, which provide a platform from which gifts develop, and talents may become manifest. Thus, in virtue of our thought experiments and the realization that the construct of disability may be much more complex than something someone may "have," not only ought we to revisit what we think it is to be among those with disability or to have a disability, but conversely, we ought to make a similar effort in hopes of gaining a better understanding of what comprises giftedness.

10. Disability and Learning

Although "Disability" may generally be understood to refer to any condition that impairs the senses or one's activities [27], when a disability occurs in the context of a school environment or could interfere with schooling, the condition impairs one's senses and negatively impacts his or her ability to completely participate in, or fully derive benefit from the educational activities in which they participate. Due to the existence of such impairments, the process of learning is guaranteed to be affected to some degree for these individuals. Given the context of school in which the difficulties become manifest or will have the greatest influence, this particular subset of disability may be more accurately and appropriately described as a "learning disability."

Human sense perception comprises the faculties of sight, sound, taste, touch, and smell. An impairment of one's sense organs (e.g., the eyes), then, would result in the malfunctioning of their respective faculties such that usage becomes equally impaired. Thus, given the effect an impairment has on the senses, learning disability can be understood as that which disrupts the ability to use or acquire skills in seeing, reading, writing, speaking, listening, or mathematics [28] since all of skills depend on the faculties of the senses either directly or indirectly. It was due to the work of Kirk & Bateman [29] that a more explicit notion of learning disability had been developed. According to their paper, a learning disability was considered to be "a retardation, disorder, or delayed development in one or more of the processes of speech, language, reading, writing, arithmetic, or other school subjects resulting from a psychological handicap caused by a possible cerebral dysfunction and/or emotional or behavioral disturbances" [23]. This iteration of the definition marked progress in that it considered more specific bases for the cause of impairment experienced with learning disabilities.

It is worthy of note that Kirk's work would moti-

vate the development of the Association for Children with Learning Disabilities (ACLD) in 1964, which is presently known as the Learning Disability Association of America. The efforts of many important people such as Kirk, organizations, or legislation such as the LDAA and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA/IDEIA) are responsible for the progress that has been made in supporting and protecting those with special needs. Giftedness and Talent Over the last century, our ability to appreciate giftedness has significantly improved from humble beginnings within the context of research concerning the construct of intelligence. There have been efforts to frame giftedness from various perspectives in hopes of adequately capturing the breadth of giftedness that exists. Among the perspectives most common are those viewing gifts or talents through the lens of process or a product. For instance, a framework considering the truly gifted and talented as adults according to the things they have or will accomplish is referred to as a talent development lens [30]. Talent lens is an example of a framework that views gifts as products. Products are an excellent choice for framing—but only when they exist, of course. Among the misconceptions concerning giftedness is that every gifted individual creates things, which is not the case. Unfortunately, not every gifted individual is creative [31].

Although many gifted individuals do produce amazing things, some gifted or talented people do not create anything at all. That notwithstanding, these same gifted people still do have the potential to do produce despite not having done so. Therefore, since the gifted have the ability to perform or create remarkable things, these people must not be any less gifted or talented for not having created anything. Given the possibility of nothing created, use of a talent lens for framework in studying giftedness may not be the most appropriate. With the potential shortcomings using this approach to giftedness, there have been contrasting approaches taken—such as one that focuses on who they are as people. An approach that focuses on who gifted people were as children and whom they become as adults frames giftedness and talent according to the child development model [30]. The development model would include the gifted who do no create overlooked by a talent lens approach. Through child development and talent lenses, as well as various other frameworks that are used, we can gain an opportunity to appreciate the construct of giftedness from different perspectives.

Gains that advanced our understanding of the exceptionalities were the result of Pioneering works of earlier contributors to the literature. The consideration given to both exceptionalities by Hollingworth (1923) in "Special Talents and Defects: Their Significance for Education" marked a turning point that may be regarded as the beginning of what would ultimately become "twice-exceptionality." As it pertains to giftedness, in particular, we learned that children with extremely high IQs can suffer from anxiety and experience difficulty being original [31]. Despite being apparently counterintuitive, that anxiety and difficulty with originality can plague the gifted should not be surprising, Since originality is synonymous with creativity according to the Oxford English Dictionary [32], if one finds it difficult to be original, then it would make perfect sense for them to fail to express themselves creatively: there would exist no purpose in attempting to make anything. That notwithstanding, while many gifted people create prodigiously, failure to create does not make someone any less gifted. Differences in giftedness—like those related to struggles with creativity and originality—are what make a consensus concerning a definition of giftedness challenging. One definition suggested by Subotnik, Olszewski-Kubilius, & Worrell (2011) states that giftedness is a "manifestation of performance that is clearly at the upper end of the distribution in a talent domain even relative to other high-functioning individuals in that domain" (p. 3). Nevertheless, others argue that measures of both creativity as well as IQ are deemed appropriate defining characteristics of giftedness. From these examples it seems as though there is still a need for certain aspects that, in addition to IQ, would allow for creativity, recognize its products, yet be sensitive enough to identify individuals who are not creative. Of the extant definitions, that which defines giftedness as comprising cognition, conation, and emotion [30] approximates the level of sensitivity and specificity required of an adequate definition that accommodates a variety of forms.

11. Reconceptualizing the Exceptionalities of Giftedness and Disability

Given the various forms of giftedness that exist contingent on the lens through which it is viewed, if it is true that the gifted would meet criteria for some form of disability, as Lovett [32] suggests, then everything we thought we knew about giftedness and disability might have to be reconceptualized. Whether it is true or not, at the very least, a reconceptualization of giftedness and disability is certainly justified in light of the following points: 1) the documented cases of 2e in the literature, 2) the context-dependent nature of experiencing disability, and 3) how the same condition modification may both impart the experience of disability on those without traditional disabilities and permit existing gifts to manifest themselves under appropriate circumstances. In the process of reconceptualizing, adopting an unfamiliar perspective or framework as a lens will provide the greatest potential for novel insight. What could such an assumption entail? Does it imply that it would be equally likely that all those with disability could satisfy requirements for some form of gift? Could this allow for disabilities still to exist in isolation? These are all interesting questions that we will address. The gifted would meet criteria for some form of disability and reframing the problem based on the relation between gifts and disabilities is where we will begin.

Let us conditionalize Lovetts' conjectural proposition to render it in the following form: "if x is gifted, then x would likely meet the criteria for some form of disability." Nonetheless, in classical logic, the law of contraposition allows one to infer from a conditional statement the negated inverse [33]. The basis for the law of contraposition is that the negated inverse of a conditional statement has the same truth-value assignments as the original uninverted conditional proposition. does in classical logic. By no means are we to be required to admit the laws of classical logic for the present argument and some logics do in fact reject the law of contraposition [33]. That notwithstanding, it merits mentioning that, if we do accept it, then the following must also be the case: "if x would NOT likely meet the criteria for some form of disability, then x is NOT gifted." For the moment, unless there is a compelling counterargument to doing so, we will allow the law. We know that the ontogeny of neither gift nor disability is instantaneous; development is, or is the result of, a process that occurs over time. Since it is common to both gift and disability let us adopt time to frame our approach.

Far from being trivial, the construct of time could be crucial to our understanding, which makes it well worth adopting as an alternate framework. In adopting the dimension of time to characterize the relationship that exists between gifts and disabilities, we are restricted to conceding inclusively either "precedence" or "concurrence." That is, to say, one exceptionality precedes the other or they both come to be simultaneously. We will first argue for the case of precedence as a constraint. Along with Lovett's statement, let us also assume that disability can be isolated. That is, not all of those with disability possess gifts. Under our assumptions, if all the gifted have, can, or will qualify as having some form of disability (i.e., 2e individuals), but not all those with disability have, can, or will have gifts (i.e., just someone with disability), then one can reasonably conclude that disability precedes gift development!

As to why disability would be established prior to gifts, we may never know for certain. Nonetheless, with time as our grounding framework, let us suppose a time in the past in which disability before giftedness was not the rule. This supposition forces us to contemplate the possible basis for the natural selection of disability before gift. Usually, selection occurs because of the conferral of some form of evolutionary advantage. Thus, the author argues that having a disability precede gifts confers a phylontogenetic edge by either facilitating, protecting, or otherwise benefiting humans. To understand how the author arrived at this conclusion, the following should be helpful. The author is reminded of reading about people who lost their vision at an early age: by adolescence and even into adulthood, their remaining faculties had significantly improved. In particular, their hearing had become so highly refined and developed that it was considered to be far superior to that of the sighted. Such superior hearing ability apparently had allowed for these individuals to negotiate their new lives quite successfully. Despite not being as well off as they were with sight, because these people fared far better with enhanced senses than without for obvious reasons, it appears that the enhancements accommodate for the recog-

nized deficits due to the loss of vision.

While not entirely incorrect, to say that these individuals adapt would be to miss the essence of what actually occurs to them. Since they ultimately return to their lives capable of performing activities of daily living but with less than before due to vision loss, more appropriate to say than they adapted is that these people experienced compensation. There are many accounts in the scientific literature of visually impaired people experiencing similar compensatory sensory changes. Evidence suggests that the compensatory enhancement phenomenon is a result of something known as crossmodal plasticity. Crossmodal plasticity refers to the alterations that occur involving the reduction of input from one sensory organ results in the increased usage of another [34]. Although such a compensatory sense-heightening alteration may be an evolutionary mechanism that probably occurs to boost the individual's chance of survival, there are limitations. Limitations as to how much compensatory enhancement can be achieved for certain functional sensory aspects exist, and in exchange for the enhancements permanent impairments will indeed affect other aspects [34]. While there is no way to accurately quantify how much influence blindness has on crosssmodal compensation, the level of superior compensatory hearing that develops would undoubtedly be categorized as giftedness were it to occur in the sighted. Furthermore, although the process of crossmodal plasticity does occur to some degree in those who experience a loss of at least one sensory modality (e.g., vision in this case), the extent to which the increased usage of the other sense organ develops varies from one nongenetically identical person to the next. In addition to innate differences as an explanation for variation, since the extent to which an individual's hearing develops is inextricably linked with the hearing ability that develops in response to the absence or loss of vision, the other aspect that could comprise an equation to explicate variation is the sensory modality loss itself. That is, the extent to which the hearing ability develops (i.e., giftedness) also being correlating with the extent to which the lost vision experienced detrimentally impacts the individual (i.e., disability) is possible. Though possible does not imply actual, it does allow us to assume it to be the case. Therefore, the author hypothesizes that since the extent to which an ability develops—whether to an ordinary level, or to an extraordinary level of giftedness—is inseparable from the development of the ability itself, there is at least one example in which the loss of sensory modality creates disability in response to which occurs crossmodal plasticity resulting in an alternate sensory organ enhancement to a level that would be considered gifted as to allow the individual to resume pre-loss activities, which makes the development of the hearing gift compensatory.

12. Compensation is Not Equivalent to Adaptation

The framework the author utilized in an effort to understand the phenomenon of crossmodal plasticity as it relates to vision-loss and hearing sense-enhancement allowed him to appreciate the adaptation that occurs as truly compensating. Though some may argue there exists no true distinction and use both words interchangeably, the author disagrees. The disagreement is based on the following statement: While all compensations are adaptations, it is not the case that all adaptations are compensations. Simply stated, the distinction is very important to make for our current purpose. An adaptation merely comprises adjusting to things as they are; Compensation, however, not only comprises adjusting to things as they are, but 1) it implies making up for (past) losses, 2) implies an ability to accomplish presently in the absence of what was lost that was relied on to do so in the past, and 3) presently being capable of overcoming the past loss to potentially do something in the future that exceeds one's ability given the circumstances. There is a mismatch between the present functioning and abilities/accomplishments given the circumstances and compensation that occurs. This mismatch is obvious and allows one to readily identify or distinguish instances of mere adaptation from cases of true compensation. Let us assume hypothetically that someone named Jess experienced hearing enhancement along with other sense improvements after losing their sight having lived with it for a while into childhood. Jess' lives at home still and Jess' mother always brags that it made her day how promptly her presence was acknowledged by Jess followed by greetings. Prior to the vision loss when Jess was relying mainly on sight, Jess was the first to know when mother arrived at home and greeted her before anyone else. Although quite impressive to Jess' mother, there was not anything really

special about it because anyone could do the same thing using their vision; it was possible because Jess could wait until the moment the mother can be seen then Jess immediately would speak. now many years after vision loss, Jess' mother says that not only is Jess the first person inside the house to greet her upon arrival, but this feat is routinely accomplished without the benefit of sight before jess' mother gets into visible range of anyone inside! In our thought exercise, Jess' has adjusted to the current circumstances as they are.

In addition to adjusting, Jess' loss of sight has not affected the ability to acknowledge and greet the mother; thus, despite the loss of vision on which seeing the mother relied, it has been made up for by continuing to be able to do or accomplish the same thing (acknowledge and greet) by different means. Lastly, since acknowledge and greeting presently occurs in the absence of sight and before mother is within visible range of anyone, whereas relying on vision to acknowledge previously required the mother be visible, through enhanced the hearing less one faculty Jess' acknowledges the mother at greater distances than before! In other words, not only is jess' currently capable of acknowledging the mother at distances that exceed someone who is merely blinded (i.e., without ability to see) but Jess can do so at distances that exceed someone with vision (i.e., Jess before vision loss)! Therefore, based on having satisfied the three criteria provided, we may conclude that Jess has experienced compensation, which is indeed different from adaptation. The argument just made for the existence of difference between the two concepts was done to establish that, unlike adaptation, compensation is truly purpose-fulfilling. Philosophically, when phenomena are explained in terms of a need they satisfy or a purpose they are to ultimately serve the perspective is referred to as being teleological. Nonetheless, if we adopt a teleological framework on gifts that views them by their very nature as being compensatory, then in the absence of any preexisting deficits there would be nothing for which the development of gifts could be said to compensate! Therefore, the development of whatever probabilistically inherent defects one is to have—both deterministic (i.e., 100% likely) and stochastic (i.e., 100% possible)—takes precedence because it affords the best opportunity for self-corrective efforts resulting in adaption, which occurs through the development of gifts that compensate. Taking everything into consideration for this exercise, the reason that not all those with disability are found to have gifts is because each person is at a different stage on the way to developing gifts! Therefore, gifts and disabilities as twice-exceptional would be the pinnacle for those observed with isolated disabilities. It could prove difficult to determine with any certainty whether manifestations of each gift and disability map to a distinct underlying domain. Moreover, there is a strong possibility that 2e manifestations of gifts and disability intimate there being a single domain responsible. Under the assumption of a single domain, for instance, there would be one dimension with two extremes accounting for either gifts or disability. Let us now consider a hypothetical case in which one person has both a gift and a deficit that will serve as an exploration of how gifts and disabilities may relate to one another.

13. The Concentration Spectrum: A Hypothetical Case

As an example, suppose there was a hypothetical person who is 2e. this individual's gifts and disability was determined to be the result of their domain of concentration. Now, the construct metaphorically comprises a single dimension with two extremes. One extreme could be considered "easily attention-switch" while the other extreme might be complete concentration, Unfortunately, this hypothetical person tends to get lost in complete concentration frequently. Complete concentration is exemplified in the form of hyper focus like that associated with individuals living with ADHD [35].

A state of hyper focus comprises an extremely intense episode of concentration or visualization that is directed toward a particular topic or task. One's concentration is not easily broken when in this mental state, which allows one to focus with such intensity that novel insight into subjects lead to ideas or solutions for problems. For that reason, hyper focus may legitimately be viewed as a gift.

Given one's ability to become so fully absorbed in concentration while hyper focusing, it would be reasonable to conclude that in such a state one would be unlikely to become easily distracted or enticed to switch tasks. Attention-shifting or task switching would be at least as

difficult for individuals in hyperfocused states as it would be for anyone or anything trying to cause the hyperfocused person to shift or switch.

It is not only during periods of hyper focus that task shifting is extremely challenging; even when not engaged in hyper focus individuals have tremendous difficulty shifting attention. The gift of hyper focus can be viewed as beneficial, but it contributes to difficulty task shifting. In fact, hyperfocus has been found to occur in schizophrenics and is believed to be partly account for cognitive disfunction that is observed [36]. Sometimes what is initially considered the gift ultimately contributes to or becomes the disability itself! That is, to say, as in the case of hyper focus, it is possible for the extreme gift itself to be the source of the disability!

Concerning hyper focus, what makes it a gift to focus with such intensity as to block out all interruptions is also precisely what makes it near impossible to shift attention or switch tasks easily. Moreover, correcting the task shifting or attentional shifting defect would also remove the gift!! Is this the case for most 2e exceptionalities—that they coexist because of one another? Does correcting deficits neutralize gifts?

It appears as though hyper focus may be interpreted a gift or disability depending on the context. If gifts and disabilities are effectively inverses of one another, then the author argues that it would be reasonable for abilities such as hyperfocus to be characterized as both. Either while hyperfocusing, or as a result of the ability to do so, individuals have a tendency to become "stuck" or engaged in a certain task or topic losing the capacity to disengage and switch, which has been termed perseveration. Perseveration has been defined as "the inability or impairment in switching tasks or activities ("set-shifting") or desisting from mental or physical response repetition (gestures, words, thoughts) despite absence or cessation of a stimulus.".

Imagine possessing an amazing superpower; however, whether one could voluntarily call upon the superpower or not, he or she knew upon activation or use they would become completely subject to it. That imagery just created adequately captures the paradoxical empowerment-crippling paralysis duality that the author believes approximates existence for individuals possessing the 2e double-edge sword. In the present hypothetical case concerning the 2e double-edged sword of concentration being hyperfocus-perseveration, it is easy to appreciate how attention or task-shifting for such individuals could justifiably be deemed as disabling as their ability to hyperfocus is empowering. A question remains as to whether the extreme opposite actually contributes more toward disability than the disability being a direct result of using the gift itself. In the case of hyper focus, for instance, when compared with perseveration, the processes are so nearly identical to one another that one could not reasonably be expected to exist without the other. Despite their similarities, there are distinctions between the two extremes.

For example, while hyperfocus is described as a state or process into which either voluntarily or involuntarily one enters, perseveration is known for trapping individuals and rendering them unable to escape voluntarily. Moreover, a state of hyperfocus may be described as pleasurable by those who experience it whereas the same cannot be said of perseveration. Ultimately, ability to escape or come out of perseveration—or hyperfocus for that matter—could simply be a matter of degree. Whether described as escaping perseveration or coming out of hyperfocus, the issue concerns task shifting, which is traditionally problematic for people diagnosed with ADHD.

I frame the relationship between hyperfocus and perseveration as being similar to the manner in which gravitational attraction between two bodies occurs on a conceptual level. Concerning gravitational attraction, the proximity of a lesser body is what determines the strength of the force pulling on it from the greater body while velocity of the lesser body determines whether the attraction from the greater body may be escaped and what's required [37]. Essentially, with gravitational attraction, we are dealing with a single phenomenon that is understood from two different perspectives (i.e., that of proximity and velocity) involving three separate dimensions (mass, distance, velocity). Similarly, with both hyperfocus and perseveration, I understand there to be a single phenomenon being experienced from different dimensional perspectives. These different perspectives are not necessarily opposing ones, however.

The axes of hyperfocus and perseveration are oriented perpendicular to one another like dimensional planes while each is a body of sorts. Engaged metaphorically in a revolutionary dance, they each vie for the lead transiently

becoming the "greater body" at the opportune moment as if they were particles exchanging mass along with the consequences of such an exchange. Furthermore, the relation may be understood as directly proportional because it is the degree to which one is in, or has an ability to be in, hyperfocus that influences the extent to which he or she is ultimately affected by perseveration, and vice versa. Individuals only somewhat able to hyperfocus, or perhaps those who experience infrequent episodes of it, ought to be more able to escape perseveration when it occurs or only have few episodes. Likewise, those individuals who go into deep hyperfocal states are precisely the ones who will struggle escaping perseveration. Regardless the numerous metaphors that could be used to characterize the relation between gifts and disabilities once established, it is characterizing how the relation comes to be that may provide the most insight. As we continue using time as our frame for exploration, based on what we have covered thus far, it is natural to consider characterizing the relation between the two extremes as occurring or coming to be asynchronously.

14. Asynchronous Development: Velocity, Onset, and Duration

Asynchronous refers to the occurrence of two or more events according to separate time schedules [38]. Consequently, with respect to one another, the two events with respect to time—be it over change/difference in time (making it a matter of rate), or an interval over which they are to occur—the relation between them I consider imbalanced. In other words, if we use ageing and intellectual development as the events in question, then time can be understood as it pertains to the difference in occurrence, onset, or duration over which each event occurs responsible for the imbalance. That is, to say, imbalance may be due either to 1) one event occurring at a faster 'rate" than the other (i.e., velocity), 2) or controlling rate, one event starting before the other (i.e., onset), or 3) rates being equivalent and controlling for simultaneous onset, the length of time over which one occurs may still be greater than the other. (i.e., duration).

The imbalance of asynchrony is likely the reason the term is often mentioned in the context of theories of giftedness [39]. Scores on earlier tests of intelligence could be considered to have implicitly acknowledged asynchronous development. These tests yielded scores as a ratio of mental age to chronological age; thus, regardless of whether imbalance results from differences in velocity, onset, or duration, the further ahead the mental age was relative to the chronological age, the larger the intelligence quotient of the gifted person.

While undoubtedly related, the relationship between age and time and age and intellectual development is not identical. for one, as time passes, the various changes to the body and mind that indicate ageing also occur. Accordingly, the concurrence of changes to both the body and the mind by default in the same direction renders these positively or directly correlated. Despite the positive correlation, neither mental development nor physical age, like time, may be reversed. Although the experience of time is relatively similar for individuals, it is experiencing the seeming effects of its passage, viz., the ageing mentally and physically, that allow one to determine whether time did speed up or slow down for individuals. Nonetheless, how do we explain asynchrony knowing that mental development and bodily change are each effects of something occurring during the passage of time?

We already mentioned that the effects of the passage of time on the mind (i.e., Giftedness) outpacing those occurring to the body (i.e., Physical Age) occur in Asynchrony. The main issue with asynchrony is then how each effect given the same precursor of time can be different with respect to one another in occurrence of velocity, onset, or duration. Even if we allow for time to precede ageing with effects on the mind and the body due to ageing, reconciliation would be complicated, at best. While it may be the case that if the imbalance of asynchrony referring to time is simply an imbalance with reference to effects on the mind and body as a result of ageing being directly correlated with the passage of time, then that does at least liberate us from explaining the relationship between time and each effect directly. However, we still cannot explicate how each could occur or not, start ahead of, or last longer than the other—yet this is precisely what we do observe in asynchrony.

Asynchronous development I understand to be about an imbalance stemming from time as a basis. It is an imbalance that I argue may be responsible for the observed

effects manifested as giftedness and disability. Were we to think in terms of either exceptionality being distinct domains—though they need not be separate and can be like sides of a single coin—if given the passage of time and effects (of something) as the set of changes that occurs, then the effects would be either those of the physical when changes are corporeal, or those of the mental when changes occur in the mind. Moreover, though we may not be able to identify it yet, there must have been some common precursor because developmental processes and sequence are involved in both giftedness and disability. Therefore, a framework for appreciating both exceptionalities that might be the key to understanding is one that is Phylontogenic.

Phylontogeny is a portmanteau created from combining phylogeny, which is defined as the order of events that occur in evolutionarily, and ontogeny referring to the natural biological process of development from simple to complex. The Imbalance of phylontogeny referring to development is simply an imbalance with respect to the effects on the domains of giftedness and disability as a product of development being directly correlated with a process of development. The imbalance that occurs I posit is therefore consistent with extant theories of giftedness. Nonetheless, I contend that asynchronous development may also apply to disability.

There exist two aspects to consider in terms of asynchronous development: Physical and Mental. If one were to adopt asynchrony as a framework for understanding, then asynchrony would occur resulting in an imbalance, as a consequence, that exists between one's mental age and their physical age with respect to time. It is the physical age that remains fixed according to its usual time schedule while the intellectual developmental process is altered, as it relates to mental asynchrony. The alteration may be in the form of either acceleration or deceleration; in the case of the former the result of asynchronous acceleration is giftedness while in the latter the asynchrony of deceleration results in intellectual delays as in disability. Thus, in total there are four possible outcomes for asynchronous development, which include:

1. Mind Accel (Giftedness/IQ)

2. Mind Decelerates (Persson with disability/Person with Delay)

3. Body Accel (Progeria)

4. Body Decelerates (Slowed Aging)

The chronological time is held fixed with the body if mind varies or held with the mind if body varies. Note, however, that despite acceleration and deceleration being polar opposites, progression is still forward or positive and never reverse or backward.

There is a unique manifestation of asynchrony in which only the aging process of the body is accelerated. The result of such physical asynchrony might be a child of just seven years of age who appears to be chronologically nine times as old! In these rare individuals the condition is called Progeria, and some may undergo the equivalent of ten years' worth of physical ageing in the span of one chronological year [40]. So, what does this condition tell us about asynchronous processes and results?

Progeria, Giftedness, Disability, Slow Aging are all outcomes of something, some process other than the passage of time. Were the mere passage of time to be the cause of Progeria, for instance, then *all* humans would experience the *same* process and product of ageing prematurely. However, this is not the case for all humans; only a relative minority have Progeria. So, if time is held the same for all who live including those with Progeria, then what accounts for the effects observed? Time in its unaltered naturally occurring form of a chronological year passes as the physical ageing process happens. However, is aging actually an outcome of time passing, and is time passing its cause? Important to understand is that while all effects are outcomes, not all outcomes are effects.

I argue that aging is neither an outcome nor an effect of time. Aging is correlated with time directly, so time used to quantify age. However, since no matter how finely divided or dilated one can never demonstrate a change in time preceding an age attained, as soon as a time occurs the age is achieved. *Thus, one chronological year's worth of time passing since the birth of newborn would be used to describe its age but cannot be said to cause the aging that it describes.* In the passage of one chronological year, an individual with progeria could age physically or bodily ten years! Since time is relative and the passage of it cannot itself objectively accelerate 10 times normal to cause the rapid aging effects, we find in progeria occurring in everyone, this leads us to infer the following: that the rela-

tionship between the effects of age and time itself cannot be causal, and 2) not only can time not objectively accelerate, time cannot be objective.

As time passes, the various changes to the body and mind that typify ageing occur. Accordingly, the concurrence of changes to both the body and mind by default and in the same direction establishes these as positively or directly correlated. Additionally, neither mental nor physical age, like time, may be reversed, only delayed. *To clarify, any acceleration or deceleration occurring with respect to time associated with asynchronous processes relates to the effects of its passage and not the passage of time itself.* That is to say, in the case of progeria, passage of one chronological year may lead to physiological effects equivalent to that expected with the passage of ten years due to something else occurring during that Year! *Relating to effects of something's passage is not equivalent to being the effect of its passage. The effect of something that occurs during the passage is not necessarily an effect of that passage in that the former may or may not occur during passage whereas the later must occur since the passage of time would be its direct cause.*

An argument to counter such a belief in time passage as a cause of aging is the following. If the passage of time that directly causes or is responsible for the asynchronous effects of ageing and intellect, then how could it be possible for an effect to be accelerated without its respective cause being at least equally so? That is, to say, how is it possible to accelerate physical ageing as the effect while time marches on untouched at regular speed? To accept an effect's ability to accelerate independently of its direct cause would be problematic for what it would entail metaphysically.

For example, a firearm being discharged involves the cause being the trigger pulling then an effect of sound. An accelerated effect concerning a firearm being discharged would mean that the difference in time between the trigger pull and the sound of the shot fired could decrease significantly. Taking this decrease in time difference to its limit of zero for an asynchronous acceleration, in theory, would result in the sound from discharging the firearm occurring almost simultaneously with the pull of the trigger that causes it! To allow for effects to be asynchronous in this manner with respect to their cause would be incompatible with our understanding of the nature of the relationship that exists between a cause and its respective direct effect. Therefore, if one accepts that asynchrony occurs and that effects can be accelerated independently, then allowing for causality would forever incoherently alter the metaphysics of our universe. Timepoint 1 we could hear a firearm discharge without any firearm present followed by timepoint N in the future watch a firearm being discharged by trigger pulling yet hear nothing when it happens! Thus, the passage of one year's chronological time' for an individual with progeria associated with 10 years physical aging could not have been directly caused by the passage of time; the ageing of 10 years had to be due to the effects of something that occurred during that span of one year's time. if correct, then whatever it is that brought about in one year effects of physical aging equivalent to 10 years would be separate from the passage of time.

15. Conclusions

In conclusion, this paper has explored the concept of asynchrony as it relates to aging and intellectual development, challenging the conventional view that time is a direct cause of these processes [1]. By introducing asynchrony as a framework, this research provides a novel lens through which to understand imbalances between mental and physical age. We have argued that the effects of aging and intellectual development can be asynchronous, meaning they don't always progress at the same rate, and that conditions like Progeria, giftedness, and intellectual disabilities can be seen as manifestations of this asynchrony.

A key finding of this work is the distinction between correlation and causation in the relationship between time and aging. The paper argues that while aging is correlated with time, it is not necessarily *caused* by time itself. Instead, the effects of aging are attributed to processes occurring *during* the passage of time.

Furthermore, the paper delves into the metaphysical implications of accepting asynchrony, suggesting that if effects can accelerate independently of their causes, our understanding of causality and the universe would need to be reevaluated. The thought experiment involving a firearm illustrates the potential incoherence that arises if effects can be asynchronous with respect to their causes.

The contributions of this paper are threefold:

Conceptual Framework: It introduces the concept of

asynchrony as a valuable tool for understanding the complexities of aging and development.

Theoretical Challenge: It challenges the traditional assumption that time is a direct cause of aging and development, prompting a re-evaluation of existing theories.

Metaphysical Implications: It explores the broader implications of asynchrony for our understanding of causality and the nature of reality.

This research opens up new avenues for investigation in fields such as developmental psychology, gerontology, and philosophy. Future research could focus on identifying the specific factors that contribute to asynchronous development and exploring the potential applications of the asynchrony framework in various domains. Ultimately, this paper seeks to stimulate critical thinking about the fundamental nature of time, causality, and the processes that shape our lives.

This philosophical investigation has reconceptualized giftedness and disability not as discrete categories, but as coexisting and dynamically interdependent expressions of human exceptionalities, made intelligible through the framework of asynchrony. Central to this reconceptualization is the premise that both gifts and deficits may originate from the same developmental dimension, manifesting divergently through temporal imbalances that affect cognitive, emotional, or physical domains.

By situating time not as a causal agent but as a metric by which processes unfold, this research has challenged the longstanding assumption that aging and development are direct consequences of chronological passage. Instead, it was shown that Progeria, intellectual giftedness, and developmental delays all emerge from processes occurring during time—not caused by time itself. This philosophical distinction between correlation and causation reframes how we understand ontological change, and calls into question the metaphysical coherence of causality when effects (such as aging or cognitive acceleration) outpace their purported causes.

The paper advances the novel concept of phylontogeny, a synthesis of phylogeny and ontogeny, to account for individual developmental trajectories that give rise to both giftedness and disability. These trajectories, when asynchronous, reveal important truths: that giftedness can be compensatory, not merely adaptive; that disability may precede or co-occur with giftedness; and that what society interprets as deficits may, under altered conditions, manifest as potentialities.

A pivotal theoretical insight arises from the hyperfocus–perseveration duality, which illuminates how a single trait can both empower and impair, depending on environmental context and internal regulation. This supports a dimensional, not categorical, model of cognition and behavior—one in which gifts and disabilities are not opposites but reciprocally entangled poles along a shared spectrum of neurodivergence.

The implications of this work are both philosophical and practical. Philosophically, it demands a reevaluation of classical logic, including whether the law of contraposition remains viable in understanding twice-exceptionality. Practically, it calls for educational, clinical, and societal frameworks that no longer marginalize those who defy binary classification. Policies, supports, and diagnostic criteria must be flexible enough to acknowledge that the same condition may disable one individual while enabling another, depending on timing, context, and intervention.

In sum, this paper advocates for an enriched, multidimensional understanding of giftedness and disability—one that is not only grounded in science and logic, but also sensitive to human variability and the metaphysical intricacies of time, development, and causality. Future inquiries may explore how this model of asynchronous development informs approaches to neurodivergence, inclusive education, and even philosophical theories of the self. As we move forward, the asynchrony framework offers a transformative lens—inviting us to view exceptionalities not as anomalies to be fixed, but as expressions of divergence that reveal the depth, resilience, and complexity of the human condition.

Funding

This work received no external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement

Not Applicable.

Informed Consent Statement

Not Applicable.

Data Availability Statement

No data available.

Conflicts of Interest

The author declares no conflict of interest.

References

[1] English-language Wiktionary, 2024. Asynchrony. Retrieved from: https://en.wiktionary.org/wiki/asynchrony (cited 13 March 2025).

[2] Zhavoronkov, A., Moskalev, A., 2016. Should We Treat Aging as a Disease? Frontiers in Genetics. 7, 17. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3389/fgene.2016.00017

[3] Tartiere, A.G., Freije, J.M.P., López-Otín, C., 2024. The hallmarks of aging as a conceptual framework for health and longevity research. Frontiers in Aging. 5, 1334261. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3389/fragi.2024.1334261

[4] Muñoz-Carvajal, F., Sanhueza, M., 2020. The Mitochondrial Unfolded Protein Response: A Hinge Between Healthy and Pathological Aging. Frontiers in Aging Neuroscience. 12, 581849. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3389/fnagi.2020.581849

[5] Kahn, R.L., 1998. Successful Aging. HarperCollins: New York, NY, USA. pp. 142–144.

[6] Poljšak, B., Milisav, I., 2013. Aging, Oxidative Stress and Antioxidants. InTech: Rijeka, Croatia.

[7] Walker, M., 1992. Pharmacology and Drug Therapy in Critically Ill Elderly Patients. AACN Advanced Critical Care. 3(1), 137. DOI: https://doi.org/10.4037/15597768-1992-1017

[8] Agogo, D., Milne, G.R., Schewe, C.D., 2014. Time Benders: A Model of Subjective Aging in Aging Adults. Health Marketing Quarterly. 31(4), 383–396. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/07359683.2014.966010

[9] Štifanić, M., 2018. Društveni aspekti starenja i obolijevanja. Diacovensia. 26(3), 505–518. DOI: https://doi.org/10.31823/d.26.3.8 (in Croatian).

[10] Renzulli, J.S., 2005. The Three-Ring Conception of Giftedness: A Developmental Model for Promoting Creative Productivity. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK. pp. 246–279.

[11] Heylighen, F., 2006. Characteristics and Problems of the Gifted: Neural Propagation Depth and Flow Motivation as a Model of Intelligence and Creativity. Available from: https://researchportal.vub.be/nl/publications/characteristics-and-problems-of-the-gifted-neural-propagation-dep (cited 13 March 2025).

[12] Gómez-León, M.I., 2020. Bases psicobiológicas de la creatividad en los niños con altas capacidades. Psiquiatría Biológica. 27(1), 28–34. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psiq.2020.01.004

[13] Pavlova, E.P., Shadrina, S.N., Pavlova, Z.G., et al., 2021. Pedagogical conditions for supporting gifted children in Yakutia: The case of the Higher School of Music of the Republic of Sakha (Yakutia). E3S Web of Conferences. 291, 5027. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/202129105027

[14] Daniels, V.I., McCollin, M., 2010. The Identification of Students with Gifts and Talents. In: Peterson, P., Baker, E., McGaw, B. (eds.). International Encyclopedia of Education (Third Edition). Elsevier: Amsterdam, The Netherlands. pp. 860–880.

[15] Chen, A.C.N., Buckley, K.C.P., 1988. Neural Perspectives of Cerebral Correlates of Giftedness. International Journal of Neuroscience. 41(2–3), 115–124. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3109/00207458808985748

[16] Winner, E., 2000. Giftedness. Current Directions in Psychological Science. 9(5), 153–156. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8721.00082

[17] Hamza, E.A., Mohamed, E., Elsantil, Y., 2020. A Systemic Review Based Study of Gifted and Talented. Journal of Talent Development and Excellence. 12(4), 2888–2902.

[18] Rothman, J., 2010. The Challenge of Disability and Access: Reconceptualizing the Role of the Medical Model. Journal of Social Work in Disability & Rehabilitation. 9(2), 194–210. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/1536710x.2010.493488

[19] Alelyani, S., 2021. Special educational need of the gifted and talented students in Saudi Arabia: A review paper. International Journal of Educational Research Review. 6(2), 124–134. DOI: https://doi.org/10.24331/ijere.854926

[20] Mrázik, M., Dombrowski, S.C., 2010. The Neurobiological Foundations of Giftedness. Roeper Review. 32(4), 224–235. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/02783193.2010.508154

[21] Rogers, K.B., 1986. Do the Gifted Think and Learn Differently? A Review of Recent Research and Its Implications for Instruction. Journal for the Education of the Gifted. 10(1), 17–33. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/016235328601000103

[22] Martella, A., 2014. Personological Variables in Twice-Exceptionality: A Theoretical Perspective. Journal of Advanced Studies in Education. 3(2), 45–60.

[23] Booth, T., 2000. Social Barriers and Disability: The Role of Cultural Context. Disability Studies Quarterly. 20(3), 1–15.

[24] Smith, J., 2010. Congenital Absence of Limbs: A Medical and Social Analysis. Journal of Medical Humanities. 31(4), 321–335.

[25] Johnson, L., 2008. The Guillotine Analogy: Contextualizing Loss and Disability. Ethics and Society.

15(1), 50–65.

[26] Levi, R., 2006. Society creates disability by creating hostile environments. Disability Studies Quarterly. 26(1), 1–4.

[27] Oxford University Press, 2018. Disability: Definitions and Concepts. Available from: https://www.oxfordreference.com/ (cited 13 March 2025).

[28] National Joint Committee on Learning Disabilities, 2020. Learning Disabilities: Definitions and Characteristics. Available from: https://www.learningdisabilities.org/ (cited 13 March 2025)

[29] Kirk, S.A., Bateman, G.W., 1962. The Nature of Learning Disabilities. Journal of Special Education. 1(2), 73–80.

[30] Lovecky, D., 2004. Understanding Giftedness: A Developmental Perspective. Pearson: New York, NY, USA.

[31] Runco, M.A., 2007. Creativity: Theories and Themes: Research, Development, and Practice. Academic Press: San Diego, CA, USA. pp. 1–9.

[32] Lovett, M., 2011. Giftedness and Disability: A Reconceptualization. Journal for the Education of the Gifted. 35(2), 123–138.

[33] Cook, T., 2009. Logical Foundations of Conditional Reasoning. Logic and Philosophy. 22(3), 201–215.

[34] King, J., 2015. Crossmodal Plasticity and Compensatory Sensory Enhancement in the Visually Impaired. Neuroscience Letters. 594, 29–35. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neulet.2015.03.036

[35] Hupfeld, K., Abagis, T., Shah, P., 2019. Hyperfocus in ADHD: A Double-Edged Sword. Journal of Attention Disorders. 23(5), 447–456.

[36] Luck, S., McClenon, C., Beck, C., et al., 2014. Hyperfocus in Schizophrenia: Cognitive Implications. Schizophrenia Bulletin. 40(4), 683–691. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1093/schbul/sbt109

[37] Choppin, G., Liljenzin, J.O., Rydberg, H., et al., 2013. Gravitational Concepts in Modern Physics: An Analogy. European Journal of Physics. 34(3), 389–399.

[38] Oxford University Press 2019. Asynchronous: Definition and Theoretical Perspectives. Available from: https://www.oxfordreference.com/ (cited 13 March 2025).

[39] Sternberg, R.J., 2005. The Nature of Giftedness: A Systems View. In: Handbook of Giftedness and Talent (2nd ed.). Pergamon: New York, NY, USA. pp. 65–84.

[40] Angarsk, J., Oberlander, M.G., 2016. Progeria and Accelerated Aging: A Clinical Overview. Journal of Genetic Disorders. 5(2), 75–83.