

The breakdown of worldviews

People have told us that different areas of professions in worldview are not possible to syncretize, the sciences and theology are naturally contradictive, and even theology in itself cannot be made sense of as a whole. You have to view the different professions like Christianity as a matter of itself, ignoring the other viewpoints of worldview.

But how would that remotely make sense?

Did God create the world ex nihilo, and later science took over control?

No, there is a better way to explain it.

The deceptions of scientific leadership

Let's first look at the dogmas of science.

Atheists have a belief system around science. It revolves around the belief that science already understands the nature of the universe. This could easily be dismantled, but atheists usually stop asking at the crucial points.

The worldview of science has brought inhibitions up on the inquiry of existence which was supposed to be the core of scientific endeavor.

The dogmas of science revolve around materialism – I name the core dogmas

+nature is mechanical

+matter is unconscious

+the laws of nature and their constants are fixed

+the total amount of matter and energy is always the same

+nature is purposeless

+biological hereditary is material

+memories are stored inside your brain as material traces

+your mind is inside your head

+psychic phenomena like telepathy are impossible

+mechanistic medicine is the only kind that works

Credit for those go to Rupert Sheldrake

https://youtu.be/sF03FN37i5w?si=3V32WhQGK3slq_HW

These dogmas are part of the belief system of educated people around the world. Yet hardly any of these dogmas hold up well against scrutiny. In fact some of these dogmas are already pretty much proven wrong, but education keeps teaching them as if they were untouchable.



I think this fabricated belief system is actually being taught for its effective consequences, not for truth apt. Belief holds power, so it's valuable for those in power to shape our beliefs by whats best for them.

If you question these dogmas you get ignored or made out as an idiot even if you have all the evidence and the epistemic reasonability on your side.

The worldview is based on the principle: "Give us one free miracle and we explain the rest"

The one miracle is the appearance of all the energy and the laws that govern it.


Our concious existence still isn't well explained though even with the free miracle.

But what makes us so sure that the laws don't evolve?

In fact it has proven to be impossible to explain the beginning of the universe with our best models, leading physicians to believe the laws of nature changed within the development of the universe.

A better way to explain the nature of the universe is with habits.

Constants are not constant.



The speed of light changed significantly before the science leadership used an trick to deceive us. They defined the speed of light by the speed of light – by itself.

The gravitational constant varied by more than 1.3% in recent years in exact measurements.

The mind is not contained to the head. We probably project out our mind based on our thinking and awareness.

There's a great deal of evidence people can feel someone's gaze from behind when they couldn't notice them in theory.

Let's evaluate some of these dogmas:

I'm not sure science provides the most objective understanding of the world.

In terms of video games, to accurately define every game mechanic and glitch may help to get maximum use of those, but the objective truth is still that its specified processes and data running on a computer system.

Similarly to use science to exhaustingly describe nature may help to make use of its behavior, but the objective truth may still be more that it's an entropically determined system by the wave between possibilities and the determinate. An entropically driven wave between possibilities and the determinate may also explain the emergence of intelligence.

Emergent phenomena are incredibly interesting.

1. Nature is mechanical?

Nature partly appears mechanical. As a computer appears to be a digital device, it's still set in an analogue environment, and saying a computer operates by digital processes doesn't cover the whole truth. Computers analogue hardware can impact performance, data accuracy, sensor inputs, calculation validity and more

At the base nature allows contradictions and does not behave mechanical at all

At the very least, though it probably impacts more, it would be ensuring that nature behaves mechanical to begin with, so by saying nature purely behaves mechanical you already left out part of the equation and state you didn't.

2. matter is unconscious?

We don't know if life is mechanical at all. Computers don't exist as digital device only, just because they seem to behave digital.

3. the laws of nature and their constants are fixed?

Because science chooses to believe that against their own evidence?

4. the total amount of matter and energy is always the same?

No one has ever even remotely proven that the universes total amount of energy is constant. Since they are the ones claiming the burden of proof lies with them.

5. nature is purposeless?

Since the nature of all self-deciding entities is to express themselves to the universe and experience the universe, purpose can just be to optimize this.

6. biological hereditary is material?

That's not necessarily the whole truth. Processes of live originating could be guided, explaining why abiogenesis happens though it should be extremely unlikely to happen. Those processes could be made more likely due to a preselection of what's possible as the goal of their entropical drive.

7. memories are stored inside your brain as material traces?

Memories by humans are stored in highly abstracted form, and must be recreated on reuse after a longer time. On the spectrum between possibilities and the determinate, older Memories get stretched out. We require good access to the realm of possibilities to recreate old Memories well.

8. your mind is inside your head?

Consciousness in our case reaches from the determined into possibilities. The determined part of is in our brain and the neuronal states in it, the entropical reaching out to possibilities by raising probabilities of something possible in our mind reaches out.

9. psychic phenomena like telepathy are impossible?

Some things viewed as "psychic" are possible, explainable, and observable. While lifting things with your mind currently lacks any support, other "phenomenon" like intuition and "mind reading" are easily explained as evolutionary instinct and tricks.

10. mechanistic medicine is the only kind that works?

It's well known that pharmaceuticals aren't the only factor. From placebo to determination, it's clear that the body can play a role in medicine. This however does *not* mean that magical crystals can heal you.

I won't mention herbal medicine, since it's the basis for modern pharmaceuticals and very obviously works, just not as effectively as engineered medicine.

The deceptions of organized religion

But not just science leaders deceive their community, religious organisations do also.

The church prevents knowledge of things like the vatican having been built on a mithraetic temple, Christmas being the celebration of mithras days of the invincible sun, Christ was born in april, even the gospel hints on that, the hat of the pope is dedicated to mithra, the bible was polytheist, the bible was a epic of gilgamesh knock of, the bible and the canon wasn't decided in nicea at all, nicea was to decide about implementing of fake trinities, psychics who mess around with believers by romes pleasing.

And of course that most of the bible was written 300 years after Christ died, largely by roman tribal agents.

Also that John the baptist was Jesus religious leader.

Let's look at Christmas real quick – it's a pagan celebration that was rebranded for Christianity without holding any true Christian meaning.

The solstice of Christmas was celebrated by pagans for ages before Christianity, that Christ was born in April can be shown by Nasa science following back the star of betlehem and Chinese records of the star of betlehem plus your own gospels hint on it.

The Star of Bethlehem a Comet in 5-BC and the Date of the Birth of Christ

Show affiliations

Humphreys, C. J.

Astronomical and historical evidence suggests that the Star of Bethlehem was a comet which was visible in 5 BCV and described in ancient Chinese records. A comet uniquely fits the description in Matthew of a star which newly appeared, travelled slowly through the sky against the star background and 'stood over' Bethlehem. It is proposed that a remarkable sequence of three astronomical events stimulated the journey of the Magi: the triple conjunction of Saturn and Jupiter in 7 BCV the massing of the three planets Saturn, Jupiter and Mars in 6 BC; and finally the appearance in 5 BC of the 'star of Bethlehem', a comet initially in Capricornus. It is shown that each of these three events would have been rich in significance to the Magi, and the combination would have provided a very clear sign that a mighty new king was about to be born in Israel. The evidence points to Jesus being born in the period 5 BC March 9 - May 4, probably around Passover time: 5 BC April 13-27. Birth in the spring is consistent with the account in Luke that there were shepherds living out in the fields nearby keeping watch over their flock by night. Birth in 5 BC is also consistent with the census of Caesar Augustus. The date of the Nativity presented here enables a new chronology of the life of Christ to be constructed which is consistent with the available evidence.



Publication: Quarterly Journal of the Royal Astronomical Society,
Vol. 32, NO.4/DEC, P.389, 1991

For immoral people get declared saints:

<https://www.rcinet.ca/en/2013/05/07/canadian-study-mother-teresa-not-so-saintly/>

The research team of Professor Serge Larivée, from the Department of Psychoeducation at the University of Montreal, and colleague Geneviève Chénard, along with Carole Sénéchal from the University of Ottawa's Faculty of Education suggest that the Vatican should have taken a closer look at her views, and handling of money.

Echoing earlier work by journalist and author Christopher Hitchens, they say that her image does not stand up to fact, and that beatification was orchestrated by an effective media campaign. The authors say that Mother Teresa's rise to international attention began with an interview on the BBC with the famous Malcolm Muggeridge who shared her anti-abortion views. She quickly realized the power of mass media and used it effectively in promotion.

The Canadian research team collected 502 documents on the life and work of Mother Teresa (Agnes Gonxha), and after eliminating duplicates, were left with 287 documents about the founder of the Order of the Missionaries of Charity (OMC)

They raise questions about "her rather dubious way of caring for the sick, questionable political contacts, her suspicious management of the enormous sums of money she received, and her overly dogmatic views regarding, in particular, abortion, contraception, and divorce."

During her life, she opened over 500 missions welcoming the sick and the poor, but doctors visiting such missions in Calcutta described them more as "homes for the dying". They claimed there was significantly poor hygiene, even unfit conditions, a shortage of real care, inadequate food, and no painkillers.

"There is something beautiful in seeing the poor accept their lot, to suffer it like Christ's Passion. The world gains much from their suffering," was her reply to criticism, cites the journalist Christopher Hitchen.

The report suggests that although her foundation raised hundreds of millions of dollars, but was less than generous with it to those in need. During numerous floods in India or following the explosion of a pesticide plant in Bhopal, she offered numerous prayers and medallions of the Virgin Mary but no direct or monetary aid.

Doctors also dispute the miracle that was accredited to Mother Teresa, saying it was their drug treatment that cured a Monica Besra of her abdominal pain caused by an ovarian cyst and tuberculosis.

The Vatican however, was quick to classify it as a miracle. Mother Teresa's popularity was such that she had become untouchable for the population, which had already declared her a saint. "What could be better than beatification followed by canonization of this model to revitalize the Church and inspire the faithful especially at a time when churches are empty and the Roman authority is in decline?" Larivée and his colleagues ask.

The researchers say that Mother Teresa undoubtedly inspired others to humanitarian work which has helped many of the sick and poor around the world but suggest that media coverage of Mother Teresa should have been more rigorous.


Organized religion is wack.

The abrahamic religions have leaders of people who put little boy wiener in their mouths and think they are greater than God, dye society in their colors and suppress society under them, declare immoral people saints and rely on them to solve their problems, use missionaries to further overpopulation and spread illnesses, create a legal vacuum in their rows for members to abuse with pedophilia and violence, dictate interpretation of their scripture they put together in the worst ways, rule that cutting of foreskin is not a body modification which are generally haram by scripture but dressing female like is one because they say so, being gay means you need to get brutally murdered but raping your 3 year old wife every day is halal if she doesn't die from internal bleedings, proclaiming pedophile heavens and more.

Also the statistics about charity contributions of organized religion are fraudulent. I heard organized religion counts donations to themselves as charity contributions from them.

They make members do charity work treating them like slave workers and take the glory, while they do hardly anything, have largely the states pay for their building upkeeps and do hardly anything while horting piles of gold having people starving around them.

Because the bible tells us so



There is no actual proof for the bible being the word of God – faith as per the bible is based on circular logic - deception. Christians avoid learning about the historic backgrounds of their scripture. That is, of ancient semites influenced by the stories of the epic of gilgamesh coming up with stuff while being on psychedelic 'shrooms. The bible was largely polytheist originally, thats the historical consensus.

On the gospels, hardly any of them are from apostles, most of them were written 300 years later by roman tribal engineers loosely based on apostolic Jewish culture.

The scriptures may have some validity based on things that were actually highly inspired, but other parts of it are mere nonsense.

Religious teaching is based on deception like scientific worldview education.

What can we make of it

Syncretism would be possible by just fixing the parts. Science and all of theology go together perfectly if you only take into consideration what's actually true, not what is fabricated for its utility.

+the chances of a universe randomly happening are basically non-existent.

+why do physical laws exist and not contradict

Physical laws happening in a non-contradictory fashion in a way that allows life is already extremely unlikely, plus it necessitates things moving from the possible to the determinate to begin with, the very thing I'm claiming

microorganisms forming is even more unlikely without guided procedure, etc

The universe has a sequential build model but where did that come from.

+What is energy and where did it come from

+why are we not p-zombies

+science largely accepts the placebo effect but does not care to explain it


+why do we feel the gaze of other people

+Don't forget physical constants change

+it's impossible to explain the emergence of the universe holding to the continuance of physical laws and our best models

Did all the quantum fluctuations randomly end up consistently making physical laws convenient for us, and keep doing so just because? No, they aim towards them because that's part of the universe's concept on top of their entropic drive, within the all-encompassing entropic wave between what's possible and the determinate.

We are taught worldviews for effective consequences because belief holds power, not for truth-aptness, for that reason they deceive us.



The Worldviews of education are self validating or self-defeating not truth-apt. As I'll explain in the next section what doesn't get recorded doesn't really exist.



Things that get recorded in the visual section of our brain (or any other thing that can record) have their wave function collapse and the version of the highest probability becomes real.

Otherwise it's a dance of probabilities.

Crucial is the impact of belief on those probabilities.

And that's precisely why it's important for the leaders' self-interest what we believe. They give us self-validating/defeating worldviews – if we believe them they control us.

But nothing of it seems to hold up to scrutiny well. Our very laws of logic consist of 4 principles – a useless tautology and 2 laws that are simply wrong in detail and 1 grossly oversimplification that's dangerous.

You can see the same methods of making us believe whatever is comfortable to our leaders no matter how wrong it is looking at political news. Russia attacked Ukraine in February 2022 but hasn't done much wrong before that. But the western media was shitting on Russia for a decade before that. In fact Ukraine fought 2 wars against the separatist regions without Russian involvement and lost them. Then the Minsk agreement happened that granted the separatist regions independence and you can validate it had nothing to do

with russia by looking at the minsk agreement. But that didn't stop western media from claiming the opposite, and the cisa controlled social media from shitting at russia. Then the west hired nazi regiments to brutally bomb and genocide the separatist regions with artillery, russia invaded later based on that.

More examples would be wikileaks and snowden for example. Edward snowden fled the USA under the danger of getting executed for being a hero, then he went to England. In England he gave a lot of documents to wikileaks. Later he fled on to russia after the US fangs reached to England.

Wikileaks founder assagne suddenly got accused of the claims of a woman that he raped her, the western standard method to frame political opposition in the population.

Wikileaks went down and up again, and suddenly we heard the documents aren't genuine, they are Russian fakes and snowden was never in England, he went straight to Russia.

Conveniently western law ruled a while ago about the necessary forgetfulness of the internet, that somehow only concerns things our leaders don't like, not anything that would be in our interest, and the news about snowden and his doings in England were taken down.

A+theist worldview by attempted truth-aptness not effective consequences shaped for the whims of our leadership, namely the ones who buy up power with money.

A+theism

All of the issues we listed in last section can be resolved easily and the universe explained holistically if we make following considerations:

Entropy is the natural tendency of spectra to measure the probability of a state, and to drive towards the higher probability of a state.

And minds are an entropical drive between the spectra of all that is possible and what is determinate in instance, in case of humans through an conceptual filter of abstractioned beliefs into concepts by another entity.

Multiple decision worthy possibilities build between continuing on what is, the mind decides between possibilities with will and intelligence.

So if you have the sum of all possibilities onto that which is already determined in instance its entropy drive(mind) can


*measure that which is already determined reflect upon memories)

*guess higher probability state based upon something that is possible towards an instance of its understanding upon the whole (thinking about possibilities)

*determine instanciated probability state by the whole (memorise observations)

*decide upon one of the sum of seeming possibilities, which would usually be of the highest probability in instance as per being

A material body, so basically a determined body as ones root is only necessary for minds that root in the determinate, not for minds that root in possibilities.



All 3 entropy arrows can point to conscious or unconscious actors. The one of entities would be the one of beings and objects, the one of the deterministic universe would govern physical law and be satan in principle, the one of the back of the wave would give us intuition, the possibilities of free will, and be God.

Since we are part of an all-encompassing wave between all that is possible and the determinate of God, we are basically actors in a dream of God.

physicalism really doesn't remotely make sense, this pyramid could never have built bottom up.

At which point do quantum fluctuations decide to fix a universe without contradictions by a rindler horizon if it's not due to a mind thinking about concepts?

And you believe this happens bottom up against the direction of entropy.... for no reason at all? When just accepting it happens by the guided direction of entropy instead explains everything fine instead making no sense at all? also if you look at any bottom up building process at all, it always starts with something very static and fixed, the axiom so to say, and on the other end we have the fluctuations.

Suddenly physicalists want to spin that around for no reason.

The fact that anything exists, and did change, necessitates that reality that is made up by waves, is subordinate to a parent wave that transfers between possibilities and the determinate. This is how the universe came into existence, possibilities were determined, also modern science doesn't say reality is made up by things, but instead reality is a dance of probabilities. A probability there is merely a x% determined possibility. The principle of entropy states that entropy is the natural drive of a spectrum to measure probability of a state(perception) and increase its probability. In order for the parent wave to entropically increase probabilities its required to take into account all that is already determined, so all quantum fluctuations in existence. That requires enormous intelligence. Our minds are those reaching from the determined in direction of possibilities in entropic order, those are surrounded by the part of the parent wave that can be identified as satan, while the whole rest of the parent wave, mainly the part from infinite possibilities towards the determinate, that gives us intuition and free will, is God

Even when assuming the anthropic principle, it requires that physical laws initially formed, no? This means things went in and out of reality regarding physical law. This is already enough to posit a wave between all that is possible and the determinate, the same thing that then can explain a guiding force without additional complexity. Ok as I see it a special temporal framework is not necessary; reality only needs what itself is to have laws added: Part of the spectrum between possibilities and determinate on the side of determination. I understand time just as a flow of actualization of possibilities into the determinate. A waveform implies some systematic, but this can be done through its own determined possibilities. The internal complexity builds naturally from the entropically effect to raise probabilities. In order to keep raising probabilities its necessary to take into account what

already has been done on a new selection of a possibility, which creates intelligence on the systematic wave building from side of possibilities.

I don't think my theory poses a problem to relativity, spacetime and causality if we understand time as an actualization interval from possibilities to the determinate. If we consider the entropically drive to increase probability on a possibility and selecting possibilities out of infinite possibilities in question has to take into account, all the quantum fluctuations as a whole it explains high potential for coherent structures and high intelligence. I think quantum uncertainty points to an overlying concept, not to an underlying logic.

Holding on to the laws of Einstein makes it impossible to explain the beginning of the universe which leads scientists to believe the laws changed in between. My theories show a possible way how. Selecting from infinitely many possibilities never results in statistical inevitability.

I assume the universe is made up of waves that are subordinate to a parent wave so that the whole of waves is circling between possibilities and determinate.

We are granted free will through Gods feeding back from infinite possibilities into our brains. Quantum fluctuations base and those neuronal outlooks give rise to our recreation/reconstruction of memories also once set.

Don't forget the entropic principle on raising likelihood on topic.

If you decide between "it just keeps happening by chance of infinitesimal small probability" or "here we have a good explanation" you would normally go for the latter.

Are you curious about how free will works if there's someone turning every single gear of the universal clock?

It's because our being reaches the breaking points of possibilities as opposed to the determinate giving us the ability to choose measure of growth of possibilities in us to the determinate.

This can be tested by

Theoretically by either neuronal science with quantum science accepting that the quantum fluctuations base is biased in good favor for the being growing up and thinking, or by the improbability statistics of the universes sequential build model emerging and keeping up.

Especially also in abiogenesis.

As per entropic entities building, I would expect biases towards life in the chemical procedures, meaning when chemically in procedures are multiple possible outcomes, I assume a bias towards outcomes that in combination produce life.

But where's your proof? [Where's] Your designer's signature?

If we take meta-rulesets into account, the designers signature would be that those are smooth shaped and not rough shaped. If they happened just because you'd have to assume they would be rough shaped.

About Newtonian and Einstein physics.

If you assumed coincidence you'd have to wonder if it even behaved as a function not rather a relation. At the very least the function would form a zig-zag line.

Morality

I want to give some context evil can be seen as actions of "arbitrary" free will in the direct context of reality that reduce freedom of other members of society.

"arbitrary" in this sentence does not directly inherit the colloquial meaning of arbitrary. It does not mainly refer to logical arbitrariness, but to the condition of a subset of free will, that results in the reduction or potential reduction of freedom of other members of society.

Furthermore, I point out that that which is evil, has an implementation, meaning a direct context, rather than an abstract context.

An abstract context is a projection of the context into a virtual space or other method that results in the separation of free will of the society member of the original context and the freedom of other members of said society.

An abstract context can still influence reality negatively by negatively affecting the user or someone involved, but it is a different kind of immorality.

I want to establish the definition of an approach to moral behavior, that does implement moral decisions by a synthesis of 2 different approaches Those are weighted differently.

The second most weighted approach is one of utilitarian kind, that uses logical evaluation of implications to find a solution that minimizes evil as defined above.

The most weighted approach is one that instead implements a set of laws with different weighting.

Moral safety Everyone gets his fair chances	
Prosperity No one left behind	Freedom We make our own decisions
Well-being The old one helps the new on the way (The senior usually educates the junior, be good parents)	Autonomy Be critical on symbolism and ask yourself twice or more

Objective moral law

I'm not saying countries should be enforced to by the west, I'm saying countries including western countries should be enforced to get into intellectual debate in which they have to agree that they use objectively worse moral law deliberately though they wouldn't have to and have that publicly broadcasted.

All self-deciding actors have in common that they express themselves to the universe and perceive the universe.

So bad acts are those that in total reduce actors' ability to express themselves to the universe/perceive the universe, and good acts increase it.

Preventing reduction of other beings' freedoms is overall more important than actors right to express freedom arbitrarily.

So, you must ask from the neutral position which arbitrary action reduces freedoms.

=>the action of posting nudes on Facebook=>arbitrarily reduces users rights for a safe for work platform

It would be a different story if it was laid out as a nsfw compatible platform.

=>the action of arbitrarily posting ads on Facebook=>reduces the platform hosts freedom to monetize their platform

User says only Allah's moral law is objective as given in scripture:

That's complete and utter nonsense. Theism started with polytheism and people did worship Allah's wife originally. Allah does give commandments in the bible multiple times that he DOESN'T want to have executed. Jesus even expands on that and says screw you if you blindly follow the law, you should become morally steady like a rock instead.

God selects entirely different prophets throughout history with different focuses that partly even contradict each other.

There is not "one definite specific" morally objective law there cannot be "one definite specific" morally objective law. The world is fluent, one time you have cavemen hunting boars with clubs, the other time you have an intergalactic civilization flying around with spaceships.

If you give cavemen the commandment to skin animals, to use their fur pelts to cover your blossoms that's meaningless to the intergalactic civilization.

So, you cannot have specific moral law that's definite, you can only have specific moral meta law that's definite.

Instead of skin animals and put their furs around you, or cover your blossoms, you'd have to say:

The self-deciding actors' nature is to express themselves to the universe and perceive the universe. Thus, society should optimize this regarding individuals' avatars so that the intellectual value and content of the expression does not get underrated.

To realize Objective moral law as far as possible

It's a bit going through with rule of the thumb but it's not that hard to do alright if you have enough reasonability.

1. Go to the base action of the topic before consequences.
(peeing in public, posting nudes on Facebook, putting ads on Facebook as the user)
2. Wonder about the influences of these actions on other people's freedoms, are they arbitrary, do they restrict other people's freedoms.
3. If there are systematic consequences in place, are they just?