Notes:

"*A designer knows he has achieved perfection not when there is nothing left to add, but when there is nothing left to take away.*" ~ Antoine de Saint-Exupery

I have no idea what content you wish your document to posses. that is entirely up to you.

"*The goal is for every entity to be in peace and gladly contributing to the flourishing of the universe in unity.*" ~ acceptGod

How do you know what every entities goal is? Have you asked everything? How can you possibly know what anything's goal is other than your own goal? Even if others say one thing can you know that to be the case? Does the world look like everyone has this goal? If no then where did this assertion come from? Where else could it have come from other than yourself? I never only ask one question sorry. It is good that you are thinking about such things. These questions are age old and the only consistent thing that comes up is that people come up with different answers.

Add from Acd on observer topic

Title:Out of the danger zone

A holistic description of the principles of how the universe was established, what it is made of what is life, conscious, God, and how to get it on track again

How to save the world?

1)Reasonability

1.1)Moral standard

1.2)set theory

1.3)why 10 laws basis

2)Dependance

2.1)high from low – and NOT low from high

2.2)effect of clinging and pride

2.3)safety coming from common understanding

Transitions and connections important to follow the thing

I think you can structure this however you want, but if you're asking how I would structure something like this I might generally follow the scientific method:

1. Relevant observations. (Laying the groundwork for why it is necessary to have a discussion)

2. Hypothesis (Expand specifically on what you're trying to show here. No need for any proof or demonstration in this section. Should be connected to questions raised in the observation section)

3. Planning (What kinds of proof would demonstrate your hypothesis is true? This section can be short because it will naturally lead to the next section)

4. Demonstration of the truth of your hypothesis (or the falsity, if that's the case). (This would be real world examples, descriptions, etc of the type you predicted would prove your hypothesis in section 3. I would think this section and section 2 would be the largest sections of your work.)

5. Conclusion (This will reassert that your data from 4 demonstrates your hypothesis (or not). You can also either assert that this data is conclusive and that you believe you've fully demonstrated that you are correct, or that you think you're only partially there.)

6. Where do we go from here? (How does your hypothesis help us? Good time to connect back to questions raised in 1. What do we need to study from here on out?)

How to save the world?

1)Reasonability

What is reasonable? Why should I act reasonable?

What is unreasonable? Egoism, clinging to power, collateral damage

Rulers who are not acting objective, are not doing their natural duty

Hierarchy in nature are held from below

And after your turn, you are held accountable from below.

Hierarchies are only doing their job if they are improving the below context

In today's age with super weapons, ruling egoistically and basically playing world domination on the shoulders of the country is getting dangerous

Indeed, desire of power is problematic in power position it seems

With collateral damage I meant system kills of population, but environment is also important

Rulers have the duty to mediate the lower context

You can't mediate the lower context if you are not considerate of it's state and situation

Mediating the lower context is why binding forces with a degree of freedom are granted degree of freedom

I think nature works this way because it's the logical consequence of the observation

-being granted a degree of freedom of mediating below context to dissolve inconsistency (not getting along)

-you are trying to improve the situation for the parts you are binding

Improving below context, is what cells, organs, sentient beings naturally do for below context

After your turn you are held accountable from below. I remember the weird court arrangement where God helped me out, before I arrived in this universe

Context is, for example status of cells in a cell cluster.

Or the status of your flavor's consistency.

Context seems to catch it all as a term.

You are right, that natural hierarchy and societal are not of same kind.

"most of universe does not follow hierarchy"?

'Its just stuff in different patterns'?

Patterns that are defined by binding rules from hierarchical binding forces?

Are you unable to see the pattern on your patterns?

Just state your disproving example, so I can comment on it

Or do you want to assert orbital objects do not have patterns or lifeforms don't? I don't see what you are trying to say

A pattern comes from hierarchical binding putting a rule, if there is one. There does not need to be a definite pattern

There are patterns, just not clear ones

If there was no pattern it's chaos

so, then you would agree that the rules wouldn't exist if there wasn't a pattern to demonstrate it?

Depends if they are established

So, rules can be established without anything to demonstrate that it exists, according to your logic?

Sigh,

There is accountability from the lower context

Btw you can argue based individualism, if done right, will lead to higher intrinsically consistency, collectivism is a superficial solution (with based I mean some solid philosophical base)

1.1)   Moral standard

Back to moral: An entity's moral usually mirrors his idea of what the context should become like

It's an input to the whole of morality request to the context, which can be governed democratically

Self-Morality-ideas are a form of expectation/desire on the context future

They channel request, for an inventory status

But have to be processed reasonably

Morality feelings are an inherent truth

The question should be how to improve your own reasonably

Morality is a fact, not it's content per entity

How do I explain this?

Maybe entity x has an idea of morality like everyone has to act like described in "knigge"

That doesn't make it true

An entities morality is his idea of the context goal

If an entity takes his context idea to heart, it becomes moral feelings

The system of binding forces that raise in hierarchical depth

Requires sub-units that have their own unique

In order for the system to advance

Imagine your flavors where all samey, your creativity would be weak

As goes for societys

But you can also see a common moral basis is necessary

It's the system of self improvement through hierarchical and environmental syncing from the universe

That's a potential definition for morality. Why is it practical?

Because as you use long-term and short-term memory, for it's use cases, moral memory is best used in moral use cases, in combination with process update. It should be caressed as other mental ability

You've used to term "moral use case" for these imaginary or example cases, why would it be practical to use a system of morals in those instances?

You should use a hammer for nails, works better than a screwdriver for nails

Because the degree of freedom, which you are acting upon, gets the input in adequately format for usage

Using the screwdriver for the nails requires more raw force, while the hammer does his own job of pushing the nail in

You get the idea

The moral framework in moral use case, when caressed, will support the process and make it easy doing the correct decision. Only when caressed though

Because evolutionary the moral framework is the expert on the job in social mammals

When it's used right...

Not sure how well it's developed for what species

But ours is pretty good when caressed

It's like the client does update and work on a cloud part, a distributed system of contributors

You're stating (I think) that morality usage would allow a contribution to society?

Think back about those moral use cases and about why they support a societal structure when they're used in those cases. Why does morality work better than say purely thinking about the self?

I would say the main thing: Morality frameworks mirror your context idea, meaning, you think context based instead self-based. So it allows for more unbiased thinking, instead egoistic conclusions.

It is very much your consideration. You act as your idea of the context expects others to do.

Your idea, of the society, leads to expectations, how it's members should behave

Are they all unbiased and not self-based?

"what you take to heart" and this is not ego? not self-based?

Not necessarily unbiased. But not self based at least, in that it focusses on the context.

But it is you focused on the context. Why are you trying to remove your self from the equation?

Why would you want to remove Your values, Your consideration Your bias?

You don't, it's the very opposite.

You just don't betray them egoistically this way.

When you think self based when deciding for the context, you betray your values about morality

If our trying to say people often act very selfishly and other people get hurt as a result then I agree that is a fact of the world.

So "you think context based instead self-based" (or not selfishly or with consideration) and you have an expectation that this is how societies "members should behave".

You value 'consideration' you would like others to also share this value then? That I understand!

What I do not get is how that is not you, your ego or your bias, your desires.

Technically it is your ego, desires and CAN be biased.

But:

It doesn't have to, depending on how you caress your moral framework

"caress your moral framework" = ignore what is technically your ego and call it something else?

No, take to heart what is to be taken to heart

do you have a choice about what you take to heart?

can you choose to care when you do not care?

Yes, in my book I go on about this alot

why would you choose to care about something if you do not care about it?

For the context to get in better status

You're on the right track when you say morality frameworks mirror your context idea. However I agree with Riv that context idea is too loose a term. Morality is not something that generates unbiased thinking. What is the human mechanic(or function) that causes morality?

Empathy

Empathy is usually good…

but that implies you do care about it already or why would you want a better context?

Responsibility

do you mean you want to hold other people responsible or yourself?

and hold them to what standard? their standard or your standard?

Your responsibility, that arises from a contract

Depends on your position in society

Basically you want the law to be enforced to hold people to account to the contracts they sign in society?

I don't make such considerations, that's up to others

that is fine

you value Consideration, Honesty and Compassion

I believe that.

Be considerate, honest and compassionate. be your biased self

Is that not enough? Do you want more?

You want others to be likewise? Is that what you mean by "Moral Framework"?

Morality is the psychology of projecting ones own values onto some 'Ideal' they then give a label to which is anything other than their own bias.

Not really, I like diversity. But people improving themselves towards their better selves is always a good thing.

I just described my understanding.

Look carefully at all moralists or all religions and ideologies. they will all tell you to 'abandon self'. why?

So that they can persuade you to adopt 'their values, their bias', you know, for 'The greater Good'.

Be careful. If you are honest you only have your own values and nothing else.

As we just discussed, would it then not be better to try an create an empathy based moral system rather than focusing on responsibility? If you were to try to create a static moral system at all?

Isn't that naturally a thing? Just trust your instinct if you caressed your morals.

Not as you've described it. You've described creating a hierarchal responsibility based system. Previous static moral systems as Riv pointed out have been for "The Greater Good" or "What would Yahweh want?" Or whatever. It may seem natural, but the results don't end up that way

Also beard balm is an amazing thing and I'm glad to have discovered and shared this proud moment :joy:

I didn't described "creating", I understand it that moral duty follows from responsibility of context, logically.

If this logical duty is to take into laws, is for others to decide

Same for other changes

You believe there is a "moral duty follows from responsibility of context"?

That is not dependent upon Law? Not dependent upon Self-Bias either your or anyone else?

This is a common belief I have ever understood.

How can I learn about this "moral duty"?

:rofl: teen cartoons and animation?

we do use narratives and stories to generate empathy for characters to express values for sure

we project our inner values in a multitude of ways to one another to find common ground.

entertainment and fear are methods.

I know which I prefer

Fear is meh

Stops advancing of system until it eventually would break

The great moral question of modernity is "how do we live in a pluralistic society, where everyone has different beliefs and ideas about what is wrong and right?" I think you're touching on an answer. Maybe expand further

When distanced entities share common interest, conflict could arise. The solution is to close the distance, by valuing self in a way that accepts the diversity of the world, and the diversity of the world accepting itself. But the diversity of the world still needs to become a working set. That's where the base comes in.
^^^^ The real question to answer is How do you effectively get to value self in a way that accepts the diversity of the world?
I think the first answer touches the understanding of how hate arises. Hate comes, were the road goes. The road can be
-your plan for the future
-a chunk of your expectations following your will by your personal understanding (not necessarily correct understanding)
The cause of the disappearing road is usually the target of hate - or, in many cases people or groups used as scapegoats
Therefore, the solution here is better roadmap and road mapping ability Also open minds, don't get affected easily
=>Without hate, how to arrive at acceptance? Acceptance stems from facing fear So stopping to run away.
=>The 3rd part is valuing self in a compatible way. The solution is to be consistent

An observer can only observe data streams or not observe data streams, yet not observing data streams is not an experience. Meaning it is only possible to observe data streams for an observer. Resulting in the consequences of a will to optimize data streams.

The general existence can't be "undone". General existence came to conscious before, it would again. It's the biggest mistake possible, wanting to "end" things. At worst, at an actual reset, we'd have to go through the messy past again. At a blink of an eye we would be reborn as one-cellars or something. -Scary business-

that is why I ask. What is Moral Realism is For? I want to know the motive. i want the Psychology.

Not making enemy's at all

that would be nice. in the real world they will find you.

Yes it seems when you make big changes there will always be some. Still, it's comparably extremely much better than egoism

what is egoism to you?

Not taking the everything into consideration enough
On decisions

yeah. The Selfish person does not consider other people. however, a person that act according only to the own Self-interests need not be selfish. A person can value other people and take them into consideration. by the sound of it that is your value. You can give yourself credit for that. Other people will value that in you. That is how it works in reality. Those that do not care about other people and act inconsiderately will likewise inevitably be judged accordingly by others. that is how our social reality works and it does that without any Objective Moral System. this is the "Universe" or how nature works in us. The Golden Rule are generalized formulae used to teach these social facts. They call it morality and try to embody it with Authority.

More awareness would help

Yes Awareness is key. keep expanding your awareness and learning

It's like saying you'd have gravity in the solar system without the sun. Morality to me is contingent on a concious agent in a social environment

No. It's true that there are objective reasons why they think it's bad

I guess this depends on how you define moral facts. For realists it would mean things that are true even without people. Just like the sun shining
U can have facts about why someone thinks something and even about what they think but that doesn't mean what they think is true without context or without them

To me is doing something for yourself in spite of what it would do to others.
Altruism for me is just defined as any behavior that helps others (whether or not it helps yourself too is separate)

what is an objective reason?
I need to go out a bit. get some air.

Evolution. Nature. Social meme development across history. Nurture. Etc

I don't think all Moral Realists understand it this way.

Sure. But that's how it's defined in methaethics courses and consistent with most literature on it
Most realists assume a god standard btw
Objective (independent of minds) vs subjective (mind dependent) Real (true as any fact is true) vs non realism (constructed) Absolute (always the same independent of context) vs relative (depends on factors that vary with time, space, persons, etc)
Moral realism entails moral objectivism and usually highly correlated with absolutism

I think morality depends on minds by definition so it is subjective. But there objective reasons why people reach those notions. It is real in that it exists as a social construction that can be measured and studied in the social zeitgeist or internalized in one's mind. But not real separate from concious beens in the same way that the sun is. It is what it is... but it that doesn't mean it ought to be that way. It is absolute in that the universe has rules of what works and will happen whether we know it or not. But not absolute in a sense that it is the same everywhere. In fact, evidence shows perceptions change with environment.
I think people who talk of absolute, real, objective morality in the terms above are talking about something that doesn't exist and that they can prove it does

Btw it's not really that I would have made those up for the most part.. In my understanding
They are from my spiritual journey

I am not sure what spiritual journey means but sure

when people talk of spiritual I interpret that as psychological or mental. try to think of language people use as metaphorical rather than literal definitions. So God would be equivalent to nature for us in my opinion. then the sentence makes sense which ever way round it is translated

Well sometimes that's not what they mean at all
I dont want to guess what they mean

1.1.1)observations

1.1.2)hypothesis

1.1.3)Planning

1.1.4)Demonstration

1.1.5)Conclusion

1.1.6)Recommendation

1.2)set theory

Set theory:

So the idea is, that if a belief system is exclusive for their idea of heaven, you build another spirit safe zone that includes all religions and atheists around it, as a rescue net

Why not just let all people in based off of whether or not they were a good person since god has objectively good morals (somehow)?

More efficient

is your use of sets to find a set that is all inclusive and thus not divisive?

It's not supposed to be divisive at all

what divides us?

Intolerance, egoism

should we be tolerant of everything then and give up our own biases (which we have already agreed I think to be technically impossible)?

No, that's unnecessary especially if you aren't responsible for a general context

so divisions then are necessary?

No

That's why sets are a thing

You are not divided if you have some outer connected bond

you say intolerance divides us. i agree.

but you say tolerance of everything is not necessary also.

So, you use sets to get round this problem?

ask yourself. what do you tolerate and what are you not prepared to tolerate and why?

what would you like others to tolerate and not tolerate and why, if you wish to concern yourself with how others think at all that is.

or what do you think 'we ought' to tolerate and not tolerate.

can we talk about tolerance without drawing circles around ideas and dividing things? is division something bad to be avoided? why?

oh and what is this "outer connected bond"? I would like to know :slight_smile:

I'm intolerant of cruelty.

Aside from that I can accept things, I think.

Also, I wasn't really talking about myself building more than one sets. That happens by itself. The outer bond is the outer connecting set A, which includes T1, T2, T3 and so on

so set A includes all but excludes Cruelty?

I think we can ignore Yahweh-ism (but yes that is a cruel system) these are IT's own thoughts which is good :heart:

what if T1 wants to be cruel to T2 because they are intolerant of that group and do not call their intolerance cruel because they call it morality instead and claim it is T2's fault for not 'choosing' the good of T1?

is not prison cruel?

or social exclusion?

or eating meat?

So much stuff to consider.

But generally it should be easy enough to not get excluded from A.

But if there is a heaven you gonna have to get self-consistent mostly

Is Set A a group that accepts all but Cruelty?

how are you defining Set A?

Set A would be like you stay in your current degree of freedom

I was thinking more theory based.

It means rebirth in similar situations.

It is what currently seems to work out in my understanding :man_shrugging:

If there's just substance and binding force, how's that gonna work

Why not making a ever improving just system

if you have the Power @acceptGod-improve to change those observable facts or think they are different please let me know how so :heart:

it is often ironically our desires which contribute to our suffering the most

Set A means don't be cruel, suggestion is to uphold the 10 laws

Lets say you have lifeforms including humanity in set A

Now there's set Christianity T, Islam T2 and so on

It just works when its a T ⊆ A system

If A is a working set...

You make A a working set by applying the "base"

The base is a moral and understanding base using common truths

What I have in common with everybody else in this world

Existence, life, reality

Existence:

As an entity

Life:

As a life circle

Reality/Universe rule:

As Gods concept of self

Moral resolution:

The goal is for every entity to be in peace and gladly contributing to the flourishing of the universe in unity.

This is the resolution, because, as an unbound entity we are not getting based on what we contribute.

As a life circle, I.e., the humans body elements altogether are giving based on what they are receiving.

A cell is part of the whole, the only way to flourish is to contribute and trust.

As a part of reality, unlike an unbound entity, we altogether are getting based on how we are contributing together.

The universe rule is "attract or repel, distance per self-value comparison"

Close distancing leads to groups.

When distanced entities share common interest, conflict could arise.

The solution is to close the distance, by valuing self in a way that accepts the diversity of the world, and the diversity of the world accepting itself. But the diversity of the world still needs to become a working set.

That's where the base comes in.

An evil action is what(increasing in severity)

1. prevents flourishing (uphold and follow the will of improvement)

2. leads to a general dislike of others, or giving up on hope for society

3. leads to general apathy or disliking existing itself

4. Takes away chances for betterment

It's in the actors' responsibility to be aware in reasonable possible ways

Good means to

1. Encourage flourishing

2. Participating into an convincing likable society

3. Lead to general empathy

This regards lifeforms of today and in the future, depending on their used and unused potential and future potential Unused Potential is the unused possibility of betterment, targeting optimizing way and goal towards general good.

Unused potential should be treated with goodwill and viewed with a wide range and a principle of charity.

We should keep diversity

About the conflicts between authoritarian and more lenient systems:

The goal should be little necessary pressure, but that's not possible everywhere to do safely right now. The question should be more how to arrive at less necessary pressure over time generally.

Is there any question less necessary pressure is better? I wouldn't see why.

My recommendation on how to get to less necessary pressure is to teach more critical thinking and have people think more for themselves "why", but also explain the basic necessity

Then we also need things that are a "general values everyone can agree to"

Just some basic things, for example my suggestion

A - Blame yourself first to be(come) good, blame others first and you take a step towards becoming evil

B - maximize Group inclusion where it matters, meaning people shouldn't be outcasted for being different

C - Understanding over Authority, authority where needed, but less of it due to understanding is better

D - make someone feel loved is to give him joy, driving him to improve is often better => make someone rightfully love himself is the greatest gift, but it should be out of free will

E - Cattle gives help - treat it accordingly,

Consequentionally humanity is to give wildlife help

(There should be a possibility of "leasing natural habitat areas" for a good price by the international community to protect them)

F: Hyrarchies with transparency moving upwards, upper Hierarchies should be held accountable from below

H: Stigma is rarely worth it

It can for example be about some government being pushed into a corner, its often better to give them an escape route, than to try to force them into full consent

Other examples could be about religious dogma

So basically the meaning is:

Don't be to greedy also about putting the things in a way you think is right; to much at once can backfire later

1.2.1)observations

1.2.2)hypothesis

1.2.3)Planning

1.2.4)Demonstration

1.2.5)Conclusion

1.2.6)Recommendation

1.3)why 10 laws basis

Ontological commitment

10, because there are 10 degrees of binding, when you take none into account

No, not about legal stuff. It's the laws of the universe, because binding. They are laws towards lower, expectations from lower to higher, holding accountable

what if they are just a list of observations, thoughts, desires, fears and feelings you have had to date and are not Laws in any meaningful sense at all?

That would be a ridiculous coincidence

I didn't even define them

Except maybe 1

Well yes, we are part of multiverse

Hm... Well it aligns with my theory and observations

-the old universe ending

-arriving in the new one

-dreams

-astral traveling dreams

1.3.1)observations

1.3.2)hypothesis

1.3.3)Planning

1.3.4)Demonstration

1.3.5)Conclusion

1.3.6)Recommendation

"**my 10 suggestions for humanity to adopt to enable us to get along better.**"

10, because there are 10 degrees of binding, when you take none into account

1 law for every degree of binding

1)We are the universe and as its inhabitants, making our own decisions

2)Everyone gets his chances

3)No one left behind

4)Social Norms suck hard time, so do better... In many ways. Especially when you understand social norms

5)The Old one supports new one on the way

6)Also we want to live consciously... So hiding sucks eventually

7)Symbolism sucks hard time, Demonization even more.

8)God is in charge of the higher...

9)Perdue your ideal self(Perdue? Hm... Lost to sight; hidden; in concealment; in ambush)

10)Logic and scientist are both needed... Truly understand the meaning of that if you want... The workforce to, spinning things

Interpretation:

1)According to the entirety of my worldview I've been presenting here, everything is made from avatars, partly still possessed. The universe basicly being Gods
10)maybe try to read the resume/fazit of my book

1.

We are the universe is better interpreted "put the we first"

Hierarchy as more degree of freedom comes with more degree of responsibility towards everyone

Accountable from below

Putting the we first, doesn't mean we have to be samey, not at all. That would be putting the higher context first. But no, this means: The above Regulator considers the lower context first.

Interpretation on originating level:

2)everyone gets his chances

limited lifespan

3)No one left behind

Interpretation on flavor/organ level

Expectation to be eventually granted life leading chance (sharing partly human conscious as flavor)

4)Social Norms suck hard time, so do better... In many ways. Especially when you understand social norms

Interpretation on subflavor/cell cluster level (sharing partly human conscious as subflavor)

Expectation to have a degree of freedom in better or worse

5)The Old one supports new one on the way

Interpretation on cell level (sharing partly human conscious)

Expectation to have a degree of freedom in passing away

6)Also we want to live consciously... So, hiding sucks eventually

Interpretation on molecule /atom cluster level… same, wanting a degree of freedom

7)Symbolism sucks hard time, Demonization even more.

Interpretation on Atom level…

Maybe radioactive stuff shouldn't be made?

8)God is in charge of the higher...

Hardrons: (proton, neutron) => decay is their action

9)Perdue your ideal self(Perdue? Hm... Lost to sight; hidden; in concealment; in ambush)

Quarks:an quarks ideal is not interacting with nature is their action… or rather they interact on difference, preference

Resulting in minds growth and value distance grouping (entanglement)

10)Logic and scientist are both needed... Truly understand the meaning of that if you want... The workforce to, spinning things

Leptoms: the leptom is the grouping leftover… which is the workforce to the higher

Leftover parts Resulting in logic and making logic

Interpretation on Human viewpoint:

2) to climb up in the hierarchy

Everyone gets his chances for becoming what he desires, in this universe. If it is granted depends on the will of the affected context.

3) No one left behind

 yes, so all the more reason to do stuff about it

Especially don't take chances for improvement away.

4) Social Norms suck hard time, so do better... In many ways

that's why they need improvement, they shouldn't bind a lot either

5) the old person holding a position in society should bring the later successor on his way, and be respected for that if done well enough

6) for example not embodying the universe much, also living unaware of meaning, just being another in the mass, without any distinction is boring

7) yeah, for example Hitler seems to have looked at the cross the wrong way.

Demonization sucks, because it's a 1-way ticket. It can only get worse for both sides from that.

9)basically, don't spill your rank

2)Dependence in the hierarchy

Defining the problem

The problem with dependencies is, that they might lead to abuse. The upper hierarchic position could think it has to abuse its position to make the lower context agree on his ways. But oppression on ways leads to intrinsic tension, that can also, at first subtly, shine to the outside.

Goal

The goal is to minimize authority/oppression to what is required.

2.1)Existentially the dependence is high from low – and NOT low from high

Higher hierarchy depends on lower in general uphold, which is of existential importance to the hierarchical position.

Lower hierarchy depends on higher in stability of the lower context, also when its unclear who is responsible for something, a higher hierarchy can help. Furthermore an higher hierarchy can help to respond faster to an event, and can support with an identifying reputation for the context

It's only natural that higher hierarchy is held accountable from below.

2.2)effect of clinging to a position in the hierarchy and pride

Clinging is usually problematic. Seeing things in foresight is better than in hindsight.

2.3)safety of the hierarchical context coming from a common understanding

The common understanding can grow on basic agreement in forms of laws and expectations.

Freedom of inquiry can help to join the understanding more.

3)philosophic and scientific theories

3.1)what is the universe

3.1.1)substance

3.1.2)binding force

3.1.2.1)without conscious

3.1.2.2)with conscious

3.2)what does it do

3.2.1)the absolute truth

3.2.2)self consistency

3.2.3)entropy

Medium article Theory V2

1. There's no considering something moral without a chosen standard

2. The laws of the universe determine what we chose as a standard (for morals)

C: The laws of the universe determine what is considered moral

But under this definition what is moral is determined by the laws of the universe.

but what is it for?

A threshold for getting along

I thought the goal was a kind, peaceful, happy world with freedom or something

Do you mean "How to overcome discrimination" And "Why we should not discriminate" And "Examples of what a society that does not discriminate looks like"? Just trying to clarify

We are all part of the whole, the material, you, me, a rock somewhere... the immaterial thoughts, flavors, God.... Basically its all of the same substance. The difference lies just in grouping.

Truths are like common binding rules.

The absolute truth from an universe is the binding rule all universe entity have in common.

The absolute rules of this universe: **Entity attract or repel(Group), distancing/seperating based on preference (by self-value comparison) and advance groups.**

What does that mean? For example it includes all the things you do all day and night.

Every change can be thought of as forming (or destroying) a group. For example, here are some actions you do every day, re-described in terms of grouping: Cooking is just grouping food elements eating is regrouping the food parts within your body sleeping is grouping/structuring your mind. Pooping destroys a group, by expelling the leftovers from the grouping done by your digestive system.

There's just substance and binding forces managing them

I call the more scientific application of this value distance grouping.

The natural world is made by substances formed by expectational rules in agreement.

An avatar is a group of entities that grant an degree of freedom of choice to an binding force unifying them. The binding force is the observer, when having that degree of freedom, or the degree of freedom is handed to a higher level binding force. The possession is done from below, so it's not a possession. By comparison of self-value.

Expectation can be computed, does not require binding force/observer

A passed observer leaves binding force

Information is a abstraction of expectations

A rocks groups and particles, group because they meet each others expectations by self ideal comparison..

They are not alive

Information is dealing with the selected idea or value of an lower entity

information

noun

1. facts provided or learned about something or someone.

2. what is conveyed or represented by a particular arrangement or sequence of things.

abstraction

noun

1. the quality of dealing with ideas rather than events.

2. freedom from representational qualities in art.

expectation

noun

plural noun: expectations

1. a strong belief that something will happen or be the case.

2. mathematics: another term for expected value.

Here

It seems to be something like

Attracting entities enrich self-consistency by bias

Repelling entities worsen self-consistency by bias

Neutral entities are self-consistent without bias

A rocks groups and particles, group because they meet each others expectations by self ideal comparison.. They are not alive. Information is dealing with the selected idea or value of an lower entity information

1. facts provided or learned about something or someone.

2. what is conveyed or represented by a particular arrangement or sequence of things.

abstraction noun

1. the quality of dealing with ideas rather than events.

2. freedom from representational qualities in art.

expectation noun plural noun: expectations

1. a strong belief that something will happen or be the case.

2. mathematics: another term for expected value.

So if you take the current state v of the universe; and v' is a following state; and v! Is completed low energy state,

va+vb+vc+vd=v for 4 assumed groups in v

v' = (va + vb)! + vd! +vc

Meaning some entities still are incomplete, but reach competition through others;

big bang state is when vc=0 entity count

Then vbreak = (v-a + vb) + vd!

After break up when va observer changes it's liking to v-a

Then v' = v1-a + (v2-a + vb)! + vd!

Continuing until v1-a = 0 entity (big bang state)

Until V'' = vab! + vd!

But it is impossible to reach V''' == vabd!

Which is why yin and yang

Would be a fast try of me describing that

Moving towards lower energy states is something a system will do only in relation to a lower energy environment.

if the entity is self-complete or isolated it cannot loose energy
what is it loosing it to?
chemistry as atoms move to lower energy states they give off heat
or light

It's just splitting up, because it's observer

" if you take the current state v of the universe"

So v is describing self-consistency

now you see i am confused. so v is no longer the current state of the universe?

The current self-consistency state

what does it mean to say the state of the universe is self-consistent or inconsistent for that matter?

maybe ...
but not now!
Conserved!
Except no dark energy > cosmological red shift

yes i imagine symmetry wins in end but this is not time or place for real physics

Self consistency is not expecting more than yourself V" = vab! + vd! The 2 would neither repel nor attract

It's overwhelmingly what the universe is made of

start just by defining all these terms in a manner where this maths makes sense. the state of the universe really is not generally going to be expressed in an equation which involves someone else

+ means binding force, with or without observer

Why are we reinventing general relativity
But making it worse?

Maybe, I never got acquainted with it

https://youtu.be/xZTb6sfHEX8
YouTube
PBS Space Time
Will the Universe Expand Forever? | Space Time | PBS Digital Studios

To be fair, Einstein probably spent more than an hour on it

I'm not sure he did
Lol
He sure couldn't do the math. I promise u that
He needed help too
https://youtu.be/-4PayaEgEZc
YouTube
PBS Space Time
Why the Universe Needs Dark Energy | Space Time | PBS Digital Studios

v = ? a = ? b = ? c = ? d = ? what does it mean to say va or vb? are these variables being multiplied and why? ok I get adding ' or " indicate an arbitrary progression in time I understand that ! indicates some low energy state why does: bang state is when vc=0 entity count ? What entity is now being counted?

V=current self consistency state A, b, c, d subgroups that make up v

Do u know there are 4?
Or u just picked a random number
And now you'll create 4 things to make it fit

current self consistency state of what exactly? and what does it mean to be consistent or inconsistent?

What is a self consistency state

Entity don't need to be counted, it just indicates an empty group

[...]
we doing set theory?

I just started somewhere in
Lower there's examples with less

Consistency means, you don't emit force

you started with this statement: "Logically, binding forces work is completed only at the big bang state" none of this has helped to clarify anything in this statement. it "*looks like*" mathematics or logic but i am fairly sure it is not.

Emit or not be under force?
You could argue force only interacts with force (field) but not substance

This is either new logic or I don't follow

a force which does not interact with anything. that is definitely new concept. force is the measure of influence of one thing upon another (attraction or repulsion) and vice versa according to Newton's 3rd law
Force noun 1. strength or energy as an attribute of physical action or movement.

According to Newton's third law of motion, **whenever two objects interact**, they exert equal and opposite forces on each other. This is often worded as 'every action has an equal and opposite reaction'.
Then what about parts that don't interact with nature

Consistency would like inertia (that would not not having a net force acting on you)
such as?

Quarks
No
Special quarks

Wtf are special quarks

very special, we made of them and they are a part of nature and they exert and are subject to forces. primarily the strong nucear force which binds atomic nuclie together

Sure...

atoms are: up and down quarks + electrons

I've heard of charm or strange quarks Special are new
Up or down
top and bottom are my favorite and i can honestly say i have no idea when or where they are found. so many things in particle physics I get lost

Special must be where the soul hides

Inside stars and particle accelerators
During supernovae too

Anyway, there's a bunch of theory, even proved ones, that lower abstraction planes "special groups" don't interact with higher abstraction planes groups, which explained void on matter level

What is void on matter level
What is matter level actually
What are lower or higher abstraction planes

what are "abstraction planes"? what does it mean if they are higher or lower?

So many fucking terms I don't know
It's like learning a new language

Does anyone else uses these terms

Void on our viewpoint

both me a Carpe have degrees in Physics. occasionally we know what we are talking about but

normally manage to find things to argue the toss over but this has lost both of us

What do u mean by viewpoint
I ask for one definition and I just get deeper into metaphors lol

I mean void is not nothing, but atoms go right through

each unknown term is 'explained' with an exponential expanding rate of new unknown terms. Is it unknown terms all the way down?

So what is it
What is this thing atoms go through?
Space?

Void is quantum stuff that does not interact with the higher level

Ah!

Ether? Dark matter? Neutrinos?

Self satisfied quantum stuff

Oh shit
More esoteric words
What is self satisfied
I honestly lost track of what the top definition layer was by now lol

Self consistent

And we've come full circle

"Logically, binding forces work is completed only at the big bang state"

Pretty sure we started there lol
What's self consistent

self consistently confusing is officially granted

Self consistent means the binding forces bias results in bias 0

What the actual fuck
I think this is the 8th layer of definitions
Let's keep going

or the 8th dimension

What are binding forces
Things that group things?

Yes, a conscious is a binding force with degree of choice

Like electromagnetic force?
Oh no. I thought it knew it
Fuck it's another Layer

For example

What is a concious (something like you who has self awareness?) You mean something with conciousness?
Yes

So something with conciouss that can chose (has will)
How is that a binding force
At the same category as electromagnetism

I didn't realize my conscious could be a binding force. Can it pull things to me? Do I have telekinetic powers?

It's the secret. You manifest reality

dammit i knew i should have brought up electromagnetism when arguing for free will

The lowest binding force with decisive force is a cell

cells dont make decisions but okay
They do sometimes
well actually they can act to save their ass when in danger. this is actual science
very much so indeed. we are talking less than plant level intelligence

Electromagnetism
Cells
Concious creatures
What's the common thread

IT what does electromagnetism, cells, and concious creatures that have will have in common that they are all categorized as binding forces

this was the question and the start of the longest rabbit hole in history

They hold a group of entity together

so basically we are just talking about different forms of attraction?

What's a group of entity

A group of particles made of substance and possibly groups of them

So groups or groups of groups of things that have substance
What are things that have substance
(The hole continues)
I can taste the bedrock!

so basically. **we live in a world where things are grouped into entities through attraction except for those things that are not or brake up by repulsion.** is this it in short? ^^

There's just substance and binding forces managing them

What's substance
?
Material things?

that is a tough question and you know it. For me it is a set of properties that are linked together and allow it to interact with other sets of properties

To me it's just material things
Or at least that's what i think he means
Is is substance IT?

Hm... Well... Substance is the status or information
Like substance = memory

Binding force an bias applied to the state of memory

Basically it's quantum smallest spin parts

I'm keeping track
I'm 21 layers deep

he's not wrong though! physical matter and our physical world existence is contingent upon time and the establishment of factual history and our memory of it is necessary for our knowledge of it. this is good shit

So substance is your term for quantum states? Or information?

Well if it is information than memory is just the history of that
So it'd be what riv said

Answer this IT

So substance is your term for quantum states? Or information?

It's basically both

Bedrock!

welcome to physicalism
I want to cry
Can I cry
Im just so overjoyed
I never thought this day would come
The relief

the world is matter and information which are really both the same with the latter being the measure of the former

0) So substance is quantum information. The history of which is memory
and consciousness is the processing of that information which needs that memory
1) Things that have substance are things that have quantum states (or information that can change) or groups of such things
2) Binding forces are things that group or repel things that have substance
I wonder about history

That's just what Riv said
Memory is like the storage of information on previous / current quantum states (that's what I meant by history)
...
jeopardy music plays

Waiting for approval of step 0
We are back to step 0
He put a hand down
0) Substance is quantum information. And memory is the data on current or previous information
Better?

0) Substance is quantum information. And memory is the data on current or previous such states, also of substance

Forget that
0) So substance is quantum information.
Is this okay

Sure

1) Things that have substance are things that have quantum states (or information that can change) or groups of such things
2) Binding forces are things that group or repel things that have substance
Now before we can climb up I need to know somerhing about binding forces
Why do u call concious entities that have will a binding force?
Why cells?
Why electromagnetism?
How are all of these binding forces
How is concious things something that groups or repels things?
I dont think the examples fit the definition
I mean electromagnetism does

they are just examples of thing attracting or grouping i think. he is just generalising or trying to surmise a general concept.

my brain is quite fuzzy too now but ok

2) Binding forces (still need to distinguish examples) --> Binding force bias = 0 (need to define bias here....Hopefully not another hole) --> self consistency--> self satisfied -->
Stuff that doesn't interact with higher level --> void -->

it's all the anthropomorphism of physicalism that gets confusing

neutrino's are lower level that do not interact (very much)?
self consistency--> self satisfied = thermal equilibrium or stable lowest energy state at a guess

--> our viewpoint (not sure how this fits) Void on matter level (need to define this) happens because special groups / self consistent stuff / stuff on lower abstention plane doesn't interact with higher levels (gotta ask what this is better; ties with clarification needed above)
This Consistent means no force and thus no interaction Self consistency means you have the property of doing that (even with yourself)

i do maintain myself that reductionist are wrong about causal significance. lower level particle physics does not determine higher level structural causality but it is primarily the other way around in the middle levels of complex structures aka the world of our daily lives. that maybe what he is also sensing

V = self consistent state (with possible subgroups (a, b,c, d, etc) representing entities - of the void (special stuff types), I suppose; that could be part of such a state
+ means binding force, with or without observer (this could start another hole no idea what he means here withe the return of the binding force term)

He also said self consistent is not expecting more than yourself (gotta clarify that)

QM is not dependent upon conscious minds ! woot

And then we are back to that quasi algebra mess

Perhaps. Or stuff like neutrino or dark matter

you cannot beet quasi algebra mess when it comes to derailing an interlocutor

Axiomatic matter?

wow what is axiomatic matter? is that like Platonic numbers?

Which is whe he gets confused. Tries to go bottom up and then realizes there is a related top down patten (then uses same general idea for both "controls")

I think it confuses many people. when i here science geniuses like brian greene make elementary errors

No it's a dark matter candidate together with WIMPs
Sterile neutrinos
Primordial blackholes
Etc
Proposed ideas for what "special stuff" might be
I'll be honest Riv now that i know 90% of what he means I'm fairly certain 99% of it makes no sense

special stuff is in my opinion: Emergent systems and their Causal powers

No. That's not what he means
By special stuff

This
special groups / self consistent stuff / stuff on lower abstraction plane that doesn't interact with higher levels That explains void at matter level
I think it's dark matter
Literally

Excited that I understood your language

But just because I understand your words

ok. it is like if a buldoser is coming too knock down your house does it matter what it is made of? no the material is irrelevant. does what atoms individual matter in a steam engine? no. it is the system that has causal power over the atoms.

Doesn't mean the way you are stringing then makes sense
It's like someone who learns a few EnglIsh words say something like....
Banana is four trees trucks sleep tire
I know the words but they don't mean shit together lol

Maybe that makes sense. It's not what he's saying

it is how you say it that doesn't make sense. discovering there is some underlying reason that

does match physical reality is the exciting part for Carpe   I always had faith you are on right

path ... i think

I dont. Not yet
I'm half convinced I'm wasting time
But I can hope I'm wrong
Am I wrong Riv?

Nah. That's the magic of being a skeptic
Question everything
Even what you think you know

next you will become a Relationist QM

Note: While v=v1-a + v2-a + vb + vd! : V1-a = immaterium V2-a = reality Vd: not interacting completed reality Vb: another reality
Is a possible interpretation/application

With V1-a + v2-a: the + binding force has the degree of freedom of t Or the one + is at, the other is t

So what's the ultimate purpose of writing this doc?
Having agreeance on the 10 laws of the universe, as a getting along threshold
Agreement you mean?

What this theory is about:

-The absolute truth of this universe

-What is the self

-What is God

-Why he exists

-What is the universe

-After explaining those we continue by applying this knowledge into basic moral guidelines

The absolute truth of this universe

Where to start?

With the rules, even God follows in this universe. (Tbd think about restating that part)

We are all part of the whole, the material, you, me, a rock somewhere... the immaterial thoughts, flavors, God.... Basically its all of the same substance. The difference lies just in grouping.

Truths are like common binding rules.

The absolute truth from an universe is the binding rule all universe entity have in common.

The absolute rules of this universe: **Entity attract or repel(Group), distancing/seperating based on preference (by self-value comparison) and advance groups.**

What does that mean? For example it includes all the things you do all day and night.

Every change can be thought of as forming (or destroying) a group. For example, here are some actions you do every day, re-described in terms of grouping: Cooking is just grouping food elements eating is regrouping the food parts within your body sleeping is grouping/structuring your mind. Pooping destroys a group, by expelling the leftovers from the grouping done by your digestive system.

I call the more scientific application of this value distance grouping.

Take quarks. Or atoms. Or objects. Or planets. Or solar systems. Each behaves the same. The entities group value-based to each other.

A bit is a descriptive information on the grouping state of the subatomic particle, describing the states the quantum spins can take. Take 5 bits of a subatomic particle. Now let's say those 5 bits describe the values of how the quantum objects group. Now group 100 elements of those subatomic particles. The values average, and this group and other groups of this level appear to have less powerful interactions.

Atoms and molecules seem to group their distance based on similarities. Magnetism is when a material is "samey" in value, it doesn't affect materials that are set diverse and made up of different values because they nullify the force but those who align or are similar. On bigger objects like planets or meteor, the materials equal each other out so value distance grouping only leaves, that which is value distance grouping on a higher plane – gravity. As value distance grouping on the lower plane of subatomic particles seems to be made of electromagnetism.

The difference comes from the following effect.

 Random numbers 412457446 and 898345035.

 Now let's split them.

4,1,2,4,5,7,4,4,6

8,3,8,3,4,5,0,3,5

Now divide the second-row elements through the first-row elements. First use 1 element each Then 2 Then 3. What you should see, the differing force gets smaller with higher planes(bigger numbers) You have to build a sort of average if you do it for multiple.

Tbd: calculate through

In what way is that useful or relevant for this doc

Entanglement

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Quantum_entanglement

Think more about 4 basic forces and how they come to be

What are bits of subatomic particles relating to

Add **t** = change 2^0 Bits (1) 2 possibilities	1 Quantum spin (Not grouped) 1 Dimension Abstraction => 2^1=2 possibilities

„Not assigned" „Dead" „Regroup ASAP"	"Assigned" "stay the same" "No Regroup"

Add **at** (into / out of reality)
2^1 Bits (2)
4 possibilities

Reinterpret **t** = In Reality (Alife/Dead)

Group   2 Quantum spins 2 Dimension

Abstractions =>

t Value (In Reality?)
⇨   at Value (t Value abstracted – into/out of reality) – matter antimatter

2^2=4 possibilities

	at Value (into/out of reality) = 0	at Value (into/out of reality) = 1
t=0 No Regroup	A Nothing exists out of reality	A Something exists in reality
T=1 Regroup	A Nothing exists out of reality regroup	A Something that exists in reality regroups

Add **f and s**
2^2 Bits (4)
16 possibilities

Group   4 Quantum spins   4 Dimensions

Abstraction => t Value (In Reality?)
at Value (t Value abstracted – into/out of reality) – matter antimatter
=> f Value – something or nothing(void)
=>s Value (spin ^v) - keep developing or done

2^4 = 16 possibilities
Example: Quark,Antiquark | Leptoms and antileptoms | Gauge bossoms | Scalar Bossoms

```
                        ┌─────────────────────────┐
                        │   Elementary particles  │
                        └─────────────────────────┘
```

Elementary fermions Half-integer spinObey the Fermi–Dirac statistics

AT=1

Elementary bosons Integer spinObey the Bose–Einstein statistics

AT=0

Quarks and antiquarksSpin = 1/2Have color chargeParticipate in strong interactions

S=1/2

Leptons and antileptonsSpin = 1/2No color chargeElectroweak interactions

S=-1/2

Gauge bosons Spin = 1Force carriers

S=1

Scalar bosons Spin = 0

S=0

Add **v and cs/tb**

2^3 Bits (8 bits)
256 possibilities

Group   8 Quantum spins   8 Dimensions

Abstraction =>   t Value (In Reality?)
                  at Value (t Value abstracted – into/out of reality) – matter antimatter
                  f Value – something or nothing(void)
                  s Value (spin ^v) – keep developing or done

                  => tb Value (TBD)
                  => cs Value (TBD)
                  => ?
                   => ? TBD

   2^8 = 256 possibilitie

Selection: Quark,Antiquark | Leptoms and antileptoms | Gauge bossoms | Scalar Bossoms decision per f & s

Example: Quark

	f = 0 at=0	f = 0 at=1	f = 1 at=0	f= 1 at=1
tb=0	down	antidown	up	antiup
cs=0	?	?	charm	anticharm
tb=1	Bottom	Antibottom	Top	antitop
cs=1	?	?	Strange	antistrange

Add

RoomTime

(position existence)

2^4 Bits (16 Bits)

65.536 possibilities

Group   16 Quantum spins   16 Dimensions

Abstraction => t Value (In Reality?)

at Value (t Value abstracted – into/out of reality) – matter antimatter

f Value – something or nothing(void)

s Value (spin ^v) – keep developing or done

=> tb Value (TBD)

=> cs Value (TBD)

=> ?

 => ? TBD

=>x Value (onto Quark or similar - on x)

=>Y Value (onto x)

=>z Value (onto y)

 =>i Increase / Decrease (onto z Value – into unkown)

Structuring

t-Value

,

At-Value   **ThisWorld**

f-Value

staying

something

Quarks

Top,Up,Charm, Strange

Leptoms

void

Quarks

Down, Bottom

Leaving

something

Black Holes

void

Antiquarks

Antileptoms

Otherworld

staying

?

Leaving

something

Gauge Bossoms, scalar Bossoms

void

Dark Void

More theory

About abstraction/interpretation

What are the base dimensions of the universe?

Room position x, y, z? I don't think so…

Into is what we perceive

Out is what we emit to our surroundings.

Then there is scaling levels

And change

How these 3 base dimensions came to be

At the beginning there was only the unknown. And possible grouping. But no agreement on room. You only had what arrives at you, what you give away, and when you bind with other entities, a binding structure. These binding structures became higher level entities. Obviously grouping requires "change".

These basics can be displayed in this above diagram.

The unknown/Unallocated Space are parts of the substance, that are not bound through a common binding structure, by higher entities.

Circle of life, i.e. cells, organs, people, animals

Room is just agreeance on "how we perceive at our scale"

If a circle builds of our emitance, because we are accepted enough to let something through our surroundings until it re-arrives at our perceptance.

Then we life and can self-improve.

The more we emit on ideas and the more they reflect into our perceptance, the more we become in terms of informing our surrounding

"Emitting" is an action on reality.

Sensory input is from reality.

So basically, we abstract input into our own understanding of reality, possibly act, but also interpret more new invented data into the understanding.

Believing means to rate your interpretations success expectation rate highly.

Scaling/abstraction levels

The circles of life which group up into a higher being, will share some common understanding, a reality

A reality can be understood as agreement of an abstraction level

So the amount of scaling/abstraction levels is limited, they are not that many

Theory summary

Ok the main things or my concept are 2 things

1: Value distance grouping

2: Abstraction levels

1: so it seems Atoms, Molecules, The universe follow the rule of value distance grouping. That means the more different something is, the further is distances it from another entity.

2. Abstraction levels: There are the subatomar layer, the molecular layer, the planetside, the universe... Abstraction means, the data from the sublayer are displayed in abstracted form in a higher layer

Another concept is:

1. Decay

2. Multiverse

Decay means any entity falls apart when it doesn't keep grouping. Eventually it goes to the **immaterial** world. The multiverse concept is part of the concept, you basically keep some attributes over to nextlife. The whole everything keeps advancing and changing by having its parts repeatedly switching between this world and otherworld and fight decaying. By doing so the grouping parts improve.

Other universe, force on lower circle of life components

A circle of life controller, meaning a top of self, can use believe force, to get his lower component circle of life into agreeance.

Doing so requires to send down some sort of energy

Other universe tbd

Gravity tbd

What is the self? What is God?

This can be answered through the science of control theory

"control theory"-signal-structure of intelligent entity:	"control theory"-signal-structure of God expanded: Red Box: top of yourself Green Box: Chosen responsibility and understanding of self as a PERSON, a circle of life
	Blue Box: workload processing of God Everything: God

So how to we move our arm? So basically there is **the immaterial world**. In the immaterial world flavours ideas form by value distance grouping. The upper group is sending information down on a value it needs. Like the coordinates the arm is going to need to go. Then the lower groups detail that request, by alligning to the requested value. In the material world, the immaterial world is still in the background. Like a void is not really nothing. Thats basically the keeping the information up in mind. We go with the resulting interpretation or not. Then we stream this information to our organs, by keeping the belive - the force behind the interpretation flow from our flavours to our organs - up So what are we? >>>>>The "Link" between interpretation(done by belief) and abstraction(our understanding of the underlying reality)<<<<< - The Link between **the flavours of the immaterial world** we link into our organs and the data we abstract and use to request on flavours

Tbd immaterial world explanation

"control theory"-signal-structure of Person expanded:

Green Box: Chosen responsibility and understanding of self as a PERSON, a circle of life

Blue Box: workload processing

Red Box: a "sub-self/Flavor", basically like a class (in programming terms) of many of your Mind
An Operant that processes inputs to results in the right understandable format for the top parts
Orange Box: top of yourself/Experiencing unit/Perception(abstraction control)
/Feedback(interpretation control),

Flavors do stuff like making your heart beat, coordinating your muscles controls, or coming up with ideas in your mind on stuff you request.

As I understand it, they are called flavours, because of the way they give of influence in your mind on events.

For example you see your cat jumping on the kitchen sink, and a flavour comes up "cat thirsty".

You receive the information: cat repositions to kitchen sink.

The flavour in your mind takes that information, and uses it's understanding of cats behaviours to conclude: cat thirsty.

And provide you with that information.

We request on flavors. The flavors appear in our mind, but we don't construct them each manually, they do that themselves. Then we review the flavors results and maybe act upon a selected flavor. After we

act upon them, or maybe directly on the appearances of the flavors if you are like me, we show remorse or acknowledgment to them. That teaches the flavors. So the soul is the memory belonging/regarding to the feedback unit - conscience stuff usually. But also "believe" in general.

For me, belief is expectation from awareness from memory or from conclusion from memory or sensory.

Signal conversions are not necessarily displayed in this control theory signal chart

Try to not confuse signal graphs with topologic ones. Signal graphs try to categorize logical elements of processing a signal and how these interact.

What's happening at selection:

It's focussing a flavour, like in a classroom when the teacher selects a pupil to present his solution before the classroom

 'Self Concept':

a list of ideas about myself, identity, situation, potential, ability, values, character etc ...

also included 'Past Self': who I was and where I came from

and 'Furture Me': what I would like and what i think is likely etc ...

i also included understanding of things

While flavours together are the workforce, feedback is the scheduler, and concept of self consists of two things. Memory/understanding of self, and body interaction

Two flavours because I just wanted to illustrate that it's more than one. It can be more than two of course.

Bundling just means that the signals are transmitted parallel.

There is always an internal **feedback** loop(self) to a being

Otherwise lucid dreams would be impossible – or even observations of own thoughts

Every workload processing of one level expands to the same "control theory" structures(multiple)on a lower level

But when interacting with feedback, only one of the substructures is communicating usually

A lower level is a flavor

On this level ourself/person

On a higher level God/Universe

A flavor is an entity that processes subtasks for us. Can give us thoughts for example.

You can also see the connection between 3 appearances on each level. Like top of self⇔(spirit/workforce=>soul/body) for example

	Unity	Feedback loop	Control/process	Plant(Concept of self of Feedback loop)	Spirit
Top entity level	God	Father	Son(chosen piece a time)	Universe	Sum of being
Control/process part of top	Person	Self	Flavor(chosen piece a time)	Body(temporary)+ Soul(static)	Sum of your flavors
Control/process part of person	Flavor	Feedback unit of the flavor	chosen sub flavor a time	Matrix-like structure appearing in brains for short time periods	Sum of sub flavors

A concept of self consists of a body + soul (conscience)

Memories are part of the body

What is the universe
"Concept of self of God":

Basically the Body of God.

The Universe and God's conscience.

What is the soul
The soul is your being as it's memorized by higher instances.

The soul is the state of your mind, capturing your conscience.

Argument
A1-there are physical effects of actions, which are encouraged by reasoning

A2-the physical effects are happening by the action, depending on physical law, not depending on the quality of the reasoning

B-see picture above; Universe/God, Person, Flavor follows the same Structuring

C1-point applies to a person's body; flavors ideas can change the reality of a body, but those do not directly affect other flavors, except when the body change interacts with them later

C2-while pondering and holding thoughts in mind, ideas of flavors, form the thoughts in the mind, for all flavors

=> syncing of personal reality to truth happens on 2 distinct pools, body and soul

Why I'm sure God exists

-he appeared before me, helped me out since and gave me a task in 2010

-control theory wise it makes no sense to assume we would be the top conscious

Expand on that, and why control theory applies tbd

-we can affect reality by thinking only in our dreaming, not outside, therefore reality stems from a higher conscious

Expand on that tbd

Aside from the one regulating this universe, there is also the other one who makes universe I suppose.

The one handles being the other nature probably.

Special thanks, credits:

There is a lot of discord people I want to thank, who made this possible.

I'm still working on trying to convince most of them, to have their (nick)names appear here though.

For me:

Think about (Frog)

reason may be useful in building predictive models but it lacks ontic commitment

I was saying reason is justified by itself rather than the actual state of things

Anything else I should do? thinking

-ontological commitment(what is the effect on the state of the world, rather than expecting an ideal rational reaction from everywhere, and how to optimize)

-optimize God arguments

-structure of the docs and transition between chapter (how does one chapter connect to the other)

-explain control theory

-explain absolute truth further

-use perspective thinking to find unclear parts

-think about analytic description, don't start with the result

-explain all special terminology

-use subheadings

Neutrons are just happy with self....

A self satisfied entity....

Looks like I should resolve this immaterial world tbd part already

About Time:

There still hasn't been an account of change that makes sense of change without appealing to a limited subset of potential temporal intervals (which still invokes temporal properties -- instantaneous is a temporal property).

How so? Time is observer-bound. There's a lot of observers, but who said "universe internal change" is observed from there :thinking:

When a black box does not make a change visible at it's connectivity, how do you observe

I'm just saying the universe can go from a external caused state in an external uncaused, if it's cause is inside and that is. It just needs to reattach causation.

Times kickstart is done as the observers realize causation flow, internal or external

Like fry in futurama?

He caused himself, after killing his grandfather accidently

binding

Feedback

State/Process

0

on self
consistency

Feedback

State/Process

1/0

Feedback

Feedback

State/Process

S/P.

State /Process

2/1

About soul and immaterium:

Let me see... Immaterium
So based on this

An entity emits and receives. The immaterium is the inside of the observer giving the feedback.

If you think of this, to another entity, a entity is only visible by interaction So the immaterium could be the parts, that interact less with nature

Basically an entity is an observer avatar, possessed or not

Maybe one day I'll print out a collage of all the graphics I've gotten on discord

What do you think of my immaterium definition? Does it make sense to you?

No
I never understand your pictures
You're going to have to explain

Ok

Are these like space-time diagrams or whatever those things are called
Immaterium is a cool word that you made up though

It was so fun because that's a Warhammer 40k thing
CHAOS IS STRONG

No they are not about space Remembering this part of the doc? How these 3 base dimensions came to be
At the beginning there was only the unknown. And possible grouping. But no agreement on room. You only had what arrives at you, what you give away, and when you bind with other entities, a binding structure. These binding structures became higher level entities. Obviously grouping requires "change". These basics can be displayed in this above diagram. The unknown/Unallocated Space are parts of the substance, that are not bound through a common binding structure, by higher entities.
So basically there is substance and observers
There is hyrarchies of entities (some avatar an observer made and might be using) As shown above
The inside of the observers is the immaterium
Since the inside of the observer is only indirectly interacting with nature, it's hard to detect

Man I disagree with like all of this.
So to start, since we are claiming God to exist, wouldn't god have known about everything at the beginning? And what does agreement on room mean? The stuff from the big bang certainly didn't have the capacity to agree with one another on room. Idk maybe carpe could help with that one.

God does know everything that is knowable from below, or concludable

Plus the circle of life isn't an infinite loop, life can certainly end and it has definitely nearly ended many times in the past. There is no such thing as a true infinite loop in a closed system in this universe due to entropy.

No, infinite loop exclusively means yahwe
Okay, but my objections still kind of hold. Yahweh supposedly exists outside of the universe alongside nature? I'm not sure if the diagram is helping you explain what you're saying here. Also I'm not sure this is the case, but in terms of doctrine you wish to demonstrate, it would appear that you're wanting to demonstrate the Jewish version of God?

I'm not familiar enough with the details to answer this question

I'm mostly noting the observation that you're referring to God as Yahweh, which could suggest you're referring to the Jewish version

Well yes, insofar that the top would be 1, who makes the universe context, below that there can be a regulator

I would probably advise steering away from any definitions of God that rely on the Bible. Those have been easily refuted and thoroughly debunked. The definition you appear to be using is more of a watchmaker god. One that initiated the universe and just set things in motion. Do I have that right?

Seems like it, though he does interact sometimes

That would seem like an issue with your diagram then. God interacting both inside and outside of the universe would mean he can exist at least temporarily within the universe and be on the same flow of time
And then additionally the issue of entropy with anything that exists in the universe

Well he might just keep moving with the flow?

He would need to be inside this universe to do that (and if we really think and account for gravity, this planet)

Not quite inside, wouldn't embody work

Weirdly enough, intentional or not, that's an interesting choice of words as Norse mythology actually has an original god similar to that called Ymir that quite literally embodies the universe. But in that sense, what god is could simply be replaced with reality.
Also gimp is a free software that could help with the diagrams. Or even PowerPoint

Ok thanks for the feedback

Yahweh? How the heck

Somewhere a fairy just died
?I have no idea what I just saw. But it seemed like the kind of thing that murders fairies

Multiversal entity a nature deallocation

observer focussing sensory

-body acquiring accumulating information from sensory from nature

-brain makes data understandable/converts

-warping to immaterium trough observer

-the immaterium abstracts the information, deallocating the leftover data to the unknown

-the observer receives an abstracted understanding of nature

Something like that in first picture

Lost me at warping
Thats where the fairy died
Immaterium made it worse
No idea what u meant there

"Warping to immaterium" through observer

The Immaterium (aka, the Realm of Chaos, the Sea of Souls, the Realm of Chaos, the Aether, Warpspace, and the Empyrean), is a dimension which is made up purely of psionic energy. This energy supports and echoes the four dimensions of the material universe. It's the source of "magic" and all psionic powers. It's in the Immaterium where the Chaos Gods and the daemons were born and reside.
"The Warp is a strange and terrible place. You might as well throw a traveller into a sea of sharks and tell him to swim home as send him through the Warp unprotected. Better it is not to let common man travel through the stars. Better still, let him not know such a thing is feasible."
—Fra Safrane, 5th Aide to Navigator De'el.
Has someone been playing Warhammer?

Some of my friends

Are you aware of the fact that you have taken ideas from a fantasy game which has nothing to do with reality and incorporated them into your model of reality?

No, because I didn't

What is the Immaterium and the warp to you in reality?

I've never read a warhammer book
Immaterium=the inside of an observer, or the collective insides of observers Warp=the distance from nature looking inside

You/observer focusing sensory -body acquiring accumulating information from sensory from nature -brain makes data understandable/converts ~~warping to immaterium trough observer~~ ~~-the immaterium abstracts the information, deallocating the leftover data to the unknown~~ -the observer receives an abstracted understanding of nature <-- this is your **mind**. your **perspective**

every sentient animal is alive and has a perspective and *really* feels reality through consciousness.
you can remove the warhammer jargon. that is not philosophy, it is fantasy
if you want people to understand you that is

Is it far-fetched though to assume there is an inside to the observer/feedback unit ?

What do you mean "inside"
Like physically located in the body? Or like a though inside their mind?

As stated here, it means parts, that do not interact with nature directly
outside Objective perspective (material world) -> Individual body that percieves and acts <-
individual subjective perspective (mind) Mind/Body duality does not reflect different substances

but instead different perspectives. Individuals being able to hold both but only 'seeing' ones own mind.
different perspectives on **the same thing** that being your body and it's internal workings including thoughts
you are a part of nature. all of you

Even if so, would those parts be reasonably detectable?

slap yourself accross the face and ask yourself that same question
your internal and external 'view' are one and the same thing

But that is like a 50/50 guess

Reality/
Nature

Visible?

No Feedback
directly
from that
part

observation
& Feedback

the objective fact that you cannot 'see' another persons perspective is the excuse that is used to create metaphysical nonsense to 'explain' the same said self-evident fact
Reality = [O O O O O O O O] the set of embodied perspectives. O = individual perspective and is only accessible to itself. We all posses a perspective. we call it Mind and share a language 'Folk Psychology' ("I have a headache") to describe subjective feelings.

I still see no arguments that would prove either no-hidden brain parts or hidden brain parts

I still see no arguments that would prove either no-hidden fairies or hidden fairies. We can all make up what we like and no one can disprove them. This is true and what of it?
What do we all have in common. Of what can we really speak? That is all that really matters.
"you cannot disprove it" is so boring and of no interest.

I'm with Rivalyn, this is sounds like dualism. You've created some kind of non-physical soul that is somehow both a part of my body and also not part of my body

dammit -*converts to dualism*

do things subsist now?

Lol destroyed
The difficult decision of agreeing with me or agreeing with Naut. Neither are attractive options

the art of mistaking linguistic categories for ontological tri-ism

Huh

Exist-Subsist-Absist

Oh, didn't know it was called Tri-ism

i'll stick with my simplistic monism and its states (information)

What would the non-dualistic control theory look like?

I am sorry you had a background of Yahwehism. that language is born to confuse and subjugate people into submission. mixing up other fantasy language from Warhammer can only make sense IF you already have a fantasy mindset. I can only help you understand our single shared reality and how to describe it if you can let go of the carrots that they offered you. you can make your own purpose and goals and judge yourself then accordingly and not worry about disappointing "him" who was almost certainly just a part of your imagination when you had those "conversations"

I made that up. i do that
i am free to do so and it is good

Just a number 3, hanging out
Cooking outside
But suddenly! Concept of self moves in for the kill

what if this diagram was secretly a strategy drawing for a big space battle?

information is patterns of states in nature - it enters your body through the senses - you brain processes this information and translates it into words, resaons and actions in accordance with your desires and goals - you behave - you have the ability to say why you did what you did. Follow the information.

With a swift blue arrow, Concept do Self knocks the 3 right out of there and it becomes a 2. The soul of the 3 waits in a blue dimension
Looking inside

that is another way to say the same thing. i think   or not ...

But Gah! The attack isn't without its consequences. The Concept of self is disconnected from the bundling! Noo!

Ignore that Yahweh term. But attachment Means, inside of feedback is only indirectly acting towards outside, a black box in external view

Concept of Self has to make a decision, it moves in to destroy the 2, knocking it down to a 1. But again, consequences. Now Concept of Self is just "Concept"
Truly, this is a „Net of Warp"

I am sure this will help us all achieve clarity

Oh my quotes are wrong

the target is aligned within the center of the circle of life, fire when ready

@acceptGod-improveIn short you are your body and your mind is your perspective of the world in which your body lives.

"Set Point to Control Elements: Manipulate Variable!"
The Plant senses a disturbance….

oh those are just generalisation i make as to the motives of people. pure guesses of course. I assumed you were merely exploring those ideas which is fair as they cannot be ruled out by any evidence.

1)According to the entirety of my worldview I've been presenting here, everything is made from avatars, partly still possessed. The universe basicly being Gods 2-9) I work on that later 10)maybe try to read the resume/fazit of my book

that maybe fair. however I have drawn those conclusions from history rather than just IT. I think we all use metaphors. All language is metaphors and some guess work is needed to help clarify meaning when people are essentially using a different language. Mistakes once made can then always be corrected helping with clarity. God being a metaphor for the Mysterious hidden power of nature which is essentially unknown and which pertains to explain the whys to that which we do not know. I do not think it is a good metaphor because it is anthropomorphic and attributes agency where it cannot be found on inspection. Spiritual is really just a metaphor for mind and our inner life. The illusion of Dualism is one interpretation that can result from it but not necessarily.
@acceptGod-improvewhen a rock falls down a hill is that because some agent made it happen or because a force of nature made it happen?

You could say observerless (without observer) agents did. So it doesn't really matter, because there is no (bad) experience
But it really depends on what you understand under agent
You could view it like that, if your light cone(observer) embodied parts of that substance, it would be a different story

It matters to the rock. Things don't necessarily matter if there suddenly is a presence of an observer

basically and agent has degrees of freedom which are intrinsically not predictable. however most things that are not sentient (able to observe) follow very simple predictable behaviours in accordance with the Laws of Physics. if they had any agency at all in any meaningful sense then they would be able to not follow these Laws. We do not see that so we call them inanimate (not agents). Distinguishing between agents and inanimate objects is an important distinction to make in understanding the world you live in.
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZM8ECpBuQYE
YouTube
CrashCourse
Motion in a Straight Line: Crash Course Physics #1

Well ok, God possibly embodys that rock

don't get me wrong. Agents still cannot brake the Laws of Physics we just cannot easily be predicted by them. Agents or sentient life are far more complex.

Why can't it just be a rock? God doesn't need to embody it for it to do rock things

I even said possibly
Okay, Ymir possibly embodies that rock

what does it mean to have agency to you?

        and please watch that video   and as much physics as you can get your hands on
i will get up and move now in unpredictable directions without being hit by external bodies which forced me to do. be back laters guys!

I don't understand what that means exactly...

"everything is made from avatars, partly still possessed" what does this mean to you? 1] What are avatars? 2] What is it that is doing the possessing and what it is that is being possessed? (This is Dualism)

I now take on my new role being an agent/representative of the universe. I am here to tell everyone that the universe really doesn't work that hard to do anything. The universe is, in fact, very lazy and just let's stuff happen. It's almost as if there isn't anything controlled or designed about it at all

I also inherit this point of view with work. That is all

yes the unicorn is very lazy but please do not tell evryone. i really am off now and it is not my fault i am late

An avatar is a group of entities that grant an degree of freedom of choice to an binding force unifying them. The binding force is the observer, when having that degree of freedom, or the degree of freedom is handed to a higher level binding force. The possession is done from below, so it's not a possession. By comparison of self-value. Our observation level is that of the t value(see attachments)

Also apologise about history

I'm having trouble doing that optimally, because I'm having trouble identifying with "that!".

I don't know if that "binding id" was me or not. Probably some parts of that are still in me.

Even so, I clearly need to apologise. But when I do it I want to do it decently. So taking my time.

I understand even the actual truth is hard to get used to.

What is it that makes us disregard a life of limitless potential?

We can be, obtain, achieve anything?

Imo those philosophers were cats in the dog's age of time.

Which played a big role.

That "will to go on and that drives them" that "haunts them" is only that of a cat running from dogs following them

I would know from my history

Of course cat-rule is just as troublesome to dogs

Being lifeless and worn-out as those philosophers were, is no state for a population to take

Why would a cat not appreciate a dogs liveliness

Why would a dog not appreciate a cats thoughtfulness

God is not dead

And the universe might appear lifeless, but it was deserted, not dead

And why did no one think of a dog-cat-God

About Schopenhauer,

I only yesterday, 11.06.2021 heard of him

Sigh, he sure was smart I guess.

However, self regulation does not have to base of pain.

Fear is also meh.

Self regulation can be utilized by the shame of failure. wink

Far Future:

At some point, desire might drain to much, resulting in stagnation.

Well its Yin and Yang.

No, this solution is not for forever.

But don't forget.

Usually they switch all 1000 years.

Like around year 0, 1000, 2000…..

Titled with different Themes.

This time: Understand the gods

Note: It makes sense to assign an low-desire person on the job by an high-desire past and vice versa.

History shows possible mistakes.

It usually ends up less good after awhile…

Hypocrisy and unreasonability vs. hedonism and worn outness