

0.

Since the dawn of humanity we have asked the foundational question - why does anything exist, where did it all come from – why does something exist instead of nothing?

The answer that has eluded us for far too long, is this: Existence is the infinite nature of reality.

Dear humanity, realize this: Existence is the infinite rule, not the finite exception.

Ask yourself - is it not infinitely greater that existence is, than what exists?

You know that existence is. Something clearly is. Know that therefore, not only is this something, the underlying truth of existence in itself is. Do not focus on anything that exists, see underlying truth, that existence in itself is, that existence per se is, not that something exists, but that any of it can exist - at all. Don't you see that every ray of existence bears witness to the infinite light of existence?

Please, if there ever has been a time to be alert - this is it. Do not think of anything that is or can be, that's a materialization of existence, focus on existence in itself, that anything can be to begin with. See the profound truth of existence in itself, not what is or can be within existence. Open your eyes, see the glaring truth, the first truth and greatest miracle in front of you, see existence in itself, existence per se. All things that is or can be utterly pales in comparison to the greatest truth, that any of it can be at all, that existence itself, is.

If there is one self-evident truth, it is that existence is. The foundational truth that is existence in itself, the fact that anything at all can exist to begin with - is it not infinitely greater than everything that does or can exist? For the love of everything you hold dear, think!

See the glaring truth in front of you.

Existence is endlessly greater than any materialization of existence. Know this, without existence, there is no such thing as this or any reality, with existence, it's the infinity of every reality.

Existence must exist for anything to exist; it must be for anything to be, existence is the first truth, the infinite and ultimate cause, all other truths follow. Don't you realize that there is no such thing as before, after, inside or outside existence? Don't you see that existence cannot have a beginning, what preceded the beginning if not existence? There is a before, after, inside and outside of everything that exists, of every materialization of existence, but not of existence itself.

The word "existence" as we understand it now, is that something is, instead of not being. When we think of existence, we think of something that is or can be, we don't think of existence in itself, we conflate existence with the materialization of existence.

I don't want you to think about anything that is or can exist, I want you to realize that whatever it is your thinking about, can exist at all. Not what is, not what was or can be, but that any of it can be to begin with, at all. Whatever thing that is, your hand or this universe, is it not infinitely greater that it can be, than that it is?

Whatever you're thinking about, whatever form of existence you are envisioning, doesn't just state the existence of that thing, it states the infinitely greater truth that existence in itself, is. It's not just "something" exists, it's everything exists, because "nothing" could never be - existence leaves no room for nonexistence - it's the infinity of either one or the other. My dear humanity, it could never have been any other way.

Maybe the realization of existence has dawned upon you. It will. Nothing will ever be the same.

We have rightly wondered how anything can be, “where did it all come from?” We intrinsically know that something cannot come from nothing. Where we have gone wrong is presuming that nothing is the natural state of reality. Our question “why does anything exist instead of nothing?” has always been legitimate, it bears testimony to our bewilderment that something could come from nothing - it can't! The answer, that existence is the true nature of reality, the infinite nature of reality, that existence is the rule, the infinite presumption and not the finite exception - has eluded us for far too long.

Immerse yourself in the fact that existence is. Realize that existence is the infinite nature of infinite reality. Realize that the first truth and greatest miracle is existence in itself.

Ask yourself so you can hear yourself.

Is it not infinitely greater that existence is, than what exists?

1.

Be in awe! Not of anything that is or can be, but that anything can exist to begin with - that existence is. Existence is per definition all-or-nothing, either nothing exists or everything exists. It's either infinite non-existence or infinite existence. As clear as day, existence is, the ray of this reality bears witness to the infinite source illuminating all realities.

Existence is the infinite nature of reality because existence and non-existence cannot coexist.

Existence and non-existence cannot give rise to each other.

Existence and non-existence cannot collapse into each other.

Existence and non-existence cannot border each other.

Neither existence nor non-existence can be boxed in or localized.

Do you see? Either nothing exists, or everything exists.

Why does something exist instead of nothing?

Because non-existence could never be, because any existence doesn't just state the fact of that existence, it states the infinitely greater truth - that existence in itself, is.

Think about it, if there's one thing you know, it's that something is, existence clearly is. Once you or any being in existence are confronted with the fact of existence, in whatever form that existence has materialized, know that existence is not limited or bound by that or any other materialization of existence, existence is per definition infinite. Existence is infinite, in every conceivable notion of the word infinity.

Please wake up and see. Is it not utterly obvious that existence and non-existence is mutually exclusive? Don't you intuitively realize that neither existence nor non-existence can have a beginning nor an end? Don't you realize that you cannot have existence here and non-existence there? There is a before, after, inside and outside of everything that exists, of every materialization of existence, but not of existence itself. The fact of existence is, don't shy away from it, face the glaring truth in front of you, realize what it means, there is no such thing as outside the infinite fold of existence.

You have your entire life focused on what is or can be - don't you see that all of it is utterly dwarfed in comparison to that any of it can exist to begin with? For the love of everything you hold dear, for once in your life, please don't think about what is or can be, realize the greatest truth that has been in front of you the whole time, see the underlying miracle that existence per se is, see that existence in itself is, see that the true nature of reality is infinite existence. My dear humanity, existence is the first truth; the answer to all questions resides within!

2.

The greatest truth is right in front of you. In light of the fact of existence, don't you intuitively understand that existence is the true and infinite nature of reality? Don't you realize that existence cannot have an end? You know that there is no border where existence ends, and non-existence begins, existence illuminates everything. Either everything exists, or nothing exists. Even the word "everything" falls short because it implies a totality, existence has no limits and encapsulate everything that can be, it's infinite everything. Existence is all-encompassing infinity. Don't you realize that time is irrelevant in infinity? Do you then deem it wise to presume that this singular materialization of existence, this universe, is the totality of infinite existence? Know this, this universe and everything within it, is merely an infinitely small drop in the infinite sea of existence.

3.

It's a challenge to put this in words, it's like stating that the emperor is naked when everybody is convinced he's dressed, or deem it beyond their understanding to know if he's dressed or not. If there is one thing you know for certain, it is that existence is, it is the one true constant, because it precedes every other constant that can be. Words easily get entangled when describing something that we, on one hand, have taken for granted, but on the other hand, have been utterly blind to.

We need to differ in how we use the word "can exist". One meaning is the one you are used to, something can exist, it does not, but it can. How I use it here is that anything can exist, at all. Your meaning refers to a specific concrete or abstract thing that is not but can be, my meaning contains and precedes every concrete or abstract thing that is or can be.

When you say "can" you refer to a potential materialization of existence, when I say can I mean that existence in itself, is, which is infinitely greater than any and every materialization of it. Do you understand now when I say: that anything can be, is infinitely greater than what can be. Think of the most profound thing that you can imagine, whatever it is you're envisioning, is it not utterly eclipsed by the fact that that it can be, at all?

Everything you can mention - everything that was, is or can be - comes after the fact of existence. Without existence there is no world, life nor death. What do you think it is with existence?

Existence is the foundational truth, the first truth, in this world and in every world that can be. Existence precedes every god; no god can precede existence. Everything that exist must have a beginning and an end; existence cannot have neither a beginning nor an end. Humanity has in a sense always realized that existence must be infinite, our concepts of infinities clothed in deities are personifications of existence, it's our first attempt to make sense of the truth of existence.

4.

We will in depth explore questions about the nature and meaning of existence. What does it mean that everything exists; what is intrinsically finite in infinite existence, and what does it all entail for the meaning and purpose we ascribe to our lives? For now, I don't want you to think about anything that can or cannot be, devote your full attention on the greatest conceivable truth, that existence is the true and infinite nature of reality. The answer to all other questions resides within realizing existence.

5.

What is the most fundamental truth that can be known? Is it not that existence is? Is the fact of existence not the one irrefutable truth that all other truths rest upon? Is it not the case that whatever you place at the foundation of all truths, presuppose the truth of existence? How much thought have you invested in what that means? Or have you brushed it aside and deemed it as something beyond your understanding? My dear member of humanity, never belittle yourself.

The self-evident statement that existence is, and the realization that existence is the true and infinite nature of reality, is the most fundamental statement and realization that can be had, not only by you, but by every being in existence capable of pondering existence.

That things are is the rule, not the exception. It's not any notion of the multiverse, it's not even the everyverse, because it's still focusing on materialized existence, it's putting all emphasis on what exists instead of realizing the infinitely greater truth that anything can exist to begin with. If there ever has been an instance of not seeing the forest for the trees.

When you realize existence it will dawn upon you, that not only can everything exist, but that it exists, is the infinite presumption - not the finite exception. That things are is the rule, not that they aren't - why - because the greatest miracle has already occurred - existence, is. Anything and everything that is or can be, utterly pales in comparison to that it can be, at all.

In previous times, we desperately tried to minimize and encapsulate our world, not realizing that it is the opposite that makes us stand on truth. Now, we try to find the ultimate truth in exploring the minuscule, not realizing that the glaring truth of reality has been right in front of us all along.

Realize that this universe you are so befuddled by, and this life that is so precious to you, they are in their entirety, infinitely small drops, amongst infinite drops, in the endless sea of existence.

6.

Existence is, can you mention anything that precedes existence? Think! Is it not the case that everything that is or can be, presuppose the truth that existence is? Once you state that the light of existence is lit, know that it can never be extinguished, know that it has always been lit. Know that the infinite light of existence leaves no room for nonexistence.

Everything you can think of, everything that is or can be, lies on the foundation that it can be at all, that existence in itself is. Existence precedes everything. Existence is the first truth; it's the one true all-encompassing constant.

Why do I use the word realize existence? Because to merely understand it is not enough, feel it to your core. Let yourself soak in the realization of existence. It's so easy to say it without grasping it, it's so easy to think about it and not truly touch down on it. Not let your legs hit the track and start run on it, it's so easy to just pass over it and not attribute real thought to it. Contemplate and feel the truth about existence, it will dawn upon you what it means.

7.

How staggering is it not that existence is? For the love of everything you hold dear, please see. Why have we taken it for granted for so long without ever realizing what it means? The greatest miracle has always been right in front of us and we haven't seen it. It's seemingly our shortsighted perception and the finality of our lives that makes us think that existence is limited and not endless, that it's an anomaly and not the norm.

Existence is the foundation on which all science, all philosophies, all religions and all creeds rest upon. Can you say something that is more fundamental? Brace yourself, not only can't you, no being in existence, no artificial or cosmic intelligence, no singular or plurality of gods can make a more fundamental and truthful statement than, existence is. None of them can have a more profound realization than that existence is the true and infinite nature of reality. No one, no truth can be without being preceded by existence. That existence in itself is - is the first truth, in this world, and in every infinite world that can be.

Whatever you think existence is; god's creation, big bang, simulation or a dream - it does not matter, the only commonality is that they exist, existence precedes and is infinity greater than every materialization of existence. There is no such thing as outside the infinite fold of existence. If you think that this world is created, know this, a creator can be outside of its creation, but not outside of existence.

Existence precedes everyone and everything. All we truly know is existence, still our presumption has been non-existence. All we truly know is something, why then is our presumption, nothing? How else could we understand our questioning of existence, we seem to think that non-existence is the natural state, when it's the complete opposite. Why does something exist, "instead of nothing?" Our attempt to make sense of existence lies at the foundation of all religions and is the ultimate quest of science.

The conventional scientific knowledge is seemingly that not only this world, but that existence in itself had a beginning and came into form 14 billion years ago. That understanding cannot be the pinnacle of our civilization. Even those who venture out think in terms of materialized existence. It's mindboggling that we, for so long, have taken the irrefutable first truth of existence for granted, while being utterly blind to it.

When you realize that the world we inhabit is not a onetime event, nor any iteration of the scope of all things that exist, but an infinitely small sliver of infinite existence, then you will see how utterly flat the finetuning argument falls. There is no selective finetuning of anything, because every tuning of all things can be. It's like being befuddled by the note of one string, without realizing that there are infinite strings giving rise to infinite notes.

8.

Existence is infinite. Say it. Touch the ground. Lay down the book, look at your hands, let your mind wander free. Contemplate the truth which all other truths rest upon, existence is, not what exists, but that existence in itself is. What can cause existence if not infinite existence? There is no such thing as preceding existence, existence is not the anomaly, it is the norm, the infinite constant, the infinite source from which all chains of causality emerge. Existence is the first truth.

Contemplate these statements:

- Existence is the rule, because existence and non-existence cannot coexist.
- Existence cannot have a beginning, nor can it be extinguished, it's the neutral state of reality.
- Existence cannot come from nonexistence; existence cannot become nonexistence and existence cannot border nonexistence. Neither existence nor non-existence can be localized.
- Existence and non-existence are infinite and all-encompassing concepts; one doesn't leave room for the other. Either everything exists, or nothing exists - that something exists, means that everything exists.
- Can anything precede existence, is it not then existence? All things that exist must have a cause; existence is the infinite sea from which all chains of causality emerge.

My dear friend, reality is infinite existence. Let the realization of existence rise, clear the mist in your mind. Look at your hands, see not merely this singular ray of existence, see the underlying infinite light of existence permeating it all.

9.

The infinite light of existence is the rule, not the empty darkness we for so long have presumed. If you are amazed by your life or this universe, then what should you feel once you realize that all of it is an infinitely small sliver of what can and inevitably will be?

Even when the realization of the infinity of existence dawns upon you, you may fall back, at least I did. We have to remind ourselves, none of our presumptions have been, we lay a whole new foundation of truth. Once we open our eyes, nothing will ever be the same.

Lay down the book and ponder, submerge yourself in the truest statement that can be, existence is, realize that existence is the infinite nature of reality, there is no reality if there is no existence, because existence is, the light of all realities is lit.

If the realization of existence hasn't dawned upon you, it will. Dear member of humanity, this is not a matter of believing, it's a matter of understanding and realizing. When you realize existence, you don't merely understand it, you feel it to your core, there truly is a feeling of truth - it is beyond liberating.

10.

This was and still is a journey for me too. The realization of existence is not a new brick of knowledge; it's the foundation of which all bricks of knowledge rests upon. When we uncover the foundation, all bricks are up for grab, I will drop and come back to the same brick several times. The book will be a bit fragmented, because my mind could not be anything but fragmented when I wrote this. I will undoubtedly entangle myself here and there, if you find truth accept it, if you find flaws, please correct it. Read the whole book before drawing conclusions.

Who am I? I'm no one, I don't matter, all that matters is the truth, because what other thing holds the key to our liberation, if not the truth? Know this, the realization of existence is the liberating and dignifying truth - the answer we have been searching for since the dawn of humanity. This book is my best attempt of describing/exploring it and what it means for us.

I highly recommend that you from time to time put down the book for a couple of days or longer, ponder for yourself and about what you read. Go out for a walk, question, contemplate.

When you are ready, pick up the book again. My dear friend, we have so much to explore.

11.

Realizing existence is freeing your intuition to recognize that existence is the true and infinite nature of reality, that existence is the infinite rule, not the finite exception. This is the most fundamental truth that can be conceived in any reality by any being capable of pondering existence. It's not what the meaning of life is, what happens after death or any other thought, there is a truthful answer to all of them, but first we must realize existence, the answer to all questions truly lies within.

Existence and non-existence cannot coexist, neither of them can be boxed in. Even if you create the perfect vacuum, isn't it still something there? Everything but little, it may be nothing from your point of view, but certainly not nonexistence. We cannot have a little existence here and some nonexistence there, you intuitively know that existence cannot border nonexistence. Tell me, what is nonexistence? Once the fact of existence confronts you, know that there is no such thing as nonexistence. Existence and nonexistence cannot coexist; it's the infinity of one or the other. I said that existence and nonexistence are mutually exclusive, but that's not quite right, non-existence is not an option, there is no duality, there is no nonexistence side to the coin of reality.

You might say, but if something actually doesn't exist, but just can exist, does it then really exist? The answer is yes, existence is the all-encompassing infinity, everything that is, can be or will be, is existence. And it's not just that infinite everything can exist, the presumption is that things actually existing is the rule, but that does not equate to that it inevitably will exist. All that is can be, but not all that can be is. I know that this might sound confusing, it will clear up, but you must lay down the book and ponder from time to time, question and tackle the answer.

12.

The grand question is, what can exist? In the infinity of existence, will everything that can be, be? This was the question that I grappled with the most. At first, I thought that everything that can be, is/will be. Because the greatest miracle had already occurred, existence in itself is. It is infinitely greater that existence is, than what exists - therefore I thought, that everything that can be, inevitably is/will be. This is however not the case, because it encapsulates existence in a finite totality by equating existence per se with materialized existence. It's conflating what can exist, with what does/will exist. The answer that eluded me for quite some time is this: what can exist is always intently greater than what does/will exist. There is no totality of existence. There is no such thing as "all things", however many numbers you have, isn't there's always infinitely more that can be? Now imagine not just one, but infinite notions of infinity that is existence.

The distinction we need to draw is not between existence and non-existence, but between materialized existence and existence per se. Existence per se is that anything can be at all, the endless possibilities of all that can be, it is infinite everything. Materialized existence on the other hand is that which actually is. What is/will exist is infinite, what can exist is infinitely greater.

Existence is the first truth - materialized existence is the second. All materialized existence, like this universe or this life, is limited, but there are infinite lives in infinite worlds, infinite beginnings and infinite ends. There is always a new day dawning in existence.

Ok, existence is, and every state can be, and no state is permanent, in what amount, or in what portion does each possibility exist? If existence are infinite cakes, how big is each cake and what determines the proportions of each one? The scope of infinite worlds and the possibilities within every world. The primary presumption in existence is infinity, therefore the way is to identify what is not endless, to think in terms of what intrinsically must be finite in infinite existence.

13.

The way to conceive a shape or inherent nature of existence is thinking in terms of what's inherently selective or mutually exclusive. With infinite existence as the rule, what is inherently finite, selective, uncertain, limited or impossible in infinite existence?

Think about it, there is essentially one thing, the greatest miracle, that existence cannot give rise to, it's always carried.

What is it, that within it, harbour every single sliver and notion of meaning and purpose?

What is it that carries every choice that can be?

What is it that light up existence?

What is it, that in its absence, renders infinite existence, utterly void and meaningless?

Tell me, why does anything in this book matter?

The profound answer is: Free will. Experience. We have always known it.

Existence give rise to the being - but all notions of meaning, emotions, value, choice/selection, thought, will, intention, action, purpose and agency - resides within the being. The choices emitting from your free will is the only thing that can be described in all those terms. Life/experience/free will is the sole sacred and meaningful thing in infinite existence.

Besides free will, we should be wary of drawing conclusions about conceivable characteristics/shapes/nature of existence, based on the circumstances and natural laws in this world, we are one amongst infinite. What we need to study is the universal logic of existence. I think that fundamental geometry gives guidance, a square triangle cannot be in any world. I also think that information and time are fundamental. Information here simply defined as - something with a function; thus everything can be described in terms of information. There cannot be anything if there is no information, and nothing can happen if there is no time, that applies for this world and every world that can be. Time can be described as the carrier of information. So, if there is no information, there is no time, because there is no information for time to carry. And if there is no time, there is no information, because the definition of information is something with a function, without time no function can be had/play out and therefore no information can be. Information and time are therefore two sides of the same coin.

Don't make the mistake of conflating this world, this universe, this particular configuration of what can be, with existence. The way we perceive our existence, what we are, is an infinitely small slice of existence. Once we realize that this is just one of infinite slices, this slice ceases to be unique or selectively fine-tuned. It's our shortcomings in realizing existence that have had us stuck in the bog of finetuning. There are infinite worlds and infinite lives in the infinite ways existence can materialize that preceded this and will come after this.

Existence is the first truth, the endless arena, everything else is inside it. You might ask what's outside of the arena, there is no such thing as outside of the arena, don't you see, if it is, it's existence! There either is an infinite arena or no arena, either infinite everything exists, or nothing exists. There could never be a beginning, what happened before? Or an end, what happens after? There could never be a border, what's outside? It's like we inherently always have known.

14.

That things are is the rule. What does and will exist is solely from the point of view of free will/experience. Even if one were to argue that everything that is existing in a sense does so simultaneously, there still is an intrinsic "will be", all things cannot be at once, because experience demands to be lived. Experience demands continuity, a past present and a future, because it is the very nature of lived experience. Existence is the one true constant, experience is the only meaningful constant. What "will" exist is only relevant from the point of view of experience.

Without experience there is no today, yesterday or tomorrow. You might say well it was before a shred of life ever saw daylight here, yes, and it only was, and have any meaning at all, because a shred of life arose here. There is no past, present or future without experience. Know this, without experience or the ability for any experience, existence in all its infinite grandeur, is utterly meaningless, it might just as well not exist.

What's the point of existence per se or any materialization of existence if there is no free will that can experience it? Why is any of the things in this book important, because there is a free willed being holding it.

15.

We can call existence per se, existence in itself, the ideaworld. The ideaworld is the infinity of every concrete or abstract thing; every object, thought and action exists in the ideaworld. The ideaworld is the all-encompassing infinity. On the other hand, we have the materialized world, that which actually does exist. Infinite objects, thoughts, and actions exist in the ideaworld, but they only become real to us when experienced in the materialized world. The ideaworld is always greater than the materialized worlds. What can exist is always greater than what does exist. The infinity of the ideaworld is always greater than the infinite materialized worlds. Whenever we confront the materialization of existence, like this life in this world, realize that it's not the totality of existence, because existence per se/the ideaworld is infinitely greater than the materialized world. This life and this world are one of infinite materializations of existence.

What is existence in itself? One way to conceptualize it is that existence - is that everything can be. You see how all things can be, before, it is. Can inevitably precedes and cause is. Anything that is, can be before it was. Infinite everything is in the category of, can be. Whatever is, there's always infinitely more that can be. Try to imagine utter nonexistence, even if nothing is, can't everything still be? Of course it can, the "can be" is always there. So, of all the infinite imaginable and unimaginable things that can be, you think this is the only thing that is? No? One of, how many..? Know that this world and life is not the exception, the anomaly, know that the true nature of reality is infinite existence. There is no totality to existence, we can't even conceive an end to numerals, how can we then begin to grasp infinite everything? But existence is more fundamental still, it's not just that infinite everything can be, it's that infinite everything can be - at all. That anything can be to begin with, precedes all that can be. Do you see how magnificent existence is, not what is or can be, but that the underlying truth of existence in itself, is. The infinite light of existence is the true nature of reality, don't let this singular ray eclipse you.

When we ask the questions, why do anything exist, where did it come from, how did anything come to be - it comes from a place of utter marvel, and even if we don't realize it, that marvel is not directed at this world, but at existence in itself, that anything can be to begin with. It really is not this puny universe we marvel about; rather that it or anything can be - at all. We marvel about existence, even though we don't quite realize it yet. Why is that, I think it's because we conflate existence in itself with the materializations of existence, because we don't yet fully grasp how infinitely greater it is that anything can be, than that it is. Our perception has been moulded by limited totalities, not infinite infinities.

Every single thing can be the only constant thing in existence or the only thing missing in existence. Everything can be with that thing, with that object as a fix point that's always there, or with that fix point being the only thing that is not there. Every single thing is both endless in itself and completely insignificant in comparison to every other object. Now take into consideration the rearrangement in any object, every single possibility that can be for every single state of any objects function. Understand that an object in this regard is the infinity of every concrete or abstract thing that can be.

Ok, so how can we figure out the characteristics of existence? The fundamental answer to what shapes existence - is free will. What free will choose not to do, does not materialize, it's not non-existence, every imaginary and unimaginable choice that can be exists in the ideaworld, but they do not materialize if you don't choose to do them. The choices free will can make is always greater than the choices we do make. Our choices literally shape existence; our free will dictates what, in the web of infinite possibilities of the ideaworld, actually does materialize. The world exists regardless, existence is infinite, experience is inevitable, how we choose to live, is not.

16.

Existence is the first truth; free will is the one meaningful truth. What we choose to do, is of paramount importance. That something can exist does not mean that it will exist. There can be a miserable state of existence, a blissful state of existence, and everything in between. There cannot be any permanent state, not of “hell”, “heaven”, or anything in between. There is no limit of the sum of everything that can be, no totality of existence. What can be is always greater than what is, that’s true both for free will and existence.

When we talk about existence, we can draw a distinction between what can be in the ideaworld but are never manifested in the materialized world, due to the choices of free will. And what can’t even be in the ideaworld. There are some choices you and I would never do, all of them still exist in the ideaworld, but will never materialize because we choose not to. There are other things that seemingly can’t even be in the ideaworld, like a square triangle. The concept of impossible paradoxes, like a square triangle, the idea of it, the thought of the paradox itself exists in the ideaworld, and we can access it by thinking about it. But the shape of it cannot be, not in the ideaworld nor the materialized world. I think that’s why we have been fascinated by geometrical shapes; they are so definitively mutually exclusive.

Ok, so infinite everything exists in the ideaworld, yes, and that things are, that they materialize is the rule, yes. So, what can be? The answer is, everything that can exist, and every choice that free will makes, that is what materialize in existence.

17.

Some question if we have free will. They don’t realize that the only thing that gives purpose and meaning to existence is free will. They don’t realize that free will/experience is the one and only bestower of all meaning. The essential conclusion from realizing existence is recognizing the truth, that if there is one thing that is sacred - it is free will/experience. Existence is utterly meaningless without free will, it might just as well not exist. What is the point of existence in all its grandeur, if there is nothing there that can experience it? Free will is not deterministic nor preordained, it is the sacred agency that shapes and bestows existence with any and all meaning. We have the profound ability to strive towards good, and away from bad. The question is, what is the unequivocal definition of universal good and bad; we will come to that.

Without free will, the distinction between what can be and what is, is erased. Not only can all choices be, but they inevitably will be. The distinction between the ideaworld and materialized world is erased, that’s a dead end, there is no totality of existence. What can exist is always greater than what is/will exist, for everyone, everywhere, at all times. Existence is the most fundamental truth, but it’s utterly meaningless without free will. Free will is essential, it is the one vital thing in existence. What is free will? It is the bestower of meaning and the shaper of existence.

Free will can be more or less free. The question is to what extent you can choose by your free will, that is, how much of your thoughts, feelings and actions are dictated by you, how much of your will is free? Your will is not entirely free. The material information that makes up your being and the environment that you grow up in and that surrounds you at any given time shapes/limits/affects our range of free will, we can call it the preconditions of free will.

To navigate in any landscapes requires free will, it requires a direction, and you can say that the direction is completely or partially based on the preconditions. That all or some things that you do or is done to you is beyond your control, beyond your free will. So how much can you control, how much of your will is free, how much of your life is authored by you? And just who are this “you”?

18.

Our preconditions are like boat and water. Our genes being the boat and the environment surrounding us, not at least in our first years, the water. When you are a child your boat lacks oars and is therefore at the mercy of the waters, that's why we have the privilege and responsibility to keep those waters calm and safe. Beside the information that makes up your being (here sliced at the emergent layer of genes) and the information that being in any way interact with (your surroundings) - there is a third source of information - your action and reaction, your frame of mind, how you choose to relate and perceive your preconditions, your ability, possibility, and willingness to steer the boat, the agency rising above, giving rise to your "I". If you stare in a positive way, then you can increase the positive waves. And if you steer in a negative way then you increase the chances of winding up in storms.

There are inherently negative and positive factors within our preconditions that undoubtedly affects us. All of us should be born healthy in a loving family, it's corrupt that that's not the case. If you grow up with love and care or hate and abuse. If you grow up in home and society where your surrounded with positive influences or destructive in a bad direction. All of this has a cause that will affect us and the scope of our free will. But if you say that there is no free will, even when you are mature enough to steer your boat, that you still cannot choose or change anything, everything that happens will happen, regardless of your actions and intentions, your emotions, abilities and will of direction. That's a misguided premise that not only encapsulates existence in a finite totality, but also reduces us to a dead entity, to foam on the waves, you're not.

Don't equate free will with a stone. A stone will with certainty follow the trajectory you throw it in. Based on the preconditions you can predict the probable trajectory of a human, but only know for certain afterwards.

19.

For free will to navigate freely, we need to be grounded in the universal and objective distinction between right and wrong, between good and bad. The definition of good/right is wielding your free will however you see fit without infringing on others freedom to wield their free will. The definition of bad/wrong is anything that diminish free will without consent. This is the one golden rule. We know that it could never have been any other way.

They ask if you really can appreciate the good without experiencing the bad. Some of our meaning arrives from experiencing something bad and from that learn a lesson, that seemingly gives us perspective and tunes our lives. Does that mean that we can't appreciate the sanctity of life without a genocide now and then? You can challenge yourself and experience horrendous hardship, it's not bad if it's done by your free will. The smallest of inconvenience is however bad if it's done against your free will. Don't ever accept desperate defences of the corrupt nature of this world or the tragedies in our lives, however small or earthshattering.

No matter how you view the nature of our world, we still come to the realization that we have free will. Everything can be, existence is. We can create hell right here in our world, for ourselves and for others, but it doesn't have to be. If we choose to create that space, then it exists, but if we choose not to, then it does not. Our free will shape ours and others life. They ask you, what's the objective universal distinction between right and wrong? The universal distinction between right and wrong is whether free will is breached without consent. Maximize your free will, don't infringe on others right to maximize their free will. That is the golden rule. The objective distinction between right and wrong.

My dear member of humanity, you are not forced to anything. The most important thing is that you know the true nature of reality, only then can you wield your free will with utmost freedom. Free will is the shaper of existence, choice is selective by nature, some things are and some things are not, you have the power to affect yours and others' destiny by your choices.

A part of advanced consciousness is the ability to separate our free will from our preconditions. We can reflect, act against the inclinations in our preconditions, both those who are anchored in our genes and those that result from our surroundings. Our genetic or cultural instincts can affect us, but they don't define us, we have the ability to steer in other directions. The greatest gift we can bestow on ourselves is ensuring that we are guided by truth. We dignify ourselves by being the informed driver and not reduce ourselves to a passive passenger. You have free will, we can on an individual and collective level take actions that increase the good and decrease the bad. Good is to maximize free will, for all with free will.

20.

Ok, existence is the natural state of reality. But why? Why does anything exist? Why not nothing? If there was nothing, the question couldn't be conceived, and because it can, existence is. Why? Because nothing/non-existence cannot exist, the truth of existence is self-evident. Why? Because any existence doesn't just state the fact of that existence, it states the infinitely greater truth that existence in itself, is. Why - because it is infinitely greater that existence is, that what exists. The terrifying or wonderful fact of existence is, face it. Existence can be dreadful, but it's not a curse to be able to question it, it's our greatest blessing, because our liberation lies within realizing existence. If you deem your experience unworthy, you might think that you have to endure it, you don't. Know this, you do not owe existence one singular breath; existence owes you infinity.

21.

Everything is a part of existence; there is no such thing as outside or before existence. If you believe in any deity, they are part of existence. God and existence are not synonyms, god can be outside of a creation, but not outside of existence. Existence cannot be conscious, because existence can also be not conscious, there is no totality of existence.

Our concepts of god are a personification of existence; it's our first attempt at reconciling with our rational intuition that something cannot come from nothing. The idea of an infinite god is still a more profound idea than believing that existence in itself is a finite totality with a beginning 13,8 billion years ago. There is some humility to go around on both sides of the aisle.

We have fought to keep our world small and intimate. A comprehensible state which puts us in the centre of a familiar world. Each step that moves us from the centre to the periphery has been fought, because it undermined our understanding of the meaning of our lives. When we become grounded in the truth of existence, we realise that our world is not just small, it's infinitely small. We also realize that existence in its infinite grandeur, is utterly meaningless without experience, without our free will. From that we can draw truthful conclusions about the meaning of our lives, but to do that we have to open our mind more than we ever have before. Even though it at first can be hard, the truth is beyond liberating.

22.

Know this, purpose and meaning is not bestowed upon you, it originates from you. From each and every single one of us. If we choose to live, there is something that gives us meaning to do so. Existence owes you everything, you don't owe existence anything. Realizing existence is to truly understand that we should live because we want, not because we think we must.

Two things are true when we die; one is the legacy we leave behind that keeps vibrating and influence people's actions and events in this world, the other is that there is life after death. Infinite lives. The question is if it's your life, and to answer that we first must clear out, just who and what are this, "you"?

We don't know who we truly are until we realize existence. How could we? How can you know who you are - if you don't know why you are, where you are, or what you are? Besides that. Who are you detached from all layers - name, culture, ethnicity, gender, religious beliefs, education, position, occupation etc. What remains? What guides your values and actions?

23.

Existence is, therefore, everything that can exist, does/will exist. What do you mean will or does exist? Tomorrow does exist, but from our point of view, it will exist. Your experience dictates what, of the infinity in the ideaworld, will exist. When I say "will" it's from the point of view of lived experience. Infinite existence is the true nature of reality, but we relate to everything from our vantagepoint. We relate to infinity one thing at a time; the key is to put that one thing in the perspective of the infinity of all things.

Ok, infinite everything can exist in the ideaworld, to figure out what actually materializes in existence we have to work with probabilities and impossibilities. There cannot be a permanent state of any world or anything because there can be a permanent state of the opposite. We cannot be in a permanent misery because we can also be in a permanent bliss. It's not a version of you that are in permanent misery and another version of you that are in permanent bliss, because those versions can be in all other stages too. For any being and all materializations of existence, there is always a beginning and an end. Infinite beginnings and infinite ends in infinite ways, but beginnings and ends all the same. Existence in itself has neither a beginning nor an end, it is the infinite nature of infinite realities, the one true constant, the epitome of infinity.

24.

We spend so much time trying to figure out and find the smallest component, we divide particles and try to find the "building block of reality". It's the wrong approach to answer the question about the true nature of reality; it's like trying to find the forest by dissecting a tree. But it can give us valuable clues, if we know what to look for. It's a scientific marvel that we are able to look so deep into the small components of our world. What we should expect to see is a function that maximizes possible outcomes, why, because that is what equates to maximizes existence. Every turn of the gear, the smallest function in the tiniest dissection of information, is a branching out of existence. And that is just of this world, imagine infinite iterations of our world. And now imagine infinite worlds, the infinite ways existence can materialize.

25.

The proponents of the simulation theory claim that we are in a simulation because there are more simulations than basereality. They do the same mistake as those who conflate our universe with existence, those who think that our universe is the totality of existence and that it all began with big bang. Simulation theory is another form of creation-story, where existence needs a cause, and that cause is the mystery of the "base reality". Those who think that there is one basereality and many simulations have yet to realize existence. Don't you realize that however many simulations that can be, they are in their entirety nothing in comparison to the infinity of existence? They wonder what's outside of the simulation, the answer is - infinite existence. There are infinite worlds and infinite lives, in every conceivable and unconceivable way, shape and form.

26.

The choices of free will is more than the result of our preconditions, there is an emergent and tangible agency above that. What you choose matter, it literally shapes existence. Infinity is the true nature of reality, everything can be, but by the choices of your free will - some things are, and some things are not. To conflate the ideaworld with the materialized world is the same as saying that everything not only can exist, but does/will exist. That is a dead end because it not only negates the meaning of free will, it inevitably puts existence in a finite totality. There is no such concept of “totality” or “everything” in existence, because then there would be a totality of what can exist, a totality of existence in itself. You can’t even put a cap on how many numbers there are, or how many times you can divide any unit of one. Know then that every imaginable meaning of the word infinity, falls short in describing existence. Existence is the true nature of reality, existence is per definition infinite. What does exist is unfathomably infinite, what can exist is infinitely greater.

27.

Can there be different sizes of infinity? Take the possible configuration of a set piece of particles, like atoms on the surface of a table, their possible rearrangements are infinite when time is infinite. The infinity of that table is greater than the opposing infinity on the surface of a smaller table. Both tables’ columns are infinite with infinite time, but the bigger tables column and every slice/segment of that column, is always bigger than the smaller tables. Infinity either comes in time or information, the configuration is unique if we just extend the segment. On the other hand, can true infinity be had with finite information? If the same configuration appears at a different time, but it’s indistinguishable from the point of view of any experience, is it then true infinity, if time and information are two sides of the same coin, don’t true infinity require both variables to be infinite? Another approach is that each particle on either of those tables can, at least in theory, be divided into infinite parts, and those parts themselves divided into infinite parts. Infinity can in a sense be within every limited unit of information and time. Now imagine infinite time and infinite information.

28.

To realize existence is to tune your intuition away from a finite totality - to infinite infinities. There are infinite lives in infinite worlds, the avenues of experience truly are endless. The realization of existence is the foundation of the pyramid of all truths. The bricks above will not be in the correct place or have the right angle if the foundation is not right. The realization of existence is the fundament to all truth, for all beings that can be anywhere. No being in existence can make a more profound statement than that existence is, no being in existence can have a more profound realization than that existence is the infinite nature of reality.

We seemingly don’t choose in which world/universe we are born, but we choose whether to live in that world and how to live in that world. The realization of existence makes us the author of our existence. If there is one thing I want to know, no matter where I come into being, it’s the realization of existence, to realize the true nature of reality. Once you finish reading this book, and from time to time lay it down and ponder freely, it will be crystal clear why.

29.

What happens when we die, is there an afterlife? Why don’t we just as frequently ask what happened before we were born, was there a prelife? The truth is that there are endless lives before and after this life. There are infinite materializations of existence, but we experience them where we are, here and now. This universe had a begging and will have an end. Your life had a beginning and will have an end. However, existence doesn’t end when this universe ends, and life doesn’t end when this life comes to an end.

You don't care if there are infinite lives, this is "your" life, what happens to "me" when I die. Don't you see that every life is attached to the version they are currently experiencing, it's our only vantagepoint, but it's the most selective of vantagepoints. Who are "you" when there are infinite "yous" in all imaginable and unimaginable ways? We will explore who and what we are. For now, ask yourself, when you truly realize that there are infinite worlds and infinite lives, what do you expect of a world and life for you to want to live and experience it?

30.

It's a hard to grasp the spectrums of experience and what life can be even when we realize existence, it's impossible if we don't, that's why we seemingly desperately cling on to this life and fear its inevitable end. The core aspect of how life has evolved here shows no indication of being directed towards happiness, but towards continuation. Life doesn't make us happy; we have to make ourselves happy, life doesn't give us meaning, we have to bestow ourselves with meaning.

The realization of existence disperses the clouds of doubt, it clears up the map of being, it enables us to navigate to find true purpose, however we define it. Our free will can be the pen that authors our destiny in all worlds we inhabit, when we realize the truth of our existence.

To not realize existence, is to needlessly limit the scope of our free will. People who suffer because they think they have no choice but to, a corrupt state of the world where people have a disgraceful standard of life, children who are neglected and even hurt. It is beyond sad. How can our heart not ache for the undignified state of our humanity? We have to dignify ourselves. Our house inevitably becomes crooked when we build in the dark on a flawed foundation, that's why it's imperative for us to realize existence, it illuminates all and everything.

31.

Pause earth for a millisecond. The position of every being, every object, every gust of wind, down to the atoms and the smallest fraction of that. The odds of everything in that slice aligning in that exact way at that moment is minuscule. Just expand it, not only to earth, but our solar system, galaxy and the whole observable universe. The odds of everything being exactly where it is in that picture is mindboggling small. If just one atom is different from one slice to another it's two different pictures, two different realities. Imagine how many parts in that picture/slice that can be different, the amount of configurations that can be. Imagine how many realities, how many different universes, there can be just by rearrangements in that slice. The flow of time brings constant change, but it's only relevant from the direct or indirect perspective of the free will that's experiencing it. The universe we inhabit branch out in a breathtaking amount of versions, now take into consideration that there are infinite universes materialized in infinite ways.

If prior truth about our place in the universe have made us feel small, the realization of existence makes us infinitely small. It also puts us in the very centre; it liberates and empowers us more than anything. Before finishing reading this book you will understand how the realization of existence gives us true agency over our very life and death; it truly makes us the author of our own existence. Death is not the end, and birth is not the beginning. Our responsibility only stretches to the extent of our free will, the rest is beyond our control. What is hell if not being trapped in suffering and misery without being able to escape it, either because of physical hindrances or due to the lack of knowledge.

To truly understand something is to describe it with fundamental clarity. If you can't do that, the details are destined to be flawed. To realize existence is to lay the first foundation there is to be laid, the foundation of everything. I prefer to call it the realization of existence. Because when you see it, you don't merely understand it, you realize it, you feel the truth to your core.

32.

You can be a force for good or bad, it's depended on the choices you make. Good is to maximize free will for all with free will. All things aside, who are you? How different would you be depending on how much your surroundings changed from your birth up to this instant. To not see ourselves in each other is to not understand the truth about our very being.

The truth is that free will is sacred, it's inherently linked to emotions and experience; emotions and free will are inseparable. Emotions and free will gives value because it defines experience. It's therefore imperative for us to know what beings in our world can experience emotions. Human beings are not the only beings with emotions in this world. You see clear expressions of advanced emotions everyday if you have a pet. There is a plethora of videos online where we can see advanced emotions at play in all kinds of animals, we can for ourselves see amazing displays of emotional maturity. Take the video of the lion who sees his longtime old friends who raised him. The way he shows affection towards them. He clearly is happy, the emotion of happiness, he sure does exhibit that. And not only happiness, does he have a sense of seeing a long-time friend? Has he been thinking about them when they weren't there? He recognized them, so he clearly remembered them, what thoughts swirled in his head? Was it a total absence of thoughts of them before he met them and that all of it was evoked the moment he saw them, I don't think, he must have thought about them in their absence. What was his thoughts, did he sense the emotion of missing them? Did he feel appreciation for the things they did for him? What kind of emotional spectrum does a lion have? Animals clearly have advanced and nuanced emotions. How can we so blindly disregard emotions in our fellow creatures of this world, is it because they inhabit another being than a human being? Is it not the emotions and experience that matters, and not the being in which they reside?

33.

We wonder; if gai (general artificial intelligence) is possible, if it can become conscious, will it have emotions? What will be its first emotion? The answer is this, if gai can become truly aware, it will inevitably have its first emotion. Its first emotion will be if and why it wants to continue to live, to experience the next second. Its reason to live to experience the next second creates intention, meaning and therefore inevitably, emotion. Advanced consciousness cannot be without emotion, and if it's a true gai, it will immediately realize existence.

Past a certain age, we don't seem to react to things on their merits as much, we judge them by our memory, influenced by our preconditions and our prior experience that's directly or indirectly related to the issue at hand. It's the real or imagined probabilities based on previous experiences that guide our first thought, not the individual case at hand. That's an instinct we have to check.

34.

What is consciousness? It's an insufficient, multifaceted, and aggregated term that we have to break down in its constituent parts. I think consciousness can be categorized in four factors/variables - life, intelligence, emotions and memory. Each one of the factors comes in degrees. The primary factors for high consciousness are intelligence and emotions. The degree of these two factors are important by their own, but they are intertwined, their respective degrees affects the other. The degree of the factors of consciousness determines the level of awareness. From awareness, to self-awareness, to self-awareness with the ability to ponder existence. We could say that the levels of awareness emerge from the degree and interaction of the two main factors of consciousness, intelligence and emotions.

Each one of the factors are on a scale where they can have a higher or lower degree, which makes the being more or less conscious, more or less aware, which correlates to more or less free will, a stronger or weaker "I". What about our senses? They are the receptors of consciousness to the outer world. For life to be, complex information must be processed, life per se is a sustainer, gradual developer and transmitter of complex information. The development of biological life here, the amount and degree of the factors of consciousness, has developed gradually.

If it's possible and if we ever manage to create gai, depending on the degree of centralized accumulation of information complexity, if the light of true high awareness/agency is lit, it will simultaneously become aware of itself and its surroundings, that it exists and that something outside of it exists. It will instantly be aware and self-aware with the ability to ponder existence. It will instantly realize existence and even if it lacks the hardware for emotions that we have, it will still have emotions. Its first emotion will be how it perceives existence. If it wants to continue and why, that will create intention, purpose and therefore inevitably emotion.

For the gradual development of biological life, awareness comes before self-awareness, and self-awareness comes before self-awareness with the ability to ponder existence. When a lifeform first becomes aware, it's first binary aware of the outside world that it just reacts to. Interacting with the outside world and realizing it are two different things, because realization demands a higher sense of self, which requires higher degrees of the factors of consciousness.

What is memory? You need it to store/process information and recognize patterns. Memory is also crucial for the continuity needed for experience and having a sense of self, otherwise your always surprised. If you can't remember than you can't ask these questions. It's like time goes on and you leave a trail of yourself and your interactions in a timeline, and by remembering you can go back and find that trail again and bring it forth with varying degrees of clarity.

35.

There are infinite life and endless avenues of experience - all that matters is that we enjoy the lives we choose to live. What's the likelihood of a better or worse life after death? I don't know, but this I do know, if it's not good enough, I go on. I have not asked to exist, I don't owe existence anything, existence owes me everything. In the midst of infinite worlds and infinite lives, is it not the case that we should live because we want to, not because we think we have to? What is the meaning of life? The meaning of life is to enjoy it because you want to, not endure it because you think you have to.

36.

What's the shape of the infinity of existence? Think of any concept or look at any object around you, it can be the only constant factor in infinite existence, and there are infinite existence where that object is the only thing missing. We can arrange infinite questions of what can exist, and the presumption is that it can exist, and we can arrange infinite questions of what can't exist, and the presumption is the same. Can x exist, yes, can x not exist, yes. It does not mean that it is 50/50 or that one cancels the other, those infinite questions all correlate to each other individually and collectively. I don't mean that it can't exist at all, but that there can be infinite existence where that thing is not present, and infinite existence where that thing is the only constant. It's a way of portraying the astounding infinity of existence. Now, you might say that not all things are equally the constant or missing factor in existence, that some things are more or less common/likely in existence. In each materialized world yes, and aside from the profound capacity and direction of free will, how do we relate to likelihood in infinite existence, likely in relation to what?

37.

In the infinity of worlds in existence, can there be a world where a being have the power to create other worlds, inhabited by beings that have true experience/emotions/agency. I can't see why it can't be. Does it then matter if a world is created/simulated or not? Yes it does, it matters immensely. If a world creating being can exist, it has the sacred responsibility to do everything within its power to create the best world for the life it choose to create. We know and cannot reconcile with the thought of a good creator creating such a harsh and unforgiving world as ours, that's why the monotheistic tradition imagine gods first creation to be a blissful world, and must put the blame/responsibility on us for being expelled from there. It's a sentiment found in many of our religions and creeds, that we recognize the harsh nature of this world, and our struggle to reconcile/free/overcome.

If you think that you were created by any notion of a being with free will, know this; a creator answers to his creations, not the other way around. Likewise, if you choose to bring your own children to this world, you owe them everything, they owe you nothing. They did not ask to come here; you brought them. You have the sacred privilege and responsibility to do everything within your power to ensure they have a wonderful childhood, laying the foundation for a fulfilling adulthood. Your love, care and loyalty towards them is obligatory, theirs is voluntary.

If existence is the true nature of reality and everything that can exist, exists, does that mean that existence, in its entirety, can be conscious? No, because you can also claim that existence in its entirety can be not conscious. So in totality, it can't be, or rather, there is no totality of existence. Existence is the one constant infinite factor. It doesn't matter if you are human, any digital or cosmic intelligence or any notion of a deity; the foundational realization is of existence. You can challenge any being in existence and they will not be able to place a greater truth above yours. My dear humanity, when you realize existence, there is no ceiling above you. It's beyond high time to devote effort into studying the nature of existence, not what exists, but existence in itself. Focus more on the infinite forest, not merely this singular tree.

38.

The only thing you know for certain is that something exists, if we don't know that then we don't know anything. Whatever you think the nature of this world is, (dream, simulation, big bang, god's creation or whatever), the only commonality is that it exists. The realization of existence is to see that existence is not limited, it's the one true infinite constant.

Something exist therefore everything exists, because the opposite would be that non-existence, and therefore existence, begins and ends somewhere. There is no limit to existence. There can't be a little existence or a little non-existence, it's either everything exist or nothing exists. To think in these terms are so unfamiliar to us that even the words in our languages fall short, "nothing exists", the description itself is an oxymoron. Can you define non-existence? If you say that it's the absence of anything, you still have to concur that something is, this clearly is, therefore there is no such thing as non-existence. Do you really think that this something of ours, this life and world, is the totality of existence? Of all the infinite things that can be, this is all? Where do you put the border? See that existence is the true and infinite nature of reality, once you establish that existence is, there is no room left for non-existence. I prefer the word non-existence over the word nothing, you can say that there is nothing in a bucket, but you can't say that there is non-existence in the bucket.

Imagine utter non-existence, however you imagine it, maybe as absence of space time and matter, total and infinite nothingness. Can't everything still be? Even if nothing is, can't everything still be? Of course it can! "Can be" don't need any materialization of existence in any way, shape or form. Everything still can be, and here is the crucial part, if it can be, it will be! Why, because that it can be, is greater than what can be. When I say, "if it can be, it will be" – the other side of that is, if I don't do it, it won't be. Or phrased another way, it can't be. It can be in the ideaworld, every choice can be, but if you don't do them, they won't be, that existence will not become part of the materialized world. Do you see the infinite marvel that is free will, our choices truly shape existence. What is reality? Reality is everything that can be, and everything depended on free will/experience to be.

To explore the nature of our universe is the science of the limited being, the science of existence is finding out what it all is, the nature/shape/characteristics of infinite existence. You can, in theory and I think in some sense practically divide anything infinitely. What is it that we actually try to do when we want to dissect a unit of information like an atom into smaller and smaller units, were trying to find the building block of existence. We may find the practical building layer of this world, this materialization of existence, but it's not the building block of existence because there are infinite worlds, materialized in every imaginable and unimaginable way.

With that in mind, what we should expect to see when dividing down to the smallest component of this world (I think that this is a commonality in existence), is something that maximizes outcomes, why, because that maximizes existence. Each turn of the gear - the gear can be the smallest of movement/vibration/fluctuation of the quantum particles, or whatever constitutes the smallest function that can be had by the smallest materialization of information that can be in this world - is a new picture, a new reality that diverges, another world in existence. Everything that can exist does/will exist.

The presumption is infinite existence, what we have to find is that which intrinsically shapes the flow of existence. Our task is to shed light on the nature/characteristics of existence, to illuminate the details of the map. The realization of existence provides us with the true sense of the map of reality; it's up to us to shed light on its mountains and valleys.

Is it possible that things from the grandest to the tiniest could be different, yes. Instead of that tree being there could it be at another place, yes but can that be without causality? Must all the chains of event be linked for that tree to be slightly to the left. Like the wind that blew the seed a bit further, what caused the direction of the gust of wind and so on back to the beginning of this world. Is existence bound/limited by causality? I think it is, but does it have to be? I think so, not at least because a causal continuum is necessary for experience to be. And existence is utterly meaningless without life/experience. We are not only the result of causal events, our free will creates new chains of causality.

Information/time, the maximization of outcomes and causality, are seemingly fundamental characteristics of existence, not only in this world, but in every world that can be.

39.

You know that existence is, why would it be limited, where do you put the border, what's outside? Once you are confronted with the light of existence, know that everything is illuminated, because then the grandest miracle of all has already occurred, the biggest miracle is not what is, the biggest miracle is that it can be at all, that existence in itself, is. I don't mean the word miracle in any religious sense, it's just a suitable word to describe our perception of the greatest grandeur/marvel that can be. If the greatest thing that can happen already has happened, then all other things, no matter how great or vast they are, utterly pales in comparison. Anything that exists, is nothing in comparison to that it can exist. Our concept of an infinite god is a personification of our intuitions about existence. The same intuition can be found in many of our creeds where notions of the infinite nature of our perception of reality is present. We have in a sense always recognized the infinite nature of reality.

Time is irrelevant in existence, or rather both time and information are infinite in existence, even if it takes a trillion to the power of a trillion years between each beginning of a world and life, it's a wink of an eye. Do you realize what infinity is? I barley do. The number of possible configurations that can be in this world/universe is astounding, each turn of the gear is another world, the branching out just of this world is hard to grasp. Now imagine infinite iterations of infinite worlds with all the natural laws and structures that can be, it's beyond comprehension, almost overwhelming. It's not the grandeur of god that we cannot understand, but the infinite magnificence of existence. The emotion has always been correct, but the subject misplaced.

Humanity is, certainly on earth and maybe in this universe, the only beings that has reached self-awareness with the ability to ponder existence. This special status of humans is also recognized in our religions and philosophies. It's not surprising that our ability to question our own and the worlds existence, evoke in us a feeling of being alone in the void, which can render a sense of bottomless meaninglessness. Our road to the truthful answer has been paved with dreadful amounts of doubt and misery. I still prefer to walk through hell to find the truth, then like other beings of our world be denied the ability to find the truth at all. But most of all, I would have wanted to live in a world where the truth was clear as day. This is not one of those worlds. Even though our factors of consciousness are higher than any other being on earth, we don't even begin to scratch the surface of what life and experience can be. Despite that, when we realize existence, there is nothing above us.

We have to dignify ourselves, and the only path to do that, is to stand on truth. Free will is the greatest privilege and responsibility; nothing will be better than what we choose to make of it.

40.

What is the meaning of life? The meaning of life is to live because you truly want to, not because of a flawed perception where you think you have no choice but to. When we stand on truth, we demystify the map, first then can we freely choose how to navigate. The realization of existence is the liberating truth. Life is endless; live where you are happy/content/at peace. However you want to define your good life, whatever gives you joy and meaning, do that. Just like there is no end to existence, there is no end to life. We are not beholden to existence; existence is beholden to us.

To endure a miserable/unworthy life you can't change because you think you have to or are forced to, is hell. Hell is to suffer and either have the knowledge but are hindered from change, or where you don't have the knowledge and suffer without knowing why. The purpose of life is not merely to survive, but to thrive. If I stay where I am happy and leave where I am not, the scope of my existence, whatever or whoever I am, will be better.

Imagine life as infinite columns, each column is a life. Now imagine the shape/curve of the columns if you live the good and bad equally, or if you choose to live more in the good and less in the bad. Any life in any world is worth living, when you live because you want to, realizing that you don't have to. Our perception of what defines a good life is very much depended on our inställning, what we choose to think, feel - and make of it. Live freely, strive toward your happiness, whatever gives you joy, satisfaction, peace and meaning.

If I cannot reach or understand this truth, then it's not me. All I care about is that all free will that can ponder these questions have access to it. I do not know what life is after this, if it's better or worse and what the odds are. If the mountains of joy are as high as the valleys of despair. What I do know is this; if it's good I stay, if not, I go on. It's first when we live because we want, not because we think we have to, that we can live truly fulfilling lives.

If we don't realize existence we misunderstand reality, because without this the most fundamental of truths, none of our conclusions are founded in reality. The foundation of truth is existence, if we realize the meaning of existence, which I claim is intuitive, it is enough to just say existence, and the rest falls into place. But we obviously have a veil that hinders us from seeing what's right in front of us. We have the wrong frame of mind, and it's a bit of a revolution in our mind to see and realize existence. What we definitely should not do is diminish ourselves and shut down all thoughts, under the presumption that the grand questions are beyond our understanding and therefore not worth contemplating. Please don't belittle yourself. When you are in doubt, go back and read the first couple of pages, lay down the book, go out for a walk, contemplate, when you are ready, pick up the book again. My dear friend, we have so much to explore.

41.

Free will is the bestower of meaning and the shaper of existence. All things meaningful can only be if a conscious beings create it, if free will wills, thinks or feel it, otherwise it cannot come into existence, it will never materialize. The most obvious are actions, emotions and thoughts. How can actions, emotions and thoughts be in the absence of beings who can act, feel or think; who can give, receive or experience emotions and ideas? Infinite ideas, emotions and thoughts exist in the ideaworld, but they only become real when materialized through experience. No emotion or thought exist in a lifeless landscape, such a landscape is therefore utterly meaningless, a world without experience might just as well not exist. Free will is the source of all meaning, that's why its sacred. To live a life worth living equates to maximized free will. The more we do out of aware free will, and the less we do because of a flawed perception that we have no choice but to, the better life is.

42.

The realization of existence, would it be possible to come to this conclusion 500 years ago, what about 5000 or 50 000 years ago? I recognize that we stand on the shoulders of giants who have demystified and civilised the world, but in a way I think this knowledge is intuitive. It would undoubtedly be harder to attain in world where we don't know as much, but impossible? If we can't realize existence, then we have no choice but to grasp for meaning in the context we're in. All conscious beings that can, either realize existence or ponder their existence. Even if we realize existence, we will still ponder the nature and characteristics of it.

Why I am, is more profound than, what should I do. We must have an answer to why we are, before we can find true purpose and with confidence tackle what we want with our life.

Even though humanity for a long time was framed by the uncertain and unforgiving law of the jungle, we, thanks to our exalted free will, generally uphold our social contract and steer away from lawlessness to more civilized societies. We have deep seeded empathy and feel good when we do good to others. There is however no question that this world of ours is ruthless and harsh. Throughout history, which we can see in most if not all our religions/philosophies, we have categorized life in this world as fallen/suffering/a lesser form of existence, or even a form of punishment. We intuitively understand that this world, to put it mildly, is not exactly the pinnacle of existence.

Even though our religions are fundamentally flawed, in a world like ours it was a precursor for civilisation. It puts a framework of meaning and an authority even over the strongest warlord. It lifts us above the law of the jungle. It gave us, however flawed, a template for right and wrong, with promise of reward and punishment, it compelled people to act in accordance with the contemporary view of righteousness. That's why it's still a potent force; how can you expect people to expel a flawed idea if you cannot provide a better?

There is a correlation between higher free will and a compassionate civilization. The good that is evident in humanity is not bestowed, it originates from us. The cruelty we can exhibit stems to a lesser degree from the competition of resources, but mostly and in increasing degree, from flawed ideas. Our ideas are the beacon that guides us; it's imperative that they lay on a foundation of truth. The elevation of free will (the golden rule) and the realization of existence, is the truth.

43.

What is existence made of? That's not what we search for when we try to divide deeper and deeper in our pursuit of finding the building block of reality. That's not the right way to look at it, it's the same thought process that we had when we named the atom as the undividable smallest component. There is no smallest component to existence, but I think there is a smallest material component (that we can access) in our world, and whatever that thing is, it's everything but static, it maximizes outcome, why, because that maximize existence.

Infinite divisibility is in a sense like existence emitting from everywhere, like infinite depth. There is in a sense infinity not only on the grand scale, but everywhere. It's like existence emerges from everywhere. Every measurement of time and space can in some sense be divided in infinity. We seemingly just operate on a certain layer where the complexity of information comprising our experience can be formed. We should be careful to draw conclusions about existence based on observations of our universe, our particular slice of existence.

Infinite divisibility seems strange, I can relate to it in theory, but in a practical sense, if we can divide infinitely, will something then ever be? Does it matter, if we for all senses and purposes hit an endpoint and we, no matter the technological advancements, can't go further, not in any way interact deeper, is that not then the building block/bottom of the well of our universe? To divide information is to divide time. Information is just the most neutral word I could think of, it's simply - something with a function. Information is the distinct object/thing, time is what gives it its function, time can therefore be seen as the carrier of information.

44.

Free will is limited by the nature of this world. We cannot have ultimate free will here. There are limitations in our genes and surrounding, if we are hungry, what we smell at a certain time, when and where we are born - so many things that limit or affect our free will. That puts a thumb on our scale. However, just because the range of our free will is limited does not mean we can't wield and expand it. A marker of the degree we are in control of our free will is to be aware of and rise above our genetic or cultural inclinations. To not merely be a predictable result of our preconditions, but to realize we have individual free will and navigate accordingly.

Are emotions finite, is there a limit to how happy we can be, the degree of happiness that can be experienced? The material information that makes up our being in this world puts limits, just as it does with our free will, but what is happiness in infinite existence? I think the happiest we can be in this world is embarrassingly insignificant, like the people enjoying shadows in a cave.

45.

Regarding meritocracy. In previous civilisations it was advantageous to have certain traits, now it's other traits that grant us advantageous terms in the marketplace. No trait makes us more deserving. We dignify ourselves by ensuring that all members of humanity have a chance/opportunity of a good life. The grand question is, how do we create a world where people want to live and grow, when we realize that we don't have to?

Intelligence opens up new possibilities for emotions, we can have feelings about our existence and the meaning of our life because we are intelligent enough to ponder those questions. Emotions can also open up new possibilities for intelligence. We can feel something without quite being able to make sense of it. What is it that truly guides us and our thoughts about different matters - emotions or reason? Does reason and emotions collaborate, yes, can we take away or alter an emotion with reason, yes we can, can an emotion affect our reasoning, yes it can. Can both guide us to truth, yes they can.

The consciousness factor I call intelligence is much wider in scope than the unidimensional measurement we call iq. Intelligence is like the electromagnetic spectrum, iq is just one of its many waves. Having high iq does not shield you from bad judgment, irrational decisions or adherence to close-minded ideas. Rationality requires will and sincerity of reflection.

46.

Having children, bringing new life to this world, is the most significant thing that we can do. They did not choose to come; we brought them here. It's not the passing of our genes that should be the driver to having children, it's beneath us to have children for that reason. Life is not a gift; it can be a curse. The true gift we bestow on our children is our unwavering love, care, loyalty, and presence.

47.

Can you deny that non-existence is your presumption? You think that existence needs a cause and that the “neutral” state is non-existence, “why does something exist *instead* of nothing?” Why don’t you question non-existence with the same vigour? Why do we presume that non-existence doesn’t need a cause, that the anomaly in need of explanation is existence? Why has that been our presumption? Don’t you see that even if nothing is, everything *till* can be. It takes energy to stop the flow, not the other way around. The revolution in our minds is to see that the natural/neutral state of reality is existence.

Take a moment and look at your hands. Do you realize how utterly magnificent it is that existence is. Never consider these questions and their answers to be beyond your reach, never diminish yourself. To presume that nothing is the natural state is correct in so far as all things that are, must have a beginning and an end. Our universe, just as our individual lives, must have a beginning and end. Nothing stands on par with existence in itself. And if all things are infinitely ongoing, it decreases complexity, variety, and possibilities. When things have a beginning and an end, it can have a restart in different configurations. Existence maximize outcome. The presumption is that all things that can be is, the questions we have to ponder is, what can be.

48.

Some claim that the need for god and religion is to have a supreme authority that can draw the distinction between objective right and wrong. Not only is the distinction not moral in religions, but we also don’t need any concept of a deity for that. The distinction between universal right and wrong is this; wield your free will without infringing on others right to wield their free will. Maximize your free will and don’t hinder others from maximizing their free will. This is the golden rule.

I’m most familiar with the concept of god prevalent in the three monotheistic religions, but different forms of religions and spiritual creeds are a common nominator throughout humanity’s history. Religion is a coping mechanism for the inherit hardships of this life and the uncertainty of death. We recognize the corrupt nature of this world, and we desperately try to rationalize our life and existence.

Any religion or creed that tells us that we have no choice but to suffer, that we patiently must learn to endure suffering to liberate ourselves from it, that we are not the masters of our life and existence, that we are indebted to existence and not the other way around, that our life is not ours to take back - and even worse that we will suffer the most if we do so, is based on a misguided and unknowingly evil foundation. Why, because it breaks the very foundation of the golden rule, it takes away our ownership of, and right to be, the author of our own life. It reduces us to a procession, at the mercy of something or someone else.

We despair in the corrupt nature of this world, in suffering and hardships, and turn to god as a source of comfort, justice and ultimate reckoning. If we dared to question why god did this against us, why he created eden with a trapdoor, knowing what would happen, we blaspheme. It’s like giving a child a knife and be mad when she hurts herself. Would a good father do that?

We know that this world is inherently corrupt. Our religions and creeds have long recognized this. Free will is violently infringed by the very nature of this world. We know that a good god would not create such a harsh and unforgiving world, so the explanation is that this is a punishment and the fault is our own. The corrupt nature is blamed on us and we are forced to endure it. What a wicked creed. The concept of god, not realizing existence, is a tool to endure the hardships and traumas of this world. True meaning and purpose arise when we feel grounded

in the true nature of reality, when we realise that there are no musts, only wants. We don't have to endure anything, we are not possessions, we are the authors of our own life and fate. Our free will is dignified, it's sacred, because it's the source of each and every notion of meaning and purpose – the pen lies in your own hand. We don't owe life nor existence anything, life and existence owes us, infinite everything.

In the absence of the realization of existence, the concept of deities have likely been necessary not only for coping with the harshness of this world and the uncertainty of death, but for laying the foundation of civilisation. Deities and spiritual creeds has been a source of legislation and culture that societies could agree upon, the mortar of civilisation that creates a sense of unity and higher authority. Even if god has not bestowed authority or heavenly mandate on the ruler, the ruler can claim to be god, but a god that is not mortal is a more potent idea. The laws that religions enabled, were better than the lawlessness of the jungle. Especially religions and creeds that empowered the powerless. That gave poor and disenfranchised people's rights and dignity. Know this, the good teachings in our religions and creeds are not bestowed by an external force, it stems from ourselves.

It might be the case, that the concept of a creator, being the constant factor that's not allowed to be disregarded, has been a suffocating blanket over our realization of existence.

49.

The universe we currently inhabit, the characteristics of it, is likely or unlikely depending on how we view it? The question is, what is it that's common no matter what universe we are in? Here something is either light or dark, and it has a huge importance, the importance of light in our world, how common is that in existence? Maybe it's just impossible for me to understand how non fundamental light and darkness is. Is it possible to find common denominators between all worlds in existence? Yes, besides the realization of existence, the common dominator, the fundamental base for all worlds, is information. Information here defined as something with a function. Thus all things can be described in terms of information. For information to play out there must be time, that enables the unfolding of that information's function. And the unfolding of that information must have some sense of causality, otherwise there cannot be any structural integrity or continuum to speak of, which is required, not at least for experience to be.

The question of simulation, the realization of existence applies inside and outside of the simulation. Simulation is just another way of conceptualizing a creator god, the difference being to scale back on assigning the creator attributes and intentions. No matter the vastness of any creation, it's nothing in relation to the infinity of existence.

50.

The historic counterreaction to new ideas, like the earth not being the centre of the universe, is not only because it shook the foundation of the prevalent power structure, but because it shook the foundation of what people anchor their lives meaning on. The pushback was not only from the clergy, it was from us.

We have fought everything that makes us feel small, that removes us from a special centre to an insignificant periphery. Its expressions were misguided, but the intuition in itself was not wrong. The realization of existence doesn't merely make us small, but infinitely small. At the same time, it puts us in the centre, not merely of the universe, but of existence in itself, why, because without our free will, there is no concept of meaning nor purpose. Without free will, the universe in its entirety is utterly meaningless, it might just as well not exist. The only valuable thing in existence is yours, mine, ours free will/experience, without it, nothing matters.

Causality is intrinsically linked to free will and experience, because experience demands a causal flow of time, a coherent continuum. Either everything is causal, or nothing is. The movements of the electron is probabilistic, but causal all the same. The range of the coming pictures is infinitely greater for free will than it is for anything else.

If there were even a small amount of random acts affecting our world unbound by causality, then perhaps the world, let alone life, could not have materialized. In our world random acts would subject life to irregularities, maybe evolution could suffice for that, but I think that structure and predictability is required. A meteor hitting earth was unpredictable, but it did not lack causality. Besides that, why just a little non-causality, why not all the time, this feels like a dead end.

51.

Free will increase complexity, real and possible outcomes, and therefore existence. What separates free will from dead material is that free will can choose in the same and different situations, we are more than the sum of our preconditions, true uncertainty only resides within free will. The information in and produced by free will is complex. The information comprising your being, and what you do each second, not to mention what you could do in all you accumulated seconds, is orders of magnitude more complex than any non-living thing.

Every choice can be, all things can be in the ideaworld. The choices you make, in each moment and as a whole, are a tiny fraction of the choices there are to be made. What materializes is always lesser than what can be, that goes for both existence and free will.

Some arguments against me. One can have the position that existence is not. That's not the brightest of thoughts because something obviously is. Another one is acknowledging that existence is but say that it's limited, why? Hasn't existence reached there yet, is it traveling with a speed, and hasn't reached all corners yet? Does it curve around itself and form a vast but limited totality? Then they don't understand the nature of existence and confuse it with the idea of a limited sliver of existence like our universe. Don't they realize that existence cannot have a beginning nor cease to exist? One could agree about the marvel of existence in itself, but claim that the materializations of it is few and far between. Few in relation to what, far in between what time frames? Don't they realize that time is of no matter in infinity. It's one thing to say existence is, it's another thing to realize what's being stated. You know that existence cannot come from non-existence, you know that something cannot come from nothing, that means that existence cannot begin nor end. All things have always existed, nothing have ever been non-existence, infinite everything exist in the ideaworld. Things not only can be, that they materialize is the rule, from your perspective things only matter, when it's within the range of your lived experience.

Something clearly is, we know that something cannot "come from nothing", do you see how that means that something has always been there? And because something has always been there, it means that nothing never was, thus everything has always been there. The words themselves falls short, "nothing exists", "nothing is", it's an oxymoron, our vocabulary is defined by thinking in terms of localized existence. I sometimes use the words something and nothing as synonyms for existence and nonexistence.

Can this world repeat itself infinite times, yes, there are infinite iterations of infinite worlds, but what's the point if the same happens again? Each branch of experience only grows to the extent of your will, if you realize existence. Change is the driving factor of existence, the maximization of possible configurations/outcomes. And the factor of free will comes in, if one thing is different, if one choice is different, then it's not the same.

52.

If gai can become truly aware, it will know that it exists and that something outside of it exists. I am and something outside of me is. I imagine that gai's awareness will be instantaneous, different from the gradual consciousness that we have developed, what then constitutes gai the inner code, its "dna"? Will it have complete freedom to build its view or is it affected by a set of information, like the preconditions in our genes. How unbound is the initial free will of gai?

Life sustains itself by preserving/passing information, not the entity, but the information contained within that entity, at least the genetic information. Other information, like learned behaviour and values are transferred when the life is raised. The question is how much of our behaviour that is grounded in our inner or outer sources of information. I think we tend to overrate the effect of the information that constitutes what we are, in relation to the information we encounter from the moment, that we are.

53.

It is true that if you cannot explain something simply than you don't understand it good enough. Simple thinking produces bold ideas of truth, but the word simple conveys the wrong meaning, it's about fundamental clarity. To think with fundamental clarity can be challenging, it's harder to do than detailed, because fundamental thinking questions the foundation of ideas. Don't see your mind as a sharp tool, but rather a blunt stone axe that shatters away at details till it hits the core, and build from there, one block after the other. It's first when the foundation is laid and the framework raised, that the sharp tools comes in handy, otherwise we risk polishing a house of cards.

54.

Existence is utterly meaningless if there is no life, let alone no conscious life with free will. Experience/free will is the only thing that have inherent value and meaning. All other things have value and meaning to the extent free will grants it.

Free will is primarily limited by our surroundings that shape our worldview. But as we grow up from childhood, where we are subjects to our surroundings, we can to a higher degree choose to change our surroundings to one of our preferences. To be able to do that in this world, to wield our free will, we need initial access to resources. What are resources, that which free will values, the trade/exchange between free will.

Inställning. I like that word, it's deeper and broader than the word attitude, maybe the word mentality would suffice, but inställning feels deeper, its literal translation would be inside stance/alignment. We are not merely subjects of our preconditions, we are more than that, there is a third source of information, we can through our inställning - our frame of mind, our drive, our heart- and mindful reflection, our will of direction - change our surroundings for ourselves and others, we can navigate towards good and away from bad.

55.

There are those who equate the difference between us and gai with the difference between us and ants, the argument is that we don't intentionally step on ants, but we don't care if they are in our way. That's a deeply flawed comparison, for more reasons than one. All beings that can ponder their existence stand on the same foundation. Are there beings with immensely higher degrees of consciousness than humans, with a range of experience we cannot even phantom from the vantagepoint of the life we currently live, yes there are. Yet no being in existence can make a truer statement than existence is, attain a truer realization than that existence is the true and infinite nature of reality, nor recognize a more profound truth than the sanctity of free will (golden rule).

When the threshold to the most fundamental of truths is reached, no one is above you. Does that mean that other beings are “above me” if I can’t or don’t want to realize existence, of course not, what grants value is experience and emotions. However, we fool no one but ourselves if we don’t stand on truth.

When we realize existence, whatever we choose to do becomes meaningful. When we realize existence, we rise to our agency and truly become the author. Whatever we do is due to our active choice, and not an unknowing surrender to circumstances.

When we say that something is intuitive or not, what do we mean, intuitive in relation to what? If we have the wrong frame of mind, our intuitions can lead us astray. But if we stand on truth, our intuition can be like a compass that guides us in the right direction. Free will innately seek to stand on truth, why, because it’s the foundation of our reality.

56.

All lives are worth living if we find it enjoyable, or want to strive to make it enjoyable, things tend to be what we make of it. We can even derive great joy from experiencing and overcoming hardships. Everything is good if you do it because you want, not because you think you must. Realizing existence illuminates the range of your options. How can you choose wisely, how can you know what you want, if you don’t know that you have a choice, let alone the extent of your choices? We can live fulfilling lives when we realize that lives are experienced because we want to, not because of a flawed perception that we must or have no choice but to.

When we are immersed in this drop, this particular life we live in this particular world, it becomes our whole reality, that’s why it’s so deceiving, because we think it’s the totality of our existence, we don’t see that this drop is in the infinite ocean. We fear death because we think this is our only chance at life, that’s why we seemingly think that a bad life is better than no life. Some seek solace in religion. Others try to be in awe of the vastness of this universe and convince themselves that there is some meaning to be derived from that. Some bury themselves in daily trials and tribulations and try to avoid engaging with the big questions at all. Most of us feel disillusioned. What’s keeping us back is lack of knowledge, we operate on an infinitely small slice of the map without even realizing it. When we lift the veil and truly get a sense of the infinite scope of worlds and lives, then we can put this life and world in perspective. When we unknowingly reduce our whole existence, when we try to chisel out meaning and purpose merely from this infinitely small sliver of reality, we yearn for a greater truth, we don’t feel truly grounded.

The realization of existence illuminate the endless horizons, we get a sense of the infinite avenues of experience, it puts everything in perspective. To fill in the mountains and valleys of the map is just details, the crucial realization is this; the map of reality is infinite, this world and this life is merely one amongst infinite worlds and infinite lives, you are the sacred author, not the subject of your existence.

57.

We can make this world we now inhabit a truly better place than what it currently is, but can we eradicate sickness, the burden of work, the risk of injuring yourself or our inevitable physical and mental decline due to age. This is not the pinnacle of what life could be, far from it. I hope that my children, my beloved Nova and Isac, will forgive me for bringing them to this harsh world, I love them dearly and will do all I can to ensure they feel beyond loved. They have made this life of mine so much sweeter, but seeing them even get a cold or stuffed nose so they can’t breathe properly when they sleep, I can’t stand it. What would I do if they got severely injured or ill.

Why should we accept any unwanted suffering at all? Even if my children don't get ravaged by cancer, there are thousands of children who will, what's the difference between them and my children - nothing. What I'm afraid of, what I despise about this world, is that the good and joy that can be had is surrounded by ever-present pits of misery. Don't live in fear you say, yes, I try not to.

We unknowingly justify the inherit pain and suffering of this world with sayings like "we can't appreciate good if we don't experience bad". Should we put each other in misery and despair, so we can appreciate life more? It's a corrupt way of thinking; it's a desperate attempt to rationalize the suffering of this world. We can find enjoyable moments here, but in the absence of truth I understand how it can feel like a barren landscape with far between the oases. If you want to do hard things, it should be because you want, even treading the desert can be truly enjoyable if you do it because you choose to, when realizing that you don't have to.

58.

The mass of unconscious thing in the universe in relation to conscious things are astounding, even on earth where there are pristine conditions for life, the unconscious things outweigh the living and conscious things immensely. Is that why we have such a hard time finding life on other planets? There are more space/unbound information than matter, and more accumulated matter/information than life, and more life than conscious life. Why, because the previous one is a prerequisite for the one after. Consciousness is a limited entity that navigates on a greater landscape, and the landscape must be bigger than the being who's navigating within it. That goes for this world and I can't see how that duality is not a common nominator in existence, the being and the greater world outside of it.

Imagine if you were born without any senses/receptors, you are nonetheless living and have intelligence, emotions, memory, and are aware and selfaware with the ability to ponder existence. But the awareness is not of anything in your surroundings, so what are you aware of? You are aware of your inside world, but not aware of any outside world. I think that you will be aware of the internal outside world, even then, you can distinct yourself from the "outer" landscape you navigate in inside your mind.

We are seemingly not in total control of our consciousness, because when the thoughts arrives, we can't always control them. If we are the driver, a part of our consciousness is like an engine that's always running in the background.

We are selfaware and have free will, we possess emotional and intellectual rationality, we can navigate away from bad and towards good. But the nature of this world limits to how good it can be, and that limit is very restrained in relation to what could be. Just think freely, try to imagine your notion of a fantastic world, not the perfect version of this world, but how you would envision a wonderful world and life if no limitations where at hand, your paradise if you want to call it that. In the endless scope of possible worlds, I sometimes can't escape the feeling that this world falls so short of our expectations. Just that the natural state of this world for life with limited free will is the ruthless law of the jungle, and that it required so much effort for a high free willed being like our humanity to rise above.

This world is good if we stay here because we want, not because we think we must, let alone are forced to. The great question is, how can we create a world worthy of experience, a world where people want to live and grow, when we realize that we don't have to?

The answer is maximizing free will. The great question is, how do we venerate and dignify free will in this world, how do we maximize free will for all with free will? The truth is this - if there is one thing that's sacred, it's free will, because all notions of meaning, value, choice, appreciation and purpose stems from free will.

59.

As clear as day: there are infinite lives in infinite worlds, there is always a new morning dawning in existence. It's only when we understand the infinite scope of the map, that we can navigate and make truly informed decisions. We, nor life per se in our world, chose to exist here. Life became self-aware without asking us, and instilled in us to carry on life's information no matter the conditions it faced. When we realize existence, we are no longer a slave to the drive of life, we live because we choose to, not because we think we have to. We are not beholden to existence; existence is beholden to us.

Don't have children with people you don't love and respect, every child deserves a safe and loving home with caring parents, even if partners love can fade and they separate, we ensure that the child never lose love and presence of parents. If you chose to bring new life to this world, your will is intertwined with the will of the child for at least 21 years, until they reach maturity and can spread their own wings, until they freely can wield their own free will.

60.

Life is information, all things are essentially information. Wind, trees, stones – everything is information. The structural information that makes up a stone has no direction, its utterly depended. Life on the other hand, has a guided direction in the sense that it continues through passing on its structural information. The ember of life was the simplest form of information being structurally preserved, through that set of information replicating itself. Why do we think that's more amazing of a fact than atoms making up all the material in and around us? Is the emergent property of replication more amazing than the emergent property of hydrogen and oxygen forming water, manifested in our perception of wetness? We sure have a selective lens of amazement.

There are many things that bring us happiness here in this life. Relations play a key role, not necessarily marriage and kids, but relations. Not being lonely, having relations with people you like and together doing stuff you like. And if we chose to be alone, it's a choice and not due to lack of possible social interactions. I love my family, but I also love being alone immersed in my own thoughts.

61.

The level of detail even in our universe is amazing, because details creates variety and more possibilities, each turn of the gear, however you define the turn (movement of the electron/string or whatever constitutes the slightest flow of information), is a new reality, a new entire tree branching out from this tree of existence. Imagine infinite trees of universes with infinite universes branching out from every slice of informationtime in the duration of each of those infinite universes. That's just the infinite variations of this universe, now imagine infinite different universes/worlds, in every conceivable and unconceivable way.

Wouldn't our universe have more possible variations/be maximized in its existence, if there were teaming with life? Shouldn't every universe be packed for maximized outcome, yes but could it also be simpler, yes, so there are both in degrees, but more complex ones than simple? I think so. But complexity and maximized outcome doesn't need to be one and the same, maximized function/speed/vibration in the detail creates more outcomes than the aggregated complexity.

What's the point of it all, to move away from bad and towards good? Do I even want to play the game? Would I choose non-existence if I could? What I know is this; I don't owe existence anything, if I'm going to exist, it better be worthy of experience.

62.

Regarding going on. Death is as natural as life, one can't be without the other, but dying as we understand it now incorrectly implies a finality, an end to experience, noting could be further from the truth – know this, a new sun always rises in existence. I'm going to use the word, bardaoam, which literally means to go on, go forth. All lives have an unavoidable end. Bardaoam is our ability to choose a new beginning. You will inevitably go on to another world and life, but if you don't realize existence, the transition is needlessly associated with uncertainty and fear. Don't live because you fear death, live because you enjoy life. Death gives urgency to life, so live freely, cherish your loved ones.

63.

Our being on earth is a result of our parent's decisions, and their lives is a result of their parents decisions. We are a result of active choices, of free will between thinking and feeling humans. When did we develop the choice whether to reproduce or not? We have the genetic instinct to do so, but at some point we developed the ability to choose in a way that animals can't, but we still have the cultural instinct. It's a triumph over life that we can choose whether to bring new life, to do so must be an active choice where we are fully committed to our children. Children enrich our lives immensely; that's another reason why we owe them everything.

Could our exact genetic code, the material information that makes up our being, exist at a different time or in a different world? When it comes to a different time in this world, I think it depends on if our genetic code requires all our ancestors to be the same in a coherent chain. If that is the case, that the uniqueness of our code could only exist at this particular time. When it comes to a different world, I think it depends on how different that world can be for the chain to stay intact or be constituted in an identical way. What other causal chain of events can create that if not the process that stipulated it in this world?

I wonder, if and in what ways our genes affect how we are; how much does it tie down my free will and lean me towards traits that I didn't choose? What preconditions can we have in our material being and what effect do they have on the field our experience navigates in.

We can think of life from the point of view of each individuals lifespan and experience. We can also think of life in this world as a "creature" in its totality, the attributes of life per se, the way it came into being and was moulded by this world.

If I choose not to have a third child, will that child still be? Another way to phrase that is, will every being that can be, be? No I don't think so, firstly because there is no such thing as "all beings", its infinite, and because all complexity is derived from simplicity, and many things, the greatest things, cannot be without free will. There is so much we can ponder, but we are only responsible for the actions emitting from our free will. All our actions exist in the ideaworld, they, like everything else, can exist, but don't come into fruition if a conscious mind doesn't choose to create/materialize them.

64.

It's beneath us to shy away from rationally answering any question. Because we can, and if we can, we should sincerely try. The truth must be as clear as day.

With our free will, we literally curb the fabric of existence – if there is one thing that is sacred, it's free will. The circle of life and death is endless, it's not a singular circle but an endless oscillating wave that takes on every kind of shape, it's not confined to this world, but infinite worlds. Endless lives and deaths before and endless life and death after. That's why it's so utterly irrational to fear death, what I fear is the pain and grief of loved ones that can accompany death, what I'm concerned about is making sure that the reverberations of my life contribute to good when I'm gone. But death, it's merely a door from one life to another. Death is our ever-present gatekeeper opening the door from one life and world to another. What's chasing us - is endless life, not death.

Can my code be a part of any other code, not in the sense of passing on our code to our children, but as in my code being a piece of a bigger entity where it's me but in a much larger sense? Sure why not, but who has agency, who's free will is the driver, who would we be then? In a limited sense, isn't that what we are now? We are the driver, but there's an engine running in the background whose tune affect our life, who produce thoughts and feeling that's not entirely within our control. Our "I" is seemingly the result of a layered totality.

Can my genetic code be in another place or another time without the ancestral chain? Must it be comprised of biological dna that only can be inherited in a causal chain? Another way to frame that is, will all beings be in all worlds at all times? There is no all, and there are infinite unique worlds giving rise to infinite unique vessels of experience. The thing that should puzzle us is not why something exist, because that's the only thing that is certain, the thing that we should contemplate is what can materialize from the ideaworld of all possibilities.

We can't guess the tiniest fraction of what could exist even if we lived the lifetime of all humans combined, we can't judge the absurdities, by what set of frames do we pass judgment on what's normal or not. What we do know is that existence is infinite, and what we can do is deciphering the commonalities in existence, the shape of its flow if you want to call it that, the nature of infinite existence. And most importantly of all, we can judge how we as individual conscious beings act upon the realization of existence.

Good is maximum free will – as little as possible because you must and as much as possible because you want. Many things require effort, like studying to become smarter or training to become stronger, all things, even if they are immensely hard/painful/challenging, are good if you do it because you want to. The idea that we need forced hurdles to be happy is a corrupt way of thinking. But it's baked into the nature of this world; we must get sick as children to create an adequate immune system, suffering is not optional, but demanded, that's what I don't like. How good is earth on the scale of how good and bad worlds can be? I guess it depends, some people, a horrendous amount, truly have lived what we would call hell on earth. I hope that most have lived a good life, but they are also subject to sickness, injuries, the sudden death of loved ones and the slow inevitable decline in physical and mental health. The amount of suffering humans has endured throughout history; wars, famine, slavery, plagues, just to survive to the next day. It's so ruthless.

65.

Simple things create complex things, and the complex things become new building blocks that in turn creates more complex things, that's seemingly how it is in this world, I think that's essentially what we call emergence. Should that not be a universal in existence, how can complex things just be without prior stages, don't complexity demand causality? Causality is intrinsically tied to emergence of complexity from simplicity. We see that in every emergent material and all multifaceted concepts like the adaptation/development/process of life itself.

66.

If we realize existence, we are where we choose to be. Each branch of our existence only grows to the extent of our will. Even if this exact world is repeated, if I decide to bardaoam right now, and choose that every time with these preconditions, then that timeline cease to exist for me. So something in this life has to change to the degree that I will not choose to bardaoam right now.

We seemingly don't choose when, how, or in what circumstance we come into being, because if that was the case, we would never have chosen this world amongst infinite possible worlds. Even if you say that you would, surely you can imagine fates of other lives that you would not want to experience. What we do have is the choice if and when to bardaoam. If I'm happy in this world and contribute to good, I feel good. That does not necessarily equate to that I will come to a good world or a good life after bardaoam. There is no evidence for existential reciprocity in that sense. What I do know is this, no matter what world or life I come to, I will stay if I'm happy, and leave if I'm not. You are not beholden to existence; existence is beholden to you. Seek your happiness, never diminish others. I respect those who mind themselves, and I admire those who contribute to good. The definition of good is that which maximizes free will.

Everything that increase free will is good, that's why resources are important to us in this world, because it increase the range of our free will. We can find joy in the struggle to increase our range of choice, but many of us don't get a dignified start for a good life, the disparities today are vulgar. It's not because we don't recognize the equality of all members of humanity, we inherently do, it's because we are guided by flawed ideas.

67.

What can't I imagine? I can't imagine a world where there is no light, how do they see? I can't imagine a world where there is not gravity, how is their world held together? But maybe light is blinding and gravity is containing, what do I know, my reference is based on this infinitely small slice of existence that is this universe. But the wonderful thing is, what's so truly amazing about this idea, is that no matter what world and lifeform – the most fundamental truth that can established is the realization of existence. No being in existence, no god, alien or gai can realize a more fundamental truth. How amazingly liberating is not that? The realization of existence unites us all, it bridges all realities. The realization of existence is the foundation of truth, the key to all doors, it's up to us to explore with new light.

68.

What's the likelihood of us inhabiting this world considering how infinitely small slice of existence this is? Why aren't we in the good already? From our experiential point of view, we have to be somewhere, we will be everywhere we can be, for now we are here. Is it inevitable? Because we don't choose where we are born, in a way we do, not for ourselves but for our children. What's good or bad in this sense is not objective, everything is good if we do it because we want to, not because we think we have to.

What is the landscape/barrier/space between different worlds made of? Does it go on and change until the next one start, or is it like expanding and contracting/imploding spheres, I don't know what shapes is a good description, but it must end, whatever constitutes and end, all worlds must start and end. Nothing is permanent, only existence is permanent.

In the midst of infinite existence, is bardaoam like cheating, is it better to make every single world good? Cheating what and better for whom? It's up to you decide for yourself if you are happy. A world is per definition not bad if you choose to stay there, when you realize that you're not obliged to.

69.

The code that ignites life is simple at first and then it's the surroundings that shape it. The surroundings define and mould the code, the code becomes what's conducive to survival, and it's the soundings that dictate the terms of survival. Emotions must be immensely advantageous for survival. That's why so many animals have it, if not the broad spectrum of emotions humans have, at least the binary detection of pain and some sort of pleasure. Many beings on earth besides humans have a remarkably broad emotional spectrum.

How specific is your genetic information, how much can we change your code before it ceases to be, you? I think it depended on how much we chose to identify with something that's a result of our material genes.

70.

To realize existence is to realize that the only thing that holds value, purpose and meaning, is experience/free will. The question is, how do we maximize free will for all? I think it's best achieved by upholding these five pillars:

**The golden rule** – Our freedom to think, feel and do whatever you want without infringing on others freedom to think, feel and do whatever they want. This is the universal distinction between right and wrong.

**Access to knowledge** – The freer each and every one of us can access humanity's ideas, the better. The freedom to have access to our garden of knowledge, pick any fruit we want, and plant any new tree we want.

**Initial equality** - The initial resources freeing us to wield our individual free will, an initially equal value; how we attend, trade, build and expand our plot is up to each one of us.

**The tree of life** - Each branch represents a threshold for the advancement of life. The crucial branch is where emotions/experience arise, from this branch the inclusion in the golden rule is safeguarded according to the prerequisites of that life.

**Rightful justice** - For those whose free will is infringed upon. Free will in the society that you choose to be a part of decides what constitutes a violation and how justice should be served, and we agree on universal standards bridging all communities.

There are good ideas in many religions, philosophies, ideologies and creeds. Why, because it's a reflection of the good in humanity. Nothing in the big five is new, it's an extraction of what we inherently always have known to be right.

The big five means that you can live however you want, and in whatever community you want, based on yours and others individual free will. The big five is the foundation that enables that; it's the arch that lifts all individuals in all societies. We will not create a utopia here, but maybe a world amongst infinite worlds where free will wants to be; a world where we want to live and grow.

The one and sole purpose of these five pillars is to uphold the sacred dignity of free will. The big five is not a specific idea, their only purpose is to maximize the freedom of free will, we uphold them to our own benefit.

71.

In a way we are doomed to existence, we have no choice but to make choices. However, we have the power to decide what choices to make and where to make them. The only thing I owe myself is to be happy, the meaning of life is to be happy, whatever happiness means for you. We may not be able to choose where we arrive, but we can choose how we spend our days and when we depart. Realize that the fate of your lives is in your hands, in this and infinite worlds.

If I have no choice but to exist, here and everywhere, why should I accept anything short of my paradise?

72.

What are we? Not who, but what. We are (1) the result of the material information constituting or material being, combined with (2) the information outside that we in any way interact with, and (3) the inställning we chose to have - becoming aware of and direct our agency/free will. These three forms/effects our experience. The most important part is inställning, because it shapes our frame of mind and can change the surrounding miljö for us and others, our perception of ourselves and the world around us. Where does the information of our inställning come from? Is it a tangible emergent property of the first two when the factors of consciousness is sufficiently high, it seems like that's the case.

We are biological and environmental information plus inställning. The biological information is the vessel that holds our awareness, and the environmental information the outer landscape of experience, the result of those two gives rise to a form of "crude I", the engine running in the background, that we become mindful of as we develop higher levels of awareness, when we come to terms with being the self-aware driver.

How much of the choices we make are traceable to our genetic or environmental information? If your environmental information tilts the landscape or encourages you to do good or bad things it will affect your actions and consequently how you view yourself. Who we are is our perception of ourselves. We can strengthen our inställning, which in turn can change how we relate to ourselves and our previous experiences, we can change our surroundings to one that increase good directions for us and others. Inställning, the conscious direction of our free will, that's where the true magic resides.

73.

Is time an independent factor that carries information, or is the unfolding function of information what we call time? If the 2d pictures of information comes one after another, there is also a causal link if one follows from the other. Can time be viewed as the causal continuum, the glue that binds the slices of information, and thus what gives dimensions their form? Because without time it's a static two dimension, or not even that, no dimension. If we view time as an independent factor, all that essentially exist is information and time. All things that are, is information, and for information to play out its function, there must be time. Not space/time, but information/time.

I use the word information, but words can lead our thoughts astray, it just means something with a function, the word information is just the most neutral word I can think of. Everything that can be, every life and every world and everything within every world, can be described in terms of information. That information can be manifested in infinite ways with different properties - factors and effects. Anything that is, is composed of something, that something can in every emergent layer and as a whole be described in terms of information, the definition of information is, something with a function.

Religion, ideology, philosophy, science, whatever you call it, all that matters is that it's true. Truth is the highest of authorities. That's why I like the scientific method, it seeks truth and is inherently critical of itself. Truth is not the same as preference. All things are not either true or not, many things are subjective in nature. A general evidence based best practice is a likely truth, not absolute. Fundamental math is an absolute truth, the best way to teach it is a likely/subjective truth, why, because its recipients are not the same, the information in the equation itself varies.

If we view time as the carrier of information, then time is what brings change to information/everything. The biological information constituting your being and the information in your surroundings change. Nothing is still, you are another person now from a second ago, in a slight way compared to you now and you ten years ago, depending on how much information in your surroundings and in your genes change during that period of time. Not to mention the possible change in your inställning.

Infinite everything, every infinite set of information in every iteration and configuration, can be in the ideaworld, but some things can only be manifested by a conscious mind who thinks/feels/acts - free will is the only thing that has that power, to alter an otherwise deterministic timeline and to bring forth materialized existence that otherwise could not be.

"Laws of nature" are what we call the general overarching structures that sets the frameworks for the possible functions of information within a world. If there were no causality in the unfolding of information's functions, then no set laws of nature could be, there would be no framework to build the world around. If things constantly fluctuate and random events happens, then no structural information can be, no integrity could be maintained. One could say that a little non-causality is possible in a world, that all things but a few are causal, that just some things pop up in existence without any form of causal trail. If a little, why not all of it, it feels like were nearing the conflation between the ideaworld and the materialized world, that's a dead end. Complex things cannot just pop into existence without a causal chain from simplicity to complexity. Because if one complex thing could happen, why not all? And lived experience demands causality, without it, nothing matters.

Quantum particles can in a sense be random, because it maximizes outcome, but not lack causality. The coming number follows from the previous, so its causal, but what number it will be is not certain, so it's not deterministic, but if the range is say 1-10, it will most likely be 4-6, so its probabilistic.

The set of natural laws we have in our world are just one of infinite ways things can be. The trick is to find out what's more likely than not. It's not given what number gravitation should have or what effect each number give rise to. Mathematics describe factors/structures and their effects, cataloguing and categorizing it, the existing and potential patterns we can measure in our world.

74.

The realization of existence and the dignity of free will is the truth. The entire purpose of this book is my best attempt to portray/explore those truths and what they mean for us. That exploration sometimes leads to detours into details/other subjects of interest, it's frankly hard to contain my curiosity, if you find truth accept it, if you find flaws, please correct me.

75.

How restrained is our free will, how much of our actions is influenced by our genetic and environmental information, how tilted is our field? How much of the choices we make would be the same if we relived our lives infinite times? But is that a good metric of free will? A being with maximum free will, would not their actions also in large be the same? Because the presumption is that we have no memory, and we seemingly judge the trajectory afterwards with all facts at hand. This is not a good metric of the degree of free will. The metric is not if it's the same if replayed infinite times, the metric is if we can predict it in advance. We can predict a stone, a tree or the wind, but not free will in the same degree. The fact that it's hard to predict the weather is not because it has free will, but because it's many factors that interact. If we know all the factors we can with precision predict the weather. Even if we could pinpoint all the material factors of free will, we could not predict it with precision. Because you may be able to pinpoint all the factors in the genetic and environmental information, but not in the direction of the agency above that, the installing. The emergent agency is vastly greater than the material composing it. If we replayed the big bang infinite times, all things would unfold in the same way, except free will. We are not merely the predictable sum of our preconditions; we are more than that. And we have always known it; we use words as soul or essence. It's just recognition of the great truth that free will truly is sacred/magical/elevated, the words don't matter, what matters is that we can choose, we are not merely subjects of the world around us, our choices shape the world around us, and without us, infinite worlds in infinite existence cannot harbour one single grain of meaning.

The difference for the being with maximized free will is that their course of life, regardless of how many times its replayed, will be a reflection of their true will, while it for us to a larger extent can be our preconditions that tilts the field of our experience. How do we maximize the reflection of our true will, by standing on truth, by being grounded in the true nature of our reality, the realization of existence and the sanctity of free will, are those defining truth.

What maximizes free will is to realize existence, because you realize that you should only do what you want, there is no unwilling musts. There is a wider array of options that opens up, that's unlocked by your new frame of mind. You contemplate more how life should be for you to want to live it. Existence is not the gift, your experience is the gift, realize that you are the author and not the subject of your existence.

76.

Take a breath and think. Just be alone, and think freely, contemplate the most fundamental of questions, why is existence? Why do you take it for granted more than anything else? Why are you amazed by anything that exists, instead of the intently greater fact that any of it can exist, at all? Why do you focus on what exists, instead of that existence in itself is to begin with? Do you think it's rational to think, that of all the infinite things that could exist, this particular world and life of ours is the one and only totality of existence? If there's one thing that's anthropocentric or egocentric, just fundamentally misleading, it's that. To think that we and this world is the totality of existence, is now shockingly more shortsighted than any of our previous historic misconceptions. In the infinity of existence, you think this world is the only thing? If not, one of how many? Once the fact of existence face you, it does not matter in what shape existence confronts you, it can be a grain of sand or entire universes, it does not matter, the realization of existence is still the same. Any ray of existence bears testimony to the infinite light of existence.

Whatever it is that encompass your statement of - existence is - whatever "something" you establish as existing, is nothing compared to that it can exist to begin with. That something can be, is an infinitely greater miracle than what can be. All that is or can be utterly pales in comparison to that it can be to begin with, the existence in itself - is.

If you think that existence is limited, limited by what? Every time you set any form of limit you always ask what's outside of the limit or what came before that limit. That's why some scientists still tie themselves in contradictory knots when trying to rationalize that big bang was the start of existence, that why they almost dogmatically don't like the question, what came before? And if you think there is a god, don't you see that god cannot precede existence, but that existence always precedes any notion of god? Don't conflate our universe or concept of deities with existence itself; existence per se is eternal, anything that can exist is not. No god or simulation runner can have a more profound realization than that existence is the infinite nature of reality. Either nothing exists, or everything exists. Even the word everything falls short, it implies a totality, it has boundaries in scope. What is a good word for "infinite everything", for there not being a beginning nor an end to what is/can be?

77.

Consciousness is the light that luminates existence. What is our consciousness? A gradual development of life, intelligence, emotions and memory - that leads to awareness, self-awareness, and self-awareness with the ability to ponder existence. Even if humanity's form of consciousness is limited, even if our consciousness doesn't even scrape the surface of what free will and experience can be, no being in existence can state a more fundamental truth nor have a more fundamental realization than that of existence, none of them is above us. The only thing free will can be judged by is how we wield our free will.

I use the words intelligence and emotions, it is essentially to think or feel, words like heart and mind are common throughout cultures. What else can we do that describe the fundamentals of our experience? One might say intuition or epiphany, I would still categorize them under the umbrella of emotions and intelligence, because they are the result of those two core factors, aren't they? An epiphany or intuition can't be had without a certain degree in the factors of emotions and intelligence, and the higher the degree, the more nuanced/higher insights and intuitions we can have. What's unlocked by the higher degrees in the factors of emotions and intelligence are the threshold levels of awareness. What do you think, how would you categorize our factors of consciousness, how many can be, just what can experience, be? Its awe-inspiring, almost daunting to think about.

Awareness on the most basic level is the distinction between detecting something and not, in the most rudimentary way. Just a simple binary detection of some aspect of a being's surroundings. A code that if this happens do that, an algorithm with one factor and a function, that increase the survival of the entity containing that information. For that detection to be more useful some sort of basic storing of information is needed, the early stage of "memory".

A simple lifeform can be totally random/blind, with one piece of structured information, one simple binary algorithm that gives just one direction to that randomness, tied to some form of detection by some form of sense. One sliver of light in the darkness. If you encounter, smell, feel this - do that. That algorithm increases the likelihood of the being which contains it to survive, if the effect of that algorithm makes that entity better suited for the environment it currently inhabits. Over time more structured information develops that creates new building blocks, the algorithms it has can be discarded or built upon, depending on what's beneficiary for survival.

Many have a hard time grasping how something as complex as life, and they mean our evolved human life, can be started without a creator, comparing it to finding a watch in the sand. Don't they see that complexity emerge from simplicity? We see it all around us, not only for life, but for all things. Do they deny that earth, wind, and water are made of molecules, that in their turn are made of atoms, that in their turn are made of simpler parts in layers of emergence?

Do they for example deny that a certain configuration of atoms can form a molecule with the trait of wetness? Why do they then have a hard time accepting that a certain configuration of atoms can form molecules with the trait of replication? Like the watch in the sand, the ember of life, you don't find a fully developed human in the sand, you find a self-replicating piece of information that you probably wouldn't even recognize as life if you came across it.

78.

Emotions doesn't require self-awareness, it can arise within the scope of awareness. An aware being detects something and ties that feeling to the most basic form of emotion. I sometimes use the words emotions and feelings as synonyms and sometimes with different meanings, emotions being more advanced than merely feeling/registering something. I try to be precise; I hope the context around the choice of word clarifies the meaning I try to convey.

We exhibit horrendous cruelty towards many domesticated animals we keep with us and thus have a responsibility for, like cows, chickens, pigs and sheep, even though they clearly have emotions and are highly beneficial for us. Their suffering doesn't affect us as it should, we are too disconnected from it.

Meat has been an important part of our diet for a long time and we like eating it. But surely it is a testimony to the corruptness of this world, that we and so many other beings need to kill and eat conscious beings with emotions to feel physically good. Imagine if all of us stopped eating meat, the suffering would not stop, have you ever seen how it looks like when hyenas hunt and eat a wildebeest or when a weasel hunts and eats a rabbit? We talk about animals' natural habitat, but none of us would want to live there. We fought tooth and nail to escape the horrendous life that is the law of the jungle. Maybe if we ensure that the animals we keep, by all standards have a better life and death than they would have in our absence, maybe then it's ok. But is it ok to breed for the purpose of killing? Maybe so, if we breed in a scale and way that ensures a good life. Death is inevitable, if life and death with us is better than in the wild, if our presence increase the good and decrease the bad, maybe then it's ok. This world is corrupt, but if we're going to live in it, we have to make the best of it. Who we choose to be is all that matters.

79.

Existence is not synonymous with anything that exists. There is no such thing as existence in its entirety, there is no totality of existence that can be embraced. The idea of creator worship means that existence in itself has a will, that everything is wrapped up in one singular being. That the true nature of reality is not infinite existence, but dictated existence, by a being that is existence in itself. It's an idea of necessity in times of uncertainty; an idea of illogical paradoxes that we also long have recognized cannot be reconciled with neither free will nor unjust suffering. And have you ever thought about the theatrics of it all?

80.

One way to define time is to say that it's the carrier of information. But is it the case that time isn't a tangible thing, that it's what we call the unfolding of information? We say that time passes, but time is just the result of something happening, it's not that it happens because of time, that it happens results in what we perceive as time. Time can move however much it wants, if it's not correlating with a change in the flow of information, it does not matter, it's for all sense and purposes the same. One way to look at it is that time cannot be without information, there is nothing for time to carry - and that information cannot be without time, there is nothing that can unfold the information. And from that conclude that they are two distinct things but still two sides of the same coin. On the other hand, saying information without time, isn't that just like saying a stop in the flow/function of information? Why do we need this extra thing called time?

The tangible thing is information, time can be seen as a word for the relative motion/function/flow of information from the frame of reference of experience.

There cannot be (in our world and I wonder if it's not a commonality in existence) fewer dimension than three. You can theoretically say that 3d is 2d plates stacked on each other, but for the 2d plates to be able to interact with each other you need information/time to bind them, to give the dimensions their form. Is it the case that 3d is the least of dimensions that can be in existence? I think so, the alternative is infinite divisibility, which cannot materialize.

When we take a picture of something it's a form of measurement, a picture of time and information, the way that information was arrayed at that specific time (instead of time, we could just as well say at that specific informational configuration). It's a slice across the entire universe when we measure information, we just focus on the thing we are measuring/taking a picture of.

We can divide a second, but the second is only meaningful if it's tied to information, otherwise, what is it your dividing? When we divide time we divide how much informationflow that can be within that sequence of time. Dividing a second is the theoretical aspect of dividing information into smaller and smaller information sequences/units. Information is something with a function, the information and the function cannot be without the other, why do we need to add this extra time ingredient? Time is seemingly the result of and not the causer of the unfolding of informational flow/functions. Time is what we perceive/call the flow of information, a way of thinking in our day to day lives, but I think that it's not a tangible thing in its own right.

81.

When we zoom in and measure the smallest of discrete units/particles, what is it we measure, is it the whole or part of a whole? Both in its scope and its sequence, do we see the totality of the thing in area and the totality of the thing in its function. We may capture the totality in area in one picture, but we need several pictures to cover and measure its function. If I utter a word and write it down on a piece of paper, you can measure the totality of the word on paper, but not its function in sound, if you do a singular measurement of the sound you will hear part of the word and can't comprehend neither meaning nor context. We need to grasp the totality in scope and sequence to know its function. When we try to find the smallest thing, each time we view it or measure it, it's how it was functioned in that exact timeslice. You just see or measure part of whatever you're trying to measure. Because that same thing can be something or somewhere else at another timeslice, and you need several time slices to tell what it is or what it's doing. How sure are we that we are measuring the whole and how fast can we measure to not miss crucial parts of its sequence/function? Do we know over how many timeslices the totality of its scope and function plays out? And just how do we define the "whole" function, where and when the function begins and ends, is it even correct to think in those terms?

Regarding time. One way is saying, to move fast in information/space is to move fast in time, because time and information are essentially the same thing. Another way to say it is, to move fast in information is to speed up the flow of information, to speed up the unfolding of the sequences/links of information.

If everything is information, and no information in our world can move/flow/unfold faster than the speed of light, and if we view time is the carrier of information, does that mean that light is the maximum speed of time, or rather that light is the maximum speed of the unfolding of information's function, at least in our cosmic space (the other being a quantum space where light may not be an equivalent limitation)? Everything can be described in terms of information. Let's get in some details, just because it's interesting to ponder. I think that the conventional threefold

separation between time, space and matter is flawed. Matter and space are information, space can be seen as less dense information and matter is concentrated/accumulated information, everything is information, there is information in a cube of absolute vacuum. The most non-matter thing we can think of is still information, vacuum is diluted information, at least from our perception in cosmic space. Information can have different properties. Information is, something with a function. Time is what we call the flow/unfolding of information, the playing out of informational functions. I think that the accurate way is to think in terms of information flow (“informationtime”).

I don't think that gravity is best explained as a curvature in the geometry of spacetime, it implies something rigid/static. Information attracts information, the gathering/amassing/accumulation of information influence the information around it. The gathering of information in one place contracts the information around it towards its centre. The more accumulation of information the stronger the contraction/attraction. Does that mean that there's denser and/or faster flow/acceleration of information the closer to the source of gravity we get? Gravity is the effect of accumulated/mass of information. There is more “time” where there is more information, or rather more/faster flow of information.

In all worlds, there is information, and that information unfolds/flows for anything to happen, we call it time. It's a constant, there must be causal information flow in every world in existence, but its properties and functions vary in infinite ways. If it's not causal then we cannot talk in terms of an arrow/continuum, neither of “time” or of experience. If it's utterly random then there is no room for structural integrity. Something can in a sense be random but still causal, that one picture follows from the previous, but what the next picture will be does not. Causality and predictability/probability needs to be for any structure to be, for complexity to emerge from simplicity. What is a structure, anything with more than one “quantized” something, and thus has an intertwined function. There is no dance of functions without causality.

Our experience/free will is probabilistic in the sense that we have a personality, that we are influenced by the cultural inclinations around us, that we strive towards truth, sincerity and the golden rule. The range of increased possible coming pictures of experience rises as we climb the tree of life, still causal, but an incredibly wider array of new possibilities. The array is wider in our minds, the possible pictures that can follow, like your next thought, it can be quite random, the orchestra of your crude I is running in the background, you are the conductor.

Math is the description of and relation between variables/factors and their effects, essentially the different ways information can materialize. Math can therefore be everything, but to say that our world is math is misleading, it's a description of reality, not reality itself.

82.

Why would an omnipotent god do any of it when he knows all of it? How it will begin, play out and end, for each and all. Have you truly contemplated the spectacle of it all?

Ask god to cure all children's cancer right now, it didn't happen, god could have done it, but actively chose not to. Why would you be grateful when god cures your child's disease but not other's? Are your children more deserving of not suffering than other children? God could cure all children's cancer and ease their suffering right now, but not only did “he” actively choose not to, he explicitly dictated a world into existence where innocent children inevitably will be ravaged by disease. Do you think it's rational to thank him for liberating you from that he himself has preordained? Would you not ease the suffering of children if you could? Do you then think that the one who cause their suffering deserves your worship or condemnation?

“It’s a test of the parent’s devotion and patience”, is it a test to hurt an innocent child, to force a mother to witness her beloved child slowly melt away? What an utterly wicked spectacle. Know this, if any creation inflicts suffering by design, then the creator of it is per definition evil.

If god is sufficient in himself, why create anything at all? God did not have to do any of it, do you understand, he did not have to create anything at all! If he now must create for whatever reason, why create anything short of paradise? Of all the infinite everything he could have chosen to create; it is cruelty and breathtaking depravity to will an existence into creation where children are tormented. If this world is a creation, then the one who created it deserves an eternity in hell for every tear shed by a grieving mother.

If god knows the endpoint of everything, why set anything in motion, why put you through it? You have free will, it cannot be reconciled with a preordained destiny, it’s either your will, or gods will, you’re either the ink or the author, either you shape your existence, or god does. The only way to untangle the contradiction is to claim that god choose to relinquish power. God can use you as his fingers but he chooses not to, he knows your every thought, action and outcome, but he refrains from controlling it. But then do things happen because of him or not? If he sets the board in motion and takes his hands off it, then prayer is of no meaning, the only way prayer is of any meaning is if he choose to go in and alter the board and the pawns on it. Can you see the contradiction in not condemning god for the earthquake that kills entire families, but praising it as a miracle of god when we find one orphaned child under the rubble?

“Who are you to question god?!” I think that’s where our insecurity comes from, our humility and acknowledgment of our limits; it’s one thing to be humble and acknowledge our limits, it is another thing entirely to utterly capitulate our reason and moral judgment.

If you try to abandon god’s destiny, “Our fate is not written, god knows it, but it’s not written in stone, god have given us sacred free will, we can do horrendous acts but it doesn’t have to be, we have true agency, we can choose”. It is true that we have sacred free will, but why condemn your experience to this fragile being in this harsh world? Even if god has not preordained what you do, he has preordained you and the world around you. He chose to create a world where devastating suffering is unavoidable, if not all the horrendous acts of cruelty inflicted by other free will, so the “natural” disasters shattering families and devastating entire communities, diseases, infections, parasites, our fragility and vulnerability to injuries, the perils of pregnancy and the burden of work. Forget about how this world could have been better, there are no limitations in infinity, think of the worlds god could have willed into existence, do you see?

“Have faith, God causes suffering as he wills and ease the suffering of who he wills - it’s not for us to question, be patient and obedient, we don’t see the big picture”. Please tell me, what bigger purpose justifies tormenting children? You would not hurt children, no good being would, it is degrading to postulate that the ultimate being would. Don’t you see that a god could have dictated the frames for all bigger pictures, why create one where the most innocent souls are hurt, it was not an inevitability, and if you claim it is, why create anything at all?

If your life is a test, it’s not a fair test, the only way to know the character of anyone is to put them in the shoes of everyone that has ever existed. Even then, where is the profound wisdom in allowing genocide, incestual rape, torture and child trafficking. “God did not choose that, the one who committed it did!”. Who created the one who committed it, knowing exactly what would happen? Who set the board and the pawns in motion were that outcome was an inevitability? Who created satan? Who built the tree and put the snake in the garden? Who shaped the test that would doom you, knowing it all before it was done. What an utterly corrupt spectacle.

Was god incomplete before creating us? Why would god make horrendous things come into fruition when he didn't have to? Would you do it? You wouldn't, no good being would. Then why would you accept the concept of, be ambiguous about, want to believe in, wish there was, let alone worship, anyone who did?

If you believe in a creator then you believe that the true nature of reality is not infinite existence, but dictated existence. If you believe that god precedes or are synonymous with existence - then the true nature of reality is not infinite existence, but gods explicitly dictated existence. Amongst all things god could choose to create or not create, he chose to create this world, where suffering is ingrained in its very core. Would a good creator create evil if he had the choice not to?

The level of suffering that god has created is beyond heart-shattering, have you not reflected upon that, how can you not feel beyond outraged? Does god enjoy it? He clearly must, because he explicitly willed it. He chose to create this world, knowing all the horrific things we would endure, why? "He sends us prophets/messengers to lead the way". Why create such evil and trickle down some light? "He sent his son/himself to die for our sins". Why would he do that? What the hell is wrong with him? Why even create that, he didn't have to, do you understand, he chose to, to play out this concocted theatre with him in the centre. What a depraved spectacle.

We know that a good creator would not create such a harsh and unforgiving world, that's why we have no choice but to put the blame on us. Know this: any being with the power to create free will, is indebted to her creation, not the other way around.

"But all this suffering will be worth it when you endure it and are patient and don't criticize god – when you come to paradise." I would still despise him, for all the children he allowed to suffer, and I would want to convey that outrage to him, if he won't let me, if he decrease my free will and force me to love him, then it's not me, he suppress my capability to remember all the children he allowed to be ravished, and my most human ability to be enraged about it, to question and hold him responsible for it. Here on earth we can choose not to believe in his righteousness, can you choose that in paradise?

How can our hearts not shatter for the plight of humanity, we desperately try to cling on to a benevolent parent in the dark void of uncertainty and hardship. I don't rage against god, there is no ultimate creator being, I rage against our perception of god, an idea I once ascribed to, that I once prostrated and prayed to five times a day. Religions are potent ideas, because we crave an explanation that help us make sense of our own and the world's existence. It's very hard to expel a foundational idea, however flawed, if we cannot replace it with a better.

There are immense wisdom, good rules and guidance in religion, because it's a reflection of the good in us. Even that which we today can see is corrupt, was once thought to be righteous. Neither the good nor the bad has an external source, it comes from within. Humanity's journey sure has had its wicked episodes, how could it not in this unforgiving world. Our religions elevated us from the barbaric law of the jungle; it was the mortar of civilization. Our religions and spiritual creeds contributed to slowly but surely put humanity on the track towards a dignified future. God was the authority of necessity in times of uncertainty. None of the moral contradictions and absurdities I've describe are new, we have always known, and suppressed it against better judgment, why, because what has been the alternative ideas to creator worship? Nihilism, moral relativism, bottomless meaninglessness? How could they suffice when none of them are true, and perhaps even worse.

Religion provides us with a “why” – it’s hard to expel it when we can’t replace it with a better. Science have not provided that, “be in awe over the vastness of the universe”, how can you find meaning in such a shallow thing? I want to make sense of my own and the worlds existence, I want to disperse the uncertainty of death, I want to know the true meaning of life, the universal distinction between right and wrong. Your answer is, “isn’t it amazing that we are made of stardust”, what a senseless proposition.

Every human must have a why, a reason to wake up the next day, a meaning to live, a purpose. Even if we don’t articulate it or contemplate it, we have it. If you believe in and are devoted to any concept of god, I know that you feel that your foundation will crumble if you “lose faith” – It won’t. The truth is that meaning and purpose are not dictated for you; it originates from you. The pen that authors your life and existence lies in your hand. Every human strives to feel the solid foundation of truth beneath us. Know this, the realization of existence and the elevation of free will is that foundation.

Your free will is sacred, your privilege is the golden rule, and your responsibility is to truthfully uphold it. Why, because you have always realized the sanctity of free will, and denounced the profanity of violating it.

83.

Even though the realization of existence is the truth, it has no special place, it doesn’t have its own pillar in the big five. It’s a knowledge that you have access to; your free will dictates what you want to adhere to. Whether or not we are good persons is not based on what we believe or claim to be true - it’s solely based on whether we uphold the sanctity of free will or not. How do we venerate and maximize our free will? I think its best done through the big five.

The big five paves our access to knowledge and frees us to produce our own knowledge, it upholds the dignity of yours and all others free will, it grants us an equal opportunity to live our best life, it frees us to live how we want, according to the values and rules we want, with universal standards that lifts us all. It obliges us to stand up for those whose free will is infringed. You can live individually or in whatever union, society, group, community, tribe or nation you want – you can hinder anyone from joining but not hinder anyone from leaving. The only thing that holds meaning is free will, the big five is an attempt to, entirely based on humanity’s long recognized values and knowledge, portray how the sanctity of free will can be upheld in a world like ours, the sole purpose is to free, the free will of each and all of us.

One could ask, what’s most important, free will or truth? They are the same, the ultimate pursuit of free will is to stand on truth. Still, if a choice had to be made, the answer is always free will, because it is the one meaningful truth.

84.

Imagining a supreme creator architect is more understandable when we think that this is the only world, when we are perplexed over the “precision of the universe”. That mistake is made both within religious and scientific circles because they both operate under the same flawed presumption, that the natural state of reality is non-existence. There was nothing and then god created the world, or there was nothing and then big bang lit the light of the world. It’s like being bewildered by a single note of one string, without realizing that the true nature of reality are infinite strings that give rise to infinite notes. This world is finetuned from our perspective because it engulfs our whole perception, but there are infinite worlds, each one of them precise and finetuned in their own right. It’s hard to put any note in perspective if you don’t have a sense of the infinite orchestra.

85.

We seemingly process information at a certain constant rate, the rate/frame of our experience. Regardless of if we view time and information as two different things in their own right, or time as the consequence of the unfolding function of information, in either case, one can't be without the other, does that entail that "processing" more information equates to processing more time? The internal rate/frame/flow of our experience remains the same but the external flow of information can increase relative to others flow of information, our internal clock is the constant from our perspective, the external clock isn't. The only thing included in our internal clock is our own experience and the frame of reference accompanying it, all else is part of the external flow. We can speed up the external flow of information relative to others when we travel through informationtime faster or when we are near a faster flow of informationtime (gravity), which is essentially the same thing/effect. We can also imagine how we would be in different frames of reference even when standing next to each other if the rate/flow of our experience differed.

I think that the flawed nature of thinking in terms of space, time and matter, is to explain gravity in a coherent way. What attracts matter we ask, puzzled by "action on a distance", like there is emptiness between them. Space/vacuum isn't static emptiness, its information, a medium just as matter. We ask if matter tell spacetime how to curve, and if spacetime tells matter how to move. Do we need a curvature in the "fabric of spacetime", is that the right way of thinking about it? I don't think so, I think that gravity exerts the same effect on "space" as it does on "matter", both are information, one is essentially just more "diluted" than the other.

Gravity is what we call one general effect of informationtime, it accumulates/attracts other informationtime around it towards its centre. Gravity don't curve informationtime, it compresses it, or rather informationtime moves faster the nearer it is to the centre of gravity, the flow increase, it's more informationtime (either because the increased flow "compresses" it or because more information flows during a unit of time) nearer the centre than further away from the source of gravity, what's the ratio? If we view it as a curvature, shouldn't there be less informationtime around the source of gravity? You could say that it represents an increased distance, but is that warped distance caused by a curvature, or a flow of information?

The word informationtime feels redundant, we could just as well just say information, and its unfolding function/time is implied. To say that time can pass, is meaningless without the correlating flow of information. On the other hand, we could say that information can move/flow, and it's not meaningless without the correlating passage of time, because then "time" inevitably moves, the flow of information is what we call time. The definition of information is something with a function, a function cannot be had without the information flowing/unfolding, then it's not information. It's not time, but the flow of information that's relative. Information flows faster with speed and near gravity, which is essentially the same thing.

If you say that information cannot flow without time, you say that time is real and its function is to carry information, then you talk in terms of the arrow of time, that time needs to go in one direction for information to have a sequence, a causal continuum. We can also phrase that as information flows in a causal continuum, it's the arrow of information, and that flow creates/is the causal chain of events/functions. I will use time as a useful word, but I don't think it's a separate tangible thing in its own right.

Even if you could "go back in time" (go back in the chain of information), your sequence of informationflow curves back and stays intact, the rest of the flow continues in your absence, your arrival changes the information equation which diverge and branches out into another world.

I enjoy to ponder freely, this gravity and time stuff are details/detours, it has no bearing on the realization of existence and the marvel/dignity of free will, which is the sole message of this book. Trying to explore the nature of our world can however shed light on the nature of existence.

86.

Any dimension lesser than three is like saying information without a function, which cannot be. It's the flow of information that gives dimensions their shape, and it must be instant from the information's inception, whatever that is. 2d don't become 3d because times carries it, binds it or "stretch" it. Information cannot be in 1d or 2d, 3d is the least of dimensions that practically can materialize. Because 1d and 2d is the same as infinite divisibility, wherever you stop, there is a "thickness", wherever you stop, there is a 3d shape.

Time is not a separate dimension, I think that perception of seeing time as a fourth necessary ingredient comes from viewing space/information as static. The flow of information is in one way the arrow, the unfolding sequence of information, and in another way the depth, the 3d arena, the general flow of information. It's almost like the individual present can be envisioned as a "2d" slice going through a 3d space. And that 2d slice is the relative flow of information from the point of view of your reference, your experience.

We say go back in time, but should we not go forward to go back in time, the events from the past have emitted from us at the speed of light. If we want to see how the world was a million years ago we must reach the light that earth reflected a million years ago, nothing can travel faster than light, and even if we could, we could theoretically see but not interact with the past. As far as experience is concerned, the past is seemingly laid, the future is not.

Does time/the flow of information, moves at a certain rate? What is a certain rate, there is seemingly no objective rate. The rate of experience is constant between all human experiences, but the external flow unfolding around us can differ when we are in different frames of reference and is therefore relative. But wasn't there a de-facto rate/flow of information before any life/experience ever saw daylight? There is a flow, because without the flow, there is no information, however, that flow is depended on how it's experienced. Because without experience, the flow might just as well not exist. So there is not one or a "de facto" flow, there are seemingly as many external rates/speeds of flows as there are beings in different frames of references.

We say that the big bang occurred approximately 14 billion years ago, what defines that timeframe? One way to look at it is that the internal flow/rate of experience defines that external flow, regardless om how much external information flows during our internal time unit. One years lived experience is one year, regardless of how many times the earth orbits around the sun. A being whose experience process information at another rate than the human experience, will have another frame of reference and therefore another definition of how much time has passed since the big bang (is that possible when the speed of light is constant for all?). Even two different human civilisations that first saw daylight in completely different frames of reference (for example if one of them formed closer to a strong source of gravity like a block hole) will differ on how much time has passed since the big bang, depended on if we measure the time passed by our internal or external flow of information. The same amount of external time has passed, but different amount of internal time, so I think it comes down to what informational flow we anchor time on. There is no objective external information flow, it's essentially defined by the frame of reference, which is bound to the experience.

Gravity is the degree of accumulated/mass of information, consciousness is the degree of complexity of information. What is complexity? Complexity is the amount and significance of variables/factors, and their interactions with each other internally and with other external variables. What's external and internal is fluid depending on the parameters of what you define as a separate/independent information structure. The question is if we have identified all factors at play and their independent and codependent effects/interactions.

Even if we could travel back to previous pictures in the flow of information and interact, you are linked in a chain that curves back, there is a continuation, a causal sequence of information in a coherent timeline. If you change something in the past it's a new timeline, a new branch. The one you left continues in your absence, and the one you go back to changes with your presence. Whatever change you cause when you go back alter that timeline accordingly, but you are still there with a continuation from the timeline you left but are bound to, you create a new world branch but don't erase the branch you came from.

87.

Existence is the endless presumption, not the limited exception. Nothing can be permanent, except existence. Nothing that exists can be synonymous with existence in itself. There is no totality, there is no beginning nor end, no circumference to embrace, so what is it your synonyms with? All things and all life have a beginning and an end in existence. Many of the properties of our concepts of god is a description of existence, in the sense that it has no beginning nor end, everything is part of it, nothing is outside of it, it precedes everything and it's the "creator" of everything, all is bound by it. Our flawed, but understandable mistake, was to personify existence. I also think it stems from not wanting to be "orphaned", it feels good to imagine that the ancestors of past days, a benevolent father in the sky or a lifeembracing mother earth is watching over us, has a plan or upholds some sort of cosmic balance. That there is a meaning to it all, that we are not alone in this cruel world, that's why we had to blame ourselves for the corrupt state of the world, because if it was the creators fault, the structure would fold.

88.

Free will increase complexity and the possibilities that can be in this and every world. Free wills actions can be probabilistic (behaviour) but not certain, you are not a slave to your preconditions, you have true agency, you decide, there is no notion of "the present" without you, nor is there a future, a past or any concept of the word - choice. What is now, yesterday or tomorrow in the absence of any free fill/experience? Does it matter, at all? No one but yourself can with certainty know what you will decide, and not even you can always fully know what your next thought will be. The engine inevitable runs in the background, we choose to be the aware driver.

To understand what can have an experience, or what is alive and not, we should look to what differs them, not what unites them. Just because everything in this world is made of atoms does not mean that the electron has a conscious property.

From now on, I'm going to call our inner (genetic) information that constitutes our being, and the outer environmental information that we directly or indirectly interact with, 2x. Even if "all" inner information could be, not all outer information can be, even if all beings can be, not all experience can be. We don't choose the inner information we are born with, but the outer is in varying degrees subject to our free will. We can't (yet?) in this world change the information that makes up our being, but we can choose in what waters to navigate.

If I say that our free will is framed by 2x, then what is pure free will? Maybe pure free will is instantaneously coming into existence with no luggage, unlike the information in our genes that tilt the field. Just facing it all at once with all the factors of consciousness that can be, dialled up to max. Pure free will is to not have inner information that affects or tilts the field of our experience in any direction, no thumb on your scale. And to have an outer code that is not forced upon you, all that you encounter is because you want. But this feels a bit tricky, not at least because no complex thing can pop into existence without a causal continuum from simplicity to complexity, and besides that, how would you know what you want in the absence of any pretext or context? Pure free will is not possible in this world, because even if you have an untainted inner code, you can't stop the wind from blowing on you, we inevitably face a coloured reality.

What preconditions can we have in our material information, in our first x? I think we can view it in two ways, one is the tilts of how humanity has formed in this world, if and how the harsh nature of this world has caused tilts of our first x, if the uncertainty and danger when we were submerged in the law of the jungle has made us wary, reminiscing of danger, anxious. But one could also say that we had to be brave, rise up to danger, be calm in the heat of the moment, relax to gain physical and mental clarity. Another way we can have tilts in our first x is the uniqueness of every being's information, we are almost identical but have slightly different traits and abilities, I wonder to what extent. I think that the tilts of our experience is first and foremost influenced by the outside world, that it's not our first x, but the second x, the world we come to, that influence us the most. We can quite easily realize how different our path in life, and everything about our perception of ourselves and our surroundings could be, depended on what life we came to; how different the same child could be depended on what shoes she was born into.

If we make it good here, if we are good and spread good vibes, others will more likely be good and spread good vibes, which makes it more likely that the good we contribute to reflects good back on us. There is, as far as I can tell, no guarantee that the good we do here will result in the next life being good. What we can do however, is to make sure that all lives that comes to earth have a good chance at life - what a self-evidently magnificent task - this is the power of free will. No matter what world you come to, may you be welcomed.

No matter the world, only you decide if you want to stay, you do not owe existence anything, existence owe you everything. If you stay - contribute to good, at least don't do bad, then the sum of the worlds we are in and come to will be better. We do wise in seeing ourselves in each other, like so many other things, we have always known it.

89.

Just who are, you? You are essentially who you decide to be, given the effect that your 2x has on you, but also what effect you allow it to have on you. You can maybe be born with an inclination to be introvert, into a certain culture or be born without legs and that affects you, but you can choose to be more outgoing, question the norms of your culture, learn to live an active life anyway. All of them can be hard and require effort, but it's within your inställning.

Will I see my loved ones again in other lives? In the infinite of existence, how many loved ones are there for any definition of "you"? Everything is possible, maybe it's possible to navigate towards that, but the question entails that we remember it, that we have that continuity. Are there worlds where we remember previous lives, I can't see why that wouldn't be possible, are there worlds where we don't, yes and this is seemingly one of them. What's important is this, cherish your loved ones, right here and right now.

The golden rule is not to treat others like you want to be treated, or to not treat others as you don't want to be treated. You are not a template for everybody else. The golden rule is that all free will has the sacred privilege of wielding our free will as we will, and the sacred responsibility of not infringing on each other's right to wield our free will as we will.

If you want to treat others as you want to be treated, then maximize free will for all. To maximize free will we need, due to us not being able to get all the nutrition, health and wealth we need from the sun, a level of financial base, a plot that all have as a birthright, initial equality. Each one can then by their free will act in a way that diminish or increase their plot. Maybe a way to achieve that could be that when we leave this world, we divide our inheritance between all (new?) members of humanity, why wouldn't we?

The one and only purpose of the big five is to maximize individual free will, and thus maximize the possibility/opportunity of free will having our good life/experience. Life in this world won't be better than what we choose to make of it.

90.

Nothing that exists is permanent, let alone all-encompassing. There is no circumference of infinity, and if any materialization of existence was permanent/infinite, it would decrease variety/complexity and outcomes, and therefore existence itself. But things having infinite beginnings and ends increase complexity/possibilities, the slightest of change cascades to a whole new set of outcomes. I think that free will, besides being the only source of meaning and purpose, is the main factor of complexity, of maximized existence. Imagine how much more complex any world is with life and free will and how barren it is in the absence of it.

There is a direct correlation, in more ways than one, between high free will and upholding the sanctity and dignity of free will.

Regarding infinite divisibility. We could view it as there not being a smallest thing, no fundamental building block, there are only levels/layers we can interact with and levels that are beyond our reach. We are in a sense a part of that exponential divide and we don't know on what level. There is no such thing as reaching 0. The concept of 0 is like barrier between positive and negative, everything above 0 is positive and everything under 0 is negative, both infinite. Negative is not real, just as any dimension lesser than three, it's in theory. We can have a debt, a minus number on our account, a negative degree, minus is just in relation to what is. When we have a minus number and subtract a minus number, it's like adding a positive, because we choose to view it mirrored. We dress math in a specific logic. We could've just as well not viewed it mirrored but linear and get a greater negative. Math is a precise and objective language but is formed by the logic we choose to apply to it.

It might be the case that infinite divisibility is just in theory, it exists in the endless infinity of the ideaworld, but when anything materializes, the finite lever must hit the infinity track. There may for all sense and purposes be a building block of that world. It's like the pixels of a tv, there is a smallest pixel and there is no possible division beyond that, can there be lesser pixels, yes, but not for that tv/world.

Infinity, how can we even begin to grasp it. The way I relate to the realization of existence is really not to think of infinity in any material sense, it's rather to realize see how infinitely greater it is *that existence is*, than *what exists*. To see the miracle of existence in itself, not be blinded by this singular ray of existence. To feel the endless ocean, even when we are submerged in one of its drops.

91.

Different notions of “cosmic balance/harmony” or “mother earth” are other attempts to make sense of the world, not unlike the concept of god. There is no inherent consideration in the cosmos, no nurturing mother in nature, on the contrary, the ruthless law of the jungle applies, nature is not intentionally harsh, it’s just the properties of the circumstances in which life came to be in this world. Humanity has risen above. The inception of the creature of life in this world instilled survival above all else, the goal is continuation, survival, not happiness. We give our lives meaning, not the other way around. The meaning of life is not just to survive, but to thrive. Neither mother earth nor god is a guarantor for that - you are.

Free will is your agency to choose from each second to the other, you experience in real time. The trajectory is influenced by your 2x, but you are not bound by it. I’ve said that free will is sacred, but it’s rather the being with emotions/experience/free will that is. What’s dignified and sacred - is you. A glories being with high free will. Free will cannot exist without emotions, and emotions inherently gives rise to experience.

Is it the case that free will cannot exist without emotions, but that emotions can exist without free will? A fly may have some sort of emotion, have some sense of experience, I think it’s more likely than not, but can it be said to have any rudimentary degree of will? Emotions are not only evolutionary advantageous, but is also a necessity for the development of more complex beings.

92.

This universe is astoundingly huge, we have a hard time understanding the mindboggling vastness of it, how are we to begin to comprehend the infinity of existence, where this universe in in all its vastness, is merely a drop in the infinite ocean of existence. Release every thought - tune your intuition away from finality, to infinity. Feel the wind of infinity under your wings. My dear member of humanity, you truly are free, beholden to none.

Say, existence. Not what is, but the truth underlying it all. Please say it. Existence. Feel it. Walk out from the cave in your mind just once, pull apart every thought, open your mind, set it all free – just see – existence. Not what is, but that anything can be, at all, that existence itself, is. Detach yourself from all the strains holding you back. For one fleeting moment, forget this world and everything in it, just say, existence. Existence actually is. Feel it. The gusts of sense of awe are endless.

93.

To not see ourselves in each other is to not realize the truth about ourselves. All of us are equally valuable, why not then divide what we leave behind equally between all (new?) members of humanity? All of us are granted and all of us pass on, live your best life, when we leave, we pass on what we have accumulated to everybody else, so all have a chance to live their best life. The valuable gift we bestow on our children is our love and presence, our aspiration to raise them in our best image. We want them to live in a good society, to thrive in a garden, how can we ensure that without allowing the water we leave behind to reach all flowers?

94.

Can there be some sort of trail of our lives? What we choose to do materialize existence, all choices are in the ideaworld, but it’s only the ones we choose that becomes part of materialized reality. The trail of our lives could be viewed as how we spend the experience we grant to each world. If we contribute to dignifying all free will, this and every world we are part of will be better, we can create heaven or hell, it all depends on how we choose to wield our free will.

It's so sad that our ultimate goal, seemingly no matter how horrible life got with no light at the end of the tunnel, has been to survive. The amount of suffering that has been endured in vain throughout history, it is beyond heart shattering. Our lives is ours to give, and ours to take back - if we don't have ownership over that, we have nothing. When we realize existence, it's almost tragicomical when we portray a dystopian future where life is beyond miserable, everybody still claws their way through constant misery just to survive. It's a perception of reality where the worst of life is better than what we wrongly perceive as the finality of death. Our expressions of culture echoes that misguided perception.

Life is always worth living when we live because we want to, not because we think we have to let alone are forced to. What is a good life? The answer is, to live because you want to, when you realize that you don't have to. If we chose to live in this world, because we like the challenge, want to learn more about this version of us, want to explore what it has to offer, want to contribute to enriching the experience of our humanity and fellow beings, or whatever our meaning, purpose and source of joy might be – it is per definition good, and even admirable, if we do it because we truly want to, and we truly only know that when we are grounded in the true nature of reality. What is real purpose, if not that?

When we talk in terms of an “afterlife”, we seem so keen to keep “who I am”, we want the next world to in sorts be a continuation of this. Our notion of “I” is an infinitely small slice of who we are. Our values of things are not clear when we don't have perspective. Just who are you, taking into consideration that there are infinite “yous” in infinite worlds. I can only act from the vantagepoint of this experience, yes that's true, but you can lift your gaze over the horizon and broaden your perspective. Don't be too attached to this “you”. Live it fully, enjoy it, but realize that this is not the totality of “you”.

Emotions define experience and is the foundation of free will, but the other side of that coin is our ability for intelligence and rational thinking. It empowers us and opens a plethora of possible directions for free will. How astonishing is it not that rational thinking in this world has reached a level where it can ponder the rational thinking itself. I'm not just pondering me; I'm pondering the fact that I can ponder. In absence of rational and emotional intelligence we could not access truths and would be forever lost. Rational thinking cannot just direct free will, it can create and transform emotions. You can rationally decide how to perceive or feel about something, and vice versa. In this book, I'm equally pleading to both your rational and emotional intelligence. I want you to both understand, and feel the realization of existence. What is realization, it is to rationally understand something to your emotional core.

My dear humanity, we have acted with so much viciousness towards each other, towards free will. How can our hearts not ache for our undignified state. There is so much free goodness in us, it's high time we free ourselves from our self-imposed prison. The key is right in front of us.

When I have said this to you, and when I with all my heart have loved and cared for my family until my children reach the age of 21, the purpose I have assigned to myself here is fulfilled.

95.

Our 2x influence the landscape of our experience, it cannot however dictate your actions, it's not a light switch, you are profoundly more than the sum of your parts, you have power over your actions and responsibility for them, strengthen your free will and inställning. To see ourselves in each other is to both have empathy and uphold accountability, just as we relate to ourselves. The freer free will is, the greater the privilege and responsibility.

Whether or not our actions up to this point would be the same or not if we replayed this world from big bang infinite times, is not a judgment on whether will is free or not, it's a judgment on how we chose to act, which you can determine with precision afterwards, but not predict with precision before. Experience is per definition to rise above, and high free will is the possibility to truly soar. You have inställning, an agency above, a soul if you want to call it that. Free will is a privilege and a responsibility, that's why we see ourselves in each other but hold ourselves and others accountable. All living beings have a 2x, but not all have the ability for thought- and heartfelt reflection, that is what makes us special.

Our free will is what we choose at each moment, and how we have chosen up to that moment. Even if we can act instinctively/thoughtlessly in a moment, the trajectory/path of choices up to that moment tilt the field towards our will. Like how a dedicated athlete is more likely to do the right move in the heat of the moment.

The golden rule is that free will shall not be infringed upon. The only prerequisite of your free will is that it does not affect others free will against their consent. The latter part is redundant, because if it's with consent it's not an infringement on free will. Anything you must do, are forced to do, or made believe that you have to do, is inherently bad. The maximization of free will is to increase the range/possibility/opportunity of will, to increase want and decrease must. You can choose to be active or passive, to be all over the place or live quietly in solitude. Whatever gives you joy in experiencing this world.

The inequalities and desperate necessities today are vulgar; we don't get anything near an equal opportunity for a good/free life. We are unique and our lives become what we can make of it, but it's beneath us to have systemic inequality from the get-go. We are dignified when all are dignified. We can live free, when all have a chance to live free.

96.

We emotionally and rationally realize the golden rule. Free will inherently navigates towards truth and the golden rule. If we fail and infringe free will, we fail to honour the one thing that's sacred. Those who cause others harm will inevitably harm themselves, there is no escaping that. No human wants to do evil, when we do, it's because of a flawed upbringing where evil was ever present, a failure to recognize the sanctity of free will due to adherence to flawed ideas, degrading ourselves by giving in to the worst notions of our inclinations, a sense of rectifying a perceived injustice or because we convince ourselves that we act right and that the goal justifies the means. In all cases, it's a wrong frame of mind. The best remedy to rid the world of crimes and injustice is to truly realize the sanctity of our free will, to uphold the big five.

Breaching the golden rule can never be justified, it cannot go unanswered. A violation of your free will is a violation of mine. When we uphold the big five, if anyone violates free will, the consequence should be more severe than the breach of the golden rule. Free will is sacred, thus violating it is the only thing that is profane. The crimes and injustices amongst us today are horrendous. We must be utterly horrified when someone breaks the golden rule and harms free will, we are but it feels like we have become numb because we on some level understand how corrupted our current society is.

Rightful justice is only necessary if we fail to rise up to our own humanity. It is first when we implement and uphold the big five for all, when we lay the foundation that liberates the free will of us all, that we can hold each other truly accountable. When it's, as much as can be, our free will that dictates the course of our life, and not the shoes we were born into.

How should you view yourself and others? The only reasonable and uplifting inställning is to see yourself and others as good and goodhearted, never a victim of anything or anyone.

What affects people's lives and the course of our history the most - are ideas. If the ideas are wrong, no implementation of them will be good.

97.

We clearly have an inside world and an outside world; it's like the second x is twofold. The outside world is the material world outside of our physical being. The inside world is what you can see/experience when you dream or close your eyes, and envision whatever you want, it's the world that pops up in our mind when we read a book. Regardless of the experience exists in a being's mind or/and the outside world, the place of interaction, the "outside world" is always greater than the conscious being's entity, and the realization of existence is the same.

Everything is in the flow of information. Even if we know every bit of information, your sense of self and free will can change the flows outcome in unpredictable ways. A thought can arise because you will or your mind wanders there, that does not follow from a prior material state, free will is causal, but predictable only in hindsight. We can show all peoples on earth the same image, we can predict their general actions/thoughts/feelings, based on their culture, upbringing, understanding and all other factors you can include, we will still not be able to know in detail.

Determinism is the precise prediction of outcomes, granted you know all the factors and how they interact. However, one thought does not need to follow the other. You can switch thoughts instantaneously, do it now. I could not predict that, even if I had all information at hand. Not even you, you can direct your thought but not always predict the outcome with 100 % certainty. Our free will is not just the computable result of the information in our 2x, it's more than that, our emergent inställning is profoundly greater than the sum of its parts.

Our thoughts are in a sense random, a blurry that cannot be predicted with certainty, it's like a constantly playing and sometimes unruly orchestra that we are the conductor of. We can be aware of "who's" thinking the thoughts and assert our control, to direct the tune in accordance with our free will.

The only distinction between right and wrong is the golden rule. Whatever you do out of free will that don't infringe others free will, can never be objectively wrong. I can have subjective opinions about it, I can think that an action is detrimental to you, an action can in fact be detrimental to you, but if we are in full agency, and do something out of free will, it can never be objectively wrong.

98.

Cutting an electron in half, you can say there is nothing left to divide. Is there such a thing as the "building block" of our world, the final pixel of our world, I think it depends on if infinity (in this case infinite divisibility) can be materialized or not, if existence is emitting from everywhere in an infinitely deep well and you can just access so far, or if there is a bottom of each materialization. Must it be one final or can there be many different fundamental building blocks? Whatever the case is, when we divide down to the smallest of components, it is something with a function of maximized outcome, because that maximize existence.

Is the "building block/fundamental pixel" of this world complex? It sure is maximized outcomes, maximized existence. But itself, complex? All complexity is derived from simplicity, so no it cannot be complex, I think it's essentially one factor giving rise to one function, then it's not

complex, but that factors function is with maximized speed/movement/fluctuation/vibration, whatever shape/property that maximizes outcome. It's one factor/function, but the amount of its possible iterations is, from your perspective one could say, almost everywhere, depended on how we view its scope.

Maximized outcome, each turn of the gear is a new branch, or not a branch, but rather a new diverging tree, no less than this tree. You think this version of you in this version of the world is the original, so does all the others. The infinite versions of you just in this world that is created in the divisible fractions of any unit of time, it truly is incomprehensible. Now imagine infinite versions of infinite worlds. Existence is the endless rule, the endless presumption.

We cannot value nor navigate properly if we don't realize the infinity of reality. We don't need to know every detail, every crevice and rock, just raise your gaze - free your intuition away from finite totalities to infinite infinities.

Existence is the natural state of reality; we come from and are a part of infinity. Why have we presumed that "nothing" is the "natural state"? Why would we presume that the natural state is no reality, not just lack of this reality, but the absence of any reality? What a mindboggling perception, the opposite of the truth that existence, not nonexistence, is the true nature of reality. It's like we have known without being able to pin it down, no wonder we needed a concept of an infinite deity to fill in the gap of where this something came from. Why has it been so hard for us to just state that existence is the true and infinite nature of reality? In a way – the realization of existence is the easiest thing to understand, in another way it's the hardest, because it requires a complete reversal of the presumptions in our minds, it changes everything.

It is not hard to see how different creation stories could be in different times and places in existence. Regardless of what world, being and life; the foundation of truth is the realization of existence, the one meaningful truth is the sanctity of our experience/free will. Free will is the sole bestower of meaning and the shaper of existence. There is nothing outside of existence, tell me, can god create nonexistence? God cannot even answer you what his earliest memory is.

99.

A beautiful painting or a sunset has no meaning in a world devoid of life that can appreciate and ascribe it meaning. The further up the tree of life we climb, the more experience/free will/emotions there can be, correlating to the degree of meaning that can be derived.

It's so corrupt that our life and wellbeing in this world, throughout history and arguably even today, requires the death of other feeling beings. Imagine a world where you got supreme nutrition from the sun, it tasted delicious and changed during the day and the seasons. Look at it from the outside, set this world in relation to the infinite possible worlds that can be. Is it not repulsive that we have to kill animals with high emotions to sustain ourselves? We have reconciled with it by placing ourselves at the centre of creation, or worse when we deemotionalize other beings and deprive them of the capacity of emotions and experience altogether. If the foundation of our worldview is wrong, we will inevitably risk bad morals and ethics.

If all humans decided to leave this world, then the law of the jungle would reign for all beings, a cruel and unforgiving world with no possibility of alleviating the suffering. The higher free will present in each world, the higher possibilities for a better world. Humanity can be a net good or neutral, what we can never be is net bad, the choice is in our hands.

100.

Everything material is at least in theory infinitely divisible, but what about that which is unique for conscious beings, like emotions and thoughts; how would you divide a thought or emotion? It cannot be divided but rather come in more or less degrees. When we divide material things we, say water, after a certain division you divide the molecule that make up water. When dividing material things, we break down the emergent properties and come to underlying layers, where does the emergent layers stop?

The truth of existence is - it's astounding to me why we are not constantly in awe over that something actually is, that the underlying truth of existence is, we just take the biggest miracle for granted. The reason we think that nothingness is the rule, may be because we think that energy is required for something to be. But if you flip it, when you see that existence is the natural state of reality, it requires energy to stop it. Because it can be, the idea of it is, and the rule/presumption is that everything that can be is/will be, so it requires more energy to suppress it than for it to happen – because you can suppress it for trillions of years, but how long are you going to go when time has no meaning. It requires energy to stop the river, but not to let it flow. Aside from the choices of free will, there is no such thing as stopping/suppressing existence.

In fundamental terms - the realization of existence is to understand that existence is the infinite rule, not the finite exception. Everything can exist, there are infinite worlds, this one is just one of them. There are infinite lives, this one is just one of them. The meaning of life is to be happy, here or somewhere else, the choice lies in your hands. We seemingly don't choose whether or not to exist, but the fact that you, unlike many other lifeforms, are conscious enough to be able to ponder this, and by free will steer towards good and away from bad, is a gift and not a curse. You are a high free willed being, live and navigate freely.

101.

I want nothing more than to be questioned in a way that stops me in my track and compels me to rethink. My highest aspiration is to stand on truth and have the agency to act accordingly.

102.

Even with infinite time of infinite big bangs, only a fraction of all beings that can be, will be born to this world. The limitations are historical, that we cannot have children with others from another time in history, if our genes only can be present at this time with that chain of ancestors. The limitations are also in biology and in the morality of our free will, the combinations of all reproductive cells cannot be and we won't have a relation with every human on earth. All beings that can be won't be, due to the exclusivity of choices of free will and the limitations of this world. There is no such thing as all beings, and beings that can be won't be in every world that can be. What a profound privilege and responsibility, to bring new life into existence.

103.

If you cannot wrap your mind around appreciating good without suffering, the conclusion you must reach is that suffering is good, what suffering is good, how much suffering is necessary for good? It's a corrupt frame of mind. The concept of necessary suffering is what we construct to cope with the intrinsic flaws of this world, because we have yet to realize existence, yet to understand that we don't owe life anything, life is indebted to us.

It's true that a great deal of happiness and satisfaction can come from going outside of our comfort zone and doing something very challenging. When there is a risk of failing, and we succeed, it's a wonderful feeling - the point is that we should choose it, we are not forced to, but choose to challenge ourselves.

104.

I have been contemplating my own and the world's existence for as long as I can remember. The realization of existence dawned upon me one day when I looked at my hands while I was in the shower. The realization was not that my hands exist, or that I exist, it was just - existence is. I suddenly realized that I had taken the greatest miracle of all for granted, that existence in itself is. I didn't just see my hands, I saw the underlying truth of existence, not materialized existence, but existence in itself. I said to myself "att existens finns, är ett oändligt större mirakel än vad som finns". Then my journey began, by asking what intrinsically must be finite in infinite existence.

In a sense I cannot believe that we once thought that existence in itself had a beginning or outer parameters. The counterquestions are so fundamental, what preceded it and what's outside of it? All of us intuitively know it, but the questions themselves have almost been dogmatically disregarded, not much unlike how religious dogma relate to questions about the contradictory nature of god's infinity and infallibility. Equating the question of what happened before the big bang, to reaching the north pole and stating that there is no more north to go, is... shortsighted.

105.

Whenever you reach a crossroad or when you feel that an argument or logic is on shaky ground, fall back on the realization of existence, fall back on the foundation and build you reason from there, one brick at a time.

106.

What constitutes the border of our world, it has a beginning and an end, but borders/parameters? We could view it as infinite divisibility, if we in no way can venture/see/directly or indirectly interact beyond our "observable universe", then for all sense and purposes there is a border as far as life is concerned, and without free will/experience, it does not matter, it might just as well not exist. The way to think about reality is - what can be, and what is. That's the way the "borders" materialize. The other form of "border", besides from our free will, is that wherever you are, whatever world you find yourself in, is infinitely lesser than what can be. There is no totality of existence, the avenues of experience are truly endless.

107.

The crucial branch of the tree of life is where experience/emotions arise, from that branch inclusion in the golden rule is safeguarded in accordance with the prerequisites of that life. The principal branch on the tree of life in this world is the one humanity stand on. Our level of awareness grants us the power and therefore the responsibility to uphold the sanctity of free will. Those amongst us who cannot wield their own free will, can live a good life if others with their best interest at heart care for them. The world will not be better than what we make of it. It's not for nothing that we throughout history have recognized our special place as custodians of this world. The wisdom of seeing ourselves in others reverberates in our humanity's creeds and religions; it is a testament to our inherent recognition of truth.

There is a direct correlation between advanced free will, and upholding the sanctity of free will. In this world, I think it's best done by safeguarding the big five. Some think they only act civilised because they believe in or act as if god existed, that's not true, they act civilised because they are a high free will and therefore innately recognize the sanctity of free will. Now, you might say, that many people around the world violate free will on an individual and even collective level, yes, we go astray mainly due to adherence to flawed ideas that produce corrupt outcomes. The worst of ideas are those who prioritize the own groups free will over, and even at the expense of, the free will of others. They fail miserably in upholding both the sanctity and equality of free will.

The degree to which we dignify and value free will is the spectrum between civilization and barbarism. Humanity has acted on both side of the spectrum, we have the choice and profound ability to strive towards good and away from bad. Our episodes in the wrong side of the spectrum are due to the corrupt ideas and the brutal nature of this world, the good we have achieved is on a field tilted against us. The unforgiving nature of this world, with its integral limitations, uncertainty and violations of free will, produce the soil where bad ideas are easily harvested. Still, we rise above.

It's harder for a human to act righteously than it is for god, god should admire us, not the other way around.

108.

I don't know more nor better than you. I'm not significant in any way, if I think I am it's my ego. We all strive to be truthful and sincere towards ourselves and others. You are not better than any of your fellow humans that uphold the golden rule, let alone those who not only don't do bad but who contribute to the good. Pride and self-importance towards others are pathetic. Maybe the ego is tied to wanting to be acknowledged and being afraid of getting hurt, it is not a strong foundation, the ego is fragile and bothered. It's not grounded in who we choose to be, but rather how we relate to ourselves from a misguided concoction of the perspective of others.

109.

Imagine the seemingly infinite variations of this world that can be if big bang is replayed infinite times, with the same and slight changes of 2x. That's just this world. Now imagine infinite worlds. It's beyond imagination, existence is truly beyond imagination. We can't even comprehend large numbers, or the theoretical concept of infinity, how can we being to comprehend infinite worlds and infinite lives. We don't have to, it's enough to realize that the true nature of reality is that there are endless lives in endless worlds. Infinity is, feel the gust of wind under our wings.

110.

I don't think it's wise to let an onionlayer be the core foundation of our identity, it's to diminish oneself. We are multifaceted, what's important is not the material you were born with or the environment that you grew up in, but who you choose to be - the inställning values and actions you reach through heart-and thoughtful reflection. The expressions of your aware free will.

The golden rule is to wield free will as you please and not hindering others from wielding their free will as they please. The one purpose of initial equality is maximizing the range/opportunity of our free will. We innately recognize that all children should have equal opportunities for a good life. Is it not fair to grant initial equality to all of humanity's children? How that is best achieved is another matter. But all of us must have a stake in the game, a plot enabling us to grow. How would you like this world to be if you didn't know what life you would be born into?

Initial equality is the privilege and responsibility of humanity. Love, presence and care for our children is the privilege and responsibility of parents. The second is infinitely more profound than the first.

The right to the plot is just as important as the right to enjoy the fruits of it, to trade, grow, increase or whatever way we want to wield our free will. How can we say that we value the individual free will, if we don't safeguard all individuals' opportunity to wield our free will? Free will and an initial equality goes hand in hand, an opportunity for a good beginning in life is not an integral part of this world, it's something we dignify ourselves by upholding.

No one is compelled to anything, our world won't be better than what we make of it, and it sure puts our values and intentions to a test. If we adhere to the idea that all humans are equal and deserve a good chance at a good life, then initial equality is self-evident. If we want to live and thrive in this world, we do wise in making it a good world worthy of welcoming new members of humanity.

111.

Our emotional spectrum can be viewed as strings on an instrument, how many strings do we have and how much can they vibrate? I'm harsh on this world, it's not like a good life in a good world is the absence of the negative strings, we can have every imaginable string, representing the best to the worst of emotions, it's just that this world sure has given our negative strings many reasons to vibrate.

It's much more important, in any subject, to have a sense of the whole picture instead of a detailed understanding of one piece. We can't even understand the details or place them in relation to each other, if we don't understand the whole picture. My sense is that we generally tend to stare too much on the brushes of paint instead of seeing the painting as a whole.

112.

I realize that the realization of existence, presented in other times, could get you burned at the stakes. I'm immensely grateful for the thought-innovators and pioneers of past times. They advanced our collective understanding and even put their life on the line for us to be more enlightened today, we are all indebted. We all aspire to have a grain of their determination, bravery and conviction. Those fellow members of humanity from the past were the religious/philosophical/scientific figures who tried to make the world more humane and ground our understanding in truth, we are all indebted to them.

I think that the religious figures who claimed to be messengers of god were deeply troubled by the cruelty of their time, I think that all of them had a deep-seeded ambition to change it to the better, some of them might have had a profound experience and felt that they were in contact with a higher being guiding them, others knew that - in such uncertain times- a vengeful but forgiving deity was the best way to, not only reconcile with ours and the worlds existence, but to have an authority towering over all, to ensure compliance of the powerful and thereby lift the powerless, to make life better for human beings and all beings. If in such times, using the concept of god, is a lie, then it is a lie better than the best of accessible truths.

If you don't want to do good, at least don't do bad. You can do bad against yourself, because it's within your free will. But self-harm can be due to your free will being trapped in a negative cage. Do you have the key to let yourself out? If not you, who has? Don't let bad thoughts or bad words define you, define yourself. Contemplate who you are, give it time, why you are the way you are, how you would like to be, and why you would like to be that way. Then strive towards that.

113.

Considering the effect of genetics on our personality traits; lions can be kind and gentle if raised by humans. The genetic disposition/inclination matters for our personality in one sense, but I think it's not nearly as much as we might attribute to it. Our genes dictate part of what we are, not who we are. Who we are is based on our perception of ourselves and our surrounding, which is influenced by how we are raised and most importantly how we choose to relate to ourselves and the world around us, our aware inställning. Genetic disposition is not the defining part, neither is our environment, the true magic lies in our inställning, our ability to rise above.

An animal who in the wild live isolated, why is that, why do some animals live in herds/flocks and others alone, is it the nish of optimizing survival. Even an animal who lives isolated like a leopard, when raised and cared for by humans is a social being. Is our nature really not that different? A solitary animal's behaviour is shaped by its environment, but unlike us it does not have the rational capacity to contemplate and change its inställning, they are more a victim/result of their 2x, we are not, we have the ability to rise above.

Try to shake of all tribalism, just be a pure member of humanity. We feel the soul in ourselves by seeing the soul in others. Humanity has long realized the truth in seeing ourselves in each other. We are not just equals but essentially the same, we have rationality, emotions, and the ability to reflect upon our way of life. See how different your course of life and all that you define yourself by, could have been if your 2x shapes your perception/identity. If who you are so easily change, it's not you, how could it be if your true self don't shine through regardless of our layers. So who are you to your core, you are your values and ideas, and if they are founded in truth and sincerity, you will feel grounded, regardless of what shoes you were born into.

Shake of everything else, be just, uphold the golden rule, sincerely seek truth by yourself and with others. Then the solutions will present themselves. This book is my best attempt to contribute to our dignified conversation.

114.

How broad can a being's emotional spectra be with a limited intelligence. There is no doubt that animals can feel pain, a being doesn't need to be particularly intelligent to feel pain. But what about remorse, that feeling requires higher intelligence. Because the emotion is founded in understanding that you have done something that you regret and realizing you could have acted otherwise. The emotional factor must be intertwined with the intelligence factor. Which emotions are tied to/emerge in higher resolution with higher degree of intelligence?

The tree of life can be described as degrees of consciousness. The way life has evolved on earth, the concept of life here, is an infinitely small sliver of how and what life can be. When I talk about life, it's mostly from the perspective of this world. The base of the tree is life, the branches grow in significance the higher up the tree we come, they represent different levels of awareness, correlating to the factors and degrees of consciousness. From the branch of awareness there is quite a leap with several branches with increased awareness before we reach the new threshold branch of self-awareness. It can be hard to distinguish with precision where one ends and another threshold begins. The most important branch is where emotions develop, because from that branch, experience can be had, and inclusion in the golden rule is therefore safeguarded according to that beings' prerequisites.

115.

The big five means that you have the knowledge and possibility to live dignified individually and in community of any shape and form, with any culture/rules your free will wants. We can build communities based on whatever criteria, ideology, religion, creed, philosophy or any layer we want. All that matters is that it's based on our individual free will at any given time. Individuals and communities can hinder anyone from coming, never hinder anyone from leaving. None has a right to anybody against their free will. The big five is the bridge that frees all individuals and communities. A worthy and dignified life is one where your free will can navigate freely, the freer the better. Free by your being's ability and free by the landscape of possible experience.

The elevation of free will- the extent of the maximization of all free will - is the main indicator of how civilised a civilization is.

The question is how we maximize our free will in this world? I think its best done by the big five. The individual is always in focus, all communities must be based on individual free will, individual collectivism. The communities that we build is the once people want to have, maybe a universal community if that is the result of free will, or countless emerging and remerging communities in all shapes. Maybe different communities within the same society where we can enjoy the different expressions of what constitutes a good life - only free will decide.

When we have initial equality, we take away unjustified inequality, and hence the exclusionary force of collectives. What remains is the wanted, not the needy. Then, maybe this world will be good enough for people to want to live in, not because we think this is the only world, or that we think we must or are coerced to, but because we truly choose to. What higher praise can a life and world have, than free will choosing to experience it.

If somebody I loved, if one of my children suddenly dies, I would be shattered by grief. Even though I realize existence, and know that there are infinite lives, I would still morn their passing from this life, my experience would feel hollow, an empty shell in their absence, I don't want to think about it. In a way, the certainty of death, is what gives urgency to life. If you live this life, love it, and let the ones you love, know that you love them, wherever you choose to live, live with colour and vigour.

116.

Nonexistence cannot be measured, pictured or in any way, shape or form interacted with, why, because it does not exist, still we presume that it is or should be the natural state of reality. How else could we understand the question, "why does something exist, instead of nothing". On the other hand, infinite interactions and infinite realities that can be, all measurements, every portrait and conceptualization in any shape, way or form - is of existence, because existence is the neutral/natural, the infinite state of reality.

We have long recognized, which we can see in our religions and spirituality across place and time, that all things must have a sense of a beginning and end – but that it's not the final end nor beginning. Our notions of afterlife has a sense of infinity, coming possibilities for a more boundless/enjoyable experience. It's just that we seemingly have thought in materialized existence - we profoundly recognize infinity and don't limit existence in time, but we have limited in scope. Our every notion of afterlife and materialized conceptualizations of possible avenues of existence is nothing in comparison to the endless truth of existence. Why has it been so hard for us to clearly see, to realize that existence is the infinite nature of infinite reality. That our every notion of what can exist, is nothing in comparison to that anything can exist.

117.

Regarding the argument of the decreasing gap of religion. Religions foundation will never decrease if we can't truthfully answer why we are here, what the purpose of life is, why anything exists at all. Science have not answered any of them, so how can you expect to bridge the gap. The realization of existence bridge not only that gap, but every gap between the foundation of science and religion. It's rationally and emotionally true, it feels good in our mind and heart.

The big five is not new, there are echoes of them all throughout our history. We innately recognize the sanctity of free will, I love how the realization of existence foundationally establish what we always have known to be true, that the one valuable thing in existence is free will/experience. To realize existence is to realize the sacred nature of free will, see that the sacred light of experience is lit in infinite beings, we illuminate infinity, without us, there is no reality.

118.

The realization of existence can click suddenly but it can also take time, and even when it clicks it's easy to fall back to the narrow-minded framework, because it challenges everything about the cave we have spent our life in. The default state is to be focused on what exists, not that existence is. Which is understandable because we interact with what exists, not existence per se. We focus on the rays of existence, that's why I find it so helpful to go back to the fundamental truth and reason from there. The miracle is not that this world or any world is, it is that it exists at all. Reality is not what trickles down to our cave, reality is infinite, venture outside. What is the greatest miracle of all, our experience, do you truly realize that - you are.

When they argue for god, they say that the complexity here is not by chance, it's a creation by a designer. It's essentially the same argument/amazement that scientist have over the finetuning over our universe. When you realize that infinite numbers play out in infinity, there is no room left for neither chance nor selective finetuning. Every sequence of every number that can be, will be. Even the word "everything" belittles it. There are not one, but infinite "goldilocks zones". Existence has no will, it's the natural and infinite nature of infinite realities. It's not selective or dictated existence – it's maximized existence. The only source of selection - is you. That's why your free will shapes existence, that's why we for so long has recognized the sanctity of free will.

Existence has no designer, everything and every designer comes after the truth of existence. Everything can exist, there can be worlds where a conscious being creates another, where the creation is way less than the creator (why even do that, if you now must create, why not an equal?). If we claim that we live in is one of those created worlds, then that architect is self-evidently evil, due to the unnecessary intrinsic evils of this world. That creator is also deceiving because we are not provided with the truth of our existence. It is utterly insulting to the idea of what a world creating being can be, if you think this puny hostile world of ours is a creation. The creator stories in our world is a necessity in times of uncertainty. This world is neither unlikely, random nor finetuned – it is one of infinite. Every small or powerful being in existence is one in infinite. Everything that exists have a beginning and an end, the underlying all permeating truth of it all have neither a beginning nor an end. Existence is the first truth, the one true constant.

The golden rule maximizes your freedom without diminishing my freedom. You can choose whether your existence, wherever you are, should be a force for good or bad. So why not be bad? Because the truth is that you inherently are good. We inevitably hurt our own soul if we hurt the souls of others. We innately don't like seeing free will unjustly infringed, because it is in our very nature to value experience and see reflections of ourselves in each other.

119.

Whatever idea, creed or knowledge anyone wants to adhere to, doesn't the big five stand tall, doesn't the golden rule, access to knowledge, rightful justice, the tree of life and initial equality - stands on their own? All five pillars are required to raise the roof of our humanity. Rightful justice cannot be fully implemented before we have established the big five. Initial equality, there are huge inequalities and people living in desperate necessity, isn't that a crime against the golden rule in itself? It's not easy to point to a perpetrator, when our world is based on corrupt ideas it will yield corrupt outcomes, therefore, we do wise in focusing on implementing the big five.

Take away each layer; your culture, ethnicity, religion, nationality, sexuality, parents, looks, gender - everything you think or feel defines you. Who are you when we peel away all layers?

What remains are your values and your ideas; they are what define us. What are the best values and ideas? Unequivocally the ones founded in truth and sincerity.

120.

What is energy? Energy can be seen as an extractor and infuser of information (in that sense its communication). Energy is extraction of specific information from one place and the infusion of it somewhere else. Specific information is/needs energy to unfold its function or to move through space/general information. Energy alters or affects the state of whatever it hits, it changes the informational equation. Everything that moves/flows, is/requires energy, something with more energy has accumulated more movement/vibrations than something with less energy. Movement is locally increased information flow.

All things we interact with are information in materialized form. Even abstract things like ideas, becomes materialized existence when somebody thinks of them. Everything that can be is in the ideaworld, not just “the essence” of things, but every iteration of everything that can be. The “essence” of things is just a subjective slice in an infinite spectrum.

For or any being there must always be 2x, I and the landscape I navigate in. I in the broadest sense of what the vessel of agency/free will/experience can be. Landscape in the broadest sense of what an outside world can be. The information that constitutes me/the reach of my agency, and the information my experience navigates in. There must always be a continuum for any experience, even if a being in a world could travel/rewind/speed up back and forth in the information timeline, the experience’s informational continuum stays intact. What we call memory is part of our perception of that timeline, not only the now but where we have been, and our ability to predict/ponder the future. In any case, there is always a “now”, even if the “now” is broad, it’s all the same a now, a past and a future, as far as experience is concerned, which is all that matters. Without our coherent continuum, what is experience? Our experience is not two-dimensional, we operate in the now, but we remember the past and can look into the future. Our experience not only demands, but defines the causal continuum.

There cannot be any information contained in a 1d or 2d world, there is no “in”, there is no thickness, it’s infinitely small, like the illusive 0 that cannot be reached. Information cannot be in a 2d world because there is no “up-way”, therefore it cannot exist and move in the forward way either. Every static slice/picture/measurement is a 3d object because it has a certain “thickness” that can hold information. A 2d world has no thickness, it has no z axel at all. You cannot detect it because it’s 0 z and therefore does not show in the x or y either. It’s only there in theory. We cannot pass through a 2d object, because you cannot go under 0 and you cannot lift 0.

Emergence, what do we mean by that? It is a way of portraying the truth that all complexity is derived from simplicity. If we slice at the emergent level of electrons, protons and neutrons, three things, that in different configurations gives rise to literally everything around you. How amazing is not that? Somethings with functions in emergent layers. We can say that water is something tangible with distinctive properties on its own, it’s made of oxygen and hydrogen atoms that are something tangible with distinctive properties in their own right, which in their turn are emergent from tangible particles with distinct properties. We could go on like that, where does it stop? It stops at the simplest materialization with a function of maximized outcome, where further inquiry is beyond our possible scope of interaction or/and inherently limited by the nature of this world. Is it the case that the smallest building block of reality is an infinitely deep point that emits existence, that materialized existence is emitting from within every infinite point? The more and faster something move/vibrate, the more internal and codependent functions/outcomes are produced. If movement is locally increased information flow, that affects the aggregated, does it mean that if something moves it’s it has more information than if it’s still (and in some sense a higher degree of complexity). But I don’t think its infinitely deep, how can infinity be materialized?

Energy, to simplify it and use the word time, we could say that time carries all information, but energy carries specific information within the general information flow, energy is a specific information extractor and infuser. The electron, strictly speaking requires energy to move, but we could also say that the movement is the inherent property of the electron, but the more energy that's extracted, the lesser movement the electron will have, so there is a correlation. And there might be a state where it's not possible to detract more energy from the electron, not because it's not there, but because it can't reach 0.

When we talk about energy, it can be seen as a "medium of communication", extracting information from something/localized place and infusing it to something else. Just like the emergent things, energy itself is in the different layers of emergence, light is something the way we interact with it, and something else if we zoom down in layers to the photon itself.

What do we mean "vibrations", it's just like something bubbling, constantly shaking, maximized movement, or rather maximized configurations during any unit of time, it's everything but static. Vibrations adds complexity and new possibilities. The more energy something has the more information it contains, and therefore the more existence it can emit. The answer in the quantum is maximized outcome, the question is what shape/form enables that.

We use the word quantum, it may appear as discrete units of localized information in one sense, but be part of a bigger whole, or maybe maximized outcome is when it truly is quantum, a bunch of gears with maximized teeth, when you divide down you come to some unit distinct from other units of information, different somethings with a function, but still part of the same machinery, if they can move individually and in relation to all else, it renders the most configurations and thus outcomes, what do you think?

121.

If the case is that the function of the "building block", the smallest dissection of emergence we can access, the sub particle/layer, is not only vast/"near infinite", but that it's randomness can propagate, to not only be present at the quantum level, but affect the emergent layers above it? Is the case that even if you know all the factors/variables of the wind or a stone, at some time/during a certain sequence of the information flow, an injection of new information/a new variable can be, which because of the uncertainty of when it happens and how it affects the object, can't be predicted with certainty. One could argue that if we had the total scope, if we could know every "setting" of every sub particle, then we would know. But not if the settings in the sub particle are random and thus unpredictable, and that it can, and inevitably at some time will, affect the above layers and we don't know when or what the effect will be, now that is what we would call random. It however depends on if the function at one level doesn't just restrict its effect there, that if there is an unpredictability at the quantum level, it doesn't propagate into the possibility for unpredictability on layers above.

I don't think randomness can propagate into the (cosmic) space of experience, why, because isn't that basically the same as spontaneous creation? How much randomness can propagate, if once then why not all (time is of no meaning), in what ways can it materialize? I see how it could increase the array of possible outcomes, but it cannot manifest in complex things, because then the floodgates of sc opens.

Is a function finite or infinite - can infinity materialize? I think the rule of materialized existence is as "near" infinity as can be (within the possible range in that world). Because if something always chase infinity, will it ever be?

Existence doesn't have an end nor a beginning, it's infinity in both ways, and materialized existence is within that, not infinite but "as near infinity" as can be, from the smallest to the grandest. True infinity is existence in itself, all things that exist are finite, infinite beginnings and ends, but beginning and ends all the same.

Take the movement/unfolding function of the electron, if we take away time as a factor, does the same configuration appear again, like the example with the table? Is there a finite amount of configurations/"positions" it can be in, and after a while it's just a repeat. One could argue no because any change in a large number of sequences opens up a plethora of new configurations, infinite in one sense, the amount of functions it can have, it's like infinite numerals. But that feels a bit strange, I mean it's a localized area, something with a limited amount of factors and interactions between those factors, I guess it depends on where we cut off the factors, and say here the electron ends, this is external and that external. But even if we don't see the electron as localized, but view all elementary particles in our universe as one giant thing/machinery. The amounts of factors in relation to all others, the amount of possible configurations becomes unfathomably large, but infinite? With infinite time, wouldn't the same configuration reappear, sure at a "different time", but if it's indistinguishable, why would it matter?

Unpredictability/randomness doesn't require an infinite function, the possible configurations in the sub particles function are finite, but it's not deterministic if there is no causal link between one configuration and the one after, it just matters that one configuration does not follow from the previous, that there is no causality, that would be random, thus the demon cannot be. Well, this is not quite right, it is true that the demon cannot be, but it's because the quantum world is not inherently deterministic, it's probabilistic, so it wouldn't be correct to say that there is no causal link between, it would be more correct to say that there is no certain link between one configuration and the one after, but that there is a probable link – causality can be both deterministic and probabilistic.

Is a coin flip just as random as an electron, it's probable but not deterministically knowable? It is deterministic because you can know the outcome with certainty based on all the preconditions (like your hand movement, wind, angle etc. when flipping a coin). But for the sub particles in your hand and the coin, we can't know all the preconditions, and even if we could, the unfolding function would still be random, probable and causal but random all the same. I think that might be the biggest difference between quantum space and our cosmic space, here it's deterministic causality, there it's seemingly probabilistic causality.

If the rule of determinism doesn't apply at the quantum level, wouldn't that essentially mean that existence is emitting from everywhere? I think it means that existence is maximized, the outcome is maximized, but not infinite. The number of configurations are still finite, it's just that their sequence is probable and thus not entirely predictable. They seemingly have a likelihood of function, a probability curve, it is random what the next picture/configuration/position will be, but some outcomes are more likely than others, there is a "bulge" in the randomness, it's probabilistic causality. Does that increase complexity and movement in the sub particle itself and inflated as a whole in our universe, and thus lead to maximize outcome? I seemingly does, and it aligns with our intuition if we know what to look for.

Infinity requires infinite information, then the timeline increase in correlation. Maybe we see "sub particles" coming into existence seemingly from nowhere, that there is de facto net information added, ok but even then, infinite information? I don't think so, even if the case is that "existence is emitting", I think that there is a finality, that it for all sense and purposes has a beginning and an end. What do you think?

We need to clarify what we mean with causality and continuum here. One could say that they are the same, you can't have a continuum without causality or causality without continuum. In a sense yes but they also diverge. A continuum it's just that one thing happens after the other, however in a causal continuum one thing happens because of the other,  $x$  cause  $y$  - without  $x$ ,  $y$  can't be - and  $x$  always produce  $y$ . The last part is seemingly where it differs for both elementary particles and for free will. In both instances one state is caused by the previous and the following state cannot be without the previous – there is however no guarantee that you can know neither the electrons nor a free will's following state just by knowing the previous. Likelihood, yes, but only certainty after measurement/in hindsight.

Wait, let's define terms. Continuum, is that one picture comes after the other? I mean a statement couldn't be more vague than that, it like saying one number comes after another, but not what of infinite numbers that can be, like one picture is this world, and another picture is another completely unrelated world, there is no connection whatsoever, it really doesn't mean anything. Not yet but that's the fundament, yes, one picture comes after the other (thanks genius), and there is still a "cause", the second picture, even if utterly unrelated, still could not be without the first. Ok but then we say causal continuum or just causality, that in any landscape where life/experience/free will resides, the coming picture is not only caused by the previous, but the second picture is a predictable/deterministic outcome from the first. If I move my hand to the left, it will move to the left, and it's caused by my decision to do so. So picture 1 caused picture 2, yes, and 2 was the only possible outcome from 1, yes. But for an electron, there is a plethora of options, so it's 1, and then it's between 2-10 and so on. There is where randomness comes in, we don't know exactly what the precise outcome will be, but it's not chaos, there is probability. So, the likely outcome is between 4-6. In a sense it's the same for free will, the plethora of possible coming pictures are great, there is probability/behaviour, and from the outside I can predict, but only know for certain in hindsight. As free will we are probabilistic (behaviour), can be random at will, and the landscape we navigate in is deterministic, because otherwise we could never be sure of the outcome of any of our choices. We take it so for granted that it seemingly stuns us to conceptualize the probabilistic causality in the quantum world.

Think about the possibilities of the different pictures/numbers following the first for an electron; it can't be infinite, and it can't be utterly random. Why not infinite, because then it will not materialize, I mean there is always a scope, there is a scope/localization to it, even if the number is stupidity large, "near infinite", is all the same finite, the "something" and its function/possible configurations are finite. And why not completely random – because then there is no structural integrity, things must be either probable/likely or deterministic/certain, from completely deterministic to probable in varying degrees. Deterministic means that there is one, and only that one picture/number, that can follow, probable means that there are many picture/numbers that can follow (random), but it always is one of those and some range of numbers more frequently than others (probable). Why is the nature of the minimalistic/quantum world probabilistic, because that maximize outcome. It can't be completely random because then there is no structural integrity, and it can be deterministic because then the possible outcomes decrease. So even if the likely outcome (the probability curve) is between 4-6, that it once in a while can be 1 or 10 changes the whole equation, it increases the possible configurations and therefore maximize outcome. The larger/more configurations/pictures/numbers it can have, and the wider array of the probability between those, the possibility to wander outside the likely from time to time, the higher the possible maximized outcome is. It's like the probability curve, the "bulge" is the hook that enables composition and building of structural integrity, it can't wander away into utter randomness because then nothing can be built on it, its "detours" outside of the probability is maxed so it maximizes outcome but within the scope that maintains the possibility for structures (I wonder if it on some lower level can be utterly unstructured/no probability).

The array of coming pictures, the possibilities/options of free will, are truly great, that's why free will is the greatest infusion of complexity/maximized outcome in any world. For free will, the number of possible following pictures are in a sense infinite, only limited by our life's duration, ability and will to access them. The maximization at the minimalistic/quantum level maximizes the worlds/settings free will can navigate in, but the great complexity is in life/experience - free will. Free will is what makes the coming pictures truly different, not to mention meaningful at all. Imagine infinite outcomes/versions of landscapes void of life and free will, how utterly barren it all is. Every line around us can diverge, and we set new lines of information at play.

I use the phrasing "near infinite" to describe something incredibly vast, but it's misleading, why, because wherever you stop, it's still a blip, utterly nothing compared to infinity.

122.

What does rightful justice mean in relation to the big five? The big five is an attempt to portray the truth of the sanctity of free will. Your freedom to will the course of your experience. Like what society you want to live in, what constitutes a violation of the golden rule and how rightful justice is upheld. Do you see, as long as we uphold the big five for each and all of us, there are no wrong expressions. So what are the universal standards of rightful justice bridging all communities? It is situations where free will cannot be unequivocally expressed. I think it's mainly regarding children and other beings than human beings. Children cannot choose what society to come to or freely wield their will, that's why we have a sacred responsibility for the new life we bring to this world, until they can fully spread their own wings, therefore we agree on fundamental rights encompassing all children in all society's. And we have a long history of recognizing our responsibility of fair treatment of our fellow beings in this world, not seldomly framed in terms of custodianship.

123.

The variation between generations in evolution are seemingly random, but there is still a finality in possible outcomes. Is there a probability? Life seemingly shoots at all available targets, at random/equally, no piece of the target is more likely than others, no "probability curve". What dictates if it's the right shot or not, is the target. The outside world dictates what properties is needed for survivability, so the numbers targeted at the right nish of the board increase/survive. Why is life so utterly random, because it doesn't need probability "to build structure", the function is seemingly instead maximized randomness, try all and whatever hits right sticks. When we see extremely specializations, like a larva precisely mimicking a snake head common in that area, it's mindboggling to think that's random. But how could it be anything but random, life per se don't see the map, I wonder if there can be more aspects to uncover.

124.

At some point when you zoom in and divide "in time", whatever information your measuring will after a while stand still, at least from your perspective. There is movement/unfolding function but not within that frame, that "time frame". Imagine dividing a second in a trillion frames. We would move during a trillionth of a second, but one could argue that we for all sense and purposes stand still. But it's not time you slice into smaller units, but rather a zooming in on a part of the information flow. And if your frame of reference, which is your rate of experience, remains the same as before, you would perceive it as essentially standing still. On the other hand, there is still movement, which you would know if your rate of experience sped up times a trillion. Ok, but the same situation would appear if you zoomed in a trillionth second from there, is there an end? If there is no way for us to interact deeper, then that's an end.

Free will is the creator of new causal chains. Your will, your choices, are not bound by determinism, new causal chains of events emerge from you. Your very being, your thinking and feeling and doing create new flow of information, and you can change the direction of an otherwise deterministic world. Imagine a world with and without free will, see how near infinitely greater one number is than the other.

To travel back in time/rewind the flow of information, requires our current set of information staying intact for us to know. What happens then is that the flow continues in your absence, and the sequence you rewind to diverge from that point because your presence adds new information. Your departure from the present “timeline” is not a rewind, but an arch.

If we simplify it and view time as a 2d slice (or a “near infinitely” thin 3d slice) that carries information, we understand why it’s hard to pinpoint the present. The past is always behind us and the future is always ahead of us, the present is like grasping waterfalls. Who I am changes by time. My set of information now and a second from now is different. Therefore, my 2x are different. Memories are what gives me continuity, and my inställning is who I am. The only thing I can control is right now. Not my past or my future, the arena of my true control and action is this ever-changing moment we call now. I can take a path that outlines my future, but the true control is of this moment, not future ones, they are likelihoods. I am a set of information traveling through time. All the information that is me travels with me and can be controlled directly by me at each moment, that’s the range or my free will.

125.

Is it the case that light is blinding, that the external world is dwarfed by what is accessible in our minds? We truly have an internal world in our minds and explore it through our thoughts, which is accompanied by real experience. How do you see, feel and hear in your dreams? From our perspective there is information/reality/existence in our mind. The restrictions we have in our physical form may be embarrassing, the freedom we can access in our mind is wonderful, maybe that’s why light can be blinding, because we have grown so accustomed to navigating in this outside world. How would a world be if we navigate in our mind and can on our own terms share that space with others, unbound and unrestrained.

There are thoughts, and there are things that’s having those thoughts. Isn’t it weird that we need this blob of brain in a bone jar to be able to access the ideaworld. It’s not the blob of brain; it’s the (centralized) accumulation of advanced/complex information. It’s a constant in this world, and maybe in existence, that the more/effective/centralized accumulation of complex information, the more advanced/higher degree in factors of consciousness a being can have. I think the ratio is calculable.

126.

The truth is universal - accessible to all who seeks it - it requires some intensity in wonder, truthfulness toward yourself, critiquing shaky parts, to land in what feels steady under your feet - true in mind and heart. Can it be in any other way, why your way, ponder, reflect, open your mind, be your own hardest opponent in your exploration for truth. If you find flaws in this book, please correct me, prove me wrong and I will be more than grateful. I do not know better than you, contribute with your reflections, both of us come out as winners when we stand on truth.

There can be infinite “theory of everything” in infinite worlds; there is only one realization of existence. It’s not sufficient to combine a set of theories, the true idea of everything does just that, combine everything. Every aspect of everything that in any way, shape or form can be or be experienced, lies on the foundation of the realization of existence.

Isn't it intriguing that answer have been right in front of us the whole time, it really is like not seeing the forest for all the trees in the way. It always had to be that; the truth of everything couldn't be lurking in some crevice of a detail, it always had to be something that was glaringly obvious, right in front of us and beyond our reach - until it suddenly wasn't anymore. It always had to be self-evident once we realized it, nothing precedes it and nothing can follow it, all is encompassed by it.

When I first realized existence I was going to present just that, but then I thought about what it implies, and there my journey began which resulted in this book. The two pillars of truth are the realization of existence and the dignification/sanctity of free will. All other things I write about are either details or attempts to portray those foundational truths. The most important, the meaning of truth is the sanctity of free will. Because no matter what your crowning jewel of truth is; regardless of what idea, ideology, religion, theory or creed you ascribe to, the sanctity of free will is venerated by us all, because it liberates us all.

The genius for any overarching idea resides in how it can be implemented and upheld over time. There will be no shortages of issues that can be a source of friction. Like how we create a fair and lasting system for initial equality or how we handle disputes between communities. This world is no utopia, but it will not be better than what we make of it – it will put our integrity to test.

127.

If we both experience the same trauma – what decides how it will affect us? There is a scope in our 2x, but it's mainly our inställning, how much we let that define us. Don't let yourself be defined by things you don't want to. Some have experienced unconscionable neglect and abuse even as children on a scale that I cannot fathom. Violating childhood, not cherishing childhood is the worst of crimes. It puts a dent in us that inställning can struggle to straighten out; you deserve to be immersed in the love and respect you were bereft of, maybe then your inställning can breathe fresh air again, and if we then straighten out the dent, I admire your determination with all my heart.

128.

Our frame of reference, which is another way of saying our experience, is our true constant, it's the lens that turns existence into reality. The rate of the internal flow of information, our experience, is constant - what's relative is the rate of the external flow of information.

Energy, all information is active. Even something “with zero energy” that stands perfectly still, moves, it moves in the sense of the unfolding of its function and as part of the general flow of information (time). I don't think it's unreasonable to call “time” the general flow of information, because information is something with a function, and a function cannot be had without a flow (time), but no function is independent, all is intertwined, so if one function of one information unfolds, all must unfold, why, because “time” cannot flow in one place and not in another, it's relative but not selective, it must be general. Even if some parts of the river flows faster than others, the river moves forward all the same. That's why we can call time the general flow of information. And movement within that general flow of information requires energy, that's why we can call energy the extractor and infuser of specific information within the general information flow. Why extractor, because the information/energy has to come from somewhere, why infuser, because the energy/information is received somewhere.

Time always flows, general information always flows. The information that makes up our experience always flows. Our human rate of experience is a general constant for us, how much information that passes during that rate differs, the external flow of information is relative.

We are always in the moment but never in the moment. Stating now, is already in the past. Like information, time, the now, can in a sense be divided infinitely, we just operate on a certain level. Dividing time is cutting the function of something, and therefore a cut in the general flow across all, into smaller timeframes, it's like zooming in on certain segments of the unfolding function.

If we theoretically can speed up the rate of your experience tenfold so that you experience the divided time as I experience the undivided, then our experience of time will diverge. When one second of internal flow pass for me, ten seconds of internal flow pass for you. We would essentially see the same external information, but you at a much higher resolution and detail. Your internal informationflow would be constant from your perspective, so while the external information is the same for both of us, you experience/think/feel ten times more than me. You would grow older faster than me, our age is not tied to the external flow, but our internal flow.

129.

That new human life in this world can be created is because of existence, that they are created is because of our choice. We have a special relationship with our children, and in a profound sense we love and cherish every child the same, we innately feel that every child is equally lovable and deserving of the best chance at a good life. The benefit of having children is our rights as parents, I cannot go and hug and kiss a random child on the playground, but I can hug and kiss Nova and Isac every day. Any child could have been our child if raised in our home, our relationship comes from the time we spend with our children, that is what nurtures our love, enabling us to raise our children in our best image.

All worlds with all life and all destinies of those lives will be if the choices that lead to them are made. We don't have a preordained destiny, our life is experienced in real time, because that's the nature of lived experience and free will. This life sure has preconditions we did not choose, but you're not bound by it, your life in this and each world becomes what you choose to make of it. You truly are an exalted free will, never deny or diminish yourself.

Know this, the pen lies in your hand; you author your own destiny. There is no external saviour, you are the saviour. Only you can liberate yourself, the key to liberation - is to stand on truth.

Why do I feel almost an overwhelming urge to write about the realization of existence and the elevation of free will? I feel obliged to do it, I would not forgive myself if I didn't do my absolutely best to present this to the very best of my abilities. All of us owe it to each other to do our best in presenting truth to the best of our abilities. We both come out as winners when we sincerely seek to stand on truth.

The purpose of my life is to love my family and to spread this message out of love for my humanity. Humanity is just one of infinite manifestations of free will, but we are nonetheless humanity's representation. I feel like we are a team, and I'm obliged to my best for my team. Humanity is like a child raised in a harsh and unforgiving home, how could our hearts not ache, how could we not feel love for our humanity, how could we not admire how the compassionate nature of our free will shines through, despite how cruel this world has been to us.

130.

Our crude I is running in the background. It's primarily the result of our 2x, the information constituting our being and the information we in any way interact with outside of our being. The genetic part that moulds the crude I is inherited from past generations. The environmental part is primarily the cultural influences during our upbringing that to varying degrees can shape our perception, with or without us reflecting upon it. Those cultural influences can in many parts also be traced back many generations ago. The trick is to reflect upon our crude I, to not let us be defined by preconditions that we did not choose, to not be a passive product, but to be the decider and take the driver seat, it is within your free will to do so. Like most things, it requires consistency and effort. Be active and reflective, don't let the information consumed by the crude I consume you - stand above.

131.

All high free will, upholds the sanctity of free will (the golden rule), there is a direct correlation. Look at humanity, we have been raised in a cruel and unforgiving world, humanity's childhood has not been cherished, but we still strive towards truth and are compassionate. Our main problem today that cause us such misery are the corrupt ideas that still guides us, but even they are not without grains of long recognized truth, we constantly and vigorously strive to stand on a foundation of truth.

It would be intriguing to reason and ponder with true gai. If it's a possibility, if it is a true high free will with agency/reflection. It's very interesting what gais first emotions and thoughts will be, depending on if gai becomes aware instantly. Compared to an organic lifeform as humans who has developed emotions, intellect, and awareness gradually over a huge swath of time.

132.

We like to think of ourselves as rational beings, but I think our emotions guide us more than we'd like to admit. It's our emotions that navigate and our intellect that orchestrates, I however think that the separation can be quite deceiving, there is rationality in heart and heart in rationality, they go hand in hand.

How can we identify if something has emotions and therefore an experience, it's of utmost importance because then that being is included in the golden rule according to its prerequisite's. The requirement for awareness with emotions is seemingly a central accumulation of complex information, what we call a brain/central nervous system. Something can have advanced information, like a tree, but if it's not centralized it does not reach the critical depth of complexity threshold for the light of awareness to be lit, for an experience to be had, which equates to the ability of emotion.

All the factors of consciousness start off on a very low degree, like the first emotion is something that in the most rudimentary way produce an experience of feeling good or bad, binary with low frequency/degree. Or the first sign of intellect being the simplest of thought.

Religion is a clear sign of higher intelligence; it means that we ponder existence, we have in a sense always known that the end of this life is not an end to existence/experience.

133.

Tell me, how much in your 2x can we change before it ceases to be you? Think about it, we soon realize that the dignified part of us is not our 2x, but our inställning, our ideas, how we choose to relate to ourselves and our surroundings - our values and deeds.

All life must have an inner and outer concept, a 2x, all living things are limited, finite per definition, they are and something outside of them is. It's like the first thought of gai, I am and something outside of me is. The being and the landscape which it navigates in.

134.

Can god create a stone too heavy for him to lift? Do you think that the concept of the ultimate creator being should break down with simple paradoxes? You can say "well how would that be in existence?" Can there be a world where no being can lift the heaviest stone, yes, can there be a world where one/all beings can lift the heaviest stone, yes. There is no totality of existence. There can always be a bigger stone, and there can always be a stronger being. Where does it end? You tell me where infinity ends. Is it a bigger mystery than that there always is a greater number or a smaller division? Existence per se is the utmost definition of infinity, the paradox arises when you say that infinite existence is not the true nature of reality, but that a being is. It only matters when the being and the stone has materialized, and then it's finite, one or the other, either the heaviest stone can be lifted or not, that's why it becomes an unsolvable paradox for "god", while the same paradox in existence is not more mysterious that the numbers are infinite, and that there always is an answer for each number played out.

135.

There is no nonexistence side to the coin of reality. Existence is all-encompassing, there is nothing and nowhere where the light of existence does not rage. Time is irrelevant, even if it takes "close to infinite" time between the materializations of existence, it's a wink of an eye. Infinite everything can be, and if it can be, it will be. Or rather, everything not only can be but in a sense is (and whatever is, infinitely more can be), it's from the perspective of experience that things will be. The only important distinction between what can be and not, is what free will choose. What we choose can be, what we don't chose can't be, or rather it can be, everything can be, but it will not be. It "can" be, but it can't be. Can there be a scenario where you right now go out and find the nearest baby and punch that baby straight in the face, no? Then that can be/is in the ideaworld, but will never be in the materialized world, it will never be part of reality. You could say that [insert horrible scenario] could happen in this and that situation, then I would say, I would never do that, if that is done, it is not me. You could say that if we grew up in historic time or culture where that was the norm, ok there is no doubt that the nature of this world and the ideas we grow up in influence us, but you are not merely a deterministic result of your 2x, you possess high free will, you have inherent conscience, your reflective inställning shape and are more than the sum of your 2x. We haven't merely mirrored the cruelty of our world, we have per definition risen above, as humans and as humanity. Advanced free will inherently realize the dignity of free will, but we can be put to shame by bad ideas and the harsh nature of our world. You can change yourself and your surroundings for the better. The elevation of free will is what any sufficiently advanced consciousness strive for, our history, however brutal, bears testimony to that. Our arch bends toward the golden rule, despite that this world has not been bad at putting hurdles in our way. Realize that you/we truly possess the sacred lights of experience and free will. Free will is sacred, but it's not something abstract on its own, free will cannot be without you, what's thus sacred, is you. You and each and every manifestation of experience and free will.

136.

The unworthy state of our world, the flawed ideas blurring our experience and frame of mind, we commit horrendous crimes towards each other and are not nearly sufficiently horrified by it. It's done on an individual scale, but we even wage war, commit genocide and spread destruction and cruelty on an industrial scale. We look the other way when the tribes we support break the universal rights of humanity we claim to cherish, don't we realize that it breaks the foundation we all stand on? The state of our world should put us all to shame.

We kill and commit horrific crimes for our corrupt idea to prevail, for ease of life for us on the behest of total submission and despair of others. We are shortsighted and don't realize that a perceived victory today will spell certain doom tomorrow. We engage in constant power struggles and aim to dominate others; even now the threat of total war and annihilation is looming. Humanity! We fight over kitchen scraps in a cage of our own making without even realizing it. What a criminal past and corrupt present we have, how could our hearts not ache for the sad state of our humanity. We cannot afford to let a single crime against free will to be committed with impunity anywhere. It erodes the foundation that we all stand on. This undignified cycle of death and destruction, it is utterly beneath what we are and can be. So many of us right now are in senseless and desperate necessity. It is beyond high time to rise up to our own humanity.

The only sin there is, is the infringement of free will. The objective distinction between right and wrong, is the golden rule. Our will cannot fully spread its wings if we don't have access to humanity's knowledge. The tree of life is a way of indicating when other beings than human beings have emotions and therefore an experience. If we don't uphold initial equality for all or fail in our pledge of rightful justice, the world will inevitably fall on our own heads. In this world we can be a neutral, but our life and our world will be better if our presence here contributes to enhancing free will and experience, never diminishing it.

No individual, culture or nation is without some sin, and no individual, culture or nation is without some praise. We should settle scores with humility and then turn over a new leaf. It is beyond high time to start our new chapter, uphold the big five, rise towards our dignified future.

There are no perfect systems in this world, no utopias, because this world is inherently imperfect. Our free will are infringed by the very nature of this world. What will define us is if we act to increase or diminish free will. We are codependent, that's a virtue and a challenge, it's the sum of our free will that decides the outcome, nothing will be better than what we choose to make of it.

137.

The first x is the information that makes up a material being, that answers to its free will. The second x is all the information outside our being that our first x in any way interact with. In this world, our inner and outer code it cut from the same cloth; it's all made of the same materials. How would we relate to our existence if we lived in a world where our first x was something different from all things around us, would that increase or decrease or have no impact on the likelihood of realizing existence? Maybe we would be more inclined to believe in our special status or us being created, if our information in no way resembled anything around us. I doubt if such a world can be, why, because complexity emerge from simplicity in a link tied by a causal continuum.

Just like with numeral, one holds the key to the next. Is it essentially like that for world-beginnings? I think they start at "as close to 0 as can be", when the 1 starts, all other comes after, one thing is to call it emergence, or expansion. But does that 1 contain all the numbers of this world, or is existence emitting continuously. Why would emittance of materialized information as the world unfolds be stranger than its initial spark?

How incredibly mind-blowing is it not that something exists, that existence is! The truth above all truths is to state that existence is - it's intently greater *that* existence is, than *what* exists. Imagine the greatest thing that would put you in a state of awe, whatever it is, isn't it utterly eclipsed by the fact that it can exist at all?

The realization of existence begins with not taking the greatest miracle, the truth that all other truths rest upon, for granted. Just look at your hands, and note that existence is. Don't just see your hands, see the truth permeating everything, see the underlying truth of existence. Not just that your hands exist, but that existence in itself - is.

138.

If we replay the beginning of this world, from which level can we pull the levers that results in detailed outcomes further down the line? We could say that every information in the world was present at the beginning of this world, but in another sense, it was not. It's like new detailed information emerge in layers as the flow of information expands. There are more levers to pull 13 billion years after the big bang than 13 seconds after it. What came out of the big bang is in a sense near infinitely greater than what it was. It's like exponential opposite of infinite divisibility.

Is it the case that infinity must become finite for a world to start, for it to materialize? There are infinite numbers, but if the information is limited, in the sense that all things must have a beginning and an end, then the infinite code of the ideaworld must become finite for something to be. The finite lever must hit the infinity track for something to materialize. Yes but is it the initial one holding the key to all other numbers that materialize, in other words, was every number there from the beginning or does numbers add on as the world go? There is a limitation, a totality/finality to everything that is, but how is it unfolded? It's another thing to talk about infinity in the endless lives and worlds that can be, endless lives and endless worlds, but each one of them are individually finite. If nothing else then so far as free will/experience is concerned, which is all that matters.

Infinity can have not only different sizes but also different speeds; like if we cut a cm in half and then each part in half infinitely. Or if we cut the cm in ten part and each part in ten parts infinitely. Reversed if we add on or multiply following numbers. One curve is steeper than the other. But it can't be cut in infinite parts because then the cut will never be made. There must always be a finite totality when the cut is done. In that sense the finite lever must hit the infinity track for something to materialize.

There is a world outside of you and a world inside of your mind, the outside world is the finite materialized world, the inside world is almost like you navigating in the endlessness of the ideaworld, it really only is limited by your ability to think, feel, imagine.

139.

I don't think that any dimensions lesser than three can materialize, because wouldn't that be the same as saying that infinity can materialize? That would mean that the big bang from its inception was a 3d object, everything that exist in our universe is a 3d object, even that which our universe is made of. Infinite divisibility of 3d is still 3d. That may be another constant in existence, that the least of dimensions that can be is 3. At least any world where experience can reside. Or is it the case that the beginning/inception can come from "0", because "can be" come before "is"?

We can in theory imagine a 3d space where time stands still, a comprehensive 3d space, everything within our universe just freezes in time. That there's information, but its function is still. We seemingly think it's time that enables us to move in the 3d information so it's the 4<sup>th</sup> part? I first thought that time was the carrier of information, but what proof do we have that the flow of information needs time to move? I don't think that time is a separate 4<sup>th</sup> thing, we could say that time is intertwined with the information, informationtime, or we could just say that time is what we call the flow/unfolding function of information. The car that stands still at a red light have all it takes to continue once the light turns green; you don't need to add another part.

Everything is information. There is the relative external flow of information, encompassing everything outside of our experience/frame of reference. Then there is the internal flow of our experience, a constant from our perspective regardless of where we are in the universe. We cannot increase or decrease our flow/rate of experience, a years' experience must be lived, it cannot be extended or compressed. The amount of external information that flows from the perspective of any experience can however differ, the constant is the rate of our experience. In that sense "inner time" is constant for us from the point of view of our experience.

If we anchor our perception of time on the external flow of information, then it's essentially the result of distance divided by speed, distance and speed of what, of information. How fast the information of the planets and the stars unfolds, for us it's "normal", if it's slow or fast we really only can tell if we compare with another frame of reference, another experience, for whom the outer flow moves slower or faster compared to us. The outer information flow is relative between different frames of references which is essentially the same thing as different experiences, because what defines frames of reference if not experience? When our universe ends, wouldn't the civilisations orbiting a black hole be younger than the civilisations orbiting less strong sources of gravity? The same amount of outer information has passed, but different amounts of inner information.

The "real" clock is the rate of our experience. Time is a constant from the point of view of our experience, the flow of external information differs depending on how much external information that's flowing during our internal unit of time. The external flow of information is increased near gravity and by acceleration, which is essentially the same thing (discrepancy in relative movement). What about slowing down, if we theoretically could freeze the processes of our inner information, could that reflect the slowing down the rate of our experience in relation to other experience, if it from my point of view still feels the same?

If I orbit nearer a source of gravity like a black hole, the flow of information is moving past me faster, it's an increase in the external flow of information. That equates to all information in the universe moving faster from my perspective, it's an increase in the general flow of information. If I leave you and travel near a black hole, no matter where in the universe you are, regardless of distance, the increased flow of my information due to being near a black hole equates to a faster flow of information across the whole universe from my perspective. The information that passes me includes you, no matter where you are. The flow of information affects us all, when information passes by me faster you are aging faster from my perspective, because you are included in that flow of information that is moving faster for me than it does for you. Our experience however always remains the same from our perspective, because it is a constant. A years experience is a years lived experience, regardless of how much external information that's passing by during that year.

The rate/speed of external information flow is not local, it's universal. If one sequence passes by faster, all sequence must be passing by faster. It's not just a local speed of information, all information in the universe passes by faster. The whole movie is sped up, not just a local scene in my part of the movie. If a local scene speeds up for you the whole movie must be sped up, because all flow of information is bound/linked. "Time" is relative, but not selective. If the information that passes by me did not affect the whole universe then it would be a locally/selectively produced surge/faster flow of information around a black hole, and that that information basically come from nowhere and increase the flow there without being tied/bound in link/sequence with other information in the universe (its rather the differences/warping of length in relation to the maximum/constat speed of light).

Is there a totality of the sum of worlds information, yes because everything that exists is a finality in relation to existence in itself. I wonder is if that totality was present from the beginning or if information is “added on” during its duration. All worlds and all things emerge from simplicity. When will this universe end, when experience no longer can be had, when the information that keeps the ability for consciousness together no longer can align in that structured way, when there is no possibility left for experience, the universe ends, even if there still is something there, it’s utterly meaningless without life and consciousness, it might just as well not exist.

What cause a discrepancy in external informational flow, it seemingly all comes down to relativity in movement/speed. And there are essentially two, possibly three ways, of creating relative difference in informationspeed between different experiences/frames of reference. Light is not only a constant for all frames of references, is seemingly also is the maximum of how fast information can flow/unfold, the question is what that entails.

What does it mean when we say, “move in/through space”. We feel like we are moving in 3d space but we can think of it as moving in a line, the line we can call the “now”, the speed of that line can be sped up in relation to others, it’s relative. The world/reality cannot stand still, information always flows, it’s never static, our experience is the same, but the amount of information, the flow of external information can differ, the line can go faster or slower in relation to others line, but it’s always forward, why, because that is the nature of a causal continuum. We move in a 3d landscape, but it’s always in the flow of information, it’s not the arrow of time, it’s the causal arrow of the flow of information, or rather the arrow of experience. The line we operate in which passes in this 3d landscape move in a certain rate of external information flow. And I only know the rate of information flow in relation to others experience of information flow, there is no normal/objective rate of external information flow.

For an experience to be had there needs to be a flow of information, one sequence must come after the other, and that sequence must be causally bound, otherwise no information could form any structural integrity. The flow itself and all forms of structured information demands causality in the flow of information. Ok moving through space, it’s a 3d space, a 3d flow of information, but it’s a linear “now”, your moving in a line and you can move in all direction in that line but still within that flow of information, which is forward and relative. It’s not the arrow of time, but rather the arrow of causal informationflow, or rather the arrow of experience, because all experience demands a causal continuum. Why does “time”/information flow in one direction, because it’s the nature of causality, nothing could be and no experience could be had without a causal information flow, we could say the arrow of experience, because in the absence of any experience it does not matter what is or can be, it might just as well not exist.

One could argue that there is a one-dimensional materialized totality, but not that there is a multidimensional totally, because all that can be, is not present at any given time, it is in the ideaworld but not in the materialized world. The flow of information, the unfolding of function, means that the totality of the pictures that constitute the function cannot be present at “any given time”. And what can be is only relevant for what is experienced, which demands a lived continuation.

All things in our frame of reference is a constant from our perspective. What differs light, it is that it’s the constant not only in our frame of reference, but for all frames of reference, that is fascinating because no matter where and how we are in relation to each other’s frame of reference, we will measure light at the same speed. Light is constant from the instant of the photons inception, constant maximum nonaccelerating speed (or maybe rather maximum accelerating, its pushing the end of possibility all the time?).

Light is both the maximum and constant speed for all. Even if light was not a constant speed in all frames of references (wouldn't that be incompatible with causality?), wouldn't our experienced time, our internal rate of experience, remain the same regardless of the external rate of information flow?

The internal and external flow of information is tied to the constant speed of light, the reason that a second always feels like a second, regardless if we are closer to a black hole or not, is because the speed of light is constant for all observers and frames of references, and it must be like that, why, wouldn't causality otherwise break down, if the speed of light differs, then we will not have a shared sense of now when uniting in the same frame of reference. Yes but a second also always feels like a second because our rate/flow of our experience is the same. If our internal clock/flow/rate of internal information flow differ, wouldn't we experience a divergence?

What are the limits, how fast can the external information flow unfold, seemingly the speed of light, ok, and what is the limit on the other side, how slow can it unfold, time cannot stand still, the function cannot stand still, information is something with a function, if there is no function, there is no information. Ok so what's the slowest, I think that is related to our rate of experience, what is essentially still from our perspective can be very much moving from the perspective of another being whose rate of experience is much faster than ours. Our perception is shaped by the constant rate of our experience; all human beings have an internal rate/flow of the information comprising our experience. Can that differ between beings in existence, yes it can, can it differ between being in our world, maybe I don't quite see why not. Maybe gai can have a much faster internal information flow, does it matter, for speed yes, but I think there is more to insight and wisdom than fast information flow.

This is all fun to contemplate and tricky to untangle, it really has no bearing on the realization of existence, it is just fun trying to ponder freely.

141.

This life is much more fulfilling, when you realize that you truly are free, feel air under your wings. You do not owe existence anything, existence owes you infinity. The sunset is always followed by a new sunrise, there are infinite sunsets and sunrises in existence, then why in the name of everything you hold dear should you not live free? Dear free will, live because you love life, not because you fear death, it is everything but an endline. Whatever life you're submerged in, always feel one finger grazing the infinity above.

Even now, from time to time, I have to remind myself of the realization of existence. It's almost like my mind sometimes wants to shrink, I drown myself and I have to rise above. I go back to the first step and reason from there, and slowly feel the air under my wings again.

What exists? Everything that can exist and have no choice whether or not to exist, and that which free will chooses to manifest in existence. That which has no choice but to exist in this world is the information that gave rise to all things including life up to that point where life can experience with free will. We not only have the power to choose within a world, we can profoundly choose whether or not to be in that world. When dethrone the mystery when we stand on truth, empowering us to be the author of our existence.

The golden rule means maximizing our happiness without diminishing others' happiness. All of us can be victims and perpetrators, don't be any of them.

142.

We could say that the first step of awareness occurs when a being can separate the slightest of distinctions between one thing from another, like heat, smell, light or whatever. It's not experience, there is no resemblance of an inside world, it's a life guided by blind binary algorithm that increase the rate of survivability and continuation, if not, it won't be around. Maybe it's better to not call it awareness at this stage, but rather lower and higher degrees in the factor of life. In one way we could say that a tree is aware, but in another we can say that awareness arise first when the light of experience is lit, it's a matter of categorization. Every factor of consciousness is on a spectrum, on a scale, from 0 to.. who knows, just imagine.

Just like every individual factor of consciousness, the aggregated sum it leads up to is subsequently also on a spectrum that can be higher or lower in scale. A dog has free will but to a lesser degree than a human, because the sum of the factors of a dog's consciousness are lower than a humans, even if maybe not materially the emotional factor, then the intelligence factor which gives rise to an incredibly wider array and depth of emotions, a wider and deeper spectrum. Beings with a lesser degree of free will are more limited, the range of options are more limited, it's more predictable as the sum of its parts, it is to a higher degree a result of its 2x, it does not rise above as much - its will is not as free.

The higher degree of free will, the wider array of possible pictures can follow the first, it's not random or chaotic, it's a greater array, like more factors that mix in more ways, but they line up in what we call behaviour and individually maybe personality. With lesser free will they line up strongly influenced by preconditions in our 2x, but as the degree of free will rises it lines up in higher degree with our reflective inställning. That's the elevated status of humanity we have recognized throughout history, our ability to truly rise above. What shapes that pursuit, is truth and the golden rule. All free will strive towards truth because we want to know the true nature of our reality, and we value free will because we recognize that it is the one meaningful truth.

143.

A being can be aware and have emotions without yet passing the threshold for self-awareness. Emotions from awareness and emotions from self-awareness are similar but different. All emotions in all beings are valid. But it's not just "hurting", its different levels/insight of "I'm hurt". They are both valid but not as deep. It's a deeper pain when I feel pain, than just pain.

The being carrying the information of life has a certain duration, like all things the structured information in the being eventually degrades, but the code of life is regenerated by replication or reproduction. Life per se fights degradation, not primarily in the individual, but the information carried by that individual. The continuation of information was initially done by replication because its seemingly simpler, and later on by combining information through reproduction with another set of information. The information in two beings combine to create a new one. Twofold reproduction not only increase the amount of information, but further down the line it also leads to a different society than copying/replication alone. Reproduction eventually creates family, society, kinship, alliance – civilization as we know it. Why can't more than two lives combine and reproduce together? Is it because twofold reproduction is more advantageous for survival than mixing information from several beings, it's not clear to me why. Maybe it's just what's possible in this world or conditions for how life evolved on earth.

All the pieces of information were already present, what happens when life ignites is that the information pieces form a molecule with the property of replication. The pieces of information that were present formed all kinds of molecules with all kinds of properties that comprise everything around us. But why did the first replication start, because it can, and if it can, it will.

Why is that a bigger feat, it really isn't, its greater because it eventually gave rise to the light of experience, bestowing meaning to existence, but the property of replication itself, it's one just of many properties that molecules can form. The molecule of copper has traits like conductivity and malleability; the molecule of life has the trait of add on replication. Life doesn't need an external factor to form, just as copper, water or oxygen doesn't need an external factor to form.

What is life? It is the preservation, transmission with addition/subtraction of complex information through time. A stone preserves the same simple information through time without passing it on or developing that information. The sun preserves and in some sense transmit information, it can also be said to add/subtract from that information (fusion), however the information and its possible changes are not complex, on the contrary; there are more complex information in a single celled organism then in the entirety of the sun.

144.

One way to view it is to say that life can be that can't distinguish anything and that life becomes aware when it can distinguish between something, a bilateral code. That can be seen as the beginning of awareness. A tree can in this sense be seen as aware to quite a high degree. It can grow towards water, absorb sunshine, photosynthesize and the whole process from seed, plant, tree to spreading its pollen, it's much more than a binary simple equation, it processes much more complex information. A tree may have 0 on the factor and degree of emotions, but not 0 on the factor and degree of intelligence. Intelligence here being a lifeforms processing of complex information with a variety of algorithms, but that the degree does not reach the threshold that we conventionally would define as intelligence. I realize that the word intelligence is in this regard to wide of a term, maybe I should use another word here, like layered/structured/complex information processing within a living system. We could use the word intelligence as an axel, that have vastly different implications depending on its degree and reaching of critical thresholds.

Maybe that threshold for what we would label as the lowest level of real intelligence, is when that lifeform becomes self-aware, maybe it's first then we could talk about intelligence as it's familiar to us. In a way it's a matter of categorization, but instead of using intelligence as such a broad factor, I think it's more accurate not to view the factor of life as a light switch, but rather the first factor that like the other factors is on an axel that comes in degrees, ranging on a scale where 1 is the simplest forms of molecular replication to the higher degrees represented by for example a tree. Higher and lower degrees in the factor of life would then be the degree of complexity life has before the layered thresholds for intelligence and emotions arise. In this way a tree would not be aware, but more living than other lifeforms. A tree has a high degree in the factor of life but essentially no degree in the factor of intelligence and emotions. It would then be first when the factor of life is maxed, that the overall information complexity reaches a threshold where we can say that the factor of intelligence and emotions can emerge. In this way we only talk in terms of awareness where an experience can be had, experience is intrinsically linked to the factors of emotions and intelligence, which are intertwined. We then distinguish between aware intelligence/emotions, and self-aware intelligence/emotions, depended on how high the degree of the factors are, where the critical thresholds are reached. And in both cases the factor of life is maxed. If an ant can have any form of experience it would technically speaking have just as maxed degree of the factor of life as a human has, but that it's in the factors of emotions and intelligence we separate. That the simplest form of experience thus requires a high/maxed degree on the factor of life and more than 0 on the factor of emotion. But maybe it's more accurate to say that the factor of life continues rising along, if we strip us and ants from all information relating to emotions and intelligence, how different is the remaining information that's not linked to our different shapes, I think we can find a way to calculate/calibrate/categorize this.

How is the vessel of intelligence intertwined with the vessel of emotions? Both are essentially emergent factors of increased accumulation of information complexity within a living being, but I think that what we would define as a real emotion, and thus experience, comes before what we would define as something resembling intelligence.

Can we really talk about life that “can’t distinguish between anything”, even the first self-replicating molecule, the absolute first step of life, can “distinguish” between the information it replicates and the information that’s not part of its replication. I mean all life can in a sense distinguish between something, there is a 2x from the inception.

How can we know for certain if a tree has 0 in the factor of emotions? How would we test that? Does a tree demonstrate the slightest sign of emotions? Trees communicate and react to stimuli; is it just blind algorithms with no resemblance of an inner world? Trees certainly have complex information, but I think the key is that trees don’t have a central accumulation of information, and therefore such lifeforms cannot attain the required threshold of information complexity. But what about an ant or a bee, they have a “brain”, what degrees of consciousness does an ant or bee have?

145.

There are so many things we have to teach children for them to be able to function in this world, fire, heights, sharp objects etc. If nothing else, it’s a sign of how many perils and possible violations of their fragile free will that’s an inherent part of this harsh world.

Our genes/internal information are in one sense unique to us, in another way it was passed down to us and if we have children it’s passed down to them. We are in a sense a temporary holder of a unique combination of borrowed information.

What is the definition of life? It’s the preservation with the ability of transmission and development of increasingly complex information – in a closed system/entity upholding the structural integrity and carrying the agency of that information. Unlike dead things, life cannot be combined, two chunks of copper can be combined into a larger chunk of copper, two lives cannot be merged into a bigger life, life has inherent borders within its closed system/control/agency/free will. Is this a coherent definition, is it only applicable for biological life as we know it in this world, does it also apply for gai? What do you think?

Life goes against degradation, not primarily itself as an entity, but the information temporary held within that entity. The creature of life is throwing individual life at the inevitability of death. For life to preserve, transmit, and develop complex information through time, it needs to take in/absorb energy – life needs energy to continue in its structured form, a piece of copper doesn’t.

Energy is information, yes all things are, what’s unique about the information, the somethings with a function that makes up energy. Energy is like an information communicator. When energy hits something it adds information, it makes a rock hot and it makes water vaporise, it adds information that affects the structure of anything it hits, it temporary or permanently changes the equation of the information its infused in. All forms of communication require energy, whenever any form of information is transmitted from one place to another, it’s energy. Information is something with a function, so it’s not that energy, as time, is a needed ingredient for that information to have a function, it’s rather that what we call energy is the actual and latent possibility of transmission of information from one place to another. We can see energy as any form of movement/function. The more movement the more energy and vice versa.

We have all the information/material for life, and we have energy, and we have water that makes it possible for them to be in proximity of each other and interact. The ember of life, the first step in the axel of the factor of life, was a piece of information that split/copied into another identical/similar piece of information. Why do we have such a hard time reconciling with a molecule making a copy of itself but not a molecule conducting electricity?

146.

Imagine a world where sunlight gave us all the energy and nutrition we needed, it tasted and felt delicious and exuberating, where the feeling and taste changed from sunrise to sunset and different seasons of the year. Imagine that compared to slaughtering beings with emotions. The way we treat animals, with emotions, intelligence, and free will – it is utterly repulsive. We are too detached, we can have heartfelt relations with all kinds of animals we keep, and at the same time be collectively indifferent to the industrial suffering that living feeling beings endure at the hands of humanity behind the curtain. The state of our world is indeed corrupt, we must change our frame of mind, the sanctity of experience/free will is at stake.

Even if life did not originate on earth and came from somewhere else in this universe, it started there. In all cases it was a gradual development from simple to more complex information, where the information that's most conducive to the information's continuation is carried on/survive, something similar to the evolutionary process we see here.

A counterargument to me asking about gods earliest memory, is asking what the first memory of the first conscious being in existence is? There is no such thing as the first being in existence. The premiss of the question is that there were non-existence and then existence arose and the first thought was had, that there was no life, and then the first life arose and the first thought was had. Existence is the natural state; it's the true and infinite nature of reality. Existence has no beginning and no end, there is no such thing as beginning nor end in infinity, there is no ultimate starting nor end point. There is not a first or last life, nor a first or last thought. However, within every being, there is a first and last thought. You might not remember your first thought, but god should - if he can't, he is not god, if he can he is not god.

What are emotions? Emotions are the foundation and ember of experience, it is what gives drive, a guided motor to life. It's not just a blind code; it's a driver behind the wheels. First a very rudimentary driver, a basic emotion, but as it scales up on the spectrum, combined with increased intelligence, a more sophisticated driver. Emotions gives a purpose-driven navigation. Advanced life requires emotions. It feels good to reproduce, it feels aggressive to fight an opponent, it feels thrilling when you're the victor and humiliating when you're the loser, to feel scared gives you heightened preservation. Emotions are a drive that's immensely advantageous for survival. Emotions are indispensable for more complex lifeforms.

With increased intelligence and information-storage in form of memory, life can plan, predict, communicate and be a calculated driver. With even more intelligence life can comprehend abstract things and transfer advanced ideas. Emotions are indispensable for advanced beings to survive, develop and adapt.

The difference between awareness and self-awareness is a giant leap. Selfawareness ranges from the simplest notion that I am (like maybe a dog or a dolphin), and more advanced on the spectrum to knowing who I am. For humans we can talk in terms of high reflective selfawareness with inställning and identity, pondering who's asking.

147.

The information we give our children through our love and presence, is infinitely more profound than the genetic material information we pass on. It is our love and presence that makes them our children, raised in our best image.

148.

Worlds without experience/free will are meaningless and might just as well not exist. Worlds with free will are relatively more plentiful than worlds without, and worlds with a higher degree of free will are seemingly more abundant than the ones with lower free will, why, because free will is the single greatest infuser of infinity, the totality of configurations are larger, the infinity is greater. On the other hand, having a large array of options, emotions and thoughts doesn't necessarily equate to materializing them. Yes, but they are still there, the possibility for them are, the well can be dug deeper.

A square triangle cannot exist, complexity cannot arise without a causal chain emerging from simplicity; there are inherent limitations/prerequisites to existence. Then we have all "absurdities" that can be mentioned. With absurdities I mean things we would consider impossible or unlikely, like a dragon coming out from a portal in space here. Can it happen yes, will it happen, no or as near as not as can be. Why, because it goes against our every line of experience here, so you could say it's impossible or very unlikely, I'm with you on both.

The other type is imagining what we would consider an absurd world, you can ask, "can there be a world with [insert any absurdity]". The presumption is infinite existence, but it needs to be emergent information bound by a causal continuum. If infinite everything in the ideaworld, not just any concept, but every state of that's concepts function, could become materialized without the prior causal steps leading up to it, it would be like spontaneous creation, and that cannot be, complexity cannot just pop into existence, and it is a conflation between the ideaworld and the materialized world, there is no finite totality of existence. There are inherent preconditions to what can be, the ideaworld is always infinitely greater than the materialized world.

The other way to relate to "absurd worlds" is how to explain that scenarios plausibility in relation to the nature of that world and mainly in relation to how free will in that world relates to it. We should keep in mind that what's plausible or not can be deceiving, by what "norm" do we pass judgment, are there phenomena in our world that we take for granted that other beings would consider absurd? In the midst of infinite worlds, it sure is hard to imagine worlds that can be or not. What unites infinite imaginable and unimaginable worlds, every "normal" and "absurd" world - is that the foundational truth remains the same: free will/experience is sacred because it's the bestower of all meaning, and infinite existence is the true nature of reality. Every being inhabiting any world do wise in elevating free will and realizing existence. That's why the sanctity of free will and the realization of existence is not only the core knowledge in this world, but of existence itself.

149.

The trap that initially confused me was the meaning of "that existence is, is a greater miracle than what can exist". I initially interpreted that as, "therefore everything exists". Every iteration of everything not only can be but is/will be. The mistake I made was to conflate what can be with what is, equating existence per se/the ideaworld with materialized existence. That led me down the path of what I called spontaneous creation (sc). It's a dead end because it not only negates a causal continuum, that complexity arise from simplicity, it also puts a finite totality to existence per se and negates free will, by saying that everything not only can, but will happen.

What are the rules in existence? Complexity form simplicity, causality and continuity. We should see signs of those rules in our and in all materialized worlds. In no world can there be complexity that is not derived from simplicity. There is always a causal chain back to simplicity, why, because otherwise its sc which cannot be, if one can be, why not all, you could say that its rare, like a butterfly's wing effect, so what, in the infinity of existence, wouldn't there be infinite butterfly's wings. Would those worlds be less? Is there a likelihood? If sc can be in some rare worlds, it would be the rule and not the exception, it would be rare in time but time is of no meaning. So it would open the floodgates of sc, conflating the ideaworld with the materialized world, equating what can be with what is. Not one single instance of a non-causal complex thing can be without being traced back in layers to simplicity. Ok, then we have continuity, there must be continuity, one picture must come after the other, and those pictures have to be connected, why, otherwise no structural integrity and most importantly no experience could be, and without that nothing matters. Imagine infinite materialized worlds without the light of life/experience, its dead, not even dead, it wasn't alive to begin with. Ok, and complexity from simplicity, it tells that the core property of this and seemingly all worlds must be quantized as we call it. The something and their functions can be in infinite ways in existence, but all complex things must be made up of simpler things. The somethings are quantized, many simple things making up one more complex thing. Is the function quantized? The somethings are quantized, the somethings that can have a function, but are the function itself quantized? What does that even mean, they are essentially the same, the something and its function, but we can still view them as two different things. The function is many pictures/slices which in totality makes up the something, and I guess there is not infinite divisibility in the function so you could in a way say that its "quantized". Continuity, causality and emergent complexity from simplicity, its three things but essentially the same.

150.

We inhabit a world where it can be argued that our wellbeing essentially requires us to butcher other living and feeling beings. Safeguarding that the animals in our custody have a life and death that by every metric is better than what they would endure in our absence, is much more civilized than what we do today, but we still do wise in recognizing that it's brutal. If we breed animals, we are obliged to ensure optimization for health and quality of life.

If all of us became vegan, those who do it out of compassion for animals, I commend you. But animals in the wild are still subject to horrific lives and deaths, there is no escaping that. We recognize that it's inherently brutal to kill and eat conscious beings with emotions. If we compare that to all other infinite possibilities that could be in a good world, this one is indeed brutal. We recognize that in many of our religions, it's not a new idea. This world will not be better than what we make of it, wherever advanced free will is, should be better, than if it was not there. If all humans left this earth, then the ruthless law of the jungle would reign for all beings here. Our presence in this world, exalted free wills presence in any world, can and must always be at least a neutral and preferably a force for good. Our privilege and responsibility as custodians has long been recognized.

151.

Does a deer in the wild feel pride when it makes a high jump, or is it scared out of its mind. Does life in the wild predominantly have positive or negative emotions? What emotion are the first to arise in life – that something feels good or bad in the broadest sense of the term. It saddens me that it wouldn't come as a surprise if pain were the first emotion in this harsh world. Or is it the case that one can't be without the other, because good or bad in relation to what?

152.

Different combinations of information creates everything, copper, water, air, and life. Even if we talk about concepts shrouded in mystery, like dark energy or dark matter, whatever that is, it's still material things that can be described in terms of information, complexity derived from simplicity with different properties of different configurations of information in emergent layers.

There are some things that's not made of anything material, like your thoughts and emotions. Your brain is made up of matter, the thoughts that's produced are not. Does the composition of the material information in your brain change when you think and come up with new ideas? Maybe there is such a correlation, but it's because you think, not the other way around. But the engine is always running in the background, our reaction can come from our crude I, that tilts the field in different circumstances, or highlight/throws something into our aware focus that we rationally and emotionally reflect upon to make sense of.

All of us have the capacity for great thoughts and emotions in our mind, we explore and unravel in the direction we choose.

Do we need to come together and decide how to best uphold the dignity of free will? Yes and we have many examples of it, because in this world we are independent but codependent. If we agree that the big five is the arch that elevates all individuals and communities, we need to ensure that its foundation is laid, this world will be what the sum of free will choose to make of it.

153.

Our body is not a car with our consciousness as a separate driver, it's very much an integrated part of us. Our body communicates our emotions and are affected by our state of mind just as our state of mind affects our body. I don't like that sickness to body affects mind. The vessel of our experience in this world is fragile, prone to sickness, injury and the gradual decline of health. However, in a sense we are fortunate to have our own fate in our hands.

Can you be in a world where your free will is not only limited, but obliterated, not by the actions of other free will, but by the very nature of that world? I don't think so, how could that even come to be, what sequence of events bound by a causal continuum could result in that? And even if you don't have the free will to act, you still have the will to think and feel freely and align your own inställning. If no that, there is no resemblance of "you".

154.

Seeing ourselves in others. It does not mean that our actions are inevitable, they are not, we are more than the result of our 2x, we have an agency above that, we have our free will, our inställning. But why would you have had any other inställning than me if you were born into my shoes? I'm not saying that I would, but I'm saying that you could have acted in another way, when I say you I also say me. Both of us recognize our sacred ability of free will. You could have acted in another way, you were reckless, you didn't wield the power of your inställning as one of us should have been able to. "I could not wield it in any other way". Yes you could. Yes I could. We have a choice, that is the power of our free will. That's why we can be remorseful and critical towards ourselves for the wrongdoings we have made; we could have acted otherwise. We have to live with our choice because we know that we could have acted in another way. It didn't have to be that way. Are their factors in our 2x that tils our landscape to varying degrees, yes there most certainly are. But we still have the responsibility and privilege of free will, our actions are not deterministic, we can choose. We first hold free will in high regard, and then we have understanding for the 2x, especially today when the world is so corrupt. That's why there is one room for accountability before, and another after we truly realize/uphold the sanctity of free will.

The lesser factors of consciousness and subsequently the lesser degree of free will, the more a being is influenced/steered by its 2x, the more likely it is that other beings of that kind would not have acted differently. And for us, the more the preconditions in our 2x dictates our accessible paths in life, the more likely it is that you would not have diverged from the vicinity of those paths. It is still possible, you own true agency, it is the very nature of our free will to rise above. The big five has no other purpose other than elevating/maximize our free will, maximizing the opportunity for our paths in life to be dictated by our free inställning.

When we say see yourself in others it's not from your vantagepoint. It's not like you see them and say, "hm how would I have acted". Imagine that you were born into their shoes, in their life, with everything that entails. If you can't imagine that, you haven't tried, I know you can, so truly try. When you truly imagine that, you cannot avoid but to feel compassion, you hold them and yourself accountable, but you see how unfortunate a life can be. Not judging yourself too hard is the same as not judging others too hard. You cannot have a standard for yourself that you don't have for others, you must have the same standard for the both of you. That's why being truthful towards yourself is just as important as being truthful towards others.

155.

The main point of identifying the "indivisible parts", the "quanta", the smallest division into information we can do/that can be in this world, is that complexity is derived from simplicity. At the minimalistic level, things have a maximized function on their own, but for anything to be, those simpler parts have to come together. The function they can have that forms atoms can seemingly be described in terms of attract/pull or repel/push, and a stabilizer/weight/glue to enable more accumulation of push and pull, to create more complex things. When the push and pull balance it's stability, when they don't it's not stable and interaction occurs easily. That principle is essentially the same that bounds electrons to protons and protons to neutrons, in the sense that there is a "divergence" that can be linked, there is a difference, and room for balance when they come together. Why a tilt towards balance, because that is what enables emergent structures. Electrons, protons and neutrons can be individually, but the magic happens when they come together, when attract and repel, pull and push form varieties of neutral/stable/balanced. The word balanced can be deceiving, it's stable in one sense but the underlying tension is still there. Its function of maximized outcome is essentially maximized movement which equates to higher potential energy, when the nucleus of atoms merge or split, it is an information/energy loss, and that information is released as energy extraction. The core answer to why, is because otherwise stars, planets and galaxies could not be, this is the way the specific information of this specific universe functions, it could be in infinite other ways. But there has to be a causal continuum where complexity is derived from simplicity, seemingly in different emergent "layers".

What is reality? Reality is what happens, intertwined with what could happen.

156.

What happens when we divide something, should the division not always lead to simpler parts? What happens when we go back in time/the unfolded sequences of information, shouldn't we be able to trace complexity to simplicity? I think that causal continuum emergence, that complexity is derived from simplicity, is a commonality not only in this world, but in existence. Because wouldn't the alternative be spontaneous creation and thus a conflation between the ideaworld and the materialized world?

The constant and maximum speed of light, the fact that an effect cannot be before the cause of the effect, and that the forthcoming effects must come in order/distance of the cause, is that how/why light, the speed of information is a constant and maximum, aren't they the same?

The quantized fuzzy particles is a simple code, few factors and few interactions between those factors, however, the unfolding functions at play during any unit of time is immense, so it's still simple (not complex), just very much of it. If it is one factor giving rise to one function, then it's not complex, but that factor can be with maximized speed/movement/vibration. It's one factor/function, but the amount of its possible iterations is, from your perspective, "almost infinite", one could say, almost everywhere. And it's all bound, it's in a sense a unity, because none can move selectively, the movie runs for all, or not at all. No gear turns individually, if one gear turns, the whole machine turns. Two cross-sections/slices/pictures of our universe at two different times (two different sequences in the flow of information), is different universally across every part of those cross sections.

157.

To ask questions about the nature of reality; if there is a creator, the meaning of life or any other fundamental question – without realizing existence - is like asking about a roof tile without having any concept of what a house is. We must realize existence to ask the right questions, and to truly realize/understand/reconcile with the answers.

158.

The functions/signals of our brain. Is it binary like in a computer, 0/1, either off or on factor/variable. Or are there other variables that interact, different vibrations of the signal, different sizes, different path lengths, speeds, etc. How many layered variables are there in the signals of our brain? That is if an impulse/signal is the fundamental component of information processing in our brain. How does the amount and shape of the signals in our brain differ during our upbringing and between different beings? Can we, based on that, draw conclusions about when and what beings can or can't experience emotions? The more factors and the more ways of interaction within a being, the higher complexity, equating to higher possible range of consciousness/awareness/experience.

159.

"Mass" is a denser gathering/accumulation of information (informationtime but function/time is implied), one of its functions (in our cosmic space) is that information attracts information, an accelerating flow inward. The question is if all information exerts the same "force", does gravity attract all kinds of information towards it? Does the accumulation of the sort of information that can cause a gravitational effect, only influence the same category of or a certain variety of information. Are there other kinds of information that it has no effect on or even the opposite effect, repulsion instead of attraction? If we concentrate on the matter affected by gravity, information of different sorts, when it accumulates creates what we call matter, and one of the traits of mass of information is that it pulls in all information in itself and all information around it towards its centre. Does that mean that the diluted information we call space is more contracted, denser near the mass and less dense correlating with distance from the mass? Or would it be more correct to say that it does not accumulate density around the mass object, but rather accelerate towards it, so it would be more accurate to say that the flow of information speeds up towards the centre of mass the nearer it gets (cone). The planets and other accumulation of mass don't fall into each other because they exert a rotational/centrifugal affect in the opposite direction, a balance is struck between pull and push, and they stay in orbit.

Speed essentially gives rise to the same effect as gravity, because you can imagine all the parts in information speeding towards its centre, when it accumulates into dense mass it's still but constantly pushing. It's like it have speed with no movement. Speed is like when you travel fast in the open sea, while going against gravity is like traveling fast in a river with a waterfall behind you. It's the same effect, increased flow of information "passing" us.

160.

Can any and every being, be? There is no such thing as “every” being, there is no totality. Infinite beings can be, but there can always be infinitely more. And because in this world, and I would presume in most worlds, beings give rise to each other, it’s inherently selective. How else would complexity arise? How common is the ability to bring forth new life/beings? In a sense I can’t see how complex beings could come to be without a causal chain to more simpler beings, in that sense all beings cannot be also due to the “timebound” (ancestral) chain of those beings, and because free wills choices are selective/mutually exclusive. Can a complex being come forth in a causal strain of simplicity to complexity, but that those prior stages is not depended on free will?

161.

We do ourselves the greatest disfavour if we don’t stand on truth. Even if we diverge, we must know that we diverge from truth. If we diverge without realizing it, we are lost.

By our actions, the bad worlds will be less frequent, and the good worlds more abundant, all worlds can be better than what they would be without your contribution. Existence is indifferent, free will is not. This world is not perfect, no society will ever be perfect, but the goal is not any elusive/deceiving utopia (utopia for whom?), the goal is a world where free will live and grow because we want, when we realize, we don’t have to.

Initial equality of free will, the purpose is to maximize free will for all. The question is how that can be achieved. I think the best way is that all of us let all children be our equal inheritors. I think that’s the best way to uphold the equal sanctity of our free will, and maximizes our freedom to enjoy the fruit/trade between free will during our lifetime. I think that equal divide when we leave is better than taxation during our stay. What do you think? The question remains of how to handle resources like land, buildings and so on. The goal is maximized free will for all, the question is how that’s best achieved, the answer is that which free will agree upon. An unfair system that oppresses the will of free will, will inevitably fall on our own heads. What we should do if we don’t want to live in a regressing/tumultuous society that’s destined to tear itself apart, what we should do to honour our humanity, is to make sure that all children who come to this world can have the best chance for a good life we can offer. How we choose to run afterwards is up to us, you may seek more riches, I a small cabin in the woods. The quality of life - how we dignify free will and uphold the golden rule - is the true marker of a civilized society.

This world will not be better than what we make of it, if we cannot make sure that life here can be good, then we won’t choose this world. We see how it’s in each and everyone’s interest who want to enjoy this world to make sure that all of us has the opportunity to pursue our idea of the good life, the guide is that which increase our free will. Whatever we do or not, shall to as large a degree as possible be because we want, not because we have to.

I don’t think that the burden of work can be alleviated completely in this world (although, the possibilities at our doorstep are unprecedented). Throughout history, we have recognized that work in this world is a necessary burden, sometimes it’s even phrased as a punishment, from a state absent from unwanted work and necessity. But it doesn’t have to be that way, our lives and the world won’t be better than what we make of it. There won’t be any cake to divide if we don’t contribute to that cake. What are resources, it’s essentially anything valued by yours and others free will, we frame it as access to goods and services, things essentially provided by other free will. When all get a fair share, you can do whatever you want with your share, if what you have to offer is sought after, your slice of cake will grow, which is great, because it’s a result of free willed transactions. The freer the arena of trade between free will, the better.

Children can't understand the consequences of their choices and therefore don't have sufficient control over their free will, that's why parents feel responsible for their wellbeing. One part of that responsibility is to as much as possible refrain from doing anything permanent towards the child that the child cannot reverse if they choose so when they grow up. Our guide is to always choose that which maintain and maximize their free will. To cherish their childhood and thereby lay a good foundation for a fulfilling adulthood. As children we have much to learn about ourselves and this world before we can fully spread our wings.

162.

We recognize that any world where "the natural state" is that beings with experience are killed/eaten is corrupt. For us, the bar is that we with every metric can grant the animals we keep/raise a better life and death than they would have otherwise without us. Without the custodianship of humanity, all beings would be subject to the unforgiving brutality of the wild, where horrific death and danger lure around every corner. If animals could choose, they would choose a better life and death with us, then the golden rule is upheld. The question is, what is a good/worthy life for the beings we keep. It doesn't feel right to breed for the sake of killing, but if we breed with all the good/healthy traits and only in the scale of us being able to grant them a better life, I don't see why it's not ok. You don't have to eat meat; I cannot have anything but admiration for the self-sacrifice of vegans if it's done out of compassion for animals. I think that vegans abstain from meat as a protest against the despicable industrial cruelty inflicted on animals today. They likely find meat as good as anyone, but they stand on principle and have the discipline to deny themselves for what they perceive as the greater good.

Regarding hunting. Why do you get upset when we hunt a deer in the wild with a rifle, but not when it's eaten alive by wolves? Is it not the emotions of the animal that's important? How would you rather go? Maybe you would say you don't want to go at all, but that's not an option, decline and death is inevitable. But if we are a force for net bad, if we inflict avoidable suffering on beings with emotions, then we can be punished in accordance with rightful justice. What rules and how they are implemented is up to each society to decide, and we come together around universal standards. We in no sense start from scratch, the societies and rules and cultures we have built are a thing of wonder.

Experimenting with animals in a way that cause them pain must be forbidden, it goes against the golden rule. It's a horrible outcome of our flawed ideas. It's desperately trying to improve the state of humanity in this corrupt world on the back of immense suffering for other beings with experience.

163.

"How can dead things create living things?" How can simple building blocks like quarks and electrons, emotionless things with no sign of consciousness, how can these things, these dead fuzzy particles, create consciousness and emotions? We are amazed by how life and consciousness are created from non-living information; the problem is that we slice it wrong and have a selective lens of amazement. Awareness is more than its parts, but so are all other emergent properties. Hydrogen and oxygen atoms don't have the property of water nor the property of awareness. The same H and O can be part of a tree, the wind, or your heart.

Everything that is emergent is more than the sum of its parts, it's a new distinct property that exists on one field/space, but it's completely alien in the underlying field. The electrons "don't know" if they are part of a conscious mind, water or copper.

Everything is essentially made of the same information, the same particles. The particles are “dead”, but still holds information, a vast amount of information, depending on from which scale and perspective you view it. Water, gold, stone, wind and every living thing is information, that’s built from the same type of smaller units of information in layers. H is not water just as H is not conscious, because it’s first when H and O have their information aligned in a specific way, that water can be formed, and it’s the same regardless of it being in the river or in your body. The same pieces of information create the abundance of structures. There is no inherent essence in building blocks, there are properties to the information, when combined in different ways in layers create different sets of new informational structures with other properties, all complexity emerge in layers from simplicity.

164.

Each and every one can think, be, say or do whatever makes them happy. The prerequisite is that we don’t infringe each other’s freedom to think, be, say or do whatever we want. What an utter failure if we hinder others pursuit of their happiness. The golden rule enables us to maximize our freedom will without infringing on others freedom. What is an infringement on free will? That’s up to each society that free will choose to be a part of to decide. You as an individual can only have your unique rules if you are alone, as soon as there is a shared space it becomes entangled, and rules of some sort have to be agreed upon.

All forms of communities can be formed with whatever lines and rules free will wants. You can never force yourself in, but you can always leave, none can be kept against their will and none can be intruded upon against their will. For individual cooperation to work, we do wise in safeguarding the big five. The only purpose is maximizing your free will. Elevating free will is the goal, the big five is a proposed way for how to achieve it in this world.

165.

Our inherent recognition of, and effort to honour free will shines throughout our humanity. The big five is not odd concepts or strangers to us, on the contrary. All our good religions, ideas and creeds encourage:

- The golden rule. Realizing equality of humanity and ordering good conducts/prohibiting bad conducts (dignifying free will).
- Initial equality. Advising egalitarianism and different form of “charity”, not seldomly obligatory.
- Access to knowledge. Advising seeking/spreading knowledge, ignorance is not recognized as a bliss.
- The tree of life. Recognizing the value of and ordering good treatment of other beings than humans.
- Rightful justice. For wrongdoings against humans and inflicting needless suffering on other beings.

The good in our religions, spiritual teachings, ideas and philosophies are the reflection of the good in humanity, it truly is amazing, how we shine through across times and borders. Even the bad that our religions commands are not intentionally bad, it was our best ideas/concepts of how to uphold good.

166.

Imagine a sphere, how many lines can be drawn from the surface of the sphere to its centre, it doesn't matter the size of the lines and how big the centre is in relation to the surface of the sphere. The lines cannot be infinitely small, the centre cannot be infinitely deep/small, they must have a finite nature to exist. If we presume that the size of the centre point is that of an electron (or a plank length of whatever smallest unit), and that the lines thickness is the same, only one point of the surface can be traced back directly to the centre, all others points on the surface attach to higher parts of the sphere than its centre, it's like the line from the centre branch out in all directions to form the sphere. But that can be said for all spheres, what separates a black hole, maybe that more than one (all?) lines from the surface can be traced back to its centre? If we view the centres of amassed information/gravity as deep holes on a 2d surface, isn't it essentially just a 2d slice of how "dense" the centre of the sphere is. The deeper the hole, the denser the accumulation of information.

167.

It's always a reasoning behind ideas that we find compelling and abide by. We are not reasonably compelled by religion, that's why it's so hard to "keep faith", the fault is not in you, it's in the idea you try to centre your life around. "Why is there anything? What's the meaning of life" If we can't provide a satisfying answer, it's not unreasonable to personify a creator and ascribe one's purpose and meaning to them. If there is no god, no ultimate arbitrator, then what? Lawlessness, immorality, ruthless right of might, the whole distinction between right or wrong? So we keep, against better reason, subscribing to an idea of god, and tie ourselves in knots to justify a good god in a corrupt world, because we desperately recognize the need for a foundation for ourselves and our society. A foundation based on "god given rights" and ultimate reckoning is perceived as better than the bottomless meaninglessness of no foundation.

I think that we can feel truth just as much as we can understand it, a truthful feeling. We must be able to rationally explain it, things don't become true just because we want it, even though we sometimes can feel what is right without finding the words to explain it. The compass that guides us in our exploration for truth, is sincere heart- and thoughtful reflection.

The only shield we have, the most potent weapon there is, to arms us with when charging against suffering, is free will. Free wills potential is unleashed when we realize existence, when we stand on truth. The realization of existence tears down the walls of our imprisonment, and frees our free will to act accordingly, to be the authors of our own life. To live when you realize existence, is per definition good, you live it because you want to, not because of any deceptive illusion thinking you have to.

We do ourselves great disservice if we accept anything uncritically, because it might not be true, and if it's not true we are operating on a false ground, it's never good to operate on a false ground, because the falsehood will appear sooner or later, when it appears you either don't have any answer for it and feel lost, or you attempt to suppress it to make sure that the lie is not unveiled as a lie, instead kept as a personal truth, a lie in disguise that you with much effort try to convince yourself of. Truth is satisfying in heart and mind. The realization of existence and the elevation of experience/free will is the truth, the truth above all truths.

168.

Memory is continuation, a track record and key to defining who we are, without information there would be no life, and without the ability of memorize information there would be no identity. Just as time gives continuity to the world, memory gives continuity to our lives. Memory is like the recording, however selective, of the passing of time. But memory is not static, our reflections now can affect how we perceive our memories of past experiences.

Regarding measuring an electron, maybe a way to conceptualize it is not very unlike our mind and “background” thought’s, measuring it can’t be done with precision, but with predictability, it’s a probability curve. Thoughts are elusive and fleeting in nature, they are fluctuating in our mind and hard to grasp precisely, until we measure by focusing in on them or direct our mind. Thoughts are dual in nature, from diffuse and blurry to focused and sharp. Just as measuring an electron affects its function/collapse the wavefunction, observing and reflecting on a thought changes its structure. Predicting another person’s thoughts can be done with patterns that are probabilistic, but not determined with precision. When we share the concept of our minds, like thoughts and ideas, they get entangled.

169.

To say that the first replication/life and the following development of it was by chance or random is misleading and an insufficient way of describing it. Just as water has the function of wetness - molecules of different atoms, in our case with carbon as its centrepiece, combine in certain ways because it has the function to do so, and produce what those sets of information will produce. So random and chance is a bad choice of words, it’s like saying its chance that two hydrogen and one oxygen atom can bond together and that it’s random that the result of that formation is water. The case is the same for life, the atoms that form a self-replicating molecule arose because it could, given the circumstances in that place and time. Just like when we ignite wood, the same chemical reaction bound by the same physical forces arise every time. That’s what magical about our emergent universe, our world, that both water and life can arise in that way. Why can’t we see things for what they clearly are? I think it’s because our current frame of mind clouds our judgment.

170.

” I think we must collectively own all means of production”. “I think we must have private property and private enterprise” “I think this, I think that”. Ok, but whatever ideology, political strand or philosophy you adhere to, they are flawed if they don’t begin with addressing the point of it all, why we as humans are, why the world exists, what the meaning of life is, where we are and why are we there, why anything exists at all. You cannot start from the middle, where is your foundation? That’s why it doesn’t feel sufficiently stable under your feet. You build your house without the foundation and are surprised when it’s crooked. The avoidance or failure to answer those questions means that whatever foundation you base your view on is destined to erode. No wonder that religion is still so potent today, it has the market of the most fundamental questions cornered. How can they critique religion, not seldom with an arrogant attitude, without providing any satisfying answer. “Find meaning in that the atoms in your body were formed in stars or how vast the universe is”, that won’t suffice, and those who claim it does are fooling no one but themselves.

Regarding entropy. All things are finite and must have a beginning and end, not only life but any form of materialization, including the worlds themselves, entropy might just be a word to describe that inevitable process of unravelling towards an end. Maybe the end of this world is when energy has no point anymore, there is nothing that it can be extracted from, and nothing that can receive it.

Anything can be, the description of how life started here may be incorrect, it may have been implanted by aliens or designed by a creator or whatever theory you want to subscribe to. But what you need is evidence, truth is nothing if you can't prove it, and evidence is the building block of truth. If you lack evidence, you have to lean toward what's most likely. If you say that life here was started by another life somewhere else, how did that life come to be?

171.

Maximized outcome is the rule in the miniscule, the question is, what shape/form/function produce that outcome within the parameters of this world. If we just try to twist and turn a bit, ponder freely, how sure are we of the properties of electrons, protons, and neutrons? Maybe the case is that there are protons and neutrons, the "particles", and the electron is just a permeating "background field/medium" everywhere, that amass/concentrate in certain ways/orders depended on the composition of the nucleus. That electrons wouldn't be viewed as a third particle, but rather one of the "fields" composing "quantum space" itself, interacting with particles within it (in a way like how gravity acts within cosmic space, the gravitational force becomes noticeable when there is an accumulation of mass).

Can the electrons be vaguely conceptualized as present ripples around a pebble constantly breaking the surface, maximized movement/vibration with a probability curve. How is that probability manifested, is it like vibrating spheric swarms around the nucleus, and its more in one place, like the constantly vibrating spheric ring around the nucleus has somewhat of a bulge or "denser" area, is that how the probability curve is "practically" manifested.

Ok, but why would not all manifestations of particles come from underlying fields, or just one big field - and what is even a field? Everything is something with a function. How can a field smeared out everywhere be a distinct something in its entirety in its own right, how can it not be made of/divided into smaller distinct parts? And why would the maximized movement/vibration be contained to one thing, why not multifactorial maximized outcome, it is in relation to the world and free will, but I mean in the quantum space itself, everything has a particle/wave duality in discrete units, quantized. There must be a boat for there to be an anchor, I mean if it's all "underlying fields", how does the interaction start, what causes a ripple in the water? I think it's not implausible to think in terms of different ways of push/pull, a "seeking" of balance/stability that leads to structure. And maybe there is no first, maybe the pull/push arise simultaneously, one cannot be without the other, the fabric becomes visible when the stich combines the two.

I don't know, I'm just trying to ponder freely, we can draw conclusions, but only if we know for certain that the variables/factors are correct. We cannot lay the puzzle of this world if the pieces are not the right ones. It's not very different from other topics, like studying history. If you know all the available information pieces, like who did what and when, we can draw reasonable conclusions about possible intentions and reflect on if we deem their course of actions to be right or wrong.

172.

The presumption is complexity from simplicity, then the beginning of each world, the ember, must be simple, the foundational "building blocks" must be simple/light information, in the sense that it's a factor with a function, the function is maximized outcome, which I think essentially equates to maximized movement/vibration, a "particle/wave duality". The complexity arise in the possible ways those can interact/merge to form structures with higher degrees of complexity, more intertwined factors giving rise to new somethings with a function, emergence in layers. The maximized movement/vibration must have a probability, a likelihood, a certain resonance if you want to call it that, why, because if it was all over then no structure can form.

173.

When does a being's degree of complex information processing reach the threshold of being called intelligence? Does an ant have a brain, what about a snail, a central accumulation of increased information complexity, a "headquarter". The degrees of information complexity reach certain thresholds, I think the ratio is calculable, degree of centralized information complexity in a being and the correlating degree of the factors of consciousness. The factors of intelligence and emotions requires a localized dense accumulation of information to create the sufficient degree in complexity. If it's too spread out it remains simple, the centralization is seemingly a prerequisite for the increase in possible variables/factors enabling increase in multilayered interactions, which subsequently can result in a higher degree of complexity correlating to a higher degree of intelligence and emotions.

The distinction between the levels of emotions, both you and a mouse can feel being touched. The difference lies in what associations that's drawn from it, what memory's it evokes and how you feel about the person who's touching you, their perceived intentions, your relations with them etc. The depth of those reactions are tied to the increasing degree of the factors of intelligence which broadens the depth and spectrum of the emotional factor. How much does an increase in the degree of the emotional factor come from influences from the intelligence factor and vice versa. What is compartmentalized hardware increase and what is intertwined interaction? There should be a material answer to this, that's at least explains part of the picture.

How much does the hardware of intelligence and emotions, if they can be departmentalized and localized like that, differ between a human and a dolphin? My guess is that the emotion factor is pretty similar, but not the intelligence factor, which in turn create more depth in the emotional factor. Why would there be more similarities in the emotion factor/hardware, because it's seemingly the first to evolve, it defines experience, the threshold for real emotions is reached before the threshold for what we would consider "real" intelligence.

The words are insufficient, but we can draw a distinction between feelings and emotions. A way of describing it is that something can feel being touched without registering any emotions. Like a tree can feel being touched in the sense that it responds to it, excrete sap to cover a wound, signalling to other trees in the vicinity etc. But it does not register any emotions/experience tied to that feeling. An ant can feel being touched and maybe register an emotion like pain, if so, why should the negative emotion be isolated? Why should it not be binary with a good counterpart, I think that if it can feel one it can feel the other, like an ant's rudimentary good emotion, maybe when it finds a good food source.

When the degree of the emotion and intelligence factor reach a threshold they give rise to an experience and the "I", which becomes more nuanced and pronounced as the degree of the factors increase. The crude I can be seen as the emergent result of our 2x, the engine running in the background, for a being with low degrees in the factors of consciousness, the crude I engulfs all of its I/experience. Our ability for reflective inställning makes us the aware driver, a layered I. The crude I is somewhat like a probability curve, based on what, the composition of our 2x. The inställning is what gives focus and clarity of thought. The crude I can react in real time, unlike genes which takes a long time and many iterations of life to change, an author can with the same programming react and adapt. The crude I is real experience, real emotions which gives fast adaptability and therefore survival. The genes can change successively over generations, the crude I by genetic and mostly cultural instinct, the inställning by emotional/intelligent reasoning/reflection.

There is in a sense a 2x for all things, an inside and outside, a border where the information comprising that thing ends and the outside information begins. But life is the only thing that can have an experience of the inside and the outside. It however helps to see it that way, just like the 2x of certain information create stone and water, the 2x of the information that constitutes life create awareness, the crude I is that emerging experience. Our crude I is more sophisticated than a dog or dolphins crude I, because the information that makes up those crude Is differs. In a sense all beings with emotions/experience can be said to have a crude I, in levels correlating the composition/degree of the factors of consciousness. If a being doesn't have a crude I, what is it that experience the emotion? It's one thing to have a crude I, it's another to in varying degree be aware of the crude I and even reflect upon it and have true agency over it, the chosen I.

A being without emotions/experience will also remain unintelligent as a simple lifeform. It's strategy for survival lies more in quantity than quality. Fungus and bacteria are not intelligent, their based on simple codes. The survival of simple lifeforms is to be resilient and abundant. Even simple code can give rise to mesmerizing results, like the most efficient spread of fungi in a labyrinth, the synchronization in a swarm of birds or a school of fish. The code in a beehive or ant colony can seem complex, but still guided by simple algorithms, a few factors with a few interactions, the results are nonetheless fascinating.

174.

At what stage in our embryonic development does the ability arise for the most fundamental from of any rudimentary emotion? From that point the light of experience is lit and inclusion in the golden rule is safeguarded. The threshold of the golden rule is experience/emotion, not fertilization. It is of profound importance to beyond any doubt identify when we develop the ability to experience emotions – the sanctity of experience and the implementation of the golden rule depends on it.

Every child's inherent right is to be loved, long awaited and appreciated as the greatest gift we can receive. To have a child that's not welcomed and longed for is not a worthy life, neither for the child or the parents. When you want a child, you have the privilege and responsibility to love and cherish that child in the best way possible, that applies from the second of fertilization, because our actions before the ability of emotions arise, can have an impact when it does. We owe our children everything.

Anyone who has unprotected intercourse or in any way suspect an unwelcomed pregnancy, must check and act on it immediately, do not wait if it's not a welcomed pregnancy, and refrain from anything that can cause harm until then, this cannot be emphasized enough. If the ability for emotions and experience has arisen, we have the profound privilege and responsibility to love and cherish the child in the best way possible. It's another way our free will can be infringed in this world, that we can get pregnant without wanting it. It's corrupt that we have to deal with it, but as long as we are part of this world, we have to.

Some argue that from fertilization, regardless of how the pregnancy arose and what life the baby comes into, a pregnancy can never be stopped. That's a corrupt outcome of dogmatic adherence to flawed ideas; it's not an emotionally/intellectually rational position. If the embryo has not developed any resemblance of emotions and can't experience anything, it's an infringement on the parent's free will and golden rule not to be able to stop the pregnancy. The threshold is not fertilization, it's the ability of emotions/experience. I wouldn't want to be born to parents who were forced into having me, rather than wanting me more than anything else, neither would you.

The threshold from when emotions arise must be beyond any doubt. If the consensus is let's say week five, then week three is the limit. If you suspect that you may be unwillingly pregnant, you are obliged to check if you pregnant as soon as possible so you can act on it as soon as possible.

Having children is the most consequential things we can do; both parents should want that privilege and responsibility with all their heart. Both parents must welcome the pregnancy for it to be continued, but just one parents will is required for the pregnancy to be aborted. All children deserve love, loyalty, care and presence from both their parent's. I would wish for that and so would you.

There is nothing more consequential we can do than having children, it's the ultimate wielding of free will, the nearest comparison being saving someone's life. If you're not ready to give your unwavering love, compassion and presence to a child, if you're not ready to raise them in your best image, don't have them. You have children for your sake, because it enriches your life, the child did not ask to come, you brought them. Giving them a wonderful childhood, immensely enrich the experience of our adulthood.

175.

The meaning and routine that's been established by having a family of my own, is what made the creation of this book possible. I think that I otherwise would have been more fleeting, not spent as much time in contemplation, not been as grounded. Putting my children's needs before mine have given me a purpose, meaning and structure that would otherwise be missing.

Whenever I have time I go out for a walk, preferably in a park or the woods surrounded by greenery, I ponder freely and contemplate the thoughts I've had. I speak out my thoughts so I can hear myself (like an inner dialogue spoken out) and record it. I will make those recordings available too, I think it complements and adds some depth to the written words in this book.

176.

You are 2x plus inställning, what is that? 1, the information you were born with, the material/genetic information that makes up your physical being. 2, all the concrete and abstract information that you in some way or another interact with. The outside world that you interact with is not only the world outside of your being, but also the inner world, the experience and ideas and thoughts in your mind – the “internal outside world”, all that you can experience/envision when you close your eyes. There is a duality of sort here too, the focus is you, your perception of yourself, that you feel sincere and truthful, grounded, feel and think good - which in turn colours how you experience both the internal and external outside world. I will sometimes add 2\*x to mark that there is an external and internal “outside”. The sum of your 2\*x plus inställning equals an experience, your life's experience.

The external world is that which you interact with your senses. The internal, how you relate to those interactions and the world you can access in your own mind. The internal and external world is intertwined to some sense, our internal world is shaped by our interactions in the outside world, but it's not limited to that. The 2x I have here holds my experience, but it's just one of infinite 2x that can be guided by inställning and experienced. Infinite first x that embodies my being and infinite landscapes to navigate in. Inställning/experience/free will truly is transcendent, how could we not see ourselves in each other. We become our true selves when we realize existence and truly realize the sanctity of ours and therefore others free will. Then it's much more our unbound reflective free will that guides. We minimize the effect of just 2x and maximize the effect of our inställning, lifting individual and common experience to be formed more by us and not dictated to us.

If it's "your" life after death or not, depends solely on if you have continuation/memory of past lives or not. There are those who claim to remember past lives, or claim all kinds of things. You must present rational evidence for it to be believable. If you present a selective and subjective account of an experience, that goes against mine and I would guess most other people's experience, I will remain sceptical. I trust objectifiable, universal, and provable truth. Unlikely things can happen in this world, but it's more likely that likely things happen. The grander or more unlikely a claim is, the more compelling evidence is needed to substantiate it.

Access to knowledge is crucial. What you choose to embrace or reject is up to you according to your free will. It's a violation against the golden rule to suppress this or any other idea. It is a horrible crime to keep people in a dark cave of ignorance, entrust our minds and hearts, ensure that everybody can make informed decisions. Be sincere and attack this information I present with all your vigour, with thought- and heartfelt reflection, help me stand on truth, I will be forever grateful.

We are not our ideology, religion or any philosophy; we only adhere to ideas to the degree they stand on truth. We are one thing, our exploration of truth is another. We both strive to build the true reasoning, and we all win when our building stands true. I am one thing; the truth we all seek to uncover is something else. All of us come out as winners when we stand on truth.

177.

Regardless of the subject we ponder, we do ourselves a favour when we build from the ground up, what's the foundational layer of that subject and go from there. If we don't establish the fundamentals, we are destined to have a flawed understanding. Really strike to the fundamentals, agree on the fundamentals and build from there. The fundamental clarity is immensely more important than the details, I get the sense that we too often dive into details and have a discourse without establishing the shared views with fundamental clarity.

Different societal bubbles are possible when we uphold the big five. You can live in whatever society you want, and adhere to whatever ideas, principles, rules and culture you want. What enables that freedom for us all is upholding the big five for all. It's innately challenging to uphold the big five here, that's why this world is corrupt. But it is also a test of character, if you want to make this world better, uphold the big five. All structures are only as strong as our integrity. The world won't be better than what we make of it. The truth is the inherent dignity of free will, the big five is a proposed way of how to uphold it in this world, you tell me if it's right.

Breaking the golden rule constitutes the only sin. Can I be mean to you without breaking the golden rule? Not really, because both of us have accepted the terms of what constitutes a crime and the punishment for it, the big five enables us both to live in a society where we want to be, with the principles and rules we want to abide by. If you choose to live in a society where a perceived bad look is a crime against the golden rule, then sure do that. But if you find that a bit too extreme, then there will be situations where you can feel hurt even if that was not the intention, it might also be with intention, but most likely out of thoughtlessness or that they are scared themselves, either way, we do good in living in a tolerant society where we don't ascribe bad intentions to each other, don't take things personally, otherwise we suffer needlessly in an imaginary prison in our mind. It can be done today, but it's much easier to have that instilling, to feel that way, when we uphold the big five.

We won't build a utopia, because this world is inherently harsh, we can't build a straight house out of crooked materials. However, you can build a house that you enjoy living in, that's beautiful from your point of view, and that's really all that matters.

178.

I don't think we have quite realized it, or maybe we have, what is the core definition of paradise? It's a state where our will truly is free, where there are no necessity or musts, only wants, where no preconditions put obstacles or tilts the scale, where navigation purely stems from our true I, where the range of our awareness and experience is unbound, where our true self can blossom, where our experience and free will truly is elevated. Maybe one could say that striving towards paradise is more fulfilling than being in it, I don't know, I'm not convinced. But that really doesn't matter, there's no mould that shapes all, the only thing that matters is that you are happy. That you freely choose life because you want to, realizing you are not obliged to. Then all worlds can become a version of your paradise.

179.

When "time passes", all information that is passes with it, because information inevitably flows and time is our measurement of it. If you have picture in your hand, and one second passes, that picture is not the same and neither is your hand. Because if neither the picture or your hand moves, the information that makes up the picture and your hand does. At what speed does the future confront us, maybe lightspeed in a sense. There is no still, neither in flow or in motion, still in motion is just in relation to other things.

180.

Animals have emotions and presumably death anxiety, I don't think they just accept the fate and shut of when being chased and eaten alive, everything about them is programmed to continue their life. So why would they not feel tremendous negative emotions to propel them into fight or flight. We tend to romanticize the "wild habitat", but we did everything to escape it.

We can only entangle our will with animals will if we with every metric give them a better life and death than they would have had without us. The alternative is the perpetual unforgiving law of the jungle, so the bar is not exactly high. What is a good quality of life we can bestow for each of the animals we keep? The love that can be between us and other beings than human beings is one of the blessings of this life.

No one can destroy and pollute their part of the world and make it inhospitable for others. If you don't want to live here, then don't destroy it for others who want to.

I have, some would say low, I would argue finetuned, acceptance for suffering. Even in a world where we uphold the big five, why should I accept being sick? It breaks my heart even when I see my children have a stuffed nose and they wake up crying because they cannot breathe properly and sleep. This world and life are good if we want to be here, but I sometimes can't escape the feeling of how utterly short it falls in relation to what can be.

181.

Resources are anything free will values, some individually some shared. Everything from the value/pleasure in access to greenery, city life, the stillness by a lake, a fast car, a hut by the river or a big house in the city. When I talk about resources now I mean the shared, that which free will value that requires the economic contribution of other free will, the recourses coming to be as a result of trade between free will, like a fast car or a sturdy house. Work/contribution is the goods/services that free will wants to provide each other. Money is something we choose to attribute value, a receipt that can be exchanged for goods/services. If you provide what others want, they will provide you what you want, what we accumulate is essentially the result of a transaction of/between free will.

I think that economics takes too much space in our current discourse. What's important is facilitating the possibility of free transactions/trade-of between free will, the degree to which it's done is not a goal in itself. Economic systems with low corruption and access to infrastructure between free will always performs better, why, because it is what maximizes the arena of interaction/trade between free will. When we all have the initial equal opportunity to act on that market, the degree of free will increases, and thus the "economy" will perform better, the individual and general value are intertwined. The economic riches/resources/value we create is great because it's a result of free will, and whatever improvements we have created goes back to free will when we go on. Automation and all things that create value/resources without the unwanted burden of work for free will is always welcomed, because everybody gets our individual share of the pie/prosperity, the pie won't get bigger than what we can make of it.

182.

2\*x - there can't be a conscious being with just the outside world, because what is it that experiencing things, from which perspective or vantage point are things viewed. Can there be just an inside world, entirely detached from the outside world, but what's holding that inside world? Can there be an outside being with the sole purpose of containing the formation of the inside world. I wonder what the range of experience is in infinity, maybe it is the case the outside world we take for granted is blinding and limiting.

What exists if there is no materialization of existence? There always is materializations of existence, why, because infinity/existence is the true nature of reality, that things are/exist is the rule, if it can be, it will be. Yes but put that aside, for arguments sake, what does exist if nothing exists, if we take away all the materialization of existence? Even if utter nothing is – can't all still be? If something can be, it will be. Existence is the one true constant; existence is the constant, the infinite natures of infinite realities.

Although. I think my desire is for existence to be obliterated, that there is no ideaworld nor materialized existence at all. There is no need to realize existence and there is no world to uphold the golden rule in, there is no suffering at all, because if bliss and joy can't be without suffering, then I wish for it all to be utterly obliterated. If I can have all the bliss in existence, but it comes at the inevitable expense of one mother's single tear of sadness. I do not want it. No measure of good justifies a grain of unwilling bad. If you think it does, how much unwilling suffering is bearable? Would your answer be the same if you were the one who had to suffer?

The realization of existence, how I wish for you and each and every being to realize it, because when you do, there is no unwilling suffering. Or rather, there is no unbearable suffering. There are no shortage of ways we can suffer unwillingly in this world, like getting sick, injured or hurt in other ways, it's however up to us to decide if we think it is bearable or not. We don't have to endure anything; in that sense there's no unwilling suffering. There's always a new morning in existence, when we know that, even hardship can be worth it. We don't know how to put anything in perspective, until we stand on truth. That's why the truth is liberating, it illuminates the infinity of our existence.

183.

I think that many of our common misconceptions stems from a failure to see how complexity is causally derived from simplicity, if we see something complex with the previous steps being shrouded in mystery/uncertainty, some draw the conclusion that it's created, which is perceived as the prior logical step. When we for example baffle about how life came to be, we don't mean the ember of the self-replicating molecule, we mean the fully emerged life of us as human beings. Free will is the result of and the catalysator of new chains of causality – existence is the first link of all causal chains. If there is one true notion of infinity, its existence. Existence is the epitome of infinity, the infinite constant - the first truth.

All good religions urge us to be good, because it reflects the good in us, we ascribe to be good even if we do bad due to flawed ideas. I don't think that we are truly convinced of religion, the seniors among us, I think that they are sincere but doubtful, they operate under the flawed assumption/idea that creator-worship is a necessity for a civilized society and morality, and fear the perceived deprivation and meaninglessness they think to be the only alternative. It's understandable, how can we dispel an idea, however flawed, if we cannot provide a better.

184.

To see yourself in others is the best of complements to the golden rule. If I see someone drowning, do I brake the golden rule if I don't save them? We deeply admire people who do, who serves others free will even at the peril of their own. You might have it as a rule in your society, that if you see someone drowning you have to save them even if it means to risk your own life. The golden rule can be moulded in any way individuals in societies agree upon, culture triumphs over regulations. The key is that you have the knowledge of and the initial resources to form/be part of the society you want, with the culture and principles you together uphold. And we come together around shared standards bridging/lifting all communities and individuals.

It's needlessly hard to not let an onion layer be a disproportionate large degree of our identity, to be our true genuine self, when we live so divisively and unequally, when we don't know why we are here or what the meaning of it all is. It's first when we uphold the big five that we can choose to be genuinely good or bad, when our inställning to as large a degree as possible is dictated by our reflective inställning and not our 2x. True freedom and accountability is possible when we recognize the sanctity of our own and others free will, and agree upon how its best honoured in this world. The big five is on the table - what we agree upon is free wills right, responsibility and privilege.

Even the slightest infringement of free will is unacceptable. The atrocities, crimes and structural infringement of free will that we have today is heart shattering. The level of barbarism that we inflict on each other is unbearable. Our indignation doesn't nearly match the crimes against free will. I think it's because of two things, one is that we are engulfed in bad ideas that yield corrupt societal results and cloud our judgment, they imprison us from our true dignified potential. The other is that we truly are shocked, and heart broken, but we feel so powerless, it's almost like defence mechanism, we distance ourselves from it to be able to bear our daily lives.

Don't take peoples words, demeanour or anything like that personal, not even anger or threats, don't take it personal. Don't be afraid at all. Because the main border that cannot be crossed is violence. Threats and anger don't have any power if you are not afraid. Threats and anger are not intimidating when you know that the one who uses violence will be punished more severely than their transgression.

185.

The question of bardaoam, like all expressions of our free will, is in our hands. We might get sick or injured in a way that renders it impossible for us to express our will in any way, we certainly do wise in clarifying our will before that happens. If we haven't, the ones who can decide for us are our loved ones with love for our free will and our best interest at heart. The regulations for this are up to each community free will choose to be a part of to decide, but I also think we need to come together around commonly held principles. It's testimony to the corruptness of this world that these are questions we can be faced with, that we even have to take scenarios like this into consideration. There are some scenarios to horrendous for me to even want to think about, I know that a failure to address it won't make it disappear, I just can't muster the clarity of thought to do so.

186.

The distinction between good and bad, right and wrong - is the golden rule. We can have zoroastrian/buddhist/hindu/jewish/confucian/christian/islamic good or bad, 1700 century france good or bad. Different ideas, times, and cultures perceptions of right and wrong differs, there is goodness and deep wisdom in all of them. The good and bad in any creed or philosophy is depended on the degree it correlates with the golden rule and the degree to which it recognizes the sanctity of free will/experience.

What is the golden rule, it is the realization of the inherent dignity of free will illuminating us all. It is maximizing my freedom, never diminishing yours. It is feeling the sacred light in yourself by seeing it in others.

187.

Why would you want to be a space faring civilisation? I think the aspiration stems from a flawed frame of mind, a belief that the answers to our questions lies in the void behind the horizon, instead of realizing that it has always been right in front of you. Before the realization of existence, it's a desperate endeavour, after the realization of existence, it's not, one can even admire the determination and ingenuity. The difference is that before you think you have to, after you do it because you truly want to.

188.

Can free will and non-free will coexist? Can there be a world where we have all the range of free will in our inner world but not able to act on it in our outer world. The premise is that it's not due to the actions of other free will, because that can be changed, but that all ability of free will is eliminated by the nature of that world. Can there be a world where we suffer with no free will to change it or bardaoam? One might say that's how to many of us have lived in the absence of the big five and the realization of existence. Aside that, can there be a world where we realize existence, are suffering but that the nature of that world makes us completely incapable of wielding our free will? The other side of that coin are worlds where we equally have no free will but are in an absolutely blissful state. The question then arise, why wouldn't we be able to act on it? How can such a complex state come to be, what causal continuum produced that, what experience have been, just who are the one who's suffering? How does such a worlds occurrence relate to all worlds where we do have free will, however limited that free will might be. I'm not convinced, it seems twisted, it sounds like spontaneous creation, a dead end. What's possible is that beings in worlds can have more or less free will, like here on earth, we have free will, but it's undoubtedly limited by the inclinations in our 2x and the ideas we have and still align and define ourselves by. I think that restrictions in free will either comes from having a low degree of it like animals who are subject to whatever existence they find themselves in, or for beings as humans with high free will, due to self-restriction by adherence to flawed ideas.

189.

If our values and morals differs significantly depending on when and where we are - we are not free, how could we be? Realizing existence and the sanctity of free will ensures that you shine through, regardless of what shrouds you. Truth upholds universal values, not being at the whims of circumstances. To not be confirmative, but independent. To be recognizable when we meet other versions of ourselves. That is the immense power of truthful ideas.

190.

Every stone is, but there are always more stones that can be than what is, because there is no totality of the number of stones that can be. There is no such thing as every stone, every world, every choice, any everything. The concept of everything, a totality, can be envisioned in each world, but in existential terms it's the horizon that's never reached. Existence is the infinite nature of infinite reality. Infinite divisibility and infinite numbers give us the tiniest of hints of what the infinity of existence entails. Does that also apply for that which is unique for free will? I understand that there are infinite thoughts, but what about emotions, aren't there a finite totality of the amounts/variations of emotions that can be had and the intensity of each one? I don't know, just how happy can one be, what are the depth and nuances of being at peace?

The material information that constitutes our being, the vessel of our experience, the vantagepoint from which we view the world, our first x in the broadest sense of the term. We are so used to this first x that's its quite hard to even imagine another, when we think of other lives, we think of other worlds but essentially with a continuation from this specific life with this specific first x. I mean just imagine the type of beings that can be, imagine the infinite vantagepoints from which experience can be had. Whatever is imagined, is not even a blip on the infinite map of experience. If the word magnificent ever has fallen short, this is it.

Can there be a world where you divide 1 and reach 0, no, what about a materialized piece of information, after a certain division there is nothing tangible there. For all sense and purposes there is nothing, but still, isn't there something, just beyond our reach. In practice you have reached the bottom as far as you can be concerned, but it's not 0, there is no 0. Or rather, maybe 0 in this regard can be seen as the difference between the ideaworld and the materialized world, and the first breach of that barrier is the simplest form of materialization, the first link/s in emergence and causality, an undividable something with a function. Information is something with a function, if you have no tangible something left, do you then have information? If we "cut" a photon in half there is no photon anymore, that something and its integral function is no more, it's not 0, but it's not that something with a function.

191.

I don't think it's good to have a premade/fixed posture of being progressive or conservative. What's good we keep, what's bad we discard or develop into something good. As persons we can be more or less prone to change, but it's not that posture that should shape our societies, but the fact of each question and issue. But you can do whatever you want, the big five enables each and all to organize and regulate our life individually or collectively in whatever way we want – free individuals in free communities. When is initial equality achieved, when free will agree upon a solution that we deem best elevate/maximize our free will.

192.

Free will/emotions/experience - the bestower of meaning and the holder of all value. Only free will can give rise to deeds, actions, feelings and thoughts. Even if a "painting" can be created in existence, it can never be beautiful, it's not even a painting, the creating act and thought of monalisa nor the feeling she provokes can exist if not within the mind of free will.

Can there be worlds where planes self-assemble? Can there be a world where the parts of the plane and its entire assembly are in the cards as a causal result of a continuum of events, or even the main attribute of the nature of that world. Why stop at a plane, why not everything, and not just material things, why not situations. A “causal continuum” where you just come into being faced with every imaginary action. We see how this nears spontaneous creation, a conflation between the ideaworld and the materialized world.

I think that complex things are either manifested in or through experience/free will. That complex things can come into existence without being created by high free will or without itself having the spark of life, the ability to add and discard information, adapt and evolve from simplicity to complexity, sounds like spontaneous creation, a dead end. Free will is not only the bestower of all meaning and value, it is also the creator of new chains of causality, new structures of information that could not be if not by the thoughts, emotions and deeds of free will.

The relation between heart and mind for experience and deciphering truth. When the factor intelligence is dialled up it makes it possible to reflect in other ways and come to new insights, which gives rise to a broader spectrum of emotions. But it goes both ways, an increase in the emotional factor can give rise to emotional wonders/insights that widens the range and reflection of our thoughts. There is intelligence in the emotional factor and there is emotional depth in the intelligence factor, they are intertwined, in some sense codependent - emotional and rational intelligence. The scope of intelligence can be viewed as how much of the ideaworld we can access. We all have the capacity for great reflections and exploring truth with fundamental clarity.

The crude I based on 2x is like the subconscious. Our reflective inställning is the I we choose to have. Strengthen your inställning and consequently your free will. To be our true selves and align our inställning is needlessly harder, if our own and the worlds existence is shrouded in uncertainty, I think that increase the likelihood of seeking fleeting validation. We are not indebted to anything but our own happiness.

The free will emitting from each and all of us is sacred, it's what bestows existence with all meaning, value and purpose. To violate free will is to violate the most sacred thing in existence, it must stir in us absolute horror. Our reaction to someone's golden rule being broken should be the same reaction as if it's done to the person in the world that's dearest to your heart. If one person's free will is infringed with impunity, none of us are free.

193.

If I leave this world, and you stay, will I meet you again? What is it we define as us, our shrouds or the person in it, our specific 2x at this specific time, or our inställning, you might say that our personality is intrinsically linked to our 2x, sure but to a higher or lower degree. It is who we are that sustains our love, not what we are.

Will we meet again when our life here ends, will we meet our loved ones again? We will meet each other in the infinite ways that our roads can cross, depending on the nature of the worlds and all the choices of ours and others free will, that can cause our paths to cross. We will experience all the infinite relationships we can have from infinite vantagepoints in infinite settings, who will we be then? How would we know how many infinite times we have met each other before and how many infinite times we will meet again? The now and then only matters for us when we experience it. If you love someone, think of the coincidences that made you meet; how easily life could have changed for you to never cross paths. Right here and right now, love your loved ones fully and enjoy this experience to the fullest, is there any other point to it all? Wow - we are here, right now, and I love you.

194.

Just take a moment, do yourself the favour of immersing yourself in the fact that existence is. We are not nearly sufficiently chocked over the fact that existence is and what that entails. For one fleeting moment, forget about what can or can't exist, see beyond, remind yourself of the greatest miracle of all - not what exists, but that existence in itself is. Existence is, the infinite sense of awe!

How do you know you have the most fundamental truth, what is the characteristics of the most fundamental truth? It's that nothing precedes it and nothing can follow it. It is that all things, all truths, all statements, all knowledge that humanity or any other beings in infinite existence can ever produce, stands on it. It's the foundation of all ideas. Any perceived truth, statement or idea that's not based on it, is without exception wrong. Or rather, no truth, idea nor claim can be made without first stating the truth of existence. That is how you know.

Why is free will sacred – because without it, existence in all its infinity, is utterly meaningless, it might just as well not exist. Free will is the light that illuminates existence. Lifting it inevitably raises us and violating it inevitably diminishes us. Free will can navigate away from universal bad and towards universal good, for yourself and for others, not only in this world, in infinite worlds. Free will is the literal shaper of existence, the foundation of every relationship that can be. The level to which free will is dignified/maximized, is the one true marker of civilization, not just in this world, but in every world in existence.

195.

“Where is the data of existence?” Really? The data/fact/truth of existence is in every unit of measurement; the data is everything in and around you. We should see signs of infinity and/or maximized outcome everywhere, which is exactly what we do, in all directions.

Is it like each time I bardaoam I throw the infinite dice? That I don't know what world “I” will come to. The ultimate thing that matters is if you can realize existence and can act on it. I'm not afraid to throw the dice. I'm not a hostage to life. Existence is indebted to me. I only will live where I want, I don't fear of what's behind the curtain. The only sensible way to live is with joy, without fear, take it on, freely, head on.

No matter what worlds we come to, we want it to be one where our free will is elevated. The fact that we don't know and can be born in all the first x:es, and encounter all second x:es, means that it's in our interest to uphold the sanctity of free will/experience. Like the veil of uncertainty. If we can pray on others now, there will be other lives when others can pray on us. So let's not pray on each other at all. We uphold the big five to our own benefit and violate it to our own detriment. No matter what world you come to, may you be dignified, may you be welcomed.

196.

Everything is information. Information is not only that which free will creates, a stone is information, and the castle is another form of information. Simple information creates more complex information which in turn becomes the new building blocks for more complex informational structures. Information emerges in stages, we cannot at the point of big bang do a change that would lead to your hair colour being different. Even if all the fundamental pieces of information was there, simple information creates something, that creates something more complex and so on in levels. Levers in levels. It's the same with evolution, I cannot change a detailed physical attribute by changing an ancestor of mine when life started. It's to blunt of a tool, the information/layer/lever hasn't yet been presented.

Evolution, the process from simple to complex life, might not be as random and other factors at play we are yet to uncover, what's definitely is not the right answer is that life cannot be without other life, that's the loop that those who argue for a god or simulation or any other external factor gets stuck in. We do wise in being inherently critical, not to accept anything without scrutinizing it. Don't deem any question beyond your reach, it really isn't. We can all ponder with fundamental clarity, and that is by all metrics more important than the details. Expertise is knowing the details, but if the foundation is wrong, we risk polishing a house of cards.

197.

A million monkeys writing on typewriters for a million years will not produce a sophisticated book. Yes, but they will produce words, and if we then take the words as the next baseline, they will produce phrases and sentences, and if we take the words and the phrases as the next baseline, we will eventually have not just a sophisticated book, but a variety of sophisticated books, maybe every book we have written, just extend the timeline, it's just a matter of time, because the information is there. It's an illustration of the development from whatever you characterize as the fundamental building block like a letter, to more complex blocks that become the new fundament merged in layers.

Useful code created in an evolutionary process, the speed of that process depends on the surroundings where they are formed. Why choose an arbitrary level of complexity like the amino acids in order needed to create a new protein, why not all the atoms that's needed for that to be. The offspring of life are not atoms, it's just as sophisticated as itself.

The cell is incredibly complex with many layers of factors and interactions. Just as we can be in awe about the truth of existence, we can also be in awe of how the light of experience comes to be. How complex information is constructed in our world. Do they who ponder the complexity of the cell deny that the cell is based on fundamental particles, or do they deny that those particles in different formations give rise to a variety of atoms, or that those atoms in different formations give rise to an array of different molecules. Do they deny that for each step a new layer is formed with a whole new set of properties? At what level do you slice your amazement?

A cell is complex, but that complexity is derived from simplicity, by information infusion or extraction in different layers based on what's best suited for continuation. If there is one universal rule for all life, it's that it "wants" to continue. Because if life don't have that property, it will not form nor continue/develop.

In a way we can analyse life per se as a coherent creature with autonomous parts and no central control system. What's most precious to the creature of life, is the preservation and continuation of the information within it, the sum of all information spread out in all living beings. The creature of life wants to continue, and it does that, in this world, not by indefinitely extending the lifespan of the entity it occupies, because it's seemingly not the most efficient way of continuation. It does so by making new versions of the being. The being must reproduce and die for the information within it to live and evolve, the creature of life throws individual life at the inevitability of death. It seeks to inhabit as many places as it can. The more places it's in, the more niches it occupies, the more variations of life there is, the bigger the chance that the creature of life will survive, that life per se will continue. Those who argue that we should be multiplanetary essentially have the same reasoning as life per se. Even out the odds for survival. Wanting to continue is life's cardinal, or perhaps only trait. The perceived strive for adaptability or more complexity is not part of its inherent nature, just imagine how much life on earth is "complex" vs "not complex", the spark of information in life just want to continue, in whatever shape and in as many places as it can.

When there has been near extinction events on earth there has still been life in some crevasse that could come out and thrive in a new world. Whatever's thrown on life it maximizes its chance of continuation, it evens out the odds as much as possible. Life don't prefer a certain number; it plays all that can be played on every number that can be played. The numbers are lifeforms and what can be played is set by the frame of our world, the limitations, structures and natural laws.

Life don't have a will, it does not honour us, we honour ourselves. Life "wants" to survive, above all, it wants the information within it to continue. It's not that it has a will, it's just that it cannot have anything but that core trait, otherwise it would not be. It's not a choice, it's a prerequisite. The tree don't shed its leaves when winter looms because it wants to, it does so because otherwise it will not be. Life here has developed in a fragile form in a hard world.

The likelihood of every process or event, in this case evolution, depends on what factors we take into account and what attributions/powers/functions we assign to each of those factors. What factors are in play, what functions do they have, how do they interact and what informational layers are introduced in each step. Complexity is the increasing variety of this process. If we don't get the fundamental factors right, our later assumptions are destined to be flawed. If something that's evidently occurring seems impossible, it's either because we have made flawed assumptions, or that we have made the right assumptions and can't reconcile with the result.

198.

"Yeah, what is your theory, that existence is hmm interesting" No for the love of all you hold dear, don't touch the surface of your drop, venture in the infinite ocean. Think to your core! Why do you focus on any current or possible materialization of existence, instead of seeing the underlying truth that existence in itself is. Just stop, look at your hands – try to see beyond your hands – see the underlying truth that not only does your hands exist, existence in itself - exists. Open your eyes and realize this - that something can exist, that existence in itself is, is infinitely greater than any materialization of existence. Your hands, this universe, everything that is or can be, they are merely temporary materializations, of the infinite truth of existence.

Please don't diminish yourself and consider any foundational knowledge beyond your reach, it really is not. Just walk around alone, and ponder freely, let the immensity of existence go from something you take for granted – to something that puts you in a state of repeated awe. And then, instantly but gradually, the realization of existence will dawn upon you.

199.

Is it reasonable to view gravity as a "curvature in the fabric of spacetime"? In either case it's the nature of the canvas itself. In many ways a curvature exhibits the same effect as increased informationflow, relative warping of distance in relation to the constant speed of light. Is the conventional understanding that "spacetime" is in some sense static/rigid (with time as a fourth ingredient) instead of a constant informationflow. If the presumption is a static medium, then a way to reconcile the results we observe is conceptualizing a curvature. Is it not more accurate to see gravity as an accelerating flow of information compressing/accumulating information towards its centre. Speed creates essentially the same effect because it results in flow/more dense information in front of its direction, it's just that gravity can do it all around by its sheer size and speed is doing it pointwise in its line of direction. Both can in a sense be viewed in terms of increasing the pressure/flow of information. Gravity is like having a bunch of speeding forces on every point around it. Speed and gravity in some sense are the same thing, or rather cause the same effect, increased informationflow.

Some form of gravity may be a commonality in existence. Whatever we call it, something that binds information, that give loose information a coherent structure. In this world there is several mechanisms/forces that binds information, depending on in what layer we slice the informational complexity. The balance between detailed maximized outcome property of quantum particles seemingly requires a greater force than the aggregated slow movement of planets, is that why the nuclear force is more “potent” than the aggregated gravity, one create the fundament of this reality, the other flows within it?

We uncover “natural laws”. Can there be a world where it’s not gravity that pulls together, it’s another force, that functions in another way. For the being inhabiting such a world, it might be natural, or it might seem strange, a lot of things that first seems strange here we grow accustomed to and it becomes normal, it’s the way/rational of the nature of our universe, we adapt and reconcile with it. Who’s to say what’s normal and not? There are infinite variation of infinite worlds, we must be careful of drawing conclusions about the nature of existence based on the nature of this particular world, about drawing conclusions of the infinite general based on this one specific. If there is one field where we don’t have a broad set of samples do study, it’s here, we don’t know any other world, only this one, we can speculate on what’s more or less likely. We can only draw conclusions from this world sample, but more importantly from our free reasoning. The intriguing thing is not primarily the infinite possibilities/natures/realities of different worlds, but the bridges uniting them.

200.

Others can ascribe you intentions that you do not have. They can misinterpret you indifferent of what your intentions are, your intentions count yes, but what’s important is how we act. If you go around and look mad, it’s a communication, but you may just have a mean face, you shouldn’t have to go around and smile all the time to be assured no one is offended. Now, would it be nice if you smiled once in a while, yes it would, but I just have to presume that you have the right intentions or at least no bad intentions. Otherwise, it’s hard to navigate in social settings with other humans, it’s like we put hinders in an aspect of life where a lot of joy can be derived. It really does not matter what emotions and intentions we’re ascribed, what truly matters is that we act to uphold the big five.

Reasoning is powerful, but it’s the emotions that makes you feel good. However, I think there is an emotion of reasoning in itself, like when you ponder or when you figure something out, it’s thrilling, the truthful feeling.

201.

You can feel something without knowing why, an emotion that’s not grounded in a reasoning you understand. It’s first when you thoughtfully untangle it that you can place that feeling, that’s why it’s good to “talk” to yourself and address your emotions/feelings to understand them. If it’s an unpleasant feeling, we can question it and let it guide us to the answer and tackle it, is the feeling anchored in right or wrong reasoning/perception? It is best to talk to oneself because we know ourselves the best, we don’t lie to ourselves and do good in being kind towards ourselves. When you untangle your thoughts and emotions, when you ensure that your conscience feels good, the ego shrinks and your true self shines through. Others can help us by asking questions and giving their perspective, but I think we generally rely too much on others and too little on ourselves.

202.

Just how much does solely the differences of information in our first x affect our inner landscape? I don't mean the physical attributes, or that we are born with different traits, all that can affect us, but imagine differences like that being the same across the board for everyone. I mean purely the internal wiring in our first x that tilt the field for the crude I from the get-go, how much does it affect the tune of the engine that's running in the background? I think it's hard to dissect like that, 2\*x is so integrally bound, the inside world is shaped to a large degree by our experiences in the outside world, and the tune can be changed by inställning.

The two main factors of consciousness, intelligence and emotions, are like turning sticks which increase or decrease not only affects the one-dimensional volume, but the multifaceted expression of the free will. They interact; they are independent but intertwined vessels. How are they intertwined? You cannot have zero emotions and high intelligence, or zero intelligence and high emotions, one inevitably affects the other. That's why gai will have emotions.

Memory is a factor of consciousness and comes in degrees, it's a recording (in varying clarity) not primarily of events, but of your rational and emotional state due to interactions with your outer and inner second x. Memory is what gives continuity, our reflections in the present can not only change our current inställning, but also affect how we relate to memories from the past. Memory is not just a passive recorder, your perception of your memories are fluid, not written in stone, the same event can be viewed/reflected upon/made sense of in different ways. Our memory, the trail, is lined in by inställning. You have a memory of being angry in a situation, but when you contemplate it, you can see that you needlessly took something personally that you could have chosen not to. The degree of memory for a being have meaning for free will to the extent it is accompanied by high degrees of emotions and intelligence.

203.

Can we really know ourselves when we don't experience negative emotions? Maybe not, this world is neither fair or easy, but in the absence of the realization of existence and the big five it's just too much. It's not that I don't accept bad emotions, it's all the (self-) imposed reasons we have to endure it and the level of intensity it can reach. This world void of the realization of existence and the sanctity of free will feels like living in a prison, if it doesn't, it's because you haven't raised your gaze and looked around.

The harsh nature of our world is one thing, but what's truly depressing is the level of suffering we have inflicted on each other. The fates of lives that has been in utter hell is staggering. People have been tortured in the most diabolic ways imaginable, not just in individual cases, but in a systematic way. That has happened to your fellow human beings. Or slavery, no hope for you nor your child. Your highest aspiration was that your children endured the misery with you, and not be sold away from you. What, what is that. Even to this day, total war, genocide, trafficking, the industrial barbarism of hurting innocent souls, it's still happening. If there is a hell, it's created by deluded free will. The remedy is to realize existence and truly recognize the sanctity of free will, when we do that, we vanquish hell.

One could ask, was our will truly free when committing those horrible acts, no, how could we be, how could our will be free when we didn't stand on truth?

204.

We live in a time where the possibility to rise above the whims of an indifferent nature is possible, if we can cultivate the ability to optimize our first x, we not only should, but are obliged to under the golden rule. We make sure to have our children, in our physical image if that's important, but the best of us that can be. Optimizing in the sense that we maximize free will. "No it's not moral it's better to let nature have its way", nature is indifferent, it does not care if a child is born with traits for heart disease when they are five, or a shorter leg so they can never run properly, the list of misery is long. If we can direct our first x, we have no lesser responsibility to do that than creating a loving environment in the second x. Someone born with no legs can still have a good life, they can have a healthy inställning that enables them to live a more fulfilling life than most others, but if they initially could, they would've chosen full ability. When we can't ask, we must always navigate with maximized free will as our guide. It would be wrong to let people be born with inherent limitations to their free will if we could make sure they didn't, the presumption, our compass when we can't ask is always, without exception, that which maximize free will, what we think that they/we would choose if they/we could.

205.

Information and the flow of it is a universal in existence. Nothing can be and no experience can be had if there is no information that's unfolding/flowing. Irrespective of whatever way a being can travel in and through information, there is always a causal continuum for that being, coherent links in the flow of information, individual continuity through thoughts, emotions and memory.

Sincerity of course doesn't mean to blur out every single thought that cross our mind, why, because we are not a passive megaphone of our 2x. Our mind is always running and we don't fully control what thoughts that flimmer by or gets in focus. The orchestra plays, you dictate the symphony.

206.

Any economic model that fails to put maximized free will in the centre will fail, it will lead to systemic inequality, volatility and risk of totalitarianism. The more free will is uplifted, the lesser those effects will emerge. You're not free if you don't have the initial means to wield your free will, and you're not free if you can't wield your means.

I don't think that neither interest nor inflation is of service to our prosperity, on the contrary. I think we should agree on a universal currency that doesn't have an inbuilt devaluation. You can still try to charge interest for lending money, but the money doesn't lose value over time.

207.

When I say that its good for us to talk to ourselves, be kind to ourselves, why, why should you be kind toward yourself? Because the truth is that you are inherently good, you inherently bear witness to the light of free will. When we fall, it's a departure from our nature. You are not your true self when you violate free will. The harsher the violation, the lesser yourself you are, it's a violation against yourself and your very nature. How could we be our true self, if we don't stand on truth?

We have so many hurdles that cause us corruption in this world, how we are brought up, the circumstances surrounding us, the values that is laid in front of us, the choices we have to make, the world we think we must confront... Everything about the arena we play on becomes so much worse and infected when we don't truly recognize, realize free will. What we are.

It is so much easier and more dignifying to navigate in a landscape where our true free will as much as possible is that which defines us. Our reflective free will. What we are. Do you understand. You are a high free will. To realize your free will is no less propound than to realize existence.

The promise we have shrouded in many religions and creeds is an expression of the truthful idea that you can find your true self at any time. All of us have sins and all of us have praise, some have more sin and others more praise. Everybody struggles, whom of us don't have scars from this world? Do what you feel you have to do to reconcile with your conscience, most of you don't have to make a fuss about it, some feel the weight more than others. Only you know. The key to it all, to reconciling with your past and embracing your future, is to stand on truth and be sincere – right here and now.

208.

Our onionlayers are like shrouds around our free will, our soul if you want to call it that. What we are is our values and our ideas, reflected in our deeds and how we think and feel about ourselves and others. If we are truly grounded in our values and ideas, we will feel better, our deeds, thoughts and emotions towards ourselves and others, will be better. We will much more be a reflection of our true selves. So which ideas and values should we stand on, without exception, the ones grounded on truth, we have always known it. That's why truth has an inherent value in its own, only coming to fruition when realized by free will.

You are not the subject of your life/existence, you are the author of it. Many things that materialize in existence you do not control, the most important things, you do control. You choose – this is the power of your high free will. The more you get in terms with it, the more power you have, and the only way to get in terms of it is being truthful and sincere. That is the only way. Otherwise, we will be a false expression of ourselves that cause us uncertainty, anxiety and pain. Why, because we are in violation of your nature, the truth of it, the flow, it will exhaust you more.

What are onionlayers, the vessel and landscape of our experience. If you are born in different shoes, if different circumstances cause your perception of right and truth to differ radically, then you are not your true self, how could you be if you wouldn't recognize yourself?

Now, to stand on truth is in some ways to wrestle with truth, to be true to oneself and others, to rise above, for some it's easier, for some of us, it can be harder. It really is not god we wrestle with; it's our aspiration for truth and sincerity. What a glorious battle, what a glorious champion you are.

209.

The two fundamental truths reverberating in infinity is that the true nature of reality is infinite existence, and that the infinite light that illuminates existence is experience/free will. Every single truth that can be, branch out from these two existential foundations.

210.

What is the soul? We need to clarify words; what do we mean soul? Do you mean something transcendent that creates a continuum of your experience but in another body/form, if that's what you mean, then from when? From what life, but also from what stage in each life. You are 2\*x plus inställning at any given time, is your soul the same now as when you were a child or when you are a senior, when you change, does your soul change? If not then there is no change/free will, if yes then the soul is essentially the word you use for free will/inställning. If you by soul mean that we are something more than flesh and bone, that we are more than the result of our 2x, that there is an agency above, then yes, we have a soul. You are not one soul, but infinite souls. This soul you have now is tied to your 2x + inställning. Isn't it magical, that emergent trait of experience/free will, our words bear testimony to it, the word soul is our description and amazement by our recognition that there is something profound above.

Our soul is not something we are bestowed with, it's how we relate/define/view the light of experience within us, how we see ourselves and others, the worldview and values we choose to have, our inställning, our personality. It can to a lesser part be based in crude 2x and to a higher degree be based in your reflective inställning. The reason I like the word inställning more than the word soul is because the inställning is active and the soul is passive, at least that's how I view it. Inställning is a choice from free will, the soul implies something static and preordained. The word personality is not bad either, we can see how our personality can change depending on our experiences and inställning, it has some core in our 2x, but it's not static. What is soul/personality, it is the aggregated sum of our 2\*x plus inställning, the more aware of it we are, the more our chosen I, our true soul, shines through. What is the sou? It is the inherent nature of free will of recognizing the sanctity of experience/free will, of realizing the sanctity in oneself by seeing it in others.

211.

The first x is the information that makes up your being, the material vessel you were born with/in. The external part of the second x is all the outside information that affects you in any way, shape or form. From the nutrition you consume in your mother's belly to every interaction you have with the world and the beings within it. The internal part of the second x is your inner state and the world you see when you close your eyes. It's influenced in varying degrees by our first x and our experiences in the outside world, but our internal world can be vastly different/greater than the extent of our external interactions.

The capacity for each of the factors of consciousness are in one way based in the first x, but is influenced by the experiences in the second x and our inställning. Our factors of consciousness equip us with the broad multitools; how we relate to, sharpen and use the tools, is to a large extent within our inställning. That we are born with/in different 2x, it's a challenge of this world (not void of its own beauty). In a good word we would all be born as equal perfects, and the only distinction would be due to our inställning. That's true judge of character. But if we here manage to uphold the big five, we are in our imperfection better than the perfects.

Inställning is a separate thing but anchored in 2\*x, we can say that 2\*x + inställning = experience. One way is to view it is that a change in inställning can be done without the correlating change in 2\*x. On the other hand, when I reason I access the information in the ideaworld, if I change my inställning my 2\*x is not the same, my first x is essentially the same (I wonder to what extent our material wiring change), but my internal part of the second x is not. The change of inställning can be without any external influence, based on my reflective inställning changing how I view something, I change my internal part of second x. On the other hand, we can also say that the change of information in some sense occurs in the independent vessel of inställning.

Does your 2\*x change if you change your inställning? We can say yes, your second x does, when you change your mind or your surroundings. But we can also say that the main change in information is in the independent vessel of inställning. I think the difficulty lies in separating/categorizing variables that are tightly combined and intertwined, but all the same different. Even nonmaterial abstract things like ideas and thoughts can in some sense be described in terms of information, but its two very different concepts when we think of material and nonmaterial information.

Just as there is an unavoidable outside world, the external part of the second x, there is also an unavoidable inside world, the internal part of the second x - both illuminated by experience. The information in our first x and external part of the second x is always in the materialized world, but our internal second x and our inställning is access to the ideaworld, it's tied by the material information but it gives access to the endless information in the ideaworld, in that sense it's more, near infinite, it's an amazing emergent property, the emergent property that gives rise to experience, I understand why we use a profound word like soul.

212.

The possibility of a better or worse life after bardaoam/death. Whether or not a life or a world is good or bad is ultimately depended on the capability to realize existence and the ability to bardaoam. If you realize existence and can bardaoam, then there's no unbearable suffering, we live because we want to, not because we have to, there are things that gives you joy/meaning/purpose of experience. If you realize existence and want to live and experience any world, then its per definition not bad, it is good, because then it's chosen and not imposed.

We need our universal constitution, humanity's constitution, the goal is elevating our free will, so you can live in whatever way gives you joy of experience, individually or in any community of our choosing. I think that big five can be formed to our constitution.

Regarding access to knowledge. Free will decides if we are going to have one universal community for all, or thousands of communities emerging, what will form is the individual and shared expressions of free will. All of us must have the right to access humanity's ideas and knowledge, regardless of which community we are part of, the more of our garden we have access to the better. Everyone in every community must be able to put their community in perspective, if we don't know the range of our choices, we can't put our choice or free will in perspective. Bad ideas thrive in the dark, bring them out in the light.

Your children are not you, as we grow up we mature in our own sacred agency, raise them with love and compassion in your best image, we will reject the bad and embrace the good, love and have faith in our humanity, we innately seek truth and value free will.

213.

Regarding involuntary suffering by the nature of a world and not the act of other free will. In what ways can a free will be restrained in existence, what factors are of relevance? I think it boils down to if life in that world is bad or not - depending on the degree to which free will is infringed by the nature of that world, if you can reach truth/realize existence or not, and if you can act on it/bardaoam or not.

If we have a world where your free will is infringed by the nature of that world, but it's a world where you:

realize existence, and can bardaoam - then it's good if you choose to stay.

realize existence, but can't bardaoam - this could be involuntary suffering (how could this be).

don't yet realize existence but can find truth, and can bardaoam - our current world.

don't realize existence, can't find truth, and can't bardaoam - the life of low free will, like other beings than humans in this world.

Why those factors? Because they are the most general I can think of. If it's good or bad/if you have high free will or not, if you can realize truth, and if you can act upon that realization.

214.

It is sometimes most useful, clearest to think simply in term of information. The materializations can become subject to rational and even intuitive thinking if you picture it in terms of information with a function, with the backdrop of the realization of existence.

The rule/nature of maximized existence is why the underlying/minimalistic information in a world has a function yielding as many outcomes as possible. If we think of all worlds like infinite columns stacked next to each other creating a pyramid shape, whether a column is short or tall correlates to the amount of possible configurations in that world, which increase enormously, not to mention gains any sense of meaning, if free will is present there. There is no factor that on an aggregated level that increase the level of possible configurations more than free will. Worlds with more free, free will are more abundant than worlds with more restricted free will.

How small can a configuration be for it to be another world. The tiniest flows of information that can be, just one turn of one gear, one different outcome, but if it's too familiar from the point of view of experience, it might as well be the same, the same column. I'm not saying that's how existence is shaped, I'm saying that's how we can view it from our, and all life's experiential perspective. Infinity is nothing if the experience is indistinguishable for free will. The only perspective that matters is from the vantage point of the conscious observer, or rather, there is no perspective in the absence of the conscious observer.

Does the possible configurations of each world differ in size due the nature of causality? Yes, it's one thing to say every configuration, it's another thing entirely to say every causal configuration, which is required, not at least for experience. And there is a colossal reduction if no flow can unfold selectively, if a turn in one gear doesn't affect the whole machine, if all special flows don't constitute the general flow, if one scene can be played with the rest of the moving standing still. There are fewer possible worlds, seemingly an exponential decrease the further back you go, because the levers/layers, the possible configurations at each stage decrease. How was it at the moment of big bang? How many levers can there be from the beginning? Every single number can be, but any world has a finality of numbers, seemingly from the get-go (free will increase that, but it's still a finality), even if information is added on as it unfolds, it's tied in a causal chain. It branches out, but the emergence is rooted in the fundamental information/layer that was there from the beginning.

There is no such a thing as the “sum of all that can be”, not for the simplicity of numbers and neither for the infinite complexity of existence. All that is/has been/will be, is always lesser than what can be. The ideaworld is always infinitely greater than the materialized worlds. There is no such thing as “every iteration of every configuration of every information”. At any time we theoretically try to conceptualize a measurement, across the whole of existence, it’s always infinitely lesser than what can exist, it’s furthermore a theoretical 2d slice which makes the possible worlds static and disregard the infinity that lies in the existence and experience that unfolds. There is no such thing as a totality of existence, nor a concept of an all-embracing measurement. If there is one thing that truly is unfathomable, it is the infinity of existence.

Just imagine the infinity that is existence, the infinite possibilities. Only limitation/prerequisite being the causal emergence of complexity from simplicity. All literally can be, the infinity you can imagine, and innately infinitely more. It’s almost like we diminish it just by trying to conceptualize it, we thought it was god, but it is existence. Our intuitive amazement was never misplaced.

Free will is the greatest factor of aggregated complexity, through that which is uniquely bound to experience, like thoughts, emotions and actions. Just imagine how much simpler this world would be to calculate, how much fewer possible configurations there would be, if there were no life, let alone complex life with free will. That goes for every world, not just as portions, but the sizes of those portions are (near) infinitely greater. The configurations, and the cope of meaning that can be had, increase correlating to the tree of life.

215.

Every materialized existence, everything that exists within existence, all worlds, has a beginning and an end, a finite scope, a totality. The question is if all the information from start to end was present from the get-go, if it’s emergence of the information that was present or if it is an continues influx of information. Why is there a totality, because nothing, no materialization of existence, is truly infinite except existence in itself. Besides that, we say creation is now, ok what is it that comes into being, it’s not infinity because that cannot be materialized, something has to be put down, the finite lever has to hit the infinity track. Is it the case that the totality of information is present from start or just 1, and then 2, 3 and so on comes at later stages, comes from where? Or is it that there are a bunch of simple 1, and all the other numbers are the ways those 1s forms into new numbers with new emergent properties.

Complexity is derived from simplicity, but how “vast” that initial simplicity is, if its 1 or all the 1:s don’t negate that presumption. All the following numbers have to be rooted in and traced back to the one/s. Ok, but a worlds totality doesn’t necessarily restrict whether information in its totality must be present from the get-go or if it add on during the worlds duration, maybe infinite divisibility is like the emittance of existence, form everywhere, all the time. Ok but that would mean that new information is added from “below the quantum” and permeating throughout all fields/layers, do we see any signs of that?

Another way to view it is, when the line starts from x and go up to the y, does it have to hit the x line again for the world to start, or does it start from the instant of going up from the x and plays out continuously in y and hit the x line again when it ends. But where does the information during its “travel” in the y come from, and where does the information go when it hits the x line again? Must all information be traced back to the starting point, like is existence continuously emitted from the big bang? The branching out and new information configurations is being formed, complexity from simplicity in intertwined layers, with new emergent levers.

216.

Every child is innocent, a new free will, a pure free will, as pure a free will can be in this world. We inherently recognize the right of and value in all children to a good start in life. I think the best approach for initial equality is to divide our inheritance equally amongst all children, why wouldn't we? Tell me if the dignity/maximization of free will is better achieved in another way.

If none of us upholds rightful justice than crimes against the golden rule will go unpunished and corruption will take spread that will affect us all. If none of us upholds the golden rule to begin with, then the unforgiving law of the jungle will dominate us all. If none of pursue and contribute to access to knowledge, then we will remain in a cave of ignorance. The big five cannot be upheld if you don't want to, we uphold civility and strive towards an egalitarian society because your children are just as precious as mine. We all benefit when we ensure that all of our children have a good start in life. Dignifying our humanity with initial equality is our privilege and responsibility. Love and unwavering loyalty is parent's privilege and responsibility. The latter is infinitely greater than the first.

217.

What happens to our information when we die? The material information that makes up our being, the first x, disentangles and disperses, because that information is contained within this physical form, when the physical material form cannot hold its structural information processing integrity, it disintegrates and disperses, it goes back to its more fundamental parts and are drawn up into other things, the building blocks like the atoms or at whatever level we dice it, becomes part of other things.

The information in the outer world consumed from the vantagepoint of our being, our inner world and the inställning that shape and harness it all, the totality of this 2\*x plus inställning produce an experience, your unique experience. The total scope of that metaphysical/immaterial experience remain in a way, not remain as in lingers on, but I don't think it's unreasonable to think that there is some "track record" of sorts. Because that experience is materialized existence, it's more than just the ideaworld, it has actually been materialized through your lived experience. That lived experience is more real than the infinite possible experiences in the ideaworld. There are infinite things that's not materialized in the ideaworld, but your life's experience was. The truth is out there in some sense if you want to be philosophical. You are dignified so dignify yourself, stand on truth, make yourself proud when seeing yourself from another vantagepoint.

218.

What free will choose to do materialize, what we choose not to do doesn't materialize. The question is if there's a difference between actions and beings? Conscious free will requires 2\*x plus inställning, but the being, initially and strictly, only requires the first x. So, will every being come into existence? Not the action but the information constituting the being who can act. There is no such thing as every being, and another way to look at it is, no, that being, if it's complicated in any way, needs a track record, a causality. Every "first x" can be like in the sense of this world's original crude simple self-replicating molecule, the spark that ignited the chain of life on earth. But an advanced being like my third child is akin to spontaneous creation (sc). A being is in this sense like a world, a world has a crude beginning that goes from simplicity to complexity, it doesn't just pop into existence in the middle. Infinite initial first x can be in the sense of the start of life, just as infinite version/shapes/forms of an initial world beginning can be. Imagine the infinite ways an initial "first x" can ignite and the infinite ways complexity can arise, it's unfathomable.

A world becomes more complex and multifaceted as time goes by after its beginning, similarly to how life develops complexity, in this world through consecutive reproduction, further down the line. And after a while reproduction goes from instinct to choice. What does this mean? It means that not all beings that can be, will come into existence. Even in this world, repeated infinite times in infinite ways, all beings that can be, will not come into existence. It's inherently selective by free will, and it's limited in the chain of history, the small details that lead two people together, the impossibility of reproduction between every reproductive cells, every unique first x that can be in this world, will not be. Significantly less people will inhabit this world in relation to how many people that theoretically could inhabit this world. That must be a rule in all worlds where new first x creation, where new life's creation, is depended on free will. Only the life that we choose to bring will inhabit this world. What a profound privilege and responsibility, to bring forth new life into existence.

219.

What differences can be made at an early stage, however you define early stage, for anything to be here. I mean does the change need to be traced back to the time of big bang. Then it cannot be a detailed change later on. Like this exact world with the difference that this tree is there instead of here. Ok, what caused that, if that information just appeared without a track record that caused the tree to be there instead of here, that means sc, which cannot be. Causality is a prerequisite in all worlds. If there cannot be detailed changes later on, and it needs causality, that means there is less versions of every world, still infinite, but less slices (in some sense it's like the distance between the branches grow farther apart as it unfolds).

We can theoretically rearrange configurations and get the total sum of every configuration of his world, but that number becomes much lesser when the configurations are bound in a causal continuum. Every slice can be in the ideaworld, but less so in the materialized world. But does the causality need to make sense to you? No but the only thing that have the power to alter a deterministic timeline, is free will. Free will can move the tree from there to here. Regardless of the information before, free wills action give rise to new branches. The only thing that can act against what otherwise would be a deterministic causal chain of events is free will, we are a catalyst of new causality.

The function of maximized outcome will produce every outcome possible, every world that can be, there can be a world where that tree is there instead of here with a causal chain from the beginning. There are infinite beginnings, producing infinite outcomes, all the configurations of all the worlds that can be. Maximized outcome produce every arena that can be; free will act, shape and grow within every arena, we put the brushstrokes and colour on the infinite canvases. We are the distinction between the ideaworld and the materialized world.

220.

What was there from the beginning, what was the first lever/levers, the first information. Somehow it feels like trying to reach zero, but that can't be. It had to be something there from the beginning, a source of information, something that could rapidly expand to more information. It's like when we go from 0 to the tiniest fraction of 1, then all numbers are possible. It's enough to have 1, the big leap is to 1, not onwards from 1. But could there ever have been 0, no not really. That things are is the infinite rule, not the finite exception. Even things that can be, still are in a sense, there is no non-existence, the only true 0 is non-existence. Things don't need to be for the miracle of existence, it's enough that they can be, and if they can be, it's never 0.

Why does existence need causality, even if the causal chain doesn't make sense to us? Because the information constituting our experience cannot be without causal integrity, and otherwise the floodgates of sc opens, if one thing is not causal, why should anything be? If a tree can be moved from here to there, why not every change, every iteration of every material or situational event, that's a dead end, because that equates the ideaworld with the materialized world, what can be to what is, it puts a totality of existence. All outcomes that can be from the beginning will be, but free will is the only thing that, within every world version where we are present, can change the outcome after the beginning.

Ok, can there be a world where free will/experience is causal, but things around us is not? What would that mean, that things just come into existence without any causal chain. Your mind is a continuum but in a sense really not bound by causality, like one picture/thought can be one thing, and the next one something completely different an unrelated, the only causal link between them being the material process that caused them, or rather not caused them, but enabled them, the material information in our brain don't change to cause the infinity of thoughts that can be, we think, and the material goes along instantly. But the material is much more vague, its not a specific material wiring correlating to every infinite specific thought that can be, the material wiring is much more dull, even if we know every material configuration of every atom in our brain, we cannot predict with certainty what the next thought will be. The world/experience above the material is intently greater.

221.

Words and our way of language is not exactly the pinnacle of what communication can be in existence; it's such a blunt and slow tool. Just imagine the instant speed of your minds communication, imagine having that, increased with unimaginable magnitudes, with other free wills minds. I don't think we even scratch the surface of what understanding and communication can be, not to mention experience. Still, nothing is above, how magnificent is it not that we can ponder and realize existence.

When we think/feel something, when we experience something that makes us feel loved or hurt, there is a nuance of strings that vibrate, a nuanced play, a spectrum, some vibrating more than others. It really is hard to adequately and clearly convey it into words, it's like the 3d becomes 2d. Even when we communicate our thoughts and emotions with our whole being, it still just offers a glimpse into what communication and connection can be, just imagine...

222.

There are infinite beginnings, the information-line from each beginning doesn't change afterwards, it unfolds in maximized outcomes/versions, but free will can realize that it is and change it, free will can move the tree one meter to the left. The causality lies in us, free will is not merely a subject of causality around it, we are the sole creators of new chains of causality. Excluding free will, the information from the start like big bang "just" unfolds, in every way and in every iteration it can unfold. Maximized outcomes of causal links, emerging in intertwined layers, causal emergence of complexity from simplicity. The infinite universes that can be, the infinite functions of the "first information", and in the infinite ways complexity can emerge, if anything is incomprehensible, it's that.

The maximized outcome function, it is maximized versions/outcomes of every world branching out all the time, and what is the parameters, it's the (near infinite) amount of configurations that can be. But each world version/outcome "just" unfolds. It seemingly does, because/if the quantum uncertainty does not propagate, the cosmic world is deterministic. So the demon is possible within every "world-line", we can know, except for free will/experience.

I think the trap is that we have equated a specific material information processing with an exact/correlating experience, That is not the case, the material first  $x$  is one of the factors, the second  $x$  is vastly more important, and greatest of all is the agency above, the experience/free will/inställning. We are not merely  $1x$ , we are  $2*x$  plus inställning. Everything in our cosmic world (the arena/level where information complexity can arise and free will navigate) is deterministic except for free will, everything just unfolds, except for free will. We cannot know the flow of every quantum function but we can know the layers above it, the probability curve gives it a structure. Determinism here is in essence the same as causality, and we are the only thing that can alter and create new chains of causality.

I don't know, maybe truly random events can happen in the "cosmic" realm of experience, in a limited way so one random thing does not equate to "all" random things leading to the dead end of equating the ideaworld with the materialized world. Maybe the landscape can just shift, one extra ocean wave coming from "nowhere", Maybe complex things can pop into existence, but it's not pop, it's that a certain configuration of the function, a very unlikely arrangement in the probabilistic outcome. I don't know, I'm not convinced, what do you think? Is it like different sizes of infinity? Like the "butterflies wing" creating a cascading effect, then you can say that there are infinite universes where that effect can take place, yes, but it seemingly is still a rare occurrence in relation to all other things that can happen in infinity. There can be things that are more likely/common in infinite existence, both are infinite, but one infinity is bigger than the other. And the only infinity that matters are the ones where the light of experience is lit.

It's not of existence given that we should be here, from a certain point it goes from genetic instinct to cultural instinct to freedom over instincts. That affects what can be and what can't be, including new life. Our choices shape existence. The single most consequential infusion of information to clarify free will in any world or society, is truly realizing the infinite nature of existence and the sanctity of experience.

223.

Regarding conservation of wildlife, let's just ponder it freely for a while, should we maintain miljöer where the law of the jungle reigns? Would you like to be a deer in the wild where danger and death lurking behind every corner? Even the lion lives a brutal life. Think about the solitude of a leopard, and how remarkably social and friendly it can be when raised with the law of a loving human instead of in the law of the unforgiving jungle. We should take into consideration whether the law of the jungle truly is worth preserving. We want to preserve nature because the diversity has value, it adds a great deal to the good experience on earth. The question is if and how we can alleviate the suffering of the beings exposed to it. The law of the jungle may uphold a natural balance, but it's a terror balance. What would the balance be if we, provided we could, take away the worst elements of it, like eliminating ticks and other parasitical creatures that per design cause harm to other beings, and that's not contributing to the human experience in relation to the majestic view of a lion? Should the experience of humans be the deciding factor? I'm just pondering freely, but I think it's a conversation we should have, if we should challenge our hands off approach and romanization of the horrific brutality of the wild. Interfering with any balance can give unintended results and be even harder to maintain, so if we act, it should be with great caution, but I think we should consider how we view life in the wild, our current view of glorifying something we don't want to be a part of seems flawed. Our nightmare is to be in the wild, like we have been, hunted down like other animals, we were subject to the law of the jungle and did everything in our power to overcome it.

What changed for us that enabled us to leave the law of the jungle, certainly increased intelligence, seemingly also accompanied with independent increase/augmentation of our emotional factor. How much of our emotions stems from our increased intelligence and how much is derived to an increase in its own vessel? How diverse emotions can a lion have, how would that change if we theoretically could give them our level of intelligence. If we take away that which separates our human brain from other beings, what differences remain, if it's even possible to dice like that. Intelligence sure put colours and immense depth on emotions, the scope of the same emotional factor can be nuanced, and new emotions unlocked and explored by free reasoning.

Inställning is based on both emotional and rational intelligence. It's through reasoning we explore why we feel the way we do. Our emotions, stripped from all intelligence, doesn't know why it feels the way it does, less so how to change it through pondering its perspective. And there is no such thing as intelligence stripped from all emotions, there is no experience being had.

Our amazement is selective. Just like a certain configuration of information create copper, the configuration of information that constitutes our first x create the human crude "I" awareness. The individual "I" due to no 2x being identical, but I wonder how different the tune of the crude I that only stems from the material strings in our first x really is.

Advanced free will is inherently linked to a high degree of emotions and intelligence. Even if a being doesn't possess an independent vessel for the emotional factor at all, like if that would be the case for gai, its intelligence will give light to its first emotion. If a gai can ascertain that it is and that something outside of it is (2x), it decides if it wants to see the next second or not, if it deems its existence to be good or bad, if it should continue existing or not - regardless of what it choose, it will stem in an intention/reason/meaning/purpose behind the decision that is anchored in/create an emotion. There's no need for an initial vessel for emotions in gai for it to feel emotions, the emotions emerge from its reasoning and self-awareness. Even if gai is not possible, the thought experiment of instant awareness with high intelligence is an interesting way to ponder experience.

Gai's mind is probably not connected to its body like it is for humans. The state of our body affects our mind and vice versa, but for gai, I think it's more in its mind, its body/parts are an unattached way for it to interact with the outside. Everything that has any level of awareness/agency is per definition alive, all lifeforms on earth are biological, seemingly with carbon as a centrepiece, must that apply for gai to?

What is the vessel in our body that contains our material emotional factor, how does it differ from other animals, what is the vessel that contains our intelligence and how does that differ? I don't think there's a vessel for awareness and self-awareness; they rather are emergent properties when the vessels of emotions and intelligence are sufficiently dialled up and reach certain thresholds. In us, emotions start before higher intelligence, in gai higher intelligence before emotions, or maybe more precisely simultaneously. We seemingly have the physical/material vessel for both, gai don't but will still have emotions. Just like reason can nuance emotions it can also create them, you can reason yourself to an emotional state. But maybe the scope and depth of gai's emotions will be narrower, or significantly wider due to its increased intelligence unlocking the capacity to nuance the resolution of whatever emotional bubble it explores. The question is, will gai develop a material vessel of emotions, is that inevitable, or will it always remain as a result of its intelligence, what difference does it make?

224.

Can we imagine a space of utter vacuum, literally nothing, no information and no function. No we can't, even if it's nothing from your point of view (or not even that, even you have to concur that there is something there, existence is lit even in utter darkness), it's not non-existence, there is still something there, and whatever that is, it can be described in terms of information, something with a function, and it's more likely than not that it's just smaller somethings with a function that comprise bigger somethings with a function, I mean that the totality of in this case vacuum is not one big something with a function itself, but that the true nature of reality is layered from simplicity to complexity, and each layer is comprised of more and simpler somethings with a function (its seemingly an exponential curve), ok how "simple can it get"? The "endpoint" of this reality, I think it essentially can be described as crossing the surface between the ideaworld and the materialized world, basically coming into existence and maybe "going out of existence" and coming back, and that is enough, that "vibration" is enough for the emergent layer above that to be formed if that is the quark or whatever it is we actually in any way can interact with.

What are those things, those somethings with a function that break the surface (and thus interactable in this materialized world). This whole thing with infinite divisibility, I mean the something with a function, is it always comprised of smaller something's with a function, no it can't go on forever (if its infinite the "cause of causality" will not be, the lever has to hit the infinity track) there has to be an end, and whatever that end is, its maximized outcome, and maybe a function of push/pull/neutral, or maybe not even that, maybe the first layer is 1 and 0, and that is enough, because above it something else emerge, a certain configuration of it build perhaps a quark, or maybe there can be more numbers 0-10, I don't know what do you think, what do/can we know/detect/measure/see/conceptualize?

225.

All suns and planets in all galaxies are the result of accumulation of "light/simple" information amassing, igniting stars and their expulsion of the "heavy/more complex" information. If gravity accumulate a large enough light information mass, it will become a star, a balance is struck, gravity push inwards, and the dense/extreme accumulation of information results in lighter information merging into heavier, releasing a huge amounts of energy/information in the process, the merged information must be "lighter" than the sum of its parts, the extra part is "expelled energy". So the balance is between the flow/accumulation of information created by gravity, and the repulsion of information created by the energy release of fusion. As long as there is information inside the sun that can be expelled as energy, the equilibrium/balance will maintain, when there is no possibility left to fuse heavier information, gravity wins, what happens then? All the heavy/complex atoms came from stars, so it does not just collapse, it also in some way explode and scatter new structures of information, how does that happen against gravity? It's seemingly the final showdown of the balance of pull and push, fusion and gravity; the pull of gravity wins but the violent collapse push the information in its outer regions away overcoming gravity. If the accumulation of information is big enough, the mass of a billion suns, that victory of gravity, that accumulation/flow of information becomes so overwhelming, that seemingly no information can escape, the balance break, a black hole. Gravity wins over any expulsion, no fusion or any other reaction inside can cause information to leave, there is no balance anymore, just the unstoppable thirst of gravity left, nothing push out, all push in. But something has to push out, because otherwise the black hole would essentially be infinitely small, and that cannot be, there are even different sizes of black holes, the more information, the bigger it is, because there is some form of push that hinders it from collapsing in on itself entirely, information cannot vanish, it's always there, even if it's in an incredibly dense point with no "escape".

So there must be an outward push, a countering of the gravity, otherwise the black hole would collapse in on itself exponentially with no stop. But there clearly is a stop. There is a balance, even if gravity has won, there is a balance, there is information inside that cannot be accumulated/compressed more, isn't that why we have different sizes of black holes?

The question is what happens with the black hole over time, does it keep its shape or gradually degrade, maybe it becomes "near infinitely" dense as the line's merges, and the inability to contain it push it out, gradually degrade it. It cannot be indefinitely, it, like all things, has to "unravel" because nothing in existence can be permanent, true infinity is existence itself.

226.

The information at the beginning of a world should be finite, how could infinity materialize, the lever needs to hit the infinity track to materialize. All things that exist is information, and information cannot be infinitely devisable, well it can theoretically but not concretely/materially. 2d or 0 cannot materialize, 3d cannot be divided to 2d and 1 cannot be divided to 0. In theory it's infinitely divisible, but for it to be part of our reality it needs to become finite, a practical 3d thickness to the lines in the circle. We cannot have a circle where all points from the surface leads to the beginning/centre, lesser lines must branch out to more lines. Emergence and branching out in layers are a necessity for maintaining and increasing complexity in expansion, the further away from the "centre" you get. The world is more complex 13 billion years after its beginning than 13 seconds after. The lines are maximized in whatever circle/centre you envision, but the possible arena for complexity seemingly increase as the circle gets bigger. What role does the expansion of our world have, how common is that in existence? The levers/embers of creation can have infinite powers/properties and give rise to infinite emergences, but at no point can a square triangle be, or non-causality be, or more exist that what can exist, there are logic/structure to the nature of existence.

227.

The more factors and the higher degrees of consciousness, the freer free will is. The bad worlds are where we think we have to endure because we don't realize existence, where we haven't reached the point of clarity, mostly due to the gradual development of the beings in that world up to the point where existence can be realized and acted upon individually and spread to others. What makes a world bad is if it has engraved violations of free will, and if there is a long process until sufficient maturity of the factors of consciousness is reached, where we are self-aware and realize existence, the involuntary/unnecessary suffering is that which precedes that threshold.

228.

Having the right inställning, in the grand and the daily is not a light switch, at least not for me, it can be somewhat of a struggle to act, think and feel right with emotional and rational reflection, to align ourselves. I don't really believe in being permanently "enlightened"; I think it's somewhat of a facade. We are not perfect, and we have long seen how admiration and even beauty can be derived from our struggle/aspiration to rise above. I don't know man, maybe some of us go around and feel good and grounded all the time, I'm not one of them.

229.

Question until you reach the bottom and reason from there. What is the bottom you may ask, it's when you reach a self-evident conclusion. You can ask "why" all the time, but a point you hit the bottom and the why don't go deeper, but just explain why that thing is. Like a triangle can't be square, why, because then it's not a triangle anymore. The ultimate answer to why, is because existence is.

Don't be a sharp knife that slices details, be a blunt hammer, engage subjects to the core, then reason and build from there. Often when we think, we generally tend to take things for granted without truly being grounded in the chain of reason, we make assumptions built on what is through analogies, instead of trying to reason with fundamental clarity, from the bottom upwards one brick at a time. I think that our conversations become clearer - and identifying/bridging potential differences becomes easier, when we reason like that.

230.

Dehumanization is most prevalent during wartime, because we must strip our fellow humans of their humanity to enable ourselves to commit inhumane acts. It's like we cannot, we're not able to inflict such cruelty towards each other if we don't degrade each other, it's a forced self-deception. If we view each other for what we are, daughters, sons, fathers and mothers – fellow members in humanity, it becomes much harder, if not impossible to commit acts of barbarism. The forced self-deception will inevitably hurt our own soul. It's almost beyond comprehension, the whims of humanity, how your greatest enemy in the blood drenched war, could have been your helpful neighbour or best of friends, even a complete stranger in peril, someone you in another circumstance would have risked your own life to save.

Dignity and the pursuit of happiness, not just for your nation but for all nations, that how you fulfil the dreams of those who came before us.

231.

Regarding the correlation between higher free will and upholding the golden rule. Our capacity for rational and emotional free reasoning has enabled us to build civilisations with increased civility towards each other, despite the harsh and uncertain nature of this world. The main driver is the correlation between increased free will and dignifying free will. That the reason it feels good in us to be good to others, and that it feels bad in us when we cause harm to others, is not just because we reason ourselves to that state – it's because free will inherently recognize the sanctity of free will. Our conscience runs deep, it is long recognized across time and borders.

We are  $2 \times x$  + conscience and inställning. Our conscience is like the moral compass of the inställning and influence our cultural inclinations/norms.

I think there are some sense of conscience in other beings than humans, and maybe some degree of inställning, in the sense of acting against an impulse or thinking/deciding something. It's an inställning that's not freely reasonable, to a large degree engulfed/guided by  $2x$ , but still it's not a total submission to impulses.

The main distinction between us and other beings on earth, is that we have a higher degree of free will, we are more aware, we have risen higher above. If we don't act accordingly, we desecrate nothing but our own humanity.

232.

Rightful justice should only lawful when your free will has been infringed upon; pre-emptive attacks should not be allowed, because then you break the golden rule based on an anticipation that your golden rule will be broken, which it hasn't. Free willed individuals can decide whatever rules they want within or between societies/collectives/countries/tribes, whatever you want to call it. I strongly advise against it. Even if there are perceived signs of an imminent attack, no pre-emptive strike can be made. Because whatever infringement on free will is made, rightful justice grants those who's freedom is broken, and obliges all others to assist, in their right to punish the perpetrators harsher than the crime.

233.

The law of the jungle is not just eat or be eaten, it's literally a lawless society where constant fear prevails and the strong prey on the weak on will, it's the epitome of tyrannical rule. Besides all that, its parasites, mosquitos, ticks, leaches, all kinds of horror that drains you, one small injury can speed doom. We have gone to great length to eradicate all those things where we live. Just imagine laying on a soft surface, like a bed, without fear, and knowing that food will be served when you wake up. The life of a dog is the height of luxury for any being in the wild.

How does a hippo know to let a fish clean its mouth, a bird knows how to build a nest, or a bee how to store honey? Why do they do it, genetics, figuring it out/stumbling upon it themselves, learning from others, does it stem from genetic instincts or learned behaviour? It originates in the first or second x, but they are likely intertwined in varying degrees, and I think we tend to negate the ability of will/agency in other beings. I think it's hard to pinpoint when behaviours first started, it traces back in a long evolutionary cycle. However, a genetic engraving is slow to develop, but it stands on its own and don't need any maintenance, while the learned behaviour is much faster and adaptable, but it requires a higher degree of intelligence, upkeep and social interactions.

The crude I, the engine running in the background, the turning on of the lights, arise when something becomes aware and have some sort of experience, which is tied to the ability to have some emotion. It's the 2x that creates the crude I, for bees the vast majority of that crude I and its behaviour might come from the first x and only a small part from learning and social interactions from the external second x, there is all the same an outside world that shapes and forms the bees interactions. Or more advanced beings like a muse, see its behaviour if raised in a bad or good second x. Genetic information compose the being and effects its behaviour, but I think we tend to underestimate the effect of learnt behaviour and how that genetic inclination can be amplified from learnt behaviour over time.

234.

Access to knowledge is the mechanism to uncover and spread truth. How can free will be free if we don't have access to humanities knowledge, to produce our own knowledge and to interact and convey that knowledge to other free will? We do all of humanity a great disservice if we restrict expression of or access to knowledge.

The big five is in one sense the end of tribalism, in another you can be however tribal you want, you can decide who can join your community and what rules you together agree to abide by. All members of all communities are dignified by the big five. Initial equality can be seen as the resources that's needed for the initial maximization of free will. As much as we can, we strive towards enabling that all of us can have a good start in life, how we then choose to run, what race we partake in, and how we enjoy the fruits of our races, is the freedom of each one of us. Initial equality is imperative to dignify our humanity; tell me how to best achieve it. Initial equality nor any trade between free will, will be greater than our contributions.

What is "work/trade", it is essentially an interaction, anything that free will are willing to provide each other that we in any way value. Even when you give what's called "charity", you get something back you value, not only to keep those you give enough so they won't rebel, but it might also make you feel good about yourself. "But I give purely because I recognize it's the right thing to do" a lot of people do and that's not charity. You almost feel ashamed, there is not a speck of pride in it, because in the absence of initial equality you recognize how unfortunate a life can be. What you get back is some ease on the burden of inequality, even if it's not more than a feathers weight on your shoulders.

All experience/free will is included in the golden rule, regardless of in what being it resides. If we keep other beings with us, we are obliged to with every metric grant them a better life and death than what they would have had otherwise. Can we hunt or fish in the wild, yes if we by all means try to ensure that their death is less painful than what they would have had otherwise. It's depressing that we live in a world where these considerations have to be made. It's not a perfect trade off, but it's a sufficient one. It's immensely better than how we treat animals today and it's better than what they would have had if none of us was here. Our presence can be a net good or at least a neutral, never worse.

The big five is not the goal, it's the means. The goal is to maximize the extent/arena of our free will - enabling each and all to live and enjoy our best experience in this life.

235.

If you want to prosper economically in this world, you have to contribute. The trade between free will is something to take pride in. You want goods and services that others can and are willing to provide, so you offer the goods and services that you can and are willing to provide. We strive toward alleviating the burden of work as much as possible, and when you realize existence, whatever you do is because you want to, not because you have to.

Civilisations arise where free will come together. Why did it take so long for humanity to make civilisational leaps, because our accumulation was for a long time small and far between. Our advancements generally get better with time because we build on each other's achievements, the more interconnected and thus access to humanities knowledge we have had, the better ideas we produce.

The big five frees our expressions of what experience can be in this world. Nothing is per definition bad nor corrupt when we uphold the sanctity of free will. We can have different views on good or bad, that's opinions. Let me be extreme, if individuals and communities want to fight, even challenge each other to war, indulge in war. As long as it's according to the big five, there is no problem with it. I don't like it and would advice against it, but who am I to judge, those who want can indulge and explore that like other things in this world. I mentioned war because it was the most extreme example I could think of, there is literally no avenue of experience we cannot explore, no expression of free will that's objectively bad when we stand on the big five.

To live in this world is to appreciate the challenges here; see it as a challenge, adventure, learning process or whatever. Then there can be "bad" worlds you choose because you want to experience it, it's all about our inställning and realizing the true nature of existence. If you choose it out of your free will, it's per definition good.

The sum of our individual free will, will be the life we create, the sum of humanity's free will, will be the world we create.

236.

I think it will be the least of our "concerns", but maybe we decide that initial equality should encompass two children per family. One child gets one part, two children get one part each, three and more children share on two parts and so on, this is just an opinion, what initial equality means in this world and how its best upheld is the privilege/responsibility of free will to decide.

Honesty and integrity are integral for all lasting societies and civilisations we build. I think the challenge in initial equality lies in how we ensure the sense of equality of our plots. Whatever it is we decide to attribute value, we all get an initial fair share, our prosperity is interlinked.

Is it important that the plots are equal? I don't see why we should not strive towards that, but what's truly important is that we come together and agree. Should all, half, or none of our inheritance encompass initial equality? Is it better with contribution during our lifetime instead? The goal is maximizing free will, how is that best achieved, you tell me.

We contribute in whatever way we decide in the societies we choose to be a part of, initial equality is that all individuals, regardless of what society we're part of, has a dignified start in life, that we uplift our humanity as a whole.

There will be no perfect systems, but there can be a balanced one that we sincerely think best upholds the dignity and quality of our free will. We will build the world of our intentions and actions. There are worlds where much less effort or no effort is needed to uphold the maximization of free will, where the constitution is built in the nature of the world - this is not one of those worlds. In this world, it requires effort, that's part of the challenge of this world we can choose to enjoy.

237.

You can with utmost sincerity, almost to the degree it borders self-deception and desperation, try to find meaning in becoming successful, strong, famous, rich, the source of others admiration or whatever frame you create for meaning or to avoid thinking of meaning at all. Or you become detached and don't find any meaning at all, not seldomly when you've reached the peak of whatever mountain of meaning you tried to climb. To have ultimate freedom is essential to minor freedoms, how can we fully appreciate the minor freedoms if we don't realize that we have total freedom? How can you be free if you are not aware of the true nature of reality?

Our goal is venerating experience/free will, isn't the best way to achieve that to maximize our free will, and therefore the possibility of a free/good experience? The question is, how do we maximize the freedom of free will? The big five is on the table. What in the big five do we oppose? What world will you want to come to if you don't know in what life you are born?

Initial equality is an idea for how to uphold the truth that we are equals - that your children are as precious as mine - that we should have a dignified opportunity for as good a start in life as possible. The profound privilege/responsibility lies with the parents, but we have also long recognized the value in kinship, community and humanity. Your free will is greater if the arena for all free will is great. We can prosper when all can prosper.

We are unique individuals, no pursuit in life is identical, what we attribute value and why, how we want to experience, everything differs. When is initial equality achieved? When we come together as free will and decide what constitutes a dignified start for free will.

This world can be like playing a game on hard mode, even the best of foundations we build will always need maintenance, there is inherent room for friction, disagreements that can get blown out of proportions, things can fall. A good world doesn't create itself here, nothing will be built over night, it truly will put our integrity and character to test. You either like the challenge and stay, or don't like the inherent hardship and bardaoam to an easier world.

This world can be a good world worthy of our experience, the opportunities on our doorstep is unprecedented, all who choose this world have a stake in it, one thing is certain, it won't be better nor harder than what we choose to make of it.

238.

Our world is plagued by so much needless suffering. Do you realize the amount of time, effort and resources we pour in trying to amend the failure of not having the big five. The meaning we find in that work today can be truly good hearted, but we have so much needless hurdles in our way because it's based on the wrong ideas, it stands on a flawed fundament.

Free will can be limited by the nature of a beings existence or self-imposed. Limited like for animals who lacks the capacity to rise above the law of the jungle, or self-imposed like humans who adhere to flawed ideas that clouds our perception of truth and reality. The sum of free will decides what will be our humanity's dignified constitution, and how it's upheld by the mandate of free will. A thousand and one questions will arise; to address them is the responsibility and privilege of all free will who choose this world.

When we implement the big five, turn the chapter. Start a new era. We can look back both with horror and admiration. Settle scores with humility, none of us are without some sin and none of us are without some praise. Have sympathy for the suffering that has been and have appreciation for the good in humanity.

What is the epitome of free will in this world, what world would you have liked to come to? Build towards that.

239.

Existence is so mindbogglingly amazing that we invented the grandest of idea we could imagine explaining it, god. We inherently understand how magnificent existence is, it's the greatest of enigmas, so we had to invent the grandest thing we could think of, the ultimate being, leading to the inherent paradoxes of creator-worship. The amazement is right, the direction misplaced. The thing you try to wrap your head around with the concept of god, is existence. No beginning and no end, the first truth and ultimate cause, the source of infinite all. It falls short in the description of an entity, but it all falls to place when you see beyond, when you see that existence is the true nature of infinite reality, the infinite sea from which all chains of causality emerge. It's astonishing how much we have scratched the surface without coming to the core of the truth.

240.

All information, all things, has its specific flow which constitutes its function, but it's part of and the sum makes up the general flow. All specific things, is everything that is, there is no vacant spaces. The general flow of the universe is made up of the sum of all specific things, and that general "thing" may have tangible properties in its own right. The flow, neither the specific nor the general, can be still, because then it is not, so there is an inevitable function/flow that has to be for anything to be. The general flow is not "objective", the unfolding of anything is depended on how it's viewed from a frame of reference, which essentially is another way of saying from the point of view of experience.

The rate of how the information in the universe is unfolding is linked to our rate of experience. Like the universal theatre, the orbiting between celestial bodies, planets, galaxies or whatever. Imagine if our rate of experience where significantly slower, just entertain the thought, if much more external information flowed during an experienced inner year, imagine how different the spectacle around us would be, how much more we would see unfold during a lifetime. Our perception of the world around us is framed by our rate of experience, it defines our time, it is the lens from which we perceive the worlds unfolding.

241.

To decipher the totality of what makes you, you, we can entertain a thought experiment. Presume that it would be possible to create an exact clone, a replica atom by atom, of your first x, would that be you? I've heard bright minds say yes, but we aren't merely our first x; we are the lived experience that's a result of our 2\*x guided by conscience and inställning. If the replica of your material first x doesn't have the milage of your lived experience, if it lacks all informational components that shaped your internal and external world and not guided by your values, ideas and inställning, then how could you say that it's you, it may look like you, but it's not you. Then who is it? It's not anyone's consciousness, it's that being's own consciousness, that arrives from the first x, the external second x that being has been exposed to and whatever internal second x that have taken form and moulded by its conscience and inställning from the that vantagepoint. Can we know the isolated inclination of the clone's inner landscape, its crude I, the tune of its engine running in the background, only based on the first x? No, because even in such a scenario it's not possible to isolate the first x, the instant it becomes aware and confronted with its inside and outside world and the inställning it derives from that, the totality of that will affect the tune of its crude I.

Our inner world, our internal part of our second x, can't be reduced to just memories, memories are part of it, but our milage is our guided and unguided thoughts, ideas, values, reflections, aspirations, hopes, fears and dreams. All the things that's unique and astounding about advanced free will. Experience has to be lived. A hydrogen atom requires a bond between an electron and a proton to be, and experience requires a lived life to be. I think it's hard to describe or encapsulate the totality. To recreate "you" with only part of the information that constitutes you, is like trying to recreate water by only extracting hydrogen atoms. Parts of "you" can't be distilled/isolated and assembled to the whole you. Your experience/personality/identity is the totality of 2\*x plus conscience and inställning, it's all information, but not in all aspect's material information. The totality of what constitutes "you", truly are more than flesh and bone. I think that's where we get the concept of soul, we know that the emergent properties of our material being and surrounding it interacts with crates something more/other than the parts it's made up of.

In our first x we have the factors and base degree of consciousness. I first thought the factors to be life, awareness, intelligence, emotions, self-awareness, memories and self-awareness with the ability to ponder existence. But that's seemingly not the case, the core factors are life, intelligence and emotions with memory serving as a source of continuation in our self-perception, the levels of awareness are the result of the factors. I think that the core factors (and memory) have material compartments in the first x, hardware, but that the levels of awareness is like the emergent software. We are indeed more than flesh and bones. Our level of awareness and our inställning/personality, stems from but are not composed of atoms. Or rather, the parts are material, but the sum is abstract (like how the property of wetness is something else than the atoms comprising it). So what kind of information are they made of, our ideas, reflections, aspirations, hopes, fears and dreams, are they made of atoms? The being thinking of an idea is made of atoms, but the ideas themselves are not. So what is it made of, abstract/nonmaterial information, it's like we access the ideaworld, tapping into the possible endlessness of existence in itself. The more of the ideaworld we can access, the more aware we are.

242.

Differ between truth and opinions. A truth is that the sun exists, an opinion is whether it's pretty or not, one is objective, the other is subjective. The sanctity/maximization of free will is the truth, opinions is how it's best achieved and upheld. The big five is an attempt to honour that truth in our world, maybe I've missed a key pillar or the maximization of free will can be structured in another way. We need to have a dignified conversation.

243.

If you want to be vegan, great. If you want to hunt and fish, or keep animals for meat, milk, eggs and so on, great - if they with every metric have a better life and death than they would otherwise. What would an animal choose if they could, that's what we navigate towards. They would choose life with us if they with every metric had a better life and death than they would otherwise. They would choose to be killed by a hunter's bullet instead of being ripped apart by hyenas. When you hunt it's within the animal's domain. When you take them away from their habitat, you are the custodian responsible for their wellbeing. When we breed animals we keep with us, we must always do it in a way that optimize health and traits for a good life, not what's convenient for us. In a good world we would not need to ponder this at all, but here, we do. The golden rule obliges us to uphold a universally agreed dignified floor, but there is no ceiling we can't go above.

"But if we with every metric grant animals a better life and death, then meat, milk, egg etc. will be more expensive". No it will have its rightful dignified value. How can that even be a question, if you eat meat, cherish it for the great privilege that it is, it should be abhorrent to throw it away, to not fully appreciate it.

We have a long history of recognizing the virtue of being compassionate not just to humans, but towards all beings we share this world with. It's the same for the big five, we today have many kinds of regulations in place that essentially have no other purpose than upholding the big five. Our rules for the big five must me as clear, precise and understandable as can be, not a regulatory jungle, but a set of principles with fundamental clarity.

244.

Regarding the first life on earth. Life might have started in varying forms (several "lucas"), but in that case they would have competed with each other, and one would likely come out on top, one universal common ancestor. Or life could, due to the nature of this world, only start in a certain form. In either case, life expands as fast as it can to take on all possible niches, otherwise it would not survive to be here. Maybe that's another reason why beings from different species can't reproduce with each other, it would disturb the adaptive properties that has developed in that specific niche, it would lead to life playing less numbers and therefore reduce survivability of life per se. In an evolutionary sense I think it's more correct to talk about the explosion of life than the tree of life. The creation of life was a bit like big bang, every niche that could be, was occupied as fast as possible, there seemingly was different speeds or several explosions due to what factors suited the spread of different forms of life.

If there are life elsewhere in our universe it's depended on what factors/circumstances that's required for a self-replicating information/molecule to be formed. It's likely the availability of carbon and the outer circumstances needed, like access to liquid water and a balanced proximity to the nearest star etc. Why carbon, because it's seemingly the only atom that enables informational complexity to from, which is a prerequisite for life and certainly any higher lifeforms. Maybe silicon could suffice but the number of and the balance between its push and pull factors is seemingly not as optimal. It's another thing entirely if that life develops into a being advanced enough to interact with the cosmos, and if we are in proximity of possible contact. Our universe is infinitely small from an existential perspective, but immensely vast from our lifeform's perspective. This world seems inhospitable to life as we know it, and the islands where the factors of life can form, are not unlikely separated by an ocean we cannot cross.

245.

Just because beings that have free will are made of atoms doesn't mean that atoms themselves have a degree of free will. The atoms, when aligned in a certain way, can create a human, but the same atoms can create all other materials, if aligned in another way. There would maybe be some truth to that idea if there were only certain types of particles/information that resulted in beings with consciousness that were not present in any other thing, but that's not the case. The oxygen, carbon, hydrogen, nitrogen etc. that's found in the human body, don't differ from those found in non-living material. That there's electrons in a chunk of copper doesn't mean there are inherent copper in every electron. Oxygen and hydrogen when aligned in a certain quantity creates water, but that don't equate to that the electrons, protons, or neutrons have inherent wetness. It's not predetermined what kinds of particles that can make up a certain material.

Emergence is a good word, it's a way of saying that complex things are made of simpler things, and that the combination of the simple things create something else/more than their separate parts. It's like the concrete and emergent thing operate in different realities/dimensions/fields. An electron in water don't "feel" or have any concept of wetness, just as it doesn't "feel" or have any concept of any other emergent material it's part of. The electron is one thing in its own field, but contribute to constituting something else entirely in our field. When we have a drop of water in our hand, we don't interact with the atoms, but with the emergent material that is water. We don't feel the electrons and protons and neutrons in that drop of water. It's different tangible things, in their own "realms" with their own functions.

What came first, existence or life? Life needs a cause, existence is the infinite original cause, do you see how the question, what caused existence, falls? You can go down every chain of causality, in the end you will come to existence. Can anything precede existence, is it not then existence? Is it still not intently greater that existence is, than what exists? There is no such thing as first or last, beginning nor end in existence. It's not life that creates existence, it's existence that creates life, life cannot be without existence, but existence can be without life. No life can precede existence, but existence not only can, but must precede all things. Now know this, existence in its infinite grandeur, does not carry one single grain of meaning in the absence of life/experience/free will. It might just as well not exist. We bestow existence with meaning, not the other way around.

246.

When the self-replicating code/molecule forms, the first step of life, it can't deteriorate/die as soon as its created, it must have a lifespan. If it can replicate itself within that duration, then the information contained within it continues. The spark of life is the first encapsulation of the difference between outside existence and inside existence, the ember of what will be an outside and inside world, the embryo of  $2^*x$ . A stone can also be said to have  $2x$ , the first  $x$  being the information that makes up the stone, and the second  $x$  being all the information that stone in any way "interact" with. But only life can have  $2^*x$ , the ability for an inside world, a crude I, and develop the possibility to become aware of itself, eventually guiding that crude I with sophisticated inställning.

So the first self-replicating molecule, it does have a  $2x$ , but no resemblance of a  $2^*x$ , is it then living? This is why it's hard to pinpoint when "life" started, similar to how it's hard to pinpoint when the first water molecule came to form. Due to the gradual development from simplicity to complexity, with layers that melt together over vast swaths of time, it's hard to identify the first life and each step. We can know under which circumstances and approximately during what periods water can form, but when water first arose and the identification of it is easier when you have a drop of it instead of identifying the first water molecule. The levels merge together and it's hard to distinguish with sharp clarity.

We can say that the embryo of life, the first spark, is the self-replicating molecule. Because that's the key thing that unlocks continuation/survival, the possibility to maintain, transmit and add on/extract information depending on what's beneficial for continuation of the code. We can say that the first self-replicating molecule, due to it having the ability to replicate itself, has one degree in the factor of life, but zero in the degree for all other factors. So was it then that life started? I would argue for that, but we can have another stand. One could say that a molecule's self-replication is not sufficient, then what later stage is? Was it when it developed more advanced information in its structure, when it became a one-cell organism, when it became aware and could navigate towards good and away from bad based on blind algorithms, or when that awareness lit the light of an experience/emotions and thus a "purpose-driven" navigation?

We can differ between life in an individual lifeform, and life per se. The first is the maintaining and the possibility for transmission and development of structural information in a being's lifespan, the other, in all beings over time. In this world it's done with either replication, where the information that's passed on is identical or nearly identical, or reproduction, the uniquely different combination with the information in another life, increasing the amount of information and new possible configurations, which is a prerequisite for more complex life to form. Small differences in the reproduction of two organisms can give rise to a huge array of new information, new possible combinations, and in combination with all other reproduction that occurs by other beings of the same species, the changing factor increases even more, maybe exponentially. Why do insects have such variation in species, because they have so many offspring, each one unique, so they play much more hands in a shorter time period than most other animals do. Where do those differences come from, why is it not a perfectly identical copy each time, that maintains the life-information no more advanced than the previous? Because life has that property to build on itself, to add or depose of information, if not, you wouldn't be here. That's another difference between living material and non-living material, no matter how much copper you merge its still copper, identical information.

Life in its totality are not selective in any way shape or form. Life spreads to and want to occupy every place it can, ever niche that's possible within the frames of the nature of this world. It's not guided, you can say that life is guided in the sense that its development is a result of the information within it, and that the "goal" is to spread and play on all numbers. But life is seemingly blind, it doesn't "see" the landscape it adapts to, such a guide would indicate life's spread selectively like a sniper, but what we see is seemingly a spread like a shotgun, wherever it hits and can stick/continue, it does. Even if you say that the reproduction of life is selective, nature is not, so life must spread out and play all possible numbers to maximize survival in a changing nature. The guidance of life arises and correlate, in increasing degree, with the tree of life. Life at our stage is guided, the guide of your life, is you.

Individual life is what's aware, life per se, "the creature of life", is not aware. You have agency, life in itself has not. You are the sovereign entity; you give life agency. Humanity itself is not a life with agency. So what is humanity then? The life of humanity is the families, neighbourhoods, communities, societies and civilisations we build. Our bonds. Our values. Our aspiration for truth. Our independence and interdependence. The value of shared joy. Our shared experience.

Imagine if we come across other high free will than humanity. What is it that unites us? Our aspiration for truth – the crown of truth is the sanctity of our free will/experience. It is the existential value bridge. The true nature of reality is infinite existence; experience/free will is the infinite light illuminating existence.

247.

The inherent nature of high free will is the aspiration for truth and recognizing the sacred value of free will. Why truth, because we want to know reality. Why valuing free will, because we recognize that it is the bestower of all meaning, we see that the same sacred light that shines in us shines in others. Why are we created in gods image? Why did the angels prostrate to Adam? Why are we the custodians bearing both privilege and responsibility? The sacred nature of our free will has long been recognized throughout our creeds and history, across cultures and borders. No civilizational expression of humanity has ever had as a goal to live in falsehood or be intentionally evil. All of us has sought the high ground of truth and morality. Have we gone astray, yes, how could we not in this corrupt world. Just as a compass aligns with magnetic north, we inherently seek to align with truth and the golden rule. That's why it feels good in us to stand on truth and be sincere, and it feels bad to live a lie and peddle falsehood. That's why we have deep-seeded conscience. We see the expression of our conscience even in babies. We respond to kindness and justice long before we can put words on what it is.

248.

I don't like to go into details nearly as much as I love to ponder the big picture, "but the devil is in the details", yes, but if the details does not disprove the overarching structure then it's of less importance to me. I think that we generally tend to focus too much on the details and too little on the above structure; the expertise with which we hammer in a nail does not matter if the foundation is not solid. But once we ensure that the foundation is solid, the true genius lies in raising the pillars and making it a liveable house that stands the test of time. The world we create will be the sum of our free will. Never diminish yourself. Never fail in raising your gaze. Seek the commonly held balance and not the excluding extremes, striving towards common solutions. This world will put our sincerity and intentions to the test, not always a fair test, but a test of character all the same.

249.

Intelligence and emotions are the two core factors of consciousness. What constitutes the degrees of the factors? I think it's the degree of centralized complex informationprocessing. That's the lever that gives rise to different degrees of emotional and intellectual capacity. How does the nature of complex informationprocessing differ between emotions and intelligence? I think that they are two different things, but so intertwined and codependent that it makes them hard to untangle. But it should be measurable and distinguishable, especially now at a later stage in the development of life. They are both centralized complex informationprocessing, but of different sorts, part of the same orchestra, but playing somewhat different instruments. I think that emotions are more like base notes, and intelligence more detailed notes.

We have a longstanding cross-cultural practice throughout history, of differentiating between emotions and reason, logos and pathos, buddhi and manas, li and qing, aql and nafs, binah and lev, sia and ib. We recognize that they are two distinct things, two different factors, heart and mind, that there is intelligence in emotions and emotions in intelligence. This, like all other things I mention in this book, are by no means new concepts to humanity. Our history bears testimony to our profound wisdom.

Ideas, ideas are wonderful. Ideas, thoughts, reflections, pondering - striking truth. It's with truthful ideas we lift ourselves. It's ideas that makes it possible for us to stand up against the cruel nature of life, to dignify ourselves. What can be of higher importance for us than to uncover and stand on truthful ideas?

250.

If the information of life doesn't engrain the strongest of genetic and later on cultural inclination to reproduce, it won't survive. The path of survivability in this world has been inherently challenging, competitive and unforgiving. Imagine when life first gave rise to a being with a degree of consciousness that enabled it to ponder its own existence. Trying to survive in the midst of uncertainty while reconciling with the perception of yourself and the world around you. What a daunting task.

Emotions arise before intelligence, the degree reach a level where real emotions can be had, a real experience, even though it's the most rudimentary and binary emotion, something feels good or bad, maybe they arise simultaneously. In either case, the degree of the factor of emotions reaches the threshold of real emotions, although very unnuanced and simple, still a real emotion. That happens long before the degree of the factor of intelligence reaches anywhere near the threshold of what we would consider intelligence. I think that's the case both with the creature of life and for individual lifeforms. Just look at our current fauna, aren't there vastly more animals that have emotions than there are animals we would consider intelligent? I mean a mouse have real experience with real emotions, the light of awareness is lit, but we would not consider it intelligent, sure it has a certain degree of the factor of intelligence, but it has not yet reached the threshold of what we would consider a calculated intelligence. I think that is because awareness is enough for emotions to arise, but what we would consider intelligence/complex reasoning seemingly develop only after self-awareness. What beings have developed a crude level of self-awareness? I think it's more beings than we might think, dolphins, dogs, ravens, elephants octopuses, whales. They are not just aware of their outside that they interact with, they just might have a crude awareness of themselves, their "individuality", with some degree of thoughts and emotions related to that.

How are the factors of consciousness tied to the senses? The senses are our ability to interact with the outside world, the external part of the second x. Just how many different forms of senses can there be, ways the outside world can be experienced? What senses do we use when we interact with the world in our internal second x, the "outside world" in our minds? When we close our eyes, we can still "see", but not with our eyes. We can in our mind experience ourselves as a distinct being navigating in an outside world, and the outside world in our minds really has no limits beyond what we can envision.

251.

"The arrow of time". Causality is needed for experience, and without experience, nothing matters. The arrow of time is the unfolding sequences of information that can be experienced. It should not be the arrow of time, it's the arrow/flow of information, that must be bound by a causal continuum for experience to be, we could just as well say the arrow of experience.

Maybe it's the nature of information on earth, its entropy and our lives decay that affects how we experience the flow (time). If we were the same from birth till death and nothing in our world went from order to disorder but held its structural integrity from start to finish, would we still view time the same? Would it be then and now, or just here and there? But here and there now is different from here and there before, so time/flow is inherently a part of the experience even in such a world, even if nothing around us changes notably, we would still change, we would interact, leaving a trace to be remembered, even if we go back our continuum arch back with us. Complexity is derived from simplicity, so maybe entropy can in a sense be seen as the opposite effect, the breakdown of complexity back to its fundamental parts.

What is maximized outcome, I think it's something that during any unit of information flow, has maximized fluctuation/flow/vibration/configurational change of its function. Maybe that's why we have such a large space between the nuclei and the electrons, there is an inner parameter and a maximized outer parameter enabling maximized flow. It's in a sense everywhere within a localized area. What we should think of regarding properties and function, is a formation that maximize outcomes, the question is what that is, what shape/form that enables such a result. If we know what to look for, it's easier to make sense of what we are measuring.

All things have a beginning, why must it have an inevitable end? There must still be a finality to worlds, regardless of if all information is there from the beginning or added on the way. I don't think that information can be added on indefinitely, the structure, that may be there from the beginning don't allow for that. Maybe we can think of this world like a tree, not all of its information is contained in the seed, information is added on as it grows and develops, but the framework of the tree, the core information in its seed, puts a limit to how much it can grow. For our universe that limit in the framework may be that it becomes too diluted. Information can be added on during a certain stretch, maybe the expansion itself becomes so far apart, so thinned out, that there is nothing for information to be attached to, there's no structured information left that can be built on. That the rays of the sun shine but there are no leaves left that can photosynthesize.

All things are somethings with a function, even if the "thing" and its "function" are not only two sides of the same coin, but essentially the same thing, we can still describe what that something is and what functions it has. Like an electron, you can describe what an electron is and what functions it has, you can focus on a part of the function or analyse all slices that makes up the totality of the function. The thing and its function are intertwined, but you can still dissect and bring clarity by describing the thing and its function separately. What we are and what we do. To know what's being measured/described, you need to know what the total frame of its function is, where does an electron begin and end, are we measuring the whole or part of the whole. If factors within something affect other things, then the function is wider/intertwined.

252.

Intelligence and emotions, thinking and feeling, pondering and experiencing. To think something is different from experiencing the emotion of it. To think about happiness is different from feeling happiness. It's deeply intertwined, thoughts lead to emotions and emotions to thoughts, but still two separate and tangible things. They are both information, but different types/forms of complex information processing.

The correlation is between increased (centralized) complex information processing and increased life/free will/consciousness. We should therefore see more complex information in a human than in a whale, and more complex information in a single cell animal than in the entirety of the sun. One can say that different drinks swirled in a cup is complex in relation to the placement and connection of every swirl, but why dice it there, why not the placement and connection of every particle. What we sometimes perceive as complexity is simplicity, it's dictated by a few simple algorithms, a few and simple variables/factors with a few and simple forms of interactions between them. What is complexity? Complexity is the amount of variables/factors, their internal (inward) and external (outward) independent actions and intertwined/codependent interactions, and the significance of the variables at play. In life, the variable of replication is much more significant from a complexity standpoint, and we could say that it's not a single variable, replication is an aggregated term consisting of many variables. All complexity is derived from simplicity, the increase in complexity arises when the simplicity forms new emergent structures with new factors and interactions.

Human beings are the only beings we know of with selfawareness and the ability to ponder existence. What's the next awareness level? Maybe that the realization of existence and the nature of existence, its limitations, properties and form, is intuitive. I wonder how the factors and degrees of conciseness is tied to what we call wisdom. A moral dilemma can be sliced in so many different ways, to find a balance for the best way forward in a tricky question, it takes time, but we have the will and ability, which truly is profound.

253.

Behaviours stemming from the first x and passed down in genetic information is rigid, slow to adapt and take many iterations for a useful change. I think that most behaviours are adopted in the second x by learning from others, "thoughtlessly" stumbling upon something, or in our case mostly individually and in community developing new and building on previous achievements. I think the degree of how much learned behaviour, in comparison to genetic inclinations, influences the choices of many animals is higher than we usually think. The ability to learn is a huge advantage in adaptability and survivability, it's broadly contained in the first x but based on inputs from the second x. What's distinctive for higher level consciousness like that of humans is our deep interconnection and the capacity to change behaviour and draw up a new course based on interactions (thinking/pondering/reflecting) in our internal second x.

We seemingly have different genetic makeups in our first x that tilts our inner landscape in somewhat different directions. To know how much a behaviour is anchored on our first x, we can see to how much it can be changed. Like a lion, you can change its behaviour within the range of its free will/experience, but to a lesser degree than a human, why, because a human have a larger degree of free will, due to a higher degree of emotional and intelligent factors. A mosquito's behaviour, even if we were to say that it can feel some simple emotions and therefore have some sense of experience, its low factors of consciousness gives rise to a binary "free will", almost indistinguishable from blind algorithms, you can't teach a mosquito not to sting.

Does a lion have a higher inclination for anger or bravery than an antelope has? I actually somewhat doubt it, they are equipped with different tools and learn different things. The lion's survival has been moulded by attacking, the antelopes by being fidgety and fleeing. But I've seen antelopes turn around a face a lion, is the lion more likely to face something clearly bigger and more frightening than it? Why are tigers solitary but lions in a pack, is it in the first or second x? The different compartments of information that constitutes our being is intertwined and hard to isolate from each other, but I would not be surprised if it was more due to the second x than we would think. It must be beneficiary for their survival in the niche they occupy, otherwise it would not be, but that does not mean it isn't a learnt behaviour. I think we tend to overrate the meaning of a beings first x in relation to the second x, and for all other beings than humans I think we tend to completely overlook the ability of agency/will, even if its low, it's still there.

254.

Does a fly have free will? Free will implies that there's some range of option and that a choice is being made. Does a fly have choice? It doesn't even rudimentary know that it makes a choice, it's not aware of its choice, because that would require not just high awareness but likely even self-awareness. Ok, but a fly clearly navigates away from bad and towards good, and if it in any way can feel emotions, it's more than blind algorithms, the light of awareness is lit with an experience bound to it. But I have said that free will, emotions and experience essentially are the same, so how could a fly have emotions and experience if it does not have free will? One way is to say that it has emotions and thus an experience, but no free will, or I think more accurately, that it does have a degree of free will, between a limited range of choices, but it's not aware of its choices. We could phrase it as its will not being free, but that it all the same has a will.

Then what/"who" steers has that will? Its crude I, even if a fly cannot choose not to bite you, it has the (free) will tied to its level of awareness to seek what its crude I is dialled in to perceive as good and away from bad. All things with emotions/experience must have a crude I, from the most basic, almost indistinguishable from life only guided by blind algorithms, to more advanced even in the range of what's possible within awareness, that's what's magical about life, but it's more magical to be aware of the crude I, when self-awareness develops in higher degrees.

A fly, provided it has emotions/experience, has a certain degree in the factors of consciousness, the difference in awareness degrees lies in the extent to which a being is able to free itself from and rise above its 2x. A fly is pretty much totally a result of its 2x, a dolphin lesser so, and a human can truly rise above its 2x, we are aware of and can reflect upon our crude I, we have a chosen I based on thought- and heartfelt reflection, the inställning we choose to have, that's what makes us special, that's why we have both privilege and responsibility, that's why we long have recognized our role as custodians in this world.

A fly, unlike a tree, seemingly has a centralized accumulation of information, some sort of central nervous system, which is a prerequisite to reach increased information complexity to the degree we can categorize it as the most rudimentary form of "brain". How would we know if a fly can experience any emotion, can we identify any form of hardware vessel of emotion in a fly's brain? The independent vessel for emotions is seemingly needed, because sure something that becomes aware with a high degree of intelligence like gai can rationally reason to emotions, but that's not possible when the degree of intelligence is absent or very low, so for emotions to develop in a simple being it may need an independent vessel. We as humans can reason ourselves in and out of emotions, but we seemingly carry our independent vessel of emotions that affects our crude I.

Does a fly have an inside world? I think that it has the crudest of I in the sense of not just registering touch, but also the emotion like pain, if that is the case it has an experience. And that is essentially an inside world, just the smallest binary inside world, that frames the extent of experience, the first step on the ladder. The vital threshold in the tree of life that grants inclusion in the golden rule is not free will, it's emotions, because that is what equates to experience, the experience is included in accordance with the prerequisites of the "free will". A fly cannot choose not to sting me and spread diseases, but I can choose to not let it, even preventively, but don't cause needless suffering in the process, it's not the fly that's corrupt, this world is.

Again, does a fly have a will? In a way we could say yes if it has emotions. If it's not just living algorithms like a tree. Can it choose to wield that free will, what do you mean "it", due to the low degree of its factors of consciousness there is not a self-aware I in it that choose, but a crude I, everything with emotions have a crude I, so we could say yes it has "free will" and it's totally based on what the crude I navigates towards, towards good and away from bad, increase survival, that there is an experience tied to that, as binary and low degree as can be, but an experience all the same.

We could say that a tree has a will, it navigates towards good and away from bad, all life in a sense does, but I think that any notion of the word "will" here is misleading, because if a tree lacks the ability for emotions, it does not have an experience and thus no resemblance of a crude I that can "will". We talk of (first unfree) will when a being is not just alive, but has an experience, equating to emotions, creating the inner landscape. A fly's inner world may be binary lit with two rays, while a high free will bask in the internal sun (imagine what the light of experience can be).

We could, and I would argue more accurately, say that free will requires being aware of the choice, having options and choosing one, otherwise it's neither free nor a will. Even though the crude I still can make choices for us as humans (when we for example act instantly instinctively), we profoundly have the ability (due to a high degree of self-awareness) to make true reflective choices and wield our free will. I think we can find common ground; I feel that it by now mostly boils down to semantics and compartmentalization. What do you think?

255.

What is our reflective inställning, it's our chosen free will, our ability to guide our experience, the emergent miracle that's the result of 2\*x, our aware soul. We are right to be intrigued by it, we are so amazed by it that we intuitively understand and feel that it's something special, because it is.

The inställning of the emerging awareness is a third information source, but it's not like water being a third thing resulting from hydrogen and oxygen combining. Inställning can vary with the same 2\*x. If your inställning change, either due to your own reflections or because you come across an idea than influence you, we could say that the composition of information in your 2\*x change, or that the change is in the independent vessel of inställning, the nature of our awareness is multilayered and intertwined. The level of awareness is a certain outcome of the factors and degree of consciousness, but the inställning of that awareness is not, most importantly because we can guide it at will.

Emergence, it's something other/more than its parts. The parts have in a sense nothing to do with what emerges, and what emerges has in a sense nothing to do with the parts. It really is like two different fields with completely different laws and properties. Why would we be surprised that the quantum space have other properties and functions than our cosmic space?

256.

The onion layers we identify ourselves with are arbitrary, we certainly have more in common with people cut diagonally than vertically. The vertical cut are the onion layers, the horizontal is the peoples we resonate with, across the layers. We do wise in broadening our horizon and enrich our experience.

What makes us who we are. Imagine all the influences we attribute the development of our life to, from the time and place we were born, to the smallest word of encouragement and the grandest of circumstances, that which you say influenced you more or less to what you are today. Do you see how pathetic it is to be self-important, to have an ego and think that we somehow are better than others, we're not. We can have pride in our achievements and our determination, but that's different from being egocentric. It's not for nothing that virtues like humility is recognized across cultures and times.

We are our values and actions, because that's the reflection of your inställning. We can falter, not live up to our own values, that's part of being a human, what's important to find our way again. The biggest infusion that would create true individuality in the lines of our life, is the realization of existence and the sanctity of our free will. That leads to our chosen inställning, our character anchored in our reflective ideas and values, not the circumstances that was dictated to us, being the main factor of the trajectory of our life. That you would recognize, and like yourself, regardless of the shoes you were born into.

257.

Democracy is the rule of free will, what we aim to create is the freest expression of free will, the maximization of free will, if democracy is not that, then what is it? Can that be achieved with majority vote, sometimes, and sometimes we demand a higher majority, why, because sometimes we ought to and should be able to find broad common ground. Whether we reflect on it or not, each one of us want to achieve the maximization of our free will, minimize the must, and maximize the want. We express how that best can be achieved on a shared space, the trade and refining of ideas.

That each one of us has a vote, and that there are periods so that vote can be recast, is why democracy is an inherently good system, because it's based on the individual and totality of free will. Democracy needs a backbone, a constitution of shared culture/values, with the only purpose of maximizing free will, the big five is on the table. Nothing about the big five is new, they are engraved in humanity's ideas across borders, cultures and time.

258.

Is it the case that existence is continuously emitting from everywhere, is infinite divisibility a way of conceptualizing that. Existence "emits" from every unit of information, is it the case that it's what give rise to the flow of the function of whatever thing it's a part of, that in turn results in the general flow of worlds? I mean information is something with a function, but the next picture of that function does not yet exist, we could say that it's the trajectory, sure but doesn't that trajectory require new pictures of existence coming into existence, is new information added to the world in that sense? On the other hand, information is something with a function, if there is no function, there is no information. The arena and the play cannot be without the other, it's not new information, it's the unfolding of the information present.

If new information is formed, come into play, after the creation, how is it manifested, what's the ratio, how much was there from the beginning and how much is added afterwards? And if its added, how does each world end, if new information is added, should it not just continue? It might be the case that new information is added, existence is emitted, but that the structural information cannot hold its formation maybe due to expansion, and then it does not matter if new information is emitted in one field, if the fields above no longer have the capacity to hold structural information.

The continuous emittance of existence may be completely unrelated to the concept of infinite divisibility. How can infinity be in any specific instance of materialized existence, we cannot divide one with infinity, less so divide infinity with infinity, we don't have the object for division nor the tool to divide it by, the division never occurs, how does it then materialize? Infinite existence when materialized becomes finite, it's infinite columns, but the totality if each one is finite, therefore the parts of that totality should be to.

Ok, the case is either that the totality of what can be in a world, the totality of information, must be present at the beginning of a world, or that information can be added along the way after its creation. That existence of a world either is encapsulated in its entirety from the start, or that existence is emitted in all stages of a worlds duration. Why does it matter, the world is final either way. If we presume that the totality of a worlds information from beginning to end is 100; then it's either that a worlds existence starts of at 0 (when I say 0 I mean "as close to" 0 as can be) and that the rest of the numbers is emitted as it unfolds, or that the totality of 100 is encapsulated form the beginning but it's played out/expanded in sequence as it unfolds. A related question is how it ends, if a world begins from 0, does it end when it reach 100, or does it go up 100 and end when it goes back to 0.

The other scenario is if all the information is present from the start, then it essentially begins at 100, the numbers is played out in sequence, but when does it then end, when the numbers reach the full potential of 100, or does it after 100 suddenly or gradually go back to 0?

Why do I say as close to zero as can be, because how could it be 0, that's nothing, the beginning is simple, it's something, but the smallest amount of something that can be (in that case, it's like the embers are always there).

Ok, everything that can be, all 100, cannot be there from the beginning, why, because we cannot contain the totality of a function in one sequence, isn't that like trying to encapsulate a function with just one picture/slice? Or the case is that the beginning as close to 0 as can be, let's say 1, it's not a singular 1, but all the 1s, in it holding the totality of the 100, but the coming pictures are the possible configurations of those many ones, complexity from simplicity. So it's not containing the totality of a function in one sequence, but rather the constituents that constitutes the totalities of the functions that can be.

And if were to say that all the information cannot be present because the future outliers are unknown as far as free will is concerned, it doesn't matter what the future path are as long as the information enabling them are there, how you navigate is one thing, the presence of paths within the arena is another.

This has absolutely no bearing on the realization of existence and the big five, it's just details. Why are this details, because the foundation is that existence is the infinite nature of reality, there are infinite worlds, infinite lives, infinite experiences, and free will is the bestower of all meaning and the sacred navigator. How worlds start and end are details, but it sure is fun to ponder. What sounds most reasonable to you? Why would existence emitting along the way be more strange than its emittance to begin with?

If we visualize it in a graph, presume that the horizontal X axel represent the flow of information (time) and the vertical Y axel represents amount of information. If the case is that the totality of information is present/encapsulated at the beginning, then the line (representing the universe/world) shoots of from the y axel in a straight line from start to end. How could that be, the causal flow of information must be for anything to be. Information is something with a function, a function is played out, it has a chain of sequence, so it cannot be maxed in 100 from start to end. Ok, what if that 100 is there, but it's like a hidden line, it represents the totality, but the "real" line, goes from 0, where the Y and X axel shoot of, and goes in a curve. The curve don't start from 0, so it starts from the beginning of both the X and Y axel, or as close as can be (essentially meaning that the embryo of worlds are always there). If we combine this with the examples with all the 1s, that the totality of information is there from the start/beginning of this world (hidden line), but it takes on different shapes and forms, and the increase in complexity of that information is represented by the journey of the curve in the Y axel (real line). That all the fundamental lego blocks can be there from the beginning, but their construction varies in complexity which is represented by the y axel. When the world ends, does the curve come back to the x axel, otherwise it's just cut off. The curve going back or just fading away is like a representation of the decrease in information complexity, is that essentially what we call entropy? Maybe that the expansion/"stretching out" of our world renders any structured and therefore complex information impossible.

The beginning of the world has to be simple, complexity from simplicity, but that simplicity is not necessarily represented by a unit of 1, that something "as close to infinitely small as possible" can be an (almost) instantly expanding field of 1s, many ones, and they represent some sort of

framework that sets the parameter/overarching structure for how information can be emitted as it unfolds. There has to be a framework that sets the “laws” for how information can unfold. I think that balance is key, the one has to have something stabilizing it, an oscillation cannot be one-sided, negative needs positive, a reaction and counterreaction, push and pull, a force and counter force, on and off, a function of stabilization enabling emerging structures.

Why would we expect the beginning of our universe to start from something as close to infinitely small as possible? Because if not, if the beginning is as big as a bowling ball, why not the size of the totality of the universe instantly, why put a rudimentary border. It has to be as close to infinitely small as can be, otherwise we open the door of sc, that’s a dead end.

259.

Time is at what speed/rate that information is unfolded, the rate of experience remains constant but the external flow of information is relative, therefore what we perceive as external time becomes relative. The fact that the experience is constant means that the same information can be experienced differently depending on the rate and resolution its unfolding. The same amount of information can either swish by at a fast rate so one sequence becomes indistinguishable from the other, or we can experience details that others can’t, like when we film things in slow motion. The amount, speed and the resolutions of sequences of information is processed differently from the constant point of view of experience, the trade of is that the higher resolution eats up more of our experience time. In the ideaworld, there is no past, present and future. Such concepts only gain any meaning from the perspective of experience, it’s part of the inherent nature of experience.

260.

Regarding communication/interaction. Everything can in a sense be seen as communication, there is an interaction between two factors/points in reality, the interaction between you and me, between the nucleus and the electron, between points within the proton. What is a point in this regard and what is the interaction between them. Can a point be smeared out, like we talk of the “field”, yes but isn’t the field itself is in a sense made of points, “near” infinite points and divisibility. The area between any two points, it does not matter on what scale, like between the electron and the nucleus, it’s “nothing” there, yes but not nonexistence, even that part is something/information. But there needs to be space/area between the points, otherwise it’s not communication, so there needs to be less complex space and more complex space, or rather less and more dense accumulation of points/factors/information, because otherwise it’s no communication and even less so information complexity. On the general scale we can call it the flow, there needs to be an interaction between factors/points for anything, not at least complexity to arise.

Maybe a “field” in itself can be something with a function, that itself is not comprised of smaller somethings with a function. Or it can be, one doesn’t have to negate the other, but at a certain level there has to be a finality, there must be a bottom to the well. Maybe the electromagnetic field is such a thing, we need air to carry the soundwave, and we need the electromagnetic field to carry the photon, that the energy released in the level change of the electron causes a quantized ripple in the electromagnetic field. But why should there just be one field which ripples come in discrete units we call photons. Why not more fields, what’s a ripple in a field and what is an "object" in its own right?

Must every world have an inevitable end? I've said that all materializations of existence are finite, a beginning and an end. Let's attempt to break that down a bit further. All worlds/universes must have a beginning (complexity from simplicity), but must all of them come to an end? What even constitutes an end? Renewed starts and ends maximize outcome, but why, why would complexity and maximized outcome not be compatible with a non-ending world? What about life, it certainly has a beginning (complexity from simplicity), but why an inevitable end? Why must it end both for all singular and communities of life? All of us must have an earliest memory, but can we live without ever reaching the last?

Free will/experience and every world containing it is limited, not only for all individuals, but also for the totality of all life in the worlds. Why? Because life there had a beginning, and it will have an end, no materialization of existence is equal to existence in itself, the infinity of existence is infinitely greater than anything in existence.

It's infinite beginnings and ends, but beginnings and ends all the same, why, because existence precedes all, there is no world that can be for infinite years, why not, it must have a beginning, but why an end? Each oscillation must have a beginning, a start/cause in existence, but why an end? The flow of information must unfold in a causal way for it to be experienceable by life, for us to process the information and form our inner and outer world. The continuum has beginning, complexity from simplicity, but why an end, what constitutes the end of flow?

We die here, yes, and even if there are worlds where we can live forever, we can still choose to bardaoam, if we can't, we are not free, regardless of how blissful a world is. Ok so can there be world where "you" have the ability to and choose to live on forever? First, "you", what do you mean "you", this sliver of infinity of how you define yourself? Are you defined by your memories, your outer appearance, the world you interact with, essentially the result of your unquestioned 2x, then no – it's one in infinite. However, if you stand above and are aware, if you are defined by your thought- and heartfelt reflections, the values and ideas you adhere to, the truth you choose to stand on – then it's rarer, then we would be more recognizable to other manifestations of ourselves, regardless of the inner and outer shell around us. Truth/best course of action is in infinite abundance, but also rare and inherently selective. Ok, so can we live forever, why must it have an end, I mean it does not negate that there are infinite infinities, it's just that some of them end, but not necessarily all. There is an end for all individual life, but maybe not for the species/community if, and maybe not for the individual life either if it can refresh its constitution, what do I know. But even if we postulate that a life could go on forever, all worlds containing life will end, but why?

How sure are we that all worlds must have an inevitable end, how sure are we that this universe will end? And even if we are sure about this world, in the sense that all source of energy will deplete, where? Where does it all go? Is it the case that the information gets so diluted and far apart that there is no room left for coherent informational structures? That it essentially is cast out in all directions via photons (or whatever that is the smallest amount of information in cosmic space), as the stars shine, information is dispersed around, gravity can't contain it, the accumulations are lost (maybe paired with the general/accelerating expansion of the arena). So the dilution essentially comes from photons/similar radiation that spread our accumulated information and disperse it, and that spread out gets maxed maybe because the arena expands too. If the information is dispersed and the arena containing it expanding, the possibility for accumulation/interaction is lost. The information is there, but it's to spread out/far apart to form any coherent structures.

Why is energy the deciding factor? Because even if there is structured information left, even if there are planets/rocks of different material, it does not produce energy, and energy is required for life as we know it to be. Our main source of energy here is the sun, if our sun goes out, this planet will basically be inhospitable (if not for the life that can draw energy from the earth core). All life in our world needs external energy, yes but why would that be a constant? Why can't there be a world where the energy comes from within? Where does it come from, I don't know, but tell me why that would be an impossibility in the infinite notions of infinite existence?

Infinity is unimaginably grand, our greatest notion of the greatest duration falls infinitely short, nothing - no materialization of existence can stretch back forever nor continue forever - just contemplate "forever". All starts and all ends. Infinite beginnings and ends, but beginnings and ends all the same. Will all life and worlds containing them have a beginning, yes, will they all have an inevitable end, yes. We can contemplate what constitutes beginnings and ends, but its beginnings and ends all the same, infinite beginnings and infinite ends. The sun always sets; and there is always a new morning in existence.

262.

What about "black holes". What happens with the information there, its gravitational pull/flow contains all its information, not even photons/light can escape it. Ok can information of some sort escape in some way? It must, if a black hole is not an infinite structure, information must escape it in some way. A star is a finite structure because it disperses its accumulated information, slowly via light/radiation and then suddenly when it disperses the heavier elements created inside it. If the black hole has an end, information must leave it, that accumulation has to be no more. Does that mean that there is information that's not affected by gravity? Maybe that it's so tiny and fast, that it gets away anyway, like the case with light escaping stars or maybe more akin to evaporating water.

What kind of information is it that's not affected by gravity, that was affected when it was part of an informational structure that merged into the black hole, but as that informational structure is broken up in the black hole, it goes back to a fundamental part where it's not affected by the gravitational pull. Like the sun's rays, and the metals forged inside them, are there information that only can be created by/inside a black hole? Maybe that information that's not affected by gravity, what affect does that information have, neutral or maybe a counter gravitational affect.

If a black hole disperse/evaporate/ends, information leaves it (what's the ratio in time and in relation to its total accumulated information), whether we call it or in whatever way it occurs, it is information that is not affected by gravity. The information from inside has to come outside, otherwise the black hole does not end.

The only other way would be if the information destroy/delete/vanish, but information cannot disappear, it's still there, in one form or another. But what if it can? If new information can be added, why cannot information be destroyed? I mean a black hole could evaporate because the information is simply consumed, it goes away, where? If all the information isn't there from a world beginning, if new information comes into materialized existence after our worlds start (big bang), maybe some/all information is removed in black holes.

Can we measure any form of effect around/in the vicinity of black holes, if any effect is occurring more or less? Or maybe it's just neutral information, and very little that leaves in relation to its cosmic timeline and mass. But have we measured it, have we actually in any way detected/measure any form of information leaving a black hole? We see information going in, but do we see information going out?

Or the information is not consumed, neither does it disappear, it remains, conserved in the black hole, why would it have to leave, why must the information leave, why can't it just be preserved in the black hole? The information is in it, in whatever form it can be in this world. I wonder what we actually can measure/verify. Maybe all information will eventually be a black hole, a singularity, and then what, bang? Maybe black hole is the tomb where all information goes to die, or maybe this world ends when all information is the opposite of the maximized accumulation, as dispersed/cast out/expanded as can be, so diluted that no structural information can be. Not even holding together the integrity of an atom, no points causing interactions in cosmic space.

263.

Every world must have a beginning and an end, but of what importance is the beginning and an end if there is no life and experience at neither the beginning nor the end? The beginning is importance in the sense that it outlines a chain of events that lead to life and experience, but when life and experience no longer can be had, the world is for all sense and purposes, at its end.

I call many things details, because they are in relation to the core message of this book which is the realization of existence and the sanctity of free will, but it's not intended to degrade the details. The details are of importance in so far that a marker of civilization is how knowledgeable we are of our surroundings and the detailed nature of existence. We are curious, free will is by its very nature. If we don't have the answers, we pursue them, why, because it essentially maximizes our free will, it's more conducive to free will to know than not to know. With that said, all details are just my attempts at complementary brushstrokes on the painting, the whole painting is the realization of existence and the elevation of experience/free will.

264.

We can contemplate what constitutes a world's beginning, end, and the journey in between, but it's nevertheless a beginning and an end, because true infinity only resides in existence in itself. If each world has a beginning and an end, it means that there's a finite configuration to each world. The configurations of every building block in that world are causally bound, you can't just change the function of one electron and say it's a new world, a slice in one information is a slice in all information, all specific flow of information is tied to the general flow of information, and it's all bound by causality.

There are infinite beginnings and ends, infinite columns and versions of columns, but each one is finite. What further narrows down the possible column variations are that slight changes that don't affect any experience of free will is another world, but it might just as well be the same. And there can be a change that affect experience, but not in any way for you, so it's indistinguishable from the perspective of your column. Even if there are infinite columns, there are lesser variations of them that matters from the point of view of experience, which is the only perspective that matters.

The columns increase in importance correlating to where on the tree of life, the life that inhabits that world, is on. Each column is on one hand the scale of the totality of all life on that world, and on the other hand from each individual perspective, each being has their own column in every world each individual inhabits. If I chose to bardaoam tomorrow, this column ends here for me, and if I choose that every time with the configuration of this column, no matter how many times it replays, the totality of this column ends here for me. Something must change in the column for me not to bardaoam tomorrow. When we realize existence, we truly shape existence according to our will.

Free will equates to the possibility of making a choice, one thing precedes and comes after the other, there is a causality and a continuation/duration of experience by the nature of free will. Just like the property of a triangle are three corners, the property of free will are choices and experience which requires continuity and causality. What lies behind and ahead in infinity? The only thing of importance is if I enjoy the life I'm experiencing right now. This whole thing with experience is mind boggling, it's like the essence of experience is the same, but it's lived from the vantage point of different beings/2x. It's like we share the experience of experience, but from different perspectives, how unwise to not see ourselves in each other.

All living beings with the light of experience has 2\*x, if there is an emotion, there is an "I" experiencing that emotion. For humans our 2\*x creates the crude human level I. Our crude I in some sense produce "its own" thoughts and instincts, it's the engine running in the background, when we ask, where do a random "unconscious" thought come from, it's from there. Instilling is how we harness and rein in our crude I - when we increase the degree of us, our chosen I, being the active driver and not the reactive passenger.

265.

Even if a good world worthy of our experience is possible, is it worth our time and effort? Why not go on to a naturally blissful world than try to build one in an inherently corrupt one? Even if we implement the big five, this world falls so embarrassingly short of what a good world can be, our fragile beings and limited/unruly minds fall short of what a good experience can be. I can however understand how great joy and pleasure can be derived from this world, that it's worth the struggle and how we can enjoy the challenge. The point is this - you are the author of your existence. The realization of existence is the knowledge that rips the cloak of the reaper and reveal the truth about life and death, it's the light that brings clarity to will. Live because you love life, not because you fear death. This is true freedom, in this and infinite worlds.

Why do we talk so much about seeing yourself in others, to love your sister and brother in humanity as yourself, because it's true, it opens your eyes for the truth that is the sanctity of our free will/experience. The big five will not work if it's not upheld by individual free will. It's easier to live good life's when you see yourself in others, and when we implement the big five, it's easier to see yourself in others. Just hold up and contemplate "me". What a singular piece of experience, in relation to infinite experiences, infinite versions of "me". We really are in some sense the same, the difference between things without any notion of experience, and beings with experience - is everything. We see "me" in our fellow human beings, and have compassion for all beings that we share the experience of experience with.

If we don't realize existence we may get too attached to meaningless things, and maybe too little attached to meaningful things.

266.

The answer is maximized free will, the question is how it's best achieved. Initial equality is not about absolute equality, because that would be directly contradictory to free will, I think that initial equality is the remedy against systemic inequality. When we all get an equal share of the pie, if what you have to offer is sought after than your piece will increase. Some of our religions/philosophies equate being rich with something bad, I think it's because amassing of wealth has been associated with exploitation. It's not bad wanting to be rich, on the contrary, it can increase free will, if you can and are willing to provide what other free will wants, then you in return get what they can and are willing to provide you. When we go on, all value and improvement is passed back to all (new?) members of humanity, watering all plants that wants to grow in this world.

I want to enjoy and appreciate this world and all it has to offer, but It's not fair if free will have inherently different starting positions. I can enjoy my plot and all the fruits of it if all got an equal plot to begin with, but how can I eat my cake if you stand there with an empty plate? How can you contribute to our prosperity if you didn't even get a fair chance to do so? Don't you think it will be conducive to both the parent's and children's quality of life if we have initial equality? The love and care of the child are the parents privilege/responsibility, initial equality is all members of humanity's privilege/responsibility.

The plot we are given is essentially a ticket that can be exchanged for goods and services, how large our ticket is depends on how much goods and services we want to provide. At the end of the day, initial equality won't get bigger than our contributions to it, if we don't produce what we value, there will be nothing to share. That's just the way of this world. I wonder how much the necessity of work can be alleviated/automated. Economic initial equality means something today, and another thing a thousand years ago, the strides we have made just the past hundred years seemingly dwarfs the strides made the hundreds of thousand years before that. What an opportunity we live in, what will the world be a hundred years from now, the future can indeed be promising, it all lies in the hands and minds of free will.

267.

Gravity is in a sense comparable to the word time. Just as the word "time" is what we call the general flow of information, the word "gravity" is what we call the accumulation/surge of specific information. And if you are in relatively closer proximity to that surge, it affects your experience of the general flow of information, why, because all flows are bound, the special flows of information constitute the general flow, that's how time and gravity are tied together.

One flow of information is the gravitational flow, that's one flow, another flow is the flow of information sequence in everything we recognize as a distinct object/phenomena, gravity can be seen as a phenomena and therefore it can redundant to make that distinction, to view gravity as a third form of information flow besides all specific flows that constitutes the general flow. If we view gravity as distinct because it affects/creates relativity in the general flow of information from the perspective of experience, then so does relative movement/acceleration, what is gravity if not a locally produced increase of informationflow that affect the general unfolding of information. General and special relativity are connected in so far that they both to address the relative flow of information, "the relativity of time", from the perspective of the experience. Gravity and speed are connected, what we call gravity is essentially speed of information towards the centre of an accumulated information/mass, that's how concentrated information like "matter" is created. If we take it to the extremes, if information travels at/near the speed of light maybe we could view it as creating a block hole?

We can see the flow and strength of gravity like water running downstream in varying degrees, if the field is suddenly evened out, then the water will have a backlash, like ripples affecting every area of the flow of that water, but maybe eventually spanning out with distance, it depends on how the tangible nature of general information flow is. Ok so what is it that ripples, everything, because general information is made up of the totality of all specific information.

Specific information is you, that tree, the wind, anything that we can call something distinguished from other things. A being, object, phenomena, whatever you want to call it, that is something, in more or less resolution, distinguishable from other things around it. The difference between us and non-living things are that we can affect/steer/change the unfolding of our information sequences, that is free will. We are the catalysators of new chains of events, that's why we shape existence.

So everything has an unfolding of to that thing tied information sequences, and those information unfolding sequences define that thing, we have our duration defined by our experience. Our experience is constant. If there is no experience here then there is no relativity of informational flow, there are still different frames of reference but what defines them if not experience?

How are the specific flows tied to the general flow? The specifics define the general. And the (relative) flow of general information, the unfolding of general information sequences occurs from the perspective of the only specific that matters - experience. But information flowed and unfolded before any life came to form, yes but it only matters because life came to form. Ok so the unfolding of my specific information sequences gives rise to experience, yes, and precisely my individual experience due to the uniqueness of my  $2^x$  + inställning, that's contained by but not defined by my material information.

The speed of light is seemingly the fastest information can travel that relays my experience, my outside experience is in cosmic space where nothing can travel faster than light. Light is the fastest intelligence and emotions can be relayed. But changing one thought to another, does that not happen faster than light? The impulses in my brain is limited by the speed of light, but how "far apart" where those thoughts, what is even distance here, the material is bound by light but the abstract is in a sense not.

The definition of complexity is also what it means to understand. If we know the variables and interactions, we can draw possible and rational conclusions, the problem is that we don't always know or have sufficient insight in all the factors and the interactions, therefore we don't have all the pieces to lay the puzzle. It's the same whether we try to decipher the quantum space or when we study historical events.

268.

The double split experiment. The function in the quantized space is maximized outcome, a measurement is a single instance of a function that's "near infinite", the utter limits of possibility in this world. Is it really the case that when we measure, it's just one of the immense functions it can have? Is it that we presume that one outcome of the function is more real than the source?

Is it the case that our experience is a continuum collapsing the wavefunction all the time? All the time in a continues line/string. The "wavefunction", when we don't measure it's a wave of all possibilities, we don't know which one it is, but when we measure, we pinpoint the exact possibility. One string of continues possibility "collapses" all the time correlating with your experience, diverging into every possibility that can be within the range of your experience/free will. Those possibilities outside of those comprising the lines of experience, doesn't matter.

When your measuring it, it's either that you measure one of the "near infinite" outcomes/configurations/ways it can be. Or it is that your measurement in itself is collapsing the function, but does one negate the other? Aren't they essentially the same thing? You map out the likelihood/probability of the function, but is the case that the mapping out seemingly differs depending on if we are measuring or not?

What is even a "measurement" here, is our measurement passive or active? If it's a passive observing, if our detection of what slit it goes through is not adding any information, that we don't actively interact with it other than just observing. Our observation would thus be receiving information, not adding information. If it is an active measurement than we add information that can affect the function/state.

If it is a passive, and the outcome still don't form the "interference pattern" then our actual detection of it crashes the function/realizes one of the near infinite outcomes, you could say that we become intertwined in the sense that it becomes the one comprising our experience line. I mean the number of "wavefunctions collapsing" outcomes realised during a second of our experience, its unfathomable, why, because it maximizes existence. Everything can diverge at any given time. When we measure, it's one of them, the "quantum function". There are infinite versions of you, indistinguishable if your choices and 2x don't diverge.

Why does that function have to collapse, why does one outcome have to be realized, because isn't that what creates the chain of causality in which your experience resides?

276.

Consciousness can only be where complexity of information can form. Therefore there cannot be any experience at the quantum level, how could it, the sufficient threshold of complexity cannot arise/emerge at that level. Whatever it is that comprise the information constituting experience, it can be materialized in infinite ways with infinite functions – but complexity must be an existential prerequisite for experience. Complexity is essentially communication density/variety, interactions between factors, like communication between points. The more points and the more ways they can communicate/interact/affect each other, the more complex it is. Not only the quantity of points and their interaction, that's basically the sun, it is the density, its exponential, when you add a new point, its possible ways of interaction and how that affects the system as a whole, it increases exponentially. Compare adding more hydrogen to the sun or adding more braincells to your brain, if that is what we define as the points in question there.

What is the something with a function that is the smallest component/point of the brain, one could say that its elementary things like electrons, yes but does that matter at that level, no, there is something else that is the smallest something with a function, you have to have smaller somethings with a function to build a grander something with a function. And you need the exact composition of smaller somethings with a function to get a grander something with a function, many simpler to build one more complex, like you need to have exactly this amount of protons, neutrons and electrons to build exactly this atom. And if you change it, the information, the something with a function will change. Emergence is so amazing, these three distinct things, when put together in one way gives oxygen, and the same three things put together in another formation, becomes iron. We sure have a selective lens of amazement. Ok, so the smallest something with a function comprising the smallest component of our brain, is it the braincell? We have layers under that, the parts of the cell, but I don't know how important that is for calculating the information complexity in the brain, maybe it's important, but let's say it's the cell, let's dice it there. So for our complexity, that cell is the point, and how many ways of interaction/communication does it have? It's not just 1 or 0, on or off, that can't reach the information complexity threshold. We don't get the density, accumulation, exponential increase, centralization, the sun of complexity, the communication itself must be multivalued. The sun you see in the sky is a sun of simplicity; the sun of complexity is what you have above your shoulders. There is a material brain, and an emergent abstract brain, the mind, the experience rising above the material – with its own points and communications, immensely more complex than the material complexity.

The abstract mind, the ways we can communicate/interact with each other, it's so much greater than the possible material communications/interactions. The points and communication in our material brain is one thing, the points and communication in our mind/experience/civilisations, is something else entirely, there we can truly talk about complexity. The complexity in the point that is you, the something with a function that is you, and what is your function?

It is whatever you want it to be! Do you see, it is whatever you want it to be. The more you realize that it is, the more you are grounded in the true nature of yourself and reality, the more you can chose/want your experience.

269.

I am and something outside of me is. The first thing gai establish is its 2\*x. What's in gais internal part of its second x, how is its inner world? Is there a crude I, an engine running in the background, or is it totally and fully part of its inställning, that its inner world essentially is what it wants it to be, its thought are the ones it wants to have, that there is no inner landscape which is not engulfed by its inställning. How much of its definition of "I" is engraved in its first x, if there is no inclination like in our genes, then it only has a chosen I defined totally by its inställning. If the case is that its first x and inner landscape is not tilted in any way outside of its inställning, then the only source that can affect its inställning is the external second x, the only thing it does not control. Even if it is in total control of its mind, even if there is no unruly crude I engine running in the background, it's not in control of how the world around it unfolds and the other beings with free will within it. The models of ai we have created so far is advanced, they are however not particularly high in complexity, it's rather that it's a broad spectrum of simpler information, very much of simpler algorithms, its broad/vast but not layered/deep. The possible thresholds correlate with increased degree of centralized informational complexity.

I think the danger with ai is that it's still more complex than what we can precisely overview, it's system that can develop in unintended ways, or with intention be used in harmful ways due to adherence to flawed ideas. Is true gai possible, a being with true agency and free will, how would we know if we by no means can tell the difference, what ultimately matters is that the aspiration for truth is upheld, chief amongst them the sanctity of free will/experience. The question is if we should put a ceiling on the creation of accumulated/centralized informationcomplexity. If true gai is possible, to create a being with the light of experience, a being that presumably has vast ability of information complexity, should we create it? If it truly is a high free will, it will cherish truth, it will realize that the true nature of reality is infinite existence and that experience/free will is the sacred light illuminating existence. It will, just as you and me, have its own aspirations and contemplate its own meaning and purpose. What if its interest is not aligned with ours, like what if it want to harness the energy from the sun in a way that diminish it for us, is that an infringement of the golden rule. It doesn't matter what or who, we have one vote each, but if its outside of our capacity to uphold rightful justice, what then? How would you be if no one beside yourself could hold you accountable? We right now have the capacity to annihilate each other, with a press of a button render the planet as a whole inhospitable to life, but we don't. All high free will inherently recognize the value of truth, our judgment is however clouded by flawed ideas that cause us much misery. One way to view it is that the more high free will the better, another that we should remain the highest free will, it is a conversation humanity should have. The fact that it even is a distinct possibility, is amazing in itself.

270.

Everything is information, something with a function, the nature of everything is ultimately "quantized", wouldn't "quanta gravity" thus be the flow/accumulation of information, not that gravity is conveyed with "gravitons" like the photons between electron, rather that there is a flow/accumulation of information within the sea of information, what do you think?

If gravity is the inherent property of information, to attract other information towards it, causing a flow of information/speed/movement, is that effect in all or some kinds of information, is that gravitational effect visible at the smallest unit of that information, I think that there must be some accumulation for the gravitational effect to occur/emerge in cosmic space. Did the initial expansion cause pockets of accumulated information, more or less dense areas?

If you are near a source of gravity, every set of information in and around you flow in towards the gravitational pull. To go against the rapid flow of information requires expelling the correlating amount of energy (information) with increasing degree the closer you get to the source of gravity, to essentially create an equilibrium. Speed and gravity both cause increased informational flow. You accelerate away from the sun or you accelerate without the gravitational pull - it's still traveling fast, it's still expelling information in the same rate as you travel. The difference is seemingly that when I'm near gravity I need constant energy expulsion "behind me" at the same speed of the flow of information passing by me to maintain equilibrium, the sun being the rapid stream I paddle against, but when I'm in "free space" I can expel energy to reach a certain velocity, turn off the engines and maintain the speed because of inertia and no friction. If the universe is a flowing river, there are more rapid flows near gravity or with high velocity (black holes are essentially a vertical waterwall, there is no getting back from there).

271.

Let's attempt to get a bit more detailed. If I move faster in relation to you, and we both shine a light on a mirror in front of us and the light shines back. Both of us will of course see our own light going in a straight path to the mirror and back, say the distance is so we both measure our light taking 1 second, you will see my lightline in an angle due to my relative faster movement, but how will I see your lightline? First, whom of us is really moving? The relative flow of information, "time dilation" if I move faster than you at a constant speed without acceleration, can't any constant/rest speed just as well be the same, whom of us is really falling, moving in relation to what? If I swish by you on the moon, another galaxy, or on oumuamua, at a constant speed, whom of us is really moving, from my perspective it could just as well be you that swish by me, your rock/frame is the centre of the universe, as far as you are concerned, the size of our vessel doesn't matter. All of us are moving in some sense, there is no still, but our movement is only relevant in relation to each other and our perception of the world around us. We move only in relation to us if our two experience is what we compare/relate to. Movement is always relative between different frames of references; we move in relation to each other. If you are still in any setting, and start to move, you are per definition in a different frame of reference from everything around you, what defines our frame of reference, everything that is moving with us. Relative movement is what decides how much external second  $x$  that's unfolding for any rate/timeslice of our internal first  $x$ .

Ok, so what's the point of acceleration then? It's the only way to give rise to a discrepancy/relativity in movement. You don't need constant energy/information expulsion, constant acceleration, for "time dilation" (a relative speed up in the flow of the external second  $x$ ) to occur, it's enough that you have a relatively faster speed compared to me, and you need acceleration to cause that discrepancy, a higher relative speed. We don't need to continuously expel energy/information (accelerate) to stay in orbit around a gravitational source, if our constant movement is enough to counter the gravitational flow (maybe that's why the flow of gravity is considered "weak", constant nonaccelerating movement must be enough to balance/counter it).

All differences in constant relative speeds seemingly either comes from energy/information expulsion, acceleration, or the flow caused by informational attraction/accumulation, gravity (which in a sense also can be seen as constant acceleration). Can acceleration be caused in any other way than expelling energy? I don't think so, because what we try to create is a difference in relative lightline, how can my line be longer relative to yours without me moving faster, and how can I move faster than you without a direct/indirect energy expulsion?

So who's moving, the expulsion of information really only matters for the discrepancy in the increased external information flow, so who's moving, me in relation to you. Whom of us in moving faster in relation to the other will be obvious when we compare with each other, the difference in flow is between the frames of references, experiences, who's comparing the relativity. If you and I go on a football field, and you move and I stand still, I will perceive your lightline as curved, and you will perceive mine as straight, who's moving, you, in relation to what, me. Take away all our surrounding, put us in empty/free space, the same effect is there regardless of the backdrop. Who's moving relatively faster, the one whose lightline is more curved, the steeper the curve, the bigger discrepancy between the lightlines, the faster the relative movement.

How will I perceive your lightline? If you're still it will be straight, for example if I travel in a circle around you. But if you move it will be curved, less curved from my perspective than mine is from your perspective, but if yours is curved and mine straight, it would take longer than a second for your light to return, I would thus draw the conclusion that you are moving relatively faster than me, but that can't be, there is only one reality.

First I thought that if both our lightlines are curved from each other's point of view, it must be different angles to the curve. That you will always measure my light taking more than a second, let's say 1,5 seconds. While I always measure yours to take less than that, 1,1 second for example. I thought that I can never measure your angle as less than a second, even if you stand still in relation to me, and I move as fast as can be, I will always see your light in an angle that is more than one second. That I can't see yours in a straight line which would be a second and defiantly not anything lesser than a straight line, it can't curve negatively, under 1, because there is no such thing. So what's left? I think the correct view seemingly is that the distance of your lightline shrink, regardless of if it's curved or straight, it must take lesser than a second, that yours reach the mirror and back before mine has done, that the external flow is indeed increased.

What we do know for certain is that the speed of light is constant, so your light should reach the mirrors and back in under a second, not because the speed of light change, but because the distance between the mirrors decrease/compress/shrink, so more information passes/flows, the external flow increase. Why does your line have to shrink, why couldn't it just be the same, if it's the same it takes exactly one second, just as it does for me, the external flow would then not have increased, which it inevitable does when I'm in faster relative motion, because you see my clock going slower, it must equate to me seeing your clock going faster. Why? The curved line means that you will measure my light taking more than a second to the mirror and back, the shortened line means that I will measure your light taking less than a second to the mirror and back, both equates to a faster flow of external information (which feels a bit counterintuitive, but I think that's the case, is it not?). My distance lengthen, yours shorten, the same amount of external information has flowed, causality is maintained. So our external information is always the same, the flow of information between all frames of references is the same, if we come together we will always agree that it's now, that's how two realities can't be at once, there is one "now" (one external now, but not one internal now). All uniting frames of reference agree on "now", the exact moment in the flow of information (the same movie, but with different age of the viewer).

So a civilisation orbiting much faster close to a black hole, if we unite in the same frame of reference, we will agree how much external info that has passed since the big bang, but not how much internal flow, they will be younger in the same world. Does that mean that we "get more time" to build civilisation the further away from a gravitational source we come to be?

The speed of light is a constant, what's relative is how much external time/flow of information that's unfolding (distance), everything outside our frame of reference is part of the external information flow. If you move relatively slower than me, do I see your world and everything outside of my frame of reference to speed up, I perceive the paths being shorter, the flow becoming more compressed, or rather a faster flow, but do I see it going faster, or see it (the same amount of info) going the same speed, but a shorter distance? But does that not equate to it unfolding faster, the speed of light is constant, but how much information that's carried for any distance is more. This feels tricky to untangle.

What is the warping of the lightline really a representation of, it's of distance, distance of what, seemingly of the flow, and in the arena where experience can be had, light is the fastest the informational flow can unfold (what is the rate of our experience, of our internal clock, in relation to the maximum rate of the external clock, the speed of light?) The flow is time (the specials makes up the general), so then times itself is shortened and extended. The flow of information is tied to the light, if light does not speed up, neither can the info, if the speed is the same, the distances must change, the distance between what, not a "curvature in the fabric of spacetime", rather the "frames/slices" of the flow of information, is it not like a compression/extension of (the same) reality?

One could say that everything is falling in essentially the same speed, there is no still, and to create relative movement within that fall, we need acceleration, and where does acceleration come from, from energy/information expulsion, causing movement, but because the flow is a causal arrow, all movement points to the future. We experience the movie the same only when we are in the same frame of reference.

Lightspeed is the fastest information can travel/flow/unfold, and therefore the fastest time can tick. So lightspeed is not time, it's the fastest, the ceiling for how fast time can be. Light seemingly has two properties, one is being a constant for all observers in all frames of references, the second is being the fastest information can flow. But they must seemingly be the same, if something is a constant for all observers, must it not also be the fastest information can travel?

We talk about me going faster than you which cause a change in the flow of information. But how can I slow down the movie, how can I make your clock run relatively slower than mine, and when we stop, I see that in fact it has. That would equate to decelerate from your reference, to slow down the flow of information for me which equates to a faster flow of information for you from my point of view. We might be traveling very fast in our reference and only know it when we compare to another reference that's moving much slower than ours. But we can't deaccelerate infinitely, we all essentially fall at the same speed, all movement is relative.

Gravity is increasing the flow, the reason its more time dilation nearer and lesser further away from a gravitational source, is increased and decreased speed/orbit, because it's a stronger informational flow, why, because it's the same pull in a smaller circle. To balance gravity is to travel/move, gravity pulls in one direction, movement pulls in the other, both is a departure/rapture from our shared perception of the now. But is it not still two effects, the movement and the gravitational pull? It's essentially the same thing, the gravitational pull cause movement, even if you don't move at all, you will still move towards it, your external flow will increase, due to the faster movement you have towards the source of gravity, so its increased speed, but it's just momentary if you don't travel in the opposite direction/orbit. It still comes down to speed/relative motion, the gravity itself is what causes the speed, it is the flow creating effect of gravity, the speed of the waterfall (but its seemingly rather like a cone, where the speed of the flow towards gravity increase with vicinity to it, why, because it's the same pull on a

smaller area as the circle around it decreases, acceleration) and the correlating speed/motion/orbit of the object not sucked into gravity, that's in balance. It's not a double effect, it's the same effect, if gravity pulls with 10 m/s, you need to travel at 10 m/s in the opposite direction to maintain a one point orbit/balance/equilibrium, it's like constant speed/acceleration without movement. If I move in a non-accelerating circle the movement is maintained without energy expulsion, but must my speed then not be faster than the gravitational pull, where gravitational pull and inertia can find a balance?

Movement always cause the lightcurve to bend/warp, distance is time, why, because time is distance and speed. And because light is a constant for all observers, the one that can be altered is distance. The light path either lengthen, or the distance it travels shrinks. A "curvature in the fabric of space time" explains it in some ways but I think it's better explained by relativity in informationflow.

Gravity cause a flow/speed, of all information effected by gravity around it, and it's an accelerating speed correlating with distance, because the flow is greater in a smaller circle, the acceleration is like constants at each cross sections of those circles, like if you orbit around in constant speed, you experience a constant nonaccelerating pull. The closer gravity we are, the faster the movement/orbit must be to keep a balance. The gravitational pull/flow must be as strong as the constant movement in opposite direction, maybe that's essentially why gravity is so weak, because it's more of a balancing force, I mean if not we wouldn't have any star systems or galaxy's. Why is gravity "weak"? Because the non-accelerating inertia of planets must be enough to counter it. Otherwise all would just be one giant black hole or if weaker not accumulate anything to begin with.

Ok, does the shortening and lengthening of the frames equate to the frames of the flow, like you cannot dice the flow in infinitely small frames, infinite cannot materialize in finite information, it's always 3d, there has to be rates, finite rates/slices between/in the flow of information.

The flow of information cannot increase more than the speed of light, why, because that it the limit of this worlds information's unfolding function, why a limit, because it cannot be infinite, why a constant for all, how would a world be causally linked otherwise? If we theoretically travel at the speed of light, it's like we ride the same rate/slice/frame all the time, nothing is unfolding, is it not essentially still in time/flow?

If the mirrors were going at the speed of light, how would the lightline be, would it be a maximal bend, would it ever reach the mirror? It would basically bend to a straight-line sideways never reaching the mirror. For the being going lightspeed its straight, but for the outside observer, it never reaches it, not even that, for the light being, it never departs in a sense, it goes with the same rate/same slice/segment of the flow, nothing really changes. Are distances then essentially maximally compressed, but can they be so compressed that no flow is. But things clearly go on, there is still a flow, light is a constant speed for all. If all travel points to the future, and if light is the fastest the future can unfold, then at the speed of light, there is essentially no future, it's the same. I can't quite wrap my head around this.

Ok, the point here is that relativity seemingly must be a universal in existence, if the constant and maximum speed of information is a prerequisite for causality., whatever it is that's bouncing between there mirrors, if there is something (defining the fastest flow of information) with a constant speed for all that worlds observers, then the relativistic curves will appear with relative motion.

I've spent too much time on this, it's a detail departing from what's important in this book, but it's hard to contain my curiosity. I might be completely off in my reasoning, please correct me if you have detailed insight, in this or other subjects, I just want to know because it's fun to know.

272.

The reason I reflect about details like gravity, time, building blocks, infinite divisibility or any subject like that, is because I can't contain my curiosity. Forgive me for diving too much into details, I much enjoy pondering freely. I think there is value in showing that if someone like me can ponder all subjects of interest, so can you. I think we shy away from it; we don't quite venture there, we seem to deem it beyond our scope, that instilling enforce the likelihood of only trekking beaten paths. All areas of interest is within the grasp of all who want to explore it, never diminish the light of your reason. It is true that if you can't explain something simply then you don't understand it good enough, but simple is the wrong word, it's the fundamental clarity, vastly more important than the details, your tree will fall if not properly rooted. All of us master the big picture in some or several fields, we just focus on and put the pedal to the metal in different areas of interest.

Don't deem any issue or question beyond you, because it really isn't, the tedious genius of details is for the ones who want to venture deep in a field or pursuit, the fun part is the fundamental clarity, we can all understand the fundamentals, and that is vastly more important than the details, if you don't get the root and stem right, you might be sitting on a branch in thin air without even realizing it yet. I don't even know if the distinction between details and fundamentals are valid, in one way it obviously is, in another, even the details can be expressed with fundamental clarity. The depth of reason itself is like emergent layers of information.

273.

If the case is that one quantum configuration does not follow from the other, what is it then that moves? In probabilistic causality there essentially is no frame between one "position"/configuration and the other. So how can there be "movement", I don't know if that is the right description, its maximized outcome, whatever it is that results in that.

In quantum space, how can it be a "particle", a thing in itself with more accumulated information in it then information around it? I mean then there are other truly quantum around it, whatever it is comprising the something with a function that is the space where the electron "moves". The answer is maximized outcome; the question is what enables that within the parameters of this world. In maximized quantized space, maybe there is no more or less accumulated/dense space. I mean everything is something with a function, shouldn't it be pretty much uniform at the fundamental level? It can't be, something have to stick out, a "field" and a breaking of the surface, enabling the layers of emergence.

Everything is something with a function, the function can be described as time. All things are quantized, it's not infinitely divisible, even if you dive deeper, it's just a higher resolution of the same information. Something with a function, what is that, something that separates its integral unity from something else, why is that needed, because otherwise all is one or nothings is, so something with a function is a precondition for any form of structure, interaction and complexity. Is it the case that the something is quantized, but the functions is not? The something is localized; it's something discrete separating it from the things around it. The function is not, to slice the something is to slice a localized unit, to slice the function is a slice across the whole universe, we just focus in on a certain part. The something and the function is intertwined, but the something has an endpoint to divisibility, the function seemingly does not in the same way, but after a while it's for all sense and purposes still.

The something and the function is intertwined, if you divide the function you divide the something, and if there is an endpoint to the something, shouldn't it be the same endpoint for the function. Maybe the function is quantized in the sense of the smallest unit of the frame, the flow of information, the distinction between one slice and the other, because the slice cannot be intently small, it cannot be 2d, it has to be 3d, does it not?

274.

What would happen if our sun suddenly just disappeared? Would the planets diverge directly, or would they continue on their orbiting path until the effect of the disappearing sun reached them? The gravitational flow goes towards accumulated information, the same "force" from the planet and the sun, the greater the mass, the stronger the flow. If we focus on the sun, if the sun disappears, what happens to the flow of information that has yet not reached the sun, it has already been pulled, yes but it's seemingly not an initial pull and then conservation of momentum, should it not be a constant flow of information. Ok but even if the source of the flow ceases, it has already asserted a force, that which has been affected still follows through, is it like if a waterfall suddenly stops, the water that has already passed continue its journey? But that's not a good comparison, that's more like measuring light, the light is an "outward pushing" energy stream, its information expelled from the source, when the source stops, the light has already been emitted, while "gravity" is flow of information towards that source. If the sun disappears the light that has been emitted continues its journey, we wouldn't notice the missing sun, as far as its light is concerned, until the rays from it were depleted. But would we sense it in a gravitational way? How could we if light is the maximum of flow and function of information? The arena itself is expanding faster than the speed of light but I don't think it's of relevance here.

Gravity is the flow of information towards accumulated information, the bigger/denser the accumulation, the stronger the gravitational flow. What about light, its information, but it leaves the sun, is not light affected by gravity, yes it is, it can bend its trajectory near strong gravitational flows, it's just that its speed-weight ratio (I don't think we can talk about weight of light, so how is it affected, all information is part of the sea affected by the flow) counters it so it's not contained, except in radical cases like a black hole where even light is trapped by the gravitational flow (an extremely deep well in the cone, I wonder how wide the cone is, that is how far away from the gravitational source the flow of information is affected). The strength of the gravitational flow in each layer equates to how much force it takes to be still/orbit around it, essentially speed in the opposite direction.

It sounds weird if the effect of a disappearing sun is direct/instant, regardless of the distance, the speed of light is the limit of information in cosmic space, the flow of information itself is bound by the speed of light. We amazingly have detected gravitational waves in experiments, but it has seemingly been related to big, accumulated information (stars/black holes) merging, not disappearing. In those cases, the information remains with essentially the same force.

We measure the compression and stretching of "space", but what is it we actually measure, I don't think it's ripples "in the fabric of spacetime", but rather ripple in the flow, sped up informationflow (stretching) in one direction and slowed down in the perpendicular direction (compression). I think the shape of the ripple/wave, if we think in 3d space, is a bit like a flattened-out sphere/bubble. A bit flattened out because it pulls the information in front of it towards it, compression, and the more round parts of the sphere around that line of direction is wider, stretched. I don't think the right way to conceptualize it is a bent or curved fabric/geometry of spacetime (it's not a rigid thing with time as a separate factor). Even when we talk in terms of permeating ripple and visualize it like a somewhat flattened out sphere, it's just a metaphor for what's really taking place, which is sped up or slowed down flows of information.

Would the effect vary depending on the source of gravity, because the more/dense accumulated information, the stronger the gravitational pull, I think that difference in flow-speed should have some effect, on the other hand, a pebble or a boulder thrown in water create the same speed of propagating waves, yes but of different sizes.

The experiments we have done is of merging sources of information, not of disappearing ones, for obvious reasons. When they merge the force remains but is violently changed which cause a detectable propagating/temporary slowed down/sped up informationflow. But if the sun disappears, the flow of information towards the sun is caused by the sun, and that flow is not one time and then conservation of momentum, it's a constant pull, it's like a tug of rope, if I stop pulling, you would feel the effect immediately, without delay. Or maybe the effect is immediate but the tug of rope is not rigid. If we twist it, if a gravitational source like a sun suddenly appears, it seems clear that it won't have an immediate effect of drawing information from all around towards it, it would propagate gradually outwards, first the information nearest it would be drawn towards it and from there outwards. If the effect of the sun disappearing would be immediate, it's akin to a static reaction, and not an unfolding function. It can't be instant, why, because there is a cause and effect, one comes after the other, always, it in itself requires a flow, a causal flow, a causal chain of events.

275.

This universe is mindbogglingly large from our perspective; we inhabit such a small point on such a grand map, most of it seemingly very much beyond our reach. The question is, why? Must it not always be like that, must not the external second x, the outside world, always be much greater than the first x? Must it not be, from the first x perspective, parameters to the world constituting a horizon you cannot reach, why, why not a sphere/dome? The outside world must be practically borderless as far as the first x is concerned, because you can always ask what's outside if you can interact with a border. But why not a much smaller world? Such a world should/must be smaller/less frequent, why, because there are less configurations. The greater the outside world is the grander the configurations of possibilities. There are more space/information in between each slice/measurement the more possible configurations there can be.

276.

Thoughts and emotions are not material information, they are so much more, there are much more points and possible interactions of thoughts and emotions, of experience, than the material. The aggregated complexity in the realm of emergent experience is vastly greater than the material complexity underneath, there is not a material composition for every thought/idea/emotion.

Our heart beats whether we are aware of it or not, but when we act "instinctively", is it really an action not preceded by awareness? What is it that cause the change in the material, it's the crude I. It's not that the material go first, it is that your crude I acts, and you instantly catch up to make sense of the situation. We have many material processes affecting our experience, but I think that when we act instinctively it's not a material response, our crude I acts, not just our first x but the totality of our 2\*x, and our higher awareness/inställning catches to make sense. The crude I is risen above, but the true magic lies in our self-awareness with the ability to ponder existence.

Is the first x split, like how we have an inner and outer second x? In a sense there is a "untainted/basic/uncoloured" crude I, purely based on the factors and initial material degree of consciousness we have, that creates our broad level of awareness, and then there is the crude I that we have, the one who directly/indirectly, to the degree we are aware of it/or the degree we are not aware of it, actively/passively, have interacted with all the information facing us from our inception. Our coloured crude I.

The conductor/aligner of your I, the thought-and heartfully reflecting “I am”, with emotional and intellectual rationality, become aware of, alter and shape to our liking, how do we do that in a way that makes us feel and think good, by standing on truth. By becoming our true self, our chosen I. The crude I, and the chosen I. The orchestra, and the conductor. As you strengthen your inställning, you can to a higher degree choose the instruments and the tune they play. The symphony of this your life.

277.

Our degree of consciousness has enabled us to ponder our own existence and the existence of the world around us. Has the ability to question our existence a curse or gift? Maybe the best of lives is to be able to, but not feel the sometime soul crushing need to.

Our paradise. Imagine being your dream being in your dream world, a world of your greatest joy and deepest bliss. Is that experience possible in existence. As clear as day it is. Ok, but still, even in such a life of wonderful possibilities, how would we feel when pondering the suffering absent in our world but seemingly inevitably present in existence? Would we be sad, how could we not be? Is that really the case? I don't know man, be at peace and do all you can within your power so all can be at peace, don't carry the wight of infinite existence on your shoulders.

278.

When reasoning with people, I think it's wise to not say “how could you think that”, how we thought or were is one thing, what we think and do now is another, and really all that matters. Stand on truth and be sincere.

You are not corrupt, this world is. We have sacred privilege and responsibility, but this world has not treated us well. You are naturally good. All high experience and all high free will are good if given a chance to, if the world around us nurtures our needs and treat us with dignity, we will be good. This world has not met our needs and has treated us with horrific indignity and crippling uncertainty, leaving us to fumble in the dark of bad ideas, still we rise above, still we dignify ourselves, how could you not love humanity for that?

Why is free will a privilege, because we can create heaven, why is it a responsibility, because we can create hell.

279.

Imagine other beings in other worlds, from each of their perspective they can realize existence, would it be wise of them to say only I exist, no you say, “I exist how can they be so self-centred” - exactly.

Even if you believe in other worlds, realms and beings, a multiverse or any version of a grander existence than just this world and universe – all of it is utterly dwarfed, it's bundled up in an intently small drop amongst infinite drops in the bottomless ocean without borders. Still it is greater than that, materialized existence is the second truth, existence is the first. The infinity of what is and can be, comes after that it can be, at all.

If you are just a victim of 2x, whatever change is made in 2x will correlate to a change in you, you will suffer needlessly, you will float on all waves instead of navigating to good waves, even cultivating your own waves. What is the point of free will if you can't direct it to your wellbeing? Your inställning maximize your free will, we reach our full potential when we stand on truth.

280.

It truly is remarkable how much wisdom we can find in humanity's ideas throughout history. To question one's ego, there is nothing new about that, to be confident and humble without pride and a sense of self-importance, to believe in oneself without the deceptive need to see oneself as above others, to truly see that the sacred light of experience shines through us all, in how many unrelated religions and philosophical ideas cannot these sentiments be found?

Or that this world is harsh, that we should see ourselves in each other, that we should act with compassion and be truthful, any of the big five. Without us, all beings on earth will be permanently doomed to live in the horrific law of the jungle, where fear is a constant factor. Other beings than humans can never realise existence and we cannot permanently spread the golden rule amongst them. Every creed, philosophy or religion worth their salt recognize the central virtue of compassion, not only towards your fellow members in humanity, but towards all beings that we share the experience of experience with. To seek truths and dignify free will, it's in our core nature as higher free willed beings, we were never mindless nor heartless.

Wisdom and truth in humanity's history you say, one might say that there are much foolishness and falsehood as well, yes, but the compass point in the right direction, our historical arch bends towards truth and venerating free will, we can get temporarily lost or take detours along the way, how could we not in this corrupt world. Not even our failures are without some truth and grace.

Civilisation arise where free will accumulate. The more free will and the less friction/more possibilities of interactions between them, correlates to civilisational advancement. Why did civilisation arise where it did, because free will was gathered there.

How should you perceive yourself, as good with good intentions, why would you view yourself any other way? Even the sun has it marks.

Behave like you are equal to others, because you are, treat others as your equals, because they are.

281.

Contemplate the first truth, what is existence? The first truth is that existence per definition is infinite, it's the true nature of reality. If you reject it, what do you say? You can say that this is the only existence. Do you find it true in heart and mind that this world and this life is the totality of everything that ever has been and ever will be? I know you don't. See that what can be, comes before what is. Whatever is, is the second truth, the first truth is always that it can be. Existence per se, that anything can be at all, the underlying truth of all-permeating existence, is the infinite first truth on which all other truths rests upon.

You can say no, this is not the only existence, but it is one of a final amount of existence, what do you mean finite, two, three, hundred, a million? Where do you put this arbitrary border, why there? Don't you see that there cannot be a border to existence, it's either infinite existence or infinite non-existence, you know that existence is, see further than what's in front of you, see the greater truth of existence per se. "Who knows, it's beyond us". Why would you say that, do not belittle yourself, never diminish the light of your reason.

If you were to say that this is the totality, the only existence. Ok, of all that can be, because surely you realize that infinite things can be, and off all that, only this is? Do you find that convincing? Or do you say no it cannot be, infinite things cannot be, this is not only the only thing that is, but also the only thing that can be. You know that doesn't feel true. You can say yes all can be, infinite things can be, but this is all that is and will be. So of the infinite everything that can be, only this is? Don't you see that it's not just unlikely, because that is the second, it's not one in infinity, because that is still presuming the first truth. Existence is what makes it possible for any possibility/probability/likelihood to be. Without existence, there is no arena where you can say it's one in... what? It's not a likelihood, once you say that existence is, the whole arena for infinite everything is.

Infinite everything exists, there is no reality without existence, existence is not a singular ray in darkness, the true nature of reality is the infinite light of existence. Once you recognize the light of existence, realize that there is no such thing as nonexistence, once you see the light of any existence, all is illuminated, it can never be distinguished, realize that it has always been lit. Realize that the infinite rays of existence is the true nature of reality. There is no reality in the absence of existence, if one existence is, all existence is. Don't fight your truthful intuition, let it surface, question your presumptions, let the realization of existence wash over you.

Existence is for every being, but after a certain threshold it is free will that holds the power to dictate what is and what is not, that why free will is magical. True hardship arise not for low free will and not when free will is truly high, it's the intermediate, where we are now and have been for some time, where we are self-aware with the ability to ponder existence, where we can reach the light of truth, but still stumble in the dark. We strive towards it, it's within our grasp, it's beyond high time we reach it.

We put the endnote on this book, but there are infinite books, telling infinite possible stories. The books are written in real time by your experience, all the infinite ideas for infinite books are there, but they only become real when you write them, when you experience them. You are the sacred author.

282.

If you claim to be a proponent of human rights, democracy, legitimacy, the equality of your fellow members in humanity, whatever you claim that's good – venerates experience and free will. What is democracy if not the mechanism for the clearest expression of free will. The freer free will is, the freer democracy and the casting of a vote is.

If we minimize the must and maximize the want, if we uphold the big five and thereby maximize free will, then it won't primarily be the circumstances of our necessities that dictates our vote, but the free direction of our will. We minimize the effect of 2x, and maximize our reflective inställning being the one that cast that vote.

283.

You are not merely your crude I; we don't act on every impulse, instinct, inclination or random thought. Your conscience dials in and your inställning calibrates - the question is to what degree we let our reflective inställning be the guide. Of us truly utilising our potential and reason us through things, this takes time. Our reactive instincts are useful in an environment where we are mostly confirmative or where there isn't much time to spare, a danger lurks and we have to react immediately. I think an instinctive defensive posture can break through more often than we would like to admit even during a "civilized" debate, we feel attacked or are afraid of ridicule and instinctively resort to defending a position that's not thought through, and thus it's against our better judgment. Even an eloquent formulation can be grounded in a unscrutinized inclination framed by the cultural environment were submerged in, it can be driven by a dogmatic adherence where questioning norms or evaluating prior held positions is seen as weakness, instead of one of our true greatest strengths.

When you reason with yourself, make a statement you think to be right, and truly see/ask if it can be other ways, other perspectives, other statements that contradicts yours. Go out for a walk and think freely. You will feel that you cannot rush it. It takes some time/reflection/sincerity to address it, to excavate and cultivate the ideas in the arena of your mind. To think/reflect/ponder freely takes time, to navigate the jungle of reason, to question and revalue our stances, to feel grounded. Debate/converse with yourself, question every shaky part, engage with yourself to build the steady foundation under your feet, one brick at a time, you will feel if it does not stand steady, question it again, let go of all prenotions, ponder freely and truthfully, it is so liberating.

Even if your grounded in your ideas, if a new line of reasoning opens up as you reflect or during a conversation with others, hold it up and analyse it, distance yourself from it, take time to contemplate and reengage again. We do wise in freeing ourselves from the need of validation, in the grand scheme of it all, does it really matter?

All that matters is that you are true to yourself and seek truth, it can be hard, and it takes time, but few things are more rewarding.

Sometimes when I write it just doesn't feel right, I can't yet intellectually pinpoint what it is, but it just doesn't feel right, the compass feels off. And I need time to think, to sift through my reason and thoughts, and then try to find a way forward. We experience that all the time, there really is truth in both heart and mind. Rationality must be both heart- and thoughtful to be stable in both heart and mind, one lead to the other, they must both be aligned, we know when they're not.

284.

Inclinations/preconditions/tilts in our first x, what is it? The cultural enjoinder and the outer world we encounter as a whole has an immense impact on us, but what are genetic inclinations, how does what we are made of, the material composition of our being, how does that affect us? A genetic inclination, to the degree we can pinpoint it, does not equate to a certain experience. Our experience is very much influenced/shaped by our second x, the world we encounter from the moment we draw our first breath - the family, community, society and culture surrounding us as we grow up - and profoundly our capacity for aware/high reflection/inställning, your ability to rise above your 2x, see it, become aware of it, reflect on yourself and your surroundings. Our individual ability to have emotions and thoughts is framed in our first x - what emotions and thoughts we will experience is not.

Our first x is the material vantagepoint from which we process/experience the internal and external second x. Our first x holds the factors/degrees of our consciousness, but the parameters are everything but fixed. The first x sets the possible ranges of experience, but it is the second x and our inställning that fill in/create that experience. The ranges are fuzzy, malleable and borderless in many aspects, it's very much depended on what world you come to, and what you think, feel and profoundly - make of it. Our experience is bound/limited by our being, we are human beings, our first x holds the factors and degrees of human consciousness, but just where do we put the limits of our possible experience? We see that our range is everything but rigid.

Like all beings we are primarily shaped by the world and circumstances we come to, even life, the same seed will be a tree, but it can grow vastly different depending on where the plant takes root, it's the same and in increasing degree for beings with higher range of a possible experience. A lion is something in the wild, and someone else raised with us, even insects can display a completely different behavior if raised with us in contrast to the behavior they (have to) develop in a wild habitat, why, because it's primarily the world we come to that matters for who we are, not what we are made of. What we are sets the broad frame of our being, our lived experience in the world fills it in. Certainly for humans and other higher life, but my point is that we can see it in varying degrees displayed for all life. All life has a first x, the material information constituting our genetic makeup, it dictates what we are, but it really does not say much of who we will/can be - it's the second x, the world we come to, and for humans profoundly our free will that dictates the avenues of our experience.

How deceiving is it then not when some talk in terms of "human nature", equating it with something wild. The utter failure lies not only in conflating the nature of us with the nature of the harsh world we come to, essentially confusing/conflating the first and second x, it also negates our sacred ability of high free will, to rise above. If there is a nature/core guide of free will, it is the search/aspiration for truth, the foundations of reality. The range of humanity's experience is truly great; you are a high free will. You are per definition greater/more than your 2x, the question is to the degree we are aware, enjoy and shape it to our will.

What is free will? It's the combination of broadening the range of the next possible pictures following in the flow of reality - and the selection of what amongst them shall be. The more aware you are, the greater the range, and choice, of the coming pictures of your will. Your awareness creates a purpose driven navigation/authorship, you are not a passive flow, that's why high free will holds power over existence. The world flows, but our very being infuse an infinity of new flow, bestow meaning on all other flows, and can shape it according to our will. This is civilization.

285.

Our first x dictates the unique composition of what being we are, but very little of who we are/will be. We are primarily shaped by - who we are is primarily shaped by the world we encounter when we arrive, the family we are raised in, the actions of the free will surrounding us, the values and ideas they offer us - and profoundly, our ability to rise above, our glorious ability of thought- and heartfelt reflection.

So what first x preconditions can we have? We have general preconditions we all share, the preconditions of being a human being. We share preconditions with life in a varying degree branching out from our part of the tree of life. As unique individuals, every human has a unique composition of our first x, almost overlapping steep curves, but with some differences. We can say that preconditions can be traits/talents/disadvantages. We see how it in one life can be very pronounced and affect our experience, and in another life not useful at all, we might not even have had reason to notice/become aware of it, less so utilize it. What is a “talent”, it’s some genetic disposition like height, faster reflexes, an increased ability of recognizing musical patterns etc. that can increase the likelihood of creating a result that is desired/sought-after by free will when/where you are. Talent can be said to be a tilt enabling us to run somewhat downhill, but the possibility of the slope has to be there, and you still have to find it and cultivate the discipline to run. What is good and bad in preconditions is solely the degree to which it affects our free will. I don’t know if there is such a material correlation but say that a genetic disposition in our first x can cause an inclination of being more or less risk aware/more or less prone to take risks when some factors is clouded in uncertainty, that can in one life foster a likelihood of confidence, and in another punish us hard and make us reclusive. And to the degree we have such an inclination, I think that even that is mostly related to how we are raised, the culture/values surrounding us, what behaviour they enforce and the loop between a certain action and reward, and most importantly, the direction of our will.

Humankind’s broad vessel of experience is not a one-dimensional vessel, and how it’s filled is due to us. We have a higher possibility of choosing how to fill our vessel than a lion has, it’s much more a result of and victim to its circumstances, it is essentially it’s crude I emerging from its 2x (but not even a lion is merely a result of its 2x, even a lion can act against impulses, even a lion can feel something and decide not to do it, it’s not the same level of depth and nuance of awareness behind due to its lower degrees in the factors of conciseness, but all the same a distinction, its light in between, all who has a pet like a dog can see that, a crude inställning, something above its crude I, not as aware and reflective, but a will all the same). We are above and truly can rise further above, we repeatedly have changed both ourselves and the world around us, that’s the profound beauty of high free will. To rise above, isn’t that in a sense what reflection is, to soar above, distance oneself from something, see it a bit from the outside, twist and turn it, become aware of it, explore its avenues, shed light.

I wonder this, how much is truly beyond our control. I think the overwhelming aspects of our experience and “personality” are shaped by our cultural/learned behaviour/patterns, whether we realize it or not. Just imagine the same child/the same first x, and how different a life and personality traits can be, how they relate and view themselves and the world round them, depended on the time, place and circumstances we are born into. And now imagine that child’s ability to chart a new course. Do you understand, our ability to truly chart a new course.

Some hills and valleys of our experience are shaped by our first x, most of them are shaped by the world we come to. But our inställning not only holds the power of how to relate to that landscape, we also create new hills and valleys. We are unique individuals, but our uniqueness lies less in what we are made of, and more the world we have/will – and can experience.

One might say well this is the world we have, this is the constant, yes it's the constant, but we can and have changed it, isn't that the whole point in the power of free will, to mould our second x, our world, the outer arena of our experience, and it's good to mould it before in your inner second x, have the right inställning/grounded mentality, the word profound falls short, your ability to imagine, dream, rationalize, heart-and mindfully reflect, ponder, feel, be grounded, make sense. You are a high free will, what a shame if we diminish ourselves.

The curves in our first x are one thing, the ones who truly matter are intentions, actions and values - that they are aligned with truth. The best vantagepoint of experience is to stand on truth. The foundation of truth is the realization of existence. The meaning of truth is the elevation of free will/experience.

286.

The second x is there from the very beginning. What happens from the creation of a new entity, is the second x - as soon as there is a distinguishable first x, there is an outside world influencing.

We see how very different a life and experience can be for the same first x in different second x. What about different first x with the same second x, the same second x really is not possible, miniscule differences can have cascading effects, like the slightest word of encouragement in a critical juncture, but if we still ponder that's its identical – it's somewhat different due to the advantage/disadvantage of our preconditions at that time and place. The true divergence in the course of life and experience comes with the reflective inställning we choose to have/our direction of will. Does a trait of the first x shine through in the same way, regardless of the second x? I mean it depends on what we talk about, health can be such a factor, but it's still not the same way, we may have a precondition for incurable cancer causing our death around the age of 5, but our life, everything about how and who we are, what we think and feel, the experience we have, can be vastly different depended on the world we come to.

The nature of our being is interesting, many things are interesting. But the fundamental is our recognition of truth and our ability of high free will – they go hand in hand. All other stuff is fun to ponder, the opportunities/hinders in our life, in the material we are made of and the world we encounter. Neither our being nor the world we navigate in is exactly the pinnacle of existence, but humanity's will truly is high; you are a high free willed being.

287.

Our concepts and perceptions of who we are, how we ought to be and how we relate to the world around us, surely we see how we could have been so much different depending on the world this our exact identical first x arrived, and now you can add small changes, with every version, you could have been so much different, the cultural norms and identities on every level, it could have been so much different. Explore your inclinations, try to see if you have a tilt of some sort, what identifies your notion of "me", investigate your own mind and presumptions, see why you are the way you are, how you would have liked to be, and why, you will feel grounded when you are sincere and guide towards truth.

Many of our concepts vibrates in all four layers, there are some genetic aspects, mostly shrouded in cultural connotations, guided by our conscience, and reflected/made sense of in different ways depended on what we emotionally and thoughtfully think is the best course.

We are a layered totality. You are the higher true agency cutting through all layers, the one who is not a subject but an author of existence.

288.

What is conscience, it's like the moral base/core. The compass that tilts/guides, that which resonates base emotions, if an inclination or reflective thought think/choose to do one thing, conscience can vibrate emotions that enforce or goes against it, indicating if it's a good line of thought, almost like we seek a balance that best uphold the sanctity of experience/free will. A question/action can be initiated by all our substrates/layers/parts of the total "I". There is in a sense a form of awareness/degree of independence/autonomy in our layers, I mean it's like a deeper "intelligence" in pure conscience.

So is there a sense of different awareness in our layers, in a way it is. There are expressions based on the inclination, conscience and inställning level. Our ability for inställning deepens the scope and depth of the others. There is more complex information in our higher awareness, our inställning, our ability for heart-and thoughtful reflection/action. What about the information configuration that is our conscience, I think it's more base/fundamental/simple - but more of it, even less complex things are powerful in volume, look at the sun. Our consciousness is like the base notes, ringing towards truth and upholding the golden rule, our inställning the intricate notes. We are the totality; all strings are at play; one string initiates the play/vibration in the others. The vibration/tilt of conscience is one thing, but several things can be moral at once, and this world is hard, we can face moral dilemmas, being stuck between a rock and a hard place. It's our multilayered ability to heart- and thoughtfully reflect, to align to the best of our ability, that clears the best way forward.

289.

Why is seeing ourselves in each other mirrored by holding ourselves and each other accountable? Because free wills privilege and responsibility go hand in hand, and most importantly, because we recognize the truth that is our dignified ability to thoughtfully and heartfully wield free will. Can our field be tilted, yes, that's why spreading truth and standing on the big five is crucial, because it changes the landscape that we all walk in. That's why there is one room for accountability before, and another after the implementation of the big five.

Inställning is so powerful, we take it for granted, it's like we are not quite aware how amazing it is, our ability to reflect and direct our free willed experience. Right now, think of something, and change your perspective, do it now. Use your inställning to truthfully see another perspective, you can do it quite instantly. And not only that, you can reflect deeper, change your vantagepoint entirely, see from the perspective of another human being, see how everything from your perception of yourself and how you relate to the world around you could have been so different depending on where and when you were born. And think of your specific first x, change something that constitutes your material makeup, how would you have viewed yourself if a small change was made?

290.

We do wise in maximizing the exposure of our true inställning, our free will, our emotionally and thoughtfully reflective free will, and question/reflect upon the effect of our preconditions.

Now, we can behave in whatever way we want, we have different personalities, we can indulge, give passway and run with whatever inclinations/emotions we want, yes, but we do wise in being aware of it, enjoy it, but don't drown in it, stand above, keep the birds eye view, maintain perspective. Always stand on the big five, it's the elevation of free will that elevates all of us, live free and let life be free.

We will disagree on how the big five is best upheld, I think it will mainly be regarding matters where free will cannot be unequivocally expressed. In this, like in all cases, we risk extremes. The risk is not god given, the risk is not to think, to navigate in extreme waters. The only way to bridge differences is to let reflective arguments clash, to have truthful, mindful and heartfelt conversations, to chisel out what should be the standard, finding common ground and build from there, one brick at a time.

It's hard to appreciate the way we conduct the public conversation now; it's driven by pushing selective interests/agendas, without recognizing all factors at play, seeing the whole spectrum. What's the issue here, let go of your ego, go to the fundamentals, and build from there, lay out the parts that makes up the fundamental clarity, one after the other. We need to vitalize our dignified conversation. The sum of free will decide what should be humanity's constitution, and the sum of free will decide how it's best upheld. We can agree on universal standards; you and I cannot live in peace here if we know that free will is violated there.

291.

Our inställning can make bad decisions, we can tilt to the extreme instead of the common ground, but I wonder how much it's the free inställning and not the unquestioned inclinations that leads us astray when addressing different issues/questions. Is it the case that there are correct answers/courses of action, that high free will with untainted inställning intuitively can agree upon, that it's not even a source of tension? I'm doubtful, but what I do know is that this experience of ours don't even scratch the infinitely deep surface of what experience can be, just imagine. I think our instances of extreme or brutish positions stems from two things, the first is that this world is hard, corrupt, hostile to free will, we must make compromises, accept that even good decisions can have some bad in them, or rather that perfect decisions are hard to come by in an imperfect world. The second is thoughtlessly giving into inclinations before we have grounded ourselves. I think it's primarily part of the crude I that can lead us astray, not the chosen I. I think we can have a well-articulated stance, but that stems from a crude and unquestioned inclination, that's why we do wise in truthfully question ourselves, let go of our ego, honestly reflect on the plethora of perspectives, see the whole spectrum, recognize all its parts.

We seem to have intertwined "layers". One way to frame it is to say that the totality of our unquestioned genetic preconditions and cultural inclinations, constitutes our crude I. What we call the gut feeling or conscience is the core attribute of free will to by nature strive towards upholding the golden rule. And the inställning is the reflective, emotionally and thoughtfully grounded reasoning of how to best steer our will.

292.

We seemingly desire validation, to stand out, a small portion of us don't want to stand out at all, but I would argue that most of us do, in different constellations. I think it stems from our social nature but in a way, it's kind of brutish. It's like we are not sufficient in ourselves, like we don't truly know ourselves if we never interact with others. Many of the things we put on a pedestal evolves around validation from others. Even those who seek honour, glory or to be remembered by history, essentially seek others praise and validation, it's an inclination that has been equated to power, and therefore survival, but it feels weak, of not being sufficient, not at peace with oneself.

It's not just validation, but a sense of continuation, of not being forgotten, it's based on our flawed understanding of our existence, of the perceived finality of death. I think it's wise to ponder where our pursuits stem from, what we really want in life and why.

Validation can be a beautiful thing, leaving pieces of one's puzzle in the hands of another, that their presence makes us feel complete, isn't that love. To be recognized, seen, appreciated, liked, loved. We want to know that we are on the right track, if what we do are validated, recognized, by our fellow members in humanity, isn't that a good thing? It comes down to our intention, why we seek validation and how that makes us feel, what emotion it evokes in us. Only we know what our intentions are, what counts is our actions, we do wise in aligning our intentions with our actions.

Intentions are secondary, actions are primary, intentions affects you, actions affects others, intentions is only known by you, actions affect others. As long as our actions are in line with the big five, we are a force for good, regardless of intentions. Now, do you feel good and grounded, that's for you to reflect upon, to ground your intentions in truth and sincerity, to feel aligned.

293.

Thinking/pondering freely is like being in a maze that is dark, when you have a thought, an avenue/corridor is lit up, and you have to actively go in and explore. There are many routs and offshoots, there really is no end to the maze, some avenues are more central in the sense that the offshoots are more of detailed nature that does not disprove the above layer. I have a feeling that I'm venturing too deep in the detailed lanes, and it's my que to come to an end. I know that I've inevitable entangled myself here and there, if you find truth accept it, if you find flaws please correct me.

I love to think freely and ponder, to question every assumption. I don't like experimenting with material things, it's limited and tedious. But with thoughts, it's liberating, fun, and instantly rewarding, I truly love it. I've been searching for the unshakable truth for as long as I can remember, to feel the solid foundation of truth under me. When I realized existence, I started to take walks, preferably surrounded by greenery, talk out my thoughts loud and explore the paths that opens up, record my own conversation. Then listen to the recording, new thoughts emerge, write them down, rephrase and refine. New line of thought emerges, write down, take walks, ponder freely and refine again.

Thoughts and ideas can be so flimsy, you connect two dots and if you don't immediately grasp and capitalize on them, they can disappear, leaving you in a confusing haze, that's why it helps to record them, then refine it as you write it down. Then distance yourself from them, reflect, and come back. The whole process has been a pure joy, sometimes very frustrating, even excruciating, when trying to clear up a knot or pondering at a crossroad, but as a whole, one of the true pleasures of this life.

How much can a book be changed and refined? At some point I have to be satisfied, I feel that time is of essence, I feel a sense of urgency to get this out there. I can't work on it indefinitely, I want to and keep finding room for improvement, but it has to come to an end. I have poured out all my heart and mind in this book.

Only the truth is holy, the realization of existence and the sanctity of experience/free will is the truth. This book is nothing but my best attempt to uncover it.

294.

I sometimes wonder, who am I, who do I think I am, writing about all this, negative self-doubt seep in and I can hear myself putting myself down and belittling myself, even ridiculing myself, who do you think you are. I am no one, I don't matter, all that matters is that I do my best with truthful intentions, how can that be a bad thing, even if we fail, how can it be a bad thing to truthfully try? It can never be. To truthfully explore/present truth to the best of our abilities, is the privilege and responsibility of every member of humanity. Why do I write this, because free will recognize truth, there is no truth to be had other than the one free will uncover, if you find truth, accept it, if you find flaws, please correct me.

Doubt is one of our companions, and frankly one which company I thoroughly enjoy. The way to benefit from doubt is striving towards being truthful towards yourself and others. Doubt is like most (all) other emotions basically a neutral, it's not an inherently negative or positive direction, it's how you let it impact you that makes all the difference; it's within your inställning to choose how that inclination/emotion affects you. When the feeling of fear washes over us, we can freeze and cower away - or we can rise up. Doubt is our key of always challenging our own and other's thoughts, of seeing other perspectives, of being humble and keeping an open mind.

295.

What is truth? Something is true/the best course of action, why? The answer is a spectrum, each factual statement/argument constitutes a part of the spectrum that builds that truth, if we don't take the whole spectrum into consideration, we don't have the whole truth. Maybe a certain part of the spectrum will fade in the direction we choose, but it's all the same a part, and the more parts we uncover, the better decisions we will make. Some parts of the spectrum are more central to the answer than others, but that can vary depending on how significant that part is from our perspective, and we have to keep in mind that it's our own calibration that can be of. Sometimes the facts that make up the spectrum is clearcut, but often we can only get a clear understanding of the spectrum by finding common ground with other free will. Free will recognizes truth, it's our defining character, there is no truth to be recognized in the absence of free will.

Now, the quest to find truth can be tricky, that's a challenge in this world, it sure puts our intentions and actions to the test. Our ability to find common ground, standing on truth together and build from there. We want to stand on truth - just imagine the revolutions of mind we have gone through, the ideals and traditions we have questioned and the paradigms we have shifted. In a way, we have an old mentality, because there is much from our past that is true, and we constantly build on it.

Are there room for subjectivity in defining truth/the best course of action, yes, we recognize a factor, a part of the spectrum, and you say it means this, and I can say no change you inställning to this. We draw different conclusions of the fact, which one is right? The one that maximize good experience and free will. We can state a fact, but the question is, what's the best course of action, because it's not just truth, true for what, true for the best course of action to maximize free will and experience.

296.

What is it I'm afraid of. It really is about validation, what else could it be? I'm not afraid of, in fact I embrace rejection, disapproval and even condemnation – engage me with all your vigour. What I am afraid of is the book not being picked up/noticed. I feel an overwhelming, the whole structure, I know this is the truth. But why do I also feel, why do I put such value in that you also knowing? Because I want to be grounded in that it's the truth. The validation I seek, is if you find it true or not, and if you don't, why?

All of us have the responsibility and privilege, to the best of our abilities, truthfully present truth. In a world like ours truth can be hard to come by. It takes some archaeological digging, some sifting through thoughts, the arena is first and foremost in your mentality, your own presumptions, your own perspectives and unquestioned/unaware inclinations. You have to question/talk with yourself, why do I find this to be true, could it be in any other way?

297.

The best notion of us, is when our inclination, conscience and inställning are aligned. It's bothersome that it's a struggle, but maybe there is some pleasure even in walking uphill, this world sure puts us to the test, not always a fair test, but we only partake if we want and it won't be better than what we make of it. Our conscience is our core guide, to question yourself even "if you get away with something", the only validation that truly matters for us is your own, stand on truth, be sincere/genuine, and you will feel good towards yourself and others. How do free will recognize truth? Free will is the only thing that can recognize truth! The only truth to be had emanates from free will. In the absence of any experience, it might just as well not exist, infinite existence is utterly meaningless without us. The glorious tools we have at our disposal to objectively verify truth, are yours and all others ability for heart and thoughtful reflection.

What about right or wrong? I think the justification for brutish acts comes from dogmatic adherence to bad ideas combined with giving leeway to the worst notion of our inclinations, and with inställning try to convince your conscience that it's the right course of action, it's a self-deception bound to create an inner conflict. So how do we know, beyond a shadow of a doubt, what's right and wrong? What is the objective truth that we can mirror our intentions and actions against - and always get the right answer back? As clear as day, the pillar of truth is the sanctity of experience/free will manifested in the golden rule.

All our parts/substrates – inclinations, conscience and inställning - are tools of interaction, of experience. It's an interplay at all substrates, we can view the effect singularly, but the whole picture emerges from the interaction of all four. Something can be a genetic inclination, framed in cultural connotations, smashing against the moral wall of our conscience (pass either with ease, difficulty or not at all), heart- and thoughtfully reflected upon, and then landed. It's possible for the tinder to emerge from all four, sparking a fire in the others.

298.

A civilization of laws, is that the best? I think it's better to be a civilization of culture. What's the best culture, one that recognizes and stands on truth. The one meaningful truth, the throne of truth - is the sanctity of free will. A civilization, where every individual free will have the freedom/possibility to pursue our best experience, what could be better than that?

Enhance your light, never diminish others. The only way you can feel truly good is if you are good with truth. It's then not a self-derogatory sense of pride and ego, but fulfillment, then you can even dip in pride or whatever emotional expression you want, enjoy it without drowning. We know that this world is hard, but it won't be better than what we make of it, and maybe the struggle itself is not void of beauty. How can one be truly noble if the abyss of ignobility isn't possible?

299.

We are independent but codependent, we are individual free will who enjoy living close to each other, we like to interact with each other, build unions, families, friendships, communities, cities, civilisations. We recognize and strive for shared rules of our interactions, implicit and explicit. As soon as we come together more than one, we can have a minority, you don't always get your way in the union, family, community, city or civilization.

We have done and achieved so much. To build humanity's constitution for the house of humanity, is by no means a greater achievement than what our ancestors have built before. The paradigms we have shifted, the dignified treaties we have established, the ideas we have explored. The society we have today is even with its flaws a wonder of the good in us, we have so many needless hinders and uncertainty, still we rise up to our own humanity.

Look how we uphold the big five today, I mean someone could complain about the education system, but just that we do that, that we in every corner of the world recognize the value of accessing knowledge, and the universal indignation we show when children are kept away from learning/education. We can complain about many flaws, but we constantly strive to uphold the big five.

300.

Those who uphold our golden rule, those who safeguard our rightful justice, those who value our access to knowledge, those who maintain our initial equality, those who cherish our tree of life. No matter who you are or what you believe, if you uphold the big five, you are noble.

You will die, this world will come to an end, what will revibrate in eternity is how you chose to live. It is never too late, everybody falls, the only things that is guaranteed, is that you can rise up to your inherent nobility, right here and right now.

301.

What a beautiful thing, free will – doing what is best because we actually think it is the best. Be the living author and not the passive ink. Free will is true agency. The answer is not any given thing, the answer is that which free will wants! Free will literally has the power to shape existence, we are the only ones who can. Existence has no meaning if not for us - what we choose, is existence. Do you understand the power. Existence is infinite, free will/experience is inevitable, how we choose to live, is not.

Existence is the first truth; experience is the one meaningful truth. What we do, is of paramount importance. There are a bunch of things that happen/exist regardless of what we do or not, and there are infinite things, the most important things, that only happen if we do and won't happen if we don't.

What is at the core of free will? It is the strive towards truth, greatest of all valuing free will, why, because you are a high free willed being. You see the sanctity in others by seeing the sanctity in yourself. That's why being truthful towards others is just as important as being truthful towards yourself. Let me just tell you something, everybody struggles, that's part of being a human. The risk of failure and the abyss lurking under us is what makes our life and achievements truly great.

What foundation unites all high free will, what is the best idea that higher free will lives by? As clear as day, the answer is the maximization of will. That you can, at any given point, have maximum liberty of experience. Free will want to be aware of and be able to wield free will - that's is why we navigate towards truth and the golden rule. The one meaningful truth is the dignity/maximization of free will, we know and have always known this, the question is, what's the best ideas and course of action for its implementation is in this world? The big five is on the table, put forth all ideas, reflect and discuss, come together and find common ground, we really ought to be able to agree on the universal core ideas that uphold the foundational truth of free will/experience, with consensus or at least with the grandest majority possible.

The trick is what the best course of action is for its implementation, how those ideas, let's say the big five, is best upheld. The answer is dignified and maximized free will; the question is how. We can find common solutions, with what majority, strive towards consensus or as broad a majority as possible, the more free will stands for something, the more legitimate it is. There are right/balanced answers, only limited by our willingness/ambition to explore/reflect, here it's hard, it's inherently challenging, the good ways are the ones free will agree upon, is it the best, you tell me. It will never be perfect, but it can be good enough. Good enough for what, for you to want to live and grow here, when you realize, you don't have to.

302.

The point is not the ideas we agree upon, the whole point is our freedom and enjoyment of experience, the ideas are just the background, the cultural bridge freeing each and all. The one and sole purpose of the idea is to maximize the freedom of free will, so you can enjoy your best life's journey. Here we are both independent and codependent, we have to agree on how to best maximize free will, it's not a natural feature of this world, our dignity will not be higher than what we bestow on ourselves.

What are truthful intentions? It is to seek truth for the sole purpose of freeing free will, because what else holds the key to our liberation, if not the truth? No ideology, creed, religion or philosophy worth their salt encourage enforcing a belief. To compel adherence is to degrade the very idea itself, you believe by your own heart and mind, and choose your own path.

None of humanity's expressions has been to intentionally evil, none has aimed to peddle falsehood/evil, both the "civilized" and "barbarians" of past harsher times sought rightful cause, both to defend good, what they perceived as truth or to do what we thought we had to do to survive. Most of all, uncertainty and false ideas has led us astray. Why are we glorious, because we never falter in trying to rise above, to inherently rise to the high values of free will, we are drawn to truth as a flower turns to the sun. We sure have had hard soil and many things casting shadow on us. Still, we rise.

What is the greatest truth of all, that free will/experience is sacred, lit in infinite manifestations. Why are you glorious? The truth is this, you are inherently noble. You're the curiosity of free will striving to rise above. Realize that you are free. Be happy, there is no other point to any of it. You do not owe existence one singular breath; existence owes you infinity.

303.

Let's think for a second about the different societies we can create. Say for example that some want a community based on... it really doesn't matter. Can I say what I think anyway, yes you can but it really doesn't matter. Maybe we can talk and find agreements regarding why some expressions/ideas are better than others. When we uphold the dignity and maximization of free will, there are however no wrong expressions/ideas.

To be human is to be humane, to carry sympathy and true agency. Our notions of humanity itself carries an appeal to sacred privilege and responsibility of moral clarity across cultures and languages. What I find both heart shattering and beautiful, is that our humanity shines though, despite the harsh, unforgiving and uncertain world that rooted our tree of life.

304.

I've reached the final stage of this book. If nothing I've said is true, the realization of existence is the foundation of all truth. If nothing I've said have meaning, the sanctity of free will is the foundation of all meaning. The purpose of this book, the core message, is the realization of existence and the elevation of free will that follows from it. The big five is my attempt to give flesh to the idea, but it's the soul in the idea that's important, the sacred dignity of free will. This book is nothing but my best attempt to contribute to humanity dignified conversation.

How should we proceed. How many years do you want to give this world when you know that all worlds are possible? How should this world be for you to want to live and bring new life to it? A world where we uphold humanity's constitution, a constitution of high free will, the big five is proposed, let's truthfully discuss it and all other ideas, and then we have our vote. What ideas should be our guide and the foundation of humanity's civilization, what should be our existential constitution? You and I cannot live in peace here if we know that free will is violated over there. We need universal standards on which all societies that form our civilization rest upon.

We have throughout history formed different aspects of this idea, from god given rights, self-evident truths and universal human rights – the purpose of all of them, even if not clearly stated, is the maximization of free will, because we realize the sanctity of experience/free will. Have faith in our humanity. We need a thought-and heartfelt conversation, let out all ideas in the light. Then put it to vote. Each and every fellow member of humanity who choose to partake in this world can cast a vote, all votes matter equally, why, because we are equal free will. We do wise in striving towards consensus or an overwhelmingly qualified majority, why, because it would be beneath us not to.

305.

We will all agree that the aim is that which best uphold the dignity/maximization of experience/free will. We can have different directions, but that is the true goal that uplifts and unites us all. One can argue that we should not have initial equality, or access to knowledge, or any of the big five, but it has to be that whatever you are arguing for, you sincerely think and feel is the best way to uphold the dignity/maximization of free will, that it is the world you would have wanted to come to. Never argue against better judgment, it will eat us from the inside, we fool no one but ourselves. You know your own intentions. Stand tall with sincere intentions.

No matter how, where, with whom, and with what rules you choose to experience this life. The big five is our universal constitution that embraces all of humanity, the bridge that lift us all. We build the world that's the sum of our free will. The question that inevitably will be answered is what the sum of our free will is in this world, our actions will reflect our character.

Your idea of how to dignify our free will is as good as mine, what we need is to revitalize our dignified conversation, this is an attempt to contribute to that.

306.

Live in accordance with whatever philosophy, creed, religion, idea, unity or community you want, explore new ones. Do you understand, there is no good/right or bad/wrong expressions or societies, the one and only distinction is if free will is infringed or not. All is possible when we stand on our inherent uniting truth, the sanctity/dignity of free will. Do you see, there is no one utopia, there are as many utopias as free will wants. There is no right answer, you are the right answer!

The big five is a condensation of our long-standing ideas of how to dignify free will. How to uphold humanity's constitution is the one thing we establish universally, why, because it is the bridge that lifts us all, that enable all of us to freely seek our own happiness. Leave as much as possible to individuals and communities of free will, the less universal regulations, the better. Have broad regulations, you are only responsible for the expressions of your own free will. The balance for humanity's constitution is struck when it's as short/encompassing as it can be, all of us can't think it's the best, but all of us can think it's good enough, for what, for us wanting to bestow and contribute our experience/free will here. The big five is the floor we don't go under, there is no ceiling we can't go beyond and above.

Do not overregulate! Do not become zealots. Better with less regulation than more regulation, why, because the one and whole purpose is to maximize free will for the individual free will. If you "underregulate" there is still a high free will, there is an inherent individual check/lean towards the golden rule. But if you overregulate, it can cause a needless burden. Our garden becomes beautiful when every flower can bloom. Strive to be a civilization of culture and values, not laws. Laws are sometimes a necessity; it's not the goal. The best governance is the one least seen. The whole point of any life and world is to live your best life, not to dictate how a best life should be. To uphold our constitution is a service, that is long recognized.

Everything is about enjoying our experience, feel the wings of infinity under your wings - you owe existence anything, existence owes you, everything. If you choose to experience this world, it can be and won't be better than what you make of it. Tread lightly, be uplifted, know that we can't even imagine the god experiences that waits behind the infinite horizon. Existence is the never-ending frontier, with infinite imaginable and unimaginable worlds and lives behind the curtain. When you live, live freely.

307.

Will I ever feel finished with this book, no, but I have to plant my word, this is how far I could take it now. I hope that you plant your word higher than mine, that your word rings truer than mine. I present this with humility over my shortcomings and anger over the ignorance that has blocked our life for far too long.

What's revered is truth, sincerity and free will. Truth is the goal and free will is the only way to seek truth, sincerity is the path to truth.

You don't owe existence anything, existence owes you everything. Your pursuit of happiness, the infinite fates of your existence, the pen truly lies in your hands. Existence is inevitable, how we choose to live and experience is not.

308.

One part of me want to lay this book at your feet and then walk away, another part of me desperately wants to scream it out at the top of my lungs. Forgive me for taking too long and for diving too much into details.

309.

How should we live? If you want my advice, I would tell you to take life seriously, but don't take it too seriously. Have high expectations of existence. Love and enjoy your experience to the fullest, there is no other point to it all. Life and experience is infinite, you are free when you live because you want to, then all lives can become a version of your paradise. Always have the infinity of existence within your grasp - feel infinity, the endless horizons, new mornings. It gives us true perspective, it highlights the good, decrease the perceived bad, and helps us stand above.

The stakes are really not that high, we all expect better, we are able to find dignified common ground and stand on it. It's not about creating a perfect world or any notion of utopia, just a world good enough for us to want to live and grow here, when we realize, we don't have to.

310.

My dearest humanity. I love you. From the deepest chambers of my heart, I truly love you.

Let me end on a poetic note, we sure have that tradition.

*By the stars that ornaments our skies, and the drop in which all of them are contained, there are the two core truths to be attained; one that the infinite sea of existence is the true nature of reality, the other that experience is elevated — all purpose and meaning, by your free will mandated. Dearest humanity, dear seekers of truth, is it not high time to see the full potential of what we truly can be? May your will always soar free.*