

2. Belief is Reality and Paradise

Introduction

This piece of work will be in two parts. The first part will explain the main point, which is a theory of perception. The second part will extend the main point of the first essay and that is our emotions are illusion-based motivational tools. I will use this idea to paint a more objective picture of what we are as beings and offer a theory that interweaves perception with emotion.

I will be using a large number of analogies and have tried to use examples that paint a close a picture as possible to ideas I have. I will use familiar words to describe ideas and pinpoint what I mean specifically by making distinctions between these familiar words and the ideas I'm demonstrating. After making the distinction, I may use the more familiar word in my own way to ensure this piece of work sounds as grounded as possible.

Part 1: ROTOSCOPING

Belief is reality: a summary

One of the most important assertions in the main website is the fact that belief is reality and consequently reality should be described in two ways. We are all in universal reality but are restricted to experiencing our individual ones. Individual reality should copy universal reality as closely as possible. That is – I'm guessing – the plan. However, we have creative licence over what we're copying because universal reality is perceived through our senses and our senses are ultimately under our control.

I stumbled across this idea when I conceived the Baby Theory. I realised we have good and bad emotions only because we continue to use the Bad Function in the same way as we did when we were babies. I was firstly surprised by the apparent truth of this idea and secondly surprised by peoples' reluctance to accept the apparent truth.

That raised the question of how it was possible for people to have different beliefs about the same thing and because of that, be in different realities. I thought reality should just be one thing: the thing that is real. That question prompted the realisation that 'reality' should be described in two ways: universal and individual. This meant the word 'imagination' should also be described in two ways: actual and abstract.

'Abstract imagination' is what people usually now refer to as 'imagination'. When you picture something in your mind's eye, remember something or visualise something that may or may not take place in the future, you're using your abstract imagination.

'Actual imagination' is a more accurate phrase for saying 'reality'. All of our senses input data that is used to help mould creations in our mind, which become external objects or internal ideas. These are ultimately subjective projections but they are what we refer to as reality. When we believe something we've obtained enough evidence to allow our actual imagination to make this belief the truth, therefore concrete. We believe it because we think it's the more sensible thing to believe out

of all known options. Reality is a word summed up by the saying it's nothing more than 'best guess' actual imagination.

When the actual and abstract imaginations are acknowledged and separated, the proactive part we play in the creation of our reality is highlighted.

An illustration of how we perceive

There's an animation technique called rotoscoping. This process involves tracing over frames of live action so that the resultant drawn images have a realistically fluid look.

This is a very fitting analogy of how we recreate the truth. The live action film is universal reality and the traced over cartoon is individual reality. We 'see' the film with our senses and use our actual imaginations to make the cartoon. We can never know anything for certain because we never actually see the film itself, we only see the cartoon that is the already rotoscoped product. The all-inclusive circular process involved ensures we are only ever going to see our sensory impressions of the world and not the world itself. This should be enough, there are usually valid reasons to have sensory impressions but sensory impressions can be misled due to biases or misinformation. This has led to abstract things being made concrete as if they were concrete universally.

More simply put, we are in charge of how the cartoon looks and also in charge of how the film seems to be. This means we can never have a truly objective view but our views can be a lot less subjective.

There are a lot of sayings that highlight the ultimately subjective nature of our experience. One of them is 'Beauty is in the eye of the beholder.' That saying is true because everything is in the eye of the beholder or the pencil of the rotoscoper. This relates to any input from any of our senses since we perceive something, apply meaning to it by matching it to our existing records, project it outwards and then re-perceive the projection. Something is regarded beautiful because it triggers the internally held attributes of beauty. It's the same for any state and any description. All the states and all the symbols that can trigger that state are internally regulated because they're attributes of our actual imagination.

The 'now' game

The rotoscoping process is a perpetual one. I'm sure a lot of people when they were younger noticed 'now' is in some ways is always out of reach because you'd try to single one out and before you had started properly it had already passed. In the first essay, I said I believed things were not as universally important as we thought they were. A lot of things shouldn't matter as much simply because they instantly become the past. Instead of disregarding basic decency or continually making the same mistakes, we are governed by processes that ensure we try to make the most of this ever-escaping now. The ever-growing past is a vital tool in the speed/effectiveness of that.

The retroscope

This is the label I've given to what we've already rotoscoped. It is the source or store of associations that amongst other things, give meaning to the symbols currently being processed. The closest word to this is 'memory' but retroscope

means more than the conventional definition of memory in the same way rotoscoping means more than the conventional definition of perception.

The presence of the retroscope outweighs everything it contains. It can only be positive and purposeful. Since perception is a constant process, the retroscope is constantly growing in content and practicality or usefulness.

Older events have a massive impact on how new events are experienced. How and what we currently perceive depends on what we've previously perceived as well as 'mood' we are in. 'Memory' is more frequently used to talk about lots of usually isolated specific things and the retroscope always refers to the entire collection of past events, therefore everything at once. I used to liken memory to a box that new events were slotted into. Without taking the other senses into account, the retroscope is more similar to a picture that is continually being improved upon and expanded, either by extending the boundary or adding details to the contents within the existing boundary.

We could experience sensory overload at the smallest fraction of one part of the retroscope so experiencing the whole thing as a collection of individual things in one go would be too overwhelming and impractical. To avoid this, we experience the more important parts of it and that affects our view of the whole thing and the 'now'.

Base retroscopes

These are parts of the retroscope deemed more important than others so are used as contextual bases. It can be anything from the past that creates a basis for experience and gives reason for you to feel and react in one way rather than another in the present. If we go back to the animation analogy, a base retroscope would be part of the background that a symbol has been superimposed over. Some people use language in a way that illustrates some of their base retroscopes. For example, after hearing the phrase 'sunny disposition', it could be easily imagined that the person in question has a sun somewhere in their mental picture that helps them maintain a cheerful outlook.

The closest words to describe the bigger or more important base retroscopes are 'beliefs' and 'principles' amongst other similar words. All religions and superstitious ideas are examples of the installation of base retroscopes that to a certain extent people have chosen to live their lives by. Phobias and other beliefs about ability are also examples of base retroscopes that impact on everyday experiences. The Popular Misconceptions part of the first essay show commonly held but erroneous base retroscopes about bad emotions, such as you need bad to know good and bad emotions are a tolerable side effect of being human etc.

Hierarchy

Anything in the retroscope we have an 'important' association with can be considered a base retroscope but we assign varying degrees of importance to them. One of the obvious reasons for this is to avoid making potentially costly mistakes like wondering what we're going to have for dinner whilst crossing a busy road. The following are examples of some of the labels and summaries of base retroscopes I have tried to install to maintain a more sensible perspective.

Rotoscoping – The process is much more important than the current event. When I first came across the idea, I immediately realised rotoscoping at all far out-prioritises the specific thing we are rotoscoping. This is very similar to the notion that the presence of the retroscope outweighs the contents. With this perspective, I realised I should be in a good mood that I perceive regardless of what I perceive. Subjectively this is the most important thing in our experience because for us it's the basis for everything: we even rotoscope existence. If we don't rotoscope something, even if it exists for everybody else (because they are rotoscoping it) it won't exist for us.

The retroscope – The constantly growing, infinitely applicable data/association base. The retroscope is the collective name for everything you've ever experienced. Events at the time usually come in a pre-packaged view/emotional response but objectively they are neutral. We can choose to focus on a specific event but if we are in some way acknowledging the presence of everything at the same time, that specific event should not have hold over us one way or another at the exclusion of everything else.

Existence – If things were put in objective hierarchical order, this would be at the top because without this, nothing else would be possible.

Equilibrium – This is the state that most of us are in most of the time. It's the original state of perfection, which is a state we tried to improve upon as babies when we started to have desires. The pursuit of desire seemed to become the priority and led to the continual ignoring of the previously perfect state. I try to look past the illusion of good and bad feelings and see that being in equilibrium is my original and most worthwhile goal.

Luck – Looking at the big picture, the odds of us existing to experience anything is small. If there was anything different in the past of your mother or father, there's a strong chance you would not have been born. If there was anything different in the past of their mothers and fathers, there's a strong chance they would not have been born. This goes right back to the beginning of time. We could be a lot more appreciative if we focussed on that. The 'objective luck' idea is something we are not taught so it's not a part of our experience. We have to acknowledge it because if we don't rotoscope something, it doesn't exist to us.

Bad Function – Using our chemicals in the manner we do indicates we're pleasure-orientated. Bad sensations are purely a side effect of the desire actualisation process. The only bad thing about our experience is this process. Thinking about counter concepts can diminish bad feelings when they come up and the best counter concept is becoming aware of the general process. This idea highlights the illusionary aspect of bad emotions and makes it clear that it is the only reason we are able to sometimes view things as negative.

Death – This can happen at anytime and there's a strong chance that this is a state of nothingness that will last forever. Instead of taking a morbid stance in the face of this likelihood, we can use it to appreciate this moment even more.

Experience – The fact that I'm experiencing anything is more important than any of the things I may experience.

Education/adaptation to the environment – This has to be an important feature of experience because it's something that all of us do naturally. The amended Bad

Function is probably the first base retroscope we installed when we were newborns. We noticed a pattern and made a plan to use that pattern to our advantage and secure better chemicals.

Awareness with rationality and open-mindedness – Since we acknowledge belief is reality, we should erect a framework to minimise the possibility of making things concrete that are abstract. We should try to ensure that instead of being biased, we are open-minded and try to create the most sensible reality we can, taking everything into account.

I've consciously assigned importance to these so ideally they should have priority over other things during the rotoscoping process. My first tattoos were an attempt to install some of these and other similar ideas. My newest tattoos are shortcuts to refined old theories and newer theories. I got both sets so I would be reminded about the above ideas as often as possible so that they became permanent features of my experience as opposed to ideas to merely grope for.

What do you find most important? There's a strong chance that these things are so important to you that they should be constant features of your experience but unfortunately they will often be forgotten in favour of the current symbol/concept.

Base chemicals

Base chemicals are sensations derived from base retrosopes. My first essay outlined the idea that whatever else we're presently feeling should be felt on top of the euphoric feeling that is there at all times. If euphoria was based on existence or awareness, it stands to reason that euphoria would be ever-present.

People perceive in a way that makes them feel either good or bad based on their view of what's going on presently. This means they perceive in an inhibiting way, i.e. they're excluding everything other than the current symbol and associated concept. This means if the present symbol is a good one they will feel good and vice versa for bad because that's apparently the only thing to base current emotions on. If someone doesn't perceive in this exclusive or inhibiting way, they would be more easily able to focus on bigger ideas whilst the present smaller symbol was in mind. This symbol, whatever it was, would not have that much of an impact considered within context of the bigger idea.

I've already used an example of a person winning a lottery to show this. Some people would feel elated at the news but this elation could be tempered if they were told they were not able to cash it immediately or if they had to go to a certain shop to cash it as that might cause the news to be spread quicker than they wanted. Another more relatable example would be the fact that most people who work from Monday to Friday generally feel better come Friday – that now renowned Friday feeling. Another example is an arachnaphobic person feeling fear at the sight of a spider.

The closest existing word or idea to actual base chemicals is 'mood' but the word mood implies a certain level of passivity. Mood also implies a temporary state induced by something external rather than internal. If we had better control over the 'mood' influencers, we could choose to always be in a good mood. We would also be able to undergo any experience or perform any task because we know we are going to enjoy at least a certain level of enjoyment no matter what else is

happening. This is the equivalent of constantly being on a narcotic substance. Narcotic substances are used as substitutes for base chemicals.

If we focused on certain base retrospectives or made an effort to associate them to our 'now', they would eventually become a permanent feature. Permanence would depend on how and how often we focused on them. If we installed the fact that we are [autonomous chemists] we would quickly find it difficult to become bored because we would be aware that all of our chemicals are under our control at all times because of internal processes. We would see through the illusion of needing 'external' stimuli to trigger chemicals.

The young artist starting out

A child's view of the world falls significantly short of what's there because of their tools of perception and experience. We could say that they're using crayons to draw their world so it's vastly unrepresentative of a world that would be more comprehensively illustrated in a lot more detail by fine-tipped pencils. A lot of adults are still using crayons instead of relying on what could be state-of-the-art drawing instruments. These instruments if used would be vastly superior to previous ones and these newer more superior tools could possibly be considered crayon-like in comparison to future ones. An example of this crude representation is the fact that people still use the terms 'black' and 'white' when describing complexion. This is being rotoscoped by the majority of people so it's easy to fit that into the plan instead of using words that are more accurate.

Children should be taught that not only are they choosing to have certain emotions for certain reasons, those emotions are based on worlds that they are in fact creating. Therefore, children as early as possible should be taught that they have overall authority over their world. We don't believe things because they are true – things are true because we believe them. When the extent of this is understood, the chances of creating a world that's more sensible would be significantly increased because we're not going to be as easily misled.

Another way children are treated unideally in terms of the acquisition of consistent and sensible belief systems is the tradition where people routinely 'lie' to their children. This is done partly by telling stories and instilling belief in imaginary characters like Santa Claus and other traditional figures. Some people say that it's nice that children have this naïveté so are able to believe in things that are false because of the good feelings they could get but the apparent truth would be a more reliable and sensible foundation for good feelings. This apparent truth is better than any story we've conceived so far. We would always feel much better thinking about those possibilities. For adults, the general truth I'm presenting seems almost impossible to believe and one thing responsible for this may be all the untrue things that are instead being made real and the contradictions these cause.

The way young people are brought up today is a direct consequence of the past – you can say our views on perception and reality is a legacy. How we act/perceive now will have just as significant an impact on the future.

Surrogate autonomy

We have absolute autonomy of our chemical allocation, enjoyment and subsequent behaviour. This is because we have absolute autonomy of the rotoscoping process.

We're in charge of the film and the cartoon so this means they can contain anything we want them to contain. We can recreate something that exists in universal reality with varying degrees of detail or accuracy. We can also create something that doesn't exist in universal reality and give this thing as much of a concrete appearance as if it was universally real. This is exemplified by the fact that so many people believe in so many different religions. Those religions are concrete to the individual, whether they're real or not. Some of these ideas are opposing so some people are definitely subscribing to false beliefs. Whether to recreate true beliefs or create false ones, individuals trust their autonomy to someone in authority and this authoritative figure has created a reality that individuals subscribe to. This is the same as a child believing what their parent tells them simply because it's their parent.

The general autonomy idea is demonstrated by stating if someone thinks anything to the contrary, that's what they're choosing to rotoscope because that's what they think the film contains. This is a self-proving argument much like the fact that belief is reality: if a person believes something else, that would be their reality and that would prove the original assertion.

Senses up/information down

There are two generally opposing schools of philosophical thought called empiricism and rationalism. Empiricism states you can only know your reality through direct experience, therefore through your senses and consequent reasoning. Rationalism states that you can use reason alone so would not have to directly experience things through your senses to know they are true.

This means the senses are being used in different ways. Empiricists use their senses as a foundation and build beliefs up from that. Rationalists start with beliefs and then use the senses to confirm or substantiate those beliefs. The 'information down'/rationalism idea needs a surrogate authority where someone somewhere down the line directly experienced the truth.

The good thing about this is that sensible concepts can get passed down and recreated so that we don't have to philosophise to get a basic understanding of reality and experience. The bad thing about this is that once something has been rotoscoped, the ideas, true or not, get set in concrete and it's sometimes near-impossible for the person to subsequently see something that may be more sensible. This is exemplified by focusing on one aspect of the 9/11 incident. One of the planes allegedly crashed into the Pentagon and this was the generally believed story until pictures were released of the crash site that didn't feature any plane wreckage. Some people who saw these pictures instantly disbelieved the story they were told because it no longer made sense. Other people continued to believe the story due to the sensory biases the 'information down' process involves.

I try to ensure I use only a 'senses up' approach as this should involve less biases. After doing this, it was easier to replace 'information down'-orientated facts that no longer seemed to be truthful. The resultant conclusions after replacing these facts seem irrational or hard to believe to me and others possibly only because they contradict the 'false' things that are currently or were previously believed.

Consistency

Let's outline what happens when someone believes in something such as a specific religion. They have a belief or a base retroscope from an authoritative source. The

rotoscoping process/actual imagination of the individual makes this a reality. This reality has an 'information down' foundation so their senses are appropriately biased to protect the world's integrity.

It is a process that is completely self-contained and supposedly objectively-led but since we're in ultimate control we could've sanctioned the creation of anything and that will be as real to us. For the belief to be amended, the relevant base retroscope would need to be updated. The rotoscoping process would be amended automatically (because evidence suggests the film is now different) and another reality would manifest through the actual imagination.

Creating/maintaining a perfect world

The existence of the Bad Function proves that one of the most important jobs our brains have is to right a 'wrongful' world. You could say that we as individuals are Paradise creators in as much as we hold a picture of how we think our worlds should be and try to create or recreate it in the best way we can. We believe the best thing we think we're able to believe. When there are perceived contraventions to this world, the Bad Function kicks in. This combines two of our most important processes but unfortunately the Bad Function has been misinterpreted and other things have been erroneously assigned to its presence. Along with this misinterpretation, a lot of people are unaware that they proactively create their reality and think they're passively experiencing what's there.

Working on the film

Others have said what this film contains but we have to be clear that we have made these things real, regardless of whether they're actually real. We need to tell ourselves what the film contains or we will continue reproducing other peoples' version of it. I found I was able to modify my own by the use of metaphors or visualisations.

Each brain has a preferential way of understanding new information. I used to think I was more verbal than visual so when I first saw my theories, I wrote down sentences and read these sentences many times as a way of taking them onboard. I then stumbled across the fact that if I imagined a short movie that symbolically showed the concepts, I would respond a lot quicker and positively. The saying 'A picture is worth a thousand words.' is true for a lot of people. It's definitely true for me. I've undergone two most major developments in my own acceptance of my theories and this only occurred after I visualised certain things in a certain way even though I told myself the underlying concept years ago.

One thing I'm convinced about, which I state below in my 'blank pages' reference, is the real film is objectively much better than anything we can describe. The best we could do is much better than we're doing now but that best will probably always fall far short of universal reality unless a few key things are taken into account.

Making 'improvements' to the perfect world

Based on what we think we know, we've unknowingly already created the 'perfect' world and strive to maintain it every moment. The accompaniment to that is the perfect vehicle to move around and interact with it...

Part II: THE ANATOMY OF THE ROTOSCOOPER

The host/Suit connection

The following analogies revolve around the idea that we as human beings are hosts to and are part of the organism. I've tried to describe the organism in a variety of ways since I first came across the general idea but my current one is the most comprehensive. The nature of the organism makes it fairly tricky to describe but let's say this organism, as simply as possible, is made up of two main parts, a host and a Suit.

The host can be analogised with concepts such as spirit, soul and mind and we can say there are two distinguishable parts to it. There's the 'natural' part, which mainly runs natural processes and the 'programmed' part, which is the product of the collection of personal base retrosopes. When talking about myself, I can say there's the Byron (programmed) part and the non-Byron (natural) part. When growing up, the natural part of me started to build base retrosopes that related directly to my identity and contained beliefs about myself including what I was called. To distinguish further, I can say it was the natural part that amended the Bad Function as that occurred long before ideas about identity and limitations were installed. This distinction might seem convoluted to some people but it's the best way to distinguish between the part of the host that causes the illusion in the amended Bad Function and the part that continues to fall for the created illusion.

Some people refer to the natural and programmed parts of the host as the subconscious and the ego respectively. I have a slightly different view of the subconscious as I think it helps explain one of the points in the next essay when I go into more detail about the Suit's place in HEAVEN.

The organism's place in Paradise

The host inhabits the Suit and is inextricably patched into the inbuilt computer that controls and regulates it. The Suit enables the host to move around and interact with the environment. This includes improving upon an ideal environment or adapting to make the most of an unideal one.

There is a symbiotic relationship between the host and the Suit. By symbiotic I mean a relationship that is mutually beneficial and dependent for both parts. Just as the host part of me – including the part that has adopted certain programs or routines – has to ensure my needs are met, i.e. I get adequate sleep and sustenance, the Suit part of me tries to ensure the host's desires are met. The Suit is the perfect machine to enable the organism to firstly meet its needs and then satisfy its desires on the planet.

There is also a symbiotic relationship between organisms and the planet. This symbiotic relationship is better exemplified by the way that other animals interact as it can be argued that as a whole, the human species seems to have a more harmful influence than a helpful one on the biosphere. If we had a better understanding of how we worked we would operate on our environment in a less selfish and more biosphere-friendly way.

Young organisms

...are blank canvasses when they're born. Hosts don't have an understanding of their environment and capabilities until they are taught. They do whatever comes to mind after mimicking organisms around them and they behave in any way their Suits and other organisms allow. It's up to others to guide young people to make the most of their experience but this is done without taking core things into account. So instead of successfully guiding their behaviour towards purely positive ends we try to just curtail behaviour that impacts too negatively on other people. This works to various extents but there are lots of daily news stories that sensationally detail events where this has not worked. If we had a better understanding of a few basic things pertaining to our nature, guiding young people should be as easy as guiding ourselves.

If children as early as possible were taught that 1) they are in tune with rationality and 2) their emotions and behaviour are under their control, aberrant behaviour would be seen as irrational so any other option would be more attractive. Theoretically at least, they would more naturally choose to engage in the more rational actions.

User manuals

Religious texts and other documents that set rules or guidelines might as well be called user manuals for the organism and planet. Books on philosophy, psychology and some story books are also included to a lesser extent. I have difficulty taking any of them seriously in their entirety because they seem to fall far short of an objective view. All of the religiously based ones fail to take into account core things that affect all of us all of the time, such as belief being reality. I'd be more inclined to believe the user manual that clearly stated that belief was reality so we were able to make anything real but we should be making so-and-so real for so-and-so reasons. This and other glaring omissions make me think that these were clearly not written by the designer but by previous organisms, who failed to glean a more sensible understanding of what we are.

Due to the autonomous and subjective nature of rotoscoping process, religious user manuals contained ideas that have been made concrete with such negative impact, organisms have felt compelled to kill other organisms in the name of them.

All these written pieces of work are part of my informal user manual and an important feature would be the host/Suit connection. The host should learn how the Suit runs because that would mean the two parts would be in better alignment. Being in better alignment would enable us to operate as effectively as possible in any pursuit.

The after-lie

Another example that these user manuals may be falling far short of being objective is the idea of an after-life. Entry into the after-life usually depends on how well you have followed prescribed rules. A lot of these rules are common sense things that people should be following anyway. The fact that some people are not naturally following them makes it more likely these rules were made up for behaviour modification and not entry to an after-life that may or may not exist.

We act in certain ways because of how we think we are going to feel. This is why sex is arguably our favourite past-time. We feel compelled by the illusionary and motivational aspects of emotions and want to feel the best way we can and arguably, sex feels the best. If we could secure better chemicals doing something else, that would be our favourite past-time. It's clear why sex does feel so good, as it ensures our continued existence no matter what else we're doing and what beliefs we hold. Nothing is going to change the fact we're chemically motivated and sex produces the 'best' chemicals. Sex is as vital to the 'perpetuation of the species' process as the Bad Function is vital to the 'survival in our initial stages' process.

Nobody for certain knows what happens after death. We at best just hold beliefs that we're convinced about. I'm not saying that I know an after-life doesn't exist. Like I said above I'm just aware that there's a strong chance that it doesn't and after death, the host merely ceases to exist. That's another reason for being more appreciative of life and making the most of it. Realising the actual imagination and Bad Function would be a good way of achieving that. Given a lot of peoples' behaviour is considered unsavoury by a lot of people, it's more likely stories about the after-life are spread to make the more negative aspects of our day-to-day dealings more palatable. If we had a comprehensive user manual, we would get a lot more out of our experience.

When I first stumbled across actual imagination and realised the choice we have in making things real, I wondered why people would choose to make the after-life real instead of the Bad Function. Realisation of the Bad Function comes with a string of immediate benefits that affect all areas of life. It's more sensible than other alternatives and can be verified by anyone at any moment if they analyse any 'bad' event. It seems to be true objectively but it is only true subjectively if you believe in it. Belief in an after-life relies on faith but would be true objectively whether you believe in it or not.

Looking back

I think to get a more accurate picture of the Suit and the host so ultimately the organism as a whole, we should wipe the slate clean in terms of beliefs and programs and restore to factory settings. We should then try to sensibly see the natural or un-programmed organism and use that as a foundation. Despite any beliefs to the contrary, the host's experience is governed by processes and programs that the Suit runs. If these were firstly acknowledged and then understood, our view of everything would be significantly affected.

We could call the naturally occurring routines processes. These include using the Bad Function, mimicking other organisms and creating our environment and then adapting to it. As well as running processes, we also adopt routines and we can call those programs. These can be run in the same way but since they are personal they may possibly only relate to the individual.

I started writing the first essay because I conceived an analogy (magician-trick) that enabled me to more clearly see the organism's processes and my personal programs for what they were instead of the obstacles I previously perceived them to be. Unbeknownst to me at the time, making those changes was a major development in achieving alignment after positively identifying and then appropriately responding to programs that possibly caused mis-alignment. The quickest route to alignment may simply be de-programming yourself so you revert to the natural state from the programmed one.

Wiping the slate

Since user manuals contain a variety of different ideas and all of these ideas are concrete to the individual, I'm of the conviction that a more sensible user manual could have blank pages. Due to the overall process, we are able to draw or write anything onto these pages with the power to make these things real, whatever they are. This has massive implications on everything we think we know.

As far as the host or organism's personality is concerned, you could say we are a sum of associations. Everything you know is either a taught or self-learned association. Some of these associations are true and helpful: bites hurt so should be avoided. Others are false and offensive: Peruvian people smell unusual. We should re-evaluate our associations and see if they're objectivity-based such as the former example or subjectivity-based like the latter. We will be unable to roto-scope the truth if we're biased to untrue base retrosopes.

In hindsight one of the reasons why I didn't make progress in terms of believing my theories more completely sooner was I didn't think I'd have to teach myself things anywhere near this important. When that realisation dawned upon me, I saw a lot of people were failing to take fundamental things into account when creating their realities – especially the fact that they were creating their realities in the first place. I also failed to take certain things into account and thought reciting truths in word form would be enough. I only recently realised the extent of the fact that 'non-roto-scoped' means 'non-existent' so was initially confused why I was failing to immediately recreate something sensible and replace the previous not as sensible preceding idea.

Programming

Programming can be carried out by the host or other organisms and can take two main forms, education (the inputting of data) or behaviour modification (the installation of mental or physical routines).

The Suit is versatile and usually, as long as the laws of physics are taken into account, it can do anything the host thinks. A host can train their Suit to do almost anything for any reason. Someone juggling four flaming chainsaws or a woman giving a ping pong show are extreme examples of this actuality. Examples of diversity or extremity of our behaviour are demonstrated all the time.

The writers and perpetuators of existing user manuals have been pivotal in shaping our view of what the organisms should do and how the Suits should operate. They have been responsible for the bigger base retrosopes that provide contexts for the way all symbols are interpreted therefore have been instrumental in shaping our view of reality.

Original functions of the Suit

As far as I can see, the two most significant of natural functions are creating a reality for the host and then maintaining a level of equilibrium within that reality. When external conditions are not ideal (the temperature is too extreme) or when the internal conditions are not ideal (an insufficient level of nutrition) chemicals are supplied that the host experiences and then communicates. This alerts other organisms, who can make changes so ideal conditions are restored and better chemicals are experienced. This program is run many times so its effectiveness is

tried and tested. When the maintenance of equilibrium wasn't as much of a priority, this method was slightly amended so that the Suit maintained a level of enjoyment under the guise of maintaining equilibrium.

The host adapting the original Bad Function in this way is probably the first base retroscope installation. It seems to be the most impactful because it's still responsible for the way we rotoscope now and as a result, things are usually regarded as 'good' or 'bad'. The host noticed the expression of natural bad feelings usually brought about speedy resolution so instructed the Suit to create chemicals to recreate fake bad feelings so desires would be speedily resolved in the same way as needs. This instruction became a frequently used program. The resultant illusion and associated behaviour that are created become compelling and over time, the host forgets the amendment was made. This means all we're left with is the illusion that we're dedicated to creating for the same original baby reason but now for a variety of different adult things.

The same thing happened when I became a stutterer as I was initially pretending. I then forgot I was pretending until the behaviour became one I felt unable to change.

If we saw the amended Bad Function for what it is, we would stop for the same reason as we started. We would de-program the Suit so the host could choose to do something more effective without current programs being an obstacle. If we had better memories or a better view of that event or part of the retroscope, the reasoning behind the moment we decided to instigate that plan would be clear to us. This program is not being realised. The irony is when the host is older the original feeling of imbalance doesn't usually feel too uncomfortable but the amended feeling – this fake imbalance – has caused people to become depressed or worse yet, commit suicide because of the extremity of the discomfort. This was all in the ultimate pursuit of pleasure.

Pleasure model #836Alpha

One thing I hope I've made clear is that one of the most primary objectives of the Suit is to actualise your desires. Since the rotoscoping process is a perpetual one, we have a constant stream of collective information that should always be enjoyable. The collective part is made up of the six constituent forms of input, which is the data received from the six senses (the five conventional senses and consciousness). Every sense helps to create that base enjoyable experience, i.e. everything you see should look beautiful, everything you think should be worthwhile, everything you hear should sound euphonious, everything you smell should be aromatic, etc. For example, you could be sitting on a chair watching TV and notice how nice the chair feels as you sit on it, whilst noticing how good objects look on the TV, whilst noticing how nice the room smells, etc.

If there's an interruption to enjoyment from any of the six channels at any time, for example if you suddenly smell something pungent, the Suit provides uncomfortable chemicals because in the past it was the expression of these uncomfortable chemicals that ensured the restoration of enjoyment at the intervention of another person. People disagree with this idea of chemical motivation/manipulation. They think either someone else makes you feel this uncomfortable chemical, which is impossible or this chemical is used so you act in one way rather than another, which is extremely unlikely. Although it is true that chemicals do regulate some peoples' behaviour for morality reasons, it is very unlikely that this is the original reason for chemical use.

Considering this constant six way stream sensibly, we could regard ourselves as the state-of-the-art in organic pleasure pursuit models. Other animals can also be considered models but a distinction between us is a greater capacity for self-awareness. We can appreciate our present tasks and also 'step out' of our experiences and start to achieve appreciation of the bigger picture.

Since our senses are ultimately under our control, we could de-program our Suits so that our senses once again recognised that all things seen/heard etc. could only be beautiful/euphonious etc. As well as doing that, we could be aware of the Bad Function at all times so even if those things weren't 'beautiful', they certainly would not be considered 'bad'. What would follow is a more general appreciation of everything due to the change of perspective on those uncomfortable chemicals or undesirable inputs.

I don't think it's a coincidence that some foods can taste as delicious as they do or the music or songs we like sound as good as they do. I also don't think it a coincidence that we find things physically attractive because we're living our lives based around all of these and other preferences. Everything was supposed to be enjoyable but we learnt to discern, which made some things more attractive than others. Soon those things that weren't as attractive became unlikeable because of the way we perceived. Everything would be pleasurable if we had a sensible look at our experience. This is with the exception of some things that are considered life-threatening.

Seeing the chemistry of pleasure

I became fascinated by the way neurotransmitters worked when I first learned. I tried to imagine synapses firing and chemicals being released and feeling those chemicals. These visualisations were fairly difficult to imagine vividly because of the intricacy involved and what helped was a visualisation of a simplification of the process. I began to imagine there were four small cylinders in our Suits. These contain blue chemicals that by default feel very pleasurable. The intensity of the sensation depends on the quantity of liquid. The type of pleasure experienced depends on how the liquids inside the cylinders are mixed with each other. When the Bad Function is initiated, a different colour liquid, say red for danger, is injected into one or more of the cylinders and this causes 'discomfort'.

To someone unaware or unaccepting of the Bad Function, this liquid works effectively so produces a compelling feeling of discomfort that usually triggers an automatic set of behaviours. However, if you saw the intent of the apparatus and how it worked, all of the chemicals could only feel good. You would be aware that due to your body's commitment to desire actualisation, you're continuing to undergo a once effective process and consequent program and part of the program is the very convincing illusion of being in discomfort.

This type of perspective is similar to the base chemicals idea. That idea relates to you feeling a certain way because of an idea that's present. This alludes to the possibility that we are able to feel a range of only good drugs no matter what happens and how we react to it. This includes drugs that used to feel bad. All of our chemicals are objectively good and purposeful. So-called bad chemicals are even better and can be more purposeful than the good ones because a more sensible view of them gives a clearer indication of what we are as organisms. Bearing this in mind, we should be able to easily see that only positivity exists as 'bad' or

'negativity' are created illusions. We feel 'bad' because of a specific response for a specific reason. If we focussed on this, our view of the 'good' or 'positivity' would change for the much better.

A level playing field

The Suit is the most 'valuable' thing a host can 'own' so all organisms can only be equal. Hosts often rotoscope the contrary belief and therefore make that their reality so behave as if it was true. I spoke to someone one day about my ideas and they said it sounded like I was trying to be superior. That surprised me because universal equality was one of my earliest ideas after the initial Baby Theory. A person can think they have less or more than others because of their attitude to the importance of peripheral things such as objects and/or social status.

Lack of equality could be more reasonably argued taking the senses or body parts into consideration. A blind person can be said to be less fortunate than someone who has perfect vision but in universal reality those two people are still equal at a more important level. They still have the same chemicals that would be triggered after certain perceptions had been made. Those chemicals are triggered internally for both people. Symbols may have an external basis but the internal processes are more important.

So-called technology

In the Western world we have a pre-occupation with technology. This is instead of realising how lucky the host is, how specialised the Suit is and consequently how gifted the organism is. People speak of the marvel that is the human body, i.e. referring to the intricacy of the circulatory system etc but those marvellous things still seem to pale in contemporary significance and abandoned in favour for things that have so-called practical value in terms of our enjoyment. I'm referring to things such as mobile phones, modes of transport or 'advancements' in personal computers.

If humans created organisms, judging by the things that we've created already, it would cost trillions of pounds and breakdown constantly, possibly even by design because the chances are someone would devise it for financial gain. Money has apparently been one of the biggest distracters of our perfect nature because of the good associations we have made to it. We can do anything we set our minds to so since money is an important thing, we are making it a priority to find different ways of getting it because these pursuits seem more worthwhile than others. This association will continue to be more attractive until we educate ourselves and realise that a pursuit of objectivity is infinitely more worthwhile because of the constantly growing number of rewards that are potentially involved.

Let's wrap it up

Reality is just best guess actual imagination. Our actual imaginations are not blindly led but are based on universal reality. This is similar to a more realistic type of animation technique called rotoscoping is based on live film footage.

We could've come to a general realisation we were rotoscoping thousands of years ago when the earliest philosophers tried to make it public that reality was subjective. The people who disbelieved this assertion proved it correct so it was irrefutable. Accepting this would have lead to a greater understanding of the powers

involved and how to use them or at least try to ensure other people didn't abuse them. The Bad Function should've been rotoscoped first because this has been the thing that has the greatest impact on how we view the world. We could've realised years ago that we were just pretending to feel bad when things don't go our way and what that meant, instead of basing actions and ideas on these 'bad' feelings.

Taking our governing processes into sensible consideration, this is undeniably HEAVEN with an iron-clad Paradise thrown in for good measure. Since people have misinterpreted our basic functions, *this* is what we've done to/with HEAVEN. If you strip away misinterpretations of these functions and the behaviour this causes, a neutral version of HEAVEN would be left. Since we're beings of creativity, we would have had an opportunity to improve upon this HEAVEN in individual ways and share those results with others. I'll paint a picture of what this HEAVEN may have been like in a future piece of work. Well from my programmed human being perspective I'll try to paint a sensible picture of that dimension and the agency that made it all happen.

How perfect and creative is the designer of this Suit? How generous is the parent of hosts? The only 'bad' thing about existence is that all of us have in-built desire actualisers. This designer/parent forced perfection onto all of us or gave us too much power/control but previous organisms didn't convey that fairly important fact. This means we were not taught about it so we were not given the option of rotoscoping it. Since it wasn't rotoscoped, it subjectively doesn't exist. It's time to address that.

Coming attractions

I'll go into much more detail about this in a future piece of work because it helps to explain my 'Not only is this HEAVEN, it's a much better HEAVEN than any of us could've imagined' theory. It extends points re-iterated above and highlights the fact that each Suit has an in-built genie lamp that tries to satisfy each of our needs and desires immediately. Rubbing the lamp used to work, now it just creates a feeling of 'discomfort'. We have come to negatively base our view of the world on the purpose and meaning of this discomfort. This is instead of seeing the sensation for the perfect Paradise-proof illusion it is. The next essay will make that clear.